UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 98—PART 7

JUNE 28, 1952, TO JULY 7, 1952
(PAGES 8395 TO 9806)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1952

J
11
.R
v.98
pt.7

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5-6-53

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid the din of words which assail our ears in an agitated world, grant us an inner calm, undisturbed by any outer commotion. Strengthen us with Thy might that the strain of these days may not break our spirits, and that no denials of human freedom may intimidate our souls. Even when the shining river of our dreams for a fairer earth seems to sink into the sands of futility, still may we labor on, serene and confident, knowing, while the weeping for hopes deferred may endure for a night, that the joy of Thy sure victory cometh in the morning. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 27, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BROOKS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. CLEMENTE, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. VAN ZANDT had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 4686. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7876) relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; and

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242).

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States of America be and is hereby requested to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution:

"'ARTICLE

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to levy and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 4. In the event that the United States shall be engaged in a war which creates a national emergency so grave as to necessitate such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by vote of three-fourths of each House may, while the United States is so engaged, suspend, for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each, such limitation with respect to income subsequently accruing or received.'"

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by Roselano Pagano, of Buffalo, N. Y., relating to the admission into the United States of undesirable people; ordered to lie on the table.

U. N. COVENANT OF HUMAN RIGHTS—RESOLUTION OF CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF WISCONSIN, SHEBOYGAN, WIS.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Department of Wisconsin, Catholic War Veterans, at Sheboygan, Wis., disapproving the ratification of the United Nations Covenant of Human Rights.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas in the past 175 years many thousands of young Americans have paid the supreme sacrifice to protect the American way of life; and

Whereas, during these many years, foreign isms and ideas have persisted in an attempt to change our way of life; and

Whereas there will be presented before the United States Senate in the very near future, a document known as the Covenant of Human Rights of the United Nations; and

Whereas if this Covenant of Human Rights is ratified by our Senate, it will supersede

the Constitution of the United States, thus tending to deny to Americans the many freedoms allowed in the United States under the Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Catholic War Veterans do all in their power to assist Senator John W. BRICKER of Ohio, in his attempt to prevent the ratification by the United States Senate of the U. N. Covenant of Human Rights: Be it further

Resolved, That we, the Catholic War Veterans of the Wisconsin Department, in convention assembled this 3d day of May 1952, in Sheboygan, Wis., go on record favoring bill S. 177 sponsored by Senator BRICKER, and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to our State senators, as well as to the National Department of the Catholic War Veterans, for action at the national convention in Baltimore, Md.

PRICE CONTROLS ON MILK AND MILK PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN MILK DEALERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the directors of the Wisconsin Milk Dealers Association who met on June 26 and unanimously urged the dropping of price controls on milk and its products.

I ask unanimous consent that this message, which was conveyed to me by Harry Klueter, executive secretary, be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON, WIS., *June, 27, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Directors Wisconsin Milk Association in session June 26 unanimously passed and asked that each Member of Congress from Wisconsin be sent a copy of the following resolution:

"The emergency making passage of price controls necessary as a party of NDPA has passed so far as dairy products are concerned: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That Wisconsin Members of Congress now in session be and are urged to support by their vote all bills and amendments which seek an end to price controls of milk and its products under OPS on June 30 or not later than July 1 this year."

Respectfully submitted.

WISCONSIN MILK DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
HARRY KLUETER, *Executive Secretary.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 169. Resolution creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests; with amendments (Rept. No. 1982).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 960. A bill to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1983); and

S. Res. 74. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to conduct an investigation with respect to the effectiveness of existing foreign information programs; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1984); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 341. Resolution authorizing the appointment of Senators to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Canada; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada; without amendment (Rept. No. 1985); and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LOANS TO WIDOWS OF CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably an original bill to authorize the Secretary of State to make grants or loans to needy widows of Foreign Service officers who died prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, and I submit a report (No. 1986) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 3413) authorizing the Secretary of State to make grants or loans to needy widows of Foreign Service officers who died prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, reported by Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 28, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2421) to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3412. A bill for the relief of Ragnar Videll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 3413. A bill authorizing the Secretary of State to make grants or loans to needy widows of Foreign Service officers who died prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. CONNALLY when he reported the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3414. A bill for the relief of Masako Yoshida;

S. 3415. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille (Swett) Brown;

S. 3416. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jay Gilbert Lockridge;

S. 3417. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Lawrence P. Billy;

S. 3418. A bill for the relief of Maria Zarrabe;

S. 3419. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Panagiotaros;

S. 3420. A bill for the relief of E. S. Babcock;

S. 3421. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; and

S. 3422. A bill for the relief of John A. Sbarounis and Georgette A. Sbarounis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3423. A bill to increase the limitation of expenditures for projects for the development of facilities for water storage and utilization in arid and semiarid areas of the United States under the act of August 28, 1937;

S. 3424. A bill to change the date for the beginning of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, from the first day of July to the first day of October, and for other purposes; and

S. 3425. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of works diverting water from the main stream of the Colorado River above Davis Dam, together with certain appurtenant pumping plants and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3426. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces depicting the Hoover Dam; and

S. 3427. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, and section 3 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: In lieu of the matter inserted by the committee on page 56, lines 7 to 19, inclusive (being sec. 636), insert the following:

"PROMOTION OF ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY THROUGH CERTAIN REORGANIZATIONS AND INTEGRATION OF SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES WITHIN AND AMONG THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

"UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 636. (a) There shall be in the Department of Defense an Under Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within 10 years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as

Under Secretary of Defense. The Under Secretary shall take precedence in the Department next after the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

"(b) The Under Secretary of Defense shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum.

"SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 637. (a) The Under Secretary of Defense shall advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in preparation and execution of a comprehensive program to integrate supply and service activities within and among the military departments, and shall perform such other duties as are prescribed by this title.

"(b) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary shall—

"(1) develop standardized procedures and forms for supply and service functions;

"(2) eliminate duplication and overlapping within and among the supply activities of the military departments in the fields of production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution;

"(3) establish and operate depots for common items and other common supply and service installations throughout the United States;

"(4) develop unified logistics organizations overseas;

"(5) establish and operate a program to systematize scrap recovery, redistribution of excess materials, and surplus disposal, and coordinate such program within the Department of Defense and with those of other departments and agencies of the Government having responsibilities in these fields; and

"(6) develop plans for recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel within the Department of Defense.

"TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

"SEC. 638. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Defense—

"(1) all functions with respect to supply, including production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution, which are now or may hereafter be vested by law in any office, officer, board, bureau, service, commission, military department, or other organizational unit in or under any of the military departments;

"(2) all functions of the Munitions Board created by section 213 of this act, as amended; and

"(3) all functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff created by section 211 of this act, as amended, with respect to procurement, production, warehousing, and distribution of supplies, including the duty of assigning logistic responsibilities to the military services.

"(b) Except as may be otherwise permitted under regulations issued pursuant to section 504 (c) of this title, the Secretary of Defense shall exercise the functions conveyed upon him by this title through the Under Secretary of Defense.

"APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 639. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including the carrying out of functions transferred to the Secretary of Defense by this title.

"(b) During the fiscal year in which this title is enacted and for two fiscal years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense is authorized (1) to establish, under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary of Defense, such new appropriation account or accounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and (2), with the approval of the President, to transfer to such new account or accounts such sums as may be necessary therefor from appropriations available to the military departments and other agencies of the Department of Defense for carrying out logistic, supply, and service functions: *Provided*, That no funds transferred pursuant to this authority shall be available for any purposes other than those specified in the act appropriating such funds, and no funds so transferred shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the act appropriating such funds.

"(c) After the effective date of this section, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be obligated by any military department, agency, or officer in or under the Department of Defense, except the Under Secretary of Defense, to carry out any function transferred to the Secretary of Defense by this title: *Provided*, That the Under Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may issue regulations assigning responsibility for the performance of any such function to any military department or other agency or organizational unit in or under the Department of Defense, and the prohibition of this section shall not apply to the obligation of funds to carry out any function so assigned. Any such regulation shall be published in the Federal Register and a copy thereof shall be furnished to the General Accounting Office, and the appropriate committees of the Congress.

"SUPPLY PERSONNEL

"SEC. 640. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to transfer from the military departments and other agencies of the Department of Defense to the Under Secretary of Defense such civilian personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to detail to the Under Secretary of Defense such military personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

"ABOLITION OF MUNITIONS BOARD

"SEC. 641. The Munitions Board, and the position of Chairman thereof, created by section 213 of this act, as amended, are hereby abolished, and such personnel and funds of the Board as the Secretary of Defense shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title shall be transferred to the Under Secretary of Defense.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 642. (a) Sections 503 and 504 of this title shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 643. (a) In addition to any other reports required by this act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit annually to the Congress and to the President a report of the progress made by the Department of Defense in the integration, as required by this title, of common supply and service activities within and among the military departments.

"(b) In addition to the reports required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than January 15, 1953, submit to the Congress and to the President a special report with respect to the progress made by the Under Secretary of Defense in developing plans for recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel within the Department of Defense, as required by subsection 502 (b) (6) of this title, accompanied by such recommendations as he may deem appropriate for any further legislation necessary to permit the functioning of such a corps on a permanent basis.

"REPEALING AND SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 644. All laws, orders, and regulations inconsistent with the provisions of this title are repealed insofar as they are consistent with the powers, duties, and responsibilities enacted hereby: *Provided*, That the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense under this title shall be administered in conformance with the policy and requirements for administration of budgetary and fiscal and supply management and property utilization matters in the Government generally, including accounting and financial reporting, and that nothing in this title shall be construed as eliminating or modifying the powers, duties, and responsibilities of any other department, agency, or officer of the Government in connection with such matters, but no such department, agency, or officer shall exercise any such powers, duties, or responsibilities in a manner that will render ineffective the provisions of this title."

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. DOUGLAS also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—AMENDMENT

Mr. MARTIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Arthur E. Carstens to be postmaster at Hilbert, Wis., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive Q (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed by the United Kingdom, the French Republic, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany at Bonn on May 26, 1952; with an interpretation; and Executive R (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, covering security guaranties to the members of the European Defense Community by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on May 27, 1952 (Exec. Rept. No. 16).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HUNT:

Address entitled "The Legislative 'How' of Small Business," delivered by Senator SPARKMAN at the convention of the National Association of Master Plumbers, in Atlantic City, N. J., on June 3, 1952.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Address delivered by Charles L. Hardy, president of the General Association of Alumni, Dartmouth College, at a meeting of the Dartmouth Alumni Association on June 7, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Report the Port Bill for Early Passage," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer on June 14, 1952, discussing the proposed Delaware River Port Authority bill.

By Mr. MALONE:

Transcript of debate on the subject "Should Our Foreign Policy Be Changed?" participated in by Senator MALONE and Robert Aura Smith, editorial writer for the New York Times.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the unfinished business of the Senate is H. R. 7656, the veterans' readjustment assistance bill, which makes provisions for GI Korean veterans. Mr. Oliver E. Meadows, staff director of the House Select Committee on the GI bill, has given a great deal of time and attention to the drafting of the bill, which has been under consideration in the House for many weeks. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have Mr. Meadows on the floor of the Senate during the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TAXATION OF LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am directed by the Committee on Finance to ask for immediate consideration and approval of H. R. 7876. I shall be glad to explain precisely what is provided by the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7876) relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill simply extends for an additional year the formula for taxation of life insurance companies, which was included in the 1951 Tax Act. Since the bill deals only with that matter, which was thoroughly considered, the Committee on Finance has instructed me to ask that the bill not be referred to the committee, but that it be acted upon by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today's RECORD.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have heard of the long hours into the night the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and his colleagues have worked on the bill. They are to be commended for the work they have done in reaching an agreement. However, a number of Senators vitally concerned with the subject have requested an opportunity to study the conference report—at least, to see it in printed form, so that they will know what has been done.

I am wondering what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has planned with respect to the conference report. Will he tell us?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be only too glad to advise my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire. The conference bill was sent to the Printing Office at 4 o'clock this morning. An agreement has been reached between the House and the Senate as the result of a compromise on provisions adopted by the House and those of the Senate. Of course, in some respects the bill is not so strong as that which was passed by the Senate. We finally agreed on a bill after working from 10 o'clock yesterday morning until 2 o'clock this morning.

I shall be glad to answer any questions, or I shall be glad to follow any procedure the Senator from New Hampshire desires me to.

There was a yea-and-nay vote a few days ago on the Senate bill, and the bill was passed, as the Senator knows, rather overwhelmingly. I do not mean to boast about that; but I think more Senators voted against the Senate bill than will vote against the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would it be agreeable to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and to the majority leader to have the printed reports distributed, if they are available?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is agreeable to me, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. Also, would it be agreeable to have a quorum called, so that Senators may be notified?

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not object. I desired to submit the conference report, which, of course, is a privileged matter, so that it might be considered by the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is very important that the conference report be adopted because the time is almost at hand when the present law will expire.

The unfinished business is the GI bill for Korean veterans, and it should not take long to dispose of it.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is now presiding over the Senate, is to be commended for the manner in which he has pushed forward and expedited the consideration of the appropriations bills by his committee. He is very anxious that the Senate take up the defense appropriation bill and do as much work on it today as possible. I shall determine today whether Senators interested in the bill will be willing to waive objection to the requirement of 3 days' notice and permit us to proceed as far as we can today with consideration of that measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is one other matter to which I wish to call attention, and I shall ask unanimous consent that it be considered. Yesterday I entered a motion to suspend the rule so that one particular amendment could be considered.

I might explain what the amendment is. Under present law, the Federal Government in making certain purchases of automobiles and other equipment has to pay to the Federal Government a sales tax. I felt that that should not be required. We should not use money out of appropriations for military purposes to pay a sales tax to the Government itself. So if I might ask unanimous consent——

Mr. McFARLAND. When we take up the appropriation bill, we can go into that question. I see no reason why the time element should not be waived in connection with the Senator's motion also.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am anxious to proceed with the consideration of that bill today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I know that Senators will wish to be present for the consideration of the conference report on the Defense Production Act amendments. The Speaker of the House has asked that the report be messaged over to the House as soon as possible. However, I feel that we should have a quorum call. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dirksen	Gillette
Bennett	Douglas	Green
Bricker	Dworshak	Hayden
Bridges	Eastland	Hendrickson
Butler, Nebr.	Ecton	Hennings
Byrd	Ellender	Hickenlooper
Capehart	Ferguson	Hill
Case	Frear	Hoey
Clements	Fulbright	Holland
Connally	George	Humphrey

Hunt	McCarran	Schoeppel
Ives	McCarthy	Seaton
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	Smathers
Johnson, Tex.	McFarland	Smith, N. J.
Johnston, S. C.	McKellar	Smith, N. C.
Kem	Monroney	Sparkman
Kilgore	Moody	Stennis
Knowland	Morse	Taft
Lehman	Mundt	Thye
Long	Murray	Watkins
Magnuson	O'Conor	Welker
Malone	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Martin	Pastore	Williams
Maybank	Robertson	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

I also announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand that some Senators desire to discuss the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I would be very appreciative if the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] could give us a bird's-eye view of the conference report which we have on our desks, so as to high light it to the Senate before we act upon it. Will the Senator do that?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to do so.

I am very happy to be able to report back to the Senate a bill on which we agreed with the House in free conference early this morning. As the Senate knows, the House completed its action on the Defense Production Act amendments on Thursday evening. Because the House was holding a late session that evening it was impossible for us to meet in conference at that time. We did meet, however, on Friday morning and we sat in conference from 11 a. m. until 2 a. m. In view of the wide differences between the House bill and the Senate bill and the sharp controversies concerning the issues involved, I think the Senate will agree that no conference committee could have acted more expeditiously, nor worked more diligently in bringing about a satisfactory and workable compromise.

I am happy to report that on all the major issues involved, except one, the House receded from its position and the Senate conferees successfully insisted on the Senate provisions or managed to work out a good compromise.

The most important issue before the conferees was the Talle decontrol amendment, which provided that price controls could be effective on a material only if that material were rationed. For all practical purposes this would have meant the end of price controls. The House receded and accepted the Senate's provisions with respect to the suspension of controls.

The Senate accepted a House provision which would permit the suspension of reporting on those materials and services which have been selling below ceilings.

The Senate successfully resisted the so-called Cole amendment to the Herlong amendment which would have applied the historical mark-up to an individual seller rather than to all sellers as the present act provides. While the OPS may permit retailers and wholesalers in some trades to use individual margins, it is not required to in any trade. The OPS will thus be able to maintain dollar and cent ceilings on meat and uniform mark-ups on dry groceries.

The Senate conferees also managed to effect a compromise on the Wolcott Emergency Court of Appeals amendment so as to make it workable and satisfactory. The House conferees agreed to a change in the provision requiring the OPS to demonstrate the validity of its regulations by a preponderance of the evidence, by accepting instead the requirement of substantial evidence.

With respect to the provision in the Wolcott amendment permitting a temporary restraining order, it was the view and intent of the conference committee that the change in the present language of the law should not prevent the Emergency Court of Appeals from granting a stay, in its discretion.

The Senate conferees also managed to persuade the House to accept to the Talle food processing amendment, an amendment which would have the effect of making it perfectly clear that all food processors would be entitled to the benefit of the Capehart amendment, and that all distributors of processed foods would be entitled to the Herlong provision of the act. The House had received some complaints particularly from dairies selling at retail that OPS was not giving them the benefits of the Capehart or Herlong amendment. This was contrary to our intent when we originally passed these amendments. We agreed that dairies and other food processors are entitled to the same treatment as other manufacturers, and food distributors the same treatment as other distributors. This provision merely makes that clear. Each food processor is entitled to apply for a price increase under the third sentence of the Capehart amendment. Food retailers like other retailers are entitled to their customary margins. They are not entitled to any more and the amendment does not give them any additional rights. For example, since the Cole amendment was not agreed to, retailers are not entitled to individual mark-ups and neither are food retailers. Everybody is treated alike.

I notice that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is in the Chamber. We exempted from wage control all farm labor, because we thought it should be exempted. I do not know how he feels about it. We also have in the conference bill the 90 percent of parity figure which I brought up on the floor and said I was going to try to maintain.

The Senate conferees receded on both the Ferguson and Fulbright amendments dealing with the IMC, and accepted an amendment to the Sadlak amendment which the House had adopted.

This amendment stated the policy of the United States to encourage a maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, after filling requirements for the national security, including stockpiling and authorized military assistance to foreign nations, in order to increase employment opportunities and to minimize inflationary pressures.

The amendment provides that no agreement shall be entered into which limits total United States consumption of a material, unless it authorizes domestic users in the United States to buy such parts of the material allocated by IMC to any other IMC member, as are unused. This provision for the benefit of the United States users of materials was considered by the conferees to eliminate the objection to United States participation in IMC. Under this provision, when another country participating in the IMC finds that it will not use the material allocated to it, United States users of the material will have an opportunity to buy the unused supply. The authority of the Government to impose restrictions on the use of the material in this country is continued, in order to prevent improper uses, and the authority to put price ceilings on the foreign purchases is also continued, in order to prevent bidding up the world markets.

The Senate conferees refused to accept the Ramsey amendment, which would have severely limited imports of products made from materials under allocation in the United States, in the belief that the limitations which this would have imposed on shipments to this country from our associates in the free world would have impeded the common defense effort.

The Senate conferees also refused to accept the Wolcott amendment to section 701 (c) of the act which would have changed the present interpretation of the executive department as to the

meaning of "current competitive position" of established business. As a result of this action, the present interpretation of the executive department will continue in effect, rather than require a measure of competitive position at a pre-Korean level.

The Senate conferees yielded to the House on the provision relating to imports of fats and oils, but with an amendment to the House provision. This provision in the bill differs from the present section 104 by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to allow imports of a commodity in an amount 15 percent over the quotas fixed for the commodity, where necessary, so as not to affect adversely international relationships and trade. The conferees wished to make it clear that the restrictions of section 104 were not intended to apply to types and varieties of commodities which are not competitive with domestic products.

It is not my intention at this time to discuss in any detail the numerous provisions of the Senate bill which the House accepted or the many amendments which the Senate accepted or the numerous compromises on which the House and Senate concurred. Unfortunately, the Senate conferees could not expect to persuade the House to agree with the Senate views on every major issue; therefore, it was necessary for us finally to recede to the so-called Harrison amendment, which exempts processed fruits and vegetables from price control. I am hopeful, however, that because of the large inventories existing and the relatively plentiful supply, prices on such processed fruits and vegetables will not go beyond their present levels.

The Senate conferees were also forced to agree to the so-called Wheeler amendment on rent control which provides that rent control shall not be continued in noncritical defense areas unless affirmative action is taken by the local governments involved prior to September 30, 1952. It is my fervent hope that the local governing officials will have the patriotic and political fortitude to secure such affirmative action in those cities and communities where rent control is still necessary.

The so-called Ayers amendment, which would change the definition by which a critical defense area is certified as critical, was not accepted by the Senate conferees. The effect of this amendment would have been to prevent areas from being declared critical until the immigration and defense impact had already taken effect, rather than in anticipation of such impact.

However, we retained the provision which the distinguished President pro tempore urged so strongly upon me with reference to Federal rent control in certain localities, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn. This was intended to have the effect of preventing any further rent increase for the housing accommodations owned by the Government in that locality.

The House removed completely the provisions relating to credit control, whereas the Senate retained the present provisions of title VI. The compromise finally agreed upon completely removes authority in this act for credit controls on consumer goods—regulation W—but provides for the removal of credit controls on housing—regulation X—if the rate of housing starts falls below 1,200,000 per annum, to be calculated on a 3-month period.

With respect to the termination of the various titles of the bill, the House and Senate conferees agreed on a compromise which would extend the life of titles IV and V and the rent-control provisions through April 30, 1953, and extends the other titles of the Defense Production Act through June 30, 1953. The Senate bill contained the termination date of March 1 for price, wage, and rent controls, and the House bill contained the termination date of June 1, 1953. We compromised on April 30. In other words, the Senate yielded 2 months to arrive at a compromise date of April 30.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I will yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. With respect to Representative TALLE's amendment, just how does it appear in the bill now? It prescribes a formula for decontrol, as I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Talle decontrol amendment was stricken in conference. I would prefer to read the exact language on suspension of controls to which the conference agreed to the Senator.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. In the first place——

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator is going to inquire with reference to the Herlong and Capehart amendments, I want him to understand——

Mr. IVES. I am not going into those amendments at the present time. I should like to refer an amendment in which I am particularly interested.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from New York will permit me first to read a section of the committee print to the Senator from New Hampshire, I would appreciate it.

Mr. IVES. Very well.

Mr. MAYBANK. I read from page 22, beginning at line 21:

SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

SEC. 412. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services, and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volativity of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance in relation to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, it is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have sent to my office for the many telegrams and letters which I have received this morning. There are one or two other sections of the bill which I should like to have clarified in the light of the telegrams and letters which I have received today.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, we have studied this subject for a long time. I have no intention to rush matters along. The only thought I had was that perhaps we could dispose of the conference report promptly so that it could be sent to the House this afternoon.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to invite the chairman's attention to section 104, dealing with import controls on fats and oils, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other commodities.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the Senator from South Dakota that with respect to that section we took the House version and added a provision allowing, in cases where necessary, imports of a commodity in an amount 15 percent over the quotas fixed for it. We had quite a lengthy debate on that point. We voted 3 or 4 times on that section when it was before the Senate. I may say that a majority of the House conferees agreed to the 15 percent provision. I do not believe that any of the House conferees were opposed to it.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to inquire about the 15-percent escape clause, primarily for the purpose of making the legislative history clear, as it refers to butter, cheese, peanuts, dairy products, rice, and other commodities. Until the escape clause of 15 percent is reached, the amendment reads rather well.

I should like to have the chairman's version as to how this escape formula is to be operated. Does it mean that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able arbitrarily to permit additional imports to the extent of 15 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety, even though it would embarrass or reduce the domestic production and even though it would interfere with orderly domestic storing, and even though it would result in an unnecessary burden on expenditures under a price-support program; or is the Secretary's discretion in that case to be limited to permitting such an increase in imports when he finds that a 15-percent increase in imports will not adversely operate in conjunction with those three criteria?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to inform my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, exactly how I understand that provision of the conference report. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture believes that the international situation might be helped, for instance, as regards Switzerland, Belgium, or other

countries, he can permit additional imports of not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation in the case of the products the Senator from South Dakota has named, even though there is an excess supply in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us pin this down precisely. Will the Secretary of Agriculture be able to permit such additional imports——

Mr. MAYBANK. He will be able to permit additional imports to the extent of not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation, if he believes and finds and has reason to believe, and makes such a statement, that to do so is in the interest of the international trade of the United States.

The Senator from South Dakota must always remember that the United States is an exporting country; we export much more than we import. We export, among other things, wheat, cotton, and tobacco. If we are to be able to make exports, we must also permit some imports to be made.

Under the provisions set forth in the conference report, the Secretary of Agriculture will have a right to permit additional imports to the extent of not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation with respect to the commodities the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has mentioned, and that may be done without regard to the crop production in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Then, do I correctly understand that the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to permit additional imports up to 15 percent of the import limitation in the case of the specific products referred to, even though such additional importations would impair or reduce the domestic production in the United States?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. MUNDT. And that would be true even though the additional imports would interfere with the orderly domestic storing of such commodities in the South Dakota is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct. However, the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to do that only in the interest of international trade.

I repeat that for every dollars' worth of goods imported into the United States, we export a number of dollars' worth from the United States, in the form of cotton, wheat, tobacco, fruits, and other commodities.

Mr. MUNDT. However, I do not believe that the chairman of the committee will hold that because of a——

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that the conference report is a compromise agreement. It is not based on any amendment of mine, as the Senator from South Dakota well knows.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand that, but it seems to me that in this conference report we would comprise altogether too far in the direction of the interests of a foreign country, at the expense of United States producers of certain of these products.

Mr. MAYBANK. On page 3, in line 16, we maintain the criterion now in section 104 as proposed by the House.

Mr. MUNDT. It is written in on page 3, but the conference report would erase it on page 4.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not do that; the Senator from South Dakota knows that this conference report is no measure of mine. It is a conference report upon which we agreed at 2 o'clock this morning.

I wish to be frank with my distinguished colleague from South Dakota. Under the conference report the Secretary of Agriculture will have a right to permit additional imports of commodities, not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation on such commodities, even if to do so would impair certain domestic situations, provided that such additional imports will be in the interest of international affairs.

The Senator from South Dakota also knows that the United States depends upon making exports of agricultural commodities.

Mr. MUNDT. It seems to me that by such action the conference report——

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, I simply acted as chairman of the conference committee.

Mr. MUNDT. I understand that precisely. I think that by such action the conference committee threw the American farmer a life preserver, but at the same time tied a heavy anchor to it.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the conference report a great deal is done for the farmer. It removes all ceilings on the wages of agricultural workers, and retains the provision for 90 percent of parity. It includes the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. That was done with the aid of our distinguished friend, the Senator from Delaware. In the conference report much is done for the farmer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As I understand this provision of the conference report, it gives the Secretary of Agriculture the right to have leeway to the extent of 15 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; the Senate conferees agreed to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], on which there was a tie vote, provided for 10 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So, do I correctly understand that the principle of the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been written into this conference report?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding. The House conferees agreed to it, and merely raised the percentage from 10 to 15.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is there anything in this section of the report which in any way would restrict the application of other law, such as section 22?

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no; the entire conference bill is temporary legislation. If there is any permanent legislation in the conference bill, I do not know of it, except in the case of the agreement which was made in regard to the Walsh-Healey Act, which was agreed upon, as I understood, by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Let me ask one other question: Of course, certain commodities produced in foreign countries are in open competition with American farm commodities. But if there is a noncompetitive item, will its importation be restricted under the provisions of this conference report?

Mr. MAYBANK. It will not be restricted. The motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] prevailed to have such a provision included in the report of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. I have not yet had an opportunity to read the conference report; but I understand that the bill as passed by the House contained a provision extending farm price supports at 90 percent of parity under certain conditions. Does anything in the conference report affect farm prices?

Mr. MAYBANK. I rose on the floor of the Senate and said I would include such a provision, unless someone objected. No one objected. We accepted the House version to assure the farmers of support at 90 percent or more of parity.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the Senator from South Carolina explain what that provision of the conference report means?

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from North Dakota will turn to page 4, section 106, in line 21, he will find the following:

> "(1) the Agricultural Act of 1949," the following: "except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402."

I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota—for I know how hard he works for the farmers and how grateful the farmers are for what he has done as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—that this conference report will not be permanent legislation. It is only temporary legislation. This particular provision will be in effect for less than 1 year.

All of us are familiar with the formula about variable parity, which was worked out some time ago. On the other hand, this provision in the conference report will apply for less than 1 year. Under the provisions of the conference report, the farmers will receive 90 percent of parity or more.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the conference report continue the use of the dual parity formula in determining price supports?

Mr. MAYBANK. It will.

Mr. YOUNG. When will the provisions of the conference report expire?

Mr. MAYBANK. On April 30, as to this particular provision.

Mr. YOUNG. April 30 of 1953?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. I understand that the provisions of the conference report are about the same as those of the pending Young-Russell bill; is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. Of course the Senator from North Dakota knows that I have always cooperated with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in regard to agricultural matters. Nothing in this conference report will hurt any farmer; I can assure the Senator from North Dakota of that. It is possible that a few producers of cheese might be hurt, but I doubt it very much.

Mr. YOUNG. May I express my appreciation for your kind remarks concerning my work for agriculture. The conference report, if agreed to, will still make necessary the enactment of the Young-Russell bill; will it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and I point out that the conference report provides for 90 percent of parity or more.

Mr. YOUNG. The conference report will be in effect only until next April, as I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it is only temporary legislation. We would never attempt to provide permanent legislation of this sort in a temporary bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to ask a question in regard to the rent-control provisions appearing on page 29 of the conference report?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be very glad to do so. Let me say that I am sure the Senator from Illinois knows that I battled as long as I could in connection with those provisions of the report, as well as other provisions; but in the conference last night we reached a position where we no longer could hold out. The Senator from Illinois knows that we have fought these battles for the benefit of Chicago, New York, and other cities.

In the conference we agreed to include in the report a provision requiring that positive action would have to be taken by September 30, if rent controls were to be retained in areas not designated as critical defense housing areas.

I know of the unfortunate situation in Illinois, because Governor Stevenson testified some time ago before the committee, in the presence of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, about the constitutional requirements in Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee for the very hard work and devoted service he has given to this measure. I know of the terrific strain under which the conference committee has been operating. So I wish both to thank and congratulate the chairman of the committee for his efforts in behalf of the public.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I should like to say to him that, as he knows, Governor Stevenson came here last year. If there were anything I could say for the benefit of the cities of the Nation—although I come from a rural State—I would always be glad to say it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is certainly true. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator's interpretation of the language in subclause (B) of (f) (1) on page 29 of the proposed conference substitute for Senate bill 2594. Perhaps I should first make a brief explanatory statement, before I ask the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator should do so, for the RECORD, because I know what is going to happen—or at least I think I know.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The constitution of my State and, I believe, the constitutions of certain other States forbid, or at least do not permit, the city councils and local boards of aldermen to pass substantive law on this subject of rent control without prior authorization by the State legislature. No such prior authorization has been granted in my State, or in a number of others. The question I should like to raise is this: Is it the understanding of the distinguished chairman that under this subclause (B) a finding of fact by the local city council that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists and that Federal rent control is, therefore, necessary—is it his understanding that such a finding of fact by the local governing body prior to September 30, 1952, would be sufficient to justify the Federal Government in then continuing rent control under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 until the termination of that act itself, on April 30, 1953?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator that that is in accordance with my understanding. I raised the point in conference, because I knew something about the laws of the State of Illinois and also because I knew something about the constitution of that State. We provided clearly and simply that all that the local governing body had to do was to declare that a substantial shortage of housing exists, which condition would require the continuance of rent control. The local government simply makes a declaration of fact and rent control is continued by virtue of this act.

It is purely a local matter. I may say the Senator from Illinois has joined me upon many occasions in respect to local and community rights, as well as on rent control, although it is true we have been apart on certain other legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the city council would not have to act as a legislative body and pass an ordinance.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it would act by resolution, as a body authorized under this act, to give an opinion upon the local situation and make a finding and declaration of fact; and that finding of fact would then be accepted by the United States Government, and this act would, under those conditions, continue rent controls for that area through April 30, 1953. Am I correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is entirely and absolutely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With that understanding, I shall withdraw any objection which I might have had to the conference report, and congratulate the chairman upon his work.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. May I ask, along the line of the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, whether there will therefore be no requirement of permissive legislation on the part of the localities by their State legislatures.

Mr. MAYBANK. There will be no such requirement. They can make declarations such as I referred to above by themselves. This is a grant of power to the local community, to the city council by the Federal Government in this statute as to this matter.

Mr. PASTORE. And it is without any action on the part of the State legislature. Am I correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Turning to page 28, I should like to inquire of the distinguished chairman with reference to section 122. The question I desire to ask is whether the section would affect trading on the Board of Trade in commodities which might be below ceiling prices?

Mr. MAYBANK. My information on that matter came from the two distinguished Senators from Delaware. The junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] was in the conference and answered those specific questions, because he was on the conference committee, whereas my good friend, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] was not. Answering the question of the Senator from Kansas, in my opinion section 122 would not affect the matter of which he speaks.

Mr. FREAR. That is true. This is the exact language that was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. And there were no changes in it. Is that correct?

Mr. FREAR. That is correct. There were no changes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that in the consideration of the amendment, I was advised that it would in no way affect the operation of the law in that respect.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. What disposition was made of the provision affecting the International Materials Conference?

Mr. MAYBANK. We have a very good amendment which was proposed by Representative SADLAK, which, in my judgment, and in the judgment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and possibly other Senators, will be as good as the Senate provision.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that it is closely similar to the Fulbright amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. It is a combination of the amendments proposed by the Senator from Michigan, Representative SADLAK, and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask whether it was approved by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]?

Mr. MAYBANK. It was.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to take the time of the Senate to speak briefly on section 102, as submitted in connection with the conference report, because I think we should know exactly what we are doing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly that is what we should do.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senate should know.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] phrased a question as to that provision a while ago.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think section 102 represents a departure from the policy of the United States, and of the people of the United States. The American people feel differently about monopolies, cartels, and trusts than do the people of other countries. We have, I think, done something for the free enterprise or individual enterprise system, by passing antimonopoly laws and antitrust laws. We have not always enforced those laws, and by our failure to enforce them we have done harm to the individual enterprise system. However, that is a matter of administration. This country has recognized that monopoly, whether it be governmental or corporate or individual, is in conflict with our republican principles and the institutions of America.

It is in regard to that subject that section 102, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, is at variance with the long history of this Republic. If the intent of Congress is to change the principles upon which this Nation was founded, we should do it understandingly, we should do it after we know exactly what we are proposing to do. It is to that subject that I desire to speak today.

I realize that we are nearing the close of this session. I believe this mattter is of vital importance to the farmer, to the working man, and to all other Americans. Are we to depart from our historic American principles relative to monopolies and cartels, and to adopt the socialistic principles of other nations, who believe in such principles and who have set aside the principles of the individual enterprise system? Are we to go down the road to socialism, domestically, or, as here proposed, go down the road internationally along the same line?

Let us consider what has been done by the conference committee. I recognize the hard work that members of the conference have done. I also recognize the philosophy of the State Department of the United States. I may question whether the conference committee understood what the State Department had caused to be written into this measure. It is to that aspect that I desire to address myself.

When this matter came before the committee of the Senate, the State Department issued a prospective order, announcing its intention to allow American industry to buy in the open markets. That order, however, was never really put into effect. After the measure came to the floor of the Senate, the State Department apparently felt it was unnecessary to put the order into effect. Two days ago, as this bill was being sent to conference, what did the State Department do? It announced its intention of allowing American industry to go into the free market so far as copper was concerned and pay the price set upon copper by any other country. I am curious to know why trial balloons of this sort are released on the eve of congressional action upon some of these very vital principles.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator mean that processors in this country will be permitted to charge higher prices under OPS on products processed from foreign copper, than on products processed from domestic copper, which has a price ceiling of 24½ cents a pound, while there is no ceiling on foreign copper?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is it not a fact that the increased price can be passed on to the consumer?

Mr. FERGUSON. Eighty percent, but not the total amount.

Mr. President, let us ascertain what we are doing today. To section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 we are about to add the following:

> (b) When all requirements for the national security, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials, and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities and minimizing inflationary pressures.

Those are good words, Mr. President. If those words were to become the law, it would be all right, because that is all the Senator from Michigan wants. In effect, that is all the distinguished Representative from Connecticut, Mr. SADLAK, wanted. I talked to the distinguished Representative from Connecticut. He does not want this language to have his name attached to it. This is not what he desired. The Senator from Michigan certainly does not want the amendment to bear his name, because this is not what he desired.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If there is any misunderstanding, I would apologize to my distinguished friend from Michigan if I said it was his amendment. I was talking about the Ferguson amendment, the Sadlak amendment, and the Fulbright amendment. We considered all three amendments together, and out of those three amendments came this amendment. The Senator from Michigan had no part in it, nor did the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FERGUSON. I speak also for the Representative from Connecticut, and I want to deny parentage.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not blame the Senator, and I did not want him to think that I was suggesting any such thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to refer to line 18, on page 2. By the United States Government entering into an agreement to control all the raw materials of the world an international cartel is created. If that is what we are about to do, we should so understand, and do it knowingly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In reference to this amendment, a motion was made that the chairman—and, unfortunately, I happened to be the chairman—appoint a subcommittee to go into the matter. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], Representative WOLCOTT, and Representative BROWN. Those gentlemen constituted a subcommittee appointed to work out the details of this particular amendment. If I am wrong, I hope the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] will correct me. I appointed the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], but he said he could not serve.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is not a personal matter about which I am speaking; it is a matter of principle. It is not a question of whose language the amendment contains. It is a question of what we are about to do.

In line 18 there is a provision about what the United States of America can do in relation to entering into a cartel controlling as to price, allocation, and consumption, raw materials all over the world, those from America as well as those from other nations. Here is what is said:

> No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption of any material, unless—

And I underscore the word "unless," Mr. President—

> such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference—

And here are the all-important words—

> and not used by any such participating country.

In other words, Mr. President, that part of this provision authorizes the United States of America to enter into a cartel with other countries and to control the allotment and price of all raw materials, including those coming from the mines, the forests, and the pastures of America, wool among others. It gives absolute power to say that no individual

in the United States has any right to purchase outside of this country any material in the world, unless other countries do not want to use it and it is not used by other participating countries.

Do Senators believe there is any other country that will not buy when we give them the money to buy and permit them to pay 50 or 60 cents a pound when our people are allowed to pay only 27½ cents a pound, and no one but the Government itself is authorized to purchase? If ever there was a cartel, if ever there was a monopoly, I would say that one is being created by the Congress of the United States at this time.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am very much interested in the very clear explanation of this provision by the Senator from Michigan, but I am also interested in his comment, which I assume he will get around to in a little while, relative to the next sentence, beginning in line 24, which is as follows:

> Nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials both domestically produced and imported and facilities through the controlled-materials plan or other methods of allocation.

It seems to me that puts in the President the entire control to avoid any beneficial safeguards the act may have through his complete power to control and allocate, and it would nullify the first part of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan approves. The last sentence would nullify it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true, but I do not think that was intended.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wanted to hear the Senator's comments on that point.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not think it was ever intended absolutely to place in the hands of the President complete cartel power. What was sought to be done, as I understand, was to allow the President to exercise unit control. For instance, in the case of automobiles, he could say that in a given quarter so many thousands of cars could be manufactured. It was not the intent to give the President absolute control over the cartel.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Would not that be what this provision would result in?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think so.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. There is another very important implication in the last sentence, as noted by the Senator from Iowa, namely, recognition of the authority of the President under the international cartel, authority which, in the judgment of the Senator from Ohio, the President does not have under the Defense Production Act. It is purely an assumption of authority, an expansion of certain allocation authority exercised under the Defense Production Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. But this would give him absolute power.

Mr. BRICKER. Indirectly, because the President claims such power, and what the Senate states is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. I am sure the Senator from Michigan realizes the position which the junior Senator from Delaware has taken in the matter. I say to the Senator from Michigan, and to other Senators, that I do not like the amendment. I did not vote for it. As the Senator said, he does not wish to bring personalities into the discussion; but the provision was based on the wording of three amendments, that is, the Sadlak amendment, the Fulbright amendment, and, I believe, that of the Senator from Indiana, who last year was one of the prime movers of an amendment to the Defense Production Act and also had some suggestions to make in connection with the pending measure. I do not want him to have undue credit in connection with this at all, and perhaps he does not desire his name attached to any of it, but I think the language in the second paragraph, at the bottom of page 2, about which the Senator from Michigan has been speaking, was not intended to accomplish what the Senator from Michigan says he thinks it will do. I think there was a difference of opinion with respect to that.

I am opposed to it, as the Senator very well knows, but I can hardly go along with what the Senator has said regarding what he believes that part of the bill will do.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I hope it was not the intention of the conference to do what the clear language would allow to be done. I am discussing what the language will allow the State Department to do. What the State Department has done while the amendments were pending and what they did while the amendments were being debated on the floor of the Senate indicates to the Senator from Michigan that the State Department desired to do not only what I believe the language allows them to do, but to go even further into the international cartel and socialized international union with the other nations of the world and eliminate individual enterprise from world trade. That is exactly what this language would allow.

Mr. President, when the British had control of tin and rubber, and when the International Materials Conference was formed, did the British allow those two items to go under the control of the Conference? No, Mr. President. But we in America, with people out of work all over our great Nation, placed copper under the Conference. Those are the things which lead me to believe, in fact, to know, what the State Department will do under this provision. I have stated what they would be permitted to do under the clear language. While I do not say that they even wanted the last sentence, which the distinguished Senator from Iowa has mentioned, the language will allow them to do exactly what he prophesies.

Mr. President, I realize that the Senate must agree to or reject the conference report, once it comes to the Senate from the conferees. There is no way in which we can strike out this language. There is nothing we can do to disapprove except to vote "no" on the conference report.

While there are some sections of the bill I could agree with, my conscience would not allow me to vote to agree to the report, because of what we are asked to do in the provision I have been discussing, leading to the creation of a world-wide Socialist state, an international state, freezing out forever the right of an American as an individual to purchase material, because it can all be absorbed, it can all be controlled, by the governments of the world. That is what I am opposed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was not one of the committee which worked the matter out, but I was present, and I will state in all fairness to the committee what they were up against.

The International Materials Conference is a reality, whether we like it or not. Our Government is using it. Whether the Government entered into it legally or not makes no difference; it is using it.

What the committee worked out was an agreement simply saying to the Government, "You are doing something now. This is what we want you to do, if you are going to continue doing it."

Perhaps the bill should have denied the Government the right to enter into the International Materials Conference. I am not arguing that point at all. But here are the words:

> No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption of any material unless such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference and not used by any such participating country.

That protects the American businessman.

Mr. FERGUSON. How?

Mr. CAPEHART. It gives him a right to go into the open market and buy from any country throughout the world any materials which the participating countries do not use.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, yes; but this report would impose a consumption restriction. It allots to India, to Spain, to Yugoslavia, so much copper. Even though copper is mined in America, only so much copper is allotted to America. The last phrase of the sentence reads, "and not used by any such participating country."

Mr. President, we are going to give them money to buy copper in the world market. That is what we have been doing. Why would they not use the power?

Companies in Detroit had an opportunity to buy in foreign countries, radiators made of copper, but they would not do it, because they felt it would be unfair to American workingmen for

them to do so. That is exactly what would happen under this provision. Radiators would be manufactured in other countries and would be shipped into the United States. The manufacturers in the other countries would use the material.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that the International Materials Conference is a reality at the moment. The United States is participating in it. I do not know whether it is doing so legally or otherwise. My opinion is that it does not have authority to do so, but it is doing it. Also, the Government has been denying to American purchasers the right to buy in foreign countries. The conference report says to the Secretary of State, or whoever enters into the contemplated agreements, "You cannot enter into any agreement denying any domestic purchaser in the United States the right to buy from any country in the world, if that country desires to sell to him."

In other words, what will happen, under the amendment, if I grasp it correctly, is that some countries will get out of patience and will not use the International Materials Conference. They will go ahead, take their copper, take their raw materials, and immediately sell them to American purchasers.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not what the conference report says.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, it does.

Mr. FERGUSON. Chile is not participating at the present time. She has withdrawn from the agreement. The conference report covers only participating countries. We would not be able to purchase, because the materials would all be allotted; we would not be able to purchase the copper.

Mr. CAPEHART. If Chile has withdrawn, then our purchasers could buy whatever copper they desired.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, this is only to permit them to do it in participating countries. This allots Chile copper, even though Chile is not a party to the Conference. That is the wording. I hope the conferees did not mean to do what they indicate by these words could be done. I am saying only what the words themselves provide.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am opposed to the International Materials Conference. I think it is all wrong. But the fact remains that we are in it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Should Congress then approve it?

Mr. CAPEHART. This amendment, by the way, expires next April 30. It will be in effect for only 10 months. All it does is to say to whoever operates the International Materials Conference, "You cannot deny to an American purchaser the opportunity of buying materials anywhere he wants to buy them, if any country has them."

Mr. FERGUSON. Not "if any country has them," but if any country participating in the Conference is not going to use what has been allotted to it.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the other country is not participating, this provision does not apply to it.

Mr. FERGUSON. It certainly does. We allot materials in the case of countries which are not participating.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. FERGUSON. We allot Chilean copper.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not believe so.

Mr. FERGUSON. The fact is that we do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let us get the Chilean copper situation straight. The agreement with respect to Chilean copper was entered into between this country and Chile. Under that agreement, Chile agreed to sell this country 80 percent of its copper.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was not it at all. The International Materials Conference allotted 80 percent of the copper to other countries.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am fearful that the able Senator is mistaken, because I am certain that the agreement whereby Chile would supply us 80 percent of the copper was entered into a long time before the International Materials Conference came into existence.

Mr. FERGUSON. The International Materials Conference took it over.

Mr. CAPEHART. It may have taken it over later.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that Congress has never provided any legislative authority for the operations of the International Materials Conference?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; and that is why I am speaking today on this subject. I think we should understand what we are doing.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If that be true, is it not also a fact that the sentence beginning in line 24 on page 2 is, in fact, legislative authority for the President, the State Department and other agencies to cooperate with the International Materials Conference? Does the Senator so construe that provision?

Mr. FERGUSON. "Cooperate" is a very weak word, I think.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is not this language legislative authority for the President and the various Government agencies to participate in the International Materials Conference?

Mr. CAPEHART. Consider the language beginning in line 24 on page 2 and running through line 3 on page 3. The President has such authority now. He had it under the original Defense Production Act of 1950. All that language says is that he has the right to allocate any materials which any purchasers in the United States may buy anywhere throughout the world. If he is to have the right to allocate domestic materials, we must give him the right to allocate anything an American purchaser might buy abroad and bring here.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment which the Senator from Michigan offered did not grant any such authority. The President had control of the units and the industry in America. For example, if he had said that the automobile manufacturers could manufacture 1,000,000 automobiles in a quarter, that is all they could have manufactured. But what was done? Politically it was not considered desirable to say to the people of Michigan, "You may manufacture only 800,000 automobiles in a quarter." So an order was issued saying to them, "You will be allowed to manufacture 900,000 automobiles." However, the manufacturers were allotted only enough copper to manufacture 800,000. It was not considered politically expedient to limit them to 800,000, so they were allotted about 1,000,000, and then they were allocated enough copper to manufacture only 800,000. When the automobile companies find markets in the free world where they can buy copper, they are not allowed to buy it.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was the purpose of writing lines 18 to 23.

Mr. FERGUSON. That provision does not cover the free market. It applies only in cases in which materials are allotted to a participating country and it does not wish to use them. That is the only kind of materials that can be obtained.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the Senator understand that whatever authority may be granted by this particular provision expires on April 30, 1953?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I do not think so.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make a specific statement on this subject. A number of Senators have asked me to do so.

Title I expires on June 30 next year. It is temporary legislation. Titles IV and V, relating to price and wage controls and rent control all expire on April 30.

Mr. BENNETT. So title I would be in effect for a year.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Michigan. A number of Senators had asked me to make that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would be in effect for a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. As to title I, the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The senior Senator from Michigan has been extremely active in seeing that the automobile industry received an equitable distribution of copper during the past several months. I should like to invite his attention to the fact that under the operations of the International Materials Conference the United States was entitled to an allocation of 55.6 percent, while actually it received, for military and civilian purposes, an allocation of only 49.1 percent. In reality we received a deficit of 6½ percent of the total free world copper, and that deficit alone is equivalent to

214,000 tons a year, or an amount of copper which would satisfy the requirements of the automobile industry for this metal for 2 years of normal production. I think this conclusively proves the contention of the senior Senator from Michigan, that under the allocations of the International Materials Conference the United States is not receiving an equitable allocation of copper for both military and civilian uses, and to that extent we are subjecting our economy to arbitrary treatment by an international cartel.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. In all fairness, I must answer the Senator from Idaho, because I am fearful he is wrong. There was only one reason why we did not receive our allocation, and that was the price which the OPS set. The OPS told American purchasers that they could pay only X amount for copper, and they could not buy it. No one in the world would sell it to them at that price. Now that order has been eliminated, and American producers can pay any price they wish to pay for copper or other strategic materials. In the case of copper they can pay $1 a pound for it if they have to; but if they pay $1 a pound, as the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] stated a moment ago, they can pass only 80 percent of that dollar along to the consumer. So the reason we did not receive our copper allocation was not the International Materials Conference; it was the pricing policies of OPS. There was no other reason whatsoever.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is simply not a fact. The Senator from Michigan has made a study of this question. The allotment by the International Materials Conference was the reason why we did not receive our allocation. It allotted only 49 and a fraction percent; and it would not allow any American purchaser to go into the market and buy copper.

Mr. CAPEHART. It allotted 55 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; it did not allot 55 percent. Our allotment should have been based upon what we had been using prior to that time. The allotment should have been 55 percent, but the International Materials Conference allotted us for consumption only 49 and a fraction percent, as the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has stated. That was the reason why we could not buy copper in the open market. We would have been violating the order of the International Materials Conference.

That is exactly the effect of the language which we are now discussing. It provides that we cannot buy such materials if they have been allotted to some other country and that country wishes to use them. If it does not wish to use them, our great Nation is going to allow us to buy such materials back, if the other nation does not want to use them. But I prophesy that other nations will be able to make finished products of copper and ship them back into this country. The large copper users, not only in Detroit, but elsewhere, will be forced to buy goods made in other countries. The automobile industry does not use much copper compared to the amount used in Connecticut, for example, in the manufacture of various articles. However, I am not speaking for the automobile industry alone. I am speaking of all raw materials, and not merely copper. Copper simply happens to be a good example of what has happened. The same situation applies to all other materials. It applies to wool, and many other things. We shall find that the international cartel is being authorized to allot for consumption in America any raw material, whether it be produced in America or whether it be produced in any other country. That will have an effect upon the standard of living of the American people. Congress is now asked to approve such a system. Up to this time Congress has not approved it.

Mr. Attlee believes in these things. I do not blame Mr. Attlee. He says he is a Socialist at heart, and he acknowledges his international socialism and his domestic socialism. However, those who profess not to be Socialists are doing socialistic things. We should give credit to Mr. Attlee. He stands up and says he believes in these things, because he is a Socialist, and the world acknowledges him as a Socialist. We should not be doing things and at the same time deny that we are doing them. It is for that reason that I cannot vote for the conference report.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I was a member of the conference committee on the bill. I signed the conference report, but reluctantly. I shall support the report with reservations, particularly in regard to the provision which the Senator from Michigan has attacked. I wish it to be expressly understood that last evening in conference I did oppose the provision to which the Senator from Michigan objects, and I stated definitely that I am opposed to any international cartels which would place control on any material which we supply or which we can buy in the open world market in foreign countries. That is what it amounts to, Mr. President.

The authority which is being utilized in international cartels is alleged to stem from article I of the production bill. In the judgment of the Senator from Ohio, there is no such authority contained in the bill. It is a usurpation of power by the President and the State Department to the detriment of the interests of the American people, and to the handicap and hindrance of the war production program.

I did not expect to speak particularly on this point, but I wanted to assure the Senator from Michigan that there was support for his position in conference, but it represented the minority view. I abhor as much as he does any part of the bill which legalizes any action of the President which represents purely an assumption of power and an exercise of illegal power on his part.

Mr. President, there are many provisions in the bill with which I do not agree. But there are some improvements over the law as it was enacted last year.

For example, there is some help given in the price and wage control provisions. Titles IV and V have been loosened up. Some help has been given to American production. Industry has been given the right to appeal under the rent, price and wage control sections to the Emergency Court of Appeals, identical with the rights given to the American people against the administrative agencies under the Administrative Procedure Act.

I do not agree at all with the Wage Stabilization Board section. I do not believe that any Wage Stabilization Board can accomplish what it expected or intended. It will be a hindrance to production and to labor relations in the various industries of the country, and will hinder rather than help collective bargaining.

We have seen the effects of such a program enforced by a nonstatutory Executive-appointed Wage Stabilization Board, which delved into fields which were never contemplated or intended by Congress for it to delve into. We have seen this Board make recommendations which brought about a strike in the basic steel industry of this country. Now the strike lies at the door of the President of the United States, who for political stubbornness or maybe for other unsupported reasons refuses to exercise the power which was given to him by Congress.

I do approve the provision of the act endorsed by both the House and Senate by strong majorities, calling upon the President to use the laws which are already upon the statute books.

I, for one, believe that we should put an end once and for all to wage and price controls, which are a curb on the industry of this country. They are a handicap and hindrance to our production program and to our war effort. I doubt very much if anyone can prove to Congress or to the people of the United States that wage and price controls have saved the consumer of this country one red cent. On the other hand the administration of the controls is costing the country more than $50,000,000 annually. In my State alone there is a payroll of $2,500,000 for OPS. They have all sorts of experts, and advisers to experts, and assistants to experts.

According to one newspaper report which I have before me the top five men in OPS in my State—and we have four offices in Ohio—receive $10,000 a year. None of them has had any experience in business which would justify such a salary or which would justify his exercising powers of government over business in my State.

The newspaper article states that more than half of the employees of the Cleveland district OPS staff are paid more than $5,000 a year. The average for the hundreds of employees which we have in Ohio is over $5,000 a year. Many of them were picked without regard to experience. They were chosen because of their political contacts. Many of them are lame ducks who were defeated in their attempt to gain office and have

nothing else to do. That is the way the staff has been gathered together.

Instead of helping production it has handicapped production. It has not saved the consumer one red cent. Most of the products which the consumer buys at the present time are selling below ceiling prices. Yet they attempt to take credit for that fact.

Mr. President, I should like to read one or two of the items listed on the payroll in one city in my State of Ohio. They have an analyst, industrial materials; a business analyst, consumer goods; a price economist; a business analyst, industrial materials; two information and education specialists. I do not know what an information and education specialist is, except that he is a public relations officer who is supposed to go out and do his political duty in support of the continuance of OPS and to help his party in the coming election. Then we have another business analyst; a price analyst; a business analyst, food; we have an attorney; an accountant—several attorneys and accountants; an organization and methods examiner. I do not know what that means, and I doubt that they do. We have a chief of the distribution section, and a chief of the classification section, personnel. We have a printing and publishing officer, and a forms control officer.

We have all those silly titles The titles are given only to fill up the payroll, Mr President.

At the present time there is practically nothing for them to do. The local office is sitting by, spending its time on the payroll with most commodities selling under the ceiling. So they have been propagandizing and pressuring Congress during the past few weeks in an effort to get a continuance of their place on the payroll.

Mr. President, the time has come to do something for the taxpayers of this country. If we take off the payroll those who are employed in OPS alone and send them into productive industry, to do something personally, by labor or otherwise, in the productive effort of this country, their contribution will be much greater than it can possibly be under OPS.

Therefore, I believe that the Office of Price and Wage Control ought to be abolished, as well as WLB. Let us free labor and free industry to solve their differences through collective bargaining, which is the traditional system, to take care of disputes in industry in this country. They can and will settle their differences in the traditional American way. Had it not been for the action of WLB there would likely have been no steel strike so detrimental to the war effort.

There are many sections of the bill which I do not like. I do not like the agricultural section. I do not like the section dealing with the importation of fats and oils. It should be more protective of American interests. Yet I realize that the conference report is a compromise.

Mr. President, I appreciate as well as anyone else does the diligent efforts the chairman of the committee made in the conference to obtain, finally, a report which could be enacted, so that an extension of the present act would not be required and confusion could be avoided. In the conference last night the chairman of the committee did a masterful job.

I realize also that our work must be done through the committees and through both Houses of the Congress; and it is necessary for compromises to be reached on various points.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very glad the Senator from Ohio has brought out this point. I realize, of course, that the Senator from Ohio receives numerous telegrams on these matters, as do all the rest of us. It should be stressed that, after all, the legislation finally enacted must constitute a compromise between the two branches of Congress and also a compromise with the executive branch of the Government.

In working out this compromise we did the very best we could. I know the Senator from Ohio is opposed to some of the provisions of the conference report, and I myself am opposed to some of them. On the other hand, we did the best we could.

Many persons on the outside think that Members of Congress can have their own way in these situations, but it should be pointed out that in a conference we can make progress only by way of compromise.

Mr. BRICKER. Of course that is the method by which the work of both Houses of Congress is conducted. Each House passes the best bill it can devise, and thereafter the measure which finally is to be enacted must be worked out by means of compromise between the two Houses.

Mr. President, I doubt that any member of the conference committee will approve every section of the report. Most of us are bitterly opposed to some of the sections of the report. Yet I signed the report, and I intend to support it, for the reason that in this critical period, with the war production program slacking off every day, with production in the United States decreasing instead of increasing, with the National Government seemingly unable to get the war production program effectively under way and to accomplish its purpose according to the plans laid down in the law by Congress, at this time I do not dare vote to take away from the President the procurement authority, the allocation powers, and the contract rights of the Government in connection with the defense production program. Neither should we take away some of the credit authority that is necessary in connection with the expansion at this time of the defense production program.

For those reasons, and in considering the conference report as a whole, even though I object bitterly to some parts of it, but hoping that we can remedy that situation a year from now, I will support the report of the conference committee.

I express my appreciation to the chairman of the conference committee and to the other members of the committee for the diligent work they have done, leading up to the presentation of the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for what he has said.

I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Let me say that I believe the conference report does a great deal to salvage an almost impossible situation.

I should like to ask a question with reference to the wage stabilization provisions. My experience with one or two small cases is that some rather picayunish situations have been dealt with—for instance, in connection with determining whether a small plant can take action to meet the vacation schedule maintained in a large plant. I am familiar with a firm which hires a few hundred people, and which is in a competitive situation with a plant hiring thousands of persons. In one case approximately 18,000 persons are employed in a competing firm, and the large firm provides for 2½ weeks of vacation with pay. Other plans provide for 2 weeks of vacation.

The firm to which I refer is being denied, under the guise of wage stabilization, the right to meet that competitive situation by means of providing for 2 weeks vacation with pay.

As I understand the conference report, it does not contain any provision which will give the Wage Stabilization Board the right to take action, under the guise of wage stabilization, in the case of such matters of minute detail. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Nothing in the conference report would provide such authority in the case cited by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma; such a firm could still provide for reasonable vacations for its employees.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for that interpretation.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about page 10 of the conference report, in line 17, where we find the words "now in effect." I wish to determine definitely whether that means as of today; or does it mean a measure which may have been enacted by a State back in 1950?

Mr. MAYBANK. It means as of the date of enactment of the bill represented by the conference report and refers to a law enforced and in effect at that date.

Mr. THYE. As of the date of enactment of the bill in the terms of the conference report?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THYE. I wish to make sure that there is no confusion on that point.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me assure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that to my recollection the conference report does not contain any retroactive provisions. Some provisions of the conference report will expire on April 30,

and others will expire on June 30. The only permanent provisions of the conference report are certain ones with respect to the Walsh-Healey Act, as agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture himself.

Mr. THYE. And those provisions will go into effect on the date of enactment of this measure; is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. THYE. Let me say I have received a great many telegrams in regard to section 701. I believe the bill as passed by the House contained three words, "during such period", which were the subject of questions insofar as a great many automobile dealers, more especially the Ford dealers, were concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the present interpretation of the Executive Department in that regard remains in effect. The Senator is eminently correct in his point as regards those three words, but those three words were stricken out in conference. Therefore the "current competitive position" of establishments means current from time to time, and not their competitive position before the outbreak of the Korean affair.

Mr. THYE. They were stricken out, were they?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask now about the provisions in regard to the importation of fats and oils.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know of the deep interest of the Senator from Minnesota in the farmers, and I know of his earnest support of the farm programs. I say to him that the conference report gives to the Secretary of Agriculture, in this emergency, and in the interest of foreign trade, power similar to that which would have been given by the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], but the conference report provides for 15 percent instead of 10 percent.

Mr. THYE. In other words, the conference report modifies the provisions of section 104, to the extent of providing for more tolerance; is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. THYE. The conference report provides discretionary power, and places on the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility of making certain that the imports of fats, oils, butter, or cheese are not made in such quantities as to destroy the domestic market?

Mr. MAYBANK. If the importation of an additional 15 percent would have that effect, I would be wrong in agreeing to such a provision. But I do not believe the importation of an additional 15 percent would have that effect.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to make a comment with respect to a point raised just now by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, namely, regarding the effect of section 104 of the conference report, as its effect has been pointed out by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee. I believe that what he has stated will be the effect of that section of the conference report.

However, the report which is to accompany the final conference report will emphasize the point that when an agricultural commodity of a noncompetitive nature comes into the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture himself shall exercise particular discretion; and in his discretion, which will be almost complete, so far as these provisions are concerned—although so far as we are concerned, the discretion is definitely indicated as being limited—the Secretary of Agriculture must permit such noncompetitive agricultural commodities to enter the United States.

Therefore, the cheese situation, about which I assume the Senator from Minnesota is disturbed, is largely taken care of, because the great amount of cheese which enters this country from abroad is of a noncompetitive nature.

Mr. THYE. The greater part is. However, blue cheese is highly competitive. That is what we refer to as the Roquefort or blue cheese. It is highly competitive.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is taken care of by the language of section 104 in this bill with a provision for 15 percent leeway being allowed for imports.

Mr. THYE. In other words, under the conference report the Secretary of Agriculture will have the responsibility of safeguarding the producers in the United States against a great influx of fats, oils, and so forth, which would destroy or disrupt the domestic market.

Mr. IVES. That is provided by the conference report, and that point will be emphasized by the report of the managers on the part of the House which will be written on it.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in connection with the point of the possibility of injury to domestic producers by means of importations from abroad, let me say that I believe the Secretary of Agriculture always has at heart the interests of American producers of agricultural commodities. If the Secretary of Agriculture were always handling these matters, instead of having them handled by the State Department, we would be much better off.

Mr. AIKEN. And then, if the Secretary of Agriculture would apply the laws as enacted by the Congress, we would be still better off.

Mr. BRICKER. I agree.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I did not sign this conference report, because that was the only way, so far as I knew, whereby I could register my opposition to many features of this bill and to the method in which it was handled.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. I decline to yield. I do not refer, of course, to the able Senator from South Carolina. He did everything that he should have done. So did the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and, for that matter, so did the Senate. But the House and every one in America knew that the present law would expire at midnight next Monday, June 30. For some reason, the House refused to take any action on this proposed legislation until about 2 days ago. In fact, I think it concluded its action on it yesterday. Therefore, the conferees were forced to get together, as they did, last night. They remained in session until about 2:30 this morning. There was nothing which the conference committee could do, there was nothing the able Senator from South Carolina could do, but to report some sort of bill to the Senate, in order that it might go to the House this afternoon, and be finally passed before midnight June 30. It was a matter of either doing that or passing a resolution to extend the existing act for 5, 10, or 30 days. So the House placed us in a position last night, as a result of its failure to act on this matter 2 or 3 weeks ago, wherein the conferees had to continue in session for the greater part of the night; and we did. I congratulate the able Senator from South Carolina upon the way he handled affairs last night. He did an excellent job.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Indiana. We did the best we could. We were up against the gun, so to speak. We met until early this morning. As a matter of fact, I arrived home at about 4 o'clock this morning, after checking up on certain matters.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not rise to criticize any conferee who signed the report or who voted for it. I want that strictly understood. But there are a few things I desire to say about this conference bill which I hold in my hand, without being personal at all, because the conferees as a whole could have done nothing other than what they did. But, after declining to sign the report, the only other way I can register my protest against it is to say what I am now about to say.

This bill is neither fish nor fowl. It does not control prices and wages, and if the influences in America are such that prices and wages are going to be pushed up, this legislation will not act as a control. Therefore, I say it is neither fish nor fowl, but that all we are doing in this legislation, in my opinion, is simply to say to the American people that we are controlling prices and wages, when we are not—and, personally, I do not think there is any need of price and wage controls today.

I desire to say one other thing, and this is not at all personal. I presume Senators know that the House proposed 20 changes, incorporating matters in the bill which were not in it when it was passed by the Senate. The House made 20 changes. In my opinion the bill is absolutely unworkable from the administrative standpoint, at least there are features of the bill which are simply unworkable.

I dislike to make this statement, but I shall make it: We are simply misleading the American people into thinking that we are providing price and wage controls, when we are not. We are saying to the American people that controls are provided, when they are not. But we are regimenting or controlling the free-enterprise system of America. I am finding no fault with any individual, but what we should have done was to take price and wage controls off completely,

or, if we did not do that then we should have provided real controls. We ought to do one or the other. We have done neither in this bill.

We should have said to the American people, "We are going to guarantee you against runaway inflation in America." We then should have said to the American free economy, "We are going to return to the American businessman and to the Nation a free economy." We ought to have enacted a formula by which, when the Consumers' Index rises to a certain point, we would then have real price and wage controls, under a workable price and wage control act.

If the Consumers' Index never reached that point then there would be no such controls. We did not do that. Therefore, I say that all we are doing is to fool the American people. All we are doing is to regiment American industry. We are tying them up with controls, and so far as I can see, some are controls for no particular purpose. I am speaking now about price and wage controls.

There are other features of this bill, of course, such as the allocation of materials for national defense, loans for increasing production, and other things, which are desirable. However, I doubt whether there are any of them that could not be handled under the Selective Service Act, if the President did not have the Defense Production Act.

So I cannot vote to approve this conference report. I am opposed to it. I think it would have been much better for the American economy, and that we would have been more honest with the American people, the wage earner and the consumer, had we frankly said that this bill does not control prices and wages. I repeat that, if the influences existing in America today continue to exist during the next 90 days or 6 months, under this legislation prices and wages will rise. If those influences are not present, then we do not need this legislation, we need no legislation of this kind.

Therefore, Mr. President, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator refers to the influences which were exerted on this bill. I should like to add that the Senator from Indiana might not have felt constrained to make certain of the remarks he has just made, if he had been able to extend the first act which was passed by the Congress in 1950, instead of having to fight continually against influences seeking to weaken the public's protection against inflation.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, that is purely a matter of the opinion of the able Senator from Michigan, and I do not know that it carries too much weight, because he was not present when the original act was written.

Mr. MOODY. Oh, yes, I was.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know that he understands the bill, at all.

Mr. MOODY. I am quite sure I understand it better than the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The facts are that the President did not put into effect the first act, though I do not care to get into a debate or argument about that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. When the Senator from Indiana says that, with the approval of the conference report, the Defense Production Act is not going to be enforced, can he tell us whether there are any material changes between this and Defense Production Act of 1951, so far as the curbing of inflation is concerned?

Mr. CAPEHART. It is much looser. That is, it would curb inflation less than the last act did; and then, of course, it injects many things which, from an administrative standpoint, in my personal opinion, are not workable.

In other words, we are saying to the American people that we are going to control prices and wages. We are saying to the administration, "You control prices and wages." Yet, Mr. President, we are putting into the act many things that are unworkable.

Let me read section 411, page 22. It sounds all right until it is analyzed. It reads as follows:

> SEC. 411. In the administration of this title, no person shall be required to furnish any reports or other information with respect to sales of materials or services at prices which are below ceiling, if such person certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices.

As a businessman, I do not understand how that is workable, either from the standpoint of a businessman or from the standpoint of the administration. I can well understand the purpose behind it. The purpose behind the amendment was that if something was sold below ceiling it would not have to be reported. I do not see how the small-business man will be able to take care of it. In my opinion, there will be a great deal of confusion.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. President, except to repeat that I did not sign the conference report and I cannot support it, for the reason that I do not think it will control inflation. I do not think it will control prices and wages if influences exist that have a tendency to push prices up, and, at the same time, it will regiment the free economy of America when I think it should not be regimented.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, now that the conference report has been agreed to, I should like to say a word to Members of the Senate.

I think the Senate owes a great deal to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee [Mr. MAYBANK] for the effective manner in which he handled the conference, as chairman of the conference. It was a long, hard, arduous job, but the wit and good humor of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee brought the deliberations of the conference committee to a successful conclusion.

I think, Mr. President, that the bill is not all that is desired not only by the chiarman but by the other Members of the conference committee, but in my opinion we owe a great deal to the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee for bringing forth as good a piece of legislation as it was possible to get from the two versions on which the conferees had to work.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. FREAR. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as a Member of the committee, I should like to join with the able Senator from Delaware in complimenting the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to observe that, as is always true in the case of a controversial question, the conference report has some provisions in it with which I do not agree, and I dare say it has provisions in it with which other Senators do not agree, and I also dare to say that no one here is in full agreement with it. However, if we are going to continue controls, presumably the bill contains as good an agreement as can be reached at this time.

The reason why I rise to speak, Mr. President, is that I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for the splendid leadership he has given. In view of the wide difference which existed between the House version and the Senate version of the bill proposing to extend the Defense Production Act, if anyone had told me that the conferees of the two Houses could get together in less than 1 day and work out a result such as is evidenced by the conference report, which, in many ways in my opinion, is superior to the bill passed by the Senate, I would have said it was impossible. But it has been done, and I think a very large measure of the success of the undertaking and its outcome has been due to the efforts of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I want to pay tribute to him at this time.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7860) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7860) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture after full hearings of which reasonable public notice shall be given to those who may reside within twenty-five miles from the island selected"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether this is the conference report which contains a provision dealing with the construction of a hoof-and-mouth-disease laboratory.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. IVES. May I ask the distinguished Senator if he will be so kind as to state what action was taken by the conferees with respect to that matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall read to the Senator the action which was taken on the question of the location of such a laboratory "at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture after full hearings of which reasonable public notice shall be given to those who may reside within 25 miles from the island selected."

The committee thought that provision would protect the citizens of any locality. I know the situation which the Senator from New York has in mind, and I am in sympathy with his view that the citizens should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The distinguished Senator will recall, very likely, that in the bill as it was passed by the Senate there was a provision requiring that such a laboratory should be established only "at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture after public hearing and with the approval of the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House of Representatives, and the Governor of the State, if any, in which the site selected may be located."

I gather from what the Senator has just stated that that language has been entirely deleted.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been deleted and the provision which I read inserted in its stead. I hope it will meet the views of the two Senators from New York. I understand their position. It provides that the laboratory cannot be established at any point until the people within 25 miles of the island may be heard.

Mr. IVES. Is it the understanding of the Senator also, may I ask, that it will not be established if the people within that 25-mile radius object to its establishment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read it again: "at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Agriculture after full hearings of which reasonable public notice shall be given to those who may reside within 25 miles from the island selected."

Mr. IVES. Then, no language is provided which would in anyway prevent the establishment of such a laboratory, even if the people themselves were overwhelmingly opposed to it?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. IVES. Does not my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, believe it would be a good idea to have an expression of the legislative will contained in the bill at this particular point to the effect that it is the intent and understanding of Congress that such a laboratory should not be established in any location where the people within a 25-miles radius are opposed to it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Government would never establish a laboratory under such conditions.

Mr. IVES. The reason why I have raised the point is that there was in the Senate bill a provision which required that the Governor of a State should also approve the establishment of such a laboratory. If he disapproved it, the laboratory could not be established. In other words, we respected local autonomy, or home rule, so far as this matter was concerned. Anything so objectionable as obviously the proposed laboratory would be should not be located in a place where there was opposition to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was another amendment offered, to the effect that the laboratory should not be established without the approval of the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. IVES. That was a provision in the bill passed by the Senate. That was among the general provisions and was a part of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. This provision is a substitute for that, and it was the best we could get from the House.

Mr. IVES. I realize that, but what I am trying to ascertain from the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is whether it is his idea that the intent of Congress is adequately expressed in a legislative way that the laboratory should not be established in any location where people are living within a radius of 25 miles of its proposed establishment are absolutely opposed to it?

Mr. McKELLAR. I take it that if a majority of the people are opposed to it, then under no circumstances would the Department establish the laboratory.

Mr. IVES. I do not believe the Department should establish it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think it should.

Mr. IVES. Is it my understanding that the Senator desires that to be the legislative intent, in view of the fact that the bill does not now contain the language which was placed in it by the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it is the legislative intent that the laboratory should not be established in a locality whose people are opposed to it.

Mr. IVES. There is no question about it?

Mr. McKELLAR. We ought not to establish a laboratory at a given place unless the people, of that locality, or a majority of them, did not object to it.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the distinguished Senator for his explanation, and I am grateful to my colleague, the senior Senator from New York, for developing the legislative intent.

I assume, in view of what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said, that it was also the intent of his fellow conferees that the laboratory would not be built or erected if there was substantial opposition on the part of people within a certain radius of the location of the laboratory.

Mr. McKELLAR. I would say that if a majority of the people protested against it, the laboratory would not be established there.

That was my idea about it, and it was the only reason why I agreed to the language.

Mr. IVES. I am very glad the Senator has brought that out. The Senator would not have agreed to the language otherwise?

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not have agreed to it.

Mr. IVES. The Senator would not have agreed to the language had not that point been brought out?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LEHMAN. I, too, thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KILGORE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RENT CONTROL IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1910, House bill 7397, the District of Columbia rent-control bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7397) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is not my intention to object, as I understand the Senator is asking merely that the unfinished business, which is the Korean GI bill, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed with the District of Columbia rent-control bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on line 6, to strike out "March 31" and insert in lieu thereof "April 30." That is in keeping with the date in the National Rent Control Act. The Committee on the District of Columbia, after enactment of the national rent-control law, instructed that House bill 7397 be made to accord with the national law.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, all the bill does is to continue rent control in the District of Columbia until a date which conforms to the date in the national rent-control law. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct, April 30, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7397) was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2988 is indefinitely postponed.

CONTINUATION OF EFFECTIVENESS OF CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS UNTIL JULY 3, 1952

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 490) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, which were, on page 6, line 9, after "fixed", insert "by the Commission"; on page 7, line 17, strike out "(1)"; on page 7, line 22, strike out "(A)" and insert "(1)"; on page 7, line 25, strike out "(B)" and insert "(2)"; on page 8, line 14, strike out "(B)" and insert "(2)"; on page 8, strike out all after line 21 over to and including line 17 on page 9; on page 9, line 18, strike out "(3)"; on page 9, line 21, strike out all after "taxpayer" over to and including "return" in line 7, page 10; on page 10, line 8, strike out "(4)"; on page 10, line 9, strike out "(A)" and insert "(1)"; on page 10, line 10, strike out "(B)" and insert "(2)"; on page 10, line 13, strike out all after "Act" down through "1951," in line 14; on page 10, line 16, strike out "(1)"; on page 10, line 22, strike out "as follow:" and insert "reduced by that portion of the deposit in the fund expended in the construction, reconstruction, reconditioning, acquisition, or liquidation of purchase-money indebtedness of the new vessel which represents gain not recognized for tax purposes under subsection (c)"; on page 10, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 2 on page 14; on page 14, line 3, strike out "13" and insert "12"; on page 14, line 22, strike out "(other than a deposit of earnings)"; on page 15, strike out all after line 18 over to and including line 6 on page 16; on page 16, line 7, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; on page 16, strike out all after line 17 over to and including line 7 on page 18, and insert:

SEC. 13. Section 511 (1) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "portion thereof" in the second sentence the following: "with respect to a deposit made in any taxable year ending on or before June 30, 1945."

On page 18, line 8, strike out "16" and insert "14"; on page 18, line 14, strike out all after "determines" down to and including "members" in line 15; on page 18, after line 20, insert:

SEC. 15. Section 605 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) No operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of a vessel that is more than 20 years of age except one whose life expectancy has been determined as provided in section 607 (b) for a period in no case to exceed the life expectancy determined thereunder, unless the Commission finds that it is to the public interest to grant such financial aid for the operation of such vessel and enters a formal order thereon, and the Commission shall include in each annual report a full report covering each case in which such exception is made, with the reasons therefor."

On page 18, line 21, strike out "17" and insert "16"; on page 19, line 1, strike out "18" and insert "17"; on page 19, line 8, after "the" where it appears the first time, insert "subsidized"; on page 19, line 15, strike out "19" and insert "18"; on page 19, line 19, strike out "20" and insert "19"; on page 19, line 25, strike out all after "the", where it appears the third time, over to and including "the", where it appears the second time, on page 20, line 2; on page 20, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 19 on page 27 and insert:

SEC. 20. Section 607 (h) of such act is amended, effective with respect to taxable years ending after July 31, 1952, to read as follows:

"(h) The earnings or gains of any contractor receiving an operating-differential subsidy under authority of this act, which are deposited in the contractor's reserve funds as provided in this section, shall be treated as follows for Federal tax purposes:

"(1) Amounts required to be deposited as depreciation in the capital reserve fund shall be deductible in computing income subject to income and excess-profits taxes.

"(2) The proceeds of any insurance or indemnities received by the contractor on account of the total loss of subsidized vessel and the proceeds of any sale or other disposition of a subsidized vessel, to the extent such proceeds represent gain, and earnings or gains on amounts deposited in the capital reserve fund (other than amounts transferred from the special reserve fund) shall not be recognized for income or excess profits tax purposes.

"(3) Amounts deposited as depreciation in the capital reserve fund which exceed the depreciation which would be allowed under the Internal Revenue Code (assuming the life expectancy determined under section 607 (b)) and amounts described in paragraph (2) which are not recognized for tax purposes, shall not be recognized in the determination of the tax basis of any property in the acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of which such amounts are expended or in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess profits tax purposes.

"(4) Earnings deposited in the capital reserve fund, other than the amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2), and earnings deposited in the special reserve fund shall be treated as 'partially tax deferred.' 'Partially tax deferred' earnings shall not be recognized for purposes of the normal tax on corporations, but shall be recognized for purposes of the surtax and excess profits tax imposed upon corporations. 'Partially tax deferred' amounts shall not include capital gains deposited in the capital reserve fund or the special reserve fund.

"(5) Amounts treated as 'partially tax deferred' under paragraph (4) shall be recognized in the determination of the tax basis of any property acquired, constructed, or reconstructed therewith and in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess tax purposes as follows:

"(A) So much of the 'partially tax deferred' deposit in any year as would be subject, but for paragraph (4), only to the normal tax shall not be recognized in determining basis or in determining equity capital or total assets for excess profits purposes, and

"(B) The amount of the 'partially tax deferred' deposit in excess of the portion of the deposit described in the preceding subparagraph shall be recognized in the determination of basis and in the determination of equity capital or total assets for excess profits tax purposes in such proportion as the sum of the surtax and the excess profits tax attributable to such amount bears to the total tax which would have been imposed on such amount but for paragraph (4).

If 'partially tax deferred' amounts are used to reduce indebtedness, proper adjustment shall be made in the basis of the property subject to the indebtedness.

"(6) In computing the net income of the contractor for income and excess-profits tax purposes—

"(A) The amount of operating-differential subsidy accrual payable to the contractor for any taxable year, including amounts withheld by the Commission, shall be included in the income of the contractor for such year;

"(B) A deduction shall be allowed for the taxable year in the amount of subsidy reimbursement determined by the Commission to be chargeable to the contractor for such year; and

"(C) Any amount previously withheld from subsidy payments to offset such reimbursement liability which is released and paid to the contractor shall be included in the income of the contractor in the year in which paid.

"(7) Earnings or gains on deposit in the reserve funds at the termination of the contract, or withdrawn from the special reserve fund and paid into the contractor's general funds (other than for reimbursement of operating losses as provided under section 607 (c)) or distributed as dividends or bonuses, shall be taxable as follows:

"(A) 'Partially tax deferred' amounts shall, in the year of termination or withdrawal, be subject to the amount of normal tax which would have been imposed but for this section in the year in which such amounts were deposited, and

"(B) Other earnings or gains shall, to the extent not taxable upon deposit in the funds, be taxable, in the year of termination or withdrawal, under the tax rates and provisions applicable in the year of deposit.

Amounts withdrawn from the special reserve fund and used to reimburse the contractor's general funds for operating losses under section 607 (c) shall, to the extent such amount would not be recognized in the determination of tax basis under paragraph (5) or under the provisions of any closing agreement entered into between the contractor and the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable with respect to deposits made prior to the first taxable year ending after July 31, 1952, be included in income of the contractor in the year of withdrawal from the fund.

"(8) Amounts deposited in the capital or special reserve funds shall not constitute an accumulation of earnings or profits within the meaning of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

"(9) In computing the net operating loss deduction of the contractor under section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code—

"(A) The gross income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (a) and the net income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (b) and (c) shall include amounts treated as 'partially tax deferred' under paragraph (4);

"(B) The normal-tax net income of the contractor for purposes of section 122 (c) shall be an amount equal to the surtax net income; and

"(C) The net income of the contractor, for purposes of the computation under section 122 (c), shall be increased by the amount of interest on obligations of the United States or its instrumentalities described in section 26 (a).

"(10) The excess profits credit of the contractor shall be determined in accordance with the following provisions:

"(A) The average base period net income of the contractor shall be computed by including in excess profits net income determined under section 433 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code for any taxable year the amount of earnings (not including capital gains) deposited by the contractor in the reserve funds in such year other than:

"(i) Required deposits of depreciation;

"(ii) The amount of subsidy reimbursement determined by the Commission to be chargeable to the contractor for such year; and

"(iii) Earnings on amounts deposited in the capital reserve fund (other than amounts transferred from the special reserve fund).

"(B) The equity capital of the contractor for purposes of section 437 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code and the total assets of the contractor for purposes of sections 435 (e), (3), 440 (b) and 442 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be computed by determining, to the extent applicable, the adjusted basis of assets of the contractor in accordance with the provisions of paragraphs (3) and (5) or the provisions of any closing agreement entered into by the contractor and the Bureau of Internal Revenue applicable with respect to amounts deposited in the reserve funds prior to the first taxable year ending after July 31, 1952, and by attributing to amounts on deposit in the reserve funds the basis which would be attributed, under paragraphs (3) and (5) or under such closing agreement, to property acquired therewith.

"(11) For the purposes of this section, amounts withdrawn from the reserve funds or expended in accordance with the purposes of such funds shall be considered to represent the deposits in such funds in the order of deposit."

On page 27, line 20, strike out "22" and insert "21"; on page 28, line 3, strike out "constructed" and insert "construed"; on page 28, line 9, strike out "23" and insert "22"; and on page 28, line 11, strike out "(1)" and insert "(e)."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. WILLIAMS conferees on the part of the Senate.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 7656.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill, commonly known as the Korean GI bill of rights, proposes to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to veterans who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950. Of course, that was the date, as we all know, when the conflict in Korea began.

The basic, fundamental provisions of the bill have been drafted in accordance with advice, recommendations, and conclusions growing out of intensive, exhaustive investigations, hearings, and studies conducted by committees of Congress, by the General Accounting Office, and by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. As we know, the House of Representatives has had a special committee, headed by Representative TEAGUE, of Texas, which spent some 18 months investigating the matter. That committee traveled throughout the country, taking testimony in many different places, and did a magnificent job in its investigation of the problem, and then in working for a good many weeks in preparing the bill. A subcommittee of the Senate also went into the matter thoroughly and did excellent work. The General Accounting Office, under the direction of the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, made a study of the existing GI law and went into the matter very thoroughly, particularly in some 19 States. Then, of course, we have the observations and reports as a result of studies made by the Veterans' Administration itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the distinguished Senator from Alabama has rendered fine service in connection with the bill. The proposed legislation is of interest to all Senators and to the country generally. It is a bill that should be passed. The Senator from New Hampshire, who is the minority leader, is familiar with the bill in a general way, and he concurs in it. However, there are certain questions which should be clarified, and I believe the Senator from Alabama can readily clarify them.

I noticed that the Senator was very diplomatic when he said that the conflict in Korea started in 1950. I would have used the term "war." I know some Senators have referred to it as a "police action." But the Senator from Alabama used the word "conflict."

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator from New Hampshire wish me to define my use of the word "conflict" at this time?

Mr. BRIDGES. That was a little side remark by me. However, I shall call it the Korean war. The Senator may call it the Korean conflict. But with relation to that, will he define the limitations of the proposed legislation as applied to Korean veterans, so that there will be no misunderstanding about it?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will look on page 3 of the report he will find that the bill grants 1½ days of education and training for each day of service on and after June 27, 1950, regardless of where the service was performed. The service might be performed in Korea, in Europe, or even in the United States. If the veteran has had 90 days of service and has an honorable discharge, he is granted 1½ days of education or training for each day in the service. Assume that he has had 90 days of service. He would have the right to education and training for 4½ months. As the Senator knows, most of the Korean veterans have had far more than 90 days' service.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator a question which is raised by many sincere and thoughtful people. There can be no question that these benefits should be granted to a Korean veteran who has served in the Korean area, on the Korean Peninsula, in the waters around it, or in the air above it. However, there is some question with respect to a man who has served in this country and has never been more than 100 miles away from Washington. Should he receive the same type of benefits as are granted to the man who has bled and suffered in Korea, in the waters around it, or in the air over it? What is the justification for taking in everyone, even though some of them may not have gone farther away than Camp Meade?

Mr. HILL. As a former veteran himself, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire knows that when a man enters the military service, the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, he does not de-

termine where he is to serve. He is subject to orders. He is subject to serving anywhere he may be ordered to serve. If he is sent to the front lines in Korea, he goes to the front lines in Korea. On the other hand, if his superior military commanders decide that he should serve in Washington, New Hampshire, on the west coast, or in Germany, Greece, or somewhere else, he goes wherever he is ordered to go. When he enters the service he loses all control over where he is to serve. Where he serves is entirely in the hands of his superior commanders. He has nothing to say about it.

The Senator knows that during World War II there were many men who grieved because they were left at home. The same situation was true in World War I. I think the Senator and I can bear witness to the fact that during World War I, in which he and I both served in the Armed Forces, many men were dissatisfied because they were left at home and were not sent into some combat area. They felt that they had been called into service, or had volunteered, to fight for their country. In the case of many of them, instead of being sent to some combat area they were kept here, undoubtedly for some good reason, either to supervise training, give courses of instruction, or for some other particular purpose.

So when a man once puts on his uniform and enters the service of the Armed Forces he loses all control over where he is to serve or what his service shall be. As the Senator knows, under the GI bill which we passed for the benefit of veterans of World War II, we had to accept the fact that a man had no control over the place of his service, and we drew no line of distinction so far as education and training benefits were concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand that.

Mr. HILL. Let me say further to my distinguished friend from New Hampshire that no matter where the veteran may serve, his career is disrupted just the same. Even if he is in the city of Washington, serving in the Army, he cannot go to school, any more than he could go to school if he were serving in Korea, Germany or on some other foreign detail. So his career is interrupted the minute he enters the armed services, no matter where he may serve.

Mr. BRIDGES. There is one further item about which I wish to ask the Senator a question. Assuming that a veteran of the Korean war chooses not to accept the benefits, what will be his status in the future? I hope the Senator will permit me to use the expression "Korean war." I think it is a war in which we are engaged.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that the use of that word is in no sense objectionable to the Senator from Alabama. There may be a distinction between such a struggle and a war in the sense of war formally being declared by Congress. But when men engage in armed conflict, shooting at one another, that is warfare. It would be incomprehensible and inconceivable even to think of it, but if my good friend and I should have some disagreement and should resort to any kind of force to resolve that disagreement, in a sense we would be at war with each other.

Mr. BRIDGES. Consider the cases of two veterans of the Korean war. One veteran accepts the educational and training benefits, and the other does not. What provision is there in the bill with respect to any future benefits which may be accorded to veterans generally? Is any provision made for a credit or debit as the case may be, depending upon whether or not the particular veteran accepts the educational or training benefits? In other words, does the veteran who does not accept such benefits simply lose out?

Mr. HILL. Frankly, this bill does not go into the question of some future war or conflict.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not referring to that. I was referring to future benefits. For example, assume that several years from today legislation should be proposed granting further benefits to veterans of the Korean war. Would a credit or debit be given, as the case might be, in the case of a veteran who receives such benefits from the Government, as contrasted with a veteran who does not accept such benefits?

Mr. HILL. I should say that there is provision for neither credit nor debit. If at some future date Congress should see fit to enact legislation granting some new or additional benefits, at that time Congress would be well within its rights in considering the fact that some veterans received benefits under the provisions of this bill. Wisdom might well dictate that Congress consider that fact. However, there is nothing in the bill which seeks to anticipate what Congress may do in the future so far as additional benefits are concerned.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. As a matter of fact, Congress would have to do that with relation to the educational benefits which were given World War II veterans under the GI bill of rights, which is the present law. The new bill is merely an extension in that regard, and does not change the standard with reference to the present law.

Mr. HILL. So far as the basic question which the Senator from New Hampshire raises is concerned, the Senator from Rhode Island is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As the Senator from Alabama knows, that is a highly controversial subject, and one which is very much discussed in veterans' circles. I have attended many meetings where it has been the subject of discussion. The veteran who has not made use of the educational benefits under the GI bill of rights wants to know the answer to this question. He speaks up very forcefully. He says, "The other fellow has had the advantage of certain benefits. The Government has spent many thousands of dollars on him. I have never taken advantage of the benefits. Is the other fellow going to get the same thing as I get in the future?" It is a subject of great controversy and keen discussion in veterans' groups and among individuals.

Mr. HILL. I understand exactly the point the Senator is making. I sympathize with the veterans who have not taken advantage of the benefits offered them. For example, under the original GI bill, approximately 50 percent of the veterans took advantage of the educational and training benefits, while the other 50 percent, for some good reason in their own judgment, did not see fit to take advantage of those benefits. But the pending bill does not go into the question of future benefits, or what shall be granted or denied, on the basis of what may be granted as of this time.

Knowing my friend from New Hampshire as I do, and knowing his great ability, I will say that he can see how impossible it would be at this time to write any kind of formula with reference to future benefits, because so much would depend upon what the future benefits might be.

The Senator must also realize that in addition to educational and training benefits the GI's have enjoyed certain benefits in the matter of housing, loans, and other benefits.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask one more question. I am asking these questions for the purpose of clarifying the situation. As the Senator knows, there is not one American Legion post, a Veterans of Foreign Wars post, or an Amvets post which has not made inquiry about the bill. I should like to clarify it as much as possible, so that there will not be any misunderstanding. I should like to have the Senator from Alabama explain in simple A, B, C language the educational benefits provided in the bill. How do the educational benefits compare with the benefits given to World War II veterans?

Mr. HILL. As simply as I can, I will say that the over-all benefits are the same. I can say, however, that under the bill, a veteran who has had 90 days' service would get a day and a half credit for each day. Therefore, he would have a credit of 4½ months. Under the original GI bill he not only got that time but he was also given an extra year's time. So far as the over-all benefits are concerned, I think the Senator will find that the bill is treating the present-day veteran in substantially the same way the World War II veteran was treated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have one more question to ask. A great many inquires have been made about some of the schools and about some of the training which was given under the GI bill. Sometimes the GI was victimized, and sometimes unscrupulous people moved in and exploited GI's of World War II. Of course, in some cases the training was very much worth while, and not only did the GI's benefit, but the schools and colleges also benefited. What are the standards and what are the precautions in the bill with respect to that subject?

Mr. HILL. First, a school, in order to qualify to educate or train a veteran,

must have been in existence for at least 1 year. In other words, the bill puts a stop to fly-by-night schools. It provides that a veteran may take a course in the school if 10 percent of the students in the course are nonveterans. That is another safeguard against fly-by-night courses for veterans. The bill also makes another change. Under the original GI bill, veterans could hop from one course to another. Some schools—not many of them—hired high-pressure salemen to grab boys from their courses. The bill also prescribes better and higher standards which schools must meet if the veterans are to enroll in a course and if the Government is to pay the tuition.

Mr. BRIDGES. Who is going to decide on the standards?

Mr. HILL. A very effective limitation is provided on what may be called avocational courses. For example, some GI's entered dancing classes so that the school could get the tuition and the veteran could qualify for the subsistence allowance. The pending bill requires that, in order to be eligible for veterans' training and to receive Government payments for tuition, a school must be accredited by the State-approving agency, which in my State and in the Senator's State would be the State board of education.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the precautions which have been written into the bill are fine, and I am glad they are in the bill. I am wondering whether the requirement that 10 percent of the students in a course must be nonveterans, a provision which the Senator from Alabama mentioned, is sufficiently high, and whether it should not be higher, based upon the experience we have had in the past.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that bill, as passed by the House, made the requirement 25 percent. We received many complaints, however, a good many of which came from bona fide, established schools, that that percentage was too high. One of the complaints came from a school in Washington which has been in existence for more than 25 years. The head of that school, who has been running it for 25 years, impressed us as being a high-grade man. He insisted that 25 percent was much too high, and he felt that it would work against the interest of the veteran. So we reduced the 25-percent requirement to 10 percent. I will say to the distinguished Senator that, as he well knows, the item will be in conference, and no doubt the conferees will try to arrive at a figure which will protect the veteran and the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that by and large, from the Senator's description and my general study of the bill and the report, the committee has done a very good job. I am glad the members of the committee have taken the precautions which they have taken, and I commend the Senator for what he has done.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator for what he has said. Of course, the members of the Senate committee who worked on the bill are very happy to accept any bouquets that may come to them. However, in fairness I should say that the really hard work on the bill was done by the Teague subcommittee of the House. They spent 18 months investigating the whole subject, particularly with respect to what had happened under the original GI bill. They held many hearings. They heard a large number of witnesses representing educational institutions, veterans' organizations, and other interests. They spent 18 months on the subject, and they did a most thorough and painstaking and laborious job. After doing all that, they spent a great many weeks writing the bill. Therefore, I want to pay my respects and tribute to the Teague subcommittee of the House.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my good friend from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe the distinguished Senator from Alabama is far too modest. I know of the splendid work which was done by the House subcommittee, but I can testify to the fine spirit and devotion which the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Education has given to the great task of formulating this bill. He was ably assisted by the other members of the committee and by the staff, but I know of no man who devoted himself with greater industry and greater devotion and gave more study to this very important subject than the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I thank my good friend from New York for his very kind and generous words. I should like to say that the other members of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], as well as all the other members of the committee, worked hard and devotedly and laboriously on this bill.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee if he did some revamping or tightening up on the so-called on-the-job-training provisions as they were contained in the original GI bill.

Mr. HILL. We certainly did. We made a number of changes in that connection. We changed the formula of subsistence payments, and sought to make sure that a veteran receiving such training would not be drawing pay from the Government and drawing pay from some other source while not really doing the job for which the Government was paying. In other words we did everything we could—and the Teague committee did also—to make sure that when a veteran was receiving on-the-job training he was really making an effort and was a bona fide student in that type of training.

Mr. HUNT. I am very glad to hear the distinguished chairman say that, because that was the most abused section of the original GI bill of rights. I should like to ask one more question of the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HILL. We also improved the wage-ceiling provisions. The Senator from Wyoming will remember that under the old bill, if a veteran were receiving a certain amount of pay, he could not draw any money from the Government. We tightened up those provisions.

Mr. HUNT. I believe the pending bill also contains a provision preventing the fly-by-night schools getting any advantage under it.

Mr. HILL. Yes; the bill requires that a school must have been in existence for at least 1 year, and it further requires that before a veteran can take a course in such a school, at least 10 percent of the students in the particular course must be nonveterans.

Furthermore, the bill provides that the veteran may make only one change in course. The Senator from Wyoming will remember that under the original GI Act, some schools had high-pressure salesmen who persuaded veterans to change from one course to another. This bill provides that a veteran can make only one change of course.

The bill also tightens up very much the provisions regarding avocational courses, such as courses in dancing, and so forth.

Mr. HUNT. What provision is made regarding the amount of tuition to be charged by the various schools?

Mr. HILL. The original GI bill allowed tuition of $500 for the academic year. This bill provides for tuition of $360 for the academic year.

Mr. HUNT. Will that be regardless of what may be the present tuition base of the educational institution? Do I correctly understand that, regardless of what may be the present tuition base of any educational institution, the same fee or payment will be provided?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; the Senator from Wyoming must realize the tuition charged by colleges and universities varies a great deal. For instance, at Harvard Medical School, one of the outstanding medical schools, the tuition might be very much more than that at the University of Wyoming or that at the University of Alabama. We did not try to set a standard fee.

Mr. HUNT. In each instance would the board of trustees of the institution be allowed to fix the tuition?

Mr. HILL. Yes; of course, in each instance the institution can fix its own fees and tuition. That is a matter to be handled by each institution.

Mr. HUNT. Of course, some universities, including State universities, increased the tuition charged the GI's, to the disadvantage of the GI's.

Mr. HILL. Yes. In this measure we seek to provide that a GI cannot be charged any more than a civilian is charged. We take care of that situation as much as we possibly can, so that a GI cannot be charged more than a civilian is charged.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his replies to these questions.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his questions.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me join in the congratulations to the committee for having done what obviously is a very good job in improving the situation, as compared with that under the original GI bill of rights. I know that a great deal of the credit goes to the Senator from Alabama and to his very able committee.

In connection with what has been said of the Senator from Alabama, I wish to say that the Teague committee of the House of Representatives, to my knowledge, spent a great deal of time on this work. Personally, I know that Representative TEAGUE—himself a combat veteran, one of the few veterans in any congressional body who has received the Silver Star for bravery, and has received the Purple Heart three times, and who always has been a great friend of the veteran—several years ago was criticized by some of the brass of certain professional veterans' organizations because he refused to knuckle under. This bill is another evidence of Representative TEAGUE's deep loyalty and devotion to the genuine cause of veterans throughout the Nation. I am very happy that the Senator from Alabama has teamed up with Representative TEAGUE in this very worthy effort.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the words of the Senator from Florida gladden my heart. I do not know of anyone who so richly deserves the tribute the Senator from Florida has just paid as does Representative TEAGUE. As the Senator from Florida has said, Representative TEAGUE has done a magnificent job, and the entire Congress, the veterans, and all the people of the United States owe him a lasting debt of gratitude for the work he has done on this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The work of our committee would have been impossible without the prior study made by Representative TEAGUE and his committee. He was thorough, fair, and accurate. What the other Members have said is the literal truth, namely, that the Senate, the entire Congress, and all the people of the United States owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask two questions. First, does the bill contain any provision making the qualifications and conditions provided by the bill applicable to payments from appropriations for GI benefits immediately after July 1? In other words, are the appropriations for the new fiscal year contingent upon the modifications made by this bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes. We have made provision for that. We expect this bill to become effective at once, so that the Korean veterans will be able immediately to take advantage of the provisions of the bill. Some of the schools begin in August, and we wish to provide for them to continue. We have made provision for the current appropriations to be used in that connection.

Mr. CASE. Even though the appropriation bill has already been passed by both branches of Congress?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. CASE. This measure imposes some changes.

Mr. HILL. Yes, but we have written the bill in such a way that the current appropriations will be available under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CASE. I believe I now understand that side of the picture.

In this bill a limitation of $30 a month, or $360 a year, is provided as the total amount which may be paid for tuition. Formerly the total amount of tuition which could be paid was $500. Will the appropriations for the new fiscal year be subject to the reduced-tuition payments provided for by this bill?

Mr. HILL. Yes, although, of course, this bill will not change the application of the original GI bill. This bill will apply to veterans who have served since June 27, 1950.

Mr. CASE. I wonder whether in the independent offices appropriation bill reference is made to the laws in existence as of that time, and whether the funds will be available under the provisions of the old bill.

Mr. HILL. I happen to be a member of the independent offices appropriations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee; and I think my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is also a member, will bear me out when I say that we anticipated the passage of this bill, and the funds carried in the current appropriation bill will be available for this purpose. It might be found necessary to have a supplemental appropriation bill; but the current appropriations, as provided by the independent offices appropriation bill, will be available to carry out the provisions of this bill.

Mr. CASE. Not only will they be available, but they will be subject to the modifications or limitations provided by this bill, will they not? I wish to know if the thing applies both ways.

Mr. HILL. I would say the funds could not be spent unless the provisions of this bill were complied with.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would think so, but I should like to have the Senator read the provisions which he thinks would not be handled in that way.

Mr. CASE. I shall go into that a little later.

At this point let me say that the bill provides for a mustering-out payment which is to be in lieu of the old 52–$20 provision, or, in short, the old subsistence at the rate of $20 a week, for 52 weeks. The new provision will permit up to a $300 mustering-out payment, in lieu of that.

The last sentence of section 403, on page 69, reads as follows:

> A person entitled to receive the first installment of the mustering-out payment at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall, at his election, receive the whole of such payment in one lump sum, rather than in installments.

It is my understanding that the armed services regularly offer reenlistment bonuses. Will this mustering-out payment be in addition to the normal reenlistment bonus, or will it take its place?

Mr. HILL. I believe I shall have to say to the Senator from South Dakota that under the language of the bill as it now is written, the veteran would receive both. He would receive his mustering-out pay for the service he had rendered in the armed services; and then if he saw fit to reenlist, I believe he would receive the reenlistment bonus. I think that is the case.

Mr. CASE. Then it does not seem to me that that provision meets the original purpose of the subsistence allowances which were made.

Mr. HILL. This bill does not carry that provision.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that this bill does not carry it; but in the first sentence under title 4, on page 65, I read:

> Mustering-out pay as provided in this title is designed to be in lieu of any provision for unemployment insurance or readjustment (unemployment) allowances except that it is not the purpose to impair any rights to unemployment insurance which may be afforded under existing laws.

In other words, mustering-out payment is in lieu of what was provided in the subsistence or readjustment allowance. If the veteran is not going to have any readjustment, but is being mustered out for the purpose of reenlistment, he does not need what was originally needed as a readjustment allowance.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota has raised a good question, and I should like to ask what would be his thought as to how long the veteran would have to be out of service before reenlisting. Would it be the Senator's thought that a man might be denied mustering-out pay?

Mr. CASE. As nearly as I can ascertain from the language, this is a suggestion that what is contemplated is substantially an immediate reenlistment, because the discharge or release, according to lines 13 and 14, is for the purpose of enlistment or reenlistment, or appointment in a Regular component.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from South Dakota has raised a very interesting question, a question which did not come before the committee, so far as I know. It was not raised in the House during its consideration of the bill, either in committee or on the floor. It is not in the House hearings, so far as I know. I suggest that the Senator might prepare an amendment which could be taken to conference, where the whole question could be considered. We could have

the entire matter before us in a way that we do not now have it.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator. It was not the intent of the committee—at least, I do not think it was the intent of the committee—to provide a reenlistment allowance, or an adjustment allowance when it is to be made in connection with reenlistment.

Mr. HILL. If the man is to reenlist immediately, as the Senator says, then the reason for the mustering-out pay, so far as this language of the bill is concerned, would not exist. I suggest that the Senator might prepare an amendment to carry out his thought. We could take the amendment to conference, examine it, and determine what the reenlistment pay should be, and the requirements for such pay. We could study the matter more fully than is possible or the floor of the Senate at this time. We do not have the reenlistment provisions before us.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan was about to bring up that question. As I understood, it was not intended to allow these payments, as indicated, for mustering out to be paid in the case of a reenlistment. As I understood, the man was to receive that allowance because he was returning to his State, where he might have unemployment insurance.

Mr. HILL. The bill in section 401 so states.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator suggests, it might be well to take the matter to conference and have it considered.

Mr. HILL. The bill provides what the Senator from Michigan has stated; but when we take the amendment to conference we will then have an opportunity to work out the provision to better effect.

Mr. President, it had been my intention to make a somewhat lengthy statement, but I feel that the matters covered by my statement have been largely dealt with in response to the questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with those who have commended Representative TEAGUE and the members of the Senate committee. During the time I have been in the Senate the veterans have had no better friend than the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. This bill is but another evidence of the hard work he has done to assist veterans in readjusting themselves when they return to their homes.

Mr. HILL. I desire to thank my good friend the Senator from Arizona, and to say that, during the time that he has been in the Senate he has been a stanch, ever vigilant friend of the veterans. The same may be said of all the Members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who reported this bill.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that immediately following my remarks earlier in the day there be printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I received from Mr. Charles H. Slayman, Jr., director of research and legislation, American Veterans' Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE (AVC),
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1952.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: On behalf of the American Veterans Committee, I wish to congratulate you and the other members of your committee for the diligence and the speed which marked your consideration of H. R. 7656, the Korean GI bill. AVC has felt strongly for some time, as our testimony before your subcommittee last fall demonstrated, that simple justice required the enactment of this legislation in the present Congress.

I want to commend particularly the Senate committee's revised version of title II, part IV, relating to payments to veterans. This is indeed a compromise between the House provision and the advocates of direct tuition payments to schools, but it is a very fair and reasonable compromise which, in my opinion, will work for a more equitable solution to this problem, insofar as the veteran is concerned. Certainly the subsistence payments to the veteran are a vital part of this legislation, and no veteran should receive what is in effect less subsistence funds merely because he chooses to attend a higher tuition institution. It is our hope that the Senate will approve the bill as reported by your committee, and that the conference committee will agree substantially with the Senate version.

Again, the American Veterans Committee, as will be every veteran of the Korean emergency, is grateful to you and to your committee for its fine work on this important bill.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES H. SLAYMAN, Jr.,
Director of Research and Legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the bill now being considered was one of the most important measures to come before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during this entire session of the Congress.

It is a measure through which the Congress, acting for a grateful people, is discharging in part a grave obligation. It is a bill through which we can make a small but most significant repayment to the tens of thousands of young men and women who left their homes and families, postponed their plans to establish themselves in the business and professional life of the Nation, and interrupted carefully thought-out careers, in order that they might interpose their lives, their courage, and their abilities between the free world and the menace of a rapacious and predatory communism on the march. That obligation, Mr. President, can never be discharged in full. But insofar as we can express our consciousness of our debt and our intention to meet it to whatever extent is humanly possible, we can and must act promptly.

The bill now before the Senate received prolonged, careful, and conscientious study by a committee of the House of Representatives. After it passed the House and was referred to the Senate committee of which I have the honor to be chairman, I immediately appointed a special subcommittee, and named as chairman the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], one of the Senate's most outstanding statesmen, and a man known to all of us for years as thoroughly dedicated to the best interest of both the American veteran and America's educational system. It was immediately subjected to prompt, penetrating, and thoroughly objective analysis. As a matter of fact, the members of the subcommittee had devoted many days and weeks to a study of the problems involved in this measure long before the House acted, and when the bill came before them, they were well prepared to act promptly, intelligently, and decisively. They did so, as did the members of the full committee. As a result, the Senate now has before it a bill, every detail of which has been most carefully considered, and concerning which members of the committee are prepared to speak with authoritativeness and a keen understanding of its many implications.

There may well be honest and sincere differences of opinion as to certain of those details, Mr. President. In fact, I am certain that there will be, and that the Senate will be given forceful, cogent, and lucid explanations of those differences of opinion. But despite them, and while considering those differences, Mr. President, every member of our committee kept constantly in mind one single overriding consideration—our obligation to the veteran to act decisively and without delay. That is why our committee was unanimous in reporting this amended bill to the Senate.

It is in that spirit, Mr. President, that I hope the Senate will debate the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 with a full and frank discussion of its many phases, and of the implications of all suggested changes; with objectivity and fairness, with full respect for differences of opinion, but, above all, with promptness, and a constant awareness of the fact that we must and will do our part for the veterans of Korea, and do it now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of our committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] in reference to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who has always proved himself to be everything the Senator from Montana has stated about him. He is a friend of the veteran, he is one of the great men in the field of education, and he has done much for the good of education in America.

This is a bill which will accomplish good results. I think it demonstrates Congress has learned from experience, and it also demonstrates that Congress has had a weather eye upon the Veterans' Administration in terms of its relationship to this program. It is my hope that the program will be carefully administered in the light of the objectives of the bill, the prime objective being to give to every veteran an opportunity to have the best education this country can possibly provide, and to have the veteran afforded all the Government assistance which the veteran has more than earned, which he justly deserves. It should be in that spirit that the Vet-

erans' Administration takes care of its obligations in administering the act.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Montana for his very kind and generous remarks. I wish to refer to what I said about the subcommittee and all the members who worked most diligently, laboriously, and constructively on the bill. The subcommittee could not have had finer help or cooperation or support than it received from the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] who for so long has been recognized in this body as one of the great friends of veterans.

I also wish to thank my distinguished friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who is one of the Senate's great friends of the veterans in the Senate, for his very kind and generous remarks. We know how stanch and devoted he has been in support of the bill, and of his endeavors to help us in getting the advice and assistance of those best qualified to render the greatest possible service to our veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for committee amendments, which, without objection, will be considered en bloc.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 13, after the word "benefits", to strike out "the old-age and survivors insurance credits,"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "any" to strike out "apprentice council" and insert "joint apprentice committee"; on line 13, after the word "Affairs", to strike out "and"; in line 15, after the word "of", to insert "Education; and (12) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor of the United States Department of Labor"; on page 6, line 1, after the word "after", to strike out "September" and insert "August"; on page 9, line 5, after the word "pursue", to strike out: "In no event, however, may an eligible veteran pursue a program of education or training under this title at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, except that the Administrator may approve the pursuit of a program of education or training in the Republic of the Philippines at an approved educational institution or training establishment"; in line 22, after the word "education", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 10, line 6, after the word "may", to insert "unless his program had been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application"; on page 11, line 10, after the word "photography", to strike out "course," and insert "course or"; in line 11, after the word "course", to strike out "or any flight training course pursued as a hobby or which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character,"; on page 12, line 16, after the word "than", to strike out "three-fourths" and insert "ninety per centum"; on page 13, line 1, after the word "than", to strike out "two years" and insert "one year immediately prior to the enrollment of such veteran"; in line 8, after the word "than", to strike out "two years" and insert "one year"; in line 12, after the word "than", to strike out "two years" and insert "one year"; on page 14, line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment" and insert "his program of education or training"; on page 16, line 6, after the word "The" to insert "basic"; in line 7, after the word "allowance" to insert "to meet in part the expenses of subsistence, supplies, books, and equipment"; in line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "$110" and insert "$80"; in line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "$150" and insert "$105"; in the same line, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or at the rate of $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "$110" and insert "$80"; in line 23, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; on page 17, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "$50" and insert "$40"; in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "$70" and insert "$50"; in the same line, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or at the rate of $70 per mon h, if he has more than one dependent"; in line 6, after the word "The", to insert "basic"; in the same line, after the word "allowance" to insert "to meet in part the expenses of subsistence, supplies, books, and equipment"; in line 13, after "(1)" to strike out "$90" and insert "$75"; in the same line, after "2" to strike out "$120" and insert "$95"; in line 14, after the word "one," to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or (3) $115 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; in line 19, after "(2)" to strike out "$95" and insert "$85"; in line 20, after the word "one"; to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; on page 18, line 8, after "(2)" to strike out "$300" and insert "$275"; in line 9, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or (3) $310 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; in line 18, after the word "allowance" to insert "to meet in part the expenses of subsistence, supplies, books, and equipment"; in line 21, after "(1)" to strike out "$95" and insert "$70"; in line 22, after "(2)", to strike out "$120" and insert "$85"; in line 23, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; in line 25, after the word "his", to insert "basic"; on page 19, line 4, after the word "or", to strike out "$90" and insert "$80"; in the same line, after the word "one", to strike out "or more dependents" and insert "dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; on page 20, line 14, after the word "under" to strike out "one of the preceding subsections" and insert "the applicable"; on page 21, after line 4, to insert:

(h) In addition to the basic education and training allowances to meet in part the expenses of subsistence, supplies, books, and equipment, there shall be paid to each eligible veteran a course of education or training who is entitled to a basic education and training allowance under subsection (a), (b), or (d) an additional education and training allowance to meet in part the cost of his tuition and fees. Such additional education and training allowance shall be paid monthly on a pro-rata basis of the total amount of the established charges for tuition and fees for the course which a nonveteran student similarly circumstanced is required to pay and for tuition and fees for the course, except that in no case shall such additional education and training allowance exceed the rate of $40 a month for a full-time program or the pro-rata part thereof for a part-time program. The additional education and training allowance provided by this subsection shall be computed on the basis of the tuition and fees which are required to be paid by nonveteran students similarly circumstanced and shall not include optional fees, charges for board, lodging, living expenses, or travel, deposits, or fees assessed to cover the cost of supplies, books, or equipment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the last amendment so as to carry out the intended purpose of the committee. Throughout the consideration of the bill we have sought to protect the veteran as well as the Government, providing that the veterans shall not pay more than civilians. This amendment is an extra protection where there is no civilian student along with the veteran student.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, at the end of line 2, it is proposed to insert a new sentence as follows:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, where the Administrator finds that more than 90 percent of the students enrolled in the course in which the veteran is enrolled are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) or this title, the payment of the additional education and training allowance under this subsection shall be at a rate which the Administrator determines to be a fair and reasonable charge for tuition and fees for such course, but in no event exceeding the limits otherwise prescribed in this subsection with respect to charges to nonveteran students and maximum dollar amounts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, to reletter the subsection from "(h)" to "(i)"; on page 23, line 9, after "(a)", to insert a colon and *"Provided*, That the administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment above that established as the standard workweek through bona-fide collective bargaining between employers and employees"; on page 23,

line 15, after the word "Administrator", to strike our "shall" and insert "may"; in line 21, after the word "therein", to strike out the comma and "except that, in the case of a tax supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $31 per month for a full-time course"; on page 24, line 7, after "(a)", to strike out "The" and insert "Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the"; in line 12, after the word "event" to strike out "the chief executive of"; in line 16, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; in line 18, after the words "by the ", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; in line 20, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; on page 25, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; in line 16, after the word "The", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; in line 20, after the word "The", to strike out "Commissioner" and insert "Administrator"; on page 26, line 20, in the subhead, after the word "of", to strike out "Office of Education And"; in line 24, after the word "agency.", to strike out "The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title"; on page 27, line 11, after the word "shall", to strike out "(except in the case of the Office of Education)"; in line 14, after the word "agreement.", to strike out "Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this title are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office."; on page 37, line 7, after the word "standards", to strike out "or" and insert "of"; on page 40, line 17, after the words "event the", to strike out "student" and insert 'veteran"; in line 20, after the words "to the", to strike out "student" and insert "veteran"; on page 44, line 11, after the word "in" to strike out "the field of education and are representative" and insert "their respective fields of education, labor, and management, and of representatives"; in line 16, after the word "be", to strike out "an ex officio member" and insert "ex-officio members"; on page 45, line 16, after the word "Administration" to strike out "or of Office of Education"; on page 46, line 16, after the word "Veterans' " to strike out "Administration, the Office of Education," and insert "Administration"; after line 19, to insert:

(d) The Administrator may waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

On page 47, line 4, after "Sec. 265," to insert "(a)"; after line 8, to insert:

(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution, which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this title, an allowance for each full-time eligible veteran or the prorata part thereof for each part-time eligible veteran to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. The amount of such allowance for each such eligible veteran shall be determined by the Administrator but shall be uniform with respect to all educational institutions. Such allowance shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that in the event any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this title, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

On page 49, line 13, in the subhead, after the word "Penalties" to strike out "And Forfeitures"; on page 50, beginning with line 8, to strike out "shall forfeit all rights, claims, and benefits under this title and under Public Law 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both. Any person not subject to the forfeiture provisions of this section who violates this section"; on page 50, line 18, after the word "amended," to insert "the provisions of section 15 of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, the provisions of section 12 of Public Law Numbered 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 557), as amended"; on page 51, after line 21, to insert:

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 274. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings "Administration, medical, hospital and domiciliary services" and "Readjustment benefits" are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title.

On page 52, after line 14, to strike out:

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: ": *Provided*, That any person who is eligible for the benefits of this title by virtue of active service prior to June 27, 1950, or is the owner of property acquired through benefits accruing for prior service, shall not be eligible for additional benefits under this title by reason of active service on or after June 27, 1950: *Provided further*, That any guaranty entitlement used prior to reentry into service as to which the Administrator has incurred no loss and is no longer subject to contingent liability shall be restored to any veteran separated from the service after June 27, 1950"; and.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: "Entitlement derived from service on or after June 27, 1950, shall (1) cancel any unused entitlement derived from service prior to June 27, 1950, and (2) be reduced by the amount entitlement from such prior service shall have been used to obtain a direct, guaranteed, or insured loan (a) on real property which the veteran owns at the time of application or (b) as to which the Administrator shall have incurred actual liability or loss unless in the event of loss or the incurrence and payment of such liability by the Administrator, the resultant indebtedness of the veteran to the Government shall have been paid in full"; and.

On page 53, line 18, after the word "the", to strike out "third sentence" and insert "fourth sentence of such subsection, as amended by this section"; on page 54, line 19, in the subhead, after the word "Construction", to strike out the semicolon and "Warranties; Substantial Deficiencies in Housing"; in line 23, after the word "following", to strike out "new subsections"; on page 55, after line 14, to strike out:

(c) The seller of a newly constructed dwelling unit which is sold for initial occupancy to any person who meets the eligibility requirements of section 500 (a) or section 1506 of this act, as amended, with the aid of financing guaranteed or insured by an agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government, and such other person as may be required by such agency or instrumentality to become warrantor, shall be deemed to have expressly warranted to such purchaser that the dwelling is constructed in substantial conformity with the plans and specifications on which such agency or instrumentality based its valuation of the unit or its commitment to guarantee or insure a loan to finance the construction or purchase of such unit. Such warranty shall apply only with respect to failures of performances as to which the purchaser has given written notice to the warrantor within 1 year from the date of initial occupancy.

(d) The Administrator shall have the right to refuse to appraise any dwelling or housing project owned, sponsored, or to be constructed by any person identified with housing previously sold to veterans under this title as to which substantial deficiencies have been discovered, or as to which there has been a failure or indicated inability to discharge contractual liabilities to veterans, or as to which it is ascertained that the type of contract of sale or the methods or practices pursued in relation to the marketing of such properties were unfair or unduly prejudicial to veteran purchasers.

On page 57, after line 10, to strike out:

REFUSAL TO GUARANTEE OR INSURE LOANS IN CERTAIN CASES

SEC. 307. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

SEC. 514. Whenever the Administrator finds with respect to loans guaranteed or insured under this title that any lender or holder has failed to maintain adequate loan accounting records, or to demonstrate proper ability to service loans adequately or to exercise proper credit judgment or has willfully or negligently engaged in practices otherwise detrimental to the interest of veterans or of the Government, he may refuse either temporarily or permanently to guarantee or insure any loans made by such lender or holder or bar such lender or holder from ac-

quiring loans guaranteed or insured under this title: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not refuse to pay a guaranty on loans theretofore entered into in good faith between the veteran and the lending institution."

On page 58, after line 5, to strike out:

TITLE IV—OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

WAGE CREDITS FOR VETERANS OF KOREAN CONFLICT

SEC. 401. (a) Section 217 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) (1) For the purposes of determining entitlement to and the amount of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment payable under this title on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, such veteran shall be deemed to have been paid wages (in addition to the wages, if any, actually paid to him) of $160 in each month during any part of which he served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress. This subsection shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment if—

"(A) a larger such benefit or payment, as the case may be, would be payable without its application; or

"(B) a benefit (other than a benefit payable in a lump sum unless it is a commutation of, or a substitute for, periodic payments) which is based, in whole or in part, upon the active military or naval service of such veteran on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, is determined by any agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States (other than the Veterans' Administration) to be payable by it under any other law of the United State or under a system established by such agency or instrumentality.

The provisions of clause (B) shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment under this title if its application would reduce the primary insurance amount (as computed under section 215 prior to any recomputation thereof pursuant to subsection (f) of such section) of the individual on whose wages and self-employment income such benefit or payment is based by $0.50 or less.

"(2) Upon application for benefits or a lump-sum death payment on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, the Federal Security Administrator shall make a decision without regard to clause (B) of paragraph (1) of this subsection unless he has been notified by some other agency or instrumentality of the United States that, on the basis of the military or naval service of such veteran on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, a benefit described in clause (B) of paragraph (1) has been determined by such agency or instrumentality to be payable by it. If he has not been so notified, the Federal Security Administrator shall then ascertain whether some other agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States has decided that a benefit described in clause (B) of paragraph (1) is payable by it. If any such agency or instrumentality has decided, or thereafter decides, that such a benefit is payable by it, it shall so notify the Federal Security Administrator, and the Administrator shall certify no further benefits for payment or shall recompute the amount of any further benefits payable, as may be required by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) Any agency or wholly owned instrumentality of the United States which is authorized by any law of the United States to pay benefits or has a system of benefits which are based, in whole or in part, on military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, shall, at the request of the Federal Security Administrator, certify to him, with respect to any veteran of active military or naval service on or after June 27, 1950, such information as the Administrator deems necessary to carry out his functions under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(4) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the trust fund from time to time, as benefits which include service to which this subsection is applicable become payable under this title, such sums as the Administrator estimates to be necessary to meet the additional costs, resulting from this subsection, of such benefits (including lump-sum death payments). Such estimates shall be arrived at through the use of appropriate accounting, statistical, sampling, or other methods.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'veteran' means any individual who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who, if discharged or released therefrom, was so discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of a disability or injury incurred or aggravated in service in line of duty; but such term shall not include any individual who died while in the active military or naval service of the United States if his death was inflicted (other than by an enemy of the United States) as lawful punishment for a military or naval offense."

(b) Section 205 (o) of such act is amended by striking out "section 217 (a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (a) or (e) of section 217."

(c) (1) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be applicable only with respect to monthly benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act for months after, and with respect to lump-sum death payments in the case of deaths occurring after, the month following the month in which this act is enacted, except that, in the case of any individual who is entitled, on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any individual to whom section 217 (e) of the Social Security Act applies, to monthly benefits under such section 202 for the month following the month in which this act is enacted, such amendments shall be applicable (A) only if an application for recomputation by reason of the amendments is filed by such individual, or any other individual, entitled to benefits under such section 202 on the basis of such wages and self-employment income, and (B) only with respect to such benefits for months after whichever of the following is the later: the first month following the month in which this act is enacted or the seventh month before the month in which such application was filed. Recomputations of benefits as required to carry out the provisions of this paragraph shall be made notwithstanding the provisions of section 215 (f) (1) of the Social Security Act; but no such recomputation shall be regarded as a recomputation for purposes of section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act.

(2) In the case of any veteran (as defined in section 217 (e) (5) of the Social Security Act) who died prior to the enactment of this act, the time within which proof of support may be filed under subsection (f) or (h) of section 202 of the Social Security Act shall be 2 years after the date of enactment of this act.

LUMP-SUM DEATH PAYMENTS FOR REINTERMENT OF DECEASED VETERANS

SEC. 402. (a) Section 101 (d) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950 is amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma and adding: "and except that in the case of any individual who died outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to September 1950, whose death occurred while he was in the active military or naval service of the United States, and who is returned to any of such States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands for interment or reinterment, the last sentence of section 202 (g) of the Social Security Act as in effect prior to the enactment of this act shall not prevent payment to any person under the second sentence thereof if application for a lump-sum death payment under such section with respect to such deceased individual is filed by or on behalf of such person (whether or not legally competent) prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of such interment or reinterment."

(b) In the case of any individual who died outside the 48 States and the District of Columbia after August 1950 and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, whose death occurred while he was in the active military or naval service of the United States, and who is returned to any of such States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands for interment or reinterment, the last sentence of section 202 (i) of the Social Security Act shall not prevent payment to any person under the second sentence thereof if application for a lump-sum death payment with respect to such deceased individual is filed under such section by or on behalf of such person (whether or not legally competent) prior to the expiration of 2 years after the date of such interment or reinterment.

On page 65, line 3, in the heading, after the word "Title", to strike out "V" and insert "IV"; in line 5, to change the section number from "501" to "401"; in line 11, to change the section number from "502" to "402"; after line 22, to strike out:

(2) any member of the Armed Forces who is retired or separated therefrom under provisions of law other than title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

(2) any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of discharge or release from active service, is entitled to severance pay or is transferred or returned to the retired list with retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, or to a status in which he receives such pay: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply upon retirement or separation pursuant to title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949.

On page 67, line 10, after the word "Academies", to strike out "and"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "Congress." and insert "Congress; and"

"(c) A member of the Armed Forces who is eligible to receive mustering-out payments under this title and under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 for the same period of active service shall elect to receive such payment either under this title or such act, but shall not

be entitled to payment under both provisions of law."

On page 68, line 2, to change the section number from "503" to "403"; in line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "502" and insert "402"; on page 69, line 19, to change the section number from "504" to "404"; on page 70, line 13, to change the section number from "505" to "405"; on page 71, line 2, to change the section number from "506" to "406"; in line 21, after the word "section", to strike out "505" and insert "405"; on page 72, line 18, to change the section number from "507" to "407"; on page 73, line 6, in the heading, to change the title number from "VI" to "V"; in line 8, to change the section number from "601" to "501"; after line 18 to insert:

Sec. 502. Any person who served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as may thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable is hereby authorized to elect, purchase, and pursue such courses of education or training as are provided by the United States Armed Forces Institute. Such courses shall be furnished to such person by such institute subject to the same conditions, general requirements, and fees as are applicable to persons in the active service: *Provided*, That an application for such course, in the form specified by the Secretary of Defense, shall be filed by such person with the Director of the United States Armed Forces Institute within 2 years after the date of the discharge or release of such person from the active service.

And on page 74, line 13, to change the section number from "602" to "503."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new title, as follows:

TITLE V—VETERANS UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ELIGIBILITY

SEC. 501. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be entitled, in accordance with the provisions of this title and regulations issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant thereto, to receive veterans' unemployment compensation as provided herein for each week of unemployment, not to exceed the total allowable under section 502, which (1) begins after the 90th day after date of enactment hereof or the 90th day after the date of his discharge or release, whichever date is later, and (2) occurs not later than 15 months after such later date: *Provided*, That no such compensation shall be paid for any period for which he receives an education and training allowance under title II: *Provided further*, That no such compensation shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the date so determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive compensation for any week of unemployment if a claim is made and it is found that he meets all the eligibility requirements (except the requirement that he shall have earned certain amounts of wages in insured employment) under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which he resided immediately prior to his entrance into the active military or naval service. Any such claim shall be processed and paid by such State (hereinafter referred to as the "paying State") pursuant to agreements entered into under section 505 (a), but may be accepted by any State unemployment compensation office for processing and payment by the paying State.

AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION AND PAYMENT

SEC. 502. (a) The compensation for a week shall be an amount equal to the maximum benefit including dependency allowances which may be paid to a person eligible therefor under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which the veteran resided immediately prior to his entrance into the active military or naval service.

(b) The number of weeks of compensation to which each eligible veteran shall be entitled shall be the maximum number of weeks for which benefits may be paid to a person eligible therefor under the unemployment compensation law of the paying State.

SEC. 503. (a) Veterans' unemployment compensation shall be paid at the intervals prescribed by the unemployment compensation law of the paying State: *Provided*, That if none are so prescribed veterans' unemployment compensation shall be paid at such reasonable intervals as may be determined by the Administrator.

(b) Any compensation certified to but remaining unpaid upon the death of a claimant shall not be considered a part of the assets of the estate of the claimant, or liable for the payment of his debts, or subject to any administration of his estate, and the Administrator may make payment thereof to such person or persons he finds most equitably entitled thereto.

DUPLICATE BENEFITS PROHIBITED

SEC. 504. No compensation shall be payable to a claimant under this title where, for the same period, the claimant is eligible for an allowance or benefit under any Federal or State unemployment compensation law or when he is disqualified under the law of the paying State.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 505. (a) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to administer this title and shall, insofar as possible, utilize existing facilities and services of Federal and State departments or agencies on the basis of mutual agreements with such departments or agencies. Such agreements shall provide for the filing of claims for veterans' unemployment compensation with the Administrator through established public employment offices and State unemployment compensation agencies. Such agencies, through agreement, shall also be utilized in the processing, adjustment, and determination of such claims and the payment of such compensation.

(b) The Administrator, consistent with the provisions of this title, shall prescribe such rules and regulations and require such records and reports as he may find necessary to carry out its purposes: *Provided, however*, That cooperative rules and regulations relating to the performance by Federal or State departments, or agencies, of functions under agreements made therewith may be made by the Administrator after consultation and advisement with representatives of such departments or agencies.

(c) The Administrator may delegate to any officer or employee of his own or of any cooperating department or agency of any State such of his powers and duties, except that of prescribing rules and regulations, as the Administrator may consider necessary and proper to carry out the purposes of this title.

(d) Compensation paid by the cooperating State agencies shall be repaid upon certification by the Administrator. The Secretary of the Treasury, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury, and without the necessity of audit and settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall pay monthly to the departments, agencies, or individuals designated, the amounts so certified.

(e) The Administrator shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment in advance or otherwise such sums as he estimates to be necessary to compensate any Federal department or agency for its administrative expenses under this title. Such sums shall cover periods of no longer than 6 months.

(f) The Administrator shall also from time to time certify to the Secretary of Labor such State departments or agencies as may be participating in the administration of this title, and the amount of the administrative expense incurred or to be incurred by a State under agreements made pursuant to this section. Upon such certification the Secretary of Labor shall certify such amount to the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the amount, if any, payable by the Secretary of Labor under the provisions of section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, and the additional amount so certified shall be paid to each State by the Secretary of the Treasury out of the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration.

(g) Any money paid to any cooperating agency or person, which is not used for the purpose for which it was paid shall, upon termination of the period covered by such payment or the agreement with such agency or person, be returned to the Treasury and credited to the current appropriation for carrying out the purpose of this title, or, if returned after the expiration of period covered by this title, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 506. (a) No person designated by the Administrator as a certifying officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

(b) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence, or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated by the Administrator.

SEC. 507. Any claimant whose claim for an allowance has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing before an impartial tribunal of the State agency or such other agency as may be designated by the Administrator. The representative of the Administrator located in each State shall be the final appellate authority in regard to contested claims arising in such State, subject to review by the Administrator.

DECISIONS AND PROCEDURES

SEC. 508. The authority to issue subpenas and provisions for invoking aid of the courts of the United States in case of disobedience thereto, to make investigations, and to administer oaths, as contained in title III of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2033-2034; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 131-133), shall be applicable in the administration of this title.

PENALTIES

SEC. 509. Any claimant who knowingly accepts any compensation to which he is not entitled shall be ineligible to receive any further allowance under this title.

SEC. 510. (a) Whoever, for the purpose of causing an increase in any compensation authorized under this title, or for the purpose of causing any compensation to be paid where none is authorized under this title, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any compensation under this title, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or compensation under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 511. As used in this title—

(a) The term "week" means such period or periods of seven consecutive calendar days as may be prescribed in regulations by the Administrator.

(b) The term "wages" means all remuneration for services from whatever sources, including commissions and bonuses and the cash value of all remuneration in any medium other than cash.

On page 65, strike out lines 5 to 10, inclusive.

Renumber succeeding title and section numbers and references thereto accordingly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment which I have just submitted is only a technical modification of the amendment which is now on the desks of the Senators. It provides for unemployment compensation for veterans of the Korean war.

First I wish to explain in general what the amendment will do and how it will be accomplished and then I wish to outline the difference between the amendment I have submitted and the amendment which is now on the desks of the Senators.

The sole purpose of the amendment is to provide veterans with the same measure of employment security as the employed nonveteran now enjoys.

The man who remains at home and works is ordinarily covered by the unemployment compensation laws of his State. My amendment would just extend that same coverage of the Korean veteran. It is no special favor to the veteran to make him eligible for ordinary treatment when his military service is the cause of his lack of eligibility.

It may be said that this amendment establishes another "52–20 Club" or gives the veteran an unearned year of vacation. But this is most definitely not the case. Furthermore, the amendment contains every restriction that I could devise to insure that it would only serve where needed. I have tried to eliminate every possible avenue of abuse.

I feel certain that this amendment will attract more criticism because of its safeguards and its restrictions than it will because of the benefits it might confer.

Here are the principal features of the amendment:

First. A veteran of the Korean war, as defined elsewhere in the bill, would be eligible for the maximum benefits provided by the State laws regarding unemployment compensation of the State in which he lived immediately prior to his entry into the armed services. The dollar value of the compensation and the number of weeks of payment would be the maximum provided for in the applicable State law.

Second. Every eligibility qualification established by State law for unemployment compensation would apply to the veteran except that his military service would substitute for employment in "covered industries" and residence requirements. In accordance with the terms of the State law, the veteran in order to be eligible for these compensation payments must be legitimately unemployed, seeking work, willing to work, and registered with the employment service.

Third. The veteran would not be eligible for benefits under this amendment until 3 months after his discharge. The bill before the Senate now provides for mustering out pay—payable in three installments over the first 3 months following the veteran's discharge and it is my intention that he should not be eligible for this veterans unemployment compensation during the time he is receiving his mustering out pay.

Fourth. Under no circumstances would the veteran be eligible for any compensation under this title for any week beginning more than 15 months after his discharge. In other words, his eligibility for the compensation provided in this amendment is limited to 1 year.

Fifth. The veteran would not be eligible for any compensation under this amendment if he is employed, if he receives an education or training allowance, or if he is entitled to regular unemployment compensation under the State law or if he violates the State unemployment compensation laws, except as they relate to previous employment or residence.

Sixth. The administration of the program would be in the hands of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but he would be empowered to make agreements with State and Federal agencies for the actual administration of the provisions of the amendment. It is contemplated that the actual administration would be carried out by the State unemployment compensation agencies in the same manner as the Servicemen's readjustment allowance program was handled. Administrative costs would be borne by the Federal Government, as would be the cost of the benefits under the amendment.

It may be alleged that the amendment will be the opening wedge in the federalization of the State unemployment compensation systems. Nothing could be further from the truth. Administratively, the amendment is similar to the provision of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and, to the best of my belief, no one has ever declared that that act sought to federalize the State unemployment commissions.

In brief, then, those are the things which this amendment will do.

The pending amendment differs from the amendment on the desks in that it provides greater safeguards to tie it more closely to the laws of the various States. The new version clarifies the section preventing duplication of payments and it eliminates the requirement for an agent in every State since it is unnecessary.

The estimated costs of this amendment for the first year after its adoption is less than $60,000,000, and I believe the costs will be well below that because of the general high economic conditions of the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a comparison of my amendment with the provision of the original Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of Ferguson amendment with provision of original Serviceman's Readjustment Act

	World War II Act	Ferguson amendment
1. Amount of payment	$20 per week	Depends on State law; varies from $16 to $36.
2. Length of payments	52 weeks	Depends on State law, average believed to be about 20 weeks.
3. Start of program	Discharge of veteran	3 months after discharge.
4. Duration of program	2 years after discharge	15 months after discharge.
5. Disqualifications	Spelled out in act	State law applies.
6. Provision for self-employed	Eligible under act	Not eligible, no provision.
7. Administration	By VA through State agreements	By VA through State agreements.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator made a statement in reference to this amendment and had it put into the RECORD. I read it carefully. It appeared in the RECORD of June 24. I think there is much merit in the amendment of the Senator. I do not care to cut off his speeech, but, so far as I am concerned, I should be delighted to take the amendment to conference. It has merit, and it should be carefully consid.red.

The PRESIDING CFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 69, line 17, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert:

Provided, That this shall not be construed to authorize payment of both such readjustment allowances and such reenlistment allowances which may be provided by other acts.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the Senator's amendment raises a question which should be raised. If he would like me to take it to conference, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. CASE. I recognize that the language is hastily drawn. I hope the conferees will examine it carefully and see if it properly meets the situation that it is sought to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment and having it go to the conference, but I hope no amendment will be offered that will stand in the way of reenlistment pay. I think that probably should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

Mr. HILL. I think it is very much better that men voluntarily enlist than that they be forced into the service through the operation of selective service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: "Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Anna Rosenberg be printed in the RECORD just prior to the passage of House bill 7656."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1952.

Hon. ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: As you know, the Department of Defense strongly supports the Korean GI bill (H. R. 7656) which the House of Representatives approved by an overwhelming vote and which earlier this week was unanimously approved and reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Because of your deep, long-standing interest in the welfare of our fighting men and our veterans, I am writing you to urge prompt and favorable action by the Senate on this important legislation.

The Korean GI bill which provides educational benefits; home, farm, and business loans; wage credits under the Social Security Act; mustering-out payments; and employment assistance for veterans of the Korean period is nothing more or less than simple justice for our veterans. Similar readjustment benefits were granted to our veterans of World War II. We cannot in conscience do less for our veterans of this period of fighting in Korea. The rate of discharge of these veterans is increasing daily so that early action becomes imperative in order that they may plan their futures and have an opportunity to avail themselves, without a wasteful waiting period, of the readjustment benefits which a grateful country will afford them.

The equity involved in providing these benefits for Korean veterans is clear. Many of these men, out of sudden military necessity, were called upon to disrupt their lives in order to serve their country a second time in the short space of 10 years. Tens of thousands of these men have served nobly and bravely under the most adverse conditions in Korea. Others have served on arduous duty in unpleasant posts throughout the world. All have left their civilian pursuits and have had their normal life interrupted.

While the other sections of the bill have received the most attention, the section providing social security wage credits for military service during the Korean period merits special note. For the past 2 years the Department of Defense has sought the enactment of the survivors benefit bill (H. R. 5594) to provide more adequate benefits for the surviving dependents of service personnel. I do not think it is generally recognized how inadequate is the provision made today for the survivors of our men who lose their lives in the uniform service of their country. While only a stopgap measure, the social-security provisions of H. R. 7656, in addition to providing wage credits which the veteran may carry over into civilian employment, would also provide much-needed survivors' insurance benefits to the surviving dependents of many servicemen killed on active duty. These benefits will be particularly helpful to the widows and children of enlisted personnel in the lower grades. There can be no question but that a fighting man who knows his family will be protected in the event he can no longer provide for them is a better fighting man than one who is constantly beset by the fear that his death will bring want and privations to his loved ones.

In the interest of equity and justice for our Korean veterans, and for the families of the men who have given their lives in the service of their country, the Department most earnestly urges prompt and favorable action by the Senate on H. R. 7656.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments? If not, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill may be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HILL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. IVES conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to discuss the veterans' education bill which was passed earlier this afternoon while I was not in the Chamber.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon speak a little louder?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to take a few minutes on the veterans' education bill which the Senate passed earlier this afternoon while I was not on the floor. I was attending a meeting of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, which is considering proposals of the three branches of the armed services with respect to funds for public works installations of the Military Establishment. Therefore I was not on the floor when the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] presented the report on H. R. 7656 in behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Because the subject matter to which I shall address myself will necessarily be in conference, I wish to make a very brief record on it this afternoon, so that the Senator from Alabama, when he goes to conference, will have a record of my objections to one section of the bill. He is familiar with my views because as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I voted with the minority on this point in committee. As I recall, the vote difference between the majority and the minority in committee was a difference of two votes.

Speaking of section 232, there is a basic difference in the provisions of this section of the bill as it was passed by the House and as it has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for favorable consideration. This basic difference goes to the very heart of the entire measure as recommended by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and as enacted by the House after many months of study and consideration.

Under the House version as set forth in H. R. 7656, referred to as the Teague bill, the eligible veteran would be paid an education and training allowance in the nature of a scholarship to meet in part his expenses of subsistence, supplies, books and equipment. This allowance would be uniform for each veteran depending upon the type of program selected and his dependency status.

Under the bill as it is now before the Senate, the veteran would still be paid an education and training allowance but this allowance would be split into two parts. The veteran would receive a basic allowance to meet in part his expenses of subsistence, supplies, books and equipment. This basic allowance would be uniform for all veterans depending upon the type of program selected and the dependency status. In addition to the basic education and training allowance, the eligible veteran pursuing a course in an educational institution on more than half-time basis would receive an extra education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his tuition and fees up to a maximum of $40 per month but not to exceed the amount of such charges for tuition and fees as the institution might require the veteran to pay. The bill before the Senate more nearly reverts to the plan now contained in Public Law 346—the so-called GI bill of rights for World War II veterans—in that it separates the allow-

ance for subsistence and the allowance for tuition and fees.

The crux of this matter is as follows: The House version reestablishes and preserves the historic relationship between the institution and the student. It restores normal and traditional competitive statuses between the high-tuition and the low tuition instruction which existed throughout the centuries prior to the GI bill. The Senate version has as its purpose the continuance of an artificial competitive advantage enjoyed by high-tuition colleges under the GI bill.

Some of the disadvantages of the plan now before the Senate are as follows:

First. It provides a varying allowance to each individual veteran. For example, take the case of two veterans having the same period of service subsequent to June 27, 1950, both without dependents but one selecting an institution where the tuition charges equal or exceed $40 per month and the other selecting a course in an institution where the tuition and fee charges amount to only $10 per month. Under the House version, each of these veterans would draw an educational allowance of $110 per month to be used in any way the veteran saw fit to aid him in meeting his expenses while attending his elected course. Under the version as now before the Senate, the veteran selecting the higher-priced course would receive a basic allowance of $80 per month for subsistence and a tuition allowance of $40 per month for tuition and fees or a total allowance of $120 per month. The veteran selecting the lower-cost institution would receive a basic allowance of $80 per month for subsistence plus $10 per month for tuition and fees or a total allowance of $90 per month. This places the amount of the benefit on the basis of the course or institution selected by the veteran and not on the service rendered by the veteran to his country while serving in the Armed Forces. This is discrimination.

Second. Under the provisions of the bill now before the Senate, the veteran loses his personal stake in the cost of his course of training since he merely transmits to the institution the amount of the allowance provided under the law for his tuition and fees. This to a large extent destroys the basic concept as contained in the House version wherein it was determined that the veteran should have a greater stake in his own training.

Third. The provisions of the version of the bill before the Senate destroy the basic concept in the House version that the price to be paid for education and training by a veteran should be fixed through normal competition, rather than through the amount of money the institution is able to secure from the Federal Government. The tendency on the part of institutions will be to make $40 a month the floor for tuition and fee charges, and the veteran will not be personally concerned, inasmuch as the amount of money he personally will have available to spend on his education, other than for tuition and fees, will be fixed, regardless of the amount the institution is able to secure through the veteran from the Federal Government for tuition and fees.

Fourth. The provision in the Senate version of the bill to base the extra allowance on the institutions' charge for tuition and fees is an open invitation to institutions to raise their tuition charges not only to veterans but to all students. Experience under the GI bill, where the Government was paying the institution directly for tuition and fees up to a maximum of $500 per ordinary school year, clearly demonstrated that the tendency of the institution was to raise its charges up to the maximum permitted to be paid by the Government under the law.

Fifth. The version of the bill now before the Senate presents administrative difficulties which are almost insurmountable. Each veteran's allowance would have to be computed individually, and this allowance would be subject to change, depending upon whether the student dropped courses, added courses, or made other changes in his program. This arrangement leads the way for continued disputes between the Veterans' Administration and the educational institutions as to the amount of payments to be made to an institution by the Government through the veteran, a situation which caused considerable concern both to the institutions and to the Government under the GI bill.

Sixth. This provision before the Senate is an open invitation to public nonprofit institutions furnishing education or training in courses conducted exclusively for veterans, such as the institutional on-farm training courses and certain adult and elementary academic and vocational educational courses offered by public schools, to assess charges against the Government, to be collected through the veteran at the maximum of $40 a month. In these types of situations there will be few, if any, nonveteran students who will participate in the courses, and there will be no established tuition or fee charges, other than that maximum permitted to be charged to the Government under this law. In these cases the veteran will have no concern as to the amount of the charges.

Seventh. The arrangement as proposed in the Senate version of the bill will present added administrative difficulties to educational institutions, in that the institutions would have to report every course adjustment that would in any way affect the fees to be paid. In addition, disputes are bound to arise as to the amount of the allowance payable to an individual veteran. This will place the veteran in the middle between the Federal Government and the educational institution. Under the House version, the institution can deal with the veteran on the same basis as that on which it deals with any other student attending the institution.

Eighth. The payment of the educational allowance under the plan contained in the Senate version of the bill will in many cases involve delays in the total payment to the veteran. This is so because the allowance must be computed each month and must be changed for any slight change in the fee charges made by the institution to the veteran because of a change in the veteran's program. This possibility would be entirely eliminated under the House plan, by which the allowance to the veteran is made uniform, without regard to the amount of the charge made by the institution to the veteran for his course.

Ninth. Under the provisions of the version of the bill now before the Senate, when the tuition and fee charges exceed $40 a month, the institution will look to the Government for part of the fee and to the veteran for part. This will lead to confusion and dispute between the institution, the veteran, and the Government.

Tenth. Mr. President, I wish to make this general criticism of the Senate version of the bill, which I think is much less desirable than is the House version. When we boil down the Senate version to it real essence on this point of the amount of money to be allowed the veteran we cannot escape the conclusion that the Senate version takes the form of a subsidy to private educational institutions in the United States.

I happen to believe that it is unsound public policy for us, by the method of indirection provided by this version of the bill, to sanction a principle which amounts to one of using the money of the taxpayers of the United States as a subsidy to private educational institutions. It is one thing for us to support public institutions with public money; but it is quite a different thing for us to use the money of the taxpayers to provide what I consider this bill to provide, namely, a hidden, indirect subsidy to private institutions.

I sincerely hope that when the bill is in conference the conferees on the part of the Senate will come to recognize what I believe to be the clear superiority of the House version of the bill, because the House version can be justified in toto, insofar as this principle is concerned; namely, the principle of having the money go to the individual veteran. We can justify turning over the money to private schools as a matter of public policy.

We should let the veteran decide whether he wishes to attend a private institution which may charge a larger amount of tuition—and if the veteran does attend such an institution, he himself must make up the difference—or whether he wishes to attend a public institution which will charge a smaller amount of tuition. It is important that the veteran be able to make that decision, because he may be in such a financial situation that if he is to attend any institution at all, he will have to attend an institution which makes a low tuition charge, with the result that he will use part of the money available to him to pay that small charge, and will use the remainder of the money to help pay his living costs. It is important for us to make possible such an arrangement, because without it many veterans may not be able to attend any school at all. Our objective is to help the veteran obtain an education.

I stress that point, because this bill takes care of only part of the expenses a

veteran has in going to school. In making that payment, I say we should make the payment to the veterans, and not to the private institutions of the United States. Insofar as the attendance of students is concerned—be they veterans or nonveterans—let the private institutions stand on the same basis as that on which they stand before the passage of this measure. Let the private schools compete for students, be they veterans or nonveterans, without receiving a direct or indirect subsidy from the Federal Government.

For that reason, I opposed this particular private school subsidy provision of the bill when it was before our committee, and I urge the adoption of what I believe to be the much sounder principle which is set out in the House version.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in the committee it was pointed out—I do not know whether this matter has already been discussed here on the floor of the Senate—that in our country there are several States, such as California and New York, that have some institutions in which no tuition at all is charged. An attempt is being made in this bill, therefore, to try to have us take that situation into account, and, by means of this measure, to provide that a certain amount of the funds shall be set aside for tuition purposes, so that those institutions will receive the same amount of money that is received by an institution which charges tuition.

Mr. President, on that point I say that is not the responsibility of the Federal Government. Let New York, California, or any other State which has existing within it such a situation, correct the situation on a State basis. I believe it is quite wrong, as a matter of policy, for the Federal Government to say to the State of California or the State of New York, "Because you have not by means of your State legislature rectified that situation, we are now going to give you special treatment by means of this bill, and are going to provide that schools in your State which do not charge any tuition to nonveterans, nevertheless will receive by means of this bill an amount of money equivalent to the amount which schools which do charge tuition exact from their students."

Mr. President, I say it is a mistake for us to pass an educational bill which involves that principle, for that is the way—by little steps such as that—to begin to walk down the road toward real Federal interference with the educational system of the Nation.

Let me say, Mr. President, that the private schools which are so anxious to have this financial discrimination in their favor set out in this bill—as it is set out in the Senate version of the bill, but is not set out in the House version, will find as time passes that the House version of the bill is in the best, long-time interest of the private educational institutions. They should not want any form of governmental intervention in their educational program, even though for the time being it takes the form of what appears to be a nice little plum and hand-out to them, in the form of a subsidy of this type.

Mr. President, I close by saying that the sound principle we should adopt is to make the money available to the veteran, and then give the veteran the freedom to decide for himself at what school or institution he wishes to spend the money.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, heretofore I had advised the Senate that Calendar No. 1671, H. R. 5767, the so-called fair-trade bill, would be considered after disposing of the bill upon which we have just voted. Yesterday, I inadvertently gave notice that Calendar 1644, H. R. 401, to amend the Nationality Act would be considered. I intended to give notice of the taking up of Calendar No. 1671, H. R. 5767, as I had stated in a previous notice.

Since this morning the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], said it was very important that the Senate dispose of the Military Defense appropriation bill at as early a date as possible, because the bill is large, and will have to go to conference, and the time before adjournment is limited.

I have at all times stated that priority would be given to appropriation bills. It will be impossible to finish consideration of the bill this evening, but we could proceed with it and make some progress.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, because a point of order may be made against proceeding with the bill at this time——

Mr. FERGUSON. Would it not be possible to take up the bill with an understanding by unanimous consent that Senators may present amendments to committee amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was just going to include that in my unanimous-consent request. I should like to state it, and see if there is any objection to it.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1789, H. R. 7391, and dispose of all possible committee amendments; and that any Senator desiring to offer amendments to the committee amendments on Monday may be permitted to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished majority leader state what taking up the defense appropriation bill would do with respect to consideration of either the fair trade bill or the amendments to the Nationality Act? Will the defense appropriation bill be laid aside to consider them, in case we should have the time this afternoon, or are they to be put over until the defense appropriation bill is passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. The defense appropriation bill is a rather long and complicated bill. I do not believe we could reach either of the other bills this afternoon. As a matter of fact, with respect to the nationality bill, I gave notice inadvertently. I do not know whether we can reach it. I shall wish to consult with the chairman of the committee. However, I will state that we will endeavor to bring up the fair trade bill as soon as possible. It is now 10 minutes past 3. By the time we have listened to an explanation of the defense appropriation bill and have adopted as many committee amendments as possible, or all committee amendments if possible, with the proviso I have just stated, permitting Senators to offer amendments on Monday, I think that will be about all we shall have time to do today. By that time the situation will have narrowed, so that we can see more clearly what we shall be able to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The majority leader does not anticipate that the fair trade bill could possibly come to a vote this afternoon, does he?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is one reason why I think we should proceed now with the defense appropriation bill. Because of the lateness of the hour we could not complete consideration of the fair-trade bill even if we should take it up at this time. We shall try to take it up when we can go straight through and finish it.

Mr. CASE. So Senators may be assured that the defense appropriation bill is the only business for the remainder of the afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct, unless some noncontroversial bill can be brought up and disposed of.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As I understand, that would not include House bill 401 or the fair-trade bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When is the Senate going to take up the fair-trade bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. As soon as we can dispose of these other matters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. There is the defense appropriation bill and the German treaty. The fair-trade bill will follow.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Following the defenese appropriation bill, what is the next item which the majority leader wishes to take up?

Mr. McFARLAND. The fair-trade bill would have been made the unfinished

business today if we could have had some assurance that its consideration could be completed today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I understood.

Mr. McFARLAND. We would have taken it up today if we could have finished it. However, it is very important that we dispose of the appropriation bills first. So the fair-trade bill will have to follow either the German treaty, with respect to which notice has been given, or the pending bill, unless there is a change.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will it be taken up before any of the smaller bills, such as House bill 401?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think the Senator heard my announcement with respect to House bill 401. I gave notice with respect to that bill inadvertently. I intended to give notice, instead, with respect to the fair-trade bill. I did not intend to give notice that we would take up House bill 401 today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the fair-trade bill follow the defense appropriation bill and the German treaty?

Mr. McFARLAND. Unless there is an announcement to the contrary. The schedule is subject to change at any time. There may be some "must" legislation to be considered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some of us feel that certain other legislation is rather "musty," too. However, small bills are being brought up, such as the bill dealing with deputy United States marshals, the Nationality Act, and certain proposed constitutional amendments. I object to this kind of procedure. I want to know when we are going to get down to some of the bills with respect to which we have been promised action.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have just finished explaining to the Senator that I gave notice with respect to the nationality bill inadvertently.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. McFARLAND. Our program has been outlined. I have made announcements. We cannot say that it may not be advisable to change the schedule, because we do not know what is coming up. If what the Senator wants to know is whether we are to dispose of the fair-trade bill before final adjournment, so far as I am concerned, that is what I wish to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the necessity for consideration of appropriation bills. I can fully understand the necessity for considering the German treaty. But as I watch the proceedings carefully day after day, suddenly another little bill comes out of the bushes, a bill in which I am not interested. It may be a bill reported from the Judiciary Committee. I should like to obtain a commitment with respect to certain other bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will not make any firm commitment as to anything the Senate will do, because I have not the authority to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The majority leader can bring bills up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator for the compliment, but the Senate can change my mind at any time on these questions.

I have given the Senator the program to the best of my ability. Only one change has been made today. That change would not have been made had it not been for the conference report on the Defense Production Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not complaining about that at all.

Mr. McFARLAND. The consideration of the conference report occupied so much time that we could not under any circumstances complete consideration of the fair-trade bill today. So under the circumstances it is better not to take up a bill and then lay it aside, losing all that time. It is better to take up the appropriation bill and proceed with it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that before adjournment the fair-trade bill will be taken up?

Mr. McFARLAND. If we can.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What does the majority leader mean by "if we can"? I am not arguing with the majority leader. I should like to have some idea of just what he has in mind. Many Senators are interested.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have given Senators my ideas to the best of my ability. I do not see that I can make any definite promise that any particular bill will be taken up. Any bill could be filibustered to such an extent that we could not dispose of anything.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No Senator wishes to do that.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are going to do the best we can. That is all we can do; and the sooner we get to it the better off we shall be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that we are discussing the future scheduling of legislation, let me say that it is my intention to oppose the price-maintenance bill, otherwise known as the fair-trade bill, but I shall not filibuster it to death. I think it should be considered, even though I am opposed to it. It should be scheduled for consideration.

Mr. McFARLAND. It has already been scheduled for consideration. It has been scheduled for 2 or 3 days.

I invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Illinois to the fact that there is a great deal of legislation which has been on the calendar for a longer time than has the fair-trade bill. The fair-trade bill was reported to the Senate without recommendation, and it is receiving preferred treatment before the Senate at the present time; and we intend to continue to give it preferred treatment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request has already been agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I had not so understood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so announced. All this discussion has occurred since the announcement by the Chair that the unanimous-consent request had been agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me say, while the Senator from Minnesota is still present in the Chamber, that so far as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, he believes that the majority leader is eminently correct in bringing up measures which he and the policy committee think the Nation needs most. Merely because a certain Senator is interested in a bill which he thinks should be given preferred treatment, the majority leader should not forego his opinion as to what is in the best interests of the Nation. We think he is doing a good job.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All I am asking for is some knowledge as to what legislation may be on the schedule for consideration. Senators may differ in their opinions as to what may be best for the Nation. I do not believe that a bill taking deputy United States marshals out of civil service is a matter of national importance.

Mr. SMATHERS. The majority leader is doing what many of us think is a very creditable job. He is bringing up measures which he considers in the best interests of the Nation. The fact that I might disagree with him, or some other Senator might disagree with him, is no reason for any of us to become excited and make any imputations with respect to the conduct of the majority leader.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if any Senator doubts that the majority leader is doing the best he can to enable the Senate to dispose of the business of the Senate and get away from Washington, all he has to do is to look at the back of the calendar, where he will find a list of appropriation bills. The majority leader has done everything humanly possible. Both the majority leader and the assistant majority leader have urged the speedy consideration of bills. We in the committee are doing our best to handle the appropriation bills expeditiously. All any Senator has to do is to look at the list of appropriation bills. Only a few are left. For heaven's sake, let us get through with the appropriation bills so that we can get through with the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The defense appropriation bill is now before the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have served for a long time in the Senate and there has never been a leader who has been more considerate of every Senator and in trying to do his best for every Senator than the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. I want to say that I know that what he is doing is the right thing to do.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for his kind remarks. Of course, this is not a mutual admiration society, but I believe that many of the things he has said about the junior Senator from Arizona really apply to the senior Senator from Tennessee. He is the one who has pushed the appropriation bills and has gotten them to the floor of the Senate.

We are very far ahead this year over where we were last year. He has done a wonderful job in getting out the appropriation bills, and it has made it possible for us to reach our goal.

So that there will not be any misunderstanding about the program I will read again what is on the list. By reading the list I do not mean that there will not be other bills put on the list at the meeting of the Policy Committee next week which the Policy Committee may consider more important than some of the bills now on the list.

However, there are few bills that we should consider and that we should try to pass before adjournment.

There is a little bill, S. 1084 to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act. I do not know how important it is. It would not take very long to pass it.

There is the fair-trade bill.

The German peace treaty.

Military appropriations.

Foreign-aid appropriations.

Of course the calendar must be called again, and must be called from the beginning. That will take a little time.

Then there are many conference reports to be considered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I forgot about the bill in which my good friend from North Dakota is interested. What is the number of that bill?

Mr. YOUNG. It is S. 2115. Is that on the list?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is a bill to extend the parity formula. We should take up the bill and dispose of it, too.

Mr. YOUNG. Will it be definitely considered?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot promise that any of these bills will be definitely considered, but I do have them on the list. When I saw the Senator come on the floor the other day I knew at once that he was interested in one of the bills on the list.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that it has been approved by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I understand. I hope we can dispose of it in a little time between the consideration of more important bills.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—National Security Council," on page 2, line 9, after the word "Council", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$160,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it has been agreed by the Senate that the military appropriation bill may now be taken up. It has also been agreed that amendments which are agreed to this afternoon may be reopened for consideration on Monday by any Member of the Senate, after due consideration of those amendments. Because of this fact, it seems to me that it is unnecessary to go through the labor of explaining in detail each amendment and of having the clerk read each amendment. I propose, therefore, to make a general explanation of the nature of this bill—what it contains in its over-all aspect, the burden it casts upon the American economy, and the point of view from which the Senate Committee on Appropriations has approached it. After having done that, I shall ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be approved en bloc. I think there are very few controversial amendments among them, but in any event, since it is already agreed that any amendment may be reopened on Monday, I think this will prove a great saving of time and will give us an opportunity of laying before the Senate and the country the general aspects of this titanic bill.

Mr. President, the war in which we are now engaged on a world front is called a cold war, but except for the actual fighting in Korea, it is in fact an economic war. Anyone who has taken the time to read the written statements of the leaders of Soviet Russia must know that those leaders are convinced that the capitalistic system has outrun its time and that it will be undermined, destroyed, and succeeded by some other system. Soviet Russia is an exponent of the totalitarian system, which does not recognize the dignity of the individual human being, but recognizes only the overweaning power of the state, and claims the right of the state to deal with the individual as simply a cog in the machine. That theory of government and of economics is utterly at variance with everything for which this country stands. We believe that the people are supreme, and that the Government is an agency of supporting the people in the sense that it enables them to exercise their own individual judgment. The Government, according to our theory, is the servant of the people, not their master.

In order to carry on the struggle which the Soviet is waging, this economic struggle, its policy has been to create as much havoc, as much uncertainty, as much destruction economically as it can, by the bringing about of occasions which require free peoples to bleed themselves to death economically.

We, the people of the United States, are today the hope of freedom in the world against totalitarianism, and in my opinion the economic front is by all odds the vital front, because if the soundness of the American economy should be impaired or destroyed, it would then be impossible for us to maintain the struggle we are now waging to preserve freedom.

There is great confusion among the people of the United States with respect to the nature and the amounts of the expenditures which are being made by the Government of the United States in this struggle. I have, therefore, had compiled a simple statement which compares the war-connected expenditures which are being authorized by this Congress with the normal expenditures on the normal activities of Government. This bill, which the Senate Appropriations Committee directed me to submit to this body for its consideration, contains cash appropriations amounting to $45,734,750,912. Although this is under the appropriations of 1952, for the same purposes, by more than $11,000,000,000, and although it is under the estimates submitted to the Congress of the United States by the President in the sum of $5,655,958,858; although it is also below the bill which passed the House, by $472,426,642; and, furthermore, although this bill requires the Department of Defense to absorb the entire amount of the pay increase which the Congress enacted only a few weeks ago, of approximately $470,000,000, nevertheless, this measure carrying $45,734,750,912 is almost five times the cash expenditures which have been authorized in the latest form of appropriation bills pending before the Congress for the normal functions of Government. Let me read some of these items. This Department of Defense bill appropriates $45,734,750,912. In the independent offices bill there was appropriated $1,137,727,500 for atomic energy; $3,810,044,960 for the Veterans' Administration, representing expenditures made necessary by past wars; $68,350,000 for the National Aeronautics Commission, for the development and improvement of aviation, and the like, all for the purposes of war; $203,979,000 for the purchase of strategic and critical materials, and $36,772,000 for the Selective Service System. All those appropriations were contained in the independent offices bill, not in this bill. In the supplemental bill for 1953, the latest form of that bill, there is contained $1,485,000,000 for atomic energy; $2,187,000,000 for defense; $6,275,000,000 for mutual security. The total of these appropriations, Mr. President, is $60,940,464,962. That amount of course, is exclusive of the interest upon the national debt, which for the fiscal year 1953 is estimated to be $6,150,000,000.

So, Mr. President, it is clear that we have for war-connected expenditures a total appropriation projected for the fiscal year 1953 of more than $67,000,000,000. I said an appropriation; I should not have included in the word appropriation the interest upon the national debt, because that is a continuing appropriation. So, let us regard it as a total cash appropriation of $60,940,000,000.

As compared with that, the agricultural bill, the civil functions bill the Labor and Federal Security bill, the State, Justice, and Commerce bill, the Treasury and Post Office bill, the legislative bill, the Interior Department bill, and certain other items amounting to $334,000,000 in the supplemental bill, account for a total for the normal functions of the Government of $9,714,000,000.

The burden which is upon the shoulders of the taxpayers of the United States is the result, primarily, of war

connected expenditures of one kind or another.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent that a table setting forth in greater detail the figures I have mentioned be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1953 appropriation bills (latest action)

	Defense	Others
Department of Defense	$45,734,750,912	
Agriculture		$840,794,624
Civil Functions		667,474,699
District of Columbia		12,000,000
Independent offices		[1] 1,022,215,218
Atomic Energy	1,137,727,500	
Veterans' Administration	3,810,044,960	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	68,350,000	
Strategic and Critical Materials, GSA	203,979,000	
Selective Service System	36,772,000	
Interior		367,328,164
Labor-Federal Security		1,786,579,800
Legislation		76,892,461
State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary		1,012,547,852
Treasury-Post Office		3,394,047,000
Supplemental, 1953		[1] 334,293,190
Atomic Energy	1,485,000,000	
Defense	2,187,899,840	
Mutual Security	6,275,940,750	
Total	60,940,464,962	9,714,173,008
Interest on public debt, 1953	6,150,000,000	
Interest on public debt, 1952	5,900,000,000	

[1] Excludes defense items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator agree with me that the high cost of government and the increase in taxes are a result of a war world and not a welfare state?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has stated it very succinctly. His epigram is "right on the nose," as we say, if I may be permitted to go from the collegiate atmosphere to the atmosphere of the street.

OUR INADEQUATE AIR CORPS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. What was the budget recommendation for the air department of the armed services?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was just coming to that, but I will give him a specific answer now. The estimate for the Department of the Air Force was $22,570,289,770. The House cut that amount below the estimate and recommended an appropriation of $20,752,412,912. The Senate committee has recommended $20,454,110,770, which is under the House figure by $298,301,102.

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that both General Vandenberg, who is in direct charge of the Air Force, and Mr. Finletter, the Secretary for Air, have testified that we have lost control of the air in Korea and at other vital points?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; there is no statement that we have lost control of the air in Korea, but there was a statement that we might lose control of the air. If the Senator will permit me, now, I intend to develop the whole situation about the Air Force, but I should like to present it in an orderly manner, and then, after I have done so, if the Senator has questions to ask, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. MALONE. I just noticed that in this orderly manner we were laying a foundation for a political statement that no money was being expended by the Government except through the armed services.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite mistaken. I am making no political statement.

Mr. MALONE. As aided and abetted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], it sounded extraordinarily like a political statement. The Air Force is below where it should be. That is where the emphasis should be placed, instead of financing industrial plants for Europe costing from seven to ten billion dollars per year, from which they sell material to Russia to help her to fight us in world war III, and with their low-cost labor compete for this Nation's markets in competition with our own workers and investors.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, no one is more emphatically in support of air power than is the Senator from Wyoming. The members of the Committee on Appropriations are aware of the fact that in the committee I presented an amendment, the purpose of which was to permit a more rapid expansion of the Air Force. The amendment which I offered in the committee reads as follows:

For aircraft and related procurement——

This was to have been a substitute for the language which is in the bill—

$4,685,044,000 of which $1,685,044,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes, and $3,000,000,000 is for (1) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $11,000,000,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Air Force is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense for 126 combat wings, 17 transport combat groups, and other supporting elements and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made.

Mr. President, the committee was unwilling to accept that amendment. It was believed that it was contract authority, and the policy of the Congress has been not to insert contract authority in appropriation bills. That is to say, Congress has eliminated in recent years language in measures authorizing various departments of the Government to enter into contracts for construction items which in future years would be paid by cash appropriations.

That policy, while generally followed, is not actually followed with respect to civil functions or with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation. When Congress undertakes to finance rivers-and-harbors improvements, and other improvements of that general type, such as flood-control improvements, the House of Representatives receives testimony from the Army engineers, who submit a report, which is then published by the House of Representatives, becomes a House document, and contains the estimated total cost of each particular project which is recommended. But when the House of Representatives acts upon civil-function projects approved by the Army engineers, it does not appropriate the entire cash amount. It appropriates only the amount necessary to carry on the function for a single year.

The same policy is followed with respect to the Bureau of Reclamation. Congress is advised what the total estimate is and what the probable final cost will be, but it is asked to appropriate the cash which it is estimated will have to be expended during the fiscal year for which the appropriation bill is passed.

I have been unable to understand why we could not follow the same policy with respect to aircraft construction.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to ask the chairman of the subcommittee how much the bill would have been increased if the amendment he has just read to the Senate had been adopted by the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The cash appropriation would not have been increased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It would not have added anything to the cash appropriation carried in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have reduced the total amount for the Air Force carried in the bill by approximately $6,500,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it correct to say, however, that it would have permitted an expenditure and an obligation of $11,000,000,000 for aircraft for the next fiscal year, which is the amount recommended by the budget?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It is my understanding that the Joint Chiefs of Staff presented to the Department of Defense requests, which subsequently were reduced by the Department, and in turn presented to the budget, providing for a 126-wing Air Force, to be attained by July 1, 1954. When that request was presented to the Bureau of the Budget, the President and the budget, for fiscal reasons, decided on stretching out the program, which would permit attainment of 126 wings by July 1, 1955.

My question is, If the funds provided for in this bill are provided by the Senate, is it not a fact that we will postpone our Air Force readiness an additional year, or until July 1, 1956?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is very possible that that will be the effect. I hope that will not happen, because most of the reduction which was recommended by the Senate committee comes out of the appropriation for spare parts. The question will have to be decided whether

or not the failure to order all the spare parts which were planned in the justifications would delay the building of essential aircraft. Members of the committee were of the opinion that it would not have that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then is it fair to say that the President stretched out the program from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955, and in the opinion of responsible officers of the Air Force the pending bill stretches it out an additional year, until July 1, 1956?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is an accurate statement. I was going to illustrate that by a chart I have had brought to the Senate floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. However, if the amendment the Senator just read to the Senate were adopted, that would not be true, would it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There would not be any stretch-out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The spare parts we are talking about are what are known as first-year spare parts, are they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will not maintenance and operation take care of spare-parts requirements in years subsequent to the first year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. However, we did make a reduction also in that field.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. I wanted the RECORD to indicate what the spare parts were. How would it cut down the number of airplanes, if the Air Force adhered to the 64¼ percent basis?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not cut it down. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree with me completely when I say that it was the specific intention of the committee, and we want to make it a matter of legislative history, that we were restoring $560,000,000, which the House took from the appropriation, for the construction of aircraft. We want all the aircraft that it was planned to have under the budget, but we make a reduction with respect to spare parts.

Mr. FERGUSON. We felt that if they dropped from the 64¼ percent——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us explain that 64¼ percent. The Senator means by that that in the justifications the amount which was estimated by the Air Force to be necessary for the purchase of component parts and spare parts was 64¼ percent of the amount estimated for the aircraft.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. So every time a plane is built during the first year, 64¼ percent of the value of the plane is spent for spare parts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the estimates, every dollar which was authorized and appropriated for the purchase of aircraft was accompanied by 64¼ cents with which to buy spare parts.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. According to a summary of the report, the appropriations for the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force aggregate a little more than $56,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the appropriation for 1952.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. Can the Senator tell us how much of that money has not been actually spent or will not be spent up to June 30 of this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The latest estimates we have indicate that $6,500,000,000 is unexpended. That was the carry-over as estimated about 2 weeks ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. If we had proceeded under contract authority, I feel sure that instead of being in the red about $6,000,000,000, as we will be this year, we would about break even.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that huge sum is unobligated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The total amount of the unobligated and unexpended funds was, as I think I said, $6,500,000,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of that amount was unobligated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the moneys which have been appropriated, that is the amount unobligated and unexpended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator have a breakdown of the amounts which are obligated and unobligated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes, there was a full breakdown shown to the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that by June 30 the unexpended balance of the amounts which Congress has appropriated in the past for the Air Force will be approximately $25,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. I think the Senator is incorrect. There is some confusion about that matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am speaking of amounts unexpended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that as of June 30, 1952, if we include all the departments of the Department of Defense—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—the amount will be about $57,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Between $55,000,000,000 and $57,000,000,000 for the Department of Defense as a whole will have been appropriated, but not spent. However, for the Air Force will not the figure be approximately $25,000,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A little more than $23,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator says that of that sum $17,000,000,000 has been obligated, but some six and one-fourth billion will not have been obligated——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am now speaking of all the groups.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was my question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not speaking of the Air Force alone.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood the Senator to say that the entire amount appropriated last year was $56,250,000,000, of which there remained a large unexpended balance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me give the Senator the exact figures.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the Senator was giving exact figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me give the exact figures in detail. The exact figure is $6,535,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that for the entire Department?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is for the entire Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is unobligated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is unobligated. That is broken down as follows: For the Department of the Army, $2,550,000,000; for the Department of the Navy, $1,024,000,000; for the Department of the Air Force, $2,883,000,000; and for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, $77,200,000; making a total of $6,534,200,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is unobligated funds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unobligated and unexpended.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much of the money which has been obligated but not actually paid out is in the bank?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. None of this has been obligated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand with respect to the $6,000,000,000 item, but I am talking about that part which has been obligated but not expended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we subtract the $6,000,000,000 from $57,000,000,000, we have the total. It is not in the bank.

Mr. ELLENDER. I mean money which has been appropriated but not expended, although obligated. How much does that figure?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that would amount to about $51,000,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that between $55,000,000,000 and $57,000,000,000 has been appropriated for the Department of Defense, but not spent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we add to that the $45,750,000,000 recommended by the Senate committee, that makes available for the armed services between $100,000,000,000 and $102,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but we must not overlook the fact that approximately 47 percent of the entire amount appropriated for the Department of Defense goes for current, day-to-day expenditures. We have to pay the daily salaries of the men and women in the armed services. We must pay for the maintenance and operation of the installations and the bases in which they serve. We must buy the fuel and lubricants which are used to carry on those operations.

Great confusion arises from the fact that it is not yet adequately understood that the instrumentalities of modern war which we are now building are more expensive than great projects like Boulder Dam, which required 10 or 12 years to build. When we undertake to appropriate for an aircraft carrier, for example, we must remember that the aircraft carrier will cost about $216,000,000.

That is the estimated cost of the second supercarrier of the *Forrestal* class. The committee has authorized the Navy to proceed with the construction of that second carrier, but it has not added a single dollar to the bill. It has provided that the Department of the Navy must be prepared, within the amount appropriated, to drop certain other categories of ship construction which are not regarded by the Navy as being of the supreme priority which they attach to aircraft carriers.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who makes the decision?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Navy Department.

Mr. ELLENDER. So any amount of money which it has asked in the past to build a particular type of ship can be switched to the construction of aircraft carriers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct. What I am trying to point out with respect to the chart is that we are not following that procedure with respect to the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. We found no formula which could be applied to the Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We found no formula which would not involve the question of contract authority. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. We labored with that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. FERGUSON. We had the idea that we might appropriate for a year and a half, so that there would be 6 months leeway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are all in agreement that we ought to have 143 wings as soon as we could get them, with the money we could appropriate, without running the risk of involving an increase beyond the debt limit, or an increase in taxation, and increased revenues for which Congress has not provided.

Mr. FERGUSON. It ought to be emphasized that we are in agreement as to the number of planes we need, but we must be realists and face the economic condition of the country and of the people. We must bear in mind the amount of taxes that can be raised. Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. It is upon that theory that the committee acted. I should like to make that point specific in the RECORD in a few moments. I want all Members of the Senate to understand precisely what we have been doing about the Air Force, and the terrible vacillation which Congress and the Government have both exhibited in making up their minds as to what to do about the United States Air Force.

In 1946, after the end of the shooting war, the United States had the greatest Air Force in the world. We thought that peace had come because we had won the war against Mussolini and Hitler, and we allowed our Air Force to fall. The line "(A)" running across the chart, through 1950, represents the level of the 70-wing minimum. The Finletter report was received long before Secretary Finletter became Secretary of the Air Force. He was called from private life to head a special commission of high-grade citizens to study the need for air power, and he recommended what was then called the 70-group Air Force. Congress did not provide for it. The budget did not estimate for it. We allowed the Air Force to fall. I was here on the floor of the Senate during the period when Hon. Louis Johnson was Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Wyoming will remember that at the same time the President appointed the Air Policy Committee, headed by Secretary Finletter, Congress established a Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Representatives of the House and Senate, after long study of this very question, arrived at the same conclusion as did the President's Air Policy Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas is absolutely correct. I am glad he made that statement, because it is a part of the story.

The Senate had this question before it in 1948, as I recall. The House of Representatives provided money for the construction of a 58-group Air Force. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill with provision for only 48. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee then, as now, and I urged that money be provided for the 58-group Air Force. I was unsuccessful. The question was debated on the floor of the Senate, and only 9 Senators voted for the 58-group Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

When we went into conference, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who rises to ask a question, was one of the nine Senators who voted against that reduction. He was one of those who led the fight for the full number; and in conference the House conferees refused to yield. The bill came from conference with money for 58 groups, but the President and the Bureau of the Budget felt that the economy of our country would not stand that amount of spending, and we did not spend it.

Mr. FERGUSON. They cut it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They simply did not spend it. That is one of the reasons why we have been struggling with this vacillation, as the line on the chart shows.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Approximately $730,000,000 was impounded even after the disagreement between the House and Senate and after the Senate had yielded to the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was a large amount impounded. I do not have the exact amount before me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the order of the President of the United States freezing the program to 48 groups.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 29, 1949.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed H. R. 4146, a bill making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and the military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

The amounts provided in this bill for most of the components of our defense program will permit operations at the approximate levels contemplated in the original 1950 budget recommendations. For one item, however, a sharp increase in authorizations provided by the Congress represents a major shift in the direction and emphasis of our defense program. If fully utilized, this increased authorization would result in a serious lack of balance in our defense program and would require much heavier expenditures in the future than we now contemplate.

This increased authorization is largely for an expanded structure for the Air Force. In all, the Congress has increased authorizations for the Air Force by more than $615,000,000 above 1950 budget recommendations.

The significance of this change cannot be measured solely from the standpoint of the Air Force or of the Department of Defense. Rather, it must be viewed in the light of total national policies and it must be evaluated in terms of our present commitments.

The defense program submitted last January was the result of an exhaustive examination of all the programs of the Federal Government. At that time painstaking consideration was given to our requirements for national security and the effect of large military expenditures upon our economy. Our objective was to plan a defense structure which could both meet our security needs and be supported by the country without imposing too great a strain on the domestic economy. Careful account also was taken of this Nation's position in the world. Since the end of World War II we have been devoting a substantial portion of our resources to the development of a peaceful and stable world through economic assistance to other free nations. Our aid has been a major contribution toward world stability and has been instrumental in lessening world tension. However, my recommendations recognized the fact that, under existing international conditions, a relatively high level of military preparedness must be maintained for a number of years to come.

Our defense program thus represented a balance between security needs in the light of our foreign policy and the economic and fiscal problems facing us domestically.

In the 1950 budget emphasis was given to air power and the procurement of newly developed weapons with which to reequip and modernize our military forces. Similar emphasis was given to research and development, to industrial mobilization, to reserve forces, and to the integration of operations within the three services. The defense program was designed to be flexible, not rigid. It was drawn up so that changes in the international situation, in technology, and in

the domestic economy could be reflected in our defense preparations.

Action at this time by the Congress in increasing authorizations for the Air Force by over $615,000,000 could have a serious effect on our ability to maintain balanced military forces in subsequent years. Although these increased authorizations would have comparatively little effect upon military expenditures in the current fiscal year, the fact that they are largely for the procurement of aircraft would have a serious effect on expenditures in the future. As additional aircraft authorized by this act were delivered, we should have to make corresponding provisions for additional personnel to man them, for higher maintenance and operating costs, and for greater replacement costs. The present authorization for increased procurement would thus be merely the first step in an expanding program which would have to be supported by greatly increased appropriations in future years.

Furthermore, the programs provided in the budget were based on national defense plans in which our air, naval, and land forces were planned and operated under a unified strategic concept. Expansion of one service beyond the planned level would require the reevaluation of that concept. To build up the strength of the other services so that they could complement and support an expanded Air Force would require additional very large appropriations.

It is obviously impossible for the Department of Defense to plan and operate efficiently if there are to be widely fluctuating appropriations and programs. Rapid contractions or expansions inevitably result in confusion and waste.

Increasing the structure of the Air Force above that recommended in the 1950 budget would be inconsistent with a realistic and balanced security program which we can support in peacetime and would interfere with orderly planning for the three services based on a unified strategic concept.

I am therefore directing the Secretary of Defense to place in reserve the amounts provided by the Congress in H. R. 4146 for increasing the structure of the Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator for making the insertion.

Line B on the chart represents the level of 95 wings, which we now have. I invite attention to the color on the chart. It was possible only by color to represent the point upon which I wish to make emphasis. The color is red.

In 1946 the United States Air Force was the largest Air Force in the world. There is scarcely a pink tinge in the column for that year, but each year as we proceed across the chart the pink tinge grows redder and redder and redder, until now, in 1952, this deep pink [indicating] represents the fact that the Soviet air power has been expanding and that the Soviets have built their MIG's, and many of them.

The MIG's are the aircraft which the Communist Chinese are using in the Korean war. They are very good planes. They can climb far more rapidly than our Sabrejets, because they are not built, as our planes are built, for the protection of the personnel which ride in the planes. Our Sabrejets are built in such a fashion as to provide maximum armor protection for the pilots, gunners, and other personnel who are required to fly in the planes. Because we have a superior type of pilot we have been able to destroy many more MIG's than the MIG's have been able to destroy of our planes.

But the fact remains, and the off-the-record discussion before our committee demonstrates, that the Russian air power is vastly greater today than it was when the Finletter report was made in 1947 or 1948, and vastly greater than when the Senate voted to cut the Air Force and the Government impounded the funds; and vastly greater still when the budget was submitted this year.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff appeared before our committee to discuss this subject. I asked the members of that group for their best estimate with respect to the point of danger. They were in complete agreement that the point of danger toward which they were aiming in the concept of the plan of building 143 wings was the 1st of July, 1954.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They said that the stretch-out and the cut of $2,000,000,000 in the budget estimate would delay the accomplishment of that objective for a year, to 1955. Now it is said that we have a congressional stretch-out which will delay it until 1956.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also correct to say that when we in Congress appropriate, we appropriate dollars? The military determines the number of wings and the number of planes, and what goes into each plane. We do not undertake to tell the Air Force what shall go into a plane. We find that in many cases what goes into a plane makes the plane much more costly than the Soviet planes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that we are unable to determine what the money will buy, except to the extent that we are told by the military as to what they estimate will be the cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is the reason why the committee acted as it did. It is also the reason why I offered the amendment in the committee which contained what we call contract authority, which would grant to the Air Force the same authority we grant to the Navy, to make whatever adjustment or choices they deem necessary to make.

Let me add this additional thought, however, before I yield for another question. The evidence before our committee makes it clear that perfection of design has not yet been achieved. We do not know precisely the type of plane which ought to be used, and the size of the plane. But we do know that the plane which modern warfare requires is vastly more expensive than we ever dreamed it would be.

I wish also to make it perfectly clear, and as plain as I can make it, because it is of vital consideration to the people of the United States, that the fewer planes we build, the greater is the unit cost. When the Air Force determines upon the type of plane it wants to build and construction then proceeds, the planes can be obtained for a lesser sum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. Russian air power is being built up, in the words of General Vandenberg, under forced draft, whereas the United States of America is attempting to build up a preparedness program which will not claim more than 20 percent or 25 percent of the gross national income. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should first like to ask a question about the past, and then I shall turn to the future. Is it not correct to say that one of the reasons why our Air Force, at least in the last 2 years, has not risen more rapidly, is the fact that while Congress has appropriated large funds, the Air Force has been uncertain as to precisely what type of plane should be built.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I have just said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore there has been no frozen design but instead a series of experiments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have said that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore we have not gone into mass production; and it would be a mistake to say that the failure to go above our present level has been due primarily to Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be a great mistake to try to fix the blame on anyone. There is no scapegoat in this situation. We are all to blame; except that my record for 10 years shows that I have favored expanding the air power of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to bring out is that the Air Force made its considered judgment, apparently in accordance with intelligence reports, which were coordinated with other services, that the danger was not immediate, and that therefore they did not have to freeze the design. So we have been experimenting with various types of custom-made planes, so to speak; but we in Congress have provided the Air Force with sufficient funds so that once it begins mass production, it can proceed rather rapidly, can it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is a question leading to the future: I have been somewhat puzzled by the fact that the Air Force claims that relatively small reductions in appropriations will cause great delays in construction. I should like to go into that matter.

The Air Force now has an unexpended balance of $23,000,000,000, as we have developed. It asked the Bureau of the Budget for approximately $23,250,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget cut that amount to approximately $22,500,000,000

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Air Force asked for $21,400,000,000, or, I should say, the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended the appropriation of $21,400,000,000; and that was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget to $20,540,000,000, I believe.

No, Mr. President, I find I was looking at the wrong column. The Joint Chiefs of Staff asked for $700,000,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget allowed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will

yield to me, let me say that the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested $21,400,000,000, the Bureau of the Budget recommended $20,700,000,000, and the committee recommended $18,724,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is the point: The final reduction which has been made by the committee is not more than 10 or 12 percent below the figure submitted by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Yet the Joint Chiefs of Staff say this reduction will postpone the program by at least 2 years, and possibly 3 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; by 1 year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Well, the Joint Chiefs of Staff say the reduction recommended by the Bureau of the Budget will postpone the program by 1 year, and that the reduction in appropriations made by the Congress will postpone the program for an additional year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The $700,000,000 reduction was made by the Bureau of the Budget, and that is the reduction which causes the postponement for 1 year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then the reduction in appropriations made by Congress will, we are told, postpone the program an additional year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is the point: Why is it that such a relatively slight reduction in appropriations will produce such great delay, according to the Air Force, in construction? Even if we add the $700,000,000 cut made by the Budget to the $2,000,000,000 made by the committee, we obtain a final figure which is only a little more than 10 percent below the amount requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Yet the Air Force says the result will be to postpone the program 100 percent or, instead of to 1954, to 1956; instead of causing a 2-year postponement, the Air Force says the result will be to cause a 4-year postponement.

Why is it that a reduction of that relatively small proportion will, according to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, produce such great delay?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the Joint Chiefs of Staff are talking about full preparedness, as well as construction. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are not speaking of construction alone; they are speaking of trained personnel to man and fly these complex planes when they are ready.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Illinois is giving the amounts for construction, rather than the amounts for personnel. He is concerned with the fact that if the amount for construction is reduced by 10 percent, the period for production is extended 100 percent, so we are told.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct—or from 2 years to 4 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what concerns the Senator from Illinois, and it also concerns me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. One of the reasons for that is, of course, to be found in the fact that the more of any type of commodity that is manufactured, the lower is the unit cost. On the other hand, when the number produced is decreased, the unit cost is increased. I think that is the explanation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let me follow up this point a little further. Would not it be possible for the Air Force to absorb these reductions in appropriations by means of increased operating efficiency, instead of absorbing them by making reductions or delays in construction and combat effectiveness? However, whenever we try to deal in that fashion with the armed services, they immediately say that such a reduction will diminish the physical preparedness of the Nation.

Would not it be possible for the Armed Forces to eliminate the wastes which the subcommittee under the leadership of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has unearthed, and which various of the House committees have unearthed, so that we could have just as much, or more, preparedness with less money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us be fair about this matter. I do not believe anyone who has been in close contact with Secretary Lovett and his civilian personnel and has been in contact with the Joint Chiefs of Staff will fail to believe that they wish to do this job, although in the case of the Joint Chiefs of Staff it may be said that they are more concerned with military objectives and military planning than they are with price tags and with production.

Secretary Lovett and his staff have instituted survey after survey; they have invited the best brains they could find in the nation to come to the Department and go over these matters, and I think they have done some very fine work.

Moreover, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and I joined in submitting an amendment which the committee unanimously accepted. If that amendment survives the conference, as I believe it will——

Mr. FERGUSON. And the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, the Senator from Michigan is correct; the amendment must first be approved by the Senate, and then must be approved by the conference. But if the amendment survives that process, it will result in achieving economies, particularly the ones which were mentioned by the Bonner Committee. In this case we have provided for the establishment of regulations to eliminate competing systems of supply among the three services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a great step forward, and I desire to congratulate the committee.

In the House of Representatives, as the distinguished chairman of the committee well knows, the Bonner Committee showed that the Air Force was building up a duplicate system of storage warehouses and supply units all over the world, and was storing in them not only the items peculiar to the Air Force, but also the items common to both the Army and the Air Force. The Air Force was taking enormous quantities of goods out of Army warehouses which were not full, and was putting them into large, new Air Force warehouses which had been constructed at great cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that we should remember that when the Korean war began, we had approximately 1,500,000 men in the three military services. Today we have approximately 3,500,000 men in those services—or an increase of 2,000,000 men. So 2,000,000 men have been taken from the ordinary walks of life and have been put into uniform to perform this great task. Too many of them are being assigned to work to which they are not accustomed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We also find—and I believe this partly answers the question of the Senator from Illinois—that only approximately 45,000 of those in the Air Force are assigned to combat duties, out of a total of 930,000 or 940,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what the Senator from Michigan has just said points to one of the most scandalous situations in our entire armed services, namely, that in the Air Force there are 20 men assigned to noncombat duties for every man who is assigned to combat duties. In short, the ratio is 20 to 1.

On the other hand, in the Army——

Mr. FERGUSON. Thirty-five percent are in combat units.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But even in the combat units, a large proportion are not engaged in combat duty.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. However, 35 percent are in combat units.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who has done a very remarkable and effective piece of work as head of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, made to our committee a presentation with respect to this particular matter. The committee was impressed by it. The Senator from Texas and I are planning to join in a letter, to be addressed to the Department of Defense, with respect to these various matters.

However, on the basis of the evidence before us, this statement was written into the committee's report on this bill:

> The Air Force has assured the committee that the budget which it has submitted is especially tightly prepared. It lays especial emphasis on two main points in this regard. It points out that the proposed increase of 50 percent in striking power in the Air Force—from 95 to 143 wings—is to be handled with an increase in only 13 percent of its military personnel. It points out also that a major economy has been programed in equipment, namely, by the failure to provide any reserve aircraft to take care of the combat attrition. The Air Force has also assured the committee that every effort has been made to program tightly the other aspects of the program.

We have those assurances. We know that these men are men of the highest character and of the highest integrity. No man could be more patriotic or able than Secretary Finletter, or than Secretary Lovett, at the head of the Defense Department, or Secretary Pace, or those who surround them. I want the Senate to know that from long and intimate association with these gentlemen, in which I have acted as the prosecutor and

the cross examiner, I am satisfied that they have the same thought in mind as the Members of the Senate have, namely, to hold down these expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator think that they will be able to do so?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; I think they have already shown that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are undoubtedly very fine men, and I want to pay tribute to them. But they are dealing with a system.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. FERGUSON. Must we not recognize that they are dealing purely with military matters, whereas, as civilians, we are trying to cut appropriations? My experience indicates that when we are dealing with a system, when we are dealing with an organization plan, we run into difficulty when we try to alter or change the organization plan; and that is why we find a ratio of 1 in 20 in combat units in the air, and 35 percent in combat units in the Army.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment. I do not want to have the Army given the credit for such a high combat ratio as that, because if we consider the number of men in the rifle platoon and compare them with the number of men in the Army, it will be found that the number of men in the Army is approximately 15 to 20 times the number of men in the rifle platoon.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was going to state that the Marine Corps has a little better record than the Army.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that they have, but I am not bringing that in.

Mr. KILGORE. In defense of the Army——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to get into that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is only fair to say that the Army supports the Marine Corps most effectively. The Senator did not raise that question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment. Let me first make this comment upon the discussion which has been going on. There can be no doubt that, when a country get into a war, it forgets everything about expenditures, it forgets everything about the value of the dollar. I stood on this floor during World War II when an appropriation bill was reported carrying from $65,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000. It was passed by a voice vote, without a question.

It was unnecessary for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in that day to stand before the Senate to make a detailed defense or analysis of the items which were contained in the bill. There can be no doubt that every war in which this country or any other country has ever been engaged has been fought not only with the weapons of war but with "golden shovels." Money was no object in getting the desired result.

We are now doing a different thing. I think credit should be given where credit is due. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert A. Lovett, is conscientiously and diligently, day after day, trying to eliminate the traditional excess expenditures which are normally built into the military mind, and there are great numbers of men in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Air Force who are quite as desirous of saving money as we are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that the record shows it is not always the top military officers who determines the amount to be spent, but rather, that those in command down into the field and into the camp are the ones who determine what shall be spent in relation to their particular units?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is one cause of these great expenditures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The evidence before our committee has been that the Department of Defense has undertaken a widespread program to make everyone cost conscious.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The initial amount of the Air Force estimate, as of December 6, 1951, was $26,700,000,000. The Air Force estimate, as of December 14, 1951, was $22,800,000,000. The initial estimate submitted by the Department of Defense to the Bureau of the Budget, as of December 17, 1951, was $21,400,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget's initial approved estimate, as of December 28, 1951, was $16,600,000,000. The final Bureau of the Budget's estimate, as of January 21, 1952, approved for the Air Force was $20,700,000,000. A comparison of the Air Force estimate, as of December 6, 1951, of $26,700,000,000, with the final budget estimate, as of January 21, 1952, approved for the Air Force, of $20,700,000,000 indicates how the costs mount as the result of the demands of the particular commanders in charge.

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since the Senator from Oklahoma has been waiting for a long time, I yield first to him.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate greatly what the distinguished chairman has said regarding the necessity for our staying with this job over a period of time, which might be 5 years or which might be 10 years, and that, therefore, instead of the rapid and rather reckless acquisition tomorrow of certain matériel, we must be more cautious so as to be able to continue our preparedness program over a long period of time. If Russia should determine that the time she will strike would depend upon our being on her calendar and her timetable, rather than Russia's being on ours, that makes it necessary for us to be somewhat frugal with our expenditures.

I was very much interested, and wondered whether I understood correctly the distinguished chairman to say that in the aircraft programs for our 70- or 94-wing Air Force, we are not now procuring the stock of reserve planes that might be needed to offset the possible loss of planes through combat attrition, but that in our present program we are merely providing for first-line planes, and are not programing planes to be held in reserve.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right; but we are aiming at a 143-wing Air Force, including 17 transport wings. The committee is of the opinion that, while the attainment of that objective may and probably will be delayed, it will not be delayed quite so long as may be feared by those in the Air Force who, naturally and properly, are concerned about these reductions.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator that we should attain complete air effectiveness at the earliest possible date. But I hope that in attaining it the program outlined by the Senator will be followed, whereby we shall not add to the problem of obsolescence, in view of the fact that, as we all know, we are making each year more progress in the matter of jet planes, than we used to make in 5 years with the old propeller-driven aircraft. The propeller-driven aircraft will perhaps be completely obsolete in a few more years.

One further question, if the Senator will yield. Can the Senator give us some idea of how many wings, comparatively speaking, the Naval Air Force would add to our present strength in matching our Air Force program against the Russian air force program? We have another very efficient air branch in the Navy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand the Navy does not have a table of organization for its aircraft like that of the Air Force. I cannot compare naval aircraft with the Air Force aircraft in terms of weight. But the Navy has made very great progress in the building and utilization of jets. The jets operating in Korea have made very excellent records.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to revert to the statement made by the Senator a few moments ago with reference to a 10-percent cut extending the time of the completion of the program 100 percent——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not make that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I pointed out that if we took the figures which have been presented to us—namely, that the appropriations by Congress represent about 10 percent less than the amount requested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff—the Air Force declares that this will postpone the attainment of the 143-air-wing program from 1954 to 1956, and therefore project it from 2 to 4 years into the future. I was greatly puzzled as to the disparity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Are we to understand that the Senator from Wyoming disagrees with the statement of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation I gave was the unit cost increases as the number of units is reduced.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much would the program be increased if its completion were extended two years?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The extension of the completion is to be measured in time and not in wings. The issue before the Senate is whether we shall obtain 143 wings by the middle of the calendar year 1954, as the Joint Chiefs recommended, or by the middle of 1955, as the Budget figure has estimated, or to achieve it by some period in 1956, which the Air Force says would be the result of the figures which are contained in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. It goes without saying that if we were able to build 143 wings in 1954 it would cost a great deal less than if it were extended to 1956.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to believe the Senator.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. If my memory serves me correctly, there has been testimony before the Armed Services Committee to the effect that the stretch-out to 1956 has increased the cost by $19,500,000,000. That has been the cost of the stretch-out over what would have been the cost had there been no stretch-out.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. There are two horns to the dilemma. How much would we have to appropriate to meet the 1954 goal over what the bill contemplates?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In my judgment, the amendment which I offered in the committee and which the committee did not adopt because it was contract authority, would have enabled us to have certainly reached the goal by the middle of 1955, and I think it would have been effective in making it possible to achieve it sooner.

Mr. KILGORE. How much contract authority was there in addition to the appropriation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was a cash appropriation of about $4,006,000,000 and an authorization of another $11,000,000,000.

Mr. KILGORE. On the other hand, is there not a possibility that, because of improving models, the 1956 date might be desirable?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It depends upon what factor enters one's judgment in determining what the desirable date is. The date of July 1, 1954, is selected as the date of danger, when this country might be under attack. Of course, if we want the date of scientific perfection, it might be further in the future.

This is the final point that I should like to discuss this afternoon, Mr. President.

I desire to point out the general economic effect——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I have one other question along that line. From a study of airplane development, have we in our work up to this time reached a point where we could, because there has been criticism that our production is not meeting requirements, freeze production on some planes and increase production, and, at the same time, go ahead with experimental work on a better plane that we could later freeze into production?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the dilemma. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that Soviet Russia is building its air power, its naval power, its submarine power, its snorkels, its army power, without regard to the Soviet economy, because it has no concern for those factors which enter into the economy of a free nation, a capitalistic nation, like our own. They do what they please, and are concentrating on the construction of military power. On the other hand, we have adopted the extraordinary policy of only a partial mobilization. That program was laid before the country by General Marshall when he was Secretary of Defense. I remember perfectly well sitting in the Appropriations Committee, and I believe the Senator from West Virginia was there, the day General Marshall arrived, shortly after the Korean war had broken out. I was one who asked him, "Are we prepared? If not, why are we not prepared?"

He explained that the program which was being laid before us was one not of all-out manufacture of weapons of war which might never be used, but a gradual build-up and, at the same time, the maintenance of a sound American economy which we have sought to bring about.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not true that Russia, in her planning, if she is going to reach maximum production, must freeze her models? I am wondering if we have any models which we can freeze in order to get maximum production, and still be ahead of Russia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think we have.

Mr. KILGORE. And then we could set aside a certain amount for exploratory work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly that can be done, but it would involve a major decision by the Congress. Do we want to devote 25 percent of our national product to the manufacture of war implements? If we want to do that, Mr. President, we cannot monkey with taking controls off by weakening the Defense Production Act. We cannot monkey with reduction of taxes. We cannot monkey with any of the other means of loosening controls, directives, and objectives, which are essential if we go into full mobilization.

Mr. KILGORE. May I say to the Senator that I injected myself into this debate to bring out that one point, because I felt that that was what the Senator from Wyoming was going to have to say.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Have we not appropriated enough for the Air Force? There are from $25,000,000,000 to $27,000,000,000 of prior appropriations not spent, and $20,000,000,000 in this bill, so that if they decide that the danger is immediate, they can, with the funds at their disposal, freeze models and go ahead.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They can freeze models and go ahead.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They can freeze models and go ahead with big production.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But I do not believe that with the funds at their disposal, they could possibly keep pace with Soviet building.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a very important point we are making here.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not say that Congress is at fault in the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not say it is the fault of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Neither do I say it is the sole fault of the Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not the fault of the Air Force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The decision depends upon technical information, and upon the research capacities of engineers, experience in the field, and so on. I am simply saying that we have provided the Air Force with ample funds, so that they can do what, in their judgment, is militarily the wise thing to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To do what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To go into mass production of airplanes to reach the 1954 line with funds that have been appropriated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not think so, and I will tell the Senator why I do not think so. To reach the goal which we have in mind means the building of a fleet of bombers capable of carrying on strategic global bombing. That requires the building of planes which are so complex, and so expensive, that it could not be done with the funds in the bill, no matter if the Air Force did freeze models.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not true that the only thing which makes necessary a stretch-out until 1955 is a lack of funds? We have manufacturing facilities, and we have the designs of planes we need.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, would the Senator speak louder, so that we might hear what he is saying?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is it not a fact that the only thing which will prevent us from attaining a 143-wing group by July 1, 1955, as contemplated by the President's budget, is a lack of money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I would not say that is the only thing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. What else is there?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is a matter of organization, such as the Senator from Texas so cogently pointed out in the testimony which he submitted to our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has not pointed out in testimony submitted to anyone that if

we had the funds necessary, we could not obtain 143 groups by 1955.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that the question of air personnel is most important, because, after all, personnel, the manning of the planes, and the maintenance and operation of the planes, are indispensable in operating a 143-wing force. That is why I say that in my opinion—and I offer it only as an opinion—dollars alone will not do the job. Management will be required.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We have the machinery and the plants to manufacture planes, but we are not providing the money to obtain them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a very important point, mainly as to whether it is the fault of Congress in not appropriating enough, or whether it is the fault of the services in spending. I think we should at least explore the question a little.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Illinois, since I have the floor, that I hope we shall not pitch the debate upon the point of trying to blame someone for something. The Senator from Texas is not trying to blame Congress; I am sure the Senator from Illinois is not trying to blame the Air Force. We are here as Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are trying to get as much for our money as we can, without appreciable damage to the economy of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And certainly without damage to our defense. We are all agreed upon that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly. May I not ask if there is not waste within the Air Force or within the military service as a whole, which could be reduced so that we could obtain maximum defense at the previously scheduled times with the moneys already appropriated or to be appropriated? I should like to be thoroughly detailed, if I may.

The Air Force is maintaining a duplicate system of hospitals along with the Army. The Air Force is maintaining a duplicate system of storage as compared with that of the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee bill eliminates that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will save some money, and make it possible for them to reach their goal more quickly.

The services have an undue number of men in the administrative branches, in supply, in communications, and in the upper echelon units.

The Senator from Texas has pointed out that an air wing of 1,500 men has 54 men in personnel, a ratio of 1 to 30, although the civil-service ratio is 1 to 115. There are also clerks, and those who merely drive and repair, not airplanes, but trucks and automobiles, and one-quarter of the entire personnel of an air wing is in those three services. When you get to the administrative personnel above the air wing and outside the combat unit, then you get into astronomical figures.

I do not wish to censure the civilian Secretaries and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are excellent men and sincere patriots. But throughout the Armed Forces as a whole there is waste in manpower and in personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think so. The committee, by the report which has been submitted, is attempting to stimulate that effort to a higher degree of accomplishment.

There can be no doubt that there has been waste, but my point—and I think this is indisputable—is that the great cost of preparation for war lies in the unavoidable expenditures which have to be made for the fantastic weapons we are now building.

Mr. President, there was brought before our committee an electronic device only about a foot long, which it was testified had to be made by hand, at a cost which was almost unbelievable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This discussion is very interesting and instructive. I do not desire to stop it. However, Senators have asked me whether there will be any votes taken today. The hour is growing late.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning on Monday at 12 o'clock, there be a limitation of debate of 40 minutes, 20 minutes to a side, on each amendment, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on the one side, if he is opposed to the amendment, and the proponent of the amendment, on the other side, and in the event the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is in favor of an amendment, then the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or whoever he may designate; that there be the same limitation on committee amendments in the event they are contested, and that the distinguished minority leader, or anyone whom he may designate, shall be in control of the time of those who oppose the committee amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall not object, as I believe it is very important that the bill go to conference. The chairman of the full committee and I spoke this morning to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming about getting the pending bill before the Senate today. We wish to expedite it, with due allowance of time for arguments; but I believe that 20 minutes to a side would be sufficient, particularly after the general discussion of today, which will advise the Senate on the fundamentals, and the methods by which we have tried to arrive at a figure in connection with each of the various services. So I shall not object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has been urging me to bring this bill to the floor and have action on it completed so that it may go to conference at an early date. There are one or two other bills still in conference. There is a public works bill which will affect the defense expenditures, and there remains final action on the mutual security bill. It is very essential to complete consideration of these bills. I am quite willing to agree to a limitation on debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wyoming concluded?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I wish to make one or two further remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] asked the question as to whether or not, if all the money which is asked were appropriated, planes for 143 wings could be produced within the time indicated. I should say, from the evidence which we have before us, that if we could provide a blank check to be filled in by the military, the planes for 143 wings could not be produced within the time specified. Planes cannot be made from dollar bills. They can be made only from material, which includes aluminum, copper, electronic devices, and other things. While the plant capacity may exist for such production, I think we would find that at the end of next year the Department of Defense would not have been able to spend the dollars and obtain the planes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think the Senator is correct, if he is speaking of the end of next year. The Senator from Texas asked the question as to whether it was the information of the Senator from Wyoming that, if the Congress provided the necessary money, 143 wings could be obtained by July 1, 1955. That is the budget date. The information which the Senator from Texas has—and much of the information given to various committees is conflicting, as Senators know——

Mr. FERGUSON. We found that out.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Information from manufacturers, information from the Secretary for Air, information from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and information from every witness who has testified before the Committee on Armed Services has been to the effect that the only thing which would prevent this Nation from obtaining the 143 projected wings by July 1, 1955, would be lack of appropriations.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have before me a chart which was furnished by Secretary Finletter, indicating that already 6 months have been lost. His argument has been——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Bear in mind that the date mentioned was July 1, 1954.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that the maximum danger period was July 1, 1954.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Budget Bureau came along and said that regardless of the maximum danger period, for fiscal reasons this program must be stretched out until July 1, 1955. If the Senator has any evidence or information which shows that because we do not

have the manpower, because we do not have the materials, or because we do not have the capacity, it is impossible to reach the goal of 143 wings, I should like to have him give it to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have before me a memorandum. That question was asked of Mr. Finletter. This memorandum is really a prepared statement. It consists of about 52 pages, in an attempt to answer the question which has been asked. I have been unable to find the answer in it. However, there is a chart attached to the statement. Mr. Finletter's testimony indicated at one place that we had already lost 6 months. So that would bring us to the end of 1955. I see from the chart that the date shown is July 1955. That would involve expenditures of $21,400,000,000. That is all the money that is asked.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It did not require Mr. Finletter 54 pages to tell our committee that if Congress provided the money which had been requested of the budget, 143 wings could be obtained by July 1, 1955.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did he tell the committee what would be in the wings—the kind of planes, and so forth?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would they all be first-line planes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We projected 126 combat groups, with which the Senator is familiar.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would they all be what are called first-line planes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. As the Senator knows, we shall never have all first-line planes?

Mr. FERGUSON. What did he say about the pilots, the air fields, the ground crews, and other items?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Summed up in one sentence, the testimony is this: If we desire to have 143 wings, as now projected, according to the chart facing us, and if we appropriate the money to obtain the planes, we can achieve that goal.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator is talking about wings on the ground, or in storage, I would agree; and I think we can obtain them much sooner than that. I think our production capacity for the manufacture of planes, particularly if we were to freeze the designs, would produce 143 wings.

I have put the question to the authorities as to how many planes can be manufactured each month. I shall not quote the figures on the floor of the Senate. But if all our plant capacity were devoted to the manufacture of airplanes and parts for airplanes, while I cannot state the number, I am satisfied that they could be produced much sooner than has been indicated. However, it is said that we should not speak of the production of wings alone. The authorities tell us that planes piled up are no good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. What good are they unassembled? Other things must go along with the planes. That is why so much time has been spent on this question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I interrupt Senators again to submit one further procedural matter?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that it was the intention to have the amendments considered and agreed to en bloc, with the stipulation that any Senator could call up an amendment on Monday. I think that should be done.

However, one exception should be made. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] wanted to be present when the amendment on page 34, beginning at line 16, was considered. With that exception, I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming will make this request now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made the request at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. Was it agreed to?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the agreement was not made effective, so I proceeded with the discussion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator resubmit his request?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I resubmit my request with this alteration: The bill which is at the desk, on page 56, in line 23, contains the words "or other engineering techniques" which the committee wishes to have stricken.

On page 57, line 4, there should be a period after the word "plant", with the remainder of that provision, down through line 18 on page 57, stricken, so that the committee amendments will be printed in the RECORD tomorrow in the form in which I have stated them.

The committee adopted an amendment with respect to the authorization of the carrier of the *Forrestal* class, on page 23, beginning in line 10. As it appears in the printed bill, by reason of a typographical error, the following language was omitted, and I offer it now as a committee amendment to the committee amendment on page 23, at the end of line 13, namely, to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the words "but this proviso shall not be construed as granting obligating authority for future years unless duly authorized by Congress."

Mr. FERGUSON. That was omitted by reason of a typographical error.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was omitted in the printing of the bill. With those changes, Mr. President, and with the exception of the amendment to which the Senator from Arizona refers, I ask that the committee amendments may be agreed to en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming make a unanimous-consent request to that effect?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am making the unanimous-consent request that all of the committee amendments, with the elimination of the amendment to which the Senator from Arizona has referred, may be adopted en bloc, with the understanding that——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming except one amendment on page 54? Will he let that go over until Monday? I have had several requests with respect to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Michigan is referring to the amendment beginning on line 10, I believe.

Mr. FERGUSON. Lines 4 to 12, which take in the whole section on page 54.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask that no action be taken on it today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire whether under the agreement, if entered into, Senators would have an opportunity to oppose any committee amendment even though it has been adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee amendments would be adopted with the understanding that any Senator may reopen any committee amendment which has been agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. When the bill was brought up for consideration earlier today unanimous consent was given that amendments could be offered to any committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. Persident, I make that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments en bloc, with the exception noted. [Putting the question.] The committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

Under the heading "National Security Resources Board," on page 3, line 1, after the word "conclusive," to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000, to be apportioned for use during the period July 1, 1952, to April 30, 1953."

On page 3, after line 3, to insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; rental of office space in the District of Columbia; and purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment without regard to the provisions of the Act of October 26, 1942, as amended (40 U. S. C. 317); $75,000."

Under the heading "Title II—Department of Defense—Military functions—Office of the Secretary of Defense—Retired Pay," on page 5, line 16, after the word "Act", to insert "prior to the date on which he completes 30 years of active service as defined in section 412 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949."

Under the subhead "Contingencies," on page 6, line 10, after the word "Congress," to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That where an appropriation of funds is made for a specific purpose in our national defense no person shall be authorized or empowered to transfer funds for any other purpose in national defense."

Under the subhead "Emergency fund," on page 6, line 21, after the word "transferred",

to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

Under the subhead "Office of Public Information," on page 6, line 24, after the word "Information", to strike out "$312,500" and insert "$750,000."

Under the heading "Title III—Department of the Army—Military personnel, Army," on page 7, line 23, after the word "Army", to strike out "enlisted personnel" and insert "personnel whose education was interrupted when the individual began his military service."

On page 8, line 12, after the word "activities", to strike out "$4,393,000,000" and insert "$4,415,050,000, of which not to exceed $25,000,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Military personnel, Army, 1952.'"

On page 8, line 21, after the word "duty", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That no part of this or any other appropriation in this act shall be used to pay rent on space to be utilized for recruiting purposes; and no part of this or any other appropriation in this act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 25 percent of the amount expended for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952."

Under the subhead "Maintenance and operations, Army," on page 11, line 20, after the word "Government", to strike out "$4,384,400,000" and insert "$4,332,400,000"; in line 23, after the word "clothing", to insert "cotton"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 1, to insert "repossessed, reused"; in line 5, after the word "of" to insert "cotton or", and in the same line, after the word "grown", to insert "reprocessed, reused."

Under the subhead "Procurement and production, Army," on page 13, line 1, after the word "authorized", to strike out "$2,766,000,000" and insert "$2,700,000,000"; in line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out the comma and "together with not to exceed $50,000,000 appropriated under 'Expediting production,' Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952."

Under the subhead "Military construction, Army civilian components," on page 13, line 20, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the unexpended balance in the appropriation account 'Military construction, Army civilian components, 1951–1952', as established pursuant to section 403 (b) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall be merged with the appropriation 'Military construction, Army civilian components', and shall remain available until June 30, 1954: *Provided further,* That money available under this head and to be expended under the provisions of section 3 (c), Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress, may be used for the construction of armory facilities for company or battery-size and larger units."

Under the subhead "Army National Guard", on page 14, line 22, after the word "facilities", to strike out "construction and maintenance of buildings and alterations to present structures, other than armories, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any tax-supported agency therein, and unexpended funds from 'Military construction, Army civilian components', Public Law 179, Eighty-second Congress, to remain available until expended in accordance with provisions of section 67, National Defense Act, and National Guard regulations, and not made subject to the legal restrictions contained in Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress, for the construction of reserve facilities;" and on page 16, line 4, after the word "States", to strike out "whether or not" and insert "when."

Under the subhead "Research and development, Army," on page 16, line 12, after the word "for", to strike out "$450,000,000" and insert "$391,500,000."

On page 16, after line 13, to insert:

"NATIONAL BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF RIFLE PRACTICE, ARMY

"For necessary expenses of construction, equipment, and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship, and promotion of rifle practice, in accordance with the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 643), and the provisions of law contained in 10 U. S. C. 1184–1185 and 32 U. S. C. 181–186, including travel of rifle teams, military personnel, and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions, and not to exceed $18,000 for incidental expenses of the National Board, $130,000: *Provided,* That travel expenses of civilian members of the National Board shall be paid in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended."

On page 17, after line 12, to insert:

"ARMY STOCK FUND

"For additional working capital for the Army Stock Fund, established pursuant to section 405 of the National Security Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 172), $75,000,000: *Provided,* That stocks procured with funds appropriated for clothing and equipage during fiscal year 1952 may be transferred to said fund."

Under the heading "Title IV—Department of the Navy—Military personnel, Navy," on page 18, line 5, after the word "training", to strike out "$2,493,203,000" and insert "$2,478,590,000."

Under the subhead "Military personnel, Marine Corps," on page 19, line 21, after the word "training", to strike out "$610,605,000" and insert "$616,884,000."

Under the subhead "Marine Corps troops and facilities," on page 20, line 20, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$880,965,000" and insert "$800,562,000."

Under the subhead "Construction of aircraft and related procurement," on page 21, line 21, after the word "expended", to strike out "$3,810,042,000" and insert "$3,910,042,000."

Under the subhead "Ships and Facilities," on page 22, line 12, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$1,224,000,000" and insert $1,200,000,000."

Under the subhead "Shipbuilding and conversion," on page 23, line 10, after the figures "$2,076,922,000", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That obligations may be incurred against funds appropriated hereunder to the extent required during the fiscal year 1953 toward the construction of a second carrier of the *Forrestal* class; but this proviso shall not be construed as granting obligating authority for future years unless duly authorized by Congress."

Under the subhead "Ordnance and facilities," on page 24, line 3, after the word "salaries", to strike out "$900,000,000" and insert "$807,000,000."

Under the subhead "Research," on page 27, line 13, after the word "expended", to strike out "$75,700,000" and insert "$65,859,000."

Under the heading "Title V—Department of the Air Force—Aircraft and related procurement," on page 29, line 22, after the word "expended," to strike out "$12,125,044,000" and insert "$12,085,044,000."

Under the heading "Major procurement other than aircraft," on page 30, line 8, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000."

Under the subhead "Acquisition and construction of real property," on page 30, line 14, after the figures "$45,334,770", to insert "to remain available until expended."

Under the subhead "Maintenance and operation," on page 32, line 4, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$3,761,790,142" and insert "$3,540,000,000."

Under the subhead "Military personnel requirements," on page 33, line 22, after the word "deserters", to strike out "stragglers, and escaped military prisoners; payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case) for the apprehension of deserters" and insert "prisoners, and members of the Air Force absent without leave, including payment of rewards (not to exceed $25 in any one case)", and on page 34, line 11, after the word "awards", to strike out "$3,132,261,000" and insert "$3,264,000,000."

Under the subhead "Air National Guard," on page 36, line 11, after the word "Force", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further,* That units and headquarters of the Air National Guard of the United States, when they are in the active service of the United States, shall have the same privilege of free transmission of the official mail matter as the Department of Defense."

Under the heading "Title VI—General provisions," on page 37, line 25, after the word "purpose" to insert "and such amounts as may be required to meet increased costs of pay and allowances as authorized by the act of May 19, 1952 (Public Law 346) may be transferred from such unobligated balances of appropriations available to the Department of Defense as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense to applicable appropriations contained in titles II, III, IV, and V of this act."

On page 43, line 25, after the word "of", to strike out "$200" and insert "$250."

On page 52, line 19, after the word "of", to insert "an average of"; on page 53, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "at any one time"; and in line 2, after the word "year", to insert "except that to the extent such civilian employees are in replacement of military personnel, with a corresponding reduction of end strength of military personnel among the services, the number specified above may be increased by 20,000."

On page 53, line 14, after the word "of", to strike out "7,000 pounds of uncrated or 8,000 pounds if crated or the equivalent when transportation charges are based on cubic measurement" and insert "an average of 5,000 pounds net, such average to be based upon the total number of shipments authorized for permanent change of station during the previous fiscal year."

On page 54, after line 12, to strike out:

"SEC. 635. During the last quarter of the fiscal year 1953, no funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the pay, compensation, or allowances of commissioned officer personnel in excess of percentages of total average military personnel, during such quarter fiscal year, of the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps, respectively, set forth in this section as follows:

"Ranks	Army	Air Force	Navy	Marines
General of the Army or Fleet Admiral of the Navy	0.0003	0.	0.0004	0.
General or Admiral	.00055	.0007	.0007	.0004
Lieutenant General or Vice Admiral	.00175	.0019	.0029	.0016
Major General or Rear Admiral	.0111	.016	.0154	.0095
Brigadier General or Rear Admiral	.0192	.022	.0154	.013
Colonel or Captain of the Navy	.335	.43	.359	.23
Lieutenant Colonel or Commander	.85	.84	.85	.5
Major or Lieutenant Commander	1.16	2.1	1.3000	1.063
Captain or Lieutenant of the Navy	2.3	4.0	2.6597	2.25"

At the top of page 55 to strike out:

"SEC. 636. No funds contained in this act shall be used for the purpose of entering into contracts containing article 15 of the Standard Government Contract, which reads as follows:

"'Disputes: Except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract, all disputes concerning questions of fact arising under this contract shall be decided by the contracting officer subject to written appeal by the contractor within 30 days to the head of the Department concerned or his duly authorized representative, whose decision shall be final and conclusive upon the parties thereto. In the meantime the contractor shall diligently proceed with the work as directed.'"

On page 55, after line 13, to strike out:

"SEC. 637. None of the funds provided in this act shall be available for training in any legal or business profession nor for the payment of tuition for training in such professions."

On page 55, after line 16, to strike out:

"SEC. 638. Money appropriated in titles II, III, IV, and V, of this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditures thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total of $46,000,000,000."

On page 55, line 23, to change the section number from "639" to "635", and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,254,851" and insert "$6,004,851."

At the top of page 56, to strike out:

"SEC. 640. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the personnel, facilities, or activities of the Department of the Air Force to establish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951."

On page 56, after line 6, to insert:

"SEC. 636. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and for the purpose of achieving an efficient, economical, and practical operation of an integrated supply system designed to meet the needs of the military departments without duplicating or overlapping of either operations or functions, no officer or agency in or under the Department of Defense, after the effective date of this section, shall obligate any funds for procurement, production, warehousing, distribution of supplies or equipment or related supply management functions, except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) This section shall be effective 60 days after the approval of this act."

On page 56, after line 19, to insert:

"SEC. 637. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the employment of any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch, time-measuring devices, a time or motion study of any job of any employee of the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

"Nor shall any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant."

On page 57, after line 18, to insert:

"SEC. 638. No part of the funds appropriated in this act for major procurement shall be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year at a monthly rate more than 125 percent of the average monthly rate of obligation during the first 10 months of the year."

On page 57, after line 23, to insert:

"SEC. 639. The President is hereby authorized to continue during the fiscal year 1953 the 10 temporary positions authorized in section 630 of the Defense Appropriations Act of 1952: *Provided*, That five of such positions may be placed in the grade of GS-16."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make one additional and concluding comment with respect to this measure. I said at the outset, Mr. President, that the fiscal aspects of the bill are, in the minds of many members of the committee and of the Senate, by far the most important to be taken into consideration. If Congress had agreed to increase the receipts of the Federal Government, increased expenses for military purposes could be entertained. When the budget was submitted, it was estimated that there would be an administrative deficit of $14,000,000,000, if the budget recommended by the President were to have been adopted. That is, there might have been a cash deficit of $10,000,000,000. In order to make up the deficit, the President in his budget message recommended modification of the tax laws so as to increase the revenue of the Government.

At that time the statutory debt limit was, as it still is, $275,000,000,000. The problem is how to make the expenditures which are recommended or required for military preparedness without creating an additional deficit, or without increasing the debt limitation. It cannot be done.

Therefore, if we wish to maintain a pay-as-you-go system, lacking increased revenues, we have no recourse except to reduce expenditures. This, I believe, was the primary consideration among the members of the committee in voting for the reductions in the bill which has been reported.

I wish to point out that the gross public debt as of June 30, 1951, was $255,300,000,000. The deficit for fiscal 1952 may be roughly estimated to be about $5,000,000,000. When that is taken into consideration, and if the cash balance in the Treasury were applied in the amount of $1,000,000,000 to the $5,000,000,000 there would be added to the national debt about $4,000,000,000, leaving the national debt as of the 30th of June, 1952, $16,400,000,000 below the debt limitation of $275,000,000,000. If the appropriations and expenditures for fiscal 1953 exceed receipts by an amount greater than was estimated, or if the receipts are less than those which were estimated, the situation with respect to the limitation on the national debt will be modified accordingly. The best estimates I have been able to obtain would indicate that expenditures during fiscal 1953 will probably not exceed $80,000,000,000. But receipts will probably be less than those which were estimated when the budget was submitted, namely, $71,000,000,000, and will amount to only $68,300,000,000. That would mean that at the end of fiscal 1953 the deficit and the increase in debt subject to limitation would amount to $11,700,000,000.

These figures seem to me to be conclusive as indicating the need for economy, and as indicating the correctness of the request the Appropriations Committee is making to the Senate that in passing this bill for the Defense Department greater economies be instituted in the expenditure of the appropriated funds.

That, Mr. President, is the justification which we make for the reduction below the President's budget of $5,655,958,858, which is more than half the entire sum which is being appropriated this year for the normal functions of the Government. This sum amounts to $9,742,173,008.

To state it in another way, the reductions below the budget estimates which are made by the pending bill in excess of $5,600,000,000 are only $500,000,000 below the total amount which it is estimated will have to be paid upon the interest of the national debt during fiscal 1953.

It ought to be added that with these reductions we still maintain the end strength in military personnel which was estimated when the budget was submitted, which is the end strength of 3,690,605 persons, of whom 1,550,000 are wearing the uniform of the Army, 835,875 the uniform of the Navy, 243,730 the uniform of the Marine Corps, and 1,061,000 the uniform of the Air Force. It will include a provision for 408 major combatant ships in the United States Navy, 783 other ships, and 16 air-carrier groups, and it will continue the build-up of the Air Force from 95 wings to 143 wings.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the hour is late, and not many Senators are upon the floor. So it would seem somewhat futile to make a speech or to discuss the very able report of the committee, were it not for the fact that time is pressing and that material placed in the RECORD at this time can be read by our colleagues and can be considered in some measure by the country as a whole.

First, let me congratulate the Appropriations Committee, and particularly the subcommittee for appropriations in the Department of Defense, on the reductions they have made. They have done even better than I thought it was possible for them to do, and they have effected reductions of approximately $5,670,000,000, as compared to the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

So this year, the Senator from Wyoming and I, instead of finding ourselves in opposition to one another, as was the case last year, are in happy agreement; and I wish to congratulate the Senator from Wyoming for the magnificent service he has rendered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is very kind and gracious, always.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I mean that most sincerely.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I am somewhat disconcerted by the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming, which I take it expresses the attitude of the Department of Defense, namely, that these economies will be purchased in the Department of Defense by postponing our period of maximum preparedness from 1954 to 1956.

I think this Nation is in very grave danger. I think Secretary Marshall took a calculated risk when he fixed 1954 as

the period of maximum danger. I would hate to have it on my conscience if, by means of a reduction in appropriations, we made it impossible to be ready in 1954, merely in order that we would be ready in 1956. So I believe all of us find ourselves in this very cruel dilemma. We want to preserve the long-run financial security of the country and not sacrifice our short-run military security.

The point I should like to make is this: Why must the comparatively small percentage reduction in appropriations, relatively speaking, which the committee is recommending, be accompanied by such great delay in effective preparedness, as the armed services say will be the result?

As we have seen, the reduction in appropriations for the Air Force will be only approximately 10 percent below the figure which the Joint Chiefs of Staff said they would need in order to be ready in 1954. However, now the Joint Chiefs of Staff say that if they receive appropriations 10 or 12 percent less than the ones they requested, the result will be to postpone the period of preparedness by 2 years, or from 1954 to 1956.

I believe that definitive pressure by Congress is needed all along the line, in order to see to it that the Armed Forces obtain maximum efficiency throughout the services and maximum value for each dollar that is appropriated.

I do not quite know how that can be done. I have some amendments which I intend to propose to this appropriation bill. Those amendments may be ruled out of order on the ground that they constitute legislation upon an appropriation bill.

On the other hand, I have waived the observance of the customary period of 3 days between the time when the bill was reported and the time when it could be considered. In view of that action on my part, I hope points of order will not be raised against my amendments. I may not have time to file a motion to suspend the rule, and I hope it may be possible to have these amendments considered, without having the usual parliamentary hurdles interposesd in their way.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Illinois will permit me to say that the committee has not seen his amendments, and we have no means of knowing the subjects with which they deal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Neither have we any way of knowing the extent to which the amendments would be legislative in character.

Of course the Appropriations Committee operates under a rule of the Senate to the effect that the committee may not consider legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am pointing out that I have waived observance of the requirement that there be a period of 3 days between the reporting of the appropriation bill and the time when it is considered. Since I have waived observance of that rule, in view of the pressure of time and the needs of national defense, I hope my colleagues will be equally cooperative with me.

Mr. President, I wish to pay full tribute to the patriotism, devotion, skill, and energy of the civilian Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the others who are conducting our military affairs. They are splendid men.

On the other hand, they are enmeshed in a military system; and the decisions and the practices come up from the posts and units and the traditions of the services, and so forth, until at times it must seem very discouraging to these men to be fighting against such great odds.

I think we should strengthen their hands; and I believe that by means of taking affirmative action, Congress can make possible some effective economies.

First of all, why is it not possible to induce the armed services to improve their efficiency, to reduce their wastes, and to achieve maximum preparedness by 1954 with the funds which would be appropriated by means of this bill, as it has been reported from our committee? Why must all reductions come out of military efficiency, rather than out of the wastes in the armed services?

Let us begin with the minor wastes. For instance, let us consider the bonus payments. A study of the bonus payments for the Air Force has disclosed that a great many members of the Air Force who really have ceased to be active fliers are, nevertheless, receiving from $100 to $210 a month extra pay as bonus payments for flying. We are spending $250,000,000 a year on these flight bonuses.

I have given this matter some study. I believe we could provide adequate payments for actual combat pilots and those who will actually be in the active Air Force for $100,000,000 a year less, and in that way we could save $100,000,000—merely by eliminating the waste from these bonus payments.

In addition, we would save the gasoline which now is used in such flights by administrative officers, who make the flights in order to qualify for the bonus payments. Furthermore, the necessary wear and tear upon the planes, incident to such flights, would be eliminated. In my judgment, these additional savings would be as great as the savings in salary or in bonus payments; and I believe that a total of $200,000,000 of waste could thus be eliminated in this one item.

Mr. President, I wish to be very guarded in my statement, and I do not wish to censure unduly anyone, personally. However, when the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee that was considering this matter asked a very eminent leader of the Air Force what he would do if the appropriations for this purpose were reduced, his reply—and I was shocked when I read it—was that the first thing he would do would be not to call into being National Guard air units; that the next thing he would do would be to fail to carry out the expansion program; and that, if necessary, he would disband some of the air units already in service.

(See testimony before subcommittee of Senate Armed Services Committee, pp. 114–119.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I had known that this issue would come up, I would have brought to the Chamber that testimony, which now is in my office. I do not wish to mention that man's name, for to do so would be unduly censurious. However, that was extraordinary testimony and it hurt many of us to have it given.

I hope that, upon considered judgment, the Air Force will not continue to take that position. I hope that, upon considered judgment, the Air Force will be willing to reduce the expenditures in these excessive amounts and for these unnecessary purposes, and will devote the money thus saved to planes, rather than to privilege.

Let me refer to duplications. Supposedly the unification of our Armed Forces has been accomplished. However, what did our friends in the Air Force do? They promptly proceeded to develop a duplicate system of hospitals, so that now not only do we have Navy Hospitals and Army hospitals, as we had before, but, in addition, we have Air Force hospitals. So we have the spectacle of having Army hospitals and Air Force hospitals existing side by side.

The Army hospitals may have excess beds. The Air Force hospitals generally have excess beds, because—fortunately—thus far the casualties in the Air Corps have not been heavy.

Here we have a waste of original investment and a waste of continuing upkeep, with doctors and nurses on the payroll being paid, supplies being purchased, and maintenance costs being incurred which are unnecessary. But all this was not enough. The Air Force then proceeded to set up duplicate systems of storage. The Bonner committee has made its report. After studying the situation all over the world, that committee found that the Air Force was taking common-use items out of partially filled Army warehouses and putting them into separate warehouses of their own—not merely items which were peculiar to the Air Force and which they might want to have under one roof, but common-use items which the Army used as well as themselves—and that the minimum cost of constructing these duplicate warehouses was $10 a square foot.

These are merely illustrations of the waste resulting from duplication. Can we not say to the Department of Defense, "We are willing to give you money, but we ask in return that you be good stewards of the money we give you, and that you give us maximum preparedness with the sums which we give you?" At times, it seems as though some of the members of the Armed Forces, and some of the leading members of the Air Force, were more interested in building an empire on the ground than an armada in the skies.

What about the waste of personnel? In the discussion earlier in the afternoon I quoted figures from the reports of the Preparedness Committee headed by the Senator from Texas. I quote from memory, but I think the figures are substantially correct. An air wing, as I remember it, consists of 1,600 men. If we accept the tables of organization for an air wing, we find that 54 men are doing personnel work—one out of every 30 within an air wing; whereas the ratio which the Civil Service Commission has set and which the Congress has set as the maximum for the civil employees of

the Government is 1 personnel worker for every 115. I see the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is in the Chamber, and he will correct me if I am wrong. We have another large number of men within an air wing typing documents and doing administrative work. Am I correct that there are from 70 to 80 such men in an air wing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct. The Senator will find that information in the hearings, at page 1478.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are then large numbers, some 200, who are operating the motor-vehicle pool.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Two hundred and fourteen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are within the air wing. So that there are approximately 400 men engaged in personnel work, administration, and motor transport, within an air wing, or 1 man out of every 4 within the wing. I repeat that qualification. All this is within the wing. We know that in the echelons above that there are additional personnel workers, additional supply workers, administrators, and so on. I believe that the tables of organization of the Air Force of the Army, of the Navy—yes, and of the Marine Corps—need a very thorough examination and need to be revised to produce greater combat effectiveness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I agree thoroughly with what the Senator said, and commend him for the statement he has just made. I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a statement I made before the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, in which I discussed in some detail the table of organization of the Air Force as well as of the Army and Navy. I should like to inform the Senator also that there has been prepared and is now being considered by various members of the preparedness subcommittee a rather detailed report on manpower utilization, which will confirm what the Senator has just stated in regard to the great waste of manpower, under the requirements of the table of organization.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any surety, however, that we can get the Armed Forces to carry through these reforms?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the Senator has read this statement, because he has quoted some of the figures from it. I want to correct for the RECORD, the number of people in the motor vehicle pool. It is 242 enlisted men and 3 officers, who are engaged merely in maintaining and operating motor vehicles assigned to the fighter wing. If the Senator will refer to page 1487 of the hearings, he will find in the second paragraph of that page the following statement:

> For example, the Army has saved by elimination or consolidation 2,692 jobs at 18 installations and the Air Force 6,317 jobs at 8 installations. The Navy has not completed its studies but is working toward the same goal.
>
> This represents a total of 9,009 jobs that have been saved by elimination or consolidation in the Army and the Air Force. Of course, there is no immediate saving here because the men who formerly filled those jobs have merely been transferred elsewhere but there is an increase in efficiency and effectiveness and there is an ultimate saving to the taxpayer which will be considerable.

I desire to point out to the Senator that the committee has been able to visit only a comparatively few installations, a very small number of the total installations in this country and abroad, namely, 26. But in the 26, where only a cursory survey was made, the services agreed with us that 9,000 of the jobs should be eliminated; and if that survey could be extended, as the services could and should extend it to every installation in the country, I have no doubt that thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands of jobs could be abolished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the result that either the fighting effectiveness would be increased by this amount, or the cost would be decreased.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is there any way by which we can stimulate the Armed Forces to effect these savings in personnel?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. A further perusal of the statement, I may say to the Senator, gives the best answer that the Preparedness Subcommittee has been able to find. We asked the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations to join us in a letter addressed to the Secretary of Defense, and the chairman of that committee indicated earlier this afternoon on the floor of the Senate that he was prepared to sign that letter with us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, I notice a tendency, that, whereas the opinions of the Appropriations Committee are considered by the Armed Forces, before the appropriations are made, yet, after the appropriations are made, that Congress then does not have so much power and the Armed Forces go their own sweet way.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Pursuing my answer to the Senator's question, I am hopeful that the two committees which have jurisdiction over the Armed Forces, namely, the Armed Services Committee and the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, will request the Secretary of Defense to exercise the authority given him in the Defense Act of 1947, and set up a group of management experts to take the organization tables of the three services, and, between July and January, make a careful study of them, conduct hearings with the services, and submit to the Congress next January, through the Secretary of Defense recommendations, as to the number of positions which can be eliminated from the organization tables.

There are other means, such as the hit-and-miss tactics of an investigating committee, which we have employed up to now. With the cooperation of the very able Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Rosenberg, we have eliminated 9,000 jobs. We received testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the civilian Secretary, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I think they all agreed that such a study is indicated. I believe that between July and January the study should be made; and I am hopeful that when Congress returns the first of the year, the Armed Services Committee and the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee will have the Secretary's recommendations in that field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Texas is well aware of the Greek myth of Sisyphus, who, I believe, was given the job of rolling a stone up the hillside. For every step he rolled the stone up the hillside, he was, however, forced back two steps. Do the Senator's labors in trying to reduce the waste of manpower in the armed services make him feel at times that he and other Members of the Congress are modern representatives of Sisyphus? That may seem to be a rhetorical question, but I interpret the silence of the Senator from Texas as an assent.

Mr. President, the wastes are not only in connection with personnel; there are also great wastes in procurement. One of the big errors of the Military Establishment, I think, is in overspecification, in believing that each piece of equipment must be ready to meet every possible contingency which might arise simultaneously in connection with that piece of equipment. Such an occurrence is a mathematical absurdity. The result is that the specifications are so minute and so elaborate that the costs are extremely high. This is particularly the case in the field of communications, which is exceptionally overspecified.

May I ask the Senator from Texas if he agrees with this criticism, that the material and equipment purchased by the Armed Forces tend to be overelaborate, and that they should adopt the principle of the "best buy"?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas does not have a great deal of evidence in that field, but I think the statements of the Senator from Illinois are correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Texas. Sometimes this overspecification is ludicrous, as when the supply services devote four or five pages to specifying the qualities of ping-pong balls and dogs' toenail clippers. But it is always grossly expensive. I think that possibly billions of dollars could be saved by adopting more sensible purchasing practices.

It is often said that nothing is too good for our boys at the front; but that usually means that nothing is too good for the big brass at home.

Mr. President, there are two very interesting committees in the House, one of which is headed by Representative PORTER HARDY, Jr., of Virginia, who is a great public servant, and the other committee by Representative HÉBERT, of Louisiana, who has done excellent work.

The Hardy committee examined the practices of ordnance depots in Detroit and Toledo. In Detroit they found that the military had failed to break through the price practices of the automotive industry. I refer the Senate to the report of Representative HARDY which describes one piece of equipment. It cost the manufacturer $4 to produce. The company sold it to a jobber for $8; the jobber sold it to a retailer for $12; the Government bought it from the retailer for $16,

and it bought such a part in huge quantities.

It may be asking too much to say that the Government should break through to manufacturing costs, but at least it should break through to the price charged by the manufacturer and should not have added to it the mark-ups of the jobbers and retailers. The Hardy committee reported that hundreds of millions of dollars were going down the drain in this one depot, alone, through these purchasing practices of the military.

If this was being done in Detroit, was it not also being done in other sections of the country as well?

I appeal to the manufacturers of this country, who I think are as patriotic as anyone else, that instead of holding up the Government and making it pay retailer's prices, they permit the Government to buy at the manufacturer's price. We cannot, in this period of huge purchases, continue the system of retail, wholesale, and jobber distribution that is in operation in connection with individual purchasing. Hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved here.

Representative HÉBERT took virtually identical commodities which were being purchased by the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and, in some cases, by the Marine Corps, and found that widely varying prices were being paid for virtually the same commodities. While I know that these comparisons have been attacked on the ground that the purchases were not always made at the same time or under precisely the same conditions or at precisely the same places, nevertheless, the disparities were so great that they could not be accounted for by those differences. In some cases one service would pay from two to three times what other services paid.

The military forces have been very slow in developing a combined catalog for purchases—very slow, indeed.

They have been so slow that at times it looks as though they had been sabotaging, that they have not been in favor of unification, that they wanted to maintain their separate systems of supply and procurement, resulting in competitive bidding and in grave wastes.

Mr. President, I think also that we may have depended too much, in the case of major items, on renegotiation and have allowed high unit prices to be fixed for major items of supply which it would be very difficult to justify. I know the difficulties connected with this problem, that many of the items were experimental, and so forth.

I submit, Mr. President, that there are enormous wastes in expenditures by the armed services; that Congress, on the whole, has made enormous appropriations, and it is proper for us to ask the Defense Establishment to introduce economies so that we can get maximum security more speedily than they say will be the result with the money which we appropriated, and that they should not everlastingly blame Congress for a failure to appropriate.

I am not concerned with who is to blame, but I am concerned that we be prepared, with a minimum waste of manpower and resources as quickly as is possible.

I submit, Mr. President, that the figures we have given this afternoon indicate that, on the whole, we in Congress are ready to shovel out the money. If this bill passes there will be over $100,000,000,000 of purchasing power available to the armed services. One-third of the national income will be available. We are ready to appropriate, but we ask, in return, that instead of always blaming Congress, they buckle down to the job, eliminate the waste, and attain maximum effectiveness.

This is in a sense an appeal. I hope Congress will provide the machinery to see that it is done. If it is not done, the appropriation bill for next year should be correspondingly reduced.

I hope we may write definitive legislation which will compel these economies to be put into effect. The times are too serious for us to deal lightly with the subject.

I believe it was Bismarck who said that war was so important it could not be left to the generals. The defense of this country is so important that we cannot merely turn over a huge sum of money to the Military Establishment and let them do with it as they will. We must see to it that they are good stewards. I am sure the vast majority of them want to be good stewards. I am not indicting them as a group. We all develop slovenly habits and easy-going ways. But the times are too serious to permit any of us to live on that level any longer.

We must rouse ourselves individually and collectively, we, as a legislative body, the members of the Armed Forces in their capacity. I hope we may work together to that end.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an analysis of the action of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee on the Air Force budget, prepared by the Secretary of Air, and submitted to me at my request, together with a letter from Mr. John T. Hall, Jr., general counsel of the Department of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the analysis and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF ACTION ON AIR FORCE BUDGET

The Air Force portion of the President's budget submitted to Congress called for a total appropriation of $22,430,378,770, of which $1,730,378,770 was for cash to liquidate prior year contract authority, which gave the Air Force a total of $20,700,000,000 of new obligating authority. The House reduced the over-all Air Force budget by a total of $1,677,965,858, which gave the Air Force a total budget then of $20,752,412,912. This total budget still included the total of $1,730,378,770, of prior year contract authority so that the Air Force actually was left a total of $19,022,034,142. The Senate committee has now taken further action to reduce the over-all Air Force budget in two ways. It has given the Air Force a further reduction of $298,301,142 and has included a rider to the effect that the increase in military pay ($130,000,000) must be absorbed across the board within the Air Force budget, which translates itself into a total reduction of $428,301,142 made by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This, in effect, will give the Air Force a total budget of $20,454,111,770, which still includes the total of $1,730,378,770 of prior year contract authority. This means that House action and the Senate committee action has reduced the Air Force's new obligating authority by $2,106,267,000 from the $20.7 billion requested in the original President's budget to a total of $18,593,733,000.

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF AIR FORCE RECLAMA FOR RESTORATION OF CERTAIN CUTS PROPOSED BY THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE IN THE AIR FORCE FISCAL-YEAR 1953 BUDGET

I. AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

The Air Force requested a total appropriation of $12,685,044,000 for fiscal year 1953, including $1,685,044,000 to liquidate obligations incurred under contract authority for previous years. The House approved $12,085,044,000; the Senate Appropriations Committee proposes a further cut of an additional $40,000,000 for an aggregate cut of $600,000,000.

This cut will—

1. Knock out about 700 aircraft from the program.

2. Push the whole program back an additional 9 to 12 months, or until approximately mid-1956.

3. Play hob with current aircraft production schedules, which have been subject to spurts, stops, shifts, and readjustments too numerous to mention.

The adverse psychological effect upon the aircraft and related industries cannot be minimized.

The justification for this cut which is offered is that the Air Force has budgeted for too many aircraft spare parts. This may be so; the Air Force does not believe it is so. Its very best judgment is that the amount it has budgeted for spare parts is right in the light of present knowledge. The amount to be included for spare parts was arrived at only after the most painstaking and thoughtful analysis. As a result, the Air Force is prepared to accept responsibility for its estimate; it cannot accept responsibility for the estimate made by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

At no point in the hearings before the House or Senate Appropriations Committees was a specific concrete example offered of a miscalculation or of the employment of erroneous planning factors in the Air Force estimate of spare parts requirements. The cut, at bottom, rests on the hope that somehow, some way the Air Force estimate is too high and reductions can be effected.

Now what is the situation with respect to spares today?

The fact is that airplanes are grounded today for the want of spare parts to an extent which is unacceptable.

The F–86 is a good example of this. The rate of F–86's out of commission for the lack of spare parts in the Far East Air Force has been as high as 5.6 percent during the month of June. The rate for F–86's in the United States is considerably higher, having reached the point of 14.9 percent during the month of June. The simple truth is that F–86's in this country have been robbed of spare parts in order to keep F–86's in the air against MIG's in Korea and even so the rate of aircraft out of commission in Korea is higher than the Air Force would like to see. A recent newspaper account portrayed the situation rather graphically. The account described a telecon between Far East Air Force officers and Air Force supply elements on the Pacific Coast in which urgent requests were made for so-called brickbat items for Korean operations. As the account stated

"brickbats"—red-hot emergencies—get the special treatment. You don't say no to them. You manage somehow. Particularly if you're an airman who knows what combat means. Take F-86 (Sabre jet) ailerons. Or stabilizers. They don't last long in Korea."

"Frequently," General Talbot says, "we go right into the factories and onto the assembly lines to strip the parts off planes in production so we can send them to Korea. The companies scream. It interrupts their production flow. But they know what's involved, and they always come through."

This "cannibalizing" of the production assembly line is something new, it indicates just how serious this spare situation is.

To show how serious this spare-parts situation is—we have been unable to replace F-51 units in Korea—World War II piston-type fighters—with the more modern F-84 jet fighter bombers—not because the F-84's were not available, but because we did not have sufficient spare parts to sustain them in combat in the Korean theater.

An airplane without adequate spare parts really can't be counted an airplane any more than an automobile without an engine or without the fourth wheel can be counted an automobile. Spare parts are an indispensable insurance policy. If you don't pay the premium on this insurance policy you have cut right into the heart of the combat effectiveness of the force. No prudent automobile owner does very much driving without a spare tire on the assumption that luck is always going to be with him and he will never have a blowout or a puncture.

In addition to airplanes which are grounded for lack of spare parts and the necessity to send units equipped with older airplanes to Korea, serious limitations have had to be imposed upon the number of sorties which could be flown in Korea because of spare deficiencies of such a character and extent that operational effectiveness could not be maintained.

These are some of the dangerous consequences which flow from the pursuit of a policy of false economy in connection with the procurement of spare parts.

As stated, the Air Force has studied the spare-parts situation most carefully. There is no doubt about the shortage of spare parts at the places where they are needed. But the question then arises as to whether there are too many spare parts in the pipeline. This question has been most carefully studied and, as a result, we have, I think, been most successful in finding ways to hold down the pipeline to the minimum. These savings we have been able to effect in the pipeline have been reflected in our budget estimates for fiscal year 1953; that is, our hope of being able to continue our reductions in the pipeline items has already actually been reflected in the amount we have requested for spare parts in our fiscal year 1953 budget.

This process of continuous study and refinement will continue. It may be possible—certainly it will be our purpose—to achieve even further reductions—reductions beyond those which we now reasonably anticipate and to which effect has already been given in our request. If further savings can be effected, any excess spare parts will be injected back into the aircraft production pipeline for the 143-wing-force buildup. The effect, therefore, of any savings that we may make in spare parts as a result of our further studies will be to advance the date when we attain our 143-wing objective. Surely there is no objection to this.

If we fail to order spare parts in time and in adequate quantity, two things happen:

First, operational effectiveness is seriously impaired as mentioned above. But more than this, capital is tied up in expensive equipment which is forced to remain idle for the lack of spare parts. This, of course, is very wasteful. It has been estimated by aircraft manufacturers and by airlines that, for example, in the case of a Douglas DC-6, $2,000 is lost each day one of these airplanes is grounded. There is absolutely no excuse for tying up dollars in an airplane which can't fly because it lacks replacement parts.

Second, if the initial order of spare parts is too small and subsequent reorders must be made, the price of the later spare parts is necessarily much more expensive. Machine tools have to be reset and production lines have to be reestablished, both of which are paid for by the Air Force. We have experienced in the case of the B-26 and the B-29, as well as the F-51, the need to purchase additional spare parts at a later date at a considerably higher price. As a specific example the average price increase of spare parts for the B-26 in 1952 when compared with 1947 ranges from 125 to 150 percent. Costs for spares for the F-51 are even higher and in some cases are 300 percent above the costs under World War II contracts.

This matter of spare parts can be reduced to about this: They are indispensable insurance; if they are actually procured in excessive quantities, the overage can be put back into the production of complete aircraft; if they are purchased in inadequate quantities, airplanes are grounded which is wasteful in itself, and operational effectiveness is seriously impaired; and if additional spares have to be reordered at a later date a much higher price must be paid for them.

The simple logic of not underbuying spares in the first instance is compelling.

II. MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

The Air Force requested $1,300,000,000. The House approved $1,000,000,000 of this amount; the Senate Appropriations Committee proposes a further additional cut of $100,000,000 for a total cut of $400,000,000.

This cut which amounts to about 30 percent of the amount requested knocks the planned program completely out of kilter. It is a dangerous illusion to count an aircraft as effective which lacks ground support equipment, ammunition and electronics devices. A program must be in delicate balance if it is to be an effective program. The restoration of the cuts in personnel demonstrates the conviction of the Senate Appropriations Committee that aircraft without personnel are not effective aircraft. The logic of this conviction is equally true in the case of major procurement other than aircraft.

This $400,000,000 would be absorbed or distributed as follows:

Weapons and ammunition	$100,000,000
Ground powered equipment	50,000,000
Electronics equipment	110,000,000
Training equipment	30,000,000
Other major equipment	110,000,000
Total	400,000,000

The loss of $100,000,000 budgeted for weapons and ammunition will sharply reduce the combat capability of the Air Force. This amount largely represented the newer types of rockets and cannon ammunition. There is little justification for working to improve the performance of aircraft and at the same time saddling the pilot with less than the most modern armament. What is worse, there is absolutely no justification for installing the latest armament and then not providing adequate ammunition for the pilot to fire. This cut will have a most serious effect upon our reserve supply of combat ammunition. The production lead time on this newer ammunition is estimated to be around 1 year which underscores the danger implicit in allowing our reserve supply to drop below acceptable limits at a critical time.

The imbalance in the program and the adverse effect upon combat effectiveness are obvious from a mere glance at the items set forth above which will absorb the cut. Included, for example, in the $110,000,000 for electronics equipment is equipment which would permit 24-hour operation of our radar and early warning system. The effect of this will be sharply to reduce the effectiveness of our air defense capability. Other items which will have to be eliminated are certain countermeasure devices designed to increase the effectiveness of our strategic air attack.

III. MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Under this the Air Force requested $4,389,817,000. This amount was cut by the House to $3,761,790,142; the Senate Appropriations Committee proposes a further cut of $221,790,142 for a total cut of $849,472,000, or approximately 20 percent of the amount requested.

Among other things, it is estimated that this cut, if allowed to stand, will reduce flying hours in the Air Force for fiscal year 1953 from 10,600,000 hours to 8,600,000 hours or approximately 20 percent. The seriousness of the effect of this upon operational readiness and combat effectiveness cannot be sufficiently stressed. The operational level and the flying-hour estimate were calculated as a minimum requirement for adequate operational readiness and combat effectiveness.

Considering this in terms of the three basic missions and the major forces of the Air Force, the strategic air attack force, tactical air force, air defense of the United States and the Flying Training Command over which the cut will have to be evenly distributed, the effect can be more easily seen and understood. The Strategic Air Command crews are put through the most intensive and rigorous training possible to fit them to carry out their very heavy responsibility of hitting enemy targets with the maximum effectiveness should that necessity ever arise. To do this job right—a job upon which so very much depends—the crews must have adequate flying time and experience. The same thing, of course, holds true for maintenance crews which keep the SAC airplanes flying. The effect of this cut will be that one out of five training flights will have to be eliminated. The training program required to put and keep the Stategic Air Command in the highest state of operational readiness and combat effectiveness which is so indispensable was calculated by the Air Force on a bedrock minimum basis. The reduction by one-fifth in the amount of actual training flights which can be flown during fiscal year 1953 will reduce perhaps as much as proportionately the effectiveness of the SAC combat crews to fly the airplane to the target, to navigate the airplane to the target, and to drop the bomb on the target. There is absolutely no adequate substitute for flying simulated combat missions. The ability of our air defense command pilots to search out and knock down any enemy aircraft before it can drop its bombs on strategic targets in this country is in direct proportion to the training which those pilots have received and the number of practice interceptions which they have made.

In a sense, this very substantial and damaging cut in maintenance and operations does more harm than a cut in the actual number of combat wings toward which we are building because by concealing the state of operational readiness and combat effectiveness, it creates a false sense of security. It makes the basic mistake of regarding combat wings as such as the single objective without regard to the quality of the wing.

There is some suggestion that the cut is premised on the expectation that the Air Force will in fact not be able to achieve its flying-hour program during fiscal year 1953.

This expectation may result in part from the fact that the flying hours during fiscal year 1952 were somewhat less than those actually programed. The answer to this is quite simple: The requirement plainly and unmistakably exists. The program we have planned is the program we should have. There can be no justification for assuming that we will not be able to do what we should do. However, if despite our best efforts, the programed flying hours should not be met, dollars will not have been wasted. Any such slippage from factors which we cannot now anticipate will result in one of two things: either dollars will not be spent which will revert to the Treasury or, in the alternative, we will be building assets for future use which will reduce the amount required to be appropriated in subsequent years. This is particularly true in the case of operational spare parts which constitute an important part of the amount requested under this item and which will have to be very seriously cut under the reduction proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee. The false economy represented by a policy of not having adequate spare parts has been developed in connection with the discussion under I—aircraft and related procurement—above. If the flying hours in fiscal year 1953 are less than those deemed to be an absolute minimum so that spare parts are not required in the amount programed, the excess will remain in inventory to take care of requirements in following years, thus reducing the amount of funds to be requested of the Congress in such years.

IV. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The amount of $525,000,000 submitted in the President's budget for fiscal year 1953 was approved by the House. Senate Appropriations Committee recommendation reduced this amount to $496,750,000, a cut of $28,250,000.

While it is difficult on such short notice to say exactly how a cut of this magnitude would be applied over the many projects under study and development within the Air Force, the first estimate of projects which would be forced to be eliminated would include money for the development of two turbo-prop engines, design studies for a new fighter bomber, a new night intruder and a new tactical bomber. In the area of strategic air operations, we would be forced to eliminate studies for a rocket power plant for a new strategic bomber, curtail the development of an air-guided missile for bomber defense and defer studies on a guided missile to be used for reconnaissance. In the area of air defense, a new supersonic interceptor would have to be eliminated from the design studies we would plan for fiscal year 1953.

Other important programs and projects which would have to be reduced in emphasis would be the development of trainers for guided missiles, the study and development of components for two types of atomic weapons, a reduction in the effort we are placing on nuclear power for airplanes and reductions in the amount of money we could place on the development of recovery systems for guided missiles which are to be used as targets.

The items listed above do not total to the amount of $68,000,000 but are indicative of the types of important design, research, and development which would be affected by the proposed cut.

Any of the projects which would have to be eliminated or reduced in emphasis affect the Air Force program as a whole, since they are geared to the trend that the United States is forced to take by similar advancement in scientific achievement by a potential enemy.

At a time when we are waging a very close battle for air supremacy with the Soviets and at a time when developments in the field of air power are occurring at an accelerating rate, any reduction in the amount appropriated for research and development cannot help but be very, very risky. Too frequently in the past we have made the mistake of underestimating the scientific skill and technological know-how of the enemy. We cannot afford to make this mistake today. The amount which we requested for research and development was the absolute minimum we felt we could live with and discharge the heavy responsibility which we feel we have. An examination of the possible impact of this proposed cut as indicated above cannot help but be sobering.

CONCLUSION

These detailed considerations are, however, beside the point. The main consideration is whether we can take chances in our race for air supremacy with the Soviet. Our great aspiration of having a military force so impressive that it will persuade the Russians that it will be a mistake for them to start a war must not be imperiled. Rather than seeking to restrict ourselves in the battle for air power our emphasis should be in the opposite direction. We should be constantly seeking the assurance that our air power is greater than that of our possible enemies.

The emphasis must be changed. Rather than seeking to prune, our real attention should be directed to the question: Is the Air Force asking for enough and is it asking to get it fast enough? Only by this creative policy can we assure ourselves that we have done everything that we can to have a force that will prevent the enemy from attacking and sufficient, should the attack nevertheless come, to protect ourselves. In particular, rather than taking chances that the date of readiness for this force—calculated as of the middle of 1954—shall be extended beyond the date of mid-1955, all our emphasis should be on assuring that there is readiness by this July 1955 date and if possible at an earlier time.

Money spent for this objective is well spent in the interest of the security of the Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, June 28, 1952.

The Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: In his conversation with you this morning the Secretary indicated that we made no specific mention of the extent of the delay resulting from the cuts proposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee. He had in mind the conclusion to the statement appearing on page 12, which he dictated himself, where the following appears:

"In particular, rather than taking chances that the date of readiness for this force, calculated as of the middle of 1954, shall be extended beyond the date of mid-1955, all our emphasis should be on assuring that there is readiness by this July 1955 date and if possible at an earlier time."

However, the Secretary asked that I call to your attention the statement appearing on page 1 with particular reference to the cut in aircraft and related procurement to the effect that the cut in that item will push the whole program back an estimated additional 9 to 12 months. This, of course, refers to the delay in the planned modernization of the Air Force and is subject to the factual matter and qualifications with respect to spare parts which are developed at considerable length on pages 1 to 6.

If the cuts are not restored we will have to begin immediately to do a comprehensive reprograming job. As you know, the composition of our forces was determined with reference to a mid-1954 date and a further extension beyond mid-1955 will require fundamental reexamination of certain planning premises and assumptions.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES T. HILL, Jr.,
General Counsel.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

FREE-ENTERPRISE SYSTEM VERSUS FABIAN SYSTEM 20-YEAR SOCIALISM PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, with reference to the debate this afternoon about the Air Force, I remember that in 1947 the President asked for 56 air groups. A small group of Senators on the Senate floor took the program away from the President and authorized 70 air groups. The President then had constructed 48 or 46 air groups, whatever the exact number might be. In other words, he took it upon himself to divert to another purpose entirely, money appropriated for 70 air groups, and did not make any attempt to bring the Air Force up to the strength which Congress adjudged it should have been at that time.

NEEDED AIRPLANES DESTROYED

In 1946 and 1947 the administration directed the destruction of thousands of airplanes. To be sure, those airplanes at this time might be called somewhat obsolete, as compared with the newest planes that it is possible to manufacture now. But it would have been very helpful to have had some of those planes for the boys to use in Korea during the past two years. At the time the planes were sold to individuals and companies, the instruments and gasoline salvaged from the planes were sold for more than the individuals and companies paid for the planes initially.

In his series of statements during the last several months General Vandenberg has said that we have lost control of the air; that Russia has outbuilt us in the airplane field. Secretary Finletter, in his testimony recently before the Appropriations Committee, pointed out the extreme danger of the situation existing at this time. Why should this condition exist?

Administration Senators have taken great pains this afternoon to point out that they are reducing the amounts allowed by the Budget Director, substantially below the amount the Budget Director recommended, to secure 143 air groups by 1954, on the ground that the Armed Forces organization is wasteful in its operations.

I point out that the men at the head of the Armed Forces—the Army, the

Navy, and the Air Force—were appointed by the President, the head of the administration, and can be replaced by him at any time that he or the administration may become convinced that they are ineffective, inefficient, or wasteful. That is what the President should do. Instead of cutting the appropriation on the ground that those men are wasteful, and are not to be trusted to bring the Air Corps up to 143 air groups in an efficient manner, the wasteful officials, if, in fact, they are wasteful, should be dealt with just as business would deal with any official who was wasting its money.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not Russia, in her airplane construction, is ahead of our Air Force. I call the Senate's attention to a dispatch in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, June 24, 1952, in which Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, considered to be one of the outstanding air generals in the world today, reveals that Russia has 40,000 planes, a number exceeding all United States and allied planes.

General LeMay, who is head of the Strategic Air Command, pointed out that the Air Force has three specific tasks to perform. He defined these as follows:

First. Guaranteeing the security of the country. While the Air Defense Command operates to knock down attacking aircraft, the Strategic Air Command goes into action to destroy the entire enemy striking force and the bases from which it operates.

Second. Retarding any attack on the ground.

Third. Retaliatory campaigns against the enemy's war-making potential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the dispatch containing General LeMay's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEMAY REVEALS RUSSIA'S 40,000 EXCEED ALL OF UNITED STATES, ALLIED PLANES

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Command, said Sunday night that Soviet Russia has about 20,000 aircraft in organized air units, and 20,000 in reserve with "several thousands" more in possession of satellite nations.

These add up to more military planes than the combined total of all the nations arrayed against Russia, he said, and the planes are almost as good as anything turned out by the Western Powers. Under present schedules, the general said, the United States Air Force will not be "strong" until 1955.

General LeMay, the veteran commander of bomber activities in the Pacific during World War II, addressed 2,000 supervisory employees of the Republic Aviation Corp., at a dinner in the Waldorf-Astoria. The dinner was given by Republic to honor executives of various grades who have kept its Farmingdale, L. I., plant on schedule in the production of F-84 Thunderjets for Korea. Mundy I. Peale, president of the company, and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, president of Eastern Air Lines, also spoke.

"What makes the threat of Soviet air power even more formidable," General LeMay said, "is the undeniable quality of Soviet aircraft in combat units. The MIG-15 in Korea is proof of this.

"The fact that we still retain an advantage in long-range bombing capabilities is no reason for complacency."

He congratulated the Republic personnel on their "superlative record of accomplishment," but warned that "your job and ours is far from completed." Then he went on to say that "we will never achieve adequate air power without a complete integration of our resources, our industry, the people of our Nation, and their military."

General LeMay said that the Air Force has three specific tasks to perform. He defined these as:

1. Guaranteeing the security of the country. While the Air Defense Command operates to knock down attacking aircraft, the Strategic Air Command goes into action to destroy the entire enemy striking force and the bases from which it operates.

2. Retarding any attack on the ground. This includes American aid to NATO members, air interdiction of supply lines and communications, and attacks from the air of "targets of opportunity."

3. Retaliatory campaigns against the enemy's war-making potential, direct strikes against the industrial heart of any nation which might attack us.

General LeMay disclosed that 8 of the 14 nations which make up NATO have been supplied with Thunderjets. He did not specify which countries have received the jet fighters nor did he expand on what other equipment this country has sent abroad.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is interesting also to note that while giving the taxpayers of the Nation the impression that they are intending to construct planes or to bring our Air Force up to its proper place, a United Press dispatch from Paris under date of June 20 is headlined: "United States to shop in Europe's aircraft plants for planes to build up NATO's defenses."

The article points out that the planes may be purchased abroad. It reads in part:

The NATO staff will recommend the types of European planes best suited to the continent's defense, he said.

A further paragraph reads as follows:

"Aircraft are the only things we are considering at this time," Anderson said, stressing the urgency of building an air defense.

Money for the purchase of European-made planes, Anderson explained, will come from the offshore procurement funds, totaling $700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending this June 30.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire dispatch be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TO SHOP IN EUROPE'S AIRCRAFT PLANTS FOR PLANES TO BUILD UP NATO'S DEFENSES

PARIS, June 20.—The United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization today announced they have begun "shopping" in Europe's aircraft factories for large-scale purchase of warplanes for the air forces of America and the west.

The new program will underwrite the aircraft production programs of NATO countries and is in line with demands of NATO Supreme Commander Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway that No. 1 priority be given the task of plugging West Europe's air defenses.

Ambassador Fred L. Anderson, acting United States special representative for the Mutual Security Agency in Paris, said the North Atlantic Council has been instructed to form a special international staff to handle the project.

Its assignment will be coordination of European aircraft production in a manner to channel to the Continent's best factories hundreds of millions of dollars the United States Congress has voted for buying supplies abroad.

The NATO staff will recommend the types of European planes best suited to the Continent's defense, he said.

"Aircraft are the only things we are considering at this time," Anderson said, stressing the urgency of building an air defense.

Money for the purchase of European-made planes, Anderson explained, will come from the "offshore" procurement funds, totaling $700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending this June 30. The Government has asked $1,000,000,000 for next year, but the final figure has not been set due to congressional cuts.

Anderson declined to estimate how much of the funds available would be used to give European aircraft industries a "shot in the arm."

He made it clear the program means that the United States Air Force will be able to choose any of the European planes judged as good or better than similar types produced in the United States.

The offshore procurement program was designed to pump dollars into Europe to pay for the manufacture here of spare parts and military equipment for American forces.

The new plan means that the planes Europe's factories produce may be given to any of the European allies, as determined by the special NATO staff of experts.

THE FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, today the Senate passed a very significant piece of legislation, extending the Defense Production Act. Included in the Defense Production Act is a paragraph approaching what the State Department has been trying to pass through Congress for 4 or 5 years, namely, authorization for the use of some internaticnal committee which will, in the main, control the production and consumption of all materials and be able to divide the markets of this Nation and the production of this Nation with the other nations of the world through the simple expedient of allocation of the necessary raw materials for such production. This provision was inserted under title I, section 102 (b), which reads, in part, as follows:

No agreement shall be entered into—

It will be noted it approaches by the back door, and in a negative manner, but, nevertheless, an effective manner, what the State Department was unable to do directly through the Congress of the United States.

No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption—

Note the word "consumption." It is very significant—

of any material unless such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference and—

Note this further significant language—

not used by any such participating country.

Then, to separate this paragraph from the remainder of the bill, there is the following language:

Nothing contained in this act shall impair the authority of the President under this act to exercise allocation and priorities control over materials both domestically produced and imported and facilities through the controlled materials plan or other methods of allocation.

TWENTY-YEAR ONE-ECONOMIC-WORLD PROGRAM

Mr. President, I wish to point out again, as the junior Senator from Nevada has pointed out many times over the past 5½ years, that there has been a 20-year program to distribute the wealth of this Nation through the division of markets with the other nations of the world, and to make up the trade balance deficit of the foreign nations, with particular reference to the European nations, in cash each year, pending the final division of our markets with those nations, and then, to seal the bargain and forever make it impossible for this Nation to rise above or remain above the living standards of any of the other nations, to adopt, through the Congress, the International Trade Organization, which was before the Senate for at least two sessions of Congress. The junior Senator from Nevada takes particular credit for killing that organization by pointing out its dangers many times on the floor of the Senate.

PROPAGANDA APPEAL OF "RECIPROCAL" TRADE

Within the past year the State Department has hit upon the substitute organization of the International Materials Conference, to take the place of the International Trade Organization, which the Congress refused to approve. That organization operated for a considerable time with no basis of approval from the Congress of the United States, but carrying out the one-economic-world policy instituted in 1934, first through the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act.

I point out that the phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in that act. It is not reciprocal. It was never intended to be reciprocal. It was always intended as a division of the markets. But "reciprocal trade" as a phrase for propaganda purposes had considerable appeal for a while.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

What is the International Materials Conference? It now contains 28 nations. At first the International Trade Organization was proposed to take in 55 or 60 nations, or more, each with one vote. It was to meet at least once each year, to divide the markets and the production of this Nation with the other nation of the world on an equal basis. The new organization contains 28 nations. The International Materials Conference has taken the place of the ITO. Presumably it will increase its membership to 57, 60, 65, or whatever number of nations are interested in obtaining more markets and more production. When it is in full operation—and it is practically in full operation at the present time, the three-part free-trade system will be complete.

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION

So-called reciprocal trade is nothing more nor less than free trade, meaning that all the nations of the world have access to our markets with their low-wage products of sweatshop labor. By the way, no one can favor free trade and at the same time vote against free immigration, because the effect is the same. It there is free importation of the products of the sweatshop labor of the world, there is no practical difference between that and importing the labor itself.

So the effect has been to drive private money out of the investment field, with respect to those articles and in those fields where the tariffs have been lowered deliberately by the State Department, where the responsibility is fixed by the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, below the protection necessary for the workingmen and the investors in a particular field.

LOW FOREIGN WAGES

Mr. President, it is well known and well recognized—the junior Senator from Nevada has pointed it out on the floor of the Senate many times during the past 5½ years—that in many of the countries which are competitive with our markets, due principally to the fact that we are financing the industrial machinery to be install.d in those countries, and also to the use of their low-cost, sweatshop labor, the wages received by ery to be installed in those countries, which are made competitive through this method with our own high standard of living among our workers and investors amount to less than the combined social security, unemployment insurance, and industrial insurance paid for each worker in this country, not including his wages, which amount to $8, $10, $12, $15, or $20 a day, depending on the type of labor.

We have seen this thing work for a number of years with respect to controlled prices and the administration's handling of the airplane construction program. They are widely separated, but they are under the same tent. With our construction facilities, our industrial facilities and our industrial plant capacity, it is a mark of genius to be able to fall behind a backward nation such as Russia in the construction of airplanes. It takes exeprience as well as genius to lose control of the air.

The Department of Agriculture has shown almost equal genius in its regulation of farm products by running out of potatoes in this country. Again, Mr. President, that requires a mark of genius and experience, to run out of potatoes in this country, which they practically did do.

Mr. President, in 1949, in debate on the floor of the Senate on the North Atlantic Pact the junior Senator from Nevada pointed out that the North Atlantic Pact was only one part of a five-part program to average the level of the standard of living of this Nation with the world. The statement, made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 8, page 9889, reads in part:

ONE PART OF A PROGRAM OF FIVE PARTS

The North Atlantic Pact is only one part of a five-part administration hybrid national and international program that will average the wage-living standard of living of this Nation with the low-wage living standards and slave labor of the Asiatic and European countries. The complete program includes: The North Atlantic Pact, the Marshall-ERP-ECA plan, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the International Trade Organization, the "bold new program"—point 4 of the President's announcement.

This entire administration program together with a suggested alternate American program is fully outlined in my address and debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1949.

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION (ECA)

In a series of addresses on the Economic Cooperation Administration, which was before Congress in 1949, the junior Senator from Nevada made this statement:

THREE-PART FREE-TRADE PROGRAM—CONSIDERED TOGETHER

The fact that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act was extended for only 1 year, so its consideration would also coincide with the date when the ECA, the Marshall plan, would again be before this body, and the time of consideration of the International Trade Organization treaty before the Senate, was not an accident. The State Department program had always encouraged bringing each of the three-part free-trade scheme before Congress—each as a great emergency in its own right.

They were, however, timed to come before the Senate at approximately the same date this year because the three are indelibly linked together.

The Marshall plan—

Still quoting from my 1949 address—

now known as the ECA—

In 1949 it was named ECA, and it takes on new colorings and labels, as the public catches up with the schemes of distributing the wealth of the United States throughout the world. It will be remembered that we started during World War II with lend-lease, going clearly beyond any necessary lend-lease to win the war, and built up Russia for its future peacetime needs. The UNRRA, then the $3,250,000,000 loan to England, then the Marshall plan, ECA, point 4, Mutual Security, and all the rest of the nomenclature that was invented merely to take the public's mind off the taxes which it was trying to pay and which were clearly getting out of hand and beyond the ability of most people to meet without hardship, individually and in business.

The Marshall plan, now known as the ECA, the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, and the International Trade Organization Treaty form a three-part economic legislative program designed to distribute the wealth and the markets of this Nation throughout the world, and to adopt the free-trade principle as the definite and settled policy of this Nation. That is, put the low cost Asiatic and European labor in direct competition with the American workers on an even basis. This three-part free-trade program is designed to undermine the basic economic structure of this country, with the one objective of dividing our wealth and leveling our high-wage living standard with the low-wage living standards of such Asiatic and European nations.

First. The ECA appropriations are admittedly established to make up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations with hard-currency nations in cash each year. Our chief export is cash.

Second. Extend for 3 years the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, under which the State Department has adopted a selective free-trade principle, to divide the markets of this Nation with foreign nations, on the theory that, to the extent that we divide our markets with them, their trade-balance deficit will decrease.

Third. Adoption of the International Trade Organization Treaty, including ultimately 58 nations with 58 votes, in which we will have 1 vote—the same as Siam or Lithuania—and this organization is designed to meet once each year and add up the remaining production and markets of the world and divide them between the nations of the world eventually on a basis of population, thus making free trade the permanent and accepted policy of this Nation.

The first step of the three-part program, that of making up the trade-balance deficits of the European nations in each year through ECA, began rather modestly with scattered gift loans to the European nations, leading up to UNRRA—then to the gift loan of $3,750,000,000 to England in 1946—and then to the $17,000,000,000 program which is soon to be followed by the Truman global recovery program.

It will be remembered surely that every one of those programs, coming along separately, including the various banks that were set up, like the Import-Export Bank and the other international banks, were going to end all of the troubles that the United States would fall heir to, and every nation in the world would get back on its feet and would be prosperous. However, each in its turn fell down. All this now covers a period from 1945 to 1952, a period of approximately 7 years; and we are still groping for the solution.

The answer with which they always come up adds up to a greater and continual subsidy by the taxpayers of the United States to the nations of Europe.

I read further from my speech in 1949:

The second step inaugurated through the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, currently known as reciprocal trade, under which the State Department has adopted the selective free-trade principle, is to be extended for 3 years at this session of Congress and the principle later to be made permanent through the adoption of the International Trade Organization Treaty.

The reference there is to the 1949 session of Congress.

Mr. President, I have pointed out that I take credit for killing the International Trade Organization. But now the State Department has come along with the International Materials Conference, which, if approved by Congress, could do the same thing.

I quote further from my 1949 address:

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not occur in the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—it is simply a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people cloaked with the more involved and less understandable phraseology.

The third and final step of this very clever three-phase program—to divide the markets and to distribute the wealth of this Nation throughout the world—is the adoption of the presently proposed International Trade Organization under which the selective free-trade principle will be made permanent and become the settled policy of this Nation.

POLICY TO LOWER UNITED STATES STANDARD OF LIVING

Mr. President, what will be the effect of this policy? It can have only one effect, in averaging the living standards of the nations with a higher living standard and the living standards of the nations of the world having low living standards, and that effect is to lower the standard of living in the United States. That will occur in various ways.

At the moment, and for the 7-year period following World War II, we have been living on emergencies. Every time it seems that the United States is about to totter a little economically, a new emergency is cooked up. Even at the beginning of World War II, approximately eight million or nine million persons in the United States were without any employment, and approximately sixteen million or seventeen million persons in our country were partially unemployed. The beginning of that war cured that unemployment situation.

Later, when the Korean war developed, approximately, 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 persons in the United States were completely unemployed, and about 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 persons in our country were partially unemployed. In an unguarded moment 2 or 3 months after the war in Korea began, the Secretary of Commerce said, "We cured the unemployment situation." I am sure he did not mean to say it in just that way; but at least he spoke the truth, for that war really cured the unemployment situation, by putting many of the boys back into the Armed Forces and by causing large appropriations to be made for the national defense.

Mr. President, if peace were suddenly to come at any time, 60 days thereafter would be a long time for our economy to hold up. Everyone realizes that, and everyone is nervous about the situation.

In the very midst of the so-called emergency prosperity which we now have, with our tourist Army in France—several million strong, together with their wives and children—unable to protect themselves either now or at any time in the future; with our Army in Korea, where it has lost control of the air, according to our generals, including General Lemay and the statements made by General Vandenberg and Mr. Finletter, the Secretary for Air; and with our Armed Forces in that area having been murdered during the last 2 years, and not having been allowed to win the war when they could win it, and not being allowed to quit, but having to stand there and "take it"—with all that going on, and at the height of the so-called prosperity, with billions and billions of dollars being appropriated for all sorts of national defense, we see the following dispatch by the Associated Press, from Philadelphia:

Business off, textile concern allowed to cut workers' pay.

In other words, Mr. President, the situation is beginning to catch up with us in this country. Textiles are known to be "soft" in the market. In Ohio and elsewhere the crockery business is largely closing down. The mining business was largely shut down; 75 percent of the mines of the Nation were closed. Today they are being opened up, at the expense of the taxpayers, in order that the necessary minerals may again be secured.

But all this free-trade policy—this policy of letting competitive, sweatshop-labor products enter the United States almost unchecked—is having its effect at the height of our so-called prosperity.

I read from the Philadelphia Dispatch:

PHILADELPHIA, June 16.—An arbitration board today ordered a 7.7-cents-an-hour wage cut for employees of a big cotton textile firm in a decision seen as a possible future pattern maker for the industry.

The ruling applied to the Bates Manufacturing Corp. It had proposed a 30-cents-an-hour wage slash for its more than 7,000 employees in five Maine plants and two in Los Angeles and Emeryville, Calif.

William E. Simpkin, impartial arbitrator, and the company representative, George Bridges, concurred in the 2-to-1 decision by the Arbitration Board. Solomon Barkin, of the CIO Textile Workers Union, dissented.

The cut will reduce wages from approximately $1.40 to $1.32 an hour.

"The dominant consideration for awarding a reduction," Mr. Simkin said, "was the demonstrated necessity of some wage adjustment in order for the company to become more competitive and to relieve the employment situation."

Mr. President, the same thing is happening in other industries today, at the height of our so-called prosperity and full employment, with billions and billions of dollars being appropriated. For instance, just this afternoon here in the Senate we have witnessed the handling of a bill calling for the appropriation of $60,000,000,000 for our national defense. No Member of Congress would favor cutting from that bill any appropriation necessary for our national defense. As a matter of fact, I should like to see restored to the bill the $2,000,000,000 cut which the committee has recommended in the case of the appropriations for the Air Force. In fact, I should like to have the Air Force appropriation made even larger, if larger appropriations could be used effectively and efficiently by the Air Force, so as to enable it to regain control of the air. Our Air Force must regain control of the air, for any nation which loses control of the air is helpless.

Mr. President, as a further indication of the trend, I now read a June 1952 dispatch in regard to motorcycles:

HIGHER DUTIES ON MOTORCYCLES TURNED DOWN BY COMMISSION

In a test closely watched by European exporters to the United States, the Tariff Commission has rejected an appeal for higher duties on imported motorcycles.

With two of its six members dissenting, the Commission found that under existing tariffs—10 percent on finished machines and 25 percent on parts—there was no injury to American motorcycle manufacturers.

America produces almost twice as many motorcycles as it imports. Most of those coming from abroad are manufactured in Britain.

Had the decision gone the other way, repercussions would have been widespread in Europe. According to some sources, that would have been a signal, especially to British manufacturers of a multitude of products, that it was hopeless to attempt to sell in the American market, for success would only provoke higher tariffs to stop the import trade.

FLEXIBLE IMPORT FEE NOT HIGH OR LOW TARIFF

So far as I know, Mr. President, no one has ever requested what some persons

are prone to call a high tariff. They have never asked for a low tariff. What we have asked for is a tariff or import fee that would make up roughly that differential between the wage standard of living here and abroad, and what these people mean, what the administration officials mean, those who support the so-called reciprocal trade pact, when they say, "We must import these articles, because you can get them at a lower cost for the consuming public"—what they actually mean is, "We want to encourage the low-cost labor." That is what they mean, except that it is camouflaged so that the working man does not understand it, or at least they hope he does not understand it. I think he understands it. The working men in my State understand it, anyway, when they will pay 32 and 35 cents a pound for copper, 28 cents a pound for zinc, when 24½ cents a pound is paid for local copper and 18 cents a pound for zinc. In other words, there is practically no limit. I observed recently that the limit is being lifted on the imports of metal. Any price can be paid, but they limit the price on metal produced by American labor and investors.

I believe, Mr. President, there will be experienced a great shock by some of the people, this fall, who believe that the working men and investors do not understand that principle and its effect on their lives. In other words, Mr. President, there is but one thing that a country or an individual who is in business in this country can do under this free-trade system—laughingly called "Reciprocal trade"—under which a Secretary of State who has no knowledge whatever of industry, and who seems to care less, trading the jobs of American working men and the investments of American investors to a foreign country for some fancied advantage, but the only thing that an individual in business in this country can do is to do exactly as the textile firm in Philadelphia did with respect to its main plant, its California plant; namely, he can ask for a reduction of wages, and write off the investment, in order to meet the competition from abroad, or he can go out of business. If he goes out of business the jobs are gone. And, of course, that is exactly the objective of the State Department today, simply that.

INVESTMENTS WITH TAXPAYERS' MONEY

Mr. President, what is the effect of this? In order to open the mines, in order to keep these industries in circulation, industries which can make war goods, what does the administration do? It invests in these businesses the taxpayers' money, instead of investing private money; and this is how it is done.

Perhaps the people of this country forget. There may be a headline or two, and it then fades out of the picture. But in the first place, in order for them to go into the mining business now and to hold up their defense production plants, companies and individuals are given what are called short amortization periods. I pick up a paper, the Wall Street Journal of June 20, 1952, and observe the headline "The DPA"—the Defense Production Administration—"is ready to stop flow of past tax write-offs after $21,000,000,000 allowances." And, Mr. President, that has been going on for some time. They are now closer to the goal of $21,000,000,000 in allowances. What does that mean? It means that when the investments are made, $21,000,000,000 of investments, no taxes are collected. It means that the profits go to amortize the plant, for 4½ or 5 years, and that they amortize 75 percent to 90 percent or 95 percent, or even 100 percent of the plant. So what does that mean, Mr. President? It means that the individual, the people throughout this country, must take that tax load. When $75,000,000,000 is being collected in taxes, and $21,000,000,000 is written off, that amount must be collected from some source. This item in the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred reads, in part:

"Agency says many expansion difficulties have been met, or soon will be."

That means that these mines that have been shut down, including one mine in Arizona, which received $90,000,000—I am not objecting to the fact that the copper mine in Arizona received $90,000,000 from RFC, or from the Defense Production Administration, because that is the only way the copper mine could have been opened up, with free trade on copper; and free trade on copper is what we have, Mr. President. It was authorized by legislation which passed the Senate here, almost over the dead body of the junior Senator from Nevada, who stood here to debate it for some time; and everything he said at that moment has come to pass, Mr. President.

Now, we will pay 35 cents a pound for copper. We will pay it through the nose. That will be foreign copper. If we will pay 35 cents a pound for domestic copper and give domestic producers 2 years, one will have copper running out of his ears. But that is not what this administration wants. This administration wants to keep the copper mines down in this country, and to develop copper mines in foreign countries. What happens, in addition to the short amortization periods in connection with the $21,000,000,000? They go then, Mr. President, not all of these companies, but most of them, and they borrow the money from the RFC or Defense Plant Administration, money with which to go into business—they borrow the money. Where does that money come from, Mr. President? It comes from the taxes levied upon the people of the United States by the Congress. It is taxpayers' money. There is no need of the RFC, if we have a flexible import fee to make up roughly the differential of cost between the wage standard of living here and abroad.

But the junior Senator from Nevada stood here to cast the deciding vote on the Senate floor to continue the RFC, not to destroy it, because it is necessary that we have a method of getting the money into these businesses, if the private money is driven out, as it has been, by the measures that have been approved by the Senate within the past 5½ years. The Congress has simply extended the Tariff Act of 1930, which was first extended in 1934, and the 1934 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been extended six times in the past 5½ years.

FREE-TRADE FREE-WHEELING WAY OF DOING BUSINESS

What is the third thing, Mr. President, that is done in order to put taxpayers' money into the business, instead of the private money which should be in the business, and which is available for the purpose of being put into the business? They make a contract with these companies and guarantee so many cents per pound, or a unit price. Then what? It makes no difference, then, about the emergency, or whatever it might be. The unit price is guaranteed by the taxpayers' money. No one would take a chance. Not a private investor in the United States would take a chance under a free-trade, free-wheeling administration intent upon dividing the wealth of this country, because, the minute that the emergency ends, or almost that minute, then they are broke, their capital is destroyed. But it is all right to destroy the taxpayer's capital.

Three things may be done: Shorten the amortization period, loan them the money to go into business, and fix a unit price over a period of years to pay for the investment.

That, Mr. President, has taken the place of a very simple little principle under which we worked for 75 years in this country, protecting the workingman and investor through the payment of a little fee that might be the difference between what labor was paid and the standard of living in this country and abroad.

Another step was our famous Point 4 program. In a Wall Street Journal article on June 19, of this year, there are the following headlines: "Investor Protector—Government Guarantee of United States Stakes Abroad Takes in 40 New Lands—Shelter Spreads from West Europe Alone; It Covers Seizure, Dollar Embargo—Candidate Harriman the Boss."

Instead of our having a foreign policy that places a condition on cooperation with any foreign nation, and protecting the integrity of private investments and common honesty, we do not require common honesty, but we encourage the investment of Government funds and private funds in these nations and then appropriate more money to guarantee the integrity of the investment.

Try that on our banker sometime. That would be a wonderful bit of education for any young man, to consult his banker about doing business in that manner.

The article in the Wall Street Journal to which I have referred is by George E. Cruikshank. I very often notice that this reporter's articles are well written and well thought out.

Under the last headline I read, "Candidate Harriman the boss," the following occurs:

WASHINGTON.—Want to build a camphor plant in invasion-threatened Formosa? An oil refinery in Iran, where the British were kicked out last year? A housing development in South Korea?

The United States Government will now, for the first time, guarantee your investment

in all these troubled spots—as well as possibly safer ventures like raising watermelons in Afghanistan or Llamas in Nepal.

Today presidential candidate W. Averell Harriman's Mutual Security Agency will announce that its industrial guarantee program—which has been in effect since 1948 in Western European nations—will blossom out to take in nearly 40 more countries around the globe.

SCOPE: 56 COUNTRIES

This means United States businessmen will be able to invest in some 56 nations outside the Soviet orbit with United States Government backing. The backing takes two forms:

First, United States businessmen will have a Government guarantee that they won't lose a penny if some foreign government takes over their investment. And that definitely includes such expropriation-happy nations as Mexico and Iran.

Second, the United States Government will see to it that the businessmen get dollars for their profits even though the foreign government refuses to let them take dollars out of the country. And that includes all the dollar-short non-Communist countries from Britain to Burma.

The total tab for the protection, which is good until 1962: An annual "insurance premium" of 2¼ percent of his investment paid by the investing businessman. He shells out 1¼ percent a year for the "convertibility of currency" guarantee and 1 percent for the expropriation insurance. He can take out either or both.

ALREADY TALKING

MSA is already lining up guarantees for businesses interested in investing in the new countries to be covered by the expanded insurance scheme. Several firms are conferring with officials on guarantees for petroleum development in southeast Asia. Another company would like to start a synthetic fiber plant in Latin America. Still another is thinking about a mineral development program south of the border.

And if you think it somewhat fanciful that businessmen would want to invest—or the Government wants to insure their investments—in invasion-menaced areas, take a look at Berlin. Under the old program, Otis Elevator Co. plunked $225,000 into a German elevator manufacturing company; worried about the Russians swooping into the city, Otis took out the expropriation insurance. Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. did the same on its investment of nearly $3,000,000 in Hamburg, close to the Russian zone.

West European investments under the old program range from heavy machinery and chemicals to sewing machines and hybrid corn seed. E. R. Squibb & Sons recently took convertibility insurance for the drug concern's new investment in Turkey. And National Aluminate Corp.—a Chicago firm specializing in water-treating chemicals—will be guaranteed convertibility of up to $1,331,000 from its investment in a subsidiary company it's establishing at Cisterna, Italy.

A ROCKEFELLER IS OPPOSED

All this doesn't mean, however, that investors are wild about Government guaranties. Some, in fact, denounce the idea. For instance, Nelson Rockefeller, who among other things is chairman of the influential Advisory Board on International Development.

Mr. Rockefeller thinks guaranties are not what make private enterprise function but rather that a system of risks and gains is the motivating force. He, like many other businessmen, believes the best way to encourage investment of United States capital in foreign lands is to remove United States taxes on earnings from abroad.

Nor have businessmen exactly rushed to get in on the program in Western Europe. Only 40 guaranties have been issued to date. Investments covered include $36,000,000 under the convertibility of currency guarantee, and $1,200,000 under the expropriation feature. That many businessmen haven't bothered to get guarantees can be seen in the fact that direct private investments in Western Europe totaled nearly $5,000,000,000 in 1949 and 1950 alone.

The big drive for expansion of the plan comes, in fact, from Congress. For the past 2 years the legislators have been needling foreign aid officials to put some steam behind the scheme and broaden it to take in the rest of the free world. The House Foreign Affairs Committee, reviewing foreign aid spending plans for the fiscal year beginning July 1, castigated MSA for not expanding the program earlier.

OFF THE FOREIGN-AID HOOK

The reason for the lawmakers' enthusiasm seems to be that they see the scheme as a means of getting themselves off the foreign-aid hook. One of the most controversial issues they've had to face in recent years—and one the voters gripe most about—is the amount of money the United States is doling out to foreigners.

The legislators figure every dollar private investors pump into the economy of a foreign country is a dollar they won't have to appropriate for foreign aid.

So, MSA—pressured by Congress—will put on a big drive to sell the American businessman on the guarantee program.

In press releases, booklets and speeches by MSA officials before business groups, the agency will start extolling the merits and benefits to be gained by United States businessmen investing abroad under the guarantee program.

MSA will argue that "improved economic conditions" of many foreign countries offer an American businessman new or expanded markets. But one of the difficulties in serving these markets, the pitchmen will note, is the almost universal shortage of dollars with which to pay for American goods. The answer to this will be that American businessmen can overcome the dollar difficulty by establishing production facilities abroad. Under this method, they need to have only their profits turned into dollars and not the entire cost of the article being manufactured—materials, labor, overhead—since these costs can be paid in the local currency.

SEES BENEFITS FOR ALL

As MSA sees it, everybody wins. The foreign country will have gained a new business—with the benefits of jobs, consumption of raw materials and the production of items it needs. And the United States investor will be guaranteed that he can take his profits—in dollars—out of the country.

Then there is the further inducement of protection of the investment against expropriation as a result of war, overthrow of the government or other upheaveals. MSA men will be stressing this when they talk to businessmen interested in investing in Latin America where changes of government are "somewhat seasonal."

Here's how the two parts of the guarantee program work:

The convertibility guaranty provides the investor with dollars for profits—up to a stated amount depending on the amount of the investment—by simply turning local currency over to the United States. The United States Government will fork out dollars to the investor and keep the local money to pay Government bills in that country.

In "equity" investments, where there is ownership in a foreign business through stock or partnership interest or directly through a foreign branch, MSA guarantees that, over the years, profits up to 175 percent of the investment can be taken out of the country in dollars.

"REASONABLE" INTEREST

Loans are insured for the principal plus "reasonable" interest called for by the terms of the loan.

In royalty agreements, covering use of patents, processes, and techniques, the total of fixed or estimated royalty payments over the life of the guaranty is covered.

The convertibility guaranty does not, however, protect the investor against devaluation or deterioration of foreign-exchange rates. And, naturally, it doesn't protect him against any normal business risk; if he has a bad year, or the plant burns down, that's just too bad.

Investors can obtain the guaranty only if MSA decides that the project will further the purposes of the mutual security program. This is not difficult, as MSA is eager to encourage the flow of capital abroad. Also, the country in which the investment is to be made must state that it is willing to let the investor take out his profits in dollars. The guaranty comes into effect when the Government is unable—or unwilling—to carry out its original promise.

SIMPLE FOREIGN POLICY REQUIRED

Mr. President, some simple foreign policies would take care of the business. One might be, for example, that we shall have equal access to the markets in foreign nations.

Mr. President, if we establish a foreign policy as a condition of cooperation with those nations so that we would have equal access to the trade of those nations, what would happen? Instead of having a colonial system controlled by four European countries, England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium, all realizing a hundred years before we did that there are certain areas in the world producing certain strategic and critical materials and minerals which we must have, and which they control and for which they make us pay through the nose—we cannot buy the materials from nations in southeast Asia, the Malayan States, and Indochina—it would mean that if those nations should put a tariff or import fee in operation, or in any way regulate imports and exports, a third nation could not go into one of those nations and arrange it. It would be impossible for us to trade through them. They operate through manipulation of the currency system, which is a form of piracy.

As the junior Senator from Nevada has already stated, it is required as a condition of further cooperation that the integrity of private investments in the respective countries should be protected. These European nations require, Mr. President, a free exchange of currencies between themselves as a condition of their cooperation, and with American money, the way the trade is regulated now, it is impossible for us to trade with them.

If we want to ship a certain product into the Malayan States or into South America or to any of the controlled nations, and they do not want us to export that particular material, then the exchange will be fixed to take the profit out of the transaction. The price of the pound is fixed so that there is no profit in the transaction. On the surface it looks like cooperation, unless the situation is understood.

TAXPAYERS' MONEY TO INSURE INVESTMENTS

Along that same line, Mr. President, I have before me a dispatch in a Scripps-Howard newspaper, which is headed: "United States extends insurance on investments abroad. Uncle Sam is going to insure new American investors against certain kinds of losses virtually anywhere in the non-Communist world."

We must do that, if we are ignorant enough to continue cooperation and the advancement of seven to ten billion dollars a year to those people, without requiring any kind of integrity or common honesty. That is the kind of administration we have. After giving the amounts just mentioned, we take more of the taxpayers' money and guarantee the integrity of the investment.

Let us see the kind of appreciation we are getting.

The Wall Street Journal of June 23, 1952, in an editorial entitled "Exportable Surplus," says in part:

A number of the political candidates this year have had much to say about the hugeness, the complexity and the over-organization of our Federal Government. A number of candidates have talked a lot about how we need to help Europe by exporting money, arms, and know-how.

At this point I should like to say something about know-how. I happened to be in the engineering business for about 30 years. In countries like South Africa, the Malayan States, or any other country where development is possible, it would be profitable, if, as a condition of cooperation, we insisted on common honesty on the part of the controlling nation, and there would be available in the United States more money for private investment in those areas than could possibly be invested in them during the next 50 years. Government money is not necessary except where crookedness—plain, common crookedness—is encouraged—a form of piracy and manipulation of the exchange value of money, a depression of investment, as in England today, for example, and other nations, in which, if one invests $2, it is impossible to get the capital out. It is impossible to get a profit out of the country, and therefore it does not go in. So we have to send in the taxpayers' money in lieu of private investments.

The editorial continues:

In a dispatch to the New York Times, noting a marked decline in United States influence as a promoter of European economic cooperation, Mr. Michael Hoffman notes an increasing irritation and despair among European officials at the way our operations are being handled. He reports:

"If their criticism could be summed up in one word, it would be 'overorganization.' There are so many American officials dealing at so many levels with European governments on so many different aspects of economic policy that very often one branch of the United States Government does not even know what another is doing in a European capital."

Anyone who has lately been in Europe can well understand the complaints. It is not at all unusual for a European official to get advice and instruction on the same subject from the State Department representatives, the NATO, the American Military Mission, and the Mutual Security Agency—all of it contradictory.

I can testify to that. I have been in all of the foreign nations except Russia during the last 5 years, mostly during 1947 and 1948.

I was with a committee in Honduras, a little nation in Central America. I hardly ever travel with committees. I seldom travel in packs, because usually I cannot learn anything. One is always being briefed by a fellow whose previous employment has been in a dry-goods store and who has been given an $8,000 or a $10,000 a year job. In order to fulfill his new job, he reads a book and then quotes it to you.

So we were briefed in Honduras, as we were in all the other countries of Central America.

The junior Senator from Nevada generally travels alone and pays his own expenses, much as he dislikes doing so and cannot afford to. But in that way he can see what he wants to see, without loss of time.

So we stayed there for 3 or 4 hours, being briefed by the State Department and some people from the National Highway Department and the Department of Commerce. After they had made the rounds, it developed in several cases that they had a man showing where they had been sick. Their life span is not quite as long as ours, but it had not bothered them enough to think about it. We had some people out there to tell them that they should demand from their Government health insurance, hospitals, and such things. That is wonderful, but they do not have money to pay for those things, so the money had to come from the United States.

But there was one very fine man, being paid by the United States Government, borrowed from our Bureau of Public Roads, under Mr. MacDonald, who has probably one of the best organizations in the Government. Mr. MacDonald knows his business, as I can testify from having been State engineer of my own State for quite some time, and having dealt with Mr. MacDonald for a long time.

The man was there, being paid by the United States Government. So after we got through, and they got through briefing us, I asked a simple question of the President of Honduras, who was a very fine man. I asked him if it would not be possible to do as we do in Nevada, where we borrow a Federal roads man. We have taken such officials and put them on our payroll. He said, "Of course, I could."

I said, "Why do you not do it that way?"

He said, "No one ever asked me."

In other words, we do not want to do this on a business basis. We want to do it right out of the Federal Treasury—meaning at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. President, how did we get into this situation, in the first place? I think it is a good time to show just what happened in the foreign trade field.

TARIFF ACT OF 1930

In 1930, Congress passed Public Law 361, to provide revenue, to regulate commerce with foreign countries, to encourage industries of the United States, to protect American labor, and for other purposes, which was approved by the President of the United States on June 17, 1930.

I call attention to section 336, "Costs of Production," just to show that there is nothing new about the suggestion that I have made quite regularly during the last 5½ years, that there should be a method, a system, or a principle adopted by Congress—again adopted—that there be used a flexible-import fee or tariff to make up the differential in the cost of production, which amounts roughly to the difference in the wage standard of living in the United States and abroad. Then private investors can invest money according to their own judgment, not on the judgment of some 2-by-4 public official, who thinks he has to act like he owns everything because he has a pretty good salary and he is suddenly thrown into his position. No one around him knows any more than he does, but he becomes an expert.

Section 336 goes on to explain how the tariff would work, and provides, in subsection (a):

(a) Change of classification or duties: In order to put into force and effect the policy of Congress by this act intended, the commission (1) upon request of the President, or (2) upon resolution of either or both Houses of Congress, or (3) upon its own motion, or (4) when in the judgment of the Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, upon application of any interested party, shall investigate the differences in the costs of production of any domestic article and of any like or similar foreign article. In the course of the investigation the Commission shall hold hearings and give reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The Commission is authorized to adopt such reasonable procedure and rules and regulations as it deems necessary to execute its functions under this section. The Commission shall report to the President the results of the investigation and its findings with respect to such differences in costs of production. If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the differences in the cost of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total increase or decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 percent of the rates expressly fixed by statute.

That is called the flexible import-fee principle.

Subsection (b) reads as follows:

(b) Change to American selling price: If the commission finds upon any such investigation that such differences cannot be equalized by proceeding as hereinbefore provided, it shall so state in its report to the President and shall specify therein such ad valorem rates of duty based upon the American selling price (as defined in sec. 402 (g)) of the domestic article, as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences. In no case shall the total decrease of such rates of duty exceed 50 percent of the rates expressly fixed by statute, and no such rate shall be increased.

That is a very enlightening section. It adopts the principle of the flexible import fee. At this point let me say that the junior Senator from Nevada has three times introduced a flexible import fee bill, with the specific principle laid down as to how this differential should be determined. He has been unable so far to obtain hearings on the bill, but he hopes that a change will take place in the administration of the country this fall which will make it possible for this principle to be readopted.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN TRADE

In 1934 the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act was passed. This was in the form of an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, under title III. As I previously stated, in no place in this act can the words "reciprocal trade" be found. It is simply an act transferring the work of fixing tariffs from the long-experienced Tariff Commission, which is equipped to do the work on the basis of principle, to the State Department, where it is done on no principle whatever. The industries and jobs of this country are simply used to trade with a foreign country for any fancied advantage, as the Secretary of State may decide.

Each time upon its expiration, the act, which was passed on June 12, 1934, has been extended successively to this date. The last time it was extended was on June 16, 1951, for a period of 2 years. Undoubtedly it will come up for further extension early in 1953, at which time it will be the ambition of the junior Senator from Nevada to stop the extension. The act has been extended on three separate occasions since the junior Senator from Nevada became a Member of this august body.

The act will expire in June 1953. It took the place of the flexible import fee provision which the junior Senator from Nevada read into the RECORD from the Tariff Act of 1930. In other words, the entire principle was changed. For 18 years the taxpayers of this Nation have assumed that each piece of legislation proposed by the administration was a separate unit, to be considered on its own individual merits. The taxpayers may not have liked each of the individual acts or proposed acts. Each act, taken by itself, might have been assimilated without great harm to the country. As a result, notwithstanding the fact that common sense told the people it was wrong, they accepted the program through sufferance, rather than by approval of the various acts. This acceptance was due largely to the fact that the weavers of the pattern were clever enough to arrange certain benefits for various groups of citizens; also, because of the slogans, catch words, and catch phrases, such as "reciprocal trade" the proponents of the program were able to cover up the real objectives of the 20-year program.

What the public and the Congress did not see was the pattern of a plot which has eaten the heart out of our economic system; first, through recognition of Communist Russia in 1934, without any safeguards; second, removal of the metal base for our money system in 1934, laying the groundwork for unlimited spending; third, through the application of the so-called reciprocal trade principle of dividing our markets with the foreign nations of the world; fourth, through deficit financing, resulting in inflated printing-press money almost without limit; and fifth, through the sending of billions of dollars to foreign nations, on the Karl Marx principle, "from each according to his ability; to each according to his need."

DEFICIT FINANCING—COUNTERFEIT MONEY

From the time of removal of the gold standard, the metal base for our currency, there has been a deliberate program of cheapening the money of this country, to destroy the economic system. In the past 12 years—the junior Senator from Nevada has said this before on the floor of the Senate—the administration, with the approval of a subservient Congress, has stolen one-half the wages of this country, one-half the insurance of the people of the country, and one-half of the savings of the people of the country, through inflation. The effect is the same as opening the door of the safe and taking the money or the insurance policies and burning them up.

There are those who say that if labor did not ask for higher wages everything would be all right. It is said that that is what causes inflation. I say, Mr. President, that increases in wages and in the price of goods do not cause inflation. They are the effects of inflation. The real cause is the printing of counterfeit money, laughingly called deficit financing. That was a phrase which was taught in this country by Lord Keynes. It was not very difficult to teach it to the people of this country, I suppose, when he first came here in the late 1930's, because the people wanted to spend more money than they currently earned, and through deficit financing they could do it.

While the people were wondering what deficit financing meant, five, ten, fifteen, or twenty billions more of counterfeit money was printed. That is what it is. If an individual should print the money he would be thrown into jail. It is money that is printed, with no production behind it. If we were to spend $20,000,000,000 and get $20,000,000,000 worth of production, there would be a balance; but if $20,000,000,000 is printed, there is nothing behind it. It is simply more money to buy what goods there are, and naturally they cost more.

So I say to you, Mr. President, when these boys ask for higher wages, if we insist on watering the baby's milk, we must give the baby more milk; that is all. It is exactly like putting a can of milk under the pump. The President has stated that he will print $14,000,000,000 of money, and put that amount of money in the economic bloodstream of the Nation. That is exactly like putting the milk can under the pump. After the water is put in the milk it still looks like milk, but it does not taste very much like milk.

Karl Marx made his famous speech more than 100 years ago to the Democratic Club of Brussels. It is quite a coincidence that it happened to be the Democratic Club of Brussels, and that the Democrats have now adopted the policy in this country. In his speech he said:

> I am for free trade because it will hasten the revolution.

And we all remember the famous saying:

> From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.

We have adopted both slogans.

ONE ECONOMIC WORLD

Mr. President, as the pieces of the mosaic fall into place, the pattern of the one economic world planned by the theorists of all nations, including our own, should be plain to the citizens of this Nation and should frighten them into action.

I quote from the book entitled "Woodrow Wilson, Disciple of Revolution," written by Jennings C. Wise:

> It is significant that just at this moment, at the very height of a financial panic in the United States—

This was at about the time that Wilson became president of Princeton—

> Marburg decided to take a special course in economics and political science at Oxford. There he proposed to acquaint himself with the Fabians, intellectual leaders of political socialism. In England, he soon met Bryce, William T. Stead of the Pall Mall Gazette, Bernard Shaw, and Lecky who was, next to Bryce, the foremost political writer in England. Under these influences, supplemented by the views of English bankers, it was not long before he reached certain definite conclusions as to the causes of the panic in America, and the monetary troubles of other countries.

Mr. President, it is a well known fact that Marburg and George Bernard Shaw and others formed the Fabian Society, which finally changed the Government of England to what it is now, the Fabian Socialist Government, which we are supporting in the style to which they would like to become accustomed.

Mr. President, overpopulation is the basic trouble of England. There are 20,000,000 more people in England today than can make a living, unless someone else picks up the check, which we are doing.

We skip a little time and come to 1905. I read from the same text:

> The Internationalist now formed the Conciliation Internationale in Paris with many of the leading statesmen, financiers, and Socialists of France, including Leon Bourgeois and Baron d'Estournelles de Constant (members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration), on its council; while in England the Fabian Society took up the work of conciliation. Marburg hurried home to found the Maryland Peace Society, and the American Association for International Conciliation, with himself as president, and with Secretary Root, Knox, Bryan, Carnegie, Nicholas Murray Butler, Lyman Abbott, Charles Eliot, Daniel Smiley, Cardinal Gibbons, Rabbi Wise, Oscar Straus, Paul Warburg, Otto Kahn, Bernard Baruch, Clarence Mackay, and numerous other statesmen, scholars, philanthropists, and international bankers on its council. It was then this indefatigable man published his Toward an Enduring Peace, in which he virtually outlined to the world what was expected of the powers.

Later we find Mr. Carnegie endowing the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Here we find some great

names associated with the organization. It was organized on December 14, 1910. Then we come along to the time of the election of Mr. Wilson as President of the United States and the advent of Mr. House, who was called the Seer of Beverly.

In 1933 Colonel House was again on the crest of the political wave. Accordingly, an article of his entitled "Does America Need a Dictator" with a subtitle: "As a Warning to Selfish Wealth and Narrow-minded Politicians' Capitalistic Civilization," appeared in Liberty on January 7, 1933.

The book goes on to say, quoting from an article:

The amazing thing is that, in its large outline, almost the entire revolutionary program has been, or is in process of being, realized under the two Democratic Presidents who have served since Colonel House turned novelist for a few weeks.

The quotation is from an article entitled "New Deal's Moves Follow Pattern of Book Written Quarter of Century Ago; Colonel House Emerges as Prophet," published in the Wall Street Journal of July 17, 1937.

The book from which I am reading was published in 1938.

FOREIGN SUBSIDIES—DIVISION OF WEALTH

Our entire foreign policy always adds up to subsidies to foreign nations—division of our wealth with them through a division of our markets, and assessing our taxpayers for cash to give them.

DESTRUCTION OF OUR MARKETS

The wanton destruction of our markets by the State Department through deliberate importation of the foreign nations' products of sweatshop labor is an insult to the intelligence of the workingmen and investors of this Nation. Foreign nations are even now complaining because American workingmen want their jobs protected.

NATURAL TRADE AREA

Our natural trade future is in South America and in Asia. It is not in old Europe. These are the raw material producing countries, while the European nations are manufacturing and processing areas just as we are in this country.

Mr. President, to try to force our processing and manufacturing Nation to trade with the processing and manufacturing nations of Europe reminds the junior Senator from Nevada of two barbers trying to make a living in the same block by shaving each other. Just as long as we put up the money for the foreign nations with which to buy our goods they will buy a certain amount of our goods. When we quit they will stop. Then we come back to the 5½ percent of our production in foreign trade, because no nation or individual ever buys anything from any other individual or nation which it can conveniently produce itself. A nation will buy from other nations the things it must have that it cannot conveniently produce for itself; but it will not buy any more than that unless we furnish our taxpayers' money to be used for that purpose.

Apparently we do not have the intestinal fortitude to face the situation which exists in our country. We have built up to overproduce, and we must sell these goods. So we fool the public by saying that we must make up the dollar shortages of European countries, and from $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000 is appropriated every year for that purpose.

Mr. President, there is nothing wrong with the United States. This Nation could stand a readjustment, but the persons currently in power in the United States could not stand a readjustment. They would lose their jobs.

DELIBERATE INFLATION

Deliberate inflation—through the so-called deficit financing policy and the resulting "counterfeit" money poured into the economic bloodstream of the Nation, while blaming the resulting pay raise and the increased price demands for the goods on the shelves for it—is an insult to the intelligence of the American public.

STOLEN ONE-HALF OF SAVINGS—INSURANCE—WAGES

Through such inflation, the administration, with the connivance of a subservient Congress, has stolen one-half of the savings, insurance, and wages of the people in this Nation.

"DOLLAR SHORTAGE" HOAX

The "dollar shortage" hoax sold to a long-suffering American public is caused by the foreign nations which fix a higher-than-market price on their currency, which no one but a gullible Congress will pay, and, in addition, is caused by their insistence upon spending more than they currently earn.

NO INTEGRITY FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENTS

There is no integrity or protection for private investments in most foreign countries. In England, for example, neither the capital, once it is invested, nor the interest or dividends may be removed, except by special permission.

THE COLONIAL SLAVERY SYSTEM

The colonial slavery system is a form of piracy operated through the application of "Empire preferential rates" and a manipulated currency exchange, and makes it unprofitable, if not impossible, for this Nation to trade with such areas. The Far East, most of Africa, and a part of the Middle East, which contain most of the strategic minerals and materials needed by this country, are included in this outmoded system.

I suggest the principles that in my best judgment will preserve our own economic structure, while encouraging foreign nations to improve their own, and that will best enable us to cooperate with foreign nations and repel aggression from any source, if it should come.

DOMESTIC POLICY

First. Foreign trade: Promotion of world trade should be on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and must be done within the principle long maintained, that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to the country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

Second. Gold standard: We should return to a convertible gold-coin standard and abolish the present-day managed-currency system.

Third. States' rights: All rights of regulation and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution must be returned to the States in accordance with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Fourth. Congress independent branch of Government: Congress must reassert its power as one of the three independent branches of the Government set up by the Constitution as a check on the executive and the judiciary. Congress must resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce, to regulate money, and to approve treaties and agreements with foreign nations.

Fifth. Western Hemisphere independent for national defense: Make the Western Hemisphere self-sufficient in the production of strategic and critical minerals and materials for any emergency, including South America, Canada, and Alaska. The lines of transportation to such materials can then be kept open.

FOREIGN POLICY

First. Free exchange of currencies: As a condition of further cooperation, require a free exchange of the currencies of foreign nations between themselves and with the dollar, and stop the manipulation of the price of such currencies in terms of the dollar for trade advantage.

Second. Gift loans to foreign nations: Stop the gift loans to foreign nations out of the pockets of American taxpayers. In lieu of such gifts, accept reasonable amounts of foreign nations' currency at the current market rate of exchange for the purchase of goods and services in this country, and then use their own currency for the purchase of goods from such countries, utilizing the market rate of exchange at the time of such purchase.

Third. Integrity of private investments: As a further condition, require that foreign nations protect the integrity of private investments in their respective countries.

Fourth. Equal access to foreign markets: As a further condition, establish equal access to the markets of foreign nations. Provides that any nation may protect its own workers and investors, through tariffs or import fees, but that no third nation may fix such conditions, including quotas, money exchanges, or other subterfuge, to preclude the United States from trading with that nation upon an equal basis.

Fifth. The Monroe Doctrine: Extend the 128 year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas in Asia and Europe that it is necessary for us to currently defend for our own security and well-being, and retain the final decision in the Congress of the United States, in the event of war.

We should again put the best interests and the welfare of the American people first in consideration of our domestic policy.

Any foreign policy must be based upon the ultimate safety and welfare of the United States of America.

CONCLUSION

Protection of our standard of living, guarding our integrity and our American way of life built up and established over a century of time, will lead to an enlightened international cooperation.

Speaking as just one member of the United States Senate, and recalling that Winston Churchill said, in 1945, that he "did not become the King's First Minister in order to liquidate the British Empire," I can say with equal emphasis that I did not become a United States Senator in order to destroy the economic structure of the United States of America.

FOR AMERICA AS CHURCHILL IS FOR ENGLAND

I am for America, just as Churchill is for England; and I am for England, just as Churchill is for America.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF OTHER NATIONS

It must be recognized that the foreign policies of the nations of Europe and Asia are based upon the principle voiced by one of England's great Prime Ministers in 1849 when he said:

> We [the English] have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow.

This foreign policy was reiterated by another great Prime Minister of that Commonwealth, Mr. Churchill, in 1945, when he answered President Roosevelt's suggestion that England relinquish her claim to Hong Kong, with a statement which was heard around the world: "I did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

What Mr. Churchill said to Mr. Roosevelt was, in effect, "If you want to play with us, you must protect our interests."

That is what we are doing through the Atlantic pact, today—protecting their colonial interests. We guarantee their trade integrity.

Mr. President, we must acknowledge and protect our "permanent interests." This is a sound principle, which we have not been following.

COMMON HORSE SENSE

This Nation desperately needs a liberal dose of common horse sense and old-time religion.

INTEGRITY AND RESPECT

We need an administration which will reestablish integrity of Government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad. This we have lost.

Mr. President, the controlled materials program, which was approved this afternoon in connection with the Defense Production Act, is not a new or recent program; it is not a new subject. For a long time it has been the plan of the foreign nations, and the internationalists in our Government have long supported it and have tried to bring it about, in cooperation with the foreign nations, chiefly Great Britain, because Great Britain is the smartest nation on earth in the matter of foreign trade. Britain has lived on foreign trade for over 100 years, at first chiefly through domination by her fleet, so that she could control her colonial possessions.

But, Mr. President, at this time I wish to say that in my opinion the colonial system is dead, as of today; and never again will any nation be able to subdue and keep subdued another nation and collect from that nation more than it costs to keep it under the yoke.

PLAN TO CONTROL WORLD COMMODITIES

The International Materials Conference, as such, came into existence following the meeting between President Truman and Clement Attlee, then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in December 1950.

The December 1950 decision to create the International Materials Conference cannot be called the beginning of the plan to control world commodities. To really understand the purpose behind the International Materials Conference we must review the entire scheme for world socialism or internationalism. Unfortunately, time will not permit such elaboration. Therefore, a review will show the highlights of the United States participation in this international scheme for world socialization, as it pertains to commodity control.

That, Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Nevada has previously stated, will operate to divide the markets and the production of this Nation with the nations of the world, on a basis of population, and could only result in a reduction of our standard of living. They say, of course, what they will do about dividing our wealth with the nations of the world is that we shall bring everyone up to our standards. Mr. President, one might as well say that if I were to take this glass of water, representing 160,000,000 people, as against two and one-half billion people in the world today, and if I were to say, "I will pour this glass of water into a city reservoir; therefore the average level of the water of the reservoir will be that of the level of the water in the glass," and I could pour the glass of water into the reservoir. I would be without water, but the effect on the reservoir would be very slight. That should help us to understand what would be the effect, if 140,000,000 people were to average their standard of living with that of the nations of the world, including perhaps 2,500,000,000. The effect would be the same.

The interlocking of national with international groups interested in so-called social reform—including commodity control—had its start at the Arbitration Court of The Hague in 1899. This was followed by the formation of several nonofficial international groups. World socialization was their aim. One of these groups, the International Labor Organization, achieved official status in 1919, under part XIII of the Versailles Treaty, as a subsidiary of the League of Nations and is now a subsidiary of the United Nations. The groups and individuals who successfully promoted the formation of the ILO are largely responsible for the proposals and plans for commodity controls.

Two American Presidents sounded the keynote for this strategic move that would control not only commodities but the economic life of all nations.

Point III of President Woodrow Wilson's 14-point proposal for peace, January 8, 1918:

> The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

In a speech made on September 27, 1918, relative to the 14-point proposal for peace, President Woodrow Wilson explained this point 3 as follows:

> There can be no league or alliance or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the League of Nations. There can be no special selfish economic combinations within the League, and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusions except as the power of economic penalty, by exclusion from the markets of the world, may be vested in the League of Nations itself as a means of discipline and control.

Mr. President, what did President Woodrow Wilson say? He said that there would be no tariffs, that there would be no equalizations of the difference in standard of living, to hold the one nation above the other, because the one nation might have worked harder to attain its position than another.

The United States did not join the League of Nations and consequently point III of the proposal for peace did not become effective but the possibility of using commodity control as a "power of economic penalty, by exclusion from the markets of the world, as a means of discipline and control" has not been forgotten by the international socialism planners.

"The power of economic penalty, by exclusion from the markets of the world, as a means of discipline and control"—that is the only way it would be used. It will be remembered that the United States did not join the League of Nations.

According to one of the planners, Clyde Eagleton—

> Even the self-sufficient United States could be made to lose heavily, if other states should combine to exclude her exports from their markets, or needed raw materials from her importers.
>
> Thus far, the community of nations has chosen to be nice to the United States; since that has failed, they may choose next time to combine against us, if we refuse to share in a task which belongs to all states and which none should shirk—that of maintaining order and justice in the world.

The quotation is from page 285, Preliminary Reports and Monographs of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace.

Mr. President, as we go around the world, we pick up strange bits of information which fit into the mosaic. In 1947, the junior Senator from Nevada arrived at Birmingham, England, for the purpose of examining the coal mines and steel mills in that area. It will be remembered that that was the year before the famous Marshall plan was adopted. It had then been proposed in a tentative sort of way. Mr. Marshall,

arriving at a famous university in Boston, had said something about a Marshall plan which might be adopted, in order to provide money for foreign nations. Really, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, Mr. Marshall did not understand what he was going to say, and, after he had said it, did not understand what he had said. But Mr. Bevin, who was in the Cabinet in England, took the ball on the first bounce. Within 60 days he told us it would cost us $17,000,000,000 within a period of 5 years. We adopted the plan in the Senate, almost over the dead body of the junior Senator from Nevada. But, before going into the coal mines, the junior Senator from Nevada visited Sir Ben Smith, in that Birmingham area. He was in charge of coal mining in England. England had exported millions of tons of coal before World War II, but at that time it did not have enough coal to enable the people to keep themselves warm. We were shipping coal to Newcastle, England—shipping "coals to Newcastle"; and we still are, I think. That was supposed to be the height of something or other—like running out of potatoes in the United States of America, with the same kind of Government supervising the production of both coal and potatoes—the production of coal in England, the production of potatoes of America, under the same system. But what did Sir Ben Smith say? The junior Senator from Nevada had not been in the Birmingham area before, and knew very little about it; though he had been in the engineering business for many years and therefore knew something about machinery and also something about mining. He could tell whether people were doing a full day's work, and whether they were doing it efficiently. So the junior Senator from Nevada listened to Sir Ben as he poured out his story. Finally, the Senator from Nevada took a chance. He said—and this was quoted by the junior Senator from Nevada in 1948, in the course of debate on the Marshall plan, and will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of that time—Sir Ben Smith said:

> You know England controls three-fourths of the raw materials of the world, and if we want to do so, we can shut down and not let America have them.

The junior Senator from Nevada did not say anything to Sir Ben Smith, but we see it now, through threats of reprisal if we protect our own workingmen and investors in this country.

Mr. President, I think it is time we called the bluff. We have a Western Hemisphere, and if we paid more attention to it we could make it self-sufficient in the production of commodities which we need. Our trade future is in South America. It was in Asia, until we lost out in connection with the operations of England and our State Department.

WANTED ACCESS OF ALL

The next open declaration of commodity control was made on August 24, 1941, by President F. D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill as the fourth point of the Declaration of Peace Aims, known as the Atlantic Charter. What did they say:

> Wanted access of all on equal terms to trade and raw materials needed for economic prosperity.

We are tracing it from 1889, Mr. President. What did they say? They said: "Access of all on equal terms to trade and raw materials needed for economic prosperity."

They placed little emphasis on the fact that the reason people came to this country several hundred years ago was to find an opportunity to make a living and to develop this country as a colony of England. We were the first people in the world to break the colonial system. We have now become a very powerful nation, and we think we will hold the colonial system for the other four nations. But we broke away from that system, Mr. President. We are going back into virtually a colonial system. We will become virtually a member of the sterling bloc. We will join 50 or 55 other nations in the sterling bloc. Most of them are members of the International Materials Conference. We will sit down with them and divide our markets and our production with the nations of the world on a basis of need. We are doing this at least once a year; and the Senate of the United States today approved an amendment to the War Production Act which virtually allows that to be done.

It is significant that in November of 1951 the United Nations in their report "Measures for International Economic Stability," chapter II, "International Commodity Arrangements," page 19, stated:

> We recognize that international commodity arrangements of numerous kinds have been advocated for many years and that the record of achievement is small. Nevertheless, we feel that the time is now ripe for a new attempt, and this for two main reasons.

There is a question, now, as to whether this new attempt at international commodity arrangements meant the International Materials Conference or an entirely new proposal concerned with the review of chapter VI of the Habana Charter.

> The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide.

That is found on page 87, volume 1, of the President's Materials Policy Commission Report, "Resources for Freedom," June, 1952.

Mr. President, if there ever was a plan for the division of the wealth of the United States, they intend to finish the job. They have written five volumes—four now available—that would do the job. I want Senators to realize that this is not a new thing. It has been going on for 70 years. The country has been able, so far, to fight it off, but now the vise has tightened, and even the great Senate of the United States accepts an amendment to allow them to finish the job.

Quoting further, Mr. President:

> By resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, a review of chapter VI of the Habana Charter is called for some time in 1952.

That is from page 90, volume I, of the President's Materials Policy Commission report, Resources for Freedom, June 1952.

Quoting further:

> Chapter VI on international commodity agreements may be viewed basically as a qualification of the Charter's provision against import and export quotas. It recognizes that exaggerated materials price declines may cause severe distress to producers, and permits multilateral agreements regulating the prices, production, or the volume of imports and exports of such commodities. It gives this permission only when burdensome surpluses are expected which threaten severe unemployment or hardship to numerous producers.

That is from page 87, volume I, President's Materials Policy Commission report, Resources for Freedom, June 1952.

Through whose judgment will this be allowed, Mr. President? Through the committee which wrote the report, or a similar committee, composed of persons who have never been in business.

I quote further, Mr. President:

> Whether the United States supports retention of chapter VI in its present form or its replacement should depend, in the Commission's judgment, on a determination as to which course would make possible the more rapid and constructive international action toward stabilizing materials markets.

Stabilizing them, Mr. President, by dividing our own materials, our own production, our own markets, with the other nations of the world.

That quotation, that great pronouncement, is found on page 90, volume I, President's Materials Policy Commission report, Resources for Freedom, June 1952:

> The Commission views a strictly national stabilization policy in industrial materials as impracticable and highly undesirable. • • • The Commission is convinced that the solutions to the problems of materials market instability must be sought through international agreements in which the United States will have to take a leading part.

OFFICIAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

There are already in existence the International Cotton Advisory Committee; the International Rubber Study Group; International Rice Commission; International Wheat Council, and others. None of these groups appear to have the self-endowed authority that the International Materials Conference has taken upon itself. It is worthy of note that the President's Materials Policy Commission classifies the International Materials Conference as "an emergency organization established to meet an immediate problem" while the United Nations report by a group of experts appointed by the Secretary-General, titled "Measures for International Economic Stability," proposes that the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the International Materials Conference be used to administer a comprehensive scheme for a range of different commodities.

That is great language, Mr. President. An inexperienced group of persons read

it in a book, and then they know how to make everything work properly.

Now that the International Materials Conference has been exposed both in the House and in the Senate as the supercartel that it is we can expect that the International Materials Conference, the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the various international advisory and study groups will be combined under the protecting wing of the United Nations.

Popularly, internationalism is being accepted as some sort of benevolence on the part of the United States, while actually a goodly part of the program is intended to bring the United States to her knees and place her on an equal footing with the least of the lesser nations.

Mr. President, I quote from an address I made previously on the Senate floor.

Mr. MALONE. Let us see what it means, then, to lower the level of our living standards to that of the remainder of the world. Roughly speaking, the population of the United States is approximately 7 percent of all the people of the world, and this 7 percent has developed approximately 36 percent of the world's economy. That leaves 93 percent of the people of the world having 64 percent of the world's economy.

This talk was made before the last census.

If the 140,000,000 American people agree to divide their wealth with the world, and the 2,000,000,000 in the remainder of the world agree to share their poverty with us, the standard of living of the average American citizen could be one-sixth of what it is today when the final leveling takes place.

That is the broad picture of the situation which faces the average American workingman.

UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY IN PERIL

I now wish to speak about sovereignty. Interwoven in the plans for commodity control are international finance, and ecoomic, social, and political adjustment of nations. A relatively more important phase of the plan includes the limitation, if not abrogation, of national sovereignty. The following are statements made by some of our outstanding internationalist planners through the medium of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, which is now the research affiliate of the American Association for the United Nations and a subsidiary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Nations must recognize that their right to regulate economic activities is not unlimited. The world has become an economic unit; all nations must have access to its raw materials and its manufactured articles.

Mr. President, that statement appears on page 15 of A 10-Year Record, by the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace.

All that the statement means is that the inherent right of any nation to protect its own economic system has gone down the drain. That is all it means. I quote again:

All must contribute to making the United Nations an effective international organization, so successful that peoples will not be willing to return to nationalistic anarchy. We must create advantages of membership and penalties for noncooperation, and we must inspire loyalty on the part of all peoples toward an international system.

Mr. President, that is strong medicine, but it comes from page 33, Third Report, "The United Nations and the Organization of Peace," of the Commission To Study the Organization for Peace.

I hope we realize the kind of people with whom we are dealing.

I may say that a present candidate for the Presidency of the United States in one of the major parties, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], has introduced a bill to do just that. In other words, the bill provides for the President to appoint a committee to meet with representatives of the Atlantic nations to develop a federation of states.

While the bill does not specify it, in Memphis last year, on a Town Meeting of the Air, I debated with the junior Senator from Tennessee the question of a federation of nations. It developed in the debate that that is exactly what was meant—that the United States would be expected to modify its Constitution to join such a federation. It then developed that each one of the 12 nations would have 1 or 2 Senators and a number of representatives in accordance with population. Naturally, it follows that such an organization could impose taxes on the United States in accordance with our ability to pay, without the slight embarrassment that is now encountered by having to come to the Congress. The United States Congress would then become a legislature, such as the legislature of a State; and State governors and members of State legislatures of the United States would virtually become officials of counties in a great one-world organization.

Mr. President, how silly can we get? Of course, that remains to be seen, because recently there has been a little more intelligent discussion by legislatures of the country about world federation, and several of them which had already approved it have repudiated their action. I hope the remainder will do so very soon. I quote further:

Not only must international government be given the power to back up its decrees, but nations must have their power of resistance to international authority diminished.

How can it be diminished except by modification of the constitution of a nation? That would mean modification of the Constitution of the United States of America. Are the people of America ready for such a decision, which would put them on an equal basis with 11 other nations, 50 other nations, or 70 other nations, so that, each with one vote, the federation would vote taxes, war, and other important actions by a majority vote? I think not, when they fully understand it.

That was a quotation from page 285 of Preliminary Reports and Monographs of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace. I quote further:

Among the absolutely essential controls after this war are those which will give governments the means of preventing violent fluctuations in the economic system and the means of promoting and maintaining an expanding economy.

That is taken from page 182, the Transition Period—the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace.

I quote further:

These three aspects of national sovereignty, the power of self-judgment in international controversies, the power to prepare and use armed force in international relations, and the power to impose arbitrary barriers to international trade, are in most need of limitations. Reciprocally, international organization should be developed to assure the definition, application, and enforcement of such limitations upon national sovereignty."

I hope the people of the United States understand what that means.

Mr. President, this very important quotation is from page 253, Preliminary Reports and Monographs—Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, under the heading "Fundamental problems of international organization," by Quincy Wright.

With respect to the prospects of future programs of the international planners, I quote from Clyde Eagleton, under the heading "Preliminary reports":

The authority of the national government was, and is, maintained to a large degree, through the control which it constitutionally exercises over individuals within those States. It might be possible, similarly, to provide that the international government could for some purposes reach directly to the individuals within a nation.

It would be provided that the international government could, for some purposes, "reach directly to the individuals within a nation."

Continuing the quotation:

If provisions could be put both into international law and into national constitutions under which individuals would owe a duty within certain fields—for example, never to take up arms against the international authority—the task of international government would be made easier. The individual would then have a legal right to refuse to aid his government in an act of aggression; loyalty to the international government would be encouraged.

And what is an act of aggression? We have found over a period of hundreds of years that an act of aggression is generally defined by the aggressor. It will be remembered that when Hitler invaded Finland he said that Finland had attacked his nation, and, therefore, it was necessary to invade Finland.

The individual would then have a legal right to refuse to aid his government in an act of aggression; loyalty to the international government would be encouraged; internal revolution against an aggressive government would be more easy, and national solidification against international sanctions would be the more difficult.

In other words, we would be a member of this great international affair, and its members could more easily encourage internal revolution against our Government, as some governments are doing now. It is presumed that Russia is encouraging the Communists to try to destroy us. But the junior Senator from Nevada believes that we can be destroyed economically by our so-called allies, and by encouraging this sort of government. We can be destroyed completely and forever, if we get into this kind of government.

Continuing the quotation:

It should certainly not be regarded as treason for an individual to refuse to fight for his own government if that government has been decreed an aggressor by decision of the community of nations. Not only must international government be given the power to back up its decrees, but nations must have their power of resistance to international authority diminished.

The foregoing quotation is from Clyde Eagleton, in Preliminary Reports and Monographs, page 285.

I now quote from page 277, under the heading "Transition period—Commission To Study the Organization of Peace":

The transition period will probably progress through three stages, the first dominated by the need of meeting emergency problems, the second dominated by the problem of establishing new institutions, and the third dominated by the problem of vesting these institutions with the reality of political power.

It can be seen what is in store for us, Mr. President, if we continue to enact the type of legislation which we passed this afternoon.

1897 TO 1952 WITH SAME OBJECTIVE

The planners of world socialism or internationalism have consistently adhered to their program which originated at the 1897 and 1899 Arbitration Courts of The Hague. The idea for the control of the markets and monetary systems of the world was an integral part of their program.

Through the years, from the Arbitration Court of The Hague in 1899 to the present International Materials Conference and the 1950–75 plan of the President's Minerals Policy Commission, there have only been refinements as to their modus operandi and the method or medium through which they can accomplish their original purpose.

They have never changed their objective one iota. From the position and observation of the junior Senator from Nevada this night, he makes the assertion that the 20-year old program has proceeded without a slip-up or mistake. Some people believe that mistakes are being made in this Government. No mistake is being made. This is our program. We are going right into a new kind of government.

Some people used to say that Mr. Roosevelt was making many mistakes, and that if he were to die everything would be all right. Mr. Roosevelt died. That was the advent of Mr. Truman. I say, Mr. President, that the tide and the flow of legislation across the Senate floor did not change one iota. It is the same program today that it was in 1934—a complete program for an economic one-world, and a one-world government, with the modification of the Constitution of the United States.

That was the objective from the inauguration of the program, and it has never changed through the years.

PRIVATE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

The formation of the Conciliation Internationale in Paris; the Fabian Society of England; the Maryland Peace Society and the American Association for International Conciliation; the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes were among the most outstanding of the organizations, made up of Government and non-Government individuals, engaged in program, policy and methods planning. In 1910 their activity was largely supplanted by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, insofar as the program and methods were concerned. The policy "to enforce peace" through world control never varies.

There have been numerous so-called private international organizations and their method of formation and operation is important to the over-all since the organizational set-up has been used in the International Materials Conference that was devised by the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, a subsidiary of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace for the International Labor Organization which was formed under direction of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Not infrequently, these private organizations become Federal agencies. They are also important pressure groups. The means by which this is accomplished is clearly given by one of the internationalists' planners, Phillips Bradley, chairman of the Department of Political Science at Queens College, New York, who in 1942 claimed that the number of these international private organizations exceeded 700 and "cover practically every 'interest', economic and social, individual and group. They cut across State frontiers and include individual members or functional associations in several, or many, States. The latest classification (in 1942) lists 15 subjects besides 'miscellaneous'." Mr. Bradley claimed there were 32 such organizations in the miscellaneous classification. The various classifications as given by Mr. Bradley follow with the number of such organizations in 1942:

Political and international relations (including pacifism)	48
Religion, humanitarianism, and morals	124
Arts and sciences	112
Education	37
Student and university organizations	11
Medicine and hygiene	50
Law and administration	44
The press	12
Feminism	26
Labor and the professions	73
Agriculture	26
Economics and finance	18
Trade and industry	66
Communications and transit	45
Sport and tourism	36

Mr. Bradley continues:

These international associations are of all types. Some include individual membership. Others are themselves member-group associations, with strong national groups in many different States. Still others have a mixed official and unofficial membership; direct governmental support and participation is not uncommon. Finally, some of these organizations are composed of groups of governmental employees of technical administrations, although not officially sponsored by the governments themselves.

These organizations and associations correspond, in the international sphere, roughly to pressure groups in the domestic. Many are, of course, primarily technical, professional, or cultural in their objectives and activities. But just as such groups exercise an increasing influence on public policy within individual States, these international associations are by no means negligible factors in translating their interests into nonpolitical terms. As they develop the visible evidences of cooperation, through conferences, mutually controlled organs of research or cultural intercourse, and other collaborative activities and agencies, they tend to break down barriers to common official action. Other private international organizations are more frankly propagandist, seeking to develop support for the programs both nationally and internationally. But, whatever their tactics of action, their very existence helps to widen the area of nonpolitical relations between States. More than one of these organizations, originating in purely unofficial activities and interests, has become the source, and sometimes the nucleus, of official international cooperation at the administrative level.

Quoting further from Preliminary Report and Monographs:

Illustrations of this type of development are numerous. They occur most frequently in the social and economic spheres. First, there appears an organized effort to bring together individuals and groups in different States concerned with the promotion of improved conditions or uniform standards. Conferences are organized. Governments sooner or later send "observers." Gradually, as public policy within one or more States is brought into line with the objectives of these associations, governmental representatives participate officially in the conferences. Finally, interested governments associate themselves actively in the management and activities of these organizations, or take them over as official agencies of cooperation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks the remainder of page 158, as marked, and the marked portion on page 161.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thus the cycle is complete. The area of official international administration is widened; existing private organs of intercourse and policy framing are created by private initiative, are placed on an official basis, or are reorganized to suit the exigencies of cooperative governmental action.

As the area of depoliticalized international cooperation has widened through the influences noted above, the pattern of organization in official administrative agencies has been more or less stabilized. * * * The administrative is perhaps the most significant field for the further devitalizing of sovereignty as a factor obstructive to genuine international cooperation.

A second factor affecting the structure of these administrative agencies has, quite naturally, been their functional purpose. A river commission requires a different setup from a research agency. An executive agency like the International Sugar Commission or the International Health Office suggests the need for an internal structure not necessarily similar to that of a consultative organization such as the International Prison Commission.

* * * * *

No brief analysis can do justice to a movement as significant as the development of international administration over the past century and a quarter. The problem of widening the area of consensus is by no means

settled; the process of depoliticalization is only begun. But we have achieved in that time both the framework of efficient organization of and the means for effective collaboration among the civil servants of an integrated international order.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM'S FREE TRADE PLAN

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the international socialism plan calls for—

(a) Reduction of all barriers to the flow of international trade.

(b) Access to raw materials of all sorts for all nations.

(c) Access to markets for all nations.

(d) A world organization through which the nations can share freely in the supplies and the markets of the world.

The internationalists acknowledge that their first success was the Hull reciprocal agreements.

Mr. President, there can be only one result and only one final solution if these objectives are allowed to obtain, and that is, of course, the levelling of the living standards of the United States of America with the sweatshop-labor nations of the world.

Mr. President, we have been living on emergencies for 15 years. If we were to run out of an emergency for 60 days our economic system would go down and we would find ourselves perhaps with the same kind of government that we think we are now fighting. At least there is a grave danger of that happening to us in the United States.

Mr. President, there are a series of such international organizations. They include:

Combined Raw Materials Board.

Combined Tin Committee.

The Interim Coordinating Committee for International Cotton Meeting and its successor, the International Cotton Advisory Committee.

Interim Commission of the International Trade Organization.

International Sugar Council.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the U. N.

International Tin Study Group.

International Wheat Council.

International Wool Study Group.

Rubber Study Group.

Economic Cooperation Administration.

Mutual Security Agency.

Marshall Plan.

International Materials Conference.

The President's Materials Policy Commission.

All of these organizations follow the basic plan, the basic program to divide and control the markets and resources of the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S MATERIALS POLICY COMMISSION

Mr. President, the publication of this great Commission, the President's Materials Policy Commission, about which very few people know anything at all, is made up of five volumes. Volumes I, II, and IV have now been issued. The report is entitled "Resources for Freedom." Volume I is entitled "Foundations for Growth and Security. Report to the President by the President's Materials Policy Commission, June 1952."

Volume II of Resources for Freedom is subtitled "The Outlook for Key Commodities."

It is a worth-while volume to read, because the outlook is grim.

Volume III has not yet been issued.

Volume IV of Resources for Freedom is entitled "The Promise of Technology."

The Commission is composed of William H. Paley, Chairman; George R. Brown, Arthur H. Bunker, Eric Hodgins, and Edward S. Mason.

The junior Senator from Nevada has been in the engineering business for 30 years. Before coming to the Senate he was engaged in the engineering profession, and he believes he is familiar with most of the technicians in the United States. However, in reading the names of the members of the Commission there was no great enthusiasm generated in the mind of the junior Senator from Nevada by the outstanding reputations of these men. That is to put it very mildly and to give them all the breaks.

They have been at work for quite some time, and undoubtedly in the secrecy of the White House and the State Department.

Certainly they have never consulted very many people. Mr. President, a very enlightening editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 25 following the issuance of the report. The editorial is published under the heading "Review and outlook," and is entitled "The Planners Again."

The editorial says in part:

A group of citizens composing the President's Materials Policy Commission foresees difficulties about the supply of raw materials; it says that developing shortages and mounting costs raise grave questions for the Nation's security and living standards.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD, because it gives a very sensible comment on a very dangerous report.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLANNERS AGAIN

A group of citizens composing the President's Materials Policy Commission foresees difficulties about the supply of raw materials; it says that developing shortages and mounting costs raise grave questions for the Nation's security and living standards.

One may be permitted to wonder how many times people have made such reports. Certainly they could be numbered in the thousands. And none of them have ever come true; all of them have been wrong.

The simple fact is that there is no case where a raw material has been depleted while men still found it useful. The one possible exception is the fertility of the land which can be exhausted. But even that can be restored.

There are many people alive and active who can remember dire predictions that the coal supply would be exhausted. The actual fact is that there is available more coal than people can use and the only shortage results not from a depleted supply but from planned economies which have so snarled matters that sufficient coal is not mined.

If someone had forecast for your great-grandfather the present population of the United States, he would have taken pencil and paper and figured that there were not enough trees for the lumber to build houses to shelter so many people. But the people are here and lumber still is produced in quantities that would seem unbelievable to the revered ancestor.

About 25 years ago the elder Senator La Follette was chairman of a Senate committee which warned that oil supplies were running out and that gasoline would go to $1 a gallon. There is plenty of oil, although the use of it has been many times what Senator La Follette could foresee. And gasoline has never been so expensive as on the day of the La Follette report—not even with the addition of numerous taxes.

But here we are again with a group of thoughtful gentlemen who intimate—although they had the wisdom to put in some "ifs" and "buts"—a shortage of raw materials. A quite conservative newspaper headlines the story "A crisis in raw materials found imperiling security."

And how are we to avoid this danger?

Well, bless you, there must be some long-range planning. The Government would have considerable hand in controlling raw materials. And this Government would cooperate with other governments. There would be world agreement on production and prices and there would be international stockpiles and pools.

If there is one thing that could bring the dire predictions to actuality it is Government control.

Let a government begin to allocate something and there immediately develops a shortage where none existed before. Let a government take charge of production and production falls. Let a government replace a free market and people begin to go without. Man has discovered no device so potent to stop production and disarrange distribution as the device of Government control and interference.

If the Government of the United States—along with other governments—will attend to the matter of keeping peace, law, and order, and if it will get its fat, stupid self out of trying to govern economic matters, the people left to themselves will find ways to accommodate themselves to changes just as they always have when and where governments have left them free to do so.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the editorial states, in part:

Well, bless you, there must be some long-range planning. The Government would have considerable hand in controlling raw materials. And this Government would cooperate with other governments. There would be world agreement on production and prices and there would be international stockpiles and pools.

Then the editorial in the Wall Street Journal makes a statement which makes a great deal of sense, Mr. President:

If there is one thing that could bring the dire predictions to actuality it is Government control.

Mr. President, earlier in my address I said that two things which now have been brought about really required experience—not only organization, but real experience—in governmental planning. One was to lose control of the air, despite all the industrial equipment and capacity and experience the United States has, for we were turning out 50,000 airplanes a year when World War II ended; but now, in seven short years, we have been able to lose control of the air. Mr. President, that required planning. It not only required control, but it required experience, to do a job like that on the American people.

Then, Mr. President, in running out of potatoes—for the United States of America to run out of potatoes—really

was a job which required study, and required a very wise and thoughtful committee, and required almost complete governmental control, just as the editorial in the Wall Street Journal says—

If there is one thing that could bring the dire predictions to actuality it is Government control.

Mr. President, I heartily agree.

This report is one of the most dangerous reports ever made to the American people. I hope every Member of the Senate will take time to study the report. If they do not, they will live to regret it.

Today the Members of the Senate took one more step toward the chute that has been built for them. Today the Members of the Senate are up against the drift fence in the canyon, and only a very short time will be required to get them into the chute and to close the gate. When that is done, the only thing that will remain to be done will be to level the living standards of the people of the United States with those of the sweatshop-labor nations of the world.

At this point I wish to emphasize again that overpopulation of Europe and Asia is the bar to peace. No nations are quarrelsome just for the sake of being quarrelsome or for the sake of having wars. Those nations are battling for a living.

So we are faced with the choice of whether to follow the recommendations of this great committee and to act in accordance with the entire plan of the Fabian Socialists, which plan has been adopted step by step by the people of the United States, through a government which first they trusted. Still the plan is being accepted by the Congress, step by step—a complete, 20-year plan. In fact, Mr. President, it was a 70-year plan. Three world wars were required. A world war is nothing to a world planner, a Fabian Socialist. To him, a world war is just another step toward world domination.

RESOURCES FOR FREEDOM

A recent publication, "Resources for Freedom," prepared by a committee appointed by President Truman, should be of interest to every American citizen. The material was prepared by an imposing list of so-called experts, and represents in my opinion the most fallacious attack on our American system that has ever been prepared.

The publication either deliberately or because of a lack of understanding of the resources of the United States misrepresents the potentials of our economy. Through fear of a shortage of raw materials, it is an attempt to convince the American people to turn their backs on our American system and enter into a program of exploiting the world for a source of cheap raw materials.

It ignores completely the financial obligations of the United States Government or the American price level, which are the determining factors in domestic production. If it were to become the policy of the United States, it would mean economic suicide and a collapse of the free world which depends upon a solvent United States to lead the way.

The men who prepared the report should be required to get out in the broad open spaces in the United States and make a study of the many phases of costs that enter into production.

The essence of their report is to obtain cheap raw materials. They oppose the "buy American" clause which contemplates the payment of a premium of 25 percent on American production. They oppose tariffs to protect the American price level against slave labor. They ignore completely the fact that the American people are spending an average of from 25 percent to 30 percent of their income to support the Federal Government, a cost that the foreign producer does not have to pay.

A simple example can be given in the case of aluminum. The administrators of our defense program have been contemplating a contract with Canada for aluminum at a specified price equal to the American price. The duty on aluminum is 1.5 cents per pound. But this is only part of the story.

The American producers pay a 6 cents a pound tariff, the amount of taxes which they have to pay to produce in the United States. In all fairness, the duty should be 6 cents a pound, to equalize this cost factor in the United States.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to repeat that, as a rule, foreign countries do not have unemployment insurance, social security, and industrial insurance, which are paid for the American workmen, and which they themselves participate in paying for.

Assuming that we follow the program of the President's committee to buy this aluminum from Canada and to buy other minerals from the rest of the world, what would happen? The Government would obtain Canadian aluminum minus the 1.5-cent tariff, but would lose 6 cents a pound, the tax collection from the domestic producer.

The end result of foreign competition would be to close our aluminum plants, mines, etc., in the United States, and to force our economy to depend upon trade, instead of production, as a source of revenue. To make a profit from trade, we must cheat someone. In the words of Benjamin Franklin, "a nation can become wealthy through trade, which to make a profit requires cheating."

In addition to committing economic suicide, we would become dependent upon the rest of the world for national defense and a source of raw materials. Why should the United States, which has been and still is 98 percent self-sufficient in its needs for raw materials, embark on a program to exploit the world?

The fallacy of the whole program is revealed when we discard the committee's report and sit back and think.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to say that the Western Hemisphere can be made self-sufficient in the production of the strategic and critical materials we need, and the lines of communication can be protected in case of emergency, although the lines of communication for the rest of the world cannot be protected in that event. Furthermore, we would then be self-sufficient and able to protect our own standard of living, while assisting other countries to reach ours.

However, what we are doing now is to encourage other nations to hold down their wages, because in the absence of a tariff they take advantage of our markets and divide our markets by importing into the United States their sweatshop-labor goods.

But if we had a flexible import fee, which would protect the difference between the standard of living in the United States and the standard of living in foreign countries, as those countries raised their standards of living they would obtain credit for such a raise through a corresponding lowering of the flexible import fee. On the other hand, under the flexible import fee, if the foreign nations imported to the United States goods produced by low-cost labor, those nations would have to pay the difference into the Treasury of the United States. Mr. President, almost every nation, after making such payments a few times, would say to itself, "Well, the party is over." Any nation that found itself in that position would then say to itself, "We might just as well raise wages in our own country, and thus make those payments to our own people, instead of making them to the Treasury of the United States."

Then the people of that country would create a market at home. There is no market in a nation which pays 50 cents an hour for labor. There is no market in a nation, such as Japan, which pays from 7 to 12 cents an hour for skilled labor. Workingmen in America are in the market continually for automobiles, washing machines, radios, or some of the other conveniences. Laborers in some of the other countries are not in the market for any of those things. Why? Because they get nothing beyond a bare subsistence, an income that is so meager that it is hardly worth mentioning.

The first important item of raw materials is farm production. Approximately 70 percent of our raw materials are produced from the soil. In turn, 70 percent of all the goods sold to the consumer at retail are made up of five items—food, clothing, shoes, beverage, and tobacco.

There is only one reason why we cannot expand our agricultural production, and that is society's desire for cheap food. In this connection the committee makes its first error. It thinks of costs in terms of price instead of real costs.

The high cost which the committee complains about is giving the American people the lowest food cost of any nation in the world. The American people in 1951 spent 21.3 percent of their income for food as compared to about 70 percent in Europe and 85 percent for a starvation diet in India.

Why this paradox of higher prices in the United States and a food cost far below the rest of the world, thus permitting the American workers to buy 70 percent of all the automobiles the world produces? The reason is that wages and costs are reciprocal. We pay approximately $1.75 per hour for a miner in the United States. Every worker at that level is a potential market for a car. The $1.75 per hour goes into the price of a pound of copper as compared to a much lower wage in other countries.

The end result is the important thing which the committee misses entirely. the American worker for example, with a wage of $1.75 can buy 7 pounds of copper at 25 cents per pound with an hour of work. The miner in Chile working for 50 cents per hour can buy only 2 pounds.

The answer to this paradox is the thought expressed by Abraham Lincoln, "If we produce something ourselves we have both the goods and the money."

In the case of copper, if we produce 1,000,000,000 pounds at 25 cents per pound, we have that amount of copper and $250,000,000 of earned income. If we increase the price to 40 cents per pound, we have the copper and $400,000,000 of income.

The simple facts are that our lack of raw materials is due to our unwillingness to pay the cost in wages, taxes, and so forth, incidental to production.

When the administration's cohorts and followers say that we must import something because it is cheaper, they mean that they want to import the cheap labor of the world. That is what they mean, but they do not have the intestinal fortitude to put it in language of that sort, so that the people of the United States may understand what they really stand for.

Because of cheap imports, we permitted thousands of mines producing the various strategic materials to close. Not because of a lack of mineral resources but with the same theory passed on by the committee—we want them cheap. By not producing at an American price level, we lack both the metals and the income.

The need of both production and income becomes apparent when we realize that the public and private debt of the United States in 1951 had risen to $514,000,000,000 as compared to about $185,000,000,000 in 1939. Therefore the steps recommended by the committee to import cheap raw materials means a lower price level in the United States and national bankruptcy.

KARL MARX AND FREE TRADE

The committee should read the speech made by Karl Marx in Brussels, Belgium, in 1848, on free trade.

As the junior Senator from Nevada remarked previously, it was a mere coincidence, no doubt, that this speech by Karl Marx was read before the Democratic Club in Brussels. Marx said he favored free trade because it would hasten the day of the revolution. Marx felt that cheap raw materials would result in the poverty and the unrest to promote a social revolution. Stated in another way the doctrine of the President's committee would, in bankrupting the United States, benefit communism.

OUR BASIC RAW MATERIALS

In analyzing our economy, our basic raw materials can be listed in the following order of importance:

First. Agriculture and forestry.
Second. Coal and petroleum.
Third. Basic metals.
Fourth. Building materials.

In the case of agriculture all that a person needs to do is to jump into a car and drive 20 miles out of any major city. He will see on every hand acre after acre of farmland, that can be utilized to produce, not cheap food but food produced, as we do today, with American wage costs, taxes, and so forth. And, with the end result, that we have both the farm products and the income with which after spending 21.3 percent for food leaves a residue of spendable income to give our people the highest living standard of the world.

Our forefathers left Europe to get away from religious and economic oppression. Our forefathers in writing the Constitution set forth a new era in which the United States was to have a higher price than the rest of the world and with provisions giving Congress the right to protect it with tariffs. The President's committee however wants to junk the economic principles of the Constitution and the American system by returning to a system of low prices and economic exploitation.

In the case of coal and petroleum we have greater reserves of petroleum than in any period of our history. Our coal supplies and oil shale are in sufficient quantity to furnish us with motor fuel for the next 1,000 years, even though petroleum supplies should be exhausted. The members of the President's committee argue that the cost of producing gasoline from coal is too high. By using American resources and labor to produce, we have both the gasoline and money income created by production and the cost would be much lower than the price paid by English consumers, who pay a high rate of duty on imports.

Mr. President, a few years ago we had a Secretary of the Interior who, unfortunately, died recently. The junior Senator from Nevada used to enjoy analyzing his statements. One statement of which he was very fond, and which he repeated frequently several years ago while Secretary of the Interior, was to the effect that we must save our oil or keep our petroleum in the ground because we were running out of petroleum. In 1948 the junior Senator from Nevada answered him in three different places; namely, at an address in New York before a conference of governors from the petroleum-producing States, again before the independent producers at San Antonio, Tex., and again before the major producers in Chicago.

The first statement the junior Senator from Nevada made in those addresses was that it was impossible for us to exhaust our supply of petroleum fuels in the United States except by design. That was one of the mildest statements in my entire address. Why is it impossible to exhaust our supply of petroleum in the United States? First, because we probably would not exhaust the natural petroleum under ground within 100 or 200 years, unless the companies and individuals were allowed to go ahead and wildcat without a penalty by way of taxes up to 90 percent. The only way in the world we have been able to preserve the oil business, and thus keep men in that business, is a depletion allowance of 27 percent. In the case of mining there is a depletion allowance of 15 percent, which is the only thing that keeps us in the mining business even to the small extent we continue in it.

The junior Senator from Nevada, in 1925 or perhaps at some earlier period, pointed out that the United States Geological Survey, which is a very fine organization, had reported that there were 5,000,000,000 barrels of oil or petroleum available in the entire United States of America. We have continually increased our consumption of oil during the past 27 years; and yet now have about 28,000,000,000 barrels of oil, known and blocked out in the ground.

If Mr. Ickes had been Secretary of the Interior in 1925 no more oil would ever have been discovered if he had had his way. There are from 100,000,000,000 to 150,000,000,000 barrels of oil and oil shale located throughout the West and as far east as Iowa. It is cheaper to get the oil underground, but plans to develop oil from shale are ready to go any time we run short of oil. The process is further along in the laboratory than was the synthetic-rubber process when World War II came along. Any time we need petroleum from coal, all that will be necessary will be to put the heat on the laboratories and give the management plenty of money, and there will be plants ready to turn out petroleum supplies from coal in a relatively short time. There is a thousands years' supply of petroleum from the coal underground.

That is merely an example of the kind of thing the report represents. It is ignorance, or worse, that goes into writing a report of this kind. I hope it is ignorance; I should hate to believe it is worse.

In the case of building materials we have ample supplies of gravel, cement, marble, rock, plastics, etc., that can be used as substitutes for lumber. An endless supply, needing nothing more than the labor required to utilize it. As our population grows our labor force will expand in direct propostion.

Finally we come to strategic metals. Our shortage is due to just one factor—that of price. Our trade policies since 1935 much similar to the policies advocated by the committee have prevented domestic exploration and development. We have thousands of unworked deposits of lead, copper, zinc, manganese, tungsten, chrome, and so forth. We have many areas in the Western States that have never been explored and no one knows the extent of our mineral deposits.

At the present time we have a ceiling price on copper at 24.5 cents per pound while on the other hand we are paying 35 cents in the world market. If the United States were to give the domestic producer a firm contract of 35 cents per pound, we could open many new deposits and we could utilize the copper deposits in the mines abandoned in Michigan during the depression of the thirties. Again, how can we lose when we have the deposits? Production means both copper and income.

Mr. President, while all this discussion of the lack of copper in the United States was going on, 2, 3, and 4 years ago, on the Senate floor I mentioned several deposits which could be opened up at a fair price, not in competition with the $2.40 a day that is paid to labor in Chile. No one ever made such a statement as that. But if we had a tariff representing the difference between the cost of production in this country and in Chile, we could be in business right now. They mean they want the cheap labor of the world to produce copper, but they lack the guts to say so to the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

Last year work was started on a deposit of copper, one of the largest in the country, 100 miles southeast of Reno, Nev. By the end of 1953, $30,000,000 or $40,000,000 will be spent on it. They are guaranteed the unit price, I believe, a little higher than the regular price, at least 24½ cents. Give them 35 cents, and see where they go. We are only starting, Mr. President.

In 1910 hourly wages in industry averaged 20.8 cents per hour as compared to an average of $1.65 in 1951. The committee argues we must have cheap raw materials. How are we going to get cheap raw materials with current wage levels? Wage payments represent 65 percent of the national income and are a direct cost in producing any raw material. A study of our American economy will prove that wage levels cannot exceed the income level as established by raw material production.

So, Mr. President, what they are saying is that they want the workingman to have a higher standard of living, and then they cut his throat by the importation of goods through the sweat-shop labor of the world.

The record of the United States proves that our price level has been consistently higher than the rest of the world for many years. If it takes cheaper raw materials to increase our living standard how did it happen that with higher prices protected by tariffs the United States has far outstripped the world in progress?

The answer is that income is created by production and we had the resources from which to produce. We will always have raw material supplies if we will develop new sources of production.

The rest of the world has lagged behind because of low prices which would not permit the creation of new capital with which to expand production.

Under the committee's program we would take the capital we have created by production in the United States, use it to develop other nations and abandon our own.

Mr. President, the only thing that keeps private money from being invested in the development of these resources is free trade. As long as there is an emergency, there is a market, because we are buying raw material and manufactured products from foreign nations. But every investor knows he has been stung anywhere from one to three times in this country because of this policy. Just the minute the emergency is over, the investment in these materials is destroyed. The junior Senator from Nevada has already described how he goes to the Government to get a short amortization period, with no taxes until his amortization is over. Then he borrows the money from the Government to put into the investment, and gets a guaranteed price. What kind of money is going into these investments, Mr. President? It is taxpayers' money; it is not private money. There is more private money today ready to go into these investments than there is room for it. But the Government policies themselves keep driving money out.

Mr. President, in following their policies, we might as well notify the States west of the Missouri River that we are going to give that area back to the Indians. There is just a slight problem there. We have an organization known as the Indian Bureau, which now costs us $90,000,000 a year, not to take care of Indians, but to build up an Indian bureau. So with the policies we have now adopted, we might have some trouble in giving the States back to the Indians, because the Indians are natively intelligent.

PROGRAM TO DESTROY THE UNITED STATES

It is indeed hard to believe that a committee of American citizens, with the finest economic record in the world at their disposal, should present such a report to the American people. The program set forth will destroy the United States, and is a far greater threat than the expansion of communism.

Mr. Lincoln once said that if this country is ever destroyed, it will be from within, not from without. Mr. Lincoln must have been psychic. He knew that sometime, somewhere, a crowd of people imbued with the idea of one economic world might get control of the Government and destroy the economic system of the United States of America.

Mr. President, in these days of confusion, the committee could have been helpful in pointing out the differences in cost factors in the United States and other nations, and then could have made the point that to maintain and expand our raw material production it would be necessary to maintain a price based on American costs.

A MORE CONSTRUCTIVE PROGRAM

The committee could do very valuable work by pointing out that with wages of $1.50 or $1.75 an hour, prices must be comparable. The committee could point out to the people of the United States that if they desire lower prices, they must take lower wages. Do not lie to the American people and tell them they can take the low-wage production of sweat-shop labor nations of the world, and still maintain their living standard and their wage rate here. It is impossible. The committee has simply misrepresented the facts. It is not telling the American working man and the American investor the truth.

Mr. President, from that as a foundation, if we have such a report, we can import such materials as we may require at a price level at least equal to the cost of producing a similar product in the United States.

I point out that a tariff or a flexible import fee does not stop imports; it brings in imports on our level of wage-standard of living and production. There is never any dearth of materials we need. Under that system we have always secured and can continue to secure from 4½ to 5 percent of our production in foreign trade, simply because that 4½ to 5½ percent represents goods that other nations cannot produce for themselves. When they can, they generally buy, as I have said, when we give them the money with which to buy, and then perhaps only half or less than half of the money we give them is utilized in this country.

With such a program a prosperous United States would help to stabilize world prices at or near the American level. In other words, as I have already outlined, it would be an encouragement to other nations to raise their standard of living, not to lower it.

A recent report of the United Nations called attention to the fact that more than one-half of the world's population has an annual per capita income of about $100. How can we expect the demand from such an income level to create the price level we need to keep the United States solvent? We cannot expect it to, and if we follow the program advocated by the President's committee, lower prices will force the United States into bankruptcy and economic decay.

JUST ANOTHER STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM

Let me point out that this is only one report. It is just one step in the process that has been going on. It was suggested as far back as 1889, although in the last 20 years it has never missed a beat. It has been a complete plan of socialization and economic one-worldism.

If anything could be plainer than the utterances of United Nations representatives, the utterances of this committee, I am at a loss to know what it could be.

The committee, although its points to the possibility of domestic production, removed this possibility by eliminating all protection to the domestic producer, who is confronted with a domestic wage and tax level, far beyond that of his foreign competitor.

The committee has made the mistake of believing that we can have our cake and eat it. Under their program, we cannot maintain our American price level. This in turn means that we will not be able to continue the domestic production level which we now have. With a drop in our physical production of raw materials and a drop in our price level, a drop in our national income will follow, thus destroying both the market for our domestic production and the market for imports.

Under the committee's program we would continue to high-grade the natural resources which are now being used, and when these are exhausted we will abandon our production. Instead of protecting our standard of living, the President's committee would abandon it and join the rest of the world in poverty and starvation.

The end result of the program advocated by the President's committee can be illustrated by the very shortage of minerals mentioned by the committee.

We have been following the program which they advocate since 1935, when the trade agreements were put into operation. Competition of cheap foreign products produced with cheap labor have prevented domestic production.

As the junior Senator from Nevada has pointed out, it has run all private money out of investment. In other words, the only money now being invested in those businesses, where the tariffs have been tampered with, or where the threat exists, is the taxpayers' money, through three methods already outlined: short amortizations, borrowing Government money, and fixing the unit prices by using money from the taxpayers' pockets.

In 1929, 1,017,000 workers were employed in our mining industry. Since that time there has been a 30-percent increase in our population, and, in turn, in our labor force. To produce a comparable supply of minerals we should be employing 30 percent more workers in mining than we employed in 1929, or a total of 1,322,000. That is the number we should be employing. Instead of this total, our employment in the mining industry in May 1952, at a time when we are trying to expand our production, totaled 899,000, or approximately 69 percent of the employment we ought to have to keep up our raw material production in proportion to our industrial needs.

FREE TRADE AND FREE IMMIGRATION

It is an interesting situation to find Congress overriding the President's veto of the immigration bill, which restricts the importation of labor, while on the other hand the same Congress is in accord with the trade agreement policy, which imports cheap raw materials to break down our price level and take away jobs from our own workers.

The junior Senator from Nevada yesterday voted to override the President's veto, because he is against importation of large numbers of cheap foreign labor from Europe and Asia. On the other hand, he also votes against free trade, which brings products of those same people into this country to compete with the higher wage standard of living of American workers.

The junior Senator from Nevada has said many times that one cannot consistently vote for free trade and vote against free immigration.

PRODUCTION AT AMERICAN PRICE LEVEL

Since 1940 we have become 30 percent dependent upon other nations for raw materials. By employing 30 percent more workers in the mining industry we can overcome the shortage. The shortage which the committee complains about is not due to a lack of resources. It is due to the lack of a program to produce at the American price level.

Let us review the situation which existed at the time of the war. We had built our industrial program to the point where we are able to produce more goods than any other nation or combination of nations in the world. What happened? Toward the end of the war the propaganda started to the effect that, of course, we must not have unemployment, meaning that the people who had congregated in the industrial centers must be kept employed in those centers. Therefore the idea was sold to the American people, and I suppose to the Congress of the United States—the junior Senator from Nevada was not a Member of the Senate at that time—that if private industry could not furnish full employment the Government must do so. When the people were sold that bill of goods, they were sold a bill of goods which included the appropriation of money and sending it to Europe to buy goods, rather than keeping workmen here employed. That is exactly what the Marshall plan was. The European nations know that, and they sneer at us when they talk about it. The reason they knew they were going to get the Marshall plan, the reason they knew they were going to get ECA, the reason they knew they were going to get the point 4 program, the reason they knew they were going to get mutual security, and the reason they know they are going to continue to get it, is to hold up our own economy.

On May 28 of this year the junior Senator from Nevada quoted on the floor of the Senate, a resident of England, who was quoted in the Wall Street Journal and other daily newspapers as saying, in his arrogant manner, that the American people could have their choice—they could either keep sending the dollars to Europe, or they could continue to open their markets and allow foreign nations to sell their goods here. He was about the first man in England who verified what the junior Senator from Nevada had been saying on the floor of the Senate for 5½ years. In other words, the money was to make up the trade-balance deficits, until the markets could be divided.

There were rumors that the crockery people, the textile people, and many of the other industries, in order to save their employment and investments, were going to ask for a review of the tariff so as to have the tariff represent the differential between the wage-living standard here and abroad. This English resident to whom I have referred sneered at the American workingmen and investors and said, "All right; you can leave your markets open to us, or you can continue to send the dollars from your over-burdened taxpayers." He knew whereof he spoke, because now we find, in the four or five reports to which reference has been made, an effort to continue the policy.

Mr. President, a realistic program would provide for domestic production at an American price level. Any additional needs should be imported at a price equivalent to the American costs. That is what the tariff is for. We do not need a brain trust; we do not need bureau officials, most of whom, as the junior Senator from Nevada has said, are either failures in business or have never been in business, to spend the money of the American taxpayers to buy materials from foreign countries. All we need is a flexible import fee, established on the principle of fair and reasonable competition. The administration of the law should be turned over to the Tariff Commission.

I digress to say that the principle to which I have referred is exactly the same as the principle which Congress finally fixed for the railroads. For a long time every railroad had a different freight rate for every shipper and every railroad had a different rate from the other railroads. That plan did not work very well, so a principle was finally laid down. What was that principle? The Interstate Commerce Commission was created, and it said to the railroads, "You will fix the freight rates on the basis of a reasonable return on the investment."

The junior Senator from Nevada served for 8½ years on the Public Service Commission of Nevada. Hearings to determine the valuation of a utility property may extend over a period of 6 months, a year, or 2 years. What was the aim under the principle which had been established? The law is very simple. A fair basis for valuation of the equipment must be established. What is the basis upon which we must endeavor to fix a reasonable return? We take into consideration the original cost, the replacement cost, depreciation, and perhaps 100 other factors, but we finally arrive at a figure representing what the railroad, the bus line, or the public electric utility is worth.

What do we do after we determine the valuation of the property? We fix a reasonable return. What is a reasonable return? In the case of a transportation company or an electric company located in an agricultural community, it is likely to be long-lived, and a low rate of return may be very reasonable. However, in the case of a mining property, a construction camp, or something which is likely to end at an early date, a higher rate of return is fixed.

The Congress of the United States did not go into all the details. It did not specify in detail how the determination of a reasonable return was to be arrived at. It simply required a reasonable return on the investment.

The basis or principle upon which a tariff should be established is that of fair and reasonable competition. That is all that is needed. The differential in price should be protected by a flexible tariff in an amount equal to the difference in price for domestic and foreign ores, in the case of mining, but with respect to any material the same principle applies. Without such a program we shall find our economy forced to decay as we depend upon trade instead of production for the income to maintain our standard of living.

With a flexible tariff differential the United States would offer every incentive to an adjustment upward in the price of foreign raw materials, the first step in an increase in the standard of living in other nations.

It may be said, "The price is right now. Why does not private money go into this business?" It is because Congress continues to interfere, or to hold out a threat of interference, and because no principle is established. The Congress must establish a principle under which the owner of the private money for investment may figure for himself what the competitive market in the United States is to be, knowing that any

like foreign product is coming in on a basis of fair and reasonable competition. Then the prospective investors and workers in the United States will be working together to make the principle succeed.

What do we have when we have free trade? Everyone is rushing to Washington to get his share of money out of the Treasury, and the taxpayer pays the bill.

We have before us a series of reports from a commission which I would not go so far as to say is a nonentity, but a commission having little reputation among the engineers and economists of the Nation. This report is prepared on the basis of a program established by the one-worlders and the Fabian Socialists over a period of 70 years, and which they are trying to introduce into this Nation. The commission ignores every principle of development, laboratory experiments, and inventions which make for progress.

FUTURE FOR TITANIUM

At the present time my own State of Nevada is the center of titanium production. What is titanium ore? What is titanium metal? It is metal which is twice as strong, for the same weight, as aluminum. It will not corrode in water, even in sea water. It will not catch fire even in the high speeds above supersonic speeds. Therefore it must in a very reasonably short period of time replace aluminum and stainless steel; certainly in the production of fighter planes.

Just as soon as the price becomes reasonable it will replace the metal in commercial planes.

Two or three years ago it was costing $44 a pound. It now costs about $15 a pound. In a comparatively short time, with volume production, the price will probably come down to a dollar a pound or less.

Mr. President, it will revolutionize the construction of transportation equipment, because an airplane can be made 25 to 35 percent lighter and safer. A tank will be that much lighter. Titanium ore is about the fourth most plentiful substance in the earth's surface. There is no scarcity of the ore. There are several known deposits in my State of Nevada. Of course they must be explored before it can be made useful commercially. It is plentiful in Australia, and a large quantity of it has been recently discovered in Canada. The Western Hemisphere is self-sufficient so far as titanium is concerned. It will replace materials in the moving and transportation equipment.

URANIUM ENERGY

Uranium energy right now is feasible in the intermountain country. We hear about all these great reports by Mr. Conant and all the other gentlemen, who say, "The commercial feasibility of uranium is 25 or 50 years away." Others say it is 5 years away. There is no argument about it, though, that it is feasible. Mr. President, feasibility is a relative term. If you regard feasibility in terms of the Boulder or Hoover Dam, where firm power is being sold at 2 mills a kilowatt hour, or at Grand Coulee Dam, where it is very cheap, then we are a long way from feasibility. However, when we speak of feasibility of commercial power in Eureka, Nev., where it is necessary to drill a 2,500-foot shaft and have thousands of gallons of water a minute run through it in order to mine the ore, where there is an estimated 100,000,000 to 150,000,000 tons of lead and zinc at the bottom of the shaft, and when one considers the Diesel engines and the necessity of hauling Diesel fuel 600 or 700 miles—and it is impossible to haul any of it during the wintertime—and power costs 3½ cents a kilowatt hour, it is feasible.

Mr. President, there are places in the intermountain country that the junior Senator from Nevada knows about where uranium power is feasible now. That fact is not mentioned in this great report published by these great finishers of our economic system.

Mr. President, the whole compilation is a disgrace. It is a disgrace to the people of the United States of America and an insult to their intelligence.

THE STRANGE STATEMENT OF GEORGE KENNAN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I read in the press of this week that the Ambassador of the United States to the Soviet Union has recently traveled to London to confer with our Secretary of State about the current Russian attitude toward the United States. I wish to make a brief comment about our Ambassador to Russia, even though the hour is very late.

I should like to refer once more to the curious circumstances surrounding the confirmation of George Kennan to be United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

On the Senate floor, on March 17, I discussed the method by which this confirmation was all but bootlegged through the Senate on March 13, how it was brought up at the very close of business, almost surreptitiously, and hustled through.

I said, in the course of those remarks, that I was most interested in the case of Mr. Kennan since I had a piece of information about him that had come to my attention during the MacArthur hearings. I said that I had expected that hearings would be held on Mr. Kennan's nomination and that I had intended to present my information there.

No hearings whatever were held, Mr. President, and only an obscure notice in the Daily Digest of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 12 gave any warning that the Kennan nomination was about to come to the floor.

Somewhat formally, Mr. President, I addressed my remarks to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] as the Senator most likely to be acquainted with the facts about this ambassadorial rush order.

I admitted that I had not seen the notice in the Daily Digest.

I said then:

> The only excuse I have is press of business. I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has his hands full. So do I. He is a candidate for reelection next fall. So am I. These are busy days. But I cannot help feel that where the nomination of a man to be Ambassador to Russia is concerned, some more forthright warning might be given than a three-line notice in the back of the RECORD with subsequent Senate action with only a few Members present. The voters, if they got wind of this, might be more than suspicious. They would be doubly suspicious if they knew that the nominee had, upon occasion, revealed the fact that the State Department had under consideration the grant of economic aid to the Chinese Communists.

Then, I presented my information on Mr. Kennan with the proper documentation.

What happened, Mr. President?

Not a word has come to me since from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas.

But an Associated Press dispatch appeared in the Washington Star for March 18, 1952. This dispatch quoted a portion of my remarks and then told how Mr. Kennan was reached at Princeton, N. J., and how he was questioned about what I had said.

Then, according to this March 18, 1952, Associated Press dispatch, Mr. Kennan said:

> I have no strong recollection of what the Senator is talking about. I guess his statement is just one of the occupational hazards of Government service.

This comes from the man whose nomination to be Ambassador to Russia has but recently been confirmed by the Senate.

He says he has no strong recollection of what I was talking about.

What I said was that he had told a closed session of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 17, 1949, that the United States Government was going to be in a strong position in dealing with the Chinese Communists because they would require economic assistance.

I cited the transcript of this closed hearing at length.

Mr. Kennan now says he has "no strong recollection of what the Senator is talking about."

Well, Mr. President, I will say to Mr. Kennan and I will also say to the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that what I am talking about is the intent of the State Department to recognize the Chinese Communists.

And I would like to ask Mr. Kennan and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] if they are collaborating with the State Department in this intent to recognize the Chinese Communists, members of the Cominform and close allies of the Soviet Union.

And I would also ask Mr. Kennan—and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]—if either happens to recall the following account from Time magazine for October

15, 1951. The account appears on page 23 of that periodical:

In January 1949, George Kennan, then the top State Department policy planner, made a flat prediction to a Time correspondent: "By next year at this time we will have recognized the Chinese Communists."

On May 17, 1949, the New York Times' Benjamin Welles reported from London that "the United States and British Governments have agreed to coordinate their policies toward eventual recognition of the Chinese Communist regime."

In October 1949, Lincoln White, State Department press officer, said that the United States had begun talks on recognition of Communist China many months previously. He added there would be further conversations in the future with all the nations interested in diplomatic relations with a Chinese Government of unquestionable authority.

In December 1949, Secretary of State Dean Acheson told a Time correspondent: "What we must do now is shake loose from the Chinese Nationalists. It will be harder to make that necessary break with them if we go to Formosa." On the same day, another high State Department source told the same correspondent: "Acheson has been steadily arguing with Truman to go along on an early recognition of Communist China. Just before Truman left for Key West, Acheson got him to admit the logic of early recognition. Truman said that Acheson had made a forceful case. The trouble now isn't with Truman, but in persuading him to override the pressure from congressional and other groups not to recognize."

That is all, Mr. President, I have to say on the Kennan ambassadorship for the present. I shall return to the subject presently.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—AUTHORIZATION FOR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign, during the recess following today's session, the enrolled bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 30, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

James T. Hill, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Margaret Daly Campbell, of Highland Park, N. J., to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

POSTMASTER

Arthur E. Carstens to be postmaster at Hilbert, Wis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 28, 1952

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Walter A. Mitchell, pastor, Fountain Memorial Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we bow in humble submission before the throne of the God of our fathers with the deepest gratitude for Thy love and mercy. We thank Thee for that shelter and succor which are far beyond what the world can give. Help us to love Thee because Thou didst first love us. More than ever before we pray that Thou shalt inspire us with the love of justice and righteousness and with the old American ideals and principles for a better future. Bring us into a unity of soul, mind, and heart, in allegiance to one Lord and one law. Help us, O Lord, to have mighty convictions, mighty surrenders, and mighty endeavors as we rededicate our lives today at the altar of service to our country. May our service be strong, patriotic, and positive.

Wilt Thou graciously remember our President, our Speaker, and all Members and officers of this House. And finally, our Father, we pray that eternal peace shall reign within the hearts of all the nations and within our own lives as individuals.

This we pray today in the name of Jesus, our Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7313. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the said bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. CAIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–25.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3554) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "year", insert "(or on January 1 of such marketing year in the case of Maryland tobacco)."

Page 1, line 10, strike out all after "year" over to and including "and" where it appears the first time in line 2 on page 2 and insert "in which such marketing year begins."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will the gentleman explain the nature of the Senate amendments?

Mr. COOLEY. This bill amends the definition of the carry-over and total supply for Maryland-type tobacco. The amendment made by the Senate is merely in the nature of a clarifying amendment, and is to make it clear that the total supply is not to include tobacco produced during the current marketing year. That, I understand, is the only change made.

Mr. HOPE. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6773) to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That appropriations available for agricultural extension work in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (except the amount apportioned pursuant to section 23 (b) (2) of the Bankhead-Jones Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343d-1)), shall be paid to the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the same proportions as appropriations available for such work in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has the gentleman consulted the other members of the Committee on Agriculture? What effect does this amendment have?

Mr. COOLEY. The Committee on Agriculture met yesterday and unanimously approved the procedure I am following now, that is, to accept the Senate amendment. What actually happened was that the House bill authorized an additional appropriation of $516,000 to prevent reduction in the extension-service funds for those States adversely affected by the census of 1950.

The effect of the Senate amendment is to hold the status quo, so to speak, and to permit the funds to be apportioned, as they have been apportioned, without regard to the 1950 census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBINSON REMOUNT STATION, FORT ROBINSON, DAWES COUNTY, NEBR.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4686) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 3, strike out "50 percent of."

Page 3, after line 5, insert:

"Deeds to the property conveyed pursuant to this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits or fissionable materials as may be found on such lands and the right to the use of the lands for extracting and removing same."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the amendments which were put in by the other body are entirely satisfactory to the gentleman from Nebraska who is the author of the bill, and I see no reason why they should not be accepted.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It is satisfactory I think to the senior member from Nebraska and Senator MORSE from Oregon who presented the amendments. I think it is satisfactory to the city of Crawford.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BROOKS, FISHER, CLEMENTE, COLE of New York, and VAN ZANDT.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include certain excerpts and statements, newspaper articles, and editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix 1.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a complete copy of the funeral services of the late Hon. Karl Stefan. I am informed that it exceeds the usual limit, and the cost is estimated to be $180. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. The truth of the business is that it will not cost anything extra because all the people are employed and all the machinery is in operation so I am sure there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

THE STEEL STRIKE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the Federal authorities charged with the responsibility of expediting the settlement of industrial disputes move themselves to end the steel strike. Our President has gone on a sit-down strike against the Taft-Hartley Act and the country. Our mediation authorities are obviously taking their cue from the White House.

Meanwhile, the industrial production of our country is grinding to a halt. Within the next few days, some of our major steel producers will be shut down. In Cleveland, the Midland Steel Co., General Motors, and the Cadillac tank plant are closing down entirely or working on limited schedules. Our entire economy is gravely threatened.

This issue is bigger than any personal quarrel or political ambition. It is vital to the future of our country that the machinery for settling this dispute be put in motion at once. Without Government intervention at the Presidential level, the issues would long since have been resolved. It is up to Mr. Truman now to set the wheels which he stopped back into motion. Management and labor are ready to talk. Our Government must not keep them apart.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 121]

Aandahl	Burdick	Doughton
Abernethy	Carlyle	Eaton
Addonizio	Carnahan	Evins
Albert	Case	Fallon
Allen, La.	Celler	Fenton
Anfuso	Chatham	Frazier
Arends	Clemente	Furcolo
Aspinall	Cole, N. Y.	Gore
Bates, Ky.	Combs	Gwinn
Beamer	Coudert	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Beckworth	Cox	Hall, Leonard W.
Belcher	Davis, Tenn.	Hand
Boggs, Del.	Dawson	Hébert
Boggs, La.	Deane	Heffernan
Bolling	Dempsey	Heller
Bonner	Dingell	
Buckley	Donovan	

Herter	Miller, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Holifield	Mitchell	Shafer
Jackson, Wash.	Morano	Sheppard
James	Morris	Smith, Wis.
Jones, Hamilton C.	Morrison	Stanley
	Moulder	Steed
Judd	O'Hara	Stigler
Kean	Patten	Stockman
Kelley, Pa.	Philbin	Sutton
Kennedy	Pickett	Tackett
Kilburn	Potter	Thompson, Tex.
King, Calif.	Powell	Vail
King, Pa.	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson
Kirwan	Reed, Ill.	Welch
Kluczynski	Richards	Wharton
Larcade	Rogers, Tex.	Wickersham
Lyle	Sabath	Willis
McDonough	Sasscer	Wolcott
McKinnon	Scott, Hardie	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Next week will be one of those uncertain weeks. Almost anything can develop, as we all know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And probably will.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. For the guidance of the Members as to what we hope we will be able to take care of, in addition to other matters which might arise such as conference reports and other things which cannot be anticipated, on Monday there will be two contempt proceedings out of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I might remind the House that it is the policy on such matters to have a roll call so that no technical questions can be raised in any court proceedings as to the presence of a quorum. I do not imagine there will be much debate on those two matters.

Then there is a bill, H. R. 6544, in relation to the Independence National Historical Park. That concerns Philadelphia and it was brought to my attention by my colleagues from Philadelphia, the Democratic representatives and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HARDIE SCOTT] who introduced the bill. The five Democratic Congressmen have been very cooperative with him, and have asked me to program it, and I am putting it on the program for Monday. Messrs. BARRETT, GREEN, CHUDOFF, and GRANAHAN are urging that it be programed, and they are strong for the bill. At their request I am putting it down for Monday, and I think it is a good thing to do.

Then there is H. R. 8122. That is the dual parity program. That relates to the farmers of our country. I think that is 90 percent, and extending the support prices for a period of 2 years.

There is House Resolution 689, authorizing the Judiciary Committee to file reports with the Clerk of the House when the House is not in session.

Then there is H. R. 7871, the emergency flood-control bill.

If some of these bills cannot get through on Monday, I may have to get them in later on during the week, because on Tuesday there is the Private Calendar and the omnibus judges bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there will be three conference reports also on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would also include in the names I mentioned a moment ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. My uncle is president of the Independence Hall Association, and the bill was introduced by Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, at his instance, at my request and the request of other Members of Congress from Pennsylvania. At far as I know all Members of Congress from Pennsylvania on both sides have heartily supported the Independence Hall Association. A great deal of the work is progressing. It is a beautiful sight, and when the weather is better we hope all Members of Congress will come up and see what Independence Hall looks like.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is fine. I meant to include my friend's name. It shows what united action on the part of the membership on both sides can do. The delegation of Democratic Congressmen were in to see me the other day, and they were urging that I get it on the program. I know that is pleasing to my two Republican friends from Philadelphia, and will be pleasing to the people of Philadelphia.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Any constructive action is pleasing to the Republican Members from Philadelphia.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is constructive, of course, is a question of fact. But we all agree that this is constructive.

Then there is the omnibus judge bill.

On Tuesday there is the Oklahoma primary, and the usual understanding will apply to that. Any roll call on that day will go over until Wednesday.

Wednesday is Consent Calendar day and there will be suspensions. I am unable to state what the suspensions will be now because that is a matter of consultation, but I will announce them as soon as I can.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A great deal of interest is manifested on this side of the aisle as to the so-called mine safety bill. Will that be programed?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill, in my opinion, is a must, if we can get it up. That is one of the things under consideration, whether it will be taken up under suspension of the rules or not. I am for any action that will get it up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Inquiry is made for the information of the House, to let them know we are making an earnest effort to get it considered.

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill should come up. As far as I am concerned, and I know the gentleman from Massachusetts agrees, it is a must. There is a tremendous feeling in favor of the bill on both sides of the aisle.

Then there is H. R. 7888, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. That is on Wednesday.

I made a promise to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] that that bill would come up. It will follow the suspensions on Wednesday. Conference reports, of course, will take precedence, but that is the tentative order.

Then there is S. 2260 relating to the motor carrier securities, and

S. 2357 relating to horticultural commodities.

Any further program will be announced later with, of course, the usual reservation on conference reports.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the other Members of the House, that the Korean veterans' bill is being considered in the Senate today. I feel confident that it will pass today and that we will be able to get the conference report before the House early next week. Congress cannot afford to adjourn until that measure is finally passed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we all agree with the gentleman on that.

May I say to the membership that it is very important that each Member be here every day next week.

CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on House Joint Resolution 430, approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8370, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read down to and including line 13 on page 19 of the bill.

Are there further amendments to be offered at this time?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 19, line 10, after the word "bases" strike out the colon, insert a semicolon and the following: "of the total

amount appropriated in this paragraph $12,000,000 shall be allocated to the Lowry Air Base at Denver, Colo."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is designed for the purpose of protecting lives and property within my own congressional district. This is based upon a survey that has been made and is the result of four plane crashes at Lowry Field air base, Denver, Colo., within the last 8 years.

At the time the Korean war broke out they moved the training command of the B–29 gunnery to Lowry Field with the result that the Lowry Field air base, which at that time had a runway of approximately 8,000 feet, was unable properly to handle the B–29's without hazard to the people of the city and county of Denver. In the fall of last year a B–29 crashed near this base and it resulted in the death of eight airmen. Fortunately no civilians were killed. At the time of the crash it hit approximately a block of houses within the city and county of Denver and it was only two blocks from a school in which there were approximately 250 children.

We of the Colorado delegation took this matter up with the Air Force. I direct attention to page 34 of the committee report in which it is stated:

In the first place, the committee learned that the 1952 public works program for the three services was far from being firm, even though the committee had been given assurances at the time that the program was firm. As to the 1953 program, the committee learned from the Director of the Budget that it had been presented to both the Armed Services Committee and to this committee at too late a date "to do an effective job of reviewing and examining."

May I point out to the members of the committee that we asked the Air Force to take this up, which they did. We submitted to them many suggestions as to the proper method and manner of meeting this hazard as it exists at Lowry Air Base.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman go before the committee and ask for a hearing on this item?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. We first took it up with the Air Force through the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TABER. But the gentleman did not go before the Appropriations Subcommittee so that it might have an opportunity to look into that particular matter?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That is correct. This is not an additional appropriation nor is there an additional amount requested.

Mr. TABER. It is not included with the budget estimate?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. In the $1,200,000,000? I do not know. The only thing I do know is that according to the report submitted by the committee no mention or reference whatsoever is made to Lowry Air Force Base at all and because of that and because of the hazards and dangers in connection therewith and because of the statement made by the report of the committee, I feel that this is the only opportunity the Air Force will have to rectify the condition that exists at the present time. According to the report that they gave to the Colorado delegation, they estimate it will cost approximately $12,000,000 to get this job done.

(On request of Mr. MAHON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS of Colorado was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is to be commended for his interest in Lowry Field. But is it not true that there is no authorization for this project which he is discussing, there are no funds in the bill for it and no request for funds for this project either through the Armed Services Committee or the Committee on Appropriations? It is true also that if these funds are given to Lowry Field they will have to be taken away from other very essential projects? We have already cut the Air Force request by a half billion dollars. It may be stated also that Lowry Field was given $25,000,000 in the appropriation bill of last year, much of which is unexpended. I know the gentleman is truly concerned about the problem but the gentleman will agree that if officials use the balance of the $25,000,000 and they want additional funds they may apply for them. I think the gentleman should withdraw his amendment because, in my opinion, the House will not adopt the amendment under the circumstances. There is nothing that would justify the gentleman's request at this time.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well then, if that is true, may I ask the gentleman what is the meaning of your report on page 34? You say:

As to the 1953 program the committee learned from the Director of the Budget that it had been presented to both the Committee on Armed Services and to this committee too late a date to do an effective job of reviewing and examining.

Then you go ahead and you state positively here that they have no firm commitments.

Mr. MAHON. The bases are listed, and in the justifications and the hearings the amounts are provided for each base. But, Lowry Field is not among those included. So, it seems to me that the gentleman's amendment is premature. It might be appropriate next year, but I cannot see how it would be applicable at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in this morning's issue of the Washington Post there is an article regarding the Wholesale Liquor Dealers Association, headed by Mr. Kronheim, who testified regarding political contributions. In one paragraph it lists me as having received $100 contribution from the liquor dealers. A man named Porter was reported to have said by the Washington Post that in 1949 he made certain contributions to various Democratic Members of the Congress totaling $5,800 and $100 to EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, Republican of Massachusetts.

It is my practice, Mr. Chairman, not to take any contributions for my campaigns. I certainly did not receive or take $100 from Mr. Porter. I hope the Washington Post will correct the error. I believe Mr. Porter did not make any such statement before the committee. He could not have, because it is not true. And a member of the House Committee said that my name was not mentioned at the hearings.

[From the Washington Post, Tuesday July 1, 1952]

CORRECTION

Seton Porter, president of the National Distillers Products Corp., of New York, testified before a House Judiciary Subcommittee last Friday.

He made no mention of any campaign contribution to Rep. Edith Nourse Rogers (R., Mass.) as reported in the Washington Post. The Washington Post regrets the error.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I admire, naturally, the solicitude of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] in looking after the interests of the air base at Lowry Field. Lowry Field is a great air base of the Air Force. I have had occasion to inspect it in the past, but they do have there at the present time, Mr. Chairman, a real problem due to the hazards surrounding the approaches to the field and the crowded conditions around it. I discussed the matter with the Air Force, and the matter is being investigated to see how the hazard can be removed and the normal use of the field continued. I think in fairness to Lowry Field the best thing to do is to let this matter run its regular course. A commission headed by General Doolittle has been set up to study this problem, due to the fact that not only at Lowry Field, but at other fields throughout the Nation, there are hazards to the approaches to the fields. That commission is working hard on the problem. Lowry, perhaps, is not in better shape than any other air base in the country in this respect. When we get the report from the Doolittle committee I think we will know what the situation is with reference to Lowry Field.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that this matter has been referred to the Air Force; that they have made an estimate and determined that there is this hazard to the people of the city of Denver.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; there is that hazard, and they want to do something to relieve the situation to protect Lowry Field. I agree with the gentleman that Lowry Field is a great air base, and it is a valuable asset to the Air Force.

Mr. MAHON. They have $25,000,000 they have not used.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. That was given under a program of training between 18,000 and 20,000 men, and that was for barracks and facilities. I did not understand it was to be used for runway purposes, hence this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado), there were—ayes 21, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 19, line 2, strike out "$1,200,000,000" and insert "$1,120,000,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike $80,000,000 from this item of $1,200,000,000. The reason for this amendment is found in a report which was presented to and adopted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments earlier in the week. A subcommittee of that committee on which served the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], joined in a unanimous report, adopted by the full committee without objection and which reads as follows:

JUNE 27, 1952.

OVERPROGRAMING FOR AIR FORCE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee has found that over $80,000,000 of programed expenditures for Air Force troop housing is unnecessary. This finding resulted from a base-by-base analysis of 105 major Air Force bases, using figures furnished by the Air Force. In testimony at a hearing the Air Force has acknowledged the accuracy of the subcommittee's analysis and has already initiated action to correct deficiencies in policies and procedures on housing its airmen which would have resulted in building more dormitories than it needs. Simply stated, this would amount to excess building of more than 200 three-story dormitories costing $400,000 each.

The subject of airmen's housing formed a major part of the study of construction at Andrews Air Force Base on which this subcommittee reported to the Congress March 20, 1952 (H. Rept. No. 1623, 82d Cong.). In the report on Andrews the Air Force was found to be planning new dormitories to replace serviceable buildings which had been recently rehabilitated at considerable expense. The Air Force has now advised us that since our earlier report it has strengthened this aspect of its policy. It has applied this revised policy to other bases with a saving of $13,199,000 worth of barracks planned to be built. Following that report, the subcommittee expanded its inquiry to a consideration of over-all Air Force housing in continental United States.

BASIS OF THIS REPORT

Air Force method of computing dormitory requirements

The Air Force policy was to build dormitories for 80 percent of its airmen, on the theory that 20 percent of the men have dependents and will live in homes either on or off the base. At bases where the Air Force estimates that homes for these married airmen would not be available either on the base or in the community, it planned to build dormitory spaces for these men also. A low estimate of the number of houses available in the community (an uncertain and variable factor) results in a higher requirement for dormitory spaces on the base.

Percentage of married airmen

Studies prepared by the Air Force show that 32.2 percent of all airmen are married. Exclusive of the air training command, 30.1 percent live with their dependents.

Excess spaces

The analysis showed that about 30 percent of the buildings for airmen's housing which the Air Force plans to construct would not be needed in the foreseeable future. At a simple 80 percent of troop strength 21.3 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of family housing needs reported by the Air Force to the Housing and Home Finance Agency 29.7 percent of the buildings are excess; on the basis of current experience in family housing 33.4 percent of the buildings are excess.

Two factors inflated the Air Force's estimates of dormitory requirements as presented to the Congress.

(1) The estimate of houses available in the communities at each base was grossly underestimated. For example:

	Airmen actually living in the community as of Jan. 31, 1952	Air Force estimates of homes available in the community
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso, Fla	1,635	0
Kelly AFB, San Antonio, Tex	1,643	0
Rapid City AFB, Rapid City, S. Dak	1,047	100
Castle AFB, Merced, Calif	1,925	200
McChord AFB, Tacoma, Wash	1,407	300

The Air Force is also promoting a program of family housing construction by private agencies. This is done through a finding that an area is a critical area and developing with the Housing and Home Finance Agency relaxed credit and mortgage insurance commitments as a means to induce construction. The effect of this coupled with the dormitory construction would be to provide dormitories and private houses for the same airmen.

(1) The second factor concerns the percentage of airmen for whom dormitory spaces are programed. Although 30 percent of the airmen live off base with dependents, the Air Force policy was to build dormitories to accommodate at least 80 percent of its enlisted strength. This had the effect of providing rooms for at least 10 percent of the airmen who obviously will not occupy the space. The explanation offered the subcommittee for this wasteful program was that prior to Korea only the higher ranks of married enlisted men, approximately 20 percent, were allowed to live off base. Those airmen in the lower ranks who married were not allowed to reenlist. After Korea Congress granted quarters allowance to the lower ranks of enlisted men with dependents. These men now, in the main, also live off base. The Air Force has taken the position that at some time in the future it will be able to return to its old policy and require that these airmen, about 10 percent of its strength, live on the base. Consequently, the Air Force was building, or was planning to build the extra dormitories on the supposition that they might be needed in the future, and even this supposition was predicated on congressional action.

This future need for additional dormitories will not spring up over night. If it should ever arise, the present allowance of 72 square feet per man provides an ample cushion, while new construction is planned and speeded to meet the needs. All of the additional 10 percent now living off the bases could be housed in dormitories on the bases by temporarily reducing individual space allowances to 63 square feet, well above the minimum space allowance established by the Secretary of Defense.

Based on a space allowance of 72 square feet per man it is estimated that there is a surplus of 25,808 spaces in the 1952 program, about $51,616,000, and a surplus in the bill now before Congress of 16,051 spaces, about $32,102,000. (A list of the bases where excess dormitories would have been built by 1955 and the approximate cost, will be found appended to this report.)

CONCLUSIONS

The Air Force has already secured in its 1952 appropriation more than $50,000,000 which it does not need, and has been authorized by the House for its 1953 program over $30,000,000 which it does not need. The appropriation for this latter authorization is about to be considered by the House. These excesses were caused by using faulty estimates of housing dormitories for men who would not live on the base.

Following our first hearing and prior to the hearing held on June 26, 1952, the Air Force changed its policy. Dormitories will now be built to house only 70 percent of the enlisted strength to conform to conditions as they actually exist. Assurances have been provided that action to correct other deficiencies in policies and procedures with respect to airmen's housing have now been initiated by the Air Force. These corrections should include quick and decisive action not only to eliminate future contracts for excess dormitories but to cancel contracts for such dormitories which have been already awarded.

The committee has not had an opportunity to study the wisdom of requiring a rescission of the more than $50,000,000 of excess appropriation provided for fiscal 1952 and recommends to the Appropriations Committee a close scrutiny of this subject.

With respect to the appropriation for fiscal 1953, the committee is not yet advised as to the amount requested of or allowed by the Appropriations Committee. If the full amount has been included in the bill to be considered by the House, an amendment should be offered to reduce the appropriation for dormitory construction by at least $30,000,000.

The Air Force is a young organization and has had limited experience in coping with

the tremendous administrative responsibilities involved in its operations. Competent leadership is required to correct its inefficiencies. The committee is grateful particularly to Assistant Secretary Edwin V. Huggins for his cooperative attitude and for his manifest determination to make improvements. It is unfortunate that a congressional committee had to point out the deficiencies herein discussed but it is gratifying that Secretary Huggins has taken prompt corrective action. We believe that he has a consciousness of the necessity for economy in the operations of the Air Force. He has assured us that faulty policies have been corrected and that he will seek to eliminate ineptitude in effectuating those policies.

When added together the unnecessary programed expenditures discussed in this report aggregate nearly $100,000,000. It is gratifying to have assurance from the Air Force Assistant Secretary that he will not permit the construction of barracks which are destined to stand empty.

Alexandria Air Force Base, Alexandria, La	$1,314,000
Altus Air Force Base, Altus, Okla	574,000
Ardmore Air Force Base, Ardmore, Okla	412,000
Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La	1,440,000
Camp Beale Air Force Base, Camp Beale, Calif	2,154,000
Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas	492,000
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex	776,000
Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Ark	822,000
Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex	612,000
Campbell Air Force Base, Hopkinsville, Ky	214,000
Carswell Air Force Base, Ft. Worth, Tex	1,380,000
Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif	1,082,000
Charlestown Air Force Base, Charlestown, S. C	820,000
Clinton Air Force Base, Clinton, Okla	1,468,000
James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex	1,070,000
Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz	1,028,000
Donaldson Air Force Base, Greenville, S. C	1,328,000
Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Del	1,914,000
Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc Lake, Calif	1,842,000
Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla	3,594,000
Ent Air Force Base, Colorado Springs, Colo	604,000
Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash	1,112,000
Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans	2,860,000
Foster Air Force Base, Victoria, Tex	398,000
Galveston Air Force Base, Galveston, Tex	566,000
Grandview Air Force Base, Grandview, Mo	674,000
Great Falls, Air Force Base, Great Falls, Mont	434,000
Gunter Air Force Base, Gunter, Ala	354,000
Hanscom Air Force Base, Bedford, Mass	1,122,000
Harlingen Air Force Base, Harlingen, Tex	1,404,000
Holoman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, N. Mex	698,000
Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga	1,556,000
Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex	11,488,000
Kinross Air Force Base, Kinross, Mich	528,000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. M	$2,568,000
Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La	2,652,000
Lakeland Air Force Base, Lakeland, Fla	818,000
Langley Air Force Base, Hampton, Va	1,754,000
Laredo Air Force Base, Laredo, Tex	698,000
Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash	1,540,000
Laughlin Air Force Base, Del Rio, Tex	754,000
Lawson Air Force Base, Columbus, Ga	690,000
Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine	1,878,000
Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr	2,700,000
Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio	2,412,000
March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif	2,018,000
Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif	856,000
McGuire Air Force Base, McGuire, N. J	734,000
Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho	4,332,000
Newcastle Air Force Base, Newcastle, Del	650,000
Niagara Falls Air Force Base, Niagara Falls, N. Y	290,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr	666,000
O'Hare Air Force Base, O'Hare, Ill	302,000
Paine Air Force Base, Paine, Wash	366,000
Palm Beach Air Force Base, Palm Beach, Fla	2,320,000
Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla	548,000
Plattsburg Air Force Base, Plattsburg, N. Y	498,000
Pope Air Force Base, Ft. Bragg, N. C	2,496,000
Portsmouth Air Force Base, Portsmouth, N. H	2,276,000
Raleigh-Durham Air Force Base, Raleigh, N. C	390,000
Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak	710,000
Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex	574,000
Sedalia Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Mo	1,396,000
Selfridge Air Force Base, Selfridge, Mich	588,000
Selman Air Force Base, Monroe, La	1,310,000
Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, N. C	560,000
Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans	4,328,000
Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev	232,000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Suffolk County, N. Y	1,016,000
Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif	1,802,000
Truax Air Force Base, Truax, Wis	370,000
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex	778,000
Wichita Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans	618,000
Camp Wolters Air Force Base, Camp Wolters, Tex	1,700,000

Let me repeat two statements, from the report:

The subcommittee has found that over $80,000,000 of programed expenditures for Air Force troop housing is unnecessary. This finding resulted from a base-by-base analysis of 105 major Air Force bases, using figures furnished by the Air Force. In testimony at a hearing the Air Force has acknowledged the accuracy of the subcommittee's analysis.

* * * * *

The Air Force has already secured in its 1952 appropriation more than $50,000,000 which it does not need, and has been authorized by the House for its 1953 program over $30,000,000 which it does not need.

Note the situation: This matter was before the Committee on Appropriations, and the Air Force succeeded in persuading that committee through its subcommittee to give it this $80,000,000, which the amendment would strike, which the Hardy committee finds—and mark this—and which the Air Force now agrees it does not need. Why not recapture that amount from the total of this particular item which carries it. This reduction will not result in less money for any other activity which the Committee on Appropriations has passed upon. It but strikes from the $1,200,000,000 the $80,000,000 which the Air Force says it does not need for the purpose for which it was requested.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman makes a good point. It has been anticipated that 80 percent of the airmen would be single, whereas only 70 percent are single and live in these barracks so they are not going to need as many barracks as they thought they would need. In the whole program, they have only had about one-fifth of what they need, and in the whole program they need far more barracks than they have had. In view of the fact that we have cut the Air Force request here by over a half-billion dollars and taking into consideration in that cut the problem which the gentleman has presented, I think it would be dangerous for us to cut any deeper.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I get the argument. I assume the gentleman will make this same argument when he opposes the amendment. What his argument amounts to is this. And here are the facts, and let us not get away from it. The Air Force asked the Committee on Appropriations and it got $50,000,000 for 1952, and $30,000,000 for 1953 for the construction of barracks. The committee headed by Mr. HARDY, and all the credit belongs to the gentleman from Virginia and to the members of his subcommittee. I merely picked it up because I understood it would not be offered on the majority side—now look—the Air Force got this $80,000,000. They admit they do not need it, and the argument of the gentleman opposing it is this: That the Air Force program will be expanded at some time in the future, and therefore the Committee on Appropriations having authorized $80,000,000 too much the gentleman contends we should permit the Air Force to keep it on hand for some future activity. That ignores the principle and the practice that the Committee on Appropriations should be advised accurately of what the Air Force or any other force needs when asked to make appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. MAHON), Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; but will the gentleman give me one of the minutes that he has secured?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Now the Air Force people have come repeatedly to the committee and asked to reprogram some of these items for which funds have been provided because with experience they are learning, for example, that they do not need as many barracks per man as they thought they needed. So the committee has been consulted, and has agreed to these reprograming efforts on the part of the Air Force, and all the money will be required for the Air Force program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now look here. This is the fact and you cannot get away from it. The Air Force went to the Committee on Appropriations, and it asked for $80,000,000 which is carried in this bill, in this item and which it now says it does not need for the purpose for which it was requested. The argument of the gentleman is only this: We should let them have this $80,000,000; to spend some time in the future for any purpose it may consider desirable. And the answer to that is that when they or any department wants money, it should go first to the Committee on Appropriations and they should give them accurate information justifying their request. Otherwise why an appropriation committee? Why not a lump sum over all appropriations? No one is claiming any fraud or anything like that, they just did not figure out right. They have $80,000,000 they do not need, and my argument is that we should take it out of this item and then let the Air Force, if they are expanding or if they need it for other purposes, come back to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for the money it needs for any purpose and the House will give them what they need. We should not leave $80,000,000 million floating around somewhere in the air hoping or expecting that the Air Force is going to need and spend it for something—some purpose for which it was not appropriated. We have too much of that now.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If my time has not expired, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(On request of Mr. TABER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan was allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.)

Mr. TABER. When we took up this appropriation we were told, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said, they had figured their barracks proposition too heavy. That was one of the elements that resulted in the reduction for construction by the Air Force in the United States and overseas of $563,000,000. If that is not enough to cover this situation where they do not need the money, that would be one thing, but I think we should have something to show that the $563,000,000 cut is not enough. I wonder if there is anything along that line in sight.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Here is the answer to that: It is the same answer I have given before. The Air Force comes before the Appropriations Committee. It says, "We need money for barracks, including barracks, down here at Andrews Field." They get the money, fifty million for 1952 and thirty million for 1953. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] and his subcommittee go into this matter and they find, and the Assistant Secretary agrees with them, that they do not need, they do not intend to use that fifty and thirty million dollars.

My point is only this: That that item of $80,000,000 included in this total should be taken out. Then, if later the Air Force finds it needs the money, let it come to the Appropriations Committee. Any other course would establish a policy of giving them what they ask, in that and every department, and then, when they find they made a mistake, that the request was too large, leave it in there, put it through the House even when there is no need for it, even though it is admitted that had the facts been known the Appropriations Committee would not have included it.

Mr. GROSS. Any other course negates the action of the Hardy committee, does it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman will speak for himself. I can see little to be gained by investigation if not followed by appropriate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the matter I tried to clear up in the closing minutes of the debate yesterday. I tried rather unsuccessfully to get it understood. Maybe my presentation was not clear, but I am not sure that the explanations provided by the committee were full and complete.

I had given some consideration to offering an amendment similar to that offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I decided not to do it because I was not able to determine what effect it might have on the Air Force, and my thoughts ran along the line of the discussion which was raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a moment ago.

There are two aspects to this amendment. One of them is the question of the more than $30,000,000 in the authorization for 1953, which the Air Force cannot and will not use. I have no way of knowing the extent to which the reduction in barracks construction was given consideration by the Appropriations Committee, and whether a substantial part of that five hundred and sixty-eight million cut which the Appropriations Committee made was based on this barracks reduction. If the gentleman can answer that question, I can determine my own position, or what my position should be with respect to this amendment.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I shall be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RILEY. If the gentleman will look at pages 37 and 38 of the committee's report under the category "Housing, troop and family," he will find that the committee has recommended appropriations of between 50 and 60 percent of the authorized housing as authorized by the Armed Services Committee, which is considerably less, I believe, than the figure the gentleman is dealing with.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will straighten this out for me I would appreciate it; I do not know just what he means by 50 percent of the housing. Does that refer to troop housing, family housing, or what?

Mr. RILEY. It is troop and family housing. There is no family housing for the zone of the interior; but there is some for these isolated foreign stations.

Mr. HARDY. My recollection of the authorization bill is that it included amounts for troop housing aggregating $115,000,000 in the continental United States. Am I to understand from the gentleman from South Carolina that in working out the cut which would be applied to the Air Force on its troop housing construction that you instructed them to cut their construction for this year by 50 percent?

Mr. RILEY. We are not asking for more than 50 percent of the amount which has been authorized. I would like to say to the gentleman from Virginia that we have instructed the Air Force to build operational facilities first, even if some of the men have to live in tents; let the barracks come second; the runways, maintenance shops, fuel systems, and things of that kind have to come first. If the gentleman will look at the way this is set up by categories I believe he will find this is true.

Mr. HARDY. I am trying to figure it out, but I say to the gentleman that I cannot understand the hieroglyphics of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman from New York can straighten me out I would be delighted to yield.

Mr. TABER. I just want to get this straight: For housing in this country the authorization figure involved $162,399,000.

Mr. HARDY. That was the total for housing.

Mr. TABER. That is the total amount; and the figure that was allowed was $98,000,000.

Mr. HARDY. For total housing.

Mr. TABER. That would be subject to about a 4-percent reduction because we knocked off $50,000,000 from these total figures.

Mr. HARDY. On the basis of that it would seem to me that the Appropriations Committee has in effect said: You cannot build more than approximately

half the amount of troop housing which you have requested.

Mr. TABER. And on the overseas picture——

Mr. HARDY. I think we might skip that, if the gentleman does not mind, because I am talking about housing in the United States.

There is one other question insofar as I am concerned with respect to continental United States troop housing: With the reduction which the Appropriations Committee has already made I believe that that phase of this amendment should be defeated.

There is one other aspect of it which I think we should still get straight and that is that more than $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated for fiscal year 1952 have not been expended and the Air Force now says it does not need and will not expend these funds for barracks: Should there be a rescission of that? Or what should we do about it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(On request of Mr. MAHON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARDY was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. In the request for public works funds last year——

Mr. TABER. This is last year?

Mr. HARDY. Fiscal 1952.

Mr. MAHON. Fiscal 1952, a large reduction was made in the request for public works of the Air Force which more than accommodates itself to the issue which the gentleman raises. We have over-authorized for housing but we have under-appropriated for housing.

Mr. HARDY. As I recall the testimony of Secretary Huggins on this particular point he advised our subcommittee that the Appropriations Committee had given the Air Force an order to secure their public works construction with $200,000,000 less than they had asked for; that is for fiscal 1952, I am talking about. Am I to understand that $50,000,000 of that $200,000,000 which you told them to hold down is represented by this troop housing?

Mr. MAHON. I think that would be a fair statement. Most of the funds have not been expended, but officials will be back for more next spring. We are at the beginning of a buildup of the Air Force from 95 to 143 wings.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman should know if he does not know that in reference to the matter of going from 95 to 143 wings the actual requirements for troop housing are on many bases reduced.

Mr. MAHON. The over-all requirement for 143 wings is certainly greater for housing than for 95 wings.

Mr. HARDY. I think the gentleman has satisfied me reasonably well. In view of the fact that there was a curtailment in their total funds in the 1952 program of $200,000,000, and this represents only $50,000,000, it would simply avoid having them appear and ask for restoration of the $50,000,000 for some other purposes.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. This report by the Hardy committee is a good example of the information which we on the Committee on Appropriations should have. If the Committee on Appropriations would take greater advantage of committees such as the Hardy committee we could do a better job in the handling of budget requests.

Secondly, we would be most unwise if we did not take advantage of the specific recommendations of the Hardy committee in this instance. They have pointed out clear-cut reasons why we should make this reduction totaling $30,000,000. The argument has been made that if we do not disturb the present recommended funds in the long run it will balance out in the end. Members of this subcommittee on appropriations contend certain reductions take into account the facts submitted to the Congress by the Hardy committee.

This is a loose and slip-shod method. We should make the Air Force account for everything they cannot spend. What they cannot spend we should take away from them. We should not let these funds drift back and forth without firm control by the Congress.

To keep the Air Force on record as to where they spend their money we should approve the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this effort to economize unduly on troop housing and family housing is false economy. There is no branch of the service that needs housing worse than the Air Force does today. I have seen the housing that is being used by the Air Force, and some of it is not fit to house human beings. Yet we are taking men out of civilian life by the draft and housing them under conditions which we should be ashamed of. I want to say this further: That when we take a man into the armed services we obligate ourselves to give that man reasonable housing; and when we fail to appropriate money as we have failed in the past to appropriate money for the men in the armed services, we are welching on the obligation that we have to the servicemen of this country.

It is false economy, Mr. Chairman, because the men that go into the service do not stay in the service when they are inadequately housed. It is false economy because when you take a man with a wife and a family into the service you do not keep him at all. It is false economy because we provide the sum of $51.30 for a private first class with one dependent per month. It is false economy because when we do not provide the housing ourselves we give the serviceman, the private first class, $77.10 if he has two dependents and we give a man with over two dependents $93.90, and we are not saving money when we pay them the housing allotments that we do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, being a member of the Hardy committee, I want first to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] on an outstanding piece of work for the people of this country in pin pointing and exposing a wasteful practice. With the confusion about the appropriation as developed in this debate, I am afraid we are not going to take full advantage of that investigative work.

Certainly this must be true. The Committee on Appropriations made whatever cuts it did wholly without knowledge of the facts developed by the Hardy committee. The lack of need for the $80,000,000, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] would strike out, was not known to the Committee on Appropriations when it acted. Therefore, if the cut the Appropriations Committee made could be substantiated before, certainly you can add $80,000,000 and leave the situation exactly where it was, because the Committee on Appropriations did not act on the basis of this information which has been developed by the Hardy committee only within the last week.

I want to point out that in addition to the $80,000,000, the Air Force also admits that there is $13,000,000, at least, that they can save on other bases, by fixing over existing barracks, based on the Andrews Field report of the Hardy committee. So, in this bill you are giving the Air Force $93,000,000 they do not need, instead of $80,000,000, and the $13,000,000 is not the complete picture. That is simply the amount saved on a survey which is far from finished. We do not know how much more may be saved.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I think the gentleman should emphasize the fact that the Air Force itself admits that this money is not needed.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. These facts were only known within the last week. The Committee on Appropriations could not have acted on the basis of this knowledge, because it was finally confirmed only day before yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to be perfectly frank with the

committee. I am going to tell you just how I feel. There is no such situation as the gentleman from Louisiana describes. There is no use kidding yourselves about that.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I decline to yield. I want the gentleman to understand what the picture is.

There is no situation where anybody in the Air Force is without adequate housing today. These people have not been able to build the things that have been provided for. On top of that, the $50,000,000 that has been developed in the report here that is not needed for construction certainly ought to be taken into consideration. We did take into consideration that they did not need a considerable portion of the funds in the 1953 budget. They evidently had $50,000,000 of surplus in the 1952 funds. This amendment would not take it out, but it would reduce the over-all building funds. They probably have plenty of funds to let all the contracts they ought to let, even if this amendment were adopted. Frankly, I think that $50,000,000 is about as far as it ought to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Hardy committee has done a magnificent job. I think we are all interested in trying to get economy practiced in our Armed Forces. But I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the Subcommittee on Public Works for the Military has been studying since the 1st of February on its own account the constructing programs of all three services. We have gone into the matter thoroughly. We have studied it from every angle possible within that time, and we have taken into consideration the figures which have been shown here today.

I believe, and I think the other members of the subcommittee will agree with me, that every dollar we have appropriated here today is necessary to carry out the program. We have cut these people to the bone and scraped some of the bone in order to make them come up with a firm, reasonable, well-planned program.

There are bases on which you will have to have troop housing. It may be that some of these men are going to have to live in tents on some of these bases. There may be bases already constructed on which there is a surplus of housing, but I submit to you that when you cut the authorization and the request by 50 percent you have cut it enough. I am not going to stand in the way of training Air Force men and I am not going to send the sons of America into air bases where they do not have at least reasonable housing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I should like to make this observation: I believe that if you have already reduced the troop housing item by 50 percent, as stated by the gentlemen, that is a sufficient cut. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RILEY. I thank the gentleman very much for that contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RILEY) there were—ayes 65, noes 83.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 19, line 5, after the word "Missouri" strike out the comma and insert a colon, and on page 19 strike out all on lines 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 to the words *"Provided further."*

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] made a very fine statement protesting vigorously against the creation of new military installations when we have presently existing installations which can be expanded and used, and the taxpayers of the country saved many millions of dollars. I commend the gentleman for his statement of yesterday, and the amendment which I offer today is in line with that. It would simply stop any further construction of this air base at Grandview, Mo., this conversion of a cow pasture municipal airport into an air base. Last year, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], when that subject was under debate, said that this would eventually cost the taxpayers of this country about $40,000,000. I believe the top figure he used was $40,000,000. This is a good place to stop this thing. Last year it was contended and an appropriation of $13,000,000 was provided, that this air base was an urgent proposition, and had to be built right now—right away—no loss of time. A year has gone by, and if I am correctly informed, there has been no more than a million dollars spent on this air base at Grandview, Mo. There are plenty of air bases in the Middle West, which can be expanded. There is an air base at Ottumwa, Iowa, which can be used. It is of permanent, brick construction. I want to point out that it is not in my district. It can be used as an air base. There are plenty of air bases presently existing in the Middle West. Let us use those bases. This is foot-in-the-door legislation. Let us get the foot out of the door.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman realize that there is no money in this bill for the Grandview Air Base so it seems to me that his amendment would not be effective in this regard.

Mr. GROSS. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas, there is no way in the world that I can tell whether there is any money in this bill, whether by some of the devious language in this bill, unexpended balances may be made available for expenditure at Grandview. At least it will be the intent of the Congress here that we do not want to go on with this proposition down there when we have air bases within a comparatively few air miles of Grandview, Mo., which can well be expanded, and air bases that can well be activated, which today are standing idle and falling into ruin.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from Kansas who is constantly striving for efficiency and economy in the Military Establishment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I can confirm the statement made by the gentleman from Texas that there is no money in this bill for Grandview. I would point out that if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, and construction of Grandview proceeds, we would be in the position of doing this: Kansas City, Mo., is holding an election this coming month, July, to turn over the title to the Air Force. If we adopt this amendment I am afraid word will go out to Kansas City that the Air Force does not want fee title, and then the citizens will vote not to grant the fee and we will be in a worse position.

Mr. GROSS. But they have a lease for 25 years which the Government can cancel at will.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Fee title is far better than any 25-year lease, as I am sure the gentleman would agree. I admire the gentleman's zeal in ferreting out these instances of waste; but, as I said, there is no money in this bill for Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to do is to get this thing stopped, and save the taxpayers an eventual expenditure of $40,000,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Any saving to the taxpayers is to be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] is recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], which in my opinion is in effect another effort to again try to discredit a sound and worth while project. I opposed the gentleman successfully last year when he offered a similar amendment. I am sure that no Member of this body will be influenced by his perhaps unintentional but apparent misstatements regarding this matter. Could it be that the gentleman is more zealous about the fact that there are perhaps less desirable locations in his own State of Iowa that he would like to see used than he is for his protestations for economy.

The gentleman questions the Grandview, Mo., program of the Air Force because it happens to be in the same county as the home of the President. He evidently approves of all others as he makes no attack on them. As before he slurringly refers to this fine airfield site as a cow pasture, strangely reflecting on

everybody's judgment except his own He has been advised by members of the committee that his amendment serves no useful purpose because in this present bill no money is being appropriated for its construction—yet he has refused to withdraw his amendment as requested. I feel sure that so much displeasure was felt when the same efforts failed last time that it could possibly be the reason for this action.

I would like to tell the Members that in my opinion much more work has been done and the progress of the major objectives is further along than the gentleman from Iowa would lead you to believe. Only a few days ago the announcements were made regarding the letting of several large contracts for all types of work on the Grandview installations.

I ask the Members to defeat the Gross amendment decisively so that we may remove the incentive for further unwarranted criticism. The Members will remember a much clearer picture of this entire situation was given to the House a year ago by me when the actual consideration of the approval was before us. Therefore it is not my intention to take up further time now of the Members in a repetition of my remarks.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa if he will withdraw his amendment, inasmuch as there is no appropriation in this bill for Grandview.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly not.

Mr. RILEY. Then I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 19, line 2, strike out "$1,200,000,000" and insert "$1,170,000,000."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we have had much worth-while discussion on this particular item. I do think we should try to save a little at least, and from all the evidence given we can cut this $30 million, instead of the $80,000,000 previously offered, without doing the Air Force the least harm I believe I can say that this is entirely in agreement with Mr. Taber's viewpoint, is it not?

Mr. TABER. It is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It will be far better to utilize this $30 million to construct additional jet fighters and bombers, than to construct barracks for which there is no need. Let us help give the men in Korea more planes instead of duplicating construction of unneeded buildings. I hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are now in the midst of the build-up of the Air Force to 143 wings. Of course, it is far below what we need to have if we are to have overwhelming superiority in the air. The Air Force officials came and asked us for $2,000,000,000 at this time for public works. There is no doubt in the world in my mind that they do need $2,000,000,000 for public works. Not only do they not need that, they need twice as much more later on to finish this build-up to 143 wings. But by reason of the work of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY] and his subcommittee, and by reason of the dissatisfaction of the committee with the program presented, the committee said, "Gentlemen, we are for air power. We do not want to cut the striking force of this Nation. We know that this is a dangerous world, but we do not believe you are ready to obligate or spend the money you are asking for. Go back to the Pentagon, get your pencils and work with us and bring us something realistic."

So we worked with them on this program. Finally they said if we would give them in cash $1,250,000,000 they could go forward with this program without slowing down the essential construction until next spring, when they expect to come in for a supplemental, for additional funds. They said, "If you will give up this money, we will take the responsibility for pushing the program forward as fast as it can be pushed." Some Members wanted to make another reduction. So a majority of the Members voted to reduce the figure to $1,200,000,000. This proposed amendment is a reduction of $30,000,000 more, and we are maneuvering the Congress into this position: Then we will take the responsibility ourselves for retarding a program which is already far behind schedule when the responsibility had been assumed by the Air Force when they said: "We can go ahead with maximum speed on $1,250,000,000."

It, therefore, seems to me that in order to put the bee on the Air Force, so to speak, in order to say: "You said you could deliver on $1,250,000,000. Now, go ahead and deliver; it is your responsibility, you said you could do it." That is where we have got them. But we transfer the responsibility to ourselves if we make further reductions in this bill. It seems to me we should not make this reduction of $30,000,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not also true that the Air Force is having to absorb in this $1,250,000,000 an additional $52,000,000 for planning and engineering which they had asked for?

Mr. MAHON. Yes. That is far more than the funds involved in the controversy over barracks which we discussed last year. We cut them more than enough to take care of the barracks picture last year. Let us not maneuver ourselves into the position of trying to stringhalt the Air Force at this time; let us give them the ball and ask them to run with it. Under the circumstances we are strategically in the right position, so let us not maneuver ourselves out of it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. As to the order of priority of the various construction items which are listed on pages 39 and 40, are we to assume that because those items are numbered that that is any indication of their priority?

Mr. MAHON. Not necessarily. Not at all.

Mr. ELSTON. Or does the Air Force have the discretion to take them up in such order of priority as they see fit?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield——

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Did they not refuse absolutely to give us any priority? They could not give us any.

Mr. MAHON. As to whether or not you want a runway built or a parking apron, it would be difficult to give any priority; each is just as important as the other. It has to be left to them if they are to operate succesfully.

Mr. ELSTON. Is there any priority as to stations or locations? Are they required to take any particular one?

Mr. MAHON. These stations are listed in the report; they are all authorized, and they are the stations upon which the funds will be expended. There is no priority as to stations.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, on this business of constructing barracks for the Air Force, I have one small installation in my district, one of those so-called classified installations. I made an inspection of it last fall at the suggestion of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. I believe he sent a similar letter to every Member of Congress urging inspections of installations in their districts. I found there a hotel dormitory type of barracks. I have kicked around over the country in years past and I have stayed in many, many hotels that were inferior to the dormitory type of barracks that has been built in my district at heaven only knows how much extravagance and waste of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. GROSS. No, not at this time.

I saw there a Bendix washer and clothesdrier for every 9 men. I remember back in 1917 in World War I when I was in the service we did our washing with a scrub brush. Today, a Bendix clothes drier and a Bendix washer for every 9 men! Inlaid asphalt floors, beautifully veneered doors for every room, locks on the doors—mind you, brass or bronze door knobs and locks. I put in 3 years in the service but this is the first time in my life that I ever saw a setup where an enlisted man could lock himself in his room.

This is the place where, I told you last year, it has been reported to me they put in some $16 nickel-plated, solid brass toilet paper holders. They are there because I saw them, and they are still there unless they have been removed recently. There are solid brass nickel-plated tooth brush holders in this installation in my district. It is time we get down to rock bottom and stop that sort

of thing because the taxpayers' money is going right out of the window.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman mentioned this matter to me and it was investigated. I have in my office evidence of the investigation. This is just good construction like American boys are entitled to, at permanent installations of this type. It was built firmly rather than of the type built in a theater of operations, it is good construction. Why should not American boys be entitled to reasonably good buildings, particularly when you can buy this cheaper than having something inferior? This is a good piece of construction in which the taxpayer gets his money's worth over a long period of years.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted, I insert at this point in the RECORD a summary of the construction at the base under discussion.

A STATEMENT OF THE TYPE OF AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION AT WAVERLY, IOWA, A PERMANENT AIR FORCE INSTALLATION—GENERAL STATEMENT

Construction plans and specifications were prepared by Holabird and Root and Burgee, architect-engineers, Chicago, Ill., under direction of Office, Chief of Engineers. The district engineer was instructed to use plans and specifications without change, except to correct minor errors in definitives and to adjust as required for site adaptation. The operations building, tower building, radio stations, and central heating plant were designed for masonry construction only. The remainder of the buildings were designed for masonry construction with a wood frame alternate. This is typical practice for the A. C. & W. sites. At Waverly, bids were taken on a basic advertisement for concrete-block buildings throughout with an alternate bid for wood frame on the buildings where frame was permitted. Identical bids were received for both types of construction. Accordingly, the award was made for all masonry buildings.

BUILDING OUTLINE

Airmen barracks and officers quarters: Floors are soft wood with asphalt tile finishing with exception of heater room and mechanical room. Walls are concrete block, furred on inside and finished with gypsum board. Ceilings are gypsum board. The roof is wood frame with roll roofing. The hardware used is as follows: Butts are painted iron; push plates, where required, are bronze; pull plates, where required, are bronze; locks—working parts are bronze, case is painted iron; door knobs are bronze; door closers, where required, are painted iron. All of these items comply to the Federal specifications as outlined in the architect-engineer standard specifications for buildings. Based on a review of the as-built plans, it has been determined that toilet accessories—paper holders, towel racks, tooth brush and tumbler holders—comply with the Federal specifications, which provide for polished unplated white metal fixtures. An exception by the district engineer gave the contractors the option to provide painted or plated white metal.

Mess hall: Floor is concrete slab on grade, no finish. Walls are concrete block, unfinished on the interior except for painting. Ceilings are acoustical tile in dining room, cement asphalt board in kitchen, and gypsum board in storage, toilet, and heater rooms. Roof is of wood frame construction surfaced with roll roofing. The information on hardware and toilet room accessories is the same as for quarters. Kitchen equipment, contractor furnished, consists of stainless steel serving counter, with built-in stainless steel components. The balance of kitchen equipment is standard, Office, Chief of Engineers centrally procured type.

Radio buildings: Floors are concrete slab on grade, finished with asphalt tile, except in boiler room and ventilating room which are exposed concrete. Walls are concrete block, unfinished inside except for painting. Ceiling, no finish. Roof is reinforced concrete with built up roofing. The hardware is the same as referenced above.

Supply, administration, and recreation building: The floor is soft wood with asphalt tile covering in the recreation and administration portions, and concrete slab on grade in supply room. Walls are concrete block, furred and finished with gypsum board in the recreation and administration portions and unfinished in the supply room. Ceiling is gypsum board in the recreation and administration areas and unfinished in the supply room. Roof is wood frame with roll roofing. Hardware same as before. Thresholds are cast iron and overhead door in the supply room is steel. Toilet room accessories same as referenced for airmen's barracks and officers' quarters.

Maintenance building: Floor, concrete slab on grade; walls, concrete block, no interior finish; ceilings, no finishing; roof, wood frame, roll roofing, hardware same as referenced above.

Operations building: Structure frame is reinforced concrete. Floor is concrete slab on grade with asphalt tile finish except in mechanical equipment rooms. Walls, concrete block, unfinished except for painting. Ceiling is unfinished except in certain operational sections—operations, message center, teleprinter, briefing, triangulator and indicator—which have acoustical tile finish. Roof is reinforced concrete with built-up roofing. Hardware same as referenced above.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman made an investigation of this Air Force installation, he saw hundreds of dollars' worth of storm sashes, in a section of the country where zero and below zero weather is not unusual, that are practically worthless. If you made an investigation of the extravagances at this installation, whose fault is it?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say to the gentleman that I am not familiar with the gentleman's installation; but the Committee on Armed Services did investigate very carefully the housing situation for which they asked an authorization running from $1,900 to $2,100 per man unit. It seemed to us that you could not build palaces very well for that amount of money. The Navy wants $1,900, the Air Force wants a little bit more. It is really about the same amount. Some have a little additional and some have a little less.

Mr. GROSS. I know what the gentleman is talking about. As I say, I spent nearly 3 years in the Army, beginning in 1916. In that time I was in only two barracks, once for 2 days at Brest, France, and again for a few days at Camp Devens, Mass., on my way out of the service. Somehow I seem to have lived through it. I am not advocating that troops live in tents today but certainly they do not need these plush hotel dormitory type barracks.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MAGEE. What did the gentleman say about the type of toilet-paper holders that were used?

Mr. GROSS. Solid brass nickel-plated at $16 apiece.

Mr. MAGEE. The gentleman is from a State where the tall corn grows and I am afraid he is trying to make out a case for the Iowa corncob.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Iowa is trying to make out a case for economy.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whether or not the membership here is determined to vote for or against this amendment, some statements have been made that should be cleared up.

First of all, I do not think that any of you can rest your conscience, that if you vote for this amendment you had saved either $80,000,000 that you talked about earlier, or the $30,000,000 that is involved in this amendment. This is actually an increment on a large building program. This is a partial appropriation for a larger program that has been authorized. That money is going to be spent for housing either in a more compressed period of time or in a larger period of time. Do not kid yourself that because the Hardy committee said that so much money could be saved, by cutting that many dollars off of this bill you are going to save that money. It just does not work that way.

Now, there are many ways in which savings can be made. The statement has been made that the Hardy committee report was not before the Committee on Appropriations; that members of our committee did not know that the Hardy committee said we could save $80,000,000, and therefore the Committee on Appropriations did not take that

into consideration. Well, what in the world have the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] and our committee staff headed by John Donnally, been doing since last February if we did not take some of the things that we learned into consideration? Was all of that work wasted? If some of the statements that have been made here are true, then time has been wasted because we did not have before us the specific number of dollars that the Hardy committee said we could save. John Donnally did not sit up day and night poring over the hearings of the Hardy committee just in order to salve his conscience, I am sure of that. When you have a chance to study our subcommittee hearings, which have now been published, you will note that our committee has specifically pinned the Air Force down and told them there are two types of barracks, one recommended by the Strategic Air Command, and the other the standard Air Force type of barrack. Those are the things they will be permitted to build within the money appropriated for the building of barracks for these men. There has not been any publicity about some of these things that have been done; there has not been any headline on this particular work that has been done. Most of that has come from an investigating committee over in the other body that dropped the thing like a hot potato and left it to a clean-up committee in this body to actually transfer those newspaper headlines into terms of dollars and cents, and that is the position of our subcommittee this morning. And that clean-up job is reflected in dollar savings in the bill before us.

This appropriation, as I told the House yesterday, is a stop-gap thing as far as the Air Force is concerned. We have not been able to give it the attention that it ought to have because of the limitation of time, because of inadequate justifications, and the fact that the authorization bill was piled right smack on top of committee consideration of this appropriation. But, as I said, there are certain ground rules which this subcommittee has put into effect and which will be used by the Air Force; ground rules that will prevent some of these glaring things that the gentleman from Iowa and some of the others have called attention to.

Do not think for a minute that simply by lopping off a certain number of dollars you have saved that amount for the Treasury. It simply means that a lesser amount is going to be built during the course of this fiscal year, to be built at some later time.

I am not greatly concerned how you vote on this particular amendment. This $30,000,000 is not going to make or break the Air Force housing program. It probably will not affect it a great deal except by way of a possible delay, but I do not want a lot of people kidding themselves into thinking that voting for this amendment will save $30,000,000, because that is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to pursue the inquiry I made earlier of the chairman of the subcommittee and of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] with respect to the list of Air Force bases and other installations contained on pages 39 and 40 of the committee report, and to ask again if the numbering of the bases on this list is an indication that such bases and plants are to be considered in the order of their listing.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, my understanding is that that list is there, and they are numbered. On the other hand, the numbers mean nothing as to priority. It is up to the Air Force and their operations as to what they can do and when they should do it.

Mr. ELSTON. In other words, while the Barksdale Air Force Base is No. 1, but the Lockland plant near Cincinnati, Ohio, where they are making jet engines, is No. 126, it does not follow that the Barksdale Base will be taken up first and the Lockland plant when No. 126 is reached.

Mr. TABER. Not unless the Air Force decides that. They have given out no priority along that line.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Simply to confirm what the ranking minority member of the committee has stated, this list is in the report by way of limitation and not as a priority list. This list is submitted here only to make it clear that none of the money which has been outlined in various categories on pages 37 and 38 in the report is to be used on any installations of the Air Force not specifically listed on pages 39 and 40 of the bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Then the numbers do not mean anything?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. They have no significance whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated. This matter was thoroughly discussed in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and the Committee of the Whole saw fit at that time to defeat that.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this investigating committee has studied this problem since last February and has gone into the plans and specifications of these buildings and eliminated anything of a plush nature, or anything of a gingerbread nature, or anything of a decorative nature. We are allowing to go into these plans and specifications only usable and wearable articles. We are going to get a list from the services each month as to the money they have spent, the bases on which it is spent, and the increments for which it is spent.

In connection with this study, I am glad to report that the barracks today are costing in round figures $400 per inmate less than they did a year ago. That is the result of the study and the simplification and the firming up of the plans of the barracks. We have cut this appropriation bill in accordance with the results of these studies.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman realizes from all the information given to him that it is impossible even to let the contracts relating to about $30 million of this amount during this present fiscal year.

Why should we not save a little money here with no harm whatever to our national defense? A little tightening up is not going to do the Air Force any harm whatsoever. My amendment is offered because of the fact that there was considerable support here for a far larger cut, $80,000,000.

Mr. RILEY. We have already tightened this program up to the tune of cutting off half a billion dollars. I would not want to see another penny extracted from the appropriation for the Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota will be defeated, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 50, noes 84.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the House owes a vote of thanks to the sucommittee on Military Construction headed by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], the other members being the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. They have been holding hearings almost constantly since the first day of February. The rest of the members of military appropriations came into these hearings after our other subcommittees had finished their work, largely on the procurement program.

I have, and our Nation should have, the greatest admiration for these men of ours in the Air Force who have, as always, done such a magnificent job of fighting in all corners of the world. They are the world's best. So that any of these remarks which have been made, or which will be made, which may be critical of some of the programs of the Air Force are not in the least bit critical of these men and the flying and fighting job that they have done and are doing. It has been proved—and admitted by the top men in the Air Force—that in this program of construction, growing as rapidly as it has from the small force that we had up to the contemplated 143 group force, there has been a great deal of indecision, there has been some vacillation, and there have been many changes of plans, missions, and installations. This expansion should have had a logical, practical, cohesive progressive plan. However, I doubt there is an air base in the United States which has

been contemplated in this program, which has not had anywhere from 6 to 50 changes on that base. In many instances the very mission of the base itself has been changed. A case in point is the air base at Grandview. We were told last year that due to the fact that Kansas City is centrally located with highways and railways and communications, it was the one best place in all the United States for headquarters of this Central Air Defense Command. Now we hear rumors that Grandview is not going to be used as headquarters for the Air Defense Command, but that the headquarters are going to be in Colorado Springs, that Grandview is only going to be the central district base, and that the Continental Air Command Headquarters is going to be moved from Mitchell Field to Grandview Air Base. In other words, the Air Force program is constantly changing. We do not know what it is to be tomorrow; they do not know. We are hoping that with the new chief of installations, named Thursday at noon, there will be a better and more comprehensive and more realistic and more common sense construction program, not only as to the mission of these air bases, but the construction that is to be thereon made. There have been many instances which have occurred in this construction program on which criticism is warranted. The matter of the barracks mentioned by the gentleman from Iowa has been under constant scrutiny by this subcommittee.

If the gentleman will read all of the hearings and the final report, he will find that the committee under Mr. Riley has made demands on the Air Force and on the Chief of Engineers of the Army for economy and common sense in construction. He will see that the barracks, which are to be built, will be in every way adequate, but that the so-called plush has been almost completely eliminated. I trust the gentleman will be much better pleased a year from now when the report is made as to the progress of this program so far as economy and realism is concerned. There are places where some things have been done, which this committee has pointed out to the Air Force should not be done, should be stopped, and those who are the perpetrators of the plans should be given the most severe punishment possible. For instance, one example is when under the guise of soil erosion work as shown by falsified work orders, the Air Force was building a 9-hole golf course. That has been stopped. The men who were responsible for this misuse of funds should be punished. There are many other things which must be stopped. The Air Force must be economical. The Air Force must be realistic in these programs.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have had a case where the Air Force kicked approximately $100,000 out of the window by taking a low bid from a manufacturer in the State of Iowa, and the general who permitted that, and it was testified before a committee in the other body that they had made the mistake, that they had thrown nearly $100,000 away, instead of being court-martialed has been promoted from a 3-star to a 4-star general. Where is the punishment for these things?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know anything about that particular case, but I would request the gentleman to do this: I know the members of this military appropriations subcommittee. There is not a finer group of men in Congress. If you or any other Member of the House or the Senate find instances where there is anything wrong, or any waste, if you will let us know we will stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter do now close.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I did want to say a word on housing. I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MEADER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment after section 804. I do not think it is controversial.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this chapter close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] for 3½ minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I really wanted 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request, the debate will close in 7 minutes. Under the division of time the gentleman is entitled to 3½ minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I really wanted 5 minutes with reference to housing. It is something that I have studied considerably.

Our Committee on Armed Services did not overlook the matter of housing. I think good housing is very essential to the armed services. We studied the types of barracks being planned and constructed in all the armed services. Each one of them will average about $12 per square foot for all the services. In the Army the sizes will be from 105- to 225-men barracks.

I want to say to my distinguished friend from New York who took exception to my comment regarding housing in the armed services that I have taken this information from these reports, and I quote:

> There are of course in existence many barracks inferior to those described (by me a moment ago). Some of them were built during the last World War. Some of them were built 20 to 30 years or more ago, and they were temporary barracks when they were built. With respect to all of these it can be said that they vary from virtually uninhabitable to reasonably usable, depending of course on the kind of original construction and the maintenance which had been performed during their lives.

I read that for the reason—and I speak advisedly—I have seen housing that is not habitable. It is not fit to be used. I am very glad the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has come in with an appropriation that will give our men in the uniformed services the type of housing they ought to have. It is not going to be luxury housing, and I do not think it should be. But the barracks including kitchen and dining facilities in the Army will cost about $2,100 per man. The Navy, on the other hand, will run around $1,900 per man. There are some certain extras that will run it up over $2,000. The Air Force will run roughtly $2,000 per man unit.

I mentioned these things because it shows you cannot get palace-like construction out of these figures.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: Page 20, after line 10, insert a new section as follows:
>
> "SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air Force to establish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same as one adopted by the House on April 9, 1952, with respect to the 1953 Defense appropriation bill. Its purpose is to prevent the Air Forces from setting up a duplicating third supply system for so-called common-use items.

I understand the Senate proposes to approach this same problem with a little different language but with the same objective in mind. The final language can probably be perfected in conference.

I have discussed the amendment with the leadership of the committee on both sides of the aisle. I understand it is agreeable to them.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. RILEY. The gentleman's amendment seems to be sound. We have no objection on this side; we will accept the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This is entirely consistent with the action the House took on the regular Defense Department appropriation bill.

Mr. MEADER. It is almost precisely the same language except it deals only with facilities, because the item in the bill deals only with public works of the Air Forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTLETT: On page 21, line 6, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following language: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jessie Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the Delegate from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER IX

MUTUAL SECURITY

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

Government and relief in occupied areas

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of certain foreign areas (except Germany, Japan and Austria), including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required ot carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto, hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; not to exceed $2,000 for contingencies for the United States commanders, commissioners, or other administrators of foreign areas, to be expended in their respective discretions; such minimum supplies for the civilian populations of such areas as may be essential to prevent starvation, disease, or unrest, prejudicial to the objectives sought to be accomplished; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $11,000,000, of which not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151–161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in such occupied areas in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and in the manner authorized by section 111 (b) (1) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further*, That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in sections 5, 6, and 7 of the Foreign Aid Act of 1947 (Public Law 389, approved December 17, 1947): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further*, That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further*, That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,725,000 of the funds appropriated under this head for the fiscal year 1950, shall remain available until June 30, 1953, for the payment of obligations incurred under contracts executed prior to July 1, 1950.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], offered an amendment to the item contained on page 11 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. His amendment was to reduce the total amount $150,000,000 to $85,000,000. This amendment prevailed. Under the limitation of time that had been previously imposed, the committee did not have an opportunity to examine at that time the amendment in the light of the requirements of both the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission.

On yesterday, in a minute and a half, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] had this to say about his amendment:

Private power companies representing over a billion dollars in capital have offered to produce the power, and they have offered to produce it without expense to the United States.

The evidence will not support any such conclusion. Let us look at the facts and see what took place and what arrangements were made to furnish the required power to the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Commission needed 7,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually to carry on their operation. They set about to acquire this power from either the private utilities or the Tennessee Valley Authority. A group of five utility companies, jointly known as the Electric Energy, Inc., was invited by the AEC to submit a bid. Both TVA and the Electric Energy, Inc., were asked to submit their rates and bids for 25 percent, 50 percent, 75 percent and 100 percent of their power requirements. Both submitted their rates on the requested percentages and as a result of the examination of these rates it was decided that the TVA would be asked to produce 75 percent of the power and the Electric Energy, Inc., would be asked to produce 25 percent. This conclusion was warranted for many reasons as is well explained in the following letter which I received today from Mr. R. W. Cook, Director of Production, Atomic Energy Commission:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1952.

Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JONES: This is in response to your recent request concerning the power supply required for the proposed expansion program now before Congress and the steps taken and the reasoning which lead to the decision to obtain the additional power required for the proposed expansion of gaseous diffusion facilities at Paducah on a basis of 75 percent of the total requirement being obtained from TVA and 25 percent from Electric Energy, Inc., a group of five utilities.

As you know, under the present program, 50 percent of the total requirement at Paducah will be obtained from TVA and 50 percent will be obtained from EEI. The proposals received from TVA and EEI in December of 1950 for the present program were very competitive. At the time the present EEI contract was negotiated, the estimated annual charges (TVA, $14,922,000, and EEI, $14,697,560) showed a possible difference in favor of EEI of $224,000 per annum. Since that time escalation provided for in the EEI contract to reflect the increases in cost of construction of the facilities now indicates a difference in annual charges (EEI, $15,252,000, and TVA, $15,088,000) of $164,000 per annum in favor of TVA.

The primary reason for this shift in relative positions lies in the fact that the EEI rate is escalated on the basis of actual construction costs of the facilities, while the TVA rate is escalated on the basis of the Engineering News Record cost index, a national index.

In obtaining the additional power required for the proposed expansion at Paducah, the Commission was in the fortunate position of being adjacent to two large power utility systems and deemed it in the Government's interest to seek proposals from both utilities, TVA and EEI, for 100 percent of the

power, or such portions thereof in increments of 25 percent on which they wished to submit.

An analysis of the 100 percent proposals of TVA and EEI, based on cost to the AEC, on an annual charge based on 95 percent load factor, showed a material difference in favor of TVA. EEI was then given an opportunity to submit another proposal and, after many discussions during which it was pointed out that with certain changes we felt they could submit a more competitive proposal, a revised 100 percent proposal was submitted by EEI.

An analysis of the revised 100 percent EEI proposal with TVA, based on cost to the AEC on an annual charge based on 95 percent load factor, and 3½ percent financing, showed a difference in favor of TVA of $2,673,000 or a total of $66,825,000 over 25 years, the proposed term of the contract. (If EEI is required to pay 3¾ percent to obtain financing for the capital cost of the facilities, this would increase the per annum cost by $290,000.)

As to income taxes paid by EEI, based on a guaranteed return of 8 percent, after taxes, on the equity capital they would furnish in the amount of $8,500,000 out of a total estimated cost including working capital of $222,500,000, their estimate of annual income-tax payments is $603,000 or $15,075,000 in 25 years. Thus the income taxes paid by EEI over a 25-year period would lack in offsetting by $51,750,000 the saving to the AEC resulting from the TVA proposal.

The TVA proposal is on a commodity basis, with provisions for escalation of capital, fuel, and operating labor cost on formulas based on recognized indices, while the EEI proposal would result in a guaranty of costs and a guaranteed return of 8 percent after taxes on the equity capital they would furnish.

Also, the cost of the facilities to be constructed under the TVA or the EEI 100 percent proposal would be paid for by the Federal Government and in turn by the taxpayers. Under the EEI proposal it would be paid for over a 25-year period by the AEC and through the EEI charges for power and EEI would become the owners of a debt free plant in 25 years. Under the TVA proposal, the costs will similarly be paid for by AEC, and TVA, a Government agency, will become the owner of the plant.

You may be interested that in the TVA's 1951 Annual Report, for the years 1950 and 1951, the TVA reported net income, as computed under the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts, of 5.8 and 5.4 percent, respectively. Considering the depreciation reserve as providing for the repayment of invested capital, the net income could be considered as being available for payment in lieu of interest or for return to the Federal Treasury for the benefit of all taxpayers.

In reviewing the other alternatives, the cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 75 percent proposal was less than their 100 percent proposal. EEI did not submit a 75 percent proposal. The cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 50 percent proposal was considerably less than the EEI 50 percent proposal and the cost per kilowatt hour of the EEI 50 percent proposal was more than the EEI 100 percent proposal. Although the cost per kilowatt hour under the TVA 25 percent proposal was less than the EEI 25 percent proposal, it was felt that, since the Joppa plant, now under construction to serve 50 percent of the load under the present program was planned so that two additional generating units could be added, the addition of two units at the Joppa plant was adequate for 25 percent of the additional load and this should permit EEI to submit a proposal at a cost per kilowatt hour more nearly competitive with TVA. Subsequent discussions with EEI and a preliminary proposal for 25 percent indicated that a more competitive proposal could be obtained.

Further consideration indicated many advantages to the program by splitting the additional requirements, 75 percent TVA and 25 percent EEI. They are:

1. It provided two large utility systems from which to draw interim and back-up power supply, simplifying the problems on each system and increasing the dependability and reliability thereof. In addition, EEI under the 100 percent proposal was not able to fulfill all the requirements for the interim power required. Under this arrangement all requirements would be fulfilled.

2. The cost of the power during the construction period and the interim power required for the operation of the diffusion plant would be lower.

3. Access would be secured to a larger market for the absorption of any power released by a reduction in demand or termination of operations by the AEC. This would enable the Commission to negotiate more favorable cancellation provisions.

4. Additions to, and full completion of generating stations now under construction would reduce the reserves required and provide economies in construction cost, in use of critical materials, equipment, labor and in time required for completion.

5. This split would avoid the application of the higher coal cost escalator under the TVA 100 percent proposal.

6. An advantage is gained from the standpoint of dispersion.

7. It is sound from an engineering point of view.

In view of the above, it was decided that the split of 75 percent TVA and 25 percent EEI was most advantageous to the Government. Accordingly, TVA was assigned the responsibility to supply 75 percent of the additional power requirements and negotiations are now under way with EEI on the balance of 25 percent.

At Oak Ridge, which is well within the TVA power system, after discussions with adjacent public utilities on their interest to furnish the additional requirements for the proposed expansion program, and receipt of their reply that they did not feel they could submit proposals because the distance from their load centers to Oak Ridge was so great it was not economical because of transmission costs, the responsibility for supplying this additional power was assigned to TVA.

At the new gaseous diffusion plant, for which a site has not been selected, we expect to secure all the power requirements from private utilities and to that end are now negotiating with a group of 15 companies who have formed together and submitted a proposal for the total requirements.

If any additional information is desired please advise.

Yours very truly,

R. W. COOK,
Director of Production.

If TVA had furnished 100 percent of the power, their annual rate charges would have been approximately $2,600,000 less than the rates offered by the Electric Energy, Inc. Or during the 25 years of the life of the contract a savings would have been made of approximately $66,000,000.

Under the proposal which the subcommittee accepted and reported, however, TVA was asked to furnish 75 percent of the power. This annual saving in rate would be approximately $2,000,000, and during the life of the contract it would amount to $50,000,000. At the expiration of the 25-year period all plant facilities will be owned by the Federal Government. On the other hand, if the Coudert amendment prevails, at the end of the 25-year period the plant will be owned by the EEI and the Federal Government will have paid $50,000,000 more in power rates than would be required by a contract with TVA.

What is this Coudert amendment? It is an amendment to require the taxpayers of this country, every year for 25 years, to pay a bonus of at least $2,000,000 to a group of five private power companies whose representatives kept the telephones of this Capitol hot with their importunities all day yesterday. This is a case of a group of private utilities setting up a special corporation to get a contract from the Government to do for a handsome guaranteed fee and without any risk the job that an established agency of the Government itself can do as well at a huge savings to the taxpayers. This is an obvious effort to milk the taxpayers of more than $2,000,000 a year. This is not economy. Let us have no nonsense about that. It is at least $50,000,000 of outrageous extravagance.

The taxpayers provide the money for payment of the power bills of the Atomic Energy Commission. Each year they will pay an extra $2,000,000 if the Coudert amendment is adopted. When AEC has paid for the EEI plant, the plant will belong to the power companies. I say that any Member of this House who supports this amendment shows a reckless disregard for the taxpayers' interest. I gave $2,000,000 as the minimum additional amount which it will cost every year to have EEI do all the job instead of 25 percent as recommended by AEC. But $50,000,000 is, in my judgment, likely to prove a gross underestimate of the proposed grab. While TVA has offered AEC a firm price subject only to adjustments for such factors as changes in the general level of construction costs while the plant is being built, and changes in the cost of fuel to operate it, EEI's proposal is, in fact, not a firm rate at all but merely a cost-plus-fee arrangement.

This amendment is willful extravagance. It goes against the judgment of the agency responsible for the AEC program. It goes against common sense and responds to the wishes of one of the most greedy and ambitious lobbies this Congress has ever seen.

I am against the Coudert amendment and for the proposal recommended by the Atomic Energy Commission under which 75 percent of these power requirements will be provided by TVA.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does that take into consideration, which the evidence appears to show it does not, the tax situation as between the in lieu and actual taxes?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let us get to that point now and I am glad the gentleman raises it. Under the tax arrangements and arrangements of the contract entered into by the companies and AEC, the Electric Energy, Inc., would pay $150,000 annually in income taxes. So that means that the Federal Government by executing that contract on a 100 percent basis with EEI would receive $603,000 a year in income taxes. If the Atomic Energy Commission executes the contract with TVA we save

$2,600,000. It is simple arithmetic. Which is greater, $603,000 or $2,600,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(On request of Mr. COOPER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JONES of Alabama was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the amendment offered yesterday reducing this appropriation by $65,000,000 came up at an unfortunate time when there was very little time left, approximately 2½ or 3 minutes, for debate. It was impossible to adequately and properly discuss and cover it in that length of time. The gentleman from Alabama has made an outstanding argument as to why the action taken by the Committee of the Whole on yesterday, when we get into the House, should not be rejected. Not only because of the able argument of the gentleman, but from the angle of national defense, this is vitally important to the security of our country with reference to the production of atomic energy and all that goes with it. I join with my friend and others in urging that when we get into the House that we reject the amendment and permit the appropriation recommended by the Committee on Appropriations to be adopted by the House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman. To go a little bit further in emphasizing what the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated, one of the advantages of acquiring energy from the Tennessee Valley Authority is that they will have interim power available where the Atomic Energy Commission can proceed without delay. If we have to delay until such time that we will have full production and full capacity of the generating units to be constructed by the private power companies, then we will lose time. The Coudert proposal comes rather late, and it is unfortunate that the private utility companies have come up and started a campaign without presenting all of the facts.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Is it true that in this letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, which the gentleman will insert in the RECORD when we go back in the House, it is stated that the Atomic Energy Commission asked the private-utility companies to make the expansion power available for Oak Ridge, and that they refused?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The surplus energy needed to supplement the power already going to Oak Ridge will not be available from private utilities, because they refused, and they refused on the ground that they could not generate and transmit electricity that great a distance at a rate which the Federal Government could afford to pay.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the question of the policy with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority was settled years ago, and that it is not involved here? None of this power is for the people of that area or that section. All of the power sought to be produced here is for atomic energy, and for that alone, and it is vital and necessary to have this power for the production of atomic energy, and this is the only source from which that necessary power can be secured.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Tennessee is absolutely correct. Not only that, but the Tennessee Valley Authority did not propose that they construct these generating units. That proposal came from the AEC, and they were charged with the responsibility of obtaining power at the lowest possible cost. Now, when they come up with a proposition of saving the taxpayers $2,000,000, there is something sinister and wrong in that. I do not know what sins can be committed in the name of private enterprise, but certainly this is one, because factually you cannot sustain any other conclusion. I think we will all agree that one of the most important topics of discussion that comes from this well is saving the taxpayers' money. If you believe that the Federal Government should be frugal and make wise and sound investments, you cannot under any circumstances or conditions justify the support for striking out the ability of the Tennessee Valley Authority to produce this energy.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment the committee on yesterday made a most serious mistake in adopting the Coudert amendment. I shall discuss this matter from a nonpartisan standpoint and a factual standpoint. There are those in this House on both sides of the aisle, who, when the name of the Tennessee Valley Authority comes up, react just the same as if you waved a red flag in the face of a bull. That is unfortunate. The United States has over a billion dollars invested in TVA. But let us not go too far along that line. Listen to the committee report. It may be some of you have not read it:

> The bill includes the budget estimate of $150,000,000 to provide funds for commencing construction of steam electrical generating plants, transmission lines and other facilities necessary to provide power for the expansion program of the Atomic Energy Commission. The two programs go hand in hand and one is useless without the other. The program provides for the construction of 10 additional or new generating units with a rated capacity of 1,710,000 kilowatts. The total estimated cost of the program is $305,000,000.

I asked the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] if it was not true that in a letter from the general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission it was stated that the Atomic Energy Commission asked private utilities to build a steam plant to furnish this extra power at Oak Ridge. He stated, "Yes." I saw it in the letter. The private utilities refused. You can see why they refused.

In the first place, TVA has all the customers. We hope and pray that this war will not last forever. A private utility would be silly if they built a plant right in the middle of TVA when TVA has all the customers, and there would no longer be any use for it after 5 or 6 years because surely the emergency will be over in that time.

This is what it boils down to. This is no fight on TVA. When you vote this $65,000,000 cut, it means that if you want atom bombs, replace that $65,000,000. If you do not want atom bombs, cut it out. This will delay the program about 1 year, or make it that much longer.

The Kingston plant, which is located only 10 miles from Oak Ridge, is the one that gets two new units. This same bill carries an appropriation of almost $500,000,000 to expand the atomic-energy plants at Oak Ridge. You know that Oak Ridge is the place that produces the atom bombs. They must have this additional electricity at Oak Ridge. It carries the steam plant at Rogersville, Tenn., two new units at Kingston, Tenn., which is Oak Ridge itself, for it is joined together, and at Gallatin, Tenn., for the Paducah, Ky., plant. Not one kilowatt hour of that goes to us Tennessee backwoodsmen. It goes into the producing not only of atom bombs but what they call a family of atom weapons. I think even New York, as close as it is to the eastern seaboard, needs the protection of atom bombs and atom weapons to be produced at this great plant at Oak Ridge. So you are not fighting TVA when you cut this $65 million out. You are fighting the production of atomic bombs. Nobody can deny that. Not one penny of it goes to burn our electric lights in our houses or to furnish what the people from New England, with all due respect to them, seem to think Tennessee has gotten too much of. What has Tennessee gotten out of it? I might say this, without digressing in the least, I do wish many Members of my party, and I am a Member of the party to which the gentleman belongs who offered the amendment, would come to Tennessee and visit us. Come down there and see what we are like. It would seem that we must be a different kind of people according to the way we have been pictured by the New England folks. You will find in Tennessee the same kind of people as you will find in New England, but just because the TVA is there, they would take out a rapier or a pearl-handled dagger and reach in and cut out $65,000,000. It is wrong. It is fundamentally unsound. Suppose this great plant at Oak Ridge was in the Sahara Desert. It would not make any difference. Tennessee would get the same benefit out of it as it does now.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my intention is not to engage in a lengthy argument over the merits or demerits of this case, but to bring certain facts before the committee. If it were suggested that this would be an excellent opportunity for a thorough investigation of the TVA situation, I for one would be very much in accord with it. Yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] offered an amendment which reduced by a certain sum

the amount of money to be provided to the TVA for the construction of steam plants. I thought it was a good amendment at the time, and I voted for it. I still think it is a good amendment. I think some of the things that have been discussed today could bear a little further comment, and as I said before, they might well be investigated. I recall several years ago, we argued loud and long on the floor and in the corridors over whether or not we should build one steam plant in the TVA area for the purpose of firming up the electric current which was then being provided by the hydroelectric facilities, which we had favored and voted for. When this program is finished, Mr. Chairman, 62 percent of the power developed in the TVA will be developed by steam plants, an excellent example of the camel's head under the tent, and shortly the body following the head. It is said here on the floor that the AEC urged, or perhaps compelled the TVA to build these additional plants. The testimony does not quite support that statement. Those plants are now outside the territory of the TVA, the originally established territory of the TVA. I am going to say frankly, they are not very much outside; they are 10 to 15 miles out of it, but nevertheless that is another case of the camel's head, which I think might be looked into. The point I would like to make is that the AEC did not really force the TVA because the AEC asked for bids from both private industry and the TVA. I do not have the letter, but the gentleman from New York yesterday showed me a letter which indicated that the private companies were willing to supply these facilities, and to build the facilities at their own expense, and that the difference in the annual cost for current was what the gentleman from Alabama indicated, approximately $2,500,000 a year. But, Mr. Chairman, when they set that figure the TVA did not include interest, so far as I can determine. That did not include depreciation which the ordinary company would take. That did not include taxes on the same basis which private utilities would pay taxes.

Mr. Chairman, if we continue squeezing out all the taxpaying industries in the United States, who is going to pay the taxes to run this expensive Government?

I now yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Let me read to you a portion of a letter from the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Can you do it quickly? I have a couple of other points I would like to make.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. As to income taxes paid by EEI, based on a guaranteed return of 8 percent, after taxes, on the equity capital they would furnish in the amount of $8,500,000 out of a total estimated cost including working capital of $222,500,000, their estimate of annual income-tax payments is $603,000 or $15,075,000 in 25 years. Thus the income taxes paid by EEI over a 25-year period would lack in offsetting by $51,750,000 the saving to the AEC resulting from the TVA proposal.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I cannot yield further, because I want to say that if the gentleman from Alabama is agreeing with me that this is something which requires a complete investigation, I would be glad to go along with him. When these plants are built and used for the atomic-energy program, then nobody knows now what the power will be used for when the atomic-energy program lets down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of foreign military and economic aid is to help make strong those nations allied with us in the current world struggle for survival against the forces of Communist aggression.

During the debate on this bill there has been testimony that such aid since World War II has reached the $40,000,000,000 mark. Yet, today 560,000 soldiers of the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China now on Formosa and anxious to fight on our side, are without shoes.

This is the largest Asiatic anti-Communist army.

Commenting on military assistance for this particular area in the very bill now before us, the report presented by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] states:

> There is no other area of the world where the immediate need for military strength to ward off communism is more apparent.

And the bill provides for $540,000,000 for material and training in the general area of China including the troops on Formosa who today are on maneuvers without shoes.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and I saw the crack Sixty-seventh Division of the Chinese Nationalist troops drill in the hills near Taipeh 2 months ago. These, the best fitted of all the Chinese troops, wore old sneakers or tennis shoes as they marched in the mud and muck and fought mock battles.

The picture disturbed Admiral Radford, who inspected these troops on Formosa shortly after our visit, and just a few days ago the admiral reported to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the inadequate trickle of equipment being sent to the island should be quickly augmented.

Forty billion dollars in foreign military and economic aid since World War II but no shoes for this Asiatic anti-munist army!

Ask any infantryman what a good pair of army field shoes means to health, morale, and efficiency.

General Chase, who now heads the American mission of 400 officers training this friendly Chinese Army on Formosa, is at a loss to understand why we are neglecting to do more for an army which, when the chips are really down, as his men put it, may mean the difference between victory or failure in this life-and-death struggle.

And General Chase adds another clincher to his argument we should be beware of a slow boat to the Chinese on Formosa and fail to appraise realistically their possibilities. He points out that it costs only $300 to sustain a Chinese Nationalist soldier on Formosa for 1 year. The Pentagon tells me that the yearly cost to sustain an American GI runs close to $6,000. There is congressional testimony the figure is considerably higher.

I have referred to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] who saw these shoeless soldiers with me on Formosa and I feel certain that he as chairman of the committee reporting this aid bill aims to do what he can to have this deficiency corrected. I ask him if he has a word of comment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I say that I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the Chinese soldiers do need equipment. The one word that we heard more on Formosa than any other was "hardware"; that they needed "hardware" for the troops.

It is also true that they need shoes. I never saw a pair of leather shoes on a single Chinese soldier.

I am inclined to believe that if the Chinese are properly equipped they will make good soldiers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CANFIELD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. GARY. The gentleman will remember that on Korea we were told that the Korean troops now are among the best in the line. When we called attention to the poor showing that they made at the beginning of the struggle we were told by the officers from General Van Fleet right down the line that it was because at that time they were not adequately trained and equipped. But now since they have been properly trained and properly equipped they are giving an excellent account of themselves. I think the same thing would be true of the Chinese soldiers.

We are providing materials and equipment for them in this bill, and I trust that we shall continue to do so, because I think they are a very vital factor in our defense against Communism in that section of the world.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad the gentleman from Virginia made that statement; I think it is going to give real heart to those troops on Formosa who are on our side in this world conflict.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin who is so well informed on the world struggle and its dangerous portents.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey on pointing this out because, as he said, here we have one of the greatest potential anti-Communist forces in the world, particularly in Asia. We should center our attention on properly equipping them. The failure of the administration to give the green light to the Chinese Nationalist forces in Asia is one of the great tragedies of our time. A new Republican administration will base its foreign policy on liberation instead of containment and will aid these anti-Communist Chinese forces to free China and deliver the death blow to Communism in Asia.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a minute or two on the question that has now arisen regarding the amendment which was adopted yesterday to reduce the TVA authority by $65,000,000.

I have information from very reliable sources that since the Coudert amendment to the bill was adopted, when the authorization bill was before the House recently, striking out two steam plants in the TVA area, the private utilities which surround the TVA area have now made plans and are ready to build all the necessary facilities, not only generating plants but transmission lines to furnish the atomic-energy plant with all the power they can use or want. Because of that I can see no reason why the taxpayers of America should be burdened with another $65,000,000. The private utility companies which surround TVA joined together during World War II to pool their power for the defense effort. They are still doing so. They are good Americans and certainly they would not do anything that would in the least hinder the production of the atomic bomb.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Do these private utilities offer to take any risk at all in their proposal? As I understand their offer, it is proposed that they will invest a certain amount of money after having obtained loans guaranteed by the Federal Government, and they want a 25-year contract from the Atomic Energy Commission under the terms of which they will be guaranteed an 8-percent return on equity capital, after taxes, during the 25-year period plus an amortization of their entire investment within 25 years. At the end of 25 years, after having received these benefits, the entire plant would belong to them; is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. Not quite.

Mr. YATES. What is their proposal?

Mr. JENSEN. I have no information to that effect.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have a copy of the letter to which the gentleman is referring and to which the gentleman from New York made reference yesterday, and I find nothing in it to support the query of the gentleman from Illinois. I think it is a straightforward proposition to provide 1,296,000 kilowatts.

Now there is another point involved in the question of these plants. The TVA figures its rates on the cost of current, which includes the cost of the plants. Suppose it was discovered that the plant cost more than the TVA had expected when it made its rates. Would the TVA raise its cost to the consumer as a private utility would have to do to survive, or would the taxpayers be called upon to pay the difference?

Mr. JENSEN. It is the same old story. It is subsidized power, and the American taxpayers pay the difference in the final analysis for all these subsidized programs.

Mr. YATES. May I invite the attention of the gentleman from California to the fact that the utilities, the private group that is proposing to supply the power to site X, requested cancellation costs of $220,000,000 from the Atomic Energy Commission?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(On request of Mr. YATES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JENSEN was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. YATES. They asked that the Government allow cancellation costs up to about $220,000,000 on a proposed investment by the private group of $400,000,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, they must have some kind of assurance to justify spending their shareholders' dollars. This is a temporary deal.

Mr. YATES. I will ask the gentleman from California whether that is not the fact. He was at the hearing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It was $57 million for an actual power cancellation cost.

Mr. YATES. That is only partly true. AEC contemplates receiving power for its expanded program from three sources. There were three cancellation costs—the TVA asked for a cancellation allowance of $28,000,000; EEI, a private group, a cancellation allowance of $28,000,000; and the third group a cancellation allowance of $220,000,000, thus making up total cancellation costs of $277,000,000 requested by AEC of our subcommittee. That was the reason I presented my amendment yesterday to limit cancellation costs of $57,000,000, because we did not know what the cancellation costs would ultimately be with respect to the third group, and because the subcommittee believed cancellation costs of $220,000,000 were excessive in view of the proposed $400,000,000 investment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think that is the figure we should take—$57,000,000.

Mr. YATES. That is the figure the House did take. The gentleman knows and our hearings show that the Atomic Energy Commission came before our subcommittee and asked that it be allowed the sum of $220,000,000 for the purpose of building a generating plant of its own or setting aside that sum of money in a reserve to be used for cancellation costs in the event it entered into contracts with the private utilities to furnish power at site X. Is that not correct? Is that not correct, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, but there would be an equal cost if it were a Government-operated plant, and it stopped suddenly. The TVA would then have a loss itself equivalent to the cancellation clause loss.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman on that point. That is the reason the TVA asked for a cancellation clause because it takes the position that its operation should be conducted the same as a private utility. But, the fact remains, nevertheless, that the private group which proposed to furnish power at site X, wanted a clause which would permit payment of possible $220,000,000 cancellation costs. I agree with the gentleman that our subcommittee should carefully supervise what is going on to see that the taxpayers are protected. As I understand the proposal of the private companies to furnish power, it would offer so much protection to the investors as to eliminate all risk and amount to a gift of utility facilities by the Government.

Mr. JENSEN. The simple facts of the case are that if the Government builds those steam plants which they have requested, you can bet your life that over a period of years it will cost the taxpayers of America many times more than any contract that the Government would sign with private industry to furnish and transmit this power. That is one thing sure, because we have had examples of that all over the country in the past.

Mr. YATES. I do not oppose the principle of private companies furnishing the power for the project. I believe that the private companies should be given the opportunity to furnish the power, but not at the terms or under the conditions that have been proposed in the offer that has been made, because such terms and conditions are unfair. We should not permit the group of utility companies to take undue advantage of the Government, to make suckers out of the taxpayers, by using the cry of private enterprise. The term "private enterprise" presupposes the taking of a risk of some kind. In this offer of the private companies, there is no risk involved at all to the investors.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on title I close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, when the time comes to call the roll on this amendment reducing this TVA expenditure, I sincerely trust that the House will vote that amendment down.

I have never heard so much misinformation spread about the Tennessee Valley Authority as I have heard in these debates. The gentleman just now speaking complained that they did not raise the rates as the result of building these steam plants. If he will turn to the record he will find that the industrial rates in Memphis were raised just a few days ago on that account.

Do not deceive yourselves, we may be on the verge of an atomic war now. That bombing of the hydroelectric plant on the Yalu River may be the beginning of an atomic war that could leave Washington, Pittsburgh, Oak Ridge, Detroit, New York, and other key cities in ashes in a short time.

This plant is for the benefit of our Atomic Energy Commission, to help produce the instruments and materials necessary to defend our country in case of such a dire emergency.

Now they attack the TVA. I have heard that bunk for the last 20 years.

I led the fight for the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I want to give you some facts.

During the last Republican administration they were selling the power generated at the Wilson Dam, or Muscle Shoals to a power company wholesale at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour, and they showed that that was ample to pay 4 percent on the investment which would ultimately amortize for the entire cost. Today, in Florence, Ala., right at Muscle Shoals, the average wholesale rate is 4.2 mills a kilowatt-hour, or almost three times as much as the private interests were paying then. The TVA is paying for itself in more ways than one. If it were not for the TVA we might not have developed the atomic bomb in time to save this country from destruction.

The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] attacked the TVA. I want to call his attention to the fact that when the TVA was created the whole country used only 80,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Today we are using between 400,000,000,000 and 500,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, and the demand for electricity is growing all over the country. We have nearly 400,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year.

Suppose Boulder Dam were blown up? What would happen to California? The people of California are overcharged $104,000,000 a year for their electricity now, and if it were not for Boulder Dam furnishing a yardstick the chances are the overcharges would be nearer $300,000,000 a year, as they are in the State of New York, and in proportion in other States

Mr. PHILLIPS. If the gentleman will yield, the people are paying for Boulder Dam.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, and they are paying for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Every dollar that is invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority for power purposes is being paid back with interest. In the course of time every dollar that has been spent on the Tennessee River for all purposes will be paid back.

You Republicans can tie the power trust around your necks if you want to, but you cannot win, if the American people know what is going on.

I have had these attacks on me for 20 years and I am having them now, because of my support of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the rural electrification program. If it had not been for the fight I carried on here in this House most farmers would not have seen an electric light in their homes for the next 50 years, and when they did finally get it the rates would have been so high they could not have paid them.

Look what the Telephone Trust did when you gave them a monopoly. This is a drive to take over, not only the TVA but the Columbia River, Boulder Dam, and the Rural Electrification Administration, and turn them all over to a group of Wall Street financiers who own the holding companies that control the private power interests that are making this drive on Congress, and are making this fight on me, because of my attitude on this one great issue that means more to the American people than almost any other question you can raise.

The greatest wealth in America, outside of the soil from which we live, is the hydroelectric power in our navigable streams and their tributaries. We find those selfish interests here blocking the development of the Missouri River, and blocking the development of other streams, and denying to the American people the benefits of cheap electricity that does more to lift the burden of drudgery from the American farmer and all other individual householders than anything else that has ever come along.

This amendment should be defeated by all means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—MUTUAL SECURITY

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, approved October 10, 1951), as amended, as follows:

Military assistance, title I: For assistance authorized by section 101 (a) (1), $3,273,824,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 101 (a) (1) of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 25, line 25, strike out "$3,273,824,750" and insert "$3,128,224,750."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the committee during the last 2 or 3 days of its consideration of the bill developed what I think is very important and interesting information as to what is known as part 2 of the hearings. This $145,600,000 which I offer the amendment here to eliminate is part of $208,000,000 of which I could call water in this bill.

On the last day of the hearings the committee was shocked to learn of some high and fancy juggling of the figures that proved conclusively that the obligations of the agency for military purposes were plugged to the tune of $408,000,000.

The subcommittee took $200,000,000 of that out, leaving in $208,000,000, made up of this $145,600,000, $31,200,000 in title II, $24,960,000 in title III, and $6,240,000 in title IV. I understand additional amendments will be offered on the last-mentioned three items. This amendment, along with the others, seek to recapture the $208,000,000 that has been hidden by this agency, whether by accident or design. It is now learned that they have $408,000,000 more than they thought the agency had. This suggested amendment puts back to the Treasury $145,600,000 of the $208,000,000. The Mutual Security Agency came before the committee with a budget request among other things asking for authority to continue unobligated balances available after June 30, 1952. Owing to the schedule, which was submitted, it shows an estimated, unobligated balance of $398,045,000. In this part 2 of the hearings, the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1952, is shown as $658,000,000 instead of $398,000,000. So here are $270,000,000 which has been developed as a result of the hearings toward the end. During the course of the hearings, certain tables were requested showing obligations by months. Someone a few moments ago stated that other additional schedules would be requested for month-to-month schedules showing all of the expenditures that would be made, in other words setting up a kind of watch-dog performance on this whole operation with respect to housing for the Air Force. I congratulate the committee for asking for those schedules from time to time because as a result of those requests, it is developed that there is still $208,000,000 in this which we should take out.

Mr. Foster, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, came before the committee and admitted without qualification that these unobligated balances were understated by $270,000,000, being the difference between the $398,000,000 originally submitted in the schedule submitted early, and the $668,000,000 which shows in other parts of the testimony. In addition, Mr. Foster admitted considerable doubt about another item of $357,000,000. This particular item is still not explained after three different stories have been received as to the detail of what is supposed to have been furnished for the $219,000,000. The difference cannot be explained. Hence for the purpose of this amendment, the difference between $357,000,000 and $219,000,000, for which the detail has been furnished, is considered to be excess funds. This $138,000,000, which added to the $270,000,000 previously admitted, gives a total of $408,000,000 of which $200,000,000 has been deducted in the committee and $208,000,000 of extra velvet is sought in this particular amendment plus the three amendments which will be offered.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a single appropriation, in my judgment, that has ever been before this body that has been more carefully considered than the one you have before you at the present time.

Let me remind you of the fact that when the first request was submitted to the Congress in the authorization bill it amounted to $7,900,000,000. The House cut that amount very substantially, and let me say here I think very properly. It went to the Senate and there, after very careful deliberation, another amount was fixed. Then the bill went to conference, and the conferees finally agreed upon an authorization of $6,400,000,000, a cut of $1,500,000,000 from the bill.

Since the bill had been so carefully considered by both Houses of the Congress our committee felt that it determined the policy of the Congress on the subject, but that it was our duty to investigate and to ascertain if there were any items that could properly be cut without impairing the program and at the same time carry out the policy which the Congress had laid down in the authorizing legislation.

Our staff did a remarkable piece of work on this bill. They explored unobligated balances. Let me say the work they did on this bill, to my mind, is an answer to a bill that is coming on the floor next Wednesday to create some super joint committee for such investigations. We have investigators in the Appropriations Committee. They are doing an excellent job, and there is no need, in my judgment, for another committee to investigate appropriations in addition to the Appropriations Committee. It is merely an effort to impose one investigator upon another.

We did discover, as the gentleman has just stated, that the original estimates of the Department of Defense showed unobligated balances of $398,000,000. Our investigations disclosed that, instead of $398,000,000, the present estimate of unobligated balances is $669,000,000. Our committee felt that we could very properly, under those circumstances, make further reductions in the amounts allowed for military assistance, and we have taken off $200,000,000 in addition to the amount that was stricken from the original authorization bill.

In addition, there is an item in the bill of $45,000,000 for assistance in Korea. The organization that will administer that assistance will not begin to operate until 6 months after cessation of hostilities. No one knows when hostilities will cease, but if they were to cease today they could not begin operations for 6 months. They have a balance of $40,000,000 which would enable them to operate for the balance of the fiscal year. Therefore, our committee felt there was no necessity for any further appropriation insofar as Korea is concerned.

In addition to that we struck out $1,820,000 for government and relief in occupied areas, which covers Japan and the Ryukyus.

In addition to that we struck out $1,500,000 for government of occupied areas, which covers Germany, Austria, and Trieste.

We reduced the administrative expenditures $1,800,000. This item already had been very substantially reduced in the authorization bill by the Ribicoff amendment which required a 5-percent reduction in personnel.

Our committee has recommended a reduction in the entire bill of $250,120,000 below the amount finally agreed upon in the authorizing legislation. I feel very earnestly that this is all the cuts this bill can stand without impairing the program which it contemplates. Therefore I ask the House to sustain the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

(On request of Mr. CRAWFORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GARY was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 9 of part 2 of the hearings Mr. Foster and his assistant set up the figure of $1,714,000,000 for June obligations; yet on the 18th of June they had $668,000,000 of that still left; that would be $668,000,000 left to be spent in some twelve days. As the gentleman says, his committee took off $200,000,000. I congratulate the committee for doing that, but why did you not take off the other $208,000,000 which the figures would justify? That is the only question I am raising here.

Mr. GARY. Frankly, there were many doubts about those figures. There was some evidence that the authorizations were not firm authorizations but that the authorizations had been entered into. The Department of Defense admitted that the unobligated balance would be $669,000,000, but insisted that all funds beyond that would be obligated before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the $668,000,000?

Mr. GARY. No; it is $669,000,000 instead of $668,000,000; that the $669,000,000 would be unobligated. That makes a difference of $270,000,000. We took off $200,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think if the gentleman will review the figures closely he will find that the total not justified was $408,000,000.

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not imagining these figures; they are right here before me.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman's figures are based upon our investigations. The amounts may be somewhat larger, but based upon the testimony of the Defense Department $669,000,000 is the proper figure.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have three other amendments based on the same thing totaling around $200,000,000.

Mr. GARY. I said this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I appreciate that, but there are three amendments to be offered, based on the same argument, and I think it would be perhaps better to argue the first amendment, then the other three would more or less follow in line.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this amendment. I congratulate the subcommittee on the work it has done in its investigation of unobligated and unexpended balances, and I think this cut is certainly justified, based on the amazing gyrations in departmental estimates revealed by their report. These discrepancies are the result either of miscalculations by the departments or their attempt to make us miscalculate on unobligated and unexpended balances.

I arrived at the amount of $209,000,000 that might safely be cut by a somewhat more circuitous route. I had understood that there were discovered $809,000,000 of unobligated funds through the diligent work of the staff and the interrogations of the Members of the subcommittee. I took the $200,000,000 reduction made by the committee in this bill and then I allowed the $250,000,000 now said to be needed for obligation, and then I took out an amount for infrastructure, because this was cut out of the military bases authorization that this House voted recently, and I came up with $209,000,000 more reduction that this bill could stand, because of money that the departments had not obligated or spent and did not say they needed to obligate or spend. However, a more simple way is the way the gentleman from Michigan has figured, and he comes to $208,000,000. Here was what was presented to our committee only a few short weeks ago; they said that they were going to have $400,000,000 left over unobligated at the end of the year but that they needed $200,000,000 in small change lying around to obligate according to emergencies that might arise. Now we find that the amount in this one part of the bill, in the military end, is going to be not $400,000,000 but $669,000,000 unobligated, unexpended. They have hiked the amount that they want to carry in the petty cash drawer for later obligations and expenditures that they cannot make up their minds on now, they have hiked that amount by $50,000,000, or maybe $100,000,000. Well, it seems to me in view of that kind of estimate and that kind of arithmetic we are justified in making this reduction at this point in the bill. I would prefer to have it taken off of the economic aid for Europe and cut that down more to the size that it was when the authorization ceiling left this Chamber but I realize that in view of the transfer authorization given, and I think properly given, in the authorization act and not disturbed in the present bill, it does not make so much difference which part of this bill you cut down in making some modest corrections to bring the appropriation facts of life in accord with what these departments have said. Remember, there is an admitted difference of $269,000,000 between the amount they told our committee they were going to obligate and the information pulled out of them with a cork screw by the able staff of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this time to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two in regard to some queries that have arisen from people in the boatbuilding industry out on the Pacific coast, whether or not any of the funds

appropriated in this title for military purposes are to be used for the building abroad, in foreign shipyards, of vessels for the account of and use of the American Navy?

Mr. McGRATH. In answer to the distinguished gentleman—I know of his deep interest in an industry like this—in the bill there is approximately a billion dollars for off-shore procurement, some of which is for ships.

Mr. SHELLEY. I do not know whether that completely answers my question. I will tell the facts of the case as they have come to me and see if that will enable the committee to enlighten me on the situation.

On the Pacific coast the boat-building industry has been very severely hit partly because of the tendency to grant contracts to the east coast, and partly because of the application of the manpower policy No. 4, of taking the work from the west coast and removing it to the eastern area on the theory that they are distressed employment areas. Some of the people on the Pacific coast have acquired the thought that some of this money is being used to build vessels in foreign shipyards for the use of the American Navy. I made some inquiry of the Navy Department, and they tell me there are vessels being built by these funds, that they are being built in Holland, Italy, France, and the Scandinavian countries for the use of those navies, to be manned by their nationals and to be sailed under their flags as part of the North Atlantic combined fleet. But I want to check with the committee to see whether or not that is the answer.

Mr. McGRATH. We are not building in foreign shipyards any ships for our own Navy. They are, however, building for the foreign governments themselves.

Mr. SHELLEY. Is it a fact that in return for this financial aid we make the requirement that these countries in return must make these ships available for use with the combined fleet under the North Atlantic Treaty? And further that no part of these funds will be used for building vessels for ourselves in foreign yards?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this kind of measure is the sort of measure that you cannot be just halfway for and halfway against. You either believe in the principle of collective or mutual security, or you do not. I think you ought to vote accordingly. Either vote the full amount, or vote to cut it out completely.

I wonder if the Members of this House who are proposing further cuts in the mutual security bill fully understand the nature and purpose of the bill and what an adequate appropriation will accomplish. Many of us have been so busy with the great volume of complicated legislation we have had to consider that we cannot all be experts on each piece of legislation. I think I can qualify as one who understands this bill and therefore it may be helpful if I attempt to show you as clearly as I can its essential features.

Do you realize that this is both a defense bill and an economy bill?

It is a defense bill because the money contained in it will make it possible for our allies to place under arms many well-equipped divisions to defend our common interests, which otherwise they would be unable to put into the field.

It is an economy bill because not the United States but these allies of ours will be bearing the great part of the costs of raising, training, and equipping their divisions. Testimony has shown that a United States division fully equipped costs the United States about $480,000,000; a European division costs about $280,000,000 in total; the equipment we provide under this program for a European division costs the United States $133,000,000 because our allies supply the balance of the costs as well as the men. They supply about one-half of the weapons and all of the costs of raising, training, feeding, and supplying their soldiers with shoes, clothing, and all the other things that are required to build a military establishment.

I do not understand how any Member of this House can really believe he is economizing if he votes to cut an appropriation which supplies only the margin needed by our allies to build up their own military forces.

Let me put the economy aspects of this bill in another way. Testimony has indicated that in the coming year it will cost the United States in expenditures about $55,000,000,000 for our own Armed Forces; the amount originally requested for the mutual-security program in Western Europe was about $5,500,000,000, or roughly one-tenth of the amount estimated for our own military expenditures. Yet for approximately one-tenth of the cost of our domestic Military Establishment we were to have acquired actually more men in the armies of our western European allies under arms or readily mobilizable than the total of our own Army. The amount requested from the Congress for the purpose of assistance to Western Europe has already been cut to about $4,500,000,000, and I assert with all the emphasis at my command that we do not dare to cut this figure any further.

So far I have been talking about dollars and cents and men under arms. This is by no means the whole story, however. Anyone looking back over the record in Western Europe since the war if he is at all fair minded must admit the tremendous accomplishments since that time. Not only has Western Europe with our assistance recovered from the economic prostration and despair which followed the destruction of the war, but great strides have been made toward building the military and psychological strength of the nations of this area. These nations have banded together with us in the North Atlantic Treaty, they have steadily built up the size and efficiency of their armed forces, and this trend toward economic, military, and spiritual strength is increasing its pace. Furthermore, there have been great strides toward real unification in this area. The Schuman plan has just been ratified by all the Parliaments and is about to go into effect; the European Defense Community has been agreed to and is expected to be ratified this year; agreements have been completed to bring Western Germany into the European Community and to make use of its tremendous resources in the defense of the free world. All this could never have been accomplished without both the help and leadership of the United States on the one hand and the courage and devotion to the ideals of freedom of our allies on the other hand. The tide is running strongly in our favor. Is this the time to slacken our efforts and to announce that we are flagging and hestitating in our leadership and support?

I am sure that any man who really thinks about these issues cannot possibly come to the conclusion that it would be in the interest of our own defense or of economy in this country to slash this appropriation further. Such action would cost us money rather than save us money and would mean less defense against Soviet imperialism than we otherwise could obtain. It would mean also that if trouble should come our own boys would be deprived of strong allies and would have to bear a much larger part of the burden of defense than necessary. It would be our own boys who would do most of the fighting and suffer most of the casualties. Furthermore, unless we have strong allies it would be much more likely in case of war that fighting would take place on our own shores than in areas far removed from our country.

Let no man think that he is serving the interests of the United States if he votes to slash the appropriation in this bill below the already deeply cut amount which is now before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. REES of Kansas, the time allotted to him was given to Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let us make this very clear. This is not any cut in appropriations. It is actually a miscalculation on the part of the various people concerned with this program. It is almost a matter of arithmetic. That is putting the thing on as friendly a basis as one can put it, assuming that they did not deliberately come in and try to get the Congress to appropriate $408,000,000, which they admit their calculations to be. I think that is what we ought to direct our attention to. First of all, I compliment this subcommittee and its staff for a real follow-through job. In other words, frequently committees in the House have been content to have the original presentation of the departments concerned with these programs given to them in general terms, and then let it sit, and we here in Congress have to rely on it. This subcommittee did not do just that. This subcommittee went further and brought

these same people back before them. I think everyone in this House should take a look at, and, in fact, keep in their files, the report of the supplementary hearings before the subcommittee, part two, on the Mutual Security Appropriation for 1953. Incidentally, the date of this report is Tuesday, June 24, 1952; in other words, just Tuesday of this week, just a few days ago. You read those hearings and draw your conclusions from this very interesting presentation, and you will find that the departments admit that they miscalculated to the tune of $408,000,000. Now, the committee has gone ahead and cut off $200,000,000, but it seems to me the smart thing is, where they have made an error in arithmetic, that they should not be allowed to keep the additional $208,000,000. This first amendment is to cut that off pro rata. I will then offer an amendment which will cut the other pro rata off. There will be two final amendments which will total the additional $208,000,000.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that this is not merely a question of arithmetic. It is a question of estimates. The Department of Defense estimated that they would have unobligated balances totaling $398,000,000. The facts are that they were not able to obligate the funds as rapidly as they had expected. It is admitted that $270,000,000 additional will not be obligated, and we cut off $200,000,000 leaving them some little leeway. The other items are highly doubtful, and that is the reason the committee did not base its cut on them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg to disagree with the gentleman on the doubtfulness of it, just on the basis of the report. If you will look at page 20 of this hearing, you will find that the figure of $1,576,000,000 and you will find that the only amount they could actually figure out was $219,000,000 that they had actually allocated of the $357,000,000. It is better explained on page 15. That item of $219,000,000 was all that they could figure and you subtract that from $357,000,000, and you get this $138,000,000, which you have to add to the $270,000,000 that you recognized does exist. There are the two items totaling $408,000,000.

Mr. GARY. They claim they have authorizations for those amounts. The question of how firm the authorizations are, is somewhat doubtful. But it is a question of estimates. Of course, the year is not over, and they will obligate some of these funds before the end of the year. I think the program will be speeded up because of our investigation, because if we had not gone into it there might have been even greater unobligated funds.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman has done a splendid job on this. However, this question of obligation is the very point I raised on the floor in consideration of the authorization, that you have to get into these contracts and obligations.

I want to direct attention, on page 2, to a new word that has been introduced into our language. That is the word "deobligation." That is a beaut, because that is exactly what they have been doing. They will obligate and then they will deobligate, and use it for something else. So we have actually got "deobbledegook" in our language.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There is another word that I was not familiar with which is in the subcommittee's hearings, and that is "shortfall." Shortfall means the agencies tell us "We were going to obligate a lot of money and we fell short. We cannot find any way to expend it."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is exactly right. That is the way we are going ahead on these appropriations. That is exactly the way to get to it. The next step is to begin to examine some of these contracts where they say they have obligated it, because you will find some real fraud, and I use that word advisedly, in some of these contracts. One proof of it, if you will notice in this particular report, their normal amount of obligations of moneys per month is a very low figure until they get to the very date when they shall come before the Congress to have them obligate it, and then all of a sudden that figure is increased 100 percent, or even 200 percent. In other words, they are getting it obligated before they come in here. If you will look at the contracts in which that money is obligated, you will begin to see the fraud. I say under this supplemental testimony, a few well placed courts martial might very well solve a lot of our problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE AIM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS WORLD PEACE

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the conferees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives have laid before us their report on the mutual security bill for fiscal 1953. The report calls for an authorization of $6,400,000,000, reconciling the difference in amounts approved respectively by the Senate and the House. I feel that the approval of the appropriation, which authorizes $1,500,000,000 less than the President requested, is in the best interests of our Nation and of world peace, and I want to urge the Members of this body to take favorable action on mutual security appropriation.

OBJECTIVES OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

The Mutual Security Program, envisaged in the bill before us, is a logical extension of the steps which our Nation has been taking during the past 7 years to insure world peace. It forms an integral part of our foreign policy which has a twofold objective: To strengthen the free world economically and unite it in common defense, so that we can meet any threat to peace with force; secondly, to further the free development of those areas which do not directly form a part of the Western World, and to strengthen those bonds of friendship which unite those areas with us.

The Mutual Security Program is exactly what the term implies. It consists of a planned effort to create and fully develop a defensive organization among the free nations, to which each member will contribute in proportion to its means. The efforts and contributions which we are expending—and will expend in the future—to develop this organization, will strengthen our mutual security. They are as much to our advantage as they are to the advantage of the other free nations.

The bill before us, as I stated earlier, is a part of our foreign policy. It can only be judged in terms of our over-all endeavors in the field of foreign affairs, and in the light of our achievements in that sphere.

IS OUR FOREIGN POLICY A FAILURE?

Now there are some persons who, for their own reasons, have condemned our foreign policy as a failure. They argue in many different ways to reach that conclusion. I feel that there is only one right way of approaching this question: the way of looking at concrete facts, of evaluating them impartially, and of reaching conclusions from facts.

The clearest and easiest way of doing this, in my opinion, is by looking at the world as it was 7 years ago, and comparing it with the world today.

POST-WORLD WAR II PICTURE: 3 SPHERES

Let us first look at the world as it was during the immediate post-World War II period.

As we came out of World War II, and demobilized our Armed Forces, we saw the following picture on the world scene: The globe was roughly divided into 3 spheres—the Western World; the Soviet orbit; and what I term as the "Third Sphere."

I need not remind you of the conditions that prevailed at that time in the Western World. There was a group of nations, economically ruined, ravaged by war, and demoralized to the point where they could become an easy prey to any aggressor. There was no unity of purpose among them, and no other ambition except to go home and try, as best as they could, to individually patch up their wounds.

On the other hand, there was the Soviet Union, dominating one-sixth of the world's land masses, and one-third of world population. The Communist orbit, despite the destruction of war, was militarily stronger than ever, and ready to extend its dominion over the rest of the globe.

In the Third Sphere, there stretched the vast territories of Africa, the Middle and Near East, and large areas of Asia, largely populated by starving masses of diverse races and nationalities, crying for freedom and a better way of life. Large portion of those areas was permeated with a spirit of revolution, similar to the one which the western world experienced a century and a half ago. This third sphere could either become a

tool in the hands of the Communists, or side with us.

THE AMERICAN IDEA

Having this over-all picture, let us look at the course which our Nation decided to pursue. Let us recall the bold foreign policy which was enunciated by the Democratic administration, and measure its accomplishments.

Instead of withdrawing from the rest of the world, as some had advocated, and unrealistically hoping that peace and contentment would follow in the wake of an obsolete isolationist policy, we decided not to retreat into the dangerous and deceptive dreamers' paradise, but to face facts. Our own experiences during World War II showed us that the era of regional security went out with the atomic bomb, with transcontinental air flights, and with successful transoceanic invasions.

Faced with these circumstances, we decided to work for the establishment of lasting world peace. We embarked upon a program of helping the free nations of the world to get back on their feet, of unifying them in common defense, of stopping further Communist expansion, and of sharing our technological know-how with the underdeveloped areas of the world.

THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY

In pursuance of that policy, we have accomplished the following things:

In the first place, despite the preponderance of manpower and war matériel strength of the Soviet orbit, we have succeeded in stopping further Communist advance. In fact, we repelled and turned back Communist expansion in Greece and Turkey, forced them to withdraw from Iran, and are stopping it today in Korea.

Secondly, we helped the free western nations to rebuild their ravaged economies. Through the Marshall plan, and the ECA, we helped them get back on their feet.

Thirdly, we have organized and perfected a defensive organization of the free nations. Through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the present Mutual Security Program, we unified the Western World in a desire to attain lasting peace, and we gave it the means with which to attain that objective.

Fourthly, through the point 4 program, we came to the help of the underdeveloped areas of the world. We have been gaining friends within the third sphere—the same sphere which could have easily fallen into Communist hands.

Fifthly, through the Rio pact and subsequent efforts, we have solidified the nations of the Western Hemisphere, bringing them into closer relationship with our country than ever before.

Lastly, we have avoided what appeared inevitable in 1947: the outbreak of a global atomic war, which would have subjected the world to ruin beyond description.

We did all of these things, while at the same time preserving the economic stability of our own Nation, maintaining full employment, and improving the general welfare of our people.

LOOKING AHEAD

I believe that the facts which I have briefly outlined, point to the conclusion that our foreign policy has been eminently successful in bringing us closer to the realization of our ultimate goal: the establishment of lasting and just peace in the world.

We must continue in our efforts to attain that goal. We can do it today by approving the appropriation before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is recognized.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is the strangest argument I have almost ever heard. I have been in the obligating department in the Navy, in the early part of World War II. There was great pressure in my department, the Bureau of Ordnance, to obligate toward the end of the year, because they said if we did not obligate we would not get the funds. I would be very happy now if these unobligated funds had gone up to $1,000,000,000, because I think that prudent management and careful obligation is what we are after. I think that by taking these unobligated funds and discouraging the showing of as much unobligated funds as possible only encourages these services to spend their money without regard to where it goes. I hope that this amendment will be defeated and I hope that in the future this Congress will gladly congratulate any branch of the service that comes up with more unobligated funds than they expect. There is no trouble on earth to obligating funds. You can go out and make contracts, because they know they are coming up in the future. You can give letters of intent, but whenever any branch of the Government brings back more unobligated funds than they anticipated, I think it is cause for congratulation. It shows prudent management.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would agree if the unobligated funds went back into the Treasury; but, as the gentleman well knows, this agency insists that the unobligated funds be left in their hands. Therefore, we should recapture these funds and put them back into the Treasury where they belong.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, even after we make the cut the gentleman has proposed, we are still leaving them with a petty cash emergency amount of between two hundred and two hundred and fifty million dollars. All that they asked of you and me in committee was unobligated that they could use the unobligated funds for needed purposes and obligate after the end of the year.

Mr. CHATHAM. I appreciate what the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Ohio have said. I sat through 9 weeks of hearings and I have a letter of congratulation from my chairman that I was the third man in attendance. I am satisfied that these funds are being spent by just as patriotic, able, and honest people as any of us here.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHATHAM. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from Missouri used the word "fraud," and he said he used it advisedly. If he has any evidence of fraud, should he not present it to the Department of Justice or to proper authorities?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, the report of the gentleman's committee is the very basis of it; as a matter of fact, that hearing should be submitted to the Department of Justice.

Mr. CHATHAM. I would say that we could trust the people spending this money and hope that next year they will come back with twice as much unobligated money. I do not think that any of you who may be members of an organization would expect your associates to criticize you for being able to report your company in a better cash position at the end of the year than you expected.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, these four amendments will return to the Treasury of the United States a total of $408,000,000. The evidence is crystal clear that the Department of Defense overstated its obligations by $408,000,000. I refer you to part 2 of the mutual security appropriations for 1953, hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. This brief, well-presented 25-page pamphlet I hold in my hand, here, and I will quote a few pertinent colloquies from it in just a minute.

The Department of Defense overstated its obligations. The sum of $408,000,000 was at stake. Now, $408,000,000 is a lot of money to a lot of taxpaying citizens across this country of ours. As a matter of fact, it represents the total income taxes collected from 700,000 heads of American families of 4 who earn $5,000 a year. That sum of money piled up in one tall pile of crisp new thousand-dollar bills would tower 136 feet in the air.

The subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has recognized the importance of the tax dollars which would go to the Defense Department under this appropriation. They have recognized that it is morally wrong for the Defense Department to overstate its obligations in order to secure increased authorizations. The subcommittee cut $200,000,000 from this appropriation in recognition of these two hard facts, but they did not cut deeply enough.

What will happen if these four amendments are defeated and the additional $208,000,000 is left in this appropriation bill? The subcommittee knows. In the second paragraph on page 2 they discuss this very type of situation when they say:

As to obligations, when the monthly obligations came in for the month of April—recalling now that the estimates contemplated obligating $2,371,000,000 in the last 3

months—the obligations for the month of April were a net of $4,000,000. There had been some deobligation and some new obligation, but the actual net obligation for the month was roughly $3,000,000.

Did you notice that new gobbledygook term, "deobligate"? That is what will happen to the $208,000,000. It will be deobligated and the money will be spent on projects which have not necessarily secured the approval of this or any other Congress. What luxuries and gadgets and foreign boondoggles will this uncontrolled appropriation buy when the Defense Department finished its process of deobligation? This sum of money represents the total income taxes collected from 360,000 heads of American families of four who are earning $5,000 a year. I am sure that they expect the Congress which they elected to guarantee them a dollar of defense for every dollar spent. I am sure they want the United States and her allies to be strong but I am equally sure that they do not want their tax dollars wasted.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] is a distinguished businessman. He has just made the point that he would prefer that the Defense Department leave these funds unobligated rather than rush out at the last minute to obligate them before the end of the fiscal year. I agree with him fully. As a very small-business man, myself, I respect his broad business judgment and his Nation-wide reputation as an industrialist. I am afraid, however, that he may have missed the point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] were trying to establish. I do not believe it is the matter of the unobligated funds which bothers them. I know that is not the consideration which concerns me as a small-business man. I am concerned, as the subcommittee was concerned by the lack of frankness of the Defense Department which concealed until the last day of these hearings the fact that the obligations of the agency for military purposes were overstated by $408,000,000 in order to secure larger authorizations and larger appropriations.

We can argue all day as to whether this overstatement was by accident or design but there can be no argument over the fact that these obligations were not presented accurately. The subcommittee recognized this fact when they cut nearly half this amount from the Defense Department's request. This fact is borne out in the testimony. When the Mutual Security Agency came before the subcommittee with their budget request they asked for authority to continue their unobligated balances available after June 30, 1952. These unobligated balances were represented to be $398,000,000 not including items outside the first four titles such as aid to Spain and certain relief in Korea.

During the hearings the alert chairman of the subcommittee and his watchful staff requested tables indicating obligations by months. When these tables were scrutinized they revealed significant disparities. These disparities resulted in the chairman's calling Mr. William C. Foster, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Mr. C. Tyler Wood, Associate Deputy Director for Mutual Security, before the committee, last Tuesday, June 24, 1952.

It is difficult to extract the most significant portions of these hearings to present in the brief time at my disposal because they are so full of indications of sloppy estimating and loose control over funds that every Member of this House would do well to study them in detail as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has suggested.

The table on page 9, furnished by Mr. Foster, states that obligations for June would be $1,714,600,000. This is a lot of money, even for the Army, Navy, Air Force and OSD to obligate in 1 month. It is almost a fifth of the total that the Department of Defense was able to obligate in the 11 months preceding, 16.9 as much to be exact.

On June 18, the Department of Defense had to admit that they just were not able to obligate the money that fast. One billion seven hundred million dollars is a lot to spend in 1 month. As Mr. Harvey, of the committee staff, summed up the case, and his summary in the presence of Mr. Foster, on page 13, they succeeded in planning for the obligation of all but $658,000,000 by the time of the report on June 18. It is hard to obligate $658,000,000 with only 8 working days or 12 calendar days left in the month and with a new fiscal year coming up July 1. Mr. Harvey, of the committee staff, in the presence of Mr. Foster, discussed these plans for obligations during the month of June in quite some detail, which is reported at the top of page 13. Listen to this tale of figures that just do not add up, and of missing papers laying on desk tops on Saturday afternoon which result in a $313 000,000 error:

Mr. HARVEY. That left $658,000,000 unobligated at June 30, but also listed $192,000,000 which they expected would be obligated in full out of the balance, or a difference of $476,000,000 at the end of July.

Now, the subsidiary statements, one for each service, which support this total statement, vary from this, in that the $476,000,000 becomes $404,000,000 when you total up the subsidiary statements. That discrepancy they have not yet sought to explain.

This contemplated obligations by the Army during the month in the amount of $434,000,000. Of the amount of $434,000,000, there was $92,000,000 of offshore procurement, of which $72,000,000 was in the books on June 18 and $20,000,000 probably to go in later. There were some other small items.

Then there were two items—$306,000,000 for tank and automotive equipment and $7,000,000 for ammunition—which were stated by Mr. Garlock, of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, to have been a piece of paper which should have been obligated, which they found laying on somebody's desk on Saturday, and they took it up and obligated it. It should already have been obligated, as he explained it. It is from the Ordnance Corps, United States stocks, now being prepared for shipment on a reimbursable basis.

On page 20 of the hearings, Mr. Foster recognizes the impossibility of obligating the whole $1,714,600,000 when he says:

The point which I am making is that even raising the question as to the Air Force small items in June, and even raising a question as to whether the Army will be able to go ahead with one or two other items, as I total the figures, which are almost surely solid, they come to $1,576,000,000, which we will obligate during the month of June. That excludes the one-hundred-eighty-million-dollar-odd on the Air Force, which I must say I believe, on the basis of the representations from them, will actually come through.

Please notice that Mr. Foster's figure of $1,576,000,000 has shrunk by $138,000,000 from the figure of $1,714,600,000 taken from Mr. Foster's chart on page 9 of the hearings. This means that we now have $138,000,000 of water in the obligations figure on which this whole appropriation is based.

Now, let us look at Mr. Harvey's summary, with Mr. Foster present, on page 25:

Mr. TABER. You have increased the unobligated balance that was estimated by the departments from $398 million to $668 million on these particular things; is that it?

Mr. HARVEY. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. That means an increase of $270 million.

Mr. HARVEY. That is assuming that they will obligate $1,714,000,000 in June.

Mr. Foster admits that these unobligated balances which were previously stated at only $398,000,000 are actually $668,000,000. He admits, in other words, that they were previously under-stated by $270,000,000.

When you take this $270,000,000 and add to it the $138,000,000 representing the shrinkage in June obligations you arrive at the total of $208,000,000 which this series of amendments seeks to eliminate from this appropriation. These amendments accept the figures of the agency itself and seek only to return to Treasury that portion which the agency cannot justify.

Actually, there is a good case for cutting this appropriation considerably in excess of the $208,000,000. On page 15 the Air Force submits a table which purports to be a breakdown of their $357,000,000 in unobligated funds but which adds up to only $219,300,000, a discrepancy of $138,000,000. This amount, added to the $270,000,000 previously admitted as padding again gives us the total of $408,000,000 of which the committee has already deducted $200,000,000. The committee informs me that they had the General Accounting Office check into the $357,000,000 figure and found that it had been obligated in March and deobligated in April. When the committee staff discovered that the Air Force figures simply did not add up and when the Air Force was asked for a quick explanation, there is some reason to wonder if they did not hurriedly obligate it again in their eagerness to get something on the books. It is entirely possible that this whole $357,000,000 should be recaptured.

The whole question on these amendments is a question of orderly procedure, sound accounting and protection for the control of Congress over the purse strings of the Nation. It is not a question of whether or not this extra slush fund should be dumped into the military-aid appropriation for these specific areas at all.

Hardly a week passes that some national publication does not question editorially whether or not Congress has lost

all control of our budgetary processes. "Has Congress broken down" asked Fortune magazine in its great February 1952 issue which explored the Government in detail and editorialized under the caption, "Lost: Control of the purse."

Hardly a day goes my that I do not have several letters from constituents asking: Cannot Congress control this dollar-mad monster which it has created? Cannot Congress curb this wanton spending? Cannot Congress in some way control this tax program which is killing our incentive and taking away the money we need to feed and clothe and house our families?

The answer is that as long as we continue with loose, flimsily supported authorizations of this type, so long as the relationship between authorization and actual contractual obligation is as distorted and as vague as these hearings indicate in this particular case, we will not have actual control over the appropriation machinery or the purse strings of this Nation and we will have failed in our constitutional responsibility to our own constituents.

I would like to review briefly once again just what is going on here in this program of amendments based on the evidence I have outlined to you.

Four amendments probably will be offered. The amendment to title I offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] seeks to eliminate $145,600,000. This has little to do with Europe or military aid to Europe. It corrects an administrative error in estimating obligated funds. That is all.

The amendment to title II to be offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], seeks to reduce the appropriation by $31,200,000. This likewise is not an issue of military aid for the Near East and Africa. It is a matter of fiscal responsibility.

I will offer an amendment to title III seeking to reduce that appropriation by $24,960,000. I favor a vigorous military aid program in Asia and the Pacific but I want the appropriations for that program properly handled by the Pentagon. Until then I believe the $31,200,000 belongs back in the Treasury.

An amendment will be offered to title IV seeking to reduce that amount by $5,240,000. Again, this is an amendment favoring fiscal responsibility and sound budgeting. It is not a cut, as such in military aid to the American Republics.

These amounts add up exactly to the $208,000,000 which I have been discussing in such detail. That $208,000,000 added to the $200,000,000 which the committee so wisely, in my opinion, cut out setting a precedent that these authorizations based on poorly estimated obligations were out of line with the actual expenditures, comes to the total of $408,000,000. This represents the slack, the padding, the water, or the gap between the actual expenditures program planned and the commitments made.

This is not a cut in the way of limiting the effectiveness of any of these programs. This is a returning of Federal funds to the Federal Treasury, an elimination of a gigantic slush fund waiting for deobligation.

If these military aid programs need extension, I submit that the agencies can come before the Congress of the United States and request additional authorizations and appropriations based on concrete programs, outlining what they need. I submit to you, however, that this blank-check policy and this fiscal looseness of congressional control over appropriations, and especially over expenditures, is going to be a mighty issue when all of us face the voters this fall. I hope we will face up to our responsibilities today and pass all four of these amendments as a demonstration of congressional integrity.

On the basis of my own observations of the waste and extravagance inherent in military aid expenditures around the world, I for one want to be able to stand up there and say that I did everything I could to see that the taxpayer's dollar was protected by an alert Congress and spent under congressional supervision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that these funds will be taken from the military assistance program for Europe. Title I deals with Europe. This is the NATO program which is so essential to the containment of communism in Europe.

The program for the NATO and other European countries was determined at a conference held in Lisbon just a few months ago. This appropriation is based upon the requirements of the part of the program which the United States, subject to the approval of Congress, agreed to assume.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand it, the Department had said at one time it would have unobligated $400,000,000 and that turned out to be $669,000,000. $400,000,000 is accounted for appropriately as I understand it by the necessity for obligating funds before the end of the fiscal year, leaving $269,000,000 which the committee cut $200,000,000, leaving the other $69,000,000 as latitude in the situation. That is the issue?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. This amendment is seeking to cut it $208,000,000 which the gentleman says would cut into the bone.

Mr. GARY. That is correct and I may say that there is no semblance of fraud in the matter. It is simply a question of estimates. It is difficult in a program of this magnitude to determine the exact amount it will be possible to spend within a given time. Insofar as obligating large sums at one time is concerned, let me say that the amounts of monthly obligations vary greatly because in 1 month they may make a contract covering a large number of tanks or airplanes which would make a very large obligation for that particular month.

I have the monthly figures here running back to 1950. In August 1950 they obligated only $62,000,000; in May 1951 they obligated $1,092,000,000; in March of 1952 they obligated $1,188,000,000. It is not a uniform procedure and the fact that they do have some unobligated funds is certainly not a matter for condemnation. They should be complimented for not rushing out and obligating funds without proper consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the gentleman should be commended for bringing out that particular point because it shows good business administration. They could have obligated all of it.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are doing a good job and they should be given credit for it.

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. If they had obligated all of these funds, does not the gentleman think these same people would be in here trying to cut this appropriation anyway?

Mr. GARY. I know there has been continuing opposition to the program from some who are now offering the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. CRAWFORD.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 75.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section 201, $530,316,500; and in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 201 of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 30, line 18, strike out "$530,316,500" and insert "$499,166,500."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned, which cuts $31,200,000 off this item. It is only one part of that which goes to make up the total of the $208,000,000 about which we spoke.

I am not going to take the 5 minutes because I think the matter has been debated sufficiently. However, I do want to make one comment about this matter of obligated funds. The argument has been advanced that we ought to encourage these people to obligate the funds in orderly procedure. If we pursue this method we encourage them to come in and, I will again use the word, fraudulently obligate these funds ahead of time before they have a real, firm contract. I submit that is a pretty shabby argument, to say that if we try to hold these

people in line they then will engage more carefully in this program of obligating funds when they cannot reasonably and intelligently obligate them.

After all, the test is this: We authorize funds, we appropriate money for them on the basis of a presentation, and then the only check we have on whether that authorization and appropriation was justified is the experience of whether or not they actually can go ahead and spend the money wisely and legitimately. I say when we find that they cannot spend the money wisely and legitimately we ought to cut it back.

That is exactly what the situation is here. If you are talking about encouraging them to pull the wool over the eyes of Congress more, then I say that Congress ought to stand on its hind legs and resist and do again what I say: Where these contracts are not firmly entered into, are not entered into in good faith, and are simply to obligate those funds, a few well-placed courts martials will do the job.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If we adopt this series of amendments, according to the figures I have attempted to put together, we will not have cut the full amount of the estimated expenditures for military aid by the amount, $1,240,000,000, which they plan to expend in fiscal 1955. Even if they took it all out at the tail end, all we are doing is delaying for another look these proposed expenditures for fiscal 1955, so that we can see a little later whether they will be needed, whether we are going to have allies willing and able to use that military equipment 2 or 3 years from now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that this amendment will take $31,200,000 from military assistance to Greece, Turkey, and Iran. If there is any more critical part of the globe I do not know where it is. Yet after all the cuts that have been made in this bill it is proposed now to cut $31,000,000 from that vital defense area.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 73, noes 82.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and Mr. GARY as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 100, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title II: For assistance authorized by section 203, $50,822,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 203 of said act (except the amounts allocated or available for the purposes of sections 204 and 205 of said act) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

THE KERSTEN AMENDMENT: THE BASIS FOR A REPUBLICAN FOREIGN POLICY OF LIBERATION

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, contained in title I of the Mutual Security Act, as you will recall, is a provision providing that not more than $100,000,000 is to be used from these funds for military assistance to Europe, to aid selected persons who had escaped from and were residing in Communist-dominated countries, to form those escapees from the Soviet-dominated countries into national military units, or for other purposes.

This law was enacted in October of last year. I wish to refer to a sentence in the hearings which refers to this $100,000,000 and to the fact that $4,000,000 has been used of these funds for the purpose of relief to escapees. The statement in the hearings is:

This use does not in any way prejudice the intent of the escapee provision to form escapees into military units, supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Although this law was enacted last October, these military units have not been set up. The meaning of this amendment is, among other things, that these escapees could be formed into national units of their own nationality, free battalions of Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, and even Russians, Ukrainians, and so forth, in the uniforms of their own nationality. They would fly the flags of their own nationality, flags representing the freedom of their country. This provision, as I say, has not been implemented. When it was enacted into law, you will recall, the Soviet Union became very violent about this provision, charging that it was an aggressive act on the part of the United States. It is hardly necessary to point out to the members of the committee the importance of these military units. It has this importance, for one thing: When General Gruenther testified some months ago that there were 60 satellite divisions on the Soviet side, those 60 satellite divisions could be placed potentially on our side by setting up these free military units that would be the cadres of armies of liberation when the day comes.

Just imagine, Mr. Chairman, if America were taken over by the Reds and our forces were under Soviet control, the effect of free military units of American soldiers with American uniforms and American flags in Canada or Mexico or elsewhere; what effect would these military units have upon American boys under Soviet domination? It would disintegrate the hold of the Soviets upon American forces. So will the setting up of these national units in Western Europe do a great deal toward disintegrating the control and the hold of Stalin upon the 60 satellite divisions of Eastern Europe. This could well mean the difference between victory and defeat in Europe.

I suspect that this amendment has not been implemented because the administration is tied to the policy of containment, and this amendment definitely points toward the ultimate liberation of these Eastern European nations. These military units should have been set up long ago. They should have been set up the first part of this year. A representative of the Army called at my office in January or February of this year and stated that the Army had completed plans for the setting up of these units, and the plans are now with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I suspect that the hand of the State Department stayed the implementation of these units. Of course, it strikes right down to the very fundamental proposition of the difference between a foreign policy of containment and a foreign policy of liberation. That is a basic issue that will face this country this fall and this coming year; and we on our side, I am confident, are going to support a foreign policy of liberation.

The administration will not implement the Kersten amendment because the amendment is based on liberation rather than on its bankrupt and negative policy of containment.

I predict that the Republican Party at its national convention will adopt the dynamic and affirmative foreign policy plank of liberation of the nations and peoples held captive by the Communists. Such a policy looks toward the defeat of world communism and the ultimate freedom of all peoples.

Such a Republican policy of liberation will be in sharp contrast to the containment-appeasement policy of the Truman-Acheson administration that for decades would continue to confiscate most of our earnings in taxes, draft our boys, and end in an all-out world war III. The Marxian Socialists who have infiltrated the Truman administration are responsible for this deadly and un-American containment-appeasement policy. Marxian Socialists are blood cousins of the Communists. That is why they seek only to appease and never to defeat them.

A Republican foreign policy of liberation versus the Marxian Socialist policy of containment and appeasement will be the basic issue facing the American people this fall. The happiness of our children and the future of our country will await the issue.

Such a new policy of liberation will break clean with communism. It will chart the path of freedom for the captive nations and end the threat of world war III at its source. This will mean a foreseeable end to high taxes, heavy armaments, and, most important, the drafting of American boys, which the Marxian Socialists of the administration would carry on forever. ROBERT TAFT, General Eisenhower, and the Republican foreign policy adviser, John Foster Dulles, are in favor of a policy of liberation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to delay action on this bill, but to endorse heartily what the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] has said. Many of our colleagues will remember last August when the amendment now known far and wide as the Kersten amendment, appropriating

$100,000,000 for a special purpose to mutual security, was put in the legislation. At that time it was understood by many of us, perhaps by most of us, that that money could be used in order to establish military strength among the refugees who had escaped from behind the iron curtain.

I, too, regret, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has expressed his regret, that this appropriation of money has not been used. I say in all seriousness, Mr. Chairman, that I believe had that $100,000,000 been used, wisely and carefully, it could have had more effect in counteracting the threat of Communist aggression in Europe than any billion dollars we have appropriated for either military or mutual security.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I, too, should like to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I believe with you that these funds if properly used could be a tremendous and effective weapon in the hands of the Western Allies. There are hundreds and thousands of human beings coming into the Western World from behind the iron curtain, people who want to contribute, who have something to contribute, and certainly we should make use of their talents.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. May I make this personal reference: Just a few weeks ago I had the privilege of conferring with General Anders, who was a brave and outstanding leader of the Polish Army attached to the American Army headed by General Clark during the campaign in north Africa and Italy in World War II. He and those brave Polish soldiers distinguished themselves as they fought with us against Nazi tyranny. I sat in General Anders' office surrounded by his staff, which he still holds together, in the city of London, and he was anxious and eager that he and his soldiers be permitted to join as a member of this European defense army.

I think we need legislation to back up what we are trying to do and I would like to see, even in the closing days of this session, legislation providing for an army of liberation, which would include not only General Anders and his officers, together with these Polish soldiers now in exile, but also other national units which, as the gentleman from Wisconsin said, could fight under their own officers, in their own uniforms and under their own flags. They would serve as a symbol that they are fighting or at least that they are ready to fight for the defense not only of Western Europe but of their own homelands, in Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic states, Bulgaria, Hungaria, Rumania, and elsewhere.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman mentioned the name of General Anders. May I say to the gentleman that General Anders came before our committee appointed by the House to examine into the Katyn massacre tragedy and he rendered every possible service he could. He is a brave soldier, a great man, and the people that he is leading are worthy of all the encouragement we can give them.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I want to join with the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Wisconsin in their effort and to say that we need an affirmative policy for liberation, not just a containment policy. We who have Rumanians, Lithuanians and others from that part of the world in our districts know they will help liberate their countries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I appreciate the gentleman's remark. There is not a Member of this House representing an urban area in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Illinois, or any other State but has many constituents who came to America, or are descendants of immigrants from eastern European countries who are ready and anxious and eager to join with us in this fight. Let us create an army of liberation and offer hope to these people behind the iron curtain that they, too, some day may be liberated from the enslavement of Communist control.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the interest the gentleman has in this evidently very vital project. Can he assure me if we take such people into a unit to defend the democracies, people who have come from behind the iron curtain, we can depend on having the right people?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. They would have to be screened carefully. I may say to the gentleman that this question has been carefully considered, not only by General Gruenther and the NATO staff, with whom I talked about this problem recently, but other military leaders in Europe. They have gone over that matter carefully, and assure us the refugee units could make up an effective force.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title III: For assistance authorized by section 301, $540,807,500; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to section 301 of said act shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNSON: Page 31, line 16, after "section 301", strike out "$540,807,500" and insert "$515,847,500."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to use the whole 5 minutes or any major part of the 5 minutes. This is the third of the amendments which were presented as a group when the discussion started with the presentation by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], and continued with the presentation by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. This affects title 3 and results in a saving of $24,960,000. The House has already set a precedent and adopted two of these four amendments. I hope the House will adopt the other two.

This is not a matter that should be affected particularly by geographical area or program designation. This is a matter of sound procedures, of good accounting practices, and of bringing the authorization in line with actual experience. It is simply a matter of eliminating padded obligations. After all, if any of our constituents or we, ourselves, were as careless with our income tax estimates as some of the departments have been with these estimates, I think we would be subject to a great deal of difficulty. This move simply is returning unexpended money to the general fund. The money will be there. If there is an emergency, if there is a need for it in this Asia-Pacific area it can be reappropriated, and in the meantime we are exerting proper congressional control over the spending and the budget.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

$24,690,000 will be returned to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not sure that the House thoroughly understood the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] a while ago. He was referring to these unappropriated balances as if they were returned to the Treasury or retained in the agencies' hands. If this amendment carries, this $24,690,000 will be returned to the general fund of the Treasury; is that not correct?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Otherwise they are left in the hands of the agency to do with as they please.

Mr. BROWNSON. By the process of deobligation, which has already been discussed here today, they can be spent freely, taking all congressional control away.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot understand why any person with an economic mind, who has great respect for the taxpayers of this country, will insist on funds being left in an agency where they have not been justified, instead of being returned to the Treasury and left in the hands of the Congress here which represents the people.

Mr. BROWNSON. I certainly agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. I feel geography is not a matter of consideration; this is a matter of bookkeeping right here in Washington. This principle should be applied universally in titles I, II, III, and IV, in order

that the House be consistent with the action already taken. If this principle of returning these funds to the Treasury is right and sound for title I in Europe and title II in the Near East and Africa, it is just as right for title III and Asia and the Pacific. I have no quarrel with those who would help Formosa or the Philippines but there is a proper way to do that—a way that will insure a larger percentage of the funds winding up where we want them. Creation of a slush fund awaiting deobligation is not good congressional precedent. On the basis of sound procedure alone, I ask that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that the geographic element in this particular amendment is being minimized to a greater degree than necessary. As I read title III it refers to the general area of China, including Thailand, including Indochina, including the Philippines, and including the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China, which at the present time is located on Formosa.

As the Members of this House know, we entered into a mutual-security agreement with the Republic of the Philippines, and part of the funds in this particular section go toward the mutual defense of that particular part of the far-eastern area. There we have, for example, the Government of China, and it seems to me here early this afternoon the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] commented on the fact that while the Chinese Army, which numbered somewhere between five and six hundred thousand on the Island of Formosa, was in good shape physically, they did not even have shoes with which to march. There are people in this Congress who are demanding, in fact, that we use these Chinese troops to invade the mainland of China. But how are you going to train that army up to its maximum power if you do not appropriate the funds to see that this army is trained, and at the present time it is far from trained, if we can take the testimony of General Olmsted and others who testified before our committee and also before the Committee on Appropriations?

Then, insofar as Indochina is concerned, that likewise is connected with the common defense against the spread of Communist aggression. While Indochina is something like 11,000 miles from here and perhaps 7,000 miles from France, nevertheless the French there are making a great contribution, and we are helping them to the best of our ability to maintain the flank in Asia and to keep away from Russian Communists the oil, rubber, and tin of that part of the world.

It is my understanding, on the basis of the testimony before our committee, that the French this year, doing their share, are spending more than one-third of their defense budget in the war in Indochina, and that that amounts to well over $1,400,000,000.

So I hope you will pay particular attention to this part of the world and keep in mind what would happen if enough defense support and enough military support is not sent to the Philippines, to Indochina, and to Formosa. I hope you vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON], but I am opposed to this amendment. I have tried to consider each item in an appropriation bill on its merits. I have never been a believer in across-the-board percentage cuts, although as I said earlier, due to the fact that we have transfer authorization in this particular legislation, it may not make much difference where the cuts are made. However, I would be unwilling to participate in any cut of military money that is supposed to go, at least in part, to Formosa.

Admiral Radford was back here recently and the papers quoted him as dismayed at the obsession of the Government and the Congress with Europe and their neglect of the part of the world, Asia, where we are fighting a bitter war and where the struggle may expand.

Even though this is not a big cut, $24,960,000, I am opposed to it, because I think the Congress needs to take every opportunity to emphasize the importance of the defense of that area in our own security interest.

I did not feel that the original requests were very large for this area, compared with the gigantic requests for Europe, when they came before the Foreign Affairs Committee. Since then, without my vote, the amounts for military aid in the Far East have already received cuts. I am unwilling to participate in even a token or symbolic cut of appropriations for military purposes in the part of the world that involves Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, and the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I merely want the Members of the House to know what they are voting on. This amendment would cut $24,960,000 from military assistance to China, Indochina, the Philippines and Thailand. They are the only nations involved.

The gentleman from New Jersey told you just a few moments ago about the conditions which he witnessed on Formosa. I witnessed the same conditions. This talk about the Nationalist Chinese Army invading the mainland is silly unless we give them more training and more equipment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I just cannot believe that the House today, voting in the best interest of the America we love so much, will approve this amendment.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Does the gentleman consider that the army we saw in Formosa was in condition to invade the mainland of China?

Mr. CANFIELD. Of course not.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. If we ever want the Nationalist Army to invade the mainland or even to defend Formosa we must assist in training and equipping the troops.

That is the purpose of these funds. If you do not want them properly trained and equipped vote for this amendment. If you do, vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic and technical assistance, title III: (a) For assistance authorized by section 302 (a), to be furnished under the applicable provisions of section 503 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, $202,778,250; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made available pursuant to section 302 of said act and allocated or otherwise available to the Mutual Security Agency (except unexpended balances of funds allocated for assistance to Burma and Indonesia) shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation; (b) for assistance authorized by section 302 (a) to be furnished under the applicable provisions of the act for International Development, as amended, $118,634,250 and in addition, unexpended balances of (1) appropriations heretofore available pursuant to section 302 of said act and allocated or otherwise available to the Technical Cooperation Administration, and (2) funds allocated for assistance for Burma and Indonesia, shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 32, line 7, strike out "$118,634,250" and insert "$67,793,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am offering will cut $50,000,000 from an item of $118,634,250, for so-called technical aid to Asia and the Pacific. The committee proposes to give a 35 percent increase over the amount we gave last year for the same purpose.

The boondoggling technical-assistance program started off to be an inexpensive, good-neighbor program, under which we would spend a little money to send technical experts to backward countries to give them technical information which they do not possess, and which we do possess.

You will find the item which I seek to amend set out in the committee report on page 59. It is listed there under Title 3—Asia and Pacific, and the particular item is the third item in that column, listed "Technical cooperation—TCA."

The details of this so-called technical-assistance program are set out in the hearings in tables which are printed on pages 693, 694, and 695 of the hearings.

You will see by referring to these tables that the greater portion of this money

is scheduled to go to India and Pakistan. As I stated before, this so-called technical-assistance program started out to be an inexpensive, good-neighbor program. For the 1951 fiscal year we appropriated $5,193,000 to give technical information and assistance to India.

If properly spent, it seems to me that $5,000,000 ought to pay for enough technical information to last a long time and do India a lot of good. However, it was not nearly enough for the global spenders who want to bring every country in the world up to the American standard of living. For 1952 the appropriation was jumped to $54,565,000, an increase of $49,000,000; and the bill now before us proposes another $23,000,000 increase over last year's $54,000,000, making the so-called technical assistance for India in this bill $77,517,000. This is a jump in 2 years of more than $72,000,000 in a spending program which started out to be a little inexpensive good-neighbor program of furnishing technical knowledge and information to backward people. Yet the hearings show on page 698 that supplies and equipment now are about 10 to 1 as compared to services.

For Pakistan we started out in 1951 with $448,000. This was increased by more than $10,000,000 in 1952, the amount being $10,778,000, and we propose in this bill a still further increase for the next year of $12,000,000, the total carried in this bill being $22,581,000.

In addition to the tremendous increase over the 2-year period for India, you will remember that last year Congress voted $190,000,000 to send grain to India to relieve a so-called grain shortage.

If this thing is not brought to a halt, there is no telling how many billions of dollars the do-gooders and world spenders are going to take from the pockets of American taxpayers to pay for this pyramiding, snowballing, world-wide WPA program, which got its foot in the door under the guise of a technical information program, and which in a 2-year period, insofar as India is concerned, has jumped from $5,000,000 a year to $77,000,000, and insofar as Pakistan is concerned, has jumped from less than a half million dollars a year to $22,500,000 a year.

I call your attention also to the fact, and you can see the figures on page 695 of the hearings, that at this time India has foreign exchange reserves, and that means a cash balance, of nearly $2,000,000,000, and has a gross external public debt of less than half a billion dollars, while we instead of having any cash balance at all, have a national debt of $259,000,000,000. I call your attention also to the fact that the same table shows on page 695 of the hearings that Pakistan, scheduled to get $22,500,000 under this bill, also has foreign exchange reserves of $631,000,000, and no external public debt at all. In the face of these facts, and in the face of our own weakened financial position, threatened with inflation as we are, we are proposing to increase these donations to these countries this year more than 35 percent over what we gave them last year.

I heard it said on the floor of the House last year in the debate on the grain bill that India has 180,000,000 sacred cows which they are maintaining, and 136,000,000 sacred monkeys which they are maintaining. The hearings on this bill show on page 696 that India's population is increasing at the rate of 4,000,000 per year. That means that in the next 10 years at the same rate India's population will increase by 40,000,000, which is one-fourth the total population of the United States.

I do not know the rate of increase of the sacred cows or the rate of increase of the sacred monkeys. However, being protected as they are by the people of India against slaughter of any kind, on religious scruples, I would say it is reasonable to assume that there is a substantial rate of increase.

In my opinion it is foolish in the extreme for America to assume the responsibility of furnishing money to raise the standard of living of nearly 400,000,000 people in India up to our own standards, and at the same time provide for maintaining 180,000,000 sacred cows, and 136,000,000 sacred monkeys.

Reading on in the hearings, I see on page 697 that Mr. Stanley Andrews, the Administrator of this Technical Cooperation Administration, testified before the committee that they propose to drill a 250-foot well on each 200 acres of the Ganges Delta, or basin, and sink an 8-inch steel pipe in every one of these wells. He proposes to drill 2,000 of these wells to supply water for the Ganges Delta.

If we are going to begin to dig wells on each 200 acres of farm land anywhere in the world, I would like to see the program begun in the United States, where we can use these wells to just as much advantage as the farmers in the Ganges Delta. To begin with, I do not think this Government ought to dig wells for farmers anywhere. But if we are going to dig them, one for each 200-acre farm, we can use a lot of them for irrigation purposes in the State of Georgia.

Mr. Andrews proceeds to say that there are other developments of a similar nature in other areas in connection with a power dam. So this world-wide WPA program is proposing to sink irrigation wells in some parts of India, build dams in other parts, and after describing the program, Mr. Andrews proceeds to say, and I quote his language:

> I think this is probably the cheapest way if we are going to take on her responsibilities.

I am not in favor of taking on India's responsibilities to feed her rapidly increasing population, and her sacred cows and her sacred monkeys. We are overreaching ourselves. By all means this program should not be increased over what it was last year. It should be reduced, and this amendment will do it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, there are a number of Members on their feet. That would not give more than a minute or two for each.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is in error. It would be less than 1 minute.

Mr. DONDERO. I was trying to be conservative. I think the gentleman from Virginia should increase the time.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] who just spoke referred to the situation in India and Pakistan, but as I read page 54 of the report India and Pakistan are not involved in this particular item. Will the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I will have to refer that to the committee. India and Pakistan are involved, but I believe the committee will say that there are other countries included. Burma, Thailand, Nepal, and others are on the list.

Mr. GARY. The applicable table is on page 55 rather than 54.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I know how conscientious the gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is. I regret to find myself in opposition to a sincere effort on his part to save money, but I wish to remind the committee of the history of the technical assistance program. I think it represents America's spirit at its best, operating in countries that need our help. I have been interested in the program from the outset. Some of the best speeches made for technical assistance have been made by my friends from the other side of the aisle. It is relatively an inexpensive program. It was molded by a great American, one whom we all greatly admired, Dr. Henry Bennett. His tragic death hurt the program as nothing else could.

I think it is well to point out that Mr. Stanley Andrews, his successor, has the same point as to fundamental principles.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] says this is boondoggling. The gentleman is mistaken about that. It is not boondoggling. It is cast in another

direction and on another pattern. It is an inexpensive program, constituting on the whole every year less than one day's expense for our armament program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to agree with what our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS], is saying. This is a cooperative program. We have heard a great deal of talk about what would happen if China had not fallen. We might ask ourselves this question: What will happen to all of Asia if India and Pakistan do fall?

A program like this will lift these people up a little, give them two meals a day instead of one, give them a life span of 40 years instead of 27 years and give them a chance to have better shelter and better clothing. This is the kind of program that forms the cornerstone of our real foreign policy, and we should support it to the utmost.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman for that statement; and while he is speaking may I ask him if he agrees with me that all the dollars expended we receive from the money we put out in terms of good will as well as positive physical strength where we need it, if this is not the best dollar we can spend in the Orient which is such a critical area today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no doubt about that; and the gentleman knows that one of the exponents of this particular program is presently our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] who did so much to bring into being in China the joint rural reconstruction program which is in the same category as the point 4 program which we are asked to implement at the present time.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman is correct. Unfortunately, there are some items of a military nature carried in these appropriation figures but in the main this point 4 program does not cover the export of the product of our industry, of our manufactured goods and physical wealth but of our brains and know-how. This is the program that seeks to help other help themselves, one that is proving itself most effectively.

Mr. YATES. Is not this program under which we put the diplomats in the field where they come in contact with the common people, meet them on their own level, and help them solve their problems?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is it, exactly. This program is fundamental. If you can replace a wooden plow with a steel plow costing $2 you may have helped him quadruple his returns. It is especially useful in India and other parts of Asia. Many Members of the House are familiar with the former extension service representative, Mr. Horace Holmes, now in India, and I am sure they appreciate his report of his work there. It has not been an effort to establish grandiose schemes in India, to change the pattern of the life of the people, not at all, but it is simply an effort to help people build a sound agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WOOD] is recognized.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the people of America and the gentlemen of this House must soon awake to the realization that almost one-half of the fighting population of the world is now on the side of communism, due first to the mistaken policy of this administration in recognizing Russia many years ago; second, that after affording recognition we proceeded to arm and fatten her with fabulous amounts of consumer goods which we donated to her; and that last of all we gave her almost a third of the area of the globe.

I think everyone here will admit the fact that whatever peril communism is to us today the administration has largely created by its ignorance and ineptitude in foreign affairs.

You say that is water over the dam, and there is no use crying over spilled milk. Possibly, but the same administration, exhibiting the same crass ignorance, and an infantile complex of international messiahship, has encompassed the whole world in its schizophrenic schemes. Too many of the gentlemen in this House are suffering from delusions of grandeur so far as our ability to continue financing these crazy schemes much larger is concerned, even if they were not definitely doing more harm than good.

We have neither the men, money, raw materials, nor the lasting capacity to suffer possessed by Russia. We cannot destroy Russia even if we would. We must then learn to live with them whether we choose it or not. We did for over 20 years before we recognized them.

And what is more important, other nations must also learn the same lesson. And in this connection we must remember that Russia has not taken over a single square mile of territory this administration did not offer to her on a silver platter.

Our task is clear and definite. We must follow the first law of nature—to save ourselves. We must build ourselves the strongest Air Force, the strongest Navy, the strongest array of antiaircraft guns, and the largest collection of A and H bombs. We must secure and maintain suitable air bases where necessary. We must maintain the best possible relations with our American neighbors.

To the other nations of the world which we have bled ourselves white to rehabilitate, we must now tell them that nature must take its course as far as they are concerned, at least until Russia demonstrates her first act of real aggression. When, and if that comes, we can then lay a realistic course as to what we shall do, fully armed, and strong, united, and self-reliant and unhampered by international drones in the hive of freedom, to whom—all too long—we have fed the economic honey gathered by the labor of American patriots, merely to increase our own national peril, with little additional safety gained from them.

We have hung too long on the cross of internationalism; it is time to tear the nails from our hands, leave the fog of international experiment, and get back to realistic Americanism, as the basis of a new foreign policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The gentleman from Arkansas just said this was merely a technical-assistance program. I want to call attention to page 697 of the hearings. Mr. Stanley Andrews, to whom the gentleman referred, the Administrator, testified before the committee that one of the things they propose to do is to drill a 250-foot well on each 200 acres of the Ganges Delta and sink an 8-inch steel pipe in every one of them—2,000 of those wells in the Ganges Delta, one on every 200 acres in that area. This is only one of the many boondoggling projects American taxpayers would pay for under this item.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. TABER. And that is why the gentleman from Georgia proposed to reduce this item down to where they could not do such silly things as that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the table which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia read has two other figures which should be determinative with the House. Those figures are, population of India—appearing on page 695 of the hearings—356,900,000; caloric intake per day per person, 1,600 calories, about one-half of what it is in this country and about two-thirds of what is necessary to sustain normal life, pretty close to the starvation level.

The gentleman made a statement that India has some billions of dollars of foreign exchange reserves. May I inform the gentleman that a good deal of that is in frozen sterling in London, and you know how much good that is going to do them.

We have just heard an eloquent statement made here that we should not deny military aid to Formosa, Indochina, Thailand, Philippines, and so forth, and that amendment failed. We can do the same thing about this, and this amendment should suffer the same fate. If we go to the people of the Far East and say the only assistance we are going to give them will be military weapons, we are in grave danger in the Far East. The way we will win with the people of the Far East is to add to our military security program, economic and technical assistance programs like this—programs which are inexpensive considering the issues involved.

A gentleman said a few minutes ago that it is foolish to build tube wells in India. But tube wells is what India needs. The curse of India is that it does not raise enough food for its population. The way to get India to raise more food is to improve her water supply. Are we to shut our eyes to that and even use our aid blindly? I say absolutely not.

Let me call your attention to one other matter. If they were in here asking $500,000,000 for an Indian Army would you not give it to them? Of course you would. Yet you are going to cut down to $50,000,000 for means to raise many times that amount in food which is vital and essential to every person in India. I cannot see how that kind of approach can be sustained in that critical area of the world because we all know that if India and Pakistan fall then Asia is truly gone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I happen to be one Member of this House who believes that we cannot take the whole world on our lap and nurse it forever without destroying ourselves.

When I return to my district, people ask me: How long do you think, Mr. Congressman, the United States of America can stand the strain and expenditures now imposed on us? That is the question rising in the minds of our people. I believe we are nearing the brink of economic collapse. It may be later than we think.

To do good, of course, is the desire of everybody, but doing good in regard to this world program should not be a one-way street. Let me call your attention to the fact that we are a member of the United Nations. India is also a member of the United Nations. Do you know that today India does not have one soldier standing beside our boys in Korea to resist the Communist horde? Why not? Does India favor freedom or communism?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GROSS moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we are hearing the same old story all over again here today that we can spend billions and buy friends all over the world. I should like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas, with the money we have already spent on this so-called point 4 program, how many friends we have made in the world? Where are these allies that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], inquired about a moment ago? Where on the battlefield of Korea, are these friends that we have bought with point 4 and other vast amounts dished out to foreigners in the last few years alone.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman has asked a good question, and I hope it can be discussed dispassionately, because we both love our country, and the world is in a crisis.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about point 4.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes. I made the statement which I will stand by, and I wish the gentleman from Iowa, coming from an agricultural State, to be informed on that point, and that is when we send competent individuals to these foreign countries to teach them methods that will revolutionize their agriculture, we are making friends.

Mr. GROSS. That leads to another question. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question: Is it the purpose to teach foreigners how to grow cotton?

Mr. GARY. If cotton is a proper commodity for that country, it is the plan to help them increase their production so that they can become a force in the general containment program of communism throughout the world. Let me say to the gentleman that containing communism is far more important than all of the cotton in the world, because our cotton will not be worth anything if the Communists take over America.

Mr. GROSS. Now I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] if he proposes to teach his point 4 friends how to grow tobacco, does he propose to take off the rigid restrictions on the export of tobacco seed so that they can plant and raise tobacco in competition with American tobacco farmers?

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the gentleman that they do not grow tobacco in the city of Richmond.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking about Richmond.

Mr. GARY. Please let me continue—if the gentleman thinks I have a special interest in this bill—but I say the same thing in reply. And, let me say to the gentleman that this program has been the greatest help to the tobacco people and to the cotton people of the United States that they have received since the war.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman asked me a question and I am trying to answer.

Mr. GROSS. I understand.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This entire program which is now before us, the mutual security program, is headed by a man named W. Averell Harriman, the only living person, as I understand, who attended all three conferences: Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam.

Mr. GROSS. And a Wall Street banker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I think the gentleman and the House would be interested in a story that just came over the wire from Golden, Colo.:

W. Averell Harriman told the State Democratic Convention that "We'll make TAFT Stalin's candidate before we're through with this campaign."

"I can prove that Senator TAFT, if he is elected, will follow the road that Stalin wants him to follow," Harriman told the near-capacity crowd of some 2,000 Democrats. "We cannot and will not compromise with a man like TAFT who for political reasons would jeopardize our Nation."

"By following policies set out by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman," Harriman continued, "today we are winning the cold war, but we must not be impatient and lose what we have won."

This bill is financing the Harriman campaign and, of course, I think we ought to appropriate a little more money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia, whose amendment I support.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to say also that this program carries $50,000,000 for steel. That is shown on page 698. It is not a technical assistance program. It carries $10,000,000 for fertilizer, and I have already mentioned the 2,000 deep wells in the Ganges Delta. It is full of items like that. They jumped from $5,000,000 in 1951 to $77,000,000 in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to this international WPA. I get more opposed to it every year, and I get more indignant about it every time I find ourselves cutting down on the needed things here at home to try and operate a WPA not for India, not for Africa, but for the whole face of the globe. Anybody with any practical sense knows that we just cannot keep this thing up. It is about time that some of us take a stand and cut it out.

I recognize the motives of those who are supporting this thing and I appreciate their motives. I would love to be able to support the whole world, too, but we have a duty here at home. We must not break this Nation, we must not destroy the very foundation of our Nation by all this inflation.

Then they talk about the fact that this is to make friends, this is to help our friends. If there is anybody in this House who has ever seen or heard that Nehru has ever made a statement favorable to the people of the United States, I would like him to say so now.

Mr. FULTON. I will say it; yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I deny the statement and I do not believe he ever did. I never did see it. The nearest I ever saw to a friendly statement from Nehru was when we had this thing under discussion last year about giving him 90,000,000 tons of wheat to feed to the starving people of India, including the sacred monkeys and the sacred cows. The nearest he ever came to making a friendly statement about the United States was when he said, "If they want to give us this 90,000,000 tons of wheat, we will accept them, but we want it understood that when we accept them we accept them without any strings. It does not mean anything as far as friendship is concerned." That is just about the effect of what he said.

Let us consider this point 4 technical-assistance thing pretty seriously. Let us consider it from the standpoint of the American people, because we just cannot, as a matter of common, plain horse

sense, continue to build this thing up and up and up, and grind down the taxpayers of the United States for the purpose of trying to reform the whole face of the globe, a thing that nobody but good God Himself can do.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. May I state to the gentleman that I think he is correct about this. I spent some time in India last year, and I did not find personally one person out of a thousand in India who had ever heard about American grain going to India. The grain sent there by the taxpayers of this country went to the rich merchants and the politicians. People are lying starving in the streets of Calcutta today, just the same as they always have.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We have pending before the Rules Committee this minute a bill that provides for paying for the household furniture of people who were run out of Korea that belonged to this technical-assistance business when the war started. There were some 500 people we had employed in Korea. What they were doing I do not know. But they all got run out of there, and some of the bills for their household furniture run as high as $20,000.

What in the world are we going to do if we keep on with this program? This thing is going to be ruinous unless we wake up and put some common sense into it.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. A year ago last spring the chief of the Bureau of Reclamation, Michael Straus, went to India. He was sent there to try to give some of our hard-earned dollars to India. He was there 2 months. He could not give them a dollar. He came home feeling very bad because he had failed to accomplish his mission. They said, "We do not want your dollars. We will take a little know-how, but we do not want any of your dollars."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. That is the reason I objected to the consideration of this ECA-Korean evacuee bill that was on the private calendar. It was because of the payments to be made to some of those people.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope the motion to strike out the enacting clause will be voted down, and that the House will adopt the Davis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—ayes 6, noes 112.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, the question of slashing the technical-assistance program for all of south Asia is a very serious problem. This provision extends not just to India and Pakistan, it extends to Afghanistan, Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, and Indonesia, that whole southern front. If we let that vital southern front fall because of a $50,000,000 slash, we will have endangered this country.

When we hear these baseless statements that this technical assistance is a boondoggling proposition, it shows a complete lack of knowledge of the program. Here is what is involved—the access of the United States and the democratic countries to strategic minerals and materials. Our city of Pittsburgh gets about 30 to 40 percent of its manganese for the production of steel from India. We, in Pittsburgh do not want India to fall, for this reason as well as the fact it has been a good friend and ally in World War II. We do not want Malaya to fall either, with its resources of rubber and tin, and we do not want Indonesia to fall, with its oil resources. We do not want these countries to fall into Communist hands. On top of that, if we Congressmen cut Burma out, we would be doing irreparable harm. This is not just a point 4 program in Burma. This is also military aid for Burma, but it is grouped under the program with the other countries of this vital area.

What does India need more than water? India desperately needs water from the Ganges and below the surrounding plains in order to feed her starving people. She needs the water from the underlying water table brought up by wells so that the Indians can feed themselves. We must remember it was necessary for the United States to advance last year $190,000,000 in a loan to make up India's current food deficit, and I believe she is going to pay it back.

In answer to the gentleman from Virginia, may I say that Nehru is one leader who has stood strongly against communism in his own country. He has thrown Communists in jail time after time after time, and put down the demonstrations. That is more than the present Democratic administration has done in this country until forced into action by this Congress and the people. In addition to that, there is a real threat from the north, as we have seen Tibet taken over by the Communists.

When we on the Republican side say stand up not for a containment policy, but for an affirmative foreign policy that will hold these countries on our side, and hold these vital natural resources, and friendly peoples, we hope that you will vote to keep this particular provision as it is because this technical and military assistance program in protecting and developing southern Asia is vital to the defense of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am in support of the Davis amendment 100 percent. The gentleman from Montana and the gentleman from Arkansas made quite a show here a few moments ago about how this program has demonstrated its efficacy. This program is so young and so small, and it has fluctuated so much since its beginning, that it has demonstrated nothing so far as efficacy is concerned. Anyone who has ever determined policies would have to come to that conclusion, if he were trying to reach a decision as to what he was going to do with this kind of policy provided he was financing it with his own funds. The yardstick is too short. You have not had a chance to demonstrate what it can do. It started out to export technical knowledge. The gentleman just said that this was a military-assistance program. Good Lord, who knows what this program is? You change it continually. It will go on. You talk about this money saving all these countries, which our friend has just mentioned. The bill will be $150,000,000,000, not $15,000,000,000 if you are to give all these things. No one knows that any better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania. You are not going to save that part of the world with $15,000,000 or even $15,000,000,000. When you go into that big area, with our shortage of manpower, you will be dealing in figures of $150,000,000,000 to $500,000,000,000, and do not kid yourselves with this kind of chicken feed. My opposition to this program is based on the fact that it has no firm foundation, it has no anchorage. It switches around just like a kite without a tail, and the argument here this afternoon in favor of this program demonstrates that fact completely.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, last year when this bill was before the House, I offered a motion to cut technical assistance in the Middle East. But, this fall, I had an opportunity to visit that area and southeast Asia and I think we would be making a tremendous mistake to cut this money out of the bill. Many of us feel that the United States has concentrated its attention too much on Western Europe. We will spend several billions for Western Europe in this bill. Yet, here is an area, Asia, where the Communists are attempting to seize control, where the money is to be spent among several hundred million people, and where the tide of events has been moving against us. The Communists are now the second largest party in India. The Communists made tremendous strides there in the last election. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] pointed that the life expectancy of people in India is 26 or 27 years, and they are increasing at the rate of five million a year—at a rate much faster than the available food supply.

The Communists have a chance of seizing all of Asia in the next 5 or 6 years. What weapons do we have that will stop them? The most effective is technical assistance. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is right, that the amount of money involved here is not sufficient to prevent their being attracted to the Communists, but it gives them some hope, at least, that their problems

can be solved without turning to the Communists. We are planning to spend a very large amount of money in this area for military assistance, which is of secondary importance compared to this program. To cut technical assistance when the Communists are concentrating their efforts in this vital area seems to me a costly and great mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the question here is not quite as presented to the floor. Twice I have introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD statements from advisers of the point 4 program asking us not to spoil the program by the appropriation of large amounts of money. This is not the Holmes program, which probably takes $14,000 or $15,000 and does excellent work. This is not a matter of digging wells. I know the men who are digging the wells, and India was paying for them the last I heard. This is a matter of whether we adhere to the principles laid down by Henry Bennett, which are being departed from under the present program, and whether we will live up to the recommendations of the people who feel that this should be a type of program such as we see in the Extension Service in the United States, where the nations themselves put up the money, put up the labor, and we give them the know-how.

I rise, therefore, in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I have followed rather closely the point 4 program of technical assistance, and probably it has no more ardent supporter in the House than the gentleman now addressing you. But let me say to you—and I think I am qualified to speak on this and I want you to listen carefully—there is not enough technical manpower that can be sent over there to properly do the job. If you do send the number of people set up in this program, they are either going to be incompetent or untrained, or both. Not only will the money be wasted, but what to me is more dangerous, the sending of incompetent and poorly trained people to the field is going to be a vast detriment, not only to the cause of the people you are trying to help but likewise to ourselves.

I say to you, let us take this technical-assistance program in its proper stride and not try to jam a whole bottle of medicine down the patient's throat just because one teaspoonful had a good effect.

I beg of you to support the Davis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] is recognized to close debate.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of this House will bear me out in the statement that never since I have been a Member of this body have I ever indulged in personalities in debate. In response to the attempt of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] to embarrass me with questions concerning tobacco and cotton, may I say that I am a long, long way from the cotton fields of the South. Since my district has now been restricted practically to the metropolitan city of Richmond, as far as I know there is no tobacco grown in my district. But no program has contributed more to the cotton and tobacco growers of the South than the program which we are discussing at the present time. This program has furnished them markets. At the present time what we are trying to do in the technical-assistance program is to develop backward countries so that they can help themselves, and as they develop they become markets where our products may be sold. In addition we strengthen them so that they can assist in this great war that we are waging against communism whether it be the hot war in Korea or the cold war in the rest of the world. We need allies; we need all of the help that we can get.

This program is not related to India alone; it provides technical assistance for Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, Malaya, Nepal, and Pakistan. They are backward countries; they need help.

Already this program has been cut 21 percent in the authorizing legislation; it is proposed here to cut it another $50,000,000.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to add to what the gentleman has said with reference to tobacco and cotton—that the people of the cotton States would, I believe, accept any hazards in the way of potential competition from other countries aided by us in the interest of larger issues involved in our efforts to strengthen these countries.

But may I refer to another subject, if the gentleman from Virginia will permit me to continue a moment.

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from Virginia, my good friend, Mr. SMITH, referred to Nehru and the implication of his argument was that we should not help India because of Nehru's attitude. But we can disagree with Mr. Nehru and yet distinguish between his government and the people of India. I do profundly disagree with Nehru's policy in the Korean war. But it is to our credit that we will help the people of a country and still entertain differences of opinion with the head of their government. It would be impossible to make headway if another country should withhold aid from us in some of our joint international efforts because they do not agree with the Democratic administration.

I would like to add this, if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is this: During the Second World War when our survival was involved, India sent into that conflict the largest volunteer army of any nation fighting with us. Furthermore, I entertain no doubt whatever as to Nehru's sympathies with the free world in the basic conflict with communism; as a responsible head of government, he has demonstrated in many ways his opposition to communism.

On the same page to which the gentleman from Georgia refers with reference to wells, it is pointed out that India spends $3 to our $1 in this effort, since we are sending help under a plan that draws out maximum Indian resources. I thank the gentleman for generously yielding to me.

Mr. GARY. And in that effort we are contributing technical assistance to provide those wells, and probably a slight amount of equipment. But, after all, this is a technical assistance program, and it was our technicians who worked out the plan of sinking these wells to meet a great need in India.

The CHAIRMAN. All other time on this amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 114.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Military assistance, title IV: For assistance authorized by section 403 to carry out the provisions of section 401 of said act, $51,685,750; and, in addition, unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made pursuant to said section 401 shall remain available through June 30, 1953, and shall be consolidated with this appropriation;

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KENNEDY: On page 32, line 21, strike out "$51,685,750" and insert "$31,685,750."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I offered a similar amendment to cut the military assistance to the South American Republics last year, and I am offering it again now to cut $20,000,000. It does not seem to me that there is any use spending as large an amount of money as this on military equipment to South American countries. They are not in a direct line of Soviet invasion. We are giving them a much smaller sum of money for technical assistance which they need far more than military assistance. I think this is an item on which a substantial amount of money can be saved, and therefore I am asking the House to approve a cut of $20,000,000,

leaving a total of $31,000,000 for this program, which seems to be adequate and more than enough.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the fourth amendment to the $208,000,000 total cut would be included in this, and actually is a lesser amount, so that I will not be offering that particular amendment. I further call attention to the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Mutual Security Act of 1952, page 45. When that agency came before the committee to justify this previous item that had been included for $38,000,000 for Latin America, the testimony was that "we had to wait for the Joint Chiefs of Staff to draw up the plans under the appropriation for the best use of the appropriation." There was none of this $38,000,000 previously appropriated which had been obligated as of January 31, 1952.

This is not a question of whether you are for these programs or not. It is actually a question of accounting methods. This Congress just has not been following proper accounting methods in getting at these appropriations. We do not know where they are going to spend this money. They cannot possibly justify it. I submit that if you will read the hearings of this committee on page 721, as to the Latin-American Republics, you cannot get any additional information about what they are going to do with it. It is in general terms. They do not have it obligated. There are no contracts that would justify it. Actually, we could cut out the entire amount, in my opinion, and we would not alter the program one iota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, if our old friend, Bob Rich, were here today, he would say, "Where are you going to get the money?"

I wonder if it ever occurred to the Members of the House that we owe $260,000,000,000. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand millions. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars, that somebody in the generations that follow us must pay. By 1953 we will owe $275,000,000,000, or two hundred and seventy-five thousand million dollars, a terrific burden we are imposing upon the generations to follow us.

It is about time we slough off on our spending, let these countries of the world slug it out a little harder, and give a bit of relief to the American taxpayer who has generously over the past several years supported all of these programs for the rehabilitation of these devastated countries of the world. It is about time we gave relief to the American taxpayer.

I support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the House will vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not claim to be an expert on foreign affairs, therefore I have to listen to people who are supposed to be experts in this field.

We just had an amendment offered and adopted to reduce the so-called technical aid or point 4 funds. If my understanding is correct, this point 4 program is based on the premise that out of the humanity and goodness of our hearts we are supposed to help the backward peoples of the world.

If my memory serves me correctly, within the last few days one candidate for the nomination for President being offered by the minority party who is supposed to be an expert in this field made a statement to the effect that the Russians were so backward that they were no more to be feared than a bunch of polliwogs swimming down a creek. If you put those two together, then why does not Russia qualify under this point 4 program? Maybe if you would send them some point 4 assistance out of the humanitarian goodness of your heart they would quit being dirty, filthy Communists.

I am taking the word of General Eisenhower, who is supposed to be an expert in this field. He says the Russians are so backward, so terribly ignorant, so in need of technical assistance, that they are no more to be feared than a bunch of harmless polliwogs swimming down a muddy creek.

How do you justify that advice, from a man who claims to be one of the outstanding experts not only in the field of foreign affairs but in the military field, with the approach we take today?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want the House to know what they are doing when they vote for this amendment. This amendment deals with the plan to defend the American continent. During World War II it was necessary for the United States to deploy a large part of its Armed Forces to South America to protect certain strategic military points in that area. For example, there is the Panama Canal to be defended, and other strategic points in South America. This is military assistance to the South American Republics to enable them to participate effectively in a plan which has been worked out by the Department of Defense to protect America itself. This comes to our own shores.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Does not the gentleman believe that the defense of the United States should be our first concern, and if we are going to continue to scatter our hits all over the world, exhausting our resources and finances, that we will not be able to win a ball game, if we are called upon to do so?

Mr. GARY. I am trying to point out to the gentleman that this is the defense of the United States, which we are now dealing with and that the funds are very vital to the defense of our own shores.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the gentleman be able to give us some examples within the limits of security, of course, as to how this money would be spent particularly?

Mr. GARY. It is only $51,000,000 for all of the South American Republics. It includes aid to Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Mr. KENNEDY. What sort of assistance?

Mr. GARY. Military assistance purely. It is military assistance, furnishing them with the necessary accoutrements of war for defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KENNEDY) there were—ayes 79, noes 89.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. GARY as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 104; noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ocean freight, voluntary relief packages, title V: For assistance authorized by section 535, $2,587,500.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill includes $9,240,500, the amount of the budget estimate for this program, that is, the movement of migrants. The intent of the act is to facilitate the movement of surplus manpower from certain countries of Europe to other countries where such manpower can be utilized. The program for 1953 calls for the movement of 140,000 migrants as compared with the planned movement of 137,500 in 1942.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the gentleman who now occupies the chair at the moment, because it is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee which considered this particular matter in Brussels last fall; and it was he and his committee who were responsible for working out an arrangement whereby the surplus manpower from certain European countries was given the opportunity under the leadership of this organization to migrate to other parts of the world where they were needed and where there was opportunity for them.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I wish to join the gentleman from Montana in his tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the outstanding statesman who now presides as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, for the wise and far-seeing work he has done on this

problem both here and at Brussels. He followed through and helped in the selection of an outstanding man, Hugh Gibson, to be the international head of this program; and he took care that that type of man should be the head, and no other type. I want to join the gentleman in the remarks he is making.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As my colleague the gentleman from Ohio well knows, from constant observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], he worked night and day in an attempt to get a good program going and put it into operation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I, too, wish to join my colleague from Montana and my colleague from Ohio in doing honor to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who did a splendid job and was greatly responsible for developing the idea of a technique to try to help solve one of the most nettling problems with our allies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CHATHAM. I want to pay my personal tribute and that of the people of North Carolina to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] for his indefatigable efforts to help solve this very difficult problem which means a great deal not only to the people of America but to the other people of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MANSFIELD was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I simply want to make this statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] was the author of the migrant amendment to the Mutual Security Act, that he appeared before our committee and made such a good case for what he was seeking to do that the amendment was reported out of the committee unanimously. Furthermore, our colleague from New York [Mrs. KELLY] played a very vigorous and important part in the Foreign Affairs Committee in behalf of this particular amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I join in the deserving tributes that my various colleagues have paid the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] not only in connection with the legislation that the gentleman from Montana has referred to but also that we all recognize that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is one of the outstanding Members of the House, one of the hardest working Members, one of the ablest Members, one of the most sincere Members, a man whose integrity and honor is above reproach.

Our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] has devoted untiringly of his time and effort in an attempt to find a solution for the problems caused by the dislocation of peoples and surplus populations.

I was very much interested a few minutes ago when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER] made his remarks, and I think they were remarks that were very appropriate, in connection with an observation made by General Eisenhower. I am not going to refer to him as the candidate for Republican nomination for President; I refer to him in his capacity as General Eisenhower.

The General made a very unfortunate statement not long ago that disturbed me very, very much when he referred to the Russian people and their ignorance and that we should not fear them any more than we should fear polliwogs swimming down a muddy river. That to me was an amazing statement because it was contrary to everything that General Eisenhower had said before.

I remember when he addressed us in the auditorium of the Library of Congress a few years ago. He made a strong speech warning us of the danger of communism. Again when he spoke at Abilene, he made a very strong, powerful speech, calling the attention of the people of America to this international conspiracy that threatened nation after nation and which had as its ultimate object the United States of America.

Over 3 years ago I made speeches of that kind in this House and I have made them continuously out of the House. In his Denver speech, after he made that unfortunate statement, he tried to recover and he did make some very strong statements in that speech calling the attention of the people of America to this great danger that confronts us. But the fact remains that he made a most unfortunate statement to the press that we had no more to fear than from polliwogs swimming in a muddy river. That sort of took the rug out from under those of us who have believed in a strong national defense.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is speaking out of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is speaking on the question of "assistance" which will be found in line 9, page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are many of us who recognize and who strongly feel in connection with the national defense of our country that it is very important for us to render such assistance as we can within our means to other nations that are still outside of the iron curtain and to other peoples who desire their freedom and their independence.

I have always admired General Eisenhower for his strong leadership in that respect. I can remember when the mutual assistance bill was pending in the two committees of the Congress, and they voted a $1,000,000,000 reduction, he sent two telegrams over from NATO, protesting against it, but further saying that under no conditions should there be any further reduction in the authorization made in that bill at that time. I admired him and I responded to his leadership, and then when I read this statement I felt very much disappointed, because I addressed the question to myself whether or not, as a military leader, he spoke one way and as a candidate for the Presidential nomination of the Republican Party of the United States he spoke another way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Now does the gentleman from New York deny that he made the statement about the polliwogs flowing down a muddy river?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

(On request of Mr. JAVITS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. McCORMACK was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. JAVITS. Since the gentleman has asked me a question, I would like to say this: The question is whether or not the gentleman has not wrenched that statement completely out of the context in which it was made, completely out of the thought of the man who made it, and whether the gentleman does not himself believe the only reason the statement was made was to make our people feel that they should not have megalomanic fear with respect to the Russians, with which we all concur.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has repeatedly said that the spirit of America can meet any problem; the spirit of the American people and the desire of men and women to be free under God and under the law. The gentleman from Massachusetts has said that repeatedly. But the gentleman from Massachusetts has also said that while we should not fear we should not underestimate the danger that confronts us; we should go forward in meeting the problems of the day with optimism and confidence, but we certainly should not underestimate the challenge that confronts us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MASON. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall only take a moment, but in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts, let me say that General Eisenhower, when he made the remark to which the gentleman has referred, may have been, and indeed is reported to have said he was in fact referring to the Russian people as such rather than to the leaders of the Russian Government, one of whom has been characterized in certain other highly placed quarters as "Good Old Joe."

It will be fatal to the cause of world peace if we allow ourselves to forget completely that the power hungry, unscrupulous tyrants of the Kremlin do not necessarily reflect the thoughts, feelings, and aspirations of the unfortunate subjects whom they ruthlessly

dominate. There is considerable evidence that the exact opposite is true. Under more enlightened and less ambitious leadership it is always possible that the Soviet Union will turn from the dangerous course it has been pursuing and join with other nations to achieve world peace and order. At least, we should not admit that is impossible, difficult as it may be at times to keep our patience as we are confronted with instance after instance of provocative conduct. To surrender, however, to the opposite view is to concede that peace is impossible and war inevitable. That step I am not prepared to take. Nor apparently is General Eisenhower. But no one has heard from the lips of this great American any encomium or complimentary references directed to the present rulers of the Kremlin.

The Clerk read as follows:

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION

For contributions authorized by section 404 (b) of the act for International Development, as amended by section 10 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, $15,708,750.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 33, line 13, strike out "$15,708,750" and insert "$9,171,333."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the history of our efforts to reduce United States contributions to international organizations presents an interesting case history in the way that bureaucracy works to thwart the will of the Congress. In considering the 1952 appropriation for the Department of State I offered an amendment to the bill limiting our contributions to any international organization to one-third of the total cost thereof. This was accepted by the other body with the proviso that it should apply to future commitments on the part of the Department of State.

When the mutual security bill was before the House this spring, that same limitation was written into the bill by an amendment I offered from the floor—that our contributions to these international organizations should not exceed one-third of the total cost thereof.

In addition, when the 1953 Department of State appropriation bill came to the floor, we wrote the same language into the bill, which is now in the other body.

I began to wonder what these bureaucrats downtown were going to do in the way of working out some kind of loophole to get around that 33⅓-percent limitation. I began to wonder how they were going to get around the law. Then when I picked up this mutual security appropriations bill yesterday, I found that we were appropriating in this bill approximately $15,000,000 of a $24,000,000 budget for this multilateral technical assistance outfit. I read the hearings on the bill. On page 744 of the hearings a table is given showing the 1953 estimates for these agencies and the contributions of the respective nations. Out of a total of $24,514,000 contributed by all the nations the United States is being asked to give $14,708,750. That figures 60 percent, not 33⅓ percent. As a matter of fact, there is a footnote just below the table on page 744 that says that our share is 60 percent of the total budget. How the boys figure that as 33⅓ percent I did not know until I read further in the hearings. I quote now from page 749 of the hearings. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] asked a question of Mr. Ingram, of the Mutual Security Agency, in attempting to work out how they justify saying that 60 percent is actually less than 33⅓ percent.

Mr. GARY. When a program is conducted in a country that country is required to put up a substantial part of the cost, and when that cost is added to the costs that are borne by the organization our contribution to the total program would be less than 33⅓ percent?

Mr. INGRAM. That is correct.

In looking for the loophole, to find out how they managed to figure the thing like that to keep it from being subject to a point of order, I found that in the conference report on the mutual security bill there was a little bit of small print following the limitation language, which said, "including the contribution of the country receiving the aid." That was the gimmick—the loophole.

In my opinion, this is another scheme to increase our contribution—not to decrease it. It is just like giving a man a wheelbarrow, then having him tell you that you have given him only half a wheelbarrow, because he figures that his time in wheeling it home is worth half the price. It is like giving him a wheelbarrow and then having him claim you have given him only half a wheelbarrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. GARY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee. This includes the additional 5 minutes for the gentleman from Mississippi.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not believe Congress is going to permit these bureaucrats to thwart its will. This Congress has three times voted a 33⅓ percent limitation on these contributions.

As shown on page 744, the total expenses of this multilateral technical assistance outfit is $24,514,000. Those are the figures. So the United States is being asked under this bill to contribute $14,708,750 or 60 percent. I repeat that this is not 33⅓ percent, as Congress has previously demanded.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether it makes any difference in the long run whether there is a ceiling imposed or not. It is my understanding that we first contribute the money to participating nations, and then whatever money they contribute is money that we have just given to them?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You know, when I went to school two and two made four. But this crowd of international spenders seems to be able to get five out of it. Perhaps my arithmetic is out of date.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Perhaps the gentleman was coming to this, but I was interested in knowing how he arrived at this figure of $9,171,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am glad the gentleman asked me that. I simply took the $24,514,000, divided it by three, and got the sum of $8,171,333. Then I added the million dollars which was not covered by the limitation because it was a contribution to an inter-American organization. I added that and arrived at the figure of $9,171,333 to make it conform to the will of Congress—three times expressed.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Along the line of the gentleman's remarks, we received testimony before our committee just yesterday that with respect to UNKRA, I think they call it the United Nations Commission for Korea, the pledged amount, according to the set-up is 65 percent from the United States, and 35 percent from all the other nations involved, when of course the real rub is that under this set-up the actual cash contributed so far has come, with the exception of a few hundred thousand dollars, entirely from the United States and Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment, of course, is to save about $6,000,000 for the American taxpayers. Second, it is to reaffirm the position taken by this Congress three times in the last few years. I think the time has come for the Congress to reassert its responsibility and to recapture its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. We hear talk about the contributions of those countries associated with us. I would like to ask what contributions? We are meeting most of the deficits of all of these countries anyway so we are paying 100 percent of the load instead of 65 percent of the load.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am hoping that the committee can answer some of these questions. I cannot. I feel as the gentleman does.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Is it not becoming increasingly obvious to the Members of the Congress and to the American people that it does not make a great deal of difference what the Congress says so far as these agencies and bureaus are concerned, and in at least one instance that it does not make any difference what the Congress says so far as even the Chief Executive of the country is concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. RIVERS. Do not neglect to put in your statement that we are getting 100 percent of the blame for everything too.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, sir; and Americans are doing most of the dying in Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman has referred to the official position of the Congress. The official position of the Congress was expressed in a roll-call vote on the conference report of the authorization of the Mutual Security Act and it was not in fine print. It was in the same print as all the rest of it, that in estimating the 33⅓ percent payments of recipient countries should be included. That is, we went on a matching-fund basis. The House can work its will on this, but do not let anybody tell me, or tell any of us that what has been done here is against the expressed will of the Congress because the best way to find out what the Congress did is to see what it did on a roll call vote the last time it voted on this proposition.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, if you want to know what is spent on these various programs in accordance with the language that the gentleman from Ohio has just read, if you will turn to the hearings on page 748 you will find out. When these funds were justified before our committee, in order to be certain that they were not spending more than 33⅓ percent in accordance with the direction of Congress, we called for specific statements of the amounts that are being spent on these various projects. You will find that statement on page 784, where it appears that the estimated total project cost, per country, United Nations and specialized agencies, is $24,033,205, whereas the estimated total government cost, that the governments themselves put up, is $25,660,016. That makes a total of $49,693,221. Our contribution under this bill is $15,708,750, which is 32 percent of the entire amount. That is less than the 33⅓ percent specified in the authorizing legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman mention how the table on page 57 of the report relates to the figures which he has just given? They show a total for these various organizations of $14,000,000. I am having trouble to reconcile that with the figures which the gentleman has given us.

Mr. GARY. Fifteen million seven hundred and eight thousand dollars.

Mr. KEATING. Which includes one million for the organization of American States?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. But I am having trouble to reconcile the $14,000,000 figure with the one the gentleman has just given us as to expenditures.

Mr. GARY. That is our part of the contribution toward the $24,033,000 on page 748. The $24,033,000 is the amount that the United Nations organizations, to which we contribute, gave to these various countries. The other column shows the amount that the countries put up themselves. Our contribution is a part of the $24,033,000.

Mr. KEATING. What percentage of the total expenditure is the $14,708,000 which appears on page 57?

Mr. GARY. That is 32 percent of the $49,693,000 that appears in the two columns.

Mr. KEATING. Is the forty-nine-million figure the total expenditures of all of these various agencies?

Mr. GARY. That is the total expenditure. That is exactly what I am trying to point out. The total expenditures are $49,693,000, rather than the $24,000,000 which appears in the table on page 57. Our contribution, which is really $14,000,000 instead of $15,000,000, is less than 33⅓ percent of the total amount spent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On page 744 the table given says, "1953 estimation for U. N. and specialized agencies, summary of estimated dollar cost of program by category"; and in the footnote it says, "United States share, 60 percent."

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Do these other countries figure their percentage contributions on the same figure?

Mr. GARY. That is the percentage of their contribution; but when you add to that the actual amount spent by the other countries, it totals $49,000,000, and is absolutely in accord with the language of the authorizing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on that I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. GARY.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 112, noes 96.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

For contributions authorized by section 12 of the Mutual Security Act of 1952, $16,481,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 33, line 17, strike out "$16,481,000" and insert "$6,666,667."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The last part of the motion is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered with the same identical thought in mind as my last amendment. These are funds provided for the organization known as UNICEF. The object of the amendment is to reduce our contribution to one-third of the total budget of this organization, exactly as the last amendment was intended to do for that particular organization.

I attempted to find in the hearings some estimate of what the total budget of this UNICEF outfit was, but I failed to find any mention of it. If you will turn to page 749 of the hearings, you will find an attempted justification for providing these funds, but no mention is made of the total budget for this UNICEF organization.

Therefore, I went behind the hearings to the so-called justifications submitted to the Appropriations Committee by the Mutual Security Agency, and I find this: The proposed total UNICEF target budget for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, amounts to $20,000,000, of which the United States is being asked to contribute in the vicinity of $16,000,000; about 80 percent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The statute upon which this appropriation is based says that it shall be for the period ending December 31, 1953, which is a very considerably longer time than the gentleman has just stated to the House. It is a year and a half instead of 1 year, and that will completely change the gentleman's theory.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That might change it from 80 percent to about 60 percent. What I am trying to reduce it to is 33⅓ percent, as the Congress previously demanded.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is trying to reduce it a great deal more than that. It would be one-third of the budget for 1 year, but this is a contribution for at least a year and a half.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes, and we are asked to contribute about 80 percent of it, are we not?

Mr. JAVITS. No; I do not think so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, $16,000,000 as a figure, is much more than one-third of $20,000,000.

Mr. JAVITS. One-third of $20,000,000 is what the gentleman is figuring, and that is for 1 year, and the law says that this is for at least a year and a half, so the gentleman is giving them a great deal less.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Would the gentleman then be willing to correct the figures proportionately to make this amendment conform to the limitation?

Mr. JAVITS. I am just making the point that the gentleman is cutting it much more than he even intends to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I hope the gentleman, when he talks, will tell us what this organization does, and how it benefits the people of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 2½ minutes, but I see here on page 59 of the committee report that there was no appropriation whatever in 1952 for this item, and I see that for 1953 the entire amount is a new appropriation. It has plus $16,481,000. I just do not think this is any time to be taking on new appropriations and that is why I support the Williams amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think the figures have been gone into in the colloquy here. The law which this appropriation responds to, which is the Mutual Security Act, we just passed, states that the contributions to the U. N. Children's Fund shall be made until December 31, 1953. That is what this $16,000,000 covers, in other words not a year but a year and a half. I again read from the law:

Provided, That the contributions shall be made in such a manner as to give assurance that they will not exceed 33⅓ percent of contributions from all governments, including contributions made by governments for the benefit of persons located within territories under their control.

So that there can be no money expended unless it be on the one-third basis, except that my coleague from Mississippi makes the point that the application of the one-third includes contributions made by governments for the benefit of all persons under their control, and in this case that means significantly, children.

I think he is trying to cut this thing—I think that is clear from the figures—even more than he would want to cut it when he asked to cut it down to $6,000,000. That is about one-third of $20,000,000, the one year's budget, while a year and a half's budget would be $30,000,000 and called for $10,000,000 even on his formula. The American delegation which dealt with this subject at the United Nations General Assembly, generally speaking, wanted this program continued by the specialized agencies of the U. N. acting directly without continuing UNICEF. Nevertheless, the great preponderance of U. N. members wanted it continued. We felt as a matter of our standing in the world that we could not afford, where we were dealing with children, to stay out of UNICEF. That is why we had to go into it.

The UNICEF program is helping directly 42,000,000 children in the world. It covers them in terms of maternal and child welfare. It covers them in terms of health, for example, combating insect-borne disease in areas in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America. It covers them especially and significantly in terms of child-feeding assistance.

It seems to me this is a question of policy with respect to our standing in the world to cooperate with other nations in the United Nations in a program which in this case they consider most important. We would like to see it carried on by other agencies, but the great bulk of the nations in the world want us to play ball with them in this case. They would like to carry this program on in this organization UNICEF through the United Nations, so we are agreeing to contribute, according to this bill and according to the enabling legislation, one-third, in order to play with them in return for other cases where we ask that they play with us. I think it is a wise investment.

There is offered hereto the budget program for fiscal 1952–53 taken out of the report entitled "United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund—Report of Executive Board"—April 22–24, 1952—Economic and Social Council official records; fourteenth session:

II. Target program and budget for period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953

I. SUMMARY BY AREA

	Total target budget (thousand dollars)
Africa	1,710
Asia	5,630
Eastern Mediterranean	1,850
Europe	750
Latin America	2,460
Projects benefiting more than one region	500
Emergency situations	3,000
Freight	2,100
Administration	2,000
Total	20,000

II. SUMMARY BY PROGRAMS

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers	2,335
(b) School health services	150
(c) Other projects	340
B. Training programs	780
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases	2,090
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine	830
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD	900

II. Target program and budget for period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953—Continued

II. SUMMARY BY PROGRAMS—continued

	Total target budget (thousand dollars)
1. Maternal and child welfare—Con.	
C. Mass health programs—Con.	
(d) BCG antituberculosis vaccination campaigns	570
(e) Antitrachoma work	570
(f) Control of other communicable diseases	100
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance	1,655
B. Milk-conservation projects	1,700
3. Projects benefiting more than one region	500
4. Emergency situations	3,000
5. Freight	2,100
6. Administration	2,000
Total	20,000

III. SUMMARY BY AREA AND PROGRAM

Africa

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases	755
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD	25
(d) BCG	100
(f) Antitrachoma work	200
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance	630
Total	1,710

Asia

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers	1,535
B. Training programs	550
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases	775
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine	500
(c) Control of bejel, yaws, and VD	725
(d) BCG	600
(f) Antitrachoma work	100
(g) Control of other communicable diseases	100
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance	545
B. Milk conservation projects	200
Total	5,630

Eastern Mediterranean

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers	205
(d) Other projects	210
B. Training programs	125
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases	260
(d) BCG	100
(f) Antitrachoma work	150
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance	150
B. Milk-conservation projects	650
Total	1,850

Europe

1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers	200
(b) School health services	50
(d) Other projects	130
C. Mass health programs:	
(e) Control of bejel yaws, and VD	50
(f) Antitrachoma work	120

II. Target program and budget for period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953—Continued

III. SUMMARY BY AREA AND PROGRAM—con.

	Total target budget (thousand dollars)
Europe—Continued	
2. Child feeding:	
B. Milk conservation projects	200
Total	750
Latin America	
1. Maternal and child welfare:	
A. Supplies and equipment for basic MCW programs:	
(a) Supplies for MCW centers	395
(b) School health services	100
B. Training programs	105
C. Mass health programs:	
(a) Combating insect-borne diseases	300
(b) Production of antibiotics, insecticides, sera, and vaccine	330
(d) BCG	250
2. Child feeding:	
A. Long-range feeding assistance	330
B. Milk conservation projects	650
Total	2,460
Projects benefiting more than one region	500
Emergency situations	3,000
Freight	2,100
Administration	2,000
Total	20,000

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this program is one which was not included in the Budget request but was inserted by the Senate and the House in the authorizing legislation.

The same situation applies to this organization as applies to the other organizations to which we are contributing. Consequently, our contribution is less than 33⅓ percent of the total amount spent.

Several years ago this question was before the House. At that time there was on the board, or connected with this organization in some way, a Communist from Poland, and the House refused an appropriation because of that fact. The organization has now been completely freed from Communist influence. There are no Communists connected with it in any manner, shape or form.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. I wanted to ask the gentleman about the $500,000 for global projects.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I did not have a chance to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 96, noes 99.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. MCGRATH.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 119, noes 92.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title for economic or technical assistance and allocations from any appropriations to the Director for Mutual Security, or the Mutual Security Agency, or the Department of State, shall be available, without limitation on any authority conferred by the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, or any act continued in effect thereby, for rents in the District of Columbia; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of such appropriations; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of not to exceed two aircraft for use outside the continental limits of the United States and maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft; purchase of not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles for use outside the continental limits of the United States and, in addition, passenger motor vehicles abroad may be exchanged or sold and replaced for an equal number of such vehicles; transportation of privately owned automobiles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $20,000); exchange of funds without regard to section 3651 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 543); loss by exchange; expenditures (not to exceed $50,000) of a confidential character other than entertainment provided that a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director or Deputy Director of Mutual Security, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein specified; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries; acquisition of quarters outside the continental limits of the United States to house employees of the United States Government by rental (without regard to sec. 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a)), lease, purchase, or construction, and necessary repairs and alternations to such quarters; health and accident insurance for foreign trainees and technicians while en route or absent from their own countries participating in activities authorizedf under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes in the United States or elsewhere the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended; and services of commissioned officers of the Public Health Service and of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for the purposes of providing such services the Public Health Service may appoint not to exceed 20 officers in the Regular Corps to grades above that of senior assistant, but not above that of director, as otherwise authorized in accordance with section 711 of the Act of July 1, 1944, as amended (42 U. S. C. 211a), and the Coast and Geodetic Survey may appoint for such purposes not to exceed 20 commissioned officers in addition to those otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That not to exceed $42,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the departments and agencies concerned with the administration of the programs provided for herein and no part of such amount shall be used to pay the salary of any civilian employee at a rate greater than that paid by the State Department for comparable work or services in the sme area: *Provided further*, That agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products purchased or obtained under this program shall be at not less than the average market price prevailing for such commodity or commodities within the United States or the support price for such commodity or commodities, whichever is the greater.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF: On page 36, line 10, strike out "$42,000,000" and insert "$40,265,000."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes, the last 5 reserved to the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I believe in the Mutual Security Program. I would like to see it more effective. Studies at home and abroad have convinced me that the Mutual Security Program is overstaffed, overorganized, and a constant irritant to our friends abroad because of this. In touring abroad looking into this problem for the Foreign Affairs Committee there was one factor upon which there was unanimous agreement, and this agreement came not only from newspapermen who had covered the area but also from the most efficient, effective, and knowledgeable Americans who have participated in these programs, as well as representatives of foreign governments; and that was that we had so many Americans abroad that they were getting in each other's way and consequently bringing much ill will toward the United States of America.

Further study indicates that there are over 46,000 people who are accredited to the various mutual security programs; in excess of 10,000 people are in the administrative end.

One of the troubles of this administrative set-up is that they are getting in the way of the policy makers. Some of them are merely paper shufflers who ensnare with red tape the people who are trying to formulate policy and make the policy more effective.

I had offered an amendment cutting the administrative staff to the extent of 15 percent in the Foreign Affairs Committee. The committee itself approved a 10-percent cut. This House approved the 10-percent cut in the administrative personnel. In conference the authorization bill provided for only a 5-percent cut. The Appropriations Committee accepted the reduction amendment of 5 percent and added an additional 5 percent. This amendment represents another 5-percent cut, and this 5-percent cut will cut 15 percent off of the 10,000 people in the administrative end. It is my belief that because of this we will have a better, more streamlined, and effective agency, an agency that will be in a position better to administer the laws and the policies of the United

States of America. Consequently, I ask the House to adopt the amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would like to point out to the gentleman that there are some 2,000 military personnel assigned to civilian positions whose salaries and expenses are paid for out of regular Defense Department funds amounting perhaps to fifteen to twenty million dollars, and, in addition to that, there are payments for services performed by other agencies amounting to some $19,000,000 and representing perhaps over 3,500 people, not enumerated in the hearings.

I am glad the gentleman has offered this amendment. It is a very moderate amendment, I think. In my judgment, this agency has been overstaffed for several years, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time, only if permissible, to ask a question with reference to the previous Williams amendment which applied to this UNICEF program; you have an item in there: global provisions, $500,000. Could the gentleman explain what that is?

Mr. GARY. I am sorry, I cannot. That is a program of the UNICEF organization.

Mr. GAVIN. Maybe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] can answer about that authorization of $500,000 for this global project.

Mr. VORYS. I do not know. They have a whole lot of global projects. They have a program that is far larger than they have ever gotten money for. That has been their practice, and I do not know about that item.

Mr. GAVIN. Is there anybody on either side who can tell me what the $500,000 is for? I am merely trying to prove to you that you are spending a lot of money, you are voting a lot of money, but nobody can tell us about a $500,000 item. Now, a $500,000 item back in my district is a lot of money. If you want to spend $500,000 somebody should know about it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have the detailed breakdown of their budgetary program for the year July 1952 to July 1953. I will put this text in the RECORD, which breaks down in detail everything for which they are spending money. I do not know what paper the gentleman is referring to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The paper that the gentleman holds in his hand is a page out of the budget justification which was sent to the Approprations Committee by the Mutual Security Agency.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a report of the executive board of the U. N. Children's Fund that spells out in dollars and cents every item budgeted in every area, and I will put it in the RECORD. It does not contain anything about global projects.

Mr. GAVIN. Nothing about this global project? Nobody can tell me anything about this global project involving $500,000? Well, gentlemen, this is an unusual situation, where we appropriate $500,000 on a global project which no one seems to be able to explain or justify.

Mr. JAVITS. The proposed total UNICEF target budget for the period July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1953, amounts to $20,000,000 distributed as follows:

By area:	
Africa	$1,710,000
Asia	4,630,000
Eastern Mediterranean	1,850,000
Europe	750,000
Latin America	2,460,000
Global projects	500,000
Emergency situations	4,000,000
Freight	2,100,000
Administration	2,000,000
Total	20,000,000
By project:	
Supplies and equipment for basic maternal and child welfar programs	2,375,000
Maternal and child welfare training programs	780,000
Maternal and child welfare mass health programs	5,000,000
Feeding, including milk conservation	3,155,000
Global projects	500,000
Emergency situations	4,000,000
Freight	2,100,000
Administration	2,000,000
Total	20,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose this amendment, but, for the RECORD, I would like to say that if you want to vote out a lot of Republican job holders, the best thing for you to do is to support this amendment. I have visited nearly every mutual security office in the world, I think, and if there is a Democrat employed by either the former ECA or by the Mutual Security Administration I have not found him yet any place on either the MSA or ECA payroll. I say to my Republican friends, why you want to vote to cut down the payroll that has been designated by the Republican national committee I do not know, but that is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about the cuts that have been made in administrative expenses. In the first place, it is claimed by some that the budget estimates do not adequately reflect in terms of dollars the 5-percent cut in numbers of personnel prescribed by the authorizing legislation. This conclusion is in error as the following figures will show. Originally personnel services were set at $37,800,000. Five percent of this amount is $1,800,000 on an annual basis. In the estimates presented to the Appropriations Committee, $1,735,000 was cut from the administrative expenses by the executive branch. This is less than the $1,800,000 figure mentioned above but is, in fact, more than 5 percent of the personnel costs in the budget. This is so because the cut is not to be effective until 90 days after June 20 (the effective date of the bill). Thus the cut will apply to only 9 months instead of 12 months. In addition, large terminal leave payments will be required to be paid to those who are dismissed.

In addition to the $1,735,000 cut in the administrative expenses proposed by the executive branch, the committee further reduced administrative expenses by $1,790,000. The net result, therefore, is a total cut from the original estimate of $3,500,000, which is $1,250,000 more than 5 percent of the $45,000,000 total estimate of administrative expenses for the full year.

Now, let us take a few moments to discuss the effect of a further reduction in personnel or funds on the operating agencies carrying out this program. We will start with the Department of Defense.

Probably everyone will concede that the expenses of the Department of Defense in administering this program will depend chiefly on the amount of equipment to be produced and delivered to our allies abroad. The best estimates obtainable indicate that deliveries of matériel during fiscal year 1953 will greatly increase as American industry begins to achieve maximum production and long-lead items ordered since the inception of the mutual defense assistance program start coming off production lines in volume. It would follow, therefore, that the Department of Defense rather than reducing personnel should be increasing personnel assigned to this program.

In addition, this program contemplates delivery of matériel to several countries during fiscal year 1953 which have not heretofore received military assistance. These countries include Spain, Germany, and six Latin-American countries. With such an increase in recipient nations the requirements of the Department of Defense are actually increased since military missions will have to be assigned to the countries to insure proper use of the equipment and matériel delivered to them, as well as to conduct training of military personnel who will use the matériel when it is received.

Next, let us consider the effect of a further reduction on the Mutual Security Agency. I should like to remind the Members of the House that the Mutual Security Act of 1951 required this agency to cut personnel 10 percent below August 31, 1950, levels by January 1, 1952. The Mutual Security Act of 1952 requires a further reduction of 5 percent in the number of such personnel. This further cut comes at a time when expanded responsibilities for stepping up military production in allied countries and a greatly increased offshore procurement program must be undertaken, requiring the Mutual Security Agency to bend every effort to assist the Department of Defense in achieving effective utilization of the production facilities of Europe.

Let us pass now to the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State. This program, as you all know, is in the process of assuming increased responsibilities in fiscal year 1953. Bilateral negotiations with many of the countries involved have only just been consummated. At this time United States technicians should be dispatched to undertake the aid programs for the respective countries. These technicians cannot operate without effective backstopping from the TCA headquarters in Washington. If the provisions of section 504 (d) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, were to be applied agency by agency, the Technical Cooperation Administration would have to dismiss 5 percent of the personnel employed in Washington as of June 1 to provide this backstopping.

So much for the probable effect of a further reduction on the agencies involved. Let us now consider the wisdom of refusing the executive branch the relatively small amount of money required for the effective administration of this multibillion-dollar program. Truly, this is a case of false economy and false economy is no economy. The effectiveness of our aid program depends as much on the quality and adequacy of its administration as on the funds made available. The purpose of the aid program is to develop strong allies capable of joining us in resisting aggression. Our aid gives us a powerful lever in exerting leadership throughout the world for the purpose of building strength. Such leadership, however, cannot be exerted without a capable and adequate staff which has the means of obtaining the vast amounts of information necessary for the purpose, and has people qualified to take a position of leadership in the many countries in which the program operates. The surest way to get as little as possible for the large amounts of money devoted to this program is to have it administered by an inadequate staff. Even if the staff were excessive, which on the basis of testimony given is not the case, it would be far better to err on this side than to cut the staff down to the point where it could not effectively administer the program. Savings of a few million dollars in administrative expenses would, in my judgment, mean waste in the program of many times this amount. I urge that the House not adopt this short-sighted and self-defeating course.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF: On page 36, line 10, strike out "40,265,000" and insert "$37,800,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 101, noes 72.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on lines 16 to 22 on page 36 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. That language is as follows:

Provided further, That agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products purchased or obtained under this program shall be at not less than the average market price prevailing for such commodity or commodities within the United States or the support price for such commodity or commodities, whichever is the greater.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I was the author of that language in the bill. I confess that it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman concede the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 36, line 16, after the colon insert the following: *Provided further*, That no part of such funds shall be expended for the purchase of agricultural products or products produced from agricultural products not declared to be in short supply in the United States by the Secretary of Agriculture at less than the prevailing market price for such commodity within the United States or, if obtained from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, at less than the support price of such commodity including handling and storage costs."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to correct a bad practice in the operation of the foreign-aid program. The Congress has provided for the Mutual Security Program and before that the ECA. Then funds have been provided for such programs. Through the years, both under the Marshall plan operations and under Mutual Security program, in the purchase of many commodities in the United States, and particularly from the Commodity Credit Corporation, they have required that they be sold below cost and the difference be made up from section 32 funds. Not only that but many times United States funds have been used to purchase commodities from other countries, wheat from Canada for instance, when such wheat was readily available in our own country.

Through the demand by aided countries for prices below cost not only have we sold commodities for about $65,000,000 below the cost to us, but in effect you have increased ECA and mutual security aid by such $65,000,000. Doubtless many of you were not aware of this fact. This provision will prohibit that practice. It also will strengthen the hands of those in Mutual Security who want these countries to pay the amount of money that we have invested in such commodities, or the prevailing market price because as long as they have the authority to use section 32 funds, to make up any discount, the countries aided of course will urge such sale below cost. I think the amendment should be adopted for that reason. In addition, in the Mutual Security Program, we have provided that if commodities are surplus in our country, then they must be purchased in the United States if United States funds are expended. This amendment would have the additional purpose of saying that if commodities are readily available in the United States, and we are putting up the money, in the judgment of the Congress then, they should be purchased here. That is not a flat requirement because if the Secretary of Agriculture should certify that such commodities are in short supply in the United States, then this provision would not apply. I might add further that I have taken this provision up with officials of the Mutual Security Agency, and I feel that I have met the major objections they have raised to the language which was in the bill, and which was subject to a point of order. I feel there can be no question but what the membership should support this amendment and stop on the one hand a bad practice and on the other spell out the policy which should be followed where we are providing the funds. When we have the commodities available preference should be given to using our funds to buy such commodities at the prevailing price in this country, or at the support price in case they come from the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ESA

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, in voting on the appropriation for the Economic Stabilization Agency, I think we should be guided by the Biblical maxim that the laborer is worthy of his hire. By passing the extension of the Defense Production Act, we have told the stabilizers to administer these controls, and of all the appropriations we pass upon here—this one above all—is no place for false economy. On this one, of all places, we shouldn't be tempted to chisel away just because their job is a thankless one. For every 1 percent of price increase that these people save our economy, it means an annual saving of $800,000,000 in our Federal expenditures. On this score alone, you can see why the comparatively small amount of $80,000,000 should be restored to this appropriation to make sure they have enough to do an effective job. Besides this governmental saving, the prevention of a 1-percent price rise means an annual saving of $2,000,000,000 in the cost of living for 150,000,000 voters. You can be sure that we will hear from these voters if we allow their cost of living to rise any higher than it has already gone due to loopholes provided by weakening amendments to the Defense Production Act.

When the bill for the extension of the Defense Production Act was up on the floor here, the opponents of controls—who did not dare take the responsibility for voting to kill the controls outright—sought time and again to kill the controls indirectly—by putting forward innocent-sounding, but deadly amendments. I hope the conference report on the Defense Production Act will be accepted by the House. For then we will have a law which is not as good as it

might be but which still can offer substantial protection against the ravages of inflation. That is to say, the law can hold down inflation if it is enforced by an adequate staff.

But at this point the opponents of controls are trying to repeat their flank maneuver by seeking to slash the appropriation—to slash it in the name of governmental economy.

I yield to no one in my desire for governmental economy, but I say to you that those who seek to cut the appropriation for economic controls are not true advocates of economy. They are advocates of waste and extravagance. For there is nothing that can waste Government procurement appropriations as fast as giving a free rein to inflation.

And let us not forget that at the same time that inflation wastes Government appropriations, it wastes the incomes of our 50,000,000 families along with the economic strength of the Nation.

The father of world communism, Lenin, is reported to have said that the best way to destroy a nation is by destroying the value of its money—in other words—inflation. And it is very evident from recent Communist statements that they are counting on inflation in America to sap our economic strength and thereby sap our military strength.

I think the Communists are going to be proved wrong in counting on the inability of this Congress to hold inflation just as they were proved wrong in counting on a great depression to wreck the American economy during the period before their attack on Korea. Right here and now on this floor—right here and now on this appropriations bill, we have a chance to prove the Kremlin wrong. We can prove that we have the courage and self-restraint to curb the natural desires of higher profits and higher wages in the interest of stopping inflation. We must remember that every fight amongst ourselves on the details of how to accomplish stabilization, which results in weakening our inflation controls, automatically helps to make the Kremlin's predictions and hopes come true.

I do not think we want to do that. I think it is right and proper that we scrutinize every appropriation request carefully and see that it does not contain any unnecessary fat. I have sought to satisfy myself as to whether the budgetary request makes sufficient allowance for the suspension of ceilings in soft markets. I have found that the OPS, which is the organization making these suspensions, is practically a skeleton compared to the OPA staff during the last war. The fact that it will function as a shrunken organization can be seen when we compare its staff with that of OPA in World War II. It will be 10,750 for OPS against almost 65,000 for OPA in total. Allowing for the fact that OPA had roughly 38,000 of their 65,000 people devoted to rationing and rent, this leaves OPS with 60 percent less personnel for their comparable function.

We must also remember that one-half of all consumer prices are now at peak levels, and another 20 percent are within 2 percent of peak levels. Seven out of every ten dollars being spent by consumers are being spent on goods at or very near ceilings. Only about 10 percent of all prices are substantially below ceiling and can really be considered as "soft."

So, it is crystal clear that the OPS budget has already more than taken care of reduced workloads attributable to suspensions already taken or likely to be taken. It also must be noted that every one of the suspension actions imposes upon OPS the responsibility of watching price developments in the market area under suspension, so that the suspension of a particular commodity does not mean that all work in connection with that commodity ceases.

Now, of course, every Member of Congress knows that there has been a lot of criticism of both slow processing and work backlog in some of the offices of this agency on the one hand, and also criticism of overstaffing in field offices on the other hand. But, we all know the terrific handicaps under which these people are working, and I am sure that all the Members of Congress who have dealt with the various offices of this agency on our constituents' matters must have some appreciation of the problems involved in this agency, as compared to permanent Government departments.

In the first place, they have had the problem of setting up temporary staffs in a great hurry where it is difficult to accurately gage workload. Quite aside from the normal mix-ups inherent to this sort of situation, it is difficult for a temporary agency to get competent people to serve in work which has absolutely no future or security to it. The business people in the agencies are there largely out of the sense of patriotic duty and the same goes for the Government career people. There is nothing more unpopular than telling people that they cannot have higher prices, wages, or salaries.

Their second problem is a terrific organizational one. They are dealing with very comprehensive subjects requiring experts in the various industrial specialties and skills which comprise an amazing array of all the distinctions present in our vast economy. Not only this, but all their regulations must be interpreted and applied to any individual or business who has questions or a problem.

Their third problem is an operational one which I am sure all of us can see would be present in any agency which has to quickly set up personnel for handling four operations as vast as these. It is that of shifting workloads and emphasis on the various programs, as well as the geographic distinctions in field offices. This is the problem that causes too much personnel in one office, and not enough personnel to handle the processing case loads in other offices. It just takes time for them to adjust to their problems, some of which change from day to day depending upon economic fluctuations.

I could go into great detail on all of these three scores, but I know each and every Member of this body must know exactly what I am talking about from his own experience and dealings with the four different branches of this agency and the manifold problems with which they must deal.

The cost of living is again at almost the highest point in history. Millions of low- and fixed-income families are hard hit by present prices and rents, as well as by the burden of high taxes. They are looking to us to keep the cost of living and the cost of defense, which must be met by taxes, from rising any further. A vote to provide an adequate appropriation for the administration of economic controls will reassure them as to our intention of holding the line. A vote to slash this appropriation any further will weaken our anti-inflation efforts to a crippling extent. It is as obvious to the voters as it must be to us that no law can be either adequately or equitably enforced without both sufficient and capable manpower. It will add to our people's unrest at a time when we should all rally our forces to meet the economic as well as the military challenge of Communist aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

This chapter may be cited as the "Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1953."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 37, after line 2 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. —. (a) No part of any appropriation made by this act for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 85 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 15 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

"(b) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security Agency and related Government functions provided for in this act;

"(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

Provided further, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b) shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a), and the said 85 percent shall not be exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953; and *Provided further*, each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently than quarterly an amount equivalent to the savings resulting from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior incumbents of the positions."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. The amendment applies to the act and

should be placed at the end of the act, rather than at the end of the chapter which we are now considering. I wonder if the gentleman will not withdraw the amendment at this time, and offer it at the conclusion of the act.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The language contained in this amendment might well appear at any part of the act. It is not of such a nature that it must come at the conclusion of the measure now under consideration. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the word "act" in the first line of section A to "chapter," making the amendment read:

No part of any appropriation made by this chapter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment with which the membership is familiar. It is a like amendment to the other amendments which I have offered to five appropriation bills, and which this House has already adopted during this session and last session.

This amendment provides that the personnel provided for in this bill shall be reduced by not less than 15 percent. The reason I have offered this amendment to this bill is because of the fact that we hear from all who visit foreign countries in which this Mutual Security Program is operating that they are overstaffed no end; that most of these employees in foreign countries are taken care of like kings; that they have valets, housemaids, housemen, chauffeurs, at their service. I have been reliably informed that on an average each one of these employees in the Mutual Security Program is actually costing the taxpayers of America well over $10,000 per annum. We pay their way across the seas, we pay the way of their families and so forth and it must stop sometime. We are setting a very poor example to the peoples of the world whom we are trying to help. Now if you want to save about $16,630,000 in the fiscal year 1953 here is your chance. It takes no one off the payroll. It simply provides that only one vacancy out of four may be filled until the 15 percent reduction in personnel has been accomplished. By so doing we hope finally to get this overstaffing in all departments down to the point that the American people can afford to pay.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Does this in any way affect the consular staff working at Montreal, Canada?

Mr. JENSEN. If they are getting money out of the Mutual Security Program, surely it would.

Mr. SADLAK. Apparently they are understaffed there, because I have directed an air-mail inquiry to the American Consul at Montreal on June 12, and to this time I have not had an acknowledgment. Apparently they would need more help. However I do not believe this House or the American people are in the mood to spend more than $13,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1953 for personnel hire just to be governed from Washington, D. C.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIBICOFF to the amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: After (b), No. 3, add a new paragraph as follows:

"4. That 90 days after the enactment of this act, the number of civilian employees who are United States citizens, receiving compensation or allowances from the administrative expense appropriations provided by this act, employed in the United States and overseas by or assigned to the Mutual Security Agency, or employed by or assigned to the Department of State or the Department of Defense for carrying out programs the appropriations for which are provided by this act, and the military personnel assigned to such programs, shall be in the aggregate at least 15 percent less than the number so employed or assigned on June 1, 1952, except for such personnel of the Department of Defense engaged in the manufacturing, repair, rehabilitation, packing, handling, crating, or delivery of matériel: *Provided further*, That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to clarify the Jensen amendment in accordance with the very careful draftsmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee to make sure that the separation of the 15 percent would proceed in an orderly fashion, and also to make certain that we can have capable people on the staffs, and not the drones. I think the amendment in this respect is a clarifying one and will help the program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I am glad to say that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], who offered this amendment, spoke to me about his amendment, explained it to me, and I can understand that it is necessary in this particular agency; so I shall be in favor and will support the gentleman's amendment to my amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and my colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for getting together on this front to have an orderly system for cutting down that payroll, but keeping enough necessary to run the agencies. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia make his point of order?

Mr. GARY. Yes. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment, it leaves the discharge of employees entirely to the Administrator, which contravenes existing laws with reference to veterans' preference and also the civil-service laws. It is legislation; it contravenes existing legislation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late; the amendment had been debated.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I reserved the point of order at the time the amendment was offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Part of the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, after the proviso, reads:

That after the Director has determined the reduction to be effected in each agency, the determination as to which individual employees shall be retained shall be made by the head of the agency concerned.

This portion of the amendment does, in the opinion of the Chair, alter the civil-service laws and laws relating to veterans' preferences, and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 124, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared an amendment I was going to offer at the end of this particular chapter which I want to read because I desire to get the thought across to the Members. The amendment reads:

Provided, further, That funds provided in this chapter shall not be available for expenditure abroad where United States Government owned funds or credits are available for the purposes of this chapter and where the expenditure of the same would not create an undue economic strain on the country concerned.

The reason I am not offering the amendment is that the language requires a great deal more consideration in order to accomplish the purpose desired.

I want to call attention to page 858 of the hearings, where are listed the various balances outstanding that have been obtained from lend-lease, surplus property, and pipeline. You will see that the total amount of funds that we have available to us abroad is $2,200,000,000 approximately. That money has been sitting there for some time, of course, and could be utilized for mutual defense.

I call attention to the report and the consideration that we gave to the Foreign Service Building Act which came before this House on March 31, 1952, and to some of the statements made by the proponents of that act.

I will read from a special order that I had on April 1, in which I discussed this matter, page 3331, April 1, 1952, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The Members were told that it would cost the taxpayers of this country no money; the Members were told that the payments would come out of funds which this country might easily lose if we did not convert

the funds into real estate abroad; the Members were told that we would save money on rent if we authorized the State Department to spend this $90,000,000. All three of these statements are unfounded, on either study or fact.

The fact remains that all of this appropriation of some six or seven billion dollars actually does not have to come out of the taxpayers' pockets if we would utilize this some $2,200,000,000 worth of funds that are available abroad and not listen to the statements that the State Department has made in the past that those funds cannot be used, because they can be used.

Furthermore, I want to call your attention to page 14 of the hearings on this foreign building program.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I would like to say that I am doing this after conferring with the chairman of the subcommittee. He suggested that I take 5 minutes to try to explain this very important matter to the House, because he himself feels that this should be gone into, and he hopes the subcommittee will go into it and be able to come up with some language in the future whereby we can pin these people down and make them use these same $2,200,000,000 worth of sums available abroad, and if the gentleman from Ohio is no more interested in the taxpayer than his remarks indicate, I suggest that he refrain from making statements on the floor to that effect.

What I was trying to point out, in the hearings on the foreign-service building, on page 14, the State Department has previously said that these funds are tied down in different countries, and therefore you cannot switch them one country to another. But, in a little subnote 4 on that page you will find this statement:

> Insufficient foreign credits are currently available to complete FBO program plans. It is anticipated that adequate credits will be acquired through subsequent agreements transfers from other countries and/or purchase of necessary materials and equipment in other countries where credits are available.

So you notice when they come before us to get money, $90,000,000 for this, they know how to switch these funds around from one country to another. This is $2,200,000,000 that we could utilize to a certain extent for this mutual-security program and actually save our taxpayers a considerable amount of this $6,000,000,000 that we are adding on in this appropriation.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of announcing to the House the death of a former colleague from the second district of Philadelphia, the Honorable Robert N. McGarvey, who passed away this afternoon. Bob McGarvey represented the West Philadelphia district in the Eightieth Congress. Many of you will remember him as a lovable, alert little bantam of a man who held strong convictions, but who was amiable and beloved by both sides of the aisle. He used to sit just back of the terminal or "anchor" seat of the Pennsylvania delegation occupied by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. Many of us will miss him and will recall with sadness his passing. Our sincere condolences are extended to his family and to his many friends. I would like to say this as my own tribute to him, that although the years inevitably demanded their toll, he seemed perpetually youthful and full of interest in the passing scene, "he shall grow not old as we that are left grow old. Age shall not weary him, nor the years condemn; at the going down of the sun, and in the morning we shall remember him."

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would certainly be derelict if I were not to say a word on the passing of this former colleague of ours who came here and associated with us. We found him to be a quiet, modest man; diffident, yet very earnest and very sincere; a man utterly devoted to his country and its needs; very thoughtful of his colleagues; all in all, a genuine Christian man. We shall miss him very much.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I join with the other Pennsylvania Members in expressing my regret and sorrow on hearing of the death of our former colleague, Mr. McGarvey. He was a perfect gentleman in every respect. He was as true to the proper principles for the guidance of any legislator as any who ever served in this House. He deserves credit for the service he gave to the country. I am sure we all mourn his passing, and express our sincere sympathy to his relatives and friends.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I am happy to testify, from my knowledge of Bob McGarvey, to his integrity, rectitude, and unswerving loyalty to his friends and associates regardless of their political affiliations. Certainly the Democratic delegation from Philadelphia grieve his passing.

May I say also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRANAHAN], from the district which Mr. McGarvey represented, would, if he were here today, also express his sorrow at the passing of our colleague.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRANAHAN], and he has expressed to me his intention to pay his respects to the memory of our late colleague.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I join my colleagues from Pennsylvania in expressing sympathy to the family of Bob McGarvey. He was an outstanding figure in Philadelphia. He served here in a very exemplary way, and was one of the outstanding Members of the Eightieth Congress. I express my personal sympathy to his family and loved ones.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

For expenses necessary for the Office of Defense Mobilization, including compensation of the Director of Defense Mobilization, at the rate of $22,500 per annum; printing and binding without regard to section 89 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended (44 U. S. C. 213); hire of passenger-motor vehicles; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; not to exceed $5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $1,000,000: *Provided*, That contracts under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), may be renewed annually.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 37, line 9, which reads, "at the rate of $22,500 per annum." It is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] a question. I understand the controls bill is to operate for 10 months. I wonder why under those circumstances there should not be a reduction of one-sixth in each one of the items that appear in chapter X.

Mr. WHITTEN. These figures were arrived at, as the gentleman knows, only today because we had to wait and see what was contained in this conference report, which has not yet been up. We do feel with regard to the two items, which are for the first time in the conference report on a 10-month basis, approximately one-sixth of the amounts involved here should be retained for the last 2 months for clean-up purposes or for the doing away with the agency which is required by the law. It is my understanding insofar as this particular part of the appropriation bill is concerned, it is only on a 12-month basis and is not within the 10-month limitation under the agreement reached in conference. Therefore, it would be on a 12-month basis.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE TRANSPORT ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Defense Transport Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, $2,200,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: On page 39, line 20, before the period, insert "*Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for not to exceed four contracts for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), which may be renewed annually."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that this language has been agreed upon by both sides. It does not increase the amount of money to be expended by the Defense Transportation group, but it will permit them to use specialists in this field not to exceed four, for the purposes of counsel and advice in this operation. As I say, it is my understanding that this has been agreed upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and purchase (not to exceed one) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $3,500,000.

Revolving fund

For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $3,000,000.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION A ONE-STOP AGENCY FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of legislation extending the functions of the Small Defense Plants Administration for another year is testimony of the determination of the Congress to provide equal opportunity for the small-business institutions of our Nation during these trying times.

It is gratifying to the House Small Business Committee to have the recommendations of our great Committee on Appropriations adopted unanimously by the House.

These two necessary steps on the part of the House of Representatives and the Congress will enable the Small Defense Plants Administration to continue the effective programs now under way. I said in proposing the original legislation that SDPA was intended to be a one-stop agency for small business. That concept has been accepted by those in charge of the administration of this agency without reservation.

I want you to know the House Small Business Committee is watching over the operations of SDPA for you. It is your agency, an independent one, jointly sponsored by most of the Members of this House. The members of the House Small Business Committee have felt their responsibility in this regard. It is our intention after the adjournment of this session to continue to follow carefully the administration of SDPA in every particular and report our findings and conclusions to the House.

I have every reason to believe your confidence in establishing SDPA as a one-stop agency for small business will be fully justified.

At this point, I desire to include statements of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, House Report 2177, dated June 16, 1952, to accompany H. R. 8210, Eighty-second Congress, second session; the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, Senate Report 1599, dated May 27, 1952, to accompany S. 2594, Eighty-second Congress, second session; the Committee on Appropriations of the House, House Report 2316 on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, chapter X, emergency agencies; and finally, a statement of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of the President, Senate Report 1295, dated March 12, 1952, Eighty-second Congress, second session. It is extremely gratifying to me as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, to the members of the committee, and to small business across the Nation that the Small Defense Plants Administration has received the strong support of these important standing committees of both the House and the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
House of Representatives.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952 (H. REPT. 2177 ON H. R. 8210)

The Small Defense Plants Administration (SDPA) was established under section 714 of the act, which was added by the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951. Its function is to carry out the policy of the Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of the act.

Section 714f (2) sets up a procedure for carrying out jointly by SDPA and the procurement agencies the congressional policy that a fair proportion of total Government purchases and contracts be awarded to small business. SDPA has been engaged in putting this procedure into effect, by arrangements with the armed services and other procurement agencies. Under this plan, procurement requests will be screened for work which can be done by small concerns, and an appropriate portion of the procurement will be reserved for placement with small business. On March 27, 1952, the Defense Department issued a directive providing the necessary administrative framework, with details to be provided by each of the services. The Air Force has issued a directive covering actual operation for that service, and respresentatives of SDPA have been assigned to the headquarters of the Air Matériel Command at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, where the great bulk of Air Force procurement is handled. Similar directives have not yet been issued by the Army and Navy, but the Army has authorized assignment of SDPA representatives to certain of its puchasing offices as a preliminary step.

Under sections 714 (e) (6) and 714 (f) (1), SDPA is authorized to certify small-business concerns as competent, with respect to capacity and credit, to perform specific Government contracts. The certificate is conclusive upon Government procurement officers, and affords a method of aiding small business to meet requirements as to qualification. At the time of the hearings, 14 certificates of competence had been issued, and 12 concerns so certified had received contracts totaling more than $10,500,000.

Under its authority to recommend small-business loans to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, SDPA has acted on 185 applications, making favorable recommendations on over 100, totaling approximately $14,500,000, and to date 55, totaling $6,000,000 have been approved by RFC. Several hundred other applications are under consideration by SDPA.

The Administration is also entering upon the task of eliminating any procurement practices which have effects disadvantageous to small business. Arrangements have been made with the Army to eliminate bid and performance bonds on supply contracts where the interests of the Government can otherwise be protected, relieving small concerns of the difficulty they find in obtaining such bonds. Changes in the renegotiation regulations have been obtained to encourage subcontracting to small firms. Greater availability to small business of V-loan guaranties by the authorized agencies is being sought. SDPA has also recommended to the Department of Defense that it liberalize its standards for granting adjustments in Government contract prices under title II of the First War Powers Act, so as to enable small business to qualify more readily for such adjustments where unforeseen developments justify it. By cooperation between SDPA and NPA the latter has established a special reserve of steel, copper, and aluminum to take care of small-business hardship cases, and by April 15, 1952, nearly 400 small firms had obtained materials relief from this reserve.

In the field of tax amortization, SDPA and DPA are engaged in a program to insure that small manufacturers will receive their fair share of tax amortization assistance in expansion programs.

Under this set-aside program, a definite small-business share of each industrial expansion goal will be established, based on the pre-Korean position of small business in the industry, or segment of industry being expanded. Where added capacity is being sought the Defense Production Administration will hold open the small-business share for 30 days, while SDPA notifies small concerns of this opportunity to take part in the program if they can otherwise qualify for accelerated tax write-offs. Where goals have already been established, and it appears that a disproportionate share of certificates has been going to larger firms, SDPA and DPA will urge small-business participation with a view to restoring the pre-Korean balance between larger and small firms. These small manufacturers have received only 10 percent of the value of tax amortization certificates, although the same firms in fiscal 1951 received 20.9 percent of military prime contracts.

The Government is now the largest single purchaser in our economy, and Government procurement will play a major and increasing role in our economy for a considerable time to come. The factors, in a large mobilization program, which tend to pinch out the small manufacturer, have not been eliminated. Cut-backs in the allocation of critical materials for civilian use, which present especial difficulty for the small concerns, will continue for an indefinite period. Extra difficulty in obtaining financing for defense and essential civilian production will always be one of the problems of small business. The necessity for a Government program, on a stable and effective footing, to assist small business to obtain its fair share of defense

work is even more acute than it was when the original authority was granted. Your committee recommends, therefore, that the Small Defense Plants Administration be continued until June 30, 1953.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, UNITED STATES SENATE.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952 (S. REPT. 1599 ON S. 2594)

EXTENSION OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Your committee recommends an extension until June 30, 1953, of the Small Defense Plants Administration (sec. 714). Its purpose was to assist and enable small businesses to obtain a fair share of defense contracts and also their proper share of allocated materials in order that they might contribute to defense production and essential civilian production. In adopting this amendment to the Defense Production Act, Congress reaffirmed its belief that the conservation of small business enterprise is a prerequisite if we are to preserve and enhance, if possible, the competitive element in American business enterprise.

The primary aid of SDPA was not only to help the small-business man, but, more important, to get the small-business man to help the defense effort. The aggregate productive capacity of small business is tremendous and all efforts must be made to utilize this potential. This requires special effort and special safeguards to prevent small business from being impaired and engulfed while we operate under a system of allocations and large defense spending.

The Small Defense Plants Administration assists small business in receiving its proportionate share of defense contracts that it can handle; its fair share of materials whenever it is necessary to have them under allocation; and financial assistance it needs to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian business.

A report of the Munitions Board shows that the dollar volume of military prime contracts placed with small concerns has been steadily decreasing. In fiscal 1950 the percentage was 24.5; in fiscal 1951, 20.9; and the first half of fiscal 1952, 19.7. There is no basis for the belief that the trend will reverse itself. The study of the statistics of World War II shows that if strenuous efforts are made small business will share more equitably in defense spending. The small-business share of procurement by the Army service forces rose from 12.6 percent in 1943 to 26.7 percent in June 1945. This rise was largely due to the activities of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The most important and difficult task of the Small Defense Plants Administration is to broaden and increase the participation of small-business concerns in Government procurement. In addition to protecting our economy a great diffusion of military procurement will speed production, spread know-how, and increase strategic dispersal of industry and retain the productive potential of small plants.

SDPA since its inception has engaged in the following major activities in an attempt to maintain and implement the position of small business in our economy.

1. Recommendations to RFC of loans to small concerns for defense and essential civilian purposes.

2. Assistance in obtaining accelerated tax amortizations.

3. Negotiations with the Department of Defense to place SDPA procurement specialists in the major contracting offices of the Armed Forces.

4. Certifications of small plants as competent with respect to credit and capacity to perform contracts in order that contracts may be awarded such plants.

5. Encouraged and assisted in the formation of producing pools.

6. Furnished technial advice and assistance to small plants on when and how to obtain defense contracts.

7. Establish field offices and regional advisory boards as appropriations permitted.

This committee feels that so long as materials are allocated and tremendous sums are being channeled into defense production, the existence and capacity of the small businesses of this country must be safeguarded and protected in order to preserve one of the foundation stones of our competitive economy.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953 (H. R. 6370), JUNE 26, 1952

(H. Rept. No. 2316)

Small Defense Plants Administration: Funds are approved in the amount of $3,500,000 for the salaries and expenses of this agency. If the efforts of the Government to assist small business are to be successful and at the same time economical a thorough study of the small-business activities of other Federal agencies must be made by the proper authorities to insure that no duplication exists and that the intent of the authorizing act as regards transfer of funds and functions to SDPA are carried out to a greater degree than has been true in the past.

The estimate of $5,000,000 for a revolving fund to be used by this agency in the purchase of prime contracts is approved in the amount of $3,000,000.

JOINT ECONOMIC REPORT—REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT ON THE JANUARY 1952 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

(S. Rept. No. 1295)

AID TO SMALL BUSINESS

President's recommendation: Aid small business by providing the necessary funds for the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Committee's views: The mobilization program has had a damaging impact on small producers. Because of size and limited financial reserves, small business is especially vulnerable to the imbalances caused by large-scale military buying, rationing of materials, price and wage controls, heavy taxation, and a tight skilled-labor market. Since current small-business problems stem in large measure from disruptions created by the mobilization program, the Government has a responsibility for taking every precaution to minimize the hardships produced for small enterprises. At its last session Congress established the Small Defense Plants Administration to meet this obligation. An appropriation was passed providing funds for initial planning and organization but not for operation. This committee feels that adequate funds should be provided for a purposeful small-business operation and it therefore endorses the President's recommendation.

Further, the committee recommends that small-business organizations from other departments should be transferred to the Small Defense Plants Administration with the exception of small-business activities and organizations necessary to normal operations of the respective departments.

At the same time, the committee maintains that congressional efforts to assist small business cannot be limited to these steps. The Senate and House Committees on Small Business must continue their efforts on behalf of small business. Both committees in their annual reports just issued have made recommendations relating to how small-business men can become more effectively integrated in the defense program.

An excellent example of SDPA's effort to serve is incorporated in a small booklet entitled "Small Defense Plants Administration: What It Is, What It Does." This booklet with appropriate illustrations has received wide acclaim for telling a big story in the fewest possible words:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION: WHAT IT IS, WHAT IT DOES

CREATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF SDPA

The Small Defense Plants Administration was created on July 31, 1951, when, by unanimous action of Congress, section 714, establishing the agency and outlining its functions, was added to the Defense Production Act.

It was the expressed intent of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program; and that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy.

SDPA was established as an agency with no primary function or interest other than the preservation and promotion of small business enterprise. Accordingly, Congress specified that SDPA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government."

A precedent for SDPA was the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II. That agency was able to help small business make an invaluable contribution to the war effort and our ultimate victory.

The principal functions of the Small Defense Plants Administration, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that (1) small business gets its fair share of defense contracts, (2) it receives a fair share of critical materials, and (3) it gets the financial and technical assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian activities.

Telford Taylor, Administrator of the agency, took the oath of office October 19, 1951. Initial funds for preliminary organization of SDPA were appropriated by Congress November 1.

ORGANIZATION

SDPA's Washington office is organized as follows:

There are six main operating offices: Contract Procurement, Prime Contract Operations, Materials, Loans, Production and Management Assistance, and Field Operations. They report directly to one of two Deputy Administrators.

Grouped under the other Deputy Administrator are the Office of Programs and Economic Analysis and the Office of Information.

These two Deputy Administrators, plus an Assistant Administrator, and the general counsel, report directly to the Administrator.

Reporting to the Assistant Administrator are these offices: Budget and Finance, Personnel, Organization and Management, and Administrative Services.

FIELD OPERATIONS

Although SDPA regional directors are responsible to the Administrator, the Washington Office of Field Operations directs, plans and coordinates the field activities.

One of the principal objectives of the agency is to maintain a field service capable of providing one-stop service at the local level in solving small business problems arising from the mobilization program.

The agency has regional offices in principal industrial areas of the country. Each regional director has an advisory board, made up of representative small-business men from the area. These boards consult with and advise the regional offices on small-business problems, and make recommendations to the agency. Each advisory board has an industry vice chairman who serves as

a member of the National Small Business Advisory Board under the chairmanship of the SDPA Administrator.

(A list of the regional offices is contained at the back of this pamphlet.)

AGENCY PROGRAM AND OBJECTIVES

Within the limitations of the available funds and a small staff, SDPA has made substantial progress in establishing a program and putting it into effect. Its program and objectives are described in brief outline below.

Financial assistance

One of the most pressing problems of small-business concerns in any mobilization or emergency period is that of obtaining the necessary financial assistance for full participation in the defense effort.

SDPA does not make loans, but is authorized to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small-business loans for defense and essential civilian production. Such loans may not be granted if private financing is available, or if loans can be granted by the Government under provisions other than section 714 of the Defense Production Act.

Section 714, small-business loans are granted from a fund—not to exceed $100,000,000 in outstanding loans at any given time—authorized by Congress.

Joint procedures have been developed by SDPA and RFC for handling applications for these loans. Applicants file the usual RFC loan application, plus SDPA Form 22 (Application for Loan Recommendation), with regional RFC offices. RFC sends the Form 22 to SDPA immediately. It analyzes and investigates the loan application, and sends a copy of its report to SDPA for examination and recommended action.

Loan applications began to come into SDPA at the beginning of 1952, and the volume increased steadily. Requests for assistance have come from every area of the country and loans are being granted at an increasing pace.

Small-business firms from all parts of the country have complained to Congress they are not able to get defense contracts without adequate financial backing, and on the other hand, are not able to get financial backing without defense contracts. The SDPA loan program helps to eliminate this vicious circle.

Materials allocations

SDPA is not authorized to make allotments of materials, but is empowered to "consult and cooperate with appropriate agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting or expanding production by or in the formulation of policy in granting priorities to business concerns." These agencies are required by statute, before issuing such orders or announcing such priority policies, to consult with SDPA.

Since November 1951 SDPA has been represented on the Defense Production Administration Requirements and Program Adjustment Committees, and on the important committees of the National Production Authority. SDPA has worked closely with these allocating agencies to insure recognition of the special problems of small business in connection with materials distribution.

SDPA worked jointly with NPA in establishing a special Small Business Hardship Account of controlled materials for the purpose of supplementing materials allotments to small concerns cut below a break-even point of operation. SDPA is a member of the panel which determines the special allotments for individual small firms.

In addition, SDPA has been able to help in providing spot materials assistance to many small firms unable to obtain relief elsewhere.

Contract procurement

One of the principal reasons for the creation and establishment of SDPA was the desire of Congress to increase the participation of small-business firms in Government procurement. It was felt that, in addition to protecting our competitive economy, greater diffusion of procurement to small concerns was necessary to speed production, spread know-how, increase strategic dispersal of industry, make use of existing facilities, and retain the productive potential of small plants.

Section 714 authorizes SDPA and the procurement agencies to make joint determinations that, in the interest of national defense or the mobilization of productive capacity, specific contracts or parts of contracts shall go to small-business concerns.

SDPA is placing procurement specialists in major contracting offices to help carry out this mandate of Congress by working jointly with procurement officers to ear-mark and award more contracts to small concerns that are capable of handling them.

SDPA has also issued operating guides to its field offices indicating steps to be followed in increasing subcontracting opportunities for small business. In addition, a comprehensive facilities inventory plan is being put into effect in order to assure maximum utilization of the productive facilities of small business in the defense effort. This program will function at the SDPA regional level through close cooperation with State Governments, procurement officers, and large prime contractors.

SDPA has also taken steps to allow maximum flexibility in awarding contracts to small concerns.

Certificates of credit and capacity

SDPA is authorized to certify small concerns or production pools as competent with respect to credit and capacity to perform a specific contract; and procurement officers are directed by law to accept such certification as conclusive.

This is another measure by which Congress sought to assist and expedite the flow of Government contracts going to small firms.

Small-businesss production pools

SDPA gives advice and assistance in the formation of small-business production pools, formally authorizes them, and helps them in obtaining defense contracts.

The practicability of such pools was demonstrated during World War II, when 250 of them were authorized and completed $600,000,000 worth of war contracts.

Other activities

In keeping with its over-all objective of protecting and promoting the welfare of small business wherever possible, SDPA has been active in several other areas. For example, in order to assure small business a fair share of tax amortization benefits from the Government, SDPA recommended to the Defense Production Administration that a set-aside of these benefits be reserved for small concerns, and that expeditious treatment be given all applications for tax amortization from small firms.

Upon recommendation by SDPA, the Renegotiation Board recently revised its regulations to provide specific financial incentives for subcontracting defense work to small-business concerns. This provides additional subcontracting opportunities for small firms.

Another example: SDPA acted early in its existence to discourage the "general right of set-off," a practice whereby a prime contractor could deduct from payments due a subcontractor any sums which the subcontractor might owe the prime in connection with other transactions. Since this operated against small concerns and also harmed defense production, SDPA called it to the attention of Government procurement agencies. Letters were sent out to prime contractors asking them to abandon this practice, and the great majority of them have done so.

Location of regional offices

Region I, Boston: Covering Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut; Edward J. Stewart, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 40 Broad Street, Boston, Mass. Phone: Hubbard 26200, extension 96.

Region II, New York: Covering New York and New Jersey; Casper H. Citron, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 2 West Forty-third Street, ninth floor, New York, N. Y. Phone: Chickering 4–6157.

Region III,[1] Philadelphia: Covering Pennsylvania and Delaware.

Region IV, Richmond: Covering Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, District of Columbia, and North Carolina; Leon E. Savage, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 400 East Main Street, lower level, Richmond, Va. Phone: 3–7421, extension 21.

Region V, Atlanta: Covering Tennessee, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Florida; Hugh Mitchell, acting regional director, 147 Hunter Street, Kline Building, seventh floor, Atlanta, Ga. Phone: Alpine 4682, extension 8660.

Region VI,[1] Cleveland: Covering Ohio, Kentucky, and Michigan.

Region VII, Chicago: Covering Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin; Yngvar Brynildssen, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, room 901, 188 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. Phone: Dearborn 2–4500, extension 571.

Region VIII, Minneapolis: Covering Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana; J. Walter Malmquist, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, 1247 Northwestern National Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. Phone: Main 3244.

Region IX, Kansas City: Covering Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, and Kansas; Roy W. Webb, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, Federal Office Building, room 405, 911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo. Phone: Baltimore 7000, extension 591.

Region X, Dallas: Covering Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana; Henry H. Ritter, acting regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, room 808, 1114 Commerce Street, Dallas, Tex. Phone: Riverside 6951, extension 2248.

Region XI,[1] Denver: Covering Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Region XII, San Francisco: Covering California, Arizona, and Nevada; Joseph V. Ragusa, acting regional representative, Small Defense Plants Administration, Flood Building, room 1043, 870 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. Phone: Yukon 2–5800, extension 150.

Region XIII, Seattle: Covering Washington, Idaho, and Oregon; Allan L. Willard, regional director, Small Defense Plants Administration, Burke Building, room 328, 905 Second Avenue, Seattle, Wash. Phone: Eliot 9030, extension 315.

At this point for the further information of the Members of the House, I desire to cite a few examples of the effectiveness of the Small Defense Plants Administration. There is no doubt that with adequate funds and an opportunity

[1] Regional director yet to be appointed.

to subdivide contracts through its revolving fund, SDPA's record of accomplishment will materially increase:

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

LOANS

JUNE 1952.

SDPA's financial assistance program, which got under way late in December, is designed to fill a gap in Government credit facilities available for small business.

It has already resulted in $11,095,540 worth of loans to small plants for defense or essential civilian production, and new loans are being made almost every day.

These loans, which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation makes out of a $100,000,000 fund on SDPA's recommendation, have gone to 88 small concerns in over half of the States. Some 400 additional applications totaling over $200,000,000 are pending.

The guiding principle followed in recommending these loans is that encouragement and assistance to small business is, of itself, in the public interest. There is no other loan program which follows this point of view. Other Government lending authorities provide assistance to small business only incidentally to the accomplishment of other objectives.

SDPA's Office of Loans is constantly advising and consulting with small business concerns in the adjustment and management of their financial affairs. It seeks first, to obviate the necessity of Government financing whenever possible, and second, when necessary and merited, to help prepare their loan requests in such a manner that the needed financing will be forthcoming under section 714 of the Defense Production Act.

The SDPA loan program furnishes an effective means of providing the necessary financing to help small firms break the vicious circle that so often thwarts them when they try to get a defense procurement contract—they can't get the contract until they have the loan, and they can't get the loan until they have the contract.

With SDPA help, an increasing number of small firms are getting the kind of assistance they need, and which is not available elsewhere. Many of them are getting this help in the field. SDPA field offices, which began operations in February, have given advice and assistance on financial matters to more than 1,300 small-business men.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS

SDPA has issued 20 certificates of competency to small firms and these firms have received or are negotiating contracts totaling nearly $17,000,000.

These certificates, which must be taken as conclusive by contracting officers, establish a firm's competency, with respect to capacity and credit, to perform specific Government contracts. They are not awarded wholesale; they are given only after rigorous SDPA inspection, and only if a plant is the low bidder (or within negotiation range) and the contracting officer has raised a question about a plant's technical or financial ability to perform.

SDPA has put into operation the joint determination procedure (sec. 714 (f) (2) of the Defense Production Act) under which small plants are to be awarded a fair share of prime contracts. Discussions initiated by SDPA resulted in the issuance by the Munitions Board in March of a policy directive providing for the placement of SDPA representatives in contracting offices of the three military departments.

Detailed operating procedures were worked out with the Air Force in April. SDPA representatives have been assigned to Headquarters, Air Matériel Command, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio, and already several contracts have been earmarked for award to small business only. SDPA is still trying to get formal agreements on operating procedures from the Army and Navy, although its representatives have already gone to work in offices of the Quartermaster and Signal Corps and several joint determinations have been made.

Representatives of several thousand small plants have either made personal visits to the SDPA's Office of Contract Procurement or have written letters. A large number of these visits and letters have been to ask spot assistance on current procurement.

SDPA has not had sufficient personnel to follow up each one of these inquiries to determine what results have been achieved in each individual case. However, in some cases SDPA has learned that firms have been successful in obtaining Government contracts, and it is reasonable to suppose that many others have been successful also, but have not informed us of it. It is the usual practice of a small plant to call on SDPA when it needs assistance, but only rarely do they inform SDPA of their successes.

SDPA's procurement operation is only beginning, but the results of the operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base indicate that the SDPA joint determination program will result in far greater percentage of prime contracts going to small business than in the past.

In 4 weeks of operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, SDPA has screened 237 procurements and made joint determinations on 27 of these in the amount of $21,690,135. The operation at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base was started at the end of the fiscal year when the procurement flow is very small.

SDPA is recruiting qualified personnel to establish approximately 65 operations similar to that at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in all of the principal contracting centers of the armed services and major civilian agencies.

It is the objective of SDPA to reverse the declining trend of contracts being awarded to small business. The agency believes that small business participation in defense procurement can and should be increased to at least 35 percent of all procurement, whereas, for the current fiscal year through March, small business' share has been only 18.4 percent.

SDPA field offices have also been active in giving assistance. They have given help in more than 2,000 cases involving defense contracts.

FLEXIBILITY IN PROCUREMENT

Flexibility in procurement procedures, a condition long urged by many Members of Congress, has now been made possible through the efforts of SDPA. It only remains for the Defense Department to translate its authority into specific directives.

In reply to specific questions by SDPA, the Comptroller General has ruled that: (1) wherever procurement through negotiation was authorized by law, price differentials may be paid to small concerns in appropriate cases, even though the mechanics of formal advertising had been used; and (2) even where negotiation was not authorized and formal advertising was required by law, the payment of a price differential would be authorized if a joint determination had been made under section 714 (f) (2).

These two rulings give the military all the authority needed to carry out its own policy statement of April 5, 1951, favoring the payment of price differentials "to broaden the industrial base of procurement." Moreover, they remove whatever barriers may have existed to a reversion to World War II policy of paying price differentials to small concerns.

As the war experience proved, these differentials (which are more nominal than real) are useful in preserving existing enterprises and speeding up military production.

PRODUCTION POOLS

SDPA has moved to bring about a more efficient system of approving small-business production pools. Only 14 of these pools have been O. K.'d in the current mobilization program as contrasted with 250 during World War II.

SDPA felt that the diffusion of responsibility among five Federal agencies of the authority to approve these pools had a great deal to do with the small number approved. Therefore, it asked and obtained the Defense Production Administration's concurrence in a plan to centralize the approval power in SDPA. Consummation of this plan rests on the issuance of an Executive order which is now under study by the Bureau of the Budget.

In the meantime, SDPA has been assisting in the formation of production pools, a function transferred to the agency from NPA last February. Before SDPA came into existence only five pools had been organized and approved. Now there are 14. Six of these pools have been successful in obtaining more than $2,000,000 in defense prime and subcontracts.

CONTROLLED MATERIALS

Close to 500 small-business firms have been saved from disaster through assistance from a special "hardship" reserve of materials established by the National Production Authority in cooperation with SDPA.

This special reserve of steel, copper, and aluminum was created, in line with a proposal by SDPA, for the sole purpose of taking care of small-business hardship cases. The Director of SDPA's Office of Materials is a member of the panel which reviews all requests for supplemental allotments from this reserve for small businesses unable to maintain minimum operations with regular allotments.

Representatives of SDPA sit in as members on the top committees that decide how the controlled materials—steel, copper products, and aluminum—are to be divided among the various claimants, and on the committee that recommends the issuance of new materials allocation orders or the revocation of orders.

SDPA representatives are thus in a position to look out for the welfare of the small-business man by helping shape the basic decisions that are made with regard to the distribution and use of controlled materials.

SUBCONTRACTING

SDPA has acted to increase subcontracting to small concerns by obtaining changes in the regulations of the Renegotiation Board.

SDPA successfully urged on the Renegotiation Board, both by letter and in discussions, certain changes in the regulations to make clear that prime contractors would be given favorable consideration where they subcontracted substantial amounts to small-business concerns. There had been widespread doubt about this point until the Board altered its regulations in accordance with SDPA suggestions.

Also to increase subcontracting to small concerns, SDPA has a subcontracting program, administered in the field, which acts as a catalyst in bringing together large prime contractors and small-plant subcontractors.

Each SDPA regional office is supplied with the names of large primes in its area who may be expected to have substantial work to subcontract. Small plants are directed to subcontracting opportunities thus identified.

SDPA maintains contact at the top management level of large manufacturers, and has successfully urged several large primes to appoint "small business specialists" to make subcontracting easier. SDPA also maintains lists of small business productive facilities and brings them to the attention of large prime contractors with work to be farmed out.

FACILITIES INVENTORY

To carry out the provision of section 714 (e) (1) of the Defense Production Act, SDPA is putting into operation a plan for an industrial facilities inventory on a national basis, making full use of inventories made or to be made by State governments.

Great emphasis is placed on local responsibility, comprehensiveness, simplicity, and constant renewal of data. The program has practical value for procurement agencies, State governments, and prime contractors. Its aim is to provide at all times an up-to-date, simple listing of productive facilities across the Nation. Its possibilities for both emergency and peacetime use are obvious.

TAX AMORTIZATION

Upon SDPA's recommendation, a program has been established to assure small-business firms equitable participation in the Nation's industrial-expansion program now being encouraged by accelerated tax write-offs.

SDPA research disclosed that only 10 percent of the certificates had gone to small business, despite the fact that small business accounts for 42 percent of the total employment in manufacturing. It proposed to DPA, and DPA accepted, a plan under which SDPA studies various expansion goals and recommends percentages of them to be filled by small-business firms. Time is given for SDPA to find sufficient small-business firms to fill the quota we recommend.

SDPA's aim is to try to maintain the pre-Korea, small business-big business ratio within industries. This ratio was considerably upset in the first year of the present emergency.

CONTRACT PRICE ADJUSTMENTS

At SDPA's urging, the military is reexamining its administration of contract price adjustments, provided for by law to relieve hardships on a firm caught between rising costs and an inflexible price term in the contract.

SDPA feels that the armed services have been much too rigid in granting relief under this statute. Up to February 14, 1952, the Navy Contract Adjustment Board had denied 47 out of 49 applications for relief; the Army Board had denied 17 out of 36, and the Air Force had turned down every application received.

SDPA urged a redrafting of current regulations in a letter to the Secretary of Defense and has followed up this initial request in a number of conferences and personal contacts.

BID AND PERFORMANCE BONDS

At SDPA's request, the Army Corps of Engineers agreed to modify a practice which operated to prevent small plants from competing for contracts which they were qualified to undertake:

The Corps of Engineers had been requiring bid and performance bonds from bidders on advertised supply contracts of $100,000 or more, whether or not there was any need for them.

SDPA pointed out that most other military branches had no such policy, and successfully urged the Corps of Engineers to change its policy so that bonds would be required only in individual cases where there are special reasons for doing so.

DISTRESSED AREAS

SDPA asked and obtained from the Acting Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization a ruling to clarify and strengthen the Government policy that a fair proportion of defense contracts shall be awarded to small business.

Under ODM Directive No. 4 (relief of distressed areas) some contracts susceptible of performance by small business were being awarded to big concerns in distressed areas. Dr. Steelman's ruling made it clear that this was contrary to Government procurement objectives.

WAGE CONTROLS

The Wage Stabilization Board is expected to revive the World War II exemption from wage controls of concerns with eight or fewer employees.

This was recommended by SDPA to the head of the Economic Stabilization Administration on the ground that such controls frequently work disproportionate hardship on small concerns who find that, because of their unfamiliarity with Government procedures and the consequent delays in obtaining adjustments in their wage scales, they lose key personnel to larger concerns which have been able to obtain adjustments more quickly.

V-LOANS

Also on SDPA's request, the Department of Defense is considering modification of its V-loan regulations, which SDPA feels are too restrictive on small business concerns.

The V-loan program was created for the very purpose of making possible maximum participation by small business concerns in defense production. But Defense Department administration of the program falls far short of accomplishing this objective.

Meanwhile, the V-loan regulations of other guaranteeing agencies have been surveyed, and, where it was felt that they too failed to carry out the intention of Congress, requests for revisions were made. Thus far, one such agency, the Department of Commerce, has agreed to revise its regulations accordingly.

MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT

SDPA has established a machinery and equipment assistance program which already has obtained needed tools for several small concerns in various parts of the country.

Through SDPA's efforts, some 50 large producers of machine tools have been persuaded to subcontract work on which they are currently behind schedule.

SDPA has likewise acted to promote the availability of machinery, machine tools, and production equipment to the smaller manufacturer by:

(a) Obtaining a 7-day freeze on used or imported machine tool stocks in behalf of small concerns;

(b) Establishing a catalog file of over 400 domestic and foreign machine tool producers and distributors to assist small concerns in locating needed machines;

(c) Sending a special mission to the Detroit area to assist in improving employment—more than $4,000,000 worth of subcontracts were placed with small machinery manufacturers to relieve the work-load on several large manufacturers.

(d) Working with NPA, FSA, and the military departments in developing a central inventory of machine tools. By the dissemination of this list through regional offices, small concerns may immediately be in position to acquire needed tools.

SPOT ASSISTANCE

Through its 13 field offices already in operation, and through the central office in Washington, SDPA has rendered spot assistance to many individual small firms in virtually every State of the Union and engaged in almost every type of small business.

Assistance given ranges from help in obtaining contracts to advice or financial aids, from getting increased allotments of controlled materials to solving complex engineering problems.

Many letters of thanks to SDPA attest the value of the spot assistance program.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS CONCERNING SDPA ASSISTANCE

A Houston, Tex., air-conditioning company: "When I was finally directed to your organization, our company had all but ceased operations for the want of 60 tons of steel and 3,000 pounds of copper. In a matter of hours your people had given us what amounted to survival and we are grateful indeed."

A Peoria, Ill., small-business production pool: "We are most happy to say that we have positive proof that SDPA will be the salvation of small business in this defense emergency and economy, and that all small business will profit through this administration and it is our belief small business is fortunate to have such able men working on its behalf, and that this new agency will not be a 'lip-service' department for they have proved they will produce. * * * We have now received, through the aid of SDPA, one small contract with the Air Force at Wright-Patterson Air Base in Dayton, two contracts from the Ordnance Department of the Rock Island Arsenal, of which one is very substantial, one from the Navy Purchasing Office in Washington; and are in the final negotiation stage of a $3,000,000 contract with another branch of the services, which, we flatly state, without the efforts of SDPA we would never have been considered for this item."

A Rochester, N. Y., manufacturer of oil drum faucets and hard goods: "My first awakening that your organization was operating entirely different than the rank and file of Government agencies was during our correspondence last March. You offered us assistance and went out of your way, even beyond furnishing the information we asked for, to give us leads on opportunities for bidding on Government contracts."

A Clifton, N. J., electronics firm: "We are well aware that the issuance of this certificate of competency by the SDPA was the deciding factor in the award of this contract * * * and will do our utmost to justify the confidence expressed in us by your administration."

A District of Columbia electronics firm: "Please permit me to express appreciation for the splendid assistance which you and your agency have given us in our efforts to obtain an equitable share of Government work through subcontracting. * * * If it had not been for the persistence of you and your agency, our situation would have by this time reached the hopeless stage. * * * Feel there is now an agency available which is interested in protecting small business and in preserving its usefulness to the national economy. * * * We hope that you will continue to remain alert to the needs of small business."

A Reading, Pa., clothing manufacturer: "We wish to thank the Small Defense Plants Administration for its decisive part in helping our small firm obtain the order for field jacket liners being purchased by the Marine Corps at Philadelphia. * * * We cannot tell you how much this means to us, and sufficiently express our thanks. The entire item which we have now obtained through your intervention is something over $75,000. This is not much for a very large concern, but it is substantial for us. If we had not received this order, we would have had to drop a large number of our employees, perhaps never to get them back again, and perhaps within a short period have had to terminate operations completely. We are now assured of at least substantial partial operation for several months, which is not bad for a firm in a distress area. Small Defense Plants Administration deserves a note of thanks for what it has done."

A New York wire, rope, and chain maker: "It has been a source of comfort to us and we are sure to others similarly placed, to know that there is at least one arm of the Government that reflects the viewpoint of small business and concentrates its efforts to preserve the interests of small business in our nationa, plan of economy and prevent its destruction or loss of usefulness through

lack of proper consideration. * * * We feel very strongly that such an agency is an important and necessary part of our Government."

A New England (Millbury, Mass.) wire company: "I take this opportunity to write and thank you for your valuable efforts in bringing about a quick approval of our certificate of necessity."

An Illinois metal fabricator: "May I congratulate you on evolving an agency that is positively helping small business."

A Pennsylvania tire and rubber company: "We are deeply grateful to your Administration for your assistance in this matter and it is gratifying to know that there is at least one agency in Washington which will not only talk about helping small businesses but will actually do something about it."

A New England State development commission: "Again I wish to commend the effective way in which the Small Defense Plants Administration is following up these various complaints as they are brought to your attention. . It is this type of personal interest that can go a long way toward establishing confidence among our small concerns in the work of your agency."

A Massachusetts research firm: "Please accept the thanks of this corporation for your services in our behalf. * * * It is comforting to know, * * * SDPA is anxious to help us."

A Massachusetts aluminum fabricator: "I have received a notice from the NPA that my allocation of aluminum foil has been reinstated. It is needless to say that this is of great importance to me, as without it, I would have been forced out of business. Your efforts in regaining this allocation for me are greatly appreciated. * * * In closing let me say humbly, thank you for a job well done."

A Kingsport, Tenn., manufacturer: "The kindness and help you gave me * * * is certainly appreciated. It would have been impossible for me to have accomplished anything without your cooperation."

A Cleveland, Ohio, manufacturer (materials assistance case): "Our supplemental application has received favorable action. * * * Your help and advice was invaluable."

A Great Falls, Mont., wholesale firm (materials assistance case): "Our very deep appreciation for the consideration your office has shown in following through our difficulties with the various offices which might possibly help us. * * * Many thanks for the wonderful cooperation."

The Chamber of Commerce of Hugo, Okla.: "We were especially impressed with the work that you are doing for small industries and small communities * * * believe that you and your office are the answer to our problem."

A Lake View, N. Y., distributor of home building equipment: "Our deepest appreciation for the efforts you exerted in behalf of small business generally, and this company particularly, relative to the * * * invitation to bid."

A Pawtucket, R. I., textile manufacturer: "We * * * received the contract * * * and I want to thank you again for helping to expedite this matter."

The operator of a small radio station in Odessa, Tex.: "With your help and advice, I finally got the necessary permits. Thank you * * * for your thoughtful assistance."

A Port Chester, N. Y., law firm: "Recently on behalf of one of our clients * * * I had the occasion to request aid and assistance from your organization * * * [it] understood the client's problem and * * * with dispatch was of assistance."

The Naugatuck Valley Industrial Council, Inc., Waterbury, Conn.: "Although your agency is still in its infancy, [it] has already rendered notable assistance to two of our very small concerns in getting materials for them."

Of great interest to small business is the provision of the Small Defense Plants amendment—section 714 (e), (1), Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress—requiring an inventory of small-business facilities which may be utilized for defense production. This subsection was included after a conference with the representatives of our State Planning and Development Agencies. In fact, the members of the legislative subcommittee of the Association of State Planning and Development Officials sat with the Members of the House Small Business Committee when this particular provision was written. It is the first coordinated effort to perform a task which in the past has failed of accomplishment because the authority was lacking for effective cooperation between State and Federal officials.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION APPROACH TO NATION-WIDE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES INVENTORY PLAN

Pursuant to and in conformity with those specific portions of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, viz: section 714 (d) (1) "utilization of productive capacity of small business," and section 714 (e) "inventory of productive facilities of small business," together with other related portions of the entire act, a proposed plan was completed on February 8, 1952, establishing a procedure for developing a Nation-wide industrial facilities inventory.

On February 12 and 13 this proposed plan was submitted to the Executive Committees on Small Business which had been previously established and received their unanimous approval. These committees were composed of representatives of every agency of the Federal Government concerned with Federal procurement.

On February 18 the Munitions Board of the Defense Department appointed a representative from each of the Departments of Defense and in turn such civilian agencies as the General Services Administration, Mutual Security Agency, Atomic Energy Commission, and others did likewise, all of whom were to serve as a working committee in further implementing and developing the proposed plan.

PURPOSE

The proposed plan has as its basic purpose an inventory of the Nation's industrial facilities designed to contain the elements of uniformity, simplicity, usefulness, and perpetuity.

Analysis of previous plans which have first been tried and failed indicate two fundamental weaknesses: First, duplication of basic information; and second, collectively they represent only a portion of the available industrial potentiality existent in the Nation. While it is quite true that procurement officers usually have considerable facilities information on the larger manufacturing concerns, they are still required to seek out sources of supply when confronted with the constant changes effected by research and development and are still uninformed on the industrial potentiality of that segment of production capacities present in the smaller industries throughout the Nation. In innumerable instances Federal procurement agencies depend upon prime contractors and the larger manufacturing concerns to seek out this unknown segment. We find, however, that such prime contractors are likewise unaware of a vast portion of the industrial potentialities available in the smaller manufacturing plants. This entire condition, therefore, tends toward the larger industrial sections of the country building up unnecessary backlogs of defense and civilian production.

The purpose, therefore, of the proposed plan is to bring effectively and efficiently into focus, and to the attention of procurement agencies that unknown segment of the industrial potentiality and open capacities which exist throughout the Nation.

OBJECTIVES

The principal objective of the proposed plan is to make available to Federal and State procurement agencies alike as well as prime contractors and the larger manufacturing concerns accurate, factual, and current facilities information which will enable procurement to spread the base of prime contracting through increased subcontracting, accelerate defense production by such means through reduction of backlogs, and to aid small business in the utilization of existing open capacities and its usable facilities now unknown. A further objective of the plan is to provide the Federal Government with a constantly up-to-date uniform listing of the entire Nation's industrial facilities in the event of war, assure maximum utilization of existing productive capacities in war or peace and through operation of the plan assist and facilitate the procurement officers in the performance of their duties and functions which, under present complexities, are already difficult enough.

The plan would serve innumerable other objectives in that the working loads of procurement officers, agencies, and centers would be materially reduced, vital and necessary statistical data would be made available to such agencies as military and civil defense in the event of emergencies and very definite aid would be rendered in preserving free enterprise. Such a plan in full operation is vitally essential to this Nation's economy.

FUNCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

To accomplish the foregoing objectives the plan encompasses the following functions:

Examination of industrial facilities information required by all Federal procurement levels indicates that a uniform code record can be developed on every specific manufacturing plant which will meet the requirements of and furnish information common to all procurement officers. The code record system is now being developed by the working committee previously mentioned.

Each State government has within its own operations mechanical means of reproducing such code information either

in the form of IBM equipment, Remington Rand equipment, MacBee card records, et cetera. Each State government will be requested simultaneously to acquire the code information necessary on every manufacturing concern within its State. Such information would be uniform throughout all States. Every industry within each State upon the completion of its inventory facilities record will submit such record to its own State government where the code card will be made. Every time a manufacturing concern makes any changes in its man-hour production capacities through changes in equipment or skills, it will notify its own State government of such change so that the code card record can be brought up to date. Once each month each manufacturing plant will report its contemplated open capacities for the succeeding months, which information will likewise be recorded on the code card.

Such additional information as may be found necessary once the Nation-wide plan is in operation can be reported periodically by the manufacturing concern to its own State government. This information might have to do with changes made by the individual concerns in their staff of engineering talent, craftsmanship, skills, et cetera.

Each SDPA regional office will have on its staff an industrial engineer who will be liaison between State governments and the procurement agencies within its region. Such procurement agencies will notify SDPA regional offices of its contemplated procurement with sufficient lead time to enable the SDPA regional office to obtain listings of those plants or manufacturing concerns who have the facilities with which to produce the items being procured. By utilization of mechanical means such as above-mentioned, the State governments could produce within 24 hours lists of the manufacturing concerns within their State who could fulfill the procurement. Such listings will be furnished procurement officers immediately.

In the case of prime contractors seeking sources of subcontracting, they will utilize the same services of the SDPA regional offices who will act as liaison between the prime contractors and the State government's industry facilities records bureau.

In the case of large procurement orders, all regional offices of SDPA can be alerted simultaneously so that listings can be received from all regions, thereby enabling procurement officers to spread their field of procurement inquiry and, if necessary, split such procurement to various sections of the country. This would serve to accelerate procurement.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the facts obtained thus far, it can be very definitely concluded that the plan is workable. Agencies concerned with procurement have expressed the opinion that it will be most useful, that it will avoid duplication of their efforts and will reduce their workloads. It has further been expressed by them that the entire plan is a very definite aid and tool to procurement procedures, that it in no sense detracts from nor usurps authorities vested in them, that the information it is proposed to be obtained by this plan is needed, and that with the SDPA regional offices functioning as the medium through which industry facilities information is supplied them, much of their own cumbersome and exhaustive record keeping can be dispensed with.

The necessity for some medium through which an accurate and perpetual knowledge of available industrial facilities, open capacities, and potentialities can be established is a recognized fact and it is the conclusion of all those to whom this plan has been submitted that it will fulfill such necessity.

Representatives of those State governments, approximately 26 thus far, with whom this plan has been discussed have expressed the highest regard for the plan and complete willingness to cooperate. Further, large manufacturing concerns who have in the past handled extensive prime contracts have expressed full concurrence with the plan.

The cost of making the plan effective is negligible, would be nowhere near the cost of the several plans which in the past have been tried and failed and could conceivably develop into a very substantial saving to the Federal Government in its over-all procurement procedure.

THE PROGRAM OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS HAS BEEN OF GREAT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS FIRMS AND UNITS—A REVIEW OF OUR ACTIVITIES DURING THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, we are presently engaged in the struggle to preserve, protect, and defend our social, political, and economic freedoms. The United States is one of the few countries in the world that actually has preserved the fundamental concept of a representative form of government. Our survival is dependent not only upon our military strength and international negotiation, but we must preserve within our borders, freedom of enterprise and equality of opportunity. In a dynamic society or economy, such as ours, we must constantly scrutinize and correct any forces which tend to deprive us of our most prized possession—freedom of action. Only through continuous examination can we guarantee the existence of individual initiative, a reward for risk-taking in a competitive economy.

Although our present standard of living and productive strength is due to a considerable extent to the mass production system, our vast natural resources, large capital accumulation and the skill of the working people, the backbone and strength of our society still lies with the small business firm and small business units.

In the past 2 decades, we have seen the gradual development of big business, big labor, and big government with more and more concentration of economic power in the few. Of all the economic groups in this country, the small-business man has offered the greatest resistance to this centralization of control. Of all groups, however, the small firm is most susceptible to fluctuations in economic well-being. These firms suffer the most during depressions, profit the least during boom periods and have little opportunity to maintain their place during a war or total defense program. Despite this struggle to remain alive, the small firm still predominates and every year more individuals appear willing to start a business, bringing with them new investment and new ideas. They are anxious to compete and all of them hope eventually to become larger.

Out of approximately 4,000,000 business firms in existence today nearly 90 percent are considered small.

A large percentage of small businesses are single proprietorships or partnerships where one or two men manage all phases of the business. The manager is usually the owner. He keeps the books, acts as salesman. He is the buyer and foreman. He must keep up with economic trends. He must acquire a position in his community. He must do all things which in a larger business are assigned to experts or specialists. If he is industrious and intelligent he will prosper when given a fair chance and an equal opportunity. This is the economic climate we are trying to preserve.

The small-business man, however, cannot be expected to operate efficiently or compete when confronted by unfair methods of competition, monopoly, shortages of materials and labor, curtailment of civilian consumption because of defense mobilization, and other ills which have beset him in the past few years. It was to help the small concern or small units who found themselves in such circumstances that caused the House to establish the Select Committee on Small Business late in 1941.

I should like to review with you what this committee has been doing during the Eighty-second Congress, the investigations that we have conducted, the information we have collected, the recommendations we have made and the benefits we think have accrued to the small business firms from the result of our excellent program.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE

The Select Committee on Small Business, as presently organized, is composed of 11 members, whose chairman is the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, Representative from Texas; and whose ranking member is the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, Representative from the State of Indiana. Congressmen MIKE MANSFIELD, JOE L. EVINS, CLARENCE G. BURTON, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, and CLINTON D. MCKINNON, together with Chairman PATMAN, make up the majority side of the committee. Congressman HALLECK, the minority leader, is supported by Congressmen WILLIAM S. HILL, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., and THOMAS B. CURTIS. You will note there is one more majority member than minority. There is little or no politics in the work of this committee. We have always cooperated as a unit. Congressman PATMAN with his wide experience in the small business field, as chairman, and Congressman HALLECK, formerly a floor leader on the minority side, have backgrounds which qualify them to steer the work of our committee into fields where it has been of tremendous importance in preserving

the small business units of our Nation. Frankly, I am proud of my membership on this most important and worthwhile committee.

THE PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The principal problems with which the committee has concerned itself and which have exercised great hardship in the past year and a half on the small concern are: First, an inadequate share of defense contracts; second, the lack of materials sufficient to keep the business in operation; third, hardships created by control measures; fourth, cut-throat competition or price discrimination; fifth, financing individual firms; and sixth, the lack of information on the details concerning war contract bids and war contracts.

In every national emergency when our economy has been geared to a defense effort, the problems of small business firms have increased. In recent emergencies there have been restrictions on the amount of civilian goods which may be produced. Credit has been curtailed and savings encouraged so that the consumer would not place additional inflationary funds in the market. In addition there has been a shortage of materials necessary to produce these manufactured goods. The net result is a reduction in both the demand for and the production of goods manufactured by small firms. In order to stay in business, new markets must be developed. During an emergency, the largest buyer is always the Government and it is to this purchaser that the majority of business firms must offer their services or goods. Now, it is true that much of the contracts awarded for the production of war materials such as tanks, airplanes, and ships can only go to the big firms, but there are many parts of the tanks, airplanes, and ships that can be produced by small firms either through the award of prime contracts or through subcontracting. We only ask that the facilities of small business be used to the greatest extent possible.

The Small Business Committee has made a great effort to see that small business receives a fair share of prime contracts and that big business awards as many subcontracts as possible to them. Every attempt is made to insure the incorporation of small business in the defense effort, not only because it can make a valuable contribution in the form of goods but to help retain a suitable framework upon which free enterprise may continue to operate.

PROCUREMENT DIFFICULTIES OF THE SMALL FIRM

During World War II we saw the effect of indiscriminate awarding of contracts to large firms. It meant increased productive facilities and financial reserves for big business and the closing of the doors of many of our small business firms. From Pearl Harbor to the end of 1943 there was a net loss of business population of one-half million concerns.

Even today we find small business receiving only 19 percent of the total dollar value of all contracts. Sixty percent of these contracts have been awarded to 100 companies for a total of twenty-six and one-third billion dollars. When you think that small business firms represent about 90 percent of all business conducted in this country and then realize that they have been receiving less than 20 percent of the total dollar value of defense contracts, you realize the tremendous and difficult economic problem facing small business units.

FIELD HEARINGS

In an attempt to solve this particular problem, over a period of 5 months, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, conducted a series of field hearings in 29 cities in 23 States where we received testimony from about 700 witnesses. These hearings, held in the businessman's own locality or home town, gave us a chance to directly contact the individual and learn firsthand about his specific problems.

Representatives of Government agencies accompanied us and were benefited by this exposure to the grass roots. Committee members knew all along that small businessmen were relatively inarticulate. These hearings amplified our conclusion. Most small firm operators are lost in the labyrinth of Government regulations, order forms, fine print in the contracts, and so on. Consequently, our contacts at these hearings produced excellent results, both for the representatives of the Government and for the entire Congress at large. Several Congressmen told me that their mail on inquiries concerning Federal contracts diminished almost to the zero point after our committee had held hearings in the localities where defense contracts were being considered.

There are many local problems concerning business operation that are neither understood nor appreciated by the personnel in the Washington offices. As a result, the little fellow feels his country is uninterested in him and not anxious to assist him in solving his difficulties. From these hearings, and from our own research, we delineated the problems and we searched for the answers. As an operator of a small business firm myself for the last 20 years, I fully appreciate the beneficial effects and the results we had in these most important and essential hearings in the various communities.

We found in particular that there had been insufficient advertised bidding for Government contracts, lack of information on the bids, no definite information as to quantity, time of delivery, and so forth. If contracts were negotiated, there had been insufficient information given to the potential bidders. In many instances information just was not available to the local business firms. It was impossible for them to secure this information from Washington as they had no representation in the Nation's Capital. The typical businessman, according to the information as we collected it, felt that with the gradual disappearance of advertised bidding on Government contracts, procurement officers dealt only with the large firms or those with which they had dealt in the past. Although these concerns would bid on part of a contract, which was their right, procurement officials contrived to award the entire contract to the larger companies. And among other complaints, witnesses stated that their facilities were lying idle or only partially utilized while larger companies built additional facilities to handle Government orders. And I might add that the expense of building the additional facilities was, in many instances, a charge-off of tax benefits. In April 1952 tax write-offs amounted to more than $17,500,000,000, going to these large firms as a charge-off for the construction of these additional plant facilities. The necessity for many of them could have been reduced by the proper use of small business firms.

It was extremely difficult for the small manufacturer who had not maintained representatives at procurement offices to obtain consideration for a contract.

Although to some extent the procurement base has been broadened and total payments to small business firms increased, the comparative position of the small business firm has been weakened.

CONGRESSIONAL POLICY IN REGARD TO PROCUREMENT

This committee was astounded to hear so many complaints in the face of declared congressional policy.

The Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 stated specifically that small business should receive a fair proportion of defense contracts.

The Selective Service Act of 1948 stated that small business should be granted a fair share of the orders.

The Defense Production Act states that "it is the sense of the Congress that small business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of this act." The small defense plants amendment to this act recognized the importance of giving small business a fair share of defense contracts and set up an agency to accomplish this objective.

In view of established congressional policy, the obvious necessity of maintaining the small business element in our economy and considering the numerous complaints received by our committee, we made specific recommendations, directed primarily to defense officials, and we requested that they fulfill these objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE PROCUREMENT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

We recommend that—

Educational programs be inaugurated to assure that all procurement officials are aware of legislative policy and regulations promulgated to effectuate this policy.

Military small-business specialists be replaced by civilian employees with firm business experience.

Greater use be made of justifiable price differentials in negotiated procurement.

Advertised bidding be used more frequently in purchase of common-use items.

Greater use be made of qualified production pools.

Large firms should not be allowed to increase their productive facilities when there exists available facilities and open space among existing small-business concerns.

And many others designed to facilitate and increase the small businessman's role in Government procurement.

Much still has to be done to assure small business its fair share—the Small Business Committee does feel, however, that its continuing effort has produced beneficial results. We know that because of our studies and recommendations the defense organization is now more aware of the small-business problem. More specific statements of policy and policy implementation have been issued. More civilian specialists are now being used as advisers to the military.

There has been a gradual increase in the use of advertised bids. Negotiated bids are preceded by more adequate information. A distinct effort is now being made to bring prime contractor and potential small subcontractors together.

In addition, defense organizations are being more careful in an attempt to prevent the erection of new and duplicate production facilities.

The biggest problem still remains—how to broaden the procurement base—thereby utilizing more completely the vast productive facilities of this country. The Small Business Committee believes that through its continuing investigations, this may be achieved. Certainly few groups are more acquainted with the problem or in a better position to bring it about.

MATERIAL DIFFICULTIES OF SMALL BUSINESS

During the Eighty-second Congress Subcommittee No. 3 of the Small Business Committee has been studying the difficult problem of material shortages. The lack of raw material has, as much as any other factor, created hardship for the small-business man—without it he can produce for neither Government nor civilian consumption.

During an all-out war effort we would expect most of these materials to be diverted to defense production. Under a partial mobilization program, however, which is expected to continue for many years, all of the defense and much of civilian needs must be considered. This creates the problem of determination of essentiality of use in addition to problems of equitable distribution and acquisition.

Here again the committee concerned itself with the effect of mobilization on the small producer's ability to stay alive and to perform an essential role in the defense program. During the past year and a half—it has conducted several hearings and has brought forth numerous reports containing precise recommendations.

PROBLEMS OF MANUFACTURERS OF FARM MACHINERY

Many specific complaints in regard to material difficulties were raised by businessmen during the field hearings of Subcommittee No. 1. On the basis of this testimony Subcommittee No. 3 was established to make a detailed examination of the materials problems of small business. In May of last year the subcommittee investigated the extreme shortages and gray-market operations affecting small manufacturers of farm machinery. After hearings had been held in Chicago specific recommendations were made to appropriate Government agencies. As a result, gray-market operations were effectively curbed and more regular distribution of steel established.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL USERS OF ALUMINUM

In March 1950 Subcommittee No. 3 held executive hearings to study the particular problems of small users of aluminum. At that time it was proposed to prohibit the use of aluminum in many less substantial items—it would have been a death sentence to those small manufacturers who could not convert to defense production. After some study of the aluminum supply situation, the subcommittee recommended that this action be postponed. This recommendation was accepted and within months the producers of less essential items were placed under the Controlled Materials Plan and allowed to continue production with limited amounts of aluminum. At the same time, suggestions made by this subcommittee were adopted by the National Production Authority to permt more equitable distribution of aluminum scrap to secondary smelters.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE CONTROLLED MATERIALS PLAN

The most important work done by Subcommittee No. 3 has been its investigations of the problems of small business under the Controlled Materials Plan. Again the need for this particular study had its origin in the field hearings conducted in the spring of 1951, because of the many complaints received by the committee concerning irregularities, discrimination and hardship created by material shortages, and other chaotic conditions which existed in the summer of last year when a weak priorities system was being replaced by a confused partial CMP.

THE PLAN

As you know, the Controlled Materials Plan controls the distribution of all steel, aluminum and copper. On the basis of essentiality of his production program, each user is given authority to produce a certain amount of material with which to produce the finished product. In theory, no more authorizations to produce will be issued than there is available supply.

Certain programs such as the military, atomic energy, and machine tool programs are given priorities to assure an adequate supply for finished goods and their components. In addition, the use of these materials in the production of certain end products is controlled and inventories are restricted. Not all producers must receive this permission to procure a specific amount of steel, aluminum and copper, however, users of small amounts of these metals may self-certify up to specified limits.

FINDINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE IN REGARD TO CMP

The investigation was to determine policy and operational weaknesses in the Controlled-Materials Plan which precluded the orderly production and distribution of steel, aluminum, and copper. Hearings were begun in August and after several weeks of testimony a preliminary report was issued. In this report we attempted to be constructive, pointing out changes which if adopted would improve the allocation of materials under CMP. Our findings and recommendations were these:

Insufficient steel was being allotted to steel expansion programs. In the long run expansion was the only answer to satisfying needs of all steel consumers. We also felt that expansion policy was unrealistic and uncoordinated.

During these hearings we found a definite failure on the part of responsible officials to accurately determine the requirements for and supply of any of these scarce materials. This had the effect of arbitrarily causing the overissue of allotment "tickets" on the one hand, or excess capacity and unfilled order books at the mill on the other. The accurate determination of the need for steel, aluminum, and copper and of the amount of material to be produced by mills was essential to an orderly and precise program of allotment.

The subcommittee was very much disturbed by the inability of many producers to get their orders filled. In fact, the small manufacturer had a difficult time getting sufficient materials to remain in operation. We felt that much of the confusion and frustration during the early days of CMP was due to allowing steel producers to choose their own customers and to the lack of steel going to warehouses. Warehouses ordinarily supply small businesses with the greater part of their needs for these metals. Late in 1951, however, under CMP, warehouses received only 85 percent of their customary supply.

Much of the testimony received during the early days of CMP revealed that a weak compliance program was the cause of many inequalities in metal distribution. Lack of compliance meant many things—excessive inventories, placement of duplicate orders, and the inability of businessmen to interpret highly legal directives issued from Washington.

Our committee also objected in its preliminary report on CMP to the separation of the Defense Production Administration and the National Production Authority, where one was the policy-making body and the other the administrative agency for CMP.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE IN PRELIMINARY REPORT

In view of these deficiencies and others, which I have just mentioned, we recommended in our preliminary report that the following steps be taken:

First. Sufficient steel be granted expansion programs to permit an adequate future supply of steel.

Second. A more careful review be made of the requirements of users for steel, aluminum, and copper. This meant more careful review of the essentiality of civilian production programs.

Third. Shipments to warehouses be increased.

Fourth. More steel be allocated for schools and hospitals.

Fifth. That the amounts of metal which may be self-certified by small users be increased.

I am happy to say that many of these recommendations were adopted by NPA and DPA. In fact, the administrators of these two agencies have stated that our investigations and recommendations have done much to create a more effective system of allocation.

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The problems of small business during an emergency are not confined to procurement and lack of materials. One of its greatest difficulties occurs in the field of finance. Faced with a shutdown because of his inability to immediately convert to defense production and faced with lack of materials because his civilian product is not considered essential, the small-business man finds that additional financing is the only answer to his remaining in operation. For with additional funds, he can convert his plant to more essential production or add new facilities to permit his bidding for defense contracts or subcontracts. In most instances the small-business man has little working capital and insufficient reserves to permit this conversion without additional financial aid. At the same time that the small firm needs financing, banks are requested to restrict their granting of loans. In many instances, bank policy will not permit this type of lending as the bank under such conditions tends to assume the risks of ownership.

SMALL FIRMS COMPARED TO LARGE

We must recognize the fact that the financing of a small business is quite different than the financing of large firms. The latter generally have sufficient reserve to permit expansion or conversion, they are able to borrow from banks with little difficulty, and they can, if necessary, borrow in the securities market.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

One of the more important activities of the Select Small Business Committee is to advise and assist the Members of the House in enacting legislation dealing with the problems of small business. I should like to reiterate committee policy in this respect. It conducts its investigations and makes its recommendations on a strictly nonpartisan basis. We act to serve the cause of small business, a matter of concern to both political parties.

The legislative work of the committee during the Eighty-second Congress has been confined to two major problems—the role played by small business in the defense effort—and the current competitive situation in our economy.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

In the first instance we have been primarily concerned with the establishment of the Small Defense Plants Administration. As you know, the amendment to the Defense Production Act calling for the establishment of this agency was introduced by the chairman of our committee and the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. It became law on July 31, 1951. In addition, this committee presented voluminous testimony indicating the need for such an organization.

FUNCTIONS OF SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

I should like to mention briefly here the activities of SDPA. You will remember that this agency was established to give small business the opportunity to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense effort. In words of the act the function of SDPA is "to coordinate and to ascertain the means by which the productive capacity of small-business concerns can be most effectively utilized for national defense and essential civilian production."

LOANS

In the field of finance, SDPA does not make loans. Rather it is authorized to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small-business loans for essential civilian production and for defense. These loans will not be granted if private financing is available. SDPA made its first loan recommendation in December 1951. By January 11, 1952, 3 loans had been recommended to RFC totaling $507,829, while 15 additional applications totaling over $5,000,000 were under consideration.

MATERIALS

The Small Defense Plants Administration has no materials to allocate. Its function in this instance is to consult and cooperate with appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting or expanding production by, or in the formulation of policy in granting priorities to business concerns. To fulfill this purpose SDPA is represented on the principal DPA and NPA committees. It helped establish the Small Business Hardship Account and has rendered spot asistance in obtaining needed materials.

PROCUREMENT

The most important work of the agency is done in the field of procurement. Briefly, SPDA makes joint determinations with procurement agencies as to what contracts or parts of contracts can be awarded to small business. For this purpose, procurement specialists are being placed in major contracting offices to help designate those contracts which can be performed by small concerns. SDPA is also engaged in making an inventory of all small-business facilities. Finally the agency advises and assists in the creation of production pools and certifies them to procurement officials as to credit and capacity to perform contracts. Unfortunately the facilities of established production pools are not being sufficiently utilized.

Our committee believes that there is a definite need in our defense set-up for an agency in which can be centralized the problems of small business. SDPA is in an excellent position to plead the case of the little fellow and to see that he gets an opportunity and a fair share of contracts, materials, and credit.

FAIR TRADE REPORT

In February of this year this committee issued a report entitled "Fair Trade: The Problems and the Issues." The report discusses the economic aspects of fair trade, the legal issues involved, the relationship of fair trade to our competitive system, the issue of States' rights, and so forth. Both the case for and the case against has been considered. The committee gave serious consideration to the complexity of the fair-trade problem and to the significant arguments both for and against. Its recommendation which accompanied the report was that since small business needs protection against loss-leader and similar unfair business practices, which are also not in the public interest, that the States retain jurisdiction over retail-trade practices. We recommended that Congress should permit the States to makes their own choice.

DIRECT ASSISTANCE TO SMALL BUSINESS

This committee firmly believes that the problem of small-business units is only part of a larger pattern. It works, therefore, to help the individual small-business man who may submit his request for assistance by letter, telegram, or personal appearance, and it works through reports and investigations to provide better small-business legislation and administration. The committee firmly believes that the role of the small-business man is an indispensable one in an economy for on him depends the future of our political and economic institutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Agriculture to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $2,000,000.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT: On page 30, after line 23, insert the following:

"NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

"For an additional amount of $16,500,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. Code 1751–1760); *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order against the amendment. I make the point of order that the language of the amendment and the paragraph are not germane to this point in the bill. This part of the bill relates entirely to the salaries and expenses of the defense production activities, while the amendment relates to a local, domestic operation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALTER). The Chair is ready to rule. The language of the amendment provides an additional paragraph to the Department of Agriculture section of the bill. It is germane to this section, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, every day that I am in my district office I am approached by the mothers of school children and school officials urging me to have the Federal contribution to the school-lunch program increased. They are quite disturbed because the Agriculture Appropriation Bill for fiscal year 1953 does not provide for an increase in

the sum provided for this program. Because a number of additional schools were opened in the Pennsylvania area, the funds for the Philadelphia school district were depleted 2 months prior to the expiration of the school term, and the children had to pay for their own milk. Also, since that time the price of milk has increased 1 cent per quart in Philadelphia. No doubt similar situations exist in many other cities and towns in the United States.

The National School Lunch Act requires that the States match the Federal contribution by one and one-half times. However, in Pennsylvania it is matched four times through the assistance of local school boards, contributions of local organizations, and the amounts put in by the parents. The appropriation for the school-lunch program has remained the same for the past 3 years, and we all know that during that period there have been increases in labor, transportation, and food costs.

I understand that the Department of Agriculture in the three previous years requested the Bureau of the Budget to approve a total of $100,000,000 for the school-lunch program and each time it was decreased to eighty-three and a half million. This additional $16,500,000 which my amendment requests would bring the appropriation for this program up to the total figure that was originally requested and which the testimony at the hearings on the Agriculture Appropriation Bill substantiated.

On the basis of $100,000,000, Pennsylvania would get approximately $3,669,000. This is more than one and a half million dollars per year more than Pennsylvania has been granted in past years.

In the State of Pennsylvania in the last two school months of the school term, the school authorities were short $45,000. I think the gentlemen from Pennsylvania will cooperate, because they understand the problem just as I do. In my own district I had mothers and representatives from various schools come to me on one occasion in the number of 75, and then again 150, asking me whether or not the Federal Government could appropriate enough money to sustain these "kiddies" with milk over the balance of the school period.

Mr. Chairman, this is a simple amendment. The gentleman from Virginia, Judge SMITH, this afternoon said, "Let us have some charity of heart." All I am asking you today is to close your minds a little bit and open your hearts. General Hershey just a few weeks ago made the announcement that 45 percent of the inductees have been rejected for physical reasons. This is an opportunity to carry out our obligation to help build up the health of the youth of the Nation. To allow them $16,500,000 is trivial in comparison to the money which was allotted here today.

The gentleman from Indiana in his amendment yesterday asked for $80,000,000 for school construction and also $11,500,000. Pennsylvania last year had five new schools. Those children in these federally impacted areas had consumed the necessary money allowed to them for the schools in operation up to that time. Certainly they need more money. They need more milk. They need more food. Let us build the youth of our Nation by giving them this $16,500,000 in this amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. I want to compliment my colleague from Philadelphia on the excellent presentation he has made of this matter. He knows, as well as all the Members from Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, that this matter has been brought to our attention in the last month by a great number of people. I think the gentleman has done a wonderful job, as always, and I want to compliment him and tell him I am in thorough support of his amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

I just want to make this observation. I am not offering this amendment for any political reasons. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have gone back and forth to Philadelphia constantly every night after the lights dim on this Capitol.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, I do not like to object, but it is getting late and we ought not to be giving Members over 5 minutes at this time of day.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman. I thank you very much for your kindness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and do so as a member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture through which subcommittee the regular request for our school lunch program is supposed to come. I have always been a strong supporter of this program.

There has been no request, as far as I know—and I leave the substantiation of this to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]—no request for any additional provision for more money for the school lunch program, beyond the $84,000,000 we gave to it. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if that is not correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes; and if the gentleman will yield, I would like to give the House some information I have here.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the chairman of my subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1947 the Congress passed an act which provided for increased State participation. From 1947 to 1950 it was dollar for dollar; for 1951 through 1955 it is to be 1½ to 1; after 1955 it is to be 3 to 1. Notwithstanding the shift as it was set up by the Congress to the States, the Federal contribution has remained the same; we have kept it up. So through additional contributions the total amount should be increased.

Not only is that true, but the amendment which I offered, and which was adopted, permits a saving of section 32 funds for the handling of surpluses which makes many million of dollars more available in commodities than we have had the last 2 or 3 years.

Now, the sky is the limit as to what we would like to do with such a worth while program, but the question is: How much can we do?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Furthermore, the Secretary of Agriculture, at my request and insistence, and also at that of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], put into operation in March and April a program for purchasing certain pork products and shell eggs to the extent of about $25,000,000; and furthermore at our suggestion, this has been poured into the school lunch program in addition to the $84,000,000 that we contributed in the regular appropriation bill. By that program we helped our hog and egg prices go up nearer parity for the producer and at the same time helped the school children of America.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment comes out of the clear sky and has not been submitted to either the gentlemen from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] or myself. Certainly it appears to me to be very much out of place, and I hope it is defeated. I repeat, no request by the Department of Agriculture has come to us for these additional millions of dollars.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely.

Mr. BARRETT. As I understand from Mr. Triner, who is the Director of the Food Distribution Branch of the Department of Agriculture, he had come on numerous occasions and asked to bring the program up to $100,000,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. You could bring this program up to $200,000,000 and still would not satisfy everybody on this school lunch program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is impossible to put all of the money asked for in every section of the country. This $84,000,000 is simply an incentive to get the States to do what they should do and as a consequence we have a program now of over half a billion dollars in progress in America.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield briefly please.

Mr. BARRETT. This was quite a comprehensive program, broken down into three stages, A, B, and C. The A program gives them a full meal——

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry; I cannot yield for such a lengthy statement.

I want to conclude, Mr. Chairman, by saying that it should be mainly the responsibility of the States to put up more money as this program proceeds. The States should put up more money if they are interested, for there most certainly is a limit to what the Federal Government can do with a $260,000,000,000 public debt. Much as we think of the school lunch program, there is a limit to our ability to contribute. The poor children,

unable to buy hot lunches today, have them furnished free in practically every community of our Nation. That is as it should be. My subcommittee has built this great program of assistance to school children in America through the incentives furnished through the generous appropriations we have sponsored. There is a limit—I repeat, Mr. Chairman, and I ask the committee to defeat this fly-by-night amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. BARRETT and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 64, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to an item that appears on page 42 of this bill in the amount of $6,489,954 that you have agreed to pay as claims allowed by the Motor Carriers Claims Commission to certain motor carriers because they were taken over by the Government during a period from August 11, 1944, to October 4, 1945. Being a period of less than 14 months. It appears the reason for taking over these carriers was to prevent a stoppage by strike during the war. After a wage settlement was made the Government stepped out of the business. I am informed that the taking over of the property was a formal one under Executive order. The lines were run as they had done before. There were a few managers in uniform and certain additional accountings were required.

Mr. Chairman, I realize it is late now to call attention to these matters. This bill has been filed only 3 days. There is little, if any, testimony before the committee on these items. I call attention to this matter because the total in the item is a good sized one. Furthermore there is dissenting opinion filed on each of the several claims filed hereunder. These opinions are filed by one of the three Commissioners, Hon. Randolph Carpenter. He is a former Member of this House and an able lawyer.

Another reason why this matter should be called to the attention of Congress is these claims amounting to millions of dollars are chargeable against the Government, does it not raise a question of claims being filed by other transportation companies where such company operations are taken over because of a threat of strikes, or for other reasons. Then, what about the taking over of the steel industry because of dispute between the employer and employees. In any event, I deem it worth while to call these matters to your attention. Mr. Randolph's opinion on one of these claims is included herewith. The other opinions are similar. In this particular case the amount allowed was $149,921.47.

The findings of the Commission in this case are by no means complete. In my opinion, based upon the record, the following findings of fact should be made in this case:

FINDINGS OF FACT

The evidence does not establish that the petitioner suffered any pecuniary loss due to any action on the part of the Government. On the contrary, the action taken by the Government enabled the petitioner to continue operation of its system and the profits earned during the period August 11, 1944, to October 4, 1945, were more than they would have been if the Government had taken no such action.

On August 12 and 13, 1944, pursuant to a notice issued by the Midwest Operators Association, a meeting was held at Minneapolis, Minn., and was attended by representatives of a large number of the motor-carrier members of the association, including a representative of petitioner. It was also attended by Mr. Longenecker and by Mr. Roddewig, the general counsel of the Office of Defense Transportation.

At the meeting Mr. Roddewig read Executive Order No. 9462 and Mr. Longenecker read Operations Order No. 1. Mr. Longenecker stated that he hoped the existing managements would continue to operate the truck lines just as they had been doing.

Mr. Longenecker did not state at this meeting that the Government was taking physical possession of the transportation system of petitioner or their properties, or that the lines would be run for the account of the Government.

Mr. Longenecker and Mr. Roddewig stated at this meeting that they did not consider that the carriers would be compensated, and that they had no authority to commit the Government to pay compensation.

The Federal Manager exercised no affirmative control over operation of the transportation system of petitioner; on the other hand, he and his representatives assisted petitioner in the resumption and continuation of its operations in furtherance of the war effort.

The United States did not take physical possession or control of the petitioner or any of its properties.

No representative of the United States occupied petitioner's offices or other property.

The Federal manager did not inform petitioner that he was acting as manager of its business or property and did not appoint anyone as manager of petitioner.

The Federal manager did not require that signs be placed on petitioner's trucks with respect to possession or title being in the United States.

The Federal manager did not assert or claim that petitioner or its property was immune from State or local laws, licenses, regulations, or taxes.

The Federal manager did not state to any officers or employees of petitioner that they were acting as representatives of the United States.

Petitioner's officers and directors continued in office after August 11, 1944, and performed the same supervisory and managerial functions they had previously performed. The Federal manager made no attempt to displace or remove them.

The Federal manager did not exercise any control over petitioner with respect to retaining, hiring, or discharging its employees. He did not issue any instructions that they were Government employees or that they were exempt from State social security, unemployment compensation, or workmen's compensation laws.

The Federal manager did not attempt to exercise any control over petitioner's regular bank account, its cash or intangible assets, or its operation revenues or accounts receivable. Petitioner's revenues were not treated as being received for the account of the United States.

The Federal manager did not issue any orders to petitioner with regard to the routes over which it operated, the kinds of traffic it carried, or what shippers it served.

The Federal manager did not exercise any control over petitioner with respect to the purchase of equipment.

The Federal manager did not advise the petitioner that a refusal on its part to follow any directive or recommendation of the Government would subject it to possible civil or criminal prosecution; no threats of this type were made at any time.

During the period of governmental supervision, the Federal manager did not interfere with petitioner's conduct of its labor negotiations, either individual or collective.

Accounting Circular No. 1 did not require petitioner to set up a new set of books or to maintain records which it was not already maintaining, nor did it involve any additional expense to petitioner.

There is no evidence that the issuance of Executive Order No. 9462 or the actions of respondent taken pursuant thereto had any adverse effect on petitioner's credit standing.

There was an increase in operating costs during 1944 and 1945 which was caused in large part by economic factors affecting not only petitioner but motor carriers generally throughout the country. The strikes of petitioner's drivers before August 11, 1944 and after October 4, 1945 had the effect of increasing the operating ratio of petitioner.

On August 11, 1944, the vehicular equipment of petitioner was generally in a poor state of repair as a result of insufficient replacement and lack of proper maintenance.

During 1944 and 1945, motor carriers throughout the country experienced abnormally high repair expenses. There is no evidence that during the period of Government control petitioner's motor equipment experienced usage which necessitated greater expense than that experienced by other carriers not affected by Executive Order No. 9462.

Except for normal wear and tear, petitioner's motor equipment was in as good condition on October 4, 1945, as it was on August 11, 1944.

On August 11, 1944, the rental rates for all commercial motor vehicles were under the control of the Federal Government. Revised maximum price regulation 165 of the Office of Price Administration, which was in effect on August 11, 1944, prescribed the maximum amount for which commercial motor vehicles could be rented.

The ceiling or maximum under revised maximum price regulation 165 of the Office of Price Administration, for which petitioner could have rented any of its tractor-trailer units on August 11, 1944, was an amount which would produce a net return to the petitioner, on the average, of 2 cents per mile for each tractor-trailer unit, after paying all expenses and after deducting depreciation.

The fair market rental value of the average tractor-trailer unit owned by petitioner would produce a net return of 2 cents per mile to the owner, after payment of all expenses of the owner in connection with the leasing thereof and after deducting depreciation on the vehicle, if rented on August 11, 1944, and during the period ending October 4, 1945.

If petitioner had leased out the tractor-trailer units owned by petitioner on August 11, 1944, they would have been used, on the average, 50,000 miles per year.

The transference of petitioner's vehicles from the common carrier field into the rental field, an unreasonable hypothesis, if done, would have been concomitant with a similar transference by other carriers named in Executive Order 9462. As a matter of basic economics such wholesale or large scale transference on August 11, 1944, or thereafter would have satiated the market and depressed the market rentals.

On August 11, 1944, the total assets of petitioner, according to its own books and records, were $567,734.60 and on September 30, 1945, were $591,316.18.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the evidence and the findings of fact, I would accordingly make the following conclusions in this case:

The Commission has jurisdiction over the petitioner's claim and over the parties to this proceeding.

There was no taking of the transportation system or property of petitioner within the meaning of the fifth amendment. Whatever control was exercised over petitioner by the Federal Government on and after August 11, 1944, was an exercise of the Government's regulatory powers.

If there were a taking of petitioner's transportation system or property by the respondent on August 11, 1944, it was a mere technical taking and petitioner is entitled only to the pecuniary loss suffered by the petitioner as a direct result of the taking. The petitioner did not prove the amount of such pecuniary loss or that it suffered any such loss as a result of the taking.

Even if there were a taking of possession of petitioner's transportation system and property, the petitioner has failed to prove any amount of just compensation in excess of the losses it would have sustained if the Government had taken no action whatever.

If there were a taking, it was the petitioner's business as a whole operation which was taken and not merely its equipment.

If there were a taking, the proper measure of compensation is not the fair and reasonable rental value of petitioner's separate items of equipment.

OPINION

The holding in this determination is based upon the opinion filed by the writer in the case of *Hawkeye Motor Express, Inc.* v. *The United States*, decided by this Commission.

There was no evidence introduced in this case to sustain a fifth amendment taking by the Government of petitioner's truck line other than the promulgation of the Executive order and ensuing orders, all of which were set out in the Hawkeye case.

There being nothing more, in my opinion, the same would not constitute such a taking as to entitle petitioner to compensation under the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. The majority of the Commission has found otherwise and has held that petitioner is entitled to a fair market or rental value for the use of its property. In my opinion, even if there was a taking in this case, fair rental value is not the proper measure of compensation. The only compensation to which petitioner would be entitled would be extra losses over what would have otherwise been sustained which were occasioned by tht Government's operations. Such has not been established in this case.

There can be no doubt and the evidence substantiates the fact that had petitioner not been enabled to resume its business on August 11, 1944, after the strike was called on August 4, 1944, it would have suffered heavy losses. The action by the Government in assisting petitioner to resume operations was, therefore, certainly beneficial to petitioner. As pointed out in the dissenting opinion in the Hawkeye case, page 37, petitioner cannot claim damages for some speculative profit in an endeavor in which it was not engaged. The net result is that petitioner not only did not suffer any losses by the Government's action herein, but actually was greatly benefited on a dollar and cents basis. (See Findings of Fact No. 1 this opinion.)

Therefore, it is my opinion that the judgment in this case should be in favor of the respondent.

ORDER

Let this determination be filed with the clerk of the commission. The clerk is directed to give notice of the filing hereof to the parties by serving copy on attorneys of record, either personally or by mail.

Done at Kansas City, Mo., this 15th day of April 1952.

THOMAS W. O'HARA,
Chairman.
ERNEST M. SMITH,
Commissioner.
RANDOLPH CARPENTER,
Commissioner.

I, Frances N. Heiman, acting clerk of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of final determination of the Commission in the case of *Murphy Motor Freight Lines, Inc.* vs. *The United States*, case No. 61, as same was filed with me on the 15th day of April 1952, and as appears on file in my office.

Dated this 15th day of April 1952.

FRANCES N. HEIMAN,
Acting Clerk of the Commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, defense production activities

For expenses necessary to enable the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purpose of this appropriation, $1,750,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN: Page 41, after line 18, insert:

"ECONOMIC STABILIZATION AGENCY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Economic Stabilization Agency, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; including expenses of liquidation of those agencies whose operations and functions will expire prior to June 30, 1953; $57,130,000: *Provided*, That of this amount $11,000,000 shall be available for the Office of Rent Stabilization, of which $2,000,000 shall be placed in reserve under the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to be released by the Director of the Budget only on his determination that the workload of the agency so requires.

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"For an additional amount for 'Emergency operating expenses,' $5,000,000; and appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1953 shall be available only to enable the General Services Administration to carry out its functions arising out of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to make provision for the Economic Stabilization Agency, its constitutent office, and the General Services Administration. This is offered as a committee amendment. It is brought up in this form because at the time the bill was being considered by the committee final action had not been taken on the authorizing legislation.

The recommendations are based on the conference report on the Defense Production Act, which is subject to approval by the House and the Senate.

The amount of $57,130,000 recommended by the committee for ESA represents a reduction of $46,120,000 in the budget estimates of $103,250,000. The allocations to specific activities are as follows:

Office of Price Stabilization	$36,500,000
Office of Rent Stabilization	11,000,000
Wage Stabilization Board	7,500,000
Salary Stabilization Board	1,700,000
Railroad and Airline Wage Board	80,000
Office of Administrator	350,000
Total	57,130,000

In achieving the reduction of $46,120,000 the committee believes that it has placed these agencies on a realistic operating basis. That this has not been true in the past, particularly in the Office of Price Stabilization, is borne out by testimony received in the hearings on this estimate. The OPS portion of these hearings was chiefly based on a study made by the investigative staff of the committee which disclosed gross overstaffing in the regional and district offices of OPS. The committee is therefore directing that at least $25,000,000 in the OPS estimates be applied to the operation of the field offices. This is a reduction of approximately 50 percent in the request for this particular operation.

It would appear that reductions in the workload of the Office of Rent Stabilization will be achieved by the recommendation in the conference report on the Defense Production Act. The extent of these reductions cannot be forecast, especially those which will occur as a result of the rent decontrol provision therein. The committee does not believe it can recommend funds on the basis of a workload that might not materialize. Accordingly, the language of the amendment contains a provision placing $2,000,000 of the amount recommended for this office in reserve until such time as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget finds that the workload of the agency justifies its release.

Testimony before the committee disclosed that both the Wage and Salary Stabilization Boards have prepared the basic regulations to control their particular fields of endeavor. The effectiveness of these regulations is borne out by testimony of the Wage Stabilization Board which disclosed that it has approved 86 percent of the petitions for increases it has received. The remaining 14 percent have been either modified or rejected. It would appear that a sizable reduction could be made in the workload of WSB if the proper means are devised for handling the 86 percent of the petitions that are being approved.

In effecting the reductions of $46,120,000 the committee will expect the Administrator to maintain an average grade and salary in each office or board of ESA which is in line with proper classification standards and certainly no higher than those prevailing in fiscal year 1952.

Under the aforementioned conference report authority for the functions of several of these offices will expire prior to

the end of fiscal year 1953. The committee has therefore included funds within the recommended amounts for the entire liquidation costs of the agencies so affected.

The reduction of $3,500,000 in the $8,500,000 requested by the General Services Administration is generally based on the personal reduction achieved by the committee in the defense agencies. Certainly the amount of space for emergency agencies will be a great deal less than that used as a basis for the major portion of the funds requested by GSA. The committee will also expect this agency to achieve savings in 1953 by a greater use of its regular personnel and services in defense work than is anticipated by the budget estimates.

I view of the fact that this item is being handled as a committee amendment from the floor my remarks as the spokesman for the committee are to be accepted by the agencies in lieu of the usual report.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. As one of the minority members of the subcommittee that had charge of the emergency agency budget request, I state that we in the minority are in agreement with the amendment as offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. We should point out to the House what the agencies originally requested for the coming year, that are included in this amendment. The Bureau of the Budget submitted a figure of $103,250,000. This amendment provides $57,130,000; in other words, the committee has reduced the budget request almost 50 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in carrying out the provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.), including purchase (not to exceed eight) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); reimbursement of the Civil Service Commission for full field investigations of employees occupying positions of critical importance from the standpoint of national security; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with civil-defense functions; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; not to exceed $9,000 for the purchase of newspapers, periodicals, and teletype-news services; and not to exceed $6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Administrator for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $8,000,000.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer an amendment to this section of the bill and to urge the House to provide adequate funds to carry on our civil-defense program. However, realizing the absolute hopelessness of such a request in the present temper of the House, in the interest of conserving time I will not do so just now.

Mr. Chairman, in a recent action, this House voted some $45,000,000,000 for military appropriations. That action was taken because most of our Members are convinced that there is a realistic threat of war with Communist Russia. By this appropriation action for the military, we are doing our best to bolster our military defenses to help stave off that war by building strength of arms.

By the same token, those funds will be used in the active military defense of this Nation if the Kremlin does decide to go to war on a global scale.

By this and other actions, this House and its members have consistently recognized the fact that there is a possibility of war, if not a strong probability of war—and when and if that war comes, we must be prepared as best we can throughout our total security program.

For that reason, I read with alarm the supplemental appropriations bill which almost completely degutted the national civil defense program. If I read my figures correctly, the committee recommended a slash of better than 93 percent in the funds requested for this major portion of our national security effort.

This national civil-defense program is so vital that Gen. George C. Marshall, while serving as Secretary of Defense, called it an urgent military necessity.

In his statement to the Congress last fall, General Marshall said:

I have consistently advocated a strong civil defense for this Nation as an urgent and continuing necessity. I consider that the build-up of civilian capabilities in this field is essential not only from a humanitarian standpoint, but as a military necessity.

May I remind you again that only recently we voted a total of some $45,000,000,000 for our active military efforts. Yet civil defense which started far behind the military in building up its mobilization base and capabilities and which is less than 2 years old, is today faced with a cut of 93 percent of its requested funds. This comes on top of a severe cut last year of 85 percent.

I hope that the Members recognize that this committee action virtually puts civil defense out of business as a part of our security effort. This simply means that we are undercutting this tremendous investment which we have made.

Here is what Gen. Omar Bradley, the respected Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had to say to the Congress on the need for civil defense from a military standpoint:

A competent civil-defense organization must be prepared to save lives as well as to restore factories to maximum production and resume communications in the shortest possible time. The military will be unable to direct this effort.

We must have, then, an organization in being, planned and staffed beforehand to take over in the event of such an emergency. If civil defense does not function effectively, our defense efforts will be very adversely affected.

It must be apparent to the Members that the civil-defense program which was set up by this Congress in Public Law 920, can hardly be an effective organization in any sense of the word with two severe slashes in its funds.

The report of Mr. CANNON's commmittee, which is generally commendatory to the FCDA in its language, makes this statement:

The funds recommended represent continued implementation of the concept of civil defense envisaged by the committee and the Congress in making appropriations for this agency in the past two fiscal years. The continued development of this program together with the proper coordination of the civil-defense programs of the various States should provide a realistic civil-defense plan without the expenditure of large sums of money.

Realizing how many billions we have invested in military defense, and the fact that there is a constant Russian threat to our shores, the least we can do for this agency it to give it the same amount of funds voted last year—$75,000,000.

As I have said, I was prepared to introduce amendments to H. R. 8370 to effect this extremely modest increase in civil-defense funds which will at least enable this new agency, still suffering from last year's appropriation reduction, to carry on its current program which has proven sound and effective. Unfortunately, the House does not seem to realize the importance of civil defense and it would take more than the pleas of a few of us to awaken it to its responsibility to provide adequate safeguards for American lives in the event of an attack. I am sorry this is the situation.

Despite the tremendous responsibilities placed on the FCDA by this Congress in Public Law 920, FCDA has been and will continue to be one of the smallest agencies in Government. Further, even with the $75,000,000 which this Congress voted for civil defense last year, it has been able to make substantial progress against remarkable odds.

Under the title of "Operations" for this agency, I recommend a very limited increase of $3,000,000 to be added to the $8,000,000 which the Appropriations Committee has voted.

In reviewing the testimony on civil defense, and particularly the report of the committee, I was surprised at the committee's handling of the civil defense stockpiling program.

This Congress recognized the urgent need for stockpiling, primarily of medical supplies last year when it voted $50,000,000 to the agency for this purpose. These funds were not voted to FCDA until November of 1951. It was impossible for the agency to proceed before that on procurement of the stockpile items.

Immediately upon receipt of these funds, the agency began working with the Department of Defense to work out a joint procurement program which would be noncompetitive within the Government. Despite these handicaps, FCDA was able to obligate all of the $50,000,000 which this Congress voted for medical supplies, plus some $8,000,000 which reverted from the medical matching program with the States. FCDA was able to obligate every cent of the money which this Congress voted to get started on this continuing program of building

up adequate medical stockpiles in case of attack.

These facts are not evident in the committee report. Instead, it seems that they have emphasized only the amount which had actually been expended during the fiscal year which gives a distorted picture of what was actually accomplished.

In order to continue this building up of Federal reserves of medical stockpiles, it is my recommendation that the House add $34,500,000 under a new subheading, "Emergency supplies and equipment." The vast majority of this sum would be used for the stockpiling of blood and blood derivatives for war emergency purposes. I hardly need emphasize here the urgent needs for blood and plasma. Unless this amount is restored, there are no other funds available, even to the military, for this crucial program.

I feel that we are really gambling with American lives and with the billions we have invested in military defense if the House does not at least give FCDA the same amount of funds, limited though they are, that the Congress voted last year.

Recognizing the Russian armament build-up and the strong support which the civil-defense program has received from the two eminent military authorities, General Marshall and General Bradley, the least we can do is vote a total of $75,000,000 for the continuation of the national civil-defense program on its current scale of operation.

I am prepared to offer amendments to that effect.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise again to repeat what I have been saying on this floor and in speeches in my district and elsewhere since the President's announcement in 1949 that the Russians had exploded an atomic bomb. It is my firm conviction we are being very naive and unrealistic in our civil-defense program.

It is very clear to me now that we will not have adequate appropriations to implement the civil-defense needs of the dangerous days in which we live until certain steps are taken on the highest national levels. These are more active leadership on the part of the President, more interest and assistance on the part of the Defense Establishment, a more articulate presentation to congressional committees on the part of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and a growing realization by Members of Congress that it can happen here in our America.

Having returned recently from visiting our fighting men on the battlefields of Korea, it sickens me that we at home are so apathetic and unconcerned about the facts of life.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, we are all interested in an adequate civil-defense program. That interest certainly is no monopoly of those who urge bigger and better appropriations for the Civil Defense Administration.

The impression that I gained last year as a member of the Emergency Agencies Subcommittee of Appropriations was that there was a desire on the part of the Civil Defense Administration officials to do some empire building. Their plans were grandiose and expensive, in some cases duplicative. Many employees of high classifications and high salaries were sought. This situation made it necessary to do some rather sharp trimming.

This year the officials who came before the subcommittee appeared not to have amended their attitude. There seemed to be a willingness, yes, even an affirmative desire, to build a large bureaucracy to handle civil defense. I think the subcommittee acted wisely in denying a huge build-up of personnel and denying huge stockpiles of materials which in many cases would duplicate similar stocks of existing supplies or would be subject to deterioration.

This week a glaring case of personnel build-up came to my attention. My informant was a Reserve Air Force officer now on active duty at a base in one of the Southern States. I quote from the letter of this officer, a civic-minded civilian at heart from my home community:

> A matter has come to my attention in the past week which I merely want to give you for your information. I presume the whole thing smells of politics throughout.
>
> Recently, a civilian reported into our headquarters here. He uncovered officials orders of the Office of Federal Civil Defense Administration assigning him to this headquarters as their representative in this office. At that time, we in this Air Division knew nothing about his proposed duties, nor did we know that he was to be assigned to this headquarters. Upon evaluation of the duties which he is assigned to perform, it may be said that these duties are normally performed in our unit by a noncommissioned officer or junior ranking company-grade officer at the most. This man is a GS-13 civil-service employee hired for this position specifically. He informs us that he is to be bulwarked by four additional assistants holding the grade of GS-12. His functions place him in my operations section as a liaison adviser to one of my staff officers.
>
> Here is a man with four assistants each of them drawing more pay from the Federal Government than my commanding general and having very little or no responsibilities comparatively speaking.
>
> Similar personnel are being assigned throughout the Air Defense Command in its 11 air divisions; going back to second-grade arithmetic, I compute that the cost to the Government for these liaison personnel is roughly $500,000 per year. Lord knows what kind of an empire they have built up in higher headquarters.
>
> The functions of these people can be carried out by a noncommissioned officer. The responsibility in no way measures up to the amount of money they are being paid.

Mr. Chairman, this is a specific demonstration of the general impression which the members of the emergency agencies received. There is indeed a place for a civil-defense organization, but we must be careful that the funds appropriated for that purpose are not used for the building of a huge and inefficient bureaucracy. I trust the Members of the House will not attempt to substitute their less-informed opinions for the informed decisions of the members of the subcommittee who brought this portion of the bill before us.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are appropriating large sums of money today, and have in the past, for the build-up of the security of this Nation—at home and abroad—to the point where we can adequately defend our democratic way of life against the Communist world around us.

I am at a loss to understand the recent action on the part of the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, in apologizing before a closed session of the House of Commons in London because of Gen. Mark Clark's decision to bomb the Korean electrical power stations out of commission.

While millions of Americans will agree with me, nevertheless, I want to emphasize that I am speaking only for myself. As far as I am concerned, Acheson need not apologize either for General Clark's action or for failing to send a telegram of his intentions to the British Government in London. Does this apology on the part of Acheson mean that, in the future, we are going to notify the British Government what our military strategy is going to be, thereby permitting information to leak out to the enemy in time to permit the enemy's Air Force to thwart the attack?

Right here and now I want to reiterate that we neither owe Great Britain nor any political party in Great Britain, and for that matter anyone else in the United Nations any apologies for our actions in recent days. If we must apologize to someone, then I say the only one entitled to an apology is Gen. Douglas MacArthur who recommended such action well over a year ago and got fired as a result. This defense of General MacArthur is made again on my responsibility I am not defending General MacArthur as a Republican but I am defending him as an American. There is no question in the minds of millions of Americans, and certainly not in my mind, that if his advice had been heeded, we would not have the present muddled Korean situation—this albatross around our neck.

If we had listened not only to the greatest of our military leaders but perhaps one of the most outstanding Americans, the Chinese Reds would never have been given their good old sweet time to replace obsolete aircraft with MIG jets.

Could there be anything more disgusting than to hear certain British left-wingers gloat over the fact that they actually participated in MacArthur's dismissal? The American people are at the ends of their temper, and are sick and tired of this Nation being held up to

ridicule and scorn when we are paying a mighty expensive price in lives and money for the conduct of a war which we are supposed to run but which the British are running.

I want to come back to Mr. Dean Acheson. Has the Secretary of State, by his apology to the British Government, entered into a new appeasement arrangement? If so, any such secret arrangement should be repudiated upon his return. Since British opinion seems to be in opposition to any military measures which might bring this horrible fiasco to a conclusion, the new understanding which Mr. Acheson is said to have reached must involve further appeasement. Such an arrangement will lead to nothing but an eventual settlement on Communist terms at the expense of the American people.

Was it not this British limited war strategy that led us into this disgraceful and bloody stalemate?

Recent statistics will show that our casualties, around 110,000, outnumber British casualties about 40 to 1. The death toll lists 19,469 Americans and only 513 British. This is very serious as far as the American people are concerned. Can anyone dispute that more American lives will be lost the longer this now pointless war continues?

How many more American lives must be sacrified before this great Government of the United States of America comes to its senses and allows American military leaders to end this war in an American way?

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I am this day introducing a resolution which will direct the Secretary of State to disclose complete information with respect to any agreements or understandings which he may have entered into with the Government of Great Britain on his latest visit, and which may affect the conduct of the war in Korea. This resolution is similar to one adopted by this House on February 20, 1952, and which had my support. It is important and I sincerely trust that it will be given immediate consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1214. The appropriations, authorizations, and authority with respect thereto in this act or any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1953 which has not been enacted into law prior to July 1, 1952, shall be available from and including such date for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations, authorizations, and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1952, and the date of enactment of this act or the applicable act in anticipation of such appropriations, authorizations, and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the respective terms thereof.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 51, after line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1215. Foreign credits owed to or owned by the United States Treasury will not be available for expenditure by agencies of the United States after June 30, 1953, except as may be provided for annually in appropriation acts and provisions for the utilization of such credits for purposes authorized by law are hereby authorized to be included in general appropriation acts."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I have taken up this amendment with the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have taken it up also with the other gentlemen on the committee on both sides, and all agreed to it. This deals with the currency of foreign governments made available for the use of the United States, which stems from surplus property credits, lend lease, mutual security agency counterpart funds, occupation costs borne by former enemies. These funds have now been accumulating for several years and involve hundreds of millions of dollars. In most instances these foreign currencies are being made available to agencies without the approval of the Congress. This provision would place control in the hands of the Congress through annual appropriations. Agencies of the Government having need for currencies of foreign countries would advise the Congress as to the amount and purposes for which the need appeared. The Congress would then appropriate dollars for the purchase of foreign currencies standing to our credit in the United States Treasury. It is anticipated that considerable savings will result from the congressional control established by this provision. The provision is effective after the fiscal year 1953 so the regular budget for fiscal year 1954 will carry in dollars the estimated foreign currency needs of agencies operated abroad. Unless appropriated for the purchase of these currencies, they would go back to the United States Treasury. It would merely be a bookkeeping account, and it would give the Congress control of the money in these foreign countries.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment is very satisfactory to me, but I would like to have it clear in my mind. As I understand it, these agencies can use a certain portion of the counterpart funds. Does this prohibit them from using those funds unless they are appropriated by the Congress?

Mr. RABAUT. It brings this money within the control of the Treasury, and within the knowledge of the Congress in the fiscal year 1954.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What happens then to the money that is in the counterpart-funds bank in the different countries? Can they authorize or can our State Department or Mutual Security Agency authorize that to be spent for some other purpose in these countries?

Mr. RABAUT. Under this amendment, it should be made known to us after this becomes effective what needs they have for this money so that the Congress will have some control.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it will not cost us actually any more dollars because the funds will be available of the counterpart funds as provided in the appropriation bill by the Congress; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right and we will be saving money by this operation because we will have control of the funds.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. This amendment refers to credit owed to or owned by the United States Treasury. So far as I know there are no counterpart funds owed or owned by the United States Treasury so I do not know of any money in the world except some sort of foreign credit that I have not heard about that are owed or owned by the United States Treasury.

Mr. RABAUT. This is foreign currencies in the foreign countries.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Why there are all sorts of things like this lend-lease money and money from the sale of all sorts of property and surplus property, which took place after the war, and there are four or five other funds of different kinds which are scattered all over the world. There is no control over this money, but there ought to be a control and the amendment which the gentleman has offered will bring the money under the control of the Congress so that the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives can keep it from being wasted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent to return to page 13, line 12.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TABER. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 13, after line 12, insert:

"COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

"Appropriations available to the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, for fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until September 30, 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to return to page 13?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply permits the Commission to conclude its operations by the 30th of September and make its final report.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8370) making appropriations to supply certain supplemental and deficiency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Crawford amendment on page 29, line 25, cutting the military assistance from $3,273,000,000 to $3,126,000,000.

I ask for a separate vote on the Curtis amendment on page 30, line 18, cutting the military assistance, title II, from $630,316,500 to $499,116,500.

And on the Davis amendment, on page 32, line 7, cutting the technical assistance from $118,634,250 to $67,793,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 29, line 25, strike out "$3,273,824,750" and insert "$3,128,224,750."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken and the Chair announced that the Chair was in doubt.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 173, nays 167, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 122]

YEAS—173

Abbitt	Ayres	Bolton
Adair	Baker	Bow
Allen, Calif.	Barden	Boykin
Allen, Ill.	Bates, Mass.	Bramblett
Andersen, H. Carl	Beall	Bray
Anderson Calif.	Bender	Brehm
Andresen, August H.	Bennett, Mich.	Brownson
Angell	Berry	Budge
Armstrong	Betts	Buffett
	Bishop	Busbey
	Blackney	Bush
Butler	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Byrnes	Holmes	Rankin
Carrigg	Horan	Redden
Chenoweth	Hull	Reed, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hunter	Reed, N. Y.
Church	Jackson, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Clevenger	Jenison	Riehlman
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Robeson
Corbett	Jensen	Rogers, Mass.
Cotton	Jonas	Ross
Crawford	Jones, Woodrow W.	Sadlak
Crumpacker	Keating	St. George
Cunningham	Kersten, Wis.	Saylor
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Schenck
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Scrivner
Dague	Lovre	Scudder
Davis, Ga.	Lucas	Secrest
Davis, Wis.	McConnell	Shafer
Denny	McCulloch	Sheehan
D'Ewart	McDonough	Short
Dolliver	McGregor	Simpson, Ill.
Dondero	McIntire	Simpson, Pa.
Dorn	McMillan	Sittler
Ellsworth	McVey	Smith, Kans.
Elston	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Engle	Martin, Iowa	Stockman
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Gavin	Mason	Talle
George	Meader	Taylor
Golden	Miller, Md.	Teague
Goodwin	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson, Mich.
Graham	Miller, N. Y.	Tollefson
Gross	Mumma	Van Pelt
Hagen	Murray	Van Zandt
Halleck	Nelson	Velde
Hand	Nicholson	Vorys
Harden	Norblad	Vursell
Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell	Weichel
Harrison, Va.	O'Hara	Werdel
Harrison, Wyo.	O'Konski	Wheeler
Harvey	Osmers	Williams, Miss.
Hays, Ohio	Ostertag	Williams, N. Y.
Hess	Passman	Wilson, Ind.
Hill	Patten	Withrow
Hillings	Patterson	Wolcott
Hinshaw	Phillips	Wolverton
Hoeven	Poulson	Wood, Idaho
Hoffman, Ill.		

NAYS—167

Andrews	Garmatz	Mahon
Auchincloss	Gary	Mansfield
Bailey	Gathings	Marshall
Bakewell	Gordon	Merrow
Baring	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
Barrett	Granger	Mills
Battle	Grant	Morgan
Bennett, Fla.	Green	Morton
Bentsen	Greenwood	Moulder
Boggs, La.	Gregory	Multer
Bolling	Hale	Murdock
Bosone	Hardy	Murphy
Brooks	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Bryson	Havenner	O'Brien, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	O'Neill
Burleson	Hedrick	O'Toole
Burnside	Herlong	Patman
Burton	Heselton	Poage
Camp	Holifield	Polk
Canfield	Hope	Preston
Cannon	Howell	Price
Case	Ikard	Priest
Chatham	Irving	Prouty
Chelf	Jarman	Rabaut
Chudoff	Javits	Rains
Colmer	Johnson	Reams
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes
Cooper	Jones, Mo.	Ribicoff
Cox	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Crosser	Kearns	Rivers
Dawson	Kee	Roberts
Deane	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
DeGraffenried	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Delaney	Kennedy	Rogers, Fla.
Denton	Keogh	Rooney
Devereux	Kerr	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Dingell	Kilday	Shelley
Dollinger	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Doyle	Klein	Sieminski
Durham	Lane	Smith, Miss.
Eberharter	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lantaff	Spence
Feighan	Lesinski	Staggers
Fernandez	Lind	Thomas
Fine	McCarthy	Thornberry
Fisher	McCormack	Trimble
Flood	McGrath	Walter
Fogarty	McGuire	Watts
Forand	McKinnon	Whitten
Ford	McMullen	Widnall
Forrester	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Fugate	Madden	Wigglesworth
Fulton	Magee	Wilson, Tex.
Winstead	Wood, Ga.	Yorty
	Yates	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—91

Aandahl	Fallon	Perkins
Abernethy	Fenton	Philbin
Addonizio	Frazier	Pickett
Albert	Furcolo	Potter
Allen, La.	Gore	Powell
Anfuso	Gwinn	Ramsay
Arends	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Aspinall	Hall, Leonard W.	Regan
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Richards
Beamer	Heffernan	Rogers, Tex.
Beckworth	Heller	Roosevelt
Belcher	Herter	Sabath
Blatnik	Jackson, Wash.	Sasscer
Boggs, Del.	James	Scott, Hardie
Bonner	Jones, Hamilton C.	Seely-Brown
Brown, Ohio	Judd	Sikes
Buckley	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Burdick	Kearney	Stanley
Carlyle	Kilburn	Steed
Carnahan	King, Pa.	Stigler
Celler	Kirwan	Sutton
Clemente	Kluczynski	Tackett
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Thompson, Tex.
Combs	Lyle	Vail
Coudert	Machrowicz	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Welch
Dempsey	Morano	Wharton
Donohue	Morris	Wickersham
Donovan	Morrison	Willis
Doughton		Woodruff
Eaton		
Evins		

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Addonizio against.

Mr. Beamer for, with Mr. Aspinall against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Donohue against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Belcher for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Vail for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Perkins against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Gwinn for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. King of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr. Pickett for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Welch with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. James.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Seely-Brown.

Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 30, line 18, strike out "$630,316,500" and insert "$399,116,500."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 160, noes 135.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 32, line 7, strike out "$118,634,250" and insert "$67,793,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 171, noes 121.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers in the bill just passed, H. R. 8370.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed and have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Permission to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole on the bill H. R. 8370 was granted to:

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous material.

Mr. PATMAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and include a letter.

Mr. YATES and include extraneous matter.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7876. An act relating to the taxation of life insurance companies; and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2594) entitled "An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7860) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2352)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952'.

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 101. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Nor shall any restriction or other limitation be established or maintained upon the species, type, or grade of livestock killed by any slaughterer, nor upon the types of slaughtering operations, including religious rituals, employed by any slaughterer; nor shall any requirements or regulations be established or maintained relating to the allocation or distribution of meat or meat products unless, and for the period for which, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have determined and certified to the President that the over-all supply of meat and meat products is inadequate to meet the civilian or military needs therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products.'

"SEC. 102. Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '101.', and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"'(b) When all requirements for the national security, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials, and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any Act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities it shall be the policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy, including small business, thus increasing employment opportunities and minimizing inflationary pressures. No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption of any material unless such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference and not used by any such participating country. Nothing contained in this Act shall impair the authority of the President under this Act to exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials (both domestically produced and imported) and facilities through the controlled materials plans or other methods of allocation.'

"SEC. 103. Section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 15 per centum of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The

President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.'

"SEC. 104. The first sentence of section 302 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', and manufacture of newsprint'.

"SEC. 105. Paragraph (2) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: 'No regulation or order shall be issued or remain in effect under this title which prohibits the payment or receipt of hourly wages at a rate of $1 per hour or less.'

"SEC. 106. (a) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting in the fifth sentence thereof after '(1) the Agricultural Act of 1949,' the following: 'except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that Act, for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas,'.

"(b) Paragraph (3) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No ceiling prices for products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, milk, and other dairy products, shall be established or maintained in any agricultural marketing area at levels which deny to any processor of such products the cost adjustments provided in paragraph (4) of this subsection and which deny to any distributor or seller of such products the customary margin or charge provided in subsection (k) of this section. Where a State regulatory body is authorized to establish minimum and/or maximum prices for sales of fluid milk, ceiling prices established for such sales under this title shall (1) not be less than the minimum prices, or (2) be equal to the maximum prices, established by such regulatory body, as the case may be: *And provided further*, That in the case of prices of milk established by any State regulatory body, with respect to which price, parties may be deemed to contract, no ceiling price may be maintained under this title which is less than the price so established. No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fruits or vegetables in fresh or processed form.'

"SEC. 107. Paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in the case of a seller of a material at retail or wholesale within the meaning of subsection (k) of this section.'

"SEC. 108. Subsection (d) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) For the purpose of determining the applicable ceiling price under the general ceiling price regulation issued January 26, 1951, as amended, any sale of fertilizer to the ultimate user by a person who acquired it for resale shall be considered a retail sale.'

"SEC. 109. (a) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding after the word 'profession' in paragraph (ii) thereof the following: '; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity; wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of his or their profession; and wages, salaries, and other compensation paid to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of certified public accountants engaged in the practice of his or their profession'.

"(b) Paragraph (v) of subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(v) (1) Rates and charges by any common carrier or other public utility, including rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, Sixty-fourth Congress), as amended, and including compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, and charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others; charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common carrier operations; and (2) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pickup and delivery and local transfer services: *Provided*, That no common carrier or other public utility shall at any time after the President shall have issued any stabilization regulations and orders under subsection (b) make any increase in its charges for property or services sold by it for resale to the public, for which application is filed after the date of issuance of such stabilization regulations and orders, before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase, unless it first gives thirty days' notice to the President, or such agency as he may designate, and consents to timely intervention by such agency before the Federal, State, or municipal authority, if any, having jurisdiction to consider such increase: *And provided further*, That the Office of Price Stabilization shall not intervene in any case involving increases in rates or charges proposed by any common carrier or other public utility except as provided in the preceding proviso;'.

"(c) Subsection (e) of section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"'(viii) Rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing.

"'(ix) Wages, salaries, or other compensation of persons employed in small-business enterprises as defined in this paragraph: *Provided, however*, That the President may from time to time exclude from this exemption such enterprises on the basis of industries, types of business, occupations, or areas, if their exemption would be unstabilizing with respect to wages, salaries, or other compensation, prices, or manpower, or would otherwise be contrary to the purposes of this Act. A small-business enterprise, for the purpose of this paragraph, is any enterprise in which a total of eight or less persons are employed in all its establishments, branches, units, or affiliates. This paragraph shall become effective thirty days after its enactment.

"'(x) Prices charged and wages paid by bowling alleys.

"'(xi) Wages paid for agricultural labor.'

"SEC. 110. The first sentence of section 402 (k) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued or remain in effect under this title, which shall deny sellers of materials at retail or wholesale their customary percentage margins over costs of the materials or their customary charges during the period May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950, or on such other nearest representative date determined under section 402 (c), as shown by their records during such period, except as to any one specific item of a line of material sold by such sellers which is in short supply as evidenced by specific government action to encourage production of the item in question: *Provided, however*, That if the antitrust laws of any State have been construed to prohibit adherence by sellers of materials at wholesale or retail to uniform suggested retail resale prices, the President shall issue regulations giving full consideration to the customary percentage margins of such sellers during the period hereinbefore set forth.'

"SEC. 111. Section 402 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(l) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto issued under this title shall fix a ceiling on the price paid or received on the sale or delivery of any material in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed by the State law (other than any so-called "fair trade law") now in effect, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law.

"'(m) No rule, regulation, order, or amendment thereto shall be issued or maintained under this title, which shall deny to any hotel supply house or combination distributor, affiliated with any slaughterer or slaughtering establishment, or to any wholesaler so affiliated but whose affiliation does not amount to an interest or equity of more than 50 per centum, the same ceiling price or prices for meat accorded to hotel supply houses, combination distributors, or wholesalers which are not so affiliated.

"'(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, whenever price ceilings are declared in effect on any agricultural commodity at the farm level, the Director of Price Stabilization must at the same time put into effect margin controls on processors, wholesalers, and retailers, such margin controls to allow the processors, wholesalers, and retailers the normal mark-ups as provided under this Act, except that under no circumstances are the sellers to be allowed greater than their normal margins of profit.'

"SEC. 112. Section 403 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' after '403.' and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(b) (1) There is hereby created, in the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, a Wage Stabilization Board (hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Board"), which shall be composed, in equal numbers, of members representative of the general public, members representative of labor, and members representative of business and industry. The number of offices on the Board shall be established by Executive order.

"'(2) The members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board from among the members respresentative of the general public.

"'(3) The term of office of the members of the Board shall terminate on May 1, 1953. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

"'(4) Each member representative of the general public shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 a year, and while a member of the Board shall engage in no other business, vocation, or employment. Each member representative of labor, and each member representative of business and industry, shall receive $50 for each day he is actually engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board, and in addition he shall be paid his actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949 while so engaged away from his home or regular place of business. The members representative of labor, and the members representative of business and industry, shall, in respect of their functions on the Board, be exempt from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"'(5) The Board shall, under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator—

"'(A) formulate, and recommend to such Administrator for promulgation, general policies and general regulations relating to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation; and

"'(B) upon the request of (i) any person substantially affected thereby, or (ii) any Federal department or agency whose functions, as provided by law, may be affected thereby or may have an effect thereon, advise as to the interpretation, or application to particular circumstances, of policies and regulations promulgated by such Administrator which relate to the stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation.

For the purposes of this Act, stabilization of wages, salaries, and other compensation means prescribing maximum limits thereon. Except as provided in clause (B) of this paragraph, the Board shall have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. Labor disputes, and labor matters in dispute, which do not involve the interpretation or application of such regulations or policies shall be dealt with, if at all, insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, under the conciliation, mediation, emergency, or other provisions of laws heretofore or hereafter enacted by the Congress.

"'(6) Paragraph (5) of this subsection shall take effect thirty days after the date on which this subsection is enacted. The Wage Stabilization Board created by Executive Order Numbered 10161, and reconstituted by Executive Order Numbered 10233, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 10301, is hereby abolished, effective at the close of the twenty-ninth day following the date on which this subsection is enacted. After June 27, 1952, the present Wage Stabilization Board shall issue no regulation or order except with respect to individual cases pending before the Board prior to such date.

"'(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the stabilization of the salaries and other compensation of persons (not represented in their relationships or eligible to be so represented with their employer by duly certified or recognized labor organizations) employed as outside salesmen or in bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacities as such terms are defined in the regulations issued in pursuance of section 13 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or as supervisors, as defined by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, shall be administered by the Salary Stabilization Board and the Office of Salary Stabilization as presently established within the Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, subject to the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator.

"'(d) It shall be the express duty, obligation, and function of the present Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages, and to stabilize prices and wages.'

"SEC. 113. (a) (1) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended is amended by striking out 'relating to price controls under this title' and inserting in lieu thereof 'relating to price controls under this title or rent controls under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended'; and by striking out 'relating to price controls' after 'any such regulation or order'.

"(2) Subsection (b) of section 407 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'this title' the following: 'and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended'; and by inserting after 'section 705 of this Act' the following: ', or section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, as the case may be'.

"(b) Section 408 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 408. (a) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within thirty days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the President, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the President has taken official notice. Upon such filing, the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the proceeding and of all questions determined therein, and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper; to permanently enjoin or set aside, in whole or in part, the regulation or order or the amendment of or supplement to the regulation or order protested; to make and enter upon the pleadings, evidence, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the President; to dismiss the petition; or to remand the proceeding to the President for further action in accordance with the court's decree: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the President at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. The findings of the President with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the President and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the President or included by the President in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the President. The President shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the President, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"'(b) The Emergency Court of Appeals is hereby continued for the purpose of the exercise of the jurisdiction granted by this title, with the powers herein specified, together with the powers heretofore granted by law to such court which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title. The court shall have the powers of a district court with respect to the jurisdiction conferred on it by this title. So far as necessary to decision the court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, interpret the meaning or applicability of the terms of any official action under this title or under this Act, as amended, of which this title is a part and with respect to this title, or under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. The court shall exercise its powers and prescribe rules governing its procedure in such manner as to expedite the determination of cases of which it has jurisdiction under this title.

"'(c) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same manner as a judgment of a United States court of appeals as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any such regulation or order issued under this title, or under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this title, or the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"'(d) (1) Within thirty days after arraignment, or such additional times as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within five days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this Act, section 205 or 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the President setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with section 407 of this title. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within thirty days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the President or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection

(a) of this section. The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"'(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this Act, section 205 or 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"'(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"'(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under section 407 of this title prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 409 or 706 of this Act, section 205 or 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code, setting forth objections to the validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"'(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within five days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 409 (a) or 706 (a) of the Act or section 206 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals which has become effective in accordance with section 408 (b) of this title, any proceeding pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under section 407 of this title, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 409 or 706 of this Act, section 205 or 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 371 of title 18, United States Code; nor, except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given to any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under this title.'

"SEC. 114. Title IV of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"'SEC. 411. In the administration of this title, no person shall be required to furnish any reports or other information with respect to sales of materials or services at prices which are below ceiling, if such person certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices.

"'SUSPENSION OF CONTROLS

"'SEC. 412. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the President shall use the price, wage, and other powers conferred by this Act, as amended, to promote the earliest practicable balance between production and the demand therefor of materials and services and that the general control of wages and prices shall be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purposes set forth in this Act; and that pending such termination, in order to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping which retard rather than assist in the achievement of the purposes of this Act, price or wage regulations and orders, or both, shall be suspended in the case of any material or service or type of employment where such factors as condition of supply, existence of below ceiling prices, historical volatility of prices, wage pressures and wage relationships, or relative importance to business costs or living costs will permit, and to the extent that such action will be consistent with the avoidance of a cumulative and dangerous unstabilizing effect. It is further the policy of the Congress that when the President finds that the termination of the suspension and the restoration of ceilings on the sales or charges for such material or service, or the further stabilization of such wages, salaries, and other compensation, or both, is necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this Act, he shall by regulation or order terminate the suspension.'

"SEC. 115. Section 503 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'It is the sense of the Congress that, by reason of the work stoppage now existing in the steel industry, the national safety is imperiled, and the Congress therefore requests the President to invoke immediately the national emergency provisions (sections 206 to 210, inclusive) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, for the purpose of terminating such work stoppage.'

"SEC. 116. (a) Section 601 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed. The heading of title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows: 'TITLE VI—CONTROL OF REAL ESTATE CREDIT', and the subheading of such title is amended to read as follows: 'This title authorizes the regulation of real estate construction credit only'. The table of contents in the first section of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'consumer and'.

"(b) Title VI of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 607. Notwithstanding the provisions of 602 and 605 of this title, the authority of the President which is derived from said sections to impose credit regulations relative to residential property shall not be exercised with respect to extensions of credit made during any "period of residential credit control relaxation", as that term is herein defined, in such manner as to impose any down payment requirement in excess of 5 per centum of the transaction price. The President shall cause to be made estimates of the number of permanent, nonfarm, family dwelling units, the construction of which has been started during each calendar month and, on the basis of such estimates, he shall cause to be made estimates of the annual rate of construction starts during each such month, after making reasonable allowance for seasonal variations in the rate of construction. If for any three consecutive months the annual rate of construction starts so found for each of the three months falls to a level below an annual rate of 1,200,000 starts per year, the President shall cause to be published in the Federal Register an announcement of the beginning of a "period of residential credit control relaxation", which period shall begin not later than the first day of the second calendar month following such three consecutive months. Each such relaxation period may be terminated by the President at any time after the annual rate of construction starts thereafter estimated for each of any three consecutive months exceeds the level referred to in the preceding sentence.'

"(c) Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) After the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit shall be approved or carried out under this section.'

"SEC. 117. Section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection:

"'(f) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of his testimony and to be represented by counsel.'

"SEC. 118. The first sentence of section 707 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the word 'his'.

"SEC. 119. Subsection (b) of section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'It shall be the function of the Committee to make a continuous study of the programs and of the fairness to consumers of the prices authorized by this Act and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration therefor.'

"SEC. 120. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) No action for the recovery of any cooperative payment made to a cooperative association by a Market Administrator under an invalid provision of a milk marketing order issued by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 shall be maintained unless such action is brought by producers specifically named as party plaintiffs to recover their respective share of such payments within ninety days after the date of enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 with respect to any cause of action heretofore accrued and not otherwise barred, or within ninety days after accrual with respect to future payments, and unless each claimant shall allege and prove (1) that he objected at the hearing to the provisions of the order under which such payments were made and (2) that he either refused to accept payments computed with such deduction or accepted them under protest to either the Secretary or the Administrator. The district courts of the United States shall have exclusive original jurisdiction of all such actions regardless of the amount involved. This subsection shall not apply to funds held in escrow pursuant to court order. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no termination date shall be applicable to this subsection.'

"SEC. 121. (a) Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out '1952' and inserting in lieu thereof '1953'.

"(b) Section 717 (a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of this Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this Act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of April 30, 1953.'

"TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

"SEC. 201. (a) Subsection (e) of section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June

30, 1952' and inserting in lieu thereof 'April 30, 1953'.

"(b) Subsection (f) of section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) (1) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of September 30, 1952, except that they shall cease to be in effect at the close of April 30, 1953—

"'(A) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under subsection (1) of section 204 of this Act as a critical defense housing area;

"'(B) in any incorporated city, town, or village which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, or village; and

"'(C) in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more incorporated cities, towns, or villages constituting the major portion of the defense-rental area have made the declaration specified in subparagraph (B) at a time when maximum rents under this title were in effect in such unincorporated locality.

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, or village which makes the declarations specified in paragraph (1) (B) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.

"'(3) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect upon the date of a proclamation by the President or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this title is not necessary because of the existence of an emergency, whichever date is the earlier.

"'(4) Notwithstanding any provision of paragraph (1) or (3) of this subsection, the provisions of this title and regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit or action with respect to any right or liability incurred prior to the termination date specified in such paragraph.'

"SEC. 202. Section 204 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"'(p) Except in the case of action taken after full compliance with subsection (k) of this section, the President shall not re-establish maximum rents in any defense-rental area, including any community owned and operated by the Federal Government, which has previously been decontrolled under this Act until a public hearing, after thirty days' notice, has been held in such area.

"'(q) Consistent with the other provisions of this Act, all affected agencies, departments, and establishments of the Federal Government shall, by July 15, 1952, establish and administer rents and service charges for quarters supplied to Federal employees and members of the Uniformed Services furnished quarters on a rental basis in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Bureau of the Budget: *Provided however*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to housing units under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission where Federal Rent Control is now in effect.'

"SEC. 203. The Director of Defense Mobilization is hereby authorized to appoint a Defense Areas Advisory Committee to advise him in connection with the exercise of any function or authority vested in him by section 204 (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, or section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, or by delegation thereunder, with respect to determining any area to be a critical defense housing area. Any committee so appointed shall consist, in addition to a chairman, of representatives of the Department of Defense, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Office of Rent Stabilization. Any Federal Agency shall, to the fullest practicable extent, furnish such information in its possession to the Defense Areas Advisory Committee as such Committee may request from time to time relevant to its operations.

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"PUBLIC CONTRACTS

"SEC. 301. The Act entitled 'An Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes', approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 35–45), is amended (1) by redesignating sections 10 and 11 as sections 11 and 12, respectively, and (2) by inserting immediately following section 9 a new section 10 as follows:

"'SEC. 10. (a) Notwithstanding any provision of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, such Act shall be applicable in the administration of sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of this Act.

"'(b) All wage determinations under section 1 (b) of this Act shall be made on the record after opportunity for a hearing. Review of any such wage determination, or of the applicability of any such wage determination may be had within ninety days after such determination is made in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles or equipment purchased or to be purchased by the Government from any source, who is in any industry to which such wage determination is applicable.

"'(c) Notwithstanding the inclusion of any stipulations required by any provision of this Act in any contract subject of this Act, any interested person shall have the right of judicial review of any legal question which might otherwise be raised, including, but not limited to, wage determinations and the interpretation of the terms "locality", "regular dealer", "manufacturer", and "open market".'"

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
J. W. FULBRIGHT,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
JOHN W. BRICKER,
I. M. IVES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for technical, clarifying, and conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Importation and use of materials

Section 101 of the act authorizes the President to allocate materials and facilities to promote the national defense. The Senate bill included a provision which would amend section 101 so as to prohibit restrictions or other limitations under title I of the act upon a person purchasing a commodity abroad and importing and using it in the United States if the domestic production thereof exceeds allocations for defense, stockpiling, and foreign military assistance purposes. The provision would also prohibit all restrictions or other limitations under title I of the act if the domestic production of any commodity is sufficient for all civilian domestic, defense, stockpiling, and foreign military assistance requirements. The Senate bill also contained a provision which would add a new section 105 to title I of the act. Under the authority of the new section the President could participate in the International Materials Conference through Senate-confirmed representatives and, notwithstanding any other provision of title I to the contrary, after an appropriate public hearing and finding, could use his powers under the act to carry out International Materials Conference recommendations. The President, subject to the provisions of the section and without other impairment of his authority under the act, could exercise allocation and priorities controls over materials both domestically produced and imported and facilities through the controlled materials plan or other methods of allocation.

The House amendment provides for the adding of certain provisions to section 101 of the act. One of these would provide that when all requirements of the national defense, stockpiling and foreign military assistance programs had been met through allocations and priorities it would be the declared policy of the United States to encourage the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy and thus increase employment opportunities and minimize inflationary pressures. It further would be provided that no authority granted under the act could be used to limit the domestic consumption of any material in order to restrict total United States consumption to an amount fixed by the International Materials Conference.

The conference substitute retains the declaration of policy provisions contained in the House amendment with respect to encouraging the maximum supply of raw materials for the civilian economy. In addition it provides that no agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting the total United States consumption of any material unless the agreement authorizes domestic consumers to purchase the unused quantities allocated to other countries. The conference substitute also makes clear that allocations and priorities controls may be applied to materials (both domestically produced and imported) and facilities through the Controlled Materials Plan or other methods of allocation. With respect to domestic users purchasing materials allocated to another country but not used by that country it is the intention of the Committee of Conference that adequate steps shall be taken by our Government in agreement with the government of such country in order that information concerning the amount of any unused allocation will be made available to domestic users as quickly as possible in

order that such users may have the opportunity to purchase such quantities.

Import limitations

The House amendment contained a provision which would amend section 101 of the act in a manner which would require that when priorities or allocations of any raw material operate to limit the production of articles or products produced in the United States, the President by proclamation would have to limit imports of any article or product using such raw material upon the request of a substantial portion of American producers of such article or product or an article or product competitive therewith provided the Secretary of Defense has not certified to the President that American production of such article or product is insufficient to supply the essential needs therefor. The import limitation for an article or product would be set at 100 percent of the average annual imports of such article or product during the calendar years 1947 through 1949, except that, if the Secretary of Defense certifies that American production of such article or product is insufficient to supply essential needs, imports would be limited to such quantity as the Secretary of Defense certifies as necessary, in excess of American production, to meet essential defense needs. Provision would be made for appropriate hearings before the Tariff Commission and for reports by the Tariff Commission to the President. The President would be required to proclaim the appropriate import limitation within 30 days of his receipt of the report from the Tariff Commission. No similar provision was included in the Senate bill and it is not included in the conference substitute.

Import controls over fats and oils

Section 104 of the act prohibits imports of fats and oils, peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products which would (a) impair or reduce domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program.

The Senate bill rewrote section 104 so that it would provide that, for the purpose of exercising import controls over fats and oils, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products, the provisions with respect thereto of title III of the Second War Powers Act would be revived and continued in force. Under this authority such import controls could be exercised only if they are found (a) essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply, or (b) essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the Government.

The House amendment, while retaining the criteria of existing law for the exercise of such import control authority, added provisions which (1) would specifically provide that such import controls could be exercised with respect to types and varieties of a commodity or product, and (2) would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the import limitations established under section 104 up to an additional 10 percent for each types or variety which he might deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects on international relationships and trade.

The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment except that the figure of 15 percent is substituted for the figure of 10 percent in the proviso.

The committee of conference desires to make it clear that this authority is not to be exercised with respect to types of cheeses, such as Roquefort and Switzerland Swiss, which, because of their United States selling price, are clearly not competitive with domestically produced cheeses.

Application of section 402 (d) (4)

The Senate bill contained a provision which was not included in the House Amendment which specifically would make the provisions of section 402 (d) (4) of the act (which provides for adjustment of price ceilings to reflect reasonable cost increases up to July 26, 1951) inapplicable to a seller of a material at retail or wholesale within the meaning of section 402 (k) of the act (which generally provides that price ceilings may not be imposed which deny distributors customary margins over costs). The conference substitute retains this provision of the Senate bill.

Ceilings on products processed from agricultural commodities

The House amendment included a provision amending section 402 (d) (3) of the act which would require that ceiling prices in any agricultural marketing area for products resulting from the processing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, milk, and other dairy products, reflect the cost adjustments provided for in section 402 (d) (4) and the customary distributing and selling margin or charge over costs provided for in section 402 (k) of the act. The Senate bill did not contain a provision similarly amending section 402 (d) (3) of the act.

The conference substitute retains this provision with modifications. The substitute language provides that any manufacturer or processor of an agricultural commodity has the same right to an individual adjustment of his ceiling prices under the third section of section 402 (d) (4) as does a manufacturer or processor of nonagricultural commodities. Wholesalers and retailers of processed agricultural commodities shall be afforded the same treatment under section 402 (k) as other wholesalers and retailers of materials.

The provisions of section 402 (k), in the case of distribution of processed agricultural commodities, apply on a marketing area basis in the case of a commodity like milk, which traditionally is priced on that basis. The provisions of the substitute are designed to make clear that under existing law that the provisions of section 402 (d) (4) are applicable to a processor of agricultural commodities and the provisions of section 402 (k) to wholesalers and retailers of processed agricultural commodities.

While under section 402 (d) food processors are entitled to individual adjustments, under section 402 (k) food distributors are not entitled to individual margins or charges. This provision does not change the rights accruing under either section. It is merely designed to make it clear that food processors and distributors have the same rights as other processors and distributors.

Price control and rationing

The House amendment contained a provision would would add a new paragraph (5) to section 402 (d) of the act. The new paragraph would require suspension of the price ceiling on any material as long as (1) the material is selling below the ceiling price and has so sold for a period of 3 months; or (2) the material is in adequate or surplus supply and has been so for a period of 3 months. For this purpose a material would be in adequate or surplus supply whenever it is not being allocated for civilian use, or in the case of an agricultural commodity or product processed in whole or substantial part therefrom, is not being rationed at the retail level of consumer goods for household and personal use, under title I of the act. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision and neither does the conference substitute.

Price ceilings for certain sales to ultimate users

The House amendment provided for the addition of a new paragraph (6) to section 402 (d) of the act. The new paragraph (6), effective as of the date of issuance of the General Price Ceiling Regulation, would provide that any sale of fertilizer to the ultimate user by a person who acquired it for resale would be considered a retail sale for the purpose of determining the applicable price ceiling under the General Price Ceiling Regulation. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision. The conference substitute retains this provision of the House amendment, except that it takes effect upon enactment instead of as of January 26, 1951.

Engineers, architects, accountants

The Senate bill contained a provision which would amend the exemption from wage controls in section 402 (e) (ii) of the act by adding to those compensations which are exempted the wages, salaries, and other compensation paid: to professional engineers employed in a professional capacity; to professional architects employed in a professional capacity by an architect or firm of architects engaged in the practice of that profession; and to certified public accountants licensed to practice as such, employed in a professional capacity by a certified public accountant or firm of such accountants engaged in the practice of that profession. The House amendment contained no similar provision. The conference subetitute includes this provision of the Senate bill.

Exemption of wages of publication and information enterprises

The second part of section 402 (e) (iii) of the act presently exempts from price control rates charged by any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper, periodical, or magazine, or operating a radio broadcasting or television station, a motion picture or other theater enterprise, or outdoor advertising facilities. The House amendment contained a provision which would broaden this paragraph to exempt from wage control, wages paid to employees engaged in such businesses. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference substitute does not include this provision of the House amendment.

Exemption of marine terminals and certain common carrier charges

Paragraph (v) of section 402 (e) of the act exempts rates charged by any common carrier or other public utility from price control, but in a proviso grants limited intervention rights to the President, or such agency as he may designate, in proceedings for rate increases before appropriate regulatory bodies.

The Senate bill contained a provision which would, declaratory of existing law, include rates charged by marine terminals in the exemption in section 402 (e) (v). This change would be made by exempting "rates charged by any person subject to the Shipping Act, 1916 (Public Law 260, 64th Congress), as amended." The Senate provision would also, declaratory of existing law, include in the exemption of common carrier rates and charges (a) compensation for the use by others of a common carrier's cars or other transportation equipment, charges for the use of washroom and toilet facilities in terminals and stations, charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others, charges for repairing cars or other transportation equipment owned by others, charges for the use of parking facilities operated by common carriers in connection with their common carrier operations; and (b) charges paid by common carriers for the performance of a part of their

transportation services to the public, including the use of cars or other transportation equipment owned by a person other than a common carrier, protective service against heat or cold to property transported or to be transported, and pickup and delivery and local transfer services. The Senate bill would retain the limited intervention authority of the proviso referred to in the preceding paragraph.

The House amendment contained a provision which would extend the exemption presently granted in 402 (e) (v) to include rates charged by marine terminals and would have taken away the limited authority to intervene by deleting the proviso.

The conference substitute retains the provision of the Senate bill except that (1) the statement that the exemption is declaratory of existing law has been deleted and (2) a further proviso is added to the paragraph which forbids the Office of Price Stabilization to intervene in any case involving increases in rates or charges proposed by any common carrier or other public utility except in accordance with the limited intervention right now granted in the first proviso of the paragraph. The exemptions provided for in this provision merely spells out the original intention of Congress as it is the understanding of the committee that the new matters covered in this exemption are generally subject to regulatory supervision.

Exemption of State sales

The Senate bill made provision for the addition of a new paragraph (viii) to section 402 (e) of the act. The new paragraph would exempt from price controls rates, fees, and charges for materials or services supplied directly by the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States, and their political subdivisions and municipalities, the District of Columbia, and any agency of any of the foregoing. The House amendment provided for a more limited exemption in that it ran only to sales of surplus materials made by the above enumerated governmental units. The conference substitute retains the broader provisions of the Senate bill.

Customary distributor margins

The Senate bill contained a provision which would rewrite the first sentence of section 402 (k) of the act so that it would be applicable to OPS regulations issued before as well as after that section was enacted last year.

The House amendment contained provisions which would (1) make the subsection applicable to sellers of services as well as sellers of materials, (2) make clear that the subsection is applicable to sellers whether their customary margins over costs are calculated on a percentage mark-up basis or on a dollars-and-cents basis, (3) make the subsection applicable on an individual basis only, and (4) forbid the maintenance in effect of rules, regulations, orders, or amendments thereto, whether issued before or after the enactment of the amendment, unless they meet the requirements of the subsection. This amendment of section 402 (k) would take effect 60 days after its enactment.

The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment except those contained in clauses 1 and 3 of the preceding paragraph, and the changes made by the conference amendment would take effect upon enactment instead of 60 days later. The language of the conference substitute is thus the same as the corresponding provision of H. R. 8210, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

The Office of Price Stabilization, as a matter of discretion, may use individual mark-ups in fields where they are appropriate, a practice which it now follows in many of those regulations. However, under the conference substitute, the Office of Price Stabilization is not required by law to use individual mark-ups for any seller.

State minimum prices

The Senate bill contained a provision which would add a new subsection (l) to section 402 of the act under which no price ceiling for any material could be set in any State below the minimum sales price of such material fixed "by the State law (other than any so-called 'fair trade law') or regulation now in effect." The House amendment contained a generally similar provision which, however, in place of the language included in the above quotation marks would substitute "by any State law other than any so-called fair-trade law enacted prior to July 1, 1952, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law". The conference substitute retains the provision but in place of the quoted language above substitutes "by the State law (other than any so-called 'fair trade law') now in effect, or by regulation issued pursuant to such law."

It was the intent of the conferees that this provision apply only to State minimum price laws which are presently enforced and in effect, and not to State minimum price laws which are not now enforced or which are dormant.

Meat price ceilings of affiliated hotel supply houses

The House amendment contained a provision which would add a new subsection (m) to section 402 of the act. The new subsection would not permit the imposition of meat price ceilings for any hotel supply house or combination distributor which is affiliated with a slaughterer or slaughtering establishment, lower than those accorded hotel supply houses or combination distributors not so affiliated. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision. The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment, but further provides that the subsection applies to any wholesaler affiliated with a slaughterer or slaughtering establishment, whose affiliation does not amount to an interest or equity greater than 50 percent.

Ceiling on agricultural commodities and margin controls

The Senate bill in section 110 would provide that notwithstanding any other provision of the act, whenever price ceilings are imposed on any agricultural commodity at the farm level, margin controls simultaneously would have to be imposed on processors, wholesalers, and retailers allowing them normal markups as provided in the Act but not greater than their normal margins of profit. No similar provision was contained in the House amendment. The conference substitute retains this provision of the Senate bill.

ESA duty to coordinate

The Senate bill contained a provision which would add a new subsection to section 402 of the act. This subsection would make it the express duty of the Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, to coordinate the relationship between prices and wages, and to stabilize prices and wages. The House amendment contained no similar provision. The conference substitute retains this provision of the Senate bill.

Administration of salary stabilization

The House amendment contained a provision which would amend section 403 of the Act through the addition of two new sentences. These would provide that notwithstanding the other provisions of the section, administration of salary stabilization for executive, administrative, supervisory, and professional personnel would be under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Internal Revenue under stabilization policies promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Administrator. The meaning of the above enumerated personnel classifications would be the same as defined in the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and in existing regulations under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision.

The conference substitute provides that stabilization of salaries and other compensation of persons employed as outside salesmen, in bona fide executive, administrative or professional capacities, or as supervisors shall be administered by the Salary Stabilization Board and the Office of Salary Stabilization as presently established within the Economic Stabilization Agency or any successor agency subject to the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administration.

Suspension of ceilings and reporting

The Senate bill contained a provision which would add a new section to title IV of the act. The new section would declare it to be a policy of the Congress that general control of wages and prices should be terminated as rapidly as possible consistent with the policies and purpose of the act and that pending such termination, controls over wages or prices should be suspended whenever possible, consistent with specified stabilization considerations, to avoid burdensome and unnecessary reporting and record keeping. Provision would be made to revoke any such suspension actions whenever it would be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

The House amendment also contained a provision which would add a new section to title IV of the act. The new section would provide for relief from the burden of furnishing reports or other information to the OPS with respect to sales of materials or services at prices which are below the applicable ceiling prices if the seller certifies to the President that such sales were made at such prices. Thus a simple certification would replace a substantial volume of price reporting for sales made at prices which are below ceilings. The relief from the burden of furnishing reports would not, of course, deny the right of investigation under section 705. Under this provision existing price ceilings would not be suspended and would remain in effect as a stopping point should prices of a commodity go back to the ceiling.

The conference substitute contains both of these provisions which are added as new sections 411 and 412 of the act.

Limitation on natural gas exemption

Section 704 of the act now provides that no rule, regulation, or order issued under the act which restricts the use of natural gas shall apply in any State in which a public regulatory agency has authority to restrict the use of natural gas and certifies to the President that it is exercising that authority to the extent necessary to accomplish the objectives of the act. The House amendment contained a provision which would qualify this exemption by requiring that in addition to meeting the other criteria, the public regulatory agency must make provision for natural gas for house heating to amputee veterans, other hardship cases, and totally disabled individuals. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision.

The conference substitute does not contain this provision of the House amendment. It is the opinion of the committee of conference, however, that State regulatory bodies should make appropriate provision allowing for the use of natural gas for house heating for amputee veterans, totally disabled individuals, and other hardship cases.

Competitive position of business considered in allocating materials

Section 701 (c) of the act provides in part that in allocating materials the President shall, among other things, make available for business and segments thereof a fair share of the available civilian supply based on the normal share received by such business during a representative period preceding June 24, 1950, and having due regard

to the current competitive position of established business. The House amendment contained a provision which would specify that the current competitive position of established business referred to in the subsection is the position during such representative period preceding June 24, 1950. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision, and neither does the conference substitute.

Wage Stabilization Board

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided for the addition of a new subsection (b) to section 403 of the Act under which the present Wage Stabilization Board would be abolished and replaced with a new Wage Stabilization Board created in the Economic Stabilization Agency. The new Board would be composed of members representative of the general public, labor, and business and industry. The number of members would be determined by the President and all members would be appointed by the President. Public members would be paid $15,000 per year and could not engage in other employment; other members would receive compensation for service of $50 per day plus statutory allowances for necessary travel and subsistence expenses. The President would designate the Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the public members. The Board would be under the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator and would recommend to him general policies and general regulations relating to prescribing maximum limits on wages, salaries, and other compensation. The Board upon request of interested parties would advise on interpretation and application of such policies and regulations promulgated by the Economic Stabilization Administrator.

The Senate bill and the House amendment however, contained different proposals with respect to composition of the Board, confirmation of its members, term of office of its members and duties of the Board.

Under the Senate bill the Board would be composed of an equal number of members representing the public, labor, and industry and management, while under the House amendment the number of public members would have to exceed the aggregate of labor, and business and industry members. The House amendment would have provided further that labor, and business and industry would have equal representation on the Board and that among labor members, at least one would have to be a person who is not a representative of any organization affiliated with either of the two major labor organizations.

Under the Senate bill appointment of all of the Board members would be subject to Senate confirmation while under the House amendment appointment of only the public members would have to be so confirmed.

Under the Senate bill the terms of office of the members of the Board would terminate on March 1, 1953, while under the House amendment such termination date would be June 30, 1953.

Under the Senate bill the Board, or a proportionate panel of the Board, could undertake to mediate and/or arbitrate wage, salary, and other compensation labor disputes if the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service certifies to the Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency that all remedies available to the Service have been exhausted, and (a) the parties themselves ask the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate, or (b) the President asks the Board to mediate and/or arbitrate and the parties consent. The House amendment did not provide similar limited disputes authority for the Board and in fact specifically provided that aside from its advice on and interpretative duties with respect to regulations issued by the Economic Stabilization Administrator covering wages, salaries and other compensation, the Board would have no jurisdiction with respect to any labor dispute or with respect to any issue involved therein. It was further specifically provided that labor disputes, so far as governmental action is concerned, if dealt with at all would be dealt with only in accordance with statutes which have been enacted or may be enacted by the Congress.

The conference substitute follows the provisions of the Senate bill with reference to the composition of the new Wage Stabilization Board, namely, that it would consist of an equal number of members representing the public, labor, and business and industry and Senate confirmation would be required for all members appointed to the Board. With respect to powers and duties of the Board, the conference substitute follows the provisions of the House amendment and does not grant any authority to mediate or arbitrate, and in addition the term of office of the Board members would terminate on May 1, 1953. The conference substitute further provides that after June 27, 1952, the present Wage Stabilization Board shall issue to individual cases pending before the Board prior to such date.

The conference substitute is not intended to preclude the Board from, as at present, enforcing wage stabilization regulations and policies.

Credit controls

The Senate bill continued title VI of the act which provides authorities for the control of consumer and real estate credit. The House amendment included a provision repealing title VI of the act and amending section 708 of the act so that hereafter no voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit could be approved or carried out under that section.

The conference substitute revokes the authority to impose consumer credit controls under the Defense Production Act (regulation W) and to approve or carry out any voluntary program or agreement for the control of credit. Provision is made, however, for continuing and limiting the authority of the President to exercise real estate construction credit control (regulation X and related programs in connection with Government-aided housing). Whenever, for any consecutive 3 months, the annual rate of starts of permanent, nonfarm, family dwelling units falls below 1,200,000 units, the President is to publish in the Federal Register an announcement of the beginning of a period of residential credit control relaxation. Such period shall start by the first day of the second calendar month following the three consecutive months during which the annual rate of starts has dropped below 1,200,000. During the relaxation period, credit regulations cannot require more than a 5-percent down payment on the transaction price of residential property subject to such regulations. The relaxation period may be ended by the President whenever the annual rate of starts for any three consecutive months exceeds 1,200,000. He then may impose credit controls within the limits of the authority granted him by title VI of the act, as amended, during periods which are not periods of residential credit control relaxation. The conference substitute as to title VI is prospective in nature and the procedures prescribed therein begin to operate on the effective date of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952.

Review of price and rent orders and regulations

Section 407 of the act now provides for a procedure whereby any person subject to a regulation or order relating to price controls may file a protest with the President objecting to the regulation or order. Section 408 of the act now provides for review of such regulations and orders in the Emergency Court of Appeals.

The House amendment would amend section 407 so as to make available to persons subject to regulations and orders relating to rent controls the same protest procedure now available under section 407 with respect to regulations and orders relating to price controls, and to provide for review of regulations and orders relating to rent controls by the Emergency Court of Appeals. In addition, the House amendment would rewrite section 408 of the act so as to make several changes with respect to review by the Emergency Court of Appeals of regulations and orders relating to both price controls and rent controls. The amendment would permit the Court to "grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper"; and would eliminate the existing provision forbidding the Court to issue such temporary orders. The amendment would eliminate the existing provision as to the scope of review by the Court and would provide, instead, that "the findings of the President with respect to questions of fact, if supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record shall be conclusive." The amendment also would eliminate the existing provision which stays for thirty days the effectiveness of any court order enjoining or setting aside a regulation or order.

The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision.

The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment except for the following change. In lieu of "if supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record" the conference substitute provides "if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole". This change was adopted to bring this provision into conformity with the provisions of section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In removing the provision which prohibits the court from granting temporary relief it is the intention of the committee of conference that the court grant such relief only in accordance with the applicable principles of equity, and giving due consideration to the effect which such action would have upon the stabilization objectives of the Act.

With respect to removing the existing provision which stays for 30 days the effectiveness of any order of the Court enjoining or setting aside regulations or orders, the committee of conference desires to emphasize the fact that it does not intend by this action to prevent the Court from granting such stays of its orders as it deems desirable in order that the agency may make the required changes in the affected regulations or orders in order to conform to the judgment of the Court. It is the opinion of the committee of conference that the Court should give due consideration to the granting of stays of its orders so that the agency concerned may have an opportunity to bring its regulations and orders in conformity to the judgment of the Court. The committee has full confidence that the Court will use its authority to grant stays of the effectiveness of its orders where it is necessary to give the agency time in which to correct its regulations or orders so that the objectives of this Act can be achieved.

Extension of Defense Production Act

The Senate bill contained provisions which would extend titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of the act to the close of June 30, 1953. The House amendment contained provisions which would extend all titles of the act, except title VI, to the close of June 30, 1953. Title VI would be repealed.

The conference substitute provides that titles I, II, III, VI, and VII of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of June 30, 1953; and titles IV and V of this act and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of April 30, 1953.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT

Extension of the act

The Senate bill provided for the extension of the Housing and Rent act of 1947, as amended, to February 28, 1953. The House amendment contained a provision amending section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended. The amendment would extend that act to September 30, 1952, except that the act would continue in effect until the close of March 31, 1953, (a) in any area which prior to or subsequent to September 30, 1952, is certified under section 204 (l) of the act as a critical defense housing area and (b) in any incorporated city, town, or village where rent control is in effect, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares by resolution of its local governing body or by popular referendum that a substantial shortage of housing exists requiring continuance of Federal rent control in such locality. Rent control would be continued for a like period in any unincorporated locality in a defense-rental area in which one or more of the incorporated localities, constituting the major portion of the defense rental area, retains rent control. The other provisions of section 204 (f) would be retained unchanged. Veteran preferences in the rental or purchase of new housing accommodations would be extended to June 30, 1953.

The conference substitute retains the provisions of the House amendment, except that the date April 30, 1953, is substituted for March 31, 1953, as the final termination date for rent control. Veterans preferences in the rental or purchase of new housing accommodations are likewise extended to April 30, 1953.

Recontrol in decontrolled defense-rental areas

The Senate bill contained a provision which would add a new subsection (p) to section 204 of the act. Except in the case of local option recontrol under section 204 (k), the new subsection would prevent the recontrol of rents in a previously decontrolled defense-rental area, including any community owned and operated by the Federal Government, until a public hearing, after thirty days' notice, has been held in such area. The House amendment did not contain a similar provision. The conference substitute contains the Senate provision.

Critical defense housing areas

The present law in section 204 (l) contains three criteria for the certification of a critical defense housing area. These criteria are met if specified conditions as to defense installations, in-migration, shortage of housing, and rents either exist, or are impending or threatening. The House amendment would provide that the criteria are met only if these conditions are actually in existence at the time. The Senate bill did not contain a similar provision.

The conference substitute does not contain the provisions of the House amendment.

WALSH-HEALEY ACT

Section 301 of the Senate bill amends the Walsh-Healey Act by adding thereto a new section 10.

Subsection (a) of section 10 makes the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to sections 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of the Walsh-Healey Act. Section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act now excepts matters relating to public contracts from the requirements of the Act pertaining to rule making. The effect of the amendment made by subsection (a) is to make rules (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which are promulgated by the Secretary of Labor in the administration of section 1 to 5 and 7 to 9 of the Walsh-Healey Act subject to certain minimum procedural requirements applicable to agencies generally in exercising rule making powers. Such requirements include (1) adequate notice of the proposed rule making with a clear statement of the terms or substance of the proposed rule, (2) opportunity for interested persons to participate in the proposed rule making by submission of views or arguments, and (3) the right of interested persons to petition for the issuance, amendment, or repeal of a rule. It is to be noted that compliance with the procedural requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act is not required in the case of rules promulgated under section 6 of the Walsh-Healey Act. Section 6 provides statutory authority for the Secretary of Labor to make exceptions under certain conditions with respect to contracts which would otherwise be subject to the provisions of the act.

Subsection (b) of section 10 provides that all wage determinations by the Secretary of Labor under section 1 (b) of the Walsh-Healey Act shall be made on the record after opportunity for an agency hearing. The effect of this language is to compel compliance by the Secretary of Labor with the requirements of sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act (relating to hearings and decisions) as a prerequisite to the making of a determination of the prevailing minimum wages in an industry. The full force of the procedural safeguards contained in the Administrative Procedure Act is thereby brought into play insofar as these controversial determinations are concerned. The subsection further assures the right to obtain judicial review of these determinations in the manner provided in section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act by any person adversely affected or aggrieved thereby, who shall be deemed to include any manufacturer of, or regular dealer in, materials, supplies, articles, or equipment purchased or to be purchased by the Government from any source, who is in any industry to which the wage determination is applicable. The language assuring judicial review makes it clear that the court may consider the applicability of the wage determination to any person as well as the amount arrived at by the Secretary of Labor. Any such review may be sought, however, only by a proceeding instituted within 90 days after the determination is made.

Subsection (c) of section 10 is designed to permit any Government contractor whose contract contains stipulations required by the Walsh-Healey Act to obtain a judicial determination in any appropriate proceeding of any legal question (including the applicability of the act) to the same extent as any such question could be raised if the stipulations were not contained in the contract. Without the language contained in subsection (c) there would be some doubt as to whether any Government contractor who had signed a contract containing "Walsh-Healey stipulations" could later in any legal proceeding raise questions concerning (1) the applicability of the act to his particular contract, or (2) the legality of any such stipulation. Under subsection (c) the court and not the Secretary of Labor may ultimately decide whether, in respect to any particular Government contract, the Walsh-Healey Act is being properly applied. The House amendment did not contain a similar provision. The conference substitute contains the provisions of the Senate bill.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE COMMENT

Grading and grade marking of meat and meat products

It is the understanding of the committee of conference that the proviso contained in section 101a of the conference report does not grant any additional authority not now contained in the act but rather is designed to insure continuance of existing Office of Price Stabilization grading and grade marking of meat and meat products including the necessary requirements as to related records and record keeping.

Certain technical violations

The committee of conference has received several complaints concerning the general ceiling price regulation affecting lumber distributors in southern areas with respect to which the committee believes relief must be afforded. The general ceiling price regulation was issued in January 1951 shortly after the general price freeze. The provisions of the regulation as it affected such distributors were ambiguous in many respects, and attempts were immediately made to bring this to the attention of the agency. However, a period of a year elapsed before a new regulation was issued correcting and clarifying the matters complained of. During this period it is the understanding of the committee there were some technical violations of the general ceiling price regulation of a nonwillful character. Such technical violations would not be violations of the order now in effect and but for the long period of time it took to issue the current order would probably never have occurred. It is not the intention of the committee to condone willful violations of any price regulation or order in this instance or any other. But in view of the circumstances of these cases it is the opinion of the committee that there should be no prosecution of technical violations, which were nonwillful, and which would not constitute any violation of the order currently in effect.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do this merely in order to enter my protest against this manner of handling legislation. This conference report, as I understand, was reported to the House only a few hours ago. The Members have not had an opportunity to read it. It is a conference report on a bill that took 3 days of debate in the House to complete action on, and I understand there are some radical changes between the House and Senate versions. Even though I shall not object at this time, Mr. Speaker, I do enter my protest against this method of legislating.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the report that is being brought in by the committee on conference has only two changes from the original bill, the Smith amendment and the Talle amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. There were several changes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Talle amendment is stricken out.

Mr. SPENCE. The Talle amendment is stricken out.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Cole amendment is stricken out.

Mr. SPENCE. The Cole amendment is stricken out.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Wolcott amendment is stricken out.

Mr. SPENCE. One Wolcott amendment is stricken out.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there any possibility of our having the committee print that was used when this was debated in the Senate earlier today?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that it is available.

Mr. SADLAK. If it is available I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. It is available.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not come here to praise the bill, neither do I come to bury it.

When we entered the conference we had no bill that had any substantial merit. When we came back I think we have a bill that will at least subserve the purpose for which it is enacted until its expiration. The bill as it left the House had in it the Talle amendment. The Talle amendment provided that where commodities were below ceiling for a period of 3 months they would automatically be decontrolled and they could not be recontrolled until they were in short supply. That short supply would have to be evidenced by the fact that they were rationed at the retail level or were allocated. Of course, that meant that when commodities were decontrolled they would never be recontrolled because I am sure that no President would ever again ration at the retail level or allocate commodities in general use by the public. That amendment adroitly prepared a trap for the President to accomplish his own undoing. It was thoughtfully initiated and skillfully prepared.

That amendment is out of the bill, and I think the bill as it comes back here will serve the purpose for which it was enacted. I think if we are going to have price control, wage control or rent control it is obvious that we ought to have an effective bill. I do not think this bill will be very effective, but it is a bill that will keep the machinery alive and can be used if a great emergency should come upon us. It certainly would be ill advised at this time to destroy price control and wage control and the machinery that provides for it in the light of the present conditions of world affairs and the present uncertainty of our future.

We have made some changes in the bill that are material.

The Cole amendment provided for individual adjustment of dollars and cents celling on commodities. That, we felt, could not be accomplished. It was impossible to make individual adjustments for the great number of retail dealers in the United States, and that provision was not brought back.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman explain to the committee why the conference committee disregarded the wishes of the House by not insisting on an amendment as to which there were only 43 votes cast against on the floor of the House? I am speaking of the Ramsay amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. We did not think the Ramsay amendment, notwithstanding the vote of the House, was a desirable amendment at this time, and it is not in the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. That certainly does not answer the question I asked the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. The Ramsay amendment placed a limitation upon importations that we did not think was in conformity with the interest of the United States.

There are some things that were in both bills. The request to the President to use the Taft-Hartley Act was in both bills, and that was brought back here as passed by the House. Personally I think that was a mistake to tell the President what he should do to accomplish the purposes that were solely within the province of the Executive. If the House of Representatives will persist in invading the jurisdiction of the President, what argument will it have when its own jurisdiction is invaded. This is a subversive amendment that all those who love the fundamental principles of the Constitution as I do, should oppose.

The provision with reference to rents was changed very materially from either the House or the Senate bill. The Senate bill provided that the control of rents would expire on February 28, as I remember it. The House bill provided that they would expire on June 30. The conferees reconciled those differences by providing that rent control would expire on September 30. However, there is a provision in the conference report that rent control in all areas except critical defense areas will expire on September 30, unless the local regulatory body acts affirmatively and provides that they shall continue. In other words, although rent control may continue in the defense areas, in other areas of the United States it will expire on September 30 unless there is affirmative action by the local regulatory board.

I know this will not meet the approval of some of our colleagues who felt that we ought to have a strong rent-control law, but if you do not agree to the provisions of the conference report you will have no rent-control law.

Of course, it is a matter of compromise. We had to give in order to get something.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman says that we had to give in order to get. Will the gentleman tell us what we got?

Mr. SPENCE. We had a bill that was in extremes, and we took the Talle amendment out which gave it the right to live.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. You gave that. What did we receive here?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman told us what we lost in the House after our 4 days of labor. Would the chairman be kind enough to tell the Members what the Senate lost in the deal? Except for the title and the number, I do not know what the House got out of it. We did salvage the title and the number, thank God for that.

Mr. SPENCE. The Senate did not lose anything, I think, because for myself I think the Senate had a better bill than the House; and when we acceded to their provisions it was of benefit to all our people. That is my objective. I think it would have been a very ill-advised thing to destroy rent control, wage control, and price control at this time, and destroy the machinery of control that was provided.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What did you do in regard to the Wage Stabilization Board? Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. SPENCE. Under the conference report the Wage Stabilization Board is a tripartite board that merely formulates policy and has no authority to settle labor disputes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I mean, what did the conferees do in regard to that? Did they follow the wishes of the House?

Mr. SPENCE. They compromised the Lucas amendment with the Ives amendment. We have some of the provisions of the Lucas amendment in there and some of the provisions of the Ives amendment. They compromised on that and made it a tripartite board, with the three, management, labor, and the public, equally represented.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understood the gentleman from Kentucky correctly, while he is not apparently altogether satisfied with this bill, he does say that in his opinion it will subserve the purposes for which it is being enacted. I take it he means by that that a reasonable effort can be made to stabilize prices and wages. All I want to do at

this point is express the hope that as the months to come roll along there will not be such manipulation and a charge levied against the Congress as to seek to indict the majority of the Congress for the enactment of this bill, for some supposed political advantage.

Mr. SPENCE. I join in that hope, that those who voted for this bill will not be indicted, because I think it is a meritorious bill.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is it a fact that because of a matter of expediency and due to limitations of time the conferees accepted amendments which they were not convinced represented the views of the House, and that had they taken more time we might have come out with a few more of the amendments that were adopted in the House?

Mr. SPENCE. No; I think not. I do not think the limitation of time had much to do with it. We did the best we could. We had time enough to consider it. We considered it almost all of one night, and if we had considered it another night, I do not know whether we could have done any better.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Suggestions have been made that a motion to recommit might be made in connection with the conference report to correct certain things which, some might think, are not quite right. As I understand it, and I address this as a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is a motion to recommit in order?

The SPEAKER. It is not in order. The other body has already adopted the conference report, and a motion to recommit would not lie.

Mr. HALLECK. In other words, the only vote possible is for or against the conference report as it has been reported to us?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that I voted against this bill. Then I had the honor of being appointed a manager on the part of the House. I want to make my own position clear. I felt, as did others on the conference committee, that having been appointed a manager on the part of the House, we were morally bound to subordinate our own thinking to the will of the House expressed in the roll-call vote. The House expressed its will, not overwhelmingly but with a good majority that they wanted those controls continued. Therefore, it became the obligation of the managers on the part of the House to do the very best they could in the conference to save as much of the House bill as they possibly could. That was what prompted at least some of us in the conference.

In the time allotted, there will not be time to take up each and every one of these amendments. Let me say to you, however, that of the 20 amendments, and this I say in answer to some of the criticism that the House conferees yielded everything to the other body—that on this page which I hold in my hand containing 20 amendments which were in the House bill, and which were not in the Senate bill, the House got 17 of the 20. And I heard someone say that they were the easy ones, but if you think they were easy, you should have been there at 1 o'clock this morning.

Among those amendments were these:

Slaughtering quotas in respect to slaughtering: The language of the House prevailed.

Loans to manufacturers of newsprint: The language of the House prevailed.

Limitation on wage-ceiling actions: The House language prevailed.

Milk ceilings and prices established by State regulatory bodies: The language of the House prevailed.

Parity: The language of the House prevailed.

Fertilizer: The House language prevailed with a minor amendment, and I repeat, it is a minor amendment.

Exemption of bowling alleys.

Exemption of agricultural labor: The House language prevailed.

Meat price ceilings on Federal hotel supply houses: You have had a lot of correspondence on that.

Exemption of small employees.

Administration of salary stabilization: The House position clarified in a manner satisfactory to everyone.

Competitive position of business considered in allocating materials: We lost that later on.

Joint Committee on Defense Profit.

Stabilization of interstate milk markets.

Defense area advisory committee Government supply housing.

Now, with respect to the seven Senate amendments which were not in the House bill, we took the exemption for engineers, architects, and accountants.

We struck out the Senate language in respect to profit plans.

We took the very strong Senate language which had to do with the recontrol in defense rental areas, which was not in the House bill.

While I mention that, let me review what was done with respect to these rental areas. The law as it appears in the conference report states that rent controls will expire on September 30, 1952, in all areas outside the critical defense areas unless the local governing bodies take affirmative action to continue. That is one step more toward local autonomy in rent control. We compromised on the date in respect to the termination of titles 4 and 5, making it April 30, 1953. The House provided June 30, 1953.

We kept in the conference report the elimination of regulation W.

We compromised the elimination of regulation X, and provided that regulation X should not apply unless and until the starts of houses were at the rate of 1,250,000 a year. We at least made a very long step toward the elimination of regulation X.

We kept in the bill, against valiant battles I can assure you on the part of the Senate conferees, section 104 of the bill in respect to the importation of fats and oils. The only concession we made, that we had to make to get anything in there, was to raise the 10 percent to 15 percent. I thought it was rather a good bargain to make.

In respect to the Wage Stabilization Board, we took all of the language of the Lucas amendment passed by this House, with the exception of the constitution of the Board. We took the Ives amendment, a tripartite board. All the rest of the language is contained in the Lucas amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be pointed out that it is a tripartite board as the Lucas amendment provided in the House, but the language finally contained is for an equal division between public, labor, and industry. However, it is provided that all members of the new board shall be confirmed by the Senate. I think the gentleman might also point out that the conference abolishes the present board and in addition contains language in effect limiting them in the issuance of orders as of midnight last night.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That was one of the concessions we insisted upon before we agreed to take the Senate language in relation to the constitution of the Board.

As I pointed out, the slaughtering of livestock by species, the House language is left in the bill.

The milk amendment, sponsored by Mr. TALLE, applies the Capehart and Herlong amendments to the processing and distribution of milk.

In respect to the action which we were forced to take if we were to have any bill at all to deal with the other so-called Talle amendment with respect to the suspension of ceilings and reporting, I would like to call attention to what is left in the bill in that particular.

In the first place there is a very strong declaration of policy with certain standards in the Senate bill which were not in the House bill which establishes as a matter of policy that price control should be terminated as rapidly as possible taking into consideration the availability of goods and services, so that we have many of the standards which were in the House language contained in that Senate language which is in the bill.

One of the most important, if not the most important from the standpoint of those of us who were desirous that we get rid of these bothersome reporting regulations, was the House language, and the House language stayed in the bill that where a commodity is selling at any point below ceiling, on the certification of the processor or distributor on the retailer they do not after that certification have to file any reports with OPS until the prices get back to ceilings.

We yielded on the so-called Cole amendment to the Herlong amendment. If you will recall, that provided that there be individual adjustments; it also covered services, but it also took out the word "hereafter," so that it applies from the beginning of the operation of the act.

In consequence, the Herlong amendment against all of the opposition to it, against the tremendous pressure which has been brought to bear in this Congress during the last few months, is contained intact and in better form.

We can thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] for enabling us to be put in a bargaining position where we could at least keep the Herlong amendment in the law; and we can thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] for his amendment, because it was only through that amendment that we were able to keep these provisions in here in respect to not having to report when the prices were below ceilings.

In respect to the recontrol of decontrolled defense rental areas, there is additional language in the Senate bill which we accepted, and I hope there will be no criticism for our accepting it. It provides that in these decontrolled areas before there can be recontrol there must be public notice and public hearing.

So I think you should be very satisfied with the action of the conferees with reference to rent controls, decontrols, and the machinery which is set up for recontrol of rents. It will be recalled that an amendment in the House provided for the review of orders and regulations of the OPS in the same manner that orders and regulations of other governmental agencies were reviewed, excepting that the Emergency Court of Appeals was substituted for the circuit court of appeals. We not only were able to keep that language in the bill but we broadened it to the point where that review will cover rent-control regulations and orders.

We did not do so badly in conference. The more I think about it the more I come to the conclusion that we saved the best portions of the bill. There is the Talle amendment in respect to reporting and the Cole amendment in respect to individual action. It is my understanding most of the adjustments made under the Herlong amendment are on an individual basis anyway.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman says that on the strategic material amendments you accepted the Senate language. The language in the bill is considerably changed from what it was when it left the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not understand what amendment the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. DURHAM. I refer to the Sadlak amendment. It is on page 2, subsection (b). In connection with the language the gentleman mentioned, so far as the International Materials Conference is concerned, does the gentleman think that that language authorizes this International Materials Conference currently?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. DURHAM. It does not?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The termination date of the act controls. We took the first sentence of the Sadlak amendment, we took the last sentence of the Fulbright amendment in the Senate and the language in-between them is the language which we agreed upon ourselves and if there had not been this compromise in respect to authority on the part of the users of these materials in the United States to purchase from foreign countries upon notice of foreign countries they did not intend to use their allocation, I may say to the House there would have been nothing in the bill in this respect. The Senate was very adamant about that situation.

Mr. DURHAM. Was there any discussion? I feel like the language completely bypasses and prevents us from stockpiling critical materials.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that he is mistaken.

Mr. DURHAM. Will the gentleman read the language?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have read it over thoroughly.

Mr. DURHAM. If he will read the language, he will find it states:

> When all requirements for the national security, for the stockpiling of critical and strategic materials, and for military assistance to any foreign nation authorized by any act of Congress have been met through allocations and priorities.

And so forth.

We have the allocation priority under this amendment which they can bypass in this country entirely.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; the stockpiling may continue as a part of the national security program.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will be gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to the Talle amendment as relating to milk. Does not the same amendment take in all agricultural products, including livestock and milk, whether in their raw, natural, or processed state, from point of production to point of distribution at the retail level?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I should not have confined my statement to milk, but we talked so much about milk that I referred to it specifically.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to refer again to the Sadlak amendment which has to do with the operations of the International Materials Conference. I think the decisive vote in the House indicated clearly that we wanted to do away with that organization. It is operating clear outside of the authority of the law. The gentleman has said that he does not think this language legalizes the operation. I wish I could be as sure about the language, but I simply want to say at this point—and I sympathize with the gentleman's position—that he probably was put in such shape, as a minority member, that he could not retain the provisions that the House voted. But as far as I am concerned, I do not want anybody interpreting a vote for this conference report as putting the stamp of legality on the operation of the International Materials Conference. As a matter of fact, there is a prohibition in an appropriation bill now in conference against the State Department using any money appropriated for it to carry on this operation. I hope that provision in the appropriation bill will be maintained even though here, apparently, we have no opportunity to correct what I think has been a mistake with reference to this conference report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It probably was a mistake, but I can say to the gentleman that we could not under any possibility have gotten the Ferguson amendment. We did have an opportunity in substitution of that to get the Sadlak language with respect to policy. We got that. If it had not been for this compromise, we would have had nothing in the bill either in the Senate or the House by the elimination from the Senate bill and the House bill of these series of amendments; you would by that action, under the decisions of the courts, have put your stamp of approval on IMC. This language will have to recognize the existence of the IMC, but in recognizing it we give assurance that that share of the world's materials which is allocated to the United States will likely find its way into the United States. It has been recognized during this last year that the reason why users in the United States have not been able to get their allocations under IMC is because of price control. Mr. Fleischmann recognized that in insisting that price controls come off copper which was imported, so that we have this whole program that we have to consider in the light of this. Now this does make it possible for negotiations with these other countries which have been allocated materials which we need here, if we are to become, under the policy of the administration anyway, if not this Congress, the arsenal of the world, to get the materials with which to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will recall, I am certain, that the House adopted unanimously after members of the committee on both sides of the aisle had given their approval to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri which would have the effect of eliminating wage controls as they presently apply to the newspaper and publishing business, radio and television, motion picture and other theater enterprises, as well as to outdoor-advertising facilities which are not regulated with respect to the prices they charge for their product or services.

In talking with various members of the board of managers on the part of the House, I gained the impression that when the conferees of the other body indicated that they could not go along with that amendment, giving as their reasons the fact that it included a rather large group of incidental employees which might lead to confusion and offer an opportunity for the pirating of skilled

labor, that no suggestion was made to modify the provision of that amendment.

Frankly, as indicated in my earlier question directed to the chairman of our committee, I feel that this is one instance where a more deliberative conference might have been the means of arriving at a more satisfactory agreement and would have carried out the thinking of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee as expressed by the chairman at the time of its adoption when he said, in approving this amendment, "when there is no price control, there should be no wage control."

While, of course, I do not want to do anything which would cause the Defense Production Act to be suspended pending the final passage of this bill, it is with a great deal of reluctance that I shall vote to adopt this conference report, believing, as I do, that a few more hours of deliberation would undoubtedly result in some sort of a compromise on the amendment to which this discussion has been directed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Pardon me. I might say that the Senate was very unyielding on that, and they were unyielding for the reason if we left that language in here—apparently it could not be doctored up, and they could not find the language to doctor it up—I hoped they would—electricians, carpenters, painters engaged in newspaper printing plants, television studios, radio studios, would have been eliminated. They would not have been under control, but every other carpenter, painter, and electrician in the United States would have been.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, the conference committee has brought in a compromise proposal which is a little better than the decontrol bill, H. R. 8210, which passed the House last Thursday, June 26. The bill as it passed the House junked the controls program almost in toto, and would have caused living costs to soar although such costs are now near a record high. I opposed that decontrol bill. Just because we have successfully held inflation in check to some extent for the past year does not mean that we can safely abandon controls now, especially when we know defense expenditures are due to increase in the coming months. Surely we cannot conscientiously subject the people of the United States to the risks involved in rampant inflation.

The bill recommended by the conferees is certainly not a good bill. It contains many bad provisions. But either we approve this conference report or drop all controls. Under the circumstances I feel compelled to vote for the report but I do so with misgivings. The bill which passed on the 26th contained the Talle amendment. This would have decontrolled almost everything, except wages. Certainly this was most unfair. The conference committee did at least delete the Talle amendment. In this respect the present proposal is better than the House version.

I wish we could unselfishly buckle down to the task with which we as a Nation find ourselves confronted. The current mad selfish scramble for special privilege and "profits as usual" causes one to be amazed at the lack of concern on the part of some for the welfare of our Nation. Are the war profiteers unwilling to make any sacrifices at all while American boys are on the battlefield protecting them from Communist aggression? Is this fight against communism to be a bonanza for some, and terror and death only for the young men in uniform? If our great Nation fails, and the lights of liberty go out, it will be inner weakness caused by selfishness that brings on the catastrophe. If we will only stand unselfishly together, the Communist aggressor can be defeated. Our forefathers pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to the task of founding this Nation. Some of our privilege seekers seem willing to pledge only other peoples lives. This bill certainly calls for no sacrifices although some are needed. It is not the kind of legislation we should be enacting at this time. Of course, controls are obnoxious. But so is serving in the battle line. When we are again secure and our soldiers are home, we can take all controls off. While our young men are fighting fanatic Communist aggressors on foreign battlefields, we surely are called upon to restrain unbridled selfishness and control war profiteering. I hope the atmosphere in this Capitol will be more conducive to sound legislation during the sessions of the next Congress. This so-called control bill is not good legislation. I am sorry to have to support it in order to maintain even a semblance of control of inflation. Further price increases would jeopardize our entire defense effort. We must be fair to everyone but we cannot afford to be reckless with the welfare of the American people. The House bill was reckless. This conference proposal is an improvement but it is still not a good bill. I support it reluctantly.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House is today acting upon the conference report on the Defense Production Act which provides for an extension of wage and price controls for an additional 10 months.

Although many controls have been eliminated and others relaxed, this measure does provide legislation which can be used to control inflation, if the administration properly administers the act.

During the consideration of this bill, I received many telegrams and letters from retail organizations, unions and small retailers, advocating a discontinuance of all wage and price controls.

I also received many letters and telegrams from housewives, urging an extension of wage and price controls.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to all the arguments pro and con, I voted for and supported an extension of wage and price controls. I did this reluctantly, because I believe in the system of supply and demand and I am opposed in principle to all forms of oppressive controls.

In addition, there is much evidence that wage and price controls are not needed today because most consumer items are priced below established ceilings, and the white-collar worker and some labor groups are being squeezed and discriminated against by the wage-freeze policies of this administration.

Also, there is much evidence that this administration has used their control powers for the benefit of special groups; and, too, there is much evidence that they are more interested at this time in keeping on the payroll the 17,000 employees involved than in controlling inflation.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding this, I am fearful that if all controls were removed at this time that the billions of dollars of Government money which will flow into our productive system within the next 6 months in the defense building would cause such pressures as to bring about a further inflationary spiral, which would cost the taxpayers addition billions of dollars and could prove disastrous to our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this administration will take cognizance of the expression of the House and effectuate an immediate decontrol of all materials and goods selling below ceiling and not in short supply.

It is hoped, too, that they will take a realistic attitude with respect to permitting wage increases to correspond with the increased cost of living which does not materially contribute to further inflation.

In my view, the threat of a major national emergency makes necessary the continuance of this program until world tensions ease and the threat lessens, then these controls should be eliminated immediately.

THE FIFTH FREEDOM

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times, much is said about maintaining freedom at home and abroad. I have never known of any responsible American who argued against freedom in the abstract, or opposed it openly on principle.

However, many of our citizens, either unknowingly, or because of their socialistic leanings, or self interest, strive to curtail the very liberties they claim to revere and protect.

They do this in a number of ways. Sometimes it is under the claim of protecting minority groups, sometimes under the excuse of expediency due to national emergencies, or again, because of the altruistic aim of a particular program.

No matter how the loss of freedom may be disguised or sugar-coated it should be borne in mind that, in the long run, the loss is more serious than any advantage that can be temporarily achieved for any group or cause.

Everyone gives lip service to the "four freedoms." Nevertheless, I submit that there is a fifth freedom, without which the others would soon become valueless. That is the freedom to work.

Work is the basis for all advancement. Without work, there can be no production on which an individual, social, or a national economy can be based. Every unnecessary control, regulation, or use

of power, that hampers the freedom of an individual or an industry, inevitably restricts free enterprise. Such restrictions should be used with caution and restraint, and never, except to improve instead of retard over-all production of the goods and services that contribute to the general welfare or safety. Whenever the freedom of the individual to work in the field of his choice is hampered, both he and the general public suffer.

If, as under the communistic, and often in the socialistic state, this freedom is denied the ordinary citizen, the other freedoms usually are lost along with it.

Whenever an all-powerful government, be it administered by a dictator or by bureaucrats, can control the jobs available to the ordinary citizen, can tell him when, where, and how he can or cannot be employed, his independence is lost. No longer is he a free agent. He is immediately an economic prisoner. His very bread and butter and that of his dependents are subject to the whim of some governmental agent. He certainly is not free of fear; he cannot speak his mind without the danger of losing his job. He is free from want only if the government so wills it and he is willing to conform. His religious activities, if contrary to the dictates of his masters, must be hidden or restrained.

Without freedom to work, the whole castle of freedom will tumble.

This right to work in the trade or profession of one's choice, to work when and where one pleases, has been so fundamental in our national life that most Americans have taken it for granted.

Whenever business is overtaxed, hampered by red tape and confused by bureaucratic interference, there is inevitably a decreasing opportunity for free employment. That is one of the most serious objections to Government controls, and why we should do away with them except in urgent wartime crises.

If the doctrine of those who believe in implied powers is permitted to prevail and the Executive can seize industry, this power, if recognized, can be used to reduce wages just as rightfully as to increase them. The laborer in any industry automatically loses thereby his freedom to work along with his freedom to strike. He may be lured into approving as long as a wage raise is in prospect, but once established, this system could be put in reverse and his wages cut without bargaining, collective or otherwise. Then, indeed, we would have a slave-labor situation.

The value of collective bargaining, of unions and organizations of workers, cannot be denied, but if joining any organization becomes mandatory before one can get a job, certainly freedom to work is immediately limited.

Even where government does not control the citizen's right to work, if he is subject to the will of a few powerful individuals, be they industrialists or labor bosses, freedom to work ceases to be a reality. We have laws preventing combinations in restraint of trade; we should prevent combinations in restraint of employment. We should also resist controls that hamper business and limit employment.

Mr. Speaker, let us scrutinize this and all legislation, before it is approved by this body, to make sure that it does not undermine this fifth freedom. If we fail to preserve it, our great Republic will no longer be the "land of the free." I cannot support this conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we must consider this bill in the light of the circumstances under which this bill passed the House of Representatives. The bill as it passed the House would have left price control a hollow shell. However, it was important for the bill to pass the House of Representatives in order to permit the conference committee to consider the differences between the two branches, and that those differences be ironed out. Therefore, in the light of the whole situation, the conferees did a very good job. While the bill is not as strong as I would like to see it, and as many of the Members of the Congress would like to see it, nevertheless, it will at least offer the consumer some protection against the inflationary pressures. The conference report offers the best bill we can get under circumstances at this time.

While it is a weak bill it is better than having no controls at all. It will enable the Office of Price Stabilization during the next 10 months to stabilize to some extent the cost of living. I believe that there are sufficient powers in the bill to prevent run-away inflation and skyrocketing prices. It would be very harmful to permit price control legislation to expire on June 30. The passage of this bill will prevent that. In my opinion this bill, while not complete insurance against inflation, serves as a brake against the further impact of inflation. Having in mind the meaningless provisions of the bill as it passed the House, and while it is not as strong as I would make the bill, I believe the conference report is probably the best bill that could come out of the conference committee.

My remarks are confined to the price-control features of the bill. With reference to the Taft-Hartley features, and the wage-stabilization features involved, may I say, I voted against both of these amendments when the bill was being considered in the House of Representatives, and I am still opposed to them.

This bill assures the continuance of rent controls although the formula for communities having rent control is changed in some respects. I urge all communities throughout the country who desire the continuance of rent control to urge their local authorities and officials to take affirmative action which will comply with the provisions of this report when it is enacted into law.

It is extremely regrettable that the bill exempts canned and frozen, as well as fresh fruits and vegetables from price control. These items alone account for over 11 cents of the consumers' food dollar. The exemption leaves the housewife helpless against future price rises in this vital area.

The Talle meat amendment section 101 is another weakening provision. This amendment further hamstrings the authority of the Director of Price Stabilization effectively to control meat prices particularly when supplies are tight or inadequate. I think that when it comes to meat prices, it is of crucial importance that the authority of the Price Administrator should not be cut down, it should be increased.

The Talle amendment places restrictions on the OPS to allocate meat unless there is a finding by the Secretary of Agriculture of an over-all shortage. However, it is clear that this restriction in no way affects the present OPA grade-marking program. In fact the proviso clause of section 101 provides express statutory authorization for that program as well as the necessary reporting and record-keeping requirements which are a necessary part of that program.

The next Talle amendment—section 106 (b)—makes specific the legislative intent that any individual processor of an agricultural commodity may obtain an adjustment of his ceiling price in accordance with the third sentence of the Capehart amendment. Moreover, the Talle amendment insures that food distributors are provided the full benefits of the Herlong amendment on the same basis as distributors of all other commodities. The Herlong amendment as originally enacted last year, was, I think, clearly applicable to food distributors. I therefore have no objection to this further particularization of legislative intent. In brief, this entire Talle amendment, as has been explained by my good friend, Mr. WOLCOTT, serves only to clarify the congressional intent underlying passage of the Capehart and Herlong amendments last year. The Talle amendment does not, of course, provide individual margins for food sellers. This would have been the result had the Cole amendment which was adopted by the House, been accepted by the conference committee. Instead the conference committee by rejecting the Cole amendment makes it perfectly clear that food distributors like all other distributors may be covered by industry-wide margins, if OPS so decides.

Rejection of the Cole amendment means that standard food mark-ups and dollars and cents meat ceilings may be maintained unless the sellers in the particular trade can demonstrate to OPS that they are entitled, on the basis of their pre-Korean records, to higher margins. This is the effect of section 110 of the bill, which changes existing law by providing all distributors, whether covered by regulations issued prior to, or after July 31, 1951, with the right to obtain Herlong margins. Since the burden of demonstrating these changes will be on the sellers involved, OPS administrative operations will not break down.

Section 111 of the bill allows sellers subject to State minimum laws in effect and enforced on the date this bill is adopted to obtain an adjustment of their ceiling prices to the State minimum levels in the event ceilings are presently below those levels.

Another amendment, section 111 (m), has the principal purpose of clarifying

some vagueness in an Emergency Court of Appeals opinion which held that OPS could not establish different mark-ups for combination distributors and hotel-supply houses based on affiliation with slaughtering establishments. The amendment requires the same ceiling prices for affiliated and nonaffiliated combination distributors and hotel-supply houses. Another provision of the amendment prohibits different ceilings for independent meat wholesalers and for meat wholesalers whose affiliation in the slaughtering establishment does not amount to an interest or equity of more than 50 percent.

A significant change, and one which strengthens the act is section 107. This provision overrules the decision of the Emergency Court of Appeals in the Safeway case. In that case the court held that food retailers could get Capehart adjustments. This result was wholly unintended by the Congress but one which was arrived at because of the wording of the Capehart provision. Under the present amendment all distributors of commodities are given the benefits of the Herlong amendment but not of the Capehart amendment. In brief the Capehart amendment by this clarifying amendment is specifically inapplicable to wholesalers and retailers of any commodity including food. Furthermore by virtue of this new amendment the appeal in the Safeway case which is now pending in the Supreme Court has become moot.

The House bill changed in certain respects, section 408 of the act, which deals with the procedure to be followed by the Emergency Court of Appeals in reviewing price regulations and orders issued under title IV. The most significant of the changes were, first, to provide that regulations must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence on the record; second, to authorize the Emergency Court of Appeals to issue temporary restraining orders and other interim relief; and third, to permit the court to make its judgments effective at any time. The Senate bill made no changes in section 408.

The purpose of expressly requiring that price regulations be supported by adequate evidence was to subject OPS to the same standard of judicial review as agencies governed by the Administrative Procedure Act. However, since the term "preponderance of the evidence" might be construed as going beyond this, the conferees informed me that they agreed to substitute the term "substantial evidence." This is the same standard as that contained in section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act. The normal presumption of validity of administrative action upon appeal to the courts is maintained.

At the present time, section 408 expressly prohibits the Emergency Court of Appeals from issuing temporary restraining orders under any circumstances. The House bill eliminates that prohibition. The conferees, I am informed, agreed to this change with the understanding that this change in the act is not designed to encourage interim relief in the normal case but rather is intended to provide the court with discretion to enter such orders. The issuance of such an injunction will, of course, be subject to conventional principles of equity jurisdiction. In view of the crucial importance of maintaining effective price control at all times during an emergency period, it is contemplated that the application of conventional equity principles will preclude the issuance of temporary injunctions except in the most unusual cases. The court may, of course, postpone the effectiveness of the temporary injunction to permit amendment of the challenged regulation so that there will be no hiatus in price control.

The House bill also contained a related provision which would eliminate the present provision postponing the effective date of judgments of the Emergency Court of Appeals. The present act provides the agency with a 30-day period to adjust its regulations to decisions of the court. The elimination of this provision is not designed to create an automatic hiatus in the price-control program governing any industry. Rather it is intended to provide the Emergency Court of Appeals with greater flexibility to determine the effective dates of its judgment so that it may establish stay periods shorter or longer than 30 days depending on the facts of the particular case. The conference bill which we are now considering permits the court to employ its discretion to meet the factual situation without in any way detracting from the principle that price control must be continuous.

The question of stays in cases where a petition for certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court is also left to judicial discretion. The former law provided for an automatic stay.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, while I voted for extension of the Defense Production Act, I am under no illusion that it is a perfect bill. It deliberately weakens price, wage, and rent controls by a series of exemptions. In addition, many of its provisions are ambiguous and will be difficult to administer.

Take the amendment relating to the Wage Stabilization Board. There is a lot of language concerning both the wage stabilization and disputes functions of the Board, but there are no really clear answers as to how the Board should proceed, at least in dispute cases. Perhaps this ambiguity was deliberate, so that whatever the new Board does it can be criticized as fiercely and as automatically as the old Board.

On wage stabilization, Congressman Lucas himself made clear that the present wage regulations are to be continued. This indicates to me that the new Board is supposed to operate in about the same way the old Board operated. All the language about formulating policies, and advising parties as to the interpretation and application of wage regulations and policies, and the definition and stabilization as prescribing maximum limits thereon, are just roundabout methods of saying that the Board is to proceed under the same authority and policies which it now has to issue interpretations and pass upon petitions for approval of wage adjustments, in the same way as it is now doing. Perhaps the Board can no longer formally issue the wage regulations, but since the Board now submits its policies to the Administrator for approval, this effectuates no change. I wish we could have simply said what we meant, that all the functions of the Board are continued on a statutory basis.

So far as disputes are concerned, the proponents of the amendment talked about divesting the Board of its dispute authority, at least over such issues as the union shop. I have no idea whether the involved language of the act does eliminate the Board's authority to take any action with respect to such issues. On the face of the act there is an exception to the removal of jurisdiction in dispute cases, an exception which permits the interpretation and application of wage regulations in dispute cases as well as in voluntary cases. Whatever the Board advises a party is an appropriate amount of wage increase under the wage regulations in any particular case will undoubtedly be used by one or the other of the parties as an official statement of the Government's position as to the figure which should serve as the basis for negotiations. In practical effect, a union might take the position that what the Wage Stabilization Board advises as the amount which should be paid, in applying stabilization policies and regulations to the facts of the particular case, is what they will insist upon for settlement. It would be highly inflationary if the Board were to interpret this act as requiring it to advise parties only as to the maximum which might be paid under all the regulations and policies, even though the parties were not interested in availing themselves of a particular type of adjustment like a fringe benefit. I hope that the Board does not adopt this view which would flout the very purpose of the act.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, after extensive hearings and prolonged debates, the Congress has extended the Defense Production Act. It appeared for some time that controls would be effectively sabotaged by weakening amendments to the act.

It is to the everlasting credit of the able and diligent conference committee that any semblance of effective price and wage stabilization is contained in the final action of the Congress. The conferees refused to be steamrollered by the "decontrol" bill which the House sent to conference. They refused to abandon completely the interests of consumers who feel keenly the pinch of the high cost of living.

I supported the extension of the Defense Production Act in its final form because it was my honest belief that no stronger bill could be obtained. This act will inevitably result in rising prices in consumer goods and in materials purchased by the Government for the defense program. On the theory that a half a loaf is better than none, I reluctantly supported this measure in the hope that the rise in prices would be at least somewhat curtailed by our action.

The removal from price control of fresh and processed fruits and vege-

tables was, in my opinion, a mistake of the utmost gravity. These items alone make up about 7 percent of the cost of living. Any increase in their price will be reflected immediately in the housewife's already hard-pressed budget.

The amendments to the Housing and Rent Act make possible the removal of rent ceilings in most communities throughout the country. Unless affirmative action is taken by local bodies, rent may be expected to rise very sharply. Rent alone makes up about 12 percent of the cost of living for the average consumer. I am hopeful that local bodies will assume the responsibility of acting, and acting promptly, to prevent this unnecessary inflation. I am well aware of the fact that local governmental units are quite as concerned with the problems of inflation as is the Congress. But I am also aware that the pressures brought to bear upon the local bodies by the real-estate lobbies will be nearly irresistible in many cases. In areas where there is a shortage of housing, consumers must make their influence felt with their local legislative groups in order to avert the effects of this potentially devastating amendment.

The fresh and processed fruits and vegetables exemption is not the only blow struck at the food-price program of the Office of Price Stabilization. The removal of the word "hereafter" from the Herlong amendment will require OPS to increase many food prices at the retail and wholesale level. Other prices may likewise be expected to rise because of the new requirement that ceiling prices shall not be below the minimum prices prescribed by State law.

I repeat that I supported this measure with considerable reluctance. I sincerely hope that my misgivings about the future of the stabilization program are ill-founded. But the realities of the situation compel me to believe otherwise. The cost of living is nearing an all-time high, but the legislation to deal with the problem is nearing an all-time low.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the extension of the Defense Production Act most reluctantly. I do not think that it was a good bill, but I think it is better than having no controls at all. The rent-control provisions, for example, are, in my judgment, very weak. I also think that some of the price-control features, particularly the one relating to processed fruits and vegetables, is bad.

The amendments affecting the wage-stabilization program are likewise far from perfect. I do think that we were very wise in retaining the equally tripartite structure of the Wage Stabilization Board and, of course, the various regional boards. I also think it was desirable to have codified the existing practice under which the Economic Stabilization Administrator supervises, in a general way, the wage-stabilization program and coordinates wage controls with price controls. So far as other aspects of the wage-stabilization program are concerned—for example, developing policy on a case-by-case basis or handling individual cases where there are hardships, inequities, or other special circumstances present—I do not think that the amendments make any changes.

What really disturbs me is the section on the dispute functions of the new Board. By taking away Board jurisdiction over the union-shop issue, we have crippled the Board in carrying out its function in helping to settle labor disputes in important defense industries. If experience is worth anything, it shows that there is no way to settle a labor dispute unless all the issues in that dispute are settled. If, for example, there are 10 issues involved in a particular case and one of them is the union-shop issue, we cannot expect that the settlement of the other 9 issues will prevent a strike or get the men back to work if a strike is already in existence.

I also think that the provisions inserted by the conferees, which precludes the Board from issuing general stabilization regulations after June 27, is a mistake. While this provision apparently would not prevent the Board from handling individual cases which come in after that date, it would prevent the Board from dealing with over-all problems like productivity—except as to cases pending on the 27th—which the Board has been carefully considering for many months. I just do not see the point in preventing the old Board from continuing to formulate general regulations, especially when the new Board would be free to change such regulations if it so desired. After all, the new Board under the supervision of the Administrator will be free to change existing stabilization regulations if and when it should decide that this is desirable; I see no reason for treating new regulations issued by the present Board any differently.

I also think that it was a mistake to add so many exemptions from wage controls to the act. Some of these may have been justified but others, for example, a blanket exemption for agricultural labor, were not. While the wages of some people working for farmers, on farms, in such operations as harvesting, might be exempted from controls, it makes no sense to exempt all of such employees. It would be far better to have permitted the President, as we did in the small-business exemption, to make exceptions to the exemption.

While I am in complete sympathy with the purposes that lay behind the provisions exempting wage rates of $1 an hour or less, I do think that we should also have approved an exemption for fringe benefits and other compensation for such employees.

I am and was opposed to the engineer exemption. No case was made out in favor of them. It should not have been enacted.

The provision giving a statutory basis to the Salary Stabilization Board is better than the one originally passed by the House, although it is somewhat ambiguous. The amendment gives the Salary Board and the Office of Salary Stabilization jurisdiction over the categories of employees listed in the new subsection 3 of section 403, except where such employees are "represented in their relationships or eligible to be so represented with their employer by duly certified or recognized labor organizations." This exception would cover employees who are actually represented by, but not necessarily members of, a certified or recognized labor union. It would also cover cases where there is a union in existence in which the employees are eligible for membership. Such a union, of course, would have to be one which either could be certified under the National Labor Relations Act, or a similar State statute, or could be recognized by the employer.

The fact that a duly recognized union could not seek the benefits of such a statute would not make any difference, so long as the employer's recognition of the union was legal. The fact that this amendment would leave the Salary Board with very little jurisdiction may be due to the haste with which the amendment was drafted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that all of us can find things in this bill that we are displeased with and much that is not in the bill to be displeased about, I think we owe a sincere vote of thanks to each of the conferees, who did a tremendously good job under most arduous and trying circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, I asked for this minute in order to ask the chairman to explain the addition of some language on page 10 to section 111. My question to the chairman of the committee is, Is it not intended that the language beginning on line 21, "or to any wholesaler so affiliated but whose affiliation does not amount to an interest or equity of more than 50 per centum," shall apply to wholesalers only and not to any hotel-supply house or combination distributor.

Mr. SPENCE. It is obvious that it applies to wholesalers only.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I notice on page 2, line 3, it is stated:

> *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prohibit the President from requiring the grading and grade marking of meat and meat products.

Does this mean that you are going to impose compulsory grading on the meat industry even when there is no allocation or rationing?

Mr. TALLE. The answer is no.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not true that the Congress last year in amending the same section prohibited the President from imposing any restrictions on limitations upon slaughterers and processors under title I?

Mr. TALLE. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This is not to recognize that the President could impose any restriction or limitation upon the processors, is it?

Mr. TALLE. No. I may add that the language in the conference report having to do with slaughtering was supplied by me when the bill was written by the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is, the language down to the proviso is my language. That language was agreed to in advance of the proviso. In order to clarify the proviso and to see to it that it does not interfere with an action that is about to take place in the Supreme Court of the United States, the conferees inserted language in the report which states very clearly that this proviso in no sense whatever gives to the President power which he does not already have. The conferees took pains to guard against any interference with the adjudication process relating to the OPS in our Federal courts.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, this conference was a truly remarkable experience for me. It was novel, unique, and, if I may say so, noisy. It is interesting to be present at a gathering where a number of strong voices try to out-shout each other. That is what occurred from time to time.

You will note that I did not sign the conference report. I think I owe it to you to say why I did not. I did not sign it because you will recall not many days ago we had five very firm roll call votes in this Chamber, on the Talle decontrol amendment, on the Cole amendment, on the Lucas amendment, on the Smith amendment and on the Wheeler amendment. All of them were adopted by good majorities before the bill was passed.

I have always felt that a conferee is, temporarily, something more than a Member of the Congress. He is endowed with additional obligation. I have been a member of many conferences, and I have always felt it my obligation as a conferee to support with all the vigor at my command the will of the House of Representatives.

My colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from New York, and I worked like a team. We did the best we could. May I say to you that I have great admiration for the conferees who represented the other body. They worked like a team, and time upon time some Member of that body said, "Personally I do not believe in this but I am honor bound to uphold the Senate." Now I think that is the right attitude. How can a conference be a genuinely fair conference unless the conferees on both sides are eager in their desire to uphold the will of their respective Chambers?

When I consider what was put into the conference report in lieu of my decontrol amendment, I confess it sounds much like the remark of a person who says, "I feel with you in a degree the ardor of a kindred quest." And that is just about all it means.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Are you trying to tell us in so many words that the will of the House was not represented?

Mr. TALLE. I know the gentleman from South Carolina, who is a very keen gentleman, can supply the answer to that question.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I want to read the statement of policy and purpose which the Congress enunciated in the Defense Production Control Act of 1950:

> It is the intention of the Congress that the President shall use the powers conferred by this act to promote the national defense, by meeting, promptly and effectively, the requirements of military programs in support of our national security and foreign policy objectives, and by preventing undue strains and dislocations upon wages, prices, and production or distribution of materials for civilian use, within the framework, as far as practicable, of the American system of competitive enterprise.

But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the record of the OPS and the other so-called economic stabilization agencies under the Truman administration, there is no reason why any citizen should have any confidence in them, or believe that an honest attempt will be made by them in their administration of the law to preserve our free-enterprise system. That is one reason why I introduced and fought for my decontrol amendment. But I do want to call the attention of the bureaucrats who head these agencies to the fact that the Congress is again specifically saying to them that we do intend to preserve free enterprise.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the clear-cut and definite reply to the questions I propounded to Mr. TALLE with respect to the proviso in line 3 of page 2 of the committee print. I propounded these inquiries quite definitely and clearly in order that there be no mistake as to the intent of the members of the conference committee, and especially the intent of the gentleman from Iowa for the reason that this clause had been made a part of his original amendment to the bill—known as the Talle amendment. Mr. TALLE gave a complete answer. No member of the committee and no member of the House has expressed opposition to his explanation.

I wanted this explanation for the reason I am informed in some areas Government representatives are attempting to enforce compulsory grading upon the slaughtering industry notwithstanding the fact that Congress has specifically excepted meat from the quantity controls as provided under section 101 of the Defense Production Act as amended. I trust the intent of Congress, with respect to this matter, will be observed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, I want to plead with you for 1962. Then, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to plead with you again for 1972, because it is my firm conviction that today we place the pattern of controls upon America. A pattern which we may never be able to drive out of the legislative framework of our country.

Mr. Speaker, if controls today are proper, if in view of the economic circumstances in which we find ourselves, if when we find ample supplies of all of the commodities and all of the goods everybody in this country requires, and then we find it necessary for us to continue price and wage control as well as rent control, then, Mr. Speaker and my friends when can we ever come to the conclusion that this country can do without price and wage controls? Today, Mr. Speaker, the issue is not how, but whether—the issue is a fundamental one—shall we or shall we not continue for time without end price and wage and rent control. Today is the time that we can make that decision. Now is the time to make it. Now is the time for us to stand and say we are not afraid, we are not alarmed, we believe in the American system of government. We believe in free enterprise, we believe in the free choice system, we believe in America, and therefore we are going to vote down this conference report.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, of course I am disappointed and dissatisfied with what should be the Sadlak amendment commencing at line 10, page 2 of this committee print of the bill reported by the conferees. I want vigorously to disclaim totally and categorically any relationship to that part of the amendment which begins at line 18 on page 2 and continues to the end of the paragraph.

I had believed until 1 o'clock this morning, Mr. Speaker, that the overwhelming vote—169 to 102—given on a teller vote to my amendment offered as the first amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule that the conferees were well armed to retain in conference the fundamental purpose of my proposal. It provided a restriction on the illegal use of the International Materials Conference, the vehicle for the implementation of its "entitlements for consumption" being the Defense Production Act. I say once more that I never intended for a moment to affect the Controlled Materials Plan or allocations and priorities set up under the CMP.

Please look, read, think, and ponder over the wording of which Senator FULBRIGHT and the State Department must assume the responsibility—the language commencing at line 18, page 2. There is not the slightest indication as to the identity of the International Materials Conference, its origin, operation, membership, functions nothing stipulated to give notice that it presently is an extralegal creature of our State Department; that for the past 18 months, without statutory authority, an organization of 28 nations, the greater portion of their expenses being paid from the emergency fund and they have assumed unto themselves the distribution, the allocations of the raw materials, commodities of the free nations of the world limiting their availability according to "entitlements for consumption" and no more than that arbitrary total allocation can be had by a participating country. An international cartel in every sense of the word. And, mind you, by accepting this conference report—we cannot now have a motion to recommit the report back to

the conference as the Speaker ruled in reply to an inquiry by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] because the other body had already taken favorable action but must vote it up or down—and a concomitant of a vote for will give, in my opinion, statutory sanction to IMC.

Mr. Speaker, action by Congress to give legality to IMC should come through open and full hearings before the proper committees. Still reverberating in my ears from the House debate is the vigorous protest made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]—he insisted IMC has jeopardized our strategic stockpile and now this language will continue the fraud upon the American people and continue to keep strategic materials from our depleted stockpile.

I except as completely as words can assure you this Fulbright amendment because I want otherwise to vote for this report.

I am grateful to the House for the support accorded my amendment when action was taken and I urge each to check further into IMC to find how completely it will control our economy and American way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 194, nays 142, not voting 95, as follows:

[Roll No. 123]

YEAS—194

Angell	Deane	Holmes
Armstrong	DeGraffenried	Horan
Auchincloss	Delaney	Howell
Ayres	Denny	Hull
Baker	Denton	Irving
Bakewell	Dingell	Javits
Baring	Dollinger	Johnson
Barrett	Doyle	Jones, Ala.
Bates, Mass.	Durham	Jones, Mo.
Battle	Eberharter	Jones,
Bender	Elliott	Woodrow W.
Bennett, Fla.	Engle	Karsten, Mo.
Bennett, Mich.	Feighan	Keating
Bentsen	Fine	Kee
Boggs, La.	Fogarty	Kelly, N. Y.
Bolling	Forand	Kennedy
Bolton	Forrester	Keogh
Bosone	Fugate	Kerr
Boykin	Fulton	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Gamble	King, Calif.
Brownson	Garmatz	Klein
Bryson	Gary	Lane
Buchanan	Gavin	Lanham
Burnside	Gordon	Lantaff
Burton	Graham	Latham
Butler	Granahan	Lesinski
Camp	Granger	Lind
Canfield	Green	McCarthy
Carrigg	Greenwood	McConnell
Case	Gregory	McCormack
Chelf	Hale	McGrath
Chudoff	Halleck	McGuire
Colmer	Hand	McKinnon
Cooley	Hardy	McMullen
Cooper	Hart	Mack, Ill.
Corbett	Havenner	Mack, Wash.
Cotton	Hays, Ark.	Madden
Crosser	Hays, Ohio	Magee
Crumpacker	Hedrick	Mansfield
Curtis, Mo.	Herlong	Martin, Mass.
Dague	Heselton	Meader
Davis, Ga.	Hess	Merrow
Dawson	Hillfield	Miller, Calif.
Miller, N. Y.	Rains	Spence
Moulder	Reams	Staggers
Multer	Rhodes	Taylor
Mumma	Ribicoff	Thomas
Murdock	Riehlman	Thornberry
Murphy	Riley	Tollefson
Murray	Roberts	Trimble
Norblad	Rodino	Van Zandt
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Vorys
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.	Walter
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rogers, Mass.	Watts
O'Neill	Rooney	Weichel
Osmers	Ross	Widnall
Ostertag	Sadlak	Wier
O'Toole	Saylor	Wigglesworth
Patman	Scott,	Withrow
Patterson	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolcott
Polk	Secrest	Wolverton
Preston	Shelley	Yates
Price	Sieminski	Yorty
Priest	Sittler	Zablocki
Rabaut	Smith, Miss.	
Radwan	Smith, Va.	

NAYS—142

Abbitt	Ford	Nelson
Adair	Gathings	Nicholson
Allen, Calif.	George	Norrell
Allen, Ill.	Golden	O'Hara
Andersen,	Goodwin	O'Konski
H. Carl	Grant	Passman
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Patten
Andresen,	Hagen	Phillips
August H.	Harden	Poage
Andrews	Harris	Poulson
Barden	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Beall	Harrison, Va.	Rankin
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Betts	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Bishop	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Blackney	Hillings	Rees, Kans.
Bow	Hinshaw	Rivers
Brambiett	Hoeven	Robeson
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Schenck
Brooks	Hope	Scrivner
Budge	Hunter	Scudder
Buffett	Ikard	Shafer
Burleson	Jackson, Calif.	Sheehan
Busbey	Jarman	Short
Bush	Jenison	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes	Jenkins	Simpson, Pa.
Cannon	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Jonas	Springer
Chenoweth	Kearns	Stockman
Chiperfield	Kelley, Pa.	Taber
Church	Kersten, Wis.	Talle
Clevenger	LeCompte	Teague
Cole, Kans.	Lovre	Thompson,
Cox	Lucas	Mich.
Crawford	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Cunningham	McDonough	Velde
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McIntire	Werdel
Devereux	McVey	Wheeler
D'Ewart	Mahon	Whitten
Dolliver	Marshall	Williams, Miss.
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Miller, Nebr.	Winstead
Fernandez	Mills	Wood, Idaho
Fisher	Morgan	
Flood	Morton	

NOT VOTING—95

Aandahl	Donohue	Kirwan
Abernethy	Donovan	Kluczynski
Addonizio	Doughton	Larcade
Albert	Eaton	Lyle
Allen, La.	Evins	McMillan
Anfuso	Fallon	Machrowicz
Arends	Fenton	Mitchell
Aspinall	Frazier	Morano
Bailey	Furcolo	Morris
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Morrison
Beamer	Gwinn	Perkins
Beckworth	Hall,	Philbin
Belcher	Edwin Arthur	Pickett
Blatnik	Hall,	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Leonard W.	Powell
Bonner	Hébert	Ramsay
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Heller	Regan
Burdick	Herter	Richards
Carlyle	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Tex.
Carnahan	James	Roosevelt
Celler	Jones,	Sabath
Clemente	Hamilton C.	Sasscer
Cole, N. Y.	Judd	Scott, Hardie
Combs	Kean	Seely-Brown
Coudert	Kearney	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kilburn	Sikes
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Smith, Wis.
Stanley	Thompson, Tex.	Wickersham
Steed	Vail	Willis
Stigler	Vinson	Wood, Ga.
Sutton	Welch	Woodruff
Tackett	Wharton	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. McMillan against.
Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Roosevelt for, with Mr. Brown of Ohio against.
Mr. Heller for, with Mr. Vail against.
Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Woodruff against.
Mr. Jackson of Washington for, with Mr. Pickett against.
Mr. Addonizio for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin against.
Mr. Machrowicz for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Beamer.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Stanley with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Perkins with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. James.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Morris with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Kean.

Mrs. KEE and Mr. ARMSTRONG changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. SCHENCK, Mr. VAN PELT, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. JONAS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next, following Mr. REDDEN.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PRICE CONTROLS—THE PRESIDENT AND THE FACTS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the country is now being flooded with a wave of propaganda that is as false as it is vicious. This phony propaganda claims that it was the Republican Eightieth Congress that lifted price controls following the end of World War II and that Republicans are responsible for the inflation that occurred at that time.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The plain fact of the matter is that it was President Truman himself who removed price controls. The next fact is that the removal of controls took place before the Republican Eightieth Congress had even been elected.

Mr. Truman began lifting controls in September 1945 and he completed the task in October 1946. The Eightieth Congress was elected in November 1946.

A large part of the reason why the voters selected a Republican Congress was the widespread disgust with the Truman administration's handling of price controls. Mr. Truman was trying to help the candidates of his political party when he lifted the last of the price controls, but the people were not deceived.

I wish to cite one instance of the terrible confusion that characterized the administration's handling of price controls. On September 26, 1946, when housewives had to stand in long lines to purchase meat, Mr. Truman took up the subject of meat price ceilings at his press conference. Here is what Mr. Truman said:

> An increase in prices or the abandonment of price control on meat now would, in the long run, add to rather than solve our difficulties.

And what did Mr. Truman then proceed to do? Three weeks later, on October 14, 1946, he went on the air to announce the abandonment of meat controls—the exact opposite of what he said he would do. Here is how Mr. Truman announced the lifting of meat controls:

> There is only one remedy left—that is to lift controls on meat. Accordingly, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator are removing all price controls on livestock and food and feed products therefrom, tomorrow.

That action, I repeat, was taken before the voters even went to the polls to elect a Republican Eightieth Congress.

Two years later President Truman was speaking a different language. It was a campaign year, and the all-important goal, in his mind, was reelection. The facts went out the window. In their place the country was told such wild yarns as the one which Mr. Truman uttered in Bridgeport, Conn., on October 28, 1948:

> If you want relief from high prices, vote for a party that has proved by the record that it knows how to keep prices down. The best thing for your own interests is to vote the Democratic ticket.

The man talking was the same man who had lifted all price controls 2 years earlier.

And while President Truman talked low prices to city people during the 1948 campaign, he talked high prices when facing farm people.

Now the campaign of misrepresentation and falsity has started all over again. This time, however, the Americans know the facts, and they should not forget them. The facts are simply these:

First. After the Korean war started, touching off a buying wave that pushed prices up, President Truman stated repeatedly he wanted no part of price controls.

Second. Congress passed the Defense Production Act over his protests in September 1950. But Mr. Truman steadfastly refused to use the act.

Third. It was not until January 26, 1951—7 months after the start of the Korean war—that the President finally got around to issuing a price freeze. By that time food prices had already risen 9 percent and the over-all cost of living had risen 7 percent.

Fourth. Throughout this period and up until this moment, Mr. Truman has continued to follow financial policies which inevitably tend to drive prices higher and higher. I am referring to the administration's reckless spending, which is financed to a considerable extent by printing-press dollars. These printing-press dollars merely dilute everyone's savings deposits, life insurance, and United States bonds.

The biggest step to price stability in recent years was the balanced budget which the Republican Eightieth Congress achieved. The flow of cheap, printing-press Government dollars was stopped, and prices had an opportunity to level off. Every Republican Member of the Congress who had a part in that effort has good reason to be proud of his contribution to the welfare of the American people.

PROTECT FOLKS ON RELIEF FROM PITILESS PUBLICITY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, protect folks on relief from pitiless publicity.

People down on their luck are still human beings. The fact that they must seek public assistance does not mean that they should be compelled to surrender all pride and privacy.

The Jenner amendment to the Revenue Act of 1951, in effect, opens the welfare rolls to public inspection. Under the guise of exposing fraud, it would put the names of all poor people getting aid into a goldfish bowl and strip them of the last vestige of human dignity.

It would scare people who have no other means of existence, from the shame of being exhibited as charity cases and force them to go without, rather than run the gantlet of punishing publicity.

Why our most unfortunate citizens should be signaled out for such an attack, in the spurious name of economy, when so many well-heeled tax fixers and other special interests are raiding the Public Treasury, is beyond all understanding. It is striking at those who cannot fight back.

It is a broadside that will humiliate many, just to reach a few petty chiselers.

This indiscriminate approach is not designed to expose those who are receiving aid fraudulently. Under this pretext, it is the beginning of a drive to crush the whole public assistance program.

The Jenner amendment prohibits the Federal Security Administrator from withholding funds from a State, when that State by legislation prescribes the condition under which public access may be had to the records of disbursements of public assistance funds. Providing also that safeguards are established to prohibit the commercial or political use of information so obtained.

The Federal Security Agency opposed this amendment even before it was passed. It pointed out that the methods proposed are not suitable to achieve the objectives sought, and are not in keeping with the American tradition that individual dignity should be respected. We stated that the effect of the amendment might be to embarrass needy but sensitive people, and discourage them from applying for the assistance which they need. We also expressed the opinion that persons who would stoop to fraud in order to obtain assistance are not likely to be discouraged by any action the States might take under section 618. Thus, the persons most affected would be needy people, the very ones for whom public assistance programs were established.

The opinions of the Federal Security specialists in this field, based on factual studies, were disregarded. The Jenner steam roller crushed all understanding of human relations. It was a tour de force that lumped the many worthy cases with the few fraudulent ones, and then blackmailed all with the threat of publicity.

The net result has been to set neighbor against neighbor, stirring up both shame and contempt, when the delicate problem of charity should be adminis-

tered with a consideration for human feelings as well as urgent material needs.

The Federal Security Agency has always insisted that eligibility be established properly. Furthermore, no evidence exists that large numbers of persons are fraudulently receiving assistance. The only satisfactory way to weed out those who are getting relief payments when they do not need them, is through sound administration, reinforced by adequate well-qualified staff.

It is hard enough for any human beings who are in a dependent position. It is worse when they are held up to public ridicule.

No one dares come forward to suggest that the names of all farmers receiving subsidies or all veterans receiving benefits, or all persons and corporations whose taxes have been settled for a fraction of what they really owe, should be posted for all to see.

Because the howl of protest would rock the Nation.

But the Jenner amendment picks on those—the reliefers—who are at the bottom of the economic pile. It is hitting at those who are on their knees.

Welfare workers are the only people competent enough to determine who shall be eligible for public assistance and not the gossips who thrive on other people's misfortunes.

The Jenner amen iment was a mistake, it should be eliminated from the Federal law.

Some damage has been done by it.

Four States—Indiana, Illinois, Alabama, and Georgia—have already followed up with crippling legislation of their own.

To undo the harm, without working any readjustment hardship on these States, I suggest a time lag of at least a year to enable these States, and others which have not yet started, to making lists available to get back on the right road again.

All others shall immediately comply under the terms of my bill—to amend the Jenner amendment—with the original Federal social security law banning publicity of welfare rolls as a condition that must be observed by the States in order to receive Federal grants-in-aid and other payments.

Folks on relief must not be publicly branded as paupers.

Would we like to be put on parade if we were in their shoes?

How about it?

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, June 19, 1952.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANE: This letter is in response to your request of April 4, 1952, for a report on your draft bill to repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to a prohibition upon the denial of Social Security Act funds).

This bill would repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951, commonly known as the Jenner amendment. This amendment to the 1951 tax law prohibits the Federal Security Administrator from withholding funds from a State under titles I, IV, X, or XIV of the Social Security Act in the event a State, by legislation, prescribes the condition under which public access may be had to the records of disbursements of public-assistance funds, provided that appropriate legislative safeguards are established to prohibit commercial or political use of the information so obtained.

It appears from the legislative record that section 618 was proposed by its sponsors as a means of eliminating from assistance rolls persons who are receiving assistance fraudulently. Its proponents stated that the realization that names would become known would deter ineligible persons from applying for aid; if these persons should apply and receive aid fraudulently, the fraud would be exposed by citizens in the community. Thus, it was claimed that the legislation would reduce the assistance rolls and keep the cost of public assistance down.

This agency raised serious question about the amendment at the time it was under discussion. We pointed out that the methods proposed are not suitable to achieve the objectives sought, and are not in keeping with the American tradition that individual dignity should be respected. We stated that the effect of the amendment might be to embarrass needy but sensitive people, and discourage them from applying for the assistance which they need. We also expressed the opinion that persons who would stoop to fraud in order to obtain assistance are not likely to be discouraged by any action the States might take under section 618. Thus, the persons most affected would be needy people, the very ones for whom the public-assistance programs were established.

As a result of the enactment of section 618, four States, Indiana, Illinois, Alabama, and Georgia, have adopted the appropriate legislation and are now making available for public inspection lists of public assistance recipients. We have observed developments in these States and have compared the changes in the number of persons receiving public assistance in those States with the changes in the Nation as a whole. There is no evidence that the enactment of legislation taking advantage of section 618 has resulted in eliminating from the rolls any ineligible persons. For the past year, the trend in the number of recipients has been downward for the Nation as a whole. The extent of the decline has varied from one State to another. Often the reasons for the decline are peculiar to an individual State. Insofar as the availability for inspection of public assistance recipients' names has been a factor, it might very well be an indication of the unwillingness of some needy people to run the risk of embarrassment with their friends and neighbors.

It is not possible to evaluate statistically the effects of the legislation on the morale of the recipients through the knowledge that their neighbors, if they wish, may learn that they are receiving public assistance. Although the public has not been especially interested in examining the lists, as shown by reports on the number of individuals who have reviewed the lists we have no doubt that some needy people have been discouraged from applying for aid because of the knowledge that they might be embarrassed before their friends and neighbors. The enclosed letter is a case in point. It is one which was received by the Iowa State Department of Social Welfare from an individual who speaks of his experience as a child in a family receiving assistance. This letter is graphic as to the serious effect on individuals when there is public knowledge of their dependency status.

No matter how few persons may be receiving assistance without being eligible, every reasonable effort must be made to remove them from the assistance rolls. The Federal Security Agency has always insisted that eligibility be established properly. However, no reliable evidence exists to show that large numbers of persons are fraudulently receiving assistance, or that there exists a special problem needing a drastic remedy. As long as we are dealing with people, there will be some who try to "beat the game." The only satisfactory way to eliminate whatever ineligible persons on the assistance rolls, however, is through sound administration, reinforced by adequate, well qualified staff. I am satisfied that if assistance agencies hade adequate staff, the problem of "chiseling" would be virtually eliminated. This approach is far more satisfactory to all concerned—and more likely to be successful—than the approach taken in section 618.

We have a question concerning the effective date in your draft bill. The bill provides that it shall take effect with respect to the payments to which the States become entitled after the date of the enactment of the bill. Inasmuch as several States (the four mentioned above, plus a few others which have not yet started making lists available) have enacted appropriate legislation preliminary to operating under section 618, the terms of your bill may work a hardship on these States. We would recommend that the bill provide a time lag of at least a year for those States which have already enacted legislation complying with section 618.

We should recommend, therefore, that you introduce your bill. I hope the Congress will enact it.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. THURSTON,
Acting Administrator.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan to include certain extraneous matter in remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska to extend his remarks on the subject of raw-bone meal being imported into this country.

Mr. BENDER in three instances.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIBICOFF (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a tribute to Francis S. Murphy.

Mr. RODINO in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOULDER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas to revise and extend his remarks on the appropriation bill passed today and include extraneous matter, and also to extend his remarks following the remarks of Mr. TALLE on the conference report.

Mr. O'HARA and to include a speech.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an address by Admiral Thomas C. Kincaid notwithstanding it is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $294.

Mr. BERRY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE and to include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SEELY-BROWN (at the request of Mr. SADLAK), on account of illness in the family.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind";

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7800. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242); and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 26, 1952:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; and

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan.

On June 28, 1952:

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands;

H. R. 6854. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind"; and

H. J. Res. 418. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1614. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a printed copy of the report on the Agricultural Experiment Stations, 1951, issued January 1952; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1615. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to repeal Public Law 820, Eightieth Congress (62 Stat. 1098), an act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1616. A letter from the Archivist of the United States transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1617. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 2, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the San Joaquin River, Calif., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the existing project in any way at this time, particularly to provide for elimination of water hyacinths from the channels of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, San Joaquin River and tributary channels, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 21, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1618. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their official duties, suffered losses for personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of a Treasury Claim Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1619. A letter from the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1620. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 5, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on the Ohio River and its tributaries, with a view to determining whether improvement of Little Raccoon Creek, and of Raccoon Creek and its tributaries, Ohio, in the interest of flood control is advisable at this time. This investigation was requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives and United States Senate, adopted on March 15, 1949, and October 13, 1947, respectively; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 430. Joint resolution approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. S. 2594. An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2352). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 8417. A bill to amend section 42 of the Trade-Mark Act of 1946; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8418. A bill to repeal section 618 of the Revenue Act of 1951 (relating to a prohibition upon the denial of Social Security Act funds); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8419. A bill to provide that the wagering taxes shall not apply with respect to suit clubs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. J. Res. 491. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to calling of a convention to consider an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit the United States Government from engaging in business in competition with its citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. Res. 716. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to transmit to the House information relating to any agreements made by him and the Government of Great Britain during their recent meetings and conversations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 8420. A bill for the relief of Demetrois Petros Demou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 8421. A bill for the relief of Mordechay Dinewitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 8422. A bill for the relief of Sachiko Kunihiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 8423. A bill for the relief of Francesco Gorga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 8424. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shiro, and Samuel Stackman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 8425. A bill for the relief of Miss Leila Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. M. C. Johns, minister, First Baptist Church, Fairmont, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Our loving and ever compassionate Heavenly Father, we bow humbly before Thee this day to seek guidance from on high for the tasks which fall upon us. We express our sincere thanks to Thee for the blessings that are ours because of Thy love for us.

We do thank Thee for the strength Thou hast given to the Members of the Senate throughout the past months of their deliberations. Many have been the burdens they have been called to bear, and in Thy infinite love for them and our Nation, they have received strength for their daily tasks. Now, O Lord, in the final days of this session of Congress, may these Senators, the elected representatives of their neighbors back home, receive the physical strength and the mental and nervous energy necessary to give careful consideration to the projects now before them. May Thy will be done by them and through them.

We ask Thy continued blessing upon our Nation in the position she occupies as a world leader and we would always remember that, "Not by might nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord," applies to us as well as it did to a nation thousands of years ago. May we not abdicate our position of leadership while millions of people are looking to us for help and guidance. In the name of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 28, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 27, 1952:

S. 2610. An act providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colorado.

On June 28, 1952:

S. 365. An act for the relief of Jean Krueger and Edith Krueger;

S. 587. An act for the relief of Sotirios Christos Roumanis;

S. 677. An act to fix the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps, and to establish the relationship of the Commandant of the Marine Corps to the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

S. 1032. An act to authorize each of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to pool moneys derived from lands granted to it for public schools and various State institutions;

S. 1283. An act to remove the limitation on the numerical strength of the White House Police force;

S. 1536. An act to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief-program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes;

S. 1566. An act for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Helen Sadako Yamamoto;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Seidl and Sister Anna Ambrus;

S. 1903. An act for the relief of Toshiko Minowa;

S. 2561. An act for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester; and

S. 2556. An act for the relief of Niccolo Luvisotti.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

MEETING OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to announce, in his capacity as president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union, that there will be a meeting at 10:30 tomorrow morning in his office on this floor of the Capitol, which all Senators interested in the Interparliamentary Union are at liberty to attend. The Chair makes that announcement while there is a full attendance in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 28th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced he signed the enrolled bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 29, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2594) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, June 30, 1952, he signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. ANDERSON, because of illness, and Mr. KERR and Mr. RUSSELL were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate this week, and Mr. KEFAUVER was excused from attending the sessions of the Senate beginning Wednesday through the remainder of the week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, without debate, and without the time being charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and a letter, which were referred, as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 155)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $576,200, for the General Services Administration, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. Doc. No. 156)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed

supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $1,235,887, for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART (S. Doc. No. 153)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $187,500, for the Smithsonian Institution, National Gallery of Art, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 152)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $2,000,000, for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISIONS OF PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PAYMENT OF CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS (S. Doc. No. 154)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation, involving an increase of $28,071.20 in the amount necessary for payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation involving an increase of $225,000, for the payment of claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of the Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL SPENDING—RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning important grassroots expressions on the crucial problem of reducing Federal spending. One such expression came from Wall G. Coapman, secretary of the Wisconsin Bankers' Association, who conveyed a resolution which had been adopted by that fine group on June 18. The second is from R. E. Small, chairman of the resolutions committee of the Brown County Tax Survey group, who conveyed a resolution which had been adopted at a conference of Wisconsin taxpayers' groups in the city of Green Bay, on June 4.

Needless to say, I fundamentally share the sound emphasis of these organizations on the need for greater economy.

I ask unanimous consent that both of the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as indicated:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"WISCONSIN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION—RESOLUTION IV

"FEDERAL SPENDING

"Whereas the excessive spending in which our Federal Government is presently engaged is leading to the destruction of our democratic way of life; and

"Whereas recent disclosures of waste, extravagance and corruption in high places is a sad commentary on those who have been elected to serve the people of our great Nation; and

"Whereas no one opposes the necessary, though ominous spending for essential national defense: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the bankers of Wisconsin in convention assembled call on our local, our State and our national governments to recognize the national emergency for what it is and reduce operating costs of the Government to a minimum, being mindful of the fact that the present crisis will tax our economic strength to its utmost; and be it further

"Resolved, that our defense and foreign aid budgets should be guided by sound business sense and curtailed wherever possible with full consideration being given to our ability to pay and still avoid disastrous inflation and the ruin of our economy, and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be brought to the attention of each of our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to each of our senators and assemblymen in the 1953 Legislature of the State of Wisconsin."

To the Committee on Government Operations:

"FEDERAL BUDGET

"Whereas runaway Federal expenditures are leading to both ruinous inflation and ruinous taxation; and

"Whereas the Federal budget for fiscal year 1953 as presented by the President contemplates the expenditure of $85,400,000,000 which would be offset by revenues estimated at less that $72,000,000,000; and

"Whereas a budget of that nature would add an estimated $14,000,000,000 to the national debt of some $260,000,000,000 and

"Whereas Congress has before it proposed legislation which would—

"1. Streamline operations and cut costs as recommended in the Hoover Report;

"2. Create a Joint Committee on the Budget which would give both Houses of Congress an intimate and continuing knowledge of actual Federal needs; and

"3. Require the President to submit a budget in which proposed expenditures did not exceed revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by this regional conference of taxpayer associations, meeting in Green Bay, Wisconsin, June 4, 1952, That the Congress of the United States be urged to adopt all legislation recommended in the Hoover Report, create a Joint Committee on the Budget, and make mandatory the submission of a balanced Federal budget; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Wisconsin Congressmen.

"Adopted, Green Bay, Wisconsin, June 4, 1952."

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
R. E. SMALL,
Green Bay, Chairman Brown County Tax Survey.
F. P. SAUNDERS,
Fond du Lac Taxpayers Association of Fond du Lac.
ANDREW J. HOUWERS,
Sheboygan Falls, Sheboygan Falls Taxpayers Association.
THOMAS W. WELCH,
Grimms, Manitowoc County Economy Council
M. H. MCDONNELL,
New London, Waupaca County Taxpayers Association

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5120) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico, reported it favorably, without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1990) thereon.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 74, submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], on February 19, 1951. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, how much money is involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. Fifty thousand dollars. The resolution provides for a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the objectives operations, and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Department of State and other agencies of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "at the earliest practicable date," and to insert "prior to January 31, 1953," and on page 4, line 11, after the word "exceed", to insert "$50,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Whereas the first weapon of aggression by the Kremlin is propaganda designed to subvert, to confuse, and to divide the free world, and to inflame the Russian and satellite peoples with hatred for our free institutions; and

Whereas the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in Europe has just reported to Congress that the security of the free world requires not only military and economic strength but a psychological offensive in behalf of our democratic principles and aspirations; and

Whereas General Eisenhower called for a great expansion in our campaign of truth which would give enormous moral strength to all other phases of our foreign policy—military, diplomatic, and economic; and

Whereas the international propagation of the democratic creed should be made an instrument of supreme national policy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof duly designated by the chairman of such committee, in conjunction with two other Senators designated by the President of the Senate, shall conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to—

(A) the objectives, operations, and effectiveness of existing foreign information programs conducted by the Department of

State and other agencies of the United States;

(B) The prompt development of techniques, methods, and programs for greatly expanded and far more effective operations in this vital area of foreign policy, including the following, among others:

(1) maximum utilization of radio broadcasting, by medium wave as well as shortwave, to overcome barriers of language, censorship, distance, and other obstacles to reaching the minds of the peoples of the world;

(2) development of a comprehensive world-wide program to produce and exhibit documentary and educational motion pictures;

(3) significant and immediate expansion of our program for people-to-people diplomacy, through exchange of students, industrial and technical experts, as well as representatives of cultural, labor, and religious groups;

(4) use of all other practicable techniques and media to reach and inform people who are shut off from the free world by censorship and suppression;

(5) promotion of democratic education abroad, including the occupied areas of Germany and Japan;

(6) increased coordination with international information programs of other free nations;

(7) maintenance, through the United Nations and through our own diplomacy, of a steady and steadily increasing pressure in behalf of world-wide freedom of information;

(8) increased support and development of and coordination with the United Nations and its appropriate specialized agencies, facilities, and programs;

(9) further encouragement of nongovernmental agencies to help inspire and guide the efforts of the millions of private American citizens who might use their talents and resources and contacts overseas in furtherance of the programs and objectives of this resolution;

(C) the extent and scope of organization and of reorganization of existing departmental and agency structures which may be necessary or desirable to accomplish the foregoing objectives in the present world crisis.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate prior to January 31, 1953, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations for necessary appropriations or legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee is authorized to employ on a temporary basis such technical, clerical, or other assistants as it deems desirable. The necessary expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 342. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 342) reported by Mr. CONNALLY from the Committee on Foreign Relations on June 27, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount and for the same purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, approved August 2, 1946, and Senate Resolution 171, agreed to August 6, 1951, and Senate Resolution 219, agreed to October 11, 1951.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN CANADA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Concurrent Resolution 86. The concurrent resolution relates to the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Canada. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86), submitted by Mr. GREEN on June 26, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the association, and to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses to be present at such meeting. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $4,500 for each of the delegations and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 341. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I make the request so that in case the House does not act on the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) just agreed to by the Senate, Senators will be able to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Canada.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 341), submitted by Mr. GREEN on June 26, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint not more than four Members of the Senate to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the association, and to designate the chairman of the delegation to be present at such meeting. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegation and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this resolution shall not exceed $4,500 and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PROGRESS REPORT NO. 20 RELATING TO THE ALUMINUM PROGRAM (REPT. NO. 1987)

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted Defense Production Act Progress Report No. 20, relating to the aluminum program, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS RELATING TO MACHINE-TOOL SHORTAGES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 1988)

Mr. MOODY, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report on machine-tool shortages, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 1989)

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolutions 136 and 267, Eighty-second Congress, a report of an investigation of crime in the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation six lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 3428. A bill for the relief of Alexander Hahn; and

S. 3429. A bill for the relief of Franciszek Janicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 3430. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MOODY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 1689, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 345), which was

referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the document room 5,000 copies of Senate Report No. 1689, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a report of the Committee on Banking and Currency pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Address delivered by Senator RUSSELL, at Denver, Colo., on June 27, 1952, over the NBC radio network from radio station KOA.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Article entitled "It's Your Congress," written by Bruce Barton, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 29, 1952.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article from the Washington Post of June 30, 1952, concerning various Federal officials and employees who are retiring after years of service with the Federal Government.

Nine-point platform for better Federal Government by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

BOMBING OF COMMUNIST POWER FACILITIES IN NORTHERN KOREA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, under date of June 27, I addressed a letter to Hon. Jack K. McFall, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, asking that he furnish me the proceedings in the British House of Commons when the recent Korean discussion came up, and also to furnish me with the remarks the Secretary of State made before 200 members of the British House of Commons.

Today I have received a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State saying that they have cabled London for the statement made in the House of Commons, and enclosing a copy of the remarks of the Secretary of State before an informal meeting of members of Parliament in London.

I ask unanimous consent that the matters be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 27, 1952.

Hon. JACK MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Would you please secure for me, as soon as possible, a copy of the official proceedings of the British House of Commons for Wednesday, June 25. In addition, I would like to have the text of the statement referred to in the wire service today which was made by Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, before approximately 200 members of the British House of Commons relative to the recent bombing of Communist power facilities in Northern Korea.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 30, 1952.

The Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: I have your letter of June 27, 1952, in which you ask for a copy of the official proceedings of the British House of Commons for Wednesday, June 25, and for the text of the statement made by the Secretary before an informal gathering of approximately 200 members of the House of Commons relative to the recent bombing of Communist power facilities in Northern Korea.

With respect to the official proceedings of the House of Commons for Wednesday, June 25, a cable has been sent to our Embassy in London requesting that they obtain a copy and forward it to the Department by air pouch. As soon as it is received a copy will be delivered to you.

I am enclosing a copy of the text of the Secretary's remarks to which you referred.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

COMMENTS BY SECRETARY OF STATE ACHESON ON JUNE 26, 1952, BEFORE AN INFORMAL MEETING OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT IN LONDON

If I may digress for a moment I shall make some remarks about a matter which is one of controversy and which I would not speak about in England were it not for the fact that this is off-the-record. I shall restrict my remarks to what I think it is my duty to say to you at this time. This is about the matter that you have been debating in the last 2 or 3 days.

You would ask me, I am sure, if I did not say this, two questions, and I should like to reply very frankly to both of them. One question you would ask is: Shouldn't the British Government have been informed or consulted about this? To that, my answer would be yes. It should have been; indeed, it was our intention to do it. It is only as the result of what in the United States is known as a "snafu" that you were not consulted about it.

I am sure that you are wholly inexperienced in England with government errors. We, unfortunately, have had more familiarity with them, and due to the fact that one person was supposed to do something and thought another person was supposed to do something, you were not consulted. Therefore, you should have been. We have no question about that.

If you ask me whether you had an absolute right to be consulted, I should say no, but I don't want to argue that absolute right.

What I want to say is that you are a partner of ours in this operation, and we wanted to consult you; we should have, and we recognize an error.

Now you ask me whether this was a proper action. To that I say: Yes, a very proper action, an essential action. It was taken on military grounds. It was to bomb five plants, four of which were far removed from frontier, one of which was on frontier. We had not bombed these plants before because they had been dismantled, and we wished to preserve them in the event of unification of Korea. They had been put into operation once more; they were supplying most of energy which was used not only by airfields which were operating against us, but by radar which was directing fighters against our planes.

INSTALLATION OF OFFICIALS OF REORGANIZED INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Congress approved the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, for the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Today the Secretary of the Treasury, in ceremonies at the customhouse, installed officials of the reorganized Internal Revenue Service in New York City. I believe that Members of Congress and the public should know the developments since the reorganization plan was approved. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD statements by the Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, and Undersecretary of the Treasury Edward H. Foley, and also a summary of actions taken to improve the administration in the Bureau of Internal Revenue from 1946 to date.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 30.—Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder, speaking at ceremonies in the customhouse for the installation of officials of the reorganized internal revenue service in New York City, said today:

"We are entering a new era in the internal revenue service throughout the country, and today marks the beginning of a new phase in the history of the service in the city of New York.

"A completely modernized revenue service structure is being completed here and elsewhere throughout the country to keep the service fully abreast of its far-reaching responsibilities. One of the changes in the reorganization is that from now on the New York City offices of the service are to be manned only by civil service personnel. Ability, integrity and application to duty are the cardinal tests for employment and promotion in all positions in the Service.

"Conversion of Internal Revenue operations to a career service was authorized by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. New York City is the second area in which the plan has been placed in effect. Reorganization will be completed in other areas of the country within the next few months.

"I am glad that so many citizens of New York have gathered for this installation ceremony Their attendance shows they appreciate the importance of what is taking place here today.

"The reorganized internal revenue offices in the New York City district will provide more convenient and faster service to all New Yorkers who have Federal tax business to transact.

"The greater part of the public's transactions of Federal tax matters in New York City will be carried on through the offices of the new Directors of Internal Revenue

who are being installed today for Upper Manhattan, Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn. The responsibilities of the directors of internal revenue correspond to those of the former collectors of internal revenue except that the Directors are under Civil Service. Additional revenue services will be installed in each of the directors' offices, including the audit operations heretofore performed by revenue agents in charge.

"To streamline the administration of Internal Revenue operations, a district commissioner will supervise revenue operations in the city as a whole. Formerly there was no counterpart in the revenue service for this position. The three directors of internal revenue are responsible to the district commissioner. He in turn is directly responsible to the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington.

"These straight and clear lines of authority and accountability will help insure more efficient service to taxpayers.

"For the present, at least, there will be no change in the locations of any of the internal revenue offices with which New Yorkers are accustomed to doing business. But eventually, the Bureau of Internal Revenue, in order to promote efficiency and convenience for the taxpayer, plans to bring together in one location the offices under the jurisdiction of each of the three directors of internal revenue.

"The district commissioner for New York City, who assumes his responsibilities today, takes charge of an area of exceptional importance in the field of public service. This area is of far greater importance than most people realize, for in the fiscal year 1951, its people and business concerns accounted for almost 15 percent of the internal-revenue collections for the entire United States. During the calendar year 1951 alone this area produced $8,400,000,000 of internal-revenue collections, including such sums as $3,200,000,000 in corporation income and profits taxes, and $4,000,000,000 of individual income and employment taxes.

"The work of the internal revenue offices here does not end, by any means, with the collection of income taxes. During 1951, for instance, $128,000,000 in alcohol taxes and more than $80,000,000 in retail excise taxes were collected here. In one year this area is now processing over 6,000,000,000 corporate, individual, payroll and other Federal tax returns.

"Simplification of all Federal taxpaying and tax-collecting processes was a major goal in the preparation of the revenue service reorganization plan. This goal has been achieved in many important respects. Prior to reorganization, reports went to Washington from the New York City offices of three collectors, three internal revenue agents-in-charge, an appellate staff, a regional finance office, a special agent-in-charge and a district supervisor of the Alcohol Tax Division. That was a total of 10 lines of authority and responsibility in daily operation. Now there is but one line—from the district commissioner to his Washington superior. Our fixed purpose is to eliminate as many complexities for taxpayers as possible. New York City taxpayers will find that with authority lodged in the local offices to deal with a great many problems formerly referred to Washington, the compliance with Federal tax laws has been tremendously simplified.

"Under the district commissioner, the assistant district commissioner for intelligence has very important responsibilities. Under his direction, there will be intensified efforts to see that every fraudulent attempt to evade Federal taxes will bring quick investigation and action.

"The task of fighting tax frauds never was an easy one. In recent years, the criminal element has attempted tax evasion with greater persistence than ever before.

"It is our determination that this persistence of tax evaders will be met by the special agents of the revenue service with even greater enforcement activity and prosecutions.

"Last year, additional taxes and penalties resulting from tax fraud investigations in this area amounted to approximately $75,000,000. This activity will be stepped up, under the direction of the assistant district commissioner for intelligence, to the full limit of available manpower.

"The fact that the reorganization plan makes possible a more thorough audit of all types of returns will have a direct and forceful effect in the war against tax dodging.

"The plan is a forward step in government. Streamlining operations, pin pointing of responsibility and the improved business methods and procedures it embodies assures the revenue service of a high degree of efficiency.

"The independent inspection service of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which will maintain a vigorous and thorough check on the revenue service offices and employees, will be represented in the New York City district by a chief inspector. The inspection service will be directly responsible to an Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue in Washington.

"The reorganization plan has features that will stimulate high morale among revenue service personnel. Extension of the merit system throughout the service will help develop great efficiency and loyalty among the Bureau's employees. Promotion opportunities are being broadened throughout the field service.

"It is a significant fact that the reorganization of the revenue service has been accomplished through 6 years of intensive study and effort. It was by no means a quickly conceived idea.

"It became evident to me shortly after I became Secretary of the Treasury in 1946 that the revenue service had suffered severely due to the conditions under which it had had to expand under wartime restrictions and developments. There had been a great increase in the number of tax returns filed and the amount of revenue collected, many expert employees had been called into the Armed Forces, new tax legislation had been enacted, the workload had increased enormously, and the Bureau had not been able to modernize its operations due to shortage of up-to-date equipment. We immediately set about to improve management methods and achieve greater operating efficiency. But every change had to be made without interrupting the service's continuing task of collecting revenues and enforcing the tax laws.

"Conferences were held with many groups of revenue officials as early as October 1946 to discuss problems and suggested solutions. A work simplification program was set up as a means of enlisting the aid of every employee toward improved efficiency. Task forces of key officials were established to make specific surveys and reports. Congressional recommendations were given the closest attention. A firm of management engineers was employed to analyze operations of the service and suggest other improvements. The Alcohol Tax and Tobacco Tax Divisions of the Bureau were consolidated.

"In this fashion for 6 years we have been gradually reorganizing the Bureau of Internal Revenue until we have reached this final step in a long series of actions taken by the Treasury Department to improve and streamline the Federal tax-collection system. The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 is the capstone of this progressive development.

"In placing the plan in effect, we have made it our objective that only the most capable persons available would be named to the position of district commissioner of internal revenue, director of internal revenue, and other supervisory posts. To accomplish this end, we set up a Selection Board made up of top career officials of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which, acting under Civil Service Commission rules and regulations, has inquired painstakingly into the qualifications and records of all applicants and appointees.

"Installation of the reorganized internal revenue service here today for the Bureau's New York City operations under the new plan brings to a fulfillment the intensive work of many individuals and groups. All who aided in the task deserve public commendation. I also want to commend Commissioner Dunlap and his associates for the splendid work they have done in carrying out the reorganization plan. They have done so with untiring interest and earnest cooperation.

"In addition, I want to thank all who have so enthusiastically contributed to the successful outcome of the task, including congressional groups, the personnel of the revenue service, consultants of business management firms, and others who aided us in various advisory capacities. All who have taken part in this task have shown remarkable initiative, ingenuity, and objectivity.

"In closing, I want to assure you that the American people are entitled to a Federal revenue service of top efficiency, of unquestioned integrity, and of maximum operating economy. Continued success of this country's voluntary system of taxpayer compliance depends upon such a service. New York City shares significantly in the steps now being taken to provide the Nation with the finest internal revenue service it is possible to create."

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 30.—Under Secretary of the Treasury Edward H. Foley said today, in opening ceremonies at the Custom House for the installation of officials of the reorganized internal revenue service in New York City:

"These are historic premises, and they again witness an important proceeding.

"Our purpose this morning is to effect reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue offices in New York City in accordance with the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, as approved by the Congress.

"Under the reorganization plan the internal revenue service becomes, the country over, a career service. Its objectives are the best possible service to the public, a maximum degree of efficiency and economy of operation, and every possible freedom from suspicion of dishonesty or betrayal of trust.

"I want to acknowledge, on behalf of the Treasury, the effective support which the reorganization plan had from Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN, Representative EUGENE J. KEOGH, and the other members of the New York congressional delegation. The fact that the benefits of the plan are being extended today to the New York City area is due in no small measure to the endorsements which Representative KEOGH and Senator LEHMAN gave it while it was pending before the Congress.

"The ideas embodied in the reorganization plan derived in part from a thorough, unbiased examination into the structure and operating methods of the Bureau of Internal Revenue by a New York firm of management engineers—the firm of Cresap, McCormick & Paget.

"Secretary Snyder has recently had a letter from a partner of these management engineers, Mr. T. D. Morris, outlining his firm's observations as to the character of the job being done to make reorganization effective. I want to read two paragraphs from Mr. Morris' letter. He said:

"'I want to pass on to you personally our feeling that the results being obtained in the Bureau of Internal Revenue are in large

measure attributable to the fine leadership which you and other capable Treasury personnel have given, and to the enlightened use which you have made of outside specialists, both in and outside of Government.

"'My firm is indeed proud to have shared in planning these improvements and is convinced that under the continued leadership and interest which has been displayed by you and other officials of the Treasury Department, a record will be made in which all personnel of the Treasury Department can take equal pride.'

"We are happy to have had—and we appreciate—the generous cooperation of many New Yorkers in arranging this ceremony. And we are happy, of course, to have so many of you present. The Bowling Green vicinity and this famous custom house seem to me particularly appropriate for such a gathering, closely identified as they are with many forward steps in New York life. Certainly there is every prospect that the steps we are taking here today will be fruitful of real improvement and progress."

Under Secretary Foley introduced Secretary Snyder, the principal speaker at the ceremony, as the man whose guidance and inspiration started the reorganization plan on its way 6 years ago, and who patiently but resolutely saw it through to full accomplishment.

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION IN THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE, 1946 TO DATE

The reorganization now going on in the Internal Revenue Service is the culmination of a long series of actions taken in response to changes in the Federal tax system since 1946.

World War II overwhelmed the Bureau's collection and auditing machinery, geared to handle a relatively small number of prewar returns, by adding an army of taxpayers as incomes grew and exemptions were lowered. In the past decade the number of returns has increased fourfold and the volume of tax collections tenfold. With the broadening of the base of the personal income tax, wage and salary withholding was introduced, creating many new problems, not the least of which was that of mass refunding operations. The excess-profits tax, the extension of social-security coverage, and the wagering tax, has each made a new and substantial contribution to the workload. Our tax system today bears little resemblance to that of 1940.

The heavy volume of recent tax legislation, designed to finance defense expenditures, has strained severely the administrative forces of the revenue service. In the space of a little more than a year the Bureau's staff has been required to assimulate four major enactments—the Social Security Act of 1950, the Revenue Act of 1950, the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950, and the Revenue Act of 1951. These developments have been accompanied by an increase in appellate work and cases in litigation.

When Secretary Snyder assumed office in 1946 the tremendous expansion which took place during the World War II period had already revealed many organizational and procedural weaknesses. In such a period of vastly increased activity, the disruption of day-to-day operations would have had serious repercussions. Every change had to be well thought out and every detail considered before its initiation.

With this thought in mind, Secretary Snyder introduced on a trial basis, a work-simplification program of management improvement in the Bureau which started at the grass roots. The program, which was designed to tap the accumulated knowledge and experience of every employee, was the first step on the road to reorganization. This program was officially adopted and expanded to include the entire Revenue Service in 1947.

At the same time, management improvement efforts were started in other directions. In October 1946 the first large-scale conference in several years was held in Washington between field and departmental officials of the revenue service in order to survey its operational and administrative problems. A month later there was established a special committee on administration to analyze the suggestions made at this conference. The next step of the Secretary was the creation of a committee of highly qualified men from both inside and outside Government to direct the management studies of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and to act as consultant in the solution of administrative problems. In September 1948 the Congress, on the recommendation of the Secretary, authorized the employment of an outstanding firm of management engineers to make a broad-scale study of the Bureau. The firm's report and recommendations were received in August 1949.

All of these improvements have taken time—time to plan, and time to install while carrying on the heavy burdens of the Bureau. The present reorganization plan brings to fruition intensive studies which have been under way much of the time since 1947 when the management improvement program was begun. Not only does the reorganization seek to repair basic weaknesses in the old structure, but it includes provisions for further improvements which will be made in the future.

The following chronology of the actions taken and the improvements made in the management and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue clearly illustrates the painstaking care with which the groundwork was laid for the final step represented in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

CHRONOLOGY OF ACTIONS TAKEN TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION IN THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

October 7-9, 1946: Conference of Collectors and Internal Revenue Agents in Washington.

The conference, called by the Secretary, stirred interest in better management in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and resulted in the submission of a number of plans for improving the operations of the Internal Revenue Service. Many of these ideas and suggestions were adopted in 1947 and 1948 after study and experiments showed they were worth while.

October 31, 1946: The Secretary addressed a letter to all Bureau chiefs urging the streamlining of operations and other administrative improvements.

November 15, 1946: Special Committee on Administration in Bureau of Internal Revenue appointed.

This committee appraised the ideas and suggestions submitted by key officials at the October conference and immediately afterward. Its final report was submitted in August 1947. Over 100 of the ideas or plans were adopted and placed in effect in the past 5 years. Some of these were:

(a) Microfilming of records, commencing in 1947.

(b) Revision of internal forms, from 1946 to date.

(c) New sorting and filing methods for processing returns.

(d) Reduction of interest payments through improved procedures in scheduling refunds.

(e) Change in tolerance used in computing taxes on form W-2, to simplify adjustments between the taxpayer and the Government.

(f) Use of preassembled forms where practicable to increase productivity and improve service.

January 14, 1947: Letter to Bureau heads announced the appointment of a Treasury Department Committee on Employee Awards.

The committee was organized in January and began planning for a program. The regulations and instructions were issued in June and the formal announcement to employees inviting them to participate by submitting suggestions was made on July 30. Since that time Bureau of Internal Revenue employees have submitted over 14,500 suggestions. Of these 2,170 have been adopted and 1,676 cash awards made. Estimated first year's savings total $663,900. This is still a very vital and active program; 24 suggestions were adopted last month. Most of these improvements are small, an improvement in a form, or the elimination of an unnecessary step in a procedure, but when an organization is handling forms by the millions, 50,000,000 income-tax returns and 40,000,000 other tax returns per year, these small savings in time and work are enormously multiplied in some cases.

March 25, 1947: Letter to all Bureau heads urging again their accelerated efforts toward improvements to reduce expenditures.

June 1947: Inauguration of work-simplification program.

The program was begun with a pilot installation in the collector's office in St. Paul, Minn. The program might be called the grass-roots approach to management improvement, as it starts with the lowest level of management, the first-line supervisor, and trains him to apply simple techniques of management analysis. Within 5 years it has resulted in the installation of more than 2,200 improvements and an active interest in better management among the lowest supervisory levels of the internal-revenue service.

November 1, 1947: A wage- and excise-tax division was formed in collectors' offices by combining the miscellaneous and employment-tax divisions and the withholding-tax subdivision of the income-tax division. This permitted the consolidation of certain forms and records and the performance of a better coordinated service to taxpayers.

Other projects begun in 1947 which resulted in improvements in operations included:

The microfilming program, to preserve permanent records but save space and equipment required for records storage. This is now one of the standard practices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and over $100,000 per year which would otherwise be required for file cabinets and storage space is now saved. The value of file cabinets and floor space released by this program to date is over $1,300,000.

Improvements were worked out in the scheduling of payments for refund accelerating the process sufficiently to save over $2,000,000 in interest charges during one year by getting refunds to taxpayers more promptly.

The procedure for paying alcohol taxes by bottlers was simplified. Instead of the proprietor having to submit bottling-tank forms to the storekeeper-gauger for verification, then to a deputy collector with the remittance, then the receipted form back to the storekeeper gauger for release of the spirits for bottling, the new procedure eliminates all of the delay. The proprietor may now purchase stamps in advance, attach the exact value to the bottling-tank form, and present the form with attached stamps to the storekeeper-gauger who releases the spirits to be bottled.

The use of transfer stamps on all containers of industrial alcohol transferred in bond from one bonded warehouse to another was eliminated as investigation revealed there was sufficient protection to the revenue without them.

February 1948: Report by the House Committee on Appropriations.

This committee report made a number of recommendations for improving the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

February 20, 1948: The Secretary instructed the Commissioner to augment the Commissioner's staff to have the function of broad-scale management.

March 23, 1948: Organizational meeting of the Treasury Department Management Committee was held.

This committee was established to act as a consulting organization for improving management throughout the Department.

April 22, 1948: The Commissioner's management staff was established by the Commissioner's order.

The management staff has a primary objective: the improvement of management in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It has taken a position of leadership in management activities since that time.

April 1948: Report of the Advisory Group to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was released.

This report made a number of recommendations, among them:

(a) The establishment of a management staff in the Commissioner's office.

(b) The decentralization of all routine work to the field offices leaving Washington a supervisory and management headquarters.

(c) The extension of the use of depositary receipts.

(d) Improvements in tax-return forms.

(e) The use of modern sampling techniques to measure the adequacy of enforcement methods and the volume of tax evasion.

(f) The employment of outside management specialists to study the organization and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

All of these recommendations were accepted and became objectives for installation as rapidly as possible.

July 2, 1948: By Order No. S–784, the Secretary established a Committee to Direct the Management Studies of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Hon. A. L. M. Wiggins was named chairman of the committee.

This committee brought together a group of highly qualified men from both inside and outside of Government and focused their attention on the management problems of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for purposes of discussion and analysis. It has been most helpful in its advice to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and in expediting improvements.

September 1948: Congress authorized the employment of a firm of management consultants to make a comprehensive survey in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

September 30, 1948: The services of Cresap, McCormick & Paget were obtained to analyze the organization and procedures of the collectors' offices. Their recommendations were received in 1949.

There were also numerous other developments during 1948 which improved the organization and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, such as:

Successful experiments were conducted in the collector's office in Cleveland on the use of punch-card tabulating equipment for computing tax liability on W–2 returns.

Orders were issued for the retention of excise tax returns in the collector's offices instead of being forwarded to Washington. This eliminated a duplicate copy which had been retained in the collector's office and also the handling of original returns in the Washington office.

Photo copying was introduced in many offices to reduce the typing workload and relieve the shortage of typists and stenographers.

Your Federal Income Tax booklet was rewritten in nontechnical language and became a best seller.

The instructions to taxpayers enclosed with their income tax return forms were clarified so the taxpayer would know not only what he should report but what he had a legal right to omit or deduct.

The new form 1040A was introduced to simplify computation of tax liability by collectors and insure better compliance with income tax law requirements.

Authority to approve routine personnel actions was decentralized to field officials.

Authority was decentralized to the collectors to approve special refunds of social security taxes.

Estate and Gift Tax Division transferred from Miscellaneous Tax Unit to Income Tax Unit, providing closer linking of field and headquarters' offices as all field examinations of estate- and gift-tax returns were performed in the field by revenue agents.

The surveying, classifying, and storing of 2,500,000 individual income-tax returns previously performed in Washington, was transferred to the field.

January 29, 1949: Final report of management consulting firm on study of collectors' offices received.

It was a comprehensive and detailed document with many plans and recommendations for improvement in the organization and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

February 1949: The same firm, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, was engaged to study the organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue (previous study was on collectors' offices).

Spring 1949: Punch card tabulating equipment was extended to seven additional collection districts from original installation in Cleveland. In 1948 equipment had been used only for 1040A income-tax returns, and in 1949 the experiments were extended to 1040 income-tax returns, and 1040 ES returns and related documents.

Summer 1949: Tests were made as recommended in report of the management consulting firm.

1. Use of electric typewriters, continuous forms, dual roller platens, as posting machines for processing individual income tax returns.

2. Discontinuing of separate accounts to record: (a) Collection of accrued penalties and interest; (b) collections obtained after abatement of assessments as uncollectible; (c) excess collection of income and withholding taxes.

3. Use of new and simplified scheme for block numbering of returns to reduce typing and proofreading.

4. Use of validating machines and bank proofing machines for processing and control of remittances; also adaptation of cash-register machines to validate special tax stamps.

5. Simplified procedure for control and disposition of unclassified collections.

6. Use of high speed posting machines with direct subtraction using continuous carbon-interleaved forms for preparing accounting records.

August 1949: Report of management consulting firm, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, on organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue was received.

It included a number of recommendations for organizational and procedural changes.

November 14, 1949: Division of responsibilities between two Assistant Commissioners.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued an order defining the authority and responsibility of the two Assistant Commissioners. One was given supervision over the technical functions of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the other was given supervision over the operating activities of the Bureau. This provided a logical division of the organization responsibilities and provided more adequate assistance to the Commissioner.

Fall 1949: The Processing Division was given the task of inserting and mailing income-tax forms and instructions for several collectors' offices. By the fall of 1951 this was extended to 37 collectors' offices. Economies were achieved with mass production methods impossible with the job being done in 64 collectors' offices were skilled tax collecting personnel were directed to this nontechnical task.

December 16, 1949: Collectors were delegated authority to make refunds under $10,000.

This results in collectors processing about 100,000 overassessments per year instead of their being sent into the Washington office for review and scheduling.

Many other management improvements were made in 1949. Some of the more important ones are:

The audit-control program was placed in operation. This involved the sample selection of individual income-tax returns for field investigation to determine the compliance of taxpayers and the direction of investigative efforts to the best advantage.

New procedures were adopted for processing information documents. These were directed at accelerating the processing, saving time, and obtaining better utilization of the documents in auditing returns.

Post audit review work was redesigned to cover the results of audit of individual income-tax returns by collectors and to stress uniformity in field application of the tax laws and regulations.

Collectors were delegated full authority to assert delinquency penalties for late filing of all types of returns.

Collectors were delegated responsibility for the handling of all requests for certified copies of individual income-tax returns, and also for the transcript service for the States in respect to such returns.

January 1, 1950: Federal Insurance Contributions Act and income tax withheld combined in one form.

This saves work for the taxpayer and saves Bureau of Internal Revenue about $250,000 per year in costs of processing these returns. Also, this permitted extension of the depository receipt system to Federal Insurance Contributions Act taxes.

January-April: Electronic computers were used with punch-card tabulating equipment for calculating tax liability on income-tax returns.

Spring 1950: Agreements were made with five States for cooperation in the investigation of income-tax returns of residents of those States (Wisconsin, North Carolina, Kentucky, Montana, and Colorado).

September 1, 1950: Bulk gaging tanks were installed in internal revenue bonded warehouses, which saved considerable time of storekeeper-gagers.

Loss allowance schedule was eliminated in connection with remission claims filed by warehousers of distilled spirits. This reduces the workload for both Government and taxpayer.

Eliminated tax payment of distilled spirits prior to bottling in bond and arranged for payment when cases are removed from bond. This simplified tax payment procedure and eliminated delay in releasing cases from bond.

Eliminated reporting of wine gallons as well as proof gallons and tax gallons. This simplified reporting, and reduced work of storekeeper-gagers and audit clerks.

Delegated to district supervisors the authority to approve qualified documents for alcohol production plants. This reduced departmental workload and costs.

October 30, 1950: Discontinued preparation of separate reports of concurrent examination of income tax returns covering 2 years or more, which saved costs equivalent to salaries of revenue agents and typists.

Numerous other improvements were made during the course of the year. These included the following:

Eliminated certain nonproductive arithmetic verification procedures.

Numerous minor delegations of authority were issued, such as: the authority to collectors, acting collectors, and deputy collectors to sign various forms and documents for the Commissioner. These delegations simplified procedures and expedited action.

January 1951: Operational cost system installed in collectors' offices.

Provided data for businesslike cost control in collectors' offices. This facilitates operations analysis and makes it possible to staff offices on the basis of workload.

January–April: New office of Budget and Finance was created.

The first three of Bureau of Internal Revenue's regional finance offices were established to provide better and more economical fiscal service.

July 1, 1951: Uniform stock control system was adopted to provide for better control of stock issues, inventories, and requisitions for replacement.

Decentralized stationery procurement was effected to simplify procurement of those items.

New system of administrative control over budget and expenditures was adopted covering obligations and expenditures in the offices of those collectors who handle their own accounting.

New system of appropriation accounting was also placed in effect to simplify appropriation expense accounts.

September 1951: Report of survey of management improvement facilities of the Bureau of Internal Revenue completed by committee appointed by the Secretary and the Commissioner.

October 1951: Internal Revenue Inspection Service established.

This will provide effective inspection of field offices for both efficiency and integrity.

November 14, 1951: Tobacco tax functions transferred from Excise Tax Division to new Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division.

This consolidates field inspection and enforcement activities in one staff for both kinds of taxes.

November 2, 1951: The Income Tax Unit was reorganized to reduce the number of primary organizational units from 13 to 5, eliminating 113 positions.

During the year, several other changes to improve the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue were also made. These included:

Decentralized to collectors the audit of Form 940, annual return of employer of more than 8 persons under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (formerly handled by Employment Tax Division in Washington). This expedited the process by having collectors deal directly with the State unemployment-compensation agencies.

Installed new method of processing monthly returns of manufacturers of tobacco products and annual accounts of dealers in leaf tobacco, which eliminated clerical work.

Allowed revenue agents to authorize payment of claims up to $3,000 on prima facie evidence without field examination so their efforts could be directed to more productive examinations.

Installed a procedure for alphabetical prefix in classification and numbering of income-tax returns to provide for quick identification of the class of return and simplify numbering.

December 11, 1951: Procedure in the consideration of criminal fraud cases revised by eliminating the health of the taxpayer as a basis for refraining from recommending criminal prosecution for tax violations.

January 8, 1952: Establishment of a more efficient procedure in the routing of criminal tax evasion cases by providing for a direct referral of such cases from the field by the district penal attorney of the Bureau to the Department of Justice.

January 10, 1952: Further improvement in the handling of criminal fraud cases by abandonment of the former policy under which criminal prosecution was not recommended in cases where taxpayers made voluntary disclosures of intentional violation of the internal-revenue laws prior to the initiation of the investigation by the Bureau.

January 14, 1952: The President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, for the Bureau of Internal Revenue submitted to Congress by President Truman.

The reorganization will include a realinement of activities in the field and in Washington. The separate field offices engaged in different specialized activities, for example, will largely be consolidated. It is expected that the new organization will be more efficient and provide better service to the taxpayer.

January 30, 1952: Ten task forces were established to work out details of plans and procedures for the proposed reorganization under plan No. 1.

March 14, 1952: Reorganization Plan No. 1 became effective.

March: Use of flat package for mailing income tax forms and instructions.

For the first time a manufactured flat package of forms and instructions was used for two States, Indiana and Massachusetts. It will be used in all districts in the future. The experiment was very successful. Higher manufacturing costs were more than offset by savings in labor.

April: Standard mail opening methods.

The standardized mail room system installed in all collectors' offices was very successful, will save about $500,000 per year. It provides much more rapid and efficient handling of mail and remittances with a marked saving in labor. It will be refined and strengthened in all collectors' offices during 1952.

Conclusion: The foregoing chronology of the actions taken and the improvements made in management and operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue clearly sets out the painstaking care that went into the complete reorganization of the Bureau, which culminated in the final step represented by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, which was adopted by the Congress on March 14, 1952.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 7391. Heretofore all committee amendments have been agreed to en bloc, with the exception of two amendments, one on page 34, and one on page 54.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for the call of the quorum to be charged to neither side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Douglas
Bennett	Case	Duff
Benton	Clements	Dworshak
Bricker	Connally	Eastland
Bridges	Cordon	Eaton
Butler, Nebr.	Dirksen	Ellender
Ferguson	Kem	O'Conor
Flanders	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Frear	Knowland	Pastore
Fulbright	Langer	Robertson
George	Lehman	Russell
Gillette	Long	Saltonstall
Green	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Hayden	Martin	Seaton
Hendrickson	Maybank	Smathers
Hennings	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	McFarland	Sparkman
Holland	McKellar	Stennis
Humphrey	Monroney	Thye
Hunt	Moody	Underwood
Ives	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	Mundt	Welker
Johnson, Tex.	Murray	Wiley
Johnston, S. C.	Neely	Williams
Kefauver	Nixon	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent because of official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The first committee amendment to be passed over is the amendment on page 34, line 16.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Saturday all the committee amendments have been agreed to, except that all of them are open to reconsideration upon the request of any Member of the Senate. As the Vice President has stated, two amendments were passed over, one on page 34, and one on page 54.

I believe it would be well, because of the absence of certain Senators from the floor, not to take up consideration of those two amendments at this time.

Therefore, I shall proceed to offer the amendment to which I alluded on Saturday. It is a substitute for the provision on page 29, beginning in line 8, and extending to line 3, on page 30. I send the amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 29, it is proposed to strike out line 8 through line 22, inclusive, and on page 30, to strike out line 1 through line 3, inclusive, and to insert in lieu thereof the folowing: "$4,685,044,000 of which $1,685,044,000 is for payment of obliga-

tions incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes, and $3,000,000,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $11,000,000,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Air Force is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense for one hundred and twenty-six combat wings, seventeen transport combat groups, and other supporting elements and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendment provides what we commonly call contract authority, a device which has been opposed in previous years when it was used for the purpose of avoiding the appearance of enlarged appropriations. That is not the purpose in this instance. The purpose is to make it possible for the Air Force to plan for the construction of 143 combat wings, 17 of which are to be transport combat wings, for completion not later than July 1, 1955. That is a year beyond which in the opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the date of danger.

It should be pointed out again, as I did on Saturday, that Congress makes no bones whatever about appropriating the annual cash cost for rivers and harbors projects and other projects which are constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Congress makes no bones at all about appropriating the annual cost of the work to be done on reclamation projects during a fiscal year.

Congress does so regardless of the fact that in each instance the total estimated cost of these great projects is far beyond that for which cash is provided.

For example, if Congress were to appropriate for a project like the Hoover Dam, which would take years to build, it would not attempt to appropriate in cash the entire estimated cost of that dam, but would be content to appropriate the estimated amount of the expenditures to be made during the fiscal year.

Mr. President, we are confronted with the national need for an Air Force of not less than 143 wings, as is shown by the chart in the rear of the Chamber, which I described at length on Saturday. The Soviet air power is steadily being built up, while we lag. If we were to make a cut at this time in this appropriation, and if we were not to provide the contract anthority which is proposed, we would not be able to attain the desired strength of our Air Force before 1956 or 1957.

Of what use is it, Mr. President, to provide in the name of economy and in the name of technical opposition to contract authority, for less authority to build the Air Force than we need? Of what use is it to do that? If we are confronted with a present danger—and everyone who reads the stories in the newspapers, everyone who hears what is said on the radio, knows that the Soviet airpower is constantly being built up——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the contract authority which is recommended by Secretary Finletter will be sufficient to finish construction of the 143 wings as of 1954.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, as of 1954. That was the desire.

Mr. MAYBANK. This amendment will release the necessary funds, will it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that the 143 wings be constructed by July 1, 1954. $2,000,000,000 was cut from the recommendation, when the budget was sent to the Congress. That meant that the objective could not be attained until July 1, 1955. The danger now is that we shall not be able to attain it until July 1, 1956. I am offering this amendment so as to make certain that it can be attained by July 1, 1955.

Mr. MAYBANK. So the amendment, if adopted, will make possible the attainment of that goal by 1955; is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will vote for an amendment to make possible the attainment of the goal by the original 1954 date, but I understand that such an amendment cannot very well be brought forward at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the history of American air power has been the history of delay; it has been the history of failure to understand the crisis.

In 1941, after Pearl Harbor, I stood upon this floor and urged an appropriation of $500,000,000 to expand what was then the Army Air Corps. The Senate adopted that proposal, despite the fact that the War Department, as it was known at that time, was saying that it was unnecessary and would be too large an expenditure.

By the time the War Department got around to adopting the suggestion I made immediately after Pearl Harbor, the cost of expanding our Air Force was very much greater.

Then, in 1948, we had the same issue all over again. The Air Force was cut down from 58 groups to 48 groups because Senators apparently were not able to see the danger. I do not want us to make that mistake again.

The only effect of adopting my amendment will be to present to the conferees on the part of the House the plain question whether they are willing to make a cash appropriation with contract authority sufficient to make it possible for us to attain this objective which my amendment contemplates.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The two additional minutes available to the Senator from Wyoming have expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I fully concur in the statements which have been made by the Senator from Wyoming. It seems to me that at a time when admittedly we are under great threat from Communist aggression, it would be the height of folly for us to cripple our Nation by reducing the appropriations which must necessarily be made in order to provide for it the necessary strength within a reasonable time.

The whole idea of delay makes no sense to me. Either we need these things for our defense, or we do not. If we do not need them, there is no reason to appropriate large sums of money for these purposes. On the other hand, if we do need them—and I am convinced that we do—it would be a foolish, short-sighted policy for us to reduce appropriations beyond the point of safety. Yet apparently it is now proposed to do that in respect to this particular item and other items.

So I hope very much that the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming will be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming for himself and the junior Senator from Texas. I believe it represents a basic element of our survival.

The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas would simply permit the Air Force to proceed with its plans to produce an Air Force of 143 wings by 1955.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff told the President of the United States it was their best judgment that the greatest year of danger to this Nation would be 1954, and that for that reason we should have a minimum of 143 wings by July 1, 1954. The President, on the advice of his Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and for purely fiscal reasons, adopted what is now known throughout the country as the 1-year stretch-out, which would postpone our air readiness date until July 1, 1955.

Now, Mr. President, the House of Representatives has voted to go the President one better, for under the bill as passed by the House and as reported by the Senate committee, unless the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming is adopted, our air readiness will be postponed not only 1 year beyond the danger point, but until July 1, 1956. Mr. President, that is a gamble the Congress should not take. That is a responsibility the Nation should not assume.

I wish to call the attention of the Members of this body to a warning given the American people last Saturday night by the distinguished and beloved chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, the Honorable RICHARD RUSSELL, when he was speaking at Denver, Colo. At that time he said, in part:

I think the "stretch-outs" in our airplane procurement program have been a dangerous mistake, and I will continue to use every power that I command to see that more planes roll off the assembly lines. It is little short of a national disgrace to be outproduced in jet planes by Soviet Russia.

Mr. President, the stretch-out which was referred to by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee was the stretch-out called for by the President. I know the Senator from Georgia could hardly conceive that Congress would proceed to add an additional year to that stretch-out.

The Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee issued its thirty-ninth report just a few days ago. It was a unanimous report. I wish to bring it to the attention of the Members of the Senate, because I believe the vote which will be taken on the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming will be as important as any vote taken by the Senate at this session.

I read now the summary and conclusions of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, which were endorsed unanimously by all the members of that subcommittee, both Republican and Democratic:

1. According to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, our highest military authority, the period of maximum peril for the United States will be the year 1954.

2. This judgment is based on the best intelligence the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been able to obtain regarding the build-up of forces by our potential enemy. Based on that conclusion, the Joint Chiefs recommended a 143-wing Air Force and certain naval aviation force levels necessary to be in being not later than December 31, 1954, with June 30, 1954, as the preferable date.

3. In the face of the solemn warning by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, largely on the basis of advice given by civilian officials, made a decision based on fiscal considerations, the end result of which was to postpone, beyond the date of our gravest danger, the attainment of our necessary modern air power.

Unless the O'Mahoney-Johnson amendment is adopted, the Senate will postpone it for an additional year beyond the date set by the President's budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Texas, which will leave us 5 minutes on this side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The next paragraph of the summary of conclusions of the Preparedness Committee reads as follows:

4. The record indicates that reducing the total number of planes to be produced annually increased the unit cost per plane by 2½ to 3 percent.

The pending bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations cuts out 700 airplanes. We have already postponed the date 1 year, but the pending bill would eliminate 700 airplanes.

Mr. President, will such a proposal save us money? The testimony before the committee is that it will actually cost us money, because, when the volume of aircraft manufacture of each individual plane is reduced, the unit cost is increased. The O'Mahoney-Johnson amendment does not add any cash to the bill; but it does add contract authority, which, when exercised, will bring the total amount expended up to the amount recommended by the budget. I hope the O'Mahoney-Johnson amendment will be adopted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief memorandum which I have prepared on the subject.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

I am supporting this amendment because I believe that it represents a basic element of our survival.

This proposal would simply permit the Air Force to go ahead with its planning to produce 126 combat wings and 17 transport groups by 1955. It would permit our officials to make the necessary obligations this year—up to $11,000,000,000—to meet their program.

There is nothing novel or startling about such a proposal. It merely applies to our national security a principle which was established years ago in the construction of dams and in reclamation projects. It is a principle that has worked well.

It is also a principle which we should be able to apply to other fields.

If we can build dams to protect our lands, we can build fighter planes to protect our lives.

If we can have reclamation projects to fight soil erosion, we can have bombers to attack an aggressor.

The Senate Preparedness Committee has recently completed a series of exhaustive hearings on air power. During those hearings, we questioned behind closed doors the most responsible military leaders of our Nation.

These are the men who must lead our fighting forces if we are attacked. These are the men who have the enormous responsibility of planning the defenses of our lives and our institutions.

Without exception, they agreed on two points:

First, the United States will enter the period of its greatest peril in 1954.

Second, to meet that peril we should have an Air Force composed of 126 fighting wings and 17 transport wings.

The pressing recommendations of our military leaders have been overruled already by one agency of the Government. The recommendations were overruled when the President and his advisers decided to wait until 1955 to get the fighting planes that we need.

In my opinion, that was a mistake—possibly a tragic mistake. But I do not believe that one mistake is an excuse for another mistake.

This bill, as it come to us from the House and the Appropriations Committee multiplies the original error. In the original stretch-out, we were asked to live through a year of peril, inadequately armed.

The cuts in aircraft procurement proposed by the House and the Senate Appropriations Committee would extend that peril for an extra 9 months to a year. These cuts—amounting to a total of $600,000,000—would:

First, knock about 700 aircraft out of the program.

Second, push the whole program back 9 to 12 months.

Third, wreck the current schedules and force a complete programing of the whole operation.

It is probably too late to correct the mistakes of the President's stretch-out program. But I do not believe that we should commit ourselves to even greater weaknesses.

The amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming would avoid that commitment to weakness. I urge its adoption.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say in half a minute that my amendment actually takes cash out of the bill. It does not add any, but it does take it out.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, has adequately and clearly stated the conclusions and reasons of those of us who actually sat to hear the proof, and who went into the detailed charts, references, figures, patterns, and facts. As one of those who was slow to go overboard on the idea, I was fully convinced that the cut-back as a whole with reference to airplanes was a mistake, and particularly the severe one imposed by the other body, I believe, before it had the full facts in mind. It would be a tragic mistake, did the Senate not approve this amendment. I feel certain the Senate's position will prevail in the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Michigan desires some time, and I will yield to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the Senator from New Hampshire has control of the time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the fact that I am speaking in the time of the opposition does not imply that I am using the time to ask the Senate to oppose this amendment. I think this is one of the amendments which can be taken to conference, to be dealt with there, but I believe the Senate should understand what it is proposed to do by an amendment of this kind.

The Senate has labored for years with the question of contract authority. We have discovered, I think, that in the case of giving contract authority the Senate of the United States and the Appropriations Committee are not so careful with the money thus authorized to be spent as they are in regard to the appropriation of cash money to be spent by the various agencies. That, I think, is the secret of the opposition of the House. The House has determined within the past 2 years that it will not permit contract authority. By providing contract

authority we could eliminate billions of dollars from this appropriation bill and say to the people that we had reduced the appropriation, but at the same time the various agencies could contract for the same amount of money, which the taxpayers would be compelled to pay in future years.

Let me explain that a little further. The mere fact that we appropriate a certain number of dollars does not make that certain number of dollars a public debt, because the money is not taken from the Treasury or expended until there is occasion to use it. It is a few days, or at any rate, less than a month, after the money is used that it becomes a public debt.

What we are proposing to do here in regard to airplanes may be explained in this way: We are having a great deal of trouble in our figures, because of the so-called lead time, which is nothing more nor less than the time after the Government lets a contract for an article until that article is produced. It is true that the Defense Department, when it places an order for the ordinary automobiles of commercial type, is required to wait 9 months, as a matter of lead time, before it can actually get the automobile and be required to pay for it.

In the case of airplanes, we have what is known as the 3-year lead time, and a certain amount of money will be used during the first year for the production of planes. Planes contracted for in the same contract will not be produced until the following fiscal year, and still other planes covered by the same contract will not be produced until the third fiscal year.

The whole question now before the Senate is whether we should today appropriate the money for a contract covering the production of airplanes, as to which (a) a number of them will be produced in fiscal 1953, (b) a number in fiscal 1954, and (c) a number in fiscal year 1955. Should we appropriate only for those airplanes which are to be produced in fiscal 1953 and allow the Air Force to contract for the planes to be produced in fiscal 1954, and 1955? The question is asked, why do that? We do not do it in connection with the construction of dams. We do not do it in connection with the purchase of equipment for dams, to be used in reclamation and flood-control projects. We provide the amount of money which can be spent during the current fiscal year. The contractor realizes that if the Congress of the United States did not appropriate for the following year, he could not object to it, because of the provisions of his contract.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the majority leader is not present, so I shall take a little more time in order to explain this item, which I think the Senate ought to understand. We have a similar problem in connection with airplanes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely desire to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I said, we do not use contract authority in connection with contracts for flood control and reclamation. We are not using it exactly in the construction of the *Forrestal* air carrier, because we are appropriating the amount of money and are authorizing the Department to proceed to the construction of the carrier. We are appropriating sufficient money for that purpose for the first year. But when it comes to the Air Force contracting for airplanes, it is their contention that they cannot contract with a corporation or with individuals to furnish the planes unless they have authority to enter into contracts for production of planes in the distant future.

One of their reasons for that contention is that if they did not have that kind of authority, and the manufacture of planes was stopped in the second or third year, the manufacturers would not be entitled to damages. It is the contention of the Air Force that if contract authority is not authorized and they are not provided the cash, they cannot enter into contracts, because those who manufacture the planes will say, "If you do not go ahead the second and third fiscal years, there is no way in which we can get damages. We cannot sue you for the amount of damages we would suffer by not receiving the profit we would have made in the second and third fiscal years." If Congress does provide contract authority and the Air Force signs contracts to produce planes in the next fiscal year and the second and third fiscal years the United States Government can be sued for damages in the Court of Claims. If all the money were appropriated, they could then enter into a contract and set aside that amount of money as being obligated upon a contract. Therefore, they would be sure that they would get a contract for the following 2 years.

I was hoping, Mr. President, that we could conceive some other kind of appropriation than that of providing the absolute cash in one fiscal year, that we might appropriate for one and a half fiscal years, and that the airplane companies would go along. But it seems that the Air Corps is determined that they must have for the so-called lead time the amount in cash appropriated for three fiscal years, or they must have it in contract authority.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In addition to the problem which the Senator has described, it has been my understanding that when we are dealing with aircraft manufacturers there is involved the question of raw materials and the cost of the plant investment. The raw materials and plant investment are both larger items, so far as dollars and cents are involved, than is the case of a contractor on a flood-control or reclamation dam. That is one of the reasons why time is required, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say there is some distinction, but it would appear to me that airplane manufacturers, if they were able to order their materials for a year and a half, would know at the end of the year how much they were going to use within the next 6 months. Suppose the Senator from South Dakota is a contractor constructing a large dam and has thousands of dollars' worth of machinery to buy. He buys so much each year, and the wear and tear will be so much for the first year. If he does not get a contract for the second fiscal year, it is his contention that he will lose a large amount of money. His executives and other personnel are employed on a yearly basis.

Mr. CASE. That, of course, is true, except that there is this difference, it seems to me, namely, that the contractor who is building a dam is using dirt-moving equipment, and if he does not have to use it in building the dam, he may use it in building a road. But the airplane manufacturer does not have a market in the United States for so many thousand tons of airplane frames, or whatever it may be. In fact, he does not have a market at all. His equipment cannot be adapted to some other job.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that. I do not contend that it is not a difficult question. That is why I have been looking at all sides of it, to try to arrange a proper solution without going back to a provision for contract authority, because I believe we are more extravagant in the case of granting contract authority than if the money is actually appropriated.

We must have airplanes if we are to have security. This amendment will not be in the House bill, and the House, up to the present time, has insisted that it will not accept it under any circumstances. We should at least be able to take the amendment to conference, so that in conference a practical solution may be arrived at.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy the Senator has made his statement. I shall undertake, as chairman of the subcommittee, to insist that the Air Force shall make continuous reports to us with respect to the progress of the contracts, so that we may be sure that there will not be waste in expenditures.

Mr. FERGUSON. The proposed contract authority will restore to the bill the $600,000,000 reduction made unanimously by the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think that statement is not absolutely correct. If it is simply a matter of contract authority, the money will not be saved, because we shall have to appropriate the money later.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this amendment was discussed in the committee quite at length. An unprecedented situation is involved. What we all want to do is to try to build up a 143-wing Air Force. We want to keep appropriations down, and we want Congress to retain control. The purpose of the amendment is to permit expenditures for new airplanes up to $3,000,000,000 this year, with a total of $11,000,000,000.

While I was uncertain as to whether this was a proper thing to do, in view of the contract authority provision, I agree with the Senator from Michigan that it is a matter which should be taken to conference, and a determination made there whether we should go ahead with the contract authority idea. Personally, Mr. President, I shall vote in favor of the amendment with the idea of trying to work out in the conference a provision that will be satisfactory.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 or 3 minutes to myself.

Mr. President, the Appropriations Subcommittee on Armed Services have worked long and painstakingly on the bill. There is not a Senator who is not interested in the security of our country and there is not a Senator on either side who wishes to gamble with it. I think we should start with the premise that we are sincere in attempting to reach our objective. The Subcommittee on Armed Services were sincere and logical in what they did.

I sat on the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and also on the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I have heard and read the testimony. I have heard so many figures explained in so many different ways, and I know other Senators have also, that I do not believe one can reach a completely logical, completely positive position. If I had more time than merely the minute or two now at my disposal, I could present quotations from the hearings, from letters, and from other documents, which would make the problem obviously a job for a Philadelphia lawyer to analyze and to solve.

The Senate subcommittee said:

> It is the intention of the committee not to curtail the program submitted by the budget for the acquisition of aircraft, as recommended by the Secretary of Defense, to establish 143 wings, but is designed solely to effect an economy in the procurement of the component spares and spare parts.

No matter how strong an Air Force we may have, there can be no question that the question of spare parts is important. When we provide 64¼ percent spare parts for every airplane manufactured, I do not believe the action is logical. I have in my hand a morning newspaper, which says that the British have developed the most powerful jet-plane engine. The article continues by saying that the United States is going to develop a plane from the British engine. That means that our present engines would become obsolete. We have stocks of B–36 spare parts that run into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars, which now will be of no use.

Let us not condemn the Armed Services Subcommittee on their approach to the spare-parts problem. On the other hand, I am not willing to gamble with the security of the country.

So far as I am concerned—and I know the members of the two committees dealing with the armed services agree with me—I realize that the program of authorization with respect to airplanes is a new subject, unprecedented at least in current appropriations. I do not wish to establish any precedent for the future, either by the appropriation now under consideration or by any other appropriations currently being considered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have but a minute, but I will yield briefly.

Mr. THYE. The Senator from New Hampshire is entirely correct in his statement. Contract authority in large part is a question of administrative procedure, and we should never establish it as a procedure to be followed either by Congress or the administration, but in this particular instance I believe the amendment should be supported so that it may be in conference, where an effort can be made to draft appropriate language which will safeguard the situation, without establishing a precedent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator for his position. Let me tell the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the distinguished Senator from Texas, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who have spoken on the issue, that the amendment should be taken to conference. Let us work it out here, but let us not by adopting the amendment establish a precedent, in the framing of this or any other bill, indicating that we are entering upon a policy of widespread contract authorization.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offered the amendment in committee, and I offered it on the floor, solely because of the great deficiency of air power, but certainly not as a precedent for other activities.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the O'Mahoney amendment, to strike out the figure "$11,000,000,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "$10,440,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled the other day, as the present occupant of the chair understands, that amendments could not really be offered until the time on the pending amendment had been exhausted, or the time had been surrendered. With that in mind, what is the situation as to the remainder of the time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there was placed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Finletter which I think must be misleading. On the question of spare parts, the $700,000,000 taken out of the bill is only for component shares and spare parts, and has nothing to do with the number of planes which are to be actually manufactured. I wish to read into the RECORD what was said on page 711 of the hearings. The figures are not accurate, but the idea is. I read:

> Now, we have brought about some savings in our spares and spare parts. As this committee well knows, a large part of the dollars which are given us for procurement go into spare engines——
>
> Senator FERGUSON. I think you told me the other day it is half a plane.
>
> Mr. GILPATRIC. Sixty cents of every dollar spent on original equipment goes into spares.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. It is 60 instead of 50?
>
> Mr. GILPATRIC. That is correct.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. In other words, you have one plane, then you have 60 percent of the cost of that plane for parts?
>
> Mr. GILPATRIC. Spare engines, spare parts, and spare equipment, that we feel is an area that we must do something about.
>
> Senator FERGUSON. You mean you have to cut that 60 percent?
>
> Mr. GILPATRIC. We have to cut that. I do not see how, over a long period of time, we can sustain a force like this and have that much of our money going into just spares.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from New Hampshire that his time is exhausted. The Senator from Wyoming has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am generally in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I have followed the argument made here in reference to contract authority, and I appreciate the administrative difficulties.

I also appreciate the importance of having adequate air strength. Congress has to do one of two things—either to pay cash through actual appropriations, or to authorize an appropriation that is sufficient to get the program under way, and then provide contract authority to complete it.

Frankly, I am disturbed that the program has been stretched out until 1955. I ask any Member of the Senate to give any information he may have which indicates to him that the Soviet Union is cooing like a dove of peace and is going to withhold her strength until 1955. I do not believe there is any evidence to lead anyone to the belief that international tension has so eased that our problem is diminished.

Insofar as the stretch-out is concerned, it is merely a nice way of deluding the American people as to their responsibility. Frankly, the stretch-out does not mean we are not going to produce the planes; it means we are going to produce them later.

The trouble is that we do not get the cooperation we would like to have from Joe Stalin. There is nothing at all which indicates that Joe Stalin is going to abide by the wishes of the Committee on Appropriations or the Department of Defense, or of anybody else. It appears to me that our job is to take over the program.

Furthermore, a stretch-out is costly. There was evidence before the Johnson subcommittee on preparedness that a stretch-out program would cost an additional $2,000,000,000, if we stretched out the program to 1956, which the appropriation bill would literally do.

Let us tell the American people, then, that the stretch-out program will not only jeopardize national security, but will add additional cost to the procurement of aircraft or of any other military supplies.

There is no legitimate argument on behalf of the stretch-out program except to say that it more or less carries us through a period of time when we ought to be putting up the cash and authorizing contract authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from Wyoming has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota be allowed 5 minutes additional, in which to present his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is that on the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator. I was expecting to offer an amendment to the amendment in order to get time to raise a question. The amount of time was immaterial to me, so long as I received some time to ask the question, and then determine whether any amendment should be offered.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, who is in charge of the bill, so that I may ask him a question.

I note that by adding the amounts proposed in the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has offered, a total of $12,685,044,000 is reached, as compared with a total of $12,085,044,000, as the bill was reported. This makes a difference of $600,000,000, and a difference of $560,000,000 as compared with the House figure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator in response to his question that this is the situation: The House committee cut $560,000,000 from the estimates for the procurement of aircraft. The Senate committee sought to restore that amount, but at the same time it was restoring $560,000,000 for the purchase of aircraft, it took $600,000,000 from the item for component parts and spare parts. My feeling is that by dividing this item in two—cash amounting to $4,685,044,000 on the one hand, and $11,000,000,000 for contract authority on the other—we can cover the whole question of spare parts in conference, under the contract authority, and we shall be in no danger of reducing the number of planes.

Mr. CASE. In other words, the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming has offered brings us back to the original budget figure as a total?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Exactly.

Mr. CASE. I am not disposed to quarrel with the budget figure on programing for the Air Force. I recognize that a very difficult problem is involved. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has, properly, I think, said that whenever we propose contract authority we encourage laxity in appropriations. It is much easier to provide contract authority in a bill than it is to appropriate the cash.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has asked me informally if the O'Mahoney amendment makes $15,000,000,000 in all. My answer was that it does not, because the $3,000,000,000 of the O'Mahoney amendment in cash for 1953 is a part of the $11,000,000,000 in contractual authority, as I read it. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CASE. In both proposals the sum of $1,685,000,000 is available for prior contracts. The O'Mahoney amendment would make $3,000,000,000 available for payment during the year on the $11,000,000,000 worth of new contracts. But the problem as presented by the Senator from Michigan is a very real one, and I respect him for bringing it up.

I hope the pending amendment will be agreed to. I certainly am in favor of it. Nevertheless, I hope the conferees will see if there is not some way to make clearer the entire situation. When we deal with long-range problems like this, and make the sums large to allow for lead time, the problem arises of unobligated funds and unexpended funds. Then if contract authority is provided, another element is added. It is very difficult to see what we are appropriating or where we are going. It is difficult, too, because many people think that when money is once appropriated it creates a cash demand on the Treasury. Of course, we know that in dealing with something of this sort, when evidently only $3,000,000,000 will be required in cash for the next fiscal year, approximately $8,000,000,000 will be carried along and create cash requirements in subsequent years. It occurs to me that possibly the conferees may be able to break that down into the prospective cash requirements in the fiscal years of 1954 and 1955 or beyond if that is the case.

I certainly support the pending amendment, however, because I want to see the Air Force have funds which will provide for the attainment of the 143-wing goal. In 1948 I supported the proposal for funds for the 70-group Air Force. I want to see the Air Force have what is necessary to create and maintain an adequate strength in being in these times. If properly used, it can be not only our shield against but a real deterrent to aggression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired. All time for debate on the pending amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call attention to an error in the printed amendment. The amendment should read "On page 29, line 22, strike out '$12,035,044,000', on page 30, strike out line 1 through line 3, inclusive," and insert certain language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Oregon that the Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 minutes in which to ask the Senator from Wyoming certain questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not true that the bill as reported to the Senate, as shown on page 1 of the committee report, proposes to appropriate a total, in round numbers, of $45,000,000,000, in contrast to $51,000,000,000, in round numbers, for which the Military Establishment first asked?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is it fair, then, to say that the committee recommends, in round numbers, a saving of some $6,000,000,000 in this bill, under the amount which the Military Establishment asked in the first instance?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As reported, it is more than $5,655,000,000 under the estimates for 1953.

Mr. MORSE. When Congress convened this year we were confronted, in round numbers, with an administration request for a $85,000,000,000 budget, $52,000,000,000 of which was to go to the military. In this instance the committee is cutting almost $6,000,000,000 from that total request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. MORSE. In regard to this particular amendment, what assurance can the chairman of the subcommittee give the Senate that if it adopts the O'Mahoney amendment——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment should be called the O'Mahoney-Lyndon Johnson amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It is the pending amendment. Let me say, as a member of the Johnson subcommittee, that our report shows—and I signed the report—that we are opposed to the stretch-out. What assurance can the chairman of the subcommittee give us that if we provide for this contract authority, as I certainly think we should, the committee has squeezed out of the Air Force—which, in my opinion, is the most wasteful of all branches of the service—a great deal of waste to be found in expenditures by the Air Force with respect to items other than those incident to the contracting for the building of airplanes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will look at page 30 of the bill, he will find that in line 8 we have cut the appropriation $100,000,000 below the House figure; and in the appropriation for

maintenance and operation we have cut $221,790,142 below the House figure. The Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations is acutely aware of the reports which have been made by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, and by similar committees in the House; and we have endeavored, in divers ways, by cutting appropriations and by adding additional language, to promote economy. I assure the Senator that that will continue to be the purpose of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming that we could not make a part of the saving involved in the round number of $600,000,000 by saying, for example, that 50 percent of it shall be taken care of by the Air Force by making cuts elsewhere in its budget, to the amount, we will say, of $300,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say that that is one of the things which we should attempt to deal with in conference. My feeling is that the objective of obtaining 143 combat wings is too serious a matter to be the subject of an attempt to make additional cuts.

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying to the Senator that I hope a satisfactory adjustment can be accomplished in conference, because I think we must have 143 wings. I also wish to say, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that I am satisfied great savings can still be made, and should be made, in the Air Force budget, because that is a very wasteful branch of the service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed 3 minutes in which to address some questions to the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, first I wish to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee on the magnificent work he has done. I should like to call attention to what seems to be an arithmetical contradiction in the claims of the Air Force. The budget suggested appropriations for aircraft and related procurement in the sum of $12,700,000,000. The committee has cut the amount to $12,100,000,000, a reduction of $600,000,000, or slightly less than 5 percent. In the case of this program, which has been running at the rate of $12,000,000,000 a year, it is beyond my comprehension how a reduction of only 5 percent in an appropriation can result in a stretch-out of a whole year—from 1955 to 1956. I fail to see how $600,000,000 is equivalent to $12,000,000,000. I puzzled over that apparent contradiction during the entire week end, and I found no answer to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall try to do a little better by way of explanation than I did on Saturday. When the number of units is reduced the price per unit is increased.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is not possible to increase the price twentyfold, I am sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have had the assurance of the very highest technical authorities in the Defense Department, independent of the Air Force, that rising costs are likely to increase the cost of airplanes. It is for that reason that I am unwilling to gamble with it now. I feel—and I know the Senator feels as I do—that the action which has been taken with respect to defense production provisions, with respect to price control, and the like, may set off another inflationary spiral. Therefore, since securing the planes is our primary objective, I believe that we must take the figures we have before us.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The Senator is suggesting in his amendment that $3,000,000,000 of the $11,000,000,000 be tacked on for payment in 1953. Might it not be possible to consider tacking on the amount of $8,000,000,000, so as to divide it up between fiscal 1954 and 1955?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I tried to do it last year, but failed. I therefore did not try it this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). All time for debate has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Hill	Mundt
Bennett	Hoey	Murray
Benton	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	Nixon
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kem	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Seaton
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Welker
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Monroney	Young
Hennings	Moody	
Hickenlooper	Morse	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Chavez	Malone
Brewster	Duff	McMahon
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Millikin
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Capehart	Kerr	Tobey
Carlson	Lodge	

So Mr. O'MAHONEY's amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. SHEPPARD, of California, had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, vice Mr. GORE, excused.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes", approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bill and joint resolutions of the House:

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies in 1953.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. YATES, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, and Mr. ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. KERR, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FORD, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HORAN, and Mr. BUSBEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RANKIN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. ROGERS of Texas, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. O'KONSKI were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1705. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for two United States commissioners for Great Smoky Mountains National Park;

S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith;

S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees;

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4686. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford;

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; and

H. R. 7876. An act relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 30, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1705. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for two United States commissioners for Great Smoky Mountains National Park;

S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; and

S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us have order in the Senate. The Chair is going to suspend business until we have better order, and until all the senatorial staff is cleared, except those whose presence is desired by Members of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. I do not know whether it is in the rule book, but it is the ruling of the Presiding Officer that no one may occupy chairs on the Senate floor except Members of Congress. The clerks may remain, of course, but they should sit in separate chairs. Let us have order in the Senate, please. Let those who are in the Senate Chamber on missions for Members of the Senate please conduct themselves in such a way as to make it possible for the Senate to carry on its business. Whenever the present occupant of the chair sees a willful conversation or willful disregard of this statement by the Chair, whether it be by a Member of the Senate or not, the Chair will not hesitate to point the man out and let the Sergeant at Arms escort him from the Senate Chamber, even though the Chair does not want to embarrass anyone.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The committee amendments, I understand, were adopted on Saturday, with the understanding that any Senator desiring to do so might have an amendment reconsidered. I do not wish to propose an amendment to the bill as reported by the committee, but I do wish the privilege of addressing to the Senator from Wyoming, who is in charge of the bill, a question in regard to an amendment. Is it in order for me to do so at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I will yield time to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I yield him 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I would like the Senator from Wyoming to turn to page 11, line 21, at which point the so-called Berry amendment, with which the Senator from Wyoming is familiar, appears.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My question is, Is it the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming that it is clearly understood that, on page 12, line 7, the term "at United States market prices" means the world price plus transportation and United States import duty?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It means the world price plus the import duty. If transportation to the United States should be included, it might be so understood. But, to be frank with the Senator, transportation costs were not discussed in the committee hearing. I think we have prepared a very excellent

legislative history as to the meaning of the term "United States price," as the necessary price normally imposed, including the cost of all the factors which go to make it up.

The Senator is well aware that the price of all commodities in the United States is made up of the particular factors which he mentions. But I want to make clear that nothing was said about transportation, and I do not desire to leave any loophole that would make it possible to use transportation costs for an improper purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume that the words "at United States market prices" would include the cost of transportation of wool in getting it into the United States, to be resold.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I assume so, too. But I am merely saying to the Senator that that particular item was not discussed at the hearings. There never has been any question with respect to the interpretation of the language. It has been in the bill for years. I refer to the words, "at United States market prices."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to answer one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the meaning of the amendment, wherein it refers to reprocessed or reused wool, merely to give preference to such wool, regardless of origin, so long as the processing of such wool has been accomplished within the United States of America, and so long as it is available at world prices plus transportation and United States import duty?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am of opinion, and I am sure everyone who sponsored this amendment is of opinion, that articles which are processed in the United States, and which therefore have necessitated the use of American workers, are within the protection of the "buy American" clause. But I want it clearly understood that the domestic wool which is processed in the United States has a preference over the type of wool which may come into the United States by the subsidies of foreign governments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the Senator permit me to ask one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Of course, the Boston wool merchants are very substantial traders in wool. They are very much interested in this subject. Of course, they want domestic wool to be used whenever possible, and whenever there is a sufficient supply. On the other hand, they want to be just as careful and sure as they can be as to the exact meaning of this amendment. What I want to get from the Senator, and what he is giving me, is his interpretation, for legislative purposes, of the meaning of these words. As I say, I assume that the words "at United States market prices" must mean the world price plus transportation and United States import duty. I assume, personally, that the word "transportation" is included, since otherwise, the commodity could not be sold at a given price within the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would say that nothing in this amendment changes the interpretation of "United States market prices" which has obtained for years, ever since this provision has been in the law. The mere fact that we have added wool to the amendment does not in any way alter the interpretation of the words "United States market prices."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time which has been consumed by the Senator from Massachusetts and myself be allocated to the amendment which the Senator was discussing, and not to the amendment which the Senator from Texas has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement, as the proponent of an amendment, I have 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 34, line 16, in lieu of "$456,750,000", it is proposed to insert "$525,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the committee will not oppose this amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is opposing the committee amendment, is he not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas proposes to amend the committee amendment by restoring $68,000,000.

Mr. BRIDGES. But, technically and speaking from a parliamentary standpoint, is not the Senator from Texas simply opposing the committee amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. President, after extended hearings, the Budget determined that the minimum amount that should be allowed for research and development was $525,000,000. The House Appropriations Committee, after extended hearings, did not tamper with that amount; it did not whittle one dime away from the item for research and development, because, Mr. President, I believe the thinking people in this country realize that we cannot match Russia in terms of manpower, and that if we are going to survive we must outstrip her in resources and scientific equipment. Against Russia's vast fighting forces we can impose only one major superiority—our superior ability to design and to produce modern equipment.

The Senate Appropriations Committee seeks to reduce the appropriation for research and development for the Air Force of this Nation by $68,000,000. I think the Senate should know, when it takes $68,000,000 from the research and development program, just what the effect will be upon that program.

I desire to quote to the Senate a statement submitted to me by the Secretary of Air. I think it is well to run over a list of projects which will be curtailed by the committee's proposed cut.

The first estimate of projects which would be forced to be eliminated would include money for the development of two turboprop engines, design studies for a new fighter-bomber, a new night intruder and a new tactical bomber. In the area of strategic air operations, we would be forced to eliminate studies for a rocket power plant for a new strategic bomber, curtail the development of an air-guided missile for bomber defense and defer studies on a guided missile to be used for reconnaissance. In the area of air defense, a new supersonic interceptor would have to be eliminated from the design studies we would plan for fiscal year 1953.

Mr. President, it may be that the Senate wants to curtail work of this type, but I think not. I hope the chairman of the committee will take my amendment to conference and attempt to restore the minimum funds recommended by the Director of the Budget and by the House of Representatives——

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I compliment the Senator from Texas on his amendment, and I should like to ask him if it is not true that it was the reduction in the appropriation for an item precisely like this one that held back the development of the Air Force several years ago?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am unfamiliar with the item to which the Senator is referring. I shall be glad to yield to him to make a statement, but I know that with the hordes of manpower Russia possesses, the only way by which we can hope to survive is to outproduce Russia and to have the best implements of war. If we are going to cut, there are places in which we may cut, but the last place in which we should use the meat ax is in the research and development program.

Mr. MOODY. I think the Senator is correct.

To clarify the record, I should like to say that in hearings which I was conducting in the Small Business Committee representatives of the armed services pointed out that a reduction was made after the Second World War in an item in the budget providing for development and advance in the science of aviation. That was given as an explanation of why our aircraft program had not been advanced further than it is today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I appreciate the support he has given to this amendment. The Senate by unanimous vote agreed to provide funds to produce the necessary planes, instead of going along with the committee report and eliminating a great many planes from

the program. We cannot produce the necessary planes unless we have the best research and development; and we cannot have the best research and development by whittling away $68,000,000 in this important field.

Mr. President, I know the great sympathy which the senior Senator from Wyoming has for air power. I hope that in the light of the previous vote the Senate has taken, it will assure our carrying out, at least, the President's stretch-out program and that the Senator will agree to accept the amendment in the hope that we can provide for research and development sufficient money to produce not only the number of planes we need, but to be sure that we shall get the type of planes we need.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I do sympathize with everything the Senator from Texas has said. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations I have made a diligent effort to learn how much money is available for every item in the bill. It will be remembered that last year, when we were appropriating for the fiscal year 1952, we appropriated huge sums which we knew could not be expended during that year. So it was important to find out how much money would be carried over to the new fiscal year. It required a good deal of time to find out precisely what the situation was, but finally we secured the exact figures.

According to the very latest estimates of the unobligated and unexpended balance, the fund still in the hands of the Department of Defense, which is not obligated as of today, but which we appropriated during previous years, is $6,535,000,000. In the appropriation bill of 1952 we appropriated an over-all amount for research and development of $1,205,000,000. Of that amount $425,000,000 was for the Air Force.

The bill which is before the Senate today increases that amount. The committee has recommended for research and development for the United States Air Force $456,750,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct, insofar as the statement applies to the amount contained in the bill for research and development. The Senate bill appropriates approximately $2,000,000,000 less for air power than recommended by the President's budget. The Senator from Texas proposes to restore only $68,000,000 for research and development. I think it is extremely important that there be provided the money the budget recommended and which the House agreed to in this important field.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire, first, to make this point clear.

In our examination of the rate of expenditure, we sought to obtain from each branch of the Department of Defense explicit statements—and we received them—showing the amount of money which was obligated month by month. If the carry-over of $47,000,000, which the Air Force still has unobligated and unexpended for research and development, were to be committed at the rate of expenditure during the month of April, there would be left sufficient to last for 31 months-plus. If it were committed or obligated or expended at the rate of about 150% of the rate of the expenditure for April, it would last for more than 20 months, almost 21 months. That is the reason why the committee felt that this cut could be made.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has the Senator from Wyoming called to the attention of the Senator from Texas a fact which appeals to me, namely, that of the research and development appropriation for the Air Force $41,910,000 is for these purposes:

Nonelectronic air-borne equipment, such as automatic flight-control equipment, guidance and navigation instruments, and aircraft electrical systems.

Photographic reconnaissance equipment.

Ground-support equipment for piloted and pilotless aircraft.

Training equipment.

Chemical, metallurgical, structural, and textile materials, uniforms, and personal flight equipment.

Aerial delivery containers.

Rescue equipment.

I mention those items to the Senator from Wyoming because it seemed to me, when I voted on the question as I did in the committee, that this is a broad, over-all amount. Whether we appropriate all of it, or allow it minus $25,000,000, or fix the amount we did minus $68,000,000, it is a very intangible subject, very difficult to pin down. If there is any specific item as to which the amount provided may prove to be insufficient it seems to me the Department could come back in January and ask that the deficit be made up so that there would be no over-all loss. That explains why I voted as I did.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts has said as a member of the subcommittee, but I understood the distinguished Senator from Texas to suggest that this appropriation for the Air Force was $2,000,000,000 less than the President's request. I did not know that I was voting for a reduction such as that, even taking into consideration contract authority. That is the question I have in mind. Of course, I have always been a friend of the Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will discuss that subject when we have concluded with this limitation.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to know about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is taking the time of the Senator from Texas on another subject. If the Senator will bear with me, I will answer his question later.

Mr. MAYBANK. I never intended to vote a reduction of $2,000,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am for contract authority.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Budget was for $20,700,000,000. The Air Force request to the budget was for $21,400,000,000. The President cut off $700,000,000.

The President's budget was for $20,700,000,000. The Senate committee bill, as reported by the committee, is for $18,724,000,000. Eighteen billion seven hundred million from twenty billion seven hundred million is approximately two billion dollars.

The House bill was for $19,022,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much contract authority did the Senate add?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. It was my information that the amendment offered on the floor today by the Senator proposed to increase the appropriation recommended by the committee for both expenditures and contract authority for phone procurement by $600,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. In contract authority?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Eight billion dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I understood. That is what I was voting for, not a reduction from the President's budget, because I sat on the floor with the Senator in 1941 and fought for the Air Force. I have fought for the Air Force constantly since that time. The RECORD will show that I have stood, almost alone, for greater and more rapid expansion of our air arm. Back in the days when I wanted the strength raised to 72 groups, I believe there were only 12 Senators who stood with me. The misled economy bloc, following World War II, voted against me at every turn.

I am for economy, too, Mr. President. But it is foolish to practice economy at the risk of what might well be national suicide. We are right now out-numbered in the air by our potential enemy. We had better get these planes off the drawing boards and out of the wind tunnels and off the production lines and into the air where they can carry men, guns, and bombs before it is too late.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There is no mistake. The chairman of the subcommittee, I am sure, will confirm the statement that the committee bill is approximately $2,000,000,000 lower than the President's budget figure. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Without contract authority?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Without the amendment adopted this morning.

Mr. MAYBANK. But we adopted a contract authority provision by that amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Texas. I had intended in this debate to address myself to the whole subject of the military defense budget, but because of the limitation on debate, it is impossible to do so.

For more than a month I have been giving my attention to the subject matter, realizing, of course, that the committees of Congress, including the Committee on Appropriations, would make the intensive, detailed study which was necessary. But as a Member of the Senate, I feel a deep sense of responsibility as to our military budget and what is being done toward the preparedness of the United States.

I have gone over very carefully the reports of the Johnson Subcommittee on Preparedness, and I commend the committee not only for the great measure of economy which it has accomplished, but even more for pinpointing some of the weaknesses in the defense program.

The defense budget is not necessarily always in our hands. It is very much governed by the potential and actual power of the enemy. Make no mistake about that. There is an ever present and apparent enemy, and the enemy is none other than the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been devoting a tremendous amount of its resources to airpower, as set forth in the brief which I am going to ask later on to have incorporated in the RECORD as a statement of fact. In the Arctic bases alone there are over 400 large bombers capable of carrying the atomic bomb and delivering it to any American city. This is not a matter of conjecture; it is a matter of knowledge on the part of the Air Force of the United States and of our counterintelligence.

I also have documented the fact that in an attack by night, we would be very fortunate indeed if we were able to knock out as many as 10 percent of the attacking force, and in an attack by day, 25 percent.

The amendment to which the Senator from Texas has directed his attention and placed before the Senate is vital in terms of our night defense, by night fighters, in affording protection against a heavy bomber attack in the middle of the night upon the great bases of our country, such as the B–36 base at Rapid City, S. Dak., and the atomic energy plant, at Los Alamos, or some of the other great bases throughout the country.

Command of the air has first priority in modern warfare, and in national security. The leaders of all three military services are in agreement on this fact. Air superiority, as a prerequisite to all military action on land or sea or in the air, is inherent in the operational doctrine of all our armed services.

I am firmly convinced that command of the air is at stake in the defense budget for the fiscal year 1953.

I make the statement because I believe that we have postponed the build-up of air power to the point that any further postponement will exceed the limits of what in military parlance is known as a "calculated risk." We are giving Russia the time she needs to build modern weapons and modern planes to transport those weapons. We may have already pressed our luck too far. At any rate, I fear that from now on, unless we take bold action, time will be running against us in this despicable, but starkly realistic, armament race.

I am not satisfied with the appraisals of our military strength by some of our defense leaders. I personally am becoming a little tired of the inconsistencies between their "official views" and their "personal views." Now I sense a new and strange phenomenon in requests for military appropriations. Airpower has become so costly that our defense leaders, even some of the Air Force spokesmen, have become compromising in their approach to the airpower budget. They no longer ask for what they need to prevent war or to win a war. Rather, they ask only for what they think the country can take, or what the traffic will bear. This approach, at first glance, would seem to have merit, and might prompt us to pat the military leaders on the back for their broad understanding of our money problems. However, I wish to make it clear that we do not employ generals, admirals, or civilian secretaries as economists. Their job is national defense, and it is their duty to tell the Congress their frank estimate of the threat, and their frank estimate of the need. In terms of our air-power requirements, I am not at all sure that we are getting either estimate in realistic terms.

Frankly, I cannot reconcile the turbulent world situation and the steady build-up of Russian air power with the stretch-out of the air-power program of this country. I know that the O'Mahoney amendment will prevent the stretch-out from going to 1956. That is what we were almost prepared to do. At least, that was the recommendation. The O'Mahoney amendment, with the contract authority, will at least limit the stretch-out to 1955. But I ask again and again, who is there in this body who can tell me that there is anything in the international scene which indicates that we are going to be well-protected until 1955? The original program called for 1954, and that was a calculated risk. Efforts of the Soviet Union in Germany, the efforts made by the Communist international force in Japan, and every single bit of evidence we have indicates that the pressure is being intensified rather than minimized. If in the years since the end of World War II our scientific advisers and military spokesmen had correctly appraised Russia's atomic air power, I would feel safer when I go to bed at night. Unfortunately, however, our defense leaders have repeatedly underestimated Russia's ability, and I am concerned that they may be underestimating it now. They underestimated Japan's ability, too. Admirals said that that war would last 6 months. I submit that they are underestimating the potential and actual power of the Soviet Union. I am concerned that they may be underestimating it very drastically.

Let us face the fact that our military intelligence is woefully weak. The iron curtain has, for the most part, lived up to its name. Therefore, what we have learned about Russian airpower shocks me into action, for I realize that there is much that we do not know about Russia's military might.

We all remember that in 1948 the military commander of our wartime atomic bomb project, Lt. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, scorning what he referred to as Russia's "ox-cart economy," predicted that 1955 would be the earliest date by which Russia could possibly produce a quantity of A-bombs. Back then, of course, we thought of atomic power in terms of dozens of bombs, rather than the hundreds of bombs we speak of today. I cannot forget how, also, in 1948, the Secretary of Defense withheld his approval of a 70-group Air Force primarily on the premise that Russia lacked the industrial capacity to produce the atomic bomb for perhaps a decade, and explained that this was the view of the Nation's leading military scientists.

As I hear and read about our planned development of the hydrogen bomb, I sense in some quarters the almost incredible tendency to underestimate Russia's ability to produce this monstrous weapon. Equally dangerous is a tendency to feel that Russia may not choose to produce it. This is wishful thinking of the most dangerous order. I deplore the fact that some of our leading scientists are of this frame of mind. I call this attitude incredible. I call it incredible because it is hard to believe that we have not benefited from our past errors of judgment. The Soviet Union did produce the atomic bomb, and it did not require until 1955. Again we are inclined to puff out our scientific chests and say, as we said back in 1948, "It can only happen here."

Why should not Russia be expected to develop the hydrogen bomb? She is not restrained by moral scruples. She has some of the best scientific brains in the world. She has the productive capacity by virtue of an economic policy of guns-over-butter. Furthermore, she has important knowledge on which to base production of the hydrogen bomb. She has this knowledge thanks to a traitor named Klaus Fuchs, the British nuclear scientist now serving a prison term for espionage. Of late we have been reading in a national magazine the significant and distasteful account of how Fuchs betrayed our atomic secrets. Yet our authorities are far more concerned over the hydrogen-bomb data which he turned over to the Kremlin.

I believe that overconfidence in America's productive superiority and underestimation of Russia's scientific and industrial capability have dominated our approach to preparedness in this country. Too many of us think we can "do it in a hurry." Too many of us underestimate Russia's real productive strength. In my prepared statement, I have documented the potential strength of the Soviet productive capacity, as well as its actual strength.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me some more time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the whole war in Korea tells us this sad story. The MIG–15 jet fighters over Korea have proved Russia's ability to produce high-quality aircraft for modern war; and the MIG is merely a sample of that ability. Nor should it be a secret that a new long-range bomber of original design was sighted over Moscow last summer. These are fantastic new developments.

Russia's output of thousands of MIG-type aircraft, her airfleet of 20,000 land-based combat aircraft in organized air units—twice as many combat aircraft as we have in our Air Force and naval aviation units combined—plus another 20,000 planes in reserve, all add up to the fact that Russia has mastered mass production techniques, which we have considered to be the exclusive property of the free world.

Coming down to the matter of the amendment which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has submitted, the Soviet Union has been working upon new long-range bombers. There is evidence of radical new developments in jet night fighters. Neither development is beyond the capability of the enemy, for Russia has proceeded with an uninterrupted air power research and development program ever since she acquired a number of German aeronautical experts, some of the world's finest, as war booty in 1945. Our own Air Force research and development program, on the other hand, has been spotty.

During the period from 1947 to 1949, for example, the Air Force gave up, because of lack of money, fully half of its existing research and development projects. Not one new aircraft or guided missile project was undertaken from 1947 to 1949. This is a matter of official record.

As I inquire into the facts behind this situation, I find that the Air Force requests for research and development funds have been cut back repeatedly at the Defense Department level. This has occurred again in the defense budget for the fiscal year 1953. The Air Force established its requirements for research and development at $725,000,000. That was what the best brains in the Air Force felt we needed. John H. McCone, a hardheaded business executive, then Under Secretary of the Air Force, argued in vain for this amount before the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense. That Board, however, fixed the figure at $580,000,000, and this was later reduced to the present total of $525,000,000. Now a further cut is being considered. As the result of this cut-back, several important jet-engine and guided-missile projects will have to be postponed or delayed.

I ask any Member of this body, What evidence is there that would lead us to believe that we can afford to postpone guided-missile and jet-engine-development projects? We ought to be putting on the steam, putting on the pressure, rather than minimizing or reducing our efforts.

I am concerned about this state of affairs. I am worried especially about our guided-missile program. Russia inherited, or took by force, German missile experts who, in 1945, already were 10 years ahead of America in this vital field of development. I do not like to contemplate the prospect of long-range Russian missiles carrying atomic explosives. I am not convinced that we are keeping pace with this threat. I think the Senate should reestablish the Air Force research and development budget at the $725,000,000 figure, not merely $525,000,000. It should be $725,000,000, which was recommended by the Air Force itself to the Research Board for development and research. Surely the amount of $525,000,000 as recommended by the House of Representatives is an irreducible minimum. How can we even think of further reductions in light of the established urgency of research and development in air power?

After all, the taxpayer is asked to spend many billions of dollars on numbers of aircraft without being assured that they are the best aircraft. To attain the numbers of modern aircraft we need to counter the Soviet threat, we must first have a sound plan. I have searched for such a plan in the various proposals which have been made for the build-up of our air power. I do not find it in the budget presented to Congress by the executive branch, in the amount approved by our colleagues in the House of Representatives or in the proposals before us today. We are taking a risk with our security, our preparedness, which cannot be justified in face of the facts of Soviet power or Soviet pressure. The international situation calls for us to speed up our preparations, not stretch them out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the time available for debate on the amendment, I intend to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has 4 minutes remaining. The opposition has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish to yield some time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There may be other Senators who may wish to speak on the amendment in opposition, although I do not intend to speak in opposition. I shall be glad to yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, in the hope that he may conclude his remarks within that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not intend to do so. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

If the Senator from Wyoming will yield me half a minute, I should like to say that I believe the debate ought to be such as to make it perfectly clear where we stand on this subject. I for one want to develop how our defense budget has been handled, not only by Congress, but all the way down the line. I want to be sure at least that my point of view is clearly stated in the RECORD. I shall speak in my own time or ask to have my full statement made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to the subject matter covered in this amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY—THREAT OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AND AMERICAN AIR POWER

As I consider the defense budget for the 1953 fiscal year, I am disturbed by its size, and by its complexities. I am disturbed even more by the circumstances which have made necessary this gigantic budget.

Search as we might, there is no evidence that the Communist aggressor has relaxed his efforts to reshape the world to his own design. Indeed, recent Communist activity in Europe, particularly in Eastern and Western Germany, in Korea, in Japan, and in the Middle East forces the conclusion that the threat to our national security and the democratic way of life is greater today than it was a year ago, when we last debated the annual appropriation for our Military Establishment.

I do not like the tone of the recently vicious hate-America propaganda campaign which the leaders of the Kremlin are firing at the people of Russia.

This campaign is without parallel in human history. Its goal is clear. It seeks to arouse the individual Russian to a frenzy of hate against the individual American. This was clearly and publicly stated in 1946 when Russian educators and agitators were told:

"Our purpose must be to saturate the people with irreconcilable hatred toward the enemies of Socialist society. Hatred gives birth to class revolutionary vigilance and creates a feeling of irreconcilability toward the class enemy. It is necessary to learn not only to hate the enemy, but also to struggle with him, in time to unmask him, and finally, if he does not surrender, to destroy him."

To further this object, the Soviet people and the people of the Soviet satellites have been fed an unending series of atrocity stories about the American people like this:

"In July 1919 a large group of American soldiers broke into —— village. A bestial orgy followed. The interventionists robbed and raped women and girls. American soldiers arrested Mikhail Popov. They gouged out his eyes, cut out his tongue, and drove nails under his fingernails. In another village the American monsters took an expectant mother, cut off her breasts, and pushed her tresses into her mouth and pulled them out of a hole cut in her throat." These are the lies the Communists are taught about Americans.

The basis of Soviet Russia is power and complete power. Let us look at some of the forms which this power assumes. The Kremlin is omniscient insofar as control of its people is concerned. It looks at a problem, makes its decision, sets up a plan, and hands out the orders. The Soviet Government in any decision it makes can totally disregard the human element. It has so dehumanized its operations as to reduce every peasant to a numbered cog in a giant food-producing machine, every worker at his bench to an industrial statistic, every mother to a producer of recruits for a many-million army. Like machine parts stored in a giant warehouse, every citizen of the Soviet Union awaits "stamped and ticketed" to be used at the whim of the Kremlin.

In the Soviet Union every person from the atomic scientist down to the shop apprentice is subject to the sharp discipline of the Soviet labor laws.

The Soviet Government thus stands in a position to concentrate the energies of its people, to turn on or off this or that pipe line, as it sees fit. It can and does shift millions of people within its border without prior warning or consultation with them. It can turn the nation toward war or toward peace at a whim.

Whether we like it or not, we must resign ourselves to the fact that, above all else, the leaders of the Soviet Union respect power. We have already seen how they control power of political and social affairs. This power is just a means to a power of military might which takes on the greatest importance in the Soviet. What we do to counteract this power is vital to our security. The greatest threat of Soviet military power is the air power which has been built behind the iron curtain. Many of the signs of this air power have been cloaked in military censorship, but I believe it essential that they become known to our people. I think it important, for example, that we know our military leaders are concerned over the steady build-up of Soviet bomber bases along the Arctic Circle, and the evidence of formation flights by Russian aircraft over this vital northern area.

Our military intelligence experts estimate that at this moment Russia can launch more than 400 long range atomic bombers (TU–4's comparable with the American B–50 medium bomber) against America, and that these aircraft can carry enough bombs, both atomic and conventional types, to hit all of our major metropolitan industrial target areas. To be more specific, let us look at some of the targets which the Soviets might hit with one attack. There are the major B–36 bases at Rapid City, S. Dak.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Fairfield, Calif.; and Spokane, Wash. If they could knock out our B–36 bases they could take their time before we could get organized. Perhaps they would attack Britain because of our 50 bases there. Then also there are our aircraft and atomic energy plants. Those at Los Alamos or Los Angeles because of our retaliatory strength in air atomic threat would presumably be choice targets. These cities could expect to be at the top of the enemies' bombing list. Then there are the metropolitan cities—New York for morale reasons—Cleveland because of parts industry—Great Lakes and Detroit.

It is this threat which has led our Air Force to announce that henceforth some 400,000 members of the Ground Observer Corps will be on 24-hour duty in 36 of our States. This round-the-clock surveillance by civilian volunteers becomes essential to our air defense system because, despite our radar warning network, science has not yet produced gadgets which will detect low-flying aircraft. Even with the Ground Observer Corps on 24-hour duty, our defense against attacking enemy aircraft is dangerously inadequate. Responsible authorities have estimated that in broad daylight we could expect to knock down, at best, only 25 percent of any invading aircraft, that at night and in bad weather fully 95 percent of the attackers would get through to their targets. This is more than mere speculation. We all know that our B–36's and B–50's which have by some been called obsolete have proved beyond question of doubt our vulnerability to surprise air attack on simulated missions against major targets in this country.

Such is the advantage held by an aggressor in this air-atomic age. Such is the atmosphere in which we consider America's defense budget for the next fiscal year.

We are loath, however, to accept as reality the issues as laid out by the Soviet rulers. We seek escape from the ugly prospects thus presented by recourse to the most dangerous of all pastimes; wishful thinking.

Some people like to hear Soviet talk of "peaceful coexistence," insisting that this doctrine supersedes the concept of implacable hostility and relentless struggle and offers a base for a genuine understanding "if we can just get together around the conference table." To reassure ourselves in this way we have to forget that the Kremlin makes no effort to disguise that "peaceful coexistence" shall endure only so long as it suits Soviet convenience. We also have to forget that the Kremlin puts very severe requirements as to what the "enemy" camp must do to secure even such limited coexistence. These requirements, as specified in effect by Stalin a few weeks ago, are "that the United States accept the Soviet interpretation of the Potsdam agreement and that the United States get out of Europe and Asia, giving up our rights in Germany, and Japan, abandoning the North Atlantic treaty system, withdrawing from our overseas bases—in other words, limiting ourselves and our activities to this hemisphere, leaving the rest of the world to the Soviet Union and the Communists.

Many also find reassurance in the belief that the Soviet rulers rely for victory not upon their own efforts but upon the "inevitable collapse of capitalism"—the belief that the Kremlin will sit back and let "history" do their fighting for them. To draw solace from this belief, however, requires closing your ears to the Kremlin shouted insistence that they are operating on just exactly the opposite basis. Stalin couldn't have made his position clearer than when he said "Some comrades think that, once there is a revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie must be in a hopeless position; that its end is therefore predetermined; that the victory of the revolution is thus assured, and that all they have to do is to wait for the fall of the bourgeoisie and to draw up victorious resolutions. This is a profound mistake. The victory of the revolution never comes by itself. It must be prepared for and won."

Others like to think that the Kremlin relies strictly on "political weapons" in its struggle against the United States. They reason that the Kremlin puts its faith solely in subversion, propaganda, creation of internal conflicts, etc., and that the Kremlin will avoid use of its armed forces unless forced to defend its own territory.

That the Kremlin places great emphasis on such political weapons goes without saying. But it is equally true that the Kremlin considers the Soviet Army as a vital instrument in the struggle against America. To the Kremlin pacifism is one of the greatest of all crimes. War is not only a legitimate instrument of policy under certain circumstances, it is a requisite instrument of policy.

Stalin's dictum on this point is included in the indoctrination of every schoolboy—and every Red army man—in the Soviet Union. He said that Soviet assistance to the world revolution, that is, the Soviet role in the struggle against the American camp, "should be expressed first in the U. S. S. R.'s achieving the utmost possible in one country for the development, support, and awakening of the revolution in all countries. Second, it should be expressed in that the victorious proletariat of the U. S. S. R. having expropriated the capitalists and organized its own Socialist production, would stand up against the rest of the world, the capitalist world, attracting to its cause the oppressed classes of other countries, raising revolts in those countries against the capitalists, and in the event of necessity coming out even with armed force against the exploiting classes and their states."

Many who recognize the true and evil nature of the Soviet design, who appreciate the utter seriousness of Soviet intentions toward us, still refuse to see in the Soviet program a real threat. These find their escape in the enormous discrepancy between the economic strength of the United States and the economic strength of the U. S. S. R. They cannot bring themselves to believe that the masters of the Soviet Union would dare to challenge the United States in face of our industrial superiority, or, if they dared, would be able to seriously threaten us with defeat.

It is true that the economic strength of the Soviet Union compares with that of the United States as 1 to 4. Last year the gross national product of the Soviet Union was less than $75,000,000,000; that of the United States close to $320,000,000,000. Soviet steel production totaled some 33,000,000 short tons; United States nearly 105,000,000 short tons. Soviet petroleum production, 46,000,000 short tons; the United States, 337,000,000 short tons. Soviet electric power production, 104,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours; the United States, 432,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. Soviet aluminum production, 215,000 short tons; the United States, 836,000 short tons. But last year the Soviet Union with those limited resources not only maintained its gigantic military establishment in being but substantially added to it. The answer to the question of how this was done lies, of course, in the power of the Kremlin to control and manipulate everything and everybody. To appreciate what this involves, simply recall this: Since 1928 the industrial power of the Soviet Union has increased many, many times. For example, steel production has mounted from 4,200,000 tons to 33,000,000 short tons. Yet the standard of living of the Russian people has improved only slightly, if at all, since 1928. Virtually the entire increment in Soviet production since 1928, that is, throughout the period of the 5-year plans and forced industralization, has been arbitrarily channeled by the Politburo into end uses which have little bearing on the current welfare of the Russian people.

I have heard it argued that a build-up of our military forces can be justified only if we believe war to be imminent. To say that is to oversimplify the problem.

What is meant by "imminent"? In the budget before us we are dealing with prospective military problems 2 and 3 years hence. And who knows the plan of the aggressor?

Like it or not, we are on his timetable. What is his definition of "imminent"? That is the question of the moment, for which we have no simple answers.

As I see our responsibility in the pending legislation, however, it is not only to be prepared for war, should it come, but even more important, to act to prevent war. This objective must have priority in all our thinking. We must ask ourselves—what force is most capable of preventing war?—and we must act accordingly. In the years ahead we must live with the question of whether we did everything in our power—back in 1952—to prevent a series of Koreas or a full scale clash of arms.

We must also face the threat of defeat without war—well within reason in this age of power politics. This threat has been referred to as "atomic blackmail." I think the term is well chosen. It describes a state of affairs in which the Communist aggressor forces the opposition little by little to her side. Knowing that the United States will not strike first, the Soviet Union could apply an atomic squeeze on the fringe nations and on our present allies. She would be free to consolidate her gains as she went along, and deal directly with the United States in her own good time. At this point—unless we chose to contest this condition it will start all-out war—world balance of power would shift from the western democracies to the Soviet Union and her satellites. At this point Russia would have less, rather than more, reason to engage in all-out war.

This pattern, it seems to me, is completely within the scope of the Soviet Union's objectives and her demonstrated techniques of aggression. And I fear it is completely within the realm of possibility if we permit the Soviet Union to win the current arms race and control world balance of power—either by force or by the threat of force.

How can we evaluate Russia's ability to destroy our way of life—with or without war—through superiority in arms? Russia's superior power on the ground is by now well accepted by all responsible military leaders. Being a self-contained nation, not dependent upon overseas supply lines, Russia's power at sea is not a major issue, except for her submarine fleet. The balance hinges, therefore, on air power—on the relative air-power strength of communism and the free world—on command of the air.

Command of the air is the first priority in modern warfare and national security. The leaders of all three of our military services are in agreement on this fact. Air superiority, as a prerequisite to all military action on land or sea or in the air, is inherent in the operational doctrine of all our armed services.

I am firmly convinced that command of the air is at stake in the defense budget for the 1953 fiscal year.

I make this statement because I believe that we have postponed the build-up of air power in this country to the point that any further postponement will exceed the limits of what in military parlance is known as a "calculated risk." We are giving Russia the time she needs to build modern weapons and modern planes to transport those weapons. We may already have pressed our luck too far. At any rate, I fear that from now on—unless we take bold action—time will be running against us in this despicable, but starkly realistic armament race.

I am not satisfied with the appraisals of our military strength by some of our defense leaders. I am getting tired of the inconsistencies between their "official views" and their "personal views." Now I sense a new and strange phenomenon in requests for military appropriations. Air power has become so costly that our defense leaders, even Air Force spokesmen, have become compromising in their approach to the air power budget. They no longer ask for what they need to prevent a war or win a war. Rather, they only ask for what they think the traffic will bear.

This approach, at first glance, would seem to have merit, and might prompt us to pat the military on the back for this broad understanding of our money problems. However, we do not employ our generals, our admirals or our civilian secretaries as economists. Their job is national defense. It is their duty to tell the Congress their frank estimate of the threat, and their frank estimate of the need. In terms of our air-power requirements, I am not at all sure we are getting either estimate in realistic terms.

I cannot reconcile the turbulent world situation and the steady build-up of Russian air power with the stretch-out of the air-power program in this country. Either we are wrong about the Russian threat or we are wrong about the stretch-out. No other answer satisfies me. Nor should it satisfy my colleagues in the Senate.

If in the years since the end of World War II our scientific advisers and our military spokesmen had correctly appraised Russia's air atomic power, I would feel safer when I went to bed at night. Unfortunately, however, our defense leaders have repeatedly underestimated Russia's ability, and I am concerned that they may be underestimating it now. Let us face the fact that our military intelligence is woefully weak. The iron curtain has, for the most part, lived up to its name. Therefore, what we have learned about Russian air power shocks me into action—for I realize there is much we have not known about Russia's military might.

We all remember that in 1948 the military commander of our wartime atomic bomb project, scorning what he referred to as Russia's "ox-cart economy," predicted that 1955 would be the earliest date Russia could possibly produce a "quantity" of A-bombs.

Back then, of course, we thought of atomic "power" in terms of dozens of bombs rather than the hundreds of bombs we speak of today. I cannot forget how, also, in 1948, the Secretary of Defense withheld his approval of a 70-group Air Force primarily on the premise that Russia lacked the industrial capacity to produce the atomic bomb for perhaps a decade, and explained that this was the view of the Nation's leading military scientists in military matters.

As I hear and read about our planned development of the hydrogen bomb, I sense in some quarters the almost incredible tendency to underestimate Russia's ability to produce this monstrous weapon. Equally dangerous is a tendency to feel that Russia may not choose to produce it. This is wishful thinking of the most dangerous order. I deplore the fact that some of our leading scientists are of this frame of mind. I call this attitude incredible. I call it incredible because it is hard to believe that we have not benefited from our past errors of judgment. The Soviet did produce the atomic bomb and it didn't take until 1955. Again we are inclined to puff out our scientific chests and say—"It can only happen here"—as we did back in 1948.

Why shouldn't Russia be expected to develop the hydrogen bomb? She is not restrained by mere scruples. She has some of the best scientific brains in the world. She has the productive capacity by virtue of an economic policy of guns over butter. What's more, she has important knowledge on which to base production of the hydrogen bomb. She has this knowledge, thanks to a traitor named Klaus Fuchs, the British nuclear scientist now serving a prison term for espionage. Of late, we have been reading in a national magazine the significant and distasteful account of how Fuchs betrayed our atomic secrets. Yet, our authorities are far more concerned over the hydrogen bomb data he turned over to the Kremlin.

"Overconfidence in America's productive superiority and gross underestimates of Russia's scientific and industrial capability—these, I believe, have dominated our approach to preparedness in this country." Nor were these mental booby traps cast aside, as well they might have been, the moment we knew Russia had mastered an atomic explosion several years earlier than we expected. This explosion should have jolted Congress and our defense leaders closer to reality, but too many have continued to engage in wishful thinking regarding the Russian air-atomic threat. Some say, "Russia may have the bomb, perhaps many atomic bombs, but, of course, Russia doesn't have the means to deliver them." This cannot be supported by fact.

The MIG–15 jet fighters over Korea have proved Russia's ability to produce high-quality aircraft for modern war, and the MIG is merely a sample of that ability. Since it is no secret to the enemy, it should be no secret to the American people that Russia has better jet fighters than the MIG, not only in production, but in the skies over Korea. Nor should it be a secret that a new long-range bomber of original design was sighted over Moscow last summer.

Russia's output of thousands of MIG-type aircraft—her air fleet of 20,000 land-based combat aircraft in organized air units—twice as many combat aircraft as we have in our Air Force and naval aviation units combined—plus another 20,000 planes in reserve—all add up to the fact that Russia has mastered mass-production techniques which we have considered an exclusive property of the free world. Moreover, the Russian air fleet is supported by a huge industrial and research structure which enjoys the highest priorities within the economic system of the Soviet Union—something that cannot be said of our own air-power program.

I have not been surprised to learn that the cumulative production of Russia's tactical aircraft—fighters, fighter-bombers, and light bombers—was more than double our own production of comparable plane types during the past 5 years. This interest in tactical aircraft is within the tradition of Soviet airpower as an adjunct of ground forces.

I am surprised and disturbed, however, as every American should be, by the development of Russia's long-range bombing force. We have always considered the long-range bomber to be our private property. Yet, during the past 5 years, Russia has outproduced the United States in long-range bombers. It could have been assumed, I suppose, that the same strategic compulsions which have driven Russia to produce atomic weapons in advance of our estimates would also drive them to produce a long-range atomic bomber force ahead of our schedules—but the shock is there just the same.

This development again proves the fallacy and the inherent danger in these production schedules of ours which ignore the progress being made by our only potential enemy. Once and for all—let us face it. As long as the Soviet Union maintains the element of surprise—an advantage which always will be with an enemy of this Nation—just so long will we be subject to sudden attack.

If we have any realistic alternative for protecting our security without building up our air power so that it matches the air power of the Soviet Union then I have not heard of that alternative.

There might have been justifiable reasons—though they have long since ceased to exist—for not matching the Soviet Union—plane for plane—in the years since World War II. But there is no sound reason why Russia should now be approaching us, if not equaling us, in quality of aircraft. This seems incongruous for a nation which is the very heart of technological development. Yet these are the facts.

Today in Korea the air offensive—that is, the efforts of our fighter-bombers and light bombers—is being conducted primarily by aircraft which are obsolescent. They have become effective instruments of war solely because more modern planes—the F-86 jet fighters—are holding the air front over MIG Alley. Without this limited air superiority our obsolescent aircraft in Korea would be comparatively ineffective. This experience proves that—with air superiority—we need not worry too much about building up a stockpile of obsolescent air-power equipment. It also reminds us, however, that more than three-quarters of all Air Force combat planes today are obsolete or obsolescent—a situation which involves far more than a calculated risk.

Today in Korea, despite our record in air combat, we are holding air superiority by the skin of our teeth—and at the whim of the enemy, who has chosen to commit to battle only a portion of the jet aircraft available to him in the Far East. Even more important, the enemy has chosen to use MIG Alley as a training area for new pilots, while we employ our top airmen in this struggle. Thus, while we can take pride in the record of our brave men who engage the enemy in air combat, let us not be swayed in our judgment of the situation by the box score in these battles to date. Great tension prevails among our pilots in Korea, I am told, over

the constant threat that they may suddenly be confronted by new Russian-developed and Russian-made equipment which would quickly change the course of the conflict. A new gunsight for the MIG's might do it. A jet fighter capable of night combat certainly would do it.

Neither development is beyond the capability of the enemy, for Russia has proceeded with an uninterrupted air-power research and development program ever since she acquired a number of German aeronautical experts, some of the world's finest, as war booty in 1945. Our own Air Force research and development program, on the other hand, has been spotty.

During the period from 1947 to 1949, for example, the Air Force gave up, for lack of money, fully half of its existing research and development projects. Not one new aircraft or guided-missile project was undertaken. And those were the years which determined the quality of the air weapons with which we fight today.

As I inquire into the facts behind this situation, I find that Air Force requests for research and development funds have been cut back repeatedly at the Defense Department level. This has occurred again in the defense budget for the 1953 fiscal year. The Air Force established its requirements for research and development at $725,000,000. John H. McCone, a hard-headed business executive, then Under Secretary of the Air Force, argued in vain for this amount before the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense. The Board, however, fixed the figure at $580,000,000, and this was later reduced to the present total of $525,000,000. And now Congress considers a further cut. As a result of this cut-back, several important jet-engine and guided-missile projects will have to be postponed or delayed.

I am concerned about this state of affairs. I am worried especially about our guided-missile program. Russia inherited, or took by force, German missile experts who, in 1945, already were 10 years ahead of America in this vital field of development. I do not like to contemplate the prospect of long-range Russian missiles carrying atomic explosives. I am not convinced we are keeping pace with this threat. I think the Senate should reestablish the Air Force research and development budget at the $725,000,000 figure. The taxpayer is being asked to spend many billions of dollars on numbers of aircraft without being assured that they are the best aircraft.

To obtain the numbers of modern aircraft we need to counter the Soviet threat, we must first have a sound plan. I have searched for such a plan in the various proposals which have been made for the build-up of our air power. I regret to say, that neither the House nor Senate proposals meet the standards of adequate defense. Neither budget will save the taxpayer any money in the long run.

Indeed, it is now well established that the stretch-out of our air power will cost more money than if we had adhered to our original schedules. To cite but one of many examples, the stretch-out already has resulted in an increase of $160,000 in the unit cost of the B-36. There have been reliable estimates that over the time period involved the stretch-out will cost an additional $2,000,000,000.

Yet I am sure that the average taxpayer—long since confused over the complexity of this issue—has been led to believe that the air power stretch-out is a money-saving program. Let us set the record straight here and now. We will be justly criticized by the people if we do not take that course which in the long run will be more economical.

The stretch-out, to be sure, postpones the output of air weapons and hence, as an installment buying device, permits less of an outlay of funds in the coming fiscal year. Stated more clearly, it avoids the issue of the moment, and passes the buck—figuratively and literally—to another day and to another session of the Congress. Meanwhile, our air-power production will suffer, as it has suffered in these first 6 months of the stretch-out, and we will be that much further away from achieving the military stature the world situation demands.

We should accept a defense budget that is based on a sound and approved military plan. The only such plan in existence today rests somewhere in a bottom drawer of the office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This plan was based on the best intelligence information available to this Nation. It has been approved by the military chiefs and the civilian secretaries of the three armed services, and by the National Security Council. It has never been refuted.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have recommended, as a minimum security requirement, an Air Force of 143 modern wings (126 combat wings and 17 transport wings) by July 1, 1954. May I stress again that this is not a unilateral Air Force determination of its requirements. It is the best judgment of the military and civilian heads of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It represents their joint decision regarding the major strategic tasks confronting the Military Establishment as a whole, and the particular responsibilities of the Air Force in carrying out those tasks.

So much production time has been lost these last 6 months that it would be very difficult to meet that goal under our limited mobilization program.

However, Secretary of the Air Force Finletter has testified before our Committee on Appropriations that if we adhere to the budget proposed by the executive branch that we could have the air strength desired—143 modern wings—by July 1, 1955. Fortunately, the amendment proposed by Senator O'MAHONEY for contract obligation authority will achieve this limited purpose.

The sound course for the Senate to follow is to restore the budget of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Anything less, as military spokesmen repeatedly have testified, would be less than our security and national interest require.

The committee is to be congratulated for eliminating the ceiling on defense expenditures which the House would impose on the Military Establishment during the 1953 fiscal year. The House also cut approximately $1,500,000,000 from the President's budget. Now our own Committee on Appropriations is asking us, not only to sustain, but to increase these reductions.

We are being asked to cut below the House budget $78,000,000 from the Army, $115,000,000 from the Navy, $278,000,000 from the Air Force.

The largest portion of the Air Force reduction by the Senate committe $221,000,000—would come in the category known as Maintenance and Operations. This will reduce that budget item by $800,000,000 below the budget estimate. As Secretary Finletter testified before the committee, "This is the money that flies the Air Force." This is the muscle of this branch of our service.

The Air Force now estimates that should the committee's reduction in this one item be sustained, along with the reductions already made, its total flying hours during the next fiscal year would be 20 percent less than the flying hours provided for in the President's budget. These are the flying hours that determine the proficiency of our airmen. Are we justified in sending American boys into air combat with less flight training than their leaders say that they require? I do not think we should accept the risks involved in such a move.

The budget now before us also reduces funds for aircraft production below figures voted by the House. The total results, according to Air Force estimates, would be to eliminate approximately 700 aircraft from the Air Force program recommended by the President. These aircraft would include, I have learned, some of our best jet fighters and even our new B-47 jet bombers, upon which much of our aerial striking power depends.

The Air Force estimates that the budget as approved by the Senate Appropriations Committee would delay the planned build-up of the Air Force to 143 modern wings from July 1, 1955, as provided in the President's budget to July 1, 1956.

Stated in other terms—at mid-year in 1954, which the Joint Chiefs of Staff have determined will be the point of greatest danger—based on the growing air strength of the Soviet Union—the President's budget would provide the Nation with 104 modern air-force wings. The budget now before us would reduce our air strength at that time to 85 modern wings.

In our consideration of the defense budget for the coming fiscal year, let us not be sidetracked from the main issue—that command of the air is at stake in this budget—that command of the air will be the decisive factor in our relationship with the Soviet Union.

Only the mature judgment of the Senate now stands between, on the one hand, national security and world peace, and, on the other hand, atomic blackmail or atomic attack. This mature judgment must prevail despite the many domestic pressures of the moment—despite any desires for business as usual and politics as usual. We must cast aside all wishful thinking about Communist intentions. The facts of Russia's growing military machine speak for themselves. We must answer in kind.

Cut away all of the chaff of wishful thinking from the Russian problem and you have these incontrovertible facts:

1. The Soviet rulers consider that they are engaged in a struggle with the United States that can only end in either total victory or total defeat.

2. The Soviet rulers stand ready to use any weapon in this struggle, including armed forces, that promise to be effective.

3. The Soviet rulers have been urgently preparing for war against the United States since the end of the last war:

They continued to maintain an enormous army and air force in a state of readiness for action.

They continued to concentrate most of their economic resources on production of weapons of war and expansion of the industrial base required for the production of weapons of war.

They have unremittently pressed forward the development of new types of weapons.

They have kept their professional, skilled, and unskilled labor force under wartime restrictions.

They have carried out on an urgent basis an enormously costly stockpiling program.

4. The Soviet rulers have undertaken to prepare their people psychologically for war against the American people. They have sought through an atrocity campaign without parallel in history to create intense, unreasoning hatred on the part of the individual Russion toward the individual American.

5. The Soviet rulers have urgently undertaken to organize, arm, and arouse the 100,000,000 people of the European satellites and the 500,000,000 people of Communist China for struggle against the United States.

6. The Soviet rulers today have immediately at hand these forces for use in its struggle against the United States: 175 divisions in a state of full battle readiness; more than 20,000 combat aircraft; more than 50,000 tanks; a submarine fleet far superior to that possessed by Nazi Germany; an indeterminate but certainly dangerous number of A-bombs; bacteriological and chemical warfare of the most advanced type.

To scoff at danger can be very popular at times. It reassures the timid; it justifies the do-nothing; it frees the prudent from the necessity of making sacrifices.

But to scoff at danger when danger is real is the height of foolhardiness. It can be fatal, not only to the scoffer but to those lulled into a state of self-satisfied complacency by his words of disdain. It can be fatal to a whole nation.

Whatever anyone may say to the contrary, the danger posed to the existence of this country by the Soviet Union is terribly real. To ignore it would be not only to invite, but virtually to make certain our destruction.

The object of the Soviet rulers is to destroy the United States. This is no secret, confirmable only by an undercover pipeline into the Politburo. It is a well-advertised fact.

The rulers of Soviet Russia have proclaimed to the entire word that between them and us there can be no peace, that between them and us must rage a relentless struggle, that out of this struggle must come complete triumph for the one and complete defeat for the other. The Soviet rulers have characterized the world as now being divided into two camps: a Soviet camp on the one hand and an American camp on the other. And, in the words of Stalin, "the struggle between these camps will fill the history of the development of the world revolution." The issue, according to a leading Soviet spokesman a few months ago, is simply "who shall conquer whom."

In our pursuit of a balanced national budget we must ask ourselves how important that budget will become if, by viture of it, we lost world balance of power to communism.

In protecting the taxpayer from waste in the military establishment we must also protect him from the greatest waste of all—war.

In our reluctance to disturb the civilian economy with military production, we must recognize that nothing would disrupt this economy quite so much as a few well-placed atomic bombs.

We must, I believe, make funds available to permit the attainment of 143 modern wings for our Air Force by the critical date of July 1, 1954.

Let us never look back upon this moment in 1952 and conclude that, through lack of foresight, we failed to provide the means for advancing toward the goal of the century—peace with honor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am very deeply concerned with the manner in which the entire defense budget has been mishandled. We are cutting the appropriations from the level of last year by $11,000,000,000. We are cutting the appropriations by $6,000,000,000 from the estimates for this year. The item which the Senator from Minnesota is discussing, in my opinion, is one of the most important ones in the entire bill. I should like to see $725,000,000 voted for research and development, instead of $525,000,000, as proposed by the Senator from Texas.

I do not think we can afford to be niggardly with our defense appropriations. We are under a terrible threat.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to repeat what I said before the Senator from New York came on the floor. I share completely, as I think I have demonstrated, his desire to maintain a maximum air power for the United States of America. But the RECORD before us shows that as of today, the 30th of June, the Air Force has a carry-over of unobligated funds of $47,000,000 for research and development. This sum, if expended and obligated at the rate of the obligations in April of this year would last for 30 months. If expended at 150 percent of that rate, it would last almost 21 months. In those circumstances, I think the committee is not open even to the intimation that in making this cut it is in any way reducing our air power.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire is a member of the Armed Services Committee and a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Year after year when the appropriations have been large, or when they have been small, he has always stood for research and development. I believe it is absolutely essential to carry on research and development. I believe the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] in offering his amendment is attempting, of course, to bring the amount up to the figure recommended by the budget. Outside of direct airplane procurement, and perhaps even more than direct airplane procurement, research and development is the most essential item in the appropriation bill. The only question is, Is this amount needed?

I address a question to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]: Is it not a fact that the current carry-over for research and development, plus the appropriation which the committee recommended, according to the testimony, will be sufficient for 21 months?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There can be no question about that. It will be more than that. We have not been niggardly on research and development.

Mr. BRIDGES. We never have been.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The research and development estimate for 1953 was $1,515,000,000, as compared with $1,305,000,000 in 1952. The Senate committee recommended $1,305,000,000 for research and development, of which $456,750,000 was for the Air Force. That is $25,000,000 more than was appropriated for this purpose in 1952.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am not attempting to take the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to task. I wish to say, however, that if he had reference to the work of the Committee on Appropriations, the work of the Committee on Armed Services, or the subcommittee, he would find that no group has tried harder to do a fair and impartial job than the three groups I have mentioned. If the budget has been mishandled so far as it pertains to the armed services, it has certainly not been mishandled by the three groups to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire said about the intention and objectives of the three committees to which he has referred.

I should like to say that if the committee amendment is agreed to, and if we cut the House amount by $68,000,000, it is all right with me, but I want the Senate to know what it is doing when the roll is called. If we take up the morning paper today and read that Curtiss-Wright must go to the British to get the best jet engine that has been developed, or when we read our intelligence reports and note what the Russians have done in the field of scientific development, we should stop, look, and listen before we disregard our staff, the budget, and the House of Representatives.

The Senate committee has reduced the figure by $2,000,000,000. This is what the bill provides, as reported by the committee:

Aircraft and related procurement, $11,000,000,000. That is the budget figure. The Senate committee recommended $10,400,000,000, which is $600,000,000 less than the budget recommendation.

The Senate by unanimous vote a few moments ago largely corrected that error. The next item is major procurement other than aircraft. The Bureau of the Budget estimated $1,300,000,000. The committee recommended $900,000,000. I am not arguing about that item, but I want the RECORD to show that the Senate committee reduced it by $400,000,000.

For maintenance and operation the Bureau of the Budget gave the Air Force $4,390,000,000, but the Senate committee reduced it to $3,540,000,000, or by more than $200,000,000 even below the House figure.

For research and development the budget recommended $525,000,000. The House, even though it had made material reductions in other items, supported the budget estimate and recommended $525,000,000.

I offered my amendment so that we will have time to discuss the subject. As I understand the parliamentary situation, the question before the Senate will be on the adoption of the committee amendment on page 34, line 16.

If the Senate wishes to cut $68,000,000 from the funds for research and development, all the Senate has to do is vote for the committee amendment. If the Senate does not wish to make that cut in the appropriations for research and development, the Senate should vote "nay" on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment, and should leave intact the appropriation voted for this purpose by the House of Representatives.

If the committee amendment is adopted, here is what the Air Force says will be the result:

Projects which would be forced to be eliminated would include money for the development of two turbo-prop engines, design studies for a new fighter bomber, a new night intruder and a new tactical bomber. In the area of strategic air operations, we would be forced to eliminate studies for a rocket power plant for a new strategic bomber, curtail the

development of an air-guided missile for bomber defense and defer studies on a guided missile to be used for reconnaissance. In the area of air defense, a new supersonic interceptor would have to be eliminated from the design studies we would plan for fiscal year 1953.

Mr. President, I do not think it is good economy to appropriate $11,000,000,000 for airplanes in the next fiscal year, in one breath, by unanimous vote, and in the next breath vote to eliminate from the appropriations $68,000,000 that we need in order to be sure that we have the best planes the United States can produce.

Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time available for debate on the amendment has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes to discuss this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire requests an additional 2 minutes of time to speak on the amendment. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to address my remarks to the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. No one has made more of a study of this question than has the Senator from Texas, and I take off my hat to him for it. I myself have given a good deal of attention to this matter. In the past I have favored research and development for airplanes at times when other Members have not done so. I have taken that position both here on the floor and in committee.

In the justification submitted in connection with the requested appropriation for research and development, the Air Force has included several items. One of them is for research in regard to uniforms. Certainly none of us will question the importance of research in the field of electronics or plane design or construction or engine design or construction, but it seems to me that some of the other items included in the research and development program are scarcely of the same importance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, I do not favor restoring any requested appropriations for research in regard to uniforms.

Heretofore I have stated the projects which would have to be eliminated if the committee amendment were adopted. Research with respect to uniforms is not one of them. I asked for information regarding the specific projects which would have to be eliminated if the committee amendment were adopted and if the amount voted by the House of Representatives were reduced.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, certainly the Air Force is confusing the issue if it states to the Senator from Texas that essential items must be omitted if the committee amendment is adopted and if, at the same time, the Air Force intends to continue activities of a less essential nature, such as research regarding uniforms, even if the committee amendment is adopted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. How much is proposed for research in the case of uniforms?

Mr. BRIDGES. Forty-one million nine hundred and ten thousand dollars is the entire amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am not going to oppose an increase in the appropriations in the field of research and development because I have always believed in that work, and I believe in it today, and I believe the Senator from Texas is right about it.

On the other hand, I say the Air Force has put its best foot forward in submitting those figures to the Senator from Texas, for in that connection the Air Force would continue some of the less essential activities, but states that it would have to eliminate some of the more essential ones if the cut were made. Certainly the Air Force does that in an effort to make out a good case against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, in line 16. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, in line 16. If the committee amendment is adopted, the Senate will vote for the appropriation of $456,750,000 for research and development, instead of $525,000,000, as provided in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives.

Therefore, Mr. President, I understand that on this question, Senators who oppose such a reduction will vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is correct.

The Chair should make a special statement regarding the parliamentary situation: The vote about to be taken is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, in line 16.

The Senator from Texas offered an amendment, but its effect would really be to have the bill carry the figure voted at this point by the House of Representatives. Of course, that figure is already carried in the bill.

Therefore, at this time, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Senators who favor the committee amendment, which calls for a reduction in the amount carried at this point in the bill as passed by the House, will vote "yea." Senators who oppose the committee amendment will vote "nay."

The Chair has made that point clear because of the unusual situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that because the Senator from Texas originally brought up this question by means of a special amendment, some confusion might be occasioned, because no amendment was necessary, for the Senator from Texas merely seeks to reject the committee amendment.

Therefore, Senators who favor a reduction of approximately $68,000,000, which would be made by the committee amendment, will vote "yea," and Senators who share the view of the Senator from Texas will vote "nay." Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 34, in line 16. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate and if present would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pensylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—30

Bennett	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Hoey	Robertson
Douglas	Holland	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Hunt	Schoeppel
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—47

Aiken	Humphrey	Morse
Benton	Ives	Mundt
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Neely
Cain	Kem	Nixon
Case	Knowland	Pastore
Clements	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lehman	Seaton
Ecton	Long	Smathers
Frear	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fulbright	McCarran	Stennis
George	McCarthy	Underwood
Gillette	McFarland	Welker
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Hennings	Monroney	Young
Hill	Moody	

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Dirksen	McMahon
Brewster	Duff	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Taft
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capehart	Kerr	Watkins
Carlson	Lodge	
Chavez	Malone	

So the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the committee amendment on page 34, beginning in line 16 with the word "provided." It immediately follows the amendment upon which the Senate has just voted. The amendment was one of the amendments which was excepted from the action of the Senate on Saturday. I have now been advised that the Senator at whose request the Senator from Arizona had this amendment carried over does not desire to raise the question. So, Mr. President, I hope that the committee amendment will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment is agreed to.

There is one more reserved amendment, on page 54 of the bill, which the clerk will state

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. One page 54, line 9, after the word "are", the committee proposes to strike out "required to assist such officers in performing specific duties" and to insert "to assist such officers in the performance of specific military duties."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time is now under control.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have an amendment to the committee amendment just stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time on the committee amendment must be exhausted before the Senator offers his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in relation to the committee amendment, the Senator from Michigan tried to obtain and did obtain from the departments the information which he desired in relation to the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In order that the matter may be perfectly clear to the Senate, we are now discussing section 634, page 54 of the bill. It is a House provision, which reads as follows:

SEC. 634. During the fiscal year 1953 no funds appropriated by this act shall be used for the pay and allowances of persons assigned to render assistance to generals of the Army, fleet admirals of the Navy, or generals in the Marine Corps, except during periods when such persons are required to assist such officers in performing specific duties assigned by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or the head of the military department concerned.

This amendment was not discussed on the floor of the House. It was not described in the House report, but it was the understanding of our committee that its purpose was to deny to retired military officers the assistance they would get from military personnel who were assigned to them while they were not engaged in active duty.

Some question arose in the committee as to whether it would be effective only with respect to General MacArthur and not with respect to certain other generals and admirals. The position of the committee was that the rule should be equal as to all, that all officers who had reached retirement age and all who were not on active military duty should not be accorded military assistants when not engaged in military duty. The committee amended the provision by striking out the words "required to assist such officers in performing specific duties," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "to assist such officers in the performance of specific military duties."

It was the belief of the committee that the use of the words "specific military duties" would make it possible to assign military personnel to an officer like Gen. "Hap" Arnold, who, when he retired and went to his home in California, was frequently called for consultation, and clerks, stenographers, and some military persons were made available to him for that purpose. Our intention was to make the provision completely equitable and applicable to all persons in this particular position. If the language of the committee amendment does not reach that objective, I have no objection to striking out the whole amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I undertook to ascertain from the services, and I received a reply. I asked a question as to the effect of adoption of the House and Senate versions, and the reply is as follows:

There would be no difference in effect in the event of adoption of either version inasmuch as both would permit Generals Bradley and Marshall, Admirals King, Leahy, and Nimitz, and Generals Shepherd and Vandegrift to retain their assistants since all are performing both specific duties and specific military duties.

I asked some other questions, one of which was how many officers would be affected, and the reply is as follows:

Army: Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Gen. George C. Marshall.

Navy: Admiral William F. Halsey, Jr.; Admiral Ernest J. King; Admiral William D. Leahy; Admiral Chester W. Nimitz.

Marine Corps: Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Gen. Archer A. Vandegrift.

The second question was as to those named above who performed "specific duties assigned by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or the head of the department concerned," and the duties involved.

The reply was as follows:

Army: Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Eisenhower, no duties assigned; MacArthur, no duties assigned; Marshall, Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission.

Navy: Halsey, no duties assigned; King, reports to the Secretary of the Navy for duties as assigned (assigned intermittent duties as member of selection boards and in advisory capacity on general Navy policy matters); works with Historical Section of the Joint Chiefs of Staff compiling war history of the Joint and Combined Chiefs of Staff during World War II; Leahy, intermittent military duties assigned by the Secretary of the Navy or the Chief of Naval Operations; Nimitz, reports to the Secretary of Navy for duties as assigned (assigned intermittent duties as member of selection boards and in advisory capacity on general Navy policy matters).

Marine Corps: Shepherd, Commandant, Marine Corps; Vandegrift, member of the Battle Monuments Commission; serves intermittently on Marine Corps selection boards.

The third question was:

Those named in paragraph 1 above who perform "specific military duties assigned by the President, the Secretary of Defense, or the head of the department concerned, and the duties involved:

Army: Bradley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Navy: Marshall, Chairman, American Battle Monuments Commission; King, same as in paragraph 2; Leahy, same as in paragraph 2; Nimitz, same as in paragraph 2.

The fourth question was as to the number of persons assigned to assist the generals and admirals listed and the changes which have occurred in the past 6 months. The reply is as follows:

Army: Bradley, five sergeants; Eisenhower, one lieutenant colonel, two master sergeants; MacArthur, one colonel, one warrant officer, one sergeant (first class); Marshall, one major (20 percent of his time), one master sergeant.

Navy: Halsey, no persons assigned; King, one commander, one lieutenant (j. g.), two master sergeants (USMC), and one chief steward; Leahy, one lieutenant commander, one civilian secretary, one master sergeant (USMC), one steward (first class), and one steward (third class); Nimitz, one master sergeant (USMC).

Marine Corps: Shepherd, two lieutenant colonels, two master sergeants, one staff sergeant; Vandegrift, one master sergeant.

(No change in any of the above staffs in the past 6 months with exception of General MacArthur's staff reduced from seven Army and one Air Force last fall.)

General Eisenhower left official staff in France and brought back the staff enumerated above in May 1952.

I have already read a statement to the effect that the adoption of the Senate version over that of the House would not alter the situation at all. That being true, I am sure the distinguished Senator from Wyoming now feels that not only the committee amendment, but the entire provision should go to conference, so that it might be so drawn as not to permit, say, a five-star general to be assigned, for instance, to the Battle Monuments Commission, and have such service treated as essential military service. The entire provision should go to conference and be worked out in such a way as to be equitable to all concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree that that is what ought to be done, but I think the RECORD should show that the American Battle Monuments Commission is a special commission created by law, for which appropriations are made annually by Congress. There is an appropriation for the American Battle Monuments Commission in the independent offices appropriation bill. That commission is the one which makes plans for monuments which have been and are being erected throughout Europe.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the fact that it is a statutory matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that in order to carry out the purpose of the Committee on Appropriations, section 634 should be deleted. Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, I move that section 634 be eliminated in its entirety.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senate waives the rule, the committee amendment would first have to be adopted before a motion to strike out the whole section would be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, I withdraw the committee amendment and substitute as a committee amendment my motion to strike out section 634.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming withdraws the committee amendment and moves a substitute committee amendment, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 54 it is proposed to strike out section 634, beginning on line 4 and ending on line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment designated "6-27-52-C," and ask that it be stated.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment? I wonder if the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has returned to the Chamber. He desired to raise a question about a committee amendment, and I believe it would be preferable to consider that first.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is there an amendment before the Senate at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we can dispose of my amendment before the Senator from Vermont returns.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 640. None of the procurement items purchased with funds appropriated for the Department of Defense by this or any other act shall be subject to any tax imposed on the sale or transfer of such articles, or components used by manufacturers in producing such procurement items, or components purchased for replacement parts for such procurement items.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is not complicated. At the present time we are appropriating money for the purchase of defense matériel, and at the same time we are paying taxes to the Federal Government on the purchase of the matériel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I ask the Senator if it is his intention to eliminate payment of Federal sales taxes?

Mr. FERGUSON. The amendment covers any tax. I understand that State sales taxes cannot be collected and are not collected. The amendment refers to the Federal tax.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then does not the Senator feel that that should so be stated in the body of the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. That it should read "any Federal tax?"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what it was intended to cover. I modify my amendment on line 3 to read "any Federal tax."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan has modified his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The object of the amendment is to make sure that we do not appropriate money to the pocket of national defense and have it taken from that pocket and put into the general revenues of the United States, which are used not only for defraying the expenses of the Department of Defense, but also of all other departments. It is a very simple amendment. I hope the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On behalf of the committee I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, of the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 640. No part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be available for the payment of hazardous duty pay in excess of $100 a month in the case of officers and $50 a month in the case of enlisted personnel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 20 minutes.

FLIGHT PAY SHOULD BE EQUALIZED

Mr. DOUGLAS. This amendment would save, at a minimum, $90,000,000 a year. It would provide that the bonus payments now given to flight-crew members and to members of submarine crews would be placed at the same figure which is now given to parachutists, namely, $50 a month for enlisted men, and $100 a month for officers. In other words, it would reduce to substantial uniformity the bonus-system payment across the board for all branches of the service. It would save $90,000,000 in the Air Force alone, at a minimum estimate. There would be no reduction in the $100 a month which is now paid second lieutenants who fly planes. But the amendment would mean a reduction in the so-called incentive pay of captains, majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels. The payments now go up to $210 a month in the case of colonels.

If the Air Force would only cooperate with our attempts to save money, and if it would also place restrictions upon the flight pay granted to administrative officers who have long since ceased to be actual pilots, undoubtedly additional sums of money could be saved. Many thousands of flights now undertaken would not be made, and there would be a consequent reduction of many millions of dollars spent for gasoline which is now wasted. There would also be further millions of dollars saved through the reduction of wear and tear upon planes.

The evidence which has been produced before the special subcommittee investigating this subject, and the debate which has taken place upon the floor of the Senate upon at least two occasions, have indicated that there are great abuses in the matter of bonus or incentive payments for flight service.

Many facets are involved. One, of course, is that which I have mentioned a number of times, namely, that such payments are granted to desk officers and ground officers who have really finished their flying careers but who, if they go up into the air 100 hours during the year, can nevertheless continue to receive the flight bonuses. Classified material shows that these bonuses have been paid to mess officers, adjutants, supply officers, personnel officers, and others whose connection with flying is certainly most scanty.

AIR FORCE OPPOSES REMOVING PRIVILEGE

I have been considerably disappointed by the attitude of the Air Force in not dealing with this abuse. It has insisted on retaining the bonus system in its entirety. I have in my hand the testimony of a leading general of the Air Force before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services in which he makes some extraordinary statements to the effect that if the Air Force appropriation for flight pay were cut, instead of reducing the bonuses, he would recommend that

new flying units be not called up, and that some of the combat flight units already in existence be withdrawn.

I cannot believe that this testimony represents the considered judgment of that officer. I would not like to believe it. I should like to give the Air Force an opportunity to change its mind upon this subject, so that the reduction in appropriations might come from the privileges which the Air Force is now enjoying rather than from the combat effectiveness of the Air Force.

A few minutes ago I voted, along with the other members of the Senate, to increase by $600,000,000 the amount which the Air Force is to receive for the construction of airplanes and the purchase of new equipment. I did so despite the extraordinary discrepancy in the figures produced by the Air Force. I have never been able to understand how a reduction of 5 percent in the amounts appropriated could result in delaying the program for a year, or how a reduction of $600,000,000 in appropriations could mean that $11,000,000,000 worth of construction would be delayed. I have yet to hear from the Air Force any real explanation as to why these small cuts should create stretch-outs of 1 and 2 years, respectively. I think the Air Force owes it to the American people to make a more considered explanation of these discrepancies than it has thus far advanced. However, upon assurances by the very able and patriotic chairman of the subcommittee that there were good reasons involved in connection with these figures, and because I did not wish to impair the armed effectiveness of the United States, I swallowed my arithmetical scruples and voted for the increase, because I did not wish by any possibility to contribute to weakening the defenses of the Nation. Nevertheless, the Air Force owes us an explanation on this point.

REDUCTIONS SHOULD BE MADE IN WASTE, NOT PREPAREDNESS

Mr. President, Congress has been extremely generous to the Air Force. We have placed a high premium upon air power. We have shown our trust in the Air Force by the huge appropriations we have made. I do not think it improper, but, on the other hand, quite proper, for us to say to the Air Force, "Since we are pouring out billions of dollars to be expended by you, why do you continue so adamant in your refusal to give up privileges on your part?" If it is the armed security of the United States which is at stake, why can we not save $100,000,000 or $200,000,000 from these privileges and put them into planes instead?

It will be noticed that my amendment does not call for any reduction in the total amounts to be appropriated. I think the committee has done extremely well on that point. I am not proposing to cut the amounts appropriated a single cent further. The effect of my amendment would be to transfer from the field of privilege to the field of security between $100,000,000 and $200,000,000.

I should like to point out that a much more stringent amendment than this was nearly adopted by this body 2½ months ago. It was defeated only upon the assurance of the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that this subject would be considered by the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, which would go into the subject in detail and would make a report, presumably by the 15th of May.

The subcommittee proceeded to work, and was kind enough to invite me to testify before it. I have waited for its report. I am sure that it has done conscientious work, and that it has been under the pressure of other duties. However, so far as I know, the report has not been forthcoming. We are now near the conclusion of the legislative session, dealing with an appropriation bill for the Defense Establishment, and I think we must act upon this subject, even though we do not have the benefit of a formal report from the committee itself.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Illinois did not receive a copy of the report. One has been available for several days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not seen it nor was I notified of it. May I ask what the recommendations of the committee were?

Mr. HUNT. It was the view of the committee that if the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Illinois with respect to the proposed cuts in flying pay were put into effect, there would be a terrific impact on the flying personnel of the Armed Forces. Since we ran into so many complications and found the subject matter to be so intricate, we recommended the appointment of a committee similar to the Hook committee to make the investigation, the committee to be appointed by the Secretary of Defense, and to report periodically to the Armed Services Committee as its study progresses.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that some members of the committee feel that there may be some abuses with respect to flight pay. Therefore, we thought it would be well for the subcommittee to work along jointly with the committee proposed to be appointed, and make a detailed study of the subject. I regret exceedingly that a copy of the report was not made available to the Senator. However, the report has been submitted.

I may add that we have received certain information from Mr. Finletter, to the effect that since 1948 some 8,000 officers have been removed from flying status.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Wyoming, but apparently all he seems to promise us is that the committee which was appointed to investigate this subject believes that still another committee should be appointed to investigate the subject. I must say that the prospects for saving seem somewhat distant, because I think we know precisely what will happen. Unless there is a change of attitude, the Air Force will insist that any reduction in the flight bonuses will set it back irreparably.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said, that there must be a change in the attitude of the Air Force, or nothing will be accomplished. I asked the Secretary for Air, Mr. Finletter, the question which the Senator has just stated in his affirmative statement. I asked him whether the attitude of the Air Force would change. He told me that he would look into the subject with as much of an open mind as possible. I asked him to put that in writing. I have sent for the letter which he had written me on that subject. It is a very fair letter, and I think would be quite convincing to the Senator from Illinois.

If I may add one further statement let me say that, along with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], we held very long hearings on the subject of hazardous duty pay. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois uses the phrase "hazardous duty pay." That would include duty abroad submarines, parachute drops, and air piloting. It would affect many thousand persons.

Personally, I hope that the distinguished Senator from Illinois will take the assurance of the junior Senator from Wyoming, who is the chairman of the subcommittee which has been studying it, that the whole subject has been thoroughly discussed in the Committee on Armed Services. We have drawn up a report which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, signed this afternoon and sent to Mr. Lovett, asking the Secretary of Defense to appoint an impartial commission similar to the principle on which the Hook Commission, was based and submit a report to the Senate by February or March.

I honestly believe that when we have voted to increase appropriations for the Air Force, as we have voted today, and when we have voted to increase the number of wings to 143, we should not quickly and arbitrarily change the whole method of pay.

I say most respectfully to the Senator from Illinois, because my heart is in the same place as his, that I feel there should be some adjustment made. After listening to testimony for several days, I was convinced that we could not solve the question on the floor of the Senate, but that an adjustment must be worked out carefully. It must be decided whether a general shall have more hazard pay than a colonel, whether a colonel shall have more than a captain, and whether a captain shall have more than an enlisted man, and so forth.

Another question which must be decided is what should be the value of a parachute drop, for example. Another question is, How much should be paid as hazard pay for submarine duty in peacetime? There are other similar difficult questions which must be answered.

I say all this most respectfully to the Senator from Illinois, because I believe

he has made a proposal which has great merit; but, as I pointed out previously, it is not something that can be worked out quickly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to say to my very good friend from Massachusetts, for whom I have great respect and very real affection, that this is not a sudden or arbitrary action on the part of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I realize that the Senator has been consistent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have raised this question on numerous occasions. The Senate has debated the subject very thoroughly, and the facts are generally known. My proposal is an extremely moderate one. It is not a proposal to abolish the bonuses—although the ethical basis for the payment of any such bonuses is extremely dubious—but a proposal to equalize the bonuses at the same rate at which the bonus is paid in the parachute service.

Probably the most hazardous of all branches of service is that of the parachute service. In that service an enlisted man receives $50 a month extra compensation, and an officer receives $100 a month extra compensation. I am proposing that the other branches of the service, which I believe are less hazardous than the parachute service, shall be paid on the same scale. What I am suggesting is a base, from which we can conduct future investigations to see whether we should go further. The base I suggest seems to me to be the irreducible minimum, and the first step in the removal of the great abuses which exist.

I had hoped that we could get the Air Force voluntarily to come forward and stop this abuse. I am deeply disappointed that they have not done so, and I am deeply disturbed by the testimony which was given, particularly of the character which I hold in my hand and do not propose to read on the floor of the Senate. Since the Air Force will not move, it is necessary for Congress to move. I hope very much that the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will my senior colleague yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question before he starts his discussion?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope that the Senator from Wyoming will ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of his remarks, the text of the report by the subcommittee of the full Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HUNT. I shall be very pleased to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there may be printed in the RECORD the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services with respect to its study of the subject of special and incentive pay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I make that statement not because the Senator from Illinois is not sincere in his attempt to save money, but because I have a great fear that it would have a bad effect on the morale of the men who fly airplanes in our armed services.

I do not need to point to the unhappy fact that the flight service is no longer greatly desired by our young men. In fact, the recent graduates from West Point did not, as was the case in past years, in great numbers ask to be appointed to the Air Force. The opposite was true. I do not like to mention the fact that as we call back the Reserve officers they are very much displeased with having to reassume flying hazards, and we are all acquainted with results along that line.

Surely we could not find any man more conversant and more familiar with or possessing greater knowledge of the subject of incentive pay than Secretary Finletter.

Although I have conducted hearings on the subject and, while my attendance as chairman of the subcommittee was regular, I still do not feel that I am capable at this time of saying whether such incentive pay is justified or not justified. I believe it is a matter which in the last analysis must be left for decision to an impartial board after it has made very careful studies.

If I may emphasize the hazard of flying in the armed services, I should like to say that from June 1949 to June 1950 there was an attrition of 23 percent. Incentive pay has been in effect for 38 years. As I mentioned a short time ago I believe we must continue to provide that admissions to the Air Force shall be on a voluntary basis. I am advised by those who are constantly connected with our flying service that it is absolutely impossible to make a pilot out of a man who does not care to be a pilot. Admission to Air Force flight status must be on a voluntary basis.

I think it will be necessary to continue flight pay in order to retain and attract intelligent and capable individuals. That kind of individual is the only kind who can be trained as a pilot and placed in charge of a plane.

I think it is a very definitely recognized principle of industry that extra pay must be granted for hazardous employment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I should like to finish my statement first. In commercial flying a pilot certainly draws approximately three or four times the amount of compensation that a man on the ground draws. Extra compensation is paid in commercial flying because a pilot requires greater technical knowledge, and there is connected with flying much greater hazard than is the case in other employment. Military flying is far more hazardous than is commercial flying. Men in the military service must fly what are called "hot" planes. Such planes must perform in a manner that commercial planes are not required to perform. It takes a much better pilot with considerable more skill to fly a plane in the armed services than it does to fly a plane in the commercial service. Military flying is not becoming safer. In fact, it is becoming much more hazardous.

I regret to say that of 28 pilots in the Wyoming Air Guard in the Korean war 6 have already met death. During 1946, passenger fatalities in commercial flights were only one-sixth of the fatality rate of 1936. Pilot deaths since World War II have increased 25 percent over prewar fatalities, based on pilot deaths per thousand pilots each year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the junior Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield two additional minutes to my colleague.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I realize that the Senator from Illinois has had extensive experience in the armed services and had a marvelous record in the last war. His associates in the Senate take considerable pride in his record in that war. However, I repeat that on the floor of the Senate we should take action which some of us feel we are not qualified to take. I make the statement in all deference to the Senator from Illinois. I do not believe we should take a chance with the security of the Nation by depriving the pilots of the pay to which they are entitled.

After the completion of the studies to which I have referred, if the committee working with the armed services then reports that a reduction in flight pay should be made, I shall be glad to join with the Senator from Illinois in favoring such a reduction.

Until that time comes, I myself do not wish to assume the responsibility of voting to lower the morale of the Air Force, when today all of us are trying to build up the Air Force. Neither do I wish to stand on the floor of the Senate and be critical of the armed services, on the one hand, and on the other hand vote to take action which will result in lowering the morale of the armed services, with the result that they will not be so efficient and so effective as we would wish them to be.

EXHIBIT 1

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, WITH RESPECT TO SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS (HUNT, CHAIRMAN, STENNIS, LONG, SALTONSTALL, AND CAIN)

During the debate on the military pay raise bill amendments were offered which would have eliminated or substantially reduced the incentive and special pays now authorized for members of the military services performing specific duties. Because these incentive and special pays were not altered by the bill under consideration and were not considered by the Armed Services Committee, the chairman urged that the amendments not be adopted pending further study and report thereon to the Senate.

It was evident that this action by the chairman contributed to the defeat of the proposed amendments. Furthermore, previous actions by the Congress have evidenced a growing sentiment among Members that some of the special pays provided are too high or not properly administered.

Since the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee had been reviewing the administration of the laws dealing with special and incentive pays, these hearings were continued and expanded to include incentive pays, special pays, overseas allowances, special allowances for military attachés and combat pay. The members of the subcommittee designated to consider the subject matter are: Senator HUNT, chairman; Senator STENNIS; Senator LONG; Senator SALTONSTALL; Senator CAIN.

HEARINGS

Prior to convening the hearings, the chairman of the subcommittee directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense outlining the scope of the hearings and suggested that the question of these special pays be carefully reviewed within the Department in the hope that recommendations could be submitted for the modification of present laws or the rules and regulations under which the payments are administered.

Hearings were held April 16 and 17 at which time testimony was taken from the following: Lawrence Whiting, representing the Department of Defense; Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary, Department of the Air Force; Vice Adm. William M. Fechteler, Chief of Naval Operations, United States Navy; Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Chief of Staff, USAF; Vice Adm. J. H. Cassady, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air); Lt. Gen. A. C. McAuliffe, United States Army; Commander A. C. Miller, Jr., legal assistant to the Fiscal Director, Bureau of Naval Personnel; Hon. Paul H. Douglas, United States Senator from the State of Illinois; Maj. Gen. George E. Armstrong, The Surgeon General, United States Army; Dr. J. Claude Earnest, Council on Legislation, American Dental Association, accompanied by Dr. C. Willard Camalier, assistant secretary, and Francis J. Garvey, secretary, Council on Legislation; Dr. Walter B. Martin, board of trustees, American Medical Association; and Dr. W. R. Krill, American Veterinary Medical Association.

The subcommittee also took cognizance of a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force dated June 24, 1952, to Senator SALTONSTALL concerning the constructive steps which the Department of the Air Force has taken to tighten up the administration of flight pay. The letter follows:

JUNE 24, 1952.

Hon. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: This is in reply to your request during appropriations hearings on June 6, 1952, that the Air Force indicate constructive steps taken and a constructive approach concerning incentive pay.

I am sure that you are aware of the various programs the Air Force has had to tighten up the administration of flying pay. I have directed that this be a continuing program.

The Air Force requires young men of the highest quality to fly and fight its enormously complicated aircraft. Despite improvements in our airplanes and weapons, the capabilities of men controlling them will be the limiting factor. To get the best young men the Air Force must compete with industry.

I believe in this basic American competitive system. However, to compete with industry for the required high quality young man, we must provide incentive pay. I firmly believe further that this incentive pay should be increased rather than decreased.

The Air Force requires a very stringent program for its officers to qualify for flying pay. This program includes a total of 100 hours actual flying each year by all pilots which includes 15 hours at night, 20 hours of instrument, and a minimum of 35 hours in each 6 months despite the Executive order which permits a rated officer to obtain flying pay for flying 4 hours a month. In addition, the Air Force has annual physical and professional tests to further insure each man's qualifications for flying status. Failure to meet any of the requirements results in the rated officer meeting a flying evaluation board. This stringent program has resulted in the removal of some 8,000 officers from flying status since 1948.

I know the Air Force is criticized for permitting officers serving in administrative positions to be paid flying incentive pay for maintaining their flying proficiency. I believe, however, that if flying pay were eliminated, most of these officers would voluntarily terminate their flying careers. These administrative officers constitute our only Ready Reserve to meet D-day combat requirements and provide flexibility for the rotation of assignments from administrative and staff positions to operational assignments. I believe that it would be extremely dangerous to eliminate this reserve.

The administrative steps that have been taken to insure that the granting of incentive pay for flying is not abused by the Air Force has come from within the Air Force. As I stated above, I have directed that this be a continuing study. However, since this study has come from within the Air Force, I propose to recommend to the Secretary of Defense that a commission similar to the Hook Commission be established to study this whole area of incentive and hazardous-duty pay—not only within the Air Force but within the entire Defense Establishment to determine whether or not changes should be made. I strongly recommend, however, that no action be taken to cut existing incentive pays until the results of a commission such as I have indicated above, or possibly a commission such as you might wish to appoint, will have reported its findings and recommendations on this matter.

Sincerely,

THOMAS K. FINLETTER.

In every case these witnesses testified that present incentive and special pays could not be reduced and in some cases they were not now adequate. Frankly, the members of the subcommittee were disappointed that no suggestions were offered for reducing either the amount of the payment now authorized or the number of military personnel entitled to these pays. While the members of the subcommittee are convinced that drastic reductions in incentive and special pays without knowledge of the possible effects might seriously hamper the military services, we are not convinced that all such payments are now on a fair and equal basis or that reductions cannot be made in some areas despite testimony to the contrary.

Some members of the subcommittee are convinced from the proof that there should be reductions in the amounts of some of the payments now authorized, and in the number of military personnel entitled to these payments, and feel that the administration of the law has been inadequate in these respects. However, these members also feel that these reductions can properly be made only after a full development of all the facts and the careful application of these facts to the needs of the services; such reductions cannot be properly made on the floors of the Congress nor by hasty action of congressional committees.

APPLICABLE STATUTES

Section 204 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) entitled "Incentive Pay—Hazardous Duty" is the basic statute authorizing the so-called incentive pay. This section delineates nine "hazardous duties" in broad terms and fixes the rates of pay authorized for performing these duties under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the President. There are two rates of pay for incentive pay.

(a) Flight pay and submarine pay vary according to rank as indicated in the following table:

Pay grade:	*Monthly rate*
O-8	$150.00
O-7	150.00
O-6	210.00
O-5	180.00
O-4	150.00
O-3	120.00
O-2	110.00
O-1	100.00
W-4	100.00
W-3	100.00
W-2	100.00
W-1	100.00
E-7	75.00
E-6	67.50
E-5	60.00
E-4	52.50
E-3	45.00
E-2	37.50
E-1	30.00

(b) The rate for the remaining hazardous duties are on the basis of $50 for enlisted members and $100 for officers monthly.

Section 303 (b) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 in broad terms authorizes the Secretaries of the uniformed services to fix additional overseas allowances after considering all elements of cost of living to members and their dependents residing in such areas.

The services have adopted uniform procedures in administering their provisions of this section. There are no specific statutes dealing with special allowances for military attachés. Such allowances are made on the theory of reimbursement to the individual concerned for expenditures in the interest of the Government.

(c) An amendment to the military pay raise bill was adopted by the Senate providing for combat pay for military personnel in Korea. While this amendment was eliminated in conference, it is a subject which will require further consideration.

DISCUSSION

The members of the subcommittee have reviewed the testimony prescribed during and subsequent to the hearings. Members of the subcommittee are in general accord with the principle of extra compensation for those members whose primary duties are hazardous and in some instances to attract competent personnel to specific types of duties. Furthermore, members of the subcommittee are aware of the complexity of the problem and that there are numerous questions which can only be answered by long study and personal observation. In reviewing the testimony there are several areas within the scope of the hearings which members feel should be explored in an effort to reduce and equalize the incentive and special pays now in effect. A few possible areas for consideration in some of the subjects considered follow:

Flight pay

(a) Since this is the only type of hazardous-duty pay which may be continued regardless of whether the primary assignment of the member involves the duty for which additional pay is authorized, the question arises as to whether this policy should be continued. Members of the subcommittee see a marked distinction between flying which is necessary to the maintenance of an effective air arm and flying which is accomplished solely for the personal proficiency of an individual. It would appear that more senior officers are maintained on a flying status than

are required to fill unit assignments involving actual flying duties. While the actual cost of flying pay to such officers is not large, the cost of maintaining and operating airfields and planes for proficiency flying is a sizable amount. In other words, are too many senior officers being maintained on flying status?

(b) As previously indicated, there are two rates of hazardous-duty pay as follows: (1) Applicable to flight and submarine duty, which varies according to rank and (2) applicable to other hazardous duties which varies between enlisted and officer members. Should not the rate be the same for all types of hazardous duty?

(c) One of the arguments for hazardous-duty pay is the additional cost of life insurance to the member concerned. Would additional free Government insurance help to solve the problem?

(d) The rates of flight and submarine pay increase from $100 per month for a second lieutenant or ensign to $210 per month for a colonel or a captain in the Navy. Since junior officers perform the major part of the hazardous duties, should not the maximum pay for these duties be in the grade of major or lieutenant commander?

Submarine pay

Since the rate of pay for submarine duty is the same as provided for flying duty, the question in (b), (c), and (d) above apply.

Other hazardous duties for which additional compensation is authorized

These should be reviewed for possible reductions in the amount authorized as well as the rules and regulations under which the payments are administered.

Overseas allowances and special allowances for military attachés

The method of determining the amounts authorized, as well as the administration of such payments, should be reviewed. With respect to military attachés' allowances, the expenses which are considered as reimbursable should be carefully considered.

Conclusions

The testimony of the officials appearing before the subcommittee was uniformly strong against a reduction or elimination of any incentive or special pay. It was their testimony that any reduction in present payments would seriously hamper our military program. The subcommittee feels that drastic cuts in these payments without sufficient study might do serious damage to our military effectiveness, but as previously indicated, the members are not convinced that all such payments are on a fair and equal basis or that reductions cannot be made in some areas despite the testimony.

It is apparent to the members of the subcommittee that the complexity of the problem and the time necessary for a complete detailed study makes this subject one which can be best handled by an independent commission of experts. The subcommittee does not have the time or the facilities to make a detailed review of the day-to-day administration of the program under which incentive and special pays are disbursed. Such a study should include a review of the applicable statutes and, more particularly, the rules and regulations under which these payments are administered. Such a study should also include actual investigation to determine the degree of economy and efficiency in the programs.

Members of the subcommittee are particularly concerned with indications that there may be abuses in the flight-pay program. Particular reference is made to proficiency flying which is designed to maintain the efficiency of the rated officers in the military services. Under the present procedures it appears possible that officers who will never be called on to carry out flying missions draw flight pay for maintaining an unnecessary proficiency. Such a study should determine whether more efficient procedures can be devised to weed out a greater number of older officers from flying status or conversely to maintain on flying status only those officers for whom there could reasonably be expected a future flying assignment. There are at the present time many rated officers serving in positions where their primary duty does not require flying and the members feel that many of these officers will never have positions in the future in which their primary duty will require flying. It seems to us that there is room for orienting this program more toward the maintenance of an effective combat air arm and less toward a group of officers proficient in flying miscellaneous noncombat types of planes.

While the major part of this report deals with flight pay, it is because more questions have been raised concerning this type of incentive pay. It should not be construed to indicate that the other types of incentive and special pays are less important or that the present statutes and rules and regulations under which payments are administered are fair and equitable.

Recommendations

The subcommittee recommends that a letter be transmitted to the Secretary of Defense requesting that he appoint an appropriate civilian commission to study the subject matter of this report and assist the subcommittee in making recommendations to the Senate. The letter follows:

"UNITED STATES SENATE,
"COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
"*June 24, 1952.*

"Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
"*Secretary of Defense,*
"*Washington, D. C.*

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the debate in the Senate on the military pay raise bill (H. R. 5715) amendments were offered which would have eliminated or substantially reduced certain incentive and special pays now authorized for members of the military services performing specified duties. An amendment providing for combat pay was adopted, although this title of the bill was subsequently eliminated in conference.

"Because incentive pays, special pays, overseas allowances, special allowances for military attachés, and combat pay were not affected by the provisions of the bill as reported and had not been considered by the committee, I urged that the amendments not be adopted, with the understanding that the committee review the subject matter of these amendments and submit a report to the Senate at a later date. It is my opinion that had I not agreed to have the committee study this problem and report thereon, the Senate would have adopted some of these amendments.

"As you may know, a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee subsequently heard representatives of the military services with respect to the above-listed special pays and allowances. I am enclosing a report which the subcommittee has made as a result of the hearings.

"Because of the complexity of the problem and the lack of time for the members to make a detailed study of these sundry payments, it appears to the subcommittee that this matter can best be studied in the first instance by a civilian commission similar to the Hook Commission. It is therefore suggested that you name such a civilian commission to make a thorough examination of these pays. Since the present rates of incentive and special pays were, in substance, recommended by the Hook Commission, it would appear desirable to appoint individuals who did not serve with that Commission. Such a study should include a review of the applicable statutes and the rules and regulations under which the payments are administered. The questions raised in the subcommittee report are simply suggestions for study and should in no way limit the Commission's action. I am hopeful that the Commission can complete its study and be available early in the next Congress to assist the subcommittee in arriving at an equitable solution to this problem.

"I am sure you are aware that several efforts have been made in the Congress to modify some of these payments with considerable support, and without a doubt further efforts will be made. I would therefore suggest that the Commission review these actions in the Congress, including testimony offered to committees of the Congress.

"I will appreciate your cooperation and advice with respect to this request.

"Sincerely."

The subcommittee envisions a commission similar to the Hook Commission, which made a study of the military pay system. Since the members of the Hook Commission recommended, in substance, the present rates of incentive and special pay, it would be desirable to name as members individuals who did not serve as members of the Hook Commission. It is hoped that the Commission can have its study sufficiently completed to assist the subcommittee in finishing its task early in the Eighty-third Congress.

LESTER C. HUNT.
JOHN C. STENNIS.
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL.
RUSSELL B. LONG.
HARRY P. CAIN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on page 58, after line 3.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield time to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me inquire how much time remains to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield 4 minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] has said, the concluding statement contained in a letter addressed to me as a member of the Appropriations Committee by Mr. Finletter, the Secretary for Air:

As I stated above, I have directed that this be a continuing study. However, since this study has come from within the Air Force, I propose to recommend to the Secretary of Defense that a commission similar to the Hook Commission be established to study this whole area of incentive and hazardous-duty pay not only within the Air Force but within the entire Defense Establishment to determine whether or not changes should be made. I strongly recommend, however, that no action be taken to cut existing incentive pays until the results of a commission such as I have indicated above, or possibly a commission such as you might wish to appoint, will have reported its findings and recommendations on this matter.

The letter from Mr. Finletter indicates a desire on the part of the Secretary for Air to cooperate and to let an outside

group study this question and make recommendations regarding it.

Furthermore the subcommittee recommended that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee write to Secretary Lovett a letter in line with the statement I have just read from the letter addressed to me by Secretary Finletter.

I am informed that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the eminent chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, who presides most fairly at all times, who is much interested in and well informed on all subjects relative to the armed services, who has handled his responsibilities as chairman very conscientiously and efficiently, and who has the respect of all Members, will sign such a letter, if he has not already done so, thus asking, as chairman of the committee, that Mr. Lovett take that action.

So I hope the Senator from Illinois will understand that the Air Force is not simply standing in its traces, so far as this matter is concerned, and is not balking, but truly realizes that this subject is regarded by a great many persons as one of great importance.

After that study is made, I trust that we shall debate the subject thoroughly and shall draw up a new set of schedules for hazardous-duty pay, one which will be fair to all. Certainly that subject will be a proper one for debate in the new session of Congress, to begin in the coming January.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Illinois that I echo the sentiments which have been expressed so clearly by my colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has just taken his seat.

The Senator from Illinois will recall—as he himself stated a few moments ago—that this question was under consideration in this very Chamber only a few weeks ago, comparatively, when a bill covering military pay was before the Senate. At that time the Senate considered the proposal of the Senator from Illinois to reduce the amount of flight pay, and the Senate decided against that proposal. That decision was not in any sense, as I understand, a vote to the effect that the purpose sought to be achieved by the Senator from Illinois was not a correct one, but, to the contrary, was to the effect that such a matter could not safely be decided on the floor of the Senate.

I hold in my hand the report of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, which was appointed in accordance with the understanding reached at the time when the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was rejected. The report bears the signature of the following members of the Armed Services Committee of the United States Senate: The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The burden of their report is as has just been stated by my colleague the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is stated in the form of a limitation upon an appropriation, although in fact it attempts to change the schedule of air pay. I am very much convinced that when we are calling upon the United States Air Force to make raids upon the power plants along the Yalu River, and when the tempo of air fighting in Korea may become hotter and hotter and faster and faster, is no time to take action on this matter.

I believe definitely that the counsel of wisdom would be to permit a continuation of the procedure which has been initiated by the Armed Services Committee, so that when we act on this question, we shall be acting with full knowledge of all the facts, and thus it will not be possible for anyone to accuse us of unnecessarily or with undue speed depriving those who take the greatest risks in the air of the incentive pay which we have sought to provide for them.

An examination of the flight-pay schedule which is set forth in the report of the subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate indicates that it does not vary too much from the one presented by the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. President, I shall not make an attempt to raise a point of order in the case of this amendment, but I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken on this amendment, I should like to make a final comment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

My proposal is simply that there be applied to the Air Force and to the submarine force the same schedule of bonus payments which now is applied to parachutists, namely, $50 a month for an enlisted man or $100 a month for an officer, regardless of rank.

Mr. President, of all services the parachute service is probably the most dangerous. I am simply proposing that we adopt that as the standard.

I should furthermore like to point out that the combat soldiers, the riflemen in the infantry platoons, do not get a single cent of hazard pay, although their dangers are probably greater than those of any other class except the parachutists. So, Mr. President, I think it is about time that we introduced a little sanity into this matter, as well as a little economy. This amendment of mine would save from $90,000,000 to $200,000,000. It would pare away the abuse. It would introduce a greater degree of equality of remuneration for equality of sacrifice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Benton	Hoey	Murray
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Conor
Cain	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kem	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Seaton
Dworshak	Knowland	Smathers
Eastland	Langer	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Flanders	Martin	Stennis
Frear	Maybank	Thye
Fulbright	McCarran	Underwood
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Welker
Green	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	Monroney	Young
Hennings	Moody	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. CASE. I should like to address a question to the author of the amendment or to the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may address a question to whatever Senator he wishes to interrogate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. As I understand, the amendment would destroy the payment of flight pay to certain officers and certain persons.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would have the effect of curtailing the appropriations provided for in the bill.

Mr. CASE. It would; but I am wondering if the obligation would not stand under the Compensation Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to believe the Senator is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I should like to have the clerk read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$3,540,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000,000,000."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that although I think the Subcommittee on Appropriations in dealing with the pending bill has done a very good job in cutting the amount substantially below——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to finish my argument, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to identify the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MORSE. It is on page 32, line 4, to strike the figures "$3,540,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,000,000,000."

Mr. President, as I was saying, I think the committee has done a remarkably good job in bringing about substantial savings in appropriations for the Military Establishment, but as a member of the Armed Services Committee, it is my opinion that there are still many savings that could be made and should be made.

I want to address myself for a few minutes particularly to the waste which I think has characterized the administrative policies of the Air Force. I think the practices of the Air Force reek with waste. I think the way in which the Air Force, by and large, is handling its appropriations constitutes an outrageous waste of public funds.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have been sitting for a good many days on a subcommittee dealing with requests for authorization of new installations, and I want to say, as a member of that subcommittee—and the Air Force may as well know it now, because it will know it in a few days, anyway—that I think their requests in many particulars are shocking. I think the Air Force is seeking to take advantage of the great popularity it enjoys among the American people at the present time. I think it is seeking to take advantage of the fear and the feeling of insecurity which characterize the American people's thinking these days. I think that we in the Congress have the duty to make clear to the Air Force that those of us who are fighting as hard as we have been fighting for a 143-wing Air Force have also the duty to see to it that the Air Force brings about some economies which it very well can bring about in the administration of the funds it already has.

It is wasteful in regard to manpower, as the Johnson subcommittee, of which I am a member, has brought out time and time again. It is wasteful in its administrative practices on its various bases. It is wasteful in seeking installations it does not need when existing installations are sufficient for the time being.

When the Congress convened and was confronted with a proposal for a budget of $85,000,000,000, in round figures, $52,000,000,000 of it to go to the military, I took the position that a budget such as that would jeopardize our economy. We have a duty in this session to pare down the military budget wherever we can, without in any way jeopardizing the defense and the security of this country. Let me say, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that the strongest lobby which is being maintained in American politics these days is the military lobby. The brass has the opinion that it can force through Congress anything it desires, by playing upon the fears of the American people. In my judgment, it is weakening the very structure of our free economy. We cannot go on with the kind of appropriations that the military are seeking, without doing great harm to our economy. In my judgment we have an opportunity to adjust this bill so as to bring about great savings, without in any way jeopardizing the defense of the Nation.

I go to the item of maintenance and operation, Mr. President. That is where the fat is. There is where the waste is. If we really want to squeeze the waste out of the military, just cut into their maintenance and operation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I prefer to finish my argument. Then I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, the military lobby is also capitalizing on the matter of secrecy. The military keep asking for more and more, and then they seek to justify their demand for more and more, as far as public policy is concerned, by saying, "It is a great big dark secret. We cannot tell you why we have to have it, but we have to have it."

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I have been in on some of the top secret briefings that have been presented to the committee, and I state that a great deal of material presented to us as top secret ought to be made available to the American people as a matter of public information, because, in my judgment, some of it is not of security value to the enemy at all. Of course, when it has security value, I agree that it ought to be kept secret. But let me say that the American people are entitled to know much more than they are being told in regard to the justification for some of the requests for expenditures the military seeks to have granted.

Take a look at the section on maintenance and operation, beginning at page 30. That is where we can cut. That is where we can make savings. We can say to the military, "No, we are not going to give you, in round numbers, $3,500,000,000. We are going to give you $3,000,000,000. Do what you can with the $3,000,000,000."

Let me tell you what would happen. You would see them cut down on their program of rent, cut down on their requests for repair of facilities. We found in the subcommittee that they were asking for additional repair facilities in installation after installation.

On some military bases one can go into very few existing facilities and find business humming—their field printing plants, procurement of ambulances, hire of passenger motor vehicles, training and instruction of military and civilian personnel could produce some economies. In all those items found listed on pages 30, 31, and 32, we can easily make savings of a half a billion dollars, and not do any damage to the defense program, in my judgment. In addition, it would force upon the military, and particularly on the Air Force, which needs it badly, a higher degree of efficiency than exists in its present policy.

Let me talk about one item in regard to which we have been trying to get the Air Force to take what I think is a sounder approach from the standpoint of defense in time of war, namely, the matter of training mechanics by contract in existing mechanical schools. All I need to refer to here is the Stanford report. The Stanford report makes perfectly clear that under contract in existing mechanical schools in this country, airplane mechanics can be trained more cheaply and more efficiently. On that point I wish to make some observations.

There has been eliminated from the House bill any authority for the effective continuation of civilian aircraft engine mechanic schools in the Air Force contract training program. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has not restored this item in its consideration of the House bill. In my opinion, this is a grave mistake. The urgency of an adequate training program in the field of aviation mechanic fundamentals should be quite obvious to us. It is a vital link in our program of military preparedness.

At the present time Congress is gravely concerned with the objective of economy. Continuation of this contract program will harmonize rather than conflict with our over-all program of economy in government. At the outset I would like to point out that the contract program will materially reduce the necessity for an expansion of Air Force facilities for such training.

In the bill now pending before our subcommittee, for authorizations for the building in the future of so-called public works for the Air Forces, there is request after request for more money to build facilities for the training of mechanics, when we have stretched across the country available facilities that could be used on a contract basis, which would save the American taxpayers many millions of dollars. This is one specific reason why we should say to the Air Force, "You cannot get money for that kind of expenditure at the present time, when available facilities, if you would use them, would give you a job well done."

I have been informed that expansion to meet the needs of the aviation mechanic training program is contemplated. For example, I am told that at the Sheppard Air Force Base in Wichita Falls, Tex., the construction of a hangar for use in the program is proposed. This would be in addition to a hangar now being constructed at that base for the same purpose. The estimated cost of the new hangar is $21,000,000.

The continuation of the contract schools will enable the Air Force to release military teachers and supervisory personnel for other Air Force duties in strategic and tactical operation. Conversely, termination of the contract training program will require additional military and civilian personnel in the military school which will replace the civilian schools, and there is no indication that the student load will be decreased in the coming fiscal year.

The teaching personnel of the contract schools are specialists, whose life work

is devoted to this branch of the teaching profession. These teachers do not rotate, as do military teachers, to fields other than aircraft maintenance, and are not generally subject to military call. The use of these contract school teachers would constitute an extremly efficient use of manpower.

Another important aspect of the continuation of the contract school program relates to its essential defense potentialities. At this time the schools presently under contract have full capacity to meet the currently anticipated training load in aircraft and engine fundamentals for the coming fiscal year. The 11 civilian schools which have been under contract for the past few years have a combined capacity of 25,000 students a year. It is interesting to note that during World War II the Air Force found it necessary to use 55 of these contract schools.

The existing schools can readily expand to meet emergency requirements, as they did in World War II. If the program is dropped, this highly important defense potentiality will be lost. These schools cannot be created on an instant's notice. Their standby value is immeasurable.

I wish to say there is no question about the quality of their instruction, and there is no question about the efficiency of the trainees who have been turned out. But this is another example of the Air Force wanting to bring in many activities under its tent, just as we have found in hearings during recent days a tendency of the Air Force to duplicate, duplicate, and duplicate, instead of using existing facilities, to the tremendous loss and expense to the American taxpayers.

To the military lobby let me make a frank statement, because I know how they have been acting in the matter, and I know some of the representations that have been made in recent days in the State of Oregon. I intend to take them on. I intend to make clear to the military lobby that I will stand in the Senate for stanch defense of the Air Force, as far as building up the power of the Air Force is concerned. I stood on the floor of the Senate in recent years and voted for a 70-group Air Force one year, when we could get only nine Senators to support it. In 1949 I stood for a 58-group Air Force, but we were beaten on the floor of the Senate when the Senate cut it back to 48 groups. So my voting record, let me say to the Air Force lobby, has been to build up the striking power of the American Air Force.

But let me also make clear to the political Air Force lobby today that I do not intend, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, to countenance their waste. They are a wasteful and reckless lot, so far as the American taxpayer's dollar is concerned.

The Senate has a clear duty to perform. In my judgment, it must cut into the budget and, under "Maintenance and operation" make clear to the Air Force that it is going to have to sharpen its pencil and it is going to have to start to save in the interest of the American taxpayer and in the interest of protecting the greatest defense weapons of the Air Force—this economy of ours.

I hope the courtesy will be extended to me to have a roll-call vote on my amendment, because I want my colleagues in the Senate to stand up and be counted so as to indicate whether they mean it when they talk about economizing. Let them demonstrate that they can economize in a defense budget that already is stupendous, a defense budget which, in my judgment, must be cut down if we are to protect the American taxpayer.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, if he is still on the floor. Since he is not, I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to commend my friend and colleague, the Senator from Oregon, upon his very able address. I wish to assure him of my cooperation. I will be with him in his crusade, as I might call it, not to tear down the Air Force, but to make it strong.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WELKER. I invite the attention of my distinguished colleague to the fact that by his amendment he would strike out $14,152,000 for office machines alone. The next item to which I wish to invite his attention is that he would strike out by his amendment the sum of $18,580,689 for office furniture alone. Furthermore his amendment would strike out nearly $10,000,000 for furnishings alone. These items are all in the "Maintenance and operation" schedule covered by the justification which is before us at this time.

I also invite the attention of my friend to the fact that by his amendment he would strike out nearly $350,000 for agricultural and ground-keeping equipment. I could go on and on. I will close, because the Senator's time is limited. The Senator would strike out an item which would enable purchases by the Air Force of something like 19,000 desks, which would cost the taxpayers of the United States $71 each.

I commend the Senator from Oregon. He has rendered a very noble service.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to my friend from Idaho that I think there will be found in various warehouses in this country plenty of existing surplus material to meet whatever needs can be shown for the type of articles he has just mentioned.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator probably did not spend $71 for the first desk he bought when he entered the practice of law.

Mr. MORSE. I certainly did not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I can understand the persuasive eloquence of our friend from Oregon. However, I want the Senate to understand that the Committee on Appropriations has already cut the item of Maintenance and Operation by $221,790,142 below the allowance of the House.

The bill as it stands is $849,817,000 below the budget request. The Committee on Appropriations has already made a deep slash in the appropriations for maintenance and operation. I am convinced that an additional cut of $540,000,000 would be destructive of the power of the Air Force to maintain and operate this great arm of our military strength.

The entire amount of the budget estimate for maintenance and operation was $4,389,000,000. The House cut that figure to $3,761,000,000. The Senate committee made an additional cut of $221,790,142.

An examination of the various items with respect to which the estimate was furnished shows that list includes not only operation of aircraft, not only organization, base and maintenance equipment and supplies, not only logistical support, operational support, research and test support, medical support, and service-wide support, but training support as well. The entire amount in the estimate for training support is only $257,000,000, and the Senator's cut is $540,000,000.

I urge Members of the Senate not to accept this great—and, as I feel, wholly unnecessary and disastrous—cut in the appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 4 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I shall take only a minute to say that the argument the Senator from Wyoming has made is the usual argument which we hear in committee from the military, namely, "We must have it. If you do not give it to us we simply cannot function and carry out the program we have been asked to carry out."

Let me tell Senators something about the Air Force. They always ask for the best. If it is a desk they want, they never think in terms of the cheapest desk that is available. They always want the best desk. If it is an office chair they want, they never think in terms of an economical chair. They always want the best. When we come to the matter of the physical properties of the Air Force in connection with maintenance and operation, we find that that is the place where we can make savings.

There has just been made available to me by my good friend from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] a list showing item after item with respect to which anyone interested in economy knows many millions of dollars can be saved by not asking for items which cost as much as the items which are requested, but by asking for something cheaper—items which in my judgment would do the job just as well.

We are confronted with the question as to whether or not we shall say to the Air Force, "We are going to give you a certain amount of money for maintenance and operation, and no more."

Let me tell Senators another secret. We have observed time and time again in the Armed Services Committee that once a decision is made, if the military know that it is final, they will adjust to it; and it is surprising what good service we can get out of them for less money. I think we have an opportunity and a duty this afternoon to teach them a lesson, namely, that we are going to insist that they do a better job on maintenance and operation for less money.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time is left for the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, were the yeas and nays ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not yet been ordered. Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was asking how much time the committee had remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this is one of the most important items in the entire bill, for this reason: We have just voted unanimously to increase the size of the Air Force to 143 wings. We have before us in the Appropriations Committee a bill to increase the number of bases. This item is in the sum of approximately $4,000,000,000, of which a substantial amount will be spent this year.

There is no use in building up the number of airplanes; there is no use in building up the number of bases, unless we have available the personnel to operate and maintain them. It is not a question of desks, office furniture, typewriters, and things of that nature. It is a question of machinery at new bases, and of personnel to operate the bases.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sorry, but I have only 5 minutes.

I went through this problem with the Navy 5 years ago. If we build up the capital investment, namely, the number of ships, we must build up the appropriation for operation. The same thing applies with respect to hospitals under the Veterans' Administration. If we build new hospitals we must make the necessary appropriations to operate them.

If we are going to make a cut, it is better to cut items for new procurement, and to maintain and operate what we have. We have just voted unanimously in this body to increase the number of airplanes to 143 wings. Later we shall vote to increase the number of bases substantially. I voted against one of the amendments, the Johnson amendment, relating to research, because I think that is indefinite. I voted to cut a number of the items in the Department of Defense appropriations. This item has been cut already by $849,000,000. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon prevails it will cut the item by $1,300,000,000, from $4,300,000,000 to $3,000,000,000.

Mr. President, we might as well not vote for new airplanes and we might as well not vote for new bases if we are not going to give the Air Force the opportunity to operate the airplanes and air bases. That is why I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As I understand, the Senator from Massachusetts voted against research and development, but he is willing to pay $14,000,000 for office machines, $18,000,000 for furniture, and $9,000,000 for furnishings, in round figures. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I believe it is very important to provide adequate appropriations for research and development, and call for the strictest kind of economy when it comes to the purchase of furniture and furnishings. It is in appropriations for furniture and furnishings that we can very easily make great savings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We voted $468,000,000 for research. I will say to the Senate that research is intangible. The Department can come back to Congress and request more money for research. But it is not possible to do that in the case of maintenance and operation. I voted with the Senator from Wyoming for a further cut of $249,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Two hundred and eleven million dollars in this particular appropriation, and that covers every item the Senator from Oregon has been talking about. The cuts which would have to be taken, if his amendment were agreed to, would have to be in the actual operation and maintenance of planes, parts, acquisition of fuel oil, and all the other items of that kind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We cannot buy airplanes and leave them on the ground. That is what the Senator from Wyoming is saying. We cannot buy airplanes and not put gas and oil in them. We cannot buy airplanes unless we have men who are willing to fly them and mechanics who will work on them. That is why I feel a cut of $849,000,000 is the most that can be taken on this item at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming how he would answer the charge of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to the matter of contract schools for purposes of training mechanics?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will answer it this way: The entire amount in the bill for training support is only $214,000,000. A cut of $540,000,000 goes far beyond that amount.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That still does not answer the charge made by the Senator from Oregon that if we could save money by using civilian schools on a contract basis we should do so, even if we save only $1,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The answer is that the Committee on Armed Services, of which the Senator from Oregon is a member, and which is in direct charge of matters of this kind, never made any recommendation whatever with respect to such a proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not within the purview of the authority of the Department of the Air Force to make such contracts on its own, without special authorization from the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; they have made such contracts, but they do it under general authority of law. If we wish to deny that authority, we ought to do it by law, not at the last minute by an amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that under the heading of maintenance and operation, the estimate for aircraft maintenance, spares, spare parts, and supplies, was $860,000,000. The estimate for aircraft fuel and oil was $561,890,000. It is only a few million dollars above the additional cut on top of the cut of more than $800,000,000 which we have already made. Is it possible to train the pilots who must be provided to operate the new planes which we have authorized today to be purchased, if we deny an appropriation for their training?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I can understand the point of view of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can we cut down the appropriation for fuel oil? The estimate for minor modification and modernization of aircraft is $133,762,000. Such items run all the way through the appropriation.

As the Senator from Massachusetts has so well stated, in order to get an Air Force with striking power it is necessary to have the personnel, the fuel, the supplies, the maintenance and the facilities essential to keep the pilots trained and in the air. We must have shops at distant places, such as in Korea, in which mechanics can be carrying on these operations.

It is said that the mechanics could be better trained in private institutions than on the air fields. That I seriously doubt. There are no private training grounds which have the highly technical and highly complex modern airplanes which the Government is building and will continue to build. In my judgment it would be a mistake to transfer the training from the Air Force to private institutions. They cannot possibly have the planes which the Armed Forces must use.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield further.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I deeply appreciate the Senator's candid answers to my questions, because I feel that these answers should be made to charges which have been laid before us so effectively as they have been by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I should like to know whether the Appropriations Subcommittee, when officials of the Department of the Air Force appeared before it, interrogated them along the line suggested by the Senator from Oregon, namely, that they buy the best desks, and squander money upon the best type of furniture and furnishings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What kind of interrogation was made on that subject by the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to say to my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota, that, as a member of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is chairman, the hearings before the subcommittee commenced in February. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the various Secretaries first appeared before the committee. They were followed by the Administrators of the various phases of the entire military program. Hearings lasted for many weeks. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee asked very penetrating questions of all the witnesses who appeared before the committee, and such questions were also asked by the other members of the subcommittee. I wish to state quite frankly that there were very few questions which were not asked of the witnesses from all the branches of the military service. They were asked not only by the chairman of the committee but by all the members of the subcommittee, both of the majority and of the minority.

I feel that when the committee made its final recommendation to the full committee it had done a pretty good job of preparing an appropriation bill with full realization of the need to economize. We did the best job we could possibly do in granting the military forces an appropriation which we consider will permit them to establish our defense in the most equitable and speedy manner possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much. Let me add one thought: In cutting more than $211,000,000 from this particular item below what the House had allowed, the committee was directing its economy efforts toward such items as have been mentioned, namely, supplies and desks.

Furthermore, the committee wrote into the bill an amendment, offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, which was designed to make effective a much better system of supply. We wrote in an over-all amendment to eliminate the competing supply systems of the three departments. This committee amendment was drafted as a result of the hearings by the Bonner committee in the House of Representatives, and it is intended to effect economies in supplies. I have no reservation whatever in declaring that the pending bill does economize; and I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment, because I believe it would have the effect of grounding planes, when we should have them in the air.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to have the answers of the Senator from Wyoming, because I have felt they were necessary in order to put the debate into proper focus, in view of the charges which have been made.

In the statement which I have received consent to have printed in the RECORD, I have gone into this matter after some personal investigation. I am prone to agree with the Senator from Wyoming that a budget reduction of approximately $200,000,000 in this item is a substantial one.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota have in mind the contract schools, which in World War II did such a magnificent job?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked the Senator about that, and he replied that the Department says it can contract with such schools, and that if this matter is so important, it can be written into the law.

Mr. MORSE. Such contracts were made in World War II, and the contract schools did a magnificent job.

On the other hand, if we follow the report which has been made in this case, those schools will be weakened and probably put out of business. Then what shall we do if we get into an all-out war with Russia at any time in the future? In that case we shall have to rebuild what we have now. That would not be economy.

We should not permit the Air Force to bring under its tent functions it does not need to perform, for in my opinion they can be performed better on a civilian basis.

We should remind the Air Force that our economy is still a civilian economy. If we do not watch some of those in "brass," we shall move into a military economy sooner than we think.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I asked this very question of the chairman of the subcommittee, and I asked him to give us the answers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the time is running out. Let me interrupt the Senator from Minnesota at this point, because the Senator from New York wishes to ask me a question. I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, is it not a fact that the committee amendment figure is lower in the amount of $221,000,000 than the figure voted by the House of Representatives, but is actually $849,000,000 lower than the estimate for this year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is, indeed.

Mr. LEHMAN. That shows the care with which the committee amendment has been prepared.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on page 32, in line 4.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, has all time on this amendment to the committee amendment expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment to the committee amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon on page 32, in line 4. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, the yeas and nays have already been ordered on this question. Does the Senator from Texas wish to insist on his suggestion of the absence of a quorum? No doubt the roll will be called slowly, under the order for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, Mr. President, I wish to insist on my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, for I have told other Senators that I would suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes, in order to ask a question on this item of the chairman of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that if the answer to the question proposed to be asked by the Senator from Michigan will be in the nature of rebuttal, I would wish to have 2 minutes in which to answer the reply which will be given by the chairman of the subcommittee. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to both requests? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

At this time the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. My understanding is that the budget estimate for 1953, for maintenance and operations was $4,389,817,000, and that the amount recommended by the Senate committee is $3,540,000,000, or a reduction of $849,817,000.

Was it not the intention of the committee to reduce the appropriations for items such as lawn upkeep and office equipment and various other of what may be considered to be nonessential items?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Michigan is quite correct.

In the item for maintenance and operation the Senate committee cut $221,790,000 below the House figure, and a total of approximately $849,000,000 below the budget. As I was pointing out, the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Wyoming collaborated in an amendment to eliminate competing systems of supply. In other words, we have done everything possible to reduce the

appropriations contained in this bill, without injuring national defense.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply want to say by way of rebuttal that, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have listened to the Pentagon Building representatives time and time again. I want to say to the Senate that I know we can effect these savings on maintenance and operation, because that is where waste is to be found. The breakdown shows that nonessential pieces of equipment are still in this budget. This saving could be effected, and it would be an effective way to serve notice on the Pentagon that the honeymoon is over so far as wasting the taxpayers' money on maintenance and operation is concerned. Now is the time, I think, to serve definite notice on them. The adoption of my amendment would make clear to them that we mean business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] are absent on offical business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—25

Aiken	Gillette	Murray
Bennett	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Ives	Watkins
Dirksen	Kem	Welker
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Dworshak	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Martin	
Frear	Morse	

NAYS—49

Benton	Humphrey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Case	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Clements	Kefauver	Pastore
Connally	Kilgore	Robertson
Duff	Knowland	Saltonstall
Eastland	Lehman	Seaton
Ecton	Maybank	Smathers
Ellender	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Smith, N. C.
George	McClellan	Sparkman
Green	McFarland	Stennis
Hayden	McKellar	Thye
Hennings	Monroney	Underwood
Hill	Moody	Young
Hoey	Mundt	
Holland	Neely	

NOT VOTING—22

Anderson	Chavez	Malone
Brewster	Fulbright	McMahon
Bridges	Hunt	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Russell
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Cain	Kerr	Tobey
Capehart	Lodge	
Carlson	Long	

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HART, Mr. BONNER, Mr. O'TOOLE, Mr. WEICHEL, and Mr. HAND were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6544) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6544) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment in connection with the same subject matter of the previous amendment, which is to strike the figures "$3,540,000" and to insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,340,000." I shall simply repeat, by reference, the argument I made for the amendment offered a few minutes ago. I want to give the Senate another opportunity to serve notice on the Air Force that it must do a bit of drastic cutting in the maintenance and operation section of the Air Force. If we really mean to force economy upon the Military Establishment, here is the place to do it.

I have just had a conference with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in which we discussed the travel allowances to be found in the bill, in connection with the luxury trips, I call them, for want of a better term, which the Air Force is carrying on.

I spoke earlier about the lobby tendencies of the Air Force, and I want to say that, in my judgment, there is a direct relationship between the travel expenditures and this lobby.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point some newspaper clippings which I have selected. The first is a dispatch by the Associated Press, which reads as follows:

JET PLANE DELIVERS RING BETROTHED FLYER FORGOT

SCOTTSBLUFF, NEBR., June 19.—An F–80 jet fighter zoomed into Scottsbluff Tuesday night to solve a wedding crisis for Lt. Harry W. Schurr, of Indiana, Pa., who had arrived earlier to marry Phyllis Braun of Scottsbluff.

Lieutenant Schurr, now stationed at Larson Air Force Base, near Moses Lake, Wash., had left the wedding ring behind at the base.

He wired back asking that the ring be air mailed, but Lt. John W. Frazier and Lt. Charles Busick convinced their commanding officer that air mail might not arrive in time for the Friday wedding. So, with his permission, they flew the F–80 to Scottsbluff and delivered the ring in person.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire whose time the Senator from Illinois is using.

Mr. MORSE. I have given time, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have a dispatch from the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press, of February 2, 1952, which reads as follows:

GENERAL GLANTZBERG LEAVES FOR VISIT IN MISSISSIPPI—WILL RETURN TOMORROW BEFORE TRAVELING TO WASHINGTON AND NEW ASSIGNMENT AT KIRTLAND AIR FORCE BASE IN NEW MEXICO

Brig. Gen. Frederic E. Glantzberg, formerly commanding general of the Thirty-eighth

Air Division, took off this afternoon at 3 o'clock from Hunter Air Force base. The general was at the controls of his specially equipped B-25 aircraft when he left for Biloxi, Miss., where he will visit overnight with an old friend he has not seen in nearly 3 years.

Returning here tomorrow, General Giantzberg will do some last-minute checking on his family and their personal affairs and leave for Washington and Albuquerque, N. Mex. Aboard as a passenger will be Brig. Gen. Haywood S. Hansell returning to his post in United States Air Force Headquarters after a brief visit here with his family and as an honored guest at the "Fritz Giantzberg Day" activities.

"Mrs. Giantzberg and I have become more and more amazed at the fantastic demonstrations by the people of Savannah and the Thirty-eighth Air Division in expressing their genuine regret at our departure," said the general. "I humbly hope that we can be big enough to justify their confidence."

According to present plans, Mrs. Giantzberg, daughter Katherine and son Hughes will leave Savannah by automobile Tuesday morning for their new station at Kirtland Air Force base at Albuquerque.

Here is a clipping from the Robinson (Ill.) Daily News, of May 10, 1952, relating to the United States Navy, rather than to the Air Force, but it is indicative of the many junkets which are being promoted by the armed services to enlist cooperation of newspaper men. Twelve guests are mentioned, one of whom is a director of a radio station in Minneapolis; another is the chairman of the board of a chemical company in Chicago; another is the publisher of a Nebraska newspaper; another is a man connected with the Hastings Banner, of Hastings, Mich.; the publisher of a newspaper in Whealand, Wyo.; the executive vice president of the Pure Oil Co., Chicago; the editor of the Montevideo American, of Montevideo, Minn., and others. I do not care to mention the names.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are now flying through a rain storm at approximately 8,000 feet just north of Springfield, Ill., after becoming airborne at 9:03 this morning from the Glenview Naval Air Station 30 miles northwest of Chicago.

Our first scheduled stop en route to San Diego, Calif., will be at Dallas, Tex., about 3 o'clock this afternoon where we plan to place this column aboard an eastbound plane for Chicago.

Twelve guests including this reporter are aboard this 17 passenger DC-3 transport. It was originally planned to fly this ship all the way to the west coast but due to the oil strike, we are unable to get any gasoline at Wichita, Kans., so instead we are flying to Hensley Field, Dallas, Tex., where another naval transport, a 42 passenger DC-4, is waiting fully gassed to fly us on to San Diego.

We will land at Albuquerque, N. Mex., where we will pick up three more newspapermen.

The guest list as handed us aboard the plane this morning by Lt. Comdr. Garland Bryan, whose home is near Annapolis, Ill., includes the following newsmen; radio-TV representatives, and several industrial dignitaries.

* * * * *

We are now flying above the rain clouds on instruments with Commander Bryan at the controls. He has been informed by radio that the weather is expected to clear and we will break out into the sunshine this afternoon as we near Tulsa, Okla.

Our schedule calls for us to fly over Joliet, Ill., Springfield, Ill., St. Louis at 10:44 a. m. Springfield, Mo., at 12:02 p. m. Tulsa at 13:07 (1:07 p. m.) Ardmore, Okla., (Will Rogers hometown) at 2:10 p. m., arriving at Dallas at approximately 3 o'clock. We are not expected to land at San Diego until 9 p. m. tonight, where we will spend the night aboard the aircraft carrier U. S. S. *Sicily*, which will land us at Pearl Harbor on May 14.

Before leaving Glenview this morning, the entire group of guests were photographed by the Navy. This photo will be forwarded direct to each of the newspapers.

Seven of the party including this reporter spent the night at the bachelor officers quarters at Glenview where each of us enjoyed a large inch thick slice of rare roast beef at dinner last night with all the trimmings. We then took a tour of the station in the evening before retiring to our separate rooms with connecting baths.

We are now over St. Louis and the clouds have begun to lift. We can now see the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers (looks like we are over the Pacific).

We just passed over Tulsa, in bright sunshine at 1:15 p. m., and according to Commander Bryan, we are flying 3 minutes behind schedule.

Previous to reaching Tulsa, Commander Bryan sent for me to come forward and sit beside him in the copilot's seat, who was back in the cabin talking with the other passengers. All the controls and radio contacts were explained to us and then Commander Bryan let us take over control of the airplane. It was certainly a big thrill as only slight pressure on the controls took effect immediately. We have now flown a DC-3 in addition to getting to steer the battleship *Wisconsin* on our previous naval cruise to Panama 5 years ago.

After leaving Tulsa we had a long talk with Curtis Dawes, vice president of the Pure Oil Co., of Chicago. We discussed our mutual friend, J. C. Donnell II, of Findlay, Ohio, and of course the conversation ultimately led to the oil strike. Pure has two refineries that are still operating while the rest of them are down.

Mr. Dawes is a veteran of World War II, having served Admiral Radford, present commander of the Pacific Fleet, as his executive officer. We are looking forward to being Admiral Radford's guests at his home in Pearl Harbor. His uncle was the late Charles G. Dawes, of Chicago, former Vice President of the United States.

Everyone aboard is now fairly well acquainted with several card games in session at the front of the plane while I'm finishing this column sitting at the rear of the ship.

This is certainly much faster (170 miles per hour) than the milk train we left Robinson on. Despite the fact that the Big Four took off pullman accommodations 2 months ago, we found a very comfortable compartment en route to Chicago. (The only trouble we found was that they locked you in when we passed through the towns.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a trip like that costs money; and while the particular reference is to the Navy, it is not untypical of trips of other branches of the armed services.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a memorandum which I believe to be accurate. It relates to the Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club, in Washington.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 28, 1952.

At present the taxpayers are paying approximately $12,408 per year for the services of two officers to take care of the Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club in Washington. This item should, in all fairness to the taxpayers, be paid for out of the dues of the members and not out of the taxpayers' pocketbook.

Assigned to duty with the Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club are:

	Approximate cost to taxpayers
Air Force Maj. Rolland J. Lund	$6,552
Army Capt. Edward E. Pierce	5,856

N. B.—The above information may be confirmed by calling LIberty 5-6700, extension 73947.

It is obvious that there must be some full-time people to take care of the Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club, but it is equally obvious that such duties can and should be performed by civilians whose pay is taken out of the dues of the members, rather than made an arbitrary charge upon the taxpayers. This is the arrangement with all other institutions in Washington where squash rackets and handball are played, and a comparison of the dues and court fees will indicate that the Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club dues are so low that they could easily be arranged to pay for the full-time attendants.

University Club: Four squash courts; court fee, 45 cents per half hour; dues, $12.50 per month.

YMCA: Two squash courts and three handball courts; court fee, none; dues, $3.35 per month.

Pentagon Officers' Athletic Club: Five squash courts and handball courts; court fee, none; dues, $2 per month.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois for helping me build up what I think is an exceedingly sound case in support of the amendment which I offer. The examples which he cited are typical examples of the type of waste in maintenance and operation which the junior Senator from Oregon is seeking to cut out of the Air Force expenditures. The savings can be made without weakening one iota the strength of the Air Force and without grounding a plane.

I want to say, Mr. President, that several of my colleagues thought, in reference to my previous amendment, that the cut which I proposed was too large, and said that if I would reduce the amount of the cut they would be more inclined to vote for a smaller cut.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I want to say again to the Senate that I am convinced that we can make the proposed cut without in any way damaging the Air Force, but, to the contrary, actually increasing its efficiency.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think that we as a Senate should today serve clear notice on the Air Force that we are not going to continue to accept the type of waste which I say reeks throughout the maintenance operations of the Air Force. Therefore, I believe the Senate ought to adopt this cut of $200,000,000. I think it would be a very salutary thing to do, and its impression would penetrate the entire Military Establishment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. I know the Senator from Oregon is a very diligent member of the Committee on Armed Services. May I ask him if Congress has an inventory of the amount of material on hand, such as desks, typewriters, mimeograph machines, automobiles, and things of that kind?

Mr. MORSE. No; I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania, Congress does not have such an inventory. That is another type of saving I had in mind when we introduced the so-called single catalog bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] was one of my colleagues who joined as a cosponsor of the bill. It was passed in the House as the Anderson bill, and in the Senate as the Morse bill. It is now resting on the desk of the President.

I shall take this opportunity from my desk in the Senate to suggest to the President today that I have already been advised that the Military Establishment is at work trying to get him to veto the bill. But if the President wants to save the taxpayers of the country a minimum of $2,500,000,000, he will sign the bill. I am waiting with great interest to see whether the President will bring about that kind of economy, because if ever there was a sound bill to reach his desk, it is the single-catalog bill. It would provide the kind of inventory which the Senator from Pennsylvania has mentioned in his remarks, and represents the kind of saving that should be made in the Military Establishment.

If Senators do not in some way, somehow, bring the Military Establishment within reasonable limitations on their expenditures, in my judgment there is no limit to which they will not go once we put the bit in their teeth. There is no limit to which they will not go in galloping across the country with their great waste. They will trample under their hooves the sound economy of America. We must stop the military in its unconscionable waste of the taxpayers' dollar.

Mr. MARTIN. Has not the time come in connection with everything pertaining to America—our national defense and the administration of our public affairs—when all of us must start to tighten our belts?

Mr. MORSE. There can be question about that.

Mr. MARTIN. If we do not, our public debt will increase, the value of the dollar will decrease, and we will be in a spiral of inflation, just as Germany was.

Mr. MORSE. We are well on our way to that condition now.

Mr. MARTIN. We are well on the way to destroying the economy and Government of America.

Mr. MORSE. We are well on our way now. That is why I said, in January of this year, that the proposed $85,000,000,000 budget should be cut to somewhere near $70,000,000,000. We shall have to make substantial savings within the Military Establishment to do so, and here is an opportunity. It is only $200,000,000 this time, but it is an opportunity to save $200,000,000, which I believe is a step in the right direction.

Mr. MARTIN. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that no one is for more and better airplanes, better tanks, and more of them, better rifles, and more of them, and plenty of ammunition, than is the Senator from Pennsylvania. But those things are not obtained merely through the administrative end of military operations. Is not that correct?

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to join again with my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and with the distinguished military Senator from Pennsylvania, General MARTIN. I endorse the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, as I did his previous amendment, which was defeated. I think this is an opportunity for Senators really to practice economy without hurting the Air Force establishment. I think it is an opportunity really to save taxpayers' money and to be economy-minded. We can forget the speeches we make all over the country before service clubs, telling how economy-minded we are. Here is really a chance to vote economy instead of talking economy.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment on exactly the same grounds as I opposed the previous amendment. I believe this amendment, like the previous amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon, would undermine the ability of the United States to maintain its Air Force in the air, and to train pilots, who must be trained if we are to meet the growing air power of Soviet Russia.

I ask Senators to glance for a moment upon the charts which have been in the Chamber since last Saturday, and to note the fact that the red color on the chart, which begins as a pale pink in 1947, has increased to an almost deep red by 1952–53. Soviet air power is increasing.

When Senators read clippings of articles written by society editors and argue from them for reduction of the appropriation for maintenance and operation of aircraft, when clippings from society columns are read into the RECORD, and when a story is published in a newspaper with respect to alleged travel by a naval officer in an airplane, and used as an argument against the maintenance and operation of the United States Air Force, it seems to me that the absurdity of the argument has been completely demonstrated.

What are we here to do? Do we believe, as every candidate for President upon the stump today says, that we ought to have an air power capable of meeting that of Soviet Russia? Or are we playing tiddledywinks with the defense of the United States?

The Committee on Appropriations sat for weeks, listening to every witness who cared to come before it. The author of this amendment, though himself a member of the Committee on Armed Services, did not compliment the Committee on Appropriations by asking to present the amendment to the committee.

The committee analyzed the appropriations to the best of their ability, and I want Senators to know that we were not lacking in diligence.

Mr. President, I wish to say, just as the Representative from Texas said when he presented the military bill to the House of Representatives, that I fear the cut in the appropriation for maintenance and operation may have been too deep.

Are we to believe that all the officials and all the secretaries of the Department of Defense are without concern for the taxpayers' dollar? I say to my colleagues in the Senate that I sat in committee week after week, hour after hour, listening to testimony which they presented to us. I came through the sessions this year, as I did last year, with an unassailable conclusion that the officers and men of the military forces of the United States are just as patriotic and just as anxious to save money as are any Members of the Senate.

I know that the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, the Secretary for Air, Mr. Finletter, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Kimball, and the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, since they came into the positions they hold, have spent weeks and months with the entire service in trying to cut down the expenditures. They know, as well as does any Member of this body, the great burden which the American taxpayer is sustaining. But, Mr. President, I know, too, that there is no lack of witnesses who come before the Appropriations Committee urging appropriations out of which they expect to make a little profit. I have heard from areas and communities which battle for appropriations because of the thought that there is a little profit in them. I say to the Senate that the time has come in the great struggle between arbitrary totalitarianism or communism and the free peoples of the world when we must be prepared for defense. We cannot afford to trifle with a matter of such great importance as this.

The Secretary of the Air Force appeared before the subcommittee and stated that the reduction which was made by the House, of $180,000,000, with respect to operation of aircraft, would seriously impair the capacity of the Air Force to train personnel; and that the cut of $120,000,000 in the item, "Organization, base and maintenance equipment and supplies," might also impair the service. Let me point out to the Senate that when that cut of $120,000,000 was approved by the Senate committee, it was dealing with supplies. All the suggestions about desks and luxury equipment have already been taken care of. There is a cut of $163,026,585 in the appropriation for logistical support; a cut of $60,000,000 for training support; a cut of $80,000,000 for operational support; a cut of $15,000,000 for medical support; a cut of $2,655,000 for service-wide support; and a cut of $7,000,000 for research and test support.

These cuts were mentioned to us by the representatives of the Air Force, with an earnest request for restoration. We did not restore, but we cut an additional $221,000,000 from these appropriations. So we have here a cut of almost $900,000,000 in the item for maintenance and operation of our Air Force, the Air Force upon which the people of the United States must depend if any attack should ever be launched against this country. Are we going to take the responsibility of trifling with the situation by making another cut of $200,000,000?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was interested in the request which the Air Force had made before the committee. I know the Senator has gone over the list of cuts. However, there was a little confusion in the Chamber, and perhaps some Senators did not hear it. Will the Senator mention again the amounts with respect to which specific requests for restoration were made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, since the Senator desires to hear what I said, and says that he was prevented from hearing by conversation on the floor, I ask for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the cut which was made by the House of Representatives and which was sustained by the Senate Committee on Appropriations affects the item of operation of aircraft in the amount of $180,000,000; organization, base and maintenance equipment and supplies, $120,000,000; logistical support, $163,026,858; training support, $60,000,000; operational support, $80,000,000; research and test support, $7,000,000; medical support, $15,000,000; service-wide support, $2,655,000. This was only half of the cuts which were made by the House, and which the Air Force asked us to restore. We did not restore them, but we made an additional cut of $221,000,000.

So, Mr. President, I echo upon the floor of the Senate the statement which was made by the Representative from Texas, Mr. MAHON, chairman of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations in charge of the military appropriations, that he was fearful that the committee had made too great a cut.

Mr. President, what will this excessive economy amount to if we do not have the men and the planes in the air capable of meeting an attack if it should come? We have sent our planes to the Yalu River to bomb power installations of the Communist Chinese. Can any Senator say that the Russian MIG's and the Russian bombers may not be coming across the thirty-eighth parallel? Are we going to take the responsibility here of making a deeper cut than that which the committee made after thorough study?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. We have already cut $11,000,000,000 from the defense appropriations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Eleven billion dollars as compared with last year.

Mr. LEHMAN. Eleven billion dollars as compared with last year. We have already cut nearly $6,000,000,000 from requests, and I believe that most of them are legitimate requests. Now it is proposed to make another cut at a time when, instead of making cuts, I believe we should be appropriating more than the amount recommended in this appropriation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I regretfully sustained many cuts.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe we should have appropriated at least as much as we appropriated last year. We certainly know that the situation is no less threatening than it was a year ago. The threat of Communist aggression is a very real one. Instead of talking about cuts, I believe we should now appropriate more than is recommended.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from New York aware of the fact that if we were to do as he proposes, and appropriate $57,000,000,000, it would mean that the deficit would be $20,000,000,000?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I have time to answer that question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that at a time when our country is under dire threat and in great danger we cannot afford to make cuts in appropriations. We should be willing to make every sacrifice that is necessary for our defense. I do not believe that we have done it yet. I deplore the great deficits; I wish they were not necessary; I wish we could cut back; I wish we could avoid deficits; but so long as the Nation is in danger I am going to vote for the funds necessary to make it at least reasonably safe. That is all we can do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not want to get into a dispute with my good friend——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is more time, but I do not think I shall undertake to use that time. Out of the very depths of my conviction I am appealing now to Members of the Senate to vote down the amendment of my good friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I say to Members of the Senate that there is time in which we can correct any wasteful practices which may be going on in the military services—and I will not say there are none. I have cooperated in cuts designed to eliminate them.

I wrote the amendment which has been adopted by the committee, and to date is still approved by the Senate, to eliminate competing services of supply. I drafted the amendment which was unanimously adopted by the committee, to provide that out of the funds which are appropriated there shall not be obligated during the last 2 months of the fiscal year more than 125 percent of the average rate of obligation during the preceding 10 months of the year. That amendment was designed to effect economy. It was designed to prevent excessive expenditures in the last few months merely because there were unexpended balances on hand. I want the Senate to realize—and the record is clear—that under the efficient management of Secretary Lovett, Secretary Finletter, Secretary Pace, and Secretary Kimball, there were, on hand, before we had concluded consideration of the appropriation bill, more than $6,000,000,000 in unobligated funds. They had not tried to spend the money with a reckless hand merely because they had the money in their pockets.

I want the Senate to realize that in June 1950, when the Korean war started, there were 1,500,000 men in all our armed services. Today there are 3,500,000 men, an increase of 2,000,000 men.

How is it possible to expand the military force by more than 100 percent during a short period of time and expect it to be operated without adequate air support?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. Would not the very argument which the Senator from Wyoming is using now be applicable with equal force to the cuts which were made by the committee in opposition to the request of the Department of Defense?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. I would say that they could not be applied because the committee gave study and the committee gave time and the committee gave care and diligent consideration to the subject. The commmittee came to a decision after hearings. Now we are being asked to legislate upon the floor of the Senate without any hearings being held, and without any presentation of the amendment being made to the committee.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield further.

Mr. GILLETTE. Is it not a fact that the cuts which the committee has made were made after the requests for larger appropriations had been made by those representing the departments? The Senator has just alluded—and I agree with him—to the patriotism and the willingness and desire of the services to stay within the amounts provided. But when they make requests which purport to represent the bottom dollar, and the Senate committee makes substantial cuts, is it not flying in the face of the requests made by the departments, who also are supposed to have made a very careful, clear, and painstaking study of their needs?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I will say not, because with respect to the Department of the Air Force by far the largest proportion of the appropriation is for aircraft and related procurement. The Senate by a vote of 79 to 0 a few hours ago voted for the amendment which I offered, to make certain that there should be no let down in building of aircraft. By his remarks, the Senator is asking me to vote for an additional cut to keep the planes out of the air.

Mr. President, in my judgment it would be to turn back completely our program for the expansion of our air power.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one additional question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. Giving the committee credit for the superb work which it has done, does the Senator assert that the figure which the committee has reached represents the bottom dollar that can be made in savings?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my solemn judgment that we may have gone too far. To use a phrase of the military, it is a calculated risk. That is the phrase that could be applied to the recommendation of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am about to yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The Senator from Wyoming said that undoubtedly there would be mistakes made. If mistakes are made, they should be corrected on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. There is no better time than the present.

He is very much concerned about taking airplanes out of the air. The high-priced desks, the lawnmowers, the sickles, the business machines, and all the other luxuries contained in the bill are not going to keep airplanes in the air. If we want to keep airplanes in the air let us cut this kind of item in the bill.

Mr. President, a few nights ago I sat in a hearing of a subcommittee, and one of the appropriation items requested by the Air Force was $51,000 with which to build a shed to house a Diesel engine which they have been operating for several years. I asked them whether it was in good mechanical condition. They said it was in good condition. I asked them, "How have you been protecting it in the past?" Apparently they have been putting a piece of surplus canvas over it.

I said, "Do you mean to tell me that you have the nerve to come in and ask for $51,000 to house that Diesel engine, during an economy drive in the Congress?"

Mr. President, that is typical of the kind of requests which characterize the Air Force.

I say let us cut this appropriation bill if we want to save money for the American taxpayers. The amendment is a sound amendment. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am one of three or four Members of the Senate who served in the Air Force. So far as I am concerned, it is my first love among the services. So far as I am concerned, I want to see it do as splendidly as we felt it would do when it was first organized as a separate service. I still want to do all that I can do to see it perform as splendidly as we hoped it would.

However, I would be less than candid if I did not say, as I have heard many other Members of the Senate say, that we are disappointed with the lack of economy and the extravagance and the wasteful methods that have so far characterized the separate administration of the Air Force, not the conduct of the men who do the flying and the dying, but the conduct of the men who have the duty of administering this great new Air Force on which we are all relying.

I heard the distinguished Senator from Wyoming make the ridiculous statement that the Air Force cannot stand a cut of between 5 and 6 percent in its operating funds. It was a very amazing experience to hear him say that.

I think every Senator has had numerous complaints from employers in areas surrounding Air Force installations who have told about the wasteful use of Air Force employees as well as about unduly high rates of pay which are placed in effect, and which create hardships for private industries in the area.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has also had numerous complaints because young administrators of the Air Force have not called for competitive bids, but instead have wastefully and with partiality negotiated many extravagant purchases for the Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I regret that I do not have the time to yield. I want the Senator from Wyoming to know that I think he is talking ridiculously when he says seriously to the people of the United States that the Air Force, wasteful as it is known to be, and extravagant as it has shown itself to be, cannot take a 5-percent cut in its operation. The fact that it can do so is manifest.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have already made a 20-percent cut.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wyoming undoubtedly has been overpersuaded by the dulcet tones of a glamor service, of which we are all proud but which has not done a good job in this regard, and therefore needs to be checked.

In closing, Mr. President, I should like to say that, to me, one of the most wasteful practices in which the Air Force has engaged is its passing over not just dozens but hundreds of seasoned and mature men, and instead of promoting to serve as colonels and general officers, men who have not had any experience at all in business, and who are not able to carry creditably the administrative burden of this multibillion-dollar business which is the Air Force of the United States. We are proud of it. It is our own child. The boys who run it are our own boys.

Mr. President, now is a good time to let the Air Force understand that in one particular we have not been proud of their performance, namely, in their administrative wastefulness and the recklessness with which they have disposed of the substance which is theirs and which is ours and which is the principal thing we must conserve if we are to do well the job we must do in fighting for democracy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

All time on the amendment to the committee amendment has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon on page 32, in line 4.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—33

Aiken	Gillette	Magnuson
Bennett	Hendrickson	Martin
Bricker	Hennings	Morse
Cain	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case	Holland	Schoeppel
Cordon	Ives	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Watkins
Dworshak	Kem	Welker
Flanders	Langer	Wiley
Frear	Long	Williams

NAYS—43

Benton	Green	Maybank
Bridges	Hayden	McCarran
Clements	Hill	McCarthy
Connally	Hoey	McClellan
Eastland	Humphrey	McFarland
Ecton	Hunt	McKellar
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Ferguson	Kilgore	Moody
Fulbright	Knowland	Murray
George	Lehman	Neely

Nixon	Saltonstall	Thye
O'Conor	Seaton	Underwood
O'Mahoney	Smathers	Young
Pastore	Smith, N. C.	
Robertson	Stennis	

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Chavez	McMahon
Brewster	Duff	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Russell
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Byrd	Kerr	Taft
Capehart	Lodge	Tobey
Carlson	Malone	

So Mr. MORSE'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MARTIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has approached me, to ask a question about one of the committee amendments. I think we should completely dispose of the committee amendments now, since I think this is the last question that will be asked with respect to them.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before we take up the consideration of another amendment, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for an announcement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we had intended to finish both this bill and the German Treaty today. It is apparent that by the time we conclude action on the pending bill it will be a little late to consider the treaty, so I wish to announce that the Senate will remain in session until the appropriation bill is finished, regardless of the time—and I hope it will not be too late—and that the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, at which time we shall take up the consideration of the German Treaty. Following that we shall take up the Fair Trade bill. I announce, furthermore, that there will be a session tomorrow night.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Arizona also expect to move that the Senate consider the protocol to the North Atlantic Pact, immediately following action on the German Treaty?

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall do that, if it is the desire of the Senator from Texas. I have not consulted with him about that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think they are closely related.

Mr. McFARLAND. They probably are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should think that, normally, one should follow the other.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think we should be prepared to do that.

Mr. CONNALLY entered the Chamber.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from Texas that the Senator from Iowa was asking whether the distinguished Senator from Texas would desire to take up the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty following Senate action upon the German treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. They are both in the same basket.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall then have a night session tomorrow. I do not say that we shall have a session tonight, except that I have thought we would complete action on the pending bill and one other bill by 7 o'clock, though apparently we shall be unable to do that. But we will continue in session until we finish the pending bill.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont desired to raise a question with respect to the amendment on page 56, section 637, of the pending bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent on Saturday and regretted to learn later that the discussion of section 637 had taken place. I first want to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether a point of order was raised against engrafting this legislative material onto an appropriation bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the point was not raised.

Mr. FLANDERS. I asked that question because, I think at least twice before, the point of order was raised on this same section and was sustained. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is it now in order to make the point of order?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee amendments have been agreed to, and I think the point of order cannot now be raised. That would be my answer, if the question were addressed to me. I may say that section 637 was not in the House bill. It is in the Senate bill, and it was the thought of the Senate committee that the matter would be given consideration in conference.

Mr. FLANDERS. I trust that the Senator from Wyoming, who will no doubt be among the conferees, will remember that at least twice within the past few years similar amendments have been rejected on points of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands, after consulting the Parliamentarian, that under the agreement reached on Saturday afternoon it was stipulated that, after the amendments were agreed to en bloc, any Senator would be allowed to reopen any amendment. On that representation the Chair rules that the point of order is in order.

Mr. FLANDERS. I raise the point of order that this amendment, section 637, proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and should not be allowed to remain in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Vermont indicate the page and line to which he refers?

Mr. FLANDERS. I refer to page 56, section 637.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which part of the section does the Senator refer? The Chair would inquire whether the Senator refers to the entire section.

Mr. FLANDERS. I refer to the entire section.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I merely desire to say that, technically speaking, if I understand the parliamentary rule, it would first be necessary to have the amendment opened by a formal reconsideration. But there can be no doubt that the point of order has been raised against this amendment in the past, and has been sustained.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to explain very briefly the objections to this section. They relate particularly to the requirement that the Government shall not use means which are now used and have been used for years past, and for generations past, in hundreds and thousands of establishments for improving the productivity of the workers, with the approval of union workers. It is only in the case of Government work that the proposal is made to do away with the benefits of scientific management, which have been among the principal means by which the standard of living of the workers of this country have been raised, in spite of the fact that their hours have been shortened and work lightened. That the United States Government alone should be forbidden to use these means is a very serious thing.

I would have spoken against the amendment as proposing a bad provision in the bill; but I think the best approach is to follow the one which has been made in connection with previous attempts to write this section into similar bills, of making the point that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, out of order. I have therefore raised the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont makes the point of order regarding section 637 of the pending bill. The Chair's ruling is that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Oklahoma wanted to raise a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee regarding section 637 in the House text, on page 55, which was stricken out by a committee amendment. The House provision read as follows:

> None of the funds provided in this act shall be available for training in any legal or business profession nor for the payment of tuition for training in such professions.

I realize that the language of the section adopted by the House was entirely too restrictive, but I hope that the conferees, because the House provision is stricken out, will not give carte blanche to the armed services to send to law school for another period of 3 years

many officers who have completed 4 years at West Point or Annapolis and have become military officers. I should like to say that the Army has in excess of 2,200 graduate lawyers now serving as line officers, yet it is sending 40 more regular officers to law school. The Navy has 800 officers with law degrees, yet it has 18 in law school. The Marines have 125 officers with law degrees, yet they now have 25 officers enrolled in law schools, and are planning to send 43 next year.

I hope that the conferees will agree upon a provision of some kind which will help restrict the sending of officers to law schools. It is estimated that it costs the Government $15,000 a year to maintain an officer and send him to law school. Assuming the correctness of this figure, it means that the estimated cost of sending 87 commissioned officers to civilian law schools at Government expense for the purpose of obtaining law degrees is $1,305,000. The armed services are overrun with officers who have law degrees, but are now assigned to line duty. Many Reserve officers, men with qualifications and experience in our civilian courts, want to get into the Judge Advocate General's department, but cannot find a berth in that department. To summon a Reserve officer from his home and perhaps from his private law practice, and send him to serve in Korea, while Regular commissioned officers are attending civilian law school at Government expense for the purpose of obtaining law degrees, does not make very good sense to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Oklahoma has raised this question. His comment, I think, elucidates the entire problem very clearly. The committee shares the opinion of the Senator from Oklahoma. In striking out this House provision, we did so in the belief that it would be necessary in conference to work out a more reasonable prohibition. It is altogether wrong that line officers should be sent to law school for 4 years, and then sent back to the line. It is altogether unreasonable that, with the large number of Regular officers already trained in law and serving in the line, more should be trained. But, on the other hand, the training which is being given to officers in business management is highly effective, highly desirable, and will result in economy and in better management, provided the three services will do what the Navy has done, for example, with respect to the service of supply. The Navy keeps the officers so trained on the job for which they are especially qualified. Officers should not be trained as specialists and then assigned to strictly military duty. But it is also clear that when there are Armed Forces scattered throughout the world, it becomes necessary to have in the various installations, on vessels, and at bases, officers who have a knowledge of the law. Therefore, in order to give the conferees an opportunity to work out a reasonable substitute, we struck out the House provision. The Senator has read, no doubt, the language of the report in connection with the bill?

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate that, but I believe it should be more restrictive, because there is hardly a law problem that a skilled officer or a Reserve officer cannot handle. We do not have to spend all this money to make skilled lawyers out of West Point men and Naval Academy graduates.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, at a time when we are drawing upon so much professional skill among Reserve officers and others, we should not continue the old method of educating Regulars as though we still had the small force which was all that was needed before the Korean war.

Mr. MONRONEY. In peacetime it might be all right, but in wartime, when civilians and Reserve officers trained in the law are called into the service, it is a different matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator has made clear his point.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Oklahoma was objecting to sending officers to law school, and I understand the committee is in agreement with what the Senator stands for?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I was saying.

Mr. FERGUSON. We do not make lawyers by merely sending officers to law school at a cost of about $15,000 when we can utilize the service of practitioners who are in the Reserves and have had a legal education, plus practice.

Is not that the attitude of the committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is exactly the committee's attitude.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee felt somewhat different about educating officers in auditing. It was felt that if they acquired a knowledge of accounting and auditing they would be useful to the service, since it was very difficult, if not impossible, to get businessmen with experience and education in business, to go into the service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Concerning the committee amendment on page 6, line 24, where the committee has increased the amount for the Office of Public Information from $312,500 to $750,000, representing an increase of 140 percent, I think the chairman of the subcommittee might give us some explanation in justification of the increase.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The justification is simply this: The House bill provided an appropriation for this service in the three departments of the armed services. The system which has been used has been that the three services operate under the coordinating control of the Secretary of Defense. It was made clear to the committee that a very substantial part of this work consists of making reply to inquiries from the public and from the Government. This appropriation will result in a saving of time. All we did was to restore a portion of the money for use in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. It is not an increase, but merely a merging of the activities of the three services. It is an increase over what the House allowed, but a decrease below the budget estimate.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that on page 13, line 19, "$20,000,000" be stricken out and in lieu thereof there be inserted "$17,000,000"; on page 16, line 2, "$153,300,000" be stricken out and be inserted in lieu thereof "$156,300,000"; and that on page 16, line 3, a colon be substituted for a semicolon, and the following words inserted:

And in addition thereto the amount of $8,000,000 of the appropriation for "military construction, Army, and civilian components" in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, is hereby transferred to this appropriation to remain available until expended for the construction of non-Army facilities.

Mr. President, I shall be very brief. My amendment does not add anything to the appropriation. It does provide in connection with construction for the civilian components, the National Guard, and the organized Reserve, that there shall be $8,000,000 for the purpose. That is for the purpose of housing equipment, tanks, trucks, and other equipment issued to the National Guard and the Reserve. As it is now, it would be necessary for the States or some subdivision of the State governments to make a contribution of 25 percent, the same as they are doing now in the care of the construction of armories. The construction work contemplated here is to preserve the equipment of the United States of America.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator desire in his amendment to change the law so that the States will not have to put up 25 percent, so far as these items are concerned?

Mr. MARTIN. The law will remain the same, so far as armories are concerned.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the Senator seeks to change the law as to the other items.

Mr. MARTIN. The item of housing equipment is in most cases for the benefit of the United States alone. The armories aid the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Who is going to determine what buildings are to be constructed? If the State does not put up any money, we may find that there will be much more money spent, particularly if the State can determine what buildings are to be built.

Mr. MARTIN. The buildings would be constructed under the supervision of the National Guard Bureau, which is a part of the national defense, in the Pentagon Building. The States would not have anything to say about it; but in the case of armories the State or some

subdivision of the State government would still have to put up 25 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Who determines at present what buildings are to be built under the law that requires 25 percent to be contributed by the State?

Mr. MARTIN. So far as the National Guard is concerned, it is all determined by the National Guard Bureau, which is a subdivision of the Department of Defense, administered in the Pentagon Building.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there would not be any change in that regard?

Mr. MARTIN. Oh, no; there would be no change.

Mr. FERGUSON. The same bureau which now provides for the maintenance of construction would continue to do so. The Senator's amendment would change the law so that the State would not have to put up 25 percent.

Mr. MARTIN. Not unless it was for armory construction. As the Senator knows, the National Guard is under dual control. The Federal Government supervises the training and provides standards for officers and physical examinations for officers and enlisted men. But the State can use the National Guard for its own internal security. Then in a time of great emergency, such as that which exists now, several divisions and many units of the National Guard are taken into the Federal service. There is dual control. What I fear is that if this assistance is not provided, some States will not be in a financial condition to make the 25 percent contribution toward construction of buildings to house the matériel of the Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator that the National Guard of my State is very much interested in what the Senator is undertaking to do by the amendment. I believe my State would be perfectly willing to pay 25 percent toward an armory, but not toward the auxiliary buildings for housing material. They do not feel that such buildings should be paid for by the State, since they would be largely in the interest of the Federal Government, rather than of the National Guard of the State. I am very much in favor of the Senator's amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. THYE and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota and I shall yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. THYE. I have received a communication from the Adjutant General of the State of Minnesota, who urges that such an amendment as is proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania be acted upon favorably.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has so ably stated, his amendment pertains to the construction of garages or other types of storage buildings in which would be housed military equipment owned by the Federal Government, but in the hands of the National Guard of the States. Such structures would be erected for the purpose of conserving equipment now owned by the Federal Government. Instead of tanks, trucks, and artillery equipment being left out in the open, where deterioration would take place, they would be housed in some type of shed or garage, or construction of that kind.

If I am not badly mistaken in my memory, it was only a few years ago that the National Guard Act was amended so as to require a 25-percent payment by the States for this type of construction. The States would not object to a 25-percent payment toward the construction cost of armories, but they object to a payment of 25 percent toward the cost of additional buildings for the housing of equipment.

I think the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania is in order. It does not increase the over-all appropriation; it merely would make available a certain sum of money for construction of house equipment to be used in connection with the National Guard.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. A few years ago the States completely furnished the armories, but at that time there were only the Infantry, Artillery, and Cavalry, and not very much, even, of medium artillery. Large, expensive buildings in which to house matériel were not required. However, we are now, and have been since World War II, trying to make the National Guard the first line of defense, and that requires larger buildings.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. If I understood the Senator from Pennsylvania correctly, his amendment would not add any money to the appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. It would also continue the rule; as stated by the Senator, that the States contribute 25 percent of the cost of any armory used by the National Guard.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. So the Senator's amendment would apply only to the other Federal construction and experience under the new law has taught that it is really not reasonable to require the States to put up 25 percent, in the first place, because is it intended merely to house and protect Federal property, which is the primary obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator is entirely correct. Before World War II, the National Guard consisted of less than 300,000 troops. Under present plans, the number will rise to more than 600,000. That is more than the States need for their internal security.

Mr. STENNIS. Members of the Committee on Armed Services, as does everyone in the armed services, look forward to a reduction in personnel, and we know that an effective reserve program is the only possible hope. The National Guard being a component part of the reserve program, it certainly seems to me that the Senator's amendment is very timely. It really looks to the future and should be agreed to.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I recognize in the Senator from Pennsylvania an authority on the entire question of military affairs, and I am sure he is recognized as such all over the country.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator whether the proposed amendment is not consistent with the study made a few years ago, to which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] adverted, as to the extension of authority, and the reemphasizing of the part the National Guard is playing in the over-all military picture of the country?

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator is absolutely correct. What is proposed is absolutely necessary. If we are to retain individual freedom, the wars of our Republic must be fought by the people. Great numbers of our national defense personnel are in the Reserve components—the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. They are men who are not only earning a livelihood for themselves and their families, but they are training to be ready for any great emergency in which the country may become involved.

Mr. O'CONOR. It is my understanding that the amount which had been allocated previously could not be used by reason of certain definitions, and that this amendment, of course, would clear up and make available the amount which already has been voted for this general purpose.

Mr. MARTIN. That is correct. It does not add any money.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am in entire accord with the Senator's proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the Senator, his amendment would not mean the appropriation of any more money. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN. Not a penny more.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. While the National Guard is supposed to be a State organization, is it not true that all its objectives are in the interest of the Federal Government, namely, to help protect and help fight for the country in time of war?

Mr. MARTIN. That is a very fine contribution. The distinguished Senator from Texas is entirely correct.

I have seen the development of the National Guard. I was a member of the National Guard when it was fully controlled by the States. Under the Dick Act of 1903, the Federal Government sent out its inspectors, and would

make certain contributions of equipment, and so forth, if the National Guard came up to a certain standard.

It was under the National Defense Act of 1916 that we began to have dual control. At that time the States furnished armories, certain administrative expenses, and training fields for field training during the summer. The Federal Government then paid the expenses of the annual field training period.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I will yield if the Senator from Texas has concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. When I was a student in college I was a member of the National Guard. The Federal Government did not give us a dime for anything. We had to buy our own uniforms. We had to provide our own armory, if we had one—and usually we did not. We went to camp once a year, and we had to dig down in our pockets for a contribution to the mess and for other expenses. That was neither fair nor just. The Federal Government should make a contribution to pay for those things. I think the Government loaned us a number of discarded, outmoded Springfield rifles with a bore about as large as a man's thumb. Later we got some Krag-Jorgensen rifles. They were pretty good.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator was a pretty good marksman, was he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

I merely wished to point out that, as I stated a while ago, the objectives of the National Guard are national in their fundamental concept, and the Federal Government ought to contribute to it. It is no way to maintain a National Guard for the Federal Government to refuse to contribute to it.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this proposal to relieve the States of the 25 percent contribution for the nonarmory facilities came to us toward the very close of the hearings, and we did not have as much time as we would have liked to have to go into the entire question. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said. I have consulted with members of the Appropriations Committee, by whom I am authorized to say that we shall be very glad to accept the amendment and to discuss it at length in the conference.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much. I shall not take further time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD just prior to the vote on the Martin amendment a telegram which I received this afternoon from the adjutant general of Texas.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., *June 30, 1952.*

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

State of Texas glad to put up 25 percent of cost of armories but cannot and will not put up 25 percent for housing and maintenance of Federal equipment and training of National Guard. Unfair to try and force States to contribute to these nonarmory items. Texas will not derive 1 cent of good from this 11,000,000 item in H. R. 7391 unless National Guard Association amendment is accepted. Request you fight for the amendment.

K. L. BERRY,
Major General, the Adjutant General, of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is agreed to.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to have the amendment read?

Mr. MOODY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the reading of the amendment is dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment of Mr. MOODY was, at the proper place in the bill, to insert the following new title:

TITLE VII

COMBAT DUTY PAY

SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the "Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952."

SEC. 702. As used in this title—

(a) The terms "uniformed services", "member", "officer", and "secretary" (except as hereinafter specifically provided) shall have the meaning prescribed for such terms by section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and the terms "incentive pay" and "special pay" shall mean the pay authorized by section 203, 204, or 205 of such act.

(b) The term "member", when used in relation to any combat unit, means any member of the uniformed services serving and present with, or on board, such unit under competent orders

(c) The term "combat unit" means—

(1) Any military unit, not larger than a regiment, while such unit is engaged in actual combat on land; or

(2) any element of, or detail of personnel from, any military unit not larger than a regiment, while such element or detail is subjected to hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance (A) directly to a military unit, not larger than a battalion, which is engaged in actual combat on land, or (B) by fire to any military unit engaged in actual combat on land; or

(3) any military unit (not larger than a regiment) engaged in any amphibious or airborne operation, while subjected to a hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance to a military unit which is engaged in actual combat on land, by the performance of duties which require its employment at or near a beach or airhead; or

(4) any vessel while subjected to hostile fire or explosion in the course of any operation; or

(5) any aircraft while subjected to hostile fire in the course of any operation.

(d) the term "actual combat on land" means direct contact with and opposition to a hostile force by any military unit while such unit is subjected to hostile ground fire.

(e) the term "military unit" means any unit of any of the uniformed services other than a vessel or aircraft.

(f) the term "Korea" shall mean the geographical area specified for income-tax-exemption purposes by Executive Order 10195, approved December 20, 1950.

SEC. 703. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of $45 per month for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which such member was entitled to receive basic pay and during which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea on—

(a) not less than 6 days of such month; or

(b) one or more days of such month included within a period of not less than 6 consecutive days on which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea, if such period began in the next preceding month and he is not entitled to receive combat pay under this title for such preceding month.

SEC. 704. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of $45 per month for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which he was entitled to receive basic pay and in which—

(a) he was killed in action, injured in action, or wounded in action while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter dur-

ing which he was hospitalized for the treatment of an injury or wound received in action while so serving; or

(b) he was captured or entered a missing-in-action status while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter during which he occupied such status.

SEC. 705. No person shall be entitled to receive for any month—

(a) more than one combat pay authorized by this title; or

(b) combat pay under this title in addition to any incentive or special pay.

SEC. 706. (a) The Secretaries of the services concerned are authorized and directed to promulgate regulations for the administration of this title, which regulations shall be as uniform as practicable, and in the case of the military departments shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

(b) Such regulations may include appropriate provisions for the withholding of combat pay under section 203 of this title from any member or former member of the uniformed services (or any class of such persons) for any period during which such person or class of persons was not placed in substantial peril by the action of any hostile force, as determined in conformity with such regulations.

SEC. 707 (a). The Secretary of the service concerned, or such subordinate as he may specify, may make such determination of fact as may be required for the administration of this act, and any such determination shall be final.

(b) Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for the payment of combat pay under this title for any month prior to the date of enactment of this title.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, with the exception of one perfecting change in language, this is the amendment which was approved by the Senate as a part of the armed services pay raise bill. It provides $45 a month combat pay for any member of the Armed Forces who is in a unit of the Armed Forces which is in actual combat with the enemy 6 days in any 1 month. I believe the House made a serious error in refusing to accept this before and with a different set of conferees on this bill, I feel the House may now accept it, if the Senate acts again.

I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe he favors the amendment, although he is not one of its sponsors.

I wish to point out that while an investigation and inquiry has been launched by the Armed Services Committee to look into the entire question of hazard pay, and the various designations under that heading, no report can be filed for at least 6 or 8 months, or until 1953. In the meantime those who are actually fighting for their country in Korea have no consideration in the way of "hazard" pay. I think it is hardly fair to have nine different categories of men in the service listed for higher pay than is received by others of their rank, without extending the same consideration to those who are actually fighting and are actually under fire, including the GI's who are in fox holes. If anyone is in "hazard," it is certainly the men who are in actual combat, under fire.

I hope the Senator from Wyoming will accept the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In connection with section 707 (a) in the Senator's amendment, a certain situation has been called to my attention by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator will permit an interruption, the same matter was also called to my attention.

When I presented the amendment a few moments ago I said that the amendment was the same as that which had previously passed the Senate, with one perfecting change in the language. That is the section which has been changed to meet the objection of the General Accounting Office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator tell me how he has changed it?

Mr. MOODY. I will ask the clerk to read the new wording of the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SEC. 707 (a). The Secretary of the service concerned, or such subordinate as he may specify, may make such determination of fact as may be required for the administration of this act, and any such determination shall be final.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the only determination the Secretary of the service makes is a determination of fact.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And all questions of law or determinations under the law as are left as at present, under general statutes, and are not tampered with?

Mr. MOODY. I will say to my friend from Massachusetts that that is the reason why the wording of the section has been changed. It was to meet the very point the Senator raises.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming, who has done such a magnificent job as floor manager of this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I discussed this amendment with the Senator from Michigan earlier in the day, and I have been discussing it with members of the committee, principally the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. This amendment is the same amendment, except for a slight change, as that which the Senator offered earlier in the year, is it not?

Mr. MOODY. That is correct, except for the one change which has just been mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I supported that amendment. I have always felt that the Korean combat soldiers were certainly entitled to combat pay.

Mr. MOODY. It seems to me that even during an investigation and inquiry which may change the system with respect to hazard pay and other categories, to permit a situation to continue for months under which hazard pay is provided for nine categories of service in the Armed Forces, without any hazard pay for infantrymen and others actually in combat, is an obvious inequity and injustice.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The senior Senator from Michigan and I will be very glad to join the junior Senator from Michigan in sponsoring the amendment. I am authorized to say that we will take the amendment to conference.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Speaking for myself, I want it clearly understood in the RECORD that while I support the amendment, it may be difficult to retain it in conference, because a study is being made of the question, and the amendment is legislation.

Mr. MOODY. That is true. However, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that in anticipation of the fact that a point of order might be raised against the amendment, several days ago I filed notice of intention to move to suspend the rule if that should become necessary. I hope, however, that it will not be necessary, because it seems to me that this is a sheer matter of justice. I believe that the House conferees also might yield to the appeal that the GI's who are fighting for us now should not be treated with any less consideration than is shown to others who are, with good reason, paid a little extra for extra-hazardous service.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to associate myself in the sponsorship of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I think it is no more than fair that we take into consideration the foot soldier who fights on the beaches of Korea. He takes it from the air. He takes it from the artillery, and he takes it from the sniper who crawls up on him. I think it is nothing more than fair that those foot soldiers be given some extra compensation for the hardships they are enduring. We make such extra compensation available to the man who flies an airplane, the man in the submarine, and men in many other services in which we now allow such hazardous pay.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator very much. That is precisely the point I am trying to make.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator. I believe we have a report which shows the amounts of money that will be involved in this case. I should like to inquire whether the distinguished chairman believes that it might be possible to absorb this amount in the same way that the pay raise might be absorbed, so that the men who are fighting at the front may get incentive pay. Many of the men in one of the nine categories are not in what we call

combat, as compared with the men who are at the front.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I made inquiry of the Department of Defense. I asked for an estimate of the probable cost of the amendment. I have the figures before me. As I understand, the Senator's amendment would be retroactive to the first of July, 1950.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be applicable, therefore, during fiscal years 1951, 1952, and 1953.

For fiscal year 1951, the amount is estimated at $77,663,660.

For the fiscal year 1952 it is estimated at $90,529,200.

For the fiscal year 1953 it is estimated at $90,529,200. The total is estimated to be $258,722,060.

In view of the fact that by the amendment unanimously adopted this afternoon the Senate has reduced the cash appropriation for aircraft procurement, our bill is well under the Budget so far as cash is concerned, and it may be possible to work out the absorption of this hazard pay as well as of the $469,000,000, which is the estimated cost of the pay increases voted by Congress this year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator also feel that the adoption of the amendment will stimulate an effort on the part of the members of the subcommittee to study the other nine so-called incentive categories? I have deep sympathy for the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has been raising this question in committee and on the floor for quite sometime. We have had the question of incentive pay before us many times.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Committee on Armed Services is already at work on the subject. The Committee on Armed Services, in the report submitted by my colleague, has recommended that a special commission of experts go into the matter. It is entirely appropriate that that be done.

Mr. MOODY. In proposing my amendment I have no desire to reflect upon or interfere with the work of the Commission which has been mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I hope that a readjustment of the levels will go forward and that the system will be better understood when the Commission reports. My point is that it is not just or fair to continue to pay incentive pay to other categories during this interim period, which may last only 6 or 7 months, but may last considerably longer, without paying it also to the men actually doing the fighting. There is no answer to the argument that if anyone should be paid for extra hazard, certainly the man being shot at should be paid such hazard pay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee accepts the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. If the Senator will permit the observation I should like to say that for the past half century great military experts have repeatedly predicted that the ground forces would not take any part in the next war. Nevertheless during each emergency it has been necessary to fall back on the soldier who carries the bayonet, or drives the tank, or does the other things related to what we used to call the infantry but now call the ground forces.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct. No one knows it better than the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has a distinguished military record.

Mr. MARTIN. My military record is not so distinguished, but I have had a great deal of experience. It takes real courage to get down in the mud and fight an enemy, and that is what the ground soldier must do. He has to be out in the snow and in the rain. If there is any man in the service who ought to have the encouragement of a little additional compensation it is the man who serves on the ground.

I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania for his observations, and I want to associate myself with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I call up an amendment on page 16, line 13. Before it is read, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to associate themselves with me in offering the amendment: The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] for himself and other Senators.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 13, before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided further, That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be expended for the construction of the research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps authorized by Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, under Public Law 424 an appropriation of $11,000,000 was made to construct the laboratory at some place in the United States. The original plan was to have the location of the laboratory determined by an impartial commission. The commission decided that the laboratory should be constructed at Natick, Mass.

I apologize for taking the time of the Senate at this late hour, but several of us have made an effort to get an explanation from the Defense Department as to how it arrived at this site. We have not been satisfied with the explanation.

Many of the distinguished Senators who are associated with me in this amendment have tried to get an audience with Mr. Lovett, the Secretary of Defense. We have not been able to do so. We have always been required to take the matter up with a subordinate, and we have not obtained satisfactory results.

It is proposed to take the research laboratories now at Philadelphia, the one in Chicago, the one at Jeffersonville, Ind., and those at other locations and combine them in this one location. Seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars of the appropriation has been obligated. The centralization of these laboratories opposes the plan of decentralization which has been advocated by the President of the United States and others who are interested in the defense of America. The laboratory now at Philadelphia which is engaged in textile research has done a wonderful job. The same can be said of the laboratory in the Louisville, Ky., area which is in equipment research, and the one in Chicago which has to do with the food industry.

It has been my pleasure in this work to be associated with the 93 Representatives from the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, all of whom fail to see any merit in the project. All of the Senators from those five States have taken part in the investigation. I am fearful that before the new laboratory is completed it will require an expenditure of almost $50,000,000.

Furthermore, it will involve the transfer of the skilled personnel from the three locations I have mentioned which will necessitate the construction of housing, schools, and so forth, at the new location.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. In the opinion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, is not this another case in which the Military Establishment, instead of using existing facilities which have demonstrated that they are capable of doing the job that needs to be done, is attempting to build up a tremendously large, new installation, at great cost to the taxpayers, when existing institutions or installations are entirely adequate?

Mr. MARTIN. I feel that the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct, and that he has stated the matter very much better than I have been able to state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania know of any good reason why the Secretary of Defense—who, after all, is the one who should render the final decision on this question—should not have extended to the Senators and Representatives from the five States mentioned the courtesy of a personal conference, so that he himself

could have been advised by members of the congressional delegations from those States as to what they believed to be the facts in this case?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon is entirely correct, I believe. In America we still have the right to petition those who are in responsible positions. I believe the Secretary was very derelict in the performance of his duty in not seeing a committee from that group of Senators and Representatives.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in the amendment he offers and in the protest he is making, because I have examined into this matter. I satisfied myself that, in the first place, the Military Establishment was attempting to play the old Army game of run-around. In the second place, I felt that there was good cause to believe that great economies could be effected by the continued use of the present facilities, thus avoiding the necessity of expending millions of dollars for new installations. In the third place, I had serious doubt whether the Massachusetts site should be chosen, either from the standpoint of the alleged resultant efficiency to be had from an installation there or from the point of view of the manpower needed there, which would have to be moved there from the present installations. Last of all, I felt that the Defense Establishment had dealt in a rather shoddy fashion with the members of the congressional delegations from the States referred to.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question involved in the amendment submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania has come to my attention during the last few days. The brief study I have been able to make of the amendment and its subject matter leads me to believe that the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania should be adopted, so as to enable us to check into the question further, before any steps are taken to consolidate the research laboratories to which reference is made.

Therefore, I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Pennsylvania as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. His contribution is a very fine one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Pennsylvania for raising this issue.

Although Philadelphia and Pennsylvania are the localities which will be particularly affected by such a development as the Natick laboratory, I wish to say that Chicago, and Jeffersonville, Ind., will also be affected very soon.

I should like to deal very briefly, if I may, with the Philadelphia situation.

THE EFFECT ON PHILADELPHIA

As I understand, one of the purposes of the laboratory is to test various types of clothing designed for use in Arctic regions. At the laboratory it is proposed to construct scientifically designed chambers in which to test various types of clothing.

It is my information—and I should like to have the Senator from Pennsylvania correct me if I am in error about this matter—that there are already at least two such laboratories in the country belonging, I believe, to the Air Force, in in the southern part of the country, and one in the Middle West, which the Air Force says are available for use by the other services. I further understand that if this work is transferred to Natick, these two costly facilities which could be used by the other services for testing clothing will be left unused, or partially unused.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania whether I am correct on that point.

Mr. MARTIN. The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct. I have before me considerable information which is confidential in nature; but what the Senator from Illinois has stated is correct. At present the work is well established in the two other locations.

Moreover, as I stated a moment ago, the necessary trained personnel to do that work is located there. Continued use of the present establishments will make unnecessary the expense of moving the personnel to a new location and readjusting those persons in a new location.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I want the finest possible laboratory testing work that can be obtained in America done in this field; and I take that position both as regards tentage, clothing, food, and all other equipment and materials used by our Armed Forces, for the better the equipment is, the more comfortable will be our men in the front line, and the higher will be their morale.

On the other hand, I do not understand that the proposed new laboratory will help one iota in that situation. For that reason I am opposing it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further to me on this point?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

ELEVEN-MILLION-DOLLAR APPROPRIATION JUST THE BEGINNING

Mr. DOUGLAS. The initial appropriation of $11,000,000 will merely be the come-on. If that appropriation is made, the laboratory work of testing clothing will be transferred to Natick from Philadelphia; but following that, there will be transferred to Natick the food and container laboratory now at Chicago and the facilities now at Jeffersonville. That was denied by Mr. Foster, the Under Secretary of Defense in a letter dated March 27, 1952; but I should like to read from a letter which was circulated on January 18 of this year—2 months before Mr. Foster's letter—by Colonel Hickey, who is Chief of the Research and Development Division of the Quartermaster Corps. The letter, which was signed by Maj. Gen. Horkan, Quartermaster General, reads, as follows:

Ground will be broken for the new center—

That is to say, the one at Natick—

on April 19, 1952. As soon thereafter as buildings are completed and facilities are available, it is intended to transfer the functions of the research and development laboratories, now located at Jeffersonville Quartermaster Depot, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Lawrence, Mass., and Chicago Quarter Depot, to Natick, together with all personnel and personnel vacancies, necessary files, and equipment. All future planning should be directed toward the smooth and efficient transition of your functions into a consolidated activity based on integrated and common objectives.

That letter gives a clear indication of the intent of the Quartermaster General.

As a matter of fact, the Quartermaster General prepared a budget request or budget estimate for $3,500,000, to provide for transferral of the Food and Container Laboratory to Natick. However, that request was deleted at a higher echelon from the 1954 defense budget. I submit that it may have been deleted because it was felt that it would be discrete at this time not to raise the issue about the Food and Container Laboratory and about the work done at Jeffersonville, but that some persons in authority may have believed that if the initial step of moving the equipment now at Philadelphia to Natick were taken, the Food and Container Laboratory and the facilities at Jeffersonville could later be transferred to Natick.

Mr. President, I believe this proposal is a scandalously wasteful one. It may eventually involve a cost of $50,000,000 or more if the cost of moving the personnel and their equipment is considered. I submit that such a change is not needed and should not be made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been happy to join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in this amendment. I did so because at the time when this project was under consideration, an effort was made to have the subcommittee on investigations of the Committee on Government Operations check into the program relating to the construction of research facilities at Natick, Mass., and to have transferred to that new location the work presently being done in other centers.

We found, however, that the only way by which we could correct the situation was to proceed in the manner the Senator from Pennsylvania now is proposing.

As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, the Department of Defense made a hurried attempt to get sod broken at the new site and to get the project started, even after the Department of Defense had made a mistake in the original selection of the site of the new installation. Originally the Department of Defense made tests and proposed construction of the new installation at a point about 1 mile distant from the location which subsequently has been chosen.

Mr. President, let me say there is a great deal of opposition to this proposal. Many businessmen in various sections of the country have registered strong

opposition to it. I have received a number of telegrams in protest, and I shall have them incorporated in the RECORD, along with an exchange of correspondence with the Department of Defense. This correspondence indicates that many businessmen will have to travel much greater distances, at much additional expense, if the proposed move is made.

Furthermore, as has been pointed out, facilities adequate for doing this job are already in existence.

This matter involves an attempt on the part of the Defense Department to coordinate at one spot all the research work and all the research facilities. However, the fact of the matter is that the United States of America is not all at one place, and the industries of the United States are not all at one place.

It appears to me that in this instance, particularly, the Defense Establishment should attempt to decentralize its operations, rather than to centralize them, and should attempt to bring them closer to the sources of supply and production, rather than farther away.

The Senator from Pennsylvania proposes the only possible alternative, under which this matter may be gone into and checked before it proceeds too far. Make no mistake about it, it will cost a sizable sum of money. What has been asked for thus far is but an initial appropriation. It will cost a sizable sum of money for the new facility. What is more important, it will literally put out of existence the facilities which are already developed and to which the tradesmen and the producers of America are accustomed. So I join heartily with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and thank him for his leadership in this matter.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the Senator very much. I should like very much to have the two letters to which the Senator has referred printed in the RECORD at this point, in connection with his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 3, 1952.

The Honorable ROBERT A. LOVETT,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Recently it has come to my attention, principally through inquiries from responsible Minnesota citizens, that the Army plans to dismantle present functioning Quartermaster Research and Development Laboratories and center all such research in a single large laboratory at Natick, Mass.

Since this move involves a considerable expenditure, and since a question of broad policy is involved here, it ceases to be a matter of local interest to the communities directly involved and becomes of serious national concern. For this reason I should like to set forth points of inquiry with a view to clarifying certain conflicting information.

1. The amount allocated by Congress for the Natick Laboratory is $10,750,000. Does this amount cover the cost of equipping the lab, moving the scientists, and actually setting the research in operation, or is this exclusively for construction? If the latter, how much additional money will be required during the next few years for all operations necessary before the lab will be ready to function?

2. Will all fundamental and theoretical research scientists of the QM Research and Development section be located at Natick? Will all scientists and technicians whose field is applied research be at Natick?

3. How does the Department reconcile its dispersal program with the fact that Natick, located on the Atlantic seaboard, will represent a concentration of key scientists, equipment, data, and incomplete experiments in progress? If Natick were to receive a direct hit, what would be the immediate and long range future of Quartermaster Research and Development?

4. Would the amount of actual scientific research be augmented by transferring to new buildings, or would research gain more if an equivalent amount of money were spent through the existing set-up, extending lines of inquiry, attracting more scientists, and assigning an increased number of studies to our great universities and excellent private industrial laboratories and research foundations?

5. What is the connection between the Natick center and a proposed "Institute of Man" which was the subject of considerable controversy in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses.

In these inquiries and in my continuing interest in this matter, I am prompted by a desire to support and promote genuine research, and to further all scientific inquiry into ways and means of making the lot of our fighting men more tolerable and better their odds for survival.

Since April 19 has been set as the date to begin the Natick project I would be most appreciative if your answers to my queries would be made available at the earliest possible time.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

MAY 13, 1952.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I write in reply to your letter dated April 3, 1952, to the Secretary of Defense concerning the Quartermaster Research Laboratory at Natick, Mass.

For purposes of clarity, I will respond to each of your questions in the order in which you presented them in your letter:

1. The amount allocated by Congress for the Natick Laboratory is $10,750,000. Does this amount cover the cost of equipping the lab, moving the scientists, and actually setting the research in operation, or is this exclusively for construction? If the latter, how much additional money will be required during the next few years for operations necessary before the lab will be ready to function?

Answer. As is the normal procedure in regard to appropriations for new military construction, the amount appropriated by Congress for the erection of the Quartermaster Research Laboratory provides only for the erection of necessary structures. Funds required for operations ancillary to the construction itself are separately appropriated. It is estimated currently that a maximum of $355,000 will be expended in moving personnel to the new laboratory. An additional $70,000 has been estimated as the cost of moving equipment valued at $2,500,000 representing approximately 80 percent of the equipment now in use in the various activities which are to be consolidated.

A research program by its very nature requires continuous acquisition of new equipment to replace that which becomes obsolete or unserviceable and to meet the changing requirements of research missions. In this connection, it may be noted that during fiscal year 1953, in addition to normal expenditures for the replacement of obsolete or unserviceable equipment, approximately $200,000 will be spent for climatic equipment needed in the new laboratory facilities being built at Natick, and never before available for the Department of Defense.

Thus, foreseeable expenditures needed before the laboratory will be ready to function total approximately $525,000 above and beyond the appropriated $10,750,000 for construction, for purposes of moving personnel and equipment to the Natick Laboratory and for the purchase of new equipment.

2. Will all fundamental and theoretical research scientists of the Quartermaster Research and Development section be located at Natick? Will all scientists and technicians whose field is applied research be at Natick?

Answer. All Quartermaster Research and Development positions now in Washington, D. C.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Cameron, Va.; Jeffersonville, Ind.; and Lawrence, Mass.; will be consolidated at the new center. The Quartermaster Corps Food and Container Institute will remain at its present location in Chicago, Ill. Thus, with the exception of research personnel at the Quartermaster Corps Food and Container Institute in Chicago, and a small number of nontechnical liaison posts in the Office of the Quartermaster General, all fundamental and theoretical research scientists of the Quartermaster Research and Development Section will be located at Natick. The total number of personnel who, it is estimated, will move numbers 945. The total authorized for transfer is 1,052.

3. How does the Department reconcile its dispersal program with the fact that Natick, located on the Atlantic seaboard, will represent a concentration of key scientists, equipment, data, and incomplete experiments in progress. If Natick were to receive a direct hit, what would be the immediate and long range future of Quartermaster Research and Development?

Answer. One of the specific criteria used by the Ad Hoc Site Selection Committee for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory was its location with reference to target risk in the event of war. In its report, the committee said at page 3: "Certain sites have been eliminated because they are located within heavy industrial areas which might be prime targets in case of war. Moreover, such crowded, industrialized cities do not offer the best living conditions—conditions which are conducive to the peace of mind so necessary for creative work on the part of scientists, and wholesome living for their families.

It is thought that a research laboratory such as the one to be located in Natick is not a good target for enemy bombers and it is believed that the project would be relatively safe in the event of attack. The relative safety of the project is emphasized by reason of its remoteness from different but proximate installations of likely attack. Bearing in mind that the laboratory was required to be within a reasonable distance of Washington, it seems clear that its location at Natick, which is outside the danger zone of an attack directed at Boston or its shipyards, offers at least as much safety as any other site containing all features necessary to the project. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the present research laboratories which are located within military installations, which are far more likely targets than the laboratories themselves located there, are in a more hazardous position than would be a research center at Natick, Mass.

Plans are in existence for emergency operation of any existing Quartermaster activities in event of destruction of that activity by enemy action. Similar plans will, of course, be developed to cover the Natick laboratory when it is placed in operation.

4. Would the amount of actual scientific research be augmented by transferring to new buildings, or would research gain more

if an equivalent amount of money were spent through the existing set-up, extending lines of inquiry, attracting more scientists, and assigning an increased number of studies to our great universities and excellent private industrial laboratories and research foundations?

Answer. The question of whether a consolidated laboratory would be more useful than continued operations in scattered and makeshift laboratories has been carefully considered by the Quartermaster Corps, management personnel of the Department of the Army, the Research and Development Board, and the Congress. All have agreed that the consolidated laboratory is necessary and worth while, and that increased expenditures on existing facilities are not justified, especially in view of the fact that nowhere in the country are there available climatic chamber facilities of the type to be built at the new center. The cost of these facilities represents approximately $3,000,000 out of the amount to be expended for construction. One of the factors contributing to the conclusion that the new center should be built was the necessity of obtaining a facility properly equipped and located so as to attract scientific personnel of proven ability. It is a well-known fact that the supply of qualified research and development scientists falls far short of the demand. In order for the Quartermaster Corps to compete in the acquisition of such personnel of proven ability as are available, it is imperative that a physical plant reasonably comparable to those of industries engaged in similar activities be provided. It has been a difficult and often impossible task to acquire and retain high caliber scientific personnel willing to work in the inadequate facilities now in existence.

Approximately 40 percent of the annual quartermaster research and development budget is utilized for research programs conducted by private industry, educational institutions and other nongovernmental research organizations. This practice will be continued. Presently, it is not considered feasible to make any significantly greater use of this type of research activity. A great deal of Army research must be conducted in military installations because of various factors, including security classifications, inherent hazards, or the need for utilization of military personnel. In addition, the Quartermaster Corps must provide basic management and coordination of the entire program and must relate to actual military requirements the preliminary research performed either in Government or private research facilities. For example, research work along several lines may ultimately result in a single piece of equipment required by combat troops.

5. What is the connection between the Natick Center and a proposed "Institute of Man" which was the subject of considerable controversy in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress?

Answer. The research laboratory to be located at Natick was, in its early development, sometimes referred to as the "Institute of Man." This term was used in an attempt to convey the idea that quartermaster research is devoted to the needs of military personnel as human beings. The phrase is not used as the official name of the project, which is designated as the Quartermaster Research Laboratory.

The Department of the Army appreciates very much your interest in this matter and your desire to support and promote genuine research. You may be assured that the construction of the Quartermaster Research Laboratory offers every reason to believe that from it will emanate further "ways and means of making the lot of our fighting men more tolerable and better their odds for survival," as you so well expressed the purpose.

Sincerely yours,

T. A. YOUNG, *Deputy Chief.*

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Could the Senator tell us the number of personnel involved in this proposal?

Mr. MARTIN. I regret that I do not have that figure. Possibly the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] could tell us the number of employees at the different places. I have the information at my office.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I have had the information. There are 3,000 or 4,000 civilian personnel at each one of these depots. There are about 25 officers. There are only 150 or 200 persons who will be affected by the change, because they are the only ones who are in the research laboratory. That is the only number that will be affected immediately. But, as the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, it is an effort to centralize fully the research and laboratory work. The present plans do not call for a change in production or manufacture, but only in the research and laboratory work. However, it is a step toward centralization. Most of the industries of the country that have had centralized laboratories have found them to be unsatisfactory, and they are now decentralizing them. Ample evidence to that effect has been presented to the Under Secretary of War within the past few days.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, I think I can supply the figures which have been requested.

Mr. MARTIN. I am glad to yield. I think the figures ought to be put in the RECORD, if the Senator has them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The total quartermaster job strength at the five affected headquarters and depots is as follows:

Philadelphia, 4,494 (including 1,517 in manufacturing divisions); Cameron, Va., 461; Lawrence, 125; Jeffersonville, 4,636; Washington (quartermaster headquarters), 2,813; total, 12,529 jobs filled or authorized (1,019 going to Natick).

Less than 10 percent of them will go to the Natick laboratory.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. This would involve the building of a great many new homes, would it not?

Mr. MARTIN. It would be necessary to build homes, schools, churches, hospitals, and all the other utilities of a fairly large city.

Mr. LANGER. If I might inquire further from my distinguished colleague, is there anything peculiar about the topography of the city in Massachusetts where it is desired to place this laboratory? Is the site bombproof? Is it under mountains, or something of that sort?

Mr. MARTIN. I have never been there, I may say. But, from the information I have, there are thousands and thousands of areas which have the natural facilities for a laboratory such as this.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have been a little bit unclear in my mind during this discussion as to how much of the personnel which has been outlined, in thousands, is connected with research and how much is connected with quartermaster stores. Is it proposed to move all the stores to Natick, or only the research department?

Mr. MARTIN. At Natick will be a centralized laboratory. The matter of quartermaster stores of various kinds is not involved in this laboratory proposal.

Mr. FLANDERS. In listening to a recital of the many thousands of employees in the three major laboratories at Philadelphia, Chicago, and the one in the South, it seemed to me to be a larger proposition than I had understood the research project to be. Is it not true that at least a considerable number of those thousands of employees would be assignable to stores, rather than to research?

Mr. MARTIN. I regret to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I have not investigated that question, but in all research work—and the distinguished Senator from Vermont has had much experience along that line—technicians, chemists, and persons of that type constitute but a small percentage. There are different types of work requiring the services of men and women who are experts in those lines.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is true enough, but the very large figures we have been hearing of would lead me at least to suspect that we have here another overgrown organization, staffed with supernumeraries and accessories, with 10 people employed to do the work that 1 could do. It is impossible for me to conceive that a carefully organized research department, having to do with even the great variety of things that are included in quartermasters' stores, would require so many thousands, and would require churches and hospitals, as well. I think there is something phony about the whole proposition somewhere; and I would like to know where it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield me 4 or 5 minutes, I think I can explain this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has no time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have used no time on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair had understood that the Senator from Wyoming was not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have made no statement about the matter at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Wyoming is not opposed to the amendment——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, for the purposes of having time in opposition, I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, if

the Senator from Wyoming favors the amendment——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is nothing in the RECORD to so indicate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, if the Senator from Wyoming were in favor of the amendment, he would not have any time. If he were opposed to it, he would have. That is the effect of the unanimous-consent agreement, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that was, of course, the unanimous-consent agreement; but I submit the Presiding Officer has no authority to say that I am not opposed to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair does not say that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I understood, that was precisely what the Chair was saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What the Chair would like to ascertain is whether the Senator is in favor of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At this time I am opposed to the amendment, because I want to know more about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it may take me at least 10 minutes to explain it, because I have been involved in this problem since May 15, 1946.

I would respectfully say, first, that 24 bills with reference to the subject have been introduced. I recall, and I say it with a smile, that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], introduced two bills himself to get the laboratory in Philadelphia. Representative SCOTT of Pennsylvania introduced two bills to get it located in the western part of Pennsylvania. Representative VAN ZANDT introduced a bill to get the laboratory in Pennsylvania——

Mr. FERGUSON. No one in Michigan has asked for it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not so far as I know. There have been a number of other bills introduced, by myself, Representative MCCORMACK, and Representative MARTIN of Massachusetts.

The situation is somewhat as follows:

The project began shortly after the beginning of World War II, when a research laboratory with reference to clothing was established in the Pacific Mills, in Lawrence, Mass. It was undertaken as a temporary project in World War II. I was personally there in 1943 and saw a room in which the temperature was over 100 degrees, the humidity was 90, where a number of the boys, wearing a special kind of shorts, were treadmilling to find out the best kind of clothing.

In another room there was a man in a sleeping bag with at least 20 electric contacts used, in order to determine what was the best kind of a sleeping bag for cold weather.

I mention it because that has been my personal experience with that laboratory. It started my interest in the subject of how to help to clothe and equip our Armed Forces so that they would be at their very best in times of stress.

The subject came actively before Congress in January 1947. I introduced a bill to establish the laboratory in Massachusetts. The Senator from Pennsylvania introduced a bill to have it established in Pennsylvania. The laboratory, without going into how it was designed, will employ practically a thousand persons at the most. So far as churches and schools are concerned, there are ample schools in Natick and Framingham, and, I hope, ample housing. I happen to know that some of the people from other laboratories have bought land there. They have told me so.

How was Natick chosen? There was such an uproar at that time in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and New Jersey, that the site could not be quickly agreed upon.

The Committee on Armed Services considered it on three separate occasions, and they unanimously picked a Massachusetts site. A bill was introduced, but it was held up and was never passed.

The next year the Senator from Pennsylvania and I, together with his colleague, and several other Senators—in fact, all who were interested in the situation—agreed to have an impartial commission appointed. The commission was headed by a former president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mr. Compton, and on it there were four other very learned gentlemen who had no part in politics or in Government, but were distinguished scientists.

Three hundred and forty site proposals were submitted to them, representing 40 States. They simmered those sites down to five or seven, I do not remember which. They were personally investigated by the Commission. Of those five the site in Natick was chosen. There was, at first, a question as to whether the site chosen was selected without authority. That matter was gone into by a committee headed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the matter was dropped. There was no question that the site was chosen properly.

Plans are already being made to go forward with this laboratory. The question arises as to whether the work of only a thousand persons at the most can be done better at Natick or in five or six other places in the United States. The work is very important.

Two years ago, in Korea, there was much trench-foot, gangrene, and loss of limbs. A new boot was developed, and as a result the number of cases of frost bite have been practically negligible. In the year before that there were 135 amputees in Korea by reason of frostbite.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded, because I have so little time.

The whole question is: Are we going to try to get a laboratory to develop the proper clothing, and the proper food for soldiers at the front, in different climates, all around the world? There are men in Greenland and Iceland, other men in Korea, in Indochina, and so forth. Are we going to determine upon the proper clothes for those men through research effort in Natick under one group of centralized research experts, or are we going to do it in 5 or 6 different places?

That, as I see it, is the problem, Mr. President. If there has ever been a site chosen by an impartial group after 6 years of discussion of the subject, it seems to me Natick is the site. There has been a continued effort on behalf of other sites. I do not say the Senator from Pennsylvania has had anything to do with it, but I happen to know that the Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia has been trying to get the laboratory established there. Effort is being made in behalf of different places. During the time the commission was undertaking to choose a site I can truthfully say that I never approached the commission in any way, nor did any member of the Massachusetts delegation, so far as I know.

Why was Natick chosen? It is a site in metropolitan Boston, approximately 16 miles from the center of the city. It has good rail, trolley, and bus facilities. It is on the main line of one of the main roads into Boston, and it has housing, churches, and schools which are adequate for the number of persons who are going to work there.

The reasons that Natick was chosen are that there is cold weather in New England. There is Mount Washington for winter work, and Cape Cod beaches for summer work. There are the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard University, Boston University, and other colleges in the near vicinity, besides textile mills in Lawrence and Fall River manufacturing clothing and wool.

There is the shoe industry in Brockton and Lynn. We have the advantage of the research that goes into textiles and the shoe industry. All those things are in a neighborhood that is close to the metropolitan centers, with good transportation, good schools, and good housing facilities.

I say to my friends and colleagues who have been asked to oppose this project because of the people who may have to move from other localities, that I do not quarrel with them a bit; I would probably do the same thing; but I say to them that if they are interested in getting the best possible clothing, to enable our boys to have the best possible opportunity for fighting the war and to come back alive, with their feet, hands, and stomachs in good shape, then this quartermaster laboratory at Natick is worth while. If that is not desired, if it is not thought to be worth while, if it is believed that the work could be done in four, five, or six different places, I would be the last man in the world to oppose the plan.

I happen to know about this, because the Quartermaster laboratory was originally in Massachusetts. As governor of Massachusetts, I saw it. I was asked to make a visit to it as governor, not as Senator, so that I could see what the Army was doing. I have the chronology here. It was started in 1946, when the subject was first discussed. It has been before the Committee on Armed Services at least three different times. The first two times a favorable report was made. I believe the

report was unanimous. The third time, in order to get the laboratory started, because of the rows in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and elsewhere, we all agreed to have a commission study the question. The commission made a unanimous report. Of 340 sites offered in 40 different States, the site in Massachusetts, was selected. That is all I have to say. I believe the money would be properly spent. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, how much time is left for the proponents?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the proponents has expired. The opponents have nine minutes. The Senator from Wyoming is in control of the time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he has completed his statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I could become emotional, or tearful over this matter. I worked on it for 6 years. I think I know all about it. I believe there has never been a subject more carefully or more impartially studied, nor a site selected with a lesser degree of politics or political pressure, for a laboratory if we are to keep healthy for there is so much need for our boys who are in the trenches in Korea and who are serving in places like Greenland.

I have said everything I can say. I believe the project should go forward. This subject has been on my mind for 10 years, ever since I first saw the laboratory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this was a rabbit pulled out of a hat late this afternoon, so far as the chairman of the subcommittee on military appropriations is concerned. I had no idea that any such amendment was to be proposed. I have had no opportunity to make any particular research with respect to the amendment. I believe that as a matter of regular procedure an amendment of this kind ought to be presented to the committee.

From what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, it is quite evident that a great deal of study has been given to the matter. I have inquired of the Department of Defense, and have learned that $250,000 apparently has been expended for plans and specifications, and that a $63,000 contract has been let for clearing the land. The Senator from Massachusetts tells us that the site was selected from among several hundred.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Three hundred and forty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator tell us by whom the site was selected?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The site was selected by a commission appointed by Mr. Forrestal, and headed by Dr. Karl Compton, president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and four other scientists from various parts of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What was the name of the school?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is a very great school, and a very great scientist was the head of it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to correct an error. The commission reported to Mr. Compton as head of the Research Development Board. The commission itself was composed of Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, chairman; Chester M. Alter, H. S. Coleman, Donald H. Loughbridge, Gilbert H. Scribener, and John P. Traynor. I most respectfully say that I do not know those gentlemen or where they came from, but I know they are all highly respected.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator know whether the plans and specifications which have been drafted call for the establishment of a central laboratory, which would in turn result in the closing of other laboratories now doing the same work elsewhere?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is a laboratory operating now in Lawrence, Mass., in the Pacific Mills, or in space borrowed from that company. That laboratory would be moved from Lawrence, Mass., to Natick, Mass.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator must know that I once lived in Lawrence, when I was a small boy.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That makes me feel that possibly the site selected originally at Lawrence was a wise one.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Wyoming believe that this great concentrated laboratory would be subject to attack or sabotage in the event of war, just as we were told the St. Lawrence seaway and power plant would be, had the Senate voted for its construction? Would not the laboratory be subject to the same attack from foreign enemies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Vermont is making an argument in the guise of a question. I am merely trying to learn something about a matter which was never discussed in committee.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all I was trying to do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not the person to whom any of these questions should be addressed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It has just been called to my attention that Mr. Van Leer, chairman of the group, is president of Georgia Tech, in Georgia, and certainly would have no specialized interest in Massachusetts.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Senate and to the chairman of the subcommittee that of the 1,019 people who will be workers in the laboratory, 386 would come from Philadelphia, 29 from Cameron, 125 from Lawrence, Mass., and 219 from Jeffersonville.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have learned that bids for construction have not been opened, and will not be opened until August. Does the Senator know what the estimated cost of the research laboratory is?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The estimated cost is $11,000,000. The Senator is correct in stating that Mr. Bendetsen has temporarily held up the bids. He has asked to have the bids brought to his attention when they are made. I believe the land has been bought. The plans have been made, and the bids are out. I think the bids are due.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the frankness and candor with which the Senator from Massachusetts has discussed the matter. However, inasmuch as the bids have been held up, does not the Senator feel it might be wise for us to take the amendment to conference and have a session there, since our committee had no opportunity whatever to study the matter?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to have a vote to end the discussion on the amendment now. As I say, the subject is not new to me. I have been actively living with the subject for the past 6 years. I shall not hold up the bill tonight, as I could do, but I believe the laboratory should be built, in the interest of our boys in the military service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator desires a vote, I shall not propose to accept the amendment for consideration in conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My query of the Senator was whether he would be willing to accept the amendment in order that it may be taken to conference, where the conference would have an opportunity to ascertain the facts, since the committee itself has never had a chance to learn the facts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senate, after the explanation I have tried to give tonight, still feels that the amendment should go to conference, the Senator should take it there. However, I should prefer to have at least a voice expression of opinion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope the amendment will be put to a vote when the time for debate has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask that it be stated. It is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the Martin amendment the following: "until the project is submitted to the Defense Investigation Committee for investigation."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my judgment this project should not be authorized by the Senate until all the details connected with it go to the Johnson Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee for very thorough investigation. I think the charges made here on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by Senators from five States, with regard to the treatment they have received from the Pentagon Building in connection with this matter, are exceedingly serious charges. I think it is the duty of the Senate to obtain the facts with regard

to those charges before we proceed to authorize this particular project.

There are some things which I think must be said for the RECORD here tonight in answer to the Senator from Massachusetts. First, it is not the position of the junior Senator from Oregon that there should be any centralized installation such as is called for in this proposal, located in any State. I am not taking the position that it should go to Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or any other State. Rather, it is my position that it would be a mistake and a waste of money to build such an installation in the first place.

The Senator from Massachusetts has had much to say about what happened to our boys in Korea with regard to frostbite and other ailments which they suffered. However, in the course of his remarks he admitted that in the past year the situation has been greatly improved. Where did such research take place?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The research took place at Lawrence, Mass.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; and in a good many other places besides Lawrence, Mass. Some of the textile research in that connection took place at Philadelphia. Some of the research with respect to food problems which existed in Korea took place in Chicago.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, on the basis of that statement alone I think the Senator from Massachusetts has greatly weakened his case. It proves the need for individual laboratories, rather than to have them all under one big expensive tent up at Natick, Mass., and it proves that a big installation is needed. The job is being done now without this huge installation.

But there are some other things which should be brought to light with regard to this matter. That is why I think the Johnson subcommittee—and I am a member of that committee—had better go to work on this matter.

I am advised this afternoon that at one point in the history of this case there was a report from a committee of specialists which was suppressed by the Quartermaster Corps. I am also advised that that report, when it first came out, was against locating the laboratory at Natick. We know how the Pentagon Building goes to work when it wants its way, in the face of an adverse report. I am also advised that, after the heat was put on, the report was finally changed, and a report was issued which advocated placing the laboratory at Natick. When I receive information like that, I smell something which does not have a pleasing aroma. We had better find the source of the smell. I think it is in the Quartermaster General's office. I think he ought to be brought before the Johnson committee and cross-examined, first, as to whether or not there was an unfavorable report and under what circumstances that unfavorable report was subsequently turned into a favorable report.

I think this question ought to be examined from top to bottom. I do not accept the explanation given here this afternoon by my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand a report which I believe is the report to which the Senator from Oregon has referred. It is signed by all the research directors responsible for quartermaster research and development work. It is dated April 10, 1951. It is a report to the Quartermaster General. I wish to read two recommendations, and then I think this report, which I believe is the suppressed report to which the Senator from Oregon refers, should be placed in the RECORD.

I read from the report.

It is recommended that the site selected by the committee as its No. 1 choice for the Quartermaster Laboratory be regarded as unsatisfactory and that the proposed laboratory not be constructed there.

It is further recommended that a more suitable location be found, preferably along the New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C. axis.

Mr. President, I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 10, 1951.

Subject: Report of official travel.
To: The Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

SECTION I

(a) Travel order number and date:
J. C. Blake, C–1720, March 29, 1951.
S. J. Kennedy, C–1721, March 29, 1951.
Hoyt Lemons, C–1722, March 29 1951.
J. W. Millard, C–1723, March 29, 1951.
Warren Stubblebine, C–1724, March 29, 1951.

(b) Itinerary:
Left Washington, D. C., April 1, 1951, 2300.
Arrived Boston, Mass., April 2, 1951, 0830.
Left Boston, Mass. (private car), April 2, 1951, 0920.
Arrived Natick, Mass., laboratory site, April 2, 1951, 1005.
Left laboratory site (visited other sites), April 2, 1951, 1140.
Arrived Boston, Mass., April 2, 1951, 1520.
Left Boston, Mass., April 2, 1951, 2300.
Arrived Washington, D. C., April 3, 1951, 0820.

SECTION II—PURPOSE

The purpose of the trip was to inspect the site for the proposed Quartermaster Research and Development Laboratory recommended by the site committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense under Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress, to consider its suitability from the standpoint of quartermaster research and development operations, and to visit other sites in the vicinity of Natick, Mass., which have been suggested as alternate sites for the quartermaster laboratory since the filing of the committee report with the Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

SECTION III—NAMES OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Mr. J. C. Blake, Research Director, Fuels and Lubricants Section.

Dr. A. Stuart Hunter, Technical Director, Research and Development Branch.

Dr. S. J. Kennedy, Research Director, Textile, Clothing, and Footwear Section.

Dr. Hoyt Lemons, Assistant Research Director, Environmental Protection Section.

Mr. Junius Millard, Research Director, Mechanical Products Section.

Dr. Ralph G. H. Siu, Research Director, General Laboratories.

Dr. Warren Stubblebine, Research Director, Chemical and Plastics Section.

Mr. J. E. Allen, Chief, Engineering Division, New England Division, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Battis, Assistant Chief, Real Estate Division, New England Division, Corps of Engineers.

Mr. Hines, Washington representative for real estate development, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SECTION IV—OBSERVATIONS

(a) *Description of the site recommended by the site committee*

The site offered by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which was selected by the site committee as its No. 1 choice out of 340 sites offered for the Quartermaster Laboratory, is a triangular plot of land, approximately 40 acres in extent, located on the west shore of Lake Cochituate, approximately 5½ miles from the center of Framingham, Mass., and 3.2 miles from the center of Natick, Mass.

As a site for a building of the size of the proposed Quartermaster Laboratory, it is not an ideal site. Actually, it falls far short of what the members of the Quartermaster Research and Development organization have hoped for as the site of our new laboratory.

Approximately 40 percent of the area of the plot is swamp land or filled-in bog. The principal other terrain feature, which comprises approximately an additional 40 percent of the area, is a hill having an average elevation of about 50 feet and rising to a peak of around 70 feet above the level of the lake.

During the course of the inspection, a representative of the Corps of Engineers stated that there was no way to orient the proposed laboratory building on the plot. To get sufficient room, he indicated it would be necessary to dig out the swamp and level off the hill, moving the hill over to fill up the swamp. As an off-the-cuff estimate, he estimated that to get the site in condition to start to build on it, it would cost between $500,000 and $1,000,000.

In contrast to this very sizable cost of making the site usable, it was estimated that the value of the State land was around $5,000, in addition to which there is a small piece of private property in the plot to be acquired. The representative of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts had indicated that it was possible that the Commonwealth might make a gift of this land to the Federal Government. However, the relative value of the land and the cost of putting it into usable shape are obviously out of proportion.

A question was raised as to what the Stone & Webster representative who looked at the site at the request of the committee had said about it. One of the Corps of Engineers' representatives stated that he had talked to the Stone & Webster man who had inspected the site and who had said to him: "We were not called in to pass upon the merits of the site, but just to see if it had water and utilities and was away from a bombing area."

(b) *General surroundings of the site*

Even if the land were a better building site, the general surroundings of the proposed laboratory can hardly be considered satisfactory.

In place of what should be considered appropriate surroundings for a research and development laboratory, there is on one side, 2,000 feet away, a city dump, where the fires from burning garbage threw off a stench on the day of the inspection; in another direction, 1,500 feet away, were the pits of the Framingham sewage-disposal plant, and across the road from that, a drive-in theater. Due south from the site, 1,500 feet away, a

Ford assembly plant is currently being erected on the Worcester Turnpike, a highway zoned 1,000 feet on each side for industrial development. In general this highway resembles U. S. Route 1 between Washington and Baltimore, except that it is a divided highway.

From the general standpoint of the surroundings, it is difficult to commend this site for a scientific research laboratory aside from its proximity to a water supply.

It is believed that a much better site on which to construct an $11,000,000 laboratory could have been found without very much effort.

(c) Accessibility

(1) Accessibility to Other Quartermaster Activities

What has been said above regarding the site deals with it solely as a building site. There is the further matter of accessibility to the laboratory after it is constructed which must be regarded as of paramount importance to our particular operation.

It is true that one of the conditions laid down was that the laboratory should be within an over-night trip from Washington. This does not mean, however, that everything within the range of 16 hours on a train from Washington would be equally good as a site for a Department of Defense laboratory. All of the other services, except the Air Force, maintain their research and development laboratories within a close proximity to Washington, as follows:

	Mileage from Washington
Department of the Army:	
Chemical Corps:	
Edgewood, Md.	58
Frederick, Md.	46
Ordnance:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Aberdeen, Md.	70
Frankford Arsenal, Philadelphia, Pa.	140
Corps of Engineers, Fort Belvoir, Va.	18
Office of the Surgeon General, Brooklyn, N. Y.	225
Department of the Navy:	
Office of Naval Research, Washton, D. C.:	
Naval Ordnance Research Laboratory, White Oak, Md.	15
David Taylor Model Basin, Carderock, Md.	15
U. S. Marine Corps: Quantico Va.	38
Department of the Air Force: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio	596

(The papers have recently published an article to the effect that the Air Force is moving its research and development activities from Wright Field to the vicinity of Washington.)

Because of the distance of the proposed site from Washington, it seems clear that it would continue to be essential to retain in Washington, an R. and D. staff approximating in numbers and responsibility that of the group now located there in order to provide the technical support to the activities of the Quartermaster General which is required of it. It is the considered opinion of all of the research directors signing this report that construction of a Quartermaster Research and Development Laboratory at a location situated as far away from Washington and at as inaccessible a site as Natick, Mass., actually would defeat the purpose for which the laboratory is to be constructed, namely, to consolidate quartermaster research and development activities in a central location.

Furthermore, it is the considered opinion of the research directors signing this report that the location of the laboratory as far from Washington as Natick may well result in the cancellation of most or all of the economies anticipated from the consolidation of these activities, through the additional travel and communication expenses required on the part of its staff in carrying out its work with the quartermaster activities and in coordination with other military and civilian research and development organizations.

(2) Accessibility to Civilian Scientists and Industrial Research Organizations and Consultants

It is considered that the Natick site, while perhaps not too inconvenient to New England scientific and industrial research organizations and consultants, is not sufficiently centrally located to serve such organizations elsewhere in the country, whereas a location on the New York-Philadelphia-Washington axis would be far more accessible to the American industry and scientists as a whole.

(3) Accessibility to Personnel on the Staff of the Laboratory

One of the important considerations in the location of the laboratory was to place it near educational institutions so that members of the staff could carry on graduate work at these institutions on a cooperative basis, thereby making work in the laboratory attractive to younger scientists, and at the same time tapping the resources of the neighboring universities. The location of the laboratory 3.2 miles from the railway station in Natick and 5½ miles from Framingham does not make it favorable under present train schedules for people to commute readily from Boston to the laboratory, except by private car. Since many of the staff cannot be expected to own a car, the commuting train schedules are indicative of the problem which these people would face:

Commuting trains

Leave Boston	7:25	7:30	9:00
Arrive Natick	8:08	----	----
Arrive Framingham	8:15	8:05	9:31
RETURNING			
Leave Framingham	4:45	5:33	7:43
Leave Natick	4:52	----	7:56
Arrive Boston	5:35	6:10	9:05

In addition to the limitations of the train schedule, there will be a necessity for these people to obtain a bus connection to the laboratory, for which an additional 20 to 40 minutes will be required, depending upon connections, to say nothing of their own streetcar or bus connections in Boston.

What has been said above with regard to the difficulties of commuting from Boston to the laboratory would be equally applicable to industrial consultants and scientists who may wish to visit the laboratory. Difficulties of train connections, chronic shortages of pullman space, the considerable amount of time involved in getting to the laboratory from points west and south of New York, and the actual cost of travel (round trip from New York to Boston, first class, pullman, is currently $27.84), all will tend to limit the degree of cooperation between firms in American industry and scientists outside of New England with the Quartermaster Corps.

(d) Visits to other possible sites

The loss of the Princeton site, just prior to the quartermaster decision to select this site, was most unfortunate, as we had all agreed it would be a very desirable location. The possibility of finding other sites in the neighborhood of Natick which might be less objectionable as building sites than that recommended by the committee, although still subject to the same general limitations as to accessibility, has been considered. On this inspection trip four other sites were investigated: Three on Lake Cochituate (one farther away from Natick than the committee's selection, and two closer to Natick) and one at Riverside, Mass., nearer to Boston. These may be identified for convenience as follows:

1. The 3–F site (presently occupied by the Fin, Feather, and Fur Club).
2. The Natick shore-line site.
3. The peninsula site.
4. The Boston University site.

1. The 3–F site: This site comprises between 60 and 80 acres on the other side of the county road, and further north, along the west shore, from the site recommended by the committee. This land has the advantage of a considerable amount of level ground, and the swamp, which also borders it on the west, could be ignored in favor of the high ground in the center of the plot. This site has all of the other disadvantages of the location and lack of accessibility of the site recommended by the committee.

2. The Natick shore-line site: The available land area here is quite small, and no consideration can be given to this site because of its inadequate area.

3. The peninsula site: This site embraces approximately 40 acres, and is adjoined on the north by an abandoned gravel pit of about 15 acres. The location is about three-fourths of a mile from the Natick railway station. The land, aside from the boggy shore line, is moderately level, rising slightly from the tip of the peninsula to the north. The engineers agreed that this would be a good site for construction.

4. Boston University site: This land is located just on the western outskirts of Boston, at Riverside, Mass. It adjoins the main line of the Boston & Albany Railway at the Riverside station.

This station is the end of the "loop" on commuting trains coming over two lines. From the standpoint of accessibility, this site is vastly to be preferred over any of the other sites visited. It is currently used by Boston University as an athletic field. The site encompasses about 20 acres, and there is additional vacant land adjoining it. Undoubtedly it would be more expensive to acquire than any of the sites on Lake Cochituate and has a further limiting consideration as to the available supply of cooling water.

SECTION V—CONCLUSIONS

1. The site selected by the site committee near Natick, Mass., as its No. 1 choice is not a suitable site for the laboratory or a good location. Its use would involve the expenditure of public funds estimated roughly between $500,000 and $1,000,000 to put the site in a condition to be used. That we must express this view is a matter of keen disappointment to us, since after so long a period of delay in starting construction of this laboratory it had been hoped that the committee's report would solve this problem and give us the best possible site and location which the Quartermaster Corps could hope for.

2. The proposed location of the laboratory in the vicinity of Natick, Mass., may well prevent effective consolidation of Quartermaster research and development activities by requiring, because of its considerable distance from Washington, the continued maintenance of a fairly large part of Quartermaster research and development staff here. Furthermore, the distance from Washington will nullify much of the expected savings because of extensive travel and communication expenses. The same can be said for the other two sites recommended as second and third choices by the committee, Atlanta and Fort Sheridan, which are still less advantageous in this respect.

3. If we are not bound by the committee's selection and if some site must be chosen at or near Natick, the site at Riverside appears to be the most desirable of the additional sites inspected on this trip. A second choice would be the peninsula site near Natick.

SECTION VI—RECOMMENDED ACTION

1. It is recommended that the site selected by the committee as its No. 1 choice for the QM laboratory be regarded as unsatisfactory and that the proposed laboratory not be constructed there.

2. It is further recommended that a more suitable location be found preferably along the New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C. axis.

SECTION VII—ACTION TAKEN

None.

SECTION VIII—OTHER REMARKS

This report is signed by all of the research directors responsible for Quartermaster research and development work who would be located in the proposed Research and Development Laboratory which is currently proposed to be constructed.

J. C. BLAKE,
Research Director, Fuels and Lubricants Section.

S. J. KENNEDY,
Research Director, Textile, Clothing, and Footwear Section.

HOYT LEMONS,
Assistant Research Director, Environmental Protection Section.

J. W. MILLARD,
Research Director, Mechanical Products Section.

RALPH G. H. SIU,
Research Director, General Laboratories.

WARREN STUBBLEBINE,
Research Director, Chief, Chemical and Plastics Section.

Noted:

W. H. MIDDLESWART,
Major General, U. S. Army, Chief, Military Planning Division.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That report was made because of certain marshy plots of ground. The site was actually moved less than 1 mile, and the site which is now chosen is less than a mile from the site which the Senator has just described. That was the subject matter of the report which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] was asked to investigate and with respect to which he recommended no action.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My good friend from Massachusetts, I think, has unintentionally confused certain reports. The report to which I refer recommended that the laboratory not be located in Natick at all, but that "a more suitable location be found preferably along the New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D. C. axis." Natick is north of that axis.

Mr. President, I also hold in my hand a letter from Dr. B. R. Van Leer, president of the Georgia Institute of Technology, which goes into the question of the location within the town of Natick itself, and in which he says that the site which is now chosen, in Natick, was not the site which the other committee recommended at all, and that therefore he believes that the whole process is illegal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my first point by way of summary is that I have serious question as to the desirability of placing all this applied research under one roof. We are not talking about pure science research. We are talking about applied research. I point out that American industry in the great plants of this country does not separate manufacturing from applied research. A great job of applied research is being done in American industry in such concerns as General Electric, General Foods, and the various textile industries, and many others. I think there is a great deal of waste in the whole idea of having this tremendous, costly installation.

When the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] talks about $11,000,000, in my judgment he is talking about the first installment. Once this project is started, we shall be adding the Philadelphia operations, then the Jeffersonville operations, then the Chicago operations, and many other additional operations. I have been advised that before we are through with this program it will involve much more than $11,000,000, and probably in the neighborhood of $200,000,000, before the military authorities are through asking Congress, in the years immediately ahead, for funds for this kind of installation. Frankly I do not know what the facts are but I think we ought to find out what the final cost of this project may prove to be.

I think this is another chance to put the screws on the military so far as wasteful practices are concerned and to force them to economize. We should tell them to continue to use existing facilities, which, I think, have already demonstrated that they can do a pretty good job in this field, rather than to pour out large sums for such a project as is proposed. Senators from several States who have been rebuffed by the Pentagon Building on this issue have presented a point of view on the floor of the Senate today which disturbs me. I believe that as Members of the Senate, we ought to find out what the facts are, and that we should not, at the eleventh hour, put through an authorization for this kind of project without knowing all the facts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he has information as to whether the land in Natick, already purchased by the Government, possibly prematurely, might not be a good location for the hoof and mouth disease laboratory, in order that the Government's investment might not be lost.

Mr. MORSE. I am not familiar with that problem. My point is that we should investigate the subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I seriously doubt that the people of Massachusetts would be interested in paying 50 percent of the purchase price in order to reacquire it. That is what prompted my inquiry as to some other Government use of the property.

Mr. MORSE. I would be surprised if that were not true. I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Oregon has so ably stated, that a letter was furnished to the Under Secretary of War, which was written by Mr. Reynolds, the vice president of the Reynolds Metal Co., in which he said the Reynolds Metal Co. had established such a laboratory for research but found it unsatisfactory, and had distributed its research work among separate factories.

Mr. MORSE. When I was told on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that Senators from five States have been unable to date to get an audience with the Secretary of Defense to discuss this subject I reached the suspicion that apparently a brush-off is being given to them. We had better find out why Senators from five States could not sit down with the Secretary of Defense, in order to find out what his position is on the subject and what his reasons are. The Senators should not be relegated to some subordinate in the Pentagon who does not have the power of decision.

When I heard that statement I had heard almost enough. Then when the other facts started to unfold I became convinced that this project had better be delayed in the interest not only of economy, but of sound administration as well. I yield now to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon a moment ago said in his discussion of this amendment that he felt the project should not be pushed through at this late hour. I want the record to be clear that nothing was said about this project before the subcommittee on appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. If we do not stop the use of the funds we will not stop the project from going forward.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Until the Senator from Pennsylvania presented his amendment about an hour ago or 45 minutes ago the Senator from Wyoming had heard nothing about this project. I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts that I thought it might be well to take the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania to conference so that there could be a hearing on it; but I rise merely to make it clear that the Committee on Appropriations has had no opportunity to vote on such a project.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I should like to say, in response to what the Senator from Wyoming has just stated, that insofar as the junior Senator from Kentucky, and others are concerned, we did not know anything about the proposal until it came to light that plans were being made to move quite a number of personnel from the separate laboratories which were already established and doing perfectly satisfactory work. We did not realize that a project of this kind was under way, or certainly some of us would have gone before the subcommittee in time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to collaborate in the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]

with reference to the possible illegality of the action which has been taken. Public Law 424 of the Eighty-first Congress provided that the Secretary of Defense was to make a site location after an impartial ad hoc committee had determined on the site. The fact is that the impartial committee had determined upon a site which was rejected and found unsuitable. Following that rejection, the Secretary of Defense, without any further action, or any further investigation by an ad hoc committee, went ahead and determined on another site. The first site would have cost the Government approximately $5,000. That was the site at Natick, Mass., which was rejected as being unsuitable. The second site, which was finally agreed upon, without the aid of any ad hoc committee to make any determination, cost the Government $100,000. Those facts should be made clear in the RECORD.

Furthermore, I believe the intent of the law which Congress passed that an ad hoc committee make a determination has never been fulfilled. Therefore, the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon that the matter be carefuly studied is not only meritorious, but the only one that should be carried out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which was written by Mr. Blake R. Van Leer, president, Georgia Institute of Technology, chairman of the site committee appointed under the law authorizing the Natick laboratory, to Representative DENTON. The last paragraph of the letter reads:

> It certainly was not my intention to allocate the site of the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory to the town of Natick, and to permit them to move the site any place so long as it was confined to Natick.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Atlanta, Ga., May 9, 1952.

The Honorable WINFIELD K. DENTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DENTON: I have been on an extended trip to Washington and Chicago, but found upon my return your letter of May 1 relative to the action of the Ad Hoc Site Selection Committee for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory.

The committee, of which I was chairman, chose as site No. 1 in Natick, Mass., and as far as I know, the committee has not considered or passed upon any other site in Natick than the one selected. In fact, I have never seen the so-called "peninsula site."

The committee did not choose these sites on the basis of allocation to a region although naturally regional factors did influence individual members of the committee a great deal in their selection.

In many of the localities of the 340 sites proposed, the communities concerned offered several alternates. In such cases each site was given consideration. At the time the committee made its decision, there was only one site in Natick, and all the committee members thought it was a very good site. It had a railroad on one side; an excellent highway on another side; and on the third side was a lake. (The site was triangular in shape.) The committee walked over all this tract of land. It was hilly and high, and I cannot understand why it was subsequently described as too swampy and boggy. We visited the site about the first of December, and there was no indication at that time of it being swampy or boggy. Why the site was changed to another location, I do not know. All I know about the change is what I have read in the newspapers.

If further proof is needed that we passed our judgment on a specific site, I know of one place that was dropped from further consideration because the local proponents had not described all the facts pertaining to the site.

It certainly was not my intention to allocate the site of the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory to the town of Natick and to permit them to move the site any place so long as it was confined to Natick.

I hope this answers sufficiently your questions.

Yours sincerely,
BLAKE R. VAN LEER,
President, Chairman of Site Committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor for the time being.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me time to answer the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I have any time remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe approximately 20 minutes remain. I should say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota—and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who is now in the Chamber will bear me out in what I am about to say, or correct me if I do not state the facts correctly—that the original site picked by the selection board headed by Professor Van Leer was at Natick. The report of the ad hoc committee states:

> The Natick site is located 15 miles from Boston, at the northwest corner of Natick, Middlesex County, Mass., and was proposed by the Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission, Boston, Mass.
>
> The area is approximately 20 acres and is bordered on the east by Lake Cochituate, from which an ample source of cooling water would be available.

I shall not read the whole report, but I should like to call the matter to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota. The site was moved half a mile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was not illegally moved. By moving it the sum of $914,975 was saved. The total cost of the first site, with the acquisition of land and what had to be put in, would have been $1,025,225. The cost of acquisition of the second site, which was finally chosen, was $110,250; therefore a saving of $914,975 was made. That saving of a million dollars was accomplished by moving the site a mile.

I shall not labor this point further, except to say that the basis of the acquisition was Public Law 424 of the Eighty-first Congress. It authorized the acquisition of land and the construction thereon of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps. The law further provided that the site should be chosen by the Secretary of Defense on the basis of recommendations of an impartial ad hoc committee of experts to be appointed by the Research and Development Board of the Department of Defense.

I should like to read the names of the experts. If there is anything wrong with the gentlemen who have chosen Massachusetts as the site of the laboratory I should like to know about it. They are:

Dr. Blake R. Van Leer, president of the Georgia Institute of Technology, one of the largest engineering educational and research institutions in the country.

Dr. Chester M. Alter, dean of the Graduate School of Boston University, which undertakes large research programs and has carried on research projects for the Government.

Dr. H. S. Coleman, assistant director, Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, Pittsburgh, Pa., one of the oldest research institutions in the country.

Dr. Donald H. Loughridge, who was then in charge of research and scientific affairs in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Gilbert H. Scribner, of Winston & Co., one of the largest real-estate companies in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. John P. Traynor, assistant vice president of the Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, which has invested heavily in real estate.

That was the committee which chose the site in Natick. After having 340 sites in 40 States submitted to it, the committee selected the first five or seven—I do not remember which. Out of those five or seven, all of which were visited personally, I believe, by the full Commission—although I am not certain of that—Natick was selected.

Mr. President, I shall not further labor the point.

The Senator from Illinois has submitted a report. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Ad Hoc Site Selection Committee for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory, dated January 23, 1951.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD—REPORT OF THE AD HOC SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR THE QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH LABORATORY

This report was approved by the Chairman, RDB, and forwarded to the Secretary of Defense on February 8, 1951. On March 8, 1951, the Acting Secretary of the Defense notified the Secretary of the Department of the Army that location of the Quartermaster Corps Research Laboratory on the Natick, Mass., site was approved, when and if it is decided to undertake construction of the facility.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C. January 23, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM WEBSTER,
Chairman, Research and Development Board, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBSTER: In accordance with its directive, RDB 69/23, dated April 6, 1950, the ad hoc committee which you appointed to make recommendations regarding a site for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory, authorized by Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress, herewith submits its report.

Some 340 site proposals have been reviewed in detail. In arriving at its recommendations, the committee has weighed the essential and desirable technical features of the laboratory as presented by representatives of the Quartermaster General, together

with the cultural and economic factors which bear on the location of the facility.

Sincerely,

BLAKE R. VAN LEER,
Chairman.
CHESTER M. ALTER.
H. S. COLEMAN.
DONALD H. LOUGHRIDGE,
GILBERT H. SCRIBNER.
JOHN P. TRAYNOR.

1. INTRODUCTION

By letter dated March 22, 1950, the Chairman of the Research and Development Board asked this committee to serve as an "ad hoc committee of experts" to recommend a site for the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory in compliance with the provisions of Public Law 424, 81st Congress, approved October 28, 1949, and with a further directive from the Secretary of Defense, dated November 21, 1949.

At the committee's first meeting on May 12, 1950, the assistant executive secretary of the research and development board acquainted the members with the chronological events leading to the establishment of the committee and representatives from the Office of the Quartermaster General and the Corps of Engineers presented the minimum requirements of the laboratory. The committee has also studied the report of the ad hoc study group on the quartermaster proposal for a consolidated research and development laboratory[1] headed by Dr. Milton Harris.[2] Since this report and other documents on file with the RDB contain complete background information on the laboratory and the need therefor, and since the committee is concerned only with the selection of a site for the facility, this report will be confined simply to the criteria and procedures whereby the members have arrived at the conclusions and recommendations set forth.

2. PROCEDURE

A guide for preparation of site proposals[3] was prepared by the Office of the Chief of Engineers in cooperation with the RDB secretariat and personnel from the Office of the Quartermaster General. The guide, as submitted to the committee at its first meeting was approved with the added stipulation that "the Government would not be liable for the payment of any commission or fee for services in connection with the aquisition of land."

Approximately 1,300 copies of the Guide, with covering letter and releases containing information relevant to the committee membership and dead-line date for submitting site proposals, August 1, 1950, were distributed to all Members of Congress, to the press, and also to several hundred chambers of commerce and State agencies.

Approximately 340 site proposals, representing 40 States, were received. The majority of the proposals were submitted by chambers of commerce, but in some cases submissions were made by State or county organizations and by individuals. As the number of submittals was so much greater than had been anticipated, arrangements were made with the approval of the chairman, RDB, and the cooperation of the Army Secretary, RDB, to obtain the services of a group of Army Reserve officers with suitable engineering background and experience to screen the data received. Accordingly, four officers, each of whom was experienced in some pertinent field of engineering, were assigned for a 2 weeks' tour of duty with the Research and Development Board for the period August 15–29.

The reviewing officers first made a preliminary analysis of the proposals to assess the sites for basic minimum requirements as stipulated by the Quartermaster Corps and set forth in the Guide. One of the prime requisites, in the opinion of the Quartermaster Corps, was that the laboratory should have relatively easy accessibility to Washington, D. C., in view of the necessity of constant consultation with the central offices of the Quartermaster General, the General Staff, and other Department of Defense agencies. The cost of travel was also considered. In accordance with this important factor, the reviewing officers used the criterion that the site should not be more than an overnight train trip from Washington. This automatically ruled out all those sites west of the Mississippi River and those in the deep South. The committee later used the more definite criterion that the site should not be more than 1,000 miles distant from Washington, but this only altered the grouping of sites by the reviewing officers in a few cases.

The important requirement for at least 16,000,000 gallons of cooling water (at a temperature not in excess of 85° F.) a day was a criterion which many of the sites proposed could not meet. In some cases, although the sites could meet this requirement, their location would necessitate pumping the water a considerable distance and they were therefore ruled out for reasons of economy. An ample supply of potable water was also a basic requirement and this was a questionable factor in several instances.

Since cultural and educational advantages were considered to be two of the most important requirements for an institution of this sort, it was agreed that any site recommended should be within 25 miles of a city with 100,000 or more population. A great many of the sites proposed did not meet this requirement.

The fourth basic minimum requirement was that electric power capacity be immediately available.

When the reviewing officers had completed the preliminary analysis, they found that only 38 sites met all minimum requirements.

A detailed engineering analysis was then made of each of the 38 sites. In this analysis the officers evaluated the sites against the following factors: cost to the Government; sources and cost of power and fuel; fire-fighting equipment available at the site; soil and hydrological conditions; proximity to cultural and social centers; proximity to nearest post office and railroad station; number of colleges and universities within a 100-mile radius; zoning laws of the area; and sewage and waste disposal facilities.

From the detailed analysis, the reviewing officers concluded that 9 of the 38 sites afforded facilities, cultural advantages, and locations which would satisfactorily meet the stipulated requirements.

The committee, at its several meetings in the past few months, studied the site proposals and the analyses made by the reviewing officers and concurred, with but a few exceptions, in their findings. The members agreed that a qualified engineering firm should be engaged to make on-the-spot investigations of the sites in question to confirm and supplement the information which had been submitted by the sponsors and upon which the engineering evaluation had been made. Through the cooperation of the Department of the Army, the Stone & Webster Engineering Corp. was engaged to investigate the following factors at each of the sites being considered most seriously: Location; soil and foundation conditions; hydrological conditions; land values; regional factors—including zoning laws or codes, means and costs of transportation, and general labor supply; water supply; electric power, steam and fuel; and sewage and waste disposal facilities. Later, this same firm was asked to furnish comparative estimated costs of installation and operation of facilities at the sites under consideration.

A great deal of thought was given to general living conditions and to cultural and educational advantages in the areas under consideration. Representatives from the office of the Quartermaster General pointed out that it is difficult for the Government to get and keep good scientists in view of the competition with industry for trained personnel and that therefore the location finally selected for the laboratory should be as attractive as possible, and should appeal not only to the research workers themselves but to their families.

Certain sites have been eliminated because they are located within heavily industrialized areas which might be prime targets in case of war. Moreover, such crowded, industrialized cities do not offer the best living conditions—conditions which are conducive to the peace of mind so necessary for creative work on the part of the scientists, and wholesome living for their families.

By directive,[4] issued on April 28, 1950, the RDB advised this committee that "in the interest of economy and maximum utilization of existing Government facilities, site proposals should be considered in the following priority groups: (1) Sites utilizing Government-owned lands and buildings requiring some remodeling and some new construction; (2) sites utilizing Government-owned land requiring all new construction; (3) sites requiring Government acquisition of land with buildings, requiring remodeling and possible new construction; (4) sites requiring Government acquisition of land only, requiring all new construction."

Several Government-owned sites were proposed. Upon inquiry, it was learned from the military departments and the General Services Administration that many of them are already being utilized by the Government and others would be of strategic importance to the Government, in case of a national emergency, for the purposes more immediate and urgent than a research institution. Many Government-owned sites were not sufficiently adaptable to meet the requirements of this type of research laboratory. After a detailed study of the Government-owned sites proposed, it was the opinion of the committee that only the one adjacent to Fort Sheridan met all the requirements for the laboratory.[5]

The members of this committee have spent several months studying the site proposals. They have evaluated them with regard to the primary physical and engineering requisites; they have considered the economical importance and the exigency of having the laboratory within 1,000 miles of Washington, D. C.; they have studied the cultural and educational advantages available for the scientists and research workers within close proximity to the sites; and last, but not least, they have given a great deal of thought and consideration to general living conditions for the workers and their families. This point was stressed in the Harris report and the committee believes that its importance cannot be overemphasized.

The committee has studied seriously, and even exhaustively, all of the factors set forth here, and the members have made an inspection tour of the sites recommended. It is believed that the decision reached is sound and that any one of the sites recommended would meet the requirements of the laboratory and provide an above-average location.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends in order of priority sites at the following locations:

1. Natick, Mass.
2. Fort Sheridan, Ill.
3. Atlanta, Ga.

[1] RDB 69/4.
[2] Director of Harris Research Laboratories, Washington, D. C.
[3] RDB 69/22, appendix F.
[4] RDB 69/23, appendix E.
[5] See conclusions and recommendations.

Detailed data on these three sites are contained in the files of this committee within the Research and Development Board.

Natick site

The Natick site is located 15 miles from Boston, at the northwest corner of Natick, Middlesex County, Mass., and was proposed by the Massachusetts Development and Industrial Commission, Boston, Mass.

The area is approximately 20 acres and is bordered on the east by Lake Cochituate, from which an ample source of cooling water would be available. The land is almost entirely second-growth woodland, and there are no buildings on the property. The department of conservation, division of parks and recreation, uses this area for recreational purposes, but it is proposed to exclude the actively used sections from the site.

This site affords the basic physical and engineering requisites, and the cost of the property is negligible—approximately $3,000. Both highway and railroad links now exist between the proposed site and Boston.

Two of the most outstanding advantages of Natick which have prompted the committee to recommend it as the number one site are the splendid living conditions, traditionally typical of so many of the smaller towns near Boston, and its proximity to a wealth of educational institutions and cultural advantages which cannot be surpassed.

Fort Sheridan site

The Fort Sheridan site is at the outer boundary of the post on the shore of Lake Michigan, 27 miles north of Chicago, Ill. Data on this location was submitted by the territorial information department, 140 Dearborn Street, Chicago

The site proposed is a 15-acre tract on a bluff about 75 feet above the lake level, all or part of which would be available. The land is gently rolling and partially wooded and there are no buildings immediately on the site. The Stone and Webster report states that: "Although the Fort is an old established reservation complete with shops, administration building, hospital, and barracks, no barracks are said to be available, at present, for men who would be connected with the proposed laboratory."

This site is Government-owned, meets all the basic engineering requirements, and plenty of cooling water is available from Lake Michigan. The Post property is surrounded by unusually attractive residential communities—Lake Forest, Highland Park, and Highwood. It is adjacent to many colleges and universities, to the cultural advantages of Chicago, and especially to the many industrial research institutions in the city. This site partakes of the excellent transportation facilities that center at Chicago.

There was a strong feeling among the committee members that it is generally not advisable to establish a research institution on an Army post (such as Fort Sheridan), since civilian research personnel as a rule do not like being under rigorous military control. Upon inquiry, it was learned that if the laboratory were established at Fort Sheridan, it could be made a Class II installation with only the housekeeping facilities, and possibly security, under the management and control of the Post Commander.

Atlanta site

The Atlanta site is located 8 miles west of that city in Fulton County and was proposed by the industrial bureau of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.

There are available 25 or more acres for present and future requirements of the proposed laboratory from an area or over 3,000 acres of rolling country terrain bordering the Chattahoochee River. Part of the land has been used for farming and part is covered with pine. There are no buildings on the site that would be suitable for use of the research laboratory. The land would be donated to the Government by Fulton County and practically the whole cost of installation of utilities would be borne either by the city of Atlanta, county, State, or companies concerned. Also, Atlanta is strategically located for north-south transportation and the area would probably not be a prime target in case of war. There are several colleges, universities, and industrial research laboratories in the vicinity and living conditions are attractive.

The committee would finally like to say a few words about Cumberland, Md. The fact that this area has a relatively high percentage of its population unemployed has been brought repeatedy to the attention of the committee.

The site proposed in Cumberland meets the minimum physical and engineering requirements but, in the opinion of the committee members, it does not presel.t many other advantages possessed by the large urban centers near the three cities recommended—such as close proximity to large universities, research institutions, and technical libraries. It is believed that the small number of personnel which would be recruited from the area for a research establishment would do little to alleviate the unemployment situation.

The committee is mentioning this site for the benefit of those who may be concerned with the final decision and to indicate that the unemployment factor has been weighed very carefully.

AD HOC SITE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR THE QUARTERMASTER RESEARCH LABORATORY,
BLAKE P. VAN LEER,
Chairman,
CHESTER M. ALTER.
H. S. COLEMAN.
DONALD H. LOUGHRIDGE.
GILBERT H. SCRIBNER.
JOHN P. TRAYNOR.

APPENDIX A

[PUBLIC LAW 424—81ST CONG.]
[CH. 777—1ST SESS.]
[S. 2382]

An act to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Defense

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $11,000,000 for the acquisition of land and for the construction thereon of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Defense, and for such utilities and appurtenances thereto as, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army, may be necessary in connection therewith. The site shall be chosen on the basis of recommendations of an impartial ad hoc committee of experts to be appointed by the Research and Development Board.

Approved October 28, 1949.

APPENDIX B

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, November 21, 1949.

Memorandum for the Chairman, Research and Development Board:

As you know, Public Law 424 of the Eighty-first Congress reads as follows:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $11,000,000 for the acquisition of land and for the construction thereon of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Defense, and for such utilities and appurtenances thereto as, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Army, may be necessary in connection therewith. The site shall be chosen on the basis of recommendations of an impartial ad hoc committee of experts to be appointed by the Research and Development Board."

In accordance with the final sentence of Public Law 424, you are hereby directed to appoint an "impartial ad hoc committee of experts" Prior to selecting members for this committee, it is suggested that you discuss the matter with the Secretary of the Army.

The availability of appropriations to implement the authorization contained in Public Law 424 will depend, of course, on the fiscal limitations under which the Department of Defense is operating. Any site that is selected will therefore be selected on a "when, as, and if" basis, conditional upon the future availability of the requisite funds. This fiscal factor should not, however, lead to delay in the appointment of the ad hoc committee.

LOUIS JOHNSON.

APPENDIX C

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., December 2, 1949.

Memorandum for the Secretary of Defense.

Subject: Ad Hoc Committee for Selection of Site for Proposed Research Laboratory for Quartermaster Corps.

1. In accordance with your memorandum to me on November 21, I am preparing to select the members for the ad hoc committee to provide you with recommendations concerning the site of the research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, authorized in Public Law 424 of the Eighty-first Congress.

2. I have written to the Secretary of the Army, letter attached, and will discuss this matter with him as soon as appropriate.

3. In your absence the question was put to Mr. Leva concerning a procedure whereby we might set an effective deadline for the submission of site proposals. Mr. Leva suggested that when the membership of the ad hoc committee was selected, you might make a press release to the effect, with the additional statement that any questions concerning the information that should be incorporated in a site proposal, and all site proposals should be submitted to the chairman, Research and Development Board, attention: Ad Hoc Site Committee, on or before some fixed date. This date might be set at 2 months after the formation of the ad hoc committee. If you agree, I should further propose that site proposals be grouped as follows:

(a) Sites utilizing Government-owned land and buildings requiring some remodeling and some new construction.

(b) Sites utilizing Government-owned land requiring all new construction.

(c) Sites requiring Government acquisition of land, either without or with buildings, requiring remodeling and new construction.

Other factors being equal, in the interest of economy, proposals might well be given priority in accordance with the suggested grouping.

R. F. RHINEHART,
Acting Chairman.

APPENDIX D

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, December 13, 1949.

Memorandum for the acting Chairman, Research and Development Board:

The procedure outlined in your memorandum of December 2, 1949, with respect to the ad hoc site selection committee for the proposed Quartermaster Research Laboratory, meets with my approval.

Accordingly, proceed with this matter along the lines you have outlined, and in

accordance with my memorandum of November 21 to you.

APPENDIX E

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1950.

Memorandum to: Ad hoc committee for selection of site for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory

Subject: Report of the ad hoc committee concerning the site

Attachments: Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress

RDB 69/18.1, memorandum for the Chairman, RDB, from Secretary of Defense, dated November 21, 1949.

RDB 69/5, memo for the Secretary of Defense, dated December 2, 1949, "ad hoc committee for the selection of a site for the proposed research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps."

RDB 69/21, memo for acting Chairman, RDB, from Secretary of Defense, dated December 13, 1949, no subj.

RDB 69/22, draft guide for the preparation of proposals for the Quartermaster Research Laboratory site.

1. Public Law 424 of the Eighty-first Congress authorized the acquisition of land and construction thereon of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army. This law carries the provision that the site shall be chosen by the Secretary of Defense on the basis of recommendations of an impartial ad hoc committee of experts to be appointed by the Research and Development Board.

2. This ad hoc committee has been formed and attached administratively to the office of the executive secretary. It is expected that the ad hoc committee will utilize to the maximum extent the facilities and personnel available within the Board. Because of the urgency of the matter, the report of the ad hoc group should be submitted to the Board at the earliest practicable date.

3. In arriving at its recommendations the ad hoc groups should consider all the essential and desirable features of the laboratory proposal as presented by the Quartermaster General, with due regard to the technical and economic factors which bear on the problem. In the interest of economy and maximum utilization of existing Government facilities, site proposals should be considered in the following priority groups:

(a) Sites utilizing Government-owned land and buildings requiring some remodeling and some new construction.

(b) Sites utilizing Government-owned land requiring all new construction.

(c) Sites requiring Government acquisition of lands with buildings, requiring remodeling and possible new construction.

(d) Sites requiring Government acquisition of land only, requiring all new construction.

4. It appears desirable that the group present to the Board recommendations concerning several sites arranged in order of priority.

R. F. RINEHART,
Executive Secretary.

APPENDIX F

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington 25 D. C.

GUIDE FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS FOR QUARTERMASTER CORPS LABORATORY SITE [6]

1. Description of site:

(a) Location, town, county, and State.

(1) General location maps.

(2) Area and boundary (property maps): The project will require a minimum of 8 to a maximum of 15 acres of ground.

(b) Present use of land (description).

(c) Existing structures (description and floor plans): The design of the laboratory building embodies special and unusual features which preclude the possibility of altering existing structures to suit functional requirements. Existing structures, if suitable, could be used for housing approximately 100 enlisted men, used as subjects, or for any of the following: machine shop, garage, certain classes of laboratories, such as textile and plastics, or administative offices. If existing structures are extensive and unsuitable the cost of razing and clearing the land should be considered.

(d) Soil and foundation conditions. Description and nature of subsoil, particularly depth to rock as affecting construction costs; amount of rock at surface as affecting building and grading costs; elevation of ground waters; general character of the soil and the degree to which it is self-draining, impervious, or subject to erosion.

(e) Hydrological and geological conditions and features: If the site is in the flood plain of a stream or river, the hydrological data should be reported, including streamflow records, stage records, information on flood conditions and flood-control works.

(f) Land values, recommended boundaries, estimated cost of land to be purchased, ease or difficulty of acquisition, number and names of owners affected. Estimates of cost shall show the net cost to the Government. The Government shall not be liable for the payment of any commission or fee for services in connection with the acquisition of land.

2. Regional factors:

(a) Population of all cities and towns within a 25-mile radius.

(b) (1) Extent to which zoning laws and building codes are effective in the communities within the immediate regional area and prospective tendency in development of land adjacent to the staff.

(2) Extent to which State or local tax laws affect institutions doing similar types of research and development either for industry or for private schools.

(c) Transportation—accessibility:

(1) Distance in miles to centers of population for social outlets and supplies, recreational facilities, and commercial amusements.

(2) Means and costs of transportation.

(3) Existing highways, railways, and airport facilities within the immediate regional area. (Show by map.)

(4) Distance to nearest station, freight office, and post office.

(d) Accessibility and nearness to Washington, D. C.

(e) Housing, schools, etc.

(1) Problems of providing housing for personnel connected with the laboratory. It is estimated that there will be approximately 700 persons employed by the facility.

(2) Availability of grade schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and scientific institutions in the area. The primary and secondary schools will be required for children of the employees. Proximity of institutions of higher learning is desirable, inasmuch as the technical staffs of such institutions could be readily drawn upon for consultation and assistance with the problems of the laboratory.

(3) Availability of hotels, restaurants, banks, hospitals, and churches. It is the intention to hold seminars at the laboratory which will be attended by 200 or more persons.

(f) Type and size of industrial installations in the area. Because of the nature of the installation and the technical and scientific attainments of the staff, it is considered desirable to avoid highly industrialized areas. In order to attract and hold a technical staff of high caliber, the locality selected should possess a cultural environment, providing association with technical and scientific people with similar interests and ideals.

(g) Availability of local fire-fighting apparatus and forces.

3. Water supply:

(a) Sources of domestic water supply.

(b) Quantities immediately and ultimately available. It is estimated that a domestic supply of at least 500 gallons per minute, or 240,000 gallons per day, will be required. (Also see paragraph 3 (d).)

(c) Rates at which water is available.

(d) Availability of fire hydrants in locality. Total water supply required for fire protection (sprinklers and hose streams) is 1,500 gallons per minute for 4 hours, at a residual pressure of 10 pounds per square inch at grade.

(e) Availability of cooling water not in excess of 85° F. from streams, rivers, or bodies of fresh water. The condensing equipment will require a minimum of 11,000 gallons per minute for extended periods of time. The use of cooling towers for a portion of the land would reduce the demand to 4,000 gallons per minute. It is not deemed practicable or economical to consider the use of potable supply for cooling purposes in view of the widespread shortage of water.

4. Power, steam, and fuel:

(a) Existing transmission lines, or power supply, capacity, voltage characteristics, name of company, and distance and direction to site.

(b) Power capacity immediately available and location. The facility will require from 7,000 to 9,000 kilowatts of electrical energy.

(c) Rate information and cost per kilowatt-hour.

(d) Availability of commercial steam services, operating pressures, size of mains and rates. The steam demand for —10° F. zone has been estimated at 100,000 pounds per hour at 100 pounds per square inch. Colder or warmer conditions will require greater or less demand. If commercial service is not available, a suitable plant must be constructed. (See pars. 4 (e) and 4 (f)).

(e) Remark upon the availability of No. 6 fuel oil and bituminous coal, as well as length of haul. Under —10° F. conditions the facility will require 590,000 gallons of No. 6 fuel oil per year with 100,000 gallons storage or 3,580 tons of bituminous coal with storage facilities for 600 tons.

(f) Remark upon availability of natural gas, name of company, B. t. u. value and rates. Under —10° F. conditions the facility will require 87,430,000 cubic feet at 1,000 B. t. u. gas per year, with a maximum demand (coldest month) of 15,000,000 cubic feet.

5. Sewage and waste disposal:

(a) Description, with maps and drawings, of existing sanitary sewers. Sanitary sewers should be capable of assuming an additional load of 240,000 gallons during an 8-hour period each day.

[6] One copy of the information regarding each proposal is sufficient. It should be forwarded to the Chairman, Research and Development Board, Washington, D. C., marked for the attention of the ad hoc site selection committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the interest of having the bill pass, and because this matter was sprung on us, so to speak, if the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will withdraw his amendment to the amendment, I shall not object to having the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] taken to conference.

I say very frankly that I hope the conference will not adopt the amendment, because I do not think it should be adopted. However, if the Senator from Oregon will withdraw his amendment to it I shall not object to having the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania taken to conference.

I say very sincerely to the Senator from Oregon that the subcommittee headed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] has already made an investigation as to whether there was anything wrong or illegal about the matter. The Senator from North Carolina is here, and he can verify what I have said.

So if the Senator from Oregon will withdraw his amendment to the amendment, I shall not object to having the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania taken to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to state that in making the proposal to take this amendment to conference, I was not doing so for the purpose of killing the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was making the proposal in order to have an opportunity to have a study of the facts in the case made by the conferees. I believe it should be with that understanding that the request of the Senator from Massachusetts is made to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if there is anything wrong in this instance or if the laboratory should not be built, I shall be the last one in the world to favor it.

I have been interested in this matter, first, from the point of view of the men in the armed services; and, second, because the determination was made that the site in Massachusetts was the proper one.

I yield now to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, when the resolution was submitted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and other Senators, it was referred to our subcommittee on investigations.

We made a very thorough investigation to ascertain whether there was anything improper about the method of handling this matter. We decided that there was not.

The site committee was sent out to make the selection, and finally it eliminated all the other sites, and selected the site at Natick, Mass. Later the committee reported on that site.

The Secretary of the Army had practically confirmed that selection, but his engineers went to the site and then reported that the choice of a site a mile away from the other one would result in saving approximately $1,000,000, and that the other location would be a better one.

So the Secretary of the Army adopted the other site, on the basis of that report.

We found there was nothing improper in the handling of this matter, and so reported. We reported to the full committee and to the Senator who submitted the resolution that there was a question of whether the Congress wished to have all the laboratories consolidated there.

Of course, there might have been some question of the legality of selecting a site a mile away from the first one, without having the new site passed on by the committee which had reported originally; but we reported to the full committee and to the Senator who submitted the resolution that at least there was nothing illegal in that respect, but that the question of the proposed consolidation was one which we felt should be passed upon by the Congress, after it had all the facts before it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield, to permit me to ask questions of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am perfectly willing to yield for that purpose, although I wish to make one or two other brief statements in regard to this matter.

However, at this time I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, because a proposal has been made in regard to the procedure to be followed, I ask unanimous consent that the time I take in asking questions of the Senator from North Carolina not be charged to the time available to the Senator from Massachusetts or to the time available to any other Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to be sure that I understand what the Senator from North Carolina has said.

Did his subcommittee make an investigation of the merits of the question of whether there should be a consolidation and concentration in one laboratory of this applied research work?

Mr. HOEY. We did not. That is a matter which we referred to the Congress.

We passed only on the question of whether there had been any improper conduct in connection with the matter.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator's subcommittee have before it a copy of the first report which was made to the Office of the Quartermaster General, which the Senator from Illinois inserted in the RECORD this afternoon, and which I referred to as the suppressed report?

Mr. HOEY. We did.

Mr. MORSE. What was the conclusion of the subcommittee as to the reasons and motivations behind the change of opinion on the part of the site committee?

Mr. HOEY. We did not go into that phase of the matter, except to such an extent as to enable us to find that there was nothing improper in the case of the methods which had been used, and that the reason for the change was that the engineers who were on the ground, after viewing the first site did not feel that it met the requirements, whereas they believed that the other site, about a mile away, was a much better one, in their opinion, and they believed that construction of the installation there would result in saving about $1,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say that I hope the Senator from North Carolina does not mind my asking questions.

Mr. HOEY. Oh, no; I am very glad to have the Senator from Oregon ask them, because we submitted the statement.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator's subcommittee go into the question of whether, if the development is begun at Natick, as a result of the expenditure of $11,000,000, in due course of time that development probably will be enlarged so as to include the type of applied food research work which now is being done in Chicago and the type of applied textile research work which now is being done in Philadelphia, as well as other research projects, such as those at Jeffersonville and other locations?

Mr. HOEY. We did not go into that phase of the matter. We made no formal report, but we sent to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the other Senators involved a statement showing what we did. In that statement we did not go into matter to which the Senator from Oregon has just referred. All we said was that if Congress did not wish those installations consolidated, Congress should take action to prevent any further action in that connection.

Mr. MORSE. At that time was the Senator's subcommittee aware of the fact that Senators from five States had been seeking an audience with the Secretary of Defense, for the purpose of presenting to him their side of the case, but that he failed to provide them with such an audience?

Mr. HOEY. We were not advised of that. Our subcommittee suggested that the way to deal with this matter was to have legislative action taken.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Carolina very much.

Mr. President, by way of concluding my questions of the Senator from North Carolina, I wish to say that I have the greatest respect for the very fine job he has done this year, as chairman of his subcommittee, in the field of senatorial investigation work. Every Member of this body is greatly indebted to him, and I appreciate a great deal the very clear and forthright answers he has given to my questions.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In concluding, Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have heard enough this afternoon here on the floor of the Senate, in regard to the procedures which have developed since the Senator from North Carolina conducted the investigation on the part of his subcommittee, to be convinced that, on the merits of this matter, we should submit it to the so-called Johnson investigating subcommittee.

I wish to know why we have reached the point where, apparently, the Secretary of Defense thinks it is perfectly proper for him to "pass the buck" to a subordinate official in the Department of the Army, who, in this case, as I understand, when he sat down with the Members of Congress from those five States, made very clear that, of course, he had no power of determination or decision, but that in the last analysis, after all, it rested in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In fact, I understand that those Members of Congress were not even invited to confer with the Secretary

of the Army, who in this case had more power than the Assistant Secretary of the Army.

For those reasons I think we should proceed with the investigation in accordance with my amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts. The chairman of the subcommittee has indicated to the Senate that this matter was never called to the attention of the subcommittee. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts knows that it is a fact that the construction money for this particular job is carried in this particular item of the pending bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I answer the Senator by saying that it is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the money for constructing this installation is not carried in this appropriation bill, what good will it do to include in the bill a prohibition of the use for that construction item of any of the appropriations carried in this bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan is as much a judge of that matter as I am. The money has already been appropriated in another appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then will the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania answer the question? He has heard the question I have asked the Senator from Massachusetts. If this money has already been appropriated in some other appropriation bill, will the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania apply to this fund or to any other fund or measure relating to the matter the Senator from Pennsylvania has in mind?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I was going to ask for the floor for a moment. I apologize to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for not first taking up this matter with his subcommittee, but we had hoped to be able to accomplish something by having a meeting with the Secretary of Defense. However, we could not have such a meeting.

Then we had a meeting with some subordinates. In that case we had a demonstration, in the Army vernacular, of "passing the buck." There did not seem to be anyone prepared to elucidate this matter, which we felt was most important. It is not so much a question of location as it is of consolidation of various facilities in one place. It has been the attitude of the President and of practically everyone else that these institutions should be decentralized. Decentralization has even been applied to industry; and if the Federal Government insists upon decentralization of industry for security reasons, it seems to me to be most appropriate to consider decentralization in the case we have an important laboratory such as this. The only opportunity we had was to offer an amendment such as the one which I have proposed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the money actually provided in this item, and is the Senator now asking the Senate to prohibit its use?

Mr. MARTIN. The money was appropriated, I think, during the preceding session of the Congress. I would ask the Senator from Massachusetts, is not that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. I may say to the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senator from Michigan that the original site, in 1947 and 1948, was in Boston. It was moved from Boston in order that it might not be within a target area.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts answer the question I propounded?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan is that this project was authorized last year, and the money was appropriated for it. It is not carried in this appropriation bill in any way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania mean that the money would be provided through this bill, or under any other existing legislation? What would be the effect of his amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan desires to ask me the question, as to whether money is provided in this bill for the purpose, I may say I have been checking up on this matter, and I find that, according to the best information available, no money for construction would be provided by this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is money in the bill for research and development, but nothing was said to our committee with respect to the utilization of any of that money for the construction of a project of this kind.

Mr. MORSE. Is there anything in the bill or in the amendment that would prevent it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Defense Department have made their justifications and would not be able to switch the appropriations. I feel as does the Senator from Oregon, that the charges which have been made here are of such a character that there ought to be an investigation. I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts that he should agree to have the amendment accepted, with the understanding that the conference committee would not fail to look into the matter vigorously and searchingly. I say to the Senator from Oregon that the amendment which he has in mind is an unnecessary amendment, because the Preparedness Committee, of which he is a member, is fully entitled to conduct its investigation, beginning tomorrow, without writing such a provision into this bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Oregon, who is a member of the committee, as I am, that this matter was called to the attention of the committee staff some time ago. The staff looked into it, and I am informed—I do not want to make any misrepresentation at all—I am informed that the staff recommended to the chairman of the subcommittee that it was not a matter for the Preparedness Committee to look into.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I want to say is that the staff of the Johnson subcommittee never speaks for me. When I find facts such as I have found in this case, it is enough to satisfy me that we ought to investigate. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to state my position, because I do not accept the proposition that the military will not transfer funds from within this bill to this project. That is what the Military Establishment has done, time and time again, in proceeding to transfer surplus funds that they had remaining in one budget, for use for some other purpose, if that purpose has been authorized. I do not accept the conclusion that some of the money in this bill will not be used in connection with the Natick development; and I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming go into that. I may say to the Senator from Wyoming that I would be perfectly satisfied with his investigation as to whether it would be possible to use any of these funds. If the matter is taken to conference, I shall be perfectly willing to accept that arrangement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I give the Senator and the Senate that assurance. In the conference we will determine definitely whether there is any proposal to use money provided in this bill for this purpose. That will be my method; that will be my activity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I fear the time is all gone.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wanted to see whether we could work out the parliamentary situation. I think that could be done without charging the time to either side. I think that has been agreed to already. I shall conclude with this statement. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I am perfectly willing to let the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] go to conference, and to withdraw my amendment. I want to be perfectly fair about it. My interest has been sufficiently aroused in the matter, so that, as a member of the Johnson subcommittee, I shall seek to have it go into the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement. I do not want, in Massachusetts or anywhere else, anything which is not proper and necessary. This research laboratory may be located in any place where it appropriately should go, if it is necessary—and I believe it is necessary. Massachusetts was chosen, and I am glad it was. I hope that if the laboratory is to be built, it will be built in the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I am sure that neither Pennsylvania, Illinois,

Kentucky, or Indiana, nor any other State of the Union would want this laboratory, unless it would be to the country's advantage. One of the things involved is the additional amount of money which will be required. I know that $50,000,000 is not a large sum in terms of the defense of our country, but it is necessary that we tighten our belts all along the line. I do not think money should be used for the location at Natick, unless we are able to find some very strong reason for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for about 4 minutes, in order that I may ask the Senator from Wyoming one or two questions which, I think, probably will make it unnecessary for me to offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to page 34 of the bill, the item of research and development for the Air Force. Am I not correct in my understanding that the Senate, this afternoon, restored the cut for the Air Force, and that the final figure is in excess of the committee's figure? I think it returned it to $525,000,000, but I am not sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senate restored $68,250,000. It defeated the committee amendment, so that, as the bill now stands, the appropriation is $525,000,000 instead of $456,750,000, as recommended by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. I now desire to invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to page 16, and to the item for research and development for the Army. The House figure is $450,000,000. The Senate committee's figure was $391,500,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. One or two Senators who have spoken to me seem to be in doubt as to whether the action taken on the Air Force item of research and development did not restore the funds for similar items for the Army and the Navy. I told them that I was satisfied it did not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It did not.

Mr. MORSE. I think that ought to be made very clear in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MORSE. The question ought to be raised whether it is wise and sound, to be guilty of discrimination of that kind in favor of the Air Force.

With reference to all research and development problems of the Army, I am advised, for example, and I am sure it is permissible to say this, although I do not want to say more than this, that of the various projects which are being carried on in connection with missiles, some of the most important work and the greatest advances have been done in the research and development program of the Army. I am inclined to think, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services who has had a great opportunity to watch the way the three divisions spend their money, that we get more out of a dollar from the Army and Navy than we do in connection with the Air Force. I was in favor of giving the Air Force the money they needed for research and development. This afternoon we gave to the Air Force, which I think is the most wasteful of the three branches of the service and which should be forced to do the greatest amount of economizing, more money than we gave to the Army and Navy proportionately for research and development. I do not think it is fair. I would rather take my chances with the Army and the Navy on this matter of research and development, so far as the taxpayer getting his dollar's worth is concerned, than I would with the Air Force. Although I am for cutting the budget, I think the place to cut both the Army and the Navy is in maintenance and operations, and not in research. I think, in all fairness, that the committee had better go back to the House figures for the Army and the Navy if we are now going to do it for the Air Force. It is not going to breed very much good will in the interest of unification in the Military Establishment if we follow this course of action. If we cut one, we should cut them all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon will recall that the Senator from Wyoming resisted the effort in connection with the $58,000,000, on the ground that the cut made by the Appropriation Committee was based upon a study of the unobligated balances which were left over, and with the money that was available in connection with the unobligated balances, there was sufficient to last the Air Force research for 21 months, practically, at the rate of obligations during the month of April.

With respect to the Army——

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment.

With respect to the Army, the figures show that the appropriation which we have allowed, together with the unappropriated balance, is sufficient at the rate of expenditure in April of this year to last more than 22 months. In other words, I say to the Senator and to the Senate that we have diligently sought to hold the bill down wherever it could be held down. But I think one of the greatest difficulties in the matter of unification has been the tendency to have one branch of the armed services compete with another—if the Army gets a certain amount, the Navy ought to get it; if the Navy gets it, the Air Force ought to get it, and vice versa.

That tends to build up appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say—and I mean no flattery; I mean it as a very sincere compliment—I have complete trust in the fairness and the objectivity of the Senator from Wyoming, both in his committee and in the part he will play in the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. I shall endeavor not to betray that trust.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to point out to the Senator the position in which he will be in the conference. He will go into the conference with an increase in the item for the Air Force, and he will not be in position to do justice to the Army and the Navy. It is delicate to discuss this kind of a matter, but the Senator can read between the lines. I happen to know, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that the Navy is doing exceedingly important work in the field of research and development, in the whole field of missiles from submarines and from naval ships close to an enemy's potential targets. I think we certainly need to develop that part of the naval research just as much as we need to develop any part of the Air Force research. The same goes for the Army. The Army is doing great research in the field of fire power. It is increased strength in fire power that saves the lives of our boys in battle. I think we will breed, as a result of the amendment passed by the Senate, great unfairness if we do not put the Senator in a position in the committee to go along with the higher figure for the Army and for the Navy. I am convinced that it is a great mistake to let the Air Force item go in on the basis of the House figures and not the Army and Navy items; and as one who believes we must cut wherever we can cut, but that we should cut in maintenance and operations, I move that on page 16, the House figure in line 12 be substituted for the Senate figure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All the Senator has to do to ask for a reconsideration of the amendment and vote against the committee amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. By doing what the Senator now proposes we would take away from the conference committee any right to change the figures.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unless we go back to the House figure, the matter is not in conference. That is what has happened to the Air Corps figure. It has been taken away from the conference.

Mr. MORSE. I am trying to make a legislative record on this matter so that the Senator from Wyoming will be in a position of strength in the conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator does not succeed in persuading the Senate to reconsider the action already taken——

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator from Wyoming goes into the conference with the situation as it now exists, if the facts convince him that he should go somewhere between the Senate figure and the House figure as to the Army and the Navy, he will be free to do it, will he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. MORSE. So far as the Senate's action with reference to the Air Force is concerned, he will not be free to ask for a compromise below the House figure. My confidence in the Senator from Wyoming is such that if evidence is submitted in the conference committee that it is grossly unfair to leave the Army and the Navy in their present position, I know the Senator will see to it that a fairer figure is adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall exercise my judgment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the committee amendment on page 27, line 13. It deals with the research item for Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, line 13, strike out "$75,700,000" and to insert, in lieu thereof "$65,859,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is mistaken. That is for the Navy; the Senator said the Air Force.

Mr. LONG. I was referring to the Navy. The amount I had in mind for the Air Force was very large. The figure ran to $525,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana wishes to reopen debate on the amendment. Under the agreement previously entered into, it is only necessary to ask that the amendment be reconsidered; it is not necessary to have a vote. Does the Senator wish the amendment reconsidered?

Mr. LONG. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the amendment is reconsidered, and the question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. LONG. I wish to point out that the Navy would have for research, even under the House bill, only $75,000,000, and the Air Force would have about $525,000,000, as I understand. The Navy is conducting research on some items that are equally as important to the security of the Nation as are some items on which research is being conducted by the Air Force.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Louisiana realize that the Navy is conducting research development under several appropriations, not only the appropriation contained in this item? The structure of the Navy is different from that of the Air Force.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Michigan point out the other items in the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will try to find them for the Senator.

Mr. LONG. For example, I know that as to air research, the Navy is compelled to spend all of its money, because it has very little allotted to it as compared with the other branches.

In my judgment, weapons can be developed involving the possibility of rockets with atomic warheads being fired from submarines, which would endanger a great number of American cities. I point out that such weapons are more dangerous to the United States than to the Soviet Union. Research in that type of weapon is necessary to develop proper countermeasures.

It seems rather foolhardy to allow $525,000,000 for research and development in the Air Force, and not to give similar consideration to the Navy.

Mr. FERGUSON. In this bill $417,600,000 is provided throughout the Navy appropriations for research and development. The amount of $75,000,000 is not the correct item at all. The correct item is $417,600,000 for this year.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Louisiana will yield further to me for a moment, I call attention to the fact that the whole tenor of the argument which is taking place now is, "You have done this for one branch; you ought to be equally satisfied to do it for another branch. You have increased the appropriation for one service; you ought to increase the appropriation for another branch."

I ask the Senator to realize that that is not the way to get economy. I beg the Senator, and the Senate as a whole, to realize that in the Office of the Secretary of Defense there is an item to cover this subject. There is a Research Development Board which tries to coordinate all research development, and projects are allotted to the Navy for naval research, to the Army for Army research, and to the Air Force for Air Force research. That is done for the coordinated good of the entire Department of Defense.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana with everything at my command that no injustice has been done to any service. We have made certain cuts, among which was the cut in the research and development item, because the evidence before the committee showed that there was a balance of unobligated, unexpended funds, which made it clear that even with the reduced appropriation there was plenty of money to carry on all the essential research, not for 12 months but for 20 months.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. LONG. In view of the advice I have received that the amount is $417,000,000 for naval research, rather than the figure of $65,000,000, which rather alarmed me, I shall not insist on my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana withdraws his request for reconsideration.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to state that this afternoon I opposed this amendment which proposed to increase the amount of money over and above the committee recommendations for research and development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Minnesota that no amendment is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota may proceed for 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. THYE. I resisted and opposed the amendment designed to increase funds for research, because the committee had gone into the question thoroughly and had made a study of the unexpended funds, having in mind what we felt was necessary to carry on the research work.

We now find, after the committee amendment has been rejected, and an increased sum has been voted, that we are apparently in error, because now there has been an endeavor to increase the amount for the Navy and the Army.

Mr. President, I would say the amount recommended by the committee for research and development, as presented to the Senate, was a proper amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, under the agreement, I ask for reconsideration of the amendment on page 21, line 21.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, line 21, strike out "$3,810,042,000" and insert, in lieu thereof "$3,910,042,000."

Mr. CASE. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, the item to which I have invited attention is the reverse of what happened in the other instance. In the case of this item the Senate committee raised the amount proposed by the House by $100,000,000. It is the item for construction of aircraft and related procurement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The explanation of that item is very simple. When the House of Representatives denied funds for construction of the second carrier of the *Forrestal* class, it also eliminated $100,000,000 for naval aircraft, apparently under the impression that since it was not permitting the new carrier to be built, the new aircraft would not be needed. But that was a mistake. We have a certain number of carriers in service, and to complement those carriers with the airplanes they ought to have, this item of $100,000,000 must be in the bill. It has nothing to do with aircraft which will be based on the new carrier of the *Forrestal* class 3 years hence, when it is built. It has to do with planes which ought to be under construction during the firscal year 1953.

Mr. CASE. Does this mean that the Navy is going to build some long-range bombers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. These are aircraft for the carriers. We have in service exactly the same number of carriers we will have when the second carrier of the *Forrestal* class is built. When that carrier is built and ready to go into service, then one of the old class will be retired.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection to providing a proper complement of planes for the carriers which are either in service or are now being built, but I do not believe we ought to encourage the Navy to become a second Air Force and to go into the long-range bomber business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; and nothing of that kind is intended.

Mr. CASE. On the statement of the Senator from Wyoming, I withdraw my request for reconsideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment designated "6-25-52-C."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the amendment contains eight pages. Does the Senator wish to have it read?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should like to have the reading dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reading will be dispensed with, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But with the understanding that on page 6, line 9, the words "this Act" be stricken, and the words "the National Security Act of 1947" substituted therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

The amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee on page 56, lines 7 to 19, inclusive (being sec. 636), insert the following:

PROMOTION OF ECONOMY AND EFFICIENCY THROUGH CERTAIN REORGANIZATIONS AND INTEGRATION OF SUPPLY AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES WITHIN AND AMONG THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SEC. 636. (a) There shall be in the Department of Defense an Under Secretary of Defense, who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That a person who has within 10 years been on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the armed services shall not be eligible for appointment as Under Secretary of Defense. The Under Secretary shall take precedence in the Department next after the Deputy Secretary of Defense.

(b) The Under Secretary of Defense shall receive basic compensation at the rate of $19,000 per annum.

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

SEC. 637. (a) The Under Secretary of Defense shall advise and assist the Secretary of Defense in preparation and execution of a comprehensive program to integrate supply and service activities within and among the military departments, and shall perform such other duties as are prescribed by this title.

(b) Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary shall—

(1) develop standardized procedures and forms for supply and service functions;

(2) eliminate duplication and overlapping within and among the supply activities of the military departments in the fields of production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution;

(3) establish and operate depots for common items and other common supply and service installations throughout the United States;

(4) develop unified logistics organizations overseas;

(5) establish and operate a program to systematize scrap recovery, redistribution of excess materials, and surplus disposal, and coordinate such program within the Department of Defense and with those of other departments and agencies of the Government having responsibilities in these fields; and

(6) develop plans for recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel within the Department of Defense.

TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS

SEC. 638. (a) There are hereby transferred to the Secretary of Defense—

(1) all functions with respect to supply, including production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution, which are now or may hereafter be vested by law in any office, officer, board, bureau, service, commission, military department, or other organizational unit in or under any of the military departments;

(2) all functions of the Munitions Board created by section 213 of this act, as amended; and

(3) all functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff created by section 211 of this act, as amended, with respect to procurement, production, warehousing, and distribution of supplies, including the duty of assigning logistic responsibilities to the military services.

(b) Except as may be otherwise permitted under regulations issued pursuant to section 504 (c) of this title, the Secretary of Defense shall exercise the functions conveyed upon him by this title through the Under Secretary of Defense.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR SUPPLY MANAGEMENT

SEC. 639. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including the carrying out of functions transferred to the Secretary of Defense by this title.

(b) During the fiscal year in which this title is enacted and for two fiscal years thereafter, the Secretary of Defense is authorized (1) to establish, under the jurisdiction of the Under Secretary of Defense, such new appropriation account or accounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title, and (2), with the approval of the President, to transfer to such new account or accounts such sums as may be necessary therefor from appropriations available to the military departments and other agencies of the Department of Defense for carrying out logistic, supply, and service functions: *Provided*, That no funds transferred pursuant to this authority shall be available for any purposes other than those specified in the act appropriating such funds, and no funds so transferred shall be available for any period beyond that provided by the act appropriating such funds.

(c) After the effective date of this section, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds shall be obligated by any military department, agency, or officer in or under the Department of Defense, except the Under Secretary of Defense, to carry out any function transferred to the Secretary of Defense by this title: *Provided*, That the Under Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, may issue regulations assigning responsibility for the performance of any such function to any military department or other agency or organizational unit in or under the Department of Defense, and the prohibition of this section shall not apply to the obligation of funds to carry out any function so assigned. Any such regulation shall be published in the Federal Register and a copy thereof shall be furnished to the General Accounting Office, and the appropriate committees of the Congress.

SUPPLY PERSONNEL

SEC. 640. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to transfer from the military departments and other agencies of the Department of Defense to the Under Secretary of Defense such civilian personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(b) The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to detail to the Under Secretary of Defense such military personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

ABOLITION OF MUNITIONS BOARD

SEC. 641. The Munitions Board, and the position of Chairman thereof, created by section 213 of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, are hereby abolished, and such personnel and funds of the Board as the Secretary of Defense shall determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title shall be transferred to the Under Secretary of Defense.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 642. (a) Sections 503 and 504 of this title shall take effect on the sixtieth day after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 643. (a) In addition to any other reports required by this act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit annually to the Congress and to the President a report of the progress made by the Department of Defense in the integration, as required by this title, of common supply and service activities within and among the military departments.

(b) In addition to the reports required by subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense shall, not later than January 15, 1953, submit to the Congress and to the President a special report with respect to the progress made by the Under Secretary of Defense in developing plans for recruitment and training of a professional corps of supply personnel within the Department of Defense, as required by subsection 502 (b) (6) of this title, accompanied by such recommendations as he may deem appropriate for any further legislation necessary to permit the functioning of such a corps on a permanent basis.

REPEALING AND SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 644. All laws, orders, and regulations inconsistent with the provisions of this title are repealed insofar as they are inconsistent with the powers, duties, and responsibilities enacted hereby: *Provided*, That the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Secretary of Defense under this title shall be administered in conformance with the policy and requirements for administration of budgetary and fiscal and supply management and property utilization matters in the Government generally, including accounting and financial reporting, and that nothing in this title shall be construed as eliminating or modifying the powers, duties, and responsibilities of any other department, agency, or officer of the Government in connection with such matters, but no such department, agency, or officer shall exercise any such powers, duties, or responsibilities in a manner that will render ineffective the provisions of this title.

Renumber the succeeding sections.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I invite the attention of the Senator to the committee amendment on page 56, beginning in line 7. This is section 636 of the bill, a new section, drafted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the chairman of the committee as a substitute for the Bonner amendment.

I am in complete sympathy with the objective of the Senator from Illinois; but the Senator from Illinois knows that when the Bonner committee got its bill to the floor of the House the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House, on the ground that the bill dealt with a serious legislative matter affecting the National Defense Act, succeeded in getting the House to recommit the bill to the Armed Services Committee.

I shall not object to the Senator's explanation of his amendment, but this is a legislative matter, which involves the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House, and I shall be compelled to raise the

point of order. The Senator, of course, has given notice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his very clear statement of the parliamentary situation in the other House. However, I do not think we should allow ourselves to be too much deterred by the jurisdictional differences which may exist in the House of Representatives as between its respective committees.

The amendment which I am proposing calls for the centralization of supply functions within the Department of Defense, and for the appointment of an Under Secretary of Defense, who is to be a civilian, to be in charge of all supply matters.

THE UNIFICATION ACT HAS BEEN WEAKENED

This was one of the purposes of the original National Security Act of 1947, the so-called Unification Act, which provided in section 202 (a) (3) that the Secretary of Defense should take appropriate steps "to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, and research."

When the Unification Act was revised in 1949 this provision was eliminated, providing a legislative opening for duplication to exist. In fact, what we now seem to have is not unification, but triplication. The Air Force is going ahead and attempting to build up a separate supply service.

AIR FORCE STRIVING TO SET UP OWN SUPPLY SYSTEM

As the Bonner committee indicates, it is now creating separate supply units all over the world. I refer to the report of the Bonner committee, and ask that appropriate passages from the report of the Bonner committee, House Report No. 1994, Eighty-second Congress, second session, be included in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION II. AIR FORCE EXPANSION OF SEPARATE SUPPLY SYSTEM

CONCLUSIONS

The Air Force is planning or preparing to withdraw common-use items from Army supply channels throughout the world and to construct or lease additional depot facilities to handle these items.

Expansion of the Air Force supply system to include common-use items heretofore supplied by the Army constitutes one of the significant areas of unnecessary expenditures.

A directive issued by the Secretary of Defense on July 17, 1951, purporting to put a ban on such expansion, has been subject to varying interpretations by the military departments and represents a belated effort to check a process well under way.

Beginning with the so-called Eisenhower-Spaatz agreements following adoption of the National Security Act of 1947, a vast amount of time and effort and money has been expended in planning for the establishment of a completely independent supply system in the Air Force and in separating stocks for accounting, budgeting, and requisitioning purposes. In the case of separation of quartermaster stocks alone for the Air Force, accounting costs to the Army of $4,000,000 were estimated. Huge additional sums will be expended if Air Force plans for the creation of new facilities to store, issue, and maintain common-use items are authorized.

In hearings before the subcommittee, neither the Secretary of Defense nor the chairman of the Munitions Board appeared to be well informed about the existence or content of various policy statements or agreements relating to the separation of Air Force supplies, and in fact the Secretary of Defense was constrained to issue a new clarifying directive upon being made aware of developments brought to light by the subcommittee overseas.

The then Under Secretary of the Army was either uninformed or less than candid in suggesting during subcommittee hearings that the Air Force had only a limited program for the transfer of supply activities from the Army, and he was vague as to the applicability of Secretary Lovett's July 17, 1951, directive to arrangements or agreements theretofore existing.

The uncertain status of Pentagon policy with regard to the separation of Air Force stocks from Army depots is reflected in overseas theaters, causing confusion and inability to make firm plans for future logistics requirements. Field headquarters were neither promptly nor clearly informed about Pentagon directives affecting their supply responsibilities.

There are indications that interdepartmental agreements respecting the division of Army and Air Force supply responsibilities in Europe are not proceeding on the basis of the most efficient over-all utilization of depot and warehouse space now or subsequently to be made available.

Army and Air Force officials generally gave conflicting testimony as to the feasibility or cost of making the Air Force completely responsible for its supplies of common items. Air Force representatives minimized the cost of transfer and emphasized the threats to military effectiveness by continuation of Army supply to the Air Force. Army officials saw large costs in the establishment of separate facilities and asserted that the Army could supply common items to the Air Force without impairing Air Force striking power.

It was impossible for the subcommittee to obtain accurate estimates of what a completely independent Air Force supply system would entail in budgetary terms (pp. 8–9).

* * * * *

In Alaska the subcommittee learned that, in accordance with directives received from the Air Force, the Alaska Air Command would progressively assume responsibility during the fiscal years 1952–54 for depot level storage, distribution, and maintenance of all supplies theretofore provided to the Air Command by the Army except for the distribution of subsistence and medical and petroleum products. It was pointed out that as of October 1, 1951, responsibility for handling quartermaster-type class II items (clothing and equipment) had shifted from Army to Air Command, which now issued them to Air Force units; and that the separation of stocks had been accomplished in accord with Army Air Force instructions.

Maj. Gen. William D. Old, commanding general of the Alaska Air Command, stated that the assumption of responsibility for issuance of clothing and equipment by the Air Force had complicated the warehouse problem. Estimates were given to the subcommittee that 54,000 square feet of warehouse space would be required by the Air Force in assuming bulk storage of quartermaster-type items. With the cost for warehouse construction in Alaska estimated at $15 per square foot, the Air Force would require $800,000 to warehouse clothing and related items which the Army had been supplying. Another official of the Alaska Air Command indicated that the Air Force had requested funds to build such a warehouse and that he had not seen nor heard of Secretary Lovett's July 1951 directive purporting to halt the expansion of Air Force supply facilities. The point was made that the agreement between the Air Force and the Army Quartermaster Corps relative to the transfer had been made previous to July 1951, the initial instructions based on the agreement having been received in May of that year. The subcommittee was advised that the Army warehousing program in Alaska for the next 5 years was based on the assumption that Air Force supply activities would be independent (p. 32).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently the Secretary of Defense does not have the power to check this duplication. He has issued directives, as the Bonner committee has pointed out, in an effort to eliminate some of the duplicate supply developments, but the Bonner committee reports that such directives have been ignored and violated. Apparently there is not yet sufficient authority inside the Department of Defense to deal with this subject.

I quote from the report of the Bonner committee, on page 7:

Directives have been issued in profusion, but the vast military bureaucracies continue relatively undisturbed and frequently operate in ways unknown to the chairman of the board or to his superior, the Secretary of Defense. The cardinal principle of civilian control over the military is vitiated in the process.

PROPOSAL FOR AN UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SUPPLY

My amendment is really the proposal of Representative BONNER. It is his bill, taken over verbatim. What it proposes is that there should be an Under Secretary of Defense, who is a civilian, who has not been a member of the Regular forces during the past 10 years, and who is to be the third man in the Department. He, working under the Secretary of Defense, is to develop standardized procedures and forms for supply and service functions; eliminate duplication and overlapping within and among the supply activities of the military departments in the fields of production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution; and establish and operate depots for common items and other common supply and service installations throughout the United States, and so forth.

Under the terms of my amendment there would be transferred to the Secretary of Defense from the various departments all functions with respect to supply, including production, procurement, warehousing, and distribution.

THE MUNITIONS BOARD IS INADEQUATE

The testimony indicates that the Munitions Board has broken down. Secretary Lovett testified before the Bonner subcommittee on June 24, 1952, that "the present concept of the Board would prove inadequate for full mobilization." He said "the restrictions placed upon the Munitions Board go too far. They provide too much planning, too much advice, too much supervision, and too much coordination." The Munitions Board would be abolished and its powers would be placed directly under the Secretary of defense.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan knows something about the Bonner report. He feels that there is happening just what the Bonner report has indicated. Representative MEADER, of the State of Michigan, is on that committee. I have read the report and some of the testimony. I am wondering whether or not the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Michigan will be able to accomplish what we have proposed, namely, a determination by the Secretary of Defense, rather than an attempt to get the Bonner report into this bill. There seems to be a determination in the House, as explained by the Senator from Wyoming, that the Bonner bill is a matter for the Defense Committee, inasmuch as it involves litigation. Therefore, the House wanted to have it passed upon by a legislative committee. We have proposed to accomplish the desired object through the Secretary of Defense, and to hold him responsible for the elimination of duplication in the distribution systems of the various forces. Does not the Senator from Illinois feel that we may accomplish something through the committee amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have great respect for both the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Michigan. I should like to point out that testimony before the committee indicated that merely giving the Secretary of Defense these powers was not sufficient, because on page 32 of the Bonner report it is stated:

> Another official of the Alaska air command indicated that the Air Force had requested funds to build such a warehouse and that he had not seen nor heard of Secretary Lovett's July 1951 directive purporting to halt the expansion of Air Force supply facilities.

The testimony is clear that those directives have been disregarded. We wanted to shore up this authority and make it strong by statutory amendment.

Furthermore, I point out that the Senate committee eliminated section 640 of the House bill and substituted for it the language in section 636 (a). Section 640 placed a direct prohibition upon the Air Force with respect to establishing or maintaining a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951. In other words, the House language was stronger than the Senate language which the members of the committee have substituted. So we have really taken a step backward in this matter.

Mr. President, I see in the Chamber the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee. I should like to make a proposal to him. If I withdraw the amendment providing for a consolidated service of supply under a civilian head within the Department of Defense, will the Senator from Texas hold hearings on the subject and go into it thoroughly?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not desire to answer for the Senator from Texas, but I do want to suggest that all that the Senator from Illinois need do is introduce his amendment as a separate bill, and it would be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is one thing to have it sent to the committee, and another thing to have hearings held on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Illinois has addressed his question to me. I will say that the Senator from Texas, as the chairman of the Preparedness Subcommittee, will be delighted to give consideration to any proposal made to it. I must apologize to the Senator from Illinois for being engaged in conversation when he made his request, and I did not hear all that he said.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we cannot hear what is being said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want anything I said to be interpreted as assuming authority for the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I spoke of the Preparedness Subcommittee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Preparedness Subcommittee will give proper consideration to any proposal which may come to its attention and which is under its jurisdiction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a saving clause in what the Senator says when he uses the word "proper." It leaves the door wide open for an opportunity to escape.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois is asking me to make a commitment at this time the Senator from Texas will not make it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was trying to facilitate matters so that I would not have to request a yea-and-nay vote on my amendment at this time. I do not wish to do so at this late hour. I am trying to be very cooperative.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall first yield to the Senator from Massachusetts who has been on his feet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory serves me correctly, when the unification bill was passed in 1947, the amendment which the Senator is now proposing was considered. It was one of those steps which the committee felt it did not want to take at that time. It felt it should not go that far in concentrating so much power in the Secretary of Defense. That was one of the problems which Secretary Forrestal had confronting him. Times have changed, and conditions have changed. Personally I think there is considerable merit in what the Senator from Illinois is proposing. I want the RECORD to show that I join with the Senator from Texas in suggesting that the Senator introduce a bill on the subject in January and pursue it, so that the Unification Act may be amended somewhat along the line the Senator from Illinois proposes. I believe it should be amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. January is 6 months away.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I did not hear the proposal of the Senator from Illinois. I do not know of course that such a bill would be referred to my subcommittee. If my subcommittee has any jurisdiction over the matter I can say that I shall cooperate—and I am sure I can speak for the other members of the subcommittee—with the Senator from Illinois and do everything we properly can do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This matter is an extremely important one. We are undoubtedly wasting hundreds of millions of dollars, and possibly billions of dollars, through duplication in the supply function, and we may even be impairing the efficiency of getting proper supplies to Korea. It is obvious that the Department of Defense is either unwilling or unable to force the unification.

The experience of England shows that it is necessary to have a vigorous civilian in charge of the work. It was the appointment of David Lloyd George as Minister of Munitions during the First World War which turned the tide of battle. He got the production program under way. Similarly, it was the appointment during the Second World War of Lord Beaverbrook as Minister of Airplane Production which broke the bottleneck. As I pointed out, Secretary Lovett himself testified he thought the present set-up is inadequate to full mobilization. We may be getting into a very serious situation, and we must have at the top a vigorous, driving man to assure the success of the program with a minimum of waste.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that the Subcommittee on Defense Production was unanimous in its feeling that the principle of the Bonner amendment should be enacted into law. But the committee was aware of the fact that it could not be enacted into law on an appropriation bill. I want the Senator from Illinois to know that personally I have consulted with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I spoke to both of them and told them that this economy measure must be carried through. At the same time I recognize the fact that the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House are entitled as a matter of right to have the opportunity to examine into the far-reaching changes which would be made in the unification bill.

I can assure the Senator from Illinois that the withdrawal of his amendment will be followed by all the effort the Senator from Wyoming can exert to get definite and specific action on the proposal, and to get civilian control.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The assurance of the Senator from Wyoming is sufficient for me. There is no greater patriot in this body than the Senator from Wyoming. There is no one who has worked more vigorously to get both national security and economy. I know that he has spent long and patient hours in taking testimony on this bill. We may have differed on specific measures, but I want to pay that tribute to the Senator from Wyoming. If he will take it under his wing I know—and if I may mix my metaphors and sexes—it will have a good mother.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois withdraw his amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withdraw my amendment with the understanding that it will not die.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have one other amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 58, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following section:

SEC. 640. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to submit revised tables of organization of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with recommendations for decreasing the number of personnel positions, clerical positions, supply positions, and other administrative positions so that the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces may be improved. The respective Armed Services Committees shall scrutinize such recommendations and, if necessary, recommend legislation to require the Department of Defense to reduce the number of such positions so that the combat effectiveness of the armed services can be improved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as I listened to the reading of the amendment I came to the conclusion that it is wholly correct. I understand it means that the Secretary of Defense would undertake a review of the tables of organization with the objective of increasing the fire power of our military services. It ought to be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make a preparatory statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to know whether equipment, as well as personnel, is included.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to include tables of equipment as well as tables of organization, and I so modify my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very happy that the amendment has been accepted. I wish to speak on it for a few moments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment coincides practically completely with a letter which the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Wyoming, chairman of the subcommittee, have signed to be sent to the Secretary of Defense. I believe the Senator from Texas has personally discussed the matter with the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Illinois will yield, I am very happy that the Senator from Illinois has presented his proposal. After consultation with the chairman of the committee, a letter was presented to the Senator from Wyoming, to be signed by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Texas, and we talked to the Secretary of Defense about it. We took testimony for several weeks from all of the high authorities, including the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. As I pointed out on the floor of the Senate on Saturday, a statement in the hearings suggests that this very action be taken. I am glad that the Senator from Illinois joins with us; but I think that the Secretary of Defense is prepared to take action under the National Defense Act of 1947, to require such study to be made, and the Department states that the report will be made to the committees of Congress by January 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it was not my intention either to reflect on the vigilance of the Appropriations Committee or of the armed services or to detract from them any credit for this move. The credit for it is properly theirs.

I merely wished to reinforce by official legislative action the letter sent by the chairman of the committee to the Secretary of Defense, for I believe that congressional action will have more force and effect.

I may point out that the chairman of the preparedness subcommittee, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has testified in a great deal of detail about these matters, in his testimony before the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. In his testimony he has pointed out, for instance, that a Russian division of approximately 11,000 men has about as much fire power as that of an American division of 19,000 men. He has pointed out that reliable information indicates that, on a man-for-man basis, the Soviet division has more fire power, or, in other words, that the Soviet return on its investment in fire power is greater than our own. Apparently that is true on the battalion level as well.

The fact that, on a man-for-man basis, the Soviet units have more fire power, gives clear evidence of the need for review of our table of organization. In the American units there is excessive overhead, both in the lower echelons, and also in the echelons at the division level and in the higher levels. We have too many men in administrative work, in personnel work, in supply work, and in the various other auxiliary units, and not enough men in the actual combat units.

This can be dramatically illustrated in the case of an Air Force fighter wing. During the Senate hearings on Aircraft Procurement—Baruch hearings, May 28, 1952—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which conducted the hearings, developed the following figures:

A fighter wing exists for the purpose of putting 75 planes into the air as a combat unit. To do this, it is organized into five groups—a wing headquarters, a fighter group, a maintenance and supply group, an air base group, and a medical group. This totals about 1,600 uniformed personnel to keep 75 planes in combat.

Among the 1,600 men in a fighter wing we have 54 men doing nothing but taking care of the personnel work incident to putting 75 airplanes in the air. There are also 121 enlisted men who perform clerical work. We also find another 245 men engaged in maintaining and operating motor vehicles. Thus 420 men, over a fourth of a fighter wing, are overhead personnel or drive trucks and jeeps.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to say that I believe the last two amendments submitted by the Senator from Illinois have very great merit. I think we should be very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for bringing to our attention these important questions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New York very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the Senator from Illinois is adding the words "tables of equipment" to the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Inasmuch as suggestions are being made, I wish to say that I believe we could save hundreds of millions of dollars in the field of equipment—and this is no fault at all of the congressional committees—if the military services would occasionally, when they suddenly discover, after they have ordered an airplane or gun or tank, that it may not be exactly what they want in relation to maximum fire power, use the escape clause to stop some of the construction and proceed with construction of what they know will be needed in the future.

I know of many cases where contracts have been let for the construction of an airplane, let us say, the construction of which may take as long as 3 or 4 years, and during that period of construction the Armed Forces find that by the time the airplane is turned out and rolls off the construction line, it will not be what they want. However, they do not seem to have enough nerve to say, "We made a mistake; let us start all over again."

I believe that a tough civilian might well be added in connection with the program developing and producing weapons of the maximum fire power.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to make invidious comparisons between a Marine division and an Army division, but I should like to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a table of comparison of organizational strengths of a Marine division and of an Army infantry division. In that connection let me point out that although a Marine division is approximately 4,000 men larger than an Army division, or about 22 percent larger, it has 52 percent more M-1 rifles, approximately twice as many light machine guns, approximately 1,000 more automatic pistols, and is generally superior in the case of every type of fire power, with the exception of sub-machine guns—the Army having recently increased its ratio—and heavy machine guns in antiaircraft battalions.

I now ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Comparison of organizational strengths: Marine Division—Army Infantry Division

	Army	Marine	Navy USMC	Total Marine
Division	18,187	21,157	1,145	22,302
Regiment	3,668	3,755	147	3,902
Battalion	887	1,081	42	1,123
Company [1]	204	228	----------	228

[1] The rifle company is 204, the headquarters company is 117, and the heavy weapons company is 158.

2. Comparison of weapons: Marine Division—Army Infantry Division

	Army	Marine
Carbine, cal. .30, M2	6,698	6,099
Flame thrower, portable, M2-2	----------	111
Gun, machine, cal. .30, Browning, M1917A1	40	54
Gun, machine cal. .30, Browning, M1919A4, flexible	241	575
Gun, machine, cal. .50, Browning, M2, heavy barrel, flexible	331	187
Gun, sub-machine, cal. .45, Thompson, M1A1	929	99
Howitzer, 155-mm., M1, w/carriage, M1A1	18	18
Howitzer, 105-mm., M2A1, w/carriage,	54	54
Howitzer, 105-mm., M2A2	552	576
Launcher, rocket, 3.5 inch, M20	84	81
Mortar, 60-mm., M2	40	54
Mortar, 81-mm., M1	36	24
Mortar 4.2 inches, M2	2,222	3,199
Pistol, automatic, cal. .45, M1911A1	493	903
Rifle, automatic, cal. .30 Browning, M1918A2	7,803	12,128
Rifle, United States cal. .30, M1	39	12
Rifle, 75-mm., M20	81	----------
Rifle, 57-mm., M18	----------	6
Shotgun, Winchester, riot type, 12 gage, M1912	----------	9
Tank, medium, M443, w/POA, flame thrower	135	85
Tank, medium, M26	11	6
Vehicle, tank recovery, M32B3	14	----------
Gun, tank, 76-mm	135	----------
Gun, tank, 90-mm		

3. Comparison of motor transport: Marine Division—Army Infantry Division

	Army	Marine
¼-ton	999	478
¾-ton	272	190
2½-ton (cargo)	621	289
2½-ton SWB	121	200
1-ton trailers	614	304
¼-ton trailers	636	588

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I am sure the Senator from Illinois realizes that the Army is superior in some respects——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes; indeed.

Mr. LONG. I have particularly in mind that the Army has more trucks and more chauffeurs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is just the point. The 1949 tables of organization indicated that many of the men who should be used by the Army to add to its fire power were used instead to operate automobiles and trucks. I am also reminded of an advertisement in Collier's magazine of February 24, 1951. This was an Army recruitment advertisement and it stated that "Back of each man with a gun there are at least 25 men in uniform." This would certainly suggest the need for a thorough review of the extent of overhead uniformed personnel in the Army.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is accepted. I wish to inquire whether that exhausts the time available to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am afraid I have exhausted the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It might not exhaust the time of the Senator from Illinois, but it may exhaust other things.

In any case, the Senate has to vote on the amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in justice to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I wish the record to show the testimony the Senator from Texas gave in respect to this matter to the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The recommendation of the junior Senator from Texas was made with the unanimous support of his preparedness subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that his testimony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, A UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before your committee today and express some views on the highly important problems with which you are grappling.

At the outset, I would like to make it clear that this is a personal statement and not a formal presentation of the Senate Preparedness Committee. I have, of course, drawn heavily upon the results of the Preparedness Committee investigations. But the conclusions and recommendations I shall express at this hearing are my own. They have not been submitted to the other members of my committee.

THE PREPAREDNESS COMMITTEE

As you know, the Preparedness Committee was formed in July 1950 as a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It was financed originally by Senate Resolution 93 of the Eighty-first Congress and now operates under funds granted by Senate Resolution 263 of the Eighty-second Congress.

In general, the Preparedness Committee exercises the function of "watchfulness" over the Military Establishment which was assigned to the Senate Armed Services Committee by the Legislative Reorganization Act. In the language of the committee resolution, the watchfulness is designed to serve two ends:

First, that the policies and programs of the agencies charged with the military functions of the Government be "the most effective possible in the interest of the national defense."

Second, that the administration of those functions be "characterized by maximum efficiency."

In the discharge of those two investigatory responsibilities, the Preparedness Committee has made a large number of inquiries and studies and has issued 39 reports. All of these reports have been summarized in an annual report and I have here copies for the members and staff of your committee.

No. 1 constituted a study of the Government's program for the disposal of surplus property. This report is generally credited with blocking the sale of many items—including synthetic rubber plants—which the Government would have been forced to purchase later at a high price.

No. 2 dealt with the synthetic rubber situation and set forth a program which was later adopted practically in its entirety. There have been impartial estimates—in which Jess Larson, head of the General Services Administration concurs—that this program saved the taxpayers well over a billion dollars.

No. 3 disclosed that the Munitions Board clearly had failed in some of its responsibilities—including that of building a defense stockpile of wool.

No. 4 outlined the critical shortage of nickel which could be traced to the strangling monopoly maintained by a Canadian company. Since the date of the issuance of that report, several steps have been taken to dent the monopoly and assure the United States a more adequate supply.

No. 5 found that the Air Force was clearly guilty of hoarding manpower—a policy which led to overcrowding at Lackland Field. Publication of this report brought prompt remedial procedures and assurances that the situation would not recur.

No. 6 disclosed the unmerciful gouging of the United States by tin producers in Southeast Asia. The report set forth a program which was adopted by the appropriate agencies and which, according to outside estimates, has saved the Treasury at least $400,000,000.

No. 7 was based upon an investigation of Alaska's defenses—an investigation in which the committee's activities were instrumental in ironing out a labor-management dispute which had threatened to break down the defense building program during the Territory's short construction season.

No. 8 disclosed the misconduct of an Army employee who accepted payments improperly for the routing of Government shipments through the port of Orange, Tex.

Nos. 9 to 25 covered a survey of 16 military installations in which the committee's investigators found many unsatisfactory conditions. These included poor training facilities, misused manpower and misdirected effort.

No. 26 disclosed that there were enough men at these centers performing housekeeping and "chair corps" jobs to make up three to five combat divisions. As a result of this report, the Army revised its manpower policies and expects to get more combat divisions out of the men called into service.

No. 27 disclosed that the Munitions Board and the Army had been asleep at the switch during the days when it would have been relatively simple to build up the Nation's tungsten stockpile. A number of steps were outlined to improve this situation.

Nos. 28 and 30 covered the deplorable housing conditions under which dependents of servicemen were forced to live.

No. 29 consisted of a progress report upon the state of the Nation's rubber program.

Nos. 31, 34, and 36 disclosed the existence of large-scale waste at 20 Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force training centers. As a result of these reports, the armed services adopted cost consciousness programs which should make some dent in military waste.

No. 32 covered the failure of the Army and the Agriculture Department to carry out recommendations the committee had made a year earlier looking toward a close cooperation in the interest of economy.

No. 33 found that there were so many generals and admirals stationed in the Washington area that the city was top-heavy with brass. There also seemed to us a top-heavy concentration of civilian employees in the same location.

No. 35 disclosed that production of acceptable planes, tanks, guns, and other munitions had fallen "dangerously behind schedule."

No. 37 outlined a sordid story of gamblers who were permitted to fleece our airmen at Keesler Field, Miss., up to the time that the Preparedness Committee stepped in and forced drastic action.

No. 38 is a factual account of the powers, functions, and organization of the Munitions Board—a study that should be extremely helpful to anyone that must deal with this agency.

No. 39 on the quality and quantity of our aircraft is discussed a little later in this statement.

As you can see from this review, our investigations have ranged over a wide field. Our primary orientation has been preparedness—the defense needs of our Nation. But no intelligent group of men can study that subject today without giving serious and lengthy consideration to the question of waste.

OUR WASTE HELPS THE ENEMY

In an academic sense, there may have been a time when this Nation could afford to be wasteful about its defenses. By that I mean that we could fight our wars wastefully, confident that our resources were so great that we could count on winning regardless of the cost.

But if that time ever existed, it has vanished irretrievably. Modern war has become so complex and intricate and the enemy we face today is so swollen with potential power that we must count upon a total commitment of all our resources in the event of a world conflict.

Our commitment would be so absolute that a margin of waste could be the margin of defeat. Therefore, we must look upon extravagance and improvidence as positive contributions to the strength of our foe. We cannot rely upon him to make similar contributions to our cause.

Upon that premise, the Senate Preparedness Committee has made several studies of waste. We have not, of course, approached it from the same standpoint as the Senate Appropriations Committee. We have not made detailed studies of the budget nor of the individual justifications thereof.

JURISDICTIONS OVER APPROPRIATIONS

Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress—the Legislative Reorganization Act—conferred upon your committee sole jurisdiction in the Senate over appropriations. We operate under the authority granted by the same act to the Senate Armed Services Committee to "exercise continuous watchfulness of the execution by the administrative agencies concerned of any laws" whose subject matter is within the jurisdiction of that committee.

There would be no excuse nor justification for our trespassing into your field. We do not intend to do so.

Nevertheless, within our legitimate jurisdiction, we have delved into a number of fields closely related to your work. In general, these concern checks to determine how the armed services are using the money that has already been appropriated after due consideration by your committee.

THE NORTH AFRICAN AIR BASES

A case in point is the project calling for the construction of five air bases in French Morocco which has figured so prominently in recent investigative activities of the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee. Here is the prime example of haste making waste.

Originally it was estimated that it would cost the United States about $300,000,000 to construct these five air bases in French Morocco.

A letter contract for the building of these bases was executed in January 1951 and replaced by a definitive contract several months later. Because of the world situation our Government wanted these bases to be operational in the shortest time possible. The Air Force directives to the Corps of Engineers, issued in November 1950, specified that minimum operational facilities were to be furnished within 6 months from the date of entry upon the sites. This gave rise to what is known in Pentagon language as a crash program. In plain American a "crash" program simply means that you go ahead without regard to cost.

Now, nearly 18 months after the issuance of the original letter contract, we have only two of the bases anywhere near completion. Some construction has been started on a third. Meanwhile, costs have been forced up to a point where the latest authoritative estimates are $455,000,000 for completion. There are reasonably solid indications that the final sum will be much higher than that.

All sorts of excuses can be and have been advanced for these high figures. For one thing, there has been a world-wide general increase in construction costs. However, there also appears to have been a lack of liaison between the Engineers who are building the bases and the Air Force which will use them. There was helter-skelter buying that was unnecessarily wasteful because nobody felt they could take the time to figure out the cheapest way of doing things. Accepted business practices and established construction standards were sacrificed to speed. To top it all off we are now informed that substantial construction failures have occurred at the two bases almost completed.

The reason advanced for the tremendous cost of the French Moroccan project is the so-called crash program. As long as we do things this way we are going to operate wastefully.

This is a question of hindsight. I do not think we should content ourselves solely with hindsight. I think we should exercise some foresight as well and that brings me to the field that I want to discuss now.

THE MAJOR SOURCE OF WASTE

From the studies of the Senate Preparedness Committee, I have drawn the increasing conviction that the major source of waste is the waste of manpower. This waste strikes the Nation at least two hard blows:

First, it swells our defense budgets to tremendous proportions.

Second, it weakens our defenses.

In this field, we are presented with a problem which we must solve if we are to strengthen our economy and strengthen our fighting power. I am convinced that this is one area in which every step toward true economy is also a step toward true national security.

WE CANNOT MATCH THE ENEMY'S MANPOWER

We are living in a world where we cannot hope to match the manpower under the control of our potential enemy. We can produce better weapons. We can devise better tactics. We can instill into our people greater enthusiasm.

But the one thing we cannot do is to assemble greater masses of men. The gap between us is too great and we have no possibility of catching up to him. The probability is that the gap will grow even wider.

THE ONLY ANSWER

There is only one answer to this problem. We must find a method through which we will get greater firepower with fewer men.

At first glance, this might seem an impossible goal. But a preliminary examination has convinced me that we are not getting full value from our mobilized manpower. In fact, I am afraid that we have a system where a few bear the brunt of battle and a disproportionate majority wait upon those few.

SAVINGS WITHOUT WEAKNESS

I am convinced that better use of our manpower offers the only hope of salvation from drowning in a sea of swollen military budgets. This is one field where there is a possibility of making major savings without sapping the strength of our defenses.

We must have planes; we must have tanks; we must have guns; we must have weapons. But surely there must be a way by which we can back up the same number of planes, tanks, guns, and weapons with fewer soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen.

Personnel costs are among the very heaviest charges upon our military dollar. In 1947 we spent $5,540,000,000 on manpower alone—48.4 percent, or nearly one-half our total military budget.

In fiscal 1953 more than one-fifth of the military budget proposed by the President would go into personnel costs. This represents the tremendous sum of $10,933,000,000. If this figure is allowed to stand, the total amount appropriated for this one item from fiscal 1947 through fiscal 1953 will be $49,024,000,000.

TEN PERCENT WOULD SAVE $5,000,000,000

In other words, had we been able to cut our military manpower intelligently by a mere 10 percent during that period, we would have saved approximately $5,000,000,000. Surely America—the traditional land of efficiency—could figure some way of making such a cut if it turned its best minds loose on the problem.

That there is a waste of manpower cannot be denied. The exact spot at which cuts can be made is difficult to find but no one can look over an Armed Forces table of organization without suspecting that it represents overstaffing.

To illustrate my point, I would like to go over the typical organizational chart of a fighter wing.

THE FIGHTER WING

A fighter wing exists for one purpose and one purpose only. It is formed to put 75 planes into the air to fight the enemy. To perform this job, it is organized into five groups—a wing headquarters, a fighter group, a maintenance and supply group, an air-base group, and a medical group.

Altogether, this totals about 1,600 men in uniform—1,600 men to keep 75 planes in combat against the enemy. We know, of course, that the men who do the flying must be fed and housed and that the planes must be serviced. We know that there are all sorts of administrative duties that must be preserved.

Nevertheless, a list of some of the people doing personnel work is eye-opening.

In the wing headquarters we have:

One director of personnel.
Three personnel officers.
One career guidance specialist.
One career guidance supervisor.
One assistant personnel specialist.
Three personnel specialists.
One personnel supervisor.
Two welfare specialists.

In the fighter group we have:

One personnel officer.
Four career guidance specialists.
Four assistant personnel specialists.
Five personnel specialists.
One personnel supervisor.

In the maintenance and supply group we have:

Four career guidance specialists.
Two assistant personnel specialists.
Seven personnel specialists.

In the air base group we have:

One personnel service officer.
Five career guidance specialists.
One assistant personnel specialist.
Four personnel specialists.
One personnel supervisor.
One recreation specialist.

CAN ALL JOBS BE JUSTIFIED?

We have 54 men doing nothing but taking care of the personnel work incident to putting 75 airplanes into the air. We have assistant specialists, specialists, and supervisory specialists. We have even subdivided the specialist into personnel, career, guidance, welfare, and recreation.

A further look at the table of organization discloses that 121 enlisted men are scattered through this wing to perform the necessary clerical work. Going still further, we find 242 enlisted men and 2 officers engaged solely in maintaining and operating the motor vehicles assigned to the organization.

In other words, gentlemen, more than one-fourth of this wing is taken up by men who handle records, type and file documents, or drive trucks and jeeps. It is possible that every single job could be justified but I am skeptical—very skeptical.

THE HEAVY BOMBARDMENT WING

In the heavy bombardment wing, of course, the figures become even greater. The mission of this organization is to put 30 bombers into the air and to accomplish that mission the table of organization calls for roughly 3,000 men.

It would take hours to go over the total breakdown of the heavy bombardment manning charts. But I would like to quickly run down the classifications of the 21 officers and 90 airmen engaged in personnel activities.

	Total	Officers	Airmen
Personnel staff officer	2	2	
Personnel officer	4	4	
Personnel supervisor	4		4
Assistant personnel specialist	2		2
Personnel services officer	2	2	
Personnel affairs specialist	1		1
Personnel specialist	2		2
Senior personnel specialist	16		16
Assistant career guidance specialist	4		4
Senior career guidance specialist	1		1
Career guidance supervisor	1		1
Educational specialist	1	1	
Administrative supervisor	1		1
Senior information specialist	1		1
Assistant athletic specialist	1		1
Assistant recreation specialist	1		1
Recreation specialist	1		1
Senior welfare specialist	1		1
Welfare specialist	1		1
Apprentice welfare specialist	1		1
Adjutant	12	12	
Clerk	14		14
Apprentice clerk	18		18
Clerk helper	1		1
Senior stenographer	1		1
Career guidance specialist	17		17
Total	111	21	90

Again, it may be that every single one of these jobs is justified. But at the very least, I think they should be subject to searching scrutiny. I think we should also bear in mind that this represents 1 personnel worker for every 26 men engaged in the operation activities of the wing. It may be an unfair comparison but this appears excessive when we consider civil-service standards of 1 personnel employee to every 115 to 135 persons employed.

THE GROUND FORCES

The story in the ground forces is similar.

Recently, I have had occasion to look into the question of the comparative effectiveness of the American and Soviet types of military organization. The picture is confusing and I do not pretend to have the answers. But the information I have received is disturbing.

One comparison between the two types of organization lies in the ratio of fire power to manpower. The standard units generally used for such comparison are the American division with about 19,000 men and the Russian with about 11,000 men.

SMALLER BUT MORE FIREPOWER

In manpower, therefore, the Soviet division is considerably smaller. But reliable information indicates that on a man-for-man basis, the Soviet division may have more fire power. In other words, the Soviet return on its investment in military force is greater than our own.

This disparity is due to a number of factors. A Russian division has no graves registration section; fewer medical men; smaller gun crews; fewer vehicles and fewer drivers for those vehicles; practically no special-services personnel other than a political commissar; and practically no postal service.

I do not believe we would want to cut out many of the services performed for our fighting men. Unlike the Russians, we value the lives of our soldiers and want them maintained at the highest level possible.

Nevertheless, these are compelling facts which we must consider.

HOW MANY MEN SHOOT?

It is difficult to pin down this figure but it appears that about 37 men in an American rifle company of 180 men cook, keep records, or do something other than fight. In a Russian rifle company of about 115, only 2 do anything but shoot at the enemy.

Our studies indicate that the American infantry battalion—about 800 men—has 103 men engaged in nothing but communications work—approximately one-eighth of the manpower of the battalion. Communications in a Russian battalion, on the other hand, are handled by 25 or fewer men.

It appears that an American .30-caliber machine gun is operated by five men. The Russians, on the other hand, operate a .30-caliber machine gun with three men.

I do not have quite as complete a breakdown on the Navy but here is one set of figures which attracted my attention the other day.

THE NAVY REFUELS

It seems that a commercial tanker operates with somewhat more than 43 men. The Navy tankers, which conduct refueling operations at sea, operate in the Pacific with a total of 282 men and in the Atlantic with a total of 241 men. The difference is due to the fighting in Korea.

The Navy, of course, claims that refueling at sea accounts for the 200 or more extra men. Possibly that is so, gentlemen, but again I am skeptical. I am particularly skeptical in light of the fact that the Military Sea Transport Service (MSTS) operates tankers which conduct no refueling operations with 149 men. Compare that with the 43 men on a commercial tanker.

THE SERVICES CAN DO THE JOB

Again, there is something here which requires a thorough investigation. This is a situation which is beyond the power of Congress to remedy without cooperation.

I personally believe that this should be tackled by the services themselves, with the help of the best brains in the United States. I think that we should now go on record as urging the Secretary of Defense to establish a commission empowered to make the necessary study and report back to him with recommendations for action. The Secretary has authority to do so under sections 303 (a) and (b) of the National Security Act.

As an example, I believe that such a commission might enlist the services of experts from A. T. & T. to do something about the problem of communications in a battalion. It might bring in management engineers to cut down the size of the air wing.

It could do any one of hundreds of things, all of which would represent real savings—substantial savings.

A MANPOWER COMMISSION

In anticipation of this committee session, I have prepared a letter urging the Secretary to establish such a commission. It is my earnest hope that every member of this committee and every member of the Senate Preparedness Committee will be willing to sign this letter. I hereby submit it for your consideration.

This commission should be empowered to examine the whole subject of utilization of manpower. It should have the necessary staff and explicit authority to call upon the service of competent technicians to explore specific fields.

It should be instructed to report its findings at the earliest possible date.

DEFENSE OR DEFENSE JOBS

This commission could determine whether it is really necessary to have the work of battalion communications performed by 103 men.

This commission could determine whether it is really necessary to assemble 1,600 men to put 75 fighter planes into the air.

This commission could determine whether 241 men are the minimum to operate a refueling tanker.

In short, this commission could determine whether our investment in defense manpower is really creating defense or just defense jobs. It could concentrate the best minds in the country on seeking the answer to the vital question of this and every other military appropriation bill.

Are we heading toward national security or national bankruptcy?

This commission would accomplish its task only if it were manned by the finest brains available—men of initiative, bold thought, careful planning, and wide experience. These men would have to have the cooperation both of Congress and the executive agencies to succeed.

The issues which I have raised in this presentation involve the work of both of our committees. We are concerned with the adequacy of our planning for national defense. You are concerned with the money that must be applied to turn those plans into accomplished realities. I believe we should cooperate in seeking a solution to our common problem.

ECONOMIES ALREADY MADE

The armed services have already proven that they can make economies by manpower utilization surveys which they conducted in response to our recommendations. The figures are incomplete but they indicate clearly that this approach is effective and that significant results can be achieved.

For example, the Army has saved by elimination or consolidation 2,692 jobs at 18 installations and the Air Force 6,317 jobs at 8 installations. The Navy has not completed

its studies but is working toward the same goal.

This represents a total of 9,009 jobs that have been saved by elimination or consolidation in the Army and the Air Force. Of course, there is no immediate saving here because the men who formerly filled those jobs have merely been transferred elsewhere but there is an increase in efficiency and effectiveness and there is an ultimate saving to the taxpayer which will be considerable.

I have a letter signed by Brig. Gen. James F. Collins, of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense. He states that it costs approximately $5,500 a year to maintain the average military man. A little simple arithmetic demonstrates that the monetary savings made by not refilling these 9,009 jobs will eventually reach $49,549,500 a year.

We of the Senate Preparedness Committee are quite proud of this figure. We feel that our promptings were instrumental in bringing about manpower studies that result in this substantial economy. This one saving alone represents 200 times the annual budget of the Senate Preparedness Committee.

Surely, much larger savings could be made through a more thorough survey.

ECONOMY AND DEFENSE

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to amplify a point I made in the beginning of my statement.

As I have said, there are more compelling reasons for economy than merely to save money. We must economize in order to save our Nation. We must economize because a wasteful defense is an inadequate defense. We must economize because we cannot afford to squander our strength on nonessentials in the face of the danger that threatens us.

Without economy, there will be no true defense. But conversely, without an adequate defense, there will be no true economy.

NO SECOND CHANCE

We can, of course, save money merely by refusing to appropriate it. But any of those savings which weaken our defenses will become the most tragic waste in the event that our Nation is forced to defend itself against all-out attack.

That lesson was brought home to us forcibly on December 7, 1941. We cannot afford another lesson. This is one course in which there are no make-up exams to give those who flunk the first test a second chance.

It is obvious that there are a number of fields in the operation of the armed services which appear to be wasteful. It is the responsibility of Congress to take such steps as are within its power to eliminate that waste.

IS THE BILL ADEQUATE?

But that is only one congressional responsibility and it is far from the sole congressional responsibility. The basic issue—the overriding issue—is whether this bill with the so-called stretch-out and with the House cuts is adequate. Does it meet the fundamental requirement? Does it provide prudently for the defense of our homes, our families, our people, our Nation?

To this, Mr. Chairman, I cannot in conscience reply in the affirmative.

I do not wish to place myself in the position of passing on the feasibility of specific appropriations nor, at this point, would it be proper for me to do so. Nevertheless I have some familiarity with the armaments program projected by the armed services. I also have some idea of the extent to which those plans will be carried out under the funds that can be made available.

A GAMBLE WITH SECURITY

I believe this Nation has already gambled with its security. It took that gamble when it decided to postpone from 1954 to 1955 the target date for Air Force readiness. This is the decision that has been termed the "stretch-out."

As you know, we have held hearings on the quality and strength of our Nation's air power. We have examined all the facts and figures available and subjected our defense leaders to a thorough interrogation.

After months of hearings and even more months of investigation, we came to a firm conclusion. We summarized that conclusion in our thirty-ninth report which was issued last week.

It was simply that this country should do everything to raise as quickly as possible the air strength recommended by our Joint Chiefs of Staff. As we stated in the report:

"To do otherwise would reduce our defenses below safe levels and be an invitation to disaster."

I have here copies of the thirty-ninth report which I submit for your consideration. Because of military security, we could not reveal many of the facts and figures upon which our conclusion was based. But I can sum up in general terms the factors which led me, personally, to sign the report.

What I am about to say is based upon sworn testimony in our committee's record.

KOREAN WAR FIGURES DISTURBING

We have examined the figures on our inventory at the start of the Korean war and at the present time. They are disturbing—deeply disturbing.

We have examined the plans for future production of fighting planes. There is little comfort in those plans.

We have examined the best estimates on Soviet production and capacity for production. They are shocking.

We have examined the odds arrayed against our small band of airmen who daily battle for control of the skies over Korea. Their courage and achievements are heartening. The overwhelming might which they face is disheartening.

We have examined military experts on their estimates as to the adequacy of our air defense. I am convinced that it is not enough.

Despite these considerations, we have already had one stretch-out put into effect. It has extended for more than a year our time of peril.

What we are confronted with now is an even further stretch-out—the cuts and limitations that were imposed by the House on weapons procurement. If the original stretch-out was a mistake—and many are convinced that it was—those particular cuts can only be termed a tragic and possibly a suicidal mistake.

We must be very cold-blooded about this issue. We must know exactly what we are doing, and the American people must know exactly what we are doing. We must not drift into disaster simply because we are fearful of charting a course and holding to it.

OUR MINIMUM NEEDS

Let us pause for a moment and consider the story of air power.

It is the considered judgment of our military leaders that the security of this country requires an Air Force of 143 wings by mid-1954. To understand the whole picture, we must hold fast to that date. That is when the Joint Chiefs of Staff think we must be ready to face the Soviet Union.

The plans for a 143-wing Air Force, which is composed of 126 combat and 17 support wings, call for an addition to our present force of 22,840 airplanes. That, plus the modern planes we already have, is what the men who must fight our wars consider the minimum figure for air readiness based upon the best estimates of Russian capabilities.

A COMMITMENT TO IMPOTENCY

Two things have happened to those plans.

First, for fiscal reasons the administration decided to stretch out the readiness date to 1955. Stated that way it does not sound so bad. But stated in terms of security it means that we will fall short of air readiness by roughly 6,000 planes when we reach the crucial date of mid-1954.

Second, the House has proposed cuts and limitations on weapons procurement which, in terms of mid-1954, would cost us approximately another 3,000 airplanes.

The story of naval air power is the same. The stretch-out cost us an additional 844 airplanes, and the House limitation would cost us 1,112 additional airplanes.

I want to be very clear about this. I am not just referring to cuts in appropriations but to the spending limitations which the House wrote into the bill as well. I believe it is a limitation upon our national safety—not just upon spending.

It is my firm belief that the House motion in this respect would hold our military strength below the level at which we could guide our own destiny. It would commit us to impotency as the basic principle of our foreign policy.

SHEARS, NOT AN AX

I can understand the feeling of those who would limit the amount of money that the military can spend. I share the disgust that arises from daily revelations of waste and mismanagement. But this is a job that calls for pruning shears and not for an ax.

It could very well be that a careful study would disclose considerable waste in a senatorial office. We might find that a Senator's staff was careless with his funds and used stationery improperly. I am confident that the Senator would take prompt action to put an end to that waste.

That, however, would be a far cry from claiming that the Senator should have no office staff or no stationery.

All of us who have had any contact with the armed services are aware of the tremendous waste of ammunition on the battlefield. Nevertheless, no one has ever proposed to eliminate that waste by giving each soldier one bullet for every two foemen.

There is only one waste that is greater than appropriating too much money. It is to appropriate too little to do a job that must be done. When we appropriate too much we lose part of our substance. When we appropriate too little we lose everything except the salvage value.

In modern war, only the victor has an opportunity to salvage.

ENOUGH TO DO THE JOB

I believe that the American people are well aware of the vital need for adequate defenses. I believe they would agree wholeheartedly with Senator RUSSELL, who recently said to the Senate Armed Services Committee, and I quote:

"This is a country which has always demanded that our fighting men have the equipment to do the job before them. It is also a country which has chosen to sacrifice equipment rather than men whenever such a choice has had to be made. Between losing a gun and losing a man, Americans will always sacrifice the gun and sacrifice it gladly to save a life. That is as it should be."

Senator RUSSELL then went on to say:

"Above all, we must adhere to this guiding principle: Anything that is short of adequate is wasteful, and wasteful in the worst sense. Unless we devote enough of our urgency and resources to do the job, we run the risk of losing all our resources and submitting our capacity to the control of our enemy."

THE THIRD COURSE

Gentlemen, in this whole question that we are discussing today, I am concerned with two major points.

First, we must build defenses to protect our lives and our liberties because both are in peril.

Second, we must build those defenses without exhausting ourselves to a point

where we are too weak economically to fight.

We can solve the economic problem simply by refusing to appropriate money. That is one way to save dollars. But, if by doing so we weaken our defenses, we may find the dollars worthless and the ruble the medium of exchange.

We can solve the defense problem simply by turning the Treasury over to the military. That is one way to get planes, tanks, and guns But, by doing so, we will bankrupt the Nation and destroy the very liberties which we seek to defend.

Ther is a third way. It is to provide the planes, tanks, and guns that we need but to insist upon the most rigid economies. It is to find the proper balance that will give us the military strength to defend our lives and the economic strength to maintain our Nation.

We need—we must have—the weapons of defense. But American ingenuity must also find a way to man those weapons more economically and more efficiently.

That is the course I have tried to outline today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 58, after line 3, insert the following section:

"SEC. 640. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to submit revised tables of organization and tables of equipment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with recommendations for decreasing the number of personnel positions, clerical positions, supply positions, and other administrative positions so that the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces may be improved. The respective Armed Services Committees shall scrutinize such recommendations and, if necessary, recommend legislation to require the Department of Defense to reduce the number of such positions so that the combat effectiveness of the armed services can be improved."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senators from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senators from Utah [Mr. WATKINS and Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senators from Utah [Mr. WATKINS and Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Hoey	Monroney
Benton	Holland	Moody
Bricker	Humphrey	Morse
Bridges	Hunt	Mundt
Cain	Ives	Neely
Case	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kem	Robertson
Dworshak	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Eastland	Knowland	Schoeppel
Ecton	Langer	Seaton
Ellender	Lehman	Smathers
Ferguson	Long	Smith, Maine
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McCarran	Stennis
Hendrickson	McCarthy	Thye
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Williams
Hill	McKellar	Young

NOT VOTING—30

Anderson	Dirksen	McMahon
Bennett	Duff	Millikin
Brewster	Fulbright	Murray
Butler, Md.	George	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Russell
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Capehart	Kefauver	Tobey
Carlson	Kerr	Watkins
Chavez	Lodge	Welker
Connally	Malone	Wiley

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 66, the nays 0. The bill (H. R. 7391) is unanimously passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as majority leader I desire to take this occasion to commend the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for the magnificent contribution he has made to his country by his skill, leadership, and statesmanship in handling and securing the passage of this most difficult bill. His long experience and his broad knowledge of the defensive needs of America have prepared him for the service he has rendered through this long, hard day. His great ability and capacity have long held the admiration and respect of the Senate and in the service he has rendered today we have witnessed an achievement in which his State and his country may well feel a high measure of pride and gratitude.

He is to be congratulated upon the fact that, on a measure so important as the defense appropriation bill, there was not a single negative vote on its final passage. That was because of the conspicuously able manner in which the eminent Senator from Wyoming handled the bill, and the fact that he gave the Senate the full facts and all necessary information.

Of course, the Senate Committee on Appropriations is also to be commended. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] upon the splendid work he has done in assisting the chairmen of the subcommittees in getting this legislation before the Senate in time, we hope, to enable us to conclude the session next Saturday.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to acknowledge the kind and courteous words of the Senator from Arizona, which I feel are more than I deserve. I should not wish the Senate to believe that credit for this bill belongs solely to the Senator who happened to be chairman of the subcommittee. The chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], has been, I may say with a smile, pushing

me for many weeks to conclude the hearings and get the bill reported. I desire to commend particularly the cooperation I received from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the ranking minority member of the committee. The subcommittee was diligent in its application to the work before it, and I am very happy to say that, through the cooperation of an excellent staff, a staff composed of those who represent not only the committee as a whole but who also have been assigned to the minority; and through the cooperation of the Department of Defense, including the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other officials of the Department, from top to bottom, upon whom we had occasion to call, it was possible to obtain this measure, which I believe—and I am speaking for the entire committee—will provide for the national defense and make a great step forward in attaining economy in the expenditure of military funds. I am very grateful to the Senator from Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair may do so, without violating rule XIX, he would like to concur in the compliments paid to the chairman of the subcommittee, the chairman of the full committee, the full committee, and the Senate for the result which has been announced.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to join in the sentiments expressed by the distinguished majority leader. I want to say to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, that I never served on a committee in the Congress where there was more diligent, genuine effort made to effectuate economies, and, at the same time, to protect and defend the security of the Nation. I want to say further that I do not know of any Member of the Senate who could have better served his country in this crisis in connection with military and defense appropriations than has the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to join in the remarks which have been made in relation to the full committee, the subcommittee, and the chairman of the subcommittee. I have served as the ranking minority member with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

As to almost every other bill I have felt that I was compelled to offer amendments. With reference to the bill which the Senate has just passed, I offered no amendment to bring about a cut because I felt, as did the other members of the subcommittee, that due consideration was given to all matters in the subcommittee and in the full committee, and that, therefore, the bill came to the floor in such shape that it could be accepted. I believe it is a step forward in the national defense. I only hope that the Defense Department will take the bill as it comes from the conference committee in good faith and procure for the people of the United States service commensurate with the money of the taxpayers which the bill appropriates. I feel sure they will, because this great defense appropriation bill gives them the means and the opportunity to render that kind of service.

Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to each and every member of the minority of the subcommittee for their help and assistance to me. I cannot too highly praise the work of the staff of the majority as well as the staff of the minority for the able assistance they rendered to me and to the subcommittee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Illinois have had some differences of opinion, may I add my humble tribute to the magnificent work of the Senator from Wyoming. The job of chairman of the subcommittee involving the appropriation of nearly $50,000,000,000 is a crucial one, probably the most important single job any Member of Congress could have imposed upon him. The Senator from Wyoming has borne heavy responsibilities on the floor in connection with other measures before this body, but he took this crushing burden upon his shoulders, carried the load with complete fidelity, and protected the defenses of the United States. He deserves not only the thanks of every Member of the Senate but of every citizen of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to add my congratulations and thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I would have liked to see an even larger amount appropriated for the defense of our country. I think that to some extent we were delinquent in not appropriating a larger amount; but that does not detract in the slightest degree from my great admiration for the work which has been done by the Senator from Wyoming and by the other members of the subcommittee and by the committee as a whole. I think it was a tremendous task extremely well done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues who have expressed words of confidence in and praise of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I have received hundreds of letters from people in my State with reference to the military budget, and I have replied that it was under the capable guidance and examination of a very fine subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Wyoming. I personally feel comfortable and secure in knowing that the appropriation was so carefully gone over. I have listened to the debates, and I believe a great deal of good came out of them. The budget was carefully examined on the floor and the chairman of the subcommittee very ably and very capably defended his position.

It is an honor to be associated with the Senator from Wyoming, and I thank him for the guidance he gave me as a Member of this body and for the fact that I can report to my constituents that the job has been well, honestly, and efficiently done for the people of the United States.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to add a word to express my feeling of gratitude and to extend my congratulations to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], whom I have known for many years, not only as a Senator but also as a newspaperman. I have covered his activities, and I may say that in my opinion there is no Member of the Senate who has rendered more excellent service to the country than has the Senator from Wyoming.

In my judgment, there is no work so important as the proper coordination of the efforts to strengthen our country so that it can resist the international conspiracy known as communism. The Senator from Wyoming has taken the lead in that activity, and I believe Senators can return to their homes tonight feeling comfortable that under his leadership the Senate has passed a bill which will do much to defend the country and avert atomic warfare.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LANGER

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have already paid my very sincere compliments to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] this afternoon, but I wish to take a minute to pay my sincere compliments to another colleague, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. He has recently returned to the Senate from a great victory in North Dakota. I am sure that those of us, of independent judgment, appreciate very much the fact that he has demonstrated through his great victory a political faith of ours, that, after all, the voters, by and large, are voting for the man, irrespective of the political backing that party organizations may give to some men and deny to others.

It is no new experience for the Senator from North Dakota to find that in a campaign in his State he has to fight his party's machine. In the first instance, he has to fight powerful economic groups from outside the State, who poured money into his State in an attempt to defeat him. That is what the Senator tells me he experienced in the recent campaign, when some powerful forces in this country did what they could to defeat him.

As an independent Republican, I want to say to the Senator from North Dakota that I thoroughly enjoyed his great victory in North Dakota, and I hope that in the election next fall he will have the overwhelming victory which I think he deserves.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Has the distinguished Senator from Oregon any evidence that outside money was poured into the State? If so, I should like to have the evidence submitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. There are some who do not like the independence of the Senator from North Dakota, and who sought to defeat him. I suggest to the junior Senator from North Dakota that he try to get the officials of the State of North Dakota to look into the matter. I

would be considerably interested in what the investigation might show.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my resentment to the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon. Any statement that large sums of out-of-State money was poured into the North Dakota election is pure propaganda. There is no foundation for it whatever. If the Senator has any such evidence, I challenge him to present it to the appropriate committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator is so disturbed. I did not make any statement about the junior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. But the Senator from Oregon is making a statement concerning the Republican organization which I represent.

Mr. MORSE. I have not made any statement about the organization which the Senator represents. I repeat my statement that the senior Senator from North Dakota had powerful opposition within the Republican organization. Does the Senator deny that?

Mr. YOUNG. No, I do not; but I challenge the statement that money was poured into the State to defeat the senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. MORSE The Senator does not deny that the senior Senator from North Dakota had powerful opposition from organizations in the State, and that he licked that opposition. He was opposed, in part, by money that was sent into the State to defeat him.

Mr. YOUNG. I challenge the Senator to produce the evidence.

Mr. MORSE. It can be done. I arose to compliment the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] for the great victory he won in North Dakota against heavy odds. They were odds in the form of Republican Party organization against him and heavy campaign contributions coming from both within and outside the State against him. I did not arise to criticize the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and I am surprised that he speaks so feelingly about it.

I close my remarks by again congratulating the senior Senator from North Dakota for giving his well-organized and well-financed opposition a licking. I also congratulate the people of North Dakota for their independent political judgment.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MCCARRAN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional matters were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

Statement prepared by him regarding establishment and statutory authority of the National Board for Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Director of Civilian Marksmanship.

Article entitled "The War Not 'Phony' But 'Funny'" written by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "Reporters and Lawyers at Congressional Investigations," delivered by Mr. Nat S. Finney at the University of Minnesota Law School banquet on April 28, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Statement of American Jewish Congress concerning proposed peace contract with Germany.

CLAIM OF THE CUBAN-AMERICAN SUGAR CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 158)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2696, "conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States."

The bill would confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the bar of the statute of limitations, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim, together with interest thereon, of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States. The claim of the company involves refund of taxes alleged to have been erroneously and illegally assessed and collected as excess-profits taxes for the period from January 1, 1917, to September 30, 1917. The bill would direct the Court of Claims to apply a specific method of tax computation in its determination of the suit and would enjoin the United States from using a defense that might otherwise be available to it.

The amount of the claim would appear to be $790,115.87. The total interest has been computed as exceeding 180 percent of the claim, or over $1,400,000. The provision of the bill permitting interest, therefore, subjects the Government to a possible fiscal liability of over $2,200,000.

The record in this case is involved and complicated. It reveals, however, these simple facts. The company, in trying to make its tax liability as small as possible, calculated its taxes on one basis. Then, when it found a basis believed to be more advantageous, it asked to be allowed to change to the second basis. The Bureau of Internal Revenue agreed to permit the change. Still later, when the company realized that a modification of the original basis was even more beneficial, it tried to go back to it. But the realization came too late and the prescribed statutory period of limitation had run against its efforts. The fault was not that of the Government. Indeed, the Bureau of Internal Revenue was more than accommodating to the taxpayer in its efforts to accord a full and fair administrative consideration of the company's tax problems.

This is confirmed by the opinion of the Court of Claims in dismissing a petition by the company to recover on the claim which is the subject of S. 2696. *The Cuban-American Sugar Company, Inc.* v. *United States* ((1939) 27 F. Supp. 307). In this opinion, the court made it clear that the company had ample opportunity to have its tax liability for 1917 determined under the method which it sought to apply after the period of limitations with respect to that year had run. A petition for certiorari was denied by the United States Supreme Court (309 U. S. 681).

The 1927 claim which the company filed for refund of its 1917 taxes was based upon improper comparatives in the computation of the tax. The claim was denied by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on March 15, 1933. The Court of Claims has held that this action by the Commissioner was an effective and final disposition of the claim and of all protests previously made or then pending before the Bureau of Internal Revenue. On April 4, 1933, after a favorable settlement had been made of the company's 1918, 1919, and 1920 tax liability, the company tried to amend its claim in order to obtain the same favorable consideration for its 1917 tax liability. The attempted amendment on April 4, 1933, was not based upon improper comparatives. Rather, it was a request for a different basis of computation, a statutory invested capital instead of the special assessment basis. The refund claim of April 4, 1933, was filed after the statute of limitations had precluded further consideration of it. Moreover, the Court of Claims specifically ruled that such an amendment could not be made after the claim for refund had been rejected.

The Cuban-American Sugar Co. has had the benefit of extensive administrative and judicial consideration of its claim. The Court of Claims dismissed the suit brought by the company against the United States, and the court's decision was a sound one. I see no justifiable reason for the company to be afforded a second day in court on this claim.

There are additional reasons why I cannot approve the bill before me.

First. Should this bill become law, the interest which the Court of Claims would be required to assess on the principal of the claim would be at the statutory rate of 6 percent for tax overpayments. Since all payments were made on or before 1923, the total interest would exceed 180 percent of the principal of the claim, which the company asserts to be $790,115.87. The interest alone would be over $1,400,000. The total would be over $2,200,000. The Government is not liable for interest unless and until a debt becomes payable. Since the Government has owed no debt to this claimant, requiring the payment of such interest would be entirely improper.

Second. This bill would preclude the Court of Claims from deciding the proper amount of invested capital for the fiscal year 1917. The bill would direct the Court of Claims, in rendering judgment on the claim for excess-profits taxes for the period from January 1, 1917, to September 30, 1917, to use as the invested capital of the company an amount agreed upon in a stipulation

entered into for the purpose of determining tax liability for the fiscal years 1918, 1919, and 1920. To the extent that this stipulation involved a determination of invested capital for the calendar year 1917, such a determination was relevant only to the computation of tax for the fiscal year 1918, only 3 months of which were included in the calendar year 1917. This point was stated specifically by the Court of Claims in its opinion dismissing the suit brought by the company. I see no reason for limiting Court of Claims review as this bill proposes to do. Even if it were desirable to place this matter before the court again, it should be free to judge the method of computation to be used. It should not be required to apply the method which the company finally chose as most advantageous to it after the period of limitations prescribed by statute had run.

Third. The bill is unsound from the standpoint of public policy. It is special legislation which grants relief to one taxpayer whose own marshaling of positions permitted the statute of limitations to cut off his legal remedies. There is no sound reason, in my opinion, to discriminate in this way against all other taxpayers who are bound by similar statutes. I cannot endorse a measure which provides a favored exception from our general law, on facts no more persuasive of unusual hardship than are present here.

For the reasons stated, I return this bill without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1952.*

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN MISSISSIPPI

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1258) to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger, which was, on page 2, line 10, strike out "interest" and insert "interest, but the Secretary shall consider and give full effect to all of the equities of the applicant."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the Taft-Hartley law to give a measure of justice to the thousands of foremen who are deprived of freedom of association so long as employers may discharge a supervisor for participating in concerted action.

Nothing in the bill is to be construed as weakening the right of employers to choose whomever they wish to have bargaining for them. I wish to make it plain that I desire to do nothing which would adversely affect the problem of discipline in the plants.

All the bill is designed to do is to give foremen the right to join and bargain by means of organizations of their own choosing.

This would not alter the fact that I believe the basic law, the Taft-Hartley law, is bad and needs to be rewritten, but there is such a manifest injustice toward this group of workers in the United States that hearings should be held on the bill and action taken to relieve foremen from the restrictions now placed upon them.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3430) to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MOODY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

FAIR TRADE PRACTICES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1671, H. R. 5767.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5767), which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce without amendment and without recommendation.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, although the unfinished business is H. R. 5767, an act to amend the Federal Trade Act, before proceeding with the consideration of the bill, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

CONVENTION ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE THREE POWERS AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 24, Executive Q, the convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, and following disposition of this treaty I shall move that the Senate consider Calendar No. 25, Executive R, the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Q (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn, on May 26, 1952.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. In executive session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Joel D. Wolfsohn, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice Dale E. Doty.

Robert M. McKinney, of New Mexico, to be Assistant Secretary of the Interior, vice William E. Warne.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

J. Howard Rossbach, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1957, vice Robert I. Millonzi.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, O3784, commanding general, United States Army, Pacific (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. A. T. Sprouse, pastor, First Methodist Church, Jasper, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we here offer unto Thee our hearts' devotion in gratitude and praise for the heritage which is ours.

Make us worthy of the continuation of Thy love divine, which hast led us in the past. Thou hast brought us from perilous beginnings to this day of grace. Thou hast given us wise statesmen and gallant defenders. And now we ask Thy presence in this Congress. Endow with wisdom these who here plan the Nation's future, and strength of purpose to those who seek to lift the spiritual level of the Republic. Divinely inspire these Thy servants, leaders of the people, in every decision to be made. Make our Nation as great in soul as she is mighty in territory, and give her people depth of righteousness that they may fulfill their destiny as a nation and evermore walk humbly before Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 28, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HILL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. IVES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) entitled "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. WILLIAMS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Saturday, June 28, 1952, he did on Sunday, June 29, 1952, sign the following enrolled bill of the Senate:

S. 2594. An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the House to consider conference reports received by the House during this week on the day they are reported in, notwithstanding the fact that they are not printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. YATES, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. JACKSON of Washington, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, and Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.

VOCATIONAL READJUSTMENT RESTORING LOST EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RANKIN, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. ROGERS of Texas; Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. O'KONSKI.

RESEARCH INTO PRACTICAL MEANS FOR ECONOMICAL PRODUCTION FROM SEA OR OTHER SALINE WATERS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6578) to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, in view of the acute shortage of water in the arid areas of the Nation and elsewhere and the excessive use of underground waters throughout the Nation, it is the policy of the Congress to provide for the development of practicable low-cost means of producing from sea water, or from other saline waters, water of a quality suitable for agriculture, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses on a scale sufficient to determine the feasibility of the development of such production and distribution on a large-scale basis, for the purpose of conserving and increasing the water resources of the Nation.

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through such agencies of the Department of the Interior as he may deem appropriate, is authorized—

"(a) by means of research grants and contracts as set forth in subsection (d) of this section to conduct research and technical development work, to make careful engineering studies to ascertain the lowest investment and operating costs, and to determine the best plant designs and conditions of operation;

"(b) to study methods for the recovery and marketing of byproducts resulting from and incident to the production of water as herein provided for the purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of offsetting the costs of water production in any area by the commercial utilization of such products;

"(c) to acquire, by purchase, license, lease, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and any interest in land (including water rights, easements, and leasehold interests), plants and facilities, and other property or rights: *Provided*, That the land or other property acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on the experiments and demonstrations for the purposes herein provided;

"(d) to engage, by noncompetitive contract or otherwise, chemists, physicists, engineers, and such other personnel as may be deemed necessary, and any educational institution, scientific organization, or industrial or engineering firm deemed suitable to do any part of the research or other work, and to the extent appropriate to correlate and coordinate the research and development work of such educational institutions, scientific organizations and industrial and engineering firms; and

"(e) to cooperate with any other Federal, State, or municipal department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or other organization in effectuating the purpose of this act.

"SEC. 3. Research undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority contained in this act shall be coordinated or conducted jointly with the Department of Defense to the greatest practicable extent compatible with military and security limitations, to the end that research and developments under this act which are primarily of a civil nature will contribute to the defense of the Nation and that research and developments in the same field which are primarily of a military nature and are conducted by the Department of Defense will be made available to advance the purposes of this act and to strengthen the civil economy of the Nation.

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, for the sole purpose of this act, to dispose of all water and other products produced as a result of his operations under this act pursuant to regulations to be prescribed by him: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to alter existing law with respect to the ownership and control of water.

"SEC. 5. All moneys received for products of the plants under this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior shall make reports to the President and the Congress at the beginning of each regular session of the action taken or instituted by him under the provisions of this act. The report shall include suitable recommendations for further legislation.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 8. There are authorized to be appropriated, from any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000, for a 5-year period, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That departmental expenses for the correlation and coordination of information over such 5-year period shall not exceed the sum of $500,000: *Provided further*, That such departmental expenses shall be scheduled in equal amounts for each year of such period insofar as practicable."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for research into and development

of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments rewrote the House bill in different language but for substantially the same purpose as the bill which passed the House. The Senate increased the authorized appropriation from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Interior dealing with this bill, showing his agreement with us as to the purpose and scope of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The letter referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1952.

HON. CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman, Reclamation and Irrigation Subcommittee, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CLAIR: In response to your request, I am writing to confirm Mr. Lineweaver's representations to you that it is the firm position of the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of the Interior that H. R. 6578 in the form now pending before the House of Representatives does not authorize the Secretary to acquire and operate a demonstration plant in connection with the conversion of salt and brackish waters to potable uses. While the Department recommended such authority, the bill as it now stands, in my opinion, clearly rejects that authorization.

In view of the explicit language in H. R. 6578 as passed by the House and amended in the Senate, together with the discussions in committee and on the floor, the legislative history of this bill is clear that the Congress intended to deny any authority to the Secretary to acquire and operate a demonstration plant.

I am instructing Mr. Lineweaver, who will continue as my representative in the activation and coordination of this program if the legislation is enacted and funds provided by the Congress, to explain more fully to you and your colleagues my position should any further question arise.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the passing of this bill, on the contrary I am much in favor of it and I hope it passes. I should like to ask the gentleman if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], a member of the committee is in full agreement with the bringing up of this matter at this time.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Ohio is in agreement with me. I consulted with Mr. Bow. Unfortunately he is not back yet from a trip he made to Ohio over the week end; but I assure the gentleman that I have consulted with him and the other Republican members of the committee and they are in agreement.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it is highly gratifying to me to have the Senate version of H. R. 6578 adopted by the House a few moments ago. The House bill under that same number was, of course, satisfactory to me and had my full support. There is little difference in the two measures and the action just taken will avoid a conference and insure enactment in these crowded closing days.

Although I have never personally introduced a bill covering this subject matter of desalting sea water, I have strongly endorsed the several bills introduced by various members from California and have sponsored and suported the legislation through several sessions of Congress. The benefits resulting from this legislation likely are not local but are Nation-wide and world-wide. If I should confine my thinking to my own State, however, I can conceive of benefits resulting from this legislation to the State of Arizona equaling such benefits to any sea-coast State. I feel certain that our scientists will discover one of the great secrets of nature how to purify saline waters, or brackish water, to make them fit for human consumption and other consumptive uses.

Perhaps certain groups of scientists have already virtually "licked this problem," or have discovered methods of treating saline waters in quantity and inexpensively and now need only some encouragement from the Government to demonstrate the practicability of their discoveries. If the discovery has not yet been made it is my earnest hope that it will be made and that this legislation will aid powerfully to bring about that discovery.

All great irrigation projects such as in Arizona, using waters several times over are plagued with a salt problem. Such waters do not become quite so saline as the waters of the ocean but they are brackish to the point where they cannot be used by animal life and plants will not tolerate such brackish water. It is my understanding that scientists are now able to treat brackish water perhaps one-tenth as salt as sea-water at about one-tenth of the cost of treating sea water. That gives me great hope that the interior of our country, with its critical shortage of water, may ultimately be aided by the discovery which this legislation induces that we may have a wider use of the life-giving waters for irrigation which we now have in scant supply.

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 430, approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico, on March 3, 1952, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2350)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language of the Senate amendment insert the following: "That the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was drafted by the selected delegates to the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico and adopted by the people of Puerto Rico in a referendum of March 3, 1952, in accordance with the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the organization of a constitutional government by the people of Puerto Rico', approved July 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 319; 48 U. S. C., secs. 731b-731e), is hereby approved by the Congress of the United States, except section 20 of article II of said constitution: *Provided*, That section 5 of article II thereof shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the procedure prescribed by article VII of the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by adding to such section 5 the following declaration: 'Compulsory attendance at elementary public schools to the extent permitted by the facilities of the state as herein provided shall not be construed as applicable to those who receive elementary education in schools established under nongovernmental auspices': *Provided further*, That except for the purpose of adopting the amendments to section 5 of article II and to section 3 of article VII as herein provided, article VII of said constitution likewise shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the terms of said article by adding to section 3 of article VII the following new sentence: 'Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving this constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, adopted in the nature of a compact': *And provided further*, That the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico hereby approved shall become effective when the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico shall have declared in a formal resolution its ac-

ceptance in the name of the people of Puerto Rico of the conditions of approval herein contained, and when the Governor of Puerto Rico, being duly notified by the proper officials of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico that such resolution of acceptance has been formally adopted, shall issue a proclamation to that effect."

CLAIR ENGLE,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN,
REVA BECK BOSONE,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The conference agreement deletes that portion of the Senate amendment making it mandatory that every proposed change in the new Puerto Rican Constitution be approved by the Congress of the United States. The conferees believe that in keeping with the spirit of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, and the purposes of the Puerto Rican Constitution, the people of Puerto Rico should have freedom to change their constitution within the limits of applicable provisions of the United States Constitution, the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress and House Joint Resolution 430. Accordingly the conferees specified such limitations in detail in their amendment.

Although the Senate amended House Joint Resolution 430 by substituting a new section, most of it merely contained perfecting language. The only major change made by the Senate was the second proviso following the words "nongovernmental auspices" which would have required approval by the United States Congress of each amendment to the Puerto Rican Constitution. This proviso was stricken and the following language inserted: *"Provided further,* That except for the purpose of adopting the amendments to section 5 of article II and to section 3 of article VII as herein provided, article VII of said constitution likewise shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the terms of said article by adding to section 3 of article VII the following new sentence: 'Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving this constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, adopted in the nature of a compact:' ".

CLAIR ENGLE,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.,
REVA BECK BOSONE,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
A. L. MILLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and to have the same printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] may be excused as a manager on the part of the House on the bill H. R. 7072 and that the Speaker be authorized to fill the vacancy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to fill the vacancy; and the Senate will be notified of the action.

SEPARATION OF SUBSIDY FROM AIR-MAIL PAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (S. 436) to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY ACT OF 1951

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7397) to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 6, strike out "March 31" and insert "April 30."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this simply brings the District in conformity with the rest of the Nation?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to change the effective date from March 31, 1953, to April 30, 1953. At the time the bill was considered in the House District Committee it was agreed to report the bill with the understanding that the same date in the District rent bill as that agreed upon in the Federal bill would be retained. This amendment simply makes the effective date of the District law consistent with that of the Federal law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 393) authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert "That the Administrator of General Services, and such other officers of the District of Columbia and the United States as control any public lands in the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to grant permits, under such restrictions as they may deem necessary, to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, to be appointed by the President-elect, for the use of any reservations or other public spaces in the District of Columbia under their control on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953. All stands or platforms that may be erected on public space shall be under the supervision of the inaugural committee. No stand shall be built on the sidewalks, streets, parks, and public grounds of the District of Columbia, other than the area on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except with the approval of the inaugural committee, the director of inspection of the District of Columbia, and the Administrator of General Services. The reservations or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall, after the inauguration, be promptly restored to their previous condition. The inaugural committee shall indemnify the appropriate agency of the Government for any damage to such reservations or spaces.

"SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to permit the inaugural committee to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports, for illumination and other purposes. If it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation. Such conductors with their supports shall be removed on or before January 31, 1953. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, shall enforce the provisions of this joint resolution, take needful precautions for the protection of the public, and insure that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in its previous condition. No expense or damage from the stretching, operation, or

removal of the temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to lend to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, hospital furniture, ensigns, flags, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles (except battle flags), as may, in their judgment, be spared without detriment to the public service. Such loans shall be returned by the 26th day of January 1953. The committee shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use.

"SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Administrator of General Services and the inaugural committee are authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, radio-broadcasting, and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes. Such wires shall be removed within 10 days after the conclusion of the ceremonies."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill is a clarifying one and the amendments are minor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER AND PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1953

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 395) to provide for the maintenance of public order and protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "such" and insert "the."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUARTERS IN CERTAIN PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR TROOPS PARTICIPATING IN THE INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1953

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 394) to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert: "That the fourth paragraph under the heading 'State, War, and Navy Department Building' in the first section of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' approved April 28, 1903 (32 Stat. 152; 40 U. S. C. 31), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and except that the Administrator of General Services and the respective heads of executive departments and establishments may allocate such space in any public building under their care and supervision as they deem necessary for the purposes of quartering, for a period of not exceeding 5 days beginning not earlier than the 18th day of January in any year, troops participating in such ceremonies."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in inaugural ceremonies."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF BOXING CONTESTS AND EXHIBITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5768) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, after "licensed", insert "professional."

Page 1, line 10, after "licensed", insert "professional."

Page 3, line 4, after "contest", insert ": *Provided*, That no person holding or conducting any amateur boxing contest under the jurisdiction and with the sanction of the District of Columbia Association of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States shall be required to pay to the Commission any such sum which includes receipts derived from the sale, lease, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights relating to any such amateur boxing contest."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House on May 26, 1952, and yesterday the Senate passed the bill with the following amendments:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "licensed", insert "professional."

On page 1, line 10, after the word "licensed", insert "professional."

On page 3, line 4, after the word "contest" insert a colon and "*Provided*, That no person holding or conducting any amateur boxing contest under the jurisdiction and with the sanction of the District of Columbia Association of the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States shall be required to pay to the Commission any such sum which includes receipts derived from the sale, lease, or other exploitation of radio, television, or motion-picture rights relating to any such amateur boxing contest."

Mr. Speaker, the amendments to this bill are self-explanatory. The only purpose in offering these amendments is to protect amateur boxing contests.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGRATH, KIRWAN, ANDREWS, HORAN, and BUSBEY.

HIGHWAY AND RAILROAD BRIDGES OVER THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is before us today because in the construction of the McNary Dam, the floodwaters backed up the Columbia River which made the bridge across the river impassable. The money was considered in the original estimate to take care of this particular correction, but due to the fact that the Army engineers did not have the authorization to do it, we are here today to give it to them. A precedent has been set in connection with other dams, such as the Bonneville power dam and TVA.

Mr. McGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That (a) whenever, as the result of the construction of the McNary lock and dam, any bridge, trestle, or other highway or railroad structure located over, upon, or across the pool formed by the McNary lock and dam on the Columbia River or any of its navigable tributaries, including approaches, fenders, and appurtenances thereto, will be endangered or otherwise adversely affected and damaged, including any interference with or impairment of its use, or will require alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both, or to render navigation in the pool formed by the McNary lock and dam reasonably free, easy, and unobstructed, or to accommodate the relocation of any railroad or highway made necessary by the construction of the McNary lock and dam, to the extent that protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement is necessary or proper to preserve the safety or utility of such bridge, trestle, or structure, or to meet the requirements of navigation or flood control, or both, or in connection with the relocation of any such railroad or highway, the owner or owners of such bridge, trestle, or structure shall be compensated by the Secretary of the Army from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the construction of the McNary lock and dam or for maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors, in the sum of the reasonable actual cost of such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement: *Provided,* That in arriving at the amount of such compensation the bridge owner shall be charged with a sum which shall equal the net value to the owner of any direct and special benefits accruing to the owner from any improvement or addition or betterment of the altered, reconstructed, relocated, or replaced bridge, trestle, or structure. The Secretary of the Army, is empowered to contract with such owner with respect to any such protection, alteration, reconstruction, relocation, or replacement, the payment of the cost thereof and its proper division, which contract may provide either for money compensation or for the performance of all or any part of the work by the Secretary of the Army.

(b) In the event of a failure to agree upon the terms and conditions of any such contract, or upon any default in the performance of any contract entered into pursuant to this act, the bridge owner or the Secretary of the Army shall have the right to bring suit to enforce his rights or for a declaration of his rights under this act, or under any such contract, in the district court of the United States for the district in which the structure in question is located. In any such proceeding the court shall apportion the total cost of the work between the Secretary of the Army and the owner in accord with the provisions contained in this act. Any judgment, award, or decree rendered against the Secretary of the Army under this act may be satisfied out of appropriations available for construction of the McNary lock and dam, or out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors: *Provided,* That prior to such alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of said bridge the location and plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of the Army in accordance with existing laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "will", insert "in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers."

Page 22, line 15, strike out "by the Secretary of the Army."

Page 2, line 23, strike out down to and including the word "structure", on page 3, line 1, and insert "such part of the cost as is attributable to the direct and special benefits which will accrue to the bridge owner as a result of the alteration, including the expectable savings in repair or maintenance costs; and that part of the cost attributable to the requirements of traffic by railroad or highway, or both, including any expenditure for increased carrying capacity of the bridge; and such proportion of the actual capital cost of the altered bridge, as the used service life bears to the total estimated service life, including that proportion of the cost of removing the altered bridge represented by the used service life. The Chief of Engineers, acting under the direction of the."

Page 2, line 18, strike out "Secretary of the Army" and insert "Corps of Engineers."

Page 4, line 16, insert "(c) This act shall apply with respect to the Snake River highway bridge, including approaches, fenders, and appurtenances thereto, on national highway 410, notwithstanding the fact that such bridge has been relocated and reconstructed, prior to the date of enactment of this act, by the State of Washington, and compensation shall be paid to such State in the sum, determined as provided in this act, of the reasonable actual cost of the relocation and reconstruction of such bridge."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. WALTER, Pennsylvania; Mr. CHELF, Kentucky; Mr. WILSON, Texas; Mr. GRAHAM, Pennsylvania; Miss THOMPSON of Michigan.

THE STEEL STRIKE AND TAXES

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a letter I received this morning from the head of one of the big companies in my district:

> The continuance of the steel strike is going to result in tremendous reduction of the amount of taxes to be collected by the Government this year from corporations on their excess and regular profits. This is one of the arguments for the termination of the strike and the resumption of general business by forcing the President to enforce the Taft-Hartley law and stop the strike that I have not seen put forward or used.
>
> It is going to cost the Government an inestimable amount of money in the loss of taxes if present conditions are prolonged. We are feeling it in our business, which is pretty far removed from the steel business, as many other corporations are, and we know that there will not only be no excess profits paid this year, but a lot of refunds for what we paid last year in accordance with our loss.

The President and his advisers had better consider this point in acting promptly to carry out the request of Congress in the Defense Production Act which is before him today.

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING BILL OF 1952

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill called the middle-income housing bill. I think it is becoming impressed on us in the cities that the middle-income people still cannot find housing either to rent or buy within their means. The great difficulty is that costs are very high and legislation plus voluntary action need to find some way to reduce them.

The bill has the following titles:

Title I provides $10,000,000 for a program of housing research during the next 5 years in methods of production, distribution, assembly, construction, and other factors affecting the cost of housing and designed to bring down these costs and provides that this money be used for projects in engineering schools and colleges, research laboratories, and Government agencies under the direction of a National Housing Research Advisory Board consisting of representatives of the housing construction industry, building trades unions, engineering schools, municipal housing officials, and the public.

Title II provides a loan fund of $3,000,000,000—to bear an interest rate of 3 percent per annum—available at the rate of $500,000,000 for each of 6 years beginning with 1952 to cooperatives, nonprofit and limited-dividend corporations, and to institutional and other long-term investors in new housing construction in areas where there is an inadequacy of private funds available for housing mortgages and an inadequate supply of housing accommodations available at the costs or rents required for middle-income families.

Title III makes available long-term mortgage money up to $50,000,000 per project under the regular FHA plan at 4 percent to 4½ percent interest for cooperatives and institutional and other long-term investors in multifamily fireproof, elevator construction resulting from slum-clearance operations with Federal aid under title I of the Housing Act of 1949.

The problem which is sought to be dealt with by this bill, is very acute. Middle-income families are being caught in the squeeze between ineligibility for or inability to obtain public housing and the unavailability of private homes at prices or rentals which they can afford to pay. In addition, the emphasis in home construction today is drawing people out of areas where transportation or other public facilities exist and are very conveniently located to areas distant

from places of work where large investment is required for new community facilities. Decentralization is desirable and home ownership very much so, but in both of these there should be freedom of choice in order to make for sound development and this is practically nonexistent today for middle-income families. For example, only 14½ percent of the aggregate housing unit starts for 1952—or 145,000 out of over a million units—are public housing or private multifamily rental housing and of this total only 12 percent of the private multifamily rental housing will be renting in the $60-a-month range. The public housing situation is perhaps best illustrated by the condition in New York City where an estimated eligible 350,000 low-income families—mainly families of veterans—are competing for 63,000 units in public housing projects.

It is significant, that whereas my bill provides for $3,000,000,000 in direct mortgage loans where needed for middle-income housing, the total mortgage loans already guaranteed under FHA are $21,000,000,000—of which $13,500,000,000 are still in force—and also the direct loans for which I provide can move to private enterprise as well if it will undertake the necessary construction.

Amendments to the FHA provided by this bill are necessary if development is to be undertaken by private enterprise of sites made available as a result of slum clearance. These projects can only prosper if they are large. Today there are 165 communities at work in redevelopment programs under title I—either in preliminary planning stage, final planning stage or in loan or grant contract stage. These include nearly all principal metropolitan centers as well as many smaller localities. A total of 60 of these communities have selected some 86 project areas which are at or near the stage of execution. In 105 localities project areas are being currently selected.

The provision which is in this bill for an accelerated research program is of great importance. It supplements the research program already being carried on within the Housing and Home Finance Agency by providing $10,000,000 for this purpose which can be spent over a period of 5 years. This title also calls for the establishment of a National Housing Research Advisory Board of 12 members from the housing construction industry, building-trades unions, engineering schools and laboratories and municipal and State housing officials. The board is authorized to establish the policies under which the research shall be conducted. In the first place it is recognized that materials and methods in the building and construction industry are in a good many cases archaic and that home builders are often too small in size to do their own research. There is much opportunity for cooperation within the home-building industry and with the Government agency in charge of the research program and this will be provided for through the National Housing Research Advisory Board proposed by this bill. In addition, the most can be obtained for the research dollar by contracts with colleges, universities, research laboratories, existing Government agencies and similar institutions and the creation of a new Government establishment to do research is wasteful and unnecessary. A greatly accelerated housing research program is necessary and my bill attempts to provide this.

I feel every Member of Congress should have before him a definite piece of legislation trying to do something for the middle-income people in terms of housing and it is my hope that this subject will have priority of attention in the days ahead.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1952: INTERPRETATION OF SECTION 104, IMPORT CONTROLS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is to be regretted that the House did not have the opportunity to read the conference report on H. R. 8210 and S. 2594 when the report was up for consideration on Saturday, June 28. It seems to me that all available information on the terms of the agreement reached in the conference should have been presented to the membership before the final vote on the conference report. I recognize, however, that due to the fact that the present law expires on June 30, it was impossible to provide printed copies of the report and the statement of the managers.

SECTION 104, IMPORT CONTROLS

I have now had an opportunity to study the report as it appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 28, 1952, and for the purpose of the RECORD, and to clarify what I believe is congressional intent, I will briefly discuss section 104 which gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to continue import controls of fats and oils—including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products—peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products until June 30, 1953.

Although there was no material difference between section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1951 and the new section 104 of the act of 1952, which goes into operation at 12 o'clock tonight, I felt it might be well to show the difference between the two sections. I am showing herewith the existing law, section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1951:

(c) Title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1952, which the Secretary of Agriculture determines would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section."

The following is the new section 104 which becomes operative at midnight, June 30, 1952. This section does not expire until June 30, 1953:

SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and imports into the United States of any such commodity or product, by types or varieties, shall be limited to such quantities as the Secretary of Agriculture finds would not (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interefere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this section.

I am also including herewith the remarks that I made on June 18, 1952, supporting section 104 as it appeared in H. R. 8210, which was reported by the committee. These remarks were made for the purpose of clarifying congressional intent and read as follows:

Section 104 as reported by the committee authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to limit imports of the commodities enumerated in the section to such quantities as would not (a) impair or reduce domestic production of such commodities or products below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditure under any Government price-support program. This section also provides "that the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodity specified in the section, not to exceed 10 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationship and trade." This proviso and, in fact, the entire section gives the Secretary of Agriculture the broadest discretionary authority to deal with individual types and varieties of such commodities when fixing import quotas. However, the Secretary must make his findings in accordance with the criteria set forth in secton 104.

The only change made by the conference committee was to retain the proviso of the House amendment—section 104—except that the figure of 15 percent is substituted for the figure of 10 percent in the proviso. The language of the proviso, as agreed to by the conference and Congress, reads as follows:

Provided, however, That the Secretary of Agriculture after establishing import limitations, may permit additional imports of each type and variety of the commodities specified in this section, not to exceed 15 percent of the import limitation with respect to each type and variety which he may deem necessary, taking into consideration the broad effects upon international relationships and trade.

It will be noted that this proviso does not direct the Secretary to increase the import quota of any type or variety of the commodities enumerated in the section. It simphy states that he may do so under certain circumstances. However, should he decide to increase the import quota of any type of variety, such increase over and above the quota originally established by him for any type or variety is limited to a 15-percent increase.

In other words, the authority vested in the Secretary is not mandatory. It is a discretion which he may exercise and he is not required to go the full limit of 15 percent for any type or variety. He could increase the quota 1 percent or more over and above the original quota limitation. The fact that the proviso permits a limited increase in imports of certain types and varieties, does not mean that the Secretary is required to authorize increased imports of every type or variety. Should the Secretary increase all imports up to the maximum provided by the proviso, the original import quota would be meaningless.

It is not intended that the Secretary should use the proviso in cases like blue mold cheese, Cheddar cheese and other competitive cheeses, wherein increased imports over and above the original import quota would have serious impact upon domestic production or fail to comply with the criteria set forth in section 104. Before increasing quotas under the proviso, the Secretary is required to take into consideration the criteria set forth in section 104 to the fullest extent.

BASE IMPORT QUOTAS, 1948–50

Under the authority of section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1951, the Secretary of Agriculture established quotas for imports of cheese under the following formula which was issued by him on August 9, 1951:

Imports of any type of cheese in a quantity not in excess of the average annual imports of such type of cheese during the period January 1, 1948, through December 31, 1950.

It will be noted that the Secretary established the quota for cheese imports based upon average imports for the years 1948–50. He also used the year 1950 as a base period in fixing the import quota for casein.

Under date of April 11, 1952, in a brief filed with the United States Tariff Commission, the Secretary of Agriculture recommended import quotas for blue mold cheese based upon the quotas established in the above formula—1948–50.

No other base period was suggested in the debate on section 104 in either House or Senate or in the conference report. In my opinion, it would seriously disrupt administrative procedure if a new base would be selected for these commodities. Importers are familiar with the base period—1948–50—that has been heretofore established. Furthermore, the leeway given to the Secretary in the proviso will provide satisfactory means for him to make adjustments for types and varieties of cheese over and above the quotas, should such adjustments be found necessary on types of cheese which he finds are not competitive.

ROQUEFORT AND SWISS CHEESE

The following statement is made by the managers on the part of the Senate in dealing with Roquefort and Switzerland Swiss cheese:

The committee of conference desires to make it clear that this authority is not to be exercised with respect to types of cheeses, such as Roquefort and Switzerland Swiss, which, because of their United States selling price, are clearly not competitive with domestically produced cheeses.

The above language does not change the language of section 104 as adopted in the conference report. The Secretary may find it desirable, considering the present price relationship, to remove Roquefort and Switzerland Swiss cheese from import controls. However, in so doing, he must take into consideration the criteria set forth in section 104, and should the price relationship materially change so that these two types of imported cheese become competitive with domestically produced cheese, section 104 permits him to place such Roquefort and Swiss cheese under import quotas.

The Bureau of Customs lists 190 different types of imported cheese. I am informed that there are approximately 400 varieties of cheese manufactured in foreign countries, which varieties or types are under brand names of the communities or countries in which they are produced. Many of these types and varieties are highly competitive with domestic cheeses, and great care must be exercised by the Secretary in removing any of them from import controls.

EMBARGOES

Under the new section 104, the Secretary is empowered to continue the embargoes announced by him on August 9, 1951, on any or all of the commodities specified in the section, which are enumerated as follows: fats and oils—including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products—peanuts, butter, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products. He may also place an embargo against imports on cheese and casein if he deems it necessary to comply with the criteria specified in section 104.

IMPORTED COMMODITIES UNDER SECTION 104

All imports of the commodities enumerated in section 104 are considered as being imported against any import quota or limitation when any of such commodities enter a port of the United States for storage, sale or to carry out any barter agreement.

HUNDREDS OF RETIRED RAILROADERS INSTEAD OF RECEIVING AN INCREASE IN BENEFITS FROM THE 1951 AMENDMENTS TO THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT ARE ACTUALLY SUFFERING A LOSS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on June 26, I introduced H. R. 8371, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, which reads:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended is hereby further amended, effective October 30, 1951, by striking the last paragraph thereof.

The purpose of this amendment is to restore to all beneficiaries under the Railroad Retirement Act the right to receive all earned benefits from both railroad retirement and social security, rather than be forced to forfeit a portion of such benefits as is the case today, resulting from the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act.

Hundreds of retired railroaders are today the victims of a gross injustice. Instead of receiving an increase in benefits, as was the original intent of the Congress, they have actually suffered a loss, if they are entitled to both railroad-retirement and social-security benefits.

As an illustration, I submit the following self-explanatory letter received from the son of a retired railroader who resides in my congressional district:

My father, who resides at Clearfield, Pa., retired from the railroad in February 1952 after 28¼ years of service. This service was interrupted from approximately 1930 to 1941, during part of which time he worked in employment covered by social security.

Based on the foregoing facts, my father was awarded pension payments as follows:

	Per month
Railroad retirement	$88.56
Social security	26.90
Total (covering employment from 1912 to 1952, approximately 40 years)	115.46

Prior to the October 30, 1951, amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act railroad pensions were granted in addition to social-security pensions, if any, which had been earned. However, under the latter amendment, which was ostensibly designed to increase railroad retirement benefits, it was provided, for the first time, that railroad retirement benefits must be decreased by any benefits received under social security.

The effect of this amendment, in my father's case, was to produce a slightly lower combined income than he was entitled to under the old law. The railroad retirement amendment of October 30, 1951, therefore, while it has not operated to decrease my

father's pension below what he would have received under the old law, has not benefited him at all, as it presumably was designed to do.

Whatever reasons can be urged in support of the existing practice of diminishing railroad retirement benefits by the amount of social-security benefits received, it is submitted that the law as presently constituted is not equitable in that it effectively deprives my father of benefits which he earned under social security. Even if the amendment were otherwise appropriate it is submitted, that, since my father gets no recognition for his time under social security (the above combined payments being approximately equal to what he would receive for his railroad service alone under the new amendment), that he should, at least, be entitled to count his years of service under social security in computing his railroad pension. As it is, he effectively loses out on social security entirely merely by reason of the fact that he happened to be employed in the railroad, rather than some other industry.

I am writing to you at this time to urge that, if you see fit to increase social-security benefits, that the proposed bill exempt the additional benefit from offset against railroad pensions. Unless this is done any additional amount my father might get under social security will be charged against his railroad pension (under existing law, as I understand it). He would, therefore, as in the case of the 1951 railroad-retirement amendment, get nothing, as his railroad pension will automatically be decreased in the same amount as his social-security pension may be increased.

Recently the House of Representatives approved H. R. 7800, a bill to amend the Social Security Act by increasing earned benefits in the amount of either $5 or 12½ percent, whichever is the greater. Should this bill become a law, it means that retired railroaders, under the 1951 amendment to the Railroad Retirement Act, will be further penalized by having their railroad-retirement annuities reduced in the amount of the increase they receive under social security.

In my opinion, it was not the intent of the Congress of the United States, when approving the 1951 amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, to reduce the benefits granted retired railroaders, but to the contrary, the amendments were designed to increase benefits. There is only one way to correct this discriminatory injustice which has been cast upon the retired railroad workers, and that is for the Congress of the United States to immediately approve H. R. 8371.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7952) to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain just what the bill does?

Mr. COOLEY. I should be very glad to do so, but I prefer to yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to make the explanation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

This is another effort to combine research work which has been spread in several parts in one area where it can be done better and more economically. It is a consolidation bill. I know of no opposition. I will be glad to discuss it further if anybody wants me to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to combine the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra, Calif., and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Whittier, Calif.; and establish said laboratories on a site at the corner of Palm Street and South Harbor Boulevard, Anaheim, Orange County, Calif., made available by Orange County for the purpose; and erect the necessary building at an estimated cost not to exceed $150,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "purpose", insert "upon terms satisfactory to the Secretary and without cost to the Federal Government."

Page 2, line 6, insert: "SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO STATE OF OREGON

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2603, an act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it this bill provides for a transfer of land from the Federal Government to the State?

Mr. COOLEY. It transfers approximately 2 acres of land to the State of Oregon. The land formerly was owned by the State of Oregon, but is no longer needed by the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was the bill reported out unanimously by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. COOLEY. It was.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Oregon, without consideration, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described lands comprising a portion of a tract of land acquired by the United States by gift from the State of Oregon: Beginning at the northwest corner of section 8, township 2 north, range 8 east, of the Willamette meridian, which is marked with a United States Army Engineers' land monument; thence north eighty-nine degrees forty-five minutes east two hundred sixty-three and ninety-two one-hundredths feet; thence south one degree thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east two hundred ninety-one and twenty-four one-hundredths feet to an iron pipe which is the point of beginning of the tract herein described; thence south eighty degrees fifty-seven minutes thirty seconds west three hundred eighty-six and thirty-four one-hundredths feet; then south fifty degrees twenty-four minutes thirty seconds west four hundred twenty-four and five one-hundredths feet; thence north twenty-eight degrees fifty-one minutes west two hundred twenty-nine and seven one-hundredths feet; thence north seventy-four degrees thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east eight hundred forty-eight and thirty-five one-hundredths feet; thence south one degree thirty-nine minutes thirty seconds east ninety-four and eight one-hundredths feet to point of beginning, containing two acres more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURLEY TOBACCO FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8170) relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee explain this bill and tell us just what it does?

Mr. COOLEY. I shall be very glad to do so. Under the present burley tobacco acreage allotment and marketing quota law, there is a 1-acre minimum allotment provided. This bill reduces that 1 acre to seven-tenths of an acre. We held rather extensive hearings, as the gentleman knows, and many of the growers including a substantial number of little growers actually wanted to lower the minimum of five-tenths of an acre, but the committee amended it, as you know, and now provides for seven-tenths of an acre minimum allotment under the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, the committee amendment provides that no reduction of more than one-tenth of an acre can be made in any one year?

Mr. COOLEY. I was just going to call that to the attention of the House. Those are the two changes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm-acreage allotment for burley tobacco for any year shall not be less than the smallest of (1) the allotment established for the farm for the immediately preceding year, (2) five-tenths of an acre, or (3) 25 percent of the cropland. The additional acreage required under this act shall be in addition to the State acreage allotments and the production on such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota. This provision shall be effective for 1953 and subsequent crops.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "five-tenths" and insert "seven-tenths."

Page 1, line 8, after "cropland", insert: "*Provided however*, That no allotment of 1 acre or less shall be reduced more than one-tenth of an acre in any one year."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 689, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 95, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any investigation made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as its deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the purpose of this resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The purpose of this resolution briefly is this: The Judiciary Committee was given authority, given to most committees of the House, to make investigations on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. In view of the expected early adjournment of Congress, the committee asked for authority to file their reports after Congress had adjourned, but during the present Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDY OF INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief announcement to the House: On tomorrow House Joint Resolution No. 8, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualification to handle their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government will be in order.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST ARTHUR McPHAUL

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Un-American Activities as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and under House Resolution No. 7, of the Eighty-second Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Arthur McPhaul. Said subpena required the said Arthur McPhaul to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, at room 737, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., on Tuesday, February 26, 1952, at the hour of 10 a. m., to produce all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, and all money received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, and then and there to testify to matters of inquiry committed to the said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon Arthur McPhaul is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to United States Marshal: You are hereby commanded to summon Arthur McPhaul, 252 East Palmer, Detroit, Mich., to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD is chairman, together with all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, room 737 Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., Tuesday, February 26, 1952, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 13th day of February, 1952.

"JOHN S. WOOD, *Chairman.*

"Attest:

"[SEAL] RALPH R. ROBERTS,
"Clerk, United States House of Representatives."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Joseph L. Wisniewski, United States marshal, by Sam O'Connell, deputy. The return of the service by the said Sam O'Connell, endorsed thereon, is set forth as follows:

"Subpena for Arthur McPhaul before the committee on the 28th day of February 1952; Served Arthur McPhaul at Detroit, Mich., on the 18th day of February 1952.

"JOSEPH L. WISNIEWSKI,
"United States Marshal.
"By SAM O'CONNELL, *Deputy.*"

In compliance with the said subpena, Arthur McPhaul appeared before a subcommittee of the said committee and the said subcommittee then and there demanded the production of said records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organization, and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, and the said Arthur McPhaul refused to produce the said records and documents and refused to answer all questions relating thereto. The said Arthur McPhaul having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions namely:

"Mr. McPhaul, the committee has heretofore served upon you a subpena duces tecum to produce certain records and documents. Are you prepared to respond to that subpena?

"Are you prepared to produce the documents and papers that have been called upon for you to produce under the subpena?

"The question is as to whether or not you are refusing to produce the records directed to be produced under the subpena.

"My question to you was not answered by that statement, in my judgment. My question was whether or not you are refusing to produce the records which you were directed to produce under this subpena.

"I have asked you to produce the records. Now, will you produce them?

"What type of work do you engage in?

"How were you employed in 1942?

"How were you employed between 1945 and 1950?

"Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Richard F. O'Hair?

"Were you at any time a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party?

"Were you at any time a member of the Ford unit, or any unit within Ford; that is, any unit of the Communist Party?

"Did you hear him [Walter Scott Dunn] testify in regard to you in any particular?

"Are you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Do you know whether he [William Patterson] is an official of the Civil Rights Congress?

"What position does Mr. William Patterson hold in the Civil Rights Congress, if you know?

"Are you acquainted with Mary Bray?

"Were you acquainted with Jack Raskin?

"To your knowledge, did he [Jack Raskin] ever hold a position with the Civil Rights Congress?

"Are you now a member of the Communist Party?"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer such questions, and as a result of the said Arthur

McPhaul's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said Arthur McPhaul.

The record of the proceedings before the said subcommittee on February 27, 1952, during which the said Arthur McPhaul refused to produce the aforesaid records and documents pertinent to the subject under inquiry, and refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth as follows:

"(A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities consisting of Representatives JOHN S. WOOD, chairman, and MORGAN M. MOULDER, DONALD L. JACKSON, and CHARLES E. POTTER (MORGAN M. MOULDER being absent) met in room 737, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., on Wednesday, February 27, 1952, and hearings were conducted by the said subcommittee during that day, the last witness appearing before said subcommittee on said day being Arthur McPhaul.)

"Mr. WOOD. Will you call your next witness, Mr. Counsel?

"Mr. TAVENNER. I will call Arthur McPhaul.

"TESTIMONY OF ARTHUR M'PHAUL, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, GEORGE W. CROCKETT, JR.

"Mr. WOOD. Mr. McPhaul, the committee has heretofore served upon you a subpena duces tecum to produce certain records and documents. Are you prepared to respond to that subpena?

"Mr. CROCKETT. May I suggest that the photographers be instructed to cease taking pictures, Mr. Chairman?

"Mr. WOOD. Does Mr. McPhaul object to the pictures? Is that your request?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. That is right.

"Mr. WOOD. I will ask the photographers then to desist from taking further pictures. Will you answer my question, Mr. McPhaul? Are you prepared to produce the documents and papers that have been called upon for you to produce under the subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Mr. Wood, I refuse to answer this or any question which deals with the possession or custody of the books and records called for in the subpena. I claim my privilege under the fifth amendment of the Constitution.

"Mr. WOOD. In view of that answer, Mr. Counsel, do you desire to proceed with the examination of this witness at this time?

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to ask the witness if he has any other reason for refusing to produce the documents called for in the subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I think my answer covers it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to read the subpena into the record, at least part of it, and introduce it. The subpena calls for 'the appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, from the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD is chairman, together with all records, correspondence, memoranda, pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, room 737, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., Tuesday, February 26, 1952.'

"I desire to offer the subpena in evidence and ask that it be marked 'McPhaul Exhibit No. 1.'

"Mr. WOOD. It will be so marked and received.

"(The document referred to was marked 'McPhaul Exhibit No. 1' and received in evidence.)

"Mr. WOOD. In order to complete the record, Mr. McPhaul, is it in response to this subpena that has just been read that you now decline, for the reasons you have stated, to produce the documents and books and records therein called for?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I have stated the reasons, for the record.

"Mr. WOOD. Is it in response to this subpena that you refuse to answer?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. That is my answer that I have just given.

"Mr. WOOD. To this subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. To that subpena; yes.

"Mr. WOOD. Now, the question I will ask counsel is, it is now 4:30. Do you desire to proceed with the examination of this witness at this time? If so, I will administer the oath to him.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; let us proceed.

"Mr. WOOD. Will you please stand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear that the evidence that you give this subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I do.

"Mr. WOOD. Are you represented by counsel?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I am.

"Mr. WOOD. Will you identify yourself for the record, Counsel?

"Mr. CROCKETT. My name is George W. Crockett, Jr., of the Michigan bar and the United States Supreme Court bar. My office is located in the Cadillac Tower Building in the city of Detroit.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I have just handed each member of the committee a copy of a prepared statement. I also include a petition, We Charge Genocide, a crime of the Government against Negro people. That was presented to the United Nations a few weeks ago.

"Mr. WOOD. The committee has it in hand and it will be given due consideration. Just confine yourselves here to the answering of the questions asked you and we will get along.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I just wanted to help by pointing out, if you will permit me to read certain things——

"Mr. WOOD. If we desire that sort of assistance, we will call on you for it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full nan e, please?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Arthur McPhaul.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where were you born, Mr. McPhaul?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. There is some question about where I was born. You being from Virginia, sir, you know, no doubt, in most of the Southern States——

"Mr. WOOD. Will you just answer the question?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. They just don't bother to make birth certificates.

"Mr. TAVENNER. No; I didn't have one myself.

"Mr. WOOD. Just give us your best understanding about it, if you do not know definitely. Can you approximate it? I did not have one, but I finally went back to the old family Bible and dug up one.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I asked a question of one witness on an occasion of where she was born and she started back at Jamestown. I really only want to know for the purpose of the record what your age is.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I think I was born in Oklahoma.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. 1909.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. McPhaul, you were served with a subpena by Mr. Sam O'Connell, deputy United States marshal, to appear before the committee on the 26th day of February 1952 and produce the records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of and affiliation with other organizations and all moneys received and expended by the Civil Rights Congress, were you not?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Yes; I was served with a subpena.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you refuse to produce any of the records directed to be produced under the subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I have answered that, Mr. Counsel.

"Mr. WOOD. You did not answer it under oath, and I think perhaps you will agree with me that it would be proper to do so under oath if you are asked.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I will repeat the answer that I gave at the beginning.

"Mr. WOOD. Will that answer stand as your answer to the question just asked you?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Will you repeat the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The question is as to whether or not you are refusing to produce the records directed to be produced under the subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. My answer to that is, I refuse to answer this or any questions which deal with the possession of custody of the books and records called for in this subpena. I claim my privileges under the fifth amendment of the United States Constitution.

"Mr. TAVENNER. My question to you was not answered by that statement, in my judgment. My question was whether or not you are refusing to produce the records which you were directed to produce under this subpena?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I have answered it in this statement.

"Mr. TAVENNER. No, sir. You have stated that you refuse to answer any questions pertaining to them. I have not asked you a question that pertains to them. I have asked you to produce the records. Now, will you produce them?

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I will not. While he is conferencing, I wonder if the Kluxers of Georgia have ever been asked to produce their records.

"Mr. WOOD. If it was pertinent to this inquiry, I could answer that question for you, sir, that they have been requested to do so and have done so.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I would like to see the records, Mr. Chairman, of some of the proceedings from such an inquiry into the Ku Klux Klan of Georgia, especially?

"Mr. WOOD. You are perfectly at liberty, sir, to come to the committee offices and view them. I will say for the benefit of the witness, that in view of certain published statements that have been made in this city, which are intended, I believe, to reflect upon me, that I happen to be the first American official who ever prosecuted a Ku Klux Klansman in Georgia and convicted him and sentenced him to prison for outrages committed on people of both colors in my State.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. You did convict some for lynching.

"Mr. WOOD. I convicted some for outrages and for assault with intent to murder, in the courts of my State. Perhaps that might alleviate some of the feeling of some of the people because of the fact I come from the deep South.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Have you said anything against Governor Talmadge's outrageous statement against Negroes appearing on television?

"Mr. WOOD. I have said many things against Governor Talmadge.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. I mean, for the record.

"Mr. WOOD. I have not been called upon to say anything for the record. The Governor of Georgia is not an issue in this investigation.

"Mr. MCPHAUL. Lynching is always an issue as far as the Negro is concerned and I would like the record to show that I am a Negro.

"Mr. WOOD. If you would find one instance where Mr. Talmadge is identified with a lynching party or any other party designed to deprive any man of his civil rights guaranteed under the Constitution, I am sure that the proper officials of the Government of the United States and the State of Georgia will take due cognizance of that.

"Mr. McPHAUL. I just came back from Florida and they don't do it in Florida.

"Mr. WOOD. Let us not argue the question. I simply wanted to make the observation that I did make because of statements that have been made in the past.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you presently live in the city of Detroit?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long have you lived here?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Approximately 30 years.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your profession or employment?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I am a worker.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What type of work do you engage in?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I am invoking my right under the fifth amendment and I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What has been your employment over a period of the past 10 years?

"Mr. McPHAUL. What specific part of the 10 years do you want?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Begin at the beginning and end with the end. How long did you say you lived here?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Approximately 30 years.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I do not want to go back 30 years. Will you go back 10 years to 1942?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking the privileges granted me under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed in 1942?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking the privileges under the Constitution, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How were you employed between 1945 and 1950?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking the privileges under the Constitution, I refuse to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you refuse to tell the committee anything regarding your background of employment?

"Mr. McPHAUL. You can draw any conclusion you want. I have answered the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Richard F. O'Hair?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my privileges under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present during the course of his testimony on Monday of this week?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Will you repeat the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you present in this courtroom when Mr. O'Hair testified on Monday of this week?

"Mr. McPHAUL. No; I was not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. O'Hair identified you as a member of the Communist Party. Do you wish to deny or affirm that or explain it?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Will you restate the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you (addressing the official court reporter) read the question?

"(The question was read by the official court reporter.)

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the Constitution, and the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. O'Hair testified in this respect with regard to you. 'Arthur McPhaul was a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party.' Were you at any time a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you at any time a member of the Ford unit or any unit within Ford, that is any unit of the Communist Party?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in this room during the testimony on Tuesday of Walter Scott Dunn?

"Mr. McPHAUL. You asked if I was in this courtroom on Tuesday?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No. Read the question (addressing official court reporter).

(The question was read by the official court reporter.)

"Mr. McPHAUL. My subpena required that——

"Mr. WOOD. Never mind what your subpena required. You were asked whether you were here at the time he testified. That is a simple question. Can't you answer it?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I was here in answer to the subpena.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you in this room while he testified?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I was in the room part of the time that he testified.

"Mr TAVENNER. Did you hear him testify with regard to you in any particular?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Under the privilege granted me under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let me advise you that Mr. Dunn testified and in his testimony he identified you as a person known to him to be a member of the Communist Party. Was he truthful in that statement or not?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my right under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the Constitution and the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. It is the committee's information that Mr. William Patterson is the head of the Civil Rights Congress, or at least is a high official of the Civil Rights Congress. Have you discussed the matter of your testimony with Mr. William Patterson?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my right under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question. You asked me something—did you withdraw the question about Mr. Patterson being an official of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No. I asked you the question that according to our information, he was a leader or an official of the Civil Rights Congress. Do you know Mr. Patterson?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my right under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is an official?

"Mr. McPHAUL. According to the book, Genocide, he is editor of that petition. That also says it was published by the Civil Rights Congress.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you answer the question, please?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I have given the members of the committee a copy. I will give you one if you like.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question? All I am asking is a very simple thing.

"Mr. McPHAUL. What was the question?

"Mr. WOOD. Do you know him?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I thought I answered. I thought that was an answer to that question.

"Mr. WOOD. The question is, Do you know Mr. Patterson, the man whose name was given to you?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I answered that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. William Patterson.

"Mr. McPHAUL. I answered that question, the record will show it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he is an official of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my privileges under the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether he has been here in Detroit advising with witnesses who have been subpenaed to appear here?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the fifth amendment to the Constitution, I refuse to answer the question. I take it for granted your investigators will know. If not, you are getting good cooperation from the FBI and they know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What position does Mr. William Patterson hold in the Civil Rights Congress, if you know?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the privileges of the fifth amendment, I refuse to answer the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether or not Mr. Patterson was at one time one of the top-ranking officials of the International Labor Defense?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Invoking my rights under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, I refuse to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether at one time he was a director of the Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I refuse to answer the question for the same reason.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquaintend with Mary Bray? Miss Mary Bray?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I refuse to answer the question for the same reason.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you acquainted with Jack Raskin at any time?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I refuse to answer that question for the same reason.

"Mr. TAVENNER. To your knowledge, did he ever hold the position with the Civil Rights Congress?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I refuse to answer the question for the same reason.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I refuse to answer that question invoking my rights under the fifth amendment to the Constitution. It is a trick question. If a person said yes, and then you would convict him; and if he said no; you put a stool pigeon on the stand and say he is, so you are damned if you do and damned if you are not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let us see about that. It is a very simple and plain question as to whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party? It can be answered, as you say, either 'yes' or 'no', but I fail to see where there is any trick in it. It is just as perfectly plain and normal a question as anyone could be asked.

"Mr. McPHAUL. I know the record of this committee.

"Mr. JACKSON. And we know the record of the Communist Party.

"Mr. McPHAUL. I know your record, too, Mr. JACKSON.

"Mr. JACKSON. I hope you make the most of it.

"Mr. WOOD. The question is, Will you answer the question?

"Mr. McPHAUL. I answered it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. From your attitude and disposition of these matters, I assume that you are not willing to answer any question that this committee might ask you regarding the activities of the Communist Party in this locality, in the city of Detroit?

"Mr. McPHAUL. Under the fifth amendment of the Constitution, I refuse to answer that question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions.

"Mr. WOOD. Does the committee have any questions?

"Mr. JACKSON. No questions.

"Mr. POTTER. No questions.

"Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No.

"Mr. McPHAUL. There are no Negroes living in Cheboygan, Mr. Potter.

"Mr. POTTER. They are invited any time they want to come up.

"Mr. McPHAUL. They cannot eat there.

"Mr. POTTER. They certainly can.

"Mr. WOOD. Is there any reason why the witness should not be excused?

"Mr. TAVENNER. No.

"Mr. WOOD. The witness is excused."

(The witness was excused.)

Because of the refusal of the said Arthur McPhaul to produce the said records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, mentioned in the foregoing subpena, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the opportunity to inspect the same and of the evidence contained therein which your committee considers relevant to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress and under House Resolution 7 of the Eighty-second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate; and because of the refusal of Arthur McPhaul to answer the foregoing questions, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said Arthur McPhaul relevant to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and under House Resolution No. 7, of the Eighty-second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of witness to answer questions, namely:

"Mr. McPhaul, the committee has heretofore served upon you a subpena duces tecum to produce certain records and documents. Are you prepared to respond to that subpena?

"Are you prepared to produce the documents and papers that have been called upon for you to produce under the subpena?

"The question is as to whether or not you are refusing to produce the records directed to be produced under the subpena.

"My question to you was not answered by that statement, in my judgment. My question was whether or not you are refusing to produce the records which you were directed to produce under this subpena.

"I have asked you to produce the records. Now, will you produce them?

"What type of work do you engage in?

"How were you employed in 1942?

"How were you employed between 1945 and 1950?

"Are you acquainted with a person by the name of Richard F. O'Hair?

"Were you at any time a member of the Midtown Club of the Communist Party?

"Were you at any time a member of the Ford unit, or any unit within Ford, that is, any unit of the Communist Party?

"Did you hear him [Walter Scott Dunn] testify in regard to you in any particular?

"Are you a member of the Civil Rights Congress?

"Do you know whether he [William Patterson] is an official of the Civil Rights Congress?

"What position does Mr. William Patterson hold in the Civil Rights Congress, if you know?

"Are you acquainted with Mary Bray?

"Were you acquainted with Jack Raskin?

"To your knowledge, did he [Jack Raskin] ever hold a position with the Civil Rights Congress?

"Are you now a member of the Communist Party?"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry and is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared. The willful and deliberate refusal of Arthur McPhaul to produce the said records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 717) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Arthur McPhaul to answer questions before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, and as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Arthur McPhaul to produce all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the affiliation with other organizations, and all moneys received or expended by the Civil Rights Congress, before the said committee, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the eastern district of the State of Michigan, to the end that the said Arthur McPhaul may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes or so much thereof as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE]. I feel, however, it might be well for me to yield myself such time as may be necessary to make a very brief statement concerning this resolution.

Investigations conducted by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the city of Baltimore, the State of Massachusetts, and other places, have disclosed a concentration of Communist effort in certain defense areas of the country. It will be remembered that during the Massachusetts hearing, Herbert A. Philbrick detailed the method by which the Communist Party of Massachusetts used its members employed in industry to keep the national organization of the Communist Party and the international Communist movement fully advised of industrial potentialities in that area. Having in mind the great importance to the Nation of the general area of Detroit in the defense industry of our country, the committee conducted an extensive investigation in this vital defense area for the purpose of determining whether there has been Communist activities therein, and if so, the nature, extent, character and objects thereof.

During the course of the investigation, a person by the name of Arthur McPhaul was called as a witness before the committee in Detroit, and was required under a subpena duces tecum to produce certain records of the Civil Rights Congress. The witness refused to produce the records and refused to answer various questions propounded to him, basing his refusal to answer on the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I requested this time without any knowledge on the part of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] as to what I am going to say. I desire to express my own thoughts and what I am sure are the thoughts of my colleagues in the House in relation to our distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] who will not seek reelection.

I have served with JOHN WOOD during the years he has been here, and I have found him to be a gentleman of the highest type, a man of honest and sincere convictions, a man whom I consider to be one of the ablest and hardest working and one of the most conscientious Members I have ever served with.

Mr. WOOD has served as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities which as we all know is a most trying task. It is a difficult matter to serve either as chairman or as a member of that committee. As chairman of the committee he has rendered an outstanding service in the orderly conduct of investigations and not only is the gentleman from Georgia included in my congratulatory observations but all of the members of the committee are included. I refer also to the members of the staff that is associated with that committee.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] was not going to seek reelection I felt very sorry, because men of his capacity, men of his sincerity and ability, are needed in this body at any time, particularly during the trying days that now exist and which face us ahead.

He leaves this body with the keen regard of myself and I know I speak the sentiments of my colleagues without regard to party when I say that he has rendered a distinguished service in this body, he has made valuable contributions to the preservation and to the progress of our country that will go down in history as a memorial to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia and to which his descendants can point with pride. I am particularly pleased to take this time to congratulate my friend on his outstanding services and to again express my regrets at his leaving. But, in his leaving he goes back to his family, to his friends, to his constituents, being able to look them in the face with the knowledge that while he represented them in this body he represented them to the highest degree humanly possible, and that he will be able to look at them and receive the recognition and the words of commendation "Well done, thou true and faithful servant."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to join the gentleman in his remarks about the fine work performed by our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN WOOD. I think everything that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, has said is true, and I, too, want to commend the gentleman and express my sorrow that he is not coming back to the House to continue the duties which he has performed in so magnificent a manner since he has been chairman of this committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by our distinguished majority leader. I regret very much to see JOHN WOOD leave the Halls of Congress. He has done a magnificent job as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities. I think all true Americans are indebted to JOHN WOOD.

I would like to say further, Mr. Speaker, that it was my pleasure to be in college with JOHN WOOD. I happened to be president of the law class from which he and I graduated at Mercer University. Of that class of 1910 four graduates were sent to the Halls of Congress: Mark Wilcox, Ben Gibbs, John Wood, and myself. I have known John intimately from the time we were in college. I have followed his career. He served on the superior court bench in his district, which comprises a number of counties. JOHN WOOD has rendered a great public service in every sector of government in which he has worked, and I regret very much, Mr. Speaker, that a man of JOHN WOOD's caliber should leave the Halls of Congress in these times when we need constructive thinking in this Government.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the laudatory remarks just made by my leader and my very distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. I think that asking for time, and by calling attention to the fact that our friend, Mr. WOOD, leaves the House at the end of the present session, and giving the Members an opportunity to record the high esteem in which the gentleman from Georgia is held by his fellow Members, was a nice thing to have done. If Congress adjourns on the coming Saturday, as is expected, then this is probably the last time that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] will participate in the proceedings of this body for, as has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts, at the end of the session he voluntarily retires. Mr. Speaker, Carlyle, speaking of Sir Walter Scott said:

> That when he made his departure he took a man's life with him. That no sounder piece of British manhood had been put together in the century in which he lived.

And so, paraphrasing what Carlyle said let me say that when JOHN WOOD leaves this body, he will take with him a record for devoted and patriotic service excelled by none, for in my time no finer man has served in this House. In my memory, no greater, finer, or more patriotic man has served as a Member of this House. Always wise to counsel and patient to execute, he has performed a noble work. He has made a tremendous contribution to the welfare of the country he has so honorably and so faithfully served.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, a number of my colleagues paid tribute to JOHN S. WOOD, the gentleman from Georgia, who is not seeking reelection to this body. Although words cannot adequately express the deep affection and admiration in which I hold JOHN WOOD, I want to take this opportunity to add my voice in humble tribute to this great American.

I feel that in the past years I have come to know JOHN WOOD probably as well as any Member of the House. It has been my privilege to sit beside him on the Committee on Un-American Activities of which he has been chairman since the Eighty-first Congress. There, I have had the opportunity to see him dispense the wisdom of Solomon and maintain the patience of Job. You and I can recall the bitterness and attacks that were heaped upon the Committee on Un-American Activities in years prior to JOHN WOOD's chairmanship. The fact that this committee is now held in high esteem both here and by the American public is a singular tribute to him. At the present time, the slander and vilifications that are cast upon the committee and its members is immediately recognized as Communist or Communist inspired. Loyal Americans have come to recognize and appreciate the greater security that has been afforded the country by the diligence of JOHN WOOD and the committee which he has so capably directed as chairman.

I know that it was only after long and considered deliberation that JOHN WOOD decided not to seek reelection. If it had been within my power, through our close relationship, to have discouraged this resolve on his part, I would not only have performed a great personal service, but also a great public service as well.

Men of the caliber of JOHN WOOD can never be replaced. As for myself, while I will continually benefit by the great example which has been set by JOHN WOOD, I will not hesitate to call upon him for advice and counsel as I have done in the past. The words of future historians will pay a much greater tribute to JOHN WOOD than any of us can possibly do today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with appreciation to the tributes to the gentleman from Georgia. He deserves them, every one. Our friend, JOHN S. WOOD, has brought to his duties in the Congress those qualities of mind and heart that make for distinguished public service. In presiding over the important Committee on Un-American Activities he has demonstrated poise, wisdom, and patriotism. In many ways he has shown how a quiet, modest, and highly competent Representative can serve his country and his district. He will be missed in these halls.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with the many fine things that have been said here about Judge JOHN WOOD. As a relatively new Member of Congress it was my privilege to become associated with Judge WOOD on the House Committee on Un-American Activities a little more than a year ago. In that short period of time I have come to have not only a deep respect for his judicial wisdom, his understanding, and his patience, but a very deep personal regard for him.

Here on the floor of the House we sometimes wrangle over partisan considerations but I can say very truthfully that there has never to the best of my knowledge been any partisan aspect to the service of Judge WOOD on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. There is no center aisle in his mind or in his heart.

I feel that in Judge WOOD's decision not to stand for reelection the Congress is losing one of the finest Americans it has ever been my privilege to know. The loss of the House is certainly Georgia's gain. But I know that with Judge WOOD go the best wishes of those of us who have had the privilege of service with him. America is not only a better place in which to live because of his service, but America today is a safer place to live because of the work he has done as the Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE].

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to concur in the statements of my colleague, the distinguished majority leader, regarding the ability Chairman JOHN WOOD, of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has demonstrated over these many years. It is a difficult committee to chairman, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows very well.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with that statement because I was chairman of the committee investigating communism, nazism, fascism, and bigotry 16 or 17 years ago, so I can testify to the statement my friend from Illinois has just made.

Mr. VELDE. Our distinguished majority leader has had a chance to get a rather thick hide in that respect, and a thick hide is what you need, as I have found out in my brief service on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I am sure that what my distinguished friend from California said is very true regarding the impartiality shown by Chairman WOOD toward our side of the aisle in everything we had to bring up before the committee. JOHN WOOD has always put his principles of Americanism above partisan politics. He has been fair in all respects. Of course, a few little difficulties have come up, but they have always been worked out and ironed

out satisfactorily to the Members on our side of the aisle, I am sure.

It is with deep regret that I learned that JOHN WOOD has decided not to run for Congress again. It is our loss in Congress and it is America's loss, but we wish every happiness in the world to JOHN WOOD.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I see inscribed upon the Halls of the Congress a quotation from Daniel Webster that I think is apropos at this time. The quotation is, "Worthy to be remembered." I think I can say for all of us that JOHN WOOD has left a mark in the Congress of the United States for honesty, faithfulness, and service that is worthy to be remembered. I am happy to associate myself with others who have spoken before me, and to join in what has been said by them in his behalf.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities during this term of the Congress, I think I can speak with some personal knowledge, of the great service of JOHN WOOD of Georgia as chairman. One thing among others which I wish to mention about him, which has greatly impressed me, is not only his unfailing fairness and his cooperation with all members of the committee and the staff, but his abiding fairness to witnesses who appeared before the committee. The distinguished majority leader has well said it is a very "trying committee" on which to serve. But it is a real challenge, too. I personally have never observed a single instance where JOHN WOOD, in my judgment, was unfair or unkind or undemocratic, if you please, to witnesses before our committee; even though he may have had personal knowledge at the time, that he was then questioning a witness, known to be hiding behind the first amendment or the fifth amendment of the Constitution without just cause and in bad faith. Our distinguished chairman has not only been eminently fair to all witnesses, but he has preserved a cordial, harmonious, and constructive attitude among all members of the committee under difficult and trying conditions at times as is to be noted from the statement by the minority members here a few minutes ago. I personally very much regret that JOHN WOOD is not coming back. His presiding over the committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, has been a real personal inspiration to me. I know, however, that his family will benefit by his return to private life, and so will his great State. I am happy to give our distinguished chairman this bouquet while he can enjoy its fragrance. I wish him long life and good health for himself and his loved ones.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, within the finite grasp of my capacity, I fail to find words with which to express my keen regret in the knowledge that JOHN WOOD will no more be with us in this body. I have expressed to him on previous occasions my personal regret, and I want to take advantage of this opportunity to say publicly that the House of Representatives will have lost an outstanding American. I know so far as I personally am concerned, I could reach no higher, relatively new Member that I am, than to hope when my last year in this House comes to have attained something near the stature that this great American has attained so that then it could be said of me as can be said now of him, to quote the author of a bygone age:

> Lives of great men all remind us, we can make our lives sublime.
> And departing leave behind us footprints on the sands of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent the district adjoining that of the Honorable JOHN WOOD. I join my colleagues here this morning in paying my respects to the great service that he has rendered to the House of Representatives and the great service that he has rendered to the American people. I have the highest regard and highest esteem for Judge WOOD, and also for the committee over which he has presided so ably. I think the American people will be forever indebted to the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives for the distinguished services they have rendered to the American people in exposing an alien philosophy which has for its purpose the destruction of our way of life. I do regret that JOHN WOOD is not going to be with us next year. I wish him well. However, he will be close by, across the river, where I can go over to see him occasionally. I can say of JOHN WOOD's service in this House, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with those here today in paying tribute to a great statesman. JOHN WOOD probably has served for a longer period of time as the head of a committee, which is more controversial than any other committee of this body. He has served with judicial dignity and fairness.

The manner in which he has handled its business has probably added as much to the internal security and defense of this country as any other one thing we have done here in the last few years. JOHN WOOD has handled this committee so that no individual, so far as I know, can accuse him or accuse the committee of assassination of character, which we heard in the early days of the formation of this committee. It is a tough job, one that will be hard to evaluate immediately what it has really meant to our American democracy.

We associate ourselves with men in the work of this House, in the work on the committees, but he is a sportsman and he is a statesman also. I have had the pleasure of associating myself with him on the golf course while in the House of Representatives. I know of no better place to determine a man's qualities than in the field of sports. He has performed his duties as a statesman. I will personally feel the loss.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I am very sad to see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] leave this body. I say that not only because of his invaluable contribution to the public good of our country, which will live beyond every man and woman who now serves in this great body, but I have a deep personal debt of gratitude to JOHN WOOD, a debt that neither I nor the members of my family could ever repay.

Last year in the heat of a campaign in my great State I was made the subject of an unfair fight by political opponents. JOHN WOOD, who was busy, occupied, had much to do, never hesitated one moment to drop his public affairs and his personal affairs to come to my State and set the record straight. For that I, and the members of my family, shall always be tremendously and eternally grateful.

I know of no man, Mr. Speaker, who has given more generously and unselfishly of his time and his great talents to our country. The job that he was called upon to do in taking over the chairmanship of the House Committee on Un-American Activities called for statesmanship, called for a man whose every instinct was one of patriotic concern for his country and for the citizens of this great country. He has discharged that obligation with honor, with dignity, and with great credit. I know that every Member of this House regrets as deeply as I do to see him leave this body. I know that each and every one of us wishes for him and for the members of his family many, many days of happiness and well-being back home in Georgia.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, as JOHN WOOD leaves the House amid well-deserved praise for his work on the Committee on Un-American Activities, I want to remind the membership of an earlier service to his country and to Congress which he rendered in the House. In 1945 he served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and it was there that I came to know him as a level-

headed, thoughtful, fair and square American.

The Foreign Affairs Committee also is a committee that deals with controversial subjects; and in leaving that committee to take the assignment on the Un-American Activities Committee in which he has acquitted himself so splendidly, he was jumping from the frying pan into the fire. On both committees he rendered great service. He can look back on his congressional career with justified pride. I wish him well in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another distinguished son of Georgia, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in these words of tribute to a distinguished gentleman, Judge WOOD, for his splendid American service.

When first elected to Congress he left his seat to enter the World War where he served with distinction in the Army of the United States. Coming back after the war he served as a circuit judge in Georgia in a most distinguished manner, and thereafter was sent back to Congress a second time.

He has brought to the House and to the Committee on Un-American Activities the benefit of his experience; and I wish to say that I do not believe any group in Congress has rendered a more patriotic or distinguished service than this committee which he helped organize and now heads. The House will certainly lose one of its most able Members when he leaves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend; and to my good friend, JOHN WOOD, may I say that these expressions are spontaneous. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] had no knowledge that anyone was going to make any remarks on this occasion; and may I observe further for my friend JOHN WOOD'S consideration and benefit, that they come from the heart; everything that every Member has said in relation to you, my dear friend, comes from the heart; and I know it will be one of the fondest and sweetest pages in your book of memories as long as you live, that when you left here you did so with the admiration, the respect, and the affection of all of your colleagues.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the proceeding now before the House to cite Arthur McPhaul for contempt of Congress is a proceeding which I think we should all join unanimously.

The hearing of Arthur McPhaul took place in Detroit, Mich. I regret to say that I was unable to be there to listen to this witness on the stand. It is difficult, of course, to determine just what the actions of a witness are, just how much he does show his contempt, merely by reading the printed words alone, but even in this particular case, by a reading of the printed words, and the questions and answers in our report, I am sure any Member of this House can see that Arthur McPhaul was clearly in contempt of the Un-American Activities Committee at Detroit.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I have read some of the testimony to which the gentleman has adverted. I wonder whether in a court of law this contempt proceeding will stand, because this witness—and I have nothing but contempt myself for him: I am speaking as a lawyer now—I wonder whether this would be upheld in a court of law, because to almost every question that was propounded to him he availed himself of his right under the fifth amendment not to answer on the ground it might tend to incriminate him.

Mr. VELDE. If the gentleman will read the report he will find that the contempt is based upon his failure to bring in certain books and papers. As I recall it, this matter has not been definitely decided by the Supreme Court up to this time, but I do hope, if this particular case is tried and it goes up on appeal, that the Supreme Court will see fit to uphold a conviction for contempt. I believe that the Supreme Court would be duty bound in this particular case to uphold the contempt citation.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. In the Jane Rogers case the Supreme Court has held it is no defense to a subpena duces tecum to produce records to say that production would incriminate one.

Mr. CELLER. Even if the record he would submit under the subpena were incriminatory of him, the gentleman's position is he cannot refuse to submit the documents?

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. That is not my opinion. That is the opinion of the Supreme Court.

Mr. CELLER. What is the citation of that case?

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. It is the Jane Rogers case. I do not know the exact citation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VELDE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. When a man is out committing treason against this Government and our boys are dying in Korea he should not be permitted to crawl behind such an excuse as that. The Congress has a right to investigate what he is doing and to force him to submit the records that it demands.

Mr. VELDE. I do not agree entirely with that. I think every person coming before a court of justice as well as before committees of Congress should be allowed to plead the fifth amendment to the Constitution and use all of the provisions of the Constitution. I think we all agree with the gentleman that in most of these cases the contempt comes when they fail to answer the most inconsequential questions. This certainly should not be permitted and they should not be permitted to hide behind the Constitution where there is no possible chance of incrimination.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to make plain that I have no sympathy whatsoever for this gentleman who refused to answer. I would like to have some punishment meted out to him. But I wonder whether or not you can under these proceedings successfully mete out the proposed punishment. I do not know how you are going to get at him. I believe when he avails himself of his rights under the fifth amendment, regardless of whether it is treason or not, the Constitution must prevail regardless of the nature of the crimes in the sense that any criminal has the right to avail himself of his constitutional rights. I repeat, I have no sympathy whatever for him, I would spew him out as it were, but I am jealous of everybody's rights under the Constitution. However, I accept the view of the gentleman from Georgia that under the case of *Rogers* v. *U. S.* (340 U. S. 367), this man, cited, is guilty of contempt of Congress. I have read the case a few moments ago and it holds that failure to yield records, held in a representative capacity, is tantamount to contempt.

Mr. RANKIN. I repeat that if this man has been committing treason, he has no right to wrap the fifth amendment to the Constitution around him and refuse to answer questions that will show how he is trying to undermine and destroy this Government, when our boys are fighting and dying on foreign battlefronts by the thousands.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I hope that on a roll call on this particular contempt citation we may demonstrate to all Americans, the Supreme Court of the United States and to the appellate courts, we are unanimous in the belief that witnesses such as this who appear before our committee should and must be required to answer the questions propounded them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the current citations against Arthur McPhaul and Saul Grossman grow out of hearings conducted by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Detroit area several months ago, hearings which were directed at determining, if possible, the nature and the extent of Communist activities in that vital defense area.

I might say in passing that the committee did, in fact, discover and bring to light the postwar existence of more than 100 branches of the Communist Party in that American arsenal of democracy.

In line with the inquiry regarding these two individuals, Mr. Grossman and Mr. McPhaul, subpenas duces tecum were issued requiring their appearance before the Committee on Un-American Activities, to explain certain activities, certain allegations, relating to the Civil Rights Congress and the Michigan Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. Both of these committees have been cited as subversive in nature by the

Attorney General of the United States or by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or by both.

I think that any Member who reads the report will quickly become convinced that here, indeed, are two cases of barefaced contempt. I bracket the McPhaul and Grossman cases together because they are almost identical, in that those who are here being cited failed to produce certain documents and records which were required to be produced under the subpenas duces tecum before the committee. I had thought up to the time that these gentleman appeared before the committee that I had seen contempt in its purest form exhibited by some of the other witnesses who had theretofore appeared before the committee. But when Mr. McPhaul appeared, I realized that I had never seen absolute, pure, dripping contempt not only for the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and its staff, but for the Congress of the United States, the American people, and the institutions and the ideals of this country.

In contrast to the attitudes taken by the witnesses, I think it should be pointed out that every consideration was shown the witnesses. They were both permitted counsel during the entire course of the proceedings. In the case of Mr. McPhaul he requested that no photographs be taken during his appearance, and the chairman acquiesced to that request. The committee very patiently took the abuse, the vilification, some of which was of a very personal nature, without question and as part of our obligations as they exist in that committee.

There is no question as to the legality of the subpenas which were drawn. There is no question as to the legality of the service of those subpenas. There is no question as to the association of Mr. McPhaul as a functionary of the Civil Rights Congress in Detroit, nor of Mr. Grossman as a functionary of the Michigan Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. These witnesses simply refused to answer the questions put to them and disregarded that portion of the subpena which called for the production of certain papers and documents. In their attitudes they appeared to take pleasure and delight in being as obnoxious, as cantankerous, and as arrogant as they could be.

I think that there remains very little more to be said with respect to the case of Mr. McPhaul. The report is quite comprehensive. While it does not, as I say, represent the true measure of his contempt, it is still possible to read that contempt between the lines, that vocal, vociferous, arrogant contempt of anything with which he disagreed. I hope that the committee will vote these contempt citations and that they will be voted unanimously.

I might say that the House Committee on Un-American Activities has been very careful in bringing before this body citations for contempt. If there has been any question, if the case appeared to be one even approaching the border line, it has not been certified to the House for action. There is no question in my mind as to the two citations currently pending. Again I express the hope that the membership of the House will in its wisdom send these cases to the court with a mandate from this body.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor a few moments ago when the Members took this opportunity to say a few words about our departing colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activites. I beg the indulgence of the House in order that I may say a few words about a friend of long standing, with whom I have enjoyed serving during the 6 years I have been in Congress.

Southerners have often been maligned by people who do not always understand Southerners by nature. Southerners usually are individualists, and there is reason for that. We have had pretty tough going in days gone by, especially in Georgia. Being a colonial State, we produced a type of citizenry that in many respects is somewhat different than those in other sections of the country. The Revolutionary blood of the early settlers still remains in the descendents of those early people in Georgia. They are rather unique even today. The average Georgian is a person who prides himself on the fact that he can shoot a pistol straight, play a good game of cards, and do an honest day's work, and at the same time when Sunday comes around can lay aside more mundane things and worship God with great fervor.

Above all else, Georgians are patriotic. JOHN WOOD has brought to the Congress that sort of spirit. He has truly been a patriot in the service he has rendered to the United States. All of America is indebted to this man for the fine way in which he has conducted the affairs of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Even before he brought that service to the Congress, he gave to the people of Georgia a full life of wonderful public service. He is respected, honored, and held in great esteem by every one in the State of Georgia who knows him, and I may say that the name of JOHN WOOD is well known throughout our State.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. One thing I forgot to say during the course of my remarks about JOHN WOOD was that probably one of the greatest accolades of his public service was the recent action of the American Bar Association through its House of Delegates in endorsing the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Without taking much time of the House, I wish to concur in everything that has been said about my friend, JOHN WOOD. He is not only a gracious and charming southern gentleman; he is also a very able, courageous, and respected legislator. I am glad to take this opportunity to wish him the very best of everything as he retires to private life.

Mr. PRESTON. I am sure all Members join in expressing the hope that our colleague will find retirement interesting and restful. He certainly deserves it, because his life has truly been passed in a most useful manner throughout the years. I express my personal regret that he has seen fit to give up public service, but it is certainly understandable, having labored as arduously as he has.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I do not believe there is one in Georgia, Mr. Speaker, who would deny to JOHN WOOD the privilege of laying down the working tools after many, many years of splendid service to his State and his Nation. John has been honored down there as few Georgians have. He has been most deserving. He has been Solicitor General of the courts, judge of the superior courts, and has had the opportunity of serving this Nation for years in Congress. Surely, surely, he will have much pleasure in his reflections as he goes through life over the fact that as a Representative from Georgia, one of the States that were the architects of our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, that he has been privileged to defend our country against its enemies, for, naturally it is in his blood and his bones to defend this country and to defend our Constitution. Certainly his work along with that of the other fine members of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has been outstanding. The people will appreciate him more and more as the years go by. He has represented his State and country so ably, he will always remain in our hearts.

John, we wish you the very best in life. You have certainly earned it.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to one of the ablest members of this body, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of the Ninth District of Georgia, who is not seeking reelection after having served as Congressman, with distinction, for the past four Congresses and also the Seventy-second and Seventy-third Congresses.

He is a valuable member of the Committee on Education and Labor. He has won Nation-wide renown and approval for his untiring vigilance and achievements as chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and his retirement from Congress is a great loss to the committee and Congress.

His experience before coming to Washington particularly fitted him for duty in the United States House of Representatives. He served as a member of the State house of representatives. He was a splendid jurist, and had an excellent record as prosecuting attorney and judge.

Judge WOOD has one of the most brilliant minds of any man who has served in the House since I have been a Member. He is thoroughly honest and sincere.

All of us here will certainly miss JOHN WOOD. Our best wishes for his health

and happiness go with him as he leaves us for other walks of life, and we hope he will continue to be successful in all that he does. I shall especially miss him as a member of the Georgia delegation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the remarks made by my colleagues in praise of my distinguished colleague from Georgia, the Honorable JOHN S. WOOD, of the Ninth District, strike a responsive chord in me. It was with a deep feeling of regret that I learned of JOHN WOOD's decision not to be a candidate for reelection to the Eighty-third Congress. My association with him since I have been a member of the House has been most pleasant and John has at every opportunity gone out of his way to be of help to me.

It was not long after I came to this distinguished body that I learned of the high esteem in which JOHN WOOD was held by his colleagues. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, his influence has been widely felt and he has been a valuable member of that very important committee.

However, it is as a member and chairman of the Committtee on Un-American Activities that John has distinguished himself and gained a national reputation. In the struggle against communism and its infiltration into all segments of our life, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been a bulwark against these subversive influences. When John became chairman, he brought a new dignity and a renewal of confidence in this committee not only to members of the House but to the Nation as a whole. As the chairman of the committee, he has presided with effectiveness and dignity; and has at the same time that he was pressing vigorously against subversive influences and elements, safeguarded the rights of individuals appearing before his committee.

His retirement will be a distinct loss to the House and I personally will miss his cheerful smile, his wise advice and counsel as well as the personal contacts which have been so pleasant. My good wishes go with him as he returns to private life.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join, of course, in paying tribute to my distinguished friend, JOHN WOOD of Georgia, with whom I served on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

If you remember, it was my resolution in 1945, that created this Committee on Un-American Activities as a standing committee, at a time when every attempt was being made to destroy it and to destroy that vast wealth of records which the Dies committee had collected. Dr. John Beaty, one of the outstanding Christian leaders of America in the Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex., wrote a book recently called the Iron Curtain Over America, which I wish every person in the United States could read.

In that book he refers to the adoption of my amendment in 1945, in the following language:

> The Rankin amendment gave the United States of America a chance to survive as a Nation under its Constitution. Is it then to be wondered at that Mr. RANKIN has been subject to bitter reprisals ever since by Communists and fellow travelers and their dupes?

The enemies within our gates were plotting then, and are plotting today, to overthrow this Government. I, for one, am not willing to let one of them get up here and perpetuate treason against the United States Government and against our men who are fighting and dying on every battlefront in the world, and then come in and wrap the fifth amendment of the Constitution around themselves and distort it, misapply it, and use it to keep themselves out of jail or keep their necks from being broken.

You remember a few years ago, we had this old Gerhart Eisler before the committee, and he made the same plea. Where is Eisler today? He is the Communist leader in one of the countries of Europe.

This committee is doing one of the greatest works ever accomplished by any committee of the Congress of the United States. By the way, when my resolution created this committee, I was offered the chairmanship of it. I was not willing to give up the chairmanship of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, therefore, I declined. I saw a short time ago where the United Press came out with a statement to the effect that I was taken off the committee because I was not a lawyer. Of course, that is not true. I am a lawyer, although I have put in my time in Congress since coming to this House and not practicing law. But our members of the Committee on Ways and Means decided that no chairman of another committee, at least the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, should serve on any other committee, and, therefore, I had to either give up the chairmanship of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or vacate my place on the Committee on Un-American Activities. I chose the latter course, but I have never ceased to back up and support that committee in all its attempts to expose the treason of the enemies within our gates, because if this thing goes on, America is in danger of a coming revolution. If this gang that is surreptitiously trying to get control of the world, and especially of America, should succeed, the American people could not live under them. You will have the same revolution in this country that they have had in every other country in which they have seized power. That is one reason I say to the American Congress you should support the Committee on Un-American Activities and should support every other agency of this Government that would drive from power those insidious alien enemies who are now plotting the overthrow of this Government, the destruction of the American way of life, and the wiping of Christianity from the face of the earth.

I am glad to pay my tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], a man of honesty, integrity, Christianity, patriotism, and ability, who has been chairman of this committee at a time when it took more abuse than any other committee that Congress has ever seen. I am used to it myself. Every lie has been told about me that could be thought of, and published in the Communist Daily Worker, and other Red front publications.

If you are going to combat the enemies of your Government, who are insidiously trying to destroy it, you may expect such attacks, and you may expect such abuse. I have no apology to make for what I have done to save my country from destruction at their hands.

I am sorry to see JOHN WOOD leave the committee and I am sorry to see him leave this House. He is a great American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I just made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MILLS]. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, because of the technical aspect of the particular case, I feel impelled to ask for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 0, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 124]

YEAS—348

Abbitt	Burleson	Donovan
Adair	Burnside	Dorn
Addonizio	Burton	Doyle
Allen, Calif.	Busbey	Durham
Allen, Ill.	Bush	Eberharter
Andersen, H. Carl	Butler	Elliott
	Byrnes	Ellsworth
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Elston
Andresen, August H.	Canfield	Engle
	Cannon	Fallon
Andrews	Carrigg	Feighan
Angell	Case	Fernandez
Arends	Celler	Fine
Armstrong	Chatham	Fisher
Aspinall	Chelf	Flood
Auchincloss	Chenoweth	Fogarty
Ayres	Chiperfield	Forand
Bailey	Chudoff	Ford
Baker	Church	Forrester
Barden	Clemente	Fugate
Baring	Clevenger	Fulton
Barrett	Cole, Kans.	Furcolo
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Gamble
Battle	Cooley	Garmatz
Beamer	Cooper	Gary
Bennett, Fla.	Corbett	Gathings
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Gavin
Bentsen	Cox	George
Berry	Crawford	Golden
Betts	Crosser	Goodwin
Bishop	Crumpacker	Gordon
Blackney	Cunningham	Graham
Blatnik	Curtis, Mo.	Granahan
Boggs, Del.	Dague	Granger
Boggs, La.	Davis, Ga.	Grant
Bolling	Davis, Wis.	Green
Bolton	Deane	Greenwood
Bonner	DeGraffenried	Gregory
Bosone	Delaney	Gross
Boykin	Dempsey	Hagen
Bramblett	Denny	Hale
Bray	Denton	Hall, Leonard W.
Brooks	Devereux	
Brown, Ga.	D'Ewart	Halleck
Bryson	Dollinger	Hand
Buchanan	Dolliver	Hardy
Budge	Dondero	Harris
Buffett	Donohue	Harrison, Nebr.

Harrison, Va.	McGuire	Rodino
Harrison, Wyo.	McIntire	Rogers, Colo.
Hart	McKinnon	Rogers, Fla.
Harvey	McMillan	Rogers, Mass.
Havenner	McMullen	Rogers, Tex.
Hays, Ark.	McVey	Rooney
Hays, Ohio	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Hedrick	Mack, Ill.	Ross
Heller	Mack, Wash.	Sadlak
Herlong	Madden	St. George
Hess	Magee	Saylor
Hill	Mahon	Schenck
Hillings	Mansfield	Scott, Hardie
Hinshaw	Marshall	Scrivner
Hoeven	Martin, Iowa	Scudder
Hoffman, Ill.	Martin, Mass.	Secrest
Hoffman, Mich.	Mason	Seely-Brown
Holifield	Merrow	Shafer
Holmes	Miller, Calif.	Sheehan
Hope	Miller, Nebr.	Sheppard
Horan	Miller, N. Y.	Sieminski
Howell	Mills	Simpson, Ill.
Hull	Morano	Simpson, Pa.
Hunter	Morton	Sittler
Ikard	Multer	Smith, Kans.
Irving	Mumma	Smith, Miss.
Jackson, Calif.	Murdock	Smith, Va.
Jackson, Wash.	Murphy	Smith, Wis.
James	Murray	Spence
Jarman	Nelson	Springer
Javits	Nicholson	Stanley
Jenison	Norblad	Stockman
Jenkins	Norrell	Taber
Jensen	O'Brien, Ill.	Talle
Johnson	O'Brien, Mich.	Teague
Jonas	O'Hara	Thomas
Jones, Ala.	O'Konski	Thompson, Mich.
Jones, Mo.	O'Neill	Thornberry
Jones, Woodrow W.	Ostertag	Tollefson
Judd	O'Toole	Trimble
Karsten, Mo.	Patman	Vail
Kean	Patten	Van Pelt
Kearns	Patterson	Van Zandt
Keating	Perkins	Velde
Kelley, Pa.	Phillips	Vorys
Kelly, N. Y.	Pickett	Vursell
Kennedy	Poage	Watts
Kerr	Polk	Welchel
Kilburn	Poulson	Werdel
Kilday	Preston	Wharton
King, Calif.	Price	Wheeler
King, Pa.	Priest	Whitten
Klein	Prouty	Widnall
Kluczynski	Rabaut	Wier
Lane	Radwan	Wigglesworth
Lanham	Rains	Williams, Miss.
Lantaff	Ramsay	Williams, N. Y.
Latham	Rankin	Wilson, Ind.
LeCompte	Reams	Wilson, Tex.
Lesinski	Redden	Winstead
Lind	Reed, Ill.	Withrow
Lovre	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
Lucas	Rees, Kans.	Wolverton
McCarthy	Regan	Wood, Ga.
McCormack	Rhodes	Wood, Idaho
McCulloch	Ribicoff	Yates
McDonough	Riehlman	Yorty
McGrath	Rivers	Zablocki
McGregor	Roberts	
	Robeson	

NOT VOTING—83

Aandahl	Fenton	Osmers
Abernethy	Frazier	Passman
Albert	Gore	Philbin
Allen, La.	Gwinn	Potter
Anfuso	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bakewell	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Richards
Beall	Heffernan	Riley
Beckworth	Herter	Sabath
Belcher	Heselton	Sasscer
Bender	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bow	Kearney	Shelley
Brehm	Kee	Short
Brown, Ohio	Keogh	Sikes
Brownson	Kersten, Wis.	Staggers
Buckley	Kirwan	Steed
Burdick	Larcade	Stigler
Carlyle	Lyle	Sutton
Carnahan	McConnell	Tackett
Cole, N. Y.	Meader	Taylor
Combs	Miller, Md.	Thompson, Tex.
Coudert	Mitchell	Vinson
Curtis, Nebr.	Morgan	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Morris	Welch
Dawson	Morrison	Wickersham
Dingell	Moulder	Willis
Doughton	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff
Eaton		
Evins		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Hugh D. Scott.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Bakewell.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kearney.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Short.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Hamilton C. Jones with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Morrison with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Woodruff.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST SAUL GROSSMAN

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I submit a privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST SAUL GROSSMAN

Mr. WOOD of Georgia, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2), of the Seventy-ninth Congress and under House Resolution No. 7, of the Eighty-second Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to Saul Grossman. The said subpena directed Saul Grossman forthwith to be and appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States in its chambers in the city of Washington, on April 29, 1952, and as executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, to bring with him all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The subpena served upon the said Saul Grossman is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to Donald T. Appell. You are hereby commanded to summon Saul Grossman, executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born to be and appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, together with all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, in their chamber in the city of Washington, in room 226, Old House Office Building, on April 29, 1952, at the hour of forthwith, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 29th day of April 1952.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Acting Chairman.

"Attest:
"[SEAL] RALPH H. ROBERTS.
"Clerk, United States House of Representatives."

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by Donald T. Appell, investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a person duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service endorsed on the said subpena is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Saul Grossman before the Committee on Un-American Activities; served herein named in hearing room of House Committee on Un-American Activities at 11:20 a. m., April 29, 1952.

"DONALD T. APPELL,
"Investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives."

Prior to the issuance of the said subpena, a subpena duces tecum was issued on the 5th day of March 1952, requiring Saul Grossman, executive secretary of the Michigan Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, at room 737, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich., on March 12, 1952, at the hour of 10 a. m., and to bring with him all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, and then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee. The said subpena was served by W. J. Jones, an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, on the 5th day of March 1952, and said subpena was continued and extended to the 26th day of March 1952.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call on the 12th day of March 1952, at 10 a. m., in room 740, Federal Building, Detroit, Mich. Representative John S. Wood, chairman, presiding, and committee members Francis E. Walter, Donald L. Jackson, and Charles E. Potter being present. When the said Saul Grossman was called as a witness before said subcommittee, Ernest Goodman, counsel for the said Saul Grossman, advised the committee that he had received a doctor's certificate stating that the said Saul Grossman was in bed with the flu and would be confined to bed for the balance of the week. Upon examination of the doctor's certificate by the chairman, the said subpena duces tecum was continued to the 26th day of March, at Washington, D. C. The said subpena was again extended to the 29th day of April 1952, at Washington, D. C.

On the 29th day of April 1952, the Committee on Un-American Activities, under the authority heretofore set forth, caused to be issued a subpena duces tecum, requiring Saul Grossman to be and appear before a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, in their chambers in the city of Washington, and as executive secretary of the Michigan Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, to bring with him all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, on April 29, 1952, at 10:45 a. m., then and there to testify to matters of inquiry committed to the said committee and not to depart without leave of said committee. The said subpena is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America to Donald T. Appell. You are hereby commanded to summon Saul Grossman, executive secretary of the Michigan Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, to be and appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable Francis E. Walter is chairman, together with all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, in their chamber in the city of Washington, room 226, Old House Office Building, on April 29, 1952, at the hour of 10:45 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 29th day of April 1952.

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
"Acting Chairman.

"Attest:
"[SEAL] RALPH R. ROBERTS,
"Clerk, United States House of Representatives."

The said subpena was duly served, as appears by the return made thereon by Donald T. Appell, investigator for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a person duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service endorsed on the said subpena is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Saul Grossman before the Committee on Un-American Activities; served the herein named at 10:40 a. m., in room 226, Old House Office Building.

"DONALD T. APPELL,
"Investigator, Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives."

In compliance with the said subpena issued on the 5th day of March 1952, and extended to the 26th day of March 1952, and again extended to the 29th day of April 1952, as aforesaid, and the said subpena issued on the 29th day of April 1952, requiring the appearance of the witness at 10:45 a. m. in the committee chambers, Saul Grossman appeared before the said committee, and your committee then and there demanded the production of all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, and the said Saul Grossman refused to produce the said records and documents, and refused to answer all questions relating thereto, the said Saul Grossman having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions, namely:

"Why haven't you produced them [records and documents] in accordance with the demands of the subpena?

"Are you the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Are you acquainted with an organization known as the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Do you know whether the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a part of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer such questions; and as a result of the said Saul Grossman's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions and produce the aforesaid records and documents, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said Saul Grossman.

The record of the proceedings before the committee on April 29, 1952, during which the said Saul Grossman refused to produce the said records and documents pertinent to the subject under inquiry, and during which the said Saul Grossman refused to answer the aforesaid questions, pertinent to the subject under inquiry is set forth as follows:

"(A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives, consisting of Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Hon. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY, and Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON (Hon. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR., being absent), met in the chamber of the Committee on Un-American Activities in room 226, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., on April 29, 1952, at 10:40 a. m.)

"Mr. WALTER. The committee will come to order.

"The chairman of the committee has appointed a subcommittee consisting of Messrs. FRAZIER, KEARNEY, JACKSON, and WALTER, to conduct this hearing. A majority of that subcommittee is present.

"Proceed, Mr. Tavenner.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to call Mr. Grossman, please; Mr. Saul Grossman.

"Mr. WALTER. Mr. Grossman, will you raise your right hand?

"Do you swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I do.

"Mr. WALTER. Mr. Grossman, are you represented by counsel?

"TESTIMONY OF SAUL GROSSMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID REIN

"Mr. GROSSMAN. Yes; I am.

"Mr. WALTER. Will the counsel please state his name and address for the record?

"Mr. REIN. David Rein, R-e-i-n, 711 Fourteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you state your full name, please, sir?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. My name is Saul Grossman.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Grossman, you have been subpenaed here in your official capacity as executive secretary of the Michigan chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, to produce certain records called for in the subpena duces tecum.

"I would like at this point to offer in evidence the subpena, bearing date of March 5, 1952, subpenaing Saul Grossman, executive secretary of the Michigan chapter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which was served on March 5, 1952, by Mr. W. L. Jones, investigator of the Committee on Un-American Activities, and I ask that it be marked 'Exhibit No. 1.'

"Mr. WALTER. Without objection, it will be so marked and received.

"(The subpena referred to was marked 'Grossman Exhibit No. 1' and made a part of the record.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. That is Grossman exhibit No. 1.

"That subpena was for production of the records at the hearing then being conducted in Detroit.

"I desire also to introduce in evidence copy of a telegram from the chairman to Mr. Ernest Goodman. But before that I desire to refer to a direction given by the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities during the last day of the hearings in Detroit, March 12, 1952, in the following language:

"'In the meantime all witnesses who had been subpenaed to appear here before this committee during this week are directed that the subpenas are hereby continued effective until March 26, at which time you will be given official notification as to whether the committee will be back here or whether you will be required to come to Washington. That includes all witnesses who are now subpenaed here before this committee.'"

"And now I would like to introduce in evidence and have marked as Grossman exhibit No. 2, a telegram from the chairman of this committee, bearing date March 21, as follows:

"'Mr. ERNEST GOODMAN,
"'*Attorney at Law,*
"'*Cadillac Tower Building,*
"'*Detroit, Mich.*

"'Appearance before Committee on Un-American Activities of your clients Harold Franklin and Saul Grossman is hereby postponed from March 26, 1952, to Tuesday, April 29, 1952, 226 House Office Building, Washington, D. C., 10:30 a. m. Please confirm by collect return wire.'

"Then this morning on your arrival here, Mr. Grossman, you were served with a subpena requiring the production of the same records and documents before the committee here in Washington. Is that correct?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I was served with a subpena this morning as I was in the anteroom of this committee.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to offer in evidence the subpena referred to, which was served by Mr. Donald T. Appell, investigator of this committee, and ask that it be marked 'Grossman Exhibit No. 3.'

"Mr. WALTER. The documents referred to may be so marked and made of record.

"(The documents referred to were marked 'Grossman Exhibits Nos. 2 and 3,' and made a part of the record.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, Mr. Grossman, have you with you the records and documents described in the subpena duces tecum?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. No; I do not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Why haven't you produced them in accordance with the demands of the subpena?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, invoking my privileges under the fifth amendment against self-incrimination.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are the executive secretary of the Michigan chapter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, are you not?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I know of no such organization.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Then if you know of no such organization, how could production of the records of such an organization or your

testifying regarding it in any way incriminate you?

"(Mr. Grossman confers with his counsel.)

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I will stick to my previous answer to that question.

"Mr. WALTER. I did not hear that last statement.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You say you are not acquainted with any organization known as the Michigan Chapter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. That is correct.

"Mr. WALTER. Do you know whether or not there is such an organization?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. To my knowledge there is not.

"Mr. WALTER. There is not?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. That is correct.

"Mr. WALTER. Then as I understand the position you take, it is that you are afraid that you might incriminate yourself by answering the question whether or not you brought records of a nonexistent organization?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I stick to my previous answer, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with an organization known as the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you know whether the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a part of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question on the same grounds.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I request that the witness be requested to stand aside for the present, so that we may go ahead with another witness. We will recall him.

"(Whereupon, at 11:05 a. m., the witness, Saul Grossman, was temporarily excused.)"

Because of the refusal of the said Saul Grossman to produce the said records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, mentioned in the foregoing subpena, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the opportunity to inspect the same and the evidence contained therein which your committee considered relevant to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and under House Resolution No. 7 of the Eighty-second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate; and because of the refusal of Saul Grossman to answer the foregoing questions, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to the said Saul Grossman relative to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and under House Resolution No. 7 of the Eighty-Second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions, namely:

"Why haven't you produced them [records and documents] in accordance with the demands of the subpena?

"Are you the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Are you acquainted with an organization known as the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?

"Do you know whether the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a part of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born?"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared. The willful and deliberate refusal of Saul Grossman to produce the said records and documents as called for in the subpena, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

After the said witness, Saul Grossman, was temporarily excused from the witness stand, he was served with the "forthwith" subpena as described in the first paragraph of this report. In compliance with the said "forthwith" subpena, Saul Grossman appeared before the said subcommittee at 11:45 a. m., and your committee then and there demanded the production of the said records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, described in the said "forthwith" subpena; and the said Saul Grossman refused to produce the said records and documents and refused to answer all questions relating thereto. The said Saul Grossman, having appeared as a witness and having been asked questions, namely:

"Why do you not have them [the records called for in the subpena]?

"You have been subpenaed in your official capacity to produce those records.

"You are the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, are you not?

"I asked you whether or not you refuse to produce the records called for in the subpena. Because I am demanding the production of them.

"Mr. Chairman, I request that he be directed to produce the records.

"Yes; the acting chairman directs that the witness produce the records of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born described in the subpena duces tecum.

"Where are the records of this committee?

"Am I right in assuming that there are records?

"Well, how about the question asked you by counsel? Do you decline to produce the records?

"That is not what I asked you, and the question calls for a simple answer, 'Yes' or 'No.'"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer such questions; and as a result of the said Saul Grossman's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions and produce the said records and documents described in the said forthwith subpena, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon said Saul Grossman.

The record of the proceedings before the committee, on April 29, 1952, at 11:45 a. m., during which the said Saul Grossman refused to produce all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the Michigan Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, pertinent to the subject under inquiry, and during which the said Saul Grossman refused to answer the aforesaid questions, pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth as follows:

"(A subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities, consisting of Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman, Hon. JAMES B. FRAZIER, Hon. BERNARD W. KEARNEY, and Hon. DONALD L. JACKSON (Hon. JAMES B. FRAZIER being absent), meeting in the chambers of the Committee on Un-American Activities on April 29, 1952, at 11:45 a. m., continued its interrogation of the witness, Saul Grossman, who had been temporarily excused at 11:05 a. m., on the same day, FRANCIS E. WALTER, presiding.)

"Mr. WALTER. Who is your next witness, Mr. Tavenner?

"Mr. TAVENNER. I would like to recall Mr. Grossman, Mr. Saul Grossman.

"Mr. WALTER. The witness has been sworn.

"The witness is represented by the same counsel.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are Mr. Saul Grossman?

"TESTIMONY OF SAUL GROSSMAN, ACCOMPANIED BY HIS COUNSEL, DAVID REIN—Resumed

"Mr. GROSSMAN. Yes; I am.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are the same person who appeared a few moments ago as a witness before the committee and was excused temporarily?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. More than a few moments, but I am the same person.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Since you were excused temporarily from your position as a witness before the committee, there has been served on you a forthwith subpena duces tecum, on you in your official capacity as executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, to produce certain records before this committee.

"I desire to offer in evidence the subpena, which was served by Donald T. Appell, an investigator of this committee, and have it marked 'Grossman exhibit No. 4.'

"Mr. WALTER. It will be so marked, and without objection it is received.

"(The subpena referred to was marked 'Grossman exhibit No. 4,' and made a part of the record.)

"Mr. TAVENNER. I desire to ask whether you have with you the records called for in the subpena.

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I do not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Why do you not have them?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds that my answer may incriminate me.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have been subpenaed in your official capacity to produce those records. You are the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, are you not?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the same grounds.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do I understand that you are refusing to produce any records of that office?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. You do not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is that?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. You do not.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your position?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. You ask a question, and I will answer it.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I asked you whether or not you refuse to produce the records called for in the subpena. Because I am demanding the production of them.

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I request that he be directed to produce the records.

"Mr. WALTER. Yes; the acting chairman directs that the witness produce the records of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born described in the subpena duces tecum.

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. WALTER. Do you decline to produce the records?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I do not have any records with me.

"Mr. WALTER. Where are the records of this committee?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. WALTER. Am I right in assuming that there are records?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, sir.

"Mr. KEARNEY. Well, how about the question asked you by counsel? Do you decline to produce the records?

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I do not have any records with me.

"Mr. KEARNEY. That is not what I asked you, and the question calls for a simple answer, 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer that question, on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. KEARNEY. I did not hear that.

"Mr. GROSSMAN. I decline to answer the question, on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. WALTER. Any questions, Mr. KEARNEY or Mr. JACKSON?

"The witness may be excused.

"The committee will recess, subject to call.

"(Whereupon, at 11:55 a. m., Tuesday, April 29, 1952, the hearing was recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)"

Because of the refusal of the said Saul Grossman, to produce all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of the Michigan Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Michigan Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, mentioned in the "forthwith" subpena, described in the first paragraph of this report, the Committee on Un-American Activities has been deprived of the opportunity to inspect the same and of the evidence contained therein, which your committee considers relevant to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress and under House Resolution No. 7 of the Eighty-second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate; and because of the refusal of Saul Grossman to answer the foregoing questions, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to the said Saul Grossman relevant to the subject matter, which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and House Resolution No. 7 of the Eighty-second Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions, namely:

"Why do you not have them [the records called for in the subpena]?

"You have been subpenaed in your official capacity to produce those records. You are the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, are you not?

"I asked you whether or not you refuse to produce the records called for in the subpena. Because I am demanding the production of them.

"Mr. Chairman, I request that he be directed to produce the records.

"Yes; the acting chairman directs that the witness produce the records of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born described in the subpena duces tecum.

"Where are the records of this committee?

"Am I right in assuming that there are records?

"Well, how about the question asked you by counsel? Do you decline to produce the records?

"That is not what I asked you, and the question calls for a simple answer, 'Yes' or 'No.'"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared. The willful and deliberate refusal of Saul Grossman to produce the said records and documents as called for in the subpena, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 718) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of Saul Grossman to answer questions before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, and as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Saul Grossman to produce all records, correspondence, and memoranda pertaining to the organization of, the affiliation with other organizations, membership records, and all moneys expended and/or received by the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born and/or the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, before the said committee, together with all of the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Saul Grossman may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at that point immediately following the remarks which I made when the matter concerning Arthur McPhaul was under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the investigation of Communist Party activities in the defense area of Detroit, and the nature, extent, character, and objects thereof, a person by the name of Saul Grossman was called as a witness before the committee in Washington. This witness was required under various subpenas, to produce certain records of the Michigan Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, and certain records of the Detroit Chapter of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. The first subpena duces tecum required the production of certain of these documents during the course of the hearing in Detroit, but a doctor's certificate was presented showing the illness of the witness, and his subpena was continued to a later date at Washington.

On the date of the arrival of the witness in Washington, a new subpena duces tecum was issued requiring the production of the same documents in Washington. The witness, when heard by the committee in Washington, disclaimed any knowledge of the existence of the organization, the documents of which he was required to produce, and refused to answer questions relating to the alleged organization. The witness was temporarily excused from the witness stand and was then served with a subpena duces tecum requiring him to produce certain records of the Michigan Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The witness testified that he did not have with him the records called for in the subpena and refused to answer all questions relating to the existence of the records or where the records were located.

I have no requests for time, Mr. Speaker, on this side.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I see no reason particularly to take the time of the House to go into further detail concerning this particular citation, as it is very similar to the citation for contempt which we just voted upon. However, I would like to say that if the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any other committee of the Congress, is to be efficient and perform the duties over which it has jurisdiction, we must find some way to bring witnesses before those committees, and require the witnesses in some way, under penalty, to answer questions and to produce books of record.

This is a clear contempt case; there is no doubt about it.

As I stated in the other case we cannot see by the printed record just how contemptuous some of these witnesses can be who appear before our committee, and I would like at this time to ask the membership of this House to attend a session of the committee and see some of the witnesses who come before it; then they would be just as certain as I am that these witnesses are in contempt.

I hope this citation is voted unanimously.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to delay this vote unduly. As has been said, aside from the time and place of the contempt, the circumstances of the case are almost identical with that just voted upon by the House.

I believe that a study of the report will indicate beyond any doubt that a contempt was indeed committed, and that the contempt should be met promptly and properly in the forthcoming vote of the House.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, because of the peculiar technical situation involved in questions of this character I feel impelled to ask that the yeas and nays be recorded on this vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken and there were: Yeas 349, nays 0, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 125]

YEAS—349

Abbitt	Andersen, H. Carl	Andrews
Adair	Anderson, Calif.	Angell
Addonizio	Andresen, August H.	Arends
Allen, Calif.		Armstrong
Allen, Ill.		Aspinall

Auchincloss	Furcolo	Madden
Ayres	Gamble	Magee
Bailey	Garmatz	Mahon
Baker	Gary	Mansfield
Bakewell	Gathings	Marshall
Barden	Gavin	Martin, Iowa
Baring	George	Martin, Mass.
Barrett	Golden	Mason
Bates, Mass.	Goodwin	Meader
Battle	Gordon	Merrow
Beamer	Graham	Miller, Calif.
Bennett, Fla.	Grenahan	Miller, Nebr.
Bennett, Mich.	Granger	Miller, N. Y.
Bentsen	Grant	Mills
Berry	Green	Morano
Betts	Greenwood	Multer
Bishop	Gregory	Mumma
Blackney	Gross	Murdock
Blatnik	Hagen	Murphy
Boggs, Del.	Hale	Murray
Boggs, La.	Hall,	Nelson
Bolling	Leonard W.	Nicholson
Bolton	Halleck	Norblad
Bonner	Hand	Norrell
Bosone	Hardy	O'Brien, Ill.
Bow	Harris	O'Brien, Mich.
Boykin	Harrison, Nebr.	O'Hara
Bramblett	Harrison, Va.	O'Konski
Bray	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Neill
Brooks	Hart	Osmers
Brown, Ga.	Harvey	Ostertag
Bryson	Havenner	O'Toole
Buchanan	Hays, Ark.	Patman
Budge	Hays, Ohio	Patten
Buffett	Hedrick	Patterson
Burleson	Heller	Perkins
Burnside	Herlong	Phillips
Burton	Hess	Pickett
Busbey	Hill	Poage
Bush	Hillings	Polk
Butler	Hinshaw	Preston
Byrnes	Hoeven	Price
Camp	Hoffman, Ill.	Priest
Canfield	Hoffman, Mich.	Prouty
Cannon	Holifield	Rabaut
Carrigg	Holmes	Radwan
Case	Hope	Rains
Celler	Horan	Ramsay
Chatham	Howell	Rankin
Chelf	Hull	Reams
Chenoweth	Hunter	Redden
Chiperfield	Ikard	Reed, Ill.
Chudoff	Irving	Reed, N. Y.
Church	Jackson, Calif.	Rees, Kans.
Clemente	Jackson, Wash.	Rhodes
Clevenger	James	Ribicoff
Cole, Kans.	Jarman	Riehlman
Colmer	Javits	Rivers
Cooley	Jenison	Robeson
Cooper	Jenkins	Rodino
Corbett	Jensen	Rogers, Colo.
Cotton	Johnson	Rogers, Fla.
Cox	Jonas	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Tex.
Crosser	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Crumpacker	Jones,	Roosevelt
Cunningham	Woodrow W.	Ross
Curtis, Mo.	Judd	Sadlak
Dague	Karsten, Mo.	St. George
Davis, Ga.	Kean	Saylor
Davis, Wis.	Kearns	Schenck
Deane	Keating	Scott, Hardie
DeGraffenried	Kelley, Pa.	Scrivner
Delaney	Kelly, N. Y.	Scudder
Dempsey	Kennedy	Secrest
Denny	Kerr	Seely-Brown
Denton	Kilday	Shafer
Devereux	King, Calif.	Sheehan
D'Ewart	King, Pa.	Sheppard
Dollinger	Klein	Sieminski
Dolliver	Kluczynski	Simpson, Ill.
Dondero	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Donohue	Lanham	Sittler
Donovan	Lantaff	Smith, Kans.
Dorn	Latham	Smith, Miss.
Doyle	LeCompte	Smith, Va.
Durham	Lesinski	Smith, Wis.
Eaton	Lind	Spence
Eberharter	Lovre	Springer
Elliott	Lucas	Staggers
Ellsworth	McCarthy	Stanley
Elston	McCormack	Stockman
Engle	McCulloch	Taber
Fallon	McDonough	Talle
Feighan	McGrath	Teague
Fernandes	McGregor	Thomas
Fine	McGuire	Thompson,
Fisher	McIntire	Mich.
Flood	McKinnon	Thornberry
Fogarty	McMillan	Tollefson
Forand	McMullen	Trimble
Ford	McVey	Vail
Forrester	Machrowicz	Van Pelt
Fugate	Mack, Ill.	Van Zandt
Fulton	Mack, Wash.	Velde
Vorys	Whitten	Withrow
Vursell	Widnall	Wolcott
Walter	Wigglesworth	Wolverton
Watts	Williams, Miss.	Wood, Ga.
Weichel	Williams, N. Y.	Wood, Idaho
Werdel	Wilson, Ind.	Yates
Wharton	Wilson, Tex.	Yorty
Wheeler	Winstead	Zablocki

NAYS, 0

NOT VOTING—82

Aandahl	Gwinn	Potter
Abernethy	Hall,	Poulson
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Allen, La.	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Anfuso	Hébert	Regan
Bates, Ky.	Heffernan	Richards
Beall	Herter	Riley
Beckworth	Heselton	Roberts
Belcher	Jones,	Sabath
Bender	Hamilton C.	Sasscer
Brehm	Kearney	Scott,
Brown, Ohio	Kee	Hugh D., Jr.
Brownson	Keogh	Shelley
Buckley	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Burdick	Kilburn	Sikes
Carlyle	Kirwan	Steed
Carnahan	Larcade	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Lyle	Sutton
Combs	McConnell	Tackett
Coudert	Miller, Md.	Taylor
Curtis, Nebr.	Mitchell	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Morgan	Vinson
Dawson	Morris	Welch
Dingell	Morrison	Wickersham
Doughton	Morton	Wier
Evins	Moulder	Willis
Fenton	O'Brien, N. Y.	Woodruff
Frazier	Passman	
Gore	Philbin	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Taylor.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Short
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Evins with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Frazier with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Hamilton C. Jones with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Brehm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to call the attention of the House to the death of a former Member of this body, the Honorable Nathan D. Perlman. He served in this body as a Republican Member from the old Fourteenth Congressional District, now the Nineteenth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

He was first elected to this body in 1920 and served three successive terms.

Born in Prusnitz, Poland, he was brought to New York at the age of 4, and was educated in the public schools, the College of the City of New York, and New York University Law School. He was admitted to the bar of the State of New York in 1909, and was named a deputy State attorney general 3 years later. He held that post until 1914. He was a member of the New York State Assembly in 1915, 1916, and 1917, representing the sixth assembly district on the East Side of New York City.

After leaving the House in 1927, he was an attorney for the American Federation of Labor, and practiced law in New York.

In 1935 he was appointed a city magistrate by the late Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia; and in 1936 was appointed to the court of special sessions by Mayor La Guardia. At the time of his untimely demise he was a justice of that great court, and was also vice president of Beth Israel Hospital, a former vice president of the American Jewish Congress, a past grand master of the Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, a trustee of the Federation for the Support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, and a member of several bar associations.

The people of the city of New York have lost a real friend and a distinguished citizen. Our sympathies are extended to his charming wife, Florence, his son, Jack, and his two lovely grandchildren.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CALUMET RIVER

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8190) to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely gives the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. the right to construct a bridge across the river at no cost to the Federal Government, but under the supervision of the Army engineers.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad to construct a bridge across the Calumet River, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co., a railroad company organized

under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Calumet River in the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 36, township 37 north, range 14 east of the third principal meridian, in Cook County, Ill., at a point about three hundred and fifty feet south of the north line of the said section, the said point being about eight-tenths of a mile upstream from the bridge of the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., located near Hegewisch, in the State of Illinois.

"SEC. 2. The bridge authorized by section 1 of this act may be either a drawbridge or a fixed bridge as approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That changes in type, design, and location of such bridge may be made, upon approval of plans for such changes by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army.

"SEC. 3. The bridge authorized by section 1 of this act shall be maintained and operated according to existing law as contained in chapter 11 of title 33 of the United States Code and all rights granted thereunder are hereby expressly reserved.

"SEC. 4. The Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. may sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all of its rights, powers, and privileges under this act; and its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which such rights, powers, and privileges are sold, assigned, or transferred, or which acquires the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, may exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation.

"SEC. 5. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KERR, RABAUT, MARSHALL, DAVIS of Wisconsin, FORD, and TABER.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution H. Res. 707 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6544) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this resolution. I understand there is no objection to the resolution.

I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to the consideration of the rule on this side and no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H. R. 6544, to amend the act of June 28, 1948, Sixty-second Statutes, page 1061, relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park, may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), is hereby amended by the addition to that subsection of the following sentence: "The properties identified generally as 269 to 275 South Fifth Street in 'project B' in the report of the Commission."

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the act of June 28, 1948, is hereby amended by redesignating the existing paragraph "(d)" as paragraph "(e)"; and adding the following new paragraph "(d)":

"(d) Such portion of the site of the house in which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, situated at the southwest corner of Seventh and Market Streets and identified as 'project D' in the report of the Commission, as may be necessary properly to commemorate the historic event that occurred at that site."

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the act of June 28, 1948, is hereby amended by the addition thereto of the following sentence:

"The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to permit the American Philosophical Society, a nonprofit corporation, without cost to the United States, to construct, operate, and maintain in the park a building to be located on approximately the original site of historic Library Hall to house the library of the American Philosophical Society and any additions to said library, such permission to be granted the society pursuant to a lease, contract, or authorization without charge, on such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Secretary and accepted by the society, and for such length of time as the society shall continue to use the said building for the housing, display, and use of a library and scientific and historical collections: *Provided*, that the plans for the construction of the building and any additions thereto shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 6 of the act of June 28, 1948, is hereby amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of acquiring the property described in section 1 of this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $9,857,000."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "to" and insert ", 271, 273, and."

Page 1, line 8, strike out section 2.

Page 2, line 8, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "4" and insert "3."

Page 3, line 8, strike out "$9,857,000" and insert "$7,700,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House authorizes an additional expenditure of $7,700,000 to complete a project in Philadelphia which will be known as Independence National Park. Around Philadelphia we call it the Independence Mall project. It will provide for a beautiful park to be built in front of the historical buildings which consist of Independence Hall, Carpenter's Hall, and many other famous sites where the Declaration of Independence was drawn by the founding fathers of this Nation, and where the Continental Congress met.

This is a joint project between the Federal Government and the State of Pennsylvania. The State of Pennsylvania has already started its part of the demolition, and two square blocks of the city facing Independence Hall have already been torn down. I do not believe there is any objection on the part of anyone to this great project. It is long past due.

I might say that as the city grew a great many buildings were constructed around Independence Hall. The fire underwriters call it the fire belt of Philadelphia, and we really fear that if a fire should break out around these historical buildings and a substantial wind were blowing from the river it might take Independence Hall and the other buildings with it.

I want to pay particular tribute to my colleagues from Philadelphia who appeared before the committee considering this bill and who worked so arduously to have it reported out.

I also want to say to the Members of this House that this is an American bill for all Americans. I hope that if any Member of this body should have the opportunity to visit Philadelphia during the coming adjournment or recess that he or she will take the opportunity to visit the site of this park.

It is a project to be proud of and I am sure that this beautiful mall will be visited by millions of children as well as adults upon completion. This expenditure as set forth in the bill will enable us to really isolate the buildings, build a beautiful park around them, and give us a real place for visitors to come to Philadelphia and see this historical site.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would this park be adjacent to the building or close to the building where Congress met originally?

Mr. CHUDOFF. All these buildings are practically contiguous to each other; they are either in the same block or within a block of each other. The building where Thomas Jefferson helped draw the Declaration of Independence will be included.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It will serve as a memorial to the Cradle of Liberty of the United States.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Definitely; that is what we are trying to do, and we are also trying to see to it that the buildings are not destroyed by any conflagration.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to express my appreciation of the fact that not only are we preserving one of the cradles of liberty from fire and the ravages of time but we are also impressing upon America some of the lessons of history that are so badly needed at this time.

I want to say to the gentleman and to all of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have taken part in sponsoring this legislation that we recognize and appreciate the great portion of the cost that Pennsylvania itself is bearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I shall be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very strong for this bill, and I would not want to inject any note that would mar the very pleasant observations made about Liberty Hall, but I notice the phrase "Cradle of Liberty" was used. While we Bostonians have no objections in the least to the use of the word "cradle" in reference to any building that had anything to do with the Revolutionary War, we must keep the record clear that the real and the first Cradle of Liberty is Faneuil Hall in Boston.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHUDOFF. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to remind the gentleman from Massachusetts, my good friend the majority leader, that the official name of the building there is Independence Hall; so we call it the Cradle of Liberty. Of course, I give due credit to Boston, but when you come to the cooperative movement to make a great country in this hemisphere, it really occurred in Philadelphia, in my home State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCORMACK. We will not get into a discussion of historical contributions except I want to keep the record clear that the hall that is known as the Cradle of Liberty is located in Boston. I am not at all minimizing the great importance of these buildings in Philadelphia, and I am giving full faith and credit to all the kind things that have been said and deservedly said about Independence Hall, but the Cradle of Liberty is located in Boston.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in listening to the colloquy in which the gentleman from Massachusetts extolled the virtues of Faneuil Hall, may I say just a word in the defense of Pennsylvania's Independence Hall.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. First of all, the gentleman from Massachusetts made no statement that calls for any defense. Explanation toward compatibility or reconcilability or anything like that would be in order. But I assure the gentleman nothing I said calls for any defense because if there was I would be defending the great contributions made by Philadelphia.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. When that unfortunate remark was made, I was going to answer it, but the majority leader is much smarter than I am, so he got in there first. I would hate to have anything in the RECORD that Philadelphia is the cradle of liberty, because hundreds of thousands of children have been brought up in this country to believe that Faneuil Hall is the Cradle of Liberty in this country.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may all be fitting for the northeastern section of our country and Massachusetts. But, now, a word for Pennsylvania and its historical Independence Hall.

First of all, when the hall was built, Benjamin Franklin had a very great interest in it; William Allen, Chief Justice of the colony, provided the money for buying the land on which the building stands; and Edmund Wooley staked out the ground and furnished the woodwork, and finally hung the Liberty Bell that proclaimed liberty throughout the land and to the inhabitants thereof. The building still stands; a national shrine, revered by all.

In this building met the Continental Congress after first having met in Carpenters' Hall nearby. Here George Washington was commissioned as commander in chief of the Army, here on the 14th day of June 1777, the resolution was adopted creating the flag for the United States of America, here later the Second Continental Congress met, here Richard Henry Lee offered the resolution that the Colonies should be free and independent States, and here, on the 2d day of July 1776, was laid before the Congress the draft of the Declaration of Independence prepared by Thomas Jefferson in the house which has since been removed but the site of which will be marked by a plaque. The area leading down to the river is to be cleared, creating a beautiful plaza.

Here again after the war was about to close and the Revolutionary Army was retiring to their homes, men marched upon the Congress and forced it to move elsewhere. Here again in the year 1787 met the great Constitutional Convention which was to give to the world the greatest document that ever fell from the minds of man and which created our present form of government. Here again, when the Congress had reconvened and reassembled after moving from New York back to Philadelphia, the 10 amendments to the Constitution were received. Here the Articles of Confederation were first proposed.

So, all in all, this great site is not only the Cradle of Liberty, it is more than that, it is actually the symbol of everything that is good, true, and noble in these United States of America. That is our historical Pennsylvania and we ask your acceptance of this plan.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Is it not a fact that this project has been in progress for several years now?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is. And you are the author of the measure on which we are about to vote. You deserve great credit.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. And that it had been authorized by a previous Congress?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. It has now been determined that a little more money is needed to complete the project?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. And may I say that our beloved Speaker is entitled to a great deal of credit for what has been accomplished. He recognized the need for perpetuating this great shrine of liberty and gave us his help and assistance. We owe to him a lasting debt of gratitude.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. Is it not a fact also that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has appropriated a considerable sum of money of its own?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. And left to the Federal Government the opportunity of taking and converting into a park that part which is so closely associated with the early formation of our Government?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It will restore a colonial site and give every boy and girl in America a glimpse of colonial America, such as now is exemplified and typified by the rejuvenation and restoration of Williamsburg. We will have the same thing in Philadelphia where everyone can see how those ancient patriots moved in the atmosphere and acted under conditions in which they lived at that time.

Future generations of Americans will be grateful for what we do here today.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 705 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], and pending that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as the reading reflects, is an open rule for the consideration of a bill which would, in effect, continue the present parity formula support prices on certain basic agricultural and other commodities for a period of 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to this rule.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have no objection on this side to the granting of the rule, and so far as I know, no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to very briefly point out to the Members from the agricultural sections, and particularly in the peanut field, the impending meeting which is to be held tomorrow by the PMA people, at which time permanent regulations will be promulgated for the administration of the peanut program during this year. Tentative regulations have been issued, and in those regulations are found some glaring inequities which should be corrected.

The Members who represent peanut areas are familiar with the problems with which we are faced and the inequities about which I speak. I am sure that it is the sentiment of all Members of the House from these areas that these inequities should be corrected tomorrow at the meeting. Notably among the inequities is the question of moisture content where, in the State of Georgia, for instance, the maximum moisture content is 9 percent, while in the State of Virginia it is 10 percent. There is no real reason why this discrimination should be made as between these two geographic areas.

Secondly, a change has been made in the matter of penalty for damaged kernels. Heretofore a 2 percent damage required a $3.40 penalty, 4 percent would be $6.80, and 5 percent $10.20, but this year, under the proposed regulation, 5 percent damaged kernels would require $20 a ton penalty, and 7 percent as high as $55 a ton penalty. That is out of line and out of reason; there is no justification for this sort of regulation, and we feel that the PMA people tomorrow should bring those penalties back in line with current regulations applicable during the past crop year.

Thirdly, we feel that the penalty for damaged kernels with reference to the support price should be raised back to 7 percent. Under the proposed regulations they have reduced their figure to 3 percent in order to qualify for a support price for peanuts. If you have more than 3 percent damaged kernels you do not qualify for the support price. We think that figure should be raised back to 7 percent.

These things are vital to the peanut growers. The growing of peanuts is no longer the profitable business it once was. Last year the peanut farmers suffered terribly by virtue of the regulations the PMA people had laid down for them. Many of our growers flatly said they would not produce peanuts for the market any longer, that what peanuts they planted would be fed to hogs, that they would not market them because of the unjust and unreasonable regulations. If they want to have adequate oil production and peanuts produced for edible purposes they should make fair regulations in order to get the required amount of production for this very vital and valuable commodity.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I concur heartily in what the gentleman has said, and express the sincere hope that the PMA people on tomorrow will do what the gentleman has suggested they do.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I want to compliment the gentleman on his comprehensive and most laudable statement. As far as the 9-percent moisture rule relating to other States than Virginia is concerned, I have tried my dead level best to discover some reason for that rule, and I have been unable to find it. I believe the gentlemen from Virginia would join in the idea of our people that there is no reason on earth why there should be that discrimination.

The gentleman's argument about restoring the damaged peanut rule to 7 percent I believe is so fair and equitable that I sincerely hope the authorities will take cognizance of it and act accordingly.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS. I concur in what the gentleman has said. It is my opinion that those rules constitute an unfair discrimination against the peanut farmers of the southeastern section. The gentleman will recall that we have been working with the PMA officials for the last 12 months in an effort to get them to change these regulations. I certainly hope that tomorrow the PMA officials will remove this discrimination against the peanut growers of the southeastern section.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman. May I also thank the gentleman from Mississippi for allowing us this time to bring the matter before the House.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GRANT. Representing a peanut-growing area, I certainly concur in what the gentleman has said about regulations governing the 1952 crop. I hope the PMA will realize that it is in their hands as to whether or not the program the Congress has enacted will be successful. We can legislate a good program here, but if they want to carry out what the gentleman suggests they are going to carry out, they can destroy this program.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. Since the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, will explain the bill fully in the Committee of the Whole, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of continuing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8122, with Mr. DEMPSEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to continue the present support program for the basic agricultural commodities through 1955.

Section 1 of the bill is identical with the bill (S. 2115) recently reported with a favorable recommendation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This section of the bill would continue for two additional years—through 1955—the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which provides for a transitional period following the adoption of the modernized parity formula in which parity for the basic commodities is to be not less than the level under the formula in use prior to 1949.

When the modernized parity formula was adopted in the act of 1949, it was assumed that agriculture was entering a period of retrenchment when there would be a diminishing demand for American agricultural exports, less necessity for production of cereals, and a general shift to grass farming and livestock products to meet the demands of American consumers. Accordingly, the modernized parity formula established in the act of 1949 was intended to encourage and assist the adjustment of American agriculture in this direction.

Unfortunately, the period of normal, peaceful world relationships and consumer demands contemplated at that time did not materialize. On the contrary, the Nation has found itself involved in the Korean war and a far-flung defense effort which has virtually put American agriculture again on a wartime footing, with unprecedented demands for cereals, cotton, and similar agricultural commodities.

Under these circumstances, extension for 2 years of the alternative parity provision of the 1949 act is in direct conformity with the principles of the act and is much more in keeping with the policies established therein than would be adherence to the existing letter of the law and termination of that provision at the end of 1953.

Section 2 of the bill will extend for the same period of time (through 1955) the present price-support program for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity. It is the belief of the committee that the enactment of this provision is absolutely essential to assure the Nation adequate production of these important agricultural commodities during this emergency period.

All of these commodities are being supported at 90 percent of parity at the present time. It is probable that the Secretary of Agriculture would continue to support them at that level for the period prescribed by this bill. It is unlikely, therefore, that this bill will add anything whatever to the responsibility of the Government with respect to the support of these commodities.

On the other hand, it is certain that the bill will add tremendously to the response which may be expected from farmers to the Government's request for high-level agricultural production. Farmers have shown time and again since 1940 their willingness and their ability to meet unprecedented goals established by the Department of Agriculture. They know full well, however, that under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 they are acceding to the Government's request and meeting these high production goals at their own risk.

Production goals are established on the basis of the average out-turn which is expected per acre for the various crops. Good weather can boost that out-turn by as much as 20 or 25 percent, resulting in a crop even larger than that requested by the Department of Agriculture. A decrease in anticipated demand, either for exports, for stockpiling, or for domestic consumption can also occur. In either event, farmers who had patriotically undertaken to meet the Nation's production goals would find that they had created a situation in which their overabundant production had destroyed their price at the market place and that price support would be reduced correspondingly at the very time when it was most needed.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the required level of price support for these basic commodities is determined by the carry-over which exists at the beginning of the marketing year. If this carry-over is larger than normal, the support level may be reduced in proportion to the size of the carry-over.

Obviously, the Government is going to have a much more certain assurance of the tremendous agricultural production it requests during these important years if farmers have the assurance that by acceding to the Department of Agriculture's high production goals they are not going to produce themselves out of a fair market price and at the same time produce themselves out of a fair support price.

Even more important, Mr. Chairman, than that is the fact that I do not believe the membership of the House believes in what we call the sliding scale of price support for agricultural commodities. This came about in 1949, and we were forced to accept it at that time, but the effective date was postponed. The effect of the pending legislation is to postpone it for two additional years. The effect of the sliding scale actually means that when the support is needed most, it is actually weakened. The support level goes down as supplies increase. That is exactly opposite to what we have been trying to do in providing this support for agricultural prices.

I would like also to say that originally it never was intended by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I do not think it was ever intended by the Congress, that we should support at high levels the prices of perishable and nonstorable agricultural commodities, which are the commodities among which we have sustained the greatest losses. On the support program for the basic agricultural commodities, cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco, in the 18-year period that the program has operated, we have actually made a net profit to the Federal Government of $35,000,000.

Many people are led to believe that this program has been burdensome to the taxpayer and burdensome to the consumer. That is not the fact. On the cotton program alone we have made a profit of $237,000,000. On the tobacco program we have made a substantial profit of several millions of dollars.

Even after taking into consideration the losses sustained on peanuts and some of the other basic commodities, we still have a profit in excess of $35,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that in computing that profit on cotton and tobacco there is taken into consideration very large amounts of those items which have been purchased by the Government and shipped overseas under the foreign-aid program at a figure which would yield such a profit?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The profit actually resulted from the increase in the price of cotton, which occurred between the time the Government became the owner and the time the Government actually disposed of it. I doubt if we will accumulate any profit on the cotton program in the future, because we have made certain changes, but the $230,000,000 I mentioned actually went into the Treasury of the United States and it was a profit made on the cotton which had been taken over by the Government.

Mr. KEATING. But was not a large part of that through a transfer of funds from foreign aid to the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, no. I do not think the foreign-aid program had anything at all to do with it. It may be that cotton has been exported to some of these recipient countries under the foreign-aid program, but so have other commodities and industrial goods. I do not think you can say the foreign-aid program had anything to do with this profit.

Mr. KEATING. How about tobacco?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. You have shipped great quantities of industrial articles also to all countries in the program.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but what I am asking the gentleman is whether in realizing the profit, the figures of which he has given to the House, it is not a fact that that profit, in large part, arises from the fact that tobacco has been turned over to the foreign-aid program at a high figure?

Mr. COOLEY. No, no. It has not been turned over at any high figure. They have acquired it in this market and they have sent it abroad at prevailing prices; certainly not at any give-away prices that I am aware of.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that the Mutual Security Act, and the Marshall Plan Act before it, provides that these products should not be turned over by the Commodity Credit Corporation except at the prices which it paid for them, or better, and therefore that is a written-in recoupment of any loss which it might have suffered, because it gets it out of these other appropriated funds?

Mr. COOLEY. It has not been in the law until now. We do have section 32 funds which have been used to accelerate exports of certain commodities, but certainly no particular commodity has imposed upon that fund. The section 32 money has been used for various and sundry purposes, as has been designated and fixed by the Congress.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. It may sound strange coming from a Member of the House representing a large urban consumer center to make the comment that I might want to make; that is, if the chairman of the committee or the Committee on Agriculture would have any

objection to my offering an amendment striking out "90" on line 3, page 2, and inserting "100."

Mr. COOLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's position. Frankly, I would probably be inclined to agree with the view he has expressed, but I know the committee does not feel that should be done at this time, and I doubt very much if the Congress would approve of that action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. WIER. I make that comment knowing what has happened to the farmer's income because of inflation and because of the ever-increasing cost of the things he buys. Even if parity had remained at 90 percent instead of the sliding scale, the farmer would be much worse off under the 90 percent than he was 3 or 4 years ago because of his added cost of production. So I want to make the same allowance to him in his parity price as we recognize is due to labor, 10 percent.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. What about the Farm Bureau and the Grange and the statement that some farm organizations were opposed to that? I was wondering if the gentleman could tell me if that is true.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct; notwithstanding the opposition, this great Committee on Agriculture composed of 30 men, Democrats and Republicans, being thoroughly familiar with all aspects of this bill, reported it by unanimous vote.

The farm leader that advocated the sliding scale and advocated weakening of the support program was just about advocating the wreckage of the entire program, because without this support I do not think we could have a successful program. In other words, I regard this as similar to the minimum wage and maximum hours for labor; it is a floor below which prices should not be permitted to go.

Notwithstanding the opposition of these men we still bring this bill to you for favorable action. Whenever a farm leader takes the position that has been taken by some with reference to this bill it is the same thing as a labor leader's coming here and saying they do not want minimum wages, maximum hours, the right to strike, or collective bargaining. I favor those things. But I do not think a labor leader would get very far even before the Committee on Education and Labor of this House on repealing those gains.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first brought up on the Consent Calendar I objected to it because I thought it ought not to be disposed of that way, and I would like to pay a special tribute to the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Member in not pressing the consent proposition, but being quite prepared to come here under a rule to have the bill discussed and open to amendment. I might say that that is also true of the majority and minority leaders, and I think it is a great tribute to the way we do business in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I approach this whole question with the greatest deference. I do not pretend to be an expert in this field. I say only that I think for too long we have gone along with the farm program without any scrutiny from the adversary point of view. The men on the Committee on Agriculture are good men; they are all friends of ours. They are essentially from agricultural districts, but they do not actually come up against the problems we have in the cities where people have to earn a living in which food represents a very large proportion of the city person's budget.

First let us get an idea as to the question of who is involved.

In the first place we are prone to think that we can make rapid adjustments, that if prices go up wages will rise, that the working people will try to get more in wages and that the whole economy will equalize itself out. As a matter of fact, that is not so, because a very large number of Americans are almost pure consumers, and I have figures that illustrate that.

There are 4,500,000 social security annuitants in the United States; there are 6,000,000 Government workers whose salaries adjust but very slowly to rapidly rising costs of living. I tried very hard to get an estimate as to the number who were living on incomes such as widows, orphans, and older people who have their own savings or annuities from life insurance companies, but it is almost impossible to obtain such information. It is a large figure, in millions to say the least. Added to that would be 2,500,000 who receive benefits from veterans' pension and insurance legislation. Twenty-five million out of 61,000,000 actively employed in the United States who are so-called white collar workers, and we know that their salaries lag behind the more rapidly adjustable wages of the industrial workers most of whom are represented by unions.

I think there is one very good reason for not passing this bill. That is, it is unnecessary right now to pass this bill. This statement I make advisedly for this reason:

The bill has two parts. First, it proposes to perpetuate the alternative of using the new modernized parity formula or the old 1910–14 parity, whichever is higher—and I will explain in a few minutes why that is a serious matter—for 2 years beyond December 31, 1953. You do not have to do that now. There will be a new Congress here next year and there will be a full year in which to do it.

Second, fixing parity at 90 percent of the six basic commodities is also unnecessary now. We made that clear just last Saturday night when we passed the Defense Production Act which says that if there shall be only 90 percent of parity and not less for the basic commodities for the full length of time the Defense Production Act is in effect, which is 10 months. So both things have been taken care of until such time as the new Congress returns, and there is no real urgency for this bill.

As to the merits of the proposition, my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has pointed out that the farmers themselves in two great farm organizations, do not regard this as an unmixed blessing because two of the greatest of them, the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange, are against this very bill. I think that is of the greatest importance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think it would be important to insert at this point in the RECORD, as long as the gentleman has referred to the Farm Bureau, the fact that the president of that organization who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture in opposition to this bill has made some very pertinent remarks about the Congress. In a recent speech made before the twentieth annual convention of the Edison Electric Institute at Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Allan B. Kline, president, stated:

> What kind of representatives are they? Are they people with understanding? Some of these issues are just terribly simple, if they have a little bit of something to understand with. We have a lot of people in the Senate—oh, let's take the whole Congress. I want to spread this around a little bit. I do not want to quarrel with everybody. We have a lot of them down there that I have met personally and been cross-examined by very critically, where it was a very objective viewpoint. I am sure I can say honestly that they felt very happy after the cross-examination because they did not have sense enough to know how badly they had gotten beaten. When you have a lot of fellows like that, you know what happens.

Those are the words of the president of the Farm Bureau.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not believe that we in the House are so thin-skinned we are going to let that convince us one way or the other. I intend to produce the reasons in connection with this bill. I have produced one so far, and that is the fact it is unnecessary now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman feel a guaranty of a minimum wage at this time is absolutely necessary?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to pay my respects to that argument.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman like to see that thrown out?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to answer the gentleman. I think a minimum wage in the United States by law is absolutely vital and necessary but is without relevancy to this issue.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman should admit they go hand in hand.

Mr. JAVITS. They do not go hand in hand.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Parity is simply a minimum wage for the farmer.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I will reiterate my question. Does the gentleman feel it would be proper to throw off all wage minimum guaranties?

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to point out that the minimum-wage guaranty is not underwritten by the United States Government. The law says that he shall not be paid less by a private employer, but here on farm parity you are saying that this is an underwriting and every dollar of this guaranty of 90 percent of parity is going to be paid by the United States if it is not paid by the consumer. That is a very different thing.

The Federal Government last year lost $345,000,000 on this whole price-support program.

Mr. COOLEY. When the gentleman says "this program" that is not true.

Mr. JAVITS. I am going to elucidate on all the facts.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not want the gentleman to leave the impression——

Mr. JAVITS. I am about, sir, to explain it, if I may. The Federal Government lost $345,000,000 on the whole price-support program, including perishables. The Federal Government also has invested in the program right now something in the area of two and a quarter or two and a half billion dollars in commodities which are tied up in storage in one way or another. It has been said here that the Government has not lost much money on the price support for the six basic commodities. What has not been said is this, that in the case of wheat, the Government has paid, in other appropriations, not out of the Commodity Credit Corporation, about $182,000,000 this year, which is, in practical effect, a subvention for exports under the international wheat agreement and which the farmer receives in another guise to the tune of say 60 cents a bushel of wheat because of the price-support situation.

I would like to get down to the fundamental point of why the provision in this bill proposes to prevent the single standard of modernized parity from obtaining, and why it is desired to have the alternative parities. The old standard is that the farmer could buy with the things that he sells the same standard of living he bought in the period from 1910 to 1914. This was found to be archaic. It was, admittedly, completely out of date, because it took no account of the relationship between the various farm commodities themselves, that is, increased efficiency of production, of which the public did not get the benefit because it had not been reflected in the period of 1910 and 1914. So, the Committee on Agriculture adopted a new standard in the act of 1949 called the movable standard of parity, taking the average for 10 years, the immediately preceding 10 years.

Now we are asked not to let that new modernized parity standard go into effect until after 1955, a parity standard which I think is much more fair to the consumer, which takes into consideration efficiency and new techniques. But we are asked to use whatever standard is higher, in effect, the old or the new. That results in putting the support price for wheat, for example, up something like 30 cents a bushel, and it also results in making a very material difference in the support price for peanuts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New York, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, said that a worker would first have to get a job, as I understand, before he could avail himself of the minimum wage law.

Mr. JAVITS. I said more than that, not only would he have to get a job, but the minimum wage law did not guarantee payment by the Federal Government, which this law does.

Mr. GROSS. But a farmer has to produce a bushel of corn or raise hogs in order to collect the support price.

Mr. JAVITS. The farmer gets an underwriting from the Federal Government.

Mr. GROSS. Not if he does not produce.

Mr. JAVITS. He gets the support price if he does produce, but the worker does not get any underwriting from the Federal Government as to collecting wages to yield him a certain standard of living or 90 percent or any other percent of it even if he works. I am not opposed to some floor under farm prices; I think the lessons of the depression taught that we have to have some way of doing that. I do feel that the changes which are sought to be made here are not appropriate with respect to the consumers' interests, that the sliding parity formula is an approach to greater fairness to the consumer, and that the modernized parity formula is an approach to greater fairness for the consumer. I therefore believe that the law ought to remain as it is. That is the basis for my opposition to this bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman understands that the farmers have lost 14 percent of net income since 1947; does he not?

Mr. JAVITS. I will take some time in the amendment stage to answer that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some comments on the remarks of the gentleman as to the necessity for this law. Before he started his speech he emphasized the fact that he was not an expert along these lines and then he proceeded to prove that he was not. He is not acquainted with the way the farmers operate, particularly the farmer who rents his land. He makes his plans this fall, and this is 1952. He makes his financing arrangements this fall and in the early spring. Unless we have some guaranty that this 90 percent of parity will be observed during the year 1953 we find that he might not be able to make those arrangements.

We know that during the past several years, at least in my section, many of our farmers, due to adverse weather conditions and other circumstances, have actually lost money. They were in the hole at the beginning of this crop year. We had up until about a month ago a very fair prospect. I think they could have come out of it and made money this year and recouped some of the losses of former years, but if the drought we are experiencing now continues you are going to see literally thousands of farmers over the United States who are not only going to lose money this year but are going to be unable to obtain financing to continue farming next year. Without the production of those farmers many of you city people are going to find yourselves in the position of being without food, in a sufficient supply.

I should like to mention briefly the fact that despite the fact that the head of the National Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Kline, has indicated that he does not favor this program, when we would pin him down in the committee he would have to admit that he did. At the same time, I want to say that Mr. Kline, as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, does not represent all the American farmers. He does not even represent some of the farm bureau federations of the several States. There have been in Washington during the past 2 weeks directors of the State farm bureaus of the various States who have stated to members of this committee that Allan Kline did not represent their views. Frankly, I do not know whom he does represent when he tries to tell you that the farmer is not entitled to 90 percent of parity. I agree with what the gentleman from Minnesota said here a minute ago. I think this should be 100 percent of parity. When the Government calls upon the farmers to produce and has them go to extraordinary expense in producing, they should be entitled to the same guaranties we offer to other segments of business. However, I do not think we should put that in this bill, because it would be defeated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we see here today the eternal conflict between the consumer and the producer. I hope we can try for once today to see the other man's viewpoint. Surely we from agricultural America want to help the working men and women in the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to have a floor under their wages. I have voted for that a good many times. I do not believe anybody should be asked to work for low wages. All we are doing here as far as agriculture is concerned is to give the very same protection to the farmer.

The gentleman from New York made the remark that the workingman first must have a job before he is entitled to any sort of wages. Certainly that is the case. At the same time, the farmer must also, in spite of tornadoes, windstorms, droughts, frosts, and what not, be able to produce a crop before he is able to

take advantage at all of the 90-percent parity price support floor under the basic crops he produces.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, I want to lay these few facts before the House. We have had a total cost to the taxpayers over these 14 years of $1,200,000,000 for the entire price-support program. We do not charge against the price-support program the $2,043,000,000 which was used during World War II simply as a consumer subsidy to hold down the price of butter, milk, cheese, and meat. This subsidy helped the consumer but failed to make good to the farmer the loss he sustained through price ceilings set too low. The total cost to the taxpayers of America has been approximately $1,200,000,000 to date. The more you think this over, the more you analyze it, the more you will realize, I believe, that it is one of the best investments that has ever been made by the taxpayers of America. Please remember that for every dollar of gross income given to agriculture, the whole Nation benefits by a purchasing power of $6. In 1932 the gross farm income was only $6,000,000,000. The gross income for the entire Nation that year as a result fell down to $45,000,000,000, and our great Nation suffered the worst depression in its history. In 1947 the top income year for agriculture saw about $33,000,000,000 go to the farmers of the Nation, in return for the food we produced. Now mark this, the gross income of the entire Nation equaled almost exactly seven times that amount or slightly over $233,000,000,000.

Depress farm income and immediately the unemployment rolls in the Nation swell. Give to agriculture a fair share and a fair price, parity, for its products, and the entire Nation will prosper along with agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the industrial East does not accept this proven theory and put its own people to work by building upon the only new source of wealth, that produced out of the earth in agriculture, forestry, and mining.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my neighbor on the west.

Mr. LOVRE. Is it not true that this bill also assists the consumer because it provides an incentive to the farmers to produce more, and when you produce more, you have ample food which allows the law of supply and demand to operate so that the consumer will receive his food at an even cheaper price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I would feel mighty sorry for the constituents of my good friend of New York City [Mr. JAVITS] unless there was some incentive for the farmers out my way to produce food to keep his people from going hungry. They would starve to death if it were not for the great bread basket of the United States, that area 500 miles contiguous to Chicago. I would certainly feel sorry, Mr. JAVITS, for your consumers if it were not for the great amount of food that we produce throughout the Midwest, and I do not see how any reasonable man, and any man of your caliber and your thinking ability, can argue against the principle of parity for agriculture. Destroy through low, unprofitable prices to the hardest working segment of our population, the farmers of our Nation, the incentive to produce and perhaps we might again see, as we saw back in 1943, right in this city, people beginning to form bread lines hoping that they can buy some meat or butter or some bread in the stores that they had dealings with. Surely we do not want those times to return.

Mr. LOVRE. There is no better friend of the farmer than the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOVRE. Not only has he worked hard for the farmers, here in the Congress, but also for the REA and other related matters relating to farm operations.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is very fine of the gentleman to say that.

Mr. Chairman, I do hope this bill will pass unanimously. After all, it is just this spurt put into the blood stream of our economy which will insure that we will have ample food at a reasonable price for all of the children in America. The farmers do not want high prices. However, we must have equality with other groups if we are to produce ample food. I repeat, I sincerely hope this bill will pass. It is little enough in the form of protection to the basic industry in America—agriculture.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who has always supported strongly the principle of parity during the 14 years we have served here together.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks, and I am pleased to say as much and more for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] about his constant support of all legislation for the benefit of the farmers of our Nation, which, in the final analysis, benefits every American, hence I am glad to go on record in support of this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the pending bill which extends the present support prices on the basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity for 2 years.

The farmer, by reason of the hazards of his business, is unable to produce for the market with any certainty as does industry. In order to secure production and to prevent their bankruptcy there must be some assurance of price. The cities have as great an interest in this production as any other segment of our society because if the farmer goes out of business the cities will not be fed.

The mechanism by which the support price is maintained is the Commodity Credit Corporation. This Corporation's Federal charter was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, and it is under the jurisdiction of that committee. As chairman of the committee it has always been my purpose to strengthen this Corporation and to be assured that its powers and authority are broad enough to permit it to perform its functions to the fullest extent. It has performed a great service to all our citizens by causing production to be increased and stabilizing the prices of agricultural products. In the carrying out of this essential function it has been very successful. Since its inception on October 17, 1933, through April 30, 1952, support-price operations on the six basic agricultural commodities have resulted in a profit of $32,000,000. Cotton and tobacco have yielded its greatest profits.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

A PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation—H. R. 8122—to continue price supports at 90 percent parity on the six basic farm crops—wheat, corn, cotton, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. This measure to guarantee an approximate cost-of-production to millions of American farmers should be enacted into law, and I intend to cast my vote for its passage.

By endorsing this bill, I do not mean to suggest that it is the last word in farm legislation, nor do I consider it the final solution to the problem of achieving permanent prosperity for the 27,000,000 Americans who till our Nation's 6,000,000 farms. In other words, this bill is only one step toward farm prosperity, but it is certainly not the last step to be taken.

FULL PARITY NEEDED ON ALL FARM CROPS

In my opinion, this price-support bill is subject to two major weaknesses. First, it merely provides for price supports at 90 percent of parity instead of guaranteeing full 100 percent parity. I realize that parity at 90 percent is better than the 60–90 percent sliding-scale formula set forth in the GOP support program adopted during the Eightieth Congress. However, it is still not good enough, and it is my hope that Congress will soon accept the 100 percent parity principle as a basic principle of permanent farm legislation.

A second weakness in this bill is that it applies only to nonperishable farm crops—to the so-called basic crops—and does nothing to stablize prices on such perishable commodities as vegetables, eggs, potatoes, milk, butter, and other dairy products. It is my firm conviction that Congress should extend the parity principle to all farm products—perishable and nonperishable—and that perishable crops should be supported at 100

percent parity through the medium of production payments as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan back in 1948. Full parity on all farm crops offers the solution to the problem of guaranteeing cost of production to the farmers of this country.

A BETTER FARM PROGRAM NEEDED

This country has made great strides toward developing a sound and practical farm program during the last 20 years. This program—which was built plank by plank by the late President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party—rests on such basic legislation as the Triple-A, the Soil Conservation Act, the Farm Credit Act, and the rural electrification law. Because of this enlightened and forward-looking legislation, we can point with pride to two decades of steady progress toward farm security and higher living standards in rural America.

Let us examine the record. In 1932 some 42 percent of our farms were run by tenants and most of the other 58 percent were mortgaged to the hilt. Today 75 percent of the farmers own their own land, possessing an average equity of 91 percent. In 1932 only 10 percent of our farms had electricity—today—largely due to REA—over 90 percent of our farms have electric power. In 1932 the cash value of total farm production was $5,000,000,000 per year—today farm income is running at $32,000,000,000. American farms are producing 50 percent more food today than they were 20 years ago, and average real income has tripled during the same period.

Regardless of this progress, we cannot afford to stop and rest on our laurels—the economic facts of life require that we press on to new levels of farm production. According to population experts, there will be 38,000,000 more Americans 25 years from now, which means that for every four persons sitting down to a meal today, there will be a fifth person at the table in 1975. This means that we must increase farm production by 25 percent in the next quarter century just to maintain our present level of diet.

Increased farm production, higher rural living standards, and greater farm security are the policy goals which the Federal Government must seek, and it is my contention that these goals can be realized by the extension and improvement of the Roosevelt farm program. We have the basic legislation already on the statute books—we should now broaden and liberalize such basic legislation in the interests of farm prosperity and national welfare.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I will use the remaining minutes of my allotted time to discuss those broad objectives of agricultural policy which I consider of major importance, and to make some positive recommendations for achieving these objectives. It seems to me that the attention of Congress should be given to the following seven proposals:

Stabilize farm income at full parity: The stabilization of farm income at a level reflecting the cost of production and improved living standards is of prime importance to every farmer, and a goal which I heartily endorse. As I have already indicated, the principle of price supports—as embodied in this bill (H. R. 8122) now under consideration—is the soundest method for stabilizing farm income. I do maintain, however, that we should support farm prices at full parity instead of 90 percent, and that all farm products, both perishable and nonperishable, should be supported under the price-support program. The dairy farmer, the truck farmer, and the poultry farmer have as great a need for full parity as does the grower of corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco—we should give all farmers the benefit of a sound and workable support program.

Expand soil-conservation program: This country has—through the Soil Conservation Act of 1936—made some very real progress in conserving the productivity of the Nation's soil. However, it is a well-established fact that the natural productivity of most of our soils is still going down faster than it is being restored and improved. For this reason, it is mandatory that our soil-conservation efforts be intensified. More attention should be given to flood control and reforestation to stop soil erosion, more adequate funds are needed for conservation research and education, and we should experiment with direct payments to farmers for soil-conservation practices.

Increase REA power: The REA program has proven itself remarkably successful—its record of accomplishment is a tribute to the cooperative efforts of the Nation's farmers working through their REA cooperatives and the Federal Government. About 9 out of 10 farms today have electric power—and rural electrification can be 100 percent in a few years if we continue our efforts. Congress should continue to provide adequate appropriations for REA, and we need to make greater efforts to develop more electric power and build more REA transmission lines so that our farmers can realize the full benefits of this vital program of electrification.

Secure family size farm: Experience shows that the family owned and operated farm is the most efficient method of farm production and the greatest strength of community life. Family ownership means greater independence and security for our farm population, and it also means that the farm income is spent at home instead of being drained off from the community as it is where we have corporate absentee farming.

It is encouraging to note that the trend is toward individual farm ownership and operation—today nearly three-quarters of all farmers own their own land. This marks a reversal of the trend prior to 1933 which was toward increased farm tenancy (in 1932, 42 percent of the country's farms were run by tenants). I think it is clear that this change away from farm tenancy and in favor of the family-size farm is due to the farm credit policies of the Federal Government. Since our farm-credit policies have proved themselves by such great value, I think we should expand this credit program to give easily available credit at low interest rates to finance farm purchases, and give special emphasis to the loan operations of the Farm Home Administration to help low-income farmers.

More funds for research: There is a crying need for more adequate funds for continued research in all fields of scientific agriculture. We should, for example, provide more liberal appropriations for the Bureau of Animal Industry which is working on control of animal disease. The past record of this Bureau shows that it is capable of doing an outstanding job in providing technical know-how and leadership in controlling animal diseases. We should, by all means, furnish more funds to this agency for controlling Bang's disease and the hoof-and-mouth disease. Funds for improved methods of agriculture is always a good investment, and in the future we should be less economy-minded on this budget item than we have in the past.

Forestry for off-farm employment: Many farmers in my area of northern Minnesota earn part of their livelihood from the forest industries—from logging and pulpwood operations. It occurs to me that any farm program must therefore include measures to provide greater opportunity for off-farm employment. The extension of the forest practices program, with emphasis upon wood-lot forestry, tree planting, and technical forest assistance to farmers, would be a real boon to rural people, both in Minnesota and many other States.

Farmer participation in program administration: I am convinced that one of the reasons why such farm programs as Production and Marketing Administration, REA, and crop insurance, have operated so successfully is the farmers committee system. The farmers commitee system is a democratic system—it is squarely in line with the American principle of self-help. I am amazed to find that some people have criticized this form of farmer participation, but regardless of what some may say, the farmer committees have done an outstanding job in formulating and helping administer our farm programs. The committee system must be continued and adequate funds must be appropriated to enable them to operate properly.

Another form of farmer activity which deserves our continued support is the work of farm cooperatives. These cooperative organizations have given the farmer lasting benefits in both the marketing of farm products, the purchase of machinery, and in rural electrification. They deserve every encouragement, and I have nothing but contempt for the NTEA crowd who would use the Federal taxing power to destroy the cooperative movement.

Mr. Chairman, the policy recommendations which I have just outlined constitute a framework for a basic program for the American farmer. Such a program would stabilize farm income at full parity, maintain farm production at high levels, preserve soil fertility, and create the conditions under which the family-size farm would thrive and prosper. I maintain that such a program would guarantee continued progress toward the desired goals of farm prosperity and rural welfare.

The American farmer has the know-how and the will to supply the Nation's food needs. They have been meeting the food demands in both peace and war, and I know they will continue to do so. For this they deserve our consideration—they deserve a public opinion climate in which agriculture is allowed to improve and expand so that the farmer himself will receive the fruits of his labor. In this connection, I quote from a speech made on the House floor on April 30 last by our colleague and my very good friend, the Congressman from Minnesota's Sixth District [Mr. MARSHALL], when he said:

So far as farmers are concerned, filling stomachs is not an end in itself, unless it also brings mental and spiritual rewards such as a slackening in the terrific pace of farm work, increasing chances for rest and recreation for the whole family, and investing earnings in education, health, and home conveniences.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who has spoken on behalf of the consumers of his district and of the country. Certainly, no one would want to say for a moment that their interests should not be very carefully guarded in connection with any legislation of this kind. However, I think any study of the farm legislation that has been enacted in this country during the past 15 years would show that the interest of the consumer has been kept in mind. I know of no better proof of that, than the fact that during that period of time the per capita consumption of agricultural commodities in this country has increased by 13 percent. If it were true that farm programs were putting the price of farm commodities beyond the reach of consumers, that, of course, would not have occurred.

Furthermore, I want to point out that in addition to the increased quantity consumed there has been a change in the character of that consumption, in that the consumption of dairy products, meat, poultry, eggs, and fresh vegetables has increased tremendously, while there has been a decrease in the consumption of the cheaper starchy foods like potatoes and cereals. Not only has the quantity consumed increased, but that increase has been in the higher-priced commodities. That all negates the implication that is carried in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that the farm program is preventing the people of this country from enjoying proper quantities and kinds of food because they cannot afford to buy it.

Let me point out also that the statistics show that the people today are spending about the same percentage of their income for food that they were spending 10 or 15 or even 5 years ago, with this difference: That they are today getting more and better food than they were getting at that time. If they were consuming the same kind and quantity of food now that they were consuming 10 or 15 years ago they would be paying a smaller percentage of their income for food now than they were at that time. To further supplement those points I want to call attention to some of the figures in a table which I hold in my hand showing what 1 hour's industrial pay would purchase in terms of certain articles of food now and at various times in the past. First, I want to mention bread.

Back in 1914 an hour's industrial pay would purchase 4 pounds of bread; in 1951 it would purchase 10 pounds; in 1939 when all prices were certainly low, an hour's industrial pay would purchase only 7.9 pounds of bread.

Pork chops: In 1914 an hour's industrial labor would purchase 1 pound of pork chops; in 1929 it would purchase 1.5 pounds; in 1949, 1.9 pounds, while in 1951 it would purchase 2 pounds.

Butter: Back in 1914 an hour's industrial pay would purchase 0.6 pounds of butter. In 1929 it would purchase 1 pound. In 1939 it would purchase 1.9 pounds, and in 1951 it would purchase the same quantity, 1.9 pounds.

Take oranges: Back in 1919 an hour's industrial labor would purchase 0.9 pounds of oranges; in February 1951 it would purchase 3.2 pounds; in 1939, 3.2 pounds; and so I might read on from the list of all of the usual articles that one buys in a grocery store including steak, eggs, milk, potatoes, and many others. In practically every case these figures show that 1 hour's industrial labor will purchase far more food now than at any period in the past 40 years.

What we are attempting to do in this bill is not to increase support prices, not to go any further than we have gone, but simply to make it mandatory to continue for 3 years the present level of supports on the basic commodities. The bill would also continue the use of the dual-parity provision until December 31, 1955, on the basic commodities; in other words, if we pass this legislation we continue the program that is now in existence, a program which has certainly not resulted in higher prices for food to the consumers of this country.

As far as basic commodities are concerned we are in the situation now where it is important to continue production at least on the present level. A few years ago it might not have been anticipated that this would be the case. At that time we were concerned about surpluses, and the farm program to a considerable extent was a program for the prevention and disposal of surpluses. In the meantime, however, the situation has changed and our problem in the future is more likely to be one of producing enough to meet the needs of a rapidly growing population than it will be to reduce or curtail production. That means that we need support prices as an incentive to secure production of sufficient quantities of agricultural products; and that, in the main, is the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. HARVEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas the most expensive part of the normal family's diet being meat, if it is not true that the two most important meat products, beef and pork, are actually selling for less on the farm today than they were 4 years ago, and at the same time are costing the consumer at the butcher shop more per pound?

Mr. HOPE. I am sure that is a correct statement of the situation. I agree with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HARVEY. I simply offer that because I very frequently hear the statement made that the increased cost of living, particularly with regard to meat which is essential to our diet, is attributable to the increased cost at the farm. I think it is only fair to show by this statement that the increased cost of meat is not attributable to increased costs as they leave the farm.

Mr. HOPE. I thank the gentleman for making that point clear. It is an important point and should appear in this discussion.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I remember that in one of our appropriation bills there was a provision made for investigation by the Department of Agriculture of the difference in cost as between production by the farmer and when purchased by the consumer. Has the Committee on Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture published any report yet on that point?

Mr. HOPE. I am not aware of any report having been published as yet in compliance with that request; however, the Department of Agriculture issues publications regularly which show the relationship between farm prices and food prices. In other words, they show the margin between the prices that the farmer gets and the prices the consumer pays. Some information is available in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this so-called modernized double-barreled parity approach which provides a legislative guaranty of continued higher prices to American consumers. Furthermore, I am at a loss to understand why such an important measure certain to have an effect on living costs in every American home should be brought before us today without printed hearings being available to the membership.

I have heard it said here today that the bill will do a real job for the peanut belt and other belts in our country. Belts is indeed a proper word and American consumers are on the receiving line. Even the two largest farm organizations in the country, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange are bitterly opposed and, speaking for the latter organization, J. T. Sanders has declared the proposed steps would be hard to "justify before the American bar of public opinion."

Commenting on the meaning of this new deal for agriculture, which is being

protested by so many farmers as inherently wrong and indefensible, the New York Times says editorially:

Under the present law a new parity formula is supposed to go into effect for all base crops at the beginning of 1954. The present is a transition period, and in that period producers of a given crop may use either the old or the modernized parity. The Senate Committee on Agriculture recently passed a bill which would postpone the effective date for the introduction of the new formula until at least 1956. And this week the House Committee on Agriculture has given the present law both barrels, as it were. In addition to eliminating the provision affecting the change-over to the new parity (which yields lower prices in most cases than the old) it has proposed abandonment of the so-called flexible price support provisions of the present law. It would make it mandatory on the Secretary of Agriculture to support prices rigidly at 90 percent of parity.

Here is a proposal for subsidizing agriculture so obnoxious that the Nation's two great farm organizations, the American Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange, have vigorously opposed it as public policy. They have done so because they have the courage and the breadth of view to consider it in terms of the interests of the Nation as a whole. And the administration? How does the administration feel about the national interest on this issue? All we know on that point is that Secretary Brannan, appearing to testify on the legislation, has given it his official blessing.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, this bill has for its purpose the continuation of the present support program for the basic agricultural commodities through 1955 and extending for the same period of time the present price-support program for the basic commodities at 90 percent of parity.

I think that we all agree that we want a sound and prosperous agriculture. It is our basic wealth; and when we have a sound agricultural economy, there is no doubt but that it will be reflected Nation-wide and all groups will benefit. Let us look at the cost. The price-support program has cost the Federal Government over a period of 18 years about a billion dollars. Potatoes and eggs were largely responsible for this loss; in fact, potatoes for about one-half. Perishable commodities have produced most of the loss. Cotton has been a money-making proposition for the Government. We are about $35,000,000 ahead over this period of time on the basic crops.

So it is with the basic commodities that we are concerned with in this legislation.

It is not all rosy even with 100-percent support. A few minutes ago you heard a discussion of the rules and regulations that PMA will issue tomorrow with regard to peanuts. Even when we have this 90-percent support we have very little to do with the administration of the law. PMA can set up regulations as to moisture content of peanuts and many other regulations which serve to reduce the 90 percent. I do hope that the contemplated drastic regulations will be modified.

This legislation will insure to our Nation abundant production and, at the same time, fair and reasonable prices for the consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. LOVRE].

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this bill and I congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for bringing it up.

If there ever was a time for supporting farm produce at 90 percent of parity and continuing the dual parity formula, it is now. If there are any deficiencies in this bill, they are that it does not support all farm produce at 90 percent of parity. Mr. Chairman, it is to be remembered that this bill supports only the six basic commodities—corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, cotton, and peanuts.

Parity, as you know, Mr. Chairman, is a price that has been determined to be fair to both consumer and producer. This being true, it seems to me that the producer is entitled to 100 percent of parity and not 90 percent or 75 percent or anything less than 100 percent.

We must have food and at prices that we can afford to pay. This bill will do just that, because it provides an incentive to produce and only by producing in ample quantities can we have food at reasonable prices. Thus, Mr. Chairman, it can be seen that this bill is a protection not only for the producer but the consumer as well.

Remember that our farmers are the only ones who do not put a price tag on their commodities. They haul their produce to market and must either accept the price that is offered or haul the produce back home. For this reason, too, the farmers need the protection of this bill.

The farmer has learned from bitter experience that he can produce himself into bankruptcy. He remembers the thirties and he is not going to let that happen again if he can help it.

Mr. Chairman, our farmers are ready and willing to step up production of food that is so badly needed and which has been requested of them by our National Defense Department. But they want assurances that they will get a fair price. They are entitled to that assurance, particularly at a time like this when their operating costs are rising daily and at a time when net farm income is lower than it was in 1947 and in 1948. Not only is net farm income lower today than it was in 1947 and 1948 but our farmers today receive less of the national income than at any time since 1947. In 1947 the farm percentage of total national income was 8.6 percent; in 1948 it was 7 percent; in 1949 it was 6.2 percent; in 1950 it was 5.3 percent; and in 1951 it was 5.4 percent. This condition cannot be permitted to continue. If it does it will mean the end to our great agricultural industry.

Mr. Chairman, so long as farm income is up, we will have busy factories. History shows that for every dollar of farm income we have $7 of national income. When farm income goes up, national income goes up seven times. When farm income goes down, the national income goes down seven times.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest not only of the producer but also the consumer and in the interest of our national economy, it is imperative that we assure our farmers of not less than 90 percent support price for their produce. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this House will pass this bill now before us.

Mr. Chairman the time will come when we will have to adopt a long range farm program that will assure our farmer of 100 percent parity for all farm products on a self-supporting and self-governing basis. I have introduced such legislation which I sincerely hope will be passed by the Congress within the near future.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this legislation but I will support it because it is too late in this session of Congress to obtain real justice for the farmers of America.

I am opposed to 90 or even 100 percent of so-called parity. I have demanded for years and will continue to demand no less than cost-of-production prices for the farmers of this Nation.

Anything less than cost of production for farmers is to deny them equal treatment with industry.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that I support this bill only because I cannot support a better program. The time is long past due when Congress should strike down this deception known as parity.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say with reference to the remarks by the gentleman from New York in regard to the background and interest of the Committee on Agriculture, that while I realize it is the fact that all members of that committee are interested necessarily in the welfare of agriculture, I do not think they are unduly interested in it, and it certainly seems to me that if this program was not sound basically, somebody on the committee would have objected to it. I am sure the gentleman from New York knows that the House Committee on Banking and Currency brought in, in the Defense Production Act, a continuation of the 90-percent program for the life of that act. Now if the Committee on Agriculture is unduly interested in agriculture, it is difficult to reconcile that with the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency also realizes the importance of this provision. When you speak of the gains, the progressive legislation enacted in behalf of labor, the fact remains that labor does have certain protection that none of us would want to take away from them. They have unemployment compensation, social security, minimum wages, and maximum hours and other rights that they exercise. Unfortunately

the farmers of this Nation cannot exercise the same rights that have been given to labor. When an industrial worker works 8 hours, he can quit. When a farmer plants a crop in the field he must follow it all the way to harvest. He cannot turn a switch, he cannot taper off, he cannot strike, and he cannot shut down; he has got to go on. This is a basic right, and it seems to me we should be glad to accord to agriculture that right—that is, a floor below which he will not fall in the event we have tremendous surpluses that accumulate in response to Government requests for higher production.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: On page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment that this deferment of the use of the modernized parity standard should be eliminated from the bill; in other words, that at the end of next year we should have the single, modernized parity standard on which to compute parity.

Mr. Chairman, something has been made here of the fact that neither the Farm Bureau Federation or, at least, Mr. Allan Kline, who spoke for it, its president, or the National Grange, ought to be considered too seriously in connection with this question.

Let me point out that Mr. Kline, the president of the Farm Bureau Federation, said that his Federation represents 1,452,210 farm families, which sounds like a very big outfit to me, because that is about 25 percent of the farm families in the United States. He was not speaking for himself because he said at the outset, "I want to make it clear that this bill violates fundamental policy principles of the American Farm Bureau Federation." He then cited a resolution adopted at their last annual meeting, from which I read the following sentence:

W do not believe that action to raise the level of price support above that now provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 is in the long-run the interest of farm people.

Now let me read what the master of the National Grange said in his testimony, and again I quote:

In the second place, this provision of a dual parity formula is bad in that it is detrimental to a further improvement and refinement to a satisfactory unified parity formula.

I would like the Members to listen to this quotation, and again I quote:

If we do not strive for such a formula we shall decidedly weaken our case before the 80 percent of our people who are nonagricultural.

Let me give you the figures which bear that out, and represent what I think is a real peril to the farmer in this effort to push the whole parity guaranty beyond what it ought to be in reason and fairness to the consumer.

In 1939 the Consumers' Price Index showed all prices, all items in the cost of living at 99.4, and at the same time food in the cost of living index was 95.2; in other words, they were just about even. When you get down to May 15, 1952, the latest figures, what do you find? You find that all items in the Consumers' Price Index have gone up to 189 but food has gone up to 230.8. I submit that with food having outstripped all other items by such a material amount we are certainly justified in taking another look at this whole farm parity program.

What does this dual parity standard which is sought to be continued do? Take wheat, for example. Under the old parity, 1910 to 1914, which I do not think can be justified under today's conditions, it fixes a support floor under that, based on a parity of 30 cents a bushel more than under modernized parity, and I repeat, this is a support floor. No little business gets paid on the basis of a support floor, nor does any worker, no matter what has been said about that.. Here the Government underwrites the price. I say I am for it. It is necessary for farmers in view of the depression experience, put on a reasonable basis, but I say that trying to push it further than it is in the law today is an unreasonable basis.

The old parity for wheat is $2.42 a bushel. The modernized parity for wheat is $2.10. Why should not the consumers of the United States have that lower floor under prices rather than the higher floor under prices when it is the latter, lower figure, which is modernized parity, instead of the old 1910–1914 parity?

In peanuts—that makes two of these six basic commodities—it is 13.1 cents a pound for peanuts under the 1910–1914 parity and 10.7 cents a pound, a very material difference there of well over 25 percent—under the modernized parity.

It seems to me the very least we ought to do in this situation in view of the opposition of two of the great farm organizations, in view of the fact that consumer prices for food have far outstripped the rise in general consumer's price index for all items and in view of the fact that modernized parity adopted by this great Committee on Agriculture itself represents the modern conception of what the farmer's basic price guarantee ought to be figured on—I think the least we can do in fairness to the consumer is to strike out what has been properly called this double-barrel as far as the consumer is concerned, giving both the old parity and the new parity, and the right to take the highest of either. I just do not think that makes any case, and apparently it did not to the two big farm organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 21, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

"(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio: On page 2, line 5, after the word "commodity" insert the words "excepting peanuts."

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, frankly, from the fate of the previous amendment, I do not expect I have much of a chance of getting this amendment adopted, with only about 100 members on the floor. I do think a very good case can be made for the exception of peanuts.

I do not know whether you realize or not, but in this bill peanuts are defined as a basic commodity, basic to the agriculture of this Nation. I happen to represent a district that does not grow any peanuts, but does produce a lot of milk and butter and meat, and I do not see anywhere in the basic farm legislation that either of those commodities is called basic. Oh, I know the argument will be made that they are perishable, but there is a great deal of question in my mind as to whether or not peanuts can be stored. I will say this—that the Government has not treated peanuts as a storable product in the past. They have treated them as a perishable commodity, and have sold them for crushing immediately when they bought them, and have in effect subsidized peanut growers.

In 1950, there were 2,277,000 acres of peanuts grown in this country as against 83,302,000 acres of corn. Yet the peanut program costs the taxpayers considerably more than the corn program, which had an acreage nearly 40 times as large. The peanut program has cost the taxpayers or did cost the taxpayers in the year 1950, $7.04 an acre for every acre of peanuts grown. Next highest in cost was wheat, and in that year, it was less than one-third as much as peanuts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. From 1937 to 1950, the peanut price support has averaged about $2 an acre as compared to tobacco at only 50 cents and wheat only 25 cents.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think the gentleman's amendment should be accepted.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to thank the gentleman. I want to say further

in the years 1933 through 1951, the Government made money on two basic commodities in this act—tobacco and cotton. It lost money on the other four commodities, namely, peanuts, wheat, corn, and rice. But with corn and wheat together having 80 times the acreage of peanuts, still the loss on peanuts was $84,000,000 against a $70,000,000 loss on wheat. In other words, we have picked up and written into the basic-commodity law here, or are attempting to write into the law, a commodity, which in my opinion, is in no way basic. As a matter of fact, I think you might as well write in that radishes are a basic commodity. I do not know how the acreage compares, but I think there must be nearly as many acres in radishes as there are of peanuts, and certainly radishes are a basic food item.

I want you to know I am for a parity program. I believe in order to have a sound economy, the farmers must have some assurance that they can plan ahead and that they will have some kind of guaranty when their crops mature as to the kind of price that they are going to get. I believe this country cannot be prosperous without a sound agricultural economy.

I say to you when we stick into the law language that makes such items as peanuts basic commodities, I do not know exactly where we may stop. I do not want to bore this Committee with a lot of figures, but I have the figures for all commodities, and I want to reiterate that with all the tremendous acreages of the other basic commodities, peanuts has been the thing that has cost the taxpapers of this country the most money.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Can the gentleman tell us what the Government paid as a subsidy for peanuts in the last year or 2 years ago?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Right at this time I have only the year 1950. It cost the Government $16,625,930 for peanuts. That was the biggest cost to the Government of anything except wheat, but wheat had 61,000,000 acres as against 2,000,000 acres for peanuts, and the cost was very little different.

As I said a moment ago, from 1933 through 1951 peanuts cost the taxpayers of this country $84,000,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And that was paid for by the taxpayers all over the United States.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Paid for by the taxpayers all over the United States. If my amendment is adopted this cost will be saved to the taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], which attempts to take peanuts out of the bill. This amendment does not do what is intended, to wit: Remove peanuts as one of the basic commodities. What it does do is to keep peanuts from being on equal footing with the other basic commodities so far as this bill is concerned.

The peanut program has received considerable unjustified criticism in recent months. During the emergency the Government called on peanut farmers to greatly expand the production of peanuts. The farmers answered the call. When that emergency was over, it became necessary to have a gradual reduction in peanut acreage so as not to wreck the economy of the peanut producers. I realize that the peanut program has cost some money, but the producers, themselves, together with their Representatives in the Congress for the past several years, have been working together in an endeavor to put the peanut program on a sustained basis and I believe that the legislation enacted in the past 18 months or 2 years has gone a long way toward solving our problem.

I call on the Members of this House to vote down the amendment and let us work this problem out in an orderly fashion which I believe, as a matter of fact, has been done to a large extent.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think what I was hopeful of before has happened. Those who are supporting this bill are being required to put forward all their arguments. It is very obvious what will happen to those affected. The consumer in the cities and the farmer on the farm will both be doing some thinking about the fundamental thesis which is being expressed here.

A very dangerous argument, in my view, is the argument that the 90 percent of parity support is going to be an incentive to production. I say, with all deference to my friends who represent the rural areas, that is a two-pronged argument, as far as they are concerned. I can see the fight on this in terms of a basic guaranteed floor to the farmer to prevent price collapse, but when one talks about a production incentive, just begin to think about the storm which was created here when the gentleman who is now Secretary of Agriculture brought out a plan which bears his name which was interred, as I remember it, in short order with loud howls. Yet any idea of stimulating production by giving some kind of a guaranty of production payment is strangely reminiscent of that situation.

Let me show you what has happened to the farmer, which I think is very important, because he is still a basic consumer in this country. I am not unmindful of the fact that we eat what he raises and he wears what we make. The farmer of 1951 is having the largest gross receipts which he has had in all the postwar years, $37,404,000,000, but what does he have left? Fourteen billion nine hundred and twenty-nine million dollars, over two billion dollars less than he had in 1947, which was about his best net income years. In other words, the inflationary spiral which is created by increasing food prices, which for the short range looks fine, when you are getting large supports, begins to militate against the farmer when the prices on the things he buys go up as well.

The last point is this, and I think this is what is worrying many of the people in the cities: We are dealing with a lot of farmers to whom this 90 percent of parity support is important and basic, but we are dealing also with some big-scale operators to whom this 90 percent means simply the basis for a windfall of money beyond the proper operations of their abilities and of the market. I think that very clearly explains the worry a lot of people are having, especially those who are consuming these products in the cities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know of any comparable industry to agriculture that has lost 14 percent in the last few years?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the consumer has been suffering even more.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The gentleman has stated the figures of what the farmer made and what he had left. I am sure the gentleman realizes that what they do have left is worth just half as much as what they had before?

Mr. JAVITS. That is true. I am only pointing out that this situation is catching up with all of us, including the very farm people we are talking about here today.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is really questionable as to whether any comment should be made on this amendment. I think the House long ago recognized peanuts as a basic commodity. This is a sort of perennial attack which is made; it is not new; we have settled it on other occasions, and I am sure today the House will continue to recognize peanuts as a basic commodity, but I think it would be significant to mention today that the acreage of peanuts throughout the country has been brought down, and down, and down, to conform more nearly to the basic requirements for peanuts.

Peanuts have played a very important part in our defense program in the past, and even now there is a great demand for an adequate amount of oil. The Secretary of Agricultulre has asked for the production of a certain amount of peanuts. That acreage will be held to a realistic figure. There is no need for apprehension about the costliness of this program. I think the experiences we have had in the past have taught both the farmers and the Department of Agriculture how to handle this program in such manner as to avoid excessive cost to the taxpayer or to the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe that the Members of the House will recognize the necessity for carrying on this program in these times, and it is our hope that you will vote down this amendment as you did the preceding one.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ABBITT. Is it not true that recently the peanut program has been put on a very sound basis, and that the whole program has been brought into line and that we both this year and in the last few years have been coming back down to earth after these requests on the part of the Government to increase peanut production greatly? It has taken some years to get back to normal, but we have gotten there.

Mr. PRESTON. Absolutely; and the farmers themselves have voted a reduction in this program. They realize as well as anyone that when abuses occur, that when excess production occurs the cost is unreasonable it is damaging to the entire support program of the country. We did not want excessive planting of peanuts or any other commodity, but we did think we should produce the amount required for the national-defense program.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman has made an outstanding statement, and certainly a logical statement. I wonder if some of the opposition realizes that down in the section that I come from that a few years ago we suffered greatly from the boll weevil and that the peanut crop was and is a lifesaver. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has pointed out, this crop has been cut annually and is being cut. I think the Department of Agriculture is working this out now to the point where there is not going to be any loss, but I think it might be well also to understand that all during World War II it was a mighty good thing that they had some peanuts or they would not have had any oils with which to cook, and it has now been discovered that peanut oil is one of the finest cooking oils in the world and possessed of great medicinal value. If we get into an all-out war those people in the cities may be mighty glad, mighty glad that this amendment is voted down, because it may be the means of providing some food and some sustenance that they would not otherwise be able to get.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I want to commend the gentleman on his fight against this amendment. I assure the gentleman that I am against the amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I wish also to join in commending the gentleman for his fine statement. He deserves the thanks of the peanut growers in particular and the country at large in general.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. I should like to add my word of commendation to the others on the splendid statement the gentleman from Georgia has just made. It is a clarion call in the interest of the farmers; I think he has made a splendid contribution, and I am confident his position will be justified by the vote of this House.

Mr. PRESTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have just made inquiry at the desk for a copy of the hearings on this bill, H. R. 8122, and I am advised that they are not available, that there are no printed hearings. May I inquire of the chairman of the committee where copies of the hearings may be obtained?

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is that the hearings were not printed.

Mr. CANFIELD. Why were they not printed?

Mr. COOLEY. For one thing, there was the time element involved. We were anxious to call the bill up for consideration. We tried to call it up by unanimous consent, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] objected. I do not think the hearings would be very helpful to the gentleman. They are available. I can have them brought here but that would result in a further delay. If the gentleman has any questions in mind with regard to what was said at the hearing I am sure some member of the committee can give him the information.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me say to the gentleman, who is chairman of this very important Committee on Agriculture, that I think on a measure like this hearings should be available to all Members of Congress on request.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman may be right, but we passed this morning three bills that came out of the committee because they were noncontroversial, and we thought this bill was noncontroversial, notwithstanding the opposition of Mr. Kline of the American Farm Bureau. We assumed it would be noncontroversial when every Republican on the committee and every Democrat on the committee agreed that this is the thing they wanted to do and the thing that should be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, although I represent a city district, as a member of the Agricultural Committee I have supported every bill out of my committee excepting the migratory farm-labor bill. I think my record clearly shows my interest in sound agricultural legislation. I spoke here in favor of a bill to increase the acreage allotment for peanuts and also in support of a bill to raise the standard upon which the price supports for cotton are determined. I think the committee itself should deal with this peanut question, but I do not think the committee will. The gentleman from Ohio has pointed out how relatively unimportant peanuts are in the agricultural economy of the United States. He has pointed out also that they are in a sense a perishable commodity, and if they are deserving of any treatment, they should be treated as other perishables.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Someone made a statement—I believe it was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER]—that we might be glad some day if we had peanuts available for their oil content. Was it not brought out in the testimony that if this oil is required it can be obtained at no cost to the taxpayers from soybeans and other oil-bearing products?

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is right. I would like to make this point with regard to the perishable question. Until 1941, section 32 funds were used to support peanuts. Under the law these funds can be used only to purchase perishable commodities. After 1941, peanuts were listed as a basic commodity.

Further demonstrating the perishable nature of peanuts is the fact that up to this crop-year no inventory of peanuts has been carried over by the CCC, as is usually done with basic storable crops. Rather, they have all been sold by the Government for crushing. In the case of edible peanuts, this represents a direct subsidy to the farmer, because he is paid the support price for edible peanuts and the Government immediately sells them at the lower price paid for oil peanuts. Hence, Wooley's reference to subsidized peanuts for oil.

Now, to answer the gentleman from Ohio, this is the testimony of Mr. Wooley, former Deputy Administrator, PMA, on February 8, 1951:

Mr. WOOLEY. We are still, as of today, with the present oil market, losing in the neighborhood of $35 to $40 a ton on oil peanuts.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not entirely possible that an ample supply of oil peanuts may well be highly desirable from the standpoint of the country?

Mr. WOOLEY. We are of the opinion that we can get the production of oil in this country much more cheaply than we can through peanuts. We believe that through cottonseed and soybeans and other oilseed crops that we can do it more cheaply than we can through subsidized peanuts for oil. Basically, some of that acreage that is devoted to the production of peanuts for oil we think could be well devoted to the production of feed that would result in a more profitable use of our short land resources at this particular time.

The Department of Agriculture is against subsidizing peanuts for oil and states that this cropland could be put to more profitable use.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Does the gentleman make the statement that soy bean oil produces an oil that is anywhere near equal to peanut oil?

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not going into the physical or chemical characteristics. I am simply giving you the statement of Mr. Wooley of the PMA who says that the oil needs of this country can better be supplied from other sources

than from peanuts. If you want to raise peanuts, you can raise them, but I do not think you ought to ask the Government to subsidize you in producing oil that we do not need, on a soil that the Department says could better be used for other purposes. If you want to raise peanuts, raise peanuts, but do not ask the Government to underwrite them. It appears that this oil program is unnecessary and that other crops can be raised on the land now used in raising peanuts. There seems to me to be no valid reason for continuing to support peanuts or to consider them as a basic commodity. I am satisfied, if any Member of the Committee on Agriculture were asked to define a basic commodity, he could not by the widest stretch of the imagination include peanuts, unless he included 99 percent of the agricultural commodities produced in this country. There are many other commodities, dairy products, oats, rye, barley, and so forth, that are more basic.

Mr. FORRESTER. I would like to ask the gentleman, in all spirit of fairness, since the question of peanut oil as against soy bean oil has arisen, if it is not a fact that it is recognized by the medical world and by the scientific world that peanut oil possesses qualities that no other oil in this world possesses? Is that not true?

Mr. McCARTHY. The same thing can be said about castor oil, but I do not think we should stockpile that simply because it is different from other kinds of oil. I believe that the House should take this nonbasic commodity off the list of basic commodities and then pass the bill as amended.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I said when I was recognized, that I rose to oppose the amendment. I am sure my southern friends will not shout me down with the phrase "vote! vote! vote!" had they known that. I think my State antecedent got them off of balance for just a minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have never failed to support agricultural legislation. Certainly, this is their weakest case, as the gentleman from Ohio indicates. If I support this program, then I will follow my distinguished friend from North Carolina on these matters as usual. But, I am doing this, Mr. Chairman, because I am being consistent. I bow to the opinion and the experience and the awareness of the subject of the members of this committee. This is their problem, and because of the procedure of this House and the way we operate here and because the work is left to the committee, perforce we must follow their advice.

Now, the number of bales of cotton yield per acre in my district is very, very, very small, believe me. The number of peanuts, the pounds of tobacco that we get from my coal mines would not fill your hat. Yet I come here year after year baring my breast to the slings and arrows of the outraged farm districts, and vote for them. But it is a one-way street, boys, it is a one-way street.

Yes; my miners will go very hungry if you do not produce food. But, my friends, that is not the argument. We cannot live without the farmers. Anybody who would suggest that ought to have his head examined, and nobody is if he is sober, I am sure. But what happens to you when we bring to your attention our problems? Why do you otherwise charming, gracious, intelligent, patriotic, and learned gentlemen tell us how to run the coal mines, tell us how to house our poor, our starving in our great cities? Why do you not reciprocate and take our advice on matters affecting our areas which at least are equally as important to the general welfare as your farm areas—for we are the consumers—we must also live.

You point to me in the great debates on the control bill for years and you get down and thunder at me that I am a Socialist if I support liberal legislation. DANIEL JOHN FRANCIS JOSEPH FLOOD a Socialist. What double-barreled nonsense. I would never vote for any Socialist legislation, and you know it. Housing for the poor in the great cities. That is not socialism—that is Americanism. I have no great cities, but I have working people who need your help. We need your help badly for work and safety. My friends have gone through this aisle shoulder to shoulder for you year after year. We ask you for bread, you farmers, and you give us stones.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. To the greatest friend the farmer has, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], of course.

Mr. PRESTON. In this year of 1952, when politics is abroad in the land everywhere, I am grateful for that splendid compliment from one of the ablest men in the Congress.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, go on.

Mr. PRESTON. It has been my pleasure to serve on a subcommittee on appropriations, seated just to the left of the gentleman who is in the well of the House. Unquestionably he has one of the keenest intellects of any Member of the House. He is one of the ablest men to ever represent the great Keystone State of Pennsylvania. I am saying these things with the greatest of sincerity. But I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he did not inadvertently state when he took the floor that he was supporting the amendment? As a matter of fact, I believe, judging by the remarks the gentleman has made, he is in fact supporting the bill rather than the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Out of my enthusiasm, that was a complete inadvertence. I am supporting not only the bill, but I am supporting the gentleman from North Carolina and then the bill, of course.

Mr. PRESTON. May I point out that in his remarks a moment ago, he made some slight, very courteous reference to the fact that certain Members from the South sometimes do not vote on measures that are important to his area in a manner that would be pleasing to his people, but may I say that the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives from the South have supported public housing. There are some in each State who have not. I have voted for public housing on every single occasion it has been before this Congress, and the majority of my delegation have done likewise. We feel for you and your problems, and hope to reciprocate for the generosity you have shown.

(At the request of Mr. EBERHARTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have just come from testifying before the Committee on Rules with many of you Members on both sides of the aisle in behalf of that vital and important legislation, the mine safety bill. Now will you look into your hearts and vote, and will the gentleman from Georgia preach the gospel in the ears of all our friends from the South to support that mine-safety legislation when it comes on this floor as we are going to support you today? Now this is a ball game—let us play it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other Members of the House, the fact that the mine safety bill which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor after practically 4 years of consideration, and reported out by a great majority, a measure which both sides of the aisle favor, has already had four different hearings before the Committee on Rules, and we do not know yet whether we are going to get a rule, so that the House can vote on that bill. The bill passed the other body, and I am sure it would pass here under suspension of the rules. Yet there have been four different sessions before the Committee on Rules, and we are not able to bring that bill on the floor of the House up to this late date. I think that is something that should be considered by the Members from States which produce coal, and where thousands and thousands are being maimed every year and have been for many, many years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia and acting chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman agree with me that the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is an unfair statement in that it reflects upon the Committee on Rules. Let me say that this bill has not yet been printed; the report on it has not yet been filed. Yet, in spite of the fact that the committee does not ordinarily consider an application for a rule on a bill upon which no report has been filed, the committee was immediately assembled to give consideration to the application for a rule. In the hearing opportunity was given first to the proponents of the measure. We heard the main advocates of the bill on the first day. Then because of the impossibility of proceeding further and running until night, the committee was adjourned over in order to give the opposition an opportunity to be heard. We

heard them, and then we turned the hearing over to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], representing the advocates of the bill, and let him handle it in his own manner.

Mr. FLOOD. That is a proper statement.

Mr. COX. The Committee on Rules has done everything possible to cooperate in speeding up the consideration of the bill. Is that not true, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I think under any and all circumstances, we should be fair to the committee and to the membership of the House of Representatives. The Committee on Rules has cooperated with the Committee on Education and Labor, and under great difficulties. I presented the bill to the committee, and they have been most considerate and most cooperative. They have not been out of session more than a few minutes. I presented the matter to the Committee on Rules. If anyone should have an objection or complaint to file with the Committee on Rules, I think it should be some member on the committee. We found them most cooperative.

Mr. FLOOD. I have just come from the Committee on Rules, and in fairness to the gentleman who just spoke, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor and in fairness to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], acting chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], handling the bill before the Committee on Rules, just finished 10 minutes ago, may I point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a very eloquent statement in my presence before the Committee on Rules thanking them for the extensive opportunity we had.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

(On request of Mr. COX, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FLOOD was allowed to proceed for one additional minute.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is now on the floor. I have requested him to make answer to the criticism made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The situation as recounted by the chairman of the Rules Committee is substantially in effect just exactly what has happened. The committee first heard us Saturday morning. Then they carried it over, due to the lateness of the hour, until 10 o'clock this morning. The committee was in session until noon and again recessed until 2 o'clock. Both the proponents and the opponents of the legislation had ample opportunity and courteous opportunity to be heard. The proponents, of which I happen to be one, are entirely satisfied with the treatment accorded us by the Committee on Rules. I am sure the opponents of the legislation had adequate time and opportunity to be heard.

Mr. COX. One more word.

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. COX. The committee had to adjourn because we did not have a quorum present and because of proceedings on the floor in which Members were interested we could not get a quorum this afternoon. The final meeting is set for consideration in executive session tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to criticize any individual member of the Rules Committee. Some of my best friends are members of the Rules Committee. I appreciate very deeply the concern with which they are treating this request from the Committee on Education and Labor, to allow the membership of the House to vote on whether or not we should have a mine-safety law.

This is a very important measure. It means safety for thousands upon thousands of coal miners in the United States; it means life or death to many, as you know by the very serious accidents that have occurred during the past couple of years and particularly during the past several months.

Of course, if the Rules Committee takes it upon itself to set itself up as a supercommittee to go into every phase of legislation which has been reported out by a legislative committee, if the Rules Committee seeks, after the majority and the minority members have given consideration and approval to a measure, and has the approval of this House to go over the bill as reported out by the legislative committee, and therefore is given the power to veto in the last few days of the session a measure in which the entire coal-mining fraternity are very much interested, and a large percentage of the operators also favor and are interested, I say that if the House approves of that method of operation by the Rules Committee, that is one thing. I am glad I brought this subject up. I think it is a matter worthy of consideration. Here we are on Monday. We expect to adjourn sine die not later than Saturday. A request for a rule has been before this highly rated Rules Committee for several days. I am beginning to get concerned as to whether or not we are going to get a rule. I am beginning to get concerned as to whether the Rules Committee will not say, when we come to the last few days of the session, "If you will put so and so proviso in that bill we will give you a rule. If you do not put so and so a proviso in the bill we will not give you a rule." What will the miners all over the States of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, West Virginia, and other States that produce and mine coal, think about a proposition like that?

Mr. Chairman, I am glad I brought up this subject. I am willing to debate it at any time with anybody.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. If I am on a committee and I think if any other Member of this House is on a committee, and both the majority and the minority, after considering a bill for many, many months and days, then report it out practically unanimously, to allow a supercommittee to stand up and say, "You do thus and so or we will not give you a rule," I do not think we are living up to our obligation as the voters expect us to do.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, this attack on the Rules Committee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is nothing new, for he has been assaulting and lecturing the Rules Committee for a good many years; I do not know why, but those of you who have been here several terms will remember that he brought the matter to the attention of the House some three or four sessions ago and succeeded in passing the kind of resolution that he thought would clip the wings of the Rules Committee and get them to come nearer doing his bidding. That operated through that Congress, and it was found so unsatisfactory that the membership itself revolted against that rule and again restored to the Committee on Rules the former rules of the House.

I know that the Committee on Rules cannot do everything that everybody wants done at all times; it is just humanly impossible; but I think it very unfair to come here on the floor of the House and make this kind of assault on the Committee on Rules which has a rather difficult situation under the best conditions.

As to this so-called mine-safety bill, I think that in view of what has been said the House ought to know what are the actual facts on that bill. Everybody knows that Federal mine-safety legislation has been a subject that has been kicking around this Congress for a great many years. We are now 5 days from the end of this session. Not several days ago, but 1 day ago, Saturday, the Rules Committee was asked to meet and to give a hearing to this mine-safety bill. We met; we have been meeting pretty much all the time ever since. At the time that bill was presented to the Rules Committee I think the Committee on Education and Labor had had 2 years to work on it; we did not even have a printed bill before us; we had a committee print of what this legislation is. Up to this moment no member of the Rules Committee, no Member of the House of Representatives has an official printed copy of that bill, because it has not been printed. Up to Saturday when that bill came before the committee, up to today when that committee has been sitting all day on it, and up to this very moment, no Member of the House has seen or had a copy of the report of the committee on that bill with the statement of why the bill should be enacted.

I do not criticize anybody; everybody has been busy; but certainly criticism

should not be directed to the Rules Committee which has devoted 2 days to this thing without even having an official copy of the bill and without even having any copy of the report of the committee on the bill.

That is the true situation relative to the mine-safety bill. We have labored with it for 2 days. I understand the acting chairman has adjourned the committee until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock at which time he hopes to have a quorum present; and may we hope that at that time the Rules Committee may have an official print of the bill and that we may have a copy of the report.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me assure the gentleman from Virginia that there is no criticism coming from the members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from West Virginia is not criticizing; and the gentleman from West Virginia has been very fair about it and the Rules Committee is trying to be fair; we have tried to hear everybody who wanted to be heard, and we have now succeeded in hearing everybody who wanted to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee should not be criticized and I know that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are not criticizing us.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it permissible under the rules of the House for the author of an amendment to speak twice on his amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to the pro forma amendment, not my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask for a vote on the pending amendment, Mr. Chairman; there is no pro forma amendment pending; the pro forma amendments have been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina can fix the time for limitation of debate after the gentleman has completed.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not a question of fixing time. It was a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman could be recognized twice on the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my interest in the mine-safety bill. I have between 75 and 80 percent of all the coal miners in the great coal-producing State of Ohio within my district.

In my belief, the Members of this body will get a chance to vote on the mine-safety bill because it is my understanding that the majority leader has announced he plans to bring the bill up under suspension of the rules. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. May I say for the benefit of the Members and the record that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has agreed. Of course, we get permission to bring up a bill under suspension by unanimous consent and under these conditions the recognition would be as the result of an agreement on the part of the leadership. It is understood that the Speaker will recognize on Wednesday a motion to suspend the rules and consider the mine-safety bill; however, we are anxious to get a rule just the same. The Committee on Rules met as a result of the request of the leadership to try and get a rule out. We are going to bring it up under suspension because I assert this is a "must" bill, then have a rule to resort to in case it is necessary. I hope the Rules Committee will report out a rule.

The Rules Committee, of course, need not feel very much disturbed about what my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said. His statement was based upon good faith, but the facts are only known to a few. We know him to be a hard fighter and a very sincere Representative of the people of his district. It has been a subject near and close to his heart for many years.

I want to emphasize again that I consider this "must" legislation and I hope the Rules Committee will report a rule. It will come up under suspension of the rules and a rule will be available, if reported.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

A lot of Members have come on the floor since I introduced my original amendment which would take peanuts out of politics. My amendment is one to strike peanuts out of the fixed 90-percent section of the parity bill. I merely say this for the benefit of those who came in since the discussion got onto the subject of coal. I did not base it on the fact I was out to punish any section of the country because I emphasized when I introduced the amendment that I am a farmer, I believe in the farm program, but the weakest link in the farm program is here and it is the thing that is costing the taxpayers the most money. On the basis of figures we have for the years 1933 to 1951 it appears that peanuts has been the commodity that cost $14,000,000 more than any other commodity, while it has less acreage than any commodity except rice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to point out in connection with what the majority leader said, that as I understand it, the minority agreement was simply that suspensions be in order on Wednesday, but the suspensions that are to be called up is wholly a matter for the Speaker to determine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that necessarily follows. I think my friend from Indiana will interpret what I said in the proper light, that where your leadership consented to a suspension out of order it is only natural that we should consult your leadership in connection with what bills would come up. It is not a regular suspension day which would allow suspensions.

Mr. HALLECK. The agreement is necessary because suspensions would not, under the rules, be in order on Wednesday except by unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and would not ordinarily come up until next Monday, when we will be out of here.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio relative to the cost figures he just cited, that a large part of those costs was entailed as the result of the so-called excess-oil program in the peanut field, and that was later corrected by legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is trying to present his argument in the case fairly for peanuts, because he is interested in the welfare of his district. But, I would like to say that for this year we lost $7,500,000 on peanuts. In closing may I say that while I am vitally interested in coal, as a lot of other Members are, the bill before us is an agricultural bill, and the amendment we are about to vote on is a peanut amendment to strike peanuts out from under the 90-percent section of the parity program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio should not be considered in connection with the legislation now before the House. I grant you that there have been difficulties in the peanut program. There has been too much lost in the program. But, I think the way to correct that is with legislation from the Committee on Agriculture, which I have advocated from time to time. It is a fact that peanuts are not a perishable commodity. Peanuts can be stored and peanuts can be kept so that they can be marketed in an orderly fashion in accordance with the necessity of the trade and the consuming public. I do hope the House will not support this amendment and give the agricultural committee an opportunity to further study this legislation to work out the existing and difficult problems in the oil program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that losses were sustained because our Government urged and requested the farmers to substantially increase acreage during the war emergency?

Mr. BONNER. That is true; during the war years the crop was increased

due to a request by the Fats and Oils Commission of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think to set the record straight we should make the point that the big losses occurred in 1949, 1950, and 1951, which was after the war, and we had a lot of time to revise that peanut program since then.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; and I have been anxious to get a revision of the program, and I think that if a lot of the things in this program are properly ironed out we will not have this loss.

Mr. McCARTHY. This amendment will not take peanuts out but they would be subjected to a sliding scale which Congress decided should apply.

Mr. BONNER. Well, this amendment will take peanuts out as one of the basic commodities, and I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio), there were—ayes 43, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DEMPSEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 705, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Aandahl	Carlyle	Hall,
Abernethy	Carnahan	Edwin Arthur
Albert	Chiperfield	Hand
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Harden
Anderson, Calif.	Combs	Hébert
Anfuso	Coudert	Heffernan
Auchincloss	Curtis, Nebr.	Herter
Bakewell	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Bates, Ky.	Dawson	Jones,
Beall	Dingell	Hamilton C.
Beckworth	Doughton	Judd
Belcher	Eaton	Kearney
Bender	Evins	Kee
Blackney	Fallon	Kersten, Wis.
Brehm	Fenton	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Frazier	Larcade
Brownson	Furcolo	LeCompte
Buckley	Gore	Lyle
Burdick	Granger	McVey
Camp	Gwinn	Miller, Md.
Mitchell	Ramsay	Sutton
Morgan	Reece, Tenn.	Tackett
Morris	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor
Morrison	Richards	Vinson
Morton	Riley	Welch
Moulder	Sabath	Wharton
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sasscer	Whitten
Passman	Scott, Hardie	Wickersham
Philbin	Short	Withrow
Potter	Sikes	Wood, Ga.
Poulson	Steed	Woodruff
Powell	Stigler	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. JAVITS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 79, noes 165.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 121, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—207

Abbitt	Bolton	Davis, Wis.
Adair	Bonner	Deane
Allen, Ill.	Bosone	DeGraffenried
Andersen,	Boykin	Dempsey
H. Carl	Bramblett	Denton
Andresen,	Bray	D'Ewart
August H.	Brooks	Dolliver
Andrews	Brown, Ga.	Dorn
Angell	Bryson	Doyle
Arends	Budge	Durham
Armstrong	Burleson	Elliott
Aspinall	Burnside	Engle
Ayres	Burton	Fernandez
Bailey	Butler	Fisher
Baker	Byrnes	Flood
Barden	Cannon	Forrester
Baring	Chatham	Fugate
Battle	Chelf	Gary
Beamer	Chenoweth	Gathings
Bennett, Fla.	Clevenger	George
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Golden
Bentsen	Cooley	Gordon
Berry	Cooper	Grant
Betts	Cox	Gregory
Bishop	Crosser	Gross
Blatnik	Crumpacker	Hagen
Boggs, La.	Cunningham	Hall,
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Leonard W.
Halleck	McCarthy	Rogers, Fla.
Hardy	McCormack	Rogers, Tex.
Harris	McCulloch	Rooney
Harrison, Nebr.	McGregor	Scrivner
Harrison, Va.	McKinnon	Secrest
Harrison, Wyo.	McMillan	Shafer
Hart	McMullen	Sheppard
Harvey	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Havenner	Mack, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Hays, Ark.	Magee	Smith, Kans.
Hays, Ohio	Mahon	Smith, Miss.
Hedrick	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Herlong	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Miller, Nebr.	Spence
Hoeven	Mills	Springer
Holmes	Murdock	Staggers
Hope	Murray	Stanley
Horan	Norrell	Stockman
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Hunter	O'Hara	Teague
Ikard	O'Konski	Thomas
Irving	O'Neill	Thornberry
Jackson, Wash.	Patman	Trimble
Jarman	Patten	Van Pelt
Jenison	Perkins	Velde
Jenkins	Phillips	Vursell
Jensen	Pickett	Walter
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Watts
Jones, Mo.	Polk	Weichel
Jones,	Preston	Werdel
Woodrow W.	Price	Whitten
Karsten, Mo.	Priest	Wier
Kelley, Pa.	Prouty	Williams, Miss.
Kerr	Rabaut	Williams, N. Y.
King, Calif.	Rains	Wilson, Ind.
Kirwan	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Kluczynski	Redden	Winstead
Lanham	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
Lantaff	Rhodes	Wood, Idaho
LeCompte	Rivers	Yorty
Lesinski	Roberts	Zablocki
Lovre	Robeson	
Lucas	Rogers, Colo.	

NAYS—121

Addonizio	Granahan	Nelson
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Heller	Osmers
Bates, Mass.	Hess	Ostertag
Boggs, Del.	Hillings	O'Toole
Bow	Hinshaw	Patterson
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Buffett	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Busbey	Holifield	Reams
Bush	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Carrigg	James	Riehlman
Case	Javits	Rodino
Celler	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Jonas	Roosevelt
Clemente	Kean	Ross
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Sadlak
Corbett	Keating	St. George
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Crawford	Kennedy	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Scott,
Dague	King, Pa.	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Klein	Scudder
Devereux	Lane	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Latham	Sheehan
Dondero	Lind	Shelley
Donohue	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McDonough	Sittler
Eberharter	McGrath	Taber
Elston	McGuire	Thompson,
Feighan	McIntire	Mich.
Fine	Mack, Wash.	Tollefson
Fogarty	Madden	Vail
Forand	Meader	Van Zandt
Ford	Merrow	Vorys
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Widnall
Gamble	Morano	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Multer	Wolcott
Goodwin	Mumma	Wolverton
Graham	Murphy	Yates

NOT VOTING—103

Aandahl	Buckley	Eaton
Abernethy	Burdick	Elsworth
Albert	Camp	Evins
Allen, La.	Carlyle	Fallon
Anfuso	Carnahan	Fenton
Bakewell	Chiperfield	Frazier
Barrett	Chudoff	Furcolo
Bates, Ky.	Cole, N. Y.	Garmatz
Beall	Combs	Gore
Beckworth	Coudert	Granger
Belcher	Curtis, Nebr.	Green
Bender	Davis, Tenn.	Gwinn
Blackney	Dawson	Hall,
Brehm	Denny	Edwin Arthur
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Hand
Brownson	Doughton	Harden

should not be directed to the Rules Committee which has devoted 2 days to this thing without even having an official copy of the bill and without even having any copy of the report of the committee on the bill.

That is the true situation relative to the mine-safety bill. We have labored with it for 2 days. I understand the acting chairman has adjourned the committee until tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock at which time he hopes to have a quorum present; and may we hope that at that time the Rules Committee may have an official print of the bill and that we may have a copy of the report.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me assure the gentleman from Virginia that there is no criticism coming from the members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from West Virginia is not criticizing; and the gentleman from West Virginia has been very fair about it and the Rules Committee is trying to be fair; we have tried to hear everybody who wanted to be heard, and we have now succeeded in hearing everybody who wanted to be heard.

Mr. Chairman, the Rules Committee should not be criticized and I know that the members of the Committee on Education and Labor are not criticizing us.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it permissible under the rules of the House for the author of an amendment to speak twice on his amendment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rose in opposition to the pro forma amendment, not my amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. I ask for a vote on the pending amendment, Mr. Chairman; there is no pro forma amendment pending; the pro forma amendments have been withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina can fix the time for limitation of debate after the gentleman has completed.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not a question of fixing time. It was a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman could be recognized twice on the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in this House in my interest in the mine-safety bill. I have between 75 and 80 percent of all the coal miners in the great coal-producing State of Ohio within my district.

In my belief, the Members of this body will get a chance to vote on the mine-safety bill because it is my understanding that the majority leader has announced he plans to bring the bill up under suspension of the rules. Am I correct in that?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Ohio is correct. May I say for the benefit of the Members and the record that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has agreed. Of course, we get permission to bring up a bill under suspension by unanimous consent and under these conditions the recognition would be as the result of an agreement on the part of the leadership. It is understood that the Speaker will recognize on Wednesday a motion to suspend the rules and consider the mine-safety bill; however, we are anxious to get a rule just the same. The Committee on Rules met as a result of the request of the leadership to try and get a rule out. We are going to bring it up under suspension because I assert this is a "must" bill, then have a rule to resort to in case it is necessary. I hope the Rules Committee will report out a rule.

The Rules Committee, of course, need not feel very much disturbed about what my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] said. His statement was based upon good faith, but the facts are only known to a few. We know him to be a hard fighter and a very sincere Representative of the people of his district. It has been a subject near and close to his heart for many years.

I want to emphasize again that I consider this "must" legislation and I hope the Rules Committee will report a rule. It will come up under suspension of the rules and a rule will be available, if reported.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

A lot of Members have come on the floor since I introduced my original amendment which would take peanuts out of politics. My amendment is one to strike peanuts out of the fixed 90-percent section of the parity bill. I merely say this for the benefit of those who came in since the discussion got onto the subject of coal. I did not base it on the fact I was out to punish any section of the country because I emphasized when I introduced the amendment that I am a farmer, I believe in the farm program, but the weakest link in the farm program is here and it is the thing that is costing the taxpayers the most money. On the basis of figures we have for the years 1933 to 1951 it appears that peanuts has been the commodity that cost $14,000,000 more than any other commodity, while it has less acreage than any commodity except rice.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I just want to point out in connection with what the majority leader said, that as I understand it, the minority agreement was simply that suspensions be in order on Wednesday, but the suspensions that are to be called up is wholly a matter for the Speaker to determine.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that necessarily follows. I think my friend from Indiana will interpret what I said in the proper light, that where your leadership consented to a suspension out of order it is only natural that we should consult your leadership in connection with what bills would come up. It is not a regular suspension day which would allow suspensions.

Mr. HALLECK. The agreement is necessary because suspensions would not, under the rules, be in order on Wednesday except by unanimous consent?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and would not ordinarily come up until next Monday, when we will be out of here.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio relative to the cost figures he just cited, that a large part of those costs was entailed as the result of the so-called excess-oil program in the peanut field, and that was later corrected by legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman is trying to present his argument in the case fairly for peanuts, because he is interested in the welfare of his district. But, I would like to say that for this year we lost $7,500,000 on peanuts. In closing may I say that while I am vitally interested in coal, as a lot of other Members are, the bill before us is an agricultural bill, and the amendment we are about to vote on is a peanut amendment to strike peanuts out from under the 90-percent section of the parity program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio should not be considered in connection with the legislation now before the House. I grant you that there have been difficulties in the peanut program. There has been too much lost in the program. But, I think the way to correct that is with legislation from the Committee on Agriculture, which I have advocated from time to time. It is a fact that peanuts are not a perishable commodity. Peanuts can be stored and peanuts can be kept so that they can be marketed in an orderly fashion in accordance with the necessity of the trade and the consuming public. I do hope the House will not support this amendment and give the agricultural committee an opportunity to further study this legislation to work out the existing and difficult problems in the oil program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that losses were sustained because our Government urged and requested the farmers to substantially increase acreage during the war emergency?

Mr. BONNER. That is true; during the war years the crop was increased

due to a request by the Fats and Oils Commission of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think to set the record straight we should make the point that the big losses occurred in 1949, 1950, and 1951, which was after the war, and we had a lot of time to revise that peanut program since then.

Mr. BONNER. Yes; and I have been anxious to get a revision of the program, and I think that if a lot of the things in this program are properly ironed out we will not have this loss.

Mr. McCARTHY. This amendment will not take peanuts out but they would be subjected to a sliding scale which Congress decided should apply.

Mr. BONNER. Well, this amendment will take peanuts out as one of the basic commodities, and I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio), there were—ayes 43, noes 62.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DEMPSEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 705, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 126]

Aandahl	Carlyle	Hall,
Abernethy	Carnahan	Edwin Arthur
Albert	Chiperfield	Hand
Allen, La.	Cole, N. Y.	Harden
Anderson, Calif.	Combs	Hébert
Anfuso	Coudert	Heffernan
Auchincloss	Curtis, Nebr.	Herter
Bakewell	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Bates, Ky.	Dawson	Jones,
Beall	Dingell	Hamilton C.
Beckworth	Doughton	Judd
Belcher	Eaton	Kearney
Bender	Evins	Kee
Blackney	Fallon	Kersten, Wis.
Brehm	Fenton	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Frazier	Larcade
Brownson	Furcolo	LeCompte
Buckley	Gore	Lyle
Burdick	Granger	McVey
Camp	Gwinn	Miller, Md.
Mitchell	Ramsay	Sutton
Morgan	Reece, Tenn.	Tackett
Morris	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor
Morrison	Richards	Vinson
Morton	Riley	Welch
Moulder	Sabath	Wharton
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sasscer	Whitten
Passman	Scott, Hardie	Wickersham
Philbin	Short	Withrow
Potter	Sikes	Wood, Ga.
Poulson	Steed	Woodruff
Powell	Stigler	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 328 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CONTINUING SUPPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows.

Mr. JAVITS moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 79, noes 165.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 207, nays 121, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 127]

YEAS—207

Abbitt	Bolton	Davis, Wis.
Adair	Bonner	Deane
Allen, Ill.	Bosone	DeGraffenried
Andersen, H. Carl	Boykin	Dempsey
	Bramblett	Denton
Andresen, August H.	Bray	D'Ewart
	Brooks	Dolliver
Andrews	Brown, Ga.	Dorn
Angell	Bryson	Doyle
Arends	Budge	Durham
Armstrong	Burleson	Elliott
Aspinall	Burnside	Engle
Ayres	Burton	Fernandez
Bailey	Butler	Fisher
Baker	Byrnes	Flood
Barden	Cannon	Forrester
Baring	Chatham	Fugate
Battle	Chelf	Gary
Beamer	Chenoweth	Gathings
Bennett, Fla.	Clevenger	George
Bennett, Mich.	Colmer	Golden
Bentsen	Cooley	Gordon
Berry	Cooper	Grant
Betts	Cox	Gregory
Bishop	Crosser	Gross
Blatnik	Crumpacker	Hagen
Boggs, La.	Cunningham	Hall,
Bolling	Davis, Ga.	Leonard W.
Halleck	McCarthy	Rogers, Fla.
Hardy	McCormack	Rogers, Tex.
Harris	McCulloch	Rooney
Harrison, Nebr.	McGregor	Scrivner
Harrison, Va.	McKinnon	Secrest
Harrison, Wyo.	McMillan	Shafer
Hart	McMullen	Sheppard
Harvey	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Havenner	Mack, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Hays, Ark.	Magee	Smith, Kans.
Hays, Ohio	Mahon	Smith, Miss.
Hedrick	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
Herlong	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Wis.
Hill	Miller, Nebr.	Spence
Hoeven	Mills	Springer
Holmes	Murdock	Staggers
Hope	Murray	Stanley
Horan	Norrell	Stockman
Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Talle
Hunter	O'Hara	Teague
Ikard	O'Konski	Thomas
Irving	O'Neill	Thornberry
Jackson, Wash.	Patman	Trimble
Jarman	Patten	Van Pelt
Jenison	Perkins	Velde
Jenkins	Phillips	Vursell
Jensen	Pickett	Walter
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Watts
Jones, Mo.	Polk	Weichel
Jones, Woodrow W.	Preston	Werdel
	Price	Whitten
Karsten, Mo.	Priest	Wier
Kelley, Pa.	Prouty	Williams, Miss.
Kerr	Rabaut	Williams, N. Y.
King, Calif.	Rains	Wilson, Ind.
Kirwan	Rankin	Wilson, Tex.
Kluczynski	Redden	Winstead
Lanham	Rees, Kans.	Withrow
Lantaff	Rhodes	Wood, Idaho
LeCompte	Rivers	Yorty
Lesinski	Roberts	Zablocki
Lovre	Robeson	
Lucas	Rogers, Colo.	

NAYS—121

Addonizio	Granahan	Nelson
Allen, Calif.	Greenwood	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
Auchincloss	Heller	Osmers
Bates, Mass.	Hess	Ostertag
Boggs, Del.	Hillings	O'Toole
Bow	Hinshaw	Patterson
Buchanan	Hoffman, Ill.	Poulson
Buffett	Hoffman, Mich.	Radwan
Busbey	Holifield	Reams
Bush	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Ribicoff
Carrigg	James	Richlman
Case	Javits	Rodino
Celler	Johnson	Rogers, Mass.
Church	Jonas	Roosevelt
Clemente	Kean	Ross
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Sadlak
Corbett	Keating	St. George
Cotton	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Crawford	Kennedy	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Scott,
Dague	King, Pa.	Hugh D., Jr.
Delaney	Klein	Scudder
Devereux	Lane	Seely-Brown
Dollinger	Latham	Sheehan
Dondero	Lind	Shelley
Donohue	McConnell	Simpson, Pa.
Donovan	McDonough	Sittler
Eberharter	McGrath	Taber
Elston	McGuire	Thompson, Mich.
Feighan	McIntire	
Fine	Mack, Wash.	Tollefson
Fogarty	Madden	Vail
Forand	Meader	Van Zandt
Ford	Merrow	Vorys
Fulton	Miller, N. Y.	Widnall
Gamble	Morano	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Multer	Wolcott
Goodwin	Mumma	Wolverton
Graham	Murphy	Yates

NOT VOTING—103

Aandahl	Buckley	Eaton
Abernethy	Burdick	Elsworth
Albert	Camp	Evins
Allen, La.	Carlyle	Fallon
Anfuso	Carnahan	Fenton
Bakewell	Chiperfield	Frazier
Barrett	Chudoff	Furcolo
Bates, Ky.	Cole, N. Y.	Garmatz
Beall	Combs	Gore
Beckworth	Coudert	Granger
Belcher	Curtis, Nebr.	Green
Bender	Davis, Tenn.	Gwinn
Blackney	Dawson	Hall,
Brehm	Denny	Edwin Arthur
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	Hand
Brownson	Doughton	Harden

Hébert	Miller, Md.	Sabath
Heffernan	Mitchell	Sasscer
Herter	Morgan	Scott, Hardie
Heselton	Morris	Short
Jones, Hamilton C.	Morrison	Sikes
	Morton	Steed
Judd	Moulder	Stigler
Kearney	Norblad	Sutton
Kee	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tackett
Keogh	Passman	Taylor
Kersten, Wis.	Philbin	Thompson, Tex.
Kilday	Potter	Vinson
Larcade	Powell	Welch
Lyle	Ramsay	Wharton
McVey	Reece, Tenn.	Wheeler
Marshall	Reed, N. Y.	Wickersham
Martin, Mass.	Regan	Willis
Mason	Richards	Wood, Ga.
Miller, Calif.	Riley	Woodruff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Green against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Chudoff against.

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Marshall for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Heselton against.

Mr. Garmatz for, with Mr. Woodruff against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Gwinn against.

Mr. Evins for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Barrett against.

Mr. Welch for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mrs. Kee for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Albert with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Wharton.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Short.

Mr. Larcade with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Lyle with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Morris with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Potter

Mr. Granger with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Hamilton C. Jones with Mr. McVey.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Willis with Mr. Brown of Ohio.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Riley with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. Bakewell.

Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Dawson with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Norblad.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Tackett with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Denny.

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Aandahl.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUY AMERICAN: COSTLY FALLACY

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, my attention has on several occasions during the past few months been drawn to a law with a patriotic-sounding name. I am sure that my colleagues are with me in support of patriotic measures and will be interested in giving a little consideration to this law. It is called the Buy American Act and has been law since the last day of the Seventy-second Congress, March 3, 1933.

For these past 19 years it has had an important influence on the operations of the Government. It has affected a vast volume of purchasing by the Government agencies. Its influence has increased in proportion to the increase in Government buying and our efforts to insure that the Government agencies achieve the maximum degree of economy in their operations.

On close examination of this law with the patriotic-sounding name I find, however, it has been working at cross purposes with our efforts to cut waste, that it has frustrated the purpose of Congress to keep Government costs to the lowest minimum.

This Buy American Act of 1933, requiring Government agencies to spend on some items up to 25 percent above the price at which the items are available to the public, actually compels them to spend their appropriated funds wastefully. The act requires, generally, that goods purchased by Government agencies for use in the United States shall be of domestic origin unless their cost is unreasonable or unless their purchase would not be in the public interest. The law itself does not define unreasonable cost. However, purchasing regulations of the Government agencies do provide a formula, based on an administrative ruling dating back to 1934, which holds that the cost of a domestic article is unreasonable only if it is more than 25 percent above the cost of the same foreign product after taking into account whatever duty applies to the latter. The restriction against foreign goods applies generally to all Federal Government purchasing, including purchasing of strategic materials for stockpiling, and purchasing by non-Federal Government agencies, such as local housing bodies, if such agencies use Federal funds.

The act is clearly making nonsense of our efforts to save the taxpayers' money. Perhaps we ought not to be too harsh on the Congress which was responsible for this act, however, and should consider the circumstances of its adoption.

"BEGGAR-MY-NEIGHBOR"

It was enacted at a time when considerable support was being given not to curtailing Government expenditures but to increasing them for the sake of decreasing unemployment. The act came about as a floor amendment to the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Act for fiscal 1934. Like many of the measures proposed by various governments during the depression, it was in the nature of a "beggar-my-neighbor" measure. These "beggar-my-neighbor" measures attempted to stimulate domestic economic activity at the expense of other countries and, not unexpectedly, brought about similar retaliatory measures by other countries. The act is definitely a make-work law.

While the economic conditions of the early 1930's are long since past, this law remains on the books and swells the already rapidly increasing cost of Government procurement. The act was adopted during the period when Federal Government expenditures on goods and services amounted to $2,000,000,000. Last year it applied to Federal Government expenditures on goods and services amounting to $63,000,000,000. This year it will affect an even larger volume. This act is working at cross purposes with our efforts to achieve economy in Government, to put a brake on inflationary pressures, to stretch the defense dollar and to relieve the taxpayer to the fullest extent possible of the heavy burden which he now bears. As long as it remains in force, we shall find we are on a treadmill in trying to make progress toward economy in Government buying.

One reason perhaps that this measure has been permitted to persist so long is that its cost, while high, cannot be measured accurately. As it is applied, the act imposes such a substantial obstacle to Government purchase of imported goods, in addition to the tariff and other difficulties normally confronting traders, that it becomes almost impossible to sell foreign goods to the Government and therefore impractical to offer them. The Government, therefore, is denied the opportunity to compare the prices it has been paying with those it might pay. However, some Government purchases have recently drawn public attention and have pointed up to the potential savings which might be made if this restriction on Government procurement were eliminated.

SPECIFIC ILLUSTRATIONS

A recent series of Buy American cases, involving the purchase of medical microscopes, has been highly publicized and has drawn considerable interest from several committees of Congress, from various Government agencies, and from foreign governments. During 1950 and 1951 the Army awarded nine contracts for medical microscopes, six to an Italian firm and three to domestic suppliers. In each of the six cases where the award was made to the Italian firm, Galileo of Milan, the domestic microscopes were offered in sealed bidding at more than 25 percent above the price of the Italian microscopes, which included a United States tariff of 45 percent. The saving to the Army made possible by the purchase of the Italian microscopes in these six cases amounted to over $90,000. In seven of the nine cases, the price quoted by the only two domestic firms bidding were identical although their prices varied from one bidding to the next because of different specifications and different quantities.

In bidding on contracts to supply the Veterans' Administration with microscopes, the domestic companies, not under the necessity of meeting Italian competition because of specifications serving

to exclude the foreign product, were asking prices substantially in excess of the prices they were asking the Army for what were in some cases, I understand, the identical microscopes. The prices of each company, in bidding on Veterans' Administration contracts, were also identical in each case. Special notice of the similarity in bidding is given in the last annual report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.

An additional order for almost 1,300 microscopes brought offers from the Galileo company and the two domestic firms. All three had been dropping their prices. On this bid the difference between Galileo's price and that of the low domestic bidder was less than the 25-percent differential which has generally been applied as the criterion of unreasonable cost under the act—actually, the lowest domestic price was 24.1 percent above the Italian price, including duty. In accordance with Defense Department procedures, the case was reviewed by the Under Secretary of the Army, who finally decided to split the award evenly between Galileo and the low domestic bidder. This meant a saving to the Army of $40,000 over what the Department's buy-American regulations would have permitted the Army to spend. But it also meant, on the contrary, that it spent quite unnecessarily about $40,000 more than it need have if there had been no cost-increasing Buy American Act.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR COST

It is, of course, impossible to make any accurate estimate of what the Buy American Act has cost the American taxpayer. The very existence of the act has discouraged economical purchasing practices on the part of the Government. It is very reasonable to estimate that the cost has been at least $2,000,000,000. It may have been as high as $10,000,000,000.

The savings to the country would be greatest, however, in the indirect results reflected in a more wholesome economy within the entire free world. The other free countries, if they have a stable economy, will be better able to bear the cost of our joint security programs. The enemies of communism must be able to carry as much of their own burden as possible. The buy-American law is a symbol of the trade barriers which hamper the international cooperation the free world must have.

The economy of the free world, if it is to be mutually strengthened to fight communism, needs more foreign trade instead of more foreign aid.

It should be made quite clear that the restriction imposed under the Buy American Act against Government purchases of foreign goods is not intended as an equivalent to the tariff. With certain exceptions, the procuring agency, when it is deciding whether to purchase domestic or foreign goods, compares the foreign price, including duty, with the domestic price, as would any ordinary purchaser, and actually pays the amount of the tariff included in the price of a dutiable foreign product. The Buy American Act, therefore, superimposes restrictions on Government purchasing of foreign goods additional to those already applied by the tariff laws.

AGRICULTURAL MILLSTONE

The fiction that the Buy American Act is necessary to protect the price of certain agricultural commodities has grown up over the years. It provides no such protection that cannot better be provided through the price-support program, import quota agreements, and tariff laws. The Buy American Act is a millstone for all of American agriculture. It benefits no American industry able to meet the competitive demands of the free-enterprise system.

These added restrictions have an especially undesirable effect considering our objective of increasing the production of defense equipment with as few cuts as possible in production for civilian consumption. Now, the piling of defense needs on top of civilian needs naturally causes a scarcity of many goods. While we have been trying to insure a maximum availability of defense goods, this so-called Buy American Act has been putting obstacles in the way of our getting scarce goods.

In addition to being inconsistent with our defense program, the act is at complete variance with our work to preserve competition and to support our free enterprise system. We should encourage the healthy competition between foreign and domestic goods which ordinarily takes place within the limits set by the tariff laws. When it comes to Government procurements and to spending the taxpayers' money, we find that we have been tolerating these buy-American restrictions which deprive the Government of important benefits of a competitive economy.

The President's Materials Policy Commission has just issued a report which sharply illustrates the dangerous effect of our buy-American laws. The United States has a very limited supply of many critical materials. We will never gain an adequate supply if we keep legislation on the books which makes it impossible to import these materials without subsidizing marginal and inefficient production in this country. It is these marginal reserves which we should save, while importing other supplies at a more favorable cost. As long as we maintain these domestic restrictions we cannot expect to make much headway with the underdeveloped countries in our efforts to get them to eliminate outrageous tax laws, restrictions on management and the threat of nationalization and expropriation.

The advantages to the taxpayer of a little stimulating competition can be seen from the miscroscope cases. When the Italian miscroscope was first offered the Army, the price of the two domestic firms was about $410. After bidding on several occasions, the domestic and foreign prices came down and the Army was being offered an Italian microscope, delivered duty-paid, for about $280. The Veterans' Administration, not benefiting from the competition, was continuing to pay with the taxpayers' money the old prices. Fair and healthy competition is an essential element of our free enterprise system. It makes for the economic strength we have been seeking to ensure, particularly in connection with our mutual security programs, and should be encouraged.

CED STATEMENT

The effects of the act on the operation of our security programs were recently noted in a statement on tax and expenditure policy for 1952 by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. In suggesting that the President report annually to Congress the budgetary costs of compliance with the Buy-American Act as one way of achieving substantial economies, the committee in its statement noted that—

> When the low foreign bid is rejected there is a possible triple loss to the United States Government. We lose the amount by which the foreign bid is low, plus the amount of import duty that would in some cases have been paid on the foreign supplies, plus the amount of foreign aid that may be necessary because of the inability of the foreign country to earn dollars. We believe that in the interest of economy, as well as in the interest of a consistent foreign economic policy, purchases should be made from the lowest competent bidder, except where there is a clear national interest in maintaining a source of supply other than the lowest bidder.

This act, which deliberately and needlessly increases the cost of Government purchasing operations by compelling Government agencies to spend on many purchases of goods up to 25 percent of appropriated funds unnecessarily, should not be tolerated any longer. In order to remove this wasteful requirement I have introduced today a bill to repeal the Buy American Act of March 3, 1933, as amended, and the provisions of the United States housing legislation, the Rural Electrification Act of 1938, and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1946, which subject purchasing under those acts to buy-American restriction.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of the repeal bill showing the provisions of existing law which would be affected:

H. R. 8430

A bill to repeal the Buy American Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That—

SEC. 1. (1) Title III of the act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1520; 41 U. S. C. 10a, 10b, and 10c);[1]

(2) Section 633, title VI, of the act of October 29, 1949 (63 Stat. 1024; 41 U. S. C. 10d);[2]

and

(3) Section 6 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 890; 42 U. S. C. 1406 (c)),[3]

are hereby repealed.

---

[1] Buy American Act, text of 41 U. S. C. 10a, 10b, and 10c, follows text of bill.

[2] 1949 amendment to Buy American Act, text of 41 U. S. C. 10d, follows text of bill.

[3] "The use of funds made available for the purposes of this chapter shall be subject to the provisions of sec. 10a of title 41, and to make such provisions effective every contract and agreement of any kind pursuant to this chapter shall contain a provision identical to the one prescribed in section 10b of title 41."

SEC. 2. Section 401, title IV, ch. 554 of Public Resolution numbered 122, Seventy-fifth Congress (52 Stat. 818) approved June 21, 1938, is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following:

"In making loans pursuant to this title and pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration shall require that, to the extent practicable and the cost of which is not unreasonable, the borrower agree to use in connection with the expenditure of such funds only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies, as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States."

SEC. 3. Paragraph (a), section 3, of the act of July 23, 1946 (60 Stat. 597; 50 U. S. C. 98b) (a)[4] is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) make purchases of strategic and critical materials with due regard to the objectives set forth in section 1 of this act and pursuant to the determinations as provided in section 2 hereof, which purchases shall be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand and may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

BUY AMERICAN ACT

United States Code, title 41:

"SEC. 10a. American materials required for public use.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used or the articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality (Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 212, title III, sec. 2, 47 Stat. 1520).

"SEC. 10b. Contracts for public works; specification for use of American materials; blacklisting contractors violating requirements.

"(a) Every contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States growing out of an appropriation heretofore made or hereafter to be made shall contain a provision that in the performance of the work the contractor, subcontractors, materialmen, or suppliers, shall use only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States except as provided in section 10a of this title: *Provided, however*, That if the head of the department or independent establishing making the contract shall find that in respect to some particular articles, materials, or supplies it is impracticable to make such requirement or that it would unreasonably increase the cost, an exception shall be noted in the specifications as to that particular article, material, or supply, and a public record made of the findings which justified the exception.

"(b) If the head of a department, bureau, agency, or independent establishment which has made any contract containing the provision required by subsection (a) finds that in the performance of such contract there has been a failure to comply with such provisions, he shall make public his findings, including therein the name of the contractor obligated under such contract, and no other contract for the construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work in the United States or elsewhere shall be awarded to such contractor, subcontractors, materialmen, or suppliers with which such contractor is associated or affiliated, within a period of 3 years after such finding is made public (Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 212, title III, sec. 3, 47 Stat. 1520).

"SEC. 10c. Definition of terms used in sections 10a and 10b.

"When used in sections 10a and 10b of this title—

"(a) The term 'United States,' when used in a geographical sense, includes the United States and any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof;

"(b) The terms 'public use,' 'public buildings,' and 'public work' shall mean use by, public buildings of, and public work of, the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the Virgin Islands (March 3, 1933, ch. 212, title III, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1520; Proc. No. 2695, effective July 4, 1946, 11 F. R. 7517, 60 Stat. 1352)."

Forty-first United States Codes, section 10d—October 29, 1949:

"Clarification of Congressional intent regarding sections 10a and 10b (a).

"In order to clarify the original intent of Congress, hereafter, section 10a of this title and that part of section 10b (a) of this title preceding the words *'Provided, however,'* shall be regarded as requiring the purchase, for public use within the United States, of articles, materials, or supplies manufactured in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality, unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine their purchase to be inconsistent with the public interest or their cost to be unreasonable (Oct. 29, 1949, ch. 787, title VI, sec. 633, Stat. 1024)."

TAX EXEMPTION FOR WASHINGTON EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think the McCormack amendment to the Legislative Appropriation Act giving Members of Congress tax exemption on their expenses in Washington is entirely right. Not only do we have to maintain a home in Washington while we are here on our congressional business, but at the same time we have to maintain homes back in our districts. A similar tax exemption applies to every businessman or any individual coming to Washington. This amendment puts the Members of Congress in the same class as everyone else, and I approve it. I hope that the House conferees will insist on this provision.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, July 1, 1952, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there has been a change in the program for tomorrow. The omnibus judges' bill will not come up until Wednesday. Tomorrow is Oklahoma primary day and the judges' bill will be put over until Wednesday.

Bills on the Private Calendar will be called tomorrow.

House Joint Resolution 8, Mrs. BOSONE's bill will be called up. Then there will be the emergency flood control bill that was supposed to be considered today. Then there will be the bill S. 2360, relating to motor carrier securities and the bill S. 2357 relating to horticultural commodities.

Those bills will be considered tomorrow. They are probably all more or less non-controversial. If there are any roll calls I shall ask unanimous consent that they be put over until Wednesday.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7448, having to do with mine safety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, with

[4] The Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act of 1946.

House amendments thereto, insist upon the House amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HART, BONNER, O'TOOLE, WEICHEL, and HAND.

IMPROVEMENT OF DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR, MINN., AND WIS.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8321) to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this has the unanimous report of the committee?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following improvement is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans in the report hereinafter designated: Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report submitted in House Document No. 374, Eighty-second Congress, and subject to the conditions set forth in said document.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GRANAHAN to extend his remarks on the death of a former Member.

Mr. DORN and to include a speech.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an essay.

Mr. PRICE and to include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include telegrams.

Mr. LANE in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include editorials and a resolution.

Mr. BEAMER in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. MUMMA and to include a letter.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an address.

Mr. JAVITS in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAND in two instances and to include in one a speech by Mr. CASE of New Jersey and in the other an editorial.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include two editorials and other extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article by Hon. Bruce Barton.

Mr. HARVEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida.

Mr. POULSON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VURSELL.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4686. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford;

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; and

H. R. 7876. An act relating to the taxation of life-insurance companies.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1705. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for two United States Commissioners for Great Smoky Mountains National Park;

S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; and

S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 4686. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford;

H. R. 6773. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951;

H. R. 7876. An act relating to the taxation of life insurance companies;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

REVISED EDITION OF THE RULES AND MANUAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 719) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved That a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-third Congress be printed as a House document, and that 1,600 additional copies shall be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, of which 700 copies shall be bound in leather with thumb index and delivered as may be directed by the Parliamentarian of the House for distribution to officers and Members of Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUANCE ON PAYROLLS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 446) relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first section of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates and Resident Commissioners," approved August 21, 1935, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For the purposes of retirement benefits the period, not exceeding 6 months, between the termination of service upon the death or resignation of a Member prior to the amendment hereof by Public Law 477 of the Eighty-first Congress, and the election of a successor to fill the vacancy, shall be considered as continuous service."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "6 months" and insert "190 days."

Page 2, lines 1, 2, and 3, strike out the following: "prior to the amendment hereof by Public Law 477 of the Eighty-first Congress" and insert "which occurred after December 4, 1927, and prior to April 24, 1950."

Following line 4, add:

"SEC. 2. (a) The first paragraph of section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 707), is further amended by inserting after 'Columbia Institution for the Deaf' the following: 'and of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau' (b) any service rendered prior to the effective date of this section as an officer or employee of the Pan American Sanitary Bureau shall be considered creditable service for the purposes of section 9 of such act (5 U. S. C., sec. 736b)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 236) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 13,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the House document room and 3,000 copies for the Senate document room.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 570) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 80 of the Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $87,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$87,000" and insert "$35,000."

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "or subcommittee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is not this a privileged resolution?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Virginia controls the time on a privileged resolution; is that right?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LECOMPTE. May I say, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on House Administration has gone very carefully over I think 15 resolutions calling for money for investigations. In nearly every case the committee has offered an amendment reducing the amount that is asked for in the original resolution. In at least one case the committee has an amendment reducing by over half the amount asked from the committee.

When the House of Representatives votes for an investigation, I see no way for the Committee on House Administration, if it wants to be logical and consistent, to undertake to deny a reasonable amount of money for carrying on such investigation, since it has been ordered and voted by the House. I believe in most cases there is no objection to these resolutions because they were passed out of the committee almost unanimously in most cases, but to one or two there is apparently some opposition.

I wonder if those who are opposing these resolutions, who spoke as though they are going to oppose providing any money at all for investigations, or at least one or two of the investigations that have been ordered by the House, are doing realistic thinking. The House, having voted to have an investigation made, certainly favors a reasonable amount of money being provided. I am thinking at the moment about all of these resolutions.

The resolution presently before the House reduces the amount by amendment from $87,000 to $35,000. Your committee has gone over these resolutions very carefully, and I think has cut about as close as it is practical to cut these requests if the investigations are to be made.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When it comes to the matter of appropriations we know that many times authorizations are made by statute and then the appropriations are voted for much less than the authorizations. At the same time, I call to the attention of the gentleman that when these authorizations for investigations are made the Members of the House have no idea whatever as to how much the investigations may cost.

Mr. STANLEY. That is true.

Mr. EBERHARTER. One very worthy investigation and survey was made that cost over $500,000 in a space of 2 years. Does not the gentleman think that makes a little bit of difference when it comes to confirming an appropriation for an investigation? If we knew in authorizing the investigation how much it would cost that might have quite a bit of influence on the vote.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is true. The committee of which the gentleman from Virginia is chairman has looked into this very carefully and, so far as the Members can determine, have allowed about what the Members think is necessary to conduct a good investigation. Of course, when a resolution is brought before the House for an investigation of some subject, such as that of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], there is no way of knowing how much it is going to cost. But if the House votes for an investigation, certainly the committee cannot be expected to deny any funds for the investigation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I agree with the gentleman in that respect, but I was going to suggest that if we took more time in debate before we passed these investigation resolutions and went into the subject of how much they would cost and what a wide field they would cover, perhaps the situation might not be as it is this evening, with 15 different appropriations for different investigations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total amount involved in the 15 investigations?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman from Virginia will have to answer that.

Mr. STANLEY. We considered them individually. I do not have the total amount before me, although I can get the clerk to give me that information.

Mr. Speaker, on the resolution we now have before us it was clearly shown to the committee that there was a need for revision of the laws dealing with our public lands. We have over 800,000,000 acres of public lands in the United States. We have some 5,000 laws governing that area. It is quite difficult to determine how they are actually operating. This money is for a study to revise and to codify the laws on public lands. The committee feels it is money which will be well spent. In fact, this is for an initial investigation in the beginning of an attempt to revise these laws. This $35,000 is not nearly enough money for the committee to complete its work, but it is thought that was all that they could use during the recess of the Congress. Therefore, we feel that it is one of the most worthy resolutions to come before this committee for consideration.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked about the total amount requested, and the total amount recommended by the committee. The total amount requested for these several investigations is $647,000. The total amount approved by the committee for presentation here is $480,000, which is a cut from the amount requested of $167,000.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am wondering if there are not enough lawyers in the Department of Justice and enough experts in the Department of the Interior to do a good deal of this work that we are providing for in this sort of investigation. We have so many investigations that I am surprised that someone has not proposed an appropriation for a committee to investigate investigations.

Mr. STANLEY. It is hoped that they will find they are doing too many things that they should not be doing now, and bring back a report which will be very helpful to this body.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEED FOR REVISION OF PUBLIC LAND LAWS

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is today an urgent need for a revision of our public land laws. We are presently operating one of the Federal Government's largest income-producing enterprises, that is, the management, conservation, disposition, and use of our public domain, under a complex system of laws, which have developed since the beginning of the Republic. Five thousand laws now govern the management, use, sale, and conservation of the public lands of the United States. They are obsolete, ineffectual, contradictory, inconsistent, or not in the best interest of the principles of proper land disposal and management. Some of these laws have been continually amended to meet particular situations. In fact, many of such laws were designed to meet specific conditions and problems, and have been subsequently amended to meet other unrelated problems. Therefore, I propose that the Congress take the initiative in bringing about a modern, simple, and workable public land law system. First, however, let us take a brief look at the magnitude of this matter.

The United States now has under its jurisdiction and supervision, including mineral reservations, some 800,000,000 acres of land. The Bureau of Land Management under the Department of the Interior now manages 180,000,000 acres of land in the United States, which represents 39 percent of all Federal lands in the United States, plus some 270,000,000 such acres in Alaska. The Forest Service has under its jurisdiction more than 160,000,000 acres of land in the United States, which is 35 percent of all Federal lands in the United States, plus the vast acreage of Federal forests in Alaska.

There are more than 170,000,000 acres of vacant public land in the United States. There are more than 270,000,000 acres of vacant public land in Alaska; thus a total of more than 440,000,000 acres of vacant public land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior. In 1950 there were 149,440,840 acres of grazing-district lands in the United States. The total area of national forests in the United States and its territories for the year 1950 was 229,341,063 acres. As of June 30, 1950, there were pending 3,191 unperfected homestead entries involving some 372,000 acres. In 1950 there were 27,747 mineral leases of public lands involving some 23,000,000 acres. In 1950 there were 27,166 leases, other than mineral leases, in the United States and Alaska involving more than 14,000,000 acres with annual rentals of some $375,000.

The volume of mineral production from public lands in the United States for the fiscal year 1950 is as follows:

Oil and gas	barrels	75,733,000
Natural gas	M. cu. ft.	125,510,000
Gasoline and butane	gallons	145,457,000
Coal	tons	7,071,695
Potassium salts	do	4,397,530
Sodium salts	do	456,912
Phosphate rock	do	250,363
Silica sand	do	14,263

The cash receipts from Public Land resources covered into the Treasury for fiscal year 1950 are as follows:

Sales of public lands	$456,259.18
Sales of Indian lands	1,532.87
Fees and commissions	397,860.26
Mineral leases and permits	29,115,664.64
Grazing leases, licenses, and permits	1,551,300.97
Rights-of-way	95,730.33
Timber sales	364,666.07
Town lot sales	5,804.64
Rent of land	170,835.79
Other sources	4,017,694.67
Total	36,177,349.42

It may readily be seen from these statistics that the management of the public domain of the United States is of great importance to the people of the United States. It is likewise very important to the Congress of the United States, since the policy with respect to the management and disposition of such lands is determined by the Congress, and in turn administered by the executive branch of our Government.

Currently the public-land policy of the Congress, and as so administered by the Department of the Interior, may be termed a policy of "conservation and prudent use." Prior, however, to such policy by the Congress there were two phases of the administration of our public lands that involved other policies regarding management, disposition, and control. In the early days of the Republic there was great need for revenue, and the public lands offered one of the most readily available means of obtaining such revenues for the new Government. Therefore, the first policy of this Government regarding our public lands was that of disposition and sale of such lands for the purpose of raising revenues for the Government, which were so sorely needed. Thereafter there came about a second phase, which may be termed the "settlement policy." This policy was based upon the premise that land should be made available to settlers. As a result, incentives were made for settlers to take up homesteads and occupy areas of our public lands and thereby expand the people of this Nation westward with the resultant development of the resources of this Nation.

In addition to these three phases, as before described, there was continually the disposition of our public lands for specific purposes, such as the grants made to the railroads and the grants to States for school purposes, and so forth. In addition there were bounties for military service and there were, of course, the mineral patents and other patenting of the land.

Throughout such disposition of our lands there began to show a body of law to govern the use, disposition, management, and control of our public lands. In the earlier days our land disposition was a thriving and tremendous business, with the result that the laws were numerous and directed toward specific instances involving specific matters.

Some illustrations to show the complexity of these laws should be observed. For example, the average person interested in obtaining a right-of-way on public lands must select 1 of some 13 laws under which to make application. The Department of the Interior advises that expert counsel often finds it most difficult to determine which of such laws shall govern with respect to the granting of a right-of-way. These laws are governed by pages upon pages of regulations. The Code of Federal Regulation lists 92 sections detailing the instructions for the making of such applications. After the selection of the particular law under which the application must be made the applicant must select correctly 1 of some 20 forms. These 13 laws are administered by the Department of the Interior. About the same situation exists with respect to lands where rights-of-way are involved over forestry lands or lands administered by the Department of the Army, and so forth.

Another example is shown by the act of June 3, 1878, and the act of March 3, 1891, relating to the free use of timber. There have been eight subsequent statutes amending the two old statutes in order to authorize the transportation of timber out of a State or Territory in which such timber was cut. Today all

of these laws are still in effect to govern the mere subject of the free use of timber.

The homestead laws offer still another illustration of the complexity and confusion in our public-land laws. Beginning with the act of 1861 which authorized the original type of homestead, there have been 21 amendments to such law. In addition, there is a statute authorizing the enlarged homestead, which has been amended some 13 times. This is further complicated by the Additional Entry Act of 1904, which has also been equally so amended. Then there is another Additional Entry Act of 1917 which is of a different type than that of the 1904 act. Also governing homestead entries, there is a special act for Nebraska, and the special statutes relating to homesteads in Alaska. In addition, and still on the same subject, there are a multiplicity of amendments regarding the permission for homesteaders to take leave of absence, or for excuses in their compliance with the provisions of the law. There is also relating to this same subject the various provisions pertaining to the commuted homestead plus the many other acts and provisions relating to the benefits given under the Soldiers and Sailors' Relief Act. To further complicate the matter, there are the provisions regarding proof and payments on such homesteads. There is the Desert Land Entries Act, the Special Entryman Act for Nevada, the Reclamation Homesteads, and so forth. The homesteader must comply with and understand some 233 sections of the Code of Federal Regulations making regulations for such laws. The forms which accompany such regulations are conflicting, complicated, and numerous.

About the same situation exists with respect to the other subjects such as town sites and public sales. For example, there are 10 laws regarding the sales of public lands, not including those relating to the isolated tracts which are covered by a special law.

There is a whole chapter of the United States Code, title 43, chapter 21, relating to railroad grants and homesteads on such lands. The Transportation Act of 1940 terminated the railroad grants in effect, and the present effect of this whole chapter in the United States Code is not known.

Hundreds of these 5,000 laws governing the management of our public lands are outdated and have no present use. They merely serve to complicate the search as to what actually the law may be. The problem continues to grow more complicated and worse with the constant amendment of such laws by each subsequent session of Congress. The Public Lands Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee each session must spend long hours in the consideration of amending and rewriting some of the laws brought about by this complex system.

The importance of this matter may be again reemphasized when we note that the State of California has 46 percent of its lands in Federal ownership, Arizona has 69 percent, the State of Colorado 37 percent, Idaho 65 percent, Montana 37 percent, Nevada 85 percent, New Mexico 46 percent, Oregon 53 percent, Washington 35 percent, and the State of Wyoming 52 percent.

Recently an article in Fortune magazine, pointing out the importance of public land matters and the weaknesses of our present system of law and administration regarding such lands, gives an illustration as to the need for a new look at the substantive laws. The magazine article states:

An old law that requires the Government to grant only noncompetitive leases for land on which there is no known oil structure last fall caused Bureau of Land Management to hold an open lottery in southern New Mexico. Up for drawing were 79 plots apiece, a total of 40,000 acres right on the border of a producing and profitable oil field. Twenty-nine thousand people, most of whom didn't know an oil lease from a driver's license, paid the $10 filing fee and submitted bids. The winners had scarcely had their names drawn (from a washtub) before they had offers from oil companies to realize handsomely on their $10 investment. One, a filling station operator, refused $10,000. Result: the United States Treasury lost heavily on the deal; if competitive bids had been permitted, the Government would have made an estimated ten million on the sale of the leases alone and many millions more by the doubled royalties called for in competitive leases. The oil companies and a few speculators were simply enriched at the taxpayers' expense.

There is clearly presented to this Congress a duty to make an investigation of our present land-law system. It is the duty of this Congress to initiate a program for the revision, simplification, and modernization of these laws which govern and control our vast resources.

In the past, few attempts have been made by either the executive or legislative branches to investigate existing public land laws, to determine where they were leading, and in turn provide an integrated simple system of law. The Act of March 3, 1879, authorized the appointment of a Public Land Commission to investigate the public lands and their supervision. This resulted in the codification of about 3,000 acts of Congress relating to the public lands. The report of this Commission is quite voluminous, and although its recommendations were never fully completed or carried out, certainly such report proved of great benefit in the further handling of public land matters. Later in 1903 President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a commission "to report upon the condition, operation and effect of the present land laws." The final report of such commission was made in 1905, and is perhaps the basis for the present policy of our Government relating to conservation and prudent use.

In 1908 the National Conservation Commission made certain recommendations with respect to the need for control of waste and the prevention of monopoly of the public lands, and made specific recommendations for the separate disposal of timber, minerals, and so forth, and for the conservation of watersheds. Since such time there has not been a thorough look at the public land laws or policies of the United States, although in 1930 a committee appointed by President Hoover made studies regarding certain policies for the administration of the public domain.

It would seem to me that this whole matter offers a challenge to this Congress, and particularly to this committee. If we agree therefore that something should be done in order to bring about a more simple, modern, and effective public-land law, the question then resolves itself into the method and manner by which such should be done. I am offering a resolution, which, if adopted by the committee, will place the responsibility for the initiation of this revision squarely upon the shoulders of the Interior Committee. It is my belief that this is a legislative matter, and is most certainly within the prerogative of this committee. I question the advisability of having a commssion so constituted as that proposed by the bill sponsored by the Department of the Interior. I wish to repeat that, in my opinion, this is a matter for the legislative branch of our Government.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 623) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $175,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and which shall also be available for expenses incurred by said committee or subcommittees outside the continental limits of the United States, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

That the funds granted shall remain available for the expenses of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments until January 3, 1953.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 5, strike out "$175,000" and insert "$150,000."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the committee amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I object to agreeing to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 628) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorised by House Resolution 95, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional $160,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 5, strike out "$160,000" and insert "$115,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Is that the so-called Chelf committee investigation?

Mr. STANLEY. That is the so-called Chelf committee investigation.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment that I believe that committee is doing a good job and every dollar is well spent.

KOREAN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), on account of illness.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 638) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 561 incurred by the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 4, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$75,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORANO) there were—ayes 94, noes 30.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1621. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, transmitting a report by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, dated June 27, 1952, covering refunds and credits of internal-revenue taxes for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1949 and 1950, pursuant to section 3777 of the Internal Revenue Code (H. Doc. No. 524); to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

1622. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion, transmitting the fifth and final report pursuant to Public Law 377, Eighty-first Congress, first session; to the Committee on Public Works.

1623. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States Military Forces at certain public airports, pursuant to section 17 (b) of the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Georgia: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on proceedings against Arthur McPhaul (Rept. No. 2353). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on proceedings against Saul Grossman (Rept. No. 2354). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5954. A bill to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city; without amendment (Rept. No. 2355). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics. Report pursuant to House Resolution 74 and House Resolution 447, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolutions creating a select committee to investigate the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics (Rept. No. 2356). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8272. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county; without amendment (Rept. No. 2357). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1429. An act to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 2358). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 218. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2359). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2225. An act to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification; without amendment (Rept. No. 2360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; with amendment (Rept. No. 2361). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 236. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2362). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 570. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 80; with amendment (Rept. No. 2363). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 623. Resolution providing for further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; with amendment (Rept. No. 12364). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 628. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 2365). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 638. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Select

Committee To Investigate Foundations; with amendment (Rept. No. 2366). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Progress Report No. 20 on Aluminum Production, Defense Production Act (Rept. No. 2367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 7408. A bill to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 8426. A bill to permit retired members of the Armed Forces to provide annuities for their survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8427. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 8428. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8429. A bill to provide that each motor which is designed for use in the propulsion of a vehicle, and which is transported in interstate commerce, shall bear a stamp or impression indicating its serial number and year of manufacture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8430. A bill to repeal the Buy-American Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8431. A bill to authorize a program of expanded housing research, loans, and other financial aids to assist in the provision of housing for families of moderate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 8432. A bill to authorize the heads of the executive departments and the agencies and independent establishments of the Federal Government to provide for the promotion and maintenance of employee recreation programs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 8433. A bill for the relief of Helena Lewicka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 8434. A bill for the relief of George A. Vratsanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 8435. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Suzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8436. A bill for the relief of Tony Ion Bonescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8437. A bill for the relief of Michelangelo Catapano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 8438. A bill for the relief of Kim Mi Hae; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8439. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cracolice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 8440. A bill for the relief of Olindo Balboni, his wife and son; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8441. A bill for the relief of Jaakko Olavi Hursti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 8442. A bill for the relief of Theodore W. Carlson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

781. By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of residents of the Third District of Indiana, urging consideration and enactment of H. R. 2188, to penalize interstate transmission of alcoholic beverage advertisements and to prohibit radio advertising of such beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

782. By Mr. McDONOUGH: Petition of 113 citizens of the State of California in behalf of H. R. 2183, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and ban its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from whom all thoughts of truth and peace proceed, kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of all men, in spite of the wide gulfs that now separate Thy children, the true love of concord and good will. Guide, we pray Thee, with Thy pure and peaceable wisdom, all those who in these disturbed days are taking counsel for the nations of this fear-haunted globe. Further their efforts that in tranquillity Thy kingdom of justice and righteousness may at last stretch forth its frontiers until the mantle of Thy love shall cover a redeemed earth. Where our deeds can help to make this a better world, where our words can help beaten and despondent men to their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of the social order in which Thy will shall be done among men, let us act and speak and pray. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 30, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries and be announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 30, 1952:

S. 1360. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render judgment on the claim of John J. Snoke;

S. 2421. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951 (64 Stat. 1257), amending and extending title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

S. 2594. An act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and for other purposes.

On July 1, 1952:

S. 2198. An act to amend section 1708 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the theft or receipt of stolen mail matter generally; and

S. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.; and

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 236) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint res-

olutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger;

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon;

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for research into and development of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in inaugural ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the day and tomorrow, on official business.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CONVENTION ON RELATIONS BETWEEN THE THREE POWERS AND THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is now in executive session, with the German Peace Treaty as the unfinished business.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the Convention, Executive Q (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on May 26, 1952, which was read the second time, as follows:

The United States of America,
the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
and the French Republic,
of the one part, and
the Federal Republic of Germany,
of the other part:

Whereas a peaceful and prosperous European Community of nations firmly bound to the other free nations of the world through dedication to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations can be attained only through united support and defence of the common freedom and the common heritage;

Whereas it is the common aim of the Signatory States to integrate the Federal Republic on a basis of equality within the European Community itself included in a developing Atlantic Community;

Whereas the achievement of a fully free and unified Germany through peaceful means and of a freely negotiated peace settlement, though prevented for the present by measures beyond their control, remains a fundamental and common goal of the Signatory States;

Whereas the retention of the Occupation Statute with its powers of intervention in the domestic affairs of the Federal Republic is inconsistent with the purpose of integrating the Federal Republic within the European Community;

Whereas the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the French Republic (hereinafter referred to as "the Three Powers") are therefore determined to retain only those special rights of which the retention is necessary, in the common interest of the Signatory States, having regard to the special international situation in Germany;

Whereas the Federal Republic has developed free and responsible political institutions and is determined to maintain the liberal-democratic federal constitution which guarantees human rights and is enshrined in its Basic Law;

Whereas the Three Powers and the Federal Republic recognize that both the new relationship to be established between them by the present Convention and its related Conventions and the Treaties for the creation of an integrated European community, in particular the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel and the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Defence Community, are essential steps to the achievement of their common aim for a unified Germany integrated within the European Community;

Have entered into the following Convention setting forth the basis for their new relationship:

ARTICLE 1

1. The Federal Republic shall have full authority over its internal and external affairs, except as provided in the present Convention.

2. The Three Powers will revoke the Occupation Statute and abolish the Allied High Commission and the Offices of the Land Commissioners upon the entry into force of the present Convention and the Conventions listed in Article 8 (hereinafter referred to as "the related Conventions").

3. The Three Powers will thenceforth conduct their relations with the Federal Republic through Ambassadors who will act jointly in matters the Three Powers consider of common concern under the present Convention and the related Conventions.

ARTICLE 2

1. The Three Powers retain, in view of the international situation, the rights, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to (a) the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, (b) Berlin, and (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

2. The Federal Republic, on its part, will refrain from any action prejudicial to these rights and will cooperate with the Three Powers to facilitate their exercise.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Federal Republic agrees to conduct its policy in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations and with the aims defined in the Statute of the Council of Europe.

2. The Federal Republic affirms its intention to associate itself fully with the community of free nations through membership in international organizations contributing to the common aims of the free world. The Three Powers will support applications for such membership by the Federal Republic at appropriate times.

3. In their negotiations with States with which the Federal Republic maintains no relations, the Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic in respect of matters directly involving its political interests.

4. At the request of the Federal Government, the Three Powers will arrange to represent the interests of the Federal Republic in relations with other States and in certain international organizations or conferences, whenever the Federal Republic is not in a position to do so itself.

ARTICLE 4

1. The mission of the armed forces stationed by the Three Powers in the Federal territory will be the defence of the free world, of which the Federal Republic and Berlin form part.

2. The Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic, insofar as the military situation permits, regarding the stationing of such armed forces in the Federal territory. The Federal Republic will cooperate fully, in accordance with the present Convention and the related Conventions, in facilitating the tasks of such armed forces.

3. The Three Powers will obtain the consent of the Federal Republic before bringing into the Federal territory, as part of their forces, contingents of the armed forces of any nation not now providing such contingents. Such contingents may nevertheless be brought into the Federal territory without the consent of the Federal Republic in the event of external attack or imminent threat of such attack but, after the elimination of the danger, may only remain there with its consent.

4. The Federal Republic will participate in the European Defence Community in order to contribute to the common defence of the free world.

ARTICLE 5

1. In the exercise of their right to protect the security of the armed forces stationed in the Federal territory, the Three Powers will conform to the provisions of the following paragraphs of this Article.

2. In case the Federal Republic and the European Defence Community are unable to deal with a situation which is created by
an attack on the Federal Republic or Berlin,
subversion of the liberal democratic basic order,
a serious disturbance of public order or
a grave threat of any of these events,

and which in the opinion of the Three Powers endangers the security of their forces, the Three Powers may, after consultation to the fullest extent possible with the Federal Government, proclaim a state of emergency in the whole or any part of the Federal Republic.

3. Upon the proclamation of a state of emergency, the Three Powers may take such measures as are necessary to maintain or restore order and to ensure the security of the Forces.

4. The proclamation will specify the area to which it applies. The state of emergency will not be maintained any longer than necessary to deal with the emergency.

5. The Three Powers shall consult the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible while the state of emergency continues. They will utilize to the greatest possible extent the assistance of the Federal Government and the competent German authorities.

6. If the Three Powers do not terminate a state of emergency within thirty days after a request by the Federal Government to do so, the Federal Government may submit a request to the Council of the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization to examine the situation and consider whether the state of emergency should be terminated. If the Council concludes that continuance of the state of emergency is no longer justified, the Three Powers will restore the normal situation as promptly as possible.

7. Independently of a state of emergency, any military commander may, if his forces are imminently menaced, take such immediate action appropriate for their protection (including the use of armed force) as is requisite to remove the danger.

8. In all other respects, the protection of the security of these forces is governed by the provisions of the Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany referred to in Article 8 of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 6

1. The Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic in regard to the exercise of their rights relating to Berlin.

2. The Federal Republic on its part, will cooperate with the Three Powers in order to facilitate the discharge of their responsibilities with regard to Berlin. The Federal Republic will continue its aid to the political, cultural, economic and financial reconstruction of Berlin and, in particular, will grant it such aid as is set out in the annexed declaration of the Federal Republic (Annex A to the present Convention).

ARTICLE 7

1. The Three Powers and the Federal Republic are agreed that an essential aim of their common policy is a peace settlement of the whole of Germany, freely negotiated between Germany and her former enemies, which should lay the foundation for a lasting peace. They further agree that the final termination of the boundaries of Germany must await such a settlement.

2. Pending the peace settlement, the Three Powers and the Federal Republic will cooperate to achieve, by peaceful means, their common aim of a unified Germany enjoying a liberal-democratic constitution, like that of the Federal Republic, and integrated within the European Community.

3. In the event of the unification of Germany the Three Powers will, subject to such adjustments as may be agreed, extend to a unified Germany the rights which the Federal Republic has under the present Convention and the related Conventions and will for their part agree that the rights under the Treaties for the formation of an integrated European community should be similarly extended, upon the assumption by such a unified Germany of the obligations of the Federal Republic toward the Three Powers or to any of them under those Conventions and Treaties. Except by common consent of all the Signatory States the Federal Republic will not conclude any agreement or enter into any arrangement which would impair the rights of the Three Powers under those Conventions and Treaties or lessen the obligations of the Federal Republic thereunder.

4. The Three Powers will consult with the Federal Republic on all other matters involving the exercise of their rights relating to Germany as a whole.

ARTICLE 8

1. The Three Powers and the Federal Republic have concluded the following related Conventions which will enter into force simultaneously with the present Convention:

Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany;

Finance Convention;

Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation.

2. During the transitional period provided for in paragraph 4 of Article 6 of Chapter One of the Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising out of the War and the Occupation, the rights of the Three Powers referred to in that paragraph shall be deemed to be included within the exception set forth in paragraph 1 of Article 1 of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 9

1. There is hereby established an Arbitration Tribunal which shall function in accordance with the provisions of the annexed Charter (Annex B to the present Convention).

2. The Arbitration Tribunal shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all disputes arising between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic under the provisions of the present Convention or the annexed Charter or any of the related Conventions which the parties are not able to settle by negotiation, except as otherwise provided by paragraph 3 of this Article or in the annexed Charter or in the related Conventions.

3. Any dispute involving the rights of the Three Powers referred to in Article 2, or action taken thereunder, or involving the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 7 inclusive of Article 5, shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of the Arbitration Tribunal or of any other tribunal or court.

ARTICLE 10

The Three Powers and the Federal Republic will review the terms of the present Convention and the related Conventions

(a) upon the request of any one of them, in the event of the unification of Germany or the creation of a European federation; or

(b) upon the occurrence of any other event which all of the Signatory States recognize to be of a similarly fundamental character.

Thereupon, they will, by mutual agreement, modify the present Convention and related Conventions to the extent made necessary or advisable by the fundamental change in the situation.

ARTICLE 11

1. The present Convention and the related Conventions shall be ratified or approved by the Signatory States in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited by the Signatory States with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

2. The present Convention shall enter into force immediately upon

(a) the deposit by all the Signatory States of instruments of ratification of the present Convention and of all the Conventions listed in Article 8; and

(b) the entry into force of the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Defence Community.

3. The present Convention and the related Conventions shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, which will furnish each Signatory State with certified copies thereof and notify each such State of the date of the entry into force of present Convention and the related Conventions.

In faith whereof the undersigned representatives duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments have signed the present Convention.

Done at Bonn this twenty-sixth day of May, 1952 in three texts, in the English, French and German languages, all being equally authentic.

For the United States of America:

s/ DEAN ACHESON

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

s/ ANTHONY EDEN

For the French Republic:

s/ ROBERT SCHUMAN

For the Federal Republic of Germany:

s/ ADENAUER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bridges	Green	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Monroney
Carlson	Hendrickson	Pastore
Connally	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Dirksen	Hoey	Schoeppel
Douglas	Ives	Seaton
Ferguson	Langer	Thye
Flanders	Lehman	Underwood
Fulbright	Magnuson	Welker
George	Martin	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate today is considering extremely important executive business. I am glad to have been able to report the treaty with the Federal Republic of Germany—rather, the contractual relations with the Federal Republic of Germany—and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, both of which are ready for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, one of our great English poets once stated in one of his works that "He who did well in war just earns the right to begin doing well in peace." That is a solemn challenge—a solemn challenge to the United States and to the entire free world.

In spite of Soviet obstructionism, we have been doing our utmost to do well in peace. Not many months ago I had the privilege, on behalf of the Foreign Relations Committee, to present to the Senate the Japanese Peace Treaty. Today I should like to present two treaties with the Federal Republic of Germany, and to report to the Senate on what we have been able to do in working out a peace with that great nation.

The purpose of these agreements is twofold:

First, to end the occupation of Germany and to restore to the German people as much sovereignty as is possible at this time. That is accomplished by the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany.

No formal treaty could be negotiated, because the Federal Republic of Germany has not attained to full sovereignty as a nation. Resort was therefore had to a contractual relationship with the Federal Republic of Germany.

Second, to make possible a German contribution to the common defense of Western Europe. That is of the highest importance. That is accomplished, so far as the United States is concerned, by a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty extending that treaty to Western Germany.

Mr. President, if the arrangements provided for by these agreements are successful, Western Europe will be transformed. The benefits to the United States and to the whole free world will be tremendous. The importance of Germany is self-evident to anyone who takes a few minutes to study Europe. It has a highly skilled labor force and a technologically advanced industry. The country should long since have been united under a single democratic government. It is not necessary to elaborate on the reasons it has not been unified. The whole world knows the story of Soviet obstructionism, of how Russia has dropped the iron curtain between East and West Germany, and of how it is exploiting East Germany for its own selfish ends.

I wish it were a peace treaty I was presenting to the Senate today. But so long as Germany is divided as it is, there obviously cannot be a final treaty of peace. I do not believe the Russians want a peace treaty. They are fearful, with good reason, that a unified Germany would assert its independence and would not fit comfortably into their galaxy of satellites. The Russians, of course, do not have any allies; they have only satellites. That is one of the significant differences between the Russians and ourselves. We are not interested in satellites; we want free and independent allies working together on behalf of world peace.

We have, therefore, gone ahead with the British and the French in promoting the establishment of a democratic government and democratic institutions in the three western zones which now comprise the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany returns the largest measure of sovereignty now possible to the Federal Republic, and establishes the basis for the future relations between the Federal Republic and the Three Powers. This convention also lays the foundation for three other conventions, which the Senate is not called upon to ratify, because they are more technical and administrative in nature and are, therefore, subject to more frequent changes. There is a recent precedent for this procedure in the Japanese Peace Treaty, which was ratified by the Senate, and the administrative agreement covering our troops in Japan, which was not submitted to the Senate.

The three conventions stemming from the convention on relations cover financial problems, the settlement of matters arising out of the war and the occupation, and the rights and obligations of foreign forces and their members in the Federal Republic of Germany. They will, in effect, be approved by the Senate when we ratify the main convention.

American interests are amply protected in these agreements. The status of Berlin is not affected. We retain all our essential rights relating to the whole of Germany and to our right to station troops in West Germany. At the same time, we are relieved of the burden of the occupation. It is high time the occupation was ended. After 7 years, it has reached the point of diminishing returns. It became particularly anomalous after the ending of the state of war by the Congress through a joint resolution passed last year.

Concurrently with establishing West Germany as an independent state, we have also succeeded in bringing it into the alliance for the common defense of Western Europe. The Senate specifically endorsed this objective last year when in Senate Resolution 99 it declared that—

> Consideration should be given to the revision of plans for the defense of Europe as soon as possible so as to provide for utilization on a voluntary basis of the military and other resources of Western Germany.

It is obviously in our interest that Western Germany be defended, not only because the free world cannot afford to lose its manpower and industrial capacity but also because it pushes the boundary of freedom just that much farther east. The defense of Germany will, of course benefit the Germans themselves more immediately and directly than it will benefit any other nation. They should, therefore, make every effort themselves in that direction.

The United States is willing to help any free people defend themselves against totalitarian aggression. But the United States is not willing—indeed, it is not able—to carry the whole burden of defending people who are not interested in their own self-defense. The Germans have pledged their best efforts, they have undertaken very heavy commitments, and they deserve our support.

However, many countries of Western Europe who suffered from Nazi aggression during World War II were naturally reluctant to agree to anything which looked like German rearmament. The French in particular have an understandable uneasiness over the rebuilding of German power. But the danger to France and to the rest of Western Europe does not come from across the Rhine; it comes from across the Elbe, and it is apparent to us all how much greater the danger would be if the Soviet sphere were extended westward to the Rhine. The French people and their leaders have displayed the highest order of statesmanship in recognizing this fact and in overcoming the national prejudices and hatreds of hundreds of years. Had it not been for the vision and leadership of such Frenchmen as Schuman and Pleven, the agreements which are now before us would never have been written.

Although the French have had probably the bitterest experience with German militarism, they are by no means alone in insisting on adequate safeguards against its revival. The American people did not fight Germany in two world wars for the privilege of rebuilding the German general staff. The American people, quite rightly, demand guaranties that the Germany which we now welcome into our defensive alliance will not in the future strike out on imperialistic ventures of its own.

These guaranties have been secured through the European Defense Community, which was the means devised for bringing Germany into our defense system.

The United States is not a party to the treaty providing for the European Defense Community; but the text of that treaty has been submitted to the Senate for our information, and it is a most remarkable document.

It is completely in line with the frequently expressed policy of Congress.

In 1949 Congress wrote a statement of policy "to encourage the unification of Europe" into the Economic Cooperation Act. In 1950 this was changed to read "to encourage the further unification of Europe." The Mutual Security Act of 1951 expressed the desire of Congress "to further encourage the economic unification and the political federation of Europe." The Mutual Security Act of 1952, which the Congress finally passed earlier this month, is even more emphatic. It says:

> The Congress welcomes the recent progress in political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe and reaffirms its belief in the necessity of further vigorous efforts toward these ends as a means of building strength, establishing security,

and preserving peace in the North Atlantic area. In order to provide further encouragement to such efforts, the Congress believes it essential that this act should be so administered as to support concrete measures for political federation, military integration, and economic unification in Europe.

The six nations which are members of the EDC—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg—have agreed to pool their armed forces into a common European army under an international command. They have further agreed that within 6 months the assembly of the EDC will lay before the respective governments a plan for the federalization of Europe.

Mr. President, this is such a breathtaking event that the full implications of it can be grasped but slowly. I do not believe the American people are yet aware of what a truly momentous development this is. I wish that more people could have heard Under Secretary Bruce's clear and eloquent statement before the Foreign Relations Committee.

I myself—

Mr. Bruce said—

feel that this creation of a European defense community is the most significant thing which has happened in western civilization, not in my time, not in our time, but for a period of hundreds of years.

The six nations who have signed this treaty have been at each other's throats throughout much of their history; yet now, in an atmosphere of cooperation and cordiality, they surrender control over their armed forces to a supranational body. They have voluntarily given up their sovereignty over the most sensitive portion of any country's national life—not entirely; not sovereignty over all the armed forces, but those who are committed to the European armies. If there is any comparable event in history, I cannot recall it.

This arrangement contains a built-in guarantee against a revival of German militarism. There will not be a German Army. There will simply be German units in a European army—an army under international command, wearing an international uniform, an army with the various nationalities so completely integrated that it will be physically impossible for the units of any one nationality to withdraw and maintain themselves independently.

Even the munitions industries of the various countries will be so integrated that no one country will have a self-sufficient production of articles of war. Therefore, no one country could go off on its own, even if it wanted to do so.

Mr. President, as I have said, the United States is not a part of the European Defense Community, and neither is the United Kingdom; but both countries have the most obvious interests in the success and integrity of the community. The governments of these two countries have, therefore, joined with the Government of France in a Tripartite Declaration stating that they will regard any action threatening the integrity or unity of the community as a threat to their own security and that they will act in accordance with article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty. This article provides simply for consultation. After consultation, each of the nations is free to take the course which seems to it best.

There is no commitment whatever to do anything but consult. We retain complete freedom of action as to how the threat should be met.

It should be apparent, Mr. President, that our own security would be threatened by the break-up of the European Defense Community, and all this declaration does is to state what is obviously the fact anyway. The declaration is signed by the Foreign Ministers of France and Great Britain and by the Secretary of State of the United States.

In addition to this Tripartite Declaration, we have expressed our interest in the European Defense Community in more binding terms in the second agreement which the Senate is called upon to ratify. This document, which is presented as a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, provides the means for relating the European Defense Community to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It would not have been necessary if it had not been for Germany, because Germany—and when I say Germany, I mean the Federal Republic of Germany—is the only member of the European Defense Community which is not already a member of NATO. The simplest way to have handled the problem would have been to add Germany as a North Atlantic Treaty partner, just as Greece and Turkey were added earlier this year. But that would have required the unanimous consent of all the present members of NATO, and unanimous consent could not be obtained at this time.

So the members of NATO, acting collectively, have agreed to extend the protection of the North Atlantic Treaty to the European territory of the members of the European Defense Community. Conversely, the members of EDC, also acting collectively, have given a reciprocal guaranty to the members of NATO.

We therefore have the same guarantee from Germany that we have from the North Atlantic Treaty countries. The net practical result of this somewhat cumbersome procedure is substantially the same as admitting Germany to NATO.

Mr. President, this arrangement does not really enlarge United States commitments in Europe. We already have troops stationed in Germany, and those troops will remain there under these agreements. They are already covered by the North Atlantic Treaty. If they should be attacked, with or without this protocol, the United States would back them up, and we all know it. All that this new protocol does is to make the North Atlantic Treaty cover the territory in which the troops are stationed, as well as the troops themselves. That is pretty much a distinction without a difference. What is important is that through this protocol we receive far-reaching guaranties from Germany. It is Germany which is extending her commitments, not the United States. Germany is agreeing not only to assume responsibilities for her own defense but to regard an attack upon, let us say, Turkey, or Iceland, or the United States, as an attack upon herself.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations considered the Convention with Germany and the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, article by article. We gave particular attention to the extent to which the United States is committing itself, which I have already discussed, and also to the effect, if any, which these two treaties might have on the constitutional separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches of our Government. It is my own view that neither treaty has anything to do with this question, that a resolution of ratification of a treaty is not an appropriate vehicle for dealing with American constitutional questions, and that any attempt to use it as such would have an unfortunate effect on our foreign relations. The committee, however, agreed to an interpretation of the Convention with Germany declaring that—

The constitutional procedures as used in this Convention require that any military implementation, other than the retained powers referred to in paragraph 1 of article 2 of this Convention (including all other conventions, agreements, or understandings, which may become effective as a result of ratification of this Convention) must have authorization by the Congress.

The retained powers which are referred to in paragraph 1 of article 2 and which are excepted from the interpretation are the rights which we have heretofore exercised or held relating to, first, the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, second, Berlin, and third, Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

The interpretation is much less objectionable with these exceptions than it would be without them. I do not believe its legal effect will amount to very much, because I do not believe we can change the constitutional procedures of the United States by an interpretation of a treaty. It is my view that the constitutional procedures of the United States are determined by the United States alone. We could not affect those procedures by putting something into a treaty. I do not believe a treaty itself can change those procedures, and certainly there is nothing in this treaty which attempted to do so.

The committee considered and rejected a similar interpretation to the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty. To put such an interpretation on the protocol would be to single out Germany among all the countries which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. It would be unjust and discriminatory and would weaken our position in Germany. In other words, Germany would be governed by different rules and different obligations than would apply to other members of the North Atlantic Treaty.

As a practical matter, the interpretation is wholly unnecessary. All it does is to repeat in substance what is already in the North Atlantic Treaty, of which this protocol will become a part, but to repeat it in a way that can only be taken

as a slap at Germany. After literally years of negotiation, we have now succeeded in bringing Western Germany into our grand alliance. Are we now going to take action which would jeopardize the results of years of effort? I sincerely hope the Senate will stand with the Foreign Relations Committee and reject any attempts to weaken our commitments to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. President, the North Atlantic Treaty itself provides that it shall be carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. That provision applies equally to this protocol concerning Germany. Whatever our constitutional processes are—and I admit there is some dispute about them—they will have to be followed in the implementation of this protocol. Whatever our constitutional processes are, we cannot change them by anything we do with respect to this protocol. The suggested interpretation would declare the processes to be followed with respect to Germany but would leave the question exactly where it is now with respect to every other country. Surely the Senate does not want to select Germany as its special victim in this matter. I appeal to the Senate to sustain the action of the committee, which gave the matter careful consideration and rejected the proposed interpretation by a vote of 8 to 4.

Mr. President, it has also been suggested that Senate action on these treaties could well be delayed, at least until some of the European signatories have acted. I hope the Senate will not follow that suggestion, Mr. President. I have often said on this floor that the United States occupies the position of leadership in the free world. I cannot repeat it too often or emphasize it too much. What we do here influences actions in parliaments throughout the free world and it influences actions in politburos throughout the slave world, as well. We do not want to encourage our enemies and dishearten our friends by any action which could be interpreted to indicate our indifference to these arrangements in Western Europe.

There are other reasons for prompt Senate action. We all know that the duration of this session of Congress is limited. If the Senate does not ratify these conventions now, it may not have another chance until next January. That would mean a delay of more than 6 months before the treaties could come into force. We cannt afford to proceed at so leisurely a pace.

The German parliament is expected to consider these treaties in July, the French soon thereafter, and it is hoped that all ratifications can be completed by next fall. Prompt action by the United States will be helpful in securing ratification by the other signatories. If we delay, we merely encourage the others to delay.

The United States has more to gain and less to lose than any other country involved in these treaties—with the exception of Western Germany, which will have its sovereignty largely restored. Why, then, should we hesitate? Even if we ratify the treaties and some of the other signatories do not, we will have lost nothing, because the treaties will not then be effective.

Mr. President, the violence of the Communist reaction to these treaties shows how much the Communists fear what we are trying to do.

It is said that these treaties end forever the chance of a unified Germany. That is nonsense. That is what the Russians would like to have the Germans believe, because the Soviets fear that the example set by Western Germany will be contagious and that the East Germans will want to share in the progress which Western Germany will make under its democratic institutions—and has already made under British, French, and American occupation.

I believe that Soviet fear is well-founded, Mr. President. I believe freedom is contagious. I believe there is proof of that statement in the increasing numbers of East Germans who are seeking refuge in Western Germany and in the increasing reports of unrest in East Germany.

I hope the day will come when all of Germany will once more be united, under a democratic form of government, and will take its rightful, peaceful place in Europe and in the world. That remains the policy of the United States, and these treaties are a significant and important step in that direction.

Mr. President, some 35 years ago Woodrow Wilson, in a message to the joint session of the Congress, used words which reflect exactly my own view today. He said:

> We believe that our own desire for a new international order under which reason and justice and the common interests of mankind shall prevail is the desire of enlightened men everywhere. Without that new order the world will be without peace, and human life will lack tolerable conditions of existence and development. Having set our hand to the task of achieving it, we shall not turn back.

No, Mr. President, we shall not turn back. Let us push on with our task whatever the obstacles. Let us take that step now which will enable Western Germany to return to the family of nations, and make her contribution to the cause of reason and justice in the world.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I regard the action which was taken by the representatives of the three nations, the United States, Great Britain, and France, with respect to the Federal Republic of Germany as absolutely astounding. Think of grabbing Germany out of the clutches of the Soviets and bringing it into the free world and making it possible for Germany to regain its independence and freedom and its industrial power. That is something that history will long note.

The Soviets do not want Western Germany to attain its independence and freedom. They want to wait until such time as they can throw their python-like grasp around Western Germany and merge it with Eastern Germany, where Soviet policies and doctrines have been flourishing under the pressure and influence of the Kremlin.

This treaty is a significant advance in the cause of freedom and peace. The United States Senate must ratify this treaty to give new heart and new spirit to the forces of freedom and liberty, and to kindle in Germany itself an affection for democratic government and institutions, rather than the ambition to rule by the sword.

Mr. President, I hope the two treaties may be promptly ratified.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the able Senator from Texas that I have appreciated listening to his remarks with reference to these important documents. I have been receiving some inquiries by mail from people who have relatives in Germany. I will say quite frankly to the able Senator from Texas that those communications have come from members of religious groups, both Protestant and Catholic. The writers have indicated in those letters some misgivings about the future of Germany as a whole. They are fearful with respect to the final unification of Germany somewhere down the line in the future, if these instruments are ratified.

I note that the distinguished Senator from Texas did not touch upon that phase of the question. Does the Senator have an opinion to express in that connection?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that the West German Federal Republic contains the largest area of any part of Germany. I think it is also greater in population. We believe that if the Federal Republic of Germany is given its freedom and independence it will soon demonstrate to the remaining portions of Germany the desirability of following the example of the Federal Republic of Germany.

No one can give assurances as to what may transpire in Germany. As the Senator knows, there are groups, factions, and beliefs which may be in constant conflict. Even in the Federal Republic of Germany there is an opposition party, led by Mr. Schumacher. He is not a Communist. He was not a Hitlerite, as I understand. He is a strong leader, and he is opposing the total action provided by these treaties. As I understand, he is advocating the unification of all Germany. But I will say to the Senator that, however desirable that may be, it is impossible at this time because of the conflicts and the lack of unity among the people themselves.

It is our belief that if we give to the Federal Republic of Germany an opportunity to demonstrate to the remaining people of Germany its own democratic processes, it will be much easier to bring about the total unification of Germany. Personally I regard the German people and Germany itself as great instrumentalities. They are great people. They are industrious and enterprising. They have invented many things for the comfort and welfare of the world. I have a high respect for them. However, I wish to eradicate, if possible, the militaristic feeling which resides in the breasts of many Germans and which makes them

believe that their destiny is not the economic conquest of the world, but military conquest, with a sword in their hands to compel the rest of the world to bow down and admit their power and their authority.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not the able Senator from Texas feel that if these instruments are implemented and Western Germany takes its place among the nations of the world during the period and under the rules, contracts, and relations of the final treaty arrangements, it should demonstrate to the East Germans that there is no intention on the part of the Western Powers to abandon them, come what may with reference to the Soviet order? Is that a fair inference to draw?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that I agree thoroughly with the Senator that that is an objective which we ought to have in mind, and which the Federal Republic of Germany, and all of Germany, ought to have in mind. The Republic of Germany should so conduct its affairs and so conserve the interests of all Germans as to demonstrate to Eastern Germany that it cannot afford to tie its fate up with the Soviets.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There has been some question as to why we should ratify the treaty prior to the other ratifications. Does the Senator believe that, particularly with regard to the formation of the European defense community, it is important that we express ourselves on this protocol as well as the agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator, and thank him for asking the question.

I regard it as highly important, for one reason, that unless we ratify the treaty with a reasonable degree of promptness the European countries will say, "Oh, well, the United States is just leading us down a blind alley. We are not going to get anything out of this." But if we take the lead and show them that we mean what we say, and that we are going to be true to our commitments, they will be encouraged to ratify the treaties and join in the organizations which are to be established.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Schuman plan has recently been ratified, and the European countries are undertaking to set up a European defense community. It seems to me that that is the ultimate solution toward which the Marshall plan and the ECA have been directed. It would be a sort of culmination of our foreign policy of the past 5 years. Is that not the Senator's view?

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas; I believe that is entirely true. After all why did we adopt the Marshall plan? It was not adopted for the purpose of crushing Europe; we wanted to rebuild Europe, and we wanted the world to grow and prosper. The Schuman plan was altruistic in concept, and is a part of the picture, in that it contributes to the economy of the countries which have become parties to it. Back of it all was the altruistic desire to see the countries of Western Europe regain their place in the civilization and economy of the world. I believe the Senator from Arkansas is entirely correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I must leave shortly to go to Arkansas to participate in the dedication of the Bull Shoals Dam. I wish to say a word or two with regard to the convention and protocol. I regret having to leave.

I hope that the Senate will ratify the convention with Germany and the protocol of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think that in line with the answers of the chairman of the committee to the last questions I have put to him they may very well prove to be a very great step forward toward the unification of Europe.

I think in future years the world may well look back upon the establishment of the European Defense Community as an event as important in the history of the world as the adoption of our own Constitution in 1787. It seems to me that the unification of the countries of Western Europe is an essential step toward the stabilization of the political situation of the world, and a particularly important step in the effort to prevent the spread of communism throughout the universe. If the convention and protocol are ratified and implemented properly, there will be created a community in Europe which will not be subservient to the United States or to any other country, but will be an ally, because their institutions and their moral and political standards are in accord with ours.

I am very enthusiastic about this step which the European nations are proposing to take, and I believe we should do all we can to encourage it.

Actually, the obligations we assume under the protocol are not substantially greater than those we have already assumed under the North Atlantic Treaty. The addition of Germany is about the only new obligation; that is, it is an obligation to regard an attack upon her as equivalent to an attack upon any of the other members of the North Atlantic Treaty; so that there is no great increase in our obligations. However, the psychological effect of our ratification of the protocol would have a very profound effect, because it would give assurance to the nations affected that we are behind them in their efforts to create a strong and unified Europe.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will ratify the treaty and protocol without any delay.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to support the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY] in urging the prompt ratification of the convention with Germany and the accompanying protocol.

Since my first visit to Germany after the war, in 1947, I have felt that one of the most important steps for us to take with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty area was to consider the part Germany would play in any future development of that kind. In the developments leading up to the North Atlantic Treaty, I was one of those who felt very strongly that the part Germany was to play in that organization was very important. So, having completed the negotiations whereby it is made possible for Western Germany to become a partner in NATO, I feel we should move promptly now to strengthen the structure by ratifying both the treaty and the protocol.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], has outlined the contractual agreement with Germany and has given the Senate some of the compelling reasons why the Senate should give its advice and consent to its ratification at this time. The chairman has indicated that we are faced with a historical decision, not only as it applies to our own country, but for all of Europe, and logically for the world. I take this opportunity to endorse his view most heartily.

By ratification of the agreements and by carrying them out in good faith with our partners we can bring this new Western Germany, the new Federal Republic of Germany, with its potentially greater constructive power, into the family of free nations and thus make a tremendous advance toward a more secure world. But there are some grave obstacles in the way to this goal, and we need to act now, if we are to clear those obstacles.

I am frank to admit that when the subject first came up I wondered whether it would be wiser to wait until the other countries had ratified the convention, particularly Germany; but I am convinced that we should act now, and act promptly, certainly before Congress adjourns.

The agreements signed at Bonn on May 2, 1952, between the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany are the culmination of the political and economic progress made by the people of West Germany since 1945 under the guidance and with the assistance of the three powers. The area of Germany we are discussing is that area which has been under occupation by the United States, Great Britain, and France. It is our collaboration in dealing with West Germany which has brought about a very happy ending to this period of occupation.

The war brought on Germany a threefold collapse—and I am speaking of all Germany now—political, economic, and, most important, spiritual. When the four powers took over the control of that country upon the cessation of hostilities, they had to deal with some 70,000,000 people whose economic system had collapsed, whose government had disintegrated, and who were ready prey to despair and disillusion.

We faced that situation with the thought that we had an ally in Russia who would go along with us in restoring this area and bringing it back into the family of nations. We were disillusioned in the Russian attitude, of course, and that attitude has made necessary the agreements we are now considering.

From the very outset of the occupation the three Western Powers sought to

effect the economic restoration of Germany, and to assist the Germans in developing a free, democratic society. In this endeavor they had hoped for and expected the cooperation of the Soviet Union, which had pledged itself to this task in the Potsdam agreement. But it soon became evident that such cooperation would not be forthcoming. Indeed, the Soviet Union not only failed to share in the reconstruction of Germany along democratic lines, but it made clear that its primary policy objective in Germany was the complete domination of the country by the U. S. S. R. and its inclusion in the Soviet orbit.

We had a similar experience in the Far East, with Japan. We had hoped to be of some assistance in helping Japan get back on her feet. We found that the Soviet determination in the Far East was to bring Japan and all her potentialities under Soviet control. Similarly, we found that the Soviet determination in Western Europe was to bring all Germany, including the Ruhr and its industrial capacity, under Soviet control. One need only contemplate that situation to realize the danger in which the free world, including the United States itself, might have been if Russia had succeeded in these objectives.

So those of us who have been working on the program, with Japan, in the Far East, on the one hand, and with West Germany and Western Europe, on the other hand, realized the importance of the situation confronting us.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall yield if the Senator from South Dakota wishes to ask me a brief question, but at this time I prefer not to yield for lengthy debate. I should prefer to postpone that until I complete my initial presentation.

Mr. CASE. Very well; I shall wait until later.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Faced with complete frustration in our attempts to achieve the political and economic unification of Germany on the basis of freedom, the United States and its Western Allies decided in the spring of 1949 to permit the 46,000,000 Germans—out of a total of 70,000,000 in all of Germany—at that time residing in the three western zones of occupation to set up their own freely elected government.

Parenthetically, I might say that we tried to bring about a unification plan with which the Russians would agree, but we could not obtain one. So we decided to proceed on our own in the areas we were occupying. That is the question we are discussing today, namely, whether we were correct in doing that, and whether we should follow through now in helping the new republic, constituting the western zones of Germany, to join us in alliance with the three other nations.

The jurisdiction of this Government was limited only by certain reserved powers and controls which the Allies deemed necessary to retain for a time under an occupation statute. On September 21, 1949, approximately 4½ years after the capitulation of Germany, the democratically elected and constituted Federal Republic of Germany came into being.

At this point I think we should pay a very high tribute to two Americans whose names stand out in the accomplishment of that objective. One of them of course is Gen. Lucius Clay, who carried on so successfully, both during the Berlin airlift and during all the other difficulties in Germany. Succeeding him today is our High Commissioner, Mr. John J. McCloy. Both these gentlemen deserve the gratitude of the American people for the great service they have rendered and for having the vision to see the importance of a revived Germany, understanding the vital necessity of having Germany become a partner of the western democratic powers, and not be allowing her to drift into Soviet control.

Since that time—in 1949—the young Republic of West Germany has made considerable political progress. A stable, constitutional form of government, supported by the vast majority of the people, is flourishing. Despite the existence in Germany of clear traces of Nazi ideas and tendencies on the extreme right, and a small, but active, Communist apparatus on the left, it is a compelling fact that the great majority of the German people solidly support the parliamentary system of government and the democratic institutions which have grown and prospered under it. The committee inquired carefully into this matter, and feels confident that the Senate can be assured on this point.

Those of us who have been in Germany have been very much concerned over the question of whether the people there want a real democracy based on western principles, or whether they want to slip back into the old ideas of militarism and totalitarianism.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator from New Jersey if it is not true that the experiments which have been made in Western Germany have demonstrated the wisdom of our taking this step to stimulate their concern in their own government and in rebuilding their own industries and their relationships with the rest of the world. Is not that of the highest significance?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree that it is of the utmost significance, and it indicates the success of the policy we have pursued in our occupation of that country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will it not stimulate study and consideration of the unification of all Germany, and will it not set an example to the rest of Germany which is not in the Federal Republic as to the desirability of unification?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Texas, and I feel very strongly that what the Senate does here today will set a pattern which it is to be hoped will result in having Eastern Germany become a part of the new Federal Republic when the time comes.

As the committee report shows, freely elected bodies govern the nation from the local level to the national level. The German Bundestag, a freely elected parliament, functions in freedom, without fear or suppression. Even the substantial Social Democratic opposition, while not supporting the government of Chancelor Adenauer on many issues, has a long democratic tradition and is firmly anti-Communist.

There is no doubt, and I believe the Senator from Texas pointed out, that there is opposition. We do not close our eyes to it, and we are watching it very carefully. As we know, Mr. Schumacher is the head of the chief opposition party, and he is making a great deal of trouble for Mr. Adenauer. Mr. Schumacher is trying to press for unification today. However, it is clear that he is violently anti-Communist; he does not want to see communism come into his country, and he cannot be considered in any way to be allied with the Communist movement.

Economically, as well as politically, the recovery of West Germany is most impressive. Stimulated by generous assistance from the United States, the people of the Federal Republic have made great strides in erasing the devastation of the war and rebuilding a sound economy. Present production, according to the figures we have, is more than 140 percent of that of 1936—the peak prewar year. Exports are now beyond the $4,000,000,000 figure, and the German dollar gap has been closing. Despite probable future need for economic assistance to enable it to make full contribution to the defense of the free world, through its rapid economic recovery the Federal Republic is becoming increasingly less dependent upon outside assistance. The entire picture is one which shows the importance and the effectiveness of our endeavor to help a nation find itself and become economically self-supporting.

As the people of West Germany continued their progress toward economic solvency and democratic self-government, it became increasingly clear that a prolonged extension of the occupation would have an increasingly negative effect on the very democratic institutions and processes we had sought so earnestly to nurture and advance. I repeat that the situation was brought to a head when the new Federal Republic of West Germany was set up and began to establish itself on a self-sustaining and self-governing basis. The occupation continued, however. We realized that that was the psychological time to consider ending the occupation. As the Senate knows, earlier this year we passed the joint resolution bringing an end to the state of war with Germany.

The next step, logically, is to recognize the new republic and to bring it into the family of nations. Thus, despite our inability to conclude a treaty of peace

with all of Germany, because of Soviet intransigeance, we are endeavoring through the contractual agreements to effect a major change in our relationships with the largest part of this disunited country. So, Mr. President, by the convention now before the Senate, we are endeavoring to the best of our ability to bring about a treaty of peace with West Germany.

These agreements will put an end to the occupation of all of Germany outside of Soviet control, and will return to the Germans the greatest autonomy that is possible under present international conditions. They will have the effect of restoring to the great German people virtually complete control over their domestic and foreign affairs, and will result in the reestablishment of normal diplomatic relations between the Federal Republic and the three powers who are parties to this convention.

The contractual agreement, while returning to the Germans a maximum degree of control over their own affairs, does not by itself provide the answer to all the problems facing them and the other peoples of the free world. Therefore, the other step that is involved in these discussions is before us, and although we are not parties to these particular arrangements, I desire to describe them briefly.

Arrangements have been made for German participation in the so-called European defense community—a common-defense organization including, in addition to the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. This community will provide in large measure for the security of the Federal Republic and will enable free Germany to participate in its own defense through machinery which will preclude the re-creation and revival in Germany of those military institutions and traditions that have endangered all Europe in the past. The big problem faced by the negotiators, and which we all face in considering this matter, is the problem of getting Germany into position to defend herself against aggression, without at the same time giving her a chance to move into such a military position that her militarism might again rise to threaten Europe. The European defense community was invented for the purpose of solving that difficulty. The Benelux countries, France, and Italy were brought into the NATO structure. These countries, therefore, constitute the group of European countries which, with Western Germany, will contribute to the forming of a European army which is to become a part of the NATO organization under General Ridgway.

These agreements, together with the Schuman plan for the pooling of the steel and coal industries of France, Germany, and of other western European countries, are integral parts of a promising development toward a united Europe where national boundaries will lose their former meaning and traditional rivalries and selfish national interests will be subordinated to a common striving for economic security and political stability.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated, we have been thinking in terms of a united Europe, and, by means of the agreements we are considering today, and of which we are asking ratification, we are moving toward a united Europe. That is, of course, the hope we have; that is what we are striving for.

There are still obstacles to be surmounted and crises to be faced before this goal can be reached. But a great start has been made. As this integrated European community comes closer to realization, the ability of the free peoples of the west to provide for their own economic needs will increase. So, too, will their capacity to contribute to their own defense and to the defense of the free world. In the community of which I am speaking, the European defense community, a free united Germany is needed.

These are some of the considerations which convince me that the Senate should give its prompt approval to the ratification of the agreements with the Federal Republic. I very much fear that if we drag our feet or delay matters, we may discourage a movement which seems to be well started.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be happy to yield, although I told the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that I would prefer to conclude my presentation. If it is a very short question the Senator wishes to ask, I will yield. I do not, however, want to get into a discussion at this point.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of information only, have any of the eight nations who will be called upon to ratify this convention acted as yet?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think not. I think we are the first to act.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator explain at some time during his remarks, or has he already explained why we should act first, in view of the fact that there is a great deal of opposition in West Germany to ratification, and in view of the further fact that there is a great deal of opposition, or at least substantial opposition, in France to its ratification? I would appreciate having the Senator's viewpoint.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I expect at the close of my remarks to give a brief summary, because I have been asked the same question as to why I feel that the treaty should first be ratified by the United States. One is, of course, that we want to do all we can to help Adenauer in the job he is trying to do in West Germany, and to assure him that we are behind him in his effort to bring the new Federal Republic of Germany into effective working alliance with the Western Powers. But I shall develop that a little further on. If my explanation of it is not satisfactory, the Senator may then inquire.

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator will yield for one further question, it is reported that the leader of the Socialist Party in West Germany has said that if he should be elected in 1953, he would promptly move to repudiate the treaty. Has that statement been taken into consideration by the Committee on Foreign Relations and by the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think that has been very fully considered. It is reasonable to expect that he probably would take that position. He is trying in every way possible to prevent ratification of the treaty, just as there is a great deal of communistic propaganda and agitation against it. But it is my judgment that we must face the issue. It is always necessary for us to answer the question, "Shall we take this alternative or that?" Here is one positive plan we have developed. The alternative would be to do nothing, possibly to leave Germany to Soviet Russia, and let her become one of the satellite countries, with obvious menace to Western Europe, and, in the long run, to ourselves. I am stating alternatives that are difficult, I admit; but it seems to me that this is the right attitude to take.

These are some of the considerations which convince me that the Senate should give its prompt approval to the ratification of the agreements with the Federal Republic. I think it crystal clear that on the basis of the progress made during the past 3 years, the people of West Germany have demonstrated a degree of political maturity that shows them to be worthy of the freedom which these new arrangements will provide. Added to this fact is the consideration that through the conclusion of these agreements, the promising movement toward the integration of the Western European-Atlantic community will be greatly strengthened. Therefore, in order for the German people to make a maximum contribution to European integration and to the building up of the defensive strength of the free world, it is most desirable to bring the occupation period to a close. Our future relations with Germany would be similar to our relations with Japan, where we keep troops for defensive purposes, but not as an occupying power.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In bringing the occupation period to a close, does the Senator understand that that means we shall be able to bring to a close the powers of the President under the occupation status?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In regard to that situation, when we come to the interpretation which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I are supporting, we shall try to make it clear that any military implementation of these documents must be done by congressional approval.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am entirely for such an interpretation.

Mr. WATKINS. But, except for that, the Senator would accept and would by inference at least admit that certain occupation powers will be lodged in the President or in the executive department.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That would be true. We retain certain occupation powers. I will read the exact text of that provision in a moment, when I come to it.

Mr. WATKINS. The point I make is that if we are to end the period of occupation—and the Senator thinks it should be ended—why should not the powers incident to the occupation also be ended, since the occupation is the excuse for them, and the basis for them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. There would still be certain responsibilities having to do with the defense of Germany in case of aggression.

However, I would prefer not to debate the question now. I prefer to finish my address, and then there can be brought up these other questions, which are collateral, but which, I admit, are very important.

Mr. WATKINS. I hope the Senator will discuss them, because it seems to me that if we are to end the period of occupation we also ought to end the occupation powers, in the absence of some good reason to the contrary, of which I am not advised at the moment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It would be impossible to withdraw entirely, and to leave things in a vacuum. It must be remembered that we are dealing with a very critical area of Germany, an area which we cannot afford to allow to fall into hostile hands. That is the purpose of our excepting paragraph 1 of article II, which I shall read in full when we come to the discussion of that particular phase of this problem.

Only a free Germany can become a lasting partner in our great effort to achieve a peaceful world. Another and perhaps more compelling reason for these agreements is the desirability for effecting the closest possible identification of the German people with the cause of the free world. This can best be achieved by affording a free German Government the earliest possible opportunity voluntarily to participate in the common effort.

More than a year ago, when the negotiations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of these agreements were initiated, the Soviet Union and its East German puppets launched an intensive propaganda campaign through Western Europe, designed to impede the progress of the negotiations and later to prevent their signature. This, I should say, Mr. President, is another reason why I think it is desirable to ratify these treaties promptly.

In this campaign, the Russians have used all techniques and have sought all means to sabotage the agreements. In Germany they have alternated between blandishments of peace and threats of war. In the face of their unenviable record on the unification issue, the Russians have sought to place the onus for the continued division of Germany on the western allies and the West German Government, charging that the conclusion of the contractual agreements would result in the indefinite division of the country.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] brought that out a moment ago. We are thinking in terms of the ultimate unification of Germany, but at the present time we have no alternative except to build up the strength of West Germany.

On the other hand, the Soviet Union has openly suggested that the inevitable result of the conclusion of the contractual and EDC agreements, would be war, thus attempting to intimidate the people of West Germany and cause them to reconsider the desirability of going ahead with the agreements. This campaign of fear has been reenforced by concrete action. In West Berlin, the Soviets have recommenced their harassing tactics, of cutting communication lines, blocking off streets leading into the Soviet sector, and of kidnaping West Berlin residents.

In the Soviet zone of Germany they have accelerated the expansion of the so-called people's police and the "Bereitschaften," the East German Army against whose formation the Western Allies protested in May 1950. This terror campaign has also been directed against the American radio station in Berlin, RIAS, which has served as a voice of freedom to the captive people of the Soviet zone. I remember when Mr. McCloy was here he explained the effectiveness of this radio station in Berlin. Its listeners are being threatened, fined, and imprisoned. In Western Germany, the small but active Communist apparatus has been doing its utmost to contribute to the increased feeling of uncertainty and insecurity. But this campaign has not only been directed at the German people. Through the vehicle of Communist parties throughout Western Europe, particularly in France, the Soviets have endeavored to revive the intensity of traditional Western European animosities and suspicion in an effort to convince these nations of the danger of restoring the Germans to a position of equality and permitting them to participate in western defense.

Despite all these attempts to undercut the efforts of the Three Powers to restore the Germans to a place of equal status and equal responsibility in the European-Atlantic community of nations these agreements were signed. But I want to emphasize here that the battle has not been won, since these agreements cannot be implemented until the legislative bodies of the participating countries have ratified them. It is clear that this period between the signature and the ratification of the contractual agreements is a most crucial one. Communist divisive propaganda has already increased in tempo and Communist blandishments and threats can be expected to become intensified. The effects of the Communist campaign have already been felt and the greater the delay in ratifying these agreements, the greater will be the danger that Communist efforts to sabotage them will succeed.

Referring to the question of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], it could be that these Communist efforts to sabotage the whole scheme might succeed. We should think of the matter from the standpoint of our own security and the danger to us if the Soviets should take over all Germany, especially the western industrial area, which is the heart of Germany. They would probably sabotage the Schuman plan and everything else. It seems to me that we have a personal selfish interest in this matter.

We have, of course, been aware of the recent exchange of notes between the Soviet Union and the Three Powers relating to the question of German unification. The Western Powers have from the outset indicated a willingness to negotiate with the Soviet Union on this issue but have insisted that, in view of the discouraging experiences of past conferences, certain underlying principles must be agreed upon before such a meeting can be held. During the period following the cessation of hostilities, the Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated in diplomatic correspondence and around the conference table its unwillingness to accept any plan for the reunification of Germany which would guarantee basic freedoms to the German people and free choice to the German Government to associate itself with the other free nations of the world. They simply will not go in with us on any basis of that kind, to give real freedom to Germany.

This Communist campaign in both the diplomatic and publicity fields has been directed at the understandable desire of the German people for the reunification of their country and the fear of taking steps which might make the present split of the country a permanent one. This campaign has had some effect particularly since the major opposition party in the Federal Republic, the Social Democratic Party, Schumacher's party, is opposed to ratification of the agreements and in its opposition has frequently found itself alined with the Communist and neo-Nazi fringe parties which are also opposed to the agreements. Mr. Schumacher is constantly saying that he has no interest in the Communists.

I believe it is imperative that the United States exercise greatest possible leadership in order to convince both the Parliament and the peoples of West Germany and the Parliaments of France and Great Britain of the necessity of early ratification and implementation of the contractual agreements. If the Senate of the United States takes immediate and decisive action on the agreements before the conclusion of the current session, it will demonstrate the determination of the United States to see through this program for the strengthening of the free world, and support those who are behind this just unification effort. The other three parties to these agreements are in effect looking to us for that leadership. If we fail them now, we may, through our failure to act, help the Communists accomplish that which they have been unable to accomplish through their own efforts.

Oppositional elements in France, Germany, and Great Britain have, in an effort to forestall ratification, repeatedly cast doubt upon our sincerity and determination to carry out our own responsibility with respect to these agreements.

There could be no better answer to these efforts than prompt action by the United States Senate to ratify these agreements.

Mr. President, having presented what I believe to be the main arguments for immediate ratification, I desire now to discuss the interpretation which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I presented in the committee and which is attached to the main convention with Germany.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask a question or two about the program for the protection of Germany and for the cooperation of the European powers, the United States, and others. As I understand, France was not willing to enter into this arrangement and become a party to these conventions unless the United States and Great Britain would, in effect, guarantee her against any aggression whatsoever from Germany. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It might be well to read into the RECORD the tripartite declaration, in order to understand——

Mr. WATKINS. If the Senator can give it to me in general terms, so the general public can understand it, I should appreciate it. I am not asking to have it in legal terms.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is simply an interpretation by France and other nations with reference to the convention which has been signed with Germany and which is now subject to ratification. It virtually supports the European Defense Community to the extent of making it clear, I think, that we will support the spirit of the European Defense Community in the sense that Germany shall not arm herself unilaterally or individually. She is a part of the larger European Army program.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it in any degree guarantee France against aggression by Germany—the Germany which we have set up and recognized?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me read from the committee report on the subject. It is called, "The EDC and the Tripartite Declaration." I think it is well to put the language right into the discussion.

The deep interest of the United States in the EDC is reflected in the tripartite declaration issued by the governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States at the time of the signing of the EDC Treaty. In that declaration the United States and Great Britain made it clear that they would regard any action affecting the unity or integrity of the EDC as a threat to their own security.

Of course, any action affecting the integrity or unity of Germany would be considered an attempt by an aggressor to attack Germany, so we would consider that as a threat to our own security. The report continues:

The pertinent language of the declaration follows:

"Accordingly, if any action from whatever quarter threatens the integrity or unity of the community, the two governments will regard this as a threat to their own security. They will act in accordance with article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Moreover, they have each expressed their resolve to station such forces on the continent of Europe, including the Federal Republic of Germany, as they deem necessary and appropriate to contribute to the joint defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area, having regard to their obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, their interest in the integrity of the European defense community, and their special responsibilities in Germany."

I may say that because of this very declaration, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I felt it was desirable that the interpretation which I shall read presently be made a part of the convention. In brief terms, it says that any military implementation of the convention can be had only with the authorization of Congress.

In other words, we are trying to get away from the possible implication that the relationships or interrelationships between these documents might be interpreted as giving to the Executive a power, for example, to send troops abroad, with the old "troops to Europe" issue again arising. We are seeking, once and for all, to put an end to that discussion by an interpretation making it clear that that is not the intention.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa, because he was the author of the interpretation, which I supported, and he could probably make the position clear.

Mr. WATKINS. The question I had in mind should probably precede an explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am trying to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WATKINS. I am now calling attention to a particular point, so that when the Senator answers, he may take it into consideration.

On Wednesday, June 11, 1952, Hon. Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, resumed his statement to the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was asked a question by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], a part of which is as follows:

Now, in this particular case, we have before us—you have brought back—two conventions for ratification. The first is the so-called convention on relations, and the second is the protocol amendatory to the North Atlantic Treaty. In addition to that, however, you have brought back a statement signed by Great Britain, France, and ourselves, which has no legal effect.

That is the matter to which I call the Senator's attention, and I am asking questions about it at this moment.

The answer of Secretary Acheson was:

That is correct, Senator.

What I should like to have the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New Jersey explain is just what relationship, what bearing, or what force and effect, that statement has, if it has no legal effect. I take it for granted that probably Secretary Acheson knew what he was talking about when he said that the tripartite agreement had no legal effect.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Utah has read a query which was made when the hearings were being held, or when we were considering the documents which gave rise to the proposal of the Senator from Iowa, and which I supported, interpreting the language so that it could not be construed to have an effect beyond what appeared on the surface.

At this point, before the Senator from Iowa speaks on the subject, I should like to finish the quotation from page 16, which continues to give the committee's interpretation of the language I have just read.

The committee points out that there is no particular obligation on the part of the United States except to consult, in accordance with article 4 of the Atlantic Pact, in the event the integrity or unity of the EDC is threatened. Under article 4, NATO members agree to consult whenever any party so requests on the ground that the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of them is threatened. There is, however, no obligation to take any action as a result of consultation. In line with this formula the Three Powers would meet together to consider the nature of the threat and then determine, within their own constitutional requirements, what action, if any, the situation required.

A question was raised in the minds of some Senators, in connection with all the interrelated documents, treaties, and responsibilities, as to whether it would not be advisable to make it clear that there was no intention to imply any authority—for example, military implementation—without the concurrence of Congress. We know that if troops are to be sent to Europe, or equipment for troops, there is no legislative authorization for sending them. An issue has arisen over sending troops to Europe without congressional action. We felt that by this interpretation this point would be covered.

Mr. WATKINS. May I ask the Senator if he agrees with Secretary Acheson and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], that the tripartite settlement has no legal effect?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Because I was in doubt as to whether it did or did not have legal effect, I joined with the senior Senator from Iowa in suggesting this interpretation.

Mr. WATKINS. I call attention to what it is reported Secretary Acheson said day before yesterday in Berlin. I quote from the New York Times of June 30, 1952. The article apparently was written by Walter Sullivan, the New York Times correspondent in Berlin:

An hour later at the laying of a cornerstone for a United States memorial library, Mr. Acheson cited the recent declarations of Britain, France, and the United States on Berlin. He said these indicated in "unmistakable terms" that the three powers would regard any attack on Berlin "from whatever quarter" as an attack against their forces and themselves.

Is it the understanding, or can it be inferred from that statement and from Secretary Acheson's statement—and apparently the New York Times article is stating again the objectives of the tripartite settlement—that there is at least some kind of moral force or moral obligation to take some action in a certain situation, if it should arise?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the tripartite declaration from which I read—I have not read it all, but I have

read part of it—implies certain responsibilities, and we have tried to make it perfectly clear that if there was to be any military implementation of this program, it should be with the concurrence of Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Could it not be considered, as a matter of law, a holding out to other parties that if a certain situation existed, we would act; and if they relied upon that, we might have an obligation legally, if you please, to defend them and help take care of them?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, the Atlantic Pact refers to such an attack, with all of its various implications. We have discussed that before.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. I do not care to go back to that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No one does at this point, because we discussed it at length and adopted Resolution No. 99, which expressed the view of the Senate on that subject. But undoubtedly in bringing Germany virtually under the North Atlantic Pact, by bringing the EDC under it, we have brought about a situation in which an attack on Germany would raise the question of whether it was an attack on all of us.

Mr. WATKINS. Are they in a twilight zone, where they may be considered to be, in some circumstances, within the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact, and in other conditions outside the pact?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think so, because we have made it clear that in case of any military aggression, there would have to be authorization by Congress to achieve the implementation about which the Senator is thinking.

Mr. President, I now yield further to the senior Senator from Iowa because he has drafted this interpretation. He took up the matter and began to work on this clause. I yield temporarily to the Senator from Iowa to explain it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to say to the Senator from Utah that, in my judgment, I do not think there is any question that the combination of treaties and agreements which seems so complex will become one binding whole when the Senate approves the treaty now under consideration.

I invite the attention of the Senate and of the Senator to article 4 of the treaty, paragraph 1. That paragraph reads as follows:

> The mission of the Armed Forces stationed by the three powers in the Federal territory will be the defense of the free world, of which the Federal Republic and Berlin form part.

Nothing can be more clear than that. We are tied right into it.

Mr. WATKINS. That takes in not only territory in Europe, in Germany and France, but also takes in all the rest of the free world, does it not, if there is any meaning behind it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It takes in whatever we define as the "free world." It is up to the determination of the three powers.

Mr. WATKINS. It may be broad enough to take in South America.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we determine that it is a part of the free world, I presume that is true.

A moment ago the Senator raised a point as to what guaranties or assurances have been given in connection with the tripartite declaration. I am aware of the answer of the Secretary of State to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] when he asked the question in committee. I have a great respect for the legal research of the State Department, and I have great respect for the considered opinion of the Secretary of State when he gives it on a legal matter. Therefore, I do not consider his answer lightly, but I disagree with him. I do not agree that the tripartite declaration has no legal effect. I think it has complete legal effect when we adopt the treaty, because the tripartite declaration and the other documents are all interwoven in the treaty. In effect, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee stated a moment ago, we ratify them when we ratify the treaty. These documents are implementing documents. They are explanatory documents, and they inhere in the ratification of the treaty, in my judgment. So I think the tripartite declaration does have legal effect.

I must take the positive statement of the Secretary of State, because I have no other evidence. He says that all the documents and all the agreements involved in this treaty complex which we are discussing have been submitted to us in this booklet. I am referring to Executives Q and R, together with the message of the President of the United States submitting the documents. I wish to state my understanding of the guaranties which we are assuming, or which we should be interpreted as assuming. This is one of the reasons laying the foundation for the interpretation which has been placed upon the treaty in the resolution of ratification.

Several questions were asked of the Secretary along this line. He was asked, "Suppose Germany should decide to withdraw from this agreement in a few years. What would be our obligations?"

Under the tripartite declaration that becomes a most serious threat for Germany as well as for the other countries. It endangers this organization. It becomes a most serious threat to the three countries, Great Britain, France, and the United States. We will then consult on the highest level of solemnity, which, in diplomatic double talk, means that the situation is becoming pretty hot. Under the understandings which have not been written down, I am convinced in my own mind that verbal assurances have been given that France does not need to worry, that we will come to her assisance at any time her integrity is in the least threatened from any quarter. So, taken all together, these documents are guaranties of the physical security of France.

We went further in the hearings. I and other Senators asked about the position we found ourselves jockeyed into with respect to protecting the French overlordship in Morocco and Tunisia, and perhaps Indochina. How far have we gone with silent understandings to guarantee the French colonial sovereignty in those places? The answer which we received to that question was that our interests in Africa, for example, run along the line of the French interests, which relate to the defense of the free world. We never received the answer that we were defending the French colonial system as such, but that we were attempting to defend our own security and the security of the so-called free world, and that that is what the French are trying to do.

I have my own views on that subject, which are slightly different, but I think we have made guaranties, whether they are in writing or not. By the implications of the tripartite declaration and the statements in the Charter, I think we have made some rather far-reaching guaranties. That is why I want Congress to authorize military implementation of this treaty. I want to make certain that it does. I do not want to leave the situation in the twilight zone, for the Executive to interpret either way he wishes to interpret it, and plunge us into a conflict at some future date based upon Executive whim.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. How long, in the Senator's opinion, are these so-called guaranties, implied or direct, or however we may describe them, to run?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The whole complex of treaties potentially runs for 50 years. That is one of the dangerous things about it.

Mr. WATKINS. That involves an expansion of the duration of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The European Defense Community Compact runs for 50 years. NATO runs for 20 years. At the end of 20 years any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation has been given. At the end of 10 years the parties may consult for the purpose of reviewing the treaty. However, we have tied NATO into the European Defense Community for a term of 50 years. That is why it is important.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the Senator if, in effect, the main provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty are extended for 50 years?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I presume the legal experts could interpret it both ways. In effect, I think it is extended for a period of 50 years. In my opinion, that is the basic effect. We are tied into a European entanglement for 50 years. Perhaps that is a good thing. I do not say that it is necessarily not a good thing, properly approached and properly safeguarded. There are some escape devices which could be used; but we might as well face the situation. We are hooking ourselves up to Europe for 50 years, subject to the qualification that there are certain means and methods by which we might be able to disentangle ourselves under certain circumstances. However, that is what it amounts to.

Mr. WATKINS. Can we disentangle ourselves without breaking our plighted word?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are certain devices for disentangling ourselves. Let us assume that one or two nations should decide to withdraw and

and not cooperate. That would give us a reason to withdraw and not cooperate. At the end of 10 years we can consult the other nations with reference to the North Atlantic Treaty. No one can tell just what the attitude of all the parties will be at that time. There may be an opportunity to withdraw then, if certain nations do not do their share and implement the treaty as they should and can. Undoubtedly under such circumstances there would be ways and means for withdrawing under honorable conditions. I do not think the door is entirely locked. However, to all intents and purposes, under any kind of good-faith interpretation, and with reasonable cooperation on the part of the other parties, it is a 50-year deal.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I think it might be relevant at this point to read articles 12 and 13 of the North Atlantic Treaty into the RECORD, because they provide for consultation at the end of a 10-year period, and for withdrawal at the end of 20 years.

Article 12 reads as follows:

After the treaty has been in force for 10 years, or at any time thereafter, the parties shall, if any of them so request, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13 reads as follows:

After the treaty has been in force for 20 years, any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the governments of the other parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

So apparently, under the North Atlantic Treaty, we could withdraw after 20 years.

Mr. WATKINS. Can we get out of this organization?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In the light of the connection between the North Atlantic Treaty and the European Defense Community, the question is whether there is involved an additional length of time for all the agreements. The European Defense Community, to which we are not a party, is a 50-year proposition.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator from New Jersey of the same opinion as the Senator from Iowa, that in effect this is an agreement which will run for 50 years?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not so construe it. I do not know what the obligations would be.

Mr. WATKINS. Does anyone know how long it will run?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to speak to that point if the Senator from New Jersey will yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have not signed the European Defense Community Treaty, but we have agreed to guarantee the integrity of the nations belonging to it against attack. There is no doubt that we are caught in it, even though we have not signed the treaty. I do not say that we should not be in it. Perhaps we should be. I am trying to look at the situation fairly and objectively. When we make such a guarantee we are tied up with a great responsibility, whether we actually sign the treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, it is an obligation from which we cannot withdraw before 50 years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that we assume obligations which may easily continue for 50 years under many conditions. There are conditions under which we probably can get out of our obligations. We discussed some of the possibilities. A sovereign nation can always serve notice of repudiation of any treaty after a period of time. There is often involved the question of national honor, and whether the world will criticize a nation for going back on its word or accept its excuse as a good reason for withdrawing. We try to be an honorable nation, and we try to honor our obligations. We always do. I am sure that we will continue to honor our obligations.

Mr. WATKINS. What was the point of view of the State Department as to the length of time we were obligated?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That point is very fuzzy, so far as my understanding is concerned. I do not think it is clear in the record. The State Department has the view that we are implicated in several documents, and they take the position, I believe, that we can, under various conditions, get out of the North Atlantic Treaty. However, so long as everything goes all right, what difference does it make how long it continues? If it does not go all right, and other nations do not live up to their obligations, we can get out of our obligations.

Mr. WATKINS. I have in mind that they will live up to their obligations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Utah that if the European Nations had up to this time done their full share under their agreements and understandings and honorable interpretations of what they said they would do, I would have no hesitation about going forward with this proposal under reasonable safeguards.

Had the European community been a success up to this time, I would have no hesitation, as I say, but I think, in the main, it has been all paper and all talk.

I should like to call attention to the fact that every time the French Government attempts to implement their participation in the North Atlantic Treaty the Cabinet falls. They can sign all the documents they want to sign, but every time when it comes down to hard-rock implementation, the Parliament which proposes it is kicked out of office. That will happen again, in my opinion, when the chips are down and the French must put their nose to the grindstone and implement their obligations in the physical operation of NATO. I hope they can get to the point where they will be able to implement it. However, that is the history up to now. I would feel better if it were not a one-horse, one-rabbit trade, in which we give the horse and get the rabbit from the other countries. I want to go along with everything we can reasonably do to help create unity, but I should like to see a greater practical implementation on the part of the European nations who will be the first to be attacked in any invasion from the east.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That comment applies to NATO as well as to the new convention and protocol.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is a little difference, however. The convention and protocol are contractual agreements with Germany, and they are tied into NATO and the defense set-up by some clauses in the contract. However, the major purpose is to define the legal situation of Germany and to bring West Germany into the defense community, as well as hold out an opportunity for a later unification of a free Germany oriented to the west.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is correct. That is a worth-while objective.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the objective is worthy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is most desirable to bring West Germany into the picture.

Mr. WATKINS. May I ask the Senator from Iowa one other question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of what he had said about the reluctance of the French to implement the North Atlantic pact and the programs worked out under it, what opinion does he have with respect to whether the French nation will ratify the convention and protocol?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not know what the French are going to do. I can only call attention to a statement I read in the press last Friday or Saturday. It was made by General Juin, who is now the ground commander of the so-called NATO troops in Europe. He had just returned from Tunis in French Morocco, where he was the French commander. Before a meeting of Frenchmen last week he said that if America was not careful the French would walk out of the deal and withdraw from it. That was the report which I read in the press. Therefore, I do not know what the French are going to do. General Juin is a very important man in France. He is the top military man, as I understand. According to the dispatches, he said that France would step out of this deal if America were not careful. In other words, they will take their ball and bat and glove and go home if we do not play the game according to their rules.

Mr. WATKINS. And pick up all of the machinery and plants and everything else we have given them. I suppose they will take all of that, too.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes; that is something that we should speculate on.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The convention with Germany which we are discussing does not go into effect unless EDC is ratified by the parties.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The convention with Germany is tied up with all the countries which ratify the European Defense Community agreement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The convention does not go into effect until the European Defense Community agreement or treaty has been ratified. Incidentally, not one European nation has ratified the European Defense Community agreement. My personal feeling is that we are rushing into this situation too fast. I do not see any necessity for our considering it now. There is no real basis for the United States rushing into it. However, as always during the past few years, we are rushing in first and getting ourselves tied up. I have not made any motion to postpone consideration of the convention, but my personal view is that we are rushing into it too swiftly. There is no necessity for rushing into it. However, I am perfectly willing to go along, and I shall make no attempt to slow it up, because the majority opinion seems to be that we should rush into this agreement, without any other European nation even indicating that it will ratify it. We know that Germany is not going to debate the issue until late in September or November.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say to the Senator from Iowa, in view of what he has said, and in view of the fact that he is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that he has made a very significant statement. We are being rushed, during the last session of the Eighty-second Congress, to ratify a convention which I doubt as many as half a dozen Senators have read, or know what it contains. Nevertheless, we are asked to ratify it in the last few days of the last session of the Congress, even though we do not know that the other parties are going to ratify it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say in all candor that my position on the Committee on Foreign Relations is a very humble one indeed. In the past few years I have found myself in many cases a very small minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have great respect for the judgment of my colleagues on the committee, but I have been unable to agree with them. So my position is a very humble one, and no doubt it is a completely ineffective one as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to say that I think the Senator has always made a very important contribution. I have agreed with him on many occasions, although not always.

I do not agree with him with respect to any delay in ratifying the treaty. I believe we should ratify the treaty promptly.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of what the Senator from Iowa has said, does the Senator from New Jersey think it highly important that we ratify this treaty before there is stronger public opinion behind it in Europe among the other countries which must ratify it?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, if the other countries do not wish to ratify it, it will not go into effect.

The European Defense Community is the key to the whole program, and it must go through, too. That is what General Eisenhower gave so much of his attention to, in order that there might be a European Army and the necessary number of divisions formed. That is the very thing I have hoped to have brought about by means of the Mutual Security program. All those things are parts of the picture.

That is why I favor early ratification of the treaty, in order that we may be able to carry through the program as quickly as possible.

If the treaty is not ratified by the other countries, even though we ratify it promptly, at least the blame will not be ours.

Mr. WATKINS. It seems to me that in view of all that we have been doing to help the people of Europe, if they are not converted to this treaty, we shall have some very shaky and weak allies there.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am sure that Adenauer and Schumacher are thoroughly converted to it.

The question facing us is whether we shall turn our backs on the entire plan, in which case it will be in very great danger of failing entirely, or whether we shall lead in this effort. If we give the necessary leadership, we shall have done all we can do to fulfill our responsibility. As I view the matter, as one Member of the Senate, we shall be saying, "We are willing to do this, and we trust that you will ratify the treaty promptly. If you do not ratify it, our action will not count."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Iowa has said regarding the fact that up to date all the plans are on paper.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree in part, but not entirely. When some of us were abroad and had detailed conversations with our representatives there, we became convinced that although the plans are largely on paper, yet a great deal has actually been done.

Mr. WATKINS. Specifically, aside from passing resolutions, what have those countries done to implement a program upon which we can rely in the future?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, we covered that matter in detail in connection with the mutual security program. The nearest to what the Senator from Utah has in mind is the Lisbon agreement, which provides for the formation of a certain number of divisions by the end of 1952 in various of the European countries.

Mr. WATKINS. That is another agreement. But what have the Western European countries done to implement the agreement?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The divisions are being formed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Three days after the French Premier who signed the Lisbon agreement returned to Paris, his cabinet fell and he no longer was Premier.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, that is one of the problems we face. On the other hand, those countries are really taking action.

Mr. WATKINS. It is one thing to sign agreements, but it is quite another to carry them out.

I wish to go along with the program; but I believe the American people desire to know, as I do, what the other countries will do under the program, before we authorize it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Utah has always been most cooperative, and I think he takes a correct position.

Mr. WATKINS. This agreement will affect generations of Americans yet to come, and I believe we must be sure that our people will not be tied up in an organization which will be a drag on our future and may endanger our very existence.

If this plan has the backing of the peoples of the other countries, that is one thing. On the other hand, if the opposition to the plan in those countries, which has been described in the dispatches which have come to us, is so strong that there is no likelihood of having unity in those countries in favor of the agreement, it may be a dangerous one for us to enter into.

In other words, if we are to have allies, our allies must be ready to go all the way with us. On the other hand, if they are split in the middle, they are not likely to help us to defend the free world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator from Utah's points are very well taken, and I do not disagree with him at all.

We must choose as between the alternatives: Shall we take the initiative and move along the road that is before us; or shall we say, "No; we will do nothing"? If we say we will do nothing, I believe nothing will come from this movement. I say this very frankly, because I do not believe any other country is in a position to take the leadership.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey and to the Senator from Utah that it is entirely possible that the Senate of the United States has seldom taken a step so important as the decision it will make on this treaty, in addition to the decision the Senate has made on the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, and all the arrangements which thereby will be brought into being.

I am sorry indeed to see that the Senate Chamber is almost empty at the time when this question is being discussed. Whether the Senate as a whole agrees with my position in every case or does not agree with my position, makes little difference.

I believe the Senate as a whole should have heard the discussion on the part of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I believe that more Senators should have been in the Chamber to hear the discussion by the Senator from New Jersey. Senators should be here to learn more about this most vital and historic matter and the step that it is proposed the Senate take in connection with this treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I hope the Senate will become a little more attentive to this matter before the vote is taken on a proposal which may determine the destiny of our country for unknown generations to come.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me, permit me to say that I agree wholeheartedly with what the Senator from Iowa has just said. If we spend more time in investigating proposals before we agree to them, we probably shall have less difficulty in the future. As a shining example of that situation, I refer to the present Korean war. If we had given more thought to that situation before we entered it, we probably would not be in the position in which we find ourselves today. We cannot afford many more Korean episides. We cannot afford to be tied to a commitment to send our materials and our men all over the world, and at the same time leave ourselves practically undefended at home, unless we are to be reasonably sure of the wholehearted cooperation of the peoples who believe as we do.

On the other hand, if those peoples are split, as the recent dispatches indicate is the case in England, Germany, and France, we should know about that situation and should give our serious consideration to it.

I deplore that not more Senators are on the floor at this time, for what we do in the foreign field has tremendous effect upon our lives, and determines whether there will be controls, inflation, heavy expenditures, heavy taxes, and broken homes, as a result of having men of America taken from their families and their ordinary pursuits. Moreover, we know that steps such as the one now proposed may completely endanger the entire future of our country.

So it seems to me we must give greater consideration to the agreements we make, unless we intend to take them lightly and to say, "Oh, well, if this agreement does not work out all right, we shall get out of it." Certainly we do not wish to take that attitude. I have the highest respect for the honor of our Nation, and we must honor our obligations.

Therefore we should give more careful consideration to the steps it is proposed that we take, and we must give more consideration to avoiding getting into trouble, so that we shall not have to spend so much time and trouble and so many human lives in getting out of trouble.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator from Utah.

Previously in my speech on the Mutual Security Program, Mr. President, I gave the figures in regard to the foreign forces that are in being at the present time. Today those forces have reached more than 50 percent of the Lisbon goal, as set for the end of 1952. In other words, in about one-half of the time about 50 percent of that goal has been reached.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are the actual numbers secret?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The actual numbers by country are secret.

Mr. FERGUSON. I so understood.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Lisbon goal, of course, calls for 50 divisions, of which 25 shall be fully active by December 1952, and the others readily mobilizable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then is the Senator from New Jersey saying that at the present time 25 divisions are actually in existence and armed?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The goal at the end of 1952 is 50 divisions, of which 25 are to be fully armed and combat worthy, and the other 25 are to be partially equipped, depending upon the speed of our implementation of equipment. I am not sure of this, but I think that at the present time approximately 25 divisions are in being.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I had in mind. In other words, that would be about half the goal.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That would be half the total goal for the year 1952. Mr. President, I yield the floor, unless there are further questions.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I apologize. I remember that the Senator from South Dakota told me he wanted to ask some questions. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE. What would the Senator say is to be the position of Berlin with respect to the Federal Republic of Germany, under the compact?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the best answer to that is to read the section of the compact which is accepted in the Hickenlooper interpretation. Article 2 provides as follows:

1, The Three Powers—

That is, the three occupying powers who are parties to this convention with Germany—

1. The Three Powers retain, in view of the international situation, the rights, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to (a) the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, (b) Berlin, and (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

2. The Federal Republic, on its part, will refrain from any action prejudicial to these rights and will cooperate with the Three Powers to facilitate their exercise.

Mr. CASE. I notice that article 6 contains references to Berlin.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me add that Berlin is still occupied by Russia, on the one side, and by the Three Powers on the other. There is no change in that status.

Mr. CASE. Article 7 provides:

3. In the event of the unification of Germany the Three Powers will, subject to such adjustments as may be agreed, extend to a unified Germany the rights which the Federal Republic has under the present Convention and the related Conventions and will for their part agree that the rights under the treaties for the formation of an integrated European community should be similarly extended.

That contemplates the possible unification of the Russian zone, but not particularly of Berlin.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Of course, if and when the Russian zone comes in and complete unification is achieved, that will bring Berlin in, also. At the same time, Berlin was treated as a separate problem. I may call to the attention of Senators the status of the city of Berlin, which appears on page 23 of the committee's report under the heading "City of Berlin."

Mr. CASE. Going back a little bit, in article 7 we read:

2. Pending the peace settlement, the Three Powers and the Federal Republic will cooperate to achieve, by peaceful means, their common aim of a unified Germany enjoying a liberal-democratic constitution, like that of the Federal Republic, and integrated within the European community.

In other words, the compact contemplates that if there should be a unification of Germany, or if Berlin itself should be brought into the same status as that of the Federal Republic, it would not necessarily be the Federal Republic, but would be an organization similar to that of the Federal Republic.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe that is what is contemplated. I know that during the hearing we asked what was meant by "a liberal-democratic constitution," and on page 11 of the same document from which the Senator is reading mention is made of the basic democratic order. The best definition we could get of the words "a liberal-democratic constitution" was the kind of constitution which the present Federal Republic of Germany has. It would not get away from the pattern.

Mr. CASE. The basic question about which I was thinking was this: Assuming that Berlin, in the Soviet zone, were to become a part of unified Germany, with a government like that of the Federal Republic, would the succeeding government automatically assume the obligations toward the Three Powers which are established for the Federal Republic in this compact?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should not think that that would happen automatically. I think we would have come to the place in unification where we would have to have a reconsideration of the whole subject. We are now merely contemplating unification in the future. I am not sure of that. I am now stating my opinion. But my judgment would be that we would have to have a reconsideration of the situation, if we were to bring about the unification of all Germany.

Mr. CASE. Does that imply that an escape from the obligations of the compact would be made possible by the unification of Germany?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to offer a suggestion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is in this treaty a provision that, if the circumstances change, the powers may then get together for the purpose of modifying or altering the treaty. In my judgment the situation referred to by the Senator from South Dakota would

be treated in that way. I mean the circumstances would be such that that clause might be brought into play.

Mr. CASE. Let there be no misunderstanding in the record, so far as the position of the junior Senator from South Dakota is concerned. I am thoroughly in favor of a compact with the Federal Republic. I thoroughly favor granting the Federal Republic the widest possible latitude in the control of its affairs, internal and external. If anything, I think a treaty with Germany has been too long delayed.

I remember saying, at the time the Japanese Peace Treaty was before us, it was anomalous that we should be ratifying a treaty with Japan before we had made a treaty with Germany. In fact, in 1947, when I was a member of a special committee of the House on aid for Europe, I said that we should not hesitate to do what we are now proposing to do, and that we should encourage the formation of Germany into a free republic, and should encourage unity between Germany and the Western World. So, Mr. President, let there be no misunderstanding about my attitude. It seems to me, however, it ought to be perfectly clear that the addition of Berlin, or the addition of the Soviet zone to unified Germany, should not mean a lessening of the responsibilities accepted by the Federal Republic. I do not think that in any sense the mere creation of a like republic should, so far as they are concerned, give the Federal Republic an escape from the obligations which they are now assuming, nor a lessening of their responsibilities. Through this compact we join with them in asking for the maintenance of peace in Western Europe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I do not think it would release them, but I agree with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in thinking that a new situation would be created.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a rule, are not treaty obligations to be construed in the light of changed facts and circumstances? If an important change were to occur, such as the inclusion of East Germany with the Federal Republic, it might even require a change on our part, or, depending upon the circumstances, we might desire a modification of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should think so. I believe article 10 covers the point raised by the Senator from Michigan. I read from page 13 of the compilation of documents:

ARTICLE 10

The Three Powers and the Federal Republic will review the terms of the present Convention and the related Conventions—

(a) upon the request of any one of them, in the event of the unification of Germany or the creation of a European federation; or

(b) upon the occurrence of any other event which all of the Signatory States recognize to be of a similarly fundamental character.

Thereupon, they will, by mutual agreement, modify the present Convention and related Conventions to the extent made necessary or advisable by the fundamental change in the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I suggest to the Senator from South Dakota, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit, that I think one important point is that the Federal Republic of Germany is being dealt with in this treaty as and when it comes into effect as a sovereign nation subject to certain retained limitations on its sovereignty. In other words, we have troop rights, military rights, and there is established a board with some members appointed by Germany, some by the three powers, and some independent members which will pass on certain questions which may arise in connection with the settlement of the rights of foreigners and difficulties growing out of the war.

So I think the point is that West Germany is dealt with in the main and in principle on the basis that it is a sovereign nation. If that sovereign nation then undertakes to take in East Germany on unification, or to take in Berlin, that becomes a problem of whether this sovereign nation which has made a firm commitment can withdraw from it or can alter or change it without the conference to which the Senator from New Jersey has referred as contained in the treaty.

Mr. CASE. Of course, I would hope that it could not withdraw.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we wanted to take some other country into the United States, the question of whether that country becoming a part of this country would assume and agree to obligations, or whether we would want to alter them in the light of changed conditions, is a matter similar to that which is covered by the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. CASE. I think it does.

I should like to express the hope, however, that when unification comes—and I hope it does come for both Berlin and the eastern zone—it will be a joining of those additional areas with the Federal Republic, rather than the creation of a new government nearly like the present government. I should like to build on the foundations established in Western Germany for a new united Germany.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I agree with the Senator. We have laid the foundation, and we should follow through with it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So long as the Senator has brought up the subject, let me say that no one can tell exactly what the situation will be in the future. But assuming, for instance, that East Germany, with a satisfactory east boundary—and, of course, that is a problem which may not be settled for a long time—should become incorporated with West Germany into the Federal Republic of Germany, which is a technical name for the new nation which is being created; suppose they wanted to come in and accept the conditions, and make a completely unified Germany, accepting all the terms and conditions of the treaty; there probably would be very little discussion, but probably paper work and detail. Suppose, however, the Federal Republic of Germany wanted to unite with East Germany and create a new entity, with a different approach to some of their basic laws and a different approach to some of their international situations, that would involve the Federal Republic of Germany withdrawing from the obligations which it has assumed in the treaty, thus endangering the unity which is being created under the compact, and ending the so-called consultations which are provided for in the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That would bring article 10 into operation.

Mr. CASE. My question was whether they would create a new government or join the present Government. My hope would be that it would be the present Republic which would be extended, rather than creating a new government.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

During the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey,

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey, a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the convention on relations between the three powers and the Federal Republic of Germany and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I shall vote to approve the proposed compact with the Western German Republic. In my opinion, at the present moment, under the circumstances we face, and on the basis of the arrangements made, we have no alternative.

But I would be false to my conscience if I did not pronounce my fears and express my misgivings. I wish we did have an alternative.

But today we are in the grip of forces we cannot control; we can only keep alert to them. We have had to make a choice between including Western Germany as an equal partner in the Atlantic community of free nations or of taking the chance that Western Germany would fall under Soviet domination

We have made what has seemed to our own foreign and military policy makers the only possible choice. I accept that choice. And I must vote for the compact which has been worked out to implement that choice.

I do not believe in fact that Western Germany is yet ready to assume the full obligations and responsibilities of equal partnership in a defensive alliance of the free world. It is only 8 years and a month since Nazi Germany surrendered, after the most terrible world conflict, the most awful destruction, and the most barbaric interlude the world had known up to that time. It seemed almost a miracle, in retrospect, that the world was saved from conquest and enslavement by this same nation, whom we must now, perforce, embrace as an ally.

It is true that this nation or that part of it west of the Elbe had adopted a democratic regime. Its leaders are today believers in democracy. The party in power

and the chief opposition party accept constitutional processes.

But no observer who has been in Germany is satisfied that the elements within Germany which gave rise to nazism have been rooted out or even permanently chastened. Supernationalism is still there. Racial prejudice and racial philosophy still have powerful tap roots into the subsurface of the national life. And the martial spirit which we once condemned so bitterly is now being encouraged by us, for Germany must contribute, it is said, to the defense of Europe.

The German people, naturally enough, are demanding a price for their participation in the defense of Western Europe. It could not be otherwise. That price is set down, in part, in the pending compact. Germany must be freed of most of the restrictions imposed upon her in defeat and surrender. She is to be regarded as a sovereign nation, with all the attributes of sovereignty, including responsibility for keeping the peace and maintaining a democratic regime.

If the price set down in the compact were the full payment no one could object; it would certainly be, in major respects, an equitable arrangement. But there are many keen observers of the German scene who believe, regretfully, that this is but a down payment, and that, by the natural force of events, greater and greater payments will continuously be demanded, and that we shall have no alternative but to make those payments.

No one questions the good faith of the present leaders of Western Germany. Chancelor Adenauer is, according to all accounts, sincerely devoted to, even determined, to honor all the obligations which Germany has accepted under the pending contract. Chancelor Adenauer is, I believe, a firm believer in democracy, and is deeply committed to the cause of freedom and of a free and united world. He understands more clearly than most the dangers of resurgent nationalism and racism in Germany. He is firmly committed to the cause of the west.

The leader of the chief opposition party, Dr. Kurt Schumacher, is equally, I am told, a convinced believer in democracy. He is a fervent crusader for freedom and for social justice, although his attitude toward German participation in the European defense effort on the present terms is less than enthusiastic.

My uneasiness and mental reservations in regard to the proposed pact do not stem from either of these leaders. They stem from the fact that, in my judgment, Germany is being cast in a role in which extreme elements may have an increasing appeal to the German people. And the safeguards against such a development may be, I fear, insufficient to control the course of events.

I do not say that at this time we are in a position to establish more adequate safeguards. Perhaps it is too late for truly effective safeguards.

But when we had the authority and the power, we did not use them effectively for the purpose of strengthening the internal forces within Germany which could have banished the fears some of us now entertain. Perhaps it was not possible. Certainly the tension of struggle between East and West within Germany and over Germany left little time or disposition for a basic treatment of the real problem of Germany.

So today we can only hope that what we have done, and what we are here doing will contribute to the cause of peace and security, and the cause of justice. We can only hope that what we have done and are doing will redound to the best interests—the long-range best interests—of the German people.

I wish the German people well. With a whole heart I would welcome them back into the Atlantic community of free and equal peoples, to dedicate their unquestioned genius and talents to the cause of a peaceful and prosperous world. Whether we have done and are doing the right thing to provide a true welcome, and a true return is a mystery I cannot fathom. Time holds the answer to that riddle.

I only say, before casting my vote in favor of this compact, that we must not be blind to the dangers we create by this act. We must never cease to encourage the democratic elements within Germany, nor to discourage and to resist, in every proper way, the growth of elements which can endanger the peace and security of Europe and the world just as surely as do the evil forces on the other side of the Elbe. We must remember that the will in Western Germany to reunification with Eastern Germany is a force so potent that it cannot be measured in purely diplomatic, ideological, or military terms. That force must always be reckoned with.

I pray with all my heart that what we are doing here today will be for the benefit not only of the German people, and of the American people, but of all the peoples of Europe and will not come back to plague us in the years ahead.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the colloquy which has taken place within the past 10 minutes between Senators on the other side of the aisle illustrates the provisional or temporary nature of the compacts which are now before the Senate.

It is encouraging to everyone who has engaged in the titanic struggle to secure and maintain the peace of the world that the hearings held on the pending convention by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee show conclusively that that committee was fully alert to the gravity, the scope, and the implications of these compacts, and examined with great care the realities lying below the surface of these agreements and also the possible consequences which may flow from putting them into effect.

That was the subject of the discussion we have just heard. We have been ready to act speedily on these agreements so as to have a desirable effect on the deliberations of the parliaments of France and Germany. We must certainly act in such a way as to produce the desired result. But in our discussions with the committee we did not hurry over these questions which have such a profound bearing on the future peace of the world and of the survival of our civilization.

The committee approved the agreements, and the Senate is going to ratify them, I am sure, very speedily and unanimously. In the circumstances, this is the only conceivable action for us to take. Delay or hesitation on our part would be open to misinterpretation abroad. Refusal to ratify, in view of the leadership of our Government in bringing about these agreements, is unthinkable.

With respect to the rearming of Germany and establishing a community containing only a portion of the partitioned Germany, we cannot at this time revise United States policy. If we accept the military estimate that Europe cannot be defended against Russia without an armed German force, then we must accept the consequences of the estimate and proceed with the rearmament of that portion of Germany which is subject to our influence and negotiation. Whether this rearmament of Germany should take place within the framework of the European defense community rather than within a larger structure is a matter which the Senate cannot debate at this time. That is the way it is going to be done, whatever we may think of it.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, let us have no illusions about what we are doing. We must be prepared to assume the enormous risks and tremendous commitments which rearmament of Germany within a European framework entails. It must never be said that the Senate of the United States approved this policy and its implementation without knowing precisely and fully what was involved. It should also be recognized that these agreements are not going to bring about a permanent structure in Europe. They are not the culmination of policy; they are the barest beginnings of a policy. They are provisional and temporary. They will be revised and amended as time goes on.

When these agreements and the European defense community treaty have been ratified by all interested parties, the process of German rearmament can begin.

The signatories to the EDC treaty hope and believe that the rearmed Germany can be contained within the framework of the European defense community. It seems vital that the Senate know the assurances that exist to further the realization of this expectation.

During the hearings on these conventions, I submitted seven written questions to Commissioner McCloy. Question No. 5, which is found on page 103 of the hearings, is as follows:

This is question No. 5:

What is the exact nature of the guaranties which the United States and her European allies have against a possible withdrawal of Germany from the European Defense Community?

This is the answer of Commissioner McCloy:

Answer. The US and UK Governments have made an explicit statement in the tripartite declaration issued at Paris on May 27, 1952, that any action from whatever quarter which threatens the integrity or unity of the European Defense Community will be regarded by the two Governments as a threat to their own security. Such a threat could come either from without or within the Community. Although the US/UK Armed Forces in Europe (including the Federal Republic of Germany) will be stationed there for purposes of the common defense and the statement is not directed against any particular country, it seems clear that action by any single country to withdraw from the Community would in practice be impossible while such forces continue to be stationed in Europe for the defense of the North Atlantic Treaty area. Furthermore, the close interrelationship between NATO and EDC and the fact that the European Defense Forces will be under the Allied Supreme Commander will be further safeguards against such a possibility. The complete interrelationship of the basic industries of the participating countries through the Schuman plan will be an

additional practical guaranty against withdrawal by any one nation.

Mr. President, I wish to comment on the guaranties which were listed by Commissioner McCloy in answer to my question as to what guaranties existed. First, in the tripartite declaration of May 27, 1952, the United States and Britain have explicitly stated that any action which threatens the integrity of unity of the EDC will be regarded as a threat to their own security. This means that if Germany withdrew from the EDC, we would consult with our allies and seek some other means of meeting the threat to our security. The declaration does not itself constitute a real guaranty, but only a diplomatic or legal guaranty. It would have to be backed up by force of some kind.

This is the second guaranty he listed: Action by a single country to withdraw from the EDC would in practice, Mr. McCloy further states, be impossible while the United States and the United Kingdom forces continued to be stationed in Europe. They are to stay in Germany under the terms of the contractual agreement so long as the agreement remains in effect in its present form. Thus, the physical presence of six American divisions and a number of British divisions in Western Germany constitutes a real guaranty so long as they are there.

The third guaranty to which the Commissioner alluded was that EDC forces will be under the Allied Supreme Commander. This is another legal-type guaranty. If the Allied Supreme Commander were defied, his control over the EDC would prove purely nominal, unless he used troops to compel obedience. It is the troops again who provide the real assurance, not the treaty terms.

The fourth guaranty he listed was the Schuman plan. The Schuman plan will bring about such a complete inter-relationship of the basic industries of the member countries that it will be an added practical guaranty against one member withdrawing, says Mr. McCloy. This sounds like a real guaranty; but since it is based on legal and diplomatic arrangements which can be altered or broken, it is not a real guaranty in the same sense as the presence of British and American troops.

Then, Mr. President, since the really effective guaranty of the integrity and unity of the EDC is the presence of British and American troops on German soil, we may properly ask what would happen to the EDC and to Germany's relationship to the EDC if those troops were no longer there? If the really effective gauranty is removed, does it not follow that, should any member nation wish to withdraw from the EDC, or from the Schuman plan, she could do so by her own decision, and with no power able to prevent it?

Conditions now prevailing in Europe, in Britain or the United States are not going to remain permanently as they are today. What if a new administration came into office in the United States and decided to pull American troops out of Germany? What if a new government in Britain decided to cut its continental commitments and withdraw its troops? What real guaranty would then remain to the other allies in Europe that Germany would not withdraw from the EDC?

Or, approaching the same problem from another angle, suppose that, as Germany resumes its independence and grows stronger, the nationalist spirit becomes dominant again. This is certainly not out of the question. Suppose that the Germans demand that United States troops leave their country, and suppose popular passions sweep Germany as they have swept India and Egypt and Indonesia and other countries occupied by foreign troops, or where foreign troops have been stationed in the name of common defense. How will we deal with this problem before world opinion, if the Germans say they do not want us to remain there and do not need the defense of our troops?

If we are obliged by German public opinion, encouraged by Communists, neutralists, nationalists, and so forth, to pull our troops back from Germany, what then remains of the real guaranty backing the EDC?

It can be argued that this will not happen, because the German people in large numbers are now eagerly European-minded, and that the German Government is one of the principal supporters of the idea of European union. But we will not always have the same German leaders to deal with. Not only will the composition and the policy of Western Germany change, but if Germany is reunited, as the overwhelming majority of Germans want it to be, a wholly different set of forces, with new leadership, will come to power in Germany. The climate of opinion in the country will surely change, and not necessarily for the better.

I am not saying those things are likely to occur, but in estimating the commitments we are making and the responsibility we are assuming, we would be derelict in our estimate of our responsibilities if we did not anticipate what might possibly occur.

Article 10 of the contractual agreement, which the eminent Senator from New Jersey has cited two or three times, specifies that the agreement will be reviewed and revised under certain conditions. One of these conditions is the unification of Germany. What would we do if a unified Germany of 70,000,000 people decided that they did not want to remain in the EDC, that they wanted to be neutral or set up a third force, that they wanted us to withdraw our Armed Forces from their country, that they wanted to work with the Soviet bloc against the west? Where would be the guaranties against this kind of threat?

Furthermore, all these agreements are essentially predicated on the continued partition of Germany—the very thing which the Germans want to end as soon as possible—a desire with which we fully sympathize.

If the West Germans come to believe that their membership in the EDC prevents unification of their country, will they not strain every muscle to break away from the west—especially if the Russians offer the tempting bids they have at their disposal: Return of the eastern provinces, return of the territories occupied by Poland, markets in the Soviet bloc and in China, even partnership in a new try for conquest of the world? The Russians have most of the trumps in the game of unifying Germany. If our troops were obliged to leave Germany, for one reason or another, what real power would then remain to us to prevent their accepting these Russian offers?

In answer to another question of mine, No. 6, Mr. McCloy replied that Germany would not be able to dominate the EDC because (a) of the structure and procedures of the European Defense Community and the voting power of its members; (b) and the nature and size of the German contribution to the EDC which are not fixed by Germany but by the EDC.

Yet again, this is predicated on Germany remaining partitioned, with the western part in the EDC and the eastern part held by the Communists. Even if German reunification does not take place, the tremendous economic and industrial revival in Western Germany is going to increase Germany's weight in the EDC regardless of what the other members think or do.

If Germany is reunited, does anyone expect that the EDC will retain the same structure and procedures and voting power? Will 70,000,000 Germans be content to accept a position of equality with 45,000,000 Frenchmen or 45,000,000 Italians, especially in view of the immensely superior German economy?

Whenever Germany is strong enough or the situation is ripe enough, she will try to reunite. The minute this occurs, the whole European picture will change in radical fashion. Whenever Germany is united she will be strong enough—in manpower, in industry, in organization, in efficiency—to dominate Western Europe, regardless of what the French or the British or we want to do about it. Is there a man alive willing to predict that such a German-led Europe would necessarily remain within the Atlantic framework? Our whole policy is to place Germany in a purely European continental framework, and hope to keep that European structure within the larger Atlantic frame. But if Germany succeeds in dominating the European structure, it will be she, and not we, who will determine whether a German-dominated Europe stays with the west, takes a neutral third force position, or collaborates with the Russians.

We must and should proceed with the ratification of these agreements. But we should all keep in our minds that this is not the last word on this problem, but is only one of the first words. We are not building an edifice. We are building a foundation for an edifice. If we imagine that by approving these agreements, we shall obtain a German contribution to European defense which will then make it possible for us to withdraw

our troops and bring our boys home again, then we will be making the greatest mistaken assumption of the year.

My only positive contribution to this problem is the suggestion that we think less about integrating Europe, which most probably cannot contain Germany, united or not, and more about integrating the Atlantic community so as to bring Germany into a framework where she can be a vital but not dominant force because of British and American power in that framework. To have a united Germany within NATO and the Atlantic community will be imminently desirable and it will be far more possible than to try to hold her in a European community and keep the European community on our side in the critical months and years ahead.

I close with this repeated statement: It is my fervent hope that there will not be a vote cast against the ratification of the conventions which are before the Senate, that there will be no crippling reservations, and that the action will be as speedy as possible.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize, with all the force I can bring to bear, that this is a preliminary step. It is a provisional step, and until it is supplemented by something that is more definite, we have nothing in the way of a guaranty to our hopes except the mutual confidence and the stationing of American and British troops in the area affected.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to join with the distinguished Members of the Senate who have spoken before me to urge ratification of the two agreements with respect to Germany which have been presented to the Senate for ratification.

I fully recognize what the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] has just said, that this is not the consummation of a problem. It is the first step toward a consummation which may require 50 or even 100 years, or may never occur. We are facing international facts, and we are shaping international policy. We are recognizing that the world is still on fire. We have put out some of the bonfires on the globe, but in putting out the Nazi fire we have created a source for still greater fires, namely, the Kremlin.

THE NATURE OF THE TWO AGREEMENTS

The first of these agreements is the convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany. This important measure was signed at Bonn, capital of the Federal Republic on May 26, at a ceremony which I was privileged to attend.

The second is a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty extending the guaranties of that treaty to the European territory of the members of the European defense community. There are six members of the European defense community; five of them are already members of the North Atlantic Treaty. Thus, the only practical effect of this protocol is to extend the protection of the North Atlantic Treaty to Germany. That is very significant. We must recognize that in trying to understand what we are doing here today.

Mr. President, anticipating the favorable report by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I had already spoken in the Senate on June 6 in favor of ratification of these agreements.

I wonder if we should not stop to ask ourselves: What other course is open? What do we want to do? Do we want to maintain the status quo? What is the status quo?

No one knows what the status quo will be tomorrow, because the Kremlin is in the saddle over there. But when we move, as we are moving today, we are taking over the reins and we are indicating to the Kremlin and to the world that we are planning for a united, effective Europe; and that the free nations of Europe are moving, slowly at times and more rapidly at other times, toward unification, politically and economically.

I pointed out that we really had no feasible alternative but to ratify. I based my conclusion on my personal experiences in Europe, on my first-hand talks with diplomatic leaders of the German Federal Republic and other western nations.

At this time I shall not take a great deal of time of the Senate to present in elaborate detail further reasons for approval of these agreements. I believe that by and large the importance of these agreements is clearly understood and, besides, the hour is growing late in this, the second session of the Eighty-second Congress.

I should like first, however, to ask unanimous consent that there be printed a brief résumé of the principal agreements which were signed relative to Germany.

There being no objection, the résumé was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF AGREEMENTS

The first of these treaties, and one of the two which are before us for ratification, is the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany. This convention restores to the Federal Republic full authority over its external and internal affairs except for matters relating to (a) the stationing of armed forces of the Three Powers in Germany; (b) Berlin; (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

The Three Powers also retain ample authority to deal with any emergency which may arise.

There are three subsidiary conventions to this main convention. They are provided for by the main convention; and although they are not themselves before the Senate, they will be approved when we ratify the main convention. These subsidiary conventions are:

1. Convention on the Settlement of Matters Arising Out of the War and the Occupation: This is something of a housekeeping convention, providing for winding up all the odds and ends left over from the occupation. It deals with such matters as the decartelization and deconcentration of industry, the restitution of property seized by the Nazis, displaced persons and refugees, foreign claims, civil aviation in Germany, and diplomatic facilities of the Three Powers in the Federal Republic.

2. Convention on the Rights and Obligations of Foreign Forces and Their Members in the Federal Republic of Germany: This convention establishes the conditions under which our Armed Forces will be stationed in Germany. It was negotiated in close consultation with the Department of Defense, which has expressed its entire satisfaction with what has been provided. The convention deals with such matters as criminal and civil jurisdiction over the members of our forces in Germany; the rights of the forces to move about the country, to use communication and transportation facilities, and to take other measures necessary for defense; the German customs and tax treatment of the forces, and German support of the forces through the provision of supplies, services, and labor.

3. Finance convention: This convention regulates the financial arrangements for the foreign forces stationed in Germany. Perhaps its most important provision is the obligation of the Federal Republic to make a continuing contribution to western defense comparable to the contributions of other participants. Until June 30, 1953, this contribution is set at 850,000,000 Deutschemarks a month—about $210,000,000. After June 30, 1953, the contribution will be determined on the same basis that the contribution of NATO countries to the common defense is determined.

The second document before the Senate for ratification is a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty extending the guaranties of that treaty to the European territory of the members of the European Defense Community. There are six members of EDC, and five of them are already members of NATO; so the only practical effect of this protocol is to extend the North Atlantic Treaty to Germany.

As I indicated, these treaties are only part of a much more complex network of agreements, which the Senate is not called upon to ratify but which are nonetheless of transcendant importance. I shall try to summarize these agreements, statements, and understandings briefly:

First, the treaty constituting the European Defense Community. This is signed by France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, and West Germany. Those six countries agree to pool their national armies into an international European army, which will have a common uniform and a common training program and will be under the international command of General Ridgway.

Second, a protocol to this treaty in which the members of the European Defense Community agree to regard any attack on a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as an attack on themselves.

Third, a treaty between the United Kingdom and the member states of the European Defense Community in which the United Kingdom and the members of the EDC give one another reciprocal pledges of assistance in case of armed attack on either.

Fourth, a tripartite declaration by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France stating their great interest in the success of the new security arrangements in Western Europe. The Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom declare that they will regard any action threatening the integrity or unity of the European Defense Community as a threat to their own security and that they will act in accordance with article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which provides for consultation. The three powers also reaffirm their intention to maintain armed forces in Berlin and declare that they will treat any attack against Berlin as an attack against themselves.

Fifth, the treaty constituting the European Coal and Steel Community. This brings into being the much-discussed Schuman plan for integrating the West European coal and steel industry. The parties to this treaty are the same as to the European Defense Community Treaty. The coal and

steel community accomplishes in the field of industry what the defense community does in the field of the military. It has been ratified by all the parties, and representatives are meeting this week to bring the organizations provided for into being.

WE MUST NOT HARM FABRIC OF COOPERATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it should be remembered that while the Senate is being confronted with but two such agreements, all of the various European nations involved, 15 in all, will have a total of 47 separate ratification actions.

These actions comprise in total a delicate pattern of European cooperation. If any one country is to break that pattern, then dire consequences will be felt in all of the remaining countries. The entire structure has been built painstakingly, and I have cautioned any group or any individual who would possibly damage that structure and thereby bring closer the ominous cloud of world war III.

RESOUNDING BIPARTISAN APPROVAL NECESSARY

Mr. President, within this next week, one of the great parties of our country, the Republican Party, will nominate its choice for President of the United States. Two weeks later, the Democratic Party will nominate its choice. It is most fitting that in this period prior to the actions by the respective parties, the members of both political parties in the Senate decisively and resoundingly agree on this subject of German security.

Anyone who is familiar at all with the history of Germany and with the great, dynamic qualities of the German people, knows how important it is that Germany be made part of the west. That is what we are playing for today. We realize that if Germany should fall into the Russian orbit the real struggle for the world would be on. From my own personal experience, and from talking with the leaders of West Germany and with the common people, I know that there is no kinship between the German and communism.

The German people in the west know what the German people in the east are undergoing. We have been credibly informed by those who know, from contact with the 18,000,000 Germans in East Germany, that if the east Germans had a chance to vote, less than 10 percent would go with the Communists. The Germans of East Germany have had an opportunity to go into West Germany and to see the difference in the economy, in the standard of living, and in political freedom. Whatever may be said about the German, it must be admitted that he is keen to observe, keen to apprehend, and keen in many other ways. Consequently, if and when the treaties become the law of the treaty-making nations, it will be a step in the right direction toward building a unified Europe and bringing, we trust, a unified Germany into being in the future.

I am convinced that no partisan factor will enter into this particular vote on the German agreements, because it is recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike that Germany is the key to Western Europe.

If Germany falls into the lap of communism, as I said, Western Europe will no doubt similarly fall. If Germany is preserved as a bulwark for a peaceful, prosperous Europe, then we shall have been able to hold the ramparts against the communistic onslaught.

LET THERE BE NO PLAYING WITH THE POWDER KEG

Let there be no playing with matches near the powder keg. The hydrogen bomb is in the offing, and with it the possibility of wiping out life on this planet. Let no man, let no party seek partisan advantage in a situation which could lead to war and the suicide of civilization. If Russia controlled Germany, she would be infinitely stronger, infinitely more likely to light the fuse which could ignite world war III. That must not happen.

INTERPRETATIONS WERE ADVISABLE, BUT NOT CRUCIAL

In the course of these further remarks, Mr. President, I should like to make but a few additional points. First, however, I should like to clarify the matter of the interpretations which were proposed to both of these agreements.

The committee agreed to an interpretation to the convention with Germany, but rejected an interpretation to the North Atlantic Treaty protocol.

I voted for both of these interpretations because I felt that they would provide additional safeguards for our own constitutional processes without damaging our foreign relations or interfering in any way with the substantive provisions of the treaties.

But now, Mr. President, I should like to spell out the background of the exact reasons for prompt ratification. I emphasize "prompt" because I do feel that it would be inconceivable for this session to conclude without such action being taken.

Events are moving fast in Europe. The Secretary of State has just held a conference with British Foreign Secretary Eden and French Foreign Minister Schuman. The diplomats agreed to open negotiations for a 4-power conference with the Russians, with the agenda to be strictly limited to the question of proposed elections in Communist Germany.

We all know of the tremendous propaganda drive which the Communists have put on (backed by so-called neutralists) in which they have urged that a Big Four conference be held. We, however, remember Communist tactics in previous such conferences, and have been extremely skeptical and have wisely limited the agenda.

REDS HAVE SET UP NO-MAN'S LAND AT GERMAN BORDER

Another important development has been the establishment by the Soviets of a so-called security zone between the borders of Eastern Germany and Western Germany.

This is an ominous 3-mile wide cordon running for the entire 830 miles of the frontier's length. In this zone, bridges have been blown up, roads blocked, towns and villages evacuated, in order to establish a complete no-man's land between the east and the west. This is a grim indication of the Soviet attitude. It shows what cards the Soviets will play.

Meanwhile, throughout the length and breadth of the iron curtain, a "hate America," "hate the warmonger" propaganda campaign is increasing in fury. There is grave doubt as to the ultimate significance of that campaign. Often, we know dictatorships prepare their people for aggressive war by falsely attributing plans for aggressive war to their possible enemy.

With this background in mind, let us ask who principally opposes these German agreements The answer is clear. We all know that it is the Soviet Union which is making a superhuman effort to secure the rejection of the German peace agreements. The Communists in Western Germany have been ordered to produce as much riot, disturbance, and conflict as possible so as to secure rejection of these treaties. They know that if they can defeat the agreements, they can win a battle in the war to control Germany and thereby control Europe.

In France, too, Communist forces have been agitating against the German agreements. As a matter of fact, it has been predicted that in France there will be an extremely close margin by which the German agreements will either be rejected or ratified.

SLIM MARGIN OF POWER AGAINST NEUTRALISTS

We should not presume, therefore, Mr. President, that we have all the leeway in the world in the present international situation.

On the contrary, we are skating on very thin ice indeed. The margin of power between our friends and our enemies, and/or the neutralists in Western Europe is exceedingly slim. Mr. Bevan's wing of the Labor Party in England, Dr. Schumacher's Socialists in Germany, the French Socialists and Communists in France, the Italian Communists in that land—all are actively striving for power; and if they should gain power, the entire structure of the western cooperation could come tumbling down.

So, I have urged that we do nothing or say nothing, therefore, which would impair that structure.

THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE

To state simply and categorically exactly why we should approve these agreements, the first and most basic reason is and has always been that we do not actually have a feasible alternative.

If the Senate were to reject these agreements we would be recklessly issuing an invitation to Russia to take over all of Germany.

Second, we must ratify these agreements because they are indispensable, in part, to what I have described as the basic pattern of intra-European cooperation. They will fit in with the broad-visioned European Defense Community by which the age-old enemies, France and Germany, may be able to work henceforth as allies. There cannot be stability in Western Europe unless there is such French-German cooperation. So far, no one has suggested any other means by which such cooperation can be achieved, except through the European

defense community—an agreement which dovetails with the matters now before us.

We must never forget that not only are we confronted with enemies of the extreme left, but we are confronted with enemies of the extreme right. In southern Italy, followers of Mussolini's fascism are once again gaining power. In Germany, the supernationalism which brought Germany to ruin has been gaining in strength.

We must do nothing which would help bring to power either the extremists of the right or the extremists of the left. We must try to strengthen the hands of those moderates, those statesmen, like Premier de Gasperi and Chancelor Adenaur, who are trying to pilot their countries through both dangers.

GERMAN AGREEMENTS INVOLVE PATRIOTIC UNITY

Mr. President, I have on a number of occasions spoken on the question of bipartisan foreign policy. My approach to that subject has always boiled down to this point: We should commend that which deserves commendation, and oppose that which is unworthy of support.

In this instance, that of the German agreements, we have a splendid example of a patriotic issue on which there can be and must be no partisan differences. The fact that these German agreements have been written by a Democratic administration does not mean and must not mean that Republicans should or would condemn them. On the contrary, the label, the origin, the authorship does not matter. What does matter is the soundness and the merit of the proposal. There is abundant soundness, abundant merit here.

REDS TRY TO PORTRAY UNITED STATES AS DISUNITED

During the 1952 political campaign, we can be sure that the master propagandist of the Soviet Kremlin have been taking down every single harsh word which (a) Republicans have said about Democrats; (b) Republicans have said about Republicans; (c) Democrats have said about Republicans, and (d) Democrats have said about Democrats.

The Kremlin propagandists want to show the people behind the iron curtain, and the peoples of the free areas that America is allegedly hopelessly disunited, that there is chaos in America, that there is no continuity of policy here, that after November the people of Europe may anticipate a complete break in previous American policy, and that we may leave Europe in the lurch.

This is what the Soviet propagandists want to get across to Europe's peoples, and this is the diabolic effort which we must combat.

So I have appealed to the great leaders of both the Republican and Democratic Parties to avoid, if we can possibly avoid it, giving any ammunition to the Soviet propaganda artillery. I have urged that we avoid creating the false impression that we Americans are disunited even on basic principles. One such basic principle is that Germany must not be allowed to fall into the lap of Soviet communism. On that point, we are and will be definitely united.

Representing, as I do, a State in which German-Americans have made great contributions from the very first day that the first immigrant from Germany stepped ashore, I know of the warm ties between our own and the German people.

I know that in my State and throughout the Nation there is a tremendous admiration for the great contributions which Germany has traditionally made to western civilization. German theological leaders and leaders of art, science, music, poetry, and literature, have written themselves indelibly into the history of the world.

On the other hand, we realize full well the harm which has been wrought by German militarism in the past, militarism which we trust will never again rise—thanks to the Schuman plan and thanks to the European Defense Community—to do damage to the people of Germany themselves or to the people of the world.

Mr. President, we must and will ratify these agreements because we do not actually have any feasible alternative. The interpretations which we have made or attempted to make can in no way be used as an argument against approval of these agreements. I know the Senate will overwhelmingly approve these agreements, and I believe that the world will be the better for it.

Mr. President, previously I stated that I supported in committee the Hickenlooper amendment to the protocol.

In the committee I tried to obtain unanimous agreement on the part of the committee, so that we could come to the floor of the Senate with the appropriate provision. However, that was impossible in connection with the Hickenlooper amendment to the protocol.

I wish to state my present position regarding the Hickenlooper amendment to the protocol. The principal arguments against the Hickenlooper interpretation to the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty are that it discriminates against Germany; it would have a destructive impact on all operations under the North Atlantic Treaty; it would be self-defeating; and it is wholly unnecessary.

IT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST GERMANY

First. The United States did not attach this string when it originally ratified the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Second. After considerable discussions, the Senate did not see fit to apply any qualifications designed to go further than the troops-for-Europe resolution when it recently admitted Greece and Turkey to NATO. Why should Germany be treated differently?

Third. If we now attach this rider, we shall be telling Western Germans they are second-class members of the community. Will they ratify under such clear discrimination?

Fourth. The Communist propagandists would like nothing better than such action by us, which would jeopardize German ratification, which already is a hard job for Adenauer.

IT WOULD WEAKEN NATO

You will recall, Mr. President, that the troops-for-Europe resolution deals only with the sending of additional troops to implement our commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty. The Hickenlooper amendment, however, deals with military implementation, not solely with dispatch of troops. This has serious and dangerous implications.

First. Most of the work of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is military implementation. The drawing up of joint strategic plans involving Germany would be military implementation, as would be agreement on sharing the cost of air bases or facilities in Germany, development of common communications facilities, and so on. Should General Ridgway's hands be completely tied in redeploying NATO troops in Germany to meet a new Soviet threat, until the Senate can consider his proposal? Do we want to air in public debate, for the benefit of the Communists, all military implementation of our NATO planning?

Second. What is military implementation? Is it the assignment of any single United States soldier or officer to our forces in Germany? Is it the delivery of a single replacement part? Is it the transfer of a single aircraft from Europe to Germany? Obviously, it would be ridiculous to tie the President's hands to this extent in carrying out a policy already approved by the Senate in ratifying the North Atlantic Treaty.

DAMAGING EFFECT WITHIN OTHER COUNTRIES

First. The Hickenlooper amendment would create grave doubts and suspicions concerning United States intentions and whether we really want ratification and German participation.

Second. It would give powerful ammunition to Communist propagandists who now are waging bitter campaigns to prevent ratification by other countries.

Third. It would inevitably invite additional conflicting interpretations or even reservations by some countries, which would nullify even prevent ratification by the other 15 countries.

IT IS UNNECESSARY

First. Senate Resolution 99 is on the books, and retains full force and effectiveness quite apart from the action on this treaty. That resolution is a clear statement of policy. The Hickenlooper amendment is so ambiguous that its effect could be to weaken, not strengthen, Senate Resolution 99.

Second. The administration has neither acted nor given any indication of an intention to act in any way inconsistent with Senate Resolution 99.

Third. The Secretary of State has testified that contractual agreements and NATO protocol do not enlarge presidential power.

Fourth. The ratification of this treaty can in no way increase or limit the constitutional powers of the President as we know them.

I have stated that the adoption of these interpretations might have an adverse effect upon certain of the European powers. That causes me to pause, in view of the fact that the situation in Europe is not a very healthful one, and

we must watch our step. I believe these agreements to be so important to the security of the United States that I would not want to do anything which might jeopardize their success. The countries of Europe must understand our constitutional processes, of course. I think the first limitation, known as the Hickenlooper limitation, is a proper one. I understand that it has been accepted, and that there will be no contest over it.

I feel, however, that the making of reservations to the protocol might result in misunderstanding and hindrance in obtaining ratification of the treaty by the various other powers; something has been said on the floor, about the other powers not having taken action.

Mr. President, we have taken the lead in this matter. America has been called to leadership, and I feel must continue it. I know of no better way of indicating that we are to lead, and will continue to lead, than to be the first to ratify and make effective these agreements. As has been said many times on this floor, the world is looking to us. Furthermore, the Kremlin looks to us. If there should be any hesitancy in ratifying this treaty, there would be a direct reaction in the Kremlin. We must not hesitate. The Kremlin knows but one answer to any international problem, and that is force. America must grow strong. Yesterday we voted to increase our Air Force to 143 wings. By that action we indicated that we recognized the critical nature of the world situation at the present time. Yes, we indicated by that step that we recognized the seriousness of the world situation.

Let us now indicate that we recognize that it is all-important that we take steps to unify the 300,000,000 of the west who feel that in unity there is strength and safety, and that by unifying the minds, the energy, the inventive genius, and the resources of these 300,000,000 people we shall be able to oppose any aggression undertaken by the Kremlin.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I regret that I was attending a committee meeting and was unable to hear all the Senator's remarks. I am merely seeking information, because I am disposed generally to support the ratification of the treaty which is now before the Senate. But I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, whether, assuming that the Senate were to ratify the treaty and the protocol, there would be a time limitation on ratification by other powers. I do not know whether there is precedent for it, but when a constitutional amendment is sent to the States for ratification in some cases a time limit is set and in other cases not. The general practice is to say that unless the constitutional amendment is ratified by the requisite number of States within a given period of time, it shall be of no force or effect. I am wondering whether there is a time limitation upon ratification by other powers, or whether, once we ratified the treaty and protocol, we would then be committed, and the entire initiative would then pass to the other countries, who might theoretically delay action for 10 years. Furthermore, I am wondering whether we would be bound during that entire period of time, and would lose our freedom of action, when conditions then might be quite different from what they are at present. It would seem to me that certainly some reasonable time limitation should be included, if there is precedent for so doing, so that we would not be committed to an open-ended situation.

Mr. WILEY. I do not think there is any question of our being committed until four signatory nations shall have ratified the convention which is now before the Senate, and also the three conventions mentioned in article 8, in accordance with constitutional processes, and the nations shall have deposited the instruments of ratification with the German Government. Of course, as in the case of an ordinary contract, until the minds of the parties meet, there is no contract. One may indicate his willingness, but, in this case, unless the minds of the parties meet, there is no contract binding them to observe the provisions of the treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, even in the case of an escrow agreement, often time limitations are written into the agreement as to when the final papers shall be deposited or the final amounts paid. I am merely seeking information as to whether, in the history of our treaty making, this Government or any other government has ever found it necessary or desirable to place some reasonable time limitation upon the ratification of a treaty by other nations, rather than leaving the matter completely open.

Mr. WILEY. I am informed by Dr. Wilcox that in some treaties there is a limitation of the time for signing. In this instance, there is no particular time stated, except as it may be inferred from the language of article 11, which provides that the instruments of ratification shall be deposited by the signatory states with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, and that the convention shall enter into force immediately upon the deposit by all the signatory states of instruments of ratification. There is no specific time limit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, or Dr. Wilcox, chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, who sits beside him, could furnish the Senator from California any information as to treaties made during recent years which have contained a time limitation, or, if the information is not immediately available, whether it could be obtained and could be supplied to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. WILEY. I am sure the request of the Senator from California will be complied with. We have a fine staff. I am sure the staff will be glad to comply with the request of the Senator.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I think the Senate today has probably heard for the last time in debate the voice of a distinguished Senator, a distinguished citizen, and a distinguished American, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] spoke today very dramatically in support of these agreements. I remember that it was almost 14 years ago when I came to the Senate. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Texas speak on many occasions. Of course, no one is exactly like TOM CONNALLY. He is "Tom" to all of us. When Tom appeared upon this earthly scene, I presume the pattern was broken, and that there will never be another man exactly like him. But time brings many changes, not only on the world stage, but also on the floor of the Senate of the United States. As I heard the great Senator from the State of Texas speak today, I could not but reflect that this was probably his last utterance in this forum in a great cause. He has been a patriot. We have not always agreed. Thank God we did not, because disagreement, difference in thinking, is what keeps America safe. Men with different ideas can clash, but out of the clash will come clarification, so that we can see our way through the difficulty.

I invite attention to the fact that, so far as I know, there will be no other occasion when the senior Senator from Texas will speak to us in the Senate in a great cause.

Mr. President, it was good to be with him in committee. He did a grand job and carried on through the years, at times "ornery," as we might say, but always lovable, always willing to help and assist. It is going to be kind of lonesome, Mr. President, next year when we return, not to see on the other side of the aisle that good friend and great American, TOM CONNALLY.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during the French Revolution a question was addressed to a very distinguished French scholar. Someone asked him what he had done during the revolution, and he replied, "I lived."

With respect to the treaty which is now before the Senate, Mr. President, I think that probably the only answer I can make is that I must protest. I recognize that my feeble talent is not going to stay the action which the Senate will take today, but I express the hope that it might be postponed, coming as it does on the very threshold of adjournment and at a time when political fevers are in the air.

There has been no opportunity carefully to evaluate the document presented to us. I have something of a personal interest in it because, once upon a time, I was affected by a treaty, and I had an interest in a treaty which was discussed in the Senate a long time ago. I think back to the Treaty of Versailles. I had a personal interest in it, because I served abroad in the war that was concluded by the Versailles Treaty. I followed it when I returned and put aside the uniform of my country. I followed it insofar as I could, and also the discussions by distinguished Members of this body who went abroad in the land to argue the merits pro and con of some of the clauses of that treaty.

There was a military clause to delimit the size of the German Air Corps; a naval clause that sharply restricted any

naval authority and any naval power. There were economic clauses.

Then, with a sense of whimsicality, I think back to how meticulously that treaty was framed. It even provided for the trial court of the Kaiser, and recited, in a general way, who would sit as judges on that high tribunal.

I remember clauses relating to Japan, in connection with that huge area known as Chantung, in a country which is now in the grip of Red Russia. I wondered, as a matter of fact, how long that treaty would last. I thought of the ethnic dislocations occasioned by that treaty, and the little countries that were carved out and the ethnic considerations which were ignored at that time, and as a result of which there was planted some of the seed of ferment and turmoil with which we are dealing in Europe at the present time.

Eighteen years after that treaty was signed the legions began to roll in Europe, and once more we found that a treaty which was couched in fine language, and which was promulgated as an assurance of peace, did not bring peace to the world.

As I think of that, Mr. President, I cannot help alluding to the fact that on VE-day in 1945 I was in Paris. When the commander of the conquered zone said to me, "Congressman, what would you like to do?" I said, "Just give me an automobile and a GI." So, with a GI at the wheel, I went out through the Bois de Boulogne, and finally arrived at Versailles. I recall that on that day at 3 o'clock there was to be an official announcement of VE-day. When I arrived at Versailles, I heard a great host of Frenchmen, with fine spirit, singing the Marseillaise. I went through the iron grill and up to the formal buildings there, edifices dating back to the Bourbon dynasty. I saw a sign in the window which said "Ferme," which meant that the place was closed; the day was to be a holiday. I saw an American gun squad, with a French 75-millimeter field piece, ready to boom a great salute in honor of Victory in Europe Day.

I finally found a caretaker, an old poilu, who had lost an arm at Cantigny. He admitted me, notwithstanding the fact that the place was closed. I told him I wanted to go to the Salon de la Guerre—the Hall of War.

When I got there, I asked him where the table had been where the peace treaty was signed a generation before. As we went into the room, I said "Tell me, my old friend, comrade in arms, where did Woodrow Wilson sit?"

He said, "Voilà."

I said, "Tell me where Clemenceau sat."

He said, "Voilà."

I said, "Where sat Orlando, Lloyd George, and all the rest of the great and near great, who were there that day to affix their signatures and bring about the treaty in the hope that it would give an assurance of peace to the world and to our own country?"

Precisely at the hour of 3 o'clock, that 75-millimeter field piece, with which I was so familiar, because once I myself served in a battery of artillery, boomed upon the afternoon air, and then I knew that victory was a reality. There was shouting, and there were expressions of triumph. For the first time Paris was gaily decorated and festooned with flags, and the lights came on everywhere. It was a gala day.

But at 3 o'clock I thought back a generation, Mr. President. I thought back to the cemeteries in France, and I thought back to the frustrations of people who had pinned their hopes to a piece of paper, to the pious expressions and the glittering generalities of statesmen from all corners of the world. As I thought of the dead, I thought of the futility of it all, of what a lot of stupidities had been uttered, and what a lot of nonsense we had heard. I decided I would be as realistic as I knew how to be, if ever a time came for me to pass upon a treaty.

Mr. President, I remember another piece of paper, a paper that was signed at Yalta on the 11th of February, 1945. I was the guest of the British Government, and sat in the House of Commons, where I heard Winston Churchill make his report upon what was contrived at Yalta. I read what the President of the United States said to a joint session of Congress at the other end of the Capitol, and ever so often I go back and refresh myself on those rather liquid phrases in order the better to realize the complete futility which they betokened. Oh, they were so lovely and so expressive until the whole and the brutal truth came out, a truth that is being expiated by holy young American blood in Korea this afternoon, as the Senate Chamber is empty, a condition of which the country ought to know. Yes, I remember that, also, and I shall be a long time forgetting it, as I address myself, as I very infrequently do, to the subject of foreign affairs.

But now there is another protocol and another convention before the Senate, and I am a little distressed that they have been taken up during this particular season, within a few days of adjournment. I wonder why they cannot be delayed. I had first thought that I would offer a motion to postpone to a certain day in 1953. But I do not believe I shall offer such a motion. I shall be content to utter my protest and to assign my reasons today.

In the first place, the Federal German Republic has not signed these documents. They are the primary party in interest. Why are not they signing? Are we to be placed in such a position that we shall be ridiculed if they fail to sign? The Secretary of State said that we ought to sign and ratify so that our action could be a lever to drive the treaties through the parliaments of the other countries that must be signatory to these rather solemn undertakings.

I do not like to go about it in that way. The German Government is the primary party in interest. Why should we pass upon these documents first? Oh, I know it has been uttered a thousand times that we must blaze a course of leadership. Well, too often we have inherited a lot of contempt and ill will for ourselves by so doing.

I still raise the question: Why does not the German Government at Bonn first sign, since they are the primary party in interest? There is no assurance they will ever sign. The Adenauer Government has 148 votes in the German Bundestag. The Schumacher Party has 130 votes, and Mr. Schumacher has stated that if he becomes Minister in 1953, his first action will be to revoke this undertaking. We cannot throw scorn upon Mr. Schumacher. The United States Government thought enough of him to bring him to this country some years ago. I was in the office of the head of the FBI with the Secretary of the Navy in a conference when Mr. Schumacher was there. The United States Government thought enough of him to bring him here in order to elicit some information. He is identified with the Socialist wing in Germany, but he says he will bring about the revocation of such action as is contemplated in this treaty if he comes into power. If that should happen, it would put us in a very peculiar light.

So why should not this matter wait until the German Federal Republic has first signed? I do not think that question has been adequately answered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator does not mean signed, does he? He means ratified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; ratified. I am sorry for the inadvertence of my language. I should have said ratified.

No action has been taken by France on the treaty. I do not pretend to know what the Pinay government will do, but it seems to me, from what examination I have been able to make, that they are going to ask for other and more guaranties. They are rather uncertain about it. Certainly Mr. De Gaulle has referred to these documents as protocols of abandonment.

Will the French Chamber of Deputies ratify? I do not know. But I know that they are next door to Germany, and they have raised so many issues in connection with the whole European controversy that they ought to act first, instead of depending upon a country 4,000 miles away to assume leadership, because they are next door to a crisis, and they are the neighbors to trouble, if there is ever going to be trouble over there.

Here we are confronted with still a new organization, the European Defense Community. Insofar as I can spell myself out of this bewilderment, it is another organization, largely because there is being established no parity of power or equality with Germany in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. If that be the case, here is an action that is predicated upon suspicion and upon distrust.

How long can it last? Not very long. Unless there is a spirit of understanding and a little more tolerance, this sort of thing cannot last.

So the Federal German Republic has not ratified. The French Chamber of Deputies has not ratified. Why should

they not take action first? They are the primary parties.

The Parliament of Great Britain has taken no action on the treaties. As a matter of fact, Mr. Aneurin Bevan, who represents one wing in the British Parliament, has expressed his hostility on the ground that, first of all, it would be costly to carry out the commitments which would be imposed upon Great Britain, and it would be likely to increase their tax rate. Oh, how sensitive they are about taxes. Somehow the suggestion that there be a slight increase in taxes has a way of bringing about the fall of governments over there. Why should not Great Britain sign? Great Britain was at one time mistress of the seas. At one time she was a great imperial power, such as the world had never before seen, and probably will never see again. Why should not the British sign, inasmuch as Britain is so close to the continent?

If I correctly remember, the European Defense Community comes into being only if there are eight ratifications. Obviously what we might do here today would have no great force and effect unless the European Defense Community came into being. But where are the ratifiers? Where are those who ought to express their approval of this action before the United States Senate undertakes action on this treaty on the very threshhold of adjournment, when the minds of Members are being diverted by the crush and the pressure of conference reports, appropriation bills, legislation of various kinds, and all the other tumult and fever in the air at the present time? Members of Congress are desirous of getting away to the national conventions; and, Mr. President, that goes for me. I find it difficult to disengage my mind from some of the considerations which have been so freely discussed in the cloakrooms and on the hustings. I do not apologize for that. That is a part of the American system. We are standing on the threshold of two assemblies which are soon to select new leaders to uphold the standards of the respective parties. That is one of the fevers in the air. It is difficult to disengage one's self from the activities of this season, with adjournment imminent, and preparations being made by everyone to get away. Is this the time, and is this the attitude in which we ought to dispose of a matter so solemn that it may involve many American lives and much American treasure before we are through?

I do not pretend to be an expert. As a matter of fact, I confess that I am no expert in this field, but only an amateur. Nevertheless, I have had to stay up rather late in order to hew out of the hearings, out of the convention, and out of the committee report as much information as I could find. I am dissatisfied with my own concept of this proposal. It may be all right. I should like to give my hand and heart to it, but I do not want to go down a blind alley. I do not want to go down a dismal road, where this action must be expiated by holy young American blood. I have not yet commanded enough confidence in the Secretary of State to take him on faith. Other Members of the Senate may be able to do so. Frankly I cannot, under these circumstances.

Now it is proposed to create another organization. It is interesting to look at the committee report, on page 15, and note the bewildering array of organizations. Sometimes I wonder whether we shall have so many that we will lose track of them and be unable even to find alphabetical designations to characterize them. We have the United Nations, the European Defense Community, which is before us, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Coal and Steel Community, the Council of Europe, the European Army, and the Organization for European Economic Cooperation. Where are we finally to end? Where does this system, wheels within wheels, lead? Is there not, in fact, some simple approach to this problem and to the responsibility which rests upon us?

I admonish those who listen today that this is a commitment for 50 years. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] if that is not correct. That is half a century. What will be the changes in circumstances? What will be the combination of circumstances which might conceivably cause us much grief? When one gives his hand and heart to a commitment which is to last for 50 years, he had better be sure that his wits are about him. There is not a Member of this body who, if he were to enter into a contract for something which involved a substantial sum or an obligation of service for 50 years, would not have his eyes open and carefully study and puzzle over what the commitment must mean. NATO is to run for 20 years. Three years have already passed. It still has 17 years to go. But, in the light of the commitment for half a century, I raise the simple question, Why the haste? I am reminded of a sign which I saw at a junkyard beside a railroad track in Denver. It read, "Go ahead and try to beat the train. We will buy the wreck."

I do not want to buy any wreck. I do not want to beat any train. I believe that a commitment of 50 years calls for sober reflection to a greater degree than the Senate can give to it now. I do not want to be stampeded into action or to be in too much of a hurry. This proposal seems to me to be a rather insecure foundation.

In addition to everything else, I do not know that I am satisfied on the question as to whether or not an enlargement of executive power is involved. It may be that the proposal or interpretation which was offered to the protocol by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] would remedy that defect. However, if I am correctly advised, I do not believe that the reservation which the Senator from Iowa offers is a part of the treaty or convention.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The interpretation is not a part of the original convention, but, according to my view, it inheres in the conditions under which the Senate is willing to advise and consent. It is an inherent part and a limitation upon the implementation under the terms of the convention.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That has reference, of course, to the tripartite declaration which has been referred to, and which appears on page 253 of the exhibit in connection with this case.

I went through the record and noted some of the exchanges between the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Secretary of State, and others. I noticed that the Secretary of State stated that this proposal or interpretation had no legal effect. I notice also, from Walter Sullivan's dispatch from Berlin on the 29th of June, which appears on the front page of the New York Times, that the Secretary of State of the United States, while in Berlin, was laying a cornerstone for a United States memorial library. I read briefly from the dispatch:

> An hour later at the laying of a cornerstone for a United States memorial library, Mr. Acheson cited the declarations of Britain, France, and the United States on Berlin. He said these indicated in "unmistakable terms" that the three powers would regard any attack on Berlin "from whatever quarter" as an attack against their forces and themselves.

What is the obligation, Mr. President? I do not know. I should like to see it spelled out. I do not care to buy a pig in a poke. The question is, Is there in truth and in fact an enlargement of executive power which brings back the echoes of a debate in this Chamber last year when we dealt with the troops-to-Europe issue?

Still another thing is the question of the unresolved issues. I should like to be tolerant about this matter; but I am not happy about a piecemeal peace, such as the report describes. Some issues have been unresolved, and are not alluded to. They are packed and charged with headaches. What will come out of it all I do not know.

There is, for example, the question of the Saar. That is an issue. It is one which I explored when I was in Europe a few years ago. I read in the Washington Post of yesterday a short article datelined at Trier, Germany. Incidentally, it was at Trier where I was headquartered for a long time after the armistice following World War I. It is datelined at Trier, June 29. It says:

> Jakob Kaiser, West German Minister for All-German Affairs, tonight called for the return of the coal-rich Saar to Germany. He also accused the Western Powers of handing over 18,000,000 East Germans "to a dictatorial system of terror"—

And so forth. That is an issue about which nothing is said in discussing the subject which is before the Senate today. Perhaps it was contemplated that nothing should be said about it. But I do not like to see such an explosive force in existence.

There is the issue of troops.

There is the question of unification. Mr. President, I am not sure that I share the happy hopes of some that what we do today will aid unification in Europe.

It may not. That is the big issue in Germany now. If anyone has any doubt about it, let him go there and talk to the people. I have done it. I know how they feel. I know also that a poll was taken there last year. At that time 39 percent of those polled, who would so vote, were more interested in maintaining neutrality than anything else. Another poll was taken not so long ago. The number who would so vote had increased to 56 percent.

Mr. President, there is a rising tide of neutralism in Europe. Will they say, "You have undertaken a course to use ratification in the United State Senate as a lever to force this plan through the parliaments of Europe, but we are not prepared to ratify?" I do not want to be in that unhappy frame of mind. It seems to me that the parties who have the primary interest should be the first to ratify before the issue comes to the Senate.

I would be strange, indeed, if this matter entirely escaped some political intonations. One newspaper, in Paris, said that prompt action was proposed for strengthening the electoral position of the European candidates in the United States. I do not propose to comment on that statement. I simply utter it for what it is worth. I would not want to be in that unhappy position, however.

Mr. President, I shall not offer a motion to postpone to a day certain consideration of the treaty. I merely say that I am unhappy about it. I am frightfully unhappy over the fact that the treaty should come to us in the last week of the final session of the Eighty-second Congress, when every mind is charged with so much responsibility, and there is haste to dispose of the legislative agenda, then repair to the various conventions, and then go home for a merited vacation.

Could not the treaty go over? Why must it be brought up now? I am a little timid about saying it, but in my considered judgment I do not believe it is receiving adequate consideration on the part of the Senate. That is not meant in derogation of the earnest efforts and the sincere endeavors of the Committee on Foreign Relations. They heard the testimony. I have great respect for them. However, I must satisfy my own conscience. I must satisfy my own conviction. Having observed as a soldier what has happened in other days to solemn treaties which were launched with scintillating language and iridescent hopes, I am not prepared to say "Yes" to the resolution of ratification which is before us.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, it is not my intention to take a great deal of the time of the Senate this afternoon. I shall not attempt to discuss in detail all the provisions of the convention and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, both of which are before the Senate for advice and consent; nor the three documents which become effective as a result of the ratification of the convention with the Federal Republic of Germany.

I do desire, however, to discuss the interpretation which has been attached by the Committee on Foreign Relations to the resolution of ratification of the convention with Germany.

In the first place I should like to recite some history. When the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified by the Senate approximately 3 years ago it was clearly understood by the Senate that because of its terms and conditions it was not a self-executing treaty, but that all the terms of the treaty in their major details would have to be submitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives for implementation before they could become effective.

I should like to read the article in the North Atlantic Treaty which deals with ratification. It is very significant. Article 11 reads:

> This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Mr. President, it was clearly established at the time of the discussion of the North Atlantic Treaty, and later at the time of the discussion of the Greek-Turkish protocol, which included Greece and Turkey in the North Atlantic Treaty, that the provisions of the treaty were not self-executing, but that it required authorization by Congress to implement and put into effect programs and policies under the treaty.

Indeed, under the North Atlantic Treaty the military implementation of it, with respect to the furnishing of arms and supplies to troops in the European countries was submitted to Congress, and the military assistance program became law. Congress authorized the giving of matériel and materials to those countries.

To that extent the Chief Executive respected the constitutional processes of this Government. But then came the question of manpower, and the question of the lives of American boys. The Executive then promptly forgot about submitting that question to Congress in order to obtain authority, but delegated unto himself the right to assign four divisions or any number of divisions of American troops to an international command overseas, in what he called implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty, without any authority of Congress whatever and in direct violation of all the understandings of the Members of the Senate when they ratified the North Atlantic Treaty and permitted it to go into effect.

Of course, I understand that the Executive took the position that congressional authority was required to give away inanimate goods, but that he had within his own whim and caprice the right to rule the destiny and lives of American citizens, by committing them to foreign armies.

Mr. President, in view of that history and record of a disregard of the reserved powers of Congress in connection with these matters, I read with great interest this German convention.

I notice that the ratification provision of the convention with Germany and with the other two powers involved with us is as follows, as contained in article 11, paragraph 1:

> The present convention and the related conventions shall be ratified or approved by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

Mr. President, the omission from that sentence is most significant, because it does not include the words: "and its provisions carried out."

In other words, "carried out by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures."

That significant phrase was inserted in the North Atlantic Treaty in order to make doubly sure that the treaty was not self-executing and that the Executive had to come to Congress for authority for its implementation.

However, for some mysterious reason, that phrase was eliminated from this convention between the three powers and the Federal Republic of Germany. I wondered why it was omitted. To this day I do not know why it was omitted.

In my judgment the convention upon which we are acting today between the three powers and the Federal Republic of Germany is no more self-executing than was the North Atlantic Treaty. However, because we had one experience in which the Executive overrode the obligation to come to Congress for authority to send American troops to an international command, I wanted to be sure. So I proposed an interpretation to the convention we are now considering. That interpretation is as follows:

> The constitutional procedures as referred to in this convention require that any military implementation of the provisions, other than the retained powers referred to in paragraph 1 of article 2 of this convention (including all other conventions, agreements, or understandings, which may become effective as a result of ratification of this convention) must have authorization by the Congress.

Mr. President, as the proposer, sponsor, and author of that interpretation, I am advising the Senate now what I intended it to mean and what its purpose is. I want no confusion or misunderstanding about it. I say this because there have been mysterious goings and comings around the Capitol, emanating from the general direction of the State Department, indicating that this interpretation does not mean very much, anyway. Certainly, apparently inspired stories have appeared in the public press, to the effect that, "Ha, ha! This is nothing but surplusage. It does not really mean anything and, in fact, it concedes many things to the executive power."

Mr. President, I wish to say that nothing could be further from the truth. I wish to give as clearly as I know how an explanation of the intent of this interpretation; namely, that any military implementation of this convention, any military implementation arising under this convention, must have authorization by the Congress of the United States before it can become effective.

At this point I wish to refer to a statement I have on this subject:

With respect to the interpretation contained in the resolution of advice and consent to the Convention on Relations Between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, and as the sponsor and author of this interpretation, I want to make perfectly clear my views as to its meaning.

In the first place, this convention and the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Paris on May 27, 1952, which will come before the Senate shortly, create a complex of international agreements of vital and far-reaching importance. Accompanying the convention and the protocol are three other documents referred to in article 8 of the Convention on Relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, which will come into effect with that convention. These three are:

First. Convention on the rights and obligations of foreign forces and their members in the Federal Republic of Germany.

Second. Finance convention.

Third. Convention on settlement of matters arising out of the war and the occupation.

There are also texts of certain letters exchanged, a copy of the treaty constituting the European Defense Community, the tripartite declaration made between the United States, the United Kingdom and France at the signing of the European Defense Community Treaty, and a copy of the treaty constituting the European Coal and Steel Community. All of these have a bearing upon the convention with Germany and upon the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty. In the absence of clear interpretation, this complex of documents and the various provisions and interrelated agreements might lend themselves to a strained interpretation by the Executive, to the effect that military implementation by the United States is a self-executing authority. With this theory I completely disagree.

Therefore, I filed an interpretation to the convention with the Federal Republic of Germany, in order to make it perfectly clear that neither the convention nor other conventions, agreements or understandings which may become effective as a result of ratification, neither create nor affirm any authority in the executive branch of the government to implement any of their provisions; but, on the contrary, any military implementation of this convention must be authorized by the Congress under our constitutional procedures and processes. In the interpretation, reference is made to paragraph 1 of article 2 of the convention, with the Federal Republic of Germany, which is as follows:

1. The Three Powers retain, in view of the international situation, the rights, heretofore exercised or held by them, relating to (a) the stationing of armed forces in Germany and the protection of their security, (b) Berlin, and (c) Germany as a whole, including the unification of Germany and a peace settlement.

A reference to this retention of the rights by the three powers was made in the interpretation in order to make clear such rights as the United States now has, under the surrender and occupation of Germany, with respect to our own military forces in Germany, in keeping with our responsibilities growing out of the surrender of Germany, are retained. In my view, paragraph 1 of article 2 neither commits the United States to participation of American military strength in any international army or command, nor does it authorize the President to order such participation without congressional authority.

I think it is essential, Mr. President, to make this situation clear and especially in view of the fact that, since the Foreign Relations Committee adopted the interpretation to the resolution of ratification of this convention, there have appeared certain articles in public press attempting to explain this interpretation as actually authorizing and approving our participation in international adventures, such as an international military force, without congressional authorization. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I note that the Senator called attention to certain newspaper articles, which apparently took the position that this interpretation itself was an authorization for the President to do the very things, I think, that it sought to prevent. I call the Senator's attention to an article entitled "Senate Unit Votes Accord with Bonn," which appeared in the New York Times of June 24, 1952, and particularly to the following language:

EUROPEAN REGION SPECIFIED

Mr. HICKENLOOPER's declaration would require the President to seek congressional sanction before sending troops specifically to the new international army being raised by the west Europeans, to which the Germans are to contribute 12 divisions.

It would not, however, offer any new congressional bar to the dispatch of fresh troops to Germany itself and the area of West Germany, as well as all the rest of the area of the alliance, will be under the command of Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the Supreme Allied Commander.

Senator HICKENLOOPER's original proposed interpretation would have required congressional approval of troop movements to Germany itself.

The issue of Presidential power to order troop movements without consultation with Congress appeared, in short, to have been left about where it had been since the Senate called upon Mr. Truman last year to send no more soldiers abroad without a congressional approval of a nature that was not defined.

At other places in this statement it is indicated that this reservation, in effect, does not accomplish the purpose which I think the Senator from Iowa had in mind when he offered it. I desire to inquire of the Senator——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Before the Senator asks a question, I desire to comment on that article. I read it, and it is as wrong as it can be, so far as this reservation is concerned. I desire to make it perfectly clear that that is the interpretation which the State Department would like to have placed on it, and that is one of what seem to be rather inspired interpretations. It is simply wrong. That is all I can say. The reference to retained powers in the reservation means only that such powers as we, as a nation, already have in Germany are retained.

Mr. WATKINS. To what particular powers does the Senator have reference?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would have to get all the surrender documents and the agreements which were made between the four powers, including agreements covering the occupation of Germany, and so on. There is a very vast delineation of powers, but largely they are powers going to our responsibility as an occupying power.

Mr. WATKINS. And they grew out of World War II. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They grew out of the surrender of Germany. They grew out of the fact that we were one of the conquering powers. They have nothing to do with the general international-convention defense arrangement by way of united defensive forces. I want to make that clear. The purpose is to make certain that we shall not be handicapped in carrying out any continuing duties which we may have as a result of the surrender of Germany.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, these documents would practically end the occupation of Germany by the Allied forces, would they not? The agreements are so intended, are they not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This convention states that the forces in Germany—that is, in the Federal Republic of Germany—cease to be occupation forces and are to be defensive forces. But the treaty apparently makes clear that the forces in Berlin are to continue to be occupation forces under the terms of surrender and the conditions of the surrender of Germany.

Mr. WATKINS. If I may continue with the question——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I am sorry.

Mr. WATKINS. If the troops in West Germany and outside Berlin are still retained there, they are not, under the provisions of this convention, retained as a part of the occupation forces of the United States. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are retained there, without doubt, as a supplemental force to our occupation of Berlin. In other words, for us merely to leave a few troops in Berlin as occupation forces without any additional power to protect them or to back them up would be a rather silly thing to do. Our forces in Berlin are there as occupation forces.

Mr. WATKINS. Where is the line drawn between the forces we have there for that purpose and for the purpose of participating under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the European army which has been set up pursuant to a new treaty entered into by the European nations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The difference is that our troops in Germany today are still there because of the limited sovereignty of Germany. Our troops are not there today because a sovereign nation of Germany has made a solemn authoritative treaty with us, because Germany is not a sovereign nation. Even under this convention, Germany

is still a nation subject to certain overriding controls and restraints of the victorious powers in the war. That is the basis upon which our troops are in Germany, and that is the basis upon which they will remain there. That is the basis upon which our troops will continue to have certain overriding privileges and rights in Germany; Germany is not a sovereign power, for she has not since the war received the restoration of her full autonomy.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the Senator distinguish between the troops we can send for that purpose under the surrender documents and the state of war that was created by reason of the declaration of war, and the forces that are supposed to be there to defend Germany or to become a part of the North Atlantic Troops Organization?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not assume that all these forces can become a part of the North Atlantic Troops Organization without authorization of Congress. But I do think that, under all of the surrender documents and under all of the agreements which flowed from them after the war, we have a right to maintain troops there to meet our obligations arising from the surrender, and until Germany is completely restored to unlimited sovereignty as an equal nation among nations.

Mr. WATKINS. What do we give up actually, then, when we sign this treaty? What do we give up to Germany in the way of sovereignty and in the way of ending the occupation, particularly the occupation by our troops?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We give up, for instance, as I understand, the right to have our nationals in Germany tried by American courts in Germany, by an American system, either by courts martial or by a special-court system. Civil cases will be turned over to the German authorities. Even our Armed Forces, in civil matters, will be subject in most instances to the German authorities. In military matters, we still retain the jurisdiction to try our own nationals as military offenders, in our own courts martial. That applies to the sovereignty of the United States over its troops. It does not mean that we can try British troops in American courts. It does not mean that we can try French troops in American courts. But we reserve the right to try American troops. However, we turn over to Germany the supervision of their transportation, and we get on more of a basis of equality in the matter of rail fare, for instance. Our troops, however, enjoy a very great discount on railroad tickets and other things in Germany, in the way of transportation. They have rights which the German population have not enjoyed. Conditions will be equalized now, and our troops will come under the rules of the German Legislature. The situation will be changed a great deal, but we will still have authority, under proper conditions, to handle with our troops emergencies in which we can temporarily set aside any German authority and act for the security and the safeguarding of our American troops and our position there. We will have occupying troops, but they will be there to defend and support our whole position which includes the military occupation of Berlin.

Mr. WATKINS. Then it is more or less qualified; it is not an actual and complete severance of our occupation status?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The ending of the occupation is a technical and peculiar procedure. The so-called ending of the occupation is not had as the result of a restoration of cosovereignty. If we return complete sovereignty to Germany, we have no basis for overriding rights on certain occasions. So long as Germany has only limited sovereignty, even though it is almost 100 percent, so long as it is limited, it is really, in my judgment, still an occupied country under the terms of surrender and the results of the war.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose we consider the case of the four divisions which the President announced some years ago would be sent to Europe as a part of the forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Would they be a part of the occupation army, or, under the Senator's reservation, would they be first authorized by the Congress, if the reservation is given the intent which the Senator applies to it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The use of any troops or military equipment or material must have the authorization of Congress. In my view, those four divisions are still not legally assigned to any international army. I do not think the President had the right to do it. The Senate said he did not have the right to do it. It adopted a resolution saying he should come to Congress for authority. So far as the Senate was concerned, it was O. K.'d but it did not go through the Congress, so that authority has never been obtained.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator of the opinion that Congress has the right and the duty to implement all portions of the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I do not think there can be any question about that.

Mr. WATKINS. And particularly with respect to the sending of troops and putting this country into war?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not only the sending of troops, but the sending of equipment. The administration asked for authority to send equipment; they said they had no right to send our goods over there; but when it comes to human lives and assigning American boys to an international army, they say they do not need the authority of Congress to send them all over the world.

I still think they did not have the right to do so, but they did. It is like the old story of the lawyer who said to his client, "They cannot put you in jail for that." The client looked through the bars and said, "But I am here."

Mr. WATKINS. Irrespective of the treaty, the President sent the troops abroad and disregarded the Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator have in mind the legislative history that was developed during the debate on the North Atlantic Pact, that it had to be implemented according to the Constitution, and that Congress had to approve the declaring of war and the sending of troops?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not only familiar with it, but I have checked on it and rechecked on it as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I recall being present when the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] specifically, and in concert with the Secretary of State, sat at the table and put these provisions into the treaty, so it could not be self-implementing, with the positive assurance that the language would require the administration to come to Congress for the implementation of every portion of the treaty. It is that understanding which was violated by the sending of four divisions of troops to Europe, which makes me gun-shy as to any comparable assurances given by the administration or its representatives. It is for that reason that I offered this interpretation.

Mr. WATKINS. If that is now the legislative history of the meaning of article 11 of the North Atlantic Treaty, and we have here, maybe, an extension of it, why it is now necessary to have this interpretation if it has already heretofore been adopted by the Congress, and made a part of the record? Why does the Senator want this reservation on page 3 of the report of the committee? It is a committee interpretation, and I understand the Senator from Iowa was the author of it. I should like to know why he considers it necessary, in view of the fact that we have a clear-cut interpretation by legislative history and its meaning was agreed upon before the North Atlantic Treaty was ratified.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator comes from the great State of Utah, and has probably heard the story of the wise old Indian who said, "White man fooled me once—shame on him. White man fool me twice—shame on me."

The administration fooled us once on the North Atlantic Treaty. It made to us the most solemn declarations that the treaty would not be self-executing. It fooled us, because the President sent four divisions of troops and assigned them to an international army.

The administration fooled us once—shame on it. If it fools us twice, shame on us.

That is why I am putting this interpretation into the treaty. If the administration would follow the clear record of the Congress as to what the North Atlantic Treaty meant, we would not need this interpretation. But I want to do everything I can to keep the administration from fooling me twice, because it will be my fault if it does.

Mr. WATKINS. I might call attention to the fact that I did not intend to be fooled at all, and I offered a reservation to the pact before it was ratified, and not afterward.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Utah that he has exhibited one of the most far-seeing pieces of judgment on the North Atlantic Treaty I have seen since I have been a Member of the Senate. The Senator from Utah called the turn and expressed concern that this position might be taken

by the administration, but he received solemn assurance on the floor—and I was one of those who assured him, because I relied on the solemn assurance of the representatives of the administration. I assured him that, in my judgment, the President could not send troops without authority of Congress. The Senator from Utah was assured by other Members of the Senate that his reservation was surplusage, and that the treaty would not permit that to be done. Therefore, the Senator from Utah, in reliance upon that representation and assurances from the Committee on Foreign Relations, and others, withdrew his reservation. He had hardly withdrawn his amendment until the administration fooled him.

Mr. WATKINS. I call attention to the fact that was when the North Atlantic Pact was before the Senate. I think the incident the Senator has in mind occurred last February, when we were discussing the accession of Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Pact. But back in 1949, when I offered a reservation, I was told, as the Senator has just said, that what I sought to prevent could not possibly happen, that it all had to be approved by Congress. I said, "That is wonderful."

In Europe it was thought that we were making an automatic commitment; that the President could take care of the situation without action by Congress. I said, "Let us write a reservation, so that our people will understand, and Europe will understand." The answer I received was, "If that is done, the heart will be cut out of the treaty." All I was attempting to do was to write, in formal language, what I had been assured the treaty meant.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. The Senator was just as correct as he could be. He was farsighted.

Mr. WATKINS. I was one of those Indians to whom the Senator referred. I did not want to wait and be fooled. I believed that what I was endeavoring to prevent might happen, because the Europeans had an entirely different understanding. The treaty meant one thing in Europe, and another thing in the United States. To the Europeans it meant automatic commitment. It meant that an attack on one of the European nations would bring the United States into the war. To them it meant the sending of United States troops. At least we were told that it meant that to Europe. That was why I offered my reservation. I said that if the reservation had been accepted, I would have voted for the treaty.

Now we are considering an extension of the treaty for a period of nearly 30 years beyond what was originally provided, and I want to be very certain this time we will have a clear-cut understanding of precisely what is meant. I think possibly some language has been omitted from the German convention and the Protocol, and that action of the Senate is required with reference to the language.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I referred to that a while ago.

Mr. WATKINS. I am sorry I was not here, but I refer to article 11 of the Atlantic Pact, which says that the treaty must be ratified and carried out—I emphasize the words "carried out"—by the constitutional processes of the parties. The phrase "carried out" is omitted from the present agreement, as I understand.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the North Atlantic Treaty the words are "shall be ratified and its provisions carried out."

Mr. WATKINS. That was in the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. But the words "and its provisions carried out" are mysteriously missing from the German Treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. There must have been some intent to leave them out.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, I do not know. My idea is that the writers of the treaty must have worked late on several days and left out the words. But that provision is in the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator is now trying to have the language of the German Treaty conform with that of the North Atlantic Treaty. The whole theory, was to provide for implementation according to constitutional process. It seems to me that Congress must authorize the sending of troops and must be the authority to declare war.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me tell the Senator why I am a little gun-shy about this.

Mr. WATKINS. I can readily understand why. The Senator has been fooled once.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This question has been discussed once before, if the Senator will recall, in the hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty, in April 1949, I was concerned about what we were going to do in the situation, so when the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, was before the committee, I asked him a question. As I have said, this matter has been discussed repeatedly on the floor of the Senate. I said to the Secretary of State:

> I am interested in getting the answers as to whether or not we are expected to supply substantial numbers—by that, I do not mean a thousand or two, or 500, or anything of that kind, but very substantial numbers—of troops and troop organizations, of American troops, to implement the land power of Western Europe prior to aggression.
>
> Is that contemplated under article 3, where we agree to maintain and develop the collective capacity to resist? In other words, are we going to be expected to send substantial numbers of troops over there as a more or less permanent contribution to the development of those countries' capacity to resist?

Secretary Acheson said:

> The answer to that question, Senator, is a clear and absolute "No."

Mr. WATKINS. By that answer the Senator thought the Secretary meant that the treaty did not provide for the sending of troops prior to aggression, did he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. It was not that kind of agreement at all. I think the understanding the Senator had at the time the treaty was drafted—at least at the time article 11 was drafted, which is still in force and effect—was that it had been agreed that Congress had to implement every provision of the treaty, specifically with reference to the sending of troops abroad and the making of war. Such action required the approval of Congress first.

With that theory in mind, I can readily understand why the Secretary of State answered as he did, and I can understand the concern of the Senator from Iowa in asking the question, because he wanted to make the understanding perfectly clear as a matter of public record.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. The other matter, with reference to the agreement with the Secretary of State, happened in executive session, did it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That occurred in executive session, but I was present, and there have been statements on the floor of the Senate as to what occurred.

Furthermore, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in a discussion with the Senator from Utah, so stated at the time the Greek and Turkish treaty was before the Senate.

But let me bring to bear a little more evidence for the benefit of the Senator from Utah. In the Senate hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty, the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, interrogating General Bradley, asked the following question:

> Senator VANDENBERG. I only want to ask you this further question, if you can appropriately answer it: In connection with any discussions of implementation of this treaty, is there any thought that we must contribute mass manpower under any circumstances connected with the implementation of the treaty?

That was the question. General Bradley, who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, replied.

Mr. WATKINS. He was, of course, fully acquainted with the situation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I read his answer.

> General BRADLEY. I do not see how it is implied in the pact itself. In case of war you probably would act in concert with them, and that would, of course, depend upon the circumstances, and eventually would be at the will of the people, expressed through their Congress, after due consideration.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for that quotation, because that goes to the very heart of the whole question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Again I say to the Senator from Utah that we get back to the Indian who said:

> White man fooled me once, shame on white man.
> White man fool me twice, shame on Indian.

I am like the Indian. I do not intend to be fooled twice if I can help it.

Mr. WATKINS. There were many other "Indians" in the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the reason why I think such an interpretation as I have offered is most vital. It is in full keeping with Senate Resolution 99, adopted by the Senate in connection with the "troops to Europe" issue. It is in full keeping with Senate Concurrent Resolution 19. Both resolutions require that congressional authorization be given.

I desire to have such a reservation placed in this treaty, so that nothing in the treaty, or in the whole complex group of documents which would come into effect with the treaty, would create any authority in the President to implement the treaty, or establish any authority in him to do so. I do not wish to see any provision made for implementing the treaty without the authority of Congress. I wish to make that clear to the Senate. A statement has been made to the effect that we cannot affect other matters by attaching a provision to a particular treaty. No one is trying to do that. The interpretation would apply only to this treaty and the terms of the treaty. If it were desired to reach any treaty not related to or associated with this treaty, that would have to be done in another way. The interpretation would apply to the terms of this treaty, would be a limitation upon it, and would be a condition upon which advice and consent would be given.

Mr. WATKINS. I invite the Senator's attention to some words in the reservation found on page 3, which reads:

Resolved, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed by the United Kingdom, the French Republic, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany at Bonn on May 26, 1952, with the following interpretation:

1. The constitutional procedures as referred to in this convention require that any military implementation of the provisions, other than the retained powers referred to in paragraph 1 of article 2, of this Convention (including all other conventions, agreements, or understandings, which may become effective as a result of ratification of this convention) must have authorization by the Congress.

What does the Senator understand "military implementation of the provisions" to mean? I should like to have a clear-cut definition of the intention and meaning of that language.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I mean the furnishing of any military manpower or military matériel which may be considered desirable.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it include the establishment of bases?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it include naval support?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By "military implementation" I mean the human beings or the goods or services which contribute to military operations or military strength.

Mr. WATKINS. Does that include naval forces?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. Does it include air forces?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly—naval and air forces, or anything else. I use the word "military" in the broadest sense of the word.

Mr. WATKINS. If any economic relief were going directly to the point of military implementation, would that likewise be defined as military implementation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator refers to economic relief. If we erect buildings or factories for military purposes, certainly that is military implementation.

Mr. WATKINS. That would be a part of the military implementation?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what the Senator means when he uses that language?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If we furnish food and arms to other soldiers over there, not our own nationals, that is military implementation on our part. I think all those things must have the authorization of the Congress of the United States under this treaty, and that the administration must come to the Congress to have its program authorized.

Mr. WATKINS. That reservation was accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee and made a part of the document which is presented here today for our consideration.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. I am not quarreling with the committee on this subject, but I am glad of the opportunity for this discussion, because I want to make it as clear as discussion can make it what is meant by this interpretation. I do not know what the Executive will do, but this is all I know of that I can do to make assurance double sure, in order that the Congress of the United States may pass upon the question of whether American troops shall be assigned to international armies and American equipment given to international ventures or used in connection therewith.

Mr. WATKINS. That seems to cover the field very well, and I thank the Senator for his explanation.

With respect to the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty the Senator ofter referring to a proposed interpretawith regard to the constitutional processes of the United States.

It reads as follows:

Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States requires that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States must be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator referring to a proposed interpretation?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. WATKINS. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We are considering the treaty with Germany.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to ask about the other matter while I was on my feet.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not offered that reservation, because the protocol has not yet come before the Senate for consideration. However, I shall be glad to discuss it with the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of that fact, I shall not go forward with the discussion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If it will save the Senator any time, I shall be glad to discuss it at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator proposed the following reservation or interpretation with respect to the protocol:

Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States require that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States must be authorized by the Congress.

Does the Senator have in mind the same definition of military implementation as he described in connection with the treaty?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am very much honored to say that the Senator from Utah joined me in offering that interpretation, so it is as much his as mine.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make clear what the Senator had in mind.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to make it clear that military implementation covers the whole waterfront, in connection with anything which may be considered military.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I intend to make it perfectly clear that military implementation under this treaty must have the authorization of Congress.

Has the Senator concluded?

Mr. WATKINS. I have concluded.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have little more to say. I do not care to enter upon a discussion of the philosophy of peace and war at this time. I am very sympathetic with many of the things which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] said a few moments ago. I, too, vividly remember, as do other Members of the Senate, the days in 1917, 1918, and 1919, when the "peace" of Europe was again established. I remember going back to college in 1919 and taking a course in political science, after the war, in 1920.

I remember a wise instructor whom I had in that course saying at that time that the ethnic mistakes, the mistakes in major policy, the bitterness, and the suspicion which existed among the allies of that day in establishing the peace of Versailles had laid the basis for another world war in 20 years. That was his thesis in 1920.

That wise professor is now in retirement. A few years ago I wrote him a letter and recalled to him that series of lectures on what he called the atrocious peace of Versailles. He remembered the course of lectures, and said that occasionally when his ego was a little low and he thought he was not much of a prophet he dug out the series of lectures of 1920, in which he pointed out exactly what stupidity and mistakes can do to the peace of the world.

I shall not attempt to amplify the very magnificent portrayal by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] of the tragedy of Yalta and of the tragedy of Potsdam. I shall not dwell on the fact that we are today drinking the bitter dregs of the defeat, militarily and otherwise, which was served up to us at the close of this war. The territorial settlements in central Europe and in Berlin are major causes of the world's suffering today. The gift to Stalin of a third of the population of the world at Yalta and elsewhere will haunt generations of freemen for long and undetermined periods of time.

Mr. President, we find ourselves in a situation, and we must make the best we can of it. I think we have been making about the worst we could of it

in the years since the war. But certainly I believe that one of the things we must do is to aid in every way we can toward a revived, self-supporting Germany. I think it is important. We did not love the Nazis. We did not love their system; but the German people as individuals and in a collective society are a strong and vigorous people. They have been the key to the industrial movement in Europe. They have been the crossroads for the flow of raw materials and finished products back and forth. They are industrious and they can be of great help in the hope of assuring a peaceful Europe if the treaty is successful.

With the inclusion of the interpretation with reference to military implementation, I shall support the treaty. I can understand the difficulties of a return of complete sovereignty to Germany. I can also understand that far more important than unity with Western Europe in any military or economic alliance on the part of West Germany is the constantly present hope of a unified Germany under a proper and stable administration, because in my judgment it will override all other considerations and arguments of the German people if and when such an argument is properly presented and put to them.

Mr. President, sometimes I think that we may have moved too rapidly in connection with some of our international agreements and international treaties. Be that as it may, we have before us the convention with Germany which I believe is a step forward.

But let us nake no mistake about it, Mr. President; we are being asked to ratify the convention prematurely, in my opinion. I am not objecting to voting on it today or tomorrow, or whenever we come to it. But I cannot bring myself to believe that it is necessary to act with such speed. Not one of the European Defense Community countries has ratified even the European Defense Community agreement, and the convention before us does not go into effect until that is ratified. Not one of the parties to this convention has yet ratified it.

I have read in the newspapers—and I believe it is probably true, because it is stated by both sides—that the Germans will not give consideration to the treaty until sometime in September, at the very earliest. We do not know what the volatile situation of the French Government will be. We have had notice served on us, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has stated, that if Mr. Bevan gets into power in Great Britain within a short season, he will do everything he can to nullify the treaty if it is adopted.

We have had notice served on us that Mr. Schumacher in Berlin, according to some newspaper reports from Europe which I saw, stated he would "denounce the treaty if it went into effect and he came into power in Germany." He is not so far away from power at this time.

Mr. President, if the military implementation of the treaty is to be subject to the authorization of Congress, as it must be under the interpretation, and if the authority to use military force and military equipment in implementing the convention must be authorized by Congress, we have one way of advising and consenting to the treaty and yet withholding the military equipment or a part of it until we determine whether our so-called allies over the seas are going to do their part. If we should advise and consent to the treaty, and if the President should arrogate to himself the power to send military equipment and men over there without authority of Congress, we could find ourselves even more inextricably bound to the responsibility for the defense of Europe than we are now, without Europe turning a major hand in the joint venture.

Therefore we have an opportunity to take a look at the so-called cooperation of the other countries and to take a look at what they are doing in their own defense. I think there is an advantage in that. We can advise and consent to the treaty and still hold within the authorization of Congress the power of implementation. That power can be used. I am perfectly willing to vote for a reasonable implementation of the treaty, as rapidly as the allied countries overseas convince us that they are doing their share in their own behalf.

I know all the arguments about the hardships which they have suffered, and I am sympathetic. I know all about their losses, and I am sympathetic. But by the same token, I know that they are at the forefront where the attack will come first, and it is their own liberty and their own salvation that are at stake, and their own contribution must be commensurate as they value their own liberty and their own property.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the subject any further this afternoon, unless it may be by question or answer during the course of the debate. I shall vote reluctantly for the treaty. I shall vote reluctantly because I believe it is not necessary for us to consider it at this time and that we could well wait until January.

Mr. President, I am becoming a little weary of the constant and repeated argument that the United States must rush forth and show its good faith. We have been rushing forth and showing our good faith toward Europe and our so-called allies ever since 1917. One day I hope there will be a little reverse lend-lease coming from some of those countries to the United States.

Mr. President, I commend to your reading an article in this week's Saturday Evening Post dealing with North Africa, if you want to know what could be done for us, but is not done. In the article you will read about taxes which France has charged us and is trying to charge us for building installations for their own defense in North Africa; about the charges which they have imposed upon us for ground which they could well give us. Meanwhile we give them hundreds of millions and possibly billions of dollars.

Mr. President, it is very impressive that on occasions when reverse mutual help could come back, within the power of some of the other countries to give it, without costing them a cent, it simply is not forthcoming. Nevertheless, I am willing to go along and vote on the convention today. I am willing to go along because I think we have done everything we can in the treaty and have again made crystal clear that military implementation of the treaty must be authorized by Congress. I do not know of any other way in which to reach that objective and I believe we have done it.

However, I say that peace is still in the hearts and minds of men, that cooperation is still in the hearts and minds of men. I hope that the determination for cooperation and the determination for contribution will be equally as strong in the hearts and minds of our allies who will be affected by the treaty as it is when it is expressed by the sacrifice of the American people in gratuitously and freely contributing their substance toward a better world and toward a better life for those friends whom we would like so much to have with us.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to point out that the reservation accepted and adopted by the committee to the German convention seems to be sufficiently broad to take care of the power of Congress and the right of the people to speak through their representatives in Congress in regard to implementation of the treaty. That reservation has been recommended by the committee, and in my judgment it probably will receive the approval of the Senate.

If the interpretation which the Senator from Iowa, together with myself and other Senators, will offer is not accepted to the protocol, and if the protocol were then to be rejected, would that seriously interfere with this program? Or, to put the question in another way, is the protocol absolutely necessary to the implementation and carrying out of the program with the Germans?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the protocol which brings the Germans into the North Atlantic community is very important. I think it should be ratified, but it is fully as important and vital, I believe, that a similar interpretation be added to the protocol, in order to protect American institutions. I believe it is essential that the interpretation be added to the protocol.

I also believe the protocol is important. It is very important to bring Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. I fully agree with the Senator from Iowa on that point.

At the time when the North Atlantic Pact was before the Senate, I stated that if my reservation to that pact was accepted, I would vote for the pact. On the other hand, without that protection of the right of the people to speak on that matter through their representatives in Congress, I could not go along with the pact.

In the case of the convention with the Federal Republic of Germany, the interpretation seems to be almost as important as the one I offered to the North Atlantic Pact. I hope the Senate will

accept the interpretation of the protocol, for I shall be in a difficult position if the interpretation to the protocol is not accepted, because then I shall be put in a position similar to that in which I was put before, in connection with the North Atlantic Pact.

I do not intend by my vote or by my support to interfere in any way with the right of the people of the United States to speak through their representatives in Congress on the question of peace or war or on the question of the sending of troops abroad prior to an aggression or on the question of the sending of military implementation abroad prior to an aggression.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me say to the Senator from Utah that in the Foreign Relations Committee, I voted against the protocol, not because I disagreed with its theory, but because I thought the protocol must be protected and safeguarded by means of the interpretation which I offered in the committee.

A majority of the committee took the position that adoption of the interpretation to the protocol was not necessary; that the record had been fixed in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty, and that the protocol was not self-executing, in that it had to come to Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Was there any explanation of the omission of the words "and be carried out," immediately preceding the words "by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures"?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; there was not.

Mr. WATKINS. Was the significance of that omission developed?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It was significant to me, although I do not know whether it was significant to others.

At any rate, the majority of the committee did not vote to add the interpretation to the protocol.

If the Senate refuses to accept the interpretation to the protocol, the Senator from Utah will be in no more of a quandary than will I. I shall be very much distressed.

Mr. WATKINS. I have made up my mind that since the North Atlantic Pact has become the law of the land, I shall do everything within my power to see that it is implemented as it should be implemented, namely, in accordance with our constitutional processes; and I have determined that I will vote for measures to support it and for appropriations to make it effective. That treaty does not provide for procedure in the way I favored; but since we had to have some kind of program as the law of the land, I felt that once the treaty became the law of the land, I should support it, as a loyal American. So I support that program. Likewise, I shall support this program if it is ratified by the Senate.

On the other hand, I do not believe it is proper for Congress to declare, in one breath, that there must be an interpretation in regard to the German convention, but, in the next breath, to say that the same interpretation is not necessary or desirable with respect to the protocol.

Certainly the omission of the interpretation may be regarded as being of some significance.

If article 11 of the protocol means what the interpretation says it means, then that meaning should be expressed in clear words. The interpretation proposed by the Senator from Iowa and other Senators can do no harm if it is added to the protocol; but the omission of the interpretation might do harm to both the Senate and the people of the United States.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah has made a wise interpretation of this matter.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I shall vote for the ratification of this convention with more than ordinary conviction. This I would have done in any case, but my conviction has been strengthened by a recent visit to Europe, in the course of which I witnessed the signing of the document at Bonn. This was a privilege which I appreciated, though it added nothing to my conviction.

What did become clear was that this pact represents a delicate balance between the need for German resistance to the Soviet, on one hand, and the fear of German rearmament, on the other. As for myself, I am convinced that so long as the present Christian spirit in the German Government is continued, Europe is safe.

I went to Europe primarily to attend a conference of the International Conference on Christian Leadership, held at The Hague on the invitation of the Queen Mother, who calls herself Princess Wilhelmina. The subject of the conference was the application of Christian principles to the solution of world problems. As most of us know, it is my strong belief that there is no other solution, and that peace will not come to the world until we face Soviet deviltry with the sword of the spirit.

Those attending came from all European countries outside the iron curtain except Spain, Portugal, Yugoslavia, and Eire. There was a particularly strong delegation from Greece and from Germany. Among the latter were the Minister for Displaced Persons and President Ehlers, of the Bundestag. These two and Chancelor Adenauer, whom we met later at Bonn, are sincere Christians. In this fact lies the hope for peace in Europe, insofar as Germany is concerned.

The dramatic incident of the conference was the public meeting in the audience hall, where the Queen addresses Parliament. It was filled with citizens of The Hague, and was addressed by President Ehlers. The significant thing was that he spoke in German, in a hall that had never heard a German word since the war began, and to a people for whom everything German aroused fear and hatred. Faces were strained and hostile, as he began. There seemed to be danger of an angry protest. But his message was a truly Christian one, and his audience was finally won over to a sympathetic attitude. Those who ought to know assure me that the occasion was an historic one.

How different is the attitude of the present German Government from that which prevailed in Germany after the First World War. Then the Germans, unused to defeat, were frustrated, resentful, and revengeful. They had no sense of wrongdoing. In their own eyes they were pursuing their historic course, following the ethical standards of power and patriotism to which they had been bred in birth and taught from early childhood. This frustration and resentment was fertile soil for the intensified revenge and evil policies of Hitler. The Second World War was automatic, in view of the mishandling by the Allied Powers of successive crises.

The old frustration remains in a minority of the people and in a minority party, but the present Government represents another mood. There is within it a new spirit of humility and repentance. It could scarcely be otherwise in a moral people, steeped in sincere Christian principles.

Dachau and Buchenwald cannot be laughed off or put aside. It is in true humility and repentance that the Adenauer government has begun negotiations for a money indemnity to the Jews. An indemnity will not compensate for the slaughter, but it does recognize moral responsibility.

There are those who feel that in this pact we are giving the Germans but a half loaf of freedom, and that in return we shall receive but a half loaf of military support. In a sense this is true. The half loaf represents a delicate balance between the European fear of Soviet power and fear of a rearmed Germany. Those who feel that a completely rearmed Germany is in our interest even if it results in a neutral France, are running terrible risks.

One risk is in arousing a chauvinistic German nationalism, which has twice destroyed Europe. The risk is real for us as well as for France, the Low Countries, and our other allies.

The other risk is in strengthening Dr. Schumacher's opposition party which the Communists are already infiltrating by the simple device of withdrawing their candidates in constituencies where, by so doing, they can elect an opposition candidate. It is by means such as this that Soviet power has won its political victories in satellite after satellite. This must not happen in Germany.

At first thought it may seem strange that the Communists should team up with a nationalist party which expresses strongly anti-Communist sentiments. Really it is not strange at all. The Soviet Government can work much more effectively with a chauvinistic nationalism than with a liberal group which adheres to Christian principles. The strangest contrast is not between nationalism and Soviet totalitarianism, it is between Christianity and the Devil.

Mr. President, let us make no mistake. Let us not refuse or delay con-

firmation and thus force Europe even a step backward to dissension and chaos. Let us recognize this pact as a well-conceived upward step, and put the seal of our approval upon it.

WHY HURRY WITH THE GERMAN PEACE TREATY?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a few days ago I cut a record for a broadcast on the subject "Why hurry with the German Peace Treaty?" At this time, as a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the manuscript printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the manuscript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY HURRY WITH THE GERMAN PEACE TREATY?

Question. We do not hear much about the German Peace Treaty, Senator. What about it? Is it a good treaty?

Senator JENNER. I don't know, Bob. It is 300 pages of fine print, full of technical legal provisions. I should hesitate to sign it after reading it only three or four times.

Question. What does it say, Senator, that it takes 300 pages?

Senator JENNER. There are really eight documents, Bob. Two are being submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. Six agreements are submitted to the Senate for information only.

The first document sets up a curious peace settlement for a Germany half dependent, half free. The second document, an amendment of the North Atlantic Treaty, brings the problem right to our door. It says if there is an armed attack on the territory of what they call the European Defense Community, which now includes West Germany, that attack, and here I quote exactly, "shall be considered an attack against all the parties to the treaty." That means us. If someone is murdered on the German-Soviet border, and a party of German soldiers and Russian soldiers get into a fight, it may be the start of a war, and we have already signed up to join as soon as it starts.

Question. Not so fast, Senator, we cannot sign a blank check.

Senator JENNER. We can, Bob, nowadays. We did it recently when we signed the North Atlantic Treaty. We agreed that an attack on any of the 11 other signers would be an attack on us. That meant we guaranteed all Western Europe from Norway to the French possessions in Africa. Recently, we included Greece and Turkey. Now we add West Germany.

Question. Exactly what do we promise to do, Senator?

Senator JENNER. To answer that we must go back to the North Atlantic Treaty. Those who do not have a copy of the North Atlantic Treaty handy—that is, most people—will be left in the dark even if they read all 300 pages.

In the North Atlantic Treaty each party agreed that if any signer was attacked, the signer would, and I quote exactly again, "assist the party or parties so attacking by taking * * * such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force."

Question. But we still decide on what we think is necessary.

Senator JENNER. Oh, no, Bob. We have nothing to say. Our officials have agreed to act in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. That Charter says, in article 51, each member has the inherent right of self-defense until the Security Council decides what steps to take. That is a very limited and short-lived right of self-defense, if our decisions can be changed as fast as orders can be radioed from the Security Council.

Question. But the Security Council includes the Soviet Union, Senator. Surely you do not mean that our plans for the defense of Germany, if it were attacked by Russia, would be subject to immediate veto by the Soviet Union.

Senator JENNER. That is what it says, Bob. This is a game of button, button, who's got the button? In the German agreement, we promise to defend West Germany or any other signer, under NATO. Under NATO we promise to defend cosigners under the U. N. Treaty. Under the U. N. Treaty, we agree to limit our right of self-defense to the period before the Security Council acts. And when we come to the Security Council, there is the Soviet Union sitting as solid as a rock, or perhaps I should say, as secretive as the serpent under the rock.

Question. What will the U. S. S. R. do?

Senator JENNER. She will do what is best for the U. S. S. R. She may veto any action in support of NATO forces, or she may sit tight and do nothing, as she is doing today about Korea. Or she may work to win over allies on the Council to some evil plan of her own that we can hardly see, like setting up a neutral Germany that she will soon make into a puppet state.

Question. This is fantastic, Senator. You say we have signed an agreement by which we must come to the aid of any of the 14 nations now interlocked with NATO, but Russia is left perfectly free, to egg us on, to sit and watch, or to throw a monkey wrench into the whole thing.

Senator JENNER. Fantastic it is, Bob. I'd be the last one to quarrel with that. But why do people think we don't do things because they are fantastic? It's so obvious we do.

Question. You certainly picture a tangle, Senator. I am not sure I have it clear.

Senator JENNER. I'm sure you haven't got it clear, Bob. I don't try to keep it clear. I just start in all over at the beginning every time I have to decide something about NATO and U. N. and HICOG and SACLANT. Just start in all over every time, as if it was all Greek to you and you'll be all right.

So far, I've mentioned only a little treaty protocol, a page and a half long. The basic German Treaty is 14 pages long. It is an agreement between Britain, France and us on one side, and Germany on the other, to end the occupation of Germany as a conquered power.

Question. You mean it restores her to full national sovereignty, Senator?

Senator JENNER. No, Bob; again, no. The West German Republic is left free and sovereign, if it commits itself, and again I quote from the treaty, "to conduct its policy in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations."

You see, there isn't any freedom left anywhere in the world, now. No one is outside the United Nations. No member nation may legally negotiate with any other nation except through the machinery of the United Nations. No nation will negotiate with it. All the regional and special agreements have been very cleverly tied into the U. N.

The nations today are like a kind father who has given his fortune to a trust fund for his sons. Everything goes along beautifully for a long time. No quarrels, no disputes. The trust fund works without much attention. The sons who are managing it are discretion itself. Then, suddenly, the father wants to do something new and really important. But he cannot get started. No one says, "No." It's just that no one does anything. He tries to find out what is going on. He hears words—words—words, but he has no information. He decides that, if he is not free to do what he thinks right, he will get out of the trust fund, take a small share of his money, go off by himself, and do what he likes. Then, he finds he has no share of his own in the fund. He has no rights. He cannot even act alone.

As I see it, that is where we are now in U. N. That is where Britain and France and Italy and all the nations are. Only Ireland and Spain and Switzerland find themselves free today.

Question. A new administration could get out of this spider web of commitments, Senator.

Senator JENNER. I don't think so, Bob. I don't think a Republican President could get us out of these commitments. I don't think a Democratic President who opposed Mr. Acheson's policies could get us out. Of course, a nation can always cut herself loose, but that is a drastic business. We have not been making commitments for Mr. Truman's administration only. We have been making them for eternity. It is planned that we shall never get out. Some of the agreements last for 20 years, some for 50. But 50 years from now who will cut the bonds and start over?

Question. Does Germany like this new treaty, Senator?

Senator JENNER. To answer you, I should like to quote from someone else, Bob. Recently, the American Legion magazine published an article by Richard S. Weil called, "Are We Trying To Lose Germany?"

Mr. Weil said, "The Germans, wondrously for a conquered, occupied people, were deeply receptive to all things American. Hitler * * * was totally discredited. The survivors * * * raised their eyes in expectation to the winners.

"Today, almost against their will, the Germans are embittered and despairing. It is we who failed them, rather than the other way around. If we lose Germany, it will be our fault and that of no one else."

Question. Haven't we given them billions in relief, Senator? Didn't we carry on the Berlin airlift at a tremendous cost, to keep their capital in the western zone?

Senator JENNER. Our experience in postwar Germany falls into three parts, Bob. We started in Germany, where we started in Japan, with miraculous good will. But in Germany, we carried out th.. .Iiss-Lattimore plan to destroy the industry of Russia's closest rival. General MacArthur refused to carry out their plan in Japan. Dismantling Germany's steel mills was part of the first stage of destruction. The airlift represents the second stage, when we won back much of what we had lost. Then we ended military government and the State Department took over the work of the Army in Germany. Quietly, we slipped back to the sabotage of Germany's economic life. We did not notice. Our papers told us nothing. But the Germans noticed.

Question. Who is responsible, Senator, for our falling back again?

Senator JENNER. The credit must be given Mr. Acheson. He sent John J. McCloy to Germany. McCloy's principal deputy was the man at whose home Alger Hiss stayed after his first trial. Mr. McCloy's political adviser was John Davies who is one of the members of the famous John's—like John Stewart Service, and John Carter Vincent—who worked with General Stilwell to destroy free China and help the Reds get control there. McCloy started dismantling again. The Germans knew he was destroying Germany's power to defend herself against Russia, even if half the Germans had to die of starvation.

Finally, Mr. McCloy was deeply involved in what is known as the Kemnitz case. Dr. Hans Kemnitz was a double agent, that is, a Nazi who turned Communist. He was employed, after the war, by the American occupation. His forte was kidnaping anti-Communist Germans, or luring them to

Communist death camps. How the Germans hated him.

When the German occupation was lifted, the Germans arrested Kemnitz and awarded indemnity to the relatives of one of his victims. Now just imagine the situation—an ex-Nazi, a Communist agent, accused of luring many anti-Communists to certain death, while under the protection of the American Government, is convicted in open court. Suddenly, the American high commissioner stepped in, voided the order of the German courts, and took Kemnitz under American protection. American soldiers were sent to guard his house.

Senator JENNER. The German peace settlement was made by the very same people—the men who supported Alger Hiss, the men who helped defeat Chiang Kai Shek, the men who wanted to reduce Japan to a pastoral village economy on Russia's eastern flank.

The treaty was approved by Mr. Acheson and Philip Jessup, whose record in the IPR and elsewhere was so very dubious that even the Democratic majority in the Senate would not confirm his appointment to represent us at the U. N. in Paris.

The administration says, "Hurry, hurry, hurry, sign the treaty at once." But I do not think the Senate should hurry. I think we should take our time, and look very thoroughly into the whole bewildering situation in Western Europe before we sign any more treaties, make any more commitments, or give up any more of our American sovereignty, under the guidance of the men of Yalta, who engineered our disastrous failure in China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification, with accompanying interpretation, will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention on relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany, signed by the United Kingdom, the French Republic, the United States, and the Federal Republic of Germany at Bonn on May 26, 1952, with the following interpretation:

1. The constitutional procedures as referred to in this convention require that any military implementation of the provisions, other than the retained powers referred to in paragraph 1 of article 2, of this convention (including all other conventions, agreements, or understandings, which may become effective as a result of ratification of this convention) must have authorization by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, with the accompanying interpretation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Assistant Parliamentarian proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the interpretation offered in the form of a reservation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The vote will be on the treaty, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first question is on agreeing to the interpretation——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My understanding is that the question is on agreeing to the resolution as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, which contains the interpretation. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is the way I understand the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair was not in the Chamber when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, but he is advised by the Parliamentarian that the interpretation, which is in the nature of a reservation, will be voted upon first, the same as an amendment reported by a committee would first be voted on.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not ask for the yeas and nays on that question. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the ratification of the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the demand for the yeas and nays of the reservation will be withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the interpretative reservation. [Putting the question.] In the opinion of the Chair, the interpretative reservation is agreed to.

The question now recurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as amended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—77

Aiken	Hennings	Moody
Benton	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Holland	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Cain	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Ives	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Seaton
Douglas	Kilgore	Smathers
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young
Hendrickson	Monroney	

NAYS—5

Dirksen	Jenner	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Bennett	Kerr	Nixon
Brewster	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Malone	Tobey
Capehart	McMahon	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 77 and the nays are 5. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

PROTOCOL TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ON GUARANTIES GIVEN BY THE PARTIES TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY TO THE MEMBERS OF THE EUROPEAN DEFENSE COMMUNITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceed to the consideration of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive R (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty signed at Paris on May 27, 1952, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington on 4th April 1949,

Being satisfied that the creation of the European Defence Community set up under the Treaty signed at Paris on 27th May 1952 will strengthen the North Atlantic Community and the integrated defence of the North Atlantic area, and promote the closer association of the countries of Western Europe, and

Considering that the Parties to the Treaty setting up the European Defence Community have signed a Protocol, which will enter into force at the same time as the present Protocol, giving to the Parties to the North At-

lantic Treaty guarantees equivalent to the guarantees contained in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

An armed attack

(i) on the territory of any of the members of the European Defence Community in Europe or in the area described in Article 6 (i) of the North Atlantic Treaty or

(ii) on the forces, vessels or aircraft of the European Defence Community when in the area described in Article 6 (ii) of the said Treaty,

shall be considered an attack against all the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, within the meaning of Article 5 of the said Treaty, and Article 5 shall apply accordingly.

The expression "member of the European Defence Community" in paragraph (i) of this Article means any of the following States which is a member of the Community, namely, Belgium, France, the German Federal Republic, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

ARTICLE II

The present Protocol shall enter into force as soon as each of the Parties has notified the Government of the United States of America of its acceptance and the Council of the European Defence Community has notified the North Atlantic Council of the entry into force of the Treaty setting up the European Defence Community. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty of the date of the receipt of each such notification and of the date of the entry into force of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE III

The present Protocol shall remain in force for so long as the North Atlantic Treaty and the Treaty setting up the European Defence Community remain in force and the Parties to the latter Treaty continue to give, in respect of themselves and the European Defence forces, guarantees to the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty equivalent to the guarantees contained in the present Protocol.

ARTICLE IV

The present Protocol, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the Archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of all the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and of all the Parties to the Treaty setting up the European Defence Community.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries have signed the present protocol.

Done at Paris, the 27th day of May 1952.

PAUL VAN ZEELAND
A. D. P. HEENEY
STEESEN-LETH
SCHUMAN
PAN. PIPINELIS
GUNNLAUGUR PETURSSON
DE GASPERI
BECH
STIKKER
ARNE SKAUG
TOVAR
M. A. TINEY
ANTHONY EDEN
DEAN ACHESON

The VICE PRESIDENT. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty, covering security guaranties to the members of the European defense community by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Paris on May 27, 1952.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], I offer an understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the understanding.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the resolution of advice and consent to the ratification of Executive R, Eighty-second Congress, second session, by striking the period after the figure 1952 at the end thereof and adding thereto the following:

Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States require that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States must be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, we have had discussion all afternoon of the basic principle which is involved in the interpretation. Fundamentally it is the same as the interpretation in the resolution of ratification of the German treaty. The protocol which is now under consideration for advice and consent of the Senate is a protocol which takes Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. As I understand, that is the sole purpose of the protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty.

The interpretation I propose is exactly the same as the one agreed to in connection with the resolution of ratification of the treaty, except that it does not refer to the exception which was noted in the German treaty; otherwise, it is exactly the same as the interpretation placed in the German treaty. It reads:

Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States require that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States must be authorized by the Congress.

The purpose of the interpretation has been fully explored. As I said earlier in the afternoon, we have been fooled once by our failure to add an interpretative provision. In the North Atlantic Treaty itself, of which the protocol will become a part, article 11 reads:

This treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Again I call attention to the phrase "and its provisions carried out." By some peculiar circumstance or occurrence, that phrase was omitted from the convention with Germany; but it is that phrase and the one with respect to constitutional ratification which laid the basis for clearly establishing, in connection with the adoption of the North Atlantic Treaty, that it was the opinion of the Senate that all provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty must be implemented by authorization by Congress.

As I have pointed out, the administration came to Congress for authorization for the military arms implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty. However, when it came to sending manpower—human lives—to a joint European army, the administration did not see fit to come to Congress for such authorization, despite the fact that it was clearly established that it must be implemented by authorization of the Congress.

Here we are tying Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty. I believe that is sound; I favor it. I merely wish to attach to the protocol this interpretation, which I personally believe is already the law, but which the Executive has disregarded and has failed to follow. I wish to add this interpretation, so that it will be completely clear that military implementation must be authorized by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not exactly clear about the effect of the interpretation. If it is adopted, will it mean that under the present congressional authority to supply aid to the other NATO countries, we could continue to supply aid to them, but not to Germany; or would the interpretation mean that Germany would have the same status as that of the other NATO countries?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have a formal legal opinion on this point, but it is my personal view that under existing legislation which authorizes the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty by furnishing military arms, ammunition, and so forth, when Germany enters the North Atlantic community of nations, the legislation already in existence will authorize such aid to Germany as has been authorized by statute to the North Atlantic community of nations—that is, subject to various divisions and allocations.

So I believe that the terms of this interpretation have already been complied with, insofar as certain guns and equipment are concerned, through the military-assistance program.

It is the principle of congressional action authorizing such aid that I wish to preserve.

Mr. McCARTHY. In view of the fact that in connection with the submission of an amendment to an ordinary piece of legislation, if there is any ambiguity in the language of the amendment, the intent of the author of the amendment normally is controlling, especially if Congress fully understands his intent, obviously it is important that the intent of the Senator from Iowa be clear in this instance. In my opinion, the language of the proposed interpretation is not clear.

Therefore I should like to ask a question: Is it the intention of the Senator from Iowa that if the protocol is adopted, Germany will be in the same status as that of France or that of any of the other

NATO countries, insofar as concerns receiving arms, ammunition, or other military help or aid?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is my intention that Germany shall receive equitable and equal treatment in the common interest under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, along with all of the other NATO countries. When this interpretation goes into effect, I believe that under existing law substantial amounts of military equipment and supplies will be available, under existing authority, to help Germany, along with the other NATO nations.

It is entirely possible that under some of the present statutes, some funds may be specifically earmarked for one particular country or another; but I believe there are some general allocations which would enable the matériel to go to Germany.

If not, if there is any handicap, then there is no reason in the world why the administration should not come to Congress immediately and request such enlargement or alteration or change in the law as to place Germany on an equal basis, so as to permit Germany to have such reasonable assistance as other NATO countries may be receiving for the common good.

I have no desire whatsoever to curtail proper aid to Germany in connection with the common defense.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. It occurs to me that it would be extremely difficult to operate an effective defense of the NATO countries unless all of them received adequate assistance. In other words, an effective defense would be extremely difficult if we were barred in any way from giving any implementation to one of the NATO countries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This interpretation does not bar an act of Congress or action by Congress. If there is any restriction of any kind in that connection, such action as Congress deems wise can be taken.

As I have said, in some cases there may be specific allocations to certain countries for certain purposes, under existing legislation. However, I believe there is ample leeway, so that substantial aid could be given.

Furthermore, it is the duty of the administration to point out to Congress any inequity that may be done; and in that case the Executive should come to Congress, in the common interest, and request the enactment of legislation adequate for that purpose. I believe such legislation would be passed very quickly.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a further question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that congressional action would be required to extend further military aid to the NATO countries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I beg the Senator's pardon. The extension of further military aid will require only such legislation as might be necessary because of the expiration of legislation now existing. We have been legislating for NATO aid now since 1949. These laws expire from year to year. So each year it has been necessary to renew the legislation. That is only routine.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a further question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Iowa that the interpretation he proposes to add would in no way affect the aid now going to NATO countries other than Germany?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct; in my judgment it would not affect any aid now going under the law to NATO countries other than Germany. There is no confusion in my own mind, at least, about that.

Mr. McCARTHY. If addition of the interpretation would in no way affect the aid going to any other NATO countries, why should we adopt a provision which may or may not affect the military implementation insofar as Germany is concerned, in view of the fact that Western Germany may well be a key to the defense of Europe?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Because—and I think it is a very fundamental reason—I do not believe the Executive has any more power or authority to give military implementation to Germany without authorization by Congress than the Executive has to give military implementation to France, Italy, or any other country without authorization by Congress.

If we ratify the protocol without adding this interpretation to it, the protocol might be interpreted as meaning that the Executive had a special right to give aid to Germany, but not to the other NATO countries.

It is very simple for the Executive to come to Congress and request any authorization that is necessary by way of law, just as we provided such authorization to help Britain, France, and Italy in connection with the arms program.

This interpretation is only a safeguard and declaration of principle. The interpretation is not directed at Germany at all. The interpretation is a very simple one. It will not complicate matters in the least.

On the other hand, the interpretation, if adopted, will require the Executive, if he wishes to implement this protocol, to come to Congress and request for that purpose the enactment, if such legislation is not already in existence, of legislation which would authorize doing that in aid of the NATO countries.

Mr. CASE, Mr. WATKINS, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Wisconsin has concluded his questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to ask one more question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well, I yield further to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator that I certainly would have no objection whatever to this amendment, if it is very clear, or if it can be made clear, that it will in no way hamstring the NATO commander. For example, let us assume that he decides that certain of the NATO aid which has been authorized, for which money has been appropriated, should be transferred from France or from England to Western Germany. Assume that he decides it is the best way by which to defend Western Europe. I should hate to wake up to discover that we had prevented his doing that, and to find that the President had to call us back into special session in order to grant such authority.

If the Senator can give us his unqualified assurance—and I think his intent will be controlling, in view of the fact that it is his amendment—that it is his intention to affect in no way the rights of the President or of the NATO commander to shift from country to country—and I refer to the NATO countries—the aid which has been authorized, then I can see no objection to the amendment. At the same time, I question the necessity of this amendment, when it applies only to Germany and not to the other NATO countries.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin I think the principle applies to the other NATO countries. The reason for adding it to this protocol is that we were deceived on previous occasions. The record was made on the floor of the Senate that it did apply. The Senator from Iowa and other Senators who wanted to attach a similar reservation to the North Atlantic Treaty withdrew it, based upon those assurances. We were then deceived by the sending of troops to Europe without any authority. Therefore I want to have the reservation included at every appropriate opportunity, in order to make sure that we are not derelict in asserting our continued belief that the authority must come from Congress.

I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the protocol is not going into effect for a long time. The Senator does not need to be concerned about that, because in the first place it must be approved by about 16 countries. If the Senator will read it, he will find that it goes into effect when authorized by the signatories; and a list of them is set forth. I think the Senator may rest assured, and so may the Senate, that this protocol is not going into effect until after the convention on relations with the Federal Republic of Germany has gone into effect. In Germany, the debate on that convention is not even going to start until late this fall. No one knows when France will adopt it. No one knows when England will ratify it. So, in my opinion, the Senate will be in session for quite a while next year before this protocol goes into effect, and I think there will be ample opportunity, if legislation should be needed, to give aid to Germany through existing programs. I believe there is plenty of time from a practical standpoint.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, is not the Mutual Security Program and the act we passed broad enough to permit the executive department to give aid to Germany? It is a rather broad authorization.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. According to my view, there can be no question that the implementing legislation with respect to any of these treaties including the German treaty agreement, the European Defense Community, the North Atlantic pact, and the tripartite agreement will be sufficiently broad because when they are adopted and finally go into effect, all of them are going to be so interlocked in one bill that it will be impossible to tell which is which. What we do about one piece of legislation affects the situation throughout. But I think what we must keep in mind is, that there simply is no chance of these treaties going into effect, in my judgment, before the Congress returns in January. Even the German treaty or convention which we have today ratified will not go into effect until the European Defense Community pact goes into effect. Not one nation of the European Defense Community has approved that convention as yet, and I do not think any of them will do so before the snow falls. In fact, I do not think any of them will do it before the birds come back from the south next spring, if they do it by then. So I believe there will be plenty of time. Also, so much of this is dependent upon certain other things. This protocol will not go into effect first, until all the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty have approved it. From a practical standpoint, I am sure they are not going to approve it until the convention on Relations with the Federal Republic of Germany has finally gone into effect; and it will then take them into the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WATKINS and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield first to the Senator from Utah, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. WATKINS. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the Mutual Security Act, passed some time ago, was very broad in its scope. It authorized aid for Asiatic nations, the Near East, Europe, and in fact all around the world. Under that act itself I take it there would be sufficient authority to take care of Germany in the meantime. But is not the principal purpose of this reservation to establish with respect to this protocol, what now has appeared to be the legislative history, the meaning of the North Atlantic pact?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. It is an affirmation of what practically all the Members of the Senate thought was the legal effect at the time we ratified the North Atlantic Pact; and at least I and a number of other Senators still think it is the legal effect of the North Atlantic Pact. With that the President disagrees when he says he does not have to come to the Congress before sending troops on an international adventure.

Mr. WATKINS. The reservation simply puts this protocol in harmony with the convention ratified today by the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, this is a similar interpretation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We today ratified a convention with the Federal Republic of Germany, to which we attached this interpretation. This is a protocol, taking the Federal Republic of Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is utterly consistent to attach this identical interpretation to that protocol. I think it is perfectly consistent. I agree in part with the position taken by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a few days ago, when he said he did not think this was necessary in connection with the protocol. I agree that it may not be necessary. I think it necessary from a practical standpoint, but from the standpoint of the law, it should not be necessary. But it is because of the action of the Executive in disregarding the implementing provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty that this interpretation is proposed, and I think we would be derelict in our duty did we not attach it to the protocol. That is my position. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Iowa has stated that in his judgment the interpretation he proposes does not add anything to the situation so far as the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty are concerned because it coincides with his interpretation of what the prior agreements meant. However, by expressing it at this time, does it not establish as to Germany a requirement that does not exist with respect to the members of the North Atlantic Organization?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I do not think so, because I think the legislative record is clear, not only from the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, but also from the statements made on the floor of the Senate. I think the record is clear—in fact, the statement was made in the record repeatedly—that the North Atlantic Treaty requires that all military implementations under the North Atlantic Treaty require the authority of the Congress; so I think that is already the law.

Mr. CASE. There is one problem which bothers me.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The President has violated that understanding in sending troops to Europe. I merely want to add such an interpretation to the protocol at this time. It is, I believe, already required that the Executive shall follow that law. But if he will not do so, then I want to lay it down to him every chance I get.

Mr. CASE. It has been my understanding that the interpretation of the North Atlantic Treaty was as the Senator has described.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon. During the so-called great debate in connection with sending troops to Europe, the Senate stated that the President must receive the authority of Congress before he sent troops abroad to become a part of an international force. But the administration filed a brief with the Foreign Relations Committee in which the administration took the position that the President did not have to ask Congress for authority; he could do it on his own account. That was another instance of the inherent power of the President which permits him to seize coal mines and to seize newspapers, if he wants to. This mysterious power has become quite a jinni out of the bottle, and I think we had better start putting it back into the bottle before it runs riot and destroys the legislative authority.

Mr. CASE. I have no more sympathy with the so-called inherent powers of the President than has the Senator from Iowa, but what bothers me is that if we assert it in writing, and it does not exist in writing in prior statements of the Congress, are we not recognizing that we have a different situation with Germany than with other nations?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CASE. I am not a lawyer, but I have always understood that the specification of certain things in a statute operates to exclude other things. Is the Senator's reservation so stated that it latches it only on Germany?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It latches it onto this particular document. That is the only one to which we can latch it. I agree that we cannot make a treaty on X subject and legislate on Y subject. We must make our limitations and conditions applicable to the particular treaty which is being considered. I think we must limit our expression to this protocol. It is a rather technical and narrow situation, but that is what we have to do.

Mr. CASE. Does the reservation apply wholly to the German Federal Republic or to the states which are named in the latter part of article 1, namely, France, the German Federal Republic, Italy, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands? Does the reservation which the Senator is suggesting apply with equal force to the named members of the European Defense Community, which include the German Republic?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It applies to this protocol which includes an armed attack on the territory of any of the members of the European Defense Community.

Mr. CASE. Then it would apply to Belgium, France, Italy, Luxemburg, and the Netherlands, as well as to the German Federal Republic?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my judgment, if it is implemented under the North Atlantic Treaty as it affects the European Defense Community, which is a very technical and a fuzzy thing, it must be by legislation. They are all in the North Atlantic Defense Community except Germany. Their implementation is to be provided by the North Atlantic

Defense authorization. Sometimes they can put on one hat and sometimes they can put on the European defense hat. When the attempt is made to implement these nations as European Defense Community countries, I think this protocol would apply. But they do not have to do that, because they have already come to the point where they can eat their cake as defense community countries.

Mr. CASE. Article 1 also provides that an armed attack on any of the members of the European Defense Community in Europe or in the area described in article 6 (1) of the North Atlantic Treaty is an attack on all. In other words, it is a fuzzy distinction, because the North Atlantic Treaty criteria are used to define an attack on the European Defense Community.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think that is put in because there are certain specialized limitations or obligations on the North Atlantic Defense Community which might, under some interpretations, lend themselves to special consideration. I think the attempt is being made to bring them all in, so that if anyone shoots a skyrocket and hits anything, we will be in it and a part of it. The effort is to bring all the nations into an interlocked situation which reminds me of a well-tangled ball of string.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the Senator's having raised this issue, but I must confess that in my mind a very great doubt has been created, namely, that the adoption of the reservation would clearly and unmistakably apply the action as set forth in the protocol, but it raises a very great doubt in my mind whether by specification and by spelling it out we have not weakened the declared interpretation as to the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization who are not members of the defense community.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That same argument was used when we persuaded the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to withdraw his reservation to the North Atlantic Treaty. He withdrew it, and then the administration violated the treaty. I do not think it weakens it. I believe it reiterates a perfectly sound legislative stand. If the National Legislature of this country does not protect its own prerogatives, the Executive will usurp them with great rapidity.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have a suggested amendment to the Senator's amendment. I shall not offer it unless he cares to accept it. I personally have felt that we cannot have a sound defense of Western Europe unless we utilize all the manpower and resources of Germany and Spain. For that reason I think we made a great step forward in taking Germany into NATO. Anything else would be unrealistic. I am worried, however, that the Senator's amendment may be interpreted to apply only to Germany, which would mean that the NATO commander, attempting to build a defense of Europe, might find himself hamstrung to some extent.

Would the Senator care to insert the following language after the words "United States", "other than military implementation already authorized for NATO countries"?

This would mean that there would be no restriction on the part of any NATO commander, who could distribute his resources anywhere he thought best. I do not think it would weaken the Senator's reservation.

Does the Senator have in mind the language I have suggested? If he would insert the language I suggest at this point, the Senator's reservation would read:

Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States require that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States, other than military implementation already authorized for NATO countries, must be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suggest that the Senator from Wisconsin gets into difficulty there. The President says he is already authorized to send troops to Europe, but Congress has not authorized him to do so. The President takes the position that he was authorized under an interpretation. I think the Senator has a point in his suggestion. I see what he is driving at.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say further to the Senator that I suppose the President, in authorizing the movement of our troops to Europe, assumed he went beyond his authority, and assumed he went beyond his authority in authorizing certain other military implementations. The point is that he has done so.

Let us assume that war will break out in Europe. It would seem to me that the NATO commander should not have a different rule for different countries. He should be able to use whatever military implementation has been authorized where he sees fit to use it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator from Wisconsin will find that the law now makes certain provisions which amount to military implementation—so much money for one section, so much for another. Personally I think there would be no difficulty at all. I think it is probably mostly authorized already by act of Congress. Certainly, the interpretation I propose would not go into effect until January or February, if it went into effect then.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may suggest to the Senator that I shall not offer an amendment to his amendment, but I believe his amendment could be improved considerably by the insertion of the language I have suggested.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator could clarify the language, so that it would refer to authorization by Congress already provided, it would be all right. I do not want to concede that the President has any right to authorize anything without congressional action.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Neither should we approve what the President has done, as I believe, illegally. We do not wish to give any back-door approval or after-the-fact approval. It seems to me that if we kept in mind the purpose of the protocol, it would be easier to understand why it is necessary to have this kind of reservation. It is an attempt to, and it will, bring Germany into almost full membership within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That is, it will give Germany all the benefits, without actually bringing her in and requiring her to submit with entire agreement to all the parties to the Atlantic Pact. The approval must be unanimous before any nation can become a member. But recognizing Germany as a member of the European Defense Community, and accepting Germany as a member of the community, is an attempt to provide her with the benefits which flow from membership. If we are going to have the kind of agreement that covers Germany, then we shall be considered as taking on all the parties to the treaty. We ought to indicate very clearly that we are expecting the same rule to apply under this protocol that applies under the North Atlantic Pact itself, which is that the constitutional processes of a party to the treaty shall be carried out.

According to the statement of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and according to the Foreign Relations Committee, the phrase "constitutional processes," as set forth in the North Atlantic Pact, means that all the processes followed under that pact are to be authorized and implemented by Congress, with particular reference to the sending of Armed Forces and the declaration of war. There is no question about the meaning, because Secretary of State Acheson agreed to that understanding. It was insisted upon by the Senator from Georgia, and agreed, that that was the correct interpretation.

Personally, I should have liked to go further than the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has gone in his proposed reservation. But "military implementation" seems to "cover the waterfront," and that is the reason why I am willing to join in accepting his reservation. In view of what happened in February, when we considered the accession of Greece and Turkey to the North Atlantic Pact, I think we now have legislative history that fixes clearly and specifically the understanding between the executive department and the Senate that the phrase "constitutional processes" refers to implementation by Congress of all provisions of the pact, especially the sending of troops abroad and the making of war or peace.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad the Senator from Utah referred to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as having made the statement he quoted. I wish to refer to what the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, said on February 7, 1952, in connection with the Greek-Turkish protocol. The Senator from Utah was interrogating the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee about how article 11 would be implemented, whether by Congress or by the President. The colloquy was as follows:

Mr. WATKINS. I want to know if article 11 means that the provisions of this treaty are to be implemented by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. How does the Senator think they are to be implemented? Does he think they are to be implemented by the bootblack in the barbershop? Of course, they are to be

implemented by the Congress, within its constitutional powers.

No, Mr. President, the record is clear that the Senate thought these actions were to be implemented by Congress. But nobody told the President that, I suppose, because he thought he had the power to act without the consent of Congress. That is all there is to it. In my judgment, if legislation is needed, it can be obtained.

I do not think there will be any question, if any technical difficulty is involved. The reservation is not directed at Germany. It is not directed at any country in particular. It is directed to the power of Congress to legislate on the question of war or peace.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator state, then, as the author of the reservation, that it is intended to establish the same requirement which now exists for military implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my opinion, the answer to the Senator's question is, "Yes, absolutely." My complaint is that there is a difference between what Congress, the Senate, or the Committee on Foreign Relations thought was the law with regard to implementation, and what the President thought.

Mr. CASE. What I am seeking to nail down in the legislative consideration of the subject is that this reservation does not in any sense destroy the present requirement that the use of constitutional processes means action by Congress.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; it in no way destroys it. As I said a while ago, I personally believe the requirement may be surplusage; but because the President disregarded what I believe was intended, I think it is necessary to include it in the reservation and reiterate it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very anxious to have a vote, but first I desire to say a few words.

If the pending proposal were adopted, it would set up a different standard for Germany than for the other North Atlantic Treaty countries. Why do I say that? Because the language of the proposal is:

> Subject to the interpretation that the constitutional processes of the United States require that any military implementation of this protocol by the United States must be authorized by the Congress.

That is all that is affected by the amendment. The protocol simply admits Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty. She will have a different standing under the Treaty. If she receives any military aid from the United States, it will be necessary to obtain congressional approval of it. If other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty get military aid, they will not have to come to Congress; they will have to come under the regular proceedings of the North Atlantic Treaty Council.

The Senator from Wisconsin was exactly correct in his first approach to this subject when he asked, "Will the treatment of Germany and the other countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization be different?" Of course it will. If that were not so, all that would be necessary would be to say that Germany is admitted to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and stop there. We would not be required to say "military implementation of this protocol." All we would need to do would be to pass a resolution that we agree to the admission of Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. That is all that would be necessary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This protocol does not merely admit Germany to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The protocol admits the European defense community, as a technical community.

Mr. CONNALLY. The other nations are already in.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then this protocol does not admit anyone but Germany.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Germany is only a part of the European Defense Community.

Mr. CONNALLY. The answer is perfectly simple. All the other members of the European Defense Community are already members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This protocol, in effect, merely brings Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; but when Germany is brought into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, it is limited to this protocol, and a heavier burden is levied upon Germany than upon the other countries in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Do we want to discriminate against Germany?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Do we want to discriminate against Germany? We are trying to bring Germany in to help strengthen Western Europe. We are bringing Germany in because we want to see her reestablished as a great power, imbued with democratic principles. Do we want to start by saying, "You cannot come in the front door. Go around to the back door. We are going to discriminate against you. We are going to segregate you. Do not come in the front door. Go around and knock on the back door and say, 'Boss, can I come in?' "

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I take it the Senator's contention is that congressional authority is not required to implement the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is already implemented.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By what means? By congressional authority?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is implemented by the authority which was granted when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established. There is a council to deal with these questions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Why not extend the North Atlantic Treaty to Germany as well as to the others?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Iowa is not in favor of this plan at all. He said he voted for that treaty only to bring in Germany. He said he voted for it reluctantly. He dragged his feet. When he voted, he could hardly get his feet off the ground. Now he wants to amend it, tinker with it, and hornswoggle it. We tried to please him in the committee. We adopted his interpretation with respect to the treaty with Germany after we watered it down and took off some of its paraphernalia. After eliminating some of the ornaments and getting it down to its bare bones, we voted for it and adopted it.

The Senator from Iowa admits in his argument that he doubts very much whether the proposal he now makes is at all necessary. If it is not necessary, why spend the afternoon discussing it and debating it, and talking about implementation? Many people use words without knowing what they mean. I challenge anyone to tell us what "implementation" means in this connection.

The Senator from Iowa talks about sending troops to Europe. We voted on that question in the Senate. We said that congressional approval was necessary before that was done. But this is a broader term. It includes any military implementation. If we were to send over a gun, that would be military implementation. It would be necessary to call up Washington and have Congress pass a resolution every time it was desired to shoot a cannon over there. If we send shells over there, that is military implementation. The captain would say "Wait a minute, sergeant. Don't you pull that string. Don't you fire that cannon. That is military implementation, and we have to call upon Congress to pass an act before we can shoot. Bide your time. Wait until we get authority."

I know that is true, because the Senator from Iowa said it was so. His interpretation applies to any military implementation. It would apply to any kind of ammunition. There must be military implementation by Congress.

Mr. President, this interpretation ought not to be attached to the protocol. We thought, when we adopted the interpretation of the Senator from Iowa with respect to the main treaty, that that ought to meet the situation. If this interpretation had another paragraph to it, the Senator from Iowa would add another amendment to the next paragraph, to "implement" something; and if it had two more paragraphs he would have two more reservations and interpretations.

The Senator from Iowa is not in sympathy with the whole plan. I mean that in all kindness. I do not mean to imply any lack of good faith; but he is responsible for what happens in his head. Brain processes, like constitutional processes, must be regarded.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will reject this so-called interpretation, because it applies only to

Germany. It does not apply to any other country in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I do not think it is fair to discriminate against Germany when we are asking her to come in, to lock shields with us, to stand by our side to defend the independence and integrity of Western Germany. But when we say that to her we should not ask her to take a back seat. We should not ask her to sit in some row that is not occupied by her equals. She ought to be an equal. I favor making Germany an equal in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The way to bring her in is simply to admit her, and not tie on strings, understandings, interpretations, and all the folderol that goes with a reservation of this kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the interpretation offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to address a final question to the Senator from Iowa.

Am I correct in saying that if this interpretation has any effect at all, it sets a different standard for Germany?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I think not.

Mr. McCARTHY. If this provision is necessary, if we are doing something which we did not do in connection with the North Atlantic Treaty, we are setting up a different standard; are we not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think it sets up any different standard for Germany than for any of the other countries. I think the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] amply proved that in his argument, if the Senator will read what he said. He proves that it does not set up any different standard. He says that the question of implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty must be referred to the Congress. All this interpretation would say, even according to the argument made by the excitable Senator from Texas, is that if there is any action for which Congress would have to authorize implementation with respect to Germany, that is what has already been done with respect to the North Atlantic Treaty. My point is that the President does not so regard it. He says that he can implement these things without authority. Therefore I wish to put this interpretation in the protocol, to make certain. It does not single out Germany. It does not deny Germany a single thing to which the other countries are legally entitled.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has the floor.

Mr. WATKINS. I wanted to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah may ask the Senator from Iowa a question without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. The question is this: Does this protocol actually and legally bring Germany in as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. To all intents and purposes; yes. It brings in the European defense community as one of the defensive areas, with an attack on any of its members being considered an attack on any of the North Atlantic countries. All of them are already in the North Atlantic defense community with the exception of Germany. This protocol, in naming the members of the European defense community, names all the countries which are already in the community and adds the name of Germany as a member of the community. Germany is brought under the protective cloak of the North Atlantic Treaty. In a back-door and labyrinthine way Germany is brought under the wings of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. The North Atlantic Treaty requires, before any other nation can be brought into it, unanimous consent on the part of all the parties to the treaty. Must all the parties to the North Atlantic Pact ratify this protocol?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is in accordance with the terms of the potocol.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see them named in the protocol.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE. If I may inject myself into the discussion, I do not believe that the protocol admits Germany into the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see the Canadian signature on the protocol, for example. As I understand, Germany is not actually and legally brought within the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are 14 signatories to the protocol. I believe all of them signed the North Atlantic Treaty.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say that I shall have to vote against the interpretation or reservation offered by the Senator from Iowa. I think the interpretation which he suggests would certainly be the correct interpretation for the entire North Atlantic Treaty. If it is not so interpreted, an attempt to add the interpretation and have it affect only one of the NATO countries would, in my opinion, possibly hamstring any NATO commander from attempting to work out an effective and efficient defense of Western Europe.

Let me repeat that I think the interpretation of the Senator from Iowa is the interpretation which does apply in any event. I think it applies to the entire North Atlantic Treaty. I think it would be a mistake to tack it on to this particular protocol.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. I gladly yield for a question.

Mr. WATKINS. The Senator from Wisconsin has heard the statement made by the Senator from Iowa that the North Atlantic Treaty in all of its provisions must be implemented by act of Congress. That includes military implementation. Where is anything being taken away from Germany? It has to be done for Germany, too. The legislative history which was developed in the February debate on the accession of Turkey and Greece to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization shows that the entire North Atlantic Pact, and every portion of it, must be implemented by Congress. That is all that would be done by the reservation. It would merely reaffirm that interpretation with respect to Germany.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator from Utah is correct. If he is correct, then the reservation interpretation is unnecessary. If he is not correct, and it is necessary, then it creates a different standard for a new nation being admitted into the North Atlantic Treaty. Does the Senator from Utah follow me?

Mr. WATKINS. No; I cannot follow the Senator from Wisconsin in that connection. All that it does is what the Senator from Iowa explains it does, namely, to say to the President in no uncertain terms: "The Senate wants you to understand that this protocol must be implemented by Congress." It is another message to the White House; that is all it is.

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe it says to the President in no uncertain terms that this protocol must be implemented by Congress. I agree with the Senator that the North Atlantic Treaty must be implemented by Congress. If that is correct, then this interpretation is unnecessary. If on the other hand the Senator from Utah and I are not correct in our interpretation of the law, and this reservation is necessary, then it does set up a different standard for Germany.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I gladly yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. The request is sufficiently seconded, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that personally I am inclined to agree with the logic which he expresses. If one is passing candy out to a certain group of people on the same basis, and then attempts to pass out candy to another person, but with strings attached, a different basis is established. If the interpretation as to all is the same, it is not necessary to spell it out with respect to one. To spell it out with reference to one weakens, I fear, the interpretation with respect to the prior nations.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for

a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the interpretation to the resolution of ratification offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If the Senator from Arkansas were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—25

Aiken	Flanders	Smith, N. J.
Bricker	Hendrickson	Stennis
Butler, Nebr.	Hickenlooper	Thye
Cain	Hunt	Watkins
Cordon	Jenner	Welker
Dirksen	Langer	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young
Ecton	Mundt	
Ferguson	Saltonstall	

NAYS—51

Benton	Hoey	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Holland	Monroney
Case	Humphrey	Moody
Chavez	Ives	Morse
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Duff	Kilgore	Pastore
Eastland	Knowland	Robertson
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Frear	Long	Seaton
George	Magnuson	Smathers
Gillette	Maybank	Smith, Maine
Green	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McCarthy	Sparkman
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	Wiley

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Bennett	Kefauver	Nixon
Brewster	Kem	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Kerr	Schoeppel
Byrd	Lodge	Taft
Capehart	Malone	Tobey
Carlson	McMahon	

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's interpretation was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and the yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 72, nays 5, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Benton	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Conor
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Case	Hunt	Pastore
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Douglas	Kilgore	Seaton
Duff	Knowland	Smathers
Eastland	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ecton	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Martin	Sparkman
Flanders	Maybank	Stennis
Frear	McCarthy	Thye
George	McClellan	Underwood
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	Monroney	Williams
Hendrickson	Moody	Young

NAYS—5

Dirksen	Jenner	Welker
Dworshak	Langer	

NOT VOTING—19

Anderson	Fulbright	McMahon
Bennett	Kefauver	Millikin
Brewster	Kem	Nixon
Bridges	Kerr	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Tobey
Capehart	Malone	
Carlson	McCarran	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 72, the nays 5. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution advising and consenting to the ratification is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ashton H. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina, vice J. Waties Waring, retired;

Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands;

Guthrie F. Crowe, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the District of the Canal Zone, vice Joseph J. Hancock, resigned;

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board; and

Edward M. McEntee, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island, vice George F. Troy, retired.

By Mr. JENNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Kathryn McHale, of Indiana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, reappointment.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Walter L. Greene, of Alabama, to be Federal Housing Commissioner, vice Franklin D. Richards, resigned.

CONSIDERATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Earl Wayne Beck to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia, I understand that that is no longer an appointive position. I therefore ask unanimous consent that that appointment be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POSTMASTER AT BOISE, IDAHO

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James F. Hughes to be postmaster at Boise, Idaho.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I previously requested that consideration of the appointment of Mr. Hughes as postmaster at Boise, Idaho, be passed over. I do not object to consideration of the nomination at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of B. Bernard Greidinger to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this nomination was reported adversely.

Mr. GEORGE. The nomination was reported adversely, Mr. President, but the committee would like to have the nomination passed over for the day.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anthony F. Arpaia to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Kelso Elliott to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles D. Mahaffie to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1958.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, is the Senate now considering the nomination of Mr. Mahaffie to be a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I desire to invite the attention of the Senate to a report which has been filed in regard to Mr. Mahaffie. His nomination was reported by unanimous vote of the members of the committee. There was no opposing vote. There has been a report filed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], Chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. That report is very critical of Mr. Mahaffie and of the actions, decisions, workings, and organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I should like the RECORD to show that no other member of the committee, so far as I know, and certainly not the Senator from Ohio, supports the views stated in this report. It certainly does not represent the recommendations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Throughout the report the phrase "your committee" appears. There is no authorization for the use of any such phrase. I think it is an entirely improper report to have filed when a majority of the committee has not been given the opportunity of filing a report in support of Commissioner Mahaffie. His nomination met with the unanimous approval of the committee. One case was picked out with which one Member did not agree, and the Member put before the Senate and Mr. Mahaffie's colleagues on the Commission a reflection on the integrity and the ability of Commissioner Mahaffie.

An effort was then made to cure it by a plaudit given to Mr. Mahaffie in the last paragraph.

I want the RECORD to be straight, and I ask the chairman of the committee to confirm what I have said.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I confirm everything the Senator has said except that there is one difference I have with him pertaining to the report to which he has referred.

At the time when our committee voted on the nomination of Commissioner Mahaffie, and voted to report it by a unanimous vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] requested permission to file a report. That permission was given. That does not mean, however, that the report that was filed was a report by the committee.

The Senator from Ohio is correct in that regard. The Senator from New Hampshire was given permission to file a report.

Mr. BRICKER. No one objected. Any individual Member can file a report. My objection to the report is that throughout it speaks of "your committee," on the assumption that it represents the views of the committee; but it represents nothing under the sun but the views of one individual who did not vote either for or against the nomination in the committee. I think it is an entirely improper report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator is correct in that the report is the individual report of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I assume responsibility for not catching that point at the time the report was filed. I filed it for the Senator from New Hampshire, he being absent. I should have caught the point that the report purports to cover more than the Senator's own views. I presume it is entirely my fault, because I did not notice it. I take second place to no Senator in my admiration and respect for Commissioner Mahaffie. He is one of the ablest men in public service today.

Mr. BRICKER. I appreciate the statement of the chairman of the committee. I brought up the matter only so that the RECORD might show that there is no criticism of the character or record of this nominee by the other members of the committee.

There may be certain cases which Mr. Mahaffie has decided, supported by the remainder of the Commission, with which we would not agree, but that would not justify a report such as the one the Senator from New Hampshire has filed.

I do not want to hold up the nomination. I think the gentleman who is nominated is one of the ablest men who has ever served on the Interstate Commerce Commission. He is particularly well qualified to deal with matters under the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a statement of approval of Mr. Mahaffie.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, in submitting a favorable report to the Senate on the reappointment of Commissioner Mahaffie, I took such action because of the excellent record the nominee has made in his three previous terms as a member of the Commission. I likewise am influenced by the strong recommendations that were received from persons acquainted with this work and his record.

In favoring this nomination, I did not attempt to substitute my judgment on the issues or merits of cases that have come be-

fore Commissioner Mahaffie during his terms of office.

In thus presenting to the Senate this view, I desire to inform the Senate that not only has Commissioner Mahaffie made a most creditable record as a member of the Commission but that he is a man of integrity, industry, and courage, who can be relied upon in the future, as was the case in the past, to handle with complete fairness the duties assigned to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in behalf of Commissioner Mahaffie. I do not know him personally, but I know people who do know him, and I know of his record. One of those persons said he hoped Commissioner Mahaffie's nomination would be confirmed, and I am glad to have an opportunity to make that statement as a part of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Maurice Sanchez, of New Mexico, to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation of all nominations made today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON THURSDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday I gave notice of a night session in order that we might be sure to adjourn next Saturday. I would rather have shorter hours at the end of the week than to be uncertain about whether we can finish our work. If we are going to have long hours, I think it is better to have them at this time of the week, rather than on Saturday, with long sessions such as we have had in the past. I appreciate the fact that the Senate has been willing to cooperate in the program. We have made progress, and it has been because all the Members of the Senate have cooperated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 9:30 a. m. on Thursday, there be a call of the calendar from the beginning of bills to which there is no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Penagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi;

S. 1863. An act to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national;

S. 2006. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2545. An act to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency;

S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard;

S. 2630. An act for the relief of Mary Fox;

S. 2637. An act for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas;

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; and

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3168) to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. SIKES, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GORE, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, Mr. PHILLIPS, and Mr. COTTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

APPLICATION TO INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF CERTAIN WORKS IN CONNECTION WITH ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Congress, the application to the International Joint Commission, dated June 30, 1952, for approval of certain works in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and an exchange of notes, of the same date, between the Canadian Government and the United States Government concerning the St. Lawrence project (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S MATERIALS POLICY COMMISSION ON RESOURCES AND FREEDOM

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission on Resources for Freedom (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 159)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $240,000, for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 160)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $400,000, for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1953 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1951, together with a set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PUBLIC POWER—RESOLUTION OF TENNESSEE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution which was adopted by the 1952 annual convention of the Tennessee Industrial Union Council, at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 13 and 14, 1952, relating to public power.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON PUBLIC POWER ADOPTED BY THE 1952 ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE TENNESSEE INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., JUNE 13–14, 1952

All Americans, as consumers and citizens—laborers, farmers, housewives, manufacturers, merchants—have a fundamental interest in the production, distribution, and utilization of the power resources of our Nation. Abundance of low cost electrical energy or its scarcity and consequent high cost affect the standards of living of all, and the productivity and strength of our Nation itself. We as citizens of Tennessee, having personally experienced the growth and achievement of TVA, know that low cost power is vital to a full production economy. The assurance and provision of an abundant supply of power at lowest possible cost is a public responsibility; and

The American people's heritage of power resources is threatened today by unreformed private power monopolists, defending their high-cost, scarcity-supply policies by the immoral use of rate-payers' funds to corrupt our sources of information, our educational institutions and the democratic processes themselves: Therefore be it

Resolved—

1. There must be the best possible electric service to consumers everywhere—residential, agricultural, commercial or industrial—at the lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

2. All feasible potential power resources of the Nation, hydro or other, must be developed as rapidly as they can be soundly undertaken. Public and cooperative agencies must be permitted to build and operate fuel burning generating plants and to integrate them with hydro power.

3. River basins should be developed not only for power production but in accordance with comprehensive, basin-wide plans which will assure soil and forest conservation, flood control, reclamation and irrigation of land, improvement of navigation, abatement of pollution, municipal and industrial water supply, protection of fish and wildlife, expansion of recreational and cultural facilities, salinity control, and other benefits. Such development can and must be done only by public agencies with widest practical participation of local public agencies and cooperatives. The obstruction of such unified development by licensing of the economically advantageous projects to private exploitative interests must be stopped.

4. Benefits of the development of the public's power resources must reach consumers undiminished by any unnecessary added costs. Public transmission facilities and aid to local agencies or cooperatives in the establishment and acquisition of distribution systems must be provided wherever need exists.

5. Electric power publicly produced belongs to the public. The public has first preference right to it as such owners. It should not be supplied to industries or private profit distributors (1) if needed by public agencies and consumers' cooperatives, or (2) without such control of resale rates and conditions of service by the producing agency as will assure that all publicly created benefits reach the public in the form of lowest possible rates.

6. The private power industry in America must be cleansed. Although its illegal, immoral, and degrading activities were exposed and condemned only two decades ago, the unreformed and unrepentant industry given a privileged monopoly position to supply a necessity of our lives, is today again charging and expending rate-payers' money as operating expense, to corrupt public sources of information, educational institutions, public agencies, and the functioning of our democratic institutions. There must be immediately established at every level of private utility operation as thorough and continuing investigation of all expenditures of moneys by power monopolists for propaganda, lobbying, political activity, or corruption of public servants or institutions. Regulatory bodies, law-enforcement agencies, legislatures, and the Congress itself must discharge their duty to the American people to expose, punish, and publicize unethical, immoral, or illegal practices on a vigorous and continuing basis. There must be immediate and continuous action to assure that benefits of tax concessions, accelerated amortization subsidies, and similar windfalls to private companies reach consumers and that inflated valuations, watering, and inefficiency are not charged in expense.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

H. R. 6129. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1991).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Hajna Sepsi (Rept. No. 1993);

S. 1358. A bill for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky (Rept. No. 1994);

S. 1780. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi (Rept. No. 2004);

S. 1966. A bill for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo (Rept. No. 2005);

S. 2212. A bill for the relief of Charles Michell (Rept. No. 1995);

S. 2473. A bill for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini (Rept. No. 1996);

S. 2479. A bill for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb (Rept. No. 1997);

S. 2577. A bill for the relief of Mikio Abe (Rept. No. 1998);

S. 2681. A bill for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone (Rept. No. 1999);

S. 2869. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto (Rept. No. 2000);

S. 2989. A bill for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve (Rept. No. 2001);

S. 3050. A bill to authorize the payment of certain claims for damage to private property, loss of wages, personal injuries, and death, arising out of noncombat activities of the Army (Rept. No. 2002);

S. 3356. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Boczer, Terry Davis, Leopole A. Praczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris (Rept. No. 2003);

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar (Rept. No. 2006);

H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto (Rept. No. 2007);

H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell (Rept. No. 2008);

H. R. 2166. A bill for the relief of Sister Antia (Vincenzina Di Franco) (Rept. No. 2009);

H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife (Rept. No. 2010);

H. R. 2860. A bill for the relief of Ines Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel) (Rept. No. 2011);

H. R. 3071. A bill for the relief of Vito Aiuto (Rept. No. 2012);

H. R. 3211. A bill for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others (Rept. No. 2013);

H. R. 3705. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney (Rept. No. 2014);

H. R. 4002. A bill for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett (Rept. No. 2015);

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos (Rept. No. 2016);

H. R. 4590. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Piandolit and Fuencisla Segimont (Rept. No. 2017);

H. R. 4921. A bill for the relief of Silas B. Morris (Rept. No. 2018);

H. R. 5004. A bill for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co. (Rept. No. 2019);

H. R. 5006. A bill for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc. (Rept. No. 2020);

H. R. 5095. A bill for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased (Rept. No. 2021);

H. R. 5453. A bill for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug (Rept. No. 2022);

H. R. 5481. A bill for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain (Rept. No. 2023);

H. R. 5578. A bill for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad (Rept. No. 2024);

H. R. 5911. A bill for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde (Rept. No. 2025);

H. R. 6070. A bill for the relief of Paul Gust Williams (Rept. No. 2026);

H. R. 6083. A bill for the relief of Amalia Architetto (Rept. No. 2027);

H. R. 6109. A bill for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz (Rept. No. 2028);

H. R. 6356. A bill for the relief of William J. Martin (Rept. No. 2029);

H. R. 6637. A bill for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino (Rept. No. 2030);

H. R. 6641. A bill for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu) (Rept. No. 2031);

H. R. 6640. A bill for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita (Rept. No. 2032);

H. R. 6732. A bill for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof (Rept. No. 2033);

H. R. 6869. A bill for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee (Rept. No. 2034); and

H. R. 7366. A bill for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son, James Robert Eder (Rept. No. 2035).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Jacob Gitlin (Rept. No. 2037);

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith (Rept. No. 2038);

H. R. 3060. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co. (Rept. No. 2039); and

H. R. 4188. A bill for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett (Rept. No. 2040).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

H. R. 3653. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia (Rept. No. 2041);

H. R. 4163. A bill for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C. (Rept. No. 2042);

H. R. 4842. A bill for the relief of Joseph Manchion (Rept. No. 2043);

H. R. 4932. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others (Rept. No. 2044); and

H. R. 7331. A bill for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz (Rept. No. 2045).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3975. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1992).

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 3303. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2046).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of eighteen the right to vote; without amendment (Rept. No. 2036).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 3200. A bill to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 2047).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 1689, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably Senate resolution 345, to print additional copies of Senate Report 1689, Eighty-first Congress, relative to operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The cost of printing the report will be $250. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 345), submitted by Mr. GREEN on June 30, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the document room 5,000 copies of Senate Report No. 1689, Eighty-first Congress, second session, a report of the Committee on Banking and Currency pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 1, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger; and

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon.

INTERIM STAFF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

During the delivery of Mr. DOUGLAS' speech, later in the afternoon,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Illinois will yield to me in order that I may submit a report, without his losing his place on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an interim staff report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, showing the damage which has been done to America. The report has been compiled by the staff of the Joint Committee. The report is provided for by the law which was enacted the other day. It is signed by Mr. Warren, representing the House, and Mr. Pierce, representing the Senate. The report shows that if the men started back to work tomorrow, steel production this year would be less than last year. I submit the report without criticism. I wish to show only the actual facts and figures with respect to production.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is no one in this body whom we love more than the Senator from South Carolina. It is always a pleasure to yield to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that this is an act of brotherly love. My only hope, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois knows, is that we can get the steel mills started again, with all due respect to management and to the members of the Murray union, the CIO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report which I have submitted be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1952.

Memorandum to Senator MAYBANK.

Interim staff report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production on the impact of the steel strike (through June 30) on defense production:

1952 steel ingot losses due to strikes:	
April and May strikes...tons...	2,400,000
June strike.....do....	9,000,000
Estimated total losses to June 30.....tons...	11,400,000
Total 1952 ingot production (original estimate)....tons...	112,230,000
Losses to June 30.....do....	11,400,000
1952 estimate (less losses to date).....tons...	100,830,000
Percent of original 1952 estimate	90
Total 1951 ingot production.....tons...	105,000,000
1952 estimate (less losses to date).....tons...	100,830,000
Difference.....do....	4,170,000
Percent decrease	4
Start-up losses: Additional production losses estimated during first week steel plants resume operation.....tons...	2,000,000
Steel produced during June: Estimated production from plants in operation....tons...	1,000,000

Impact of the strike on the iron ore industry: It has been stated by the industry that approximately 3,000,000 tons of ore was lost in shipment each week during the strike which will be badly needed for steel production next winter when the lakes are frozen.

A. E. PIERCE, *Staff Director.*
H. J. WARREN, *Clerk.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 3431. A bill for the relief of George H. Crow; and

S. 3432. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3433. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Sengoku; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 3434. A bill to amend Part II of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment-trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of trucks and truck-trailers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 3435. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 3436. A bill to clarify the status of certain officers heretofore retired and granted retirement pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3437. A bill to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3438. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3439. A bill for the relief of Joseph Amin Kehdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 3440. A bill to limit the cases in which persons charged with offenses cognizable by the criminal branch of the municipal court

for the District of Columbia may forfeit collateral in lieu of appearing for trial;

S. 3441. A bill to provide for the better control of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia;

S. 3442. A bill to make uniform the procedure on interstate extradition in the District of Columbia;

S. 3443. A bill to amend the Narcotic Drug Act of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 3444. A bill to make certain transactions involving the making of gifts to, or the receiving of gifts by, officials of the District of Columbia prima facie evidence of a violation of certain statutes relating to bribery;

S. 3445. A bill to prescribe certain penalties applicable to present and former officers and employees of the District of Columbia who refuse to testify concerning matters relating to their public office;

S. 3446. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention and punishment of all gambling, except casual social gambling, in the District of Columbia; and

S. 3447. A bill to provide criminal penalties for the unlawful possession of narcotic drugs with intent to barter, exchange, sell or give the same to another; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SPECIAL CANCELING STAMPS OR POSTMARKING DIES IN CERTAIN POST OFFICES TO ENCOURAGE VOTING IN GENERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement of the Honorable EDWARD H. REES, a Representative from my State of Kansas, which he made before the so-called Karsten subcommittee on H. R. 7871, introduced by Representative REES in the House of Representatives, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3435) to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE REES OF KANSAS ON HOUSE BILL 7871

My bill, H. R. 7871, presently under consideration by this subcommittee, authorizes the Postmaster General to permit the use of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies to encourage citizens to register and vote in general elections. This permission will be granted to first- and second-class post offices. The legislation would further what I regard as a very real public purpose.

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., one of the larger organizations of its kind, has been gravely concerned, as many other public spirited organizations and citizens are concerned, with respect to the failure of American citizens to exercise their privilege of suffrage. The Junior Chamber of Commerce has made considerable effort to publicize the need and the duty of all citizens to exercise their voting franchise. The organization has suggested, as one of the most effective means of encouraging citizens to register and vote, the use of a special canceling stamp at the Wichita post office using the words "Register now—then vote" on outgoing mail.

I submitted this proposal to the Post Office Department, with an additional suggestion that the Department sponsor a special cancellation slogan at the time of the general election. I was informed that the law authorizing special cancellations does not contemplate that a slogan of the type proposed shall be used in postmarking mail. As to my suggestion for a special cancellation slogan at the time of the general election, I was told that even if it were possible to authorize such a slogan, postal funds or appropriations could not be used to purchase the special equipment which would be needed, and that the cost of such equipment for slogans which are authorized must be borne by private sponsors.

The Postmaster General's report on H. R. 7871 does not recommend enactment of the bill because, it says, "in some areas of public opinion there would be objection * * * since it would be felt that the suggested activity on the part of the Post Office Department would be in the nature of a partisan act" and "the Post Office Department was established for the transmission of mail matter and not as an instrument for influencing public action." We shall see whether these reasons hold water.

The Bureau of the Budget has submitted a report on this bill that supports my belief that the Department can authorize such cancellation messages. In view of this report, it is possible the Department may change its opinion as to the adequacy of present law to authorize this special cancellation. However, for the record I should like to present supporting data that I collected prior to receiving a copy of the Bureau of the Budget report.

A 1923 opinion by an acting solicitor of the Post Office Department on the policy for the use of special dies advertising various projects appears to me clearly to approve the authorization of projects such as that proposed by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, when the cost is borne by private sponsors. The opinion stressed the part of the law authorizing special canceling stamps or postmarking dies "where the event to be advertised is of general public interest and importance and is to endure for a definite period of time and is not to be conducted for private gain or profit." It was pointed out that while what is or is not of "general public interest" is largely a matter of judgment, the apparent intent is "to exclude an interest entertained by merely small classes of the public to the exclusion of the majority." No other exclusion was mentioned. The opinion indicated the propriety of authorizations for matters of "intelligent concern" to people or involving a "degree of importance which would justify unusual recognition by people with respect thereto, * * * say the automobile industry, or the tire industry" as a whole.

I have secured samplings and press releases of recent special cancellations, sponsors, and the like. Here are some examples:

One cancellation was to advertise a lilac festival at Rochester, N. Y., sponsored by the Rochester Lilac Time Committee.

Another was to advertise a tulip festival at Albany, sponsored by the Albany Tulip Festival.

Still another was to advertise a State laurel festival at Wellsboro, Pa., sponsored by the Wellsboro Chamber of Commerce.

And still another one was to advertise Aloha Week in Honolulu, Hawaii, sponsored by the Jaycee Old Timers of Hawaii.

It is entirely inconsistent and incongruous to me that the Postmaster General should deem it appropriate to authorize use of special canceling stamps for events such as these, and not to urge all citizens to exercise their greatest of all rights and privileges, the right of the secret ballot.

In 1925 Harry S. New, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, said in answer to objections raised against the use of special cancellations designed to promote the national welfare:

"All such cancellation stamps have authority of law and only such are used as in the judgment of the administration are in the interest of the United States. In no sense is the cancellation stamp placed upon letters to be taken as the view of the sender or of the addressee of mail matter, its purpose being solely to convey a message from the United States Government to citizens."

I do not conceive it to be the function of this committee to delve into the reasons behind the steady increase in the number of people who are failing to exercise their right to vote. But by the very nature of our office as Members of Congress, the fact of this increase is constantly hammered home to us. I agree it is unfortunate that people should have to be reminded of the privilege, as well as the responsibility, of casting their votes at election. Incredible as it may seem, only 49 percent of those entitled to vote in the 1948 election actually voted. Enactment of H. R. 7871, of course, will not automatically bring to the polls all of the 39,000,000 persons who failed to vote in the last Presidential election. I do believe it will be one effective means of stirring eligible voters of all parties to more active participation in general elections. For too long people have not been reminded of the dignity and seriousness clothing this privilege of voting.

Post Office Department objections to the canceling stamp "Register Now—Then Vote" are inconsistent, to say the least, with the past policy not only of the Department but of the executive branch. Presidents regardless of affiliations have always been leaders in urging citizens to vote. Theodore Roosevelt said: "It is not only your right to vote, but it is your duty if you are indeed free men and American citizens. I want to see every man vote. I would rather have you come to the polls even if you voted against me than have you shirk your duty." Lincoln was not thinking in terms of party policy when he wrote "it is not the qualified voters, but the qualified voters who choose to vote, that constitute the political power of the state." Thomas Jefferson wrote "that government is strongest of which every man feels himself a part." If ever political leaders in this country have been united in a common cause, it has been to get out the vote.

I am sure you will agree that it most certainly is as much a duty of the Government to remind its citizens of general election dates and their corollaries, the registration dates, as it is to advertise such matters as flower festivals, to say nothing of Aloha Week in Hawaii. To the extent we increase the number of voters who register and go to the polls, to that extent we strengthen our democracy.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; and

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; and

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

An address delivered by him at the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va., on June 30, 1952.

Excerpts from an address by Adolph Berle at the Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Pamphlet entitled "The Influence of the Deep South Upon the Presidential Election of 1952," by Claude Pepper.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Letter addressed by Fred Vogel to the Secretary of Commerce, regarding problems of small business.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "United States Stockowners Put at 6,500,000,000, with 76 percent Earning under $10,000," published in the New York Times of July 1, 1952.

SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain letters exchanged between the Governor of South Dakota and myself with reference to the National Guard of the State of South Dakota. I might state to the present occupant of the chair that these are the letters about which I spoke to him relating to the status of the National Guard units.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 21, 1952.

Hon. FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, Washington, D. C.:

The State of South Dakota is opposed to any program to keep South Dakota National Guard units designations in active service for 5 years. South Dakota urgently requests immediate return and reactivation of Guard units under original unit designations.

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, April 21, 1952.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Please find enclosed herewith copy of telegrams sent to the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Frank Pace, Jr., and to Major General Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, wherein I express the attitude of South Dakota in connection with National Guard units designations. I will appreciate your support and that of other Members of the congressional delegation in resisting any program to keep the National Guard units designations in active service for 5 years. I am of the opinion that the units designations should be immediately returned to the State of South Dakota for reactivation. I will appreciate your assistance in this matter.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, May 3, 1952.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 2 and copy of letter to you from Miles Reber, the Chief of Legislative Liaison of the Department of the Army both in connection with the retention of the National Guard unit's designations. I appreciate your sending me this material.

I am very opposed to any retention of the National Guard units in the services for any length of period after the return of the National Guard personnel following their completed tour of duty. In that connection I feel that H. R. 5472 (superseded by H. R. 7714) is an objectionable piece of legislation and I hope that if it should get as far as the Senate that you will assist with the coup de grace. The Department of the Army is trying to work out a kind of a watered down proposition where the units will be returned to the United States and given their old detail plus "National Guard, United States" and the regular unit will be kept in the service. This looks like a kind of a run-around deal and might lead to some confusion. In any event, Francis, I hope that you and the members of the congressional delegation will keep in mind that the National Guard of South Dakota and I are both opposed to any tampering with the return of the unit's designations to South Dakota.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 9, 1952.

Hon. SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor, Statehouse, Pierre, S. Dak.

DEAR SIG: Thanks for the recent letter pertaining to House of Representatives bill 5472, which would retain unit designations of the National Guard on duty for several years.

That bill has been superseded by H. R. 7714 which was reported to the full House Armed Services Committee from a subcommittee on May 6. The full committee agreed to report it to the House.

In that early stage of legislation I am unable to predict what the results will be. However, we do know that there is considerable opposition to retention of unit designations and that the Army is studying the problem.

At any rate, I am enclosing a copy of the bill for your information. You may also be assured that I will keep your interest in this matter in mind should this legislation reach the Senate.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CASE.

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Pierre, May 13, 1952.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANCIS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your two letters of May 9 and 10 with reference to the return of the National Guard unit designations to State control. I am going over the material that you sent me and I will write you at a later date. This morning I received a letter from Secretary of the Army Pace in connection with the same problem. Have not had an opportunity to completely digest it. As soon as I have any further thoughts in this matter, I will drop you a line.

Thanking you for your assistance in this matter and with best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

SIGURD ANDERSON,
Governor.

NEW PATRIOTIC SONG, LEAD, MY AMERICA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on the Fourth of July there is to be the annual celebration on the grounds of the Washington Monument. On that occasion the United States Marine Band will play a new patriotic song, entitled "Lead, My America," which was written by Badger Clark, poet laureate of South Dakota, and which has been set to music by Harold Dudley, of that State. The song has been played a few times, and it attracted the attention of persons who brought it to the attention of the National Parks Administration. It is to be sung on the Fourth of July by Pfc. Charles W. Oliver, of the United States Marine Corps.

I ask unanimous consent that the words of the song may appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAD, MY AMERICA

Lead, my America, daughter of nations,
Destined to lead from the day of your birth,
Fruit of the dreaming of all generations,
Sister in blood to the tribes of the earth.
Lead, my America, vision come true,
Wistful the ages have waited for you.

Liberty rings through your wonderful story,
Snapping the shackels and bursting the bars,
Upward you mounted from bondage to glory
Under your flag of the glittering stars.
Lead, my America, ride to the van,
Pointing the way to the freedom of man.

Hope of the world, with your stars ever guiding,
Dare the dim ways where no nation has gone,
On through the smoke of the battlefield riding,
Lead, ever lead, with your face to the dawn.
Lead, my America, over new sod,
Breaking a trail toward the mountains of God.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 236, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 13,000 additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law

414, Eighty-second Congress, second session, of which 10,000 copies shall be for the House document room and 3,000 copies for the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the adoption of this concurrent resolution will save $5,000. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CONTINUATION ON PAYROLLS OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF MEMBERS OF HOUSE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 446) relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the joint resolution relates solely to continuing on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. It is a courtesy to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 17 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "COPYRIGHTS"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill deals with copyrights. After it passed the House it was amended in the Senate. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. FERGUSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

The committtee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendments, insert the following: "That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

"A-6427738, Abu-Zannad, Fakhri Eddin.
"A-6775706, Albrecht, Bohumil.
"A-9542215, Balodis, Eduards.
"A-6886819, Beck, Helene.
"A-6886821, Beck, Cecile.
"A-6886820, Malek, Serena Beck.
"A-6470386, Bednar, Zdenek Frantisek.
"A-6779245, Berkovic, Isaac.
"A-6780732, Berkovic, Mulvina.
"A-6811524, Cihovicz, Anna or Sister Maria Urbana Cihovicz.
"A-6618832, Czuker, Jan.
"A-6841088, Deutsch, Josef Gabor or Joseph Gabriel Deutsch.
"A-6794942, El-Hindi, Ahmad Elf Mohamed.
"A-6870402, Falkowski, Zdzislaw.
"A-6870403, Falkowski, Maria Janina.
"A-6953383, Falkowski, Malgorzata Maria Rosa.
"A-9716783, Falk, Bernard Alojzy.
"A-6503646, Friedman, Evzen.
"A-6389949, Friedman, Ruzena or Rose.
"A-6757652, Goldburd, Zundel.
"A-6757998, Goldburd, Basia.
"A-9652186, Grinbergs, Manfreds.
"A-6780725, Grunfeld, Aizbeta.
"A-6740921, Gurwicz, Meir.
"A-6707452, Gurwicz, Serena.
"A-7095745, Haas, Erzsebet or Elizabeth.
"A-6794993, Heller, Livia.
"A-6702147, Hendeles, Lajzer.
"A-6623660, Hendeles, Moselle (nee Cohen).
"A-7283102, Hrdinova, Milena Marie Anna.
"A-6860904, Iwensky, Saja.
"A-6694231, Kalisz, Icchok.
"A-6905321, Kaplanek, Ruzena.
"A-6760574, Kesler, Michael, or Michael Kesler-Guberman.
"A-7828443, Kostins, Vladimirs.
"A-6481280, Kovacs, Anna, or Maria Anna Crescentia Kovacs.
"A-6403567, Kwan, Wei.
"A-6627366, Kwan, Yun-Sun Haleh.
"A-6819609, Lazar, Irene Theresa.
"A-6935235, Mach, Antonin.
"A-6704679, Magrys, Janina.
"A-6685998, Malach, Pinkas.
"A-7095744, Maly, Oldrich.
"A-6704677, Michniak, Felicia Theresa.
"A-6937218, Nagy, Tibor Julius.
"A-6983577, Roth, Herman.
"A-6765745, Schneider, Bluma Salzberg.
"A-6762002, Schneider, Chaim.
"A-6854619, Schwerd, Leopold.
"A-6854620, Schwerd, Bernard.
"A-6854621, Schwerd, Abraham.
"A-6804007, Segal, Simon.
"A-6726993, Seidl, Zdzislaw.
"A-6726994, Seidl, Margit.
"A-6704246, Sikora, Genowefa.
"A-6598476, Silbiger, Edith (Edita Silberger).
"A-7053523, Spiegel, Alexander Schlomo.
"A-7053521, Spiegel, Olga Wald.
"A-7941113, Spiegel, Edith.
"A-6759333, Szalai, Georgine Marie Etel Ida or Georgine Szalay.
"A-6636178, Szczepanski, Izrael.
"A-6739561, Szczepanski, Elka.
"A-7841770, Urga, Johans Jekabs.
"A-6775595, Vietorisz, Thomas Adam.
"A-7176736, Walder, Gyula.
"A-7176735, Walder, Ilona Dubik.
"A-6610297, Weinfeld, Ernest.
"A-6662194, Wenger, Szmul.
"A-6654356, Wenger, Kenia.
"A-6991753, Zaleski, Pawel or Paul Zaleski or Edward Novak.
"A-6714888, Zonabend, Zofia Felicja Zawadzka.
"A-6850602, Zupnick, Dora A.
"A-9543111, Altmark, Leo.
"A-6343513, Beer, Susan (nee Eisdorfer).
"A-6609639, Gottlieb, Marcel.
"A-6886816, Halpert, Ludwik or Leonard Halpert.
"A-6911231, Jakobi, Anna.
"A-6708652, Kawer, Benjamin.
"A-6886817, Klecki, Choma.
"A-6490332, Koppel, Izidor or Isidore.
"A-6523412, Kustin, Dina.
"A-7457274, Kustin, Abram.
"A-6523411, Kustin, Galina.
"A-6839294, Laturski, Tadeusz Stefan.
"A-6715860, Mauskopf, Mailich.
"A-6886814, Miller, Akiwa.
"A-6883775, Miller, Anna (nee Brander).
"A-6883774, Miller, Szabsy.
"A-6991757, Pap, Gabor Tivadar.
"A-6991758, Pap, Ilona.
"A-9776585, Partyka, Paul William, also Wilhelm Pawel Partika.
"A-6518510, Skotchko, Evelyn.
"A-6807055, Steinberger, Bela.
"A-6903867, Steinberger, Jeno.
"A-6440950, Verderber, Rachela.
"A-6440951, Verderber, Rechava.
"A-7073952, Wolinski, Edward.
"A-7863546, Wolinski, Henryka Wanda.
"A-6881417, Shapira, Clara.
"A-6361759, Bernardowicz, Wladislaw.
"A-6361760, Bernardowicz, Helena Sosnowitch.
"A-9776569, Burak, Josef Julian.
"A-7849973, Catarahia, Panait.
"A-7841917, Latkovic, Ilija.

"A-6780707, Neuman, Rachel.
"A-9727767, Onichimowski, Saturnin.
"A-6662205, Parkany, Janos.
"A-9543193, Pitka, Andreas.
"A-9556582, Sarr, Ludvig.
"A-7125497, Schick, Bedrich or Fritz Schick.
"A-7052319, Singer, Markus.
"A-7110845, Sinunu, Jacoub Badie.
"A-7095960, Sinunu, Alexander Badie.
"A-6860796, Teleki, Suzanne.
"A-9010488, Vajak, Jacob (Wajak).
"A-6910034, Wallner, Istvan or Stephen Wallner.
"A-6861909, Zanka, Jaroslav or Jerry.
"A-6891829, Bers, Naum Saia.
"A-6704679, Dorosz, Bozenna Anna.
"A-6771742, Dudum, Manawell.
"A-6704687, Gawel, Zofai.
"A-9801211, Hermits, August.
"A-7079989, Hrdlicka, Richard Frantisek.
"A-6689608, Krajnik, Iszak.
"A-6193516, Lakovic, Rajko S.
"A-6685877, Leibowitz, Nochim.
"A-6676326, Leibowitz, Sara.
"A-9777236, Paala, Evald Aleksander.
"A-9831393, Paju, Arnold.
"A-6291887, Piasecki, Witold Marian.
"A-6291890, Piasecka, Helena.
"A-6691306, Purec, Hersz.
"A-7802322. Saar, Evald.
"A-6794819, Schwarcz, Emil.
"A-6991809, Schwarcz, Ruzena.
"A-7957361, Schwarcz, Maxmilian.
"A-6662192, Stupaczewski, Abram.
"A-9678258, Tapp, Augustine.
"A-6632026, Trella, Felika.
"A-6830450, Awad, Ishak Said.
"A-6499960, Basch, Abraham Hersh.
"A-6383642, Blat, Pinchos.
"A-7118810, Borsay, Maria Anna.
"A-6937571, Borsody, Istvan Karoly or Stephen Borsody.
"A-6937572, Borsody, Charlotte or Sarolta Borsody (nee Herzka).
"A-6937573, Borsody, Eva Katalin.
"A-6937574, Borsody, Hanna Erzsebet.
"A-6771769, Burianek, Otto.
"A-7057913, Calauz, Rozalie Fekete.
"A-6241050, Fen, Wu Chi or Cary Wu.
"A-6944214, Hanak, Karla.
"A-6944213, Hanak, Michael.
"A-6749974, Hauer, Miklos.
"A-7821840, Ingr, Sergej Jan.
"A-6829981, Klein, Jozsef.
"A-6775565, Klima, Slava.
"A-6911181, Kolev, Ilia Gichev.
"A-9836601, Kowalczyk, Wladyslaw.
"A-7427257, Laats, Jyri Georg.
"A-6427743, Lorenzo, Jack Mubarak.
"A-6794698, Machek, Otakar.
"A-6896050, Niculescu, Barbu.
"A-6617281, Odeh, Aziz Salim.
"A-6985602, Perlmutter, Laszlo.
"A-6985601, Perlmutter, Katalin (nee Stern).
"A-7941872, Perlmutter, Aniko.
"A-6232285, Piekarski, Stanislaw Witold.
"A-6851559, Ping, Wong Wai.
"A-6622756, Raad, George Khalik.
"A-6816851, Rybarova, Anna or Anna Rybar.
"A-6344908, Rydz, Zygmunt.
"A-6803953, Rywkin, Mordchai or Mordchai Rivkin.
"A-6855954, Rywkin, Dvosia.
"A-7138279, Klimek, Adolf.
"A-9777307, Sum, Ho.
"A-6231163, Swastek, Franciszek Antoni.
"A-6683244, Szterenzer, Szymon.
"A-6912090, Szterenzer, Sonia.
"A-9663929, Varnag, Enn or Samuel Mool.
"A-7491670, Vesik, Mihkel.
"A-6461146, Vrastilova, Marie Alzbeta or Marie Vrastilova.
"A-7520334, Vymetalik, Henry or Jindrich Alos Mazarek.
"A-6536908, Weisz, Ignatz.
"A-7088157, Ziffer, Walter.
"A-7095722, Ardavanu, Nicolae alias Nicolas Rene Ardavanu.
"A-7095721, Ardavanu, Irina (nee Profeta).
"A-7052394, Benes, Rudolf.
"A-6848038, Chang, Chi-Jen.
"A-1804201, Chang, Wen Ti alias John Wen Ti Chang.
"A-7095968, Duchacek, Ivo.
"A-6694107, Dyksztejn, Idel.
"A-7439091, Fan, Mabel Shun Wha.
"A-6962949, Foris, Peter.
"A-7138234, Gold, Michel.
"A-6689553, Gross, Moric.
"A-6644593, Grunwald, Peter.
"A-6534204, Guttman, Irma.
"A-7717655, Hu, Betty Mayling (formerly Stella Wang).
"A-9582853, Ivellio, Joseph.
"A-6044017, Jablonska, Wladyslawa.
"A-6044580, Jablonska, Eleonora.
"A-6903683, Janicki, Andrzej.
"A-6491962, Kaevats, Ilmar.
"A-6491963, Kaevats, Ella.
"A-6491961, Kaevats, Juri.
"A-6727314, Kann, Eduard.
"A-7184190, Kase, Francis Joseph.
"A-6868638, Klopman, Eliase.
"A-7858008, Klunic, Anton or Tony.
"A-6419788, Laren, Kuno Boris.
"A-6778938, Lauko, Vladimir.
"A-7934744, Lazarevic, Ivo.
"A-9564652, Leppik, Artur or Arthur Lepik.
"A-6729775, Loblovics, Robert.
"A-6549173, Lu, Kuo Chin.
"A-9777296, Lukowski, Zbigniew.
"A-6390519, Macek, Vlado alias Vladimir Macek.
"A-6744210, Macek, Josipa Ivan (nee Jurak).
"A-6744283, Macek, Agnes Ljerka alias Agneza Ljerka Macek or Agnes Macek.
"A-6744284, Macek, Andre alias Andrej Macek or Andre Matchek.
"A-7132174, Mazur, Zbigniew Kandyt.
"A-7248035, Moldoveanu, Toma (Thomas).
"A-7248034, Moldoveanu, Constance.
"A-6481279, Nagy, Maria, or Sister Mary Andilla.
"A-6920909, Neumann, Leonie Finali.
"A-6794909, Nubani, Jawdat Ibrahim.
"A-6445457, Okakiewicz, Justyna Joanna.
"A-9528959, Polis, Roberts.
"A-9538292, Rabba, Heinrich Eduard.
"A-7095909, Reimann, Ernest.
"A-7095910, Reimann, Dora (nee Banffy).
"A-7197749, Rekeny, Anna.
"A-6343459, Ranty, Bronislaw George formerly Bronislaw Rubinfeld.
"A-6669273, Rzeszewski, Binem.
"A-6669274, Rzeszewski, Roisa (nee Parriser).
"A-6870015, Sadilek, Zdenek.
"A-9736877. Sai, Rudolf.
"A-9745639, Sarzants, Karlis.
"A-6704468, Schwartz, Peter.
"A-6662195, Semiatychi, Hercel.
"A-6427758, Shiber, Saba George.
"A-6704212, Sibinska, Bozenna (Barbara).
"A-6491960, Slim, Helene.
"A-6491959, Slim, Albert.
"A-6804022, Silberstein, Deszo.
"A-7049560. Silverman, Anna Rudsinsky or Silberman.
"A-6387197, Skala, Imrich.
"A-6887196, Skala, Stefania.
"A-6779237, Slavensky, Pavel, alias Jacob Frielich.
"A-6748490, Steinberg, Gennady Henry Matveievitch.
"A-6508276, Szule, Mihaly or Michael alias Sarossy.
"A-6602324, Szule, Gabriella Morocz.
"A-6497289, Tan, Kim Hoang.
"A-6620586, Tsien, Tang Zing.
"A-9764971, Uhach, Luigi
"A-6751514, Vanek, Zdenek alias Abraham Grunberger.
"A-9538394, Vesk, Karl.
"A-6803917. Wajnberg, Rywka or Rita Weinberg.
"A-6848669. Lang, Chi Ko.
"A-6403572, Yang, Anchi Wong.
"A-7886918, Ying, Wong Shan (Mrs. B. Y. Woo).
"A-7886918, Woo, Kee Pea or Nancy Woo.
"A-7122699, Zelka, Joseph Yehooda.
"A-9550407, Akula, Nikolai.
"A-7210031, Bartok, Anna.
"A-6760689, Baumohl, Sandor or Alex or Alexander Baumohl.
"A-6461100, Benno, Salman Ezra.
"A-6937370, Bialy, Jerzy Josef.
"A-6798088, Birenbaum, Solomon.
"A-7858185, Bokun, Jozef.
"A-9707201, Boomis, Driscis Zania.
"A-6882107, Brayer, Menachem Mendel.
"A-6576395, Breuer, Emil.
"A-7198815, Chang, Nathan Chong Tsau.
"A-6976880, Chu Bacon.
"A-6523895, Cieplak, Stanislaw Jozef.
"A-6923153, De Warge, Levente (Levente Warga de Sziget).
"A-6712036, Dracoqoulos, John Basil.
"A-6449406, Falkine, Stella or Selima Falkine.
"A-7414979, Fried, Ernst.
"A-6709336, Friend, Balfcura.
"A-6644123, Gottesmann, Maria.
"A-6644124, Gottesmann, Mignon.
"A-6582210, Halata, Vlasta.
"A-6983819, Hecht, Mendel.
"A-67.9386, Herskovic, Herman.
"A-7125313, Hodzova, Drahotina.
"A-6627211, Hu, Fu-Nan or (Mrs.) Lan-An Hsu.
"A-6794756, Ilitch, Milorad.
"A-6669708, Ivanoff, Helen Petrovna.
"A-7991219. Kaaman, Hugo.
"A-7879262, Kaddak, Heinrich.
"A-7052316, Kahan, Frida.
"A-7341655, Kahu, Ewald Ewraim.
"A-7121844, Kaibni, Fuad Ibrahim.
"A-6769261, Kaupas, Victor Vladas or Kyburg or Kyburz.
"A-6794761, Keleti, Pierre Georges (George Peter Keleti).
"A-9723279, Kerns, Ansis Roberts or Hans Robert Kern.
"A-7427260, Kielbasa, Joseph.
"A-6949988, Klein, Herman.
"A-6934966, Klein, Edith (nee Edith Roza).
"A-6702193, Koneff, Boris Alexandrovich or Bob or Alexander Koneff.
"A-7858098, Koo, N. Z. (Shen Ven Yeh).
"A-9514992, Kukk, Alexander.
"A-6381672, Kupferstein, Ervin.
"A-6752980, Lantos, Thomas Peter.
"A-6878013, Levita, Olga or Lewita (nee Spitzer).
"A-7985932, Lillimagi, Arthur.
"A-7095793, Lillimagi, Miralda (nee Norden).
"A-9802602, Lillimagi, Leonard.
"A-7863547, Lozicki, Jan.
"A-6248630, Luts, Heino Alfred.
"A-6830003, Maday, Bela Charles or Bela Karoly Maday.
"A-6803924, Maimon, Yeta (nee Jolan or Janta Berger).
"A-6232254, Maksymow, Jozef John.
"A-9673342, Manni, Otto.
"A-7118623, Marsak, Ivo Vaclav.
"A-7985661, Mensik, Bohumil or Francois Segal.
"A-6497203, Mikulasek, Adolf.
"A-6371452, Miller, Sophia Pavlovna (nee Rumarchuk).
"A-6271454, Miller, Rada Alexandrovna.
"A-6555839, Minoot, Rudolf or Rudolf Minuth.
"A-6610312, Miranker-Miranski, Zalman.
"A-6678556, Noulik, Eduard.
"A-6678557, Noulik, Leida Helene.
"A-6537557, Parna, Jaan Voldemar.
"A-6536276, Parna, Lizette (nee Leinberg).
"A-6597438, Pinter, Szymon.
"A-6554216, Piwowoz, Mojzesz.
"A-6740118, Platovsky, Shoshana.
"A-6819144, Pollak, Rosa.
"A-6606627, Porgesz, Herman.
"A-7463690, Posidel, Bartolo.
"A-6803935, Pressler, Stevan.

"A-9825261, Rachuba, Lidia.
"A-6835860, Rago, Louis Joseph.
"A-7849818, Romm, Carl Calle.
"A-6555819, Schiffman, Rose or Roza Schiffman.
"A-6958445, Sierpowski, Josef.
"A-6564149, Soltan, Eli Boruch.
"A-6669727, Staub, Edith Bohm.
"A-6685994, Szwarcblat, Chaim or Chaim Schwartzblatt.
"A-6984639, Tasev, Athanas Stoyanov.
"A-6843543, Taub, Solomon.
"A-6987828, Todorov, Theodore Ivanov.
"A-6239889, Veedam, Voldemar.
"A-7934148, Vimb, Evald Ferdinand.
"A-6047249, Wandzel, Adam Arthur.
"A-6634021, Weiss, Zlata.
"A-6819102, Weksler, David.
"A-6811475, Wekaler, Golda.
"A-6730652, Wu, Ming An (Man On Ng).
"A-6015116, Zucker, Emilie.
"A-7081670, Ajluni, Raymond Marfuz.
"A-6633726, Alter, Szymon.
"A-6479412, Andre, Laszlo.
"A-6772246, Ayish, Ahmad Shihadeh.
"A-6949331, Bay, Adela.
"A-6694124, Bergsztyn, Benjamin.
"A-6834685, Boucher, Nathalie Alexandrovna Konzenetsova.
"A-6911189, Demeter, Odon Thomas.
"A-6843541, Deutsch, Cheskel Ezekiel.
"A-7469208, Eid, Anisa Gabriel.
"A-6905019, Friedman, Helen.
"A-6905020, Friedman, Gisella.
"A-6694300, Hai, Kong-Ming (Paul).
"A-7821166, Hsia, Ting Wei.
"A-6534332, Ifland, Miriam Jacob.
"A-9549897, Karner, Rudolf.
"A-6794963, Kawwas, Naim Jacob.
"A-6805585, Klein, Rosita Erdan.
"A-9656333, Konstantin, Roots.
"A-9679936, Koster, Sergei.
"A-7061798, Krunci, Ladislav Antonin.
"A-9825047, Kwiecinski, Stefan Josef.
"A-6830509, Ledwon, Pawel Josephat or Prater Josephat Ledwon.
"A-6724356, Lomova, Charlotte.
"A-6956129, Lux, Verona.
"A-7178958, Musallam, Abla Eid.
"A-7879625, Musallam, Najwa Sani.
"A-7879626, Musallam, Suad Sami.
"A-6848834, Nagy, Vince.
"A-6848835, Nagy, Elsa (nee Szevera).
"A-6848846, Nagy, Adam.
"A-9758946, Pagan, Luigi Attilio Mario.
"A-7182828, Pennar, Jean.
"A-6555846, Popov, Alexander Ivan.
"A-6347212, Radsepp, Eugen.
"A-7898926, Rannala, Sten Alexander or Sten Alexander Nyholm.
"A-6821776, Resev, Nikolai or Nicholas.
"A-6860784, Rodzinski, Zyzislaw, Josef.
"A-6860785, Rodzinski, Jadwige Halina.
"A-7125370, Saar, Max Emil.
"A-6227908, Tubielewicz, Boguslaw, Ludwik.
"A-7955339, Viede, Erich.
"A-7120688, Wang, An-Pang.
"A-7053579, Waldman, Esther (nee Frenkel).
"A-6886822, Waldman, Mendel.
"A-6857570, Weiss, Lilly.
"A-6955111, Absolon, Karel Bedrich Jaroslav Willibald Jindrich.
"A-9825061, Adamska, Jadwiga.
"A-6866913, Adler, Eva (nee Ladislai).
"A-6990725, Arnost, Milan Jan.
"A-6990754, Arnost, Herta Maria.
"A-6990726, Arnost, Milan Jan, Junior.
"A-6990727, Arnost, Thomas Michael.
"A-6690579, Bitker, Alexandra.
"A-6690578, Bitker, Joseph.
"A-6523944, Bitker, Rachel.
"A-6881809, Braun, Isaac.
"A-6985312, Braun, Ruchlia.
"A-6377034, Cassis, Elias George.
"A-7069276, Celemenski, Jacoh.
"A-7457503, Costea, Alexandru Nicolai.
"A-6834663, Djonovic, Jovan Ivov.
"A-6923757, Edelman, David.
"A-6775676, Egyes, Leslie or Ladislav Egyes.
"A-6509231, Einhorn, Zelig.
"A-6830479, El Farra, Mohammad Hussein.
"A-6923780, Erlachtegerecht, Sonia.
"A-6342965, Feldman, Avner.
"A-6852892, Feristein, Berta.
"A-6750390, Fiac, Mirko.
"A-7841187, Fong, Tham.
"A-6819650, Friedman, Adolf.
"A-6779244, Friedman, Henriette (nee Waldman).
"A-6923761, Geher, Boruch.
"A-7290199, Godt, Israel Avram.
"A-6511096, Gottesman, Arthur Marcell.
"A-6887539, Gunsburg, Samuel.
"A-6794974, Hagher, Tipora Chane.
"A-7283384, Halasz, Elek Miklos.
"A-6689615, Halberstam, Rachela.
"A-6948549, Hoffmann, Jindrich.
"A-6772233, Horewicz, Julius or Juliusz Hozenpud.
"A-6537074, Huang, Yu Pao Hsu.
"A-6597973, Hujczyc, Boleslaw Adam.
"A-6635678, I, Fu Hsiang.
"A-7046037, Kabbani, Ezra Haroun.
"A-7052499, Kertesz, Stephen.
"A-7890872, Kivitis, Pauls Roberts.
"A-6694404, Klems, Ludmila.
"A-6770458, Kooby, Yacoub Sion or Jack Kooby.
"A-6774490, Kopolowitz, Ludwig.
"A-6460702, Novey, Diana (nee Daniela Slabizner or Daniela Lederman).
"A-6794821, Leitner, Hilda.
"A-7073608, Lettrich, Josef.
"A-9537477, Linkgreim, Karl.
"A-6545325, Lewin, Uszer.
"A-7069592, Morvai, Roza (nee Gero) or Rose Morvay.
"A-6868640, Najder, Konstanty Marceli.
"A-6868639, Najder Leontyna Maria.
"A-6442234, Neubert, Marie.
"A-6448304, Ngai, Shih-Hsun.
"A-6567558, Ngai, Hsueh-Hwa.
"A-6335532, Odescalchi, Paul Gabor or Pal Gabor Odescalchi.
"A-6868641, Pasztory, Catherine Sophie.
"A-6713380, Pille, Ado.
"A-6713379, Pille, Linda Marie.
"A-6740254, Rekant, Chaim.
"A-7858333, Rudnyanszky, Olga.
"A-7858334, Klein, Maria Anna.
"A-7244177, Russo, Anna.
"A-6862610, Sayovicz, Mayer.
"A-9738075, Savovic, Niko Mihailo.
"A-7366402, Sitko, Antoni Ludwik.
"A-6954059, Svozil, Metodej.
"A-6954060, Svozil, Vratislava Jana (nee Smekalova).
"A-6780717, Szorenyi, Emma.
"A-7841882, Tamaro, Pietro.
"A-6927968, Tanav, Heino.
"A-6772299, Teleki, Deneb.
"A-6921249, Toeg, Naima or Naima Menashi.
"A-7131201, Tomaszewski, Stefan.
"A-7903396, Valle, Josip or Giuseppe or Joe.
"A-9541986, Vilk, Heinrich.
"A-6985631, Votava, Helena.
"A-6965382, Wacholder, Benzion.
"A-6685099, Wajdenbaum, Towia.
"A-6843065, Wajdenbaum, Sara (nee Dawidowicz).
"A-6831434, Wajdenbaum, Samuel.
"A-6847920, Wen, Victor Yen Hsiung.
"A-7053545, Wosnansky, Hannal or Judith Enricht.
"A-6847812, Yao, Cheng Yu.
"A-2687547, Zarko, Martin.
"A-9764876, Babushkin, Moses Alexander or David Alexander Miller.
"A-6737988, Bialestocki, Morduch.
"A-6606121, Bigo, Olga.
"A-6916676, Chou, Yung Hsuan.
"A-6616289, Cuklerman, Chil Wolf.
"A-6566966, Cuklerman, Frida.
"A-8021211, Cuklerman, Mary.
"A-6453859, Culik, Rudolf.
"A-7184427, Decleva, Paul.
"A-6923754, Dembitzer, Chiel.
"A-6923755, Dembitzer, Rafael.
"A-6984617, Epstein, Dydio or Yedidia Epstein.
"A-6884898, Faytelew'cz, David.
"A-6760581, Ferdman, Noach or Feldman.
"A-6751442, Ferdman, Mina (nee Brejzman).
"A-6819651, Fono, Andras.
"A-6843558, Hauer, Rozalie (nee Mozes).
"A-6534330, Huang, Helene Te-Yao.
"A-7284228, Hui, Florence A. or Hsiu Chang Hui.
"A-7361083, Hutt, Juri or George J. Hutt.
"A-7056726, Jaksy, Elsa nee Moskovitz.
"A-6472585, Kadvany, Alexander J.
"A-6472586, Kadvany, Louise.
"A-6990739, Konig, Margit (nee Ausch).
"A-6685985, Lejbiker, Jochanan.
"A-6676396, Lejbiker, Sara.
"A-6544517, Leppma, Zoja.
"A-6849327, Leppma, Tonu Ilmari.
"A-6475641, Maly, Gero.
"A-9825230, Mattessich, Giovanni Andrea.
"A-9727771, Paleta, Jan Piotr.
"A-7941871, Popovich, Slobodan.
"A-6537556, Rehepapp, Aleksander.
"A-6819127, Reich, Lilly (nee Fried).
"A-6819128, Fliegman, Agnes (nee Fried).
"A-6740512, Schiffer, Janos Pal.
"A-6775692, Szto, Pa'' Chu Hsuen.
"A-6794729, Szucs, Tibor Istvan or Tibor Stephen Such.
"A-6760678, Tabak, Maier or Maier Fisch.
"A-7398380, Tamm, Meinhard.
"A-6332586, Turnauer, Martin.
"A-7395209, Udvarnoki, Bela, Junior.
"A-7121716, Wang, Kung Fong.
"A-6886837, Wieczorek, Aleksander.
"A-6837931, Yin, Huo-Chin.
"A-7910377, Yin, Log Yuin How.
"A-7099681, Zenki, Petr.
"A-7099682, Zenhl, Pavla.
"A-6622735, Abboud, Fuad Labib.
"A-6613211, Aboody, Albert Moshi.
"A-7354343, Andrassy, Elizabeth Maria.
"A-6897916, Aubrecht, Veroslava Anna.
"A-6877413, Barczykowski, Wladyslaw Mieczyslaw.
"A-7463692, Bercari, Louis.
"A-6805598, Berger, Ilona (nee Hoch).
"A-7828767, Berzins, Karlis Arvids.
"A-7402058, Berzins, Roberts (alias Robert Bersin).
"A-6953060, Bondo, Isidore Juda.
"A-6383637, Bronsztejn, Szyja.
"A-9203941, Brus, Tobias Albert.
"A-7201405, Brzorad, Vilem Jan.
"A-6668898, Bursbtyn, Nuchim Benjamin.
"A-7828039, Bussanich, Nicolo.
"A-6829982, Butosi, Janos.
"A-7174556, Ch'en, Shih Chen also known as Flora May Ch'en or Flora May Chun.
"A-6606896, Chiang, Sze Jih.
"A-6491659, Czarnecki, Jan.
"A-7069335, Darnoi, Denis Nicholas.
"A-6685878, Dolinski, Josef.
"A-6984654, Dolinski, Inda.
"A-6697383, Doman, Francis Steve or Ferenc Doman.
"A-7115666, Dowek, Judel.
"A-7115667, Dowek, Elyasz.
"A-6463167, Ehrenfeld, Sandor.
"A-6616297, Elissa, Jeanette Joseph.
"A-6595048, Fajwusowicz, Zalman.
"A-6574575, Fajwusowicz, Ewa.
"A-6574574, Fajwusowicz, Cyla.
"A-6142241, Fang, Pao-Hsien.
"A-6804019, Fernbach, Sarolta (nee Blau).
"A-6819645, Fischman, Helen.
"A-7144010, Gabor, John Michael Joseph.
"A-6769829, Gartman, Stanislaw.
"A-6716261, Gerganoff, Stoyan Tsonu.
"A-6716262, Gerganoff, Zdravko Tsonu.
"A-6819649, Gluck, Hedy Cseszne.
"A-7046277, Goda, Erno.
"A-7046278, Goda, Olga.
"A-6903762, Goldstein, Andrej.
"A-6953264, Goldwag, Matys.
"A-7138289, Goldwag, Sylwka.
"A-7299341, Grabowski, Wojciech Waclaw.
"A-6855674, Gross, John (nee Janos Grosz).
"A-6862640, Gross, Margrit.

"A-6621147, Gutlejzer, Szanja.
"A-6490311, Gutlejzer, Enia (nee Lebensold).
"A-9777256, Gyorffy, Gabriel Emery.
"A-6922075, Haim, Haskel Joseph.
"A-6685996, Halpern, Kalman.
"A-6847991, Hardoon, Hisqail Hougie.
"A-6819097, Hauer, Erwin.
"A-7991864, Hauer, Judesz.
"A-6985843, Hauer, Gisella.
"A-6570459, Hendrikson, Oskar Rudolf.
"A-6570460, Hendrikson, Mary Henriette.
"A-6538671, Hendrikson, Matti.
"A-7210071, Hesser, Andre.
"A-6877764, Holt, Charles Chi-Chien, alias Chi-Chien Ho and Kai-Him Ho.
"A-6794990, Horowitz, Tauba Padawer (nee Herschthal).
"A-6534359, Ivanoff, George Georgevich.
"A-6622742, Jbeily, Joseph Ibrahim.
"A-7097890, Jungreisz, Tibor.
"A-6843557, Jurkanski, Blanka Malek (nee Blanka Malek).
"A-6199301, Jurkovic, Vincenc Martin.
"A-7982539, Juskiewicz, Bronislaw.
"A-6383406, Kao, Chao Ming alias Robert Kao.
"A-6991788, Karman, Rozsi alias Rozsi Kohn and Rozsi Farkas.
"A-6622739, Karram, Mussa Hussein.
"A-7129579, Karram, Mariam Mussa.
"A-8021522, Karram, Monia Mussa.
"A-6369727, Kask, Karl.
"A-6985793, Katz, Ruzena.
"A-6990779, Katz, Desider Simonovic.
"A-6524393, Kavardjieva, Lilia Vlachova.
"A-6943767, Klein, Michal or Miksa.
"A-7841916, Knesich, Luciano.
"A-6803926, Koenigsberg, Eugene or Eugene Konigsberg.
"A-6953005, Kohn, Alexander.
"A-2712646, Koo, Sheu Tse.
"A-9802872, Kowalski, Boleslaw.
"A-98225141, Kozloski, Stanislaw.
"A-6770126, Krek, Mihael (Michael).
"A-5915370, Krek, Amalia.
"A-6043936, Krek, Alex.
"A-8001000, Krotowski, Stanislaw.
"A-8021889, Krotowska, Alicja (nee Landowska).
"A-9542199, Krumins, Karlis Valdemars.
"A-7841411, Kujovic, Radoslav Radoje.
"A-6390161, Laevsky, Israel Henry.
"A-9582579, Latkovic, Filip.
"A-6537889, Lebovic, Edith (nee Edith Sicherman or Edith Sichermann).
"A-6827138, Lewanska, Franciszka.
"A-6760596, Liebling, Joel.
"A-6765747, Liebling, Zelda.
"A-6330125, Macuka, Darinka.
"A-6286699, Magi, Kaljo.
"A-6662179, Margolin, Mowsza.
"A-6652101, Margolin, Ester.
"A-6652100, Margolin, Ejdla.
"A-6819164, Mayyasi, Sami Ali H.
"A-6837572, Meisels, Fani.
"A-7128147, Mendel, Desideriu.
"A-6771762, Meo, Leila Marie-Therese.
"A-6620565, Miller, David Solomon.
"A-6620555, Miller, Lydia Semon Rivkin.
"A-6830207, Miodonski, Ted George or Tadeusz Szymon Miodonski.
"A-9635262, Morawski, Jozef.
"A-7383020, Mravak, Dragutin.
"A-9238144, Narel, Aleksander.
"A-9728202, Nestorowicz, Marian.
"A-7849802, Nomm, August.
"A-6992471, Ohmer, Sofka or Sofia (nee Pentcheva).
"A-6929684, Onody, Desider Andrew.
"A-6606301, Orleanski, (Brother) Casimir Karol.
"A-7841141, Natkanski, Wincenty.
"A-9550887, Ostrowski, Ignagy.
"A-7078165, Piatkowski, Juliusz Konstanty.
"A-9825018, Pionko, Jerzy.
"A-7243264, Podlewski, Stefan.
"A-6991768, Prec, Klara Judith.
"A-679,4989, Prec, Oldrich.
"A-7886182, Rochowczyk, Jozef.
"A-6700642, Rosenbloom, Elie Samuel.
"A-6496749, Rubin, Anna (nee Halberstam).
"A-6953463, Saltoun, Violette Haron.
"A-7095742, Salzmann, Zdenek.
"A-6984637, Samter, Louise.
"A-6440743, Shohet, Naim Rouben (nee Chohate).
"A-9770509, Sillak, Joosep.
"A-6709294, Smirnoff, Oleg Gabriel.
"A-7809072, Socha, Kazimiera.
"A-6857654, Smutny, Jerzy Mieczyslaus.
"A-6612870, Steinmetz, Heinrich.
"A-6845778, Stenzler, Clara or Klara.
"A-6903753, Sterling, Harry alias Hersch Stelung.
"PR-947098, Stolz, Jiri.
"A-5914235, Stolz, Marta (nee Bergmann).
"A-7043949, Stolz, Jiri Junior.
"A-7043950, Stolz, Eva.
"A-7828824, Strak, Michal.
"A-6643498, Suchestow, Judyta Jeannette.
"A-9632473, Tamm, Waino alias August Eduard Tamm.
"A-5911908, Tarkas, Erich.
"A-6544383, Tilvel, Jaan.
"A-7138041, Toffler, Arthur.
"A-7138042, Toffler, Lily.
"A-9740112, Trantmann, Otto.
"A-6304578, Tsan, Chu Hsi alias Hsi Tsan Chu.
"A-7676457, Vulicecic, Baldo.
"A-7057932, Vyssokotsky, Sergius Constantine also known as Serge Vyssokotsky.
"A-7057933, Vyssokotsky, Jenny Christine (nee Neggo) also known as Jenny Christine Neggo-Vyssokotsky.
"A-7056048, Weil, Vitezslav.
"A-7056049, Weil, Margaret.
"A-6886848, Weiner, Abraham Abby alias Abraham Abi Weiner.
"A-6619083, Weiss, David.
"A-6551930, Weitz, Louis.
"A-6551931, Weitz, Regina.
"A-7133269, Wen, Chang Hsien (Sister Mary Cyrilla).
"A-6791636, Winkler, Joseph.
"A-6791637, Winkler, Aniela.
"A-6791638, Winkler, Maria Paula.
"A-7415146, Yee, Ping Kou.
"A-7135691, Yin, Huo-Min.
"A-6847817, Yu, Kwok Tung alias Mason Yu.
"A-7802470, Arge, Heinrich Leonhard.
"A-7457686, Betlejewski, Waclaw.
"A-9825097, Bochenski, Michal Walenty.
"A-6897515, Bondo, Ilona Polatsek.
"A-9825180, Bussanich, Martino.
"A-7206034, Cerna, Zorka Maria.
"A-7083852, Chescowski, Nicholas.
"A-1620402, Dambski, Apolonia Maria.
"A-1249547, Dambski, Kazimierz Jozef.
"A-6887744, Dancziger, Ferenc alias Fred Dancziger.
"A-7058911, Drabek, Jaroslav.
"A-7096050, Drabek, Jaromira.
"A-7056912, Drabek, Jaroslav Adolf, Junior.
"A-7351219, Drabek, Jan Adolf.
"A-6805595, Faber, Ruzena (nee Gross).
"A-7354828, Farnadi-Dieti, Fedor.
"A-6938000, Flaks, Jacob David.
"A-7879332, Friedman Joseph.
"A-7095797, Gidzinski, Kazimierz.
"A-7074033, Hillel, Victoria Zaharia.
"A-6968051, Hrazdilova, Jirina Marie.
"A-6301097, Jalinskas, Ceslovas.
"A-6301096, Jalinskas, Brone.
"A-6432770, Jaouni, Taysir Muhammad.
"A-6949316, Jiruska, Frantisek Jaroslav.
"A-6635258, Kalnay, George.
"A-6886924, Klein, Emil.
"A-6891807, Lefkovic, Akiba.
"A-7520872, Lew, Katherine.
"A-6924567, Lipnicki, Michael.
"A-6542040, Lucis, Janis.
"A-7054514, Machek, Miroslava (nee Mericka).
"A-7177878, Mikulik, Lubomir.
"A-7049979, Mojsilotic, Blagoje.
"A-6371460, Mul, Hersz.
"A-6762543, Muniak, Jan.
"A-6590279, Orlandic, Pavle.
"A-6899266, Plater-Zyberk, Marguerite Wielopolska.
"A-6960366, Scharl, Maria.
"A-6989080, Silhavy, Josef.
"A-6989078, Silhavy, Amalie.
"A-6989079, Silhavy, Pavel.
"A-6689775, Stanisavljevich, Nikola Dragisha.
"A-6232252, Sukiennick, Mieczyslaw.
"A-7282655, Szefner, Szyfra.
"A-6805582, Teitelbaum, Lipot.
"A-7197697, Tilt, Elmar.
"A-6855683, Tomashevich, George V.
"A-6967361, Tsou, Tcheng-Hoa alias Michael Tsou.
"A-7802495, Vaherpold, Jaan Iver.
"A-7383195, Vikulis, Pauline (nee Gailis).
"A-7143023, Waters, Elmer alias Ervin Wassermann.
"A-6766905, Wulc, Stanislaw Samuel.
"A-6567543, Yao, Vida.
"A-6694102, Zabare, Jankiel Joseph.
"A-6748822, Brtan, Vladimir.
"A-7095994, Cserna, Eugene.
"A-7095995, Cserna, Zoltan.
"A-7873136, Fermeglia, Sergio.
"A-6704042, Froomkin, Joseph Nathanovich.
"A-9759383, Heinvali, Arnold George.
"A-8001563, Ignac, Stanislaw or Ignac Stanislaw.
"A-7955272, Kanski, Frank (Franciszek Konrad Kanski).
"A-6633720, Karas, Zelman.
"A-6688188, Klein, Tereza.
"A-6688184, Klein, Mauritiu or Mor Klein.
"A-7284783, Lawler, Roland Shang-Yong.
"A-6918456, Moskovitz, Roza Grunfeld.
"A-7138291, Peress, Widad Reuben.
"A-6570439, Photos, Basil John alias Vasilios Ioannis Potos.
"A-9670060, Rebane, Albert Johannes.
"A-6918481, Renner, Teresa.
"A-6912550, Renner, Alexander.
"A-6903689, Sze, Victor Tsu-Ying.
"A-9727426, Tilt, Mihkel.
"A-7133284, Tsung, Huai Wei (Sister Mary Innocence).
"A-7809282, Vaga, Matvei.
"A-7809011, Vagvalgyi, Valerie.
"A-7050713, Vracar, Aleksander Mile or Alexander Vracar.
"A-7056849, Wertman, Murray or Motel Wertman.
"A-6923733, Wertman, Issac.
"A-9303392, Zalitis, Heines Hugo Hermans.
"A-7802092, Abraham, Meir Shaoul.
"A-7802090, Abraham, Maima Sason Chlomo David.
"A-7802091, Abraham, Madeleine Meir Shaoul.
"A-7225058, Botez, Theodor.
"A-6967733, Chiang, Helen T'Ieh-Yun.
"A-7118674, Chu, Chung Ying.
"A-7095953, Feleky, Kornelia.
"A-9748640, Ivin, Josip.
"A-6903776, Jager, Hersz.
"A-64088046, Jarvis, Arnold.
"A-7133264, Kan, Kung Ming or Kan Kung Ming (Sister Mary Irene).
"A-7097823, Kelemen, Peter Andreas George or Peter Kelemen.
"A-7095979, Kovacs, Arpad Imre.
"A-7366481, Krivik, Halina or Halina Pecenka.
"A-7139011, Lengyel, Alexander.
"A-7139012, Lengyel, Suzanne.
"A-7941169, Makkay, Elizabeth.
"A-6721757, Melamed, Mojzesz or Moses or Mosess Melamed.
"A-7356261, Metes, Olivia.
"A-8057878, Paszkiewicz, Roman.
"A-7841140, Polli, Karl Voldemar.
"A-7886676, Reibus, Arnold.
"A-6990741, Reron, Aniela Rosalia Szalay.
"A-6857549, Robitschek, Emmerich.
"A-6843478, Roh, Josef.
"A-6852890, Rosenberg, Miriam Peristein.
"A-6613209, Saleh, Es-Saleh, Rasim.
"A-7138015, Stawska, Bronislawa.
"A-7802532, Stawska, Anita.

"A-6997928, Stern, Aranka (nee Aufrichtig).
"A-7133283, Tsung, Li Chih (Sister Mary Carmel).
"A-7182599, Zechary, Jadwiga.
"A-7202565, Zajczyk, Baczewa (nee Kuszner).
"A-7139015, Zajlof, Josef Ber.
"A-6689509, Zimmerman, Isaiah Morris.
"A-7197385, Zywialowski, Jerzy Waclaw.
"A-6588202, Akrabova, Boika Svetoslavova or Akraboff.
"A-6985760, Alimanestianu, Dinu-Constantin.
"A-7828348, Alimanestianu, Barbu.
"A-6760577, Arar, Raymond Moise.
"A-7439282, Babarcich, Albino.
"A-6425831, Bamieh, Nasuh Adib.
"PR-935172, Benes, Bohus Antonia.
"PR-935173, Benes, Mrs. Emilie Berta Zedna.
"A-7243448, Bolek, Anastasia (Sister Barbara).
"A-7873185, Brejt, David.
"A-7874914, Bubich, Ludwig.
"A-7057868, Danielewski, Sylvia Jadwige (nee Lakomska).
"A-7057870, Danielewski, Tadeusz Zbigniew.
"A-7069307, Farcasanu, Mihail.
"A-7193848, Farcasanu, Pia Maria.
"A-7174330, Foldy, Ilona Maria.
"A-6942779, Ghilezan, Emil.
"A-7053573, Ghilezan, Rodica.
"A-6734350, Grynberg, Szmul.
"A-6708762, Hager, Nathan Hers.
"A-6627396, Hahn, Chen Kya.
"A-6526724, Halpern, Jakob Salomon alias Jacob Halpern.
"A-6856802, Hollosy, Zoltan.
"A-6856801, Hollosy, Erzsebet.
"A-6618510, Hsiu, Nai Shen.
"A-9825315, Iglinski, Antoni.
"A-6942790, Ipolo, Tania.
"A-6942791, Boulanovsky, Lana.
"A-6620853, Jiranek, Miroslav Vaclav.
"A-6534353, Jouraval, Albert.
"A-5611152, Kari, Johannes.
"A-6159693, Klepfisz, Roza (nee Perczykow).
"A-7193909, Klepfisz, Irena.
"A-7283395, Koo, Jennie Jang Yu.
"A-7202262, Krajcirovic, Viliam.
"A-6011300, Kuo, Ping Wen.
"A-6011302, Kuo, Ruth How.
"A-7069364, Kwiatkowski, Alexander Joseph.
"A-6369941, Li, Sing-Bay.
"A-7073735, Lindenbaum, Bronia (nee Swiatlowska).
"A-9683229, Loob, Juri.
"A-6934991, Majer, Salamon.
"A-6354829, Maluga, Ludwik alias Zygmunt Lasota.
"A-6354830, Maluga, Jadwiga alias Monica Lasota (nee Kulinska).
"A-8082936, Mayer, Karol.
"A-6997863, Mayer, Miroslawa (nee Jordan).
"A-6526908, Muzaffar, Baha Ed Din.
"A-6742100, Nagy, Joseph Bela Ervin.
"A-4463157, Narajowski, Waclaw Jan.
"A-6967511, Nieu, Chang-Teh T.
"A-6694210, Niu, Frances Teh-I Yin.
"A-6211935, Pai, Sung, Ching.
"A-7890609, Parmac, Philip.
"A-7874962, Pasztory, Balazs Gabor.
"A-6855669, Pinter, Pinkas Majlech.
"A-6285493, Piscikas, Alfonsas.
"A-6534317, Poliak, Aron alias Sam Vech.
"A-6740117, Poliakin, Robert.
"A-6768099, Potasz, Jankiel.
"A-6903698, Sher, Lola (Lola Czarna).
"A-7491017, Slugocki, Wojciech Bratislaw or Wojciech Telesfor Slugocki or Albert Slugocki.
"A-6862612, Stanescu, Alexander Paul.
"A-7097810, Sulkowski, Zdislaw Edward.
"A-6638073, Szabo, Tibor.
"A-6997894, Talacko, Joseph.
"A-7193865, Talacko, Kvetoslava (nee Jahl).
"A-7193864, Talacko, Jan.
"A-6961800, Talacko, Anezka.
"A-7367854, Verebes, Salamon.
"A-7367855, Verebes, Margit.
"A-7367954, Verebes, Erzsebet Georgette.
"A-6916040, Wagszal, Chaskel.
"A-6819099, Wagszal, Anna (nee Grunzweig).
"A-6379028, Zablocki, Aron.
"A-6887730, Zand, Mordka alias Mordcha Zand.
"A-7849171, Zand, Braindla alias Brajndla Zand (nee Bruan).
"A-6772225, Ansari, Ibrahim Abdel-Kader.
"A-6694161, Aronovsky, George Nathan.
"A-6887570, Berkovitz, Terez or Berkowitz.
"A-9702512, Chong, Loh Hain.
"A-6694195, Fastag, Azbil Dawid (Phastag).
"A-6933876, Kaczmarczyk, Bronislaus Lawrence.
"A-6992867, Kertesz, Laszlo formerly Laszlo Kohn.
"A-6880587, Kirszencwajg, Michal Hersz.
"A-6680609, Kirszencwajg, Chaim.
"A-6680588, Kirszencwajg, Chana Sura.
"A-7802320, Kustera, Slavko.
"A-6405964, Kwei, Tu.
"A-7138231, Lehman, Morris alias Mieczyslaw Lehman.
"A-7138282, Lehman, Louise alias Ludwika Halberstadt.
"A-7910500, Lehman, Norbert.
"A-6613284, Long, Sam Tack.
"A-6976770, Lonyay, Carl.
"A-6743161, Nordenshuld, Valentine or Valentine Kozakevitch.
"A-6983576, Rajnman, Hersz.
"A-6904295, Rajnman, Fryda.
"A-7283186, Reider, Hani.
"A-7178643, Rieder, Tivadar.
"A-7283188, Rieder, Olga.
"A-7095964, Rieder, Zoltan.
"A-7802323, Roman, Ahlberk.
"A-6761967, Schlesinger, Andrei Sanders.
"A-7934030, Skorobogaty, Boleslaw.
"A-6445137, Szabo, Andras (Endre) alias Andreas or Andrew Szabo.
"A-6967644, Tang, Nola I-Nan.
"A-7136909, Veske, Alexander.
"A-6953000, Wiesenfeld, Jacob Reiner.
"A-6984444, Wilner, Abraham.
"A-6983563, Wilner, Gabriel.
"A-6896024, Fisnar, Elisabeth.
"A-6618493, Steinfeld, Chana Kovlensky.
"A-6620438, Steinfeld, Avram.
"A-6620440, Steinfeld, Chaim.
"A-6620441, Steinfeld, Eichonon.
"A-6707108, Galas, Emma Roth.
"A-6829041, Gordon, Szepsel.
"A-6937216, Socoloff, Michael Alexander.
"A-6937217, Socoloff, Nadejda M.
"A-7193802, Wedzicha, Wladyslaw.
"A-7193803, Wedzicha, Sabina.
"A-7828630, Klawitter, Aniela.
"A-7384388, Beno, Jan.
"A-7383489, Beno, Zofia.
"A-7383490, Beno, Pavel Stefan.
"A-7383491, Beno, Jan Roman.
"A-6819121, Kaufman, Rozsi (nee Cseszne).
"A-6819123, Neustein, Anni (nee Cseszne).
"A-6685984, Kejsman, Juda.
"A-6704220, Wasilejko, Halina Cristina.
"A-6661938, Ekland, Catherine.
"A-7197376, Herman, Frantisek Ladislav.
"A-6802109, Oselka, Henryk.
"A-6966575, Mascarin, Giovanni.
"A-6249447, Bergmann, Witold Ulrich alias Witold Boleslaw Uderski.
"A-6851463, King, K. Ting.
"A-6484319, Bielecki, Lucjan.
"A-7283196, Tsai, Christiana.
"A-6897686, Vitek, Vera Anne.
"A-6897691, Vitek, Ferdinand Jaroslav.
"A-9550888, Paprocki, Karol.
"A-6740257, Koenig-Mayer, Bernard.
"A-9825008, Gasiorowska, Konstancja.
"A-6887756, Steyer, Danuta.
"A-6887757, Steyer, Marek Tomas.
"A-6887758, Steyer, Stanislaw.
"A-6884228, Low, Laszlo.
"A-7197372, Pei, Tsuyee.
"A-7210069, Britanisky, Leon Gregory.
"A-7210068, Britanisky, Lucy.
"A-7193955, Britanisky, Rose-Marie.
"A-7193956, Britanisky, Mark (Marek).
"A-7828442, Wexler, Dora nee Auer.
"A-7828406, Wexler, Levi Itic.
"A-6917609, Wong, Pao Tee or Wong Pao Tee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
WILLIS SMITH,
HOMER FERGUSON,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
J. FRANK WILSON,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 191, which grants congressional approval to the adjustment of status of certain displaced persons in the United States to that of permanent residence, was amended by the Senate by adding certain names to the resolution and deleting certain other names.

The conferees have carefully gone over the records in each of the cases in which there was an initial difference of opinion as to the merit of the case, and the conferees are now satisfied that the list of names contained in the conference report warrants congressional approval.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 430) approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952, which has been unanimously signed by all the conferees of both Houses, and I believe can be disposed of quickly. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1952, pp. 8618–8619.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it has always been my goal and intention to work for and to the best of my ability help legislate for all of the people concerned, rather than for a special and privileged few. So with the assurance of our conferees on the

amendment they now offer in place of the one offered and adopted by the Senate known as the Johnston amendment, that this compromise amendment will provide all the safeguards not only necessary for all the people of Puerto Rico but also the sovereignty of our own great Nation and people, I will not oppose it. I may add however, Mr. President, that since this legislation has been debated in the Congress of the United States many charges and countercharges of a serious nature have been made that have either been overlooked or unanswered. My interest in Puerto Rico shall not cease with the passing of this constitution.

I realize that Puerto Rico needs the watchful care of the Congress of the United States. For that reason I shall continue to watch the appropriations which go to Puerto Rico, looking out for the best interests of the people of this Nation, and at the same time I shall try to see that the funds are properly expended in Puerto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article entitled "Differing Reactions Over Approval of Constitutions," written by Carlos O. Torres, and published in the newspaper El Imparcial.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

[From El Imparcial of June 25, 1952]

DIFFERING REACTIONS OVER APPROVAL OF CONSTITUTION

(By Carlos O. Torres)

While some leaders of the Popular Democratic Party expressed their rejection of the amendment introduced by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON into the constitutional bill for Puerto Rico so that the same cannot be amended in the future without prior approval of Congress, others have received it with "satisfaction and rejoicing." This was revealed by a fast survey made by El Imparcial yesterday morning.

Other leaders of the Popular Party who were questioned refused to make comments of any sort regarding the Johnston amendment awaiting an official statement by the party.

One of the leaders questioned stated: "We do not see any reason why we should not feel happy and satisfied over the amendment approved by the Senate." Another said that: "Be it JOHNSTON'S or anyone else's, the amendment stipulating that the constitution cannot be amended without the approval of Congress is excellent and we accept it with open arms."

One leader pointed out that "that amendment should be maintained because it is a guarantee for our children and our grandchildren," explaining that "no one knows what may occur politically in Puerto Rico within 10 or 15 years and someone may try to amend the constitution to adopt it to an ideology that is quite different than ours."

STATEHOOD MEMBERS APPLAUD

In other quarters, leaders of the Statehood Party stated that the Johnston amendment approved by Congress, from the statehood point of view is wonderful because it constitutes an absolute guaranty that the constitution, as approved, cannot be amended at the will of those who hold the majority and the government machinery in order to get the voters to ratify some whimful amendment.

In the opinion of an outstanding statehood leader, the amendment by Senator JOHNSTON should be accepted by the Puerto Rican people.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want it known that I am for the adoption of the constitution as amended.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very happy indeed at the result of the work of the conference committee on the Puerto Rican constitution bill. I rejoice that the conferees have eliminated the phraseology of the Johnston amendment. This amendment under its own terms would, I believe, have made the new Puerto Rican constitution an almost meaningless document by reserving to the Congress the veto power over any amendments which the Puerto Rican people might choose to make to their constitution in future years.

This would have been the exact reverse of the underlying idea of the Puerto Rican constitution which was to grant to Puerto Rico the dignity of home rule and of local autonomy under the sole guardianship of the principles of the United States Constitution and of democracy itself.

Our whole purpose was to blaze a new trail in the relationship between the Union of States and the Territory of Puerto Rico. That trail was marked at one end by Public Law 600 which laid down the principles to be followed by the Puerto Rican constitution and at the other, by the Puerto Rican constitution itself.

That constitution was to be a compact between the Federal Government and the people of Puerto Rico, freely entered into on both sides, under whose terms Puerto Rico embraced and accepted the principles of democracy and the principle of United States sovereignty on the one hand, while the Congress, on the other, accepted the principle of Puerto Rican home rule and of local dignity and autonomy.

In my judgment the Johnston amendment would have violated the spirit of that compact, and, as a matter of fact, this was the widespread reaction in Puerto Rico. I have received a score of cablegrams and letters from Puerto Rican leaders and from people in New York protesting the Johnston amendment. I received a copy of a letter from that eminent jurist, Chief Judge Calvert Magruder, of the United States Court of Appeals, First Circuit, a letter addressed to Senator O'MAHONEY, expressing in no uncertain terms Judge Magruder's juridical view that the Johnston amendment was an unfortunate one.

As a matter of fact, I do not think that the author and those who voted for this amendment in the Senate really wanted to do what the amendment actually did. I think some Senators had fears that Puerto Rico might change its constitution in an un-American way. I did not share those fears. In my judgment the Puerto Rican people are so firmly grounded in democratic principles that they would not approve amendments that would be contrary to democratic principles.

But the conferees have worked out language which impresses me as being perfectly reasonable and at the same time should allay any fears which anyone might harbor. Under the terms of the new proviso replacing the Johnston amendment, Puerto Rico is expressly restrained from amending its constitution in any manner which would violate principles of the Federal Constitution, the provisions of Public Law 600, or the provisions set forth in the pending act of approval of the Puerto Rican Constitution itself.

As I see it, this is a very happy solution to the problem, fair to the people of Puerto Rico and just to all. The conferees have paved the way for the speedy approval of this historic document.

I have no doubt the conference report will be approved. It will be approved in time, I hope, for the Puerto Rican Constitution to be promulgated in Puerto Rico on July 4. That day will be celebrated in Puerto Rico with double meaning from this year forward.

I am happy to have shared in the efforts which made this great development possible. This will be a great day in the history of the relationship between continental United States and this offshore island peopled by more than 2,000,000 American citizens. The conferees are to be congratulated, the Senate is to be congratulated, and America is to be congratulated on this fine act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, Members of the Senate have requested that there be read into the RECORD at this point the language which the conferees unanimously adopted in lieu of the Senate amendment. This language has been endorsed by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who offered the amendment. The language adopted by the conferees reads:

Provided further, That except for the purpose of adopting the amendments to section 5 of article II and to section 3 of article VII as herein provided, article VII of said constitution likewise shall have no force and effect until amended by the people of Puerto Rico under the terms of said article by adding to section 3 of article VII the following new sentence: "Any amendment or revision of this constitution shall be consistent with the resolution enacted by the Congress of the United States approving this constitution, with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States, with the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act, and with Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, adopted in the nature of a compact."

Mr. President, we have been assured by the representatives of Puerto Rico that this provision will be written into the Puerto Rican Constitution willingly, and the resolution of approval, House Joint Resolution 430, now requires it. The amendment adopted by the conferees accomplishes what I think was the basic purpose of the Senator from South Carolina when he proposed his amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

FUNDS FOR ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE IN PUBLIC-WORKS PROGRAM

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of a subcommittee, has been attempting to determine whether it was necessary to authorize all the funds which the Army, Navy, and Air Force are requesting for the next fiscal year in connection with the public-works program. Having studied the matter during hearings which sometimes began at 10 o'clock in the morning and lasted until 1 o'clock the following morning, with testimony being taken almost continuously, the subcommittee is of the opinion that hundreds of millions of dollars can be saved in the public-works program without preventing one gun from being fired or one plane from flying. There is a great deal of fat that can be removed from the bill, and we shall make recommendations to the Senate that such savings be made in behalf of the taxpayers of the Nation.

However, I have been alarmed by the activities of some of the armed services in trying to prevent our recommending certain economies even while the subcommittee was conducting its hearings. While we were conducting our hearings on the Air Force, we received a letter from the White House, anticipating some of the reductions, and stating that it would not be in the national interest to make such reductions.

How the President can anticipate what savings we were going to recommend is something that I cannot understand.

In addition to that, some of us are being smeared in syndicated columns, as though we were not trying to protect the public interest.

Yesterday, Mr. Bendetsen, Assistant Secretary of the Army, was seen with a three-star general going through the corridors of the Capitol and the Office Building with what appeared to be a breakdown of what certain reductions would mean to individual States.

Today I received a letter from the junior Senator from Oklahoma, in which he expressed the fear that some badly needed barrack spaces might be eliminated at an Army base in Oklahoma. Apparently the Senator from Oklahoma has been advised that there are 2,962 men sleeping in tents at Fort Sill, and quite properly he feels that they should be moved into barracks. Apparently he was not informed that there were already under construction 3,465 new barrack spaces at Fort Sill, which would provide 500 more barrack spaces then were needed.

Mr. President, while some of us have been trying to reduce expenditures, the Air Force, Army, and Navy have been lobbying individuals and Senators to oppose proper economies.

I hope the Senate will withhold judgment on the bill until we report it to the Senate and every Senator is able to study the economies which we are recommending.

FAIR-TRADE PRACTICES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is there to be discussion of this bill, or is it to go through with supersonic speed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it goes through with that speed, we shall not have a night session.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am reminded of the old maxim, "Marry in haste and repent at leisure."

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, are we going to pass this bill without its sponsors saying a word in its behalf? Is this child to be born without any statement as to the nature of the child?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if no other Senator will discuss the bill, I shall.

Mr. President, I move that the bill be laid on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Illinois moves to lay the bill on the table?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so move.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the motion before the Senate is a motion to lay on the table the fair-trade bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. A vote of "yea" is a vote to lay the bill on the table; a vote of "nay" is a vote against laying the bill on the table. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—7

Aiken	Lehman	Murray
Douglas	Morse	Neely
Green		

NAYS—64

Benton	Holland	Mundt
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smathers
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
George	McCarran	Watkins
Hayden	McCarthy	Welker
Hendrickson	McClellan	Wiley
Hennings	McFarland	Williams
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Young
Hill	Monroney	
Hoey	Moody	

NOT VOTING—25

Anderson	Duff	McMahon
Bennett	Flanders	Millikin
Brewster	Fulbright	Nixon
Bridges	Gillette	Russell
Byrd	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Capehart	Kem	Taft
Carlson	Kerr	Tobey
Chavez	Lodge	
Connally	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' motion to lay the bill on the table was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I made a motion to table, knowing that it

would fail, as an opening shot, so that Members of the Senate might pause to know what they are doing. I had no desire to stop debate on this bill or prevent its consideration.

This is really an extraordinary situation. No Senator has risen on the floor of the Senate to expound the bill. I may point out that the bill has come from the committee without recommendation The hearings have not been printed. No sponsor has risen to explain the bill or give the reasons why he favors it. It is extraordinary that no Senator is willing to assume that burden. Therefore the Senator from Illinois made the motion to table in order the Senators might have more time to consider their action. It is an extremely important bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator think there might be some possibility that the reason no Senator has seen fit to father the child is that there may be some question as to its paternity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was trying to imply that, but I did not wish to be invidious in my references. I think perhaps there might be some doubt about the quality of the child itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield for any Senator to explain the merits of the bill. Then I should like to rise and state the reasons why I intend to oppose it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. The purpose of the bill is to fix prices and increase the cost of living.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It certainly is.

Mr. NEELY. It is a bill to enable certain merchants and druggists to charge 155,000,000 American people three-fourths of a billion dollars a year more than they are now paying for the necessaries of life. The bill, if enacted, will increase the distress of every poor family and every poor man, woman, and child in the land. Under its operation six cans of milk, corn, beans, peas, soup, or other food products will cost approximately as much as seven cans cost now. A hundred other similar illustrations could be given. If the people who will be forced to bear the burden of this legislation, were as well organized and as impressive in making their wishes known as the druggists and merchants have been and still are, the Senate would, in my opinion, defeat the measure before it as decisively as it would defeat a bill to legalize highway robbery.

Since I entered the Chamber I have heard two Senators say, in effect, "This bill ought not to be passed. But the pressure for it is so great that we have decided to vote for it." Mr. President, I cannot vote for it because, regardless of the good intentions of its supporters, which are unquestioned, the effect of the bill would, in my opinion, be just as injurious to the people as it would be if it had been conceived in greed and born in iniquity. Neither the good intentions nor the benign wishes of those who favor it will help those who have to pay the cost of its operation.

This is a fight between a few thousand grocers and a few thousand druggists, on the one hand, and 155,000,000 consumers on the other. Therefore, as usual, put me down on the side of the people for whom I never fail to vote.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I share the general convictions of the Senator from West Virginia, although perhaps on certain points I would not castigate certain groups as vigorously as he has done. I have tried to help some of the groups favoring this particular bill by trying to prevent them from being subjected to arbitrary price discriminations not justified by cost savings.

This is a bill to legalize resale price maintenance. What it does is to permit the manufacturers of trade-marked and branded commodities, if they make an agreement with one retailer, to determine the prices which all retailers shall charge for the commodity. It would enable them to determine not only the prices charged by a retailer who was a signer of the agreement, but the prices, in 45 States, which every other retail merchant charges, whether he signs the agreement or not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should like to continue and develop the argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a private price-fixing bill. What it does is to permit a manufacturer to fix prices in the retail market, even though other retailers may not wish to charge such prices. What it does is to permit the manufacturer, if he can obtain one signer in a given State, to fix the prices which all other retailers in that State may charge. All the other retailers in 45 States would be bound to charge the same price, whether they wished to do so or not.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. The Senator has raised a point which I should like to have cleared up. Does he say, as I have understood him to say, if a retail grocer or a retail druggist in Dover sells a price-fixed commodity and signs a contract for price fixing, that a retail druggist in Smyrna must charge the same price for that particular commodity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; for that commodity.

Mr. FREAR. Even though the second merchant does not sign an agreement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Even if he does not sign an agreement.

Mr. FREAR. Does it bind all the other druggists?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It binds all the other druggists who trade in that commodity.

Mr. FREAR. Why is it true in Delaware, as the Senator from Illinois has stated?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true in every State in which there is a State resale price maintenance law. Forty-five States have resale price maintenance laws. The only States which do not have such a law are Vermont, Texas, and Missouri, and the District of Columbia. If a manufacturer can get one person in each of the 45 States to sign a contract it applies for very nearly the whole United States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Suppose a manufacturer of a certain product wants his price established at the retail level in one of the 45 States to which the Senator has referred. Is it possible for him to own a drug store or a grocery store in the State, in one way or another, directly or indirectly, and make a contract for a particular product and in that way force all the other retail merchants in the State to abide by that contract on that particular item?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I should think that would be possible. Generally, however, it is not necessary for a manufacturer to own a store and make an agreement with himself. Generally he can find one out of a number of merchants who is willing to make an agreement. It is not necessary that he have a "front." But he can work through one, if he wishes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield further.

Mr. FREAR. That is what I wish to have determined. Suppose he wants to fix prices so badly that he buys a store and makes a contract. Is it possible for him to do that under this bill, if it is passed?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know of nothing that would prevent that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the record ought to be clear on that point. I know a little bit about our State laws. We have been living under such a law in Washington for a number of years. Everyone has been happy with it. Most of the State laws—and I looked into the subject when I was a member of the legislature in Washington—provide very severe penalties for doing what was suggested by the Senator from Delaware. They provide not only fines but prison terms. Forty-five States have been living under such laws. No Senator should stand up and say that Senators are cowardly in this matter, when the States which they represent have fair-trade laws. I represent the people of my State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have made no such statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I represent the State of Washington. I know the Senator from Illinois has not made such a statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be permitted to develop my argument?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a moment, the Senator from Florida wishes to support the statement which was just made by

the distinguished Senator from Washington. The Senator from Florida was the author in his State on two occasions of similar State fair trade acts which have well served the people of the State of Florida.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule a Senator may yield only for a question, not for speeches.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my illustrious friend for yielding to me.

Mr. President, we can discuss the measure before us without invective and without emotion. I honestly believe that the two points of view can be legitimately presented. I have very strong feelings about the bill. They are not engendered by textbooks, catalogs, or documents. I have feelings which arise from a great deal of experience from living at a time when there were no fair-trade laws.

I should like to say, with respect to the charge of price fixing, or whatever it may be called, that it is interesting to observe, when the Senate has provided price supports for American farmers, and justly so, that there are a great many people who want cheap food and would have it even if it would drive the farmer out of business. Who would benefit? The alleged consumer, apparently. Mr. President, among the consumers is the American farmer himself. He can consume nothing without a fair price.

The same Senators who have voted for labor laws on the floor of the Senate, which would give the right of collective bargaining, the union shop, and the closed shop, and would give the workingmen and the consumer a chance to have some money with which to buy food, oppose fair-trade laws. There are a great many people who want no unions because they want cheap labor. They do not believe in minimum wage laws. They want cheap labor.

I am in favor of minimum wage laws. I am in favor of trade-unions. I am in favor of price supports. I have seen what happened when we had no unions and no price supports. I have seen what happened when we did not have minimum wage laws and no child labor laws.

Mr. President, I shall produce evidence before this debate is over which will show what will happen to thousands upon thousands of independent merchants who will be at the mercy of the monopolistic powers in America that will drive them out of the markets. I say to the lovers of the consumer that those interests have rigged prices time and again. I saw my father-in-law driven out of business by those methods. I saw my own father suffer from them. I feel very deeply about this matter.

There are two sides to this question, Mr. President, the side of monopoly and the side of the Clayton-Sherman Anti-trust Acts. I want those laws enforced. I say to the Federal Trade Commission and the other Federal agencies: "Get busy and enforce those laws." But I also want to make sure that there is such a thing as fair play and equity, and a fair deal, to which some of us have been pledged.

There is such a thing as a fair price for an honest day's labor and a professional service. I think we shall be able to join the debate on these issues, Mr. President.

I wish to thank my very esteemed and wonderful friend, the Senator from Illinois, for giving me this chance to submit my views. He knows there is an honest difference of opinion between us.

I have the greatest respest for the distinguished Senator from Illinois; I do not have greater respect for any other man, either in connection with this matter or in connection with any other matter. The Senator from Illinois knows that we are good friends, and that we shall continue to be after we have fought out this issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am glad the exchange of shots has brought forth some arguments in behalf of this measure. I think we shall develop some discussion of it before the evening is over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I should like to finish one sentence before I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to remind all Senators that we are approaching the end of the session. The Chair wishes to have the business of the Senate transacted in an orderly way. Although we are more or less lenient when we have plenty of time, Senators should understand that a Senator who has the floor cannot yield to other Senators for speeches without endangering his place on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. Then, Mr. President, in the future I shall yield only for questions. I am very glad the Chair did not make the rule prior to this point, because I wanted my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, to have a chance to make his statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not make the rule; the Chair merely has called attention to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, Mr. President, I should like to take up the point which has been made by my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, namely, that we have price fixing for agriculture, and we have collective-bargaining agreements, and now we have rulings by the Wage Stabilization Board in regard to wages and salaries, and so forth. I wish to say that certainly a society in which prices are fixed by compulsion is not an ideal society. Certainly the ideal society should be one with a competitive economy.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am willing to yield for a question, although I wish my good friend would permit me to finish a paragraph before I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A moment ago I observed that the Senator from Illinois asked other Senators who requested that he yield to wait until he had finished a sentence. I wonder why at this point the Senator from Illinois asks that I wait until he finishes a paragraph.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I love my friend, the Senator from Vermont, so much that I yield to him at this point for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Illinois. My question is this: Is not the pending bill comparable to a closed shop for merchandise?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is much worse than a closed shop—very much worse than a closed shop, because a closed shop, after all, merely applies to those who sign the agreement. On the other hand, this measure applies not only to those who sign the agreement but also to all those who do not sign the agreement.

BILL WOULD DELEGATE CONGRESSIONAL POWERS TO PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS

This bill constitutes a surrender to the manufacturer and to a handful of retailers, to permit them to determine what shall be the price for a given brand of commodity within a given State.

Let me point out to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota, that in the case of most of the prices for which there is universal application—in fact, for nearly all of them for which there is universal application—those prices are subject to decisions by public bodies. Congress fixes the parity formula in the case of agricultural price support. An administrative board fixes wages and salaries. Wages and salaries are fixed administratively after due notice, after public hearing, and an opportunity for all parties to be represented.

But in the case now before us, private parties get together and fix prices not only for themselves but for the entire society. So I think there is a very great difference on this point.

What this measure does is to give public power to private persons to fix prices.

This bill arises, of course, as a result of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Schwegmann Bros. case, last year. In that case the Court declared that when Congress passed the Miller-Tydings Act, Congress had not intended it to apply to retailers who had not signed contracts. It was this decision of the Court—which, in my judgment was correct, namely, that a contract could not be enforced against nonsigners—which has led to the drive for the enactment of the McGuire bill, which now is before the Senate.

LOSS LEADER IS THE REAL EVIL

Mr. President, I wish to be fair in this matter, of course. I am well aware of the forces which led to the adoption of the so-called fair-trade laws in the various States. I believe those laws are really resale price maintenance laws, and I am well aware of the reasons behind the passage by Congress of the Miller-Tydings Act in 1937.

The argument which was used in support of those measures, and which swayed tens of thousands of honest merchants, was the threat of the loss leader. I think all of us know what the loss leader is. For example, during the depression the drug-store chains would advertise a sale of well-known products, such as Colgate's toothpaste and Bayer aspirin, at prices far below wholesale

costs. In this way, consumers were drawn away from independent druggists. The loss leader was profitable to the chains since, although losses were taken on the advertised products, the customers thus drawn into the store would purchase drugs and other items on which there were much larger mark-ups. The independents, not having the resources for advertising, could not compete.

An even better example is the case of the department store. If a department store offered Kodak photographic materials at less than cost, as a loss leader, it could mark up prices on other goods. The customers would buy the Kodak items on which the department store would lose money. But while in the store, customers would buy other goods, not knowing that the mark-ups had been increased. The items thus marked up were called sucker items, and proponents of retail price maintenance claimed that there was not price cutting, beneficial to the consumer, but was price juggling, whereby the consumer paid more.

Meanwhile, the neighborhood camera shop was made to look like a high-cost operation. The fact is that it may have been actually more efficient than the department store, having less advertising and general overhead, but it could not sell its only items at less than cost, and thus had to go out of business.

The same problem existed for the small bookstores, jewelry stores, clothing stores, sporting-goods stores, and others.

The problem of the loss leader was what brought popular support behind the measure now before us.

SENATE SHOULD PASS A BILL OUTLAWING LOSS LEADERS

I wish to say that I am opposed to the loss leader, and one of the amendments which I shall submit is an amendment to outlaw the loss leader. It should be done. The loss leader can serve no valid competitive purpose. One cannot be efficient by selling below cost.

It is not necessary for us to establish resale price maintenance all over the country, merely to eliminate the loss leader. A measure to prohibit the loss leader is really equivalent to the Robinson-Patman Act to prohibit discriminatory sales—or, in other words, an extension of the principle of the Robinson-Patman Act. I favor the Robinson-Patman Act.

On the other hand, the loss leader has been improperly used as the excuse to fasten private price fixing upon the country.

The solution which was sought by the small concerns—and I wish to say they have been egged on by the manufacturers of the branded products—was resale price maintenance, which would stop loss leaders.

THE BAD FEATURES OF THE SOLUTION

The solution sought by the small concerns was resale price maintenance, which would stop loss leaders. Manufacturers took up this cause, since it enabled them to fix prices at whatever level they chose. This was, perhaps, justifiable in the sense that the manufacturers wanted as many outlets as possible, in order to be able to prevent price cutting, especially price cutting which had the effect of squeezing out numerous outlets in the form of the smaller concerns or smaller stores.

However, resale price maintenance not only stopped loss leaders but it permitted—and I wish to emphasize this point—retail mark-ups to be fixed at excessively high prices, and thus permitted very large profits. As a result of high retail prices, not only did the retailer obtain a big mark-up but the manufacturer also obtained a big mark-up over cost. In many cases—in fact, I think in the majority of cases—the retailers have been used as catspaws for the manufacturers of the branded and trade-marked products.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My question is whether the Senator from Illinois has any information or evidence which would lead him to believe that when fair-trade laws were passed by the respective States, the manufacturers really were the proponents of those laws; or were they the opponents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe that the move for resale price maintenance was begun by manufacturers. At any rate what is the Biblical phrase?

Is it "the hand may be the hand of Esau, but the voice is the voice of Jacob"? Or is it just the other way around?

Mr. President, I have consulted my good friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and he says that I have completely reversed that Biblical quotation. Both manufacturers and some retailers now favor it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But I take it that the quotation from the Bible, as the Senator from Illinois gave it, is somewhat apropos in this case, because it happens that those who were opposed in the beginning to what the Senator from Illinois alleges to be price-fixing laws were the manufacturers. They were opposed because they got a big market through their cut-rate stores, and they did not care a bit about to whom they sold or how the sales were made, so long as the sales were made. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course history is a difficult thing to plumb 20 years after the date. But would my good friend from Minnesota say that the big drug companies now are opposed to this bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I may say to the Senator that the manufacturers are for this bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Most certainly they are for the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And I would like to ask the Senator further, whether he can name important items, the prices of which were sharply increased in order to get the gap between the regular price and the fair-trade price.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. We have studies by the Federal Trade Commission indicating the increase in prices which followed upon the introduction of the resale price maintenance laws, and they show very real increases in those items compared with other commodities, particularly after passage of the Miller-Tydings Act. For instance, let us take fixed-price items before and after passage of the Miller-Tydings Act in Michigan, in Knoxville, and in New York City. The increase in Knoxville after the passage of the Miller-Tydings Act was 10½ percent; in Michigan, 15.7 percent, in New York City, 25.8 percent. I ask that this material, which I shall furnish for the RECORD, be printed as part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Price increase on fixed-price items, before and after Miller-Tydings Act, in Michigan, Knoxville, and New York City

	Percentage increase
Knoxville, Tenn.	10.5
Michigan	15.7
New York City	25.8

Source: Study of Monopoly Power, hearings before House Judiciary Committee, February 13, 1952, p. 504.

Average prices in cut-rate drug stores of free-priced and fixed-price items before and after Miller-Tydings Act in Knoxville, Tenn. (196 branded items)

Free-priced items, percentage change between 1937 and 1938; 4 percent decrease.

Fixed-price items, percentage change between 1937 and 1938; 10.5 percent increase.

Source: Study of Monopoly Power, hearings before House Judiciary Committee, February 13, 1952, p. 506.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In contrast to the increases I have indicated, prices, as a whole, were falling during this period.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that the figures which the Senator is citing are related to cut-rate, below-cost prices which were being used as a means of inducing customers to enter the store, but that the legitimate price is an entirely different thing? I can give the Senator an example.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is difficult to determine what is a legal price.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can tell the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a price which will at least enable a merchant to get out of a commodity what he has put into it. I can give the Senator example after example of instances in which commodities were sold for 10 cents or 15 cents below the wholesale cost. It was because of the gap evidenced by the Federal Trade Commission's report.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have said that I understand the motive on the part of most merchants, and their desire to check the use of loss leaders is a worthy motive. In no sense do I regard the proponents of this measure as evil men. I think they are mistaken, but I can understand the reasons for

their position. I should like to point out, however, what happens when we permit this type of price fixing. The first result is that prices to the consumer go up. That is not only true historically, but there are many current illustrations of it. Fortunately, there are 3 States and the District of Columbia which do not have resale price maintenance laws. We can compare prices in those States and in the District with prices in the States which do have resale price maintenance laws. I should like to give certain illustrations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What are those States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the States which do not have such laws are Missouri, Vermont, and Texas, and the District of Columbia.

I have in my hand the House hearings on this point. I am going to read from page 433. A man by the name of Rosenthal, whose testimony was not questioned, submitted a list of 208 items. They were priced in each of the 45 resale price maintenance States. They were also priced in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. Let the Senate listen to this: The average total price of those 208 items in the 45 States which had price-maintenance laws was $945.10. The average total selling price of the same items, in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia was $740.86.

In other words, the price was $205 greater in the 45 resale price maintenance States than in the four jurisdictions which did not have such a law. The price was 28 percent higher in the resale price maintenance States than in the nonresale price maintenance States.

Mr. BENTON rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. While the Senator is checking his figures, will he yield for a question about them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. BENTON. As a very outstanding example, will not the Senator agree that manifestly, in line with his position, it is impossible, of course, for prices to go up 25 percent in New York City, while prices throughout the country are falling?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator refer to the items on the list of 208 articles?

Mr. BENTON. Is it not manifestly true that the 25 percent figure, which is the figure cited in the four areas, applies only to certain items, whether 20 or 208?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were the so-called fixed-price items. But the illustration I am giving is not a historical one; it is a current cross-section comparison of prices in the 45 States which have so-called fair trade or resale price maintenance laws, compared with the four jurisdictions which do not have such laws.

Mr. BENTON. But if I may continue a moment, do not the Senator's own figures show that the prices cited are only on certain items?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Here is the list of 208 items, and I shall put it in the RECORD. Does the Senator want me to read it? The list reads as follows:

LIST OF MERCHANDISE SUBMITTED

Submitted herewith is a list of 208 items, showing—

1. The selling price in the 45 fair-trade States $945.10
2. The selling price of the same items in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia $740.86
3. The retailer's profit in the fair-trade States ..... percent.. 38.5
4. The retailer's profit in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia ..... percent.. 21.5
5. Consumer saves in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia ..... percent.. 17.0

These figures speak for themselves and need no explanation.

	Cost to retailers in all States and District of Columbia	Fair-trade price in 45 fair-trade States	Available prices in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia where no fair-trade laws exist
Johnson Glo-coat	$0.40	$0.59	$0.49
Johnson paste wax	.46	.59	.54
Gold Seal glass wax	.33	.59	.47
Mentholatum	.23	.39	.29
Musterole, regular	.34	.54	.43
Vicks salve	.23	.33	.29
Vicks drops	.24	.37	.29
Scrutan granulars	.77	.95	.89
Scotts emulsion	.39	.63	.53
Creomulsion	.34	.57	.47
Pertussin	.36	.57	.47
Agarol, with phenolphthalein	.86	1.29	1.09
Phillips milk of magnesia	.28	.39	.33
Bisodol powder	.40	.59	.49
Bromo Seltzer	.36	.57	.49
Sal Hepatica	.22	.33	.29
Fletcher Castoria	.26	.36	.32
Pepto Bismol	.36	.59	.46
Pinkham Vegetable Compound liquid	1.10	1.39	1.19
S. S. S	.80	1.19	.98
Alka Seltzer	.37	.54	.47
Anacin tablets	.14	.19	.17
Anahist tablets	.31	.55	.42
Bayer Aspirin	.43	.59	.49
Carters Little Liver Pills	.21	.33	.27
Cystex	.69	.89	.69
Exlax	.17	.28	.22
Groves Bromo Quinine	.24	.39	.29
Heet liniment	.34	.49	.39
Baume Ben Gay	.51	.79	.67
Meads cod liver oil	.38	.57	.49
Meads Oleum Percomorpheum	.62	.84	.77
Band-Aid adhesive bandages	.19	.33	.24
Dayamin caps, 30	1.11	1.65	1.39
Dayamin caps, 100	3.30	4.95	4.09
Vi Daylin, 90 cubic centimeters	.65	.98	.89
Vi Daylin, 8 ounces	1.57	2.35	2.04
Vi Daylin, 16 ounces	2.66	3.97	3.44
Amphojel tablets, 60	.64	1.13	.97
Amphojel, liquids, 12 ounces	.87	1.29	1.07
Tyrozets	.38	.68	.57
Siblin, 4 ounces	.81	1.21	1.09
Siblin, 16 ounces	2.28	3.42	2.87
ABDEC drops, 15 cubic centimeters	.84	1.26	1.08
ABDEC drops, 50 cubic centimeters	2.34	3.50	2.79
Gluco Fedrin, 1 ounce	.59	.73	.67
Heptuna caps, 50	1.12	1.60	1.49
Heptuna caps, 100	2.08	3.15	2.69
Heptuna Plus caps, 100	3.20	5.45	4.59
Vi-Terra caps, 100	2.64	3.96	3.90
Vi-Penta drops, 15 cubic centimeters	.67	1.19	.89
Vi-Penta drops, 30 cubic centimeters	1.24	2.19	1.63
Vi-Penta drops, 60 cubic centimeters	2.21	3.95	3.19
Vi-Penta Pearls, 25	.64	1.13	.93
Vi-Penta Pearls, 100	2.12	1.13	.93
Syntrogel tablets, 100	.90	1.49	1.29
Syntrogel tablets, 50	.47	.82	.73
Empirin compound tablets, 12	$0.17	$0.25	$0.21
Empirin compound tablets, 25	.29	.45	.37
Empirin compound tablets, 50	.48	.75	.59
Empirin compound tablets, 100	0.81	1.35	0.98
Stuarts Formula tablets, 90	1.56	2.60	2.29
Stuarts Formula liquid, pint	1.56	2.60	2.29
Vi-Syneral drops, 15 cubic centimeters	.61	1.10	.89
Vi-Syneral drops, 30 cubic centimeters	1.17	1.75	1.75
Vi-Syneral drops, 45 cubic centimeters	1.66	2.95	2.47
Vi-Syneral caps, adult, 50	1.39	2.50	2.19
Vi-Syneral caps, adult, 100	2.50	4.50	4.09
Feosol tablets, 100	.75	1.25	.98
Moliron tablets, 100	.65	1.10	.89
Moliron liquid, 12 ounces	1.10	1.65	1.59
Creamalin tablets, 50	.42	.74	.59
Creamalin tablets, 200	1.51	2.65	2.19
Neosynephrine solution, ¼ percent, 1 ounce	.51	.90	.69
Neosynephrine solution, 1 percent, 1 ounce	.69	1.22	.98
Priyine, 1 ounce	.53	1.00	.79
Unicaps, 24	.63	.95	.79
Unicaps, 100	2.07	3.11	2.87
Unicaps, 250	4.64	6.96	5.47
Theragran caps, 100	6.30	9.45	7.95
Kaopectate, 10 ounces	.65	.98	.84
Clinitest tablets, 36	.38	.57	.49
Clinitest tablets, 100	.52	.96	.78
Gelusil liquids, 6 ounces	.56	.97	.87
Gelusil liquid, 12 ounces	.88	1.49	1.19
Gelusil tablets, 50	.56	.97	.79
Gelusil tablets, 100	.90	1.53	1.29
Desenex ointment, 1 ounce	.40	.69	.67
Desenex powder, 1—ounces	.40	.69	.67
Desenex liquid, 2 ounces	.40	.69	.67
Lilly's insulin U40, 10 cubic centimeters, regular	.84	1.26	.98
Lilly's insulin U80, 10 cubic centimeters, regular	1.65	2.47	1.79
Lilly's insulin U40, protamine zinc, 10 cubic centimeters	.99	1.48	1.09
Lilly's insulin U80, protamine zinc, 10 cubic centimeters	1.89	2.83	2.19
Lilly's insulin NPH U40, 10 cubic centimeters	.99	1.48	1.09
Lilly's insulin NPH U80, 10 cubic centimeters	1.89	2.83	2.19
Lilly's insulin Homicebrin, 120 cubic centimeters	.81	1.22	1.05
Lilly's Homicebrin, 120 cubic centimeters	.81	1.22	1.05
Lilly's Homicebrin, pint	2.52	3.78	2.98
Lilly's Reticulex Pulvules, 100	3.90	5.85	4.87
Lilly's Multicebrin Gelseals, 100	3.24	4.86	3.98
Old English paste wax	.39	.65	.49
666 Liquid, small	.18	.29	.24
B. C. Powders	.13	.19	.16
4-Way cold tablets	.14	.23	.19
Phillips Milk of Magnesia tablets, 30's	.14	.19	.16
Stanback powders	.13	.19	.16
J & J adhesive, ½-inch by 5 yards	.12	.20	.17
J & J cotton	.09	.17	.13
J & J bandage	.16	.27	.19
Amident tooth paste, economy	.42	.69	.63
Colgate tooth paste, economy	.42	.63	.54
Colgate tooth paste, giant	.32	.47	.39
Amident tooth powder	.28	.47	.43
Fasteeth, medium	.36	.59	.49
Fasteeth, large	.62	.98	.79
Polident, small	.20	.33	.27
Polident, large	.34	.59	.47
Barbasol shave cream, tube	.26	.39	.34
Palmolive shave cream, lather	.37	.57	.49
Palmolive shave cream, brushless	.32	.41	.39
Noxzema shave cream, jar, large	.36	.59	.43
Williams lather shave cream, large	.34	.53	.39

	Cost to retailers in all States and District of Columbia	Fair-trade price in 45 fair-trade States	Available prices in Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia where no fair-trade laws exist
Aqua Velva, 60 cents	$0.36	$0.59	$0.43
Old Spice shave lotion	.67	1.00	.87
Cashmere Bouquet talc, Gt.	.27	.43	.37
J & J baby talc	.15	.25	.19
Do	.31	.49	.37
Tampax, regular, 10's	.25	.39	.32
Kleenex, 300's	.18	.28	.23
Kotex, regular, 12's	.25	.39	.29
Mennen Skin Bracer	.38	.59	.43
Gillette Blue Blades, 10's	.31	.49	.39
Gillette Blue Blades, 20's	.60	.98	.79
Gillette Thin Blades	.16	.25	.19
Shick Injector Blades, 20's	.48	.73	.63
Lavoris, large	.53	.79	.69
Listerine, medium	.35	.49	.39
Listerine, large	.56	.79	.69
Lysol, small	.17	.27	.23
Lysol, medium	.36	.55	.47
Zonite, large	.54	.89	.69
Arrid, large	.36	.63	.54
Mum, medium	.25	.39	.33
Mum, large	.37	.69	.53
Stoppette spray	.36	.89	.59
Do	.71	1.25	1.09
Noxzema Boudoir	.38	.89	.53
Ponds cold cream, 35 cents	.20	.31	.27
Ponds cold cream, 55 cents	.34	.55	.47
Ponds vanishing cream, 35 cents	.20	.31	.27
Ponds vanishing cream, 55 cents	.35	.55	.47
Breck shampoo	.34	.60	.53
Do	.54	1.00	.79
Do	.99	1.75	1.59
Drene shampoo, 60 cents	.37	.57	.47
Toni refill, No. 81	.57	1.00	.79
Prell shampoo, medium	.37	.57	.47
Prell shampoo, large	.58	.89	.69
Jeris tonic, medium	.44	.74	.63
Vitalis, medium	.32	.49	.39
Vaseline tonic, large	.31	.47	.39
Vaseline tonic, qt	.53	.79	.67
Wildroot Cream Oil, 60 cents	.37	.59	.49
Wildroot Cream Oil, $1	.63	.98	.88
Jergen Lotion, 50 cents	.33	.49	.43
Pacquins Handcream, 50 cents	.28	.49	.43
El Producto (Boquet), box of 50	4.43	5.50	4.89
El Roi-Tan, box of 50	3.49	4.40	3.89
Phillies (perfectos), box of 50	3.49	4.40	3.89
Muriel (senators), box of 50	3.49	4.40	3.89
White Owl, box of 50	3.49	4.40	3.89
Sunbeam razor	15.90	26.50	19.79
Schick razor	14.70	24.50	18.89
Rolls razor	6.50	15.00	9.89
Ronson lighter	6.13	12.25	9.88
Remington razor	15.90	25.50	17.79
A. S. R. lighter	5.70	13.95	9.88
A. S. R. pocket lighter	2.95	6.50	4.69
Remington 60 electric shaver	16.50	27.50	21.89
Ronson pocket lighter	4.13	8.25	5.89
Ronson table lighter	6.13	12.25	9.69
Lionel freight train	18.00	29.95	22.98
G. E. vacuum cleaner	31.00	59.95	39.99
Waring Blender	22.99	37.95	31.19
Son Chief "Pop-up" toaster	6.50	14.95	8.88
G. E. alarm clock	2.65	4.95	2.99
Universal Coffeematic	17.50	29.95	21.89
G. E. grill and waffle	10.85	16.95	13.69
G. E. "Pop-up" toaster	14.14	23.95	17.69
G. E. mixer	25.51	39.95	31.89
Sunbeam mixmaster	29.70	46.50	34.79
G. E. steam iron	12.11	18.95	15.39
Toastmaster	15.15	23.00	18.69
G. E. heating pad	3.45	5.95	3.99
Infrared broiler	9.50	16.95	12.69
Fryrite	17.37	28.75	21.89
38-piece tool set	12.11	17.95	15.95
G. E. iron	8.26	12.95	9.79
Presto cooker	9.34	15.95	11.39
Universal scale	3.97	7.95	7.95
Sunbeam coffee maker	24.25	37.50	31.89
Westinghouse mixer	25.21	42.50	27.89
Le John hair dryer	3.95	6.69	4.86
Westinghouse iron	8.25	12.95	9.79

NOTE.—Costs to retailers as shown, based on direct buying retailers.

Source: Study of Monopoly Power, House Judiciary committee hearings, serial No. 12, 1952, pp. 433-435.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois would make a good druggist.

Mr. BENTON. I suggest that the Senator has made with that list the very point I was about to make, namely, that the total impact of those items on the cost-of-living index is relatively small. Is it not true that the total annual sales of the nationally advertised drug items the names of which the Senator has been reading, or at least many of them, do not represent a volume of $2,000,000 a year? Is it not true that their total impact on the cost-of-living index is small, and is it not true that the trick of the loss leader, which the Senator has twice stated he opposes, is in the small volume items of the type he has read, and, to give to the customer the illusion that, because the price, for example, of Carter's Little Liver Pills, or whatever the item may be, is cut, all the items in the store are cheap? Such a practice gives to the customer, does it not, the illusion, that, because he can buy an item of standard price, such as Carter's Little Liver Pills, at a low cost, he also can get his bread cheaper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question of the Senator from Connecticut? I do not want to lose my right to the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Is it not true that the 208 items may be higher in price and at the same time the cost of living or the general price level may fall? Does he make the point——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a moment. These are commodities to which this system is applied.

The argument of the Senator from Connecticut is apparently that, because one takes only a little from the consumer's pocket on each item, even though it is taken on hundreds of items, it does not matter in the long run.

That is the argument which has been used time and time again. The druggist says, "It is only a matter of a few cents to the consumer—why should he mind it?" The money in the consumer's pocketbook, however, goes to the purchase of a wide variety of commodities, and, if he gets "soaked" on each commodity, he then loses heavily. Small individual losses make for huge collective deficits.

This same argument has been applied in the case of gas and power rates by those who would profit at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. BENTON. I may ask the Senator if he is not misinterpreting my question. Is it not true that if the customer pays a little bit more for Carter's Little Liver Pills, while at the same time he pays less for bread and potatoes, he is not going to be out money?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that sickness plays no favorites, and that the prices fixed on drug items must be paid by the poor as well as by others in the community.

Mr. BENTON. But does not the Senator know that the trick of the loss leader is to take a loss of the pennies, so that the merchant can reap profits in the terms of dollars? Does he not know that the merchants all build their volume through the use of the loss-leader illusion, and make up any loss by higher charges on other items?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The loss leader is not in dispute here. I am not advocating the loss leader. I have an amendment which will outlaw the loss leader. In order to cure the evil of the loss leader, it is recommended by the unknown sponsors of this bill that we embark upon price fixing. The Senator's argument is beside the point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How many commodities did the Senator mention?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I mentioned 208 drug items.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator familiar with the retail study made by A. C. Nielsen?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is an independent market research agency, the world's largest independent market research agency, with an outstanding reputation for reliability.

Mr. BENTON. It is one of the best.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It analyzed 24 leading fair-trade drug-store products. The study covered the 6-months period from March through August 1951. It showed that the over-all average prices under the fair-trade items in the fair-trade stores, instead of being over, were equal to or lower than the prices paid by consumers in non-fair-trade areas for 24 products.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. If the facts, as stated by my distinguished and beloved friend, the Senator from Minnesota, are correct, and it is true that in the stores to which he refers the prices were lower than they were in the cut-rate stores, why is this proposed law desired?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I have a moment to reply to the Senator? I ask unanimous consent to make a brief reply to the Senator from West Virginia, without the Senator from Illinois losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from West Virginia has said that if my statement with reference to the Nielson study is correct, why is it that anyone would want this law. Is that correct?

Mr. NEELY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will tell the Senator. It is because of a decision by the Supreme Court involving the Tydings Act. All the bill does is to enable States to take certain action of their own, and it legitimatizes action taken in 45 State legislatures.

I want to say to my friend from West Virginia that the reason why merchants are concerned—I think they may be overapprehensive about it—is that they can see that a man can start a store across the boundary of a State and be able to evade the fair-trade laws. In other words, he can sell cigarettes cheaper because they are shipped into the next State. He can literally give away goods.

As a union man does not like a scab to take his job, so a legitimate merchant does not like to have a cutthroat artist take his business. A scab takes a union

man's job at lower wages and with poor working conditions. All that a cut-rate artist does is to lower the whole standard of business enterprise and drive legitimate merchants out of business. There is real apprehension and real fear.

There is no small-town merchant in the world who can stand competition with large concerns who would drive them out of business, by the use of loss leaders or by some other means.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My amendment outlaws loss leaders. That is not the question. The question is whether retail price fixing is justified by a manufacturer entering into an agreement with one or two merchants with respect to a certain commodity, which will then apply to the entire list of retail outlets for that commodity, and then whether the Government will make such agreements enforcible upon nonsigners as well as upon signers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator from Illinois, if he feels so strongly about it, why was it that in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, when we were objecting to the Fulbright amendment, which calls upon the Government to pay extra prices in order to get commodities——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That had to do with an action which was subject to court review, after public hearing. This is a proposal to allow a private manufacturer to reach an agreement with a single merchant without being subject to any public considerations or procedures. It then becomes enforcible, and the Government allows the full weight of the common law to be used.

I am opposed in theory to price fixing as a whole. I believe in the competitive system, but I most certainly believe that if prices are to be fixed it should be done by a public authority and not by a private one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator not know what is provided in section 5, paragraph (2) of the bill? That is the paragraph which is the heart of this bill.

It provides:

> Nothing contained in this act or in any of the antitrust acts shall render unlawful any contracts or agreements prescribing minimum or stipulated prices—

And so forth. In other words, if they try to do horizontal price fixing to lessen competition, they are subject to the full penalties of the law. The fact of the matter is that during World War II prices were the least on commodities which were under fair-trade laws as compared with commodities which were not.

Mr. MOODY rose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota, in one sentence——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to finish a paragraph without being interrupted.

Mr. MOODY. I had not even asked the Senator to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what we do if we pass this bill is to protect vertical price fixing. We permit a manufacturer to determine the prices which shall be charged all the way through to the ultimate consumer.

The Senator from Minnesota says, "Ah, yes; but we are still outlawing horizontal price fixing. In other words, the chain is around our feet, but not around our hands." I say we should not have chains on either hands or feet. We should have neither horizontal price fixing nor vertical price fixing.

The Senator from Minnesota is a very sophisticated gentleman, and I have heard him argue that agreements can be reached quietly without any evidence existing that the agreements have been reached; and from the similarity of the prices which are frequently fixed for similar products by drug stores and other stores, I have the feeling that these gentlemen know each other and that there is covert horizontal price fixing as well as vertical price fixing.

The extraordinary thing about aspirin is that it tends to sell or used to sell at about the same price when it is put on the market. There are many other drug commodities, the names of which I could read into the RECORD, the prices of which tend to be relatively uniform among the various drug houses. There are many kinds of consumers' durable goods where the prices tend to be relatively uniform.

I believe it was Lincoln who said that if and when Stephen—meaning Stephen A. Douglas—and James—meaning James Buchanan—and Roger—meaning Roger Taney—all acted, in a given way, he presumed there might be some understanding between Stephen, James, and Roger. So I presume there is some understanding on horizontal levels, as well as on vertical levels.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. NEELY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he considers horizontal price fixing or vertical price fixing to be more important.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I consider both of them bad. I know it will be said that if there is vertical price fixing, but not horizontal price fixing, there will then be competition between brands.

Mr. MOODY. That is just the point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is partially true. I do not wish to overstate my case, but I wish to make two points in reply to that suggestion. The first is that there is not as much price competition between brands as we think. The second point I wish to make is that to the low and moderate income families, retail price is very important. If prices are high, it means a definite reduction in their standard of living. The matter of price is extremely important.

Assuming, for the moment, that there is competition among competing brands, price maintenance still destroys price competition among retailers. Competition in store advertising and service works in favor of the stores with access to the greatest amounts of credit. These are not the independents. Furthermore, low-income consumers must be subjected to lower living standards by high prices. So far as living standards are concerned, decorations, store advertising, and convenience do not help the consumer to buy more. The only thing that will do this is to lower prices.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I am in the full flight of my oratory. [Laughter.]

There seems to be a design, somehow, to make people feel that it is improper of them to think of money. One of the reasons why I am against this bill, why I want to have competition, is that it would enable consumers to think of money. I do not believe it is ignoble to think of money. I believe the hard-pressed consumers of the country have a right to think of money and to get the best bargains they can obtain at competitive prices.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is an extraordinary experience, to be challenged by my dearest friends.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And we love him dearly in spite of all. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOODY and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will take the Senator from Michigan first.

Mr. MOODY. I hope the Senator will not be able to take him, but I am glad the Senator will yield.

Is it not true, as the Senator said a few minutes ago, that there is an honest difference of opinion with respect to the bill, as to which form of price fixing will harm the consumer less?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are honest differences, and there are a great many misguided people.

Mr. MOODY. It is obvious that someone is misguided. The question is, Who is misguided?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have my own opinion about that.

Mr. MOODY. So do I.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a great to-do about the consumer and his regard for prices and money. That is very good. I appreciate that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Before the Senator from Minnesota interjects—well, let him go ahead.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to get my statement into the RECORD. The Senator must consider something else. He must consider the fact that in many communities where the proposed law would apply to certain merchants, they are the merchants who contribute to the community chest. Has the Senator ever tried to get a contribution from a merchant for a community chest? Some

merchants have to rush to their headquarters in New York before they can open their back door.

Has the Senator ever tried to get a contribution for the municipal band, or to establish a new park? I have, and I am here to tell the Senator that by the time such a contribution is forthcoming to do the community a service, the whole program will be dead.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to make a reply to my good friend, the Senator from Minnesota. I take it he is well acquainted with the operas of Gilbert and Sullivan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is familiar with the Mikado. One of the stanzas of a famous song begins with the words:

The flowers that bloom in the spring, tra la, have nothing to do with the case.

The matter of getting a subscription for the village band, or of getting milk for the children on the other side of the tracks has nothing to do with the present issue. As a matter of fact, if the Senator desires to get milk of magnesia for the children on the other side of the tracks, let him help the prices come down. The idea that one should permit others to pick his pocket, if in turn they will dish it out for support of the community is a non sequitur. Post hoc ergo propter est non sequitur.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator that with his pleasing eloquence and his flights of oratory, he should tell the consumers that they do not have to buy the advertised products. For instance, he mentioned aspirin. If he wants to get aspirin, he can step into any store in the United States and get aspirin for a tenth of what he would have to pay for a standard brand. It is not fair trade that holds up the price of aspirin. After all, there are other commodities in competition. The Senator has assumed that there is no competition, but there are more brands of milk of magnesia than there are cows.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If each manufacturer tried to raise prices and was successful through agreements, it would stand to reason that the sum total of prices would be higher than they otherwise would be, because the whole which is made up of the sum of its parts, must be greater if the parts are greater.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator briefly that the trouble with his argument is that there are so many different manufacturers engaged in manufacturing, they do not dare raise their prices so high that they will go out of business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Some minutes ago, and several pages back in the RECORD, the Senator from Connecticut implied that this was a minor matter and did not substantially affect the consumer. During the progress of the debate I have been searching for a reference which I should like to give from Fortune magazine. Fortune is not biased against resale price maintenance laws. Like other great national publications, it gets a major portion of its revenue from the manufacturers of trade-marked, branded products.

In January and April of 1949 Fortune magazine conducted a survey of prices on many items in the District of Columbia and comparable prices on identical articles in surrounding fair-trade territory, primarily Virginia and Maryland. On the basis of this and other surveys, Fortune conservatively estimated that fair trade—and that is a euphemism, it is really resale price maintenance—was costing the American public no less than three-quarters of a billion dollars annually. Three-quarters of a billion dollars is not something to be sneezed at or laughed at on the floor of the Senate.

Another illustration I was trying to refer to before my good friends interrupted to interrogate me was a comparison in my own State of Illinois.

We have a so-called fair trade retail price maintenance law. The State of Missouri on the opposite side of the Mississippi River does not have such a law. There are twin cities—the city of St. Louis, which is in Missouri, and the city of East St. Louis, which is in Illinois. The St. Louis Star-Times made a study of the prices of drugs and liquors in both those cities. It was found that the average prices on liquor were approximately 16 percent lower in St. Louis, Mo., than in East St. Louis, Ill. The average prices on drug items were no less than 12 percent lower.

We on the Illinois side of the Mississippi were held up for higher liquor prices and higher drug prices because of the law which we had. That statement is supported by a number of surveys. More important than the efforts of the drug industry to pass this bill are the efforts of the liquor industry, and these price comparisons help to explain why.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, it was my intention to refer to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] but he has momentarily retired from the Chamber. Therefore I shall wait until he returns.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am right here.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, may I ask a question in the interim?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the contestants have returned. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BENTON. I am only too happy to wait.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I inquire of the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether he recalls that the able Senator from Minnesota attempted to show that the philosophy of the pending price-fixing, cost-of-living-boosting bill is similar to that of union labor organizations in relation to so-called scab competition, and if he does, will he not inform us why no labor organization favors the measure?

The argument of the Senator from Minnesota was, as usual, very interesting, but it should be remembered that he was the inspiration for the skeptic poet Timon's couplet:

The two-edged tongue of mighty Zeno who,
Say what one would, could argue it untrue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that in this case the labor unions are considering their members and the families of their members in their capacity as consumers, and are trying to protect the interests of consumers. This, I think, is a very praiseworthy step on their part, because all too often economic groups become interested simply in their incomes, how they receive their money, and not in how they have to spend their money.

I gave the comparative figures on drugs and liquor in East St. Louis and St. Louis. Now I should like to give some figures showing a comparison between the District of Columbia and neighboring States. Representative CELLER, of New York, sent out a shopper who purchased identical items in the District of Columbia, which does not have resale price maintenance, in Maryland which has resale price maintenance, as well as across the river in Virginia, which has resale price maintenance. The comparison was made among the three communities in close geographical juxtaposition. The central community did not have price fixing. The other two had price fixing. It is very interesting to compare such prices.

I should like to read some of the comparisons.

The first item is 10 cubic centimeters of u. 40 protamine zinc Lilly insulin, used by diabetics. Insulin is extremely important in the treatment of diabetes. Poor people as well as well-to-do people have diabetes. Let us see the price comparison. The price in the District of Columbia was 98 cents. The price in Maryland was $1.29. The Maryland price was 32 percent above the District price. In Virginia the price was $1.48, or 51 percent more.

Another item purchased by the shopper was a B. D. Yale 26-gage, ½-inch hypo needle. In the District of Columbia the price was 15 cents. In Virginia the price was 20 cents, or 33 percent higher. In Maryland the price was 23 cents, or 53 percent more.

Let us take Bayer aspirin, which has been introduced into the debate several times. The price in the District of Columbia was 46 cents. The price in Virginia was 59 cents, or 28 percent more for the same article in Virginia. The price in Maryland was 59 cents, also 28 percent more for the same article in Maryland. It is interesting that there should be the same mark-up in Maryland as in Virginia.

The next item is a 12-ounce bottle of Phillips milk of magnesia. The District of Columbia price was 34 cents. In Virginia the price was 39 cents, or 14 percent higher. In Maryland the price was 39 cents, 14 percent higher.

The next item is a large tube of Ipana tooth paste. The shopper paid 27 percent more for the Ipana tooth paste in Virginia than in the District of Columbia. In the District of Columbia the price was

37 cents. In Virginia the price was 47 cents; and likewise in Maryland it was 47 cents.

The next item was 20 Gillette Blue Blades. In the District of Columbia the price was 87 cents, whereas in Virginia it was 11 percent more, or 98 cents, and also 11 percent more in Maryland, namely, 98 cents.

The next item was 50 cubic centimeters of Mead's Oleum Percomorpheum. The price in the District of Columbia was $2.63. The price in Virginia was $3.29, or 25 percent more. In Maryland the price was $3.49, or 32 percent more. These are baby vitamins which are essential to the health of infants and growing children.

The next item was 18 units of Ex-Lax. The price was 19 cents in the District of Columbia. In Virginia the price was 25 cents. In Maryland the price was 28 cents. The price in Maryland was 47 percent more than in the District of Columbia and in Virginia it was 32 percent more.

The next item was a Dr. West toothbrush. This was the only article which was sold at a uniform price in all three communities. The price was 59 cents.

The next item was the large-size Mennen baby powder. In the District of Columbia the price was 47 cents. In Virginia it was 49 cents, and in Maryland 49 cents.

The total price of these commodities in the District of Columbia was $7.05. The total price of the commodities in Virginia was $8.28; and in Maryland, $8.80. The Virginia prices were 17 percent more than the prices in the District of Columbia. Maryland prices were 25 percent higher than the prices in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this material appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 7, 1952, on page 4909. I ask unanimous consent to insert the table at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed, as follows:

Item	Virginia price	Virginia percent increase over District of Columbia price	District of Columbia price	Maryland price	Maryland percent increase over District of Columbia price
10 cubic centimeters u. 40 protamine zinc	$0.98	0	$0.98	$1.29	32
Lilly insulin	[1] 1.48	51			
BD Yale 26-gage, ½-inch hypo needle	.20	33	.15	.23	53
100 Bayer aspirin	.59	28	.46	.59	28
12 ounces Phillips milk of magnesia	.39	14	.34	.39	14
Large Ipana tooth paste	.47	27	.37	.47	27
20 Gillette Blue Blades	.98	11	.87	.98	11
50 cubic centimeters Meads oleum percomorpheum (baby vitamins)	3.29	25	2.63	3.49	32
18 Ex-Lax	.25	32	.19	.28	47
Dr. West toothbrush	.59	0	.59	.59	0
Large size Mennen baby powder	.49	4	.47	.49	4
Total	8.28	17	7.05	8.80	25

[1] Richmond, Va.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me introduce personal testimony indicating that this is not merely a drug problem. A member of my staff wanted an exhaust fan to help his family survive the recent heat. He was interested in a Westinghouse Mobilaire fan. The fixed retail price was $79.95. He decided that this was too much money. Then he found a small neighborhood appliance store willing to sell the same item for $59.95. At that price he decided to buy it. The small store had signed no price-fixing agreement. The firm which does not sign an agreement is now free to charge whatever price it wishes, at least so far as the law is concerned. It would not be if this bill becomes law. That shows two things. At the fixed price, the fan would not have been purchased; it would have priced itself out of the market. If it had been purchased at the fixed price the consumer would have had to pay $20 more for the same item.

Mr. President, I think we can produce abundant evidence to indicate that resale-price maintenance results in higher prices to the consumer than would otherwise be the case.

I ask unanimous consent to insert another table from the minority report of the House Judiciary Committee illustrating this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed, as follows:

Table comparing prices of important products sold on a fair-trade basis in drug stores in 45 States with prices for the same items presently prevailing in the District of Columbia is another graphic illustration of why the consumer is heavily penalized by resale-price maintenance legislation

	Fair-trade price	District of Columbia price
Aspirin:		
100 Bayer	$0.59	$0.46
100 Squibb	.54	.47
100 St. Joseph	.49	.43
100 APC Co.	.39	
Toothpaste:		
Colgate	.47	.33
Ipana	.47	.33
Pepsodent	.47	.39
Phillips	.39	.27
Squibb	.47	.39
Lyons	.47	.33
Ammident	.53	.47
Clordent	.69	.53
Afco	.47	.39
Pebammo	.49	.39
Shaving cream:		
Colgate	.53	.47
Barbasol	.39	.33
Palmolive	.53	.41
Burmashave	.40	.33
Mollé	.43	.37
Noxzema	.59	.47
Mennen	.53	.43
Gillette	.43	.37
Williams	.47	.37
Hair tonics:		
Wildroot	.48	.43
Kreml	.57	.43

Table comparing prices of important products, etc.—Continued

	Fair-trade price	District of Columbia price
Hair tonics—Continued.		
Vitalis	$0.49	$0.33
Vaseline	.47	.39
Jeris	.49	.39
Lucky Tiger	.48	.39
Liquid shampoo:		
Admiration	.49	.43
Breck	.60	.53
Wonder	.48	
Drene	.57	.47
Kreml	.59	.47
Lueo	.43	.39
Conte Castille	.49	.33
Packers	.48	.43
Watkins Coconut	.48	.39
Richard Hudnut	1.00	.79
Wildroot	.48	.41
Woodbury's	.43	.29
Halo	.57	.43
Fitch	.59	.47
Deodorants:		
Veto	.59	.53
Arrid	.63	.47
Fresh	.59	.43
Sanite	.39	.28
Chad	.43	.39
Coty	1.00	
Hush	.49	.43
Mum	.59	.39
Odorono	.48	.37
Barz	.39	.33
Five-day pads	.59	.47
Ydoro	.59	.43
Zipp	.59	.47
Stoppette	.60	.47
Dyrad	.49	.37
Mennens	.59	.41
Amolin	.59	.47
Heed	.59	.47
Hand lotions:		
Hinds	.49	.39
Italian Balm	.45	.37
Cashmere Bouquet	.43	.37
Frostilla	.47	.43
Jergens Lotion	.49	.31
Trushay	.49	.33
Pacquin	.49	.39

Mr. DOUGLAS. My good friend from Minnesota, for whom we have great affection, said a few minutes ago that during the recent increase in prices the advance in the trade-marked, branded commodities under resale-price maintenance had been less than on other commodities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. During World War II, I said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. During World War II. That is probably true. There is a reason for it. The reason for it is that the mark-up on these items was so great originally that they could absorb the increase in cost without passing it on. It is characteristic of virtually all monopoly prices during the war. A very interesting article was written by Dr. Kenneth Galbraith, who was a leading official of OPA, which was published in the Quarterly Journal of Economics in 1946 or 1947. In that article he showed that one reason why they had been able to restrain the increase in prices during the Second World War was because in the industries dominated by monopoly, quasi-monopoly, or an oligopoly, or industries which are dominated by a few firms, the profit margins were large originally and cost increases had been absorbed; and they were able to control prices much better when there was an agreement between manufacturers than in the competitive market.

However, that is proof not of good health, but of ill health. It is proof of

an original high-profit margin. The opposite situation would hold true if we were to have a depression. The price of the branded commodities subject to resale-price maintenance would not fall as rapidly as commodities in general. As a result, the profit margin would widen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I fully agree with the Senator on his analysis. I think he is persuasive and he has made a telling point on that subject. I should like to say, however, that if he is looking for cheap prices, I will tell him how he can get cheap prices. He can do away with union plumbers and other union workers and go into the open market and pick up anyone he can. However, we have said that as a matter of social policy we do not want to do it. I should like to remind my good friend from Illinois that the man who gets a cheap price and buys cheap goods will wind up getting a cheap wage, because the same argument can be used again and again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my dear friend from Minnesota that the fundamental question is whether we want competition or do not want competition. I know that competition is a very rigorous business. It means that firms and stores which can undersell other firms and stores push out of business those who sell at higher prices. No one likes to see that happen. No one likes casualties. I want to make competition fair. We should do that. But we should not eliminate it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we remove competition from life, we substitute inefficiency. The less efficient continue in business. Those who are somewhat efficient become with time somewhat less efficient, because their profit margins are guaranteed. Experience on the whole shows that, rigorous as competition is, it is on the whole a beneficent force. It stimulates men to effort, and it is largely self-regulatory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It was Lord Keynes, I believe, who said at one time, as between the short run and the long run he came to the conclusion that in the long run we die; and that it is the short run that really counts. I would remind the Senator that we must have some modicum of protection, and that it is more than just a matter of loss leaders. Loss leaders are sold at zero, and no one can stay in business without a profit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My loss leader amendment defines loss leaders not merely as articles that are sold at less than the wholesale price, but at less than the wholesale price plus 6 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Harvard School of Business Administration in a recent survey estimated that the cost of doing business for retail merchants was an average of 28.8. How is a merchant going to stay in business with a 6-percent mark-up?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Should we guarantee a profit to any man in business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The leading question of the Senator from Illinois can be answered "no"; we do not guarantee a profit. Neither do we guarantee a profit on the ultimate aggregate total. Every one of the items which the Senator has mentioned suffer competition. It is not as if we considered only one item. They are all in competition with one another. That applies even to commodities like tooth paste. There is a variety of them; there are hundreds of them. Many of them are not fair-traded at all. The question is whether a manufacturer is going to establish a price on his commodity. It is the same question that is involved in a doctor fixing his fee at $5, and a lawyer fixing his fee at something else, at a certain profit. They are methods of maintaining the price structure.

I shall develop my theme when I speak in my own time. I may say that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois very liberally when I speak in my own time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is always fair, and I know that he will give me the same rights, and even yield to me more than I have yielded to him. Mr. President, there is no doubt that under resale price maintenance three things happen: Very high prices to the ultimate consumer, high mark-ups to the retailer, and high profits to the manufacturer. The relationship of the ultimate sale price to manufacturing costs tends to be like the ratio of the Washington Monument to a pygmy.

Mr. President, I should like to put into the RECORD some figures on the profits of the big drug companies. I want to say that this does not apply purely to drug companies; it applies to other companies as well.

In the Celler minority report of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, at page 40, there was placed in the record the net income in dollars, and in percentages the net worth, of seven large drug manufacturing companies, 1939 to 1951.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator list them, please?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask unanimous consent to have them included in the RECORD. Then I shall summarize the figures.

There being no objection, the material was ordered printed, as follows:

Net income, actual and as percent of net worth, of 7 large drug-manufacturing companies, 1939–51

[Years ending Dec. 31]

Year	Abbott Laboratories		American Home Products Corp.		Merck & Co., Inc.		Parke, Davis & Co.	
	Actual	As percent of net worth	Actual	As percent of net worth	Actual	As percent of net worth	Actual	As percent of net worth
1939	$2,048,094	14.1	$4,205,611	50.7	[1] $2,356,830	25.1	$9,254,292	24.2
1946	10,820,623	28.3	8,897,921	15.9	[2] 6,169,791	17.7	13,336,582	33.8
1948	11,120,983	23.6	9,107,168	16.8	[3] 8,520,250	19.9	9,704,467	19.4
1949	10,010,500	19.8	10,673,161	18.3	6,921,927	13.1	12,411,570	22.3
1950	10,880,301	20.0	11,844,030	18.9	[4] 11,276,604	19.2	17,864,830	27.7
1951	[5]	[5]	11,565,373	[5]	[4] 12,508,774	13.9	19,053,742	[5]

Years	Sharp & Dohme, Inc.		E. R. Squibb & Sons [6]		Sterling Drug, Inc.	
	Actual	As percent of net worth	Actua	As percent of net worth	Actual	As percent of net worth
1939	$902,271	8.9	[7] $2,060,978	12.5	$9,140,026	23.4
1946	3,048,186	21.0	[8] 5,063,904	15.2	13,939,073	21.1
1948	3,910,872	19.9	[8] 3,691,778	8.3	12,721,610	17.6
1949	4,759,641	17.5	[8] 6,883,927	13.6	13,006,961	18.1
1950	5,275,858	17.4	[8] 8,057,980	13.9	13,481,870	18.5
1951	4,556,854	[5]	[9] 9,704,801	12.2	[5]	[5]

[1] Before provision for contingencies of $500,000.
[2] Before provision for contingencies of $123,583.
[3] Before provision for contingencies of $30,904.
[4] Includes domestic subsidiaries only.
[5] Not available.
[6] Years ending June 30, except for 1939 which ends Dec. 31.
[7] Excludes European subsidiaries.
[8] Excludes Argentina's subsidiary.

Source: Moody's Industrial Securities, Moody's Investors Service; Standard Corp. Records; Standard & Poor's Corp. prepared by Hamilton D. Gewehr, analyst in industrial organization and corporation finance, Economics Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Mar. 7, 1952.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator read the names?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I shall read them. Let us take one in my own State, of which we are very proud, namely, the Abbott Laboratories.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator realize that the Abbott Laboratories manufacture pharmaceuticals and crude drugs and very few fair-trade items? They manufacture prescription drugs, which have no relationship to fair-trade items.

For example, Abbott Laboratories manufacture very few over-the-counter items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What would the Senator from Minnesota like me to read? To which company would he like me to refer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will ask the Senator to give me, for example, the profit structure on what we call regular fair-trade items. Does he have the figure for Colgate's toothpaste? Does his list contain the name of Colgate-Palmolive-Peet?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is very hard to break down the profits into particular items.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's commentary. Does the Senator have Lilly, Merck, or Parke-Davis? Abbott Laboratories basically produce pharmaceuticals. Pharmaceuticals are prescription drugs, and they are not fair-traded. That is where the big mark-ups occur.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are these companies opposed to price fixing?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; they are not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. They favor it. If these manufacturers are not subject to these laws, and if that is their chief business, why are they so concerned about the proposed legislation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because they are concerned about having a number of outlets for their products through retail pharmacists spread all over the United States, so that prescription druggists will be able to fill prescriptions with Parke-Davis products.

In other words, Parke-Davis, when it sells Ortal Compound, which is a phenol-barbitol compound, is not engaging in fair trading, but it does a tremendous business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have put these figures in the RECORD for what they are worth. The Senator from Minnesota may tear them to pieces—if he can.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, so that I may make a comment in regard to what he has said?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. It would not surprise me at all if these firms favored fair-trade laws, even though they themselves sell very few private proprietaries. These companies want large numbers of retail outlets. They do not want themselves to be at the mercy of the monopoly power represented by the development of the big chains.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In a moment I shall have something to say about the big chain business. This price-fixing business encourages the big chains.

Mr. BENTON. But this would explain their interest in fair-trade legislation. They have a deep, basic interest in the health and welfare of the independent drug store. They would prefer to deal with 50,000 customers scattered all over the country, than with 500 or 50 or 20, each with hundreds or thousands of outlets. That is sufficient to explain the situation, even though they themselves are not selling private proprietary, trade-marked items.

Of course, these products sell on narrow margins, as compared with the Abbott or Eli Lilly items which go into prescriptions, on which the consumer cannot tell what the mark-up is, for he does not know what he is paying a dollar for, whereas in the case of similar trade-marked items, he might pay a dime.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator from Connecticut stated—and I believe he did state—that in the case of the fair-traded items, the mark-up is enormous. Did not the Senator from Connecticut say that?

Mr. BENTON. No. On the contrary, in the case of the non-fair-trade pharmaceuticals which come over the counter in the form of prescriptions which are made up from little slips of paper which the consumers cannot read, and which list the names of ingredients which the consumers cannot understand, there is a far higher margin of profit, as the Senator from Minnesota will attest, than in the case of the fair-traded items of pharmaceuticals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator is correct in the case of a number of items. Many of these companies have hundreds of fair-traded items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they play a part in building up their profits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; there is no need for us to try to stretch the point, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have not yet been allowed to develop even the facts in this instance, because my good friends, the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Connecticut, have jumped down my throat before it has been possible for me to submit these figures here on the floor.

Let me read the figures for the profits of some of these companies: In 1939, which may not have been a fair year, Abbott Laboratories made profits of $2,048,094; in 1946, $10,820,623; in 1948, $11,120,983; in 1949, $10,010,500; in 1950, $10,880,301. When stated as a percentage of net worth, those profits amount to 14.1 percent, 28.3 percent, 23.6 percent, 19.8 percent, and 20 percent, respectively.

Then I shall read the percentages of profit in the case of American Home Products Corp. These figures are on the basis of net worth: 50.7 percent, 15.9 percent, 16.8 percent, 18.3 percent, and 18.9 percent, respectively, for those years.

For Merck & Co.: 25.1 percent, 17.7 percent, 19.9 percent, 13.1 percent, 19.2 percent, and for 1951, 13.9 percent..

For Parke, Davis & Co.: 24.2 percent, 33.8 percent, 19.4 percent, 22.3 percent, and 27.7 percent.

For Sharpe & Dohme: 8.9 percent, 21 percent, 19.9 percent, 17.5 percent, and 17.4 percent.

For E. R. Squibb & Sons: 12.5 percent, 15.2 percent, 8.3 percent, 13.6 percent, 13.9 percent, and 12.2 percent.

For Sterling Drug: 23.4 percent, 21.1 percent, 17.6 percent, 18.1 percent, and 18.5 percent.

Those are very large profits.

If we consider the proprietaries and if we could isolate them, I think we would find that not only is the retail mark-up large, but the unit profits to manufacturers on those items are large. I can give some illustrations on percentage retail mark-ups, although, of course, we cannot obtain unit profits for manufacturers.

For instance, in the case of Dolcin—and these figures come from the American Druggist for January 1, 1951—the retail profit is 44.3 percent.

Argyrol up to 57½ percent; Kessling fever thermometers, 45 percent; Wynoids, up to 50 percent; Ampho-Jel, up to 53.4 percent; Dichloricide moth crystals, up to 42 percent; Breck, 40 percent; McKesson & Robbins, an average of 50 percent profit.

Presumably these figures are based on retail prices. These are profits claimed for manufacturers, as stated in the American Druggist magazine, the January 1, 1951, issue.

Mr. President, where does all the money for advertising in the magazines and over the radio and on the television come from? It comes from the high unit prices.

I shall tell you, Mr. President, why manufacturers want these laws. They want to hold up the retail prices because they are afraid that if the retail prices start slipping, the retailers will insist that manufacturers' prices be reduced, in order to keep the retailers in business. Therefore, the manufacturers are pushing the retailers out in front, as a sort of a bumper to protect themselves against competition. The manufacturers are using the retail druggists as hostages, to maintain the large unit, total profits of the manufacturers, just as an army which seizes women and children puts those women and children out in front, between themeslves and the enemy, so that the enemy will not fire.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I decline to yield at this point; I wish to finish submitting these figures.

Mr. President, this is where the poor druggists have been caught in the struggle. They do have an economic stake, but behind them are the manufacturers who use them, not for the sake of the retail druggists, but for the sake of the manufacturers.

What is true in the case of drugs is also true in the case of household appliances and in the case of liquor, and that is an extremely important fact, and in the case of sporting goods and in the case of a whole series of other goods.

Now I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. NEELY. Let me inquire of the able Senator if it is not true that an additional reason for the pushing of the local druggists and merchants out front by the manufacturers lies in the fact that the local druggists and merchants have political influence which the manufacturers do not have?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have before me a statement of contributions to the so-called fair-trade or resale-price-maintenance lobby. I believe this list is correct. It has been filed under the lobby law.

I do not believe in singling out persons for castigation, nor in citing their names, because that exposes them to invidious criticism. These firms have a

perfect right to contribute; they have a perfect right to lobby. On the other hand, I think it is significant that the list of persons which I have before me indicates contributions of $45,905 in the third quarter of 1951, or for one-fourth of last year, namely, the next to the last quarter of 1951, before Congress came into session this year. It would be interesting to see how much has been contributed during the first two quarters of 1952.

These are contributions by these large drug companies. I do not wish to read into the RECORD the specific contributions they made, lest it seem that I would be putting them in the pillory; and I do not believe in doing that. On the other hand, I have the list before me, and I believe it to be correct. It indicates contributions of virtually $46,000 in one quarter.

Mr. President, what is the purpose behind these contributions? Those firms have a perfect right to make those contributions, but the purpose is to protect the prices on their products, the prices which they charge the retailers; and they do that by protecting the retailers' prices, so that the retailers will not put pressure on them to lower prices. Ultimately this monopoly business results in high prices to the consumers.

Mr. President, it is said that retail price maintenance is necessary in order to help small business. It does protect the profit margins of the merchants, the small-business men. It may well be that, taking small business as a whole, it may help. But there are very important qualifications to be attached. The first is that when the retailer has such high mark-ups, it encourages grocery chains, such as A. & P. and Safeway, to carry price-maintenance items, thus decreasing the amount of sales by the small stores. The Progressive Grocer has conducted a survey of this matter. It finds that 85 percent of the Nation's leading supermarkets now sell health and beauty aids, as compared to only 37 percent 10 years ago. In other words, the profit margins are so great that the grocery stores are entering the drug business. They are also going into the liquor business for similar reasons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator wants to be accurate. A while ago he quoted profit percentages which have absolutely no relationship to fact.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They were correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. They were correct as to the gross profit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I meant percentages of net worth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator quoted items.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the fact of the matter is, I may say to the Senator, that the items quoted by the Senator represented the maximum price the manufacturer places on the commodity. For example, a tube of Ipana toothpaste has on the tube the price 50 cents. That is the normal price. It costs the retailer 17 cents wholesale. That is a 33-cent gross mark-up. Now, what was the fair-trade price of a tube of Ipana toothpaste prior to June 1950? What was the fair-trade price? Thirty-seven cents. Does the Senator know how much gross profit the dealer got from that? Three cents. Does the Senator know how much that is? It amounted to—8½ percent. The Senator will take note that the trouble in these figures is that one gets a gross mark-up which is the market price, but the fair-trade price is a breakdown of the lowest price at which the commodity can be sold; and that is true of every single item. It is true of any product of which one may think. Take a product such as Carter's Little Liver Pills. What is the fair price?

The Senator gave the profit figures for the drug companies. I am not protecting them. So far as I am concerned, they contribute to a good many things that I do not like. I say their profits are tremendous. But there is some truth in what the Senator has said about their using druggists as a front. Sometimes I think the druggists ought to look into this a little bit themselves and not be so tied up all the time. But the fact of the matter is that the gross-profit figures are misleading, because the fair-trade figure is considerably less than the gross figure; and I want the Senator to know that. There are the regular retail price and the fair-trade price. The fair-trade price offers a basic minimum to the retailer; that is, at least as to the commodities with which I am familiar. I cannot say anything about the electric fan about which the Senator was talking.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It has been some time back, but certainly with respect to the figures submitted by Representative CELLER, those were actual prices. They showed that prices in resale price-maintained States were higher than in the District. I ask unanimous consent that I may now yield to the Senator from Delaware for that purpose without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FREAR. I do not think I quite understood what the Senator from Minnesota said. If a fair-trade price is paid, there should be a reasonable profit in it for the retailer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. There should also be a reasonable profit for the manufacturer, and so on down the line.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. There may be a difference between the fair-trade price and the established retail price for a particular product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. If the retail price set by the manufacturer is, let us say, to use a round figure, $1, and the fair-trade price is 89 cents, it is some kind of a——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Some kind of a cut price.

Mr. FREAR. A cut price—yes, that is correct. But in that there is still a reasonable profit for the retailer, as well as for the manufacturer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Not a reasonable profit.

Mr. FREAR. What happens to the difference of 11 cents in the case of an article whose price is established by the manufacturer at $1, as against a retail price of 89 cents. Where does that difference of 11 cents go—to the retailer? Or to the manufacturer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It all goes to the retailer. That is a very good question, and I should like to give a very honest and accurate answer, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall try to make the answer very brief. The Senator has posed a problem which relates to the figures used when an article is priced in a non-fair-trade territory, such as the District of Columbia, which is a highly competitive territory. When one goes into Virginia and buys an article, Virginia being a fair-trade State, what happens? There are many little stores in Virginia, particularly in small towns, where they do not give any fair-trade prices. They cut prices, and there is, therefore, not a fair profit. It amounts to 3 cents on a 33-cent item. It is not a fair profit, and no merchant can continue in business a month on a profit of that kind. What happens? One may go to the drug store in Woodstock, Va., and buy a bottle of Sal Hepatica, for which he pays 30 cents, as the regular price. That is what should be charged. It costs the druggist from 20 to 21 cents to buy that item. He must pay all of his operating costs out of his profits. What is the fair-trade price on that article? The fair-trade price would be 25 cents, possibly 24 cents. In Woodstock the druggist may charge 30 cents, because there is no hot competition in that community. What a fair-trade price does is to put the price right down to a minimum, and to prevent the sale of an article for less than it costs. That is what it amounts to. What should be charged is a legitimate price. A merchant ought to be able to make a legitimate profit by selling at a legitimate price. But the fair-trade price frequently leaves the merchant without a fair return. It leaves him with some loss. It amounts to this—that everyone plays the same game. If one does not like a particular druggist, he may simply go across the street. One druggist may be selling an article for 18 cents, the other, for 25 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that the reason for the supermarkets taking the so-called fair-trade price on resale-price-maintenance items, is because the price is held up by a retail agreement. The supermarkets, with lower costs, come in to take the field. The druggist would do better with a smaller percentage of mark-up. It would make it impossible for the supermarket groceries to come into the health and beauty business.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Perhaps I am monopolizing the time of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all right.

Mr. FREAR. I think it might be carried just a step further. Does the druggist in Woodstock who is selling Sal Hepatica at 24 or 25 cents have a fair margin of profit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. He does not, at that price—any more than he could make a profit by selling cigarettes at 5 cents a pack.

Mr. FREAR. And no more than a person could make a profit selling milk at 5 cents a quart.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In the grocery business, a profit of 12½ percent is considered satisfactory. The profit of the retail drugstore is usually abnormally low. The supermarket, with a fair-trade price on Jergen's lotion of 37 cents, may compete with a drug store across the street selling the same article at 50 cents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we had so-called fair trade, it would be unable to do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; that is what fair trade does. We have had fair trade for 17 years. The supermarkets are able to sell a 50-cent jar of Jergen's lotion for 37 cents, as they have been doing for many years; but they cannot go further and give it away. I have known stores to have the experience of replenishing their stocks on their shelves by going across the street and buying goods from Montgomery Ward, in order to meet their competition. They bring it in at the back door and sell it to the customers who enter through the front door.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the reference made to canned milk—I do not want to bring in the name of the Pet milk company, but they are very fine competitors in fluid-milk industry. I do not think there is any product which comes nearer to being properly priced than is milk. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would agree with that statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Just a minute. I know the cow has many admirers here. The affection that attaches to the cow is extraordinary.

Mr. President, I should merely like to point out that the drug stores have been meeting terrific competition from food stores which have been gradually taking on drug and liquor distribution. I have some figures indicating that from 1941 to 1951 the percentage of food stores selling drug products has grown from 37 percent to 85 percent. That is because the merchants were doing so well that it tempted the big chains to go into the drug business, so that the drug stores, by putting a tent over themselves, were inviting competition to come in from these other fields.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. It seems that one item we should consider is that a store doing a great volume of business can afford to give the consumer the benefit of lower prices. Other stores in more remote localities, not having so great a volume of business, might not be able to reduce their prices. Sometimes a housewife goes across town to buy something from a store which is doing a large volume of business, although, by and large, she buys groceries and various other items from a local store near her, which has somewhat higher prices.

A fair-trade law does not permit a store which is able to do a large volume of business to lower its prices on price-fixed items.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator fails to recognize what is the regular price for a commodity. The Senator's argument is my argument. A 50-cent article should sell for 50 cents, just as a carpenter should receive $1.75 an hour instead of $1.13. The fair-trade price is an unfair price because it is below the cost of operating the business, but, at least, it provides a minimum mark-up and a uniform one across the boards.

That is what it amounts to. A 50-cent article should sell for 50 cents. The fair-trade price is 37 cents. The little merchant cannot sell the article at 37 cents. It gives him some rules; he cannot go below that price. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. LONG. If we could help the independent merchant to refrain from loss leaders, and could protect him from the destructive effect of discrimination against him so far as the pricing of commodities is concerned, we would not have any great need for a fair-trade law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to have the support of my good friend from Louisiana. We fought shoulder to shoulder against the basing-point bill. We fought shoulder to shoulder for the Robinson-Patman Act. Now I see him entering the lists on the side of the people and my heart leaps up. A powerful champion has ridden into the arena.

Mr. LONG. Just as we pointed out in the debate on the basing-point bill, it was our feeling that if we could protect the independent merchant from the destructive effects of price discrimination which favored the large businesses over the small businesses, we would not have too much to worry about in connection with the little fellow being run out of business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We could protect him as a buyer by outlawing discrimination and then competition would see to it that as a seller he could deal with the consumer at lower prices and fair terms.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Illinois made a fight on previous occasions to protect the independent merchant from discriminations in favor of large buyers against small buyers. If we had been successful in that fight, which some of us are still endeavoring to carry on, we would not have any need for a so-called fair trade law which I fear may have the effect of reducing certain elements of price competition among the retail trade.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad that the Senator from Louisiana has made his point.

Mr. WELKER. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I did not want to interrupt my distinguished friend from New York, but from this time on the acting minority leader will insist upon the regular order of business, remembering the admonition given to us by the Vice President earlier this afternoon. I do not want to interrupt, and I trust I shall not have to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Idaho for his very clear statement. I wish to make it clear that while I shall be very glad to yield to any Senator, I shall now, according to the ruling of the Chair, be allowed to yield only for a question.

Earlier in this discussion I pointed out that resale price maintenance resulted in such high retail mark-ups that the grocery chains have gone into the drug business in order to take advantage of the high mark-ups, and that therefore the drug business and the druggists have reared up competitors for themselves because of the high margins which have been guaranteed.

I should now like to turn to the development of private brands.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, before the Senator leaves that point, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Provided it is a question. I am at the mercy of the Senator. It is understood that if he makes a statement I lose my right to the floor. The penalty falls not on him but on me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I assure the Senator that I shall certainly state it in the form of a question.

A little while ago the Senator was speaking about the impact of this system on small business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Alabama was not in the Chamber during the entire course of my speech. I have said that in my judgment it probably does give larger margins to the units which are already in business, but that this is not an unmixed blessing for them, because there are forces operating to diminish the apparent advantage which they get initially. That is my argument. I am not arguing that it is adverse to small business. I am merely arguing that it is not as beneficial as is claimed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator that I was in the Chamber and heard him make the statement. As a matter of fact, I was in the chair at the time.

I was wondering if the Senator was familiar with the survey which was made in New York last year at the time of the cut-price war which was carried on. The estimate was made that 20,000 of the approximately 105,000 small retailers in the New York area would have been forced into bankruptcy if the price war had continued for 6 months.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The point is that the price war did not continue for 6 months. That was an exuberance largely started by the big department stores in New York around Thirty-third Street, which went on a spree, seeking to get the better of one another. One store started to cut the throat of another store. The other store responded by trying to cut the throat of the first store. Then two or three others joined in the melee, but after a few days it was called off, and since then there has not been large-scale price cutting. In other words, freedom sometimes leads to excesses. But is

this a reason why we should have perpetual slavery?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course I agree with what the Senator said, except that the price war lasted longer than merely a few days. It lasted for several weeks, and presented a very serious question.

Is it not true that the splurge which those big stores made was made at the expense, first, of the United States Government, because they were in the high-tax brackets, and second, at the expense of the little store down the street, which simply could not meet the cut prices?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama, like the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], ignores the fact that I am proposing an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would outlaw loss-leaders. Under my proposal, we would not have Gone With the Wind selling for 99 cents. Furthermore, we define a loss-leader as something which is sold for less than the wholesale price plus 6 percent—not merely less than the wholesale price, but less than the wholesale price plus 6 percent. So for heaven's sake do not try to put the brand of Cain on me and say that I am defending loss-leaders. I am opposed to them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the able Senator from Illinois that I certainly would never be in the position of helping to put the brand of Cain upon the Senator from Illinois. I know that he is sincere in what he is presenting here——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, the acting minority leader has said that he will invoke the rule of the Senate if I yield for the purpose of a statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not wish to make a statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to have the Senator from Alabama trespass upon the rules of the Senate in order that I may receive the penalty. If the penalty is invoked, it will not be the fault of the Senator from Idaho. I beg my friend to conform to the parliamentary rules and at least put his statements in the form of a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the Senator that I will ask a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am familiar with the rules of the Senate. I am a lawyer. I believe I know how to lay the predicate for a question. I assure the Senator that whatever I say will be for the purpose of laying the predicate for a question. Here comes the question:

Does the Senator, or does he not, agree with this statement, which was contained in what I think is a very competent business publication, namely, Business Week magazine, when it summarized the situation in its June 1951 issue as follows——

Mr. DOUGLAS. What publication is this?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Business Week. I quote:

> Fair trade has always been another major prop for the small, independent merchants during the past decade. This has been particularly true in the drug and jewelry businesses. Under the fair-trade umbrella, the small merchant has been protected from price cutting and provided with a healthy mark-up.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Strike out "healthy" and substitute "large."

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are two more sentences:

> The end of fair trade on a national scale now throws this disadvantage into reverse. How much it will hurt the small retailer remains to be seen, but it's sure to leave its mark.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the Senator from Alabama think he proves by that quotation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the Senator from Illinois if he agrees with that statement. The article says that the system has a very serious impact on small business, and that during the past decade fair-trade laws have constituted a prop to aid small business.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The so-called fair-trade system is a system of resale price maintenance. The term "fair trade" is a euphemism, designed to cover up the smell. It is a deodorant, so to speak, applied to these practices.

With respect to the feared fate of small business, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a comparison of drug store failures in fair-trade and non-fair-trade States. It shows that such laws have no real force in stopping such failures.

There being no objection, the material was ordered printed as follows:

Failures of retail drug stores in selected States, 1939, 1940, 1946, and 1947

STATES WITHOUT FAIR-TRADE LAWS

1939

	Number	Liabilities	Rate per 1,000 concerns
Vermont			
Washington, D. C	1	$4,000	3.0
Texas	16	132,000	4.8
Missouri	9	77,000	4.1

1940

	Number	Liabilities
Vermont		
Washington, D. C	3	$29,000
Texas	19	108,000
Missouri	11	49,000

1946

Vermont		
Washington, D. C		
Texas		
Missouri		

JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1947

Vermont		
Washington, D. C		
Texas	1	$13,000
Missouri	1	2,000

Failures of retail drug stores in selected States, 1939, 1940, 1946, and 1947—Con.

ADJACENT STATES WITH FAIR-TRADE LAWS

1939

	Number	Liabilities	Rate per 1,000 concerns
New Hampshire	2	$8,000	8.9
Maine	4	30,000	10.1
Maryland	3	7,000	4.1
Oklahoma	17	119,000	15.0
Illinois	52	217,000	14.1
Kansas	8	72,000	7.4

1940

	Number	Liabilities
New Hampshire	2	$11,000
Maine	4	24,000
Maryland	3	154,000
Oklahoma	11	48,000
Illinois	45	224,000
Kansas	7	25,000

1946

New Hampshire	1	$2,000
Maine		
Maryland		
Oklahoma		
Illinois		
Kansas		

JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1947

New Hampshire		
Maine		
Maryland		
Oklahoma		
Illinois	1	$50,000
Kansas	1	7,000

Source: Minority views, H. Rept. 1516, p. 46.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no doubt that the use of this system has resulted in much higher prices to the consumers than would otherwise have been the case. It has protected retailers and manufacturers from competition. The real test is whether we believe in competition or not. I suppose every one of us in this Chamber has delivered orations at one time or another declaring in favor of competition, and against price fixing. The test is whether we are really opposed to it. Generally we are for competition for someone else. Most people are for price fixing where they are concerned. The question is whether we will permit manufacturers of trade-marked and branded commodities to fix the prices at which such commodities can sell at retail, whether or not the retail merchant has made such an agreement.

As I pointed out originally, and as the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] has reemphasized, the purpose of the bill is to provide that the nonsigner shall be compelled to charge the same prices as the signer. It delegates the power of the country to enable a private concern to determine its own price and protect itself from competition, except for such lateral competition as may exist between the various products as substitutes for one another.

Madam President, I had hoped to continue with the discussion of private brands. If I may be permitted to do so, then I shall be glad to yield for questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question with reference to the non-

signer clause, since we have taken up that point now?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator mentioned the subject of the nonsigner clause. I wonder whether he is familiar with the fact that 45 State laws have the nonsigner clause. The first State to have it was California, in 1933. The New York law contains a nonsigner clause.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a very real difference between a State legislature operating within a State and the exercise of Federal power over interstate commerce. Congress is not a State legislature. We are the National Legislature. What we are being asked to do is to turn over the power of the Federal Government over interstate commerce to permit a private manufacturer to fix the retail price of his products. In other words, we are delegating away the commerce powers of the Federal Government. We are furthermore violating the Sherman antitrust law and the Clayton act, and all the other statutes which declare combinations in restraint of trade to be violations of the basic law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not mean to interrupt the Senator, but——

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will not regard the vehemence of my reply as indicative of an unfriendly feeling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; of course not. My only other question is this. As I understand the McGuire bill, which is the bill before us, in the Whetting case, which was the second Supreme Court case under the Miller-Tydings Act, the Supreme Court said there would be no respect between the States for the laws of the respective States. In other words, a nonsigner clause in North Dakota, for example, would have no effect in Minnesota, or vice versa. Therefore a mail-order house across the line could operate in the other State without any regard to the State laws.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I want to make the case of the Senator from Minnesota for this bill being merely an enabling act as persuasive as I can. The Webb-Kenyon Act prohibited the sending of liquor into a prohibition State, and the Ashurst-Summers Act prohibited the interstate shipment of prison-made goods in competition with free labor. Have I correctly stated the situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Illinois has stated the situation very well, but I am afraid that it will not hold up after the Senator is through with me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator's proposal is to put State laws, so far as interstate commerce is concerned, ahead of Federal laws. So far as interstate commerce is concerned, the Constitution establishes congressional laws superior to State laws.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. I do not know whether he wishes to answer it. But I should like to ask it of him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from Minnesota. In the case of prison-made goods and in the case of the sale of liquor, there were no previously existing Federal laws which the State laws violated. Therefore it was proper for the Federal Government to withdraw the use of interstate commerce as a means of breaking down State laws, since there were no Federal laws prior to that.

In this case there are prior Federal laws, namely, the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act. What is now being proposed is that the Federal Government shall give away its delegated power over interstate commerce so that State fair-trade laws may be made superior to the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act.

There was good reason why Congress never passed a resale price-maintenance law for the District of Columbia. Congress is the legislative body for the District of Columbia. It was not the intent of Congress in its legislative capacity to repeal the Sherman Antitrust Act or the Clayton Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is making a very able argument, and we are all interested in the argument which he is making. I know the situation with respect to prison-made goods, because I was governor of my State.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator speak louder?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois will wish to answer my question. If he does not I will understand. I am wondering how long the distinguished Senator from Illinois and his colleagues will debate this bill, because I have an engagement, very frankly, and I wonder whether it would be possible for me to leave for a few hours. I mean that in all sincerity, because when I have talked a long time on the floor of the Senate I have said that I would talk all night, as I did in 1943.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have no intention of filibustering.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would never suggest that the distinguished Senator from Illinois would filibuster.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not going to filibuster. I was startled at the beginning of the discussion when the bill started to go through without anyone rising in support of it and when there was no discussion about it. I thought I should take the floor to show that there is real discussion needed on this measure. I have already flushed two very handsome birds out of the thicket in the persons of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. They are beautiful birds with beautiful plumage.

Mr. MAYBANK. How many more birds does the Senator from Illinois expect to flush out of the thicket? Perhaps I will be able to judge the time in that way. I am in favor of the Senator flushing the birds out of the thicket.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is conjectural.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator think it may be one or two more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is beyond my power to determine (a) how many Senators will rise in opposition to me or (b) how many Senators will rise in support of the position which I take. I can only say that I am not filibustering this bill. I expect to conclude, if I am permitted to continue with my remarks, within half an hour.

Thus far, if the RECORD will be examined, it will be found that for every sentence which I have spoken there have been paragraphs of interruptions.

If I had been allowed to proceed, I could have finished my speech in half an hour. The delay has not been mine. Incidentally I do not think it is bad for us to spend a few hours discussing a bill like this, which may involve $750,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, a long time ago I started to speak about private brands, but I was diverted by the questions which were put to me. I should like to point out that frequently the quality of private brands is as good as the nationally advertised brands. A good many brands which are not advertised and which do not have national advertising, but which are frequently sold to wholesalers who put on their own brands, are just as good in quality even though they do not have the build-up by having beautiful movie stars advertise them or have full-page displays in the weeklies. The quality is good nevertheless. By holding up the price of the branded product a field is opened up for the private brand to come in. If we hold up the prices of the branded nationally advertised products we permit unadvertised brands to come in. I used to know something about the soup business. I had friends who ran a small soup cannery, and I had some relationship to the business. My friends would produce soup which they could sell to wholesale grocers, who would put on the cans of soup their own labels, and would sell the soup in competition with nationally advertised brands. There were chiefly only two nationally advertised brands. My friends thought their product was about as good in quality as the nationally advertised brands. The high prices of the nationally advertised brands permitted my friends to furnish their soup to the wholesalers, who in turn would use it to provide competition with the nationally advertised brands.

In other words, Madam President, I am trying to say that by means of these high percentage mark-ups, although they result in higher prices to the consumers, the gain to the retailers is less than one would think, because the high mark-ups invite the nonadvertised, private brands to come into the market. Sometimes there develops the extraordinary situation that a manufacturer will produce both nationally advertised brands and private brands, and the two brands will be almost identical, but each will skim a different market.

For instance, I am told that a Sears, Roebuck Kenmore washing machine is the same as a Whirlpool washing machine, and that there is really no difference between the two. However, the Whirlpool washing machine is nationally advertised and sells at a higher price.

So one machine is sold to the snob market, so to speak, and the lower-priced machine is sold to the nonsnob market.

Madam President, should not snobs be permitted to cease being snobs? Should not they be permitted to have the advantage of price competition if they want it?

At present the whole attempt by advertising by brands is to attempt to protect prices and to make consumers believe that their future is bound up in purchasing those particular brands. Out of that process, great advertising fortunes have been built in radio, in television, by advertising copy writers—all the men who live in the happy suburbia outside of New York City, running up to Hartford, Conn., and beyond, and in Westchester County, N. Y., and out on Long Island. Out of that come the big incomes of the national weeklies. From it comes a great deal of money for the television stars and radio stars. From it come huge profits and huge mark-ups. But, Madam President, who pays the bill? Poor Mrs. Housewife pays the bill.

I believe it is about time that we had a little price competition going, and that "blue sky" no longer be sold to the American public.

Mr. MOODY. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I have been listening with great care and great interest to my illustrious and eloquent friend, the Senator from Illinois. I am wondering whether he is not arguing that when private brands come into the market, they provide competition, and therefore that the bill as it is now written would not bar competition, because it stimulates the creation of new business and new brands. If prices go too high, new competitors will come into the market.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is like saying that we should load down a man with chains on his feet and on his hands; and we should chain him to a rock, and that still there will be an element of freedom for him, in that he will want to move.

If we load down the economic system with restrictions, we may not kill it entirely; fortunately, there will still be some vitality and some spirit of competition.

The point really is that competition is not an easy theory to believe in. It involves losses, as well as profits; it involves exits from business, as well as growths and successes in business. It operates by elimination from industry, as well as by rewards for the efficient and successful. It is a stern process, but on the whole it is a beneficial one, for it stimulates men to greater energy and effectiveness.

We want to put certain floors under it; but those floors, to the degree that they are put under it, will be put under it by the community. Each one should not fix his own floor, or else he will favor himself.

One of the things that is disconcerting is how people will give lip service to competition, and then will assist every possible measure to stifle, cripple, restrict, and prevent competition. If we have faith in the competitive system, we must be willing to let it operate and to abide by its results—if we really believe in it.

Where shall we go if we permit private price-fixing, Madam President? I have heard eloquent speeches on the floor of this body against public price-fixing. I do not like public price-fixing; it involves too many decisions and too many complicated factors of costs. I prefer competitive prices. But at least the price-fixing we have been hitherto discussing has been price-fixing by the community, with an attempt made to protect the consumers.

But what we are now being asked to legitimatize is private price-fixing, prices fixed by the interested parties, and only by a fraction of them; and the prices they would fix would thus have the force of law, a system infinitely worse than the public system of price-fixing, which so many of my colleagues have denounced.

So, Madam President, I hope very much that this bill will not pass.

I think it probably is unconstitutional, because the Supreme Court, in the Schechter case, declared unconstitutional the delegation of legislative powers, such as the delegation to private individuals of the power to set prices. The decision of the Supreme Court in that case was a unanimous one. The NRA was declared unconstitutional, even though under the NRA system, representatives of labor played a part, and there were at least nominal representatives of consumers. I myself sat on some of those boards, as a representative of the consumers. I admit we were somewhat useless, but at least we were there for window dressing.

If the NRA was declared unconstitutional, in the Schechter case, by the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, what shall we say to provisions by which it is proposed to surrender to a single manufacturer—not to an entire industry, but to one manufacturer—the power to fix the prices at which his goods will be sold, and to give him the power to enforce these agreements against nonsigners? I think the bill is unconstitutional. I doubt that it will hold up in the Supreme Court. Even if it did, it would be bad public policy.

Madam President, in the few years I have spent in this body, I believe I have fought hard for competition for small business, so that small business cannot be hit over the head by big business. I have tried to protect small business against unfair advantages which big business sometimes is able to obtain by means of financial power. I want a broad distribution of ownership in the United States.

But can we depend on price-fixing, which strikes at the consumers, to protect small business? We shall do well if we can just permit small business to compete without being subjected to arbitrary power through price discrimination on the goods they purchase.

We do not need to give business, in addition, the power to gouge consumers.

Madam President, in order to crystallize the discussion, I now send to the desk my amendment outlawing the loss-leader, and ask that it be read. It is an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois will yield. This is new business, and very important business. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to do that, but I think we should have a statement of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, under the rules of the Senate, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, I would suggest that the further reading of this amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry. This is new matter which is brought before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois requests that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, may I be permitted to explain this amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should be glad to have the distinguished Senator from Illinois explain the amendment, but I think we should first have a quorum call, in order that other Senators may be present to hear the explanation, and in order that we may know where we are going from here. I suggest the absence of a quorum. This is new matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to make that as a motion?

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hunt	Murray
Benton	Ives	Neely
Bricker	Jenner	O'Conor
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cain	Kem	Schoeppel
Case	Kilgore	Seaton
Chavez	Knowland	Smathers
Clements	Langer	Smith, Maine
Connally	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Long	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dworshak	Martin	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McCarthy	Underwood
Green	McClellan	Watkins
Hendrickson	McFarland	Welker
Hill	Monroney	Wiley
Hoey	Moody	Williams
Holland	Morse	Young
Humphrey	Mundt	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator——

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not yield for anything at this time. I shall be only a few minutes, and then the Senator can propound his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. President, we are trying to expedite the work of the Senate. In my humble opinion, there is no question but what, by and large, the majority of the Senate will favor the passage of this bill when it comes to a vote. I hope that we can come to some agreement in regard to a vote. I dislike very much that Senators, in the last days of the session of the Senate, have to work long hours, but we must drive to do the work of the Senate so that Congress can adjourn. This bill has been listed as one of the bills that should be passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who listed it?

Mr. McFARLAND. The majority policy committee. I assume the Senator from Illinois did not list it.

The Senator from Illinois made a motion to table the bill, at the beginning. He might get a few more votes against it on the final passage, but not many more. If the Senator from Illinois wants to indulge in a filibuster on this bill, that is his privilege.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not yet. I shall yield in a few moments.

I am not trying to force this bill on anyone, nor is any other Senator trying to force it. I have tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon it at any time tomorrow, but Senators have told me they wanted to debate it for a long time. That is their privilege; if they want to debate it for a long time, they can do so. There are only a few days left, and we must work long hours. There is no question of giving full opportunity to every Senator to present his views.

I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. On some issues I have heard Senators suggest after a week of debate that a bill has been filibustered. But this is the first time I have heard the suggestion of a filibuster when debate on a bill has not lasted longer than 5 hours. Does the Senator from Arizona mean that a few hours of debate is considered filibustering against a bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a filibuster can be recognized when it looms upon the horizon. I do not say that any Senator is trying to filibuster, but I intend in a few minutes to ascertain whether there is an attempt to filibuster.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the majority leader feel that when statements on the floor have indicated that the bill might cost American consumers more than a billion dollars, the bill should at least be debated?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am perfectly willing to have the bill debated. The only question I should like to have answered is, How much time is desired to debate the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. We had before the Senate today an important matter, the German peace treaty. As the acting minority leader has suggested, we disposed of it promptly. It was of great moment to the country and to the world.

Yesterday we disposed of the defense appropriation bill. No bill of greater importance ever confronted the United States Senate, but the bill was disposed of under an agreement limiting debate on amendments to 20 minutes to a side.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow at 10 o'clock the debate on the pending bill be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, the time until 12 o'clock to be controlled on the one side by the Senator from Minnesota, and on the other side by the Senator from Illinois; that thereafter debate be limited on amendments to 40 minutes to an amendment, 20 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the proponent of the amendment on the one side, and by the Senator from Minnesota on the other side, in the event that he is opposed to the amendment; and in the event the Senator from Minnesota is in favor of the amendment, then the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader, or any Senator whom he may designate; and that thereafter debate upon the bill be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the distinguished Senator from Illinois on the one side, and the distinguished Senator from Minnesota on the other side.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the proposition, if he can.

The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow the debate be divided between the proponents and the opponents of the pending measure, the time to be controlled, as he suggested, by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota; that beginning at 12 o'clock, and thereafter during further consideration of the bill, debate on all amendments, motions, appeals, and so forth, be limited to 40 minutes, 20 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled, in the first instance, by the proponent of the amendment, and by the Senator from Minnesota if he opposes it; otherwise by the minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate; and that thereafter the debate on the bill itself shall be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McFARLAND. And that all amendments must be germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That all amendments must be germane.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois reserves the right to object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I wish to make it clear that I do not desire to delay the vote upon this bill after it has received proper consideration. I have not engaged in a filibuster, I will not engage in a filibuster, I do not believe in filibusters. But I should like to point out certain extraordinary circumstances connected with the way in which the bill was brought to the floor and the way in which it almost passed.

If my understanding is correct the bill came to the Senate without a favorable report of the committee. The committee merely reported the bill without recommendation. The hearings have not been printed. I have before me a typewritten copy of the hearings, but I do not believe the hearings as such have been printed or are available.

The bill was about to be passed without discussion and without sponsorship, when the Senator from Illinois, fortunately, thought that he should rise and see that there was at least some discussion—and during the last 3 hours, we have had a very interesting, although disconnected, discussion upon the merits of the bill. There has been no attempt to prevent the Senate from reaching a conclusion, but there has been an attempt, and I am proud to say we shall continue it, to see that the issues are raised, so that the Senate will have a basis for reaching a conclusion.

I shall not object to the proposal, because I thoroughly agree that after Senators have read the RECORD and have had a chance to hear the arguments, there should be a vote upon the bill tomorrow. I hope the amendment which I have suggested can be read, that I may have a chance to explain it, and that it may be printed and lie on the desk. I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has an amendment which he may intend to offer, and which, if he wishes, could be printed and lie on the desk. But I desire to clear the air, lest any imputation of filibustering be thrown upon the Senator from Illinois and other Senators who have tried to have the bill discussed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Oregon has no intention to filibuster the bill, but he does intend to present his views on the bill at whatever length it may take to present them. He is going to object to the unanimous-consent request. He has already made it clear to the majority leader that he will object to any proposal for a unanimous-consent request in regard to the bill. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret very much that there has been objection to the unanimous-consent request. I think I was unduly chastised—and I think the chastisement was uncalled for—by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] last Saturday because I called up the most important bill that has confronted the Senate during this session, the defense appropriation bill. Some proponents of the fair-trade bill have sent out word that I was delaying the bill and was trying to keep

it from being passed. I want it to be known, and I am making a record of it now, that I have made a better record on the bill than has the Senator from Minnesota. My efforts have been directed toward getting the bill considered and passed. From now on——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I will not yield yet.

I desire to have it known that I shall do everything I can to get this bill passed. Senators can talk about having a filibuster or not having a filibuster. A bill can be filibustered for a day, for 2 days, or for 3 months.

I merely wish the RECORD to show that I have done everything I could to have the bill passed, and we are going to continue our efforts to have it passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that in his temporary absence, and in the middle of the reading of an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois; the reading was interrupted so that the Senate could indulge in this proceeding, which is entirely out of order. Without unanimous consent, the reading of an ordinary amendment or an amendment in the nature of a substitute cannot be dispensed with. Therefore, the Chair orders the clerk to complete the reading of the substitute, unless consent is given for a suspension of the reading.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In view of the fact that many Senators were not present when the reading of the pending amendment started, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent that the reading proceed from the beginning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be in order to ask unanimous consent that the reading proceed from the beginning. Is there objection?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the clerk will resume reading at the place where he stopped.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will it be possible to have all the amendment printed at one place in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator wishes to ask that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the entire amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that it be printed and lie on the table, such a request is in order.

Does the Senator make such a request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The clerk will complete the reading of the amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed and completed the reading of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, the Chair will direct that the amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed intact so that it will appear all in one place. The RECORD will show that during the reading of the substitute certain proceedings were had, including the discussion which has taken place, the various unanimous-consent requests submitted, and so forth. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was the request which the Senator from Illinois was making.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that it would be better to have the amendment appear in the RECORD as a whole, without being interrupted by the proceedings. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was ordered to be printed in the RECORD entire, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 27. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"'(1) The term "delivered cost" shall mean invoice cost to a seller less the value of discounts received by a seller in money or the equivalent, plus the cost of transportation incident to delivery to the seller, and plus applicable excise and sales taxes to the seller.

"'(2) The term "seller" shall mean a vendee, as used in this act, who purchases for resale.

"'(3) The term "loss leader practice" shall mean selling a commodity, or advertising or offering a commodity for sale at retail at a price below the delivered cost of the commodity to the seller plus 6 percent of such cost, except that it does not include any of the following sales, or any advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"'(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given to the public.

"'(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"'(C) Any sale by an officer acting under an order of court.

"'(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"'(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"'(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"'(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.

"'(b) Any loss leader practice which affects commerce is hereby declared to be unlawful and actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby.

"'(c) (1) Any person injured in his business or property by any loss leader practice hereby declared to be unlawful may sue therefor in any district court of the United States, as provided in section 4 of this act, or in any State court of competent jurisdiction, and recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. Any person threatened with injury by any loss leader practice shall be entitled to injunctive relief against such threatened injury in any court of the United States, as provided in section 16 of this act, or to sue for and have such relief in any State court of competent jurisdiction when and under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity in that State, under the rules governing such proceedings, and upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.

"'(2) Section 15 of this act (providing for suits by United States district attorneys to restrain violations of this act) shall not apply with respect to any loss leader practice.

"'(d) (1) Nothing contained herein or in any of the antitrust acts shall render illegal any contract or agreement prohibiting a seller from reselling at a price below his delivered cost, any commodity which bears, or the label or container of which bears, the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others, when contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices are lawful under any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which such resale is to be made, or to which the commodity is to be transported for such resale, or for delivery to a vendee pursuant to a sale.

"'(2) Nothing contained herein or in any of the antitrust acts shall render illegal the exercise or enforcement of any right or right of action created by any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, which provides in substance that willfully and knowingly advertising, offering for sale, or selling any commodity at less than the minimum prices prescribed in any such contract or agreement whether the person so advertising, offering for sale, or selling is or is not a party to such contract or agreement, is unfair competition and is actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby: *Provided, however,* That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply where the minimum price prescribed in such contract is higher than the delivered cost to the seller: *And provided further,* That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply to any of the following sales, or advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"'(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given to the public.

"'(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"'(C) Any sale by an officer acting under an order of court.

"'(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"'(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"'(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"'(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.'

"SEC. 2. That section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies' approved July 2, 1890, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SECTION 1. Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.'"

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I wish to say only a word or two about the parliamentary situation. If the Senator from Oregon had not objected to the unanimous-consent request I would have felt it my duty to object.

The first speech which I made on the floor of the Senate was in favor of the right of free and full debate in the United States Senate. That happened in connection with what I regarded as a rather historic debate. On that occasion we agreed to a compromise, providing that when two-thirds of the Members of the Senate wished to shut off debate at any time when a measure is before the Senate, they can do so by means of signing a cloture petition and bringing it before the Senate. Sixteen Members can sign it and bring it up, and a two-thirds' vote will shut off debate completely. Those of us from the South, by and large, agreed to go along with other Senators. Judging from the indications, there are plenty of votes to carry a cloture petition in the Senate in this instance if those supporting this bill will vote for it.

The Senator from Arizona speaks of filibustering. The junior Senator from Louisiana has no scruples against filibustering if he believes the situation justifies it. Nevertheless, if filibustering is an irregularity, what shall we say of the situation when a bill is brought up without a committee report, without the hearings being printed, and without a single speech being made in favor of a bill which would affect the prices which consumers all over the Nation would have to pay for certain commodities. In this instance only one Senator rose to make a speech, and before he was three-fourths of the way through his speech, some other Senator says that a filibuster is under way, before any other Senator had an opportunity to make a speech on the subject, and before a single speech had been made in favor of the bill.

I know of no man whom I hold in higher esteem or for whom I have a greater affection in the United States Senate than the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. However, I say that it is completely unfair to suggest that a filibuster is in progress when a Senator who feels in his own heart and conscience that the bill should not pass, a man who knows something about the subject, a man who has made a study of economics, rises and makes one speech against the bill.

If Senators wish to insist on a vote on the bill, there should be plenty of votes to carry a cloture petition, if they want to shut off debate without the bill being properly debated. I say that 2 weeks' debate on a matter such as this would not be unreasonable. If the majority leader is anxious to have the Senate adjourn for the conventions, I tell him that the Senate need not adjourn sine die. The Senate can be brought back, and we can debate the bill at length. If the majority leader is worried about having a vote on the bill, we can vote after we return. I do not believe that the comfort and convenience of Senators is so important that when some Senator believes he should rise and protest a measure such as this, affecting every citizen of this Nation, that Senator should not have a right to be heard, and other Senators should not have a right to be heard, until we have had reasonable debate on the bill.

Personally, I regret that such an implication was drawn. I know that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his own heart and conscience, is against filibustering. I know of occasions when the junior Senator from Louisiana felt that a certain subject should be debated at great length, but the Senator from Illinois, although he was on the same side, felt that we should not engage in lengthy debate if it would ultimately prevent a vote on the measure. I hope the RECORD will not indicate that the senior Senator from Illinois had any desire to prevent a vote, or that the bill could not be brought to a vote if there were a reasonable determination to bring it to a vote. Whenever a minority of the Senate has prevented a measure from being voted upon, it has always been my opinion that if the majority had the same determination to pass the measure that the minority had in trying to defeat it, the bill could be passed. All the majority would have to do would be to sit while the minority stood and talked. If the majority can sit as long as the minority can stand, any filibuster can be broken.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois lost the floor, under the rule, when he yielded for a quorum call. However, if he desires to be recognized again, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield only for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to speak to the amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me without his losing the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can yield only for a question, in accordance with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield to me without his losing his right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Chair has ruled that I can yield only for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can yield for other purposes by unanimous consent.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may be permitted to yield to me without his losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois may yield, if there is no objection, to the Senator from Arizona for some other purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without losing my right to the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without losing the right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. With that understanding I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator speak louder?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Louisiana. We did not displace the bill at all, because at all times notice was given that an appropriation bill would take precedence. The misunderstanding was caused by the colloquy which occurred last Saturday. The RECORD shows that I have done everything possible to expedite the consideration and passage of this bill.

It is all right with me if Senators want to say that they believe in unlimited debate. I strongly believe in it myself. I will not ask for cloture on this bill. I have tried to give Senators an opportunity to vote on the bill. If it is defeated or if it goes over so that we cannot pass it, at least the Senate will have had an opportunity to vote on it. I think the Senate is ready to vote on the bill now. The reason no one——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield at that point? I have yielded to him on my time.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Arizona say that Senators are ready to vote on the bill now when they have not heard one speech in favor of the bill and have not read the report on the bill and do not have before them the hearings on the bill? How can the Senator from Arizona say that we are ready to vote on the bill?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I thought the Senator from Illinois was ready to vote on the bill, because he was the one who moved to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am ready to vote on my amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. The Senator was the one who made the motion to table, even before the bill was discussed. I believe every Senator knows how he will vote on the bill. The Senator from Illinois konws how he will vote on the bill. The Senator from Arizona knows how he will vote on it. I think we can dispose of it. The reason why the Senator from Illinois made his motion to table, I

presume, was because he thought the Senate was fully informed with regard to the measure. Let the small independent merchant and the small independent druggist, the men who are the balance wheel of the Nation know who is responsible for the defeat of this measure.

I merely wanted to make it absolutely clear that the Senator from Arizona is eager to bring this measure to a vote. I meant no criticism of the Senator from Minnesota, though I think he unduly chastised me. He is my friend, and I know he has a right to do it, but I thought he laid it on a little too hard; but I know how to take it.

I want the people throughout the country, especially the small druggist who is trying to eke out an existence, and who wants to be able to fight the big chain, to know who is holding up the bill. Call the roll of the Senate, Mr. President, and you will find those who are behind the small merchants and businessmen of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Arizona would not leave the Chamber.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not leaving the Chamber. I moved over here to speak to a friend who wanted to congratulate me. I am always willing to be congratulated.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I wish to say something on my own time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad that the Senator from Arizona is staying in the Chamber. At first I thought he was going to emulate Captain Shotover, the character in Bernard Shaw's play Heartbreak House, who would ask a question and then go out the door before anyone had a chance to reply.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is an unfair comment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was merely citing a play by Bernard Shaw.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is all right to cite plays, but not to cast reflections.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I made my early motion to table merely in order that there might be a preliminary skirmish on this bill. I must confess that I was shocked that the bill was on the point of being passed without anyone speaking in its favor and without any statement being made concerning it and without any report of the committee being before us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I decline to yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The motion to table was defeated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The motion was defeated. Mr. President, the amendment has been read. I wish to make it clear that my amendment is in the form of a substitute. It is in effect the so-called Celler bill, H. R. 6986. I have a limited number of copies of the bill and I shall ask the pages to distribute copies of it to the Senators in the Chamber. It is the same as the Celler bill, with one exception. It prohibits a sale below cost which affects commerce, and it defines cost as the delivered cost of a commodity to the retailer plus 6 percent. In other words, it is more liberal to the retailer than the Celler bill. The Celler bill merely forbade sales at below delivered price.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I first finish the sentence? Then I shall yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The present amendment defines cost as the delivered cost of a commodity to the retailer plus 6 percent. Therefore it is more liberal than the Celler bill. It permits a suit for damages in a Federal court by anyone who is hurt by loss-leaders. It exempts sales under bankruptcy, sales to organizations organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, literary or scientific purposes, seasonal clearance sales, and so on. The terms of the bill were worked out by Representative CELLER and experts of the House Judiciary Committee. Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wanted to ask the Senator from Illinois if he has any knowledge as to whether the bill is in accord with the President's program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not acquainted with all the details of the President's program. Certainly all members of his party are not justified in speaking for it. I can say that if the administration really means business—and I think it does—and if it opposes monopoly and opposes private price-fixing, the pending bill would seem to me to be a violation of the President's program. But I think it would be better if this information were obtained, as the English used to say, "out of the horse's mouth."

Mr. AIKEN. Has the bill been referred to any executive agency for study and report?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To the best of my knowledge it has not been. Pardon me; when I have been speaking of "the bill," I have been referring to the McGuire bill, the price-maintenance bill, as being a violation of the antimonopoly laws.

So far as I know, my amendment has not been referred to any of these agencies. However, I believe the amendment does constitute a legitimate protection to retailers. It seems to me that the amendment really continues the principles of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Illinois explain the meaning of the letter from the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, which appears on the first page of Report No. 1741? Has the bill been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and has that committee held hearings on the bill and subsequently reported the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Vermont referring to the so-called McGuire bill, House bill 5767; or is the Senator from Vermont referring to the Celler bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Illinois believe this bill should be considered by the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Vermont refer to the McGuire bill, the one now under consideration by the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not an expert on the rules of the Senate, and I shall not pass judgment on the question of whether that bill should have been considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which reported it without recommendation, or whether the bill should have been considered by the Judiciary Committee. I have made it clear that it was not my intention to insist that the bill be referred to the Judiciary Committee. I think that is another indication that I do not seek to prevent a vote on this bill.

I am perfectly willing to have the bill debated here on the floor of the Senate, and I do not wish to have the bill killed in committee.

So I shall not make any move to have the bill referred to the Judiciary Committee, but I believe the bill should be debated on the floor of this body.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Illinois know of any instance in which any so-called monopoly bill has not been considered by or referred to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I have said, I have not had the experience in this body that the Senator from Vermont has had. I know that frequently jurisdictional disputes arise over such matters. It is not my purpose to raise such a jurisdictional issue.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Illinois know what reply, if any, was made to the request of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to have the bill referred to the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The letter of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee was addressed to the eminent Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I shall have to ask him to reply to that question.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Colorado for that purpose, without causing the Senator from Illinois to lose the floor, and in that way to permit the Senate to have the information I have requested. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois be permitted to yield to the Senator from Colorado, to have the Senator from Colorado answer a question. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the question is an important one.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I understand the question, this is the answer: The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce received a request, by letter, from the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce explored the matter, and took it up with the Parliamentarian of the Senate. We were informed that inasmuch as the bill had been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, we did not have a right to refer the bill to another committee; that the only thing we could do with the bill was to handle it in our own committee or report it to the Senate.

We sent the bill to the floor of the Senate, where the Senate has complete authority and jurisdiction over the bill. The Senate can re-refer the bill if the Senate wishes to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not it be more appropriate to have the bill taken up for consideration at a time when the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may be able to answer the question.

When this bill came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, the question of the committee to which the bill should be referred was a matter to be ruled on by the Chair.

The Chair read the bill, and decided that it should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The Chair referred the bill to that committee. In that decision the Chair had the concurrence of the Parliamentarian of the Senate.

What happened to the bill thereafter, is a matter over which the Chair has no control.

Of course, any Senator could have moved that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, but no such motion was made.

The Chair referred the bill to the committee to which the Chair thought the bill was entitled to go.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Chair for that information. I merely thought it strange that the request to which I have referred appear on the first page of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So far as the Chair knows, no request was made to refer the bill to any particular committee. The Chair acted under the rules of the Senate, and referred the bill to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very glad to obtain the explanation of what happened.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to hold the floor any longer.

I shall merely say that if we wish to stop loss-leaders, the way to do so is to prohibit them—which my amendment does. In order to stop loss-leaders, it is not necessary to give to manufacturers the power to fix retail prices—in fact, not only to fix prices to those who sign agreements, but also to fix prices to all retailers, many of whom do not sign agreements.

In other words, Mr. President, in order to deal with the proximate and immediate evil, it is not necessary to take such a heavy dose as the McGuire bill proposes.

Since the Senator from Vermont has raised the issue as to the attitude of the President or of the President's office in regard to this matter, let me say that it is my information that the Bureau of the Budget—I do not know whether it can be said to speak for the President, but at least it thinks it can—has said that the fair-trade bill, the so-called McGuire bill, is not in accord with the President's program; and the Federal Trade Commission, as a substitute for the McGuire bill, has endorsed the type of bill which I have suggested, or another type of bill which, as I understand, is to be proposed, quite possibly by the Senator from Louisiana.

However, in order to make it clear that I am not trying to filibuster, I shall now yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has a right to yield at any moment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall yield at this time for a question, but I hope I shall be permitted to take my seat, so that no charge of filibustering can be leveled at me.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I sympathize entirely with the Senator's attitude. However, I wish him to yield to me for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sure the Senator from Illinois heard the distinguished majority leader refer to his deep interest in the druggist and in the grocer, and I know that the interest of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, as well as my own interest and that of all other Members of the Senate, is also in the grocer and in the druggist. On the other hand, is it not a fact that what we who are opposing this bill are trying to do is to protect the 155,000,000 consumers of the United States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. They are the ones who need protection. They are the ones who are being charged unduly high prices in many cases, the ones who are being mulcted out of hundreds of millions of dollars, without, in my opinion, any commensurate or corresponding gain on the part of the grocer and the druggist.

Is it not a fact that that is what we are fighting for—that we are not trying to hurt anyone, but we are trying to help all the people? At the present time we are particularly concerned in opposing this bill because of our desire to protect the 155,000,000 customers in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York is quite correct. We are trying to protect the really forgotten men and women of the country—the consumers.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for two short questions?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question. Let it be understood that I am doing this out of courtesy. It is my desire to yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. The questions I wish to ask are addressed strictly to the Senator's bill, which I think he can best explain.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the Celler bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator from Illinois is sponsoring it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would the Senator tell the Senate whether his bill would, in fact, put every commodity or product sold at retail, and sold below 6 percent of the delivered cost plus 6-percent profit to a retailer, under the arm of the Federal law?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. It is an attempt to prevent industry from getting under the arm of the private price fixer.

Mr. MONRONEY. Could the Senator tell me what percent he estimates is now under the fair-trade limitation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That affects only branded items, and I shall be very glad to modify my amendment so that it would refer only to the national brands or trade-marked items.

Mr. MONRONEY. The point I was trying to make in my questioning was that the way the Celler bill is drawn, as introduced in the Senate, it would include everything sold at retail which did not bear at least a 6-percent markup, whereas the fair-trade and trade-marked items add up to about 1 percent of the merchandise that is sold, and leaves it to the States to have their own fair-price system, if they so desire.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let the RECORD show that the Senator is perfectly willing to modify his amendment in the nature of a substitute, so that it will cover only the same type of goods referred to by the McGuire bill, namely, trade-marked or branded goods. The language will have to be formulated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will submit appropriate language at a later time in this debate. It will be on Senators' desks tomorrow. Again, Mr. President, unless there are other questions, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield the floor?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am, like the rest of us, greatly interested in the welfare of druggists and grocers in my State and in other States, too. They are a highly respectable and responsible group of persons for whom I have sincere regard and in whose interest I have a deep concern. I very much wish that they be enabled to make fair and consistent profits and be prosperous.

I am not worried over the profits, as such, of the large manufacturers. I want to see general prosperity in this country, and I want to see every industry make fair and equitable profits. But I

am concerned most of all at this moment, and I am worried, about the plight and the position of the consumer—the 155,000,000 consumers in this country—and I do not think there is any question that the fair-trade laws in our various States, if they are allowed to operate under the terms of the pending bill, will mean that the consumers of this country will have to pay higher prices and pay out more of their income for these protected products.

Not for a very long time, probably not since I came to the Senate, have I been more in doubt about what I should do with regard to a bill. I have thought deeply about this bill and have discussed it extensively with others, and I have finally reached a decision to oppose this fair-trade bill; I have reached that decision with reluctance and with some doubt and hesitation.

My hesitation was based in part on the fact that, as Governor of New York, I had signed one of the first fair-trade bills that was enacted in any State of the Union. I signed it in 1935. I accompanied my signature of that fair-trade law with a strong message, a message which has been quoted in the courts on a number of occasions.

I think the history of that New York bill, and the story of why I signed it in 1935, may be of interest to my colleagues in the Senate.

That bill, as I have said, was enacted in 1935, when we were working our way out of a very great depression. It was enacted at a time when it was very difficult for manufacturers to dispose of their products at fair prices in the normal manner. They had considerable inventories and the consumers had insufficient money to buy these goods. The result was that manufacturers in their efforts to sell their products and reduce their inventories were willing to sell their goods to large department stores and big distributors at any terms, at almost any price. Of course, that led to a situation in which the small druggist, the small grocer, and the small merchant, who had their own inventories and who could not compete in price with the big retailer, had no opportunity to protect themselves. The little stores were being bankrupt and driven to the wall, and going out of business. That led to very great losses on the part of small dealers, for whom, I wish to say, I have the greatest regard. I think they are one of the most important and most necessary elements in our economy. They are the backbone of our country.

There was another thing that related to that bill, which I wish to mention tonight. When I signed that bill, I thought that the manufacturer would go out and sign up all or a greater part of the distributors of his particular product. Certainly there could have been at that time no objection whatsoever to a fair-trade bill that would permit the manufacturer to invoke the protection of the law for the contracts into which he had entered with distributors and merchants. To my considerable surprise, I found that the manufacturers did not sign up the majority of the distributors, but that they used the law in such a way that if they signed up one distributor or one retailer and got him to agree to maintain a certain price, that price was enforced for every other retailer and distributor in the whole State.

I did not contemplate such a development at the time the bill was before me. I can speak only from the standpoint of New York, but I can say to Senators that such a development was not generally envisioned when the bill was passed by the Legislature of the State of New York and obtained my approval. But that situation has developed and remains until the present time, namely, that the signing up of one retailer or distributor has imposed an obligation on every other distributor or retailer in the entire State. In my opinion, that is not a sound practice, and certainly it imposes restrictions on the free enterprise and trade we all wish to see maintained.

If the pending bill is enacted, I do not think there is any doubt that it will increase the cost to the consumer, and I do not believe it will mean any real or lasting profit to the distributor or the retailer. The situation today is so different from what it was 15, 16, 17, or 20 years ago, when we were in the midst of a depression, that I believe today the distributor or retailer does not require this protection or gain by it.

I do not believe that, save in isolated cases, the little merchant's trade is seriously interfered with or that his profits are seriously interfered with, in the absence of a fair-trade law. The little pharmacist or grocer or hardware dealer has the advantage of an intimate relationship with his community and has the further advantage of knowing the people with whom he deals. I do not believe that because a large department store 2, 3, or 4 miles from where the small dealer operates, for a very short time cuts prices, is going to interfere seriously with the business of the small merchant. I think the ability and the authority given to all merchants to fix their own prices, regardless of any Federal intervention, or State intervention, if you will, at least gives the guaranty, if not of lower prices, then of stabilized, reasonable prices, which would not be the case under a fair-trade law.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I yield to no Member of this body, not even the distinguished and illustrious Senator from Illinois, in my interest in the consuming public. From the day I entered the Senate, I have sponsored measures and policies which I felt to be in the interest of the consuming public of America.

I feel that this measure is not only in the interest of the small-business men, but also in the long-term interest of the consumers. Therefore, I feel that the Senate should pass this bill.

Fair trade, so-called, is a complicated issue. There are good arguments on both sides, as we have heard here tonight. Those of us who believe strongly in a really free economy, and hope for a vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, at first hesitated to approve of fair trade.

In the best of all possible worlds, Mr. President, a fair trade act would not be necessary to protect small business. Unfortunately, we have not yet reached that happy state. We have found that when the powerful cross-currents of economic power are permitted to run unleashed they sometimes destroy not only individuals, but can cripple the economy.

The farm economy of America went through a decade of recession in the 1920's, and helped precipitate the great depression of 1930–32, until vigorous action was taken here to protect agriculture from depression. Workingmen were paid an average of $17 a week, when they could find jobs, and were threatened, blacklisted, and stink-bombed for attempts to organize, until their right of collective bargaining was assured by law. Big business itself, when governments followed its orders as a pliant stooge, plunged during 1931–32 into a slough of red ink—$3,400,000,000 worth of it—before common sense and a new administration and a new Congress came to take the practical steps needed to restore confidence and buying power.

The real danger of price fixing in America does not spring from the little-business man—the small druggist, the modest furniture dealer, the independent petroleum dealer, the neighborhood grocer. All are essential to our way of life. Mr. President, the real danger lies not so much in vertical arrangements on advertised brands, which are in competition with each other, as in the potent horizontal price-fixing alliances between some primary producers which stifle competition in some fields entirely.

It is there the antitrust laws should be enforced, Mr. President. It is there that the consumer should be protected. The consumer is not protected, in the long run, by the evanescent advantage of being able to buy a few items at less than cost, when he inevitably must make up that loss by paying higher prices for other goods, and when the result of unfair price cutting can only be to cripple or destroy small competitive business. Small business is the heart and soul of our real competitive system, which has given America the most goods at the best value, and the highest standard of living of any nation in the history of the world. When Joe's corner grocery store and Jim's drug store leave the neighborhood, something will have gone out of American life that can never be recovered. We must not let it happen, Senators, and I am confident we will not let it happen.

Should we permit small-business men to be destroyed, Mr. President, we would be undermining the basic strength that makes our country free and great.

I should like to read briefly from the report of our Senate Small Business Committee on fair trade because, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], this committee has gone into this matter with great care. The conclusion reached by the committee, and as stated in the report, reads:

CONCLUSIONS

The events of the past year in the field of fair trade have been of grave concern to

your committee. In particular, the Schwegmann decision and the ensuing price wars were viewed as matters of tremendous import to small business. Had the price wars continued, they could have done incalculable harm to countless small businesses. The memory of the early 1930's and the great numbers of small, independent concerns that were then lost to the economy directly as a result of similar price wars is still fresh. The possibility is strong that the damage to fair trade wrought by the Schwegmann decision might well precipitate similar business failures should our economy suffer a sudden reversal.

* * * * *

Your committee is hopeful that the members of the business community will recognize their responsibilities in this situation and that they will realize the dangers inherent in loss-leader selling and cut-throat competition, that they will realize that such practices can result only in damaging the whole economy. It is not only the small independent merchant who suffers in a price war. The manufacturer and the consumer also suffer. And the leaders of price-cutting campaigns should realize that injury to other segments of the retail trade cannot benefit them. Gains realized from loss-leader selling are short-lived. The practice is a vicious one and defeats itself. No merchant, no matter how large, can afford to continue loss-leader selling indefinitely. He must engage in other practices in order to recoup his losses. And such other practices of necessity require that he sell other merchandise at high profits. The consumer must sooner or later discover the fallacy of the loss-leader selling technique, and then the retailer loses the good will of his customers and their patronage. The good sense and recognition of their responsibilities should impel the overwhelming mass of the business community to the logic and wisdom of fair trade. The Nation's economic well-being depends to a large extent on the vitality of America's small businesses. Threats of price wars must be eliminated if that vitality is to endure.

Mr. President, I may say parenthetically that I should like to see the Senator from Illinois offer his amendment, if he offers it, as an addition to the bill, rather than as a substitute.

Mr. President, I believe the consumers would be better protected if this bill should pass than if it should fail to pass. The danger of monopoly would be much greater without the bill than with it, I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is not my intention tonight to speak at length on this measure, but I feel that in light of the colloquy, and the very sharp debate which has gone on, some explanation is due.

First of all, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made a point of the fact that when this bill was called on the calendar the proponents of the bill did not speak up. I happened to be at the telephone at the time the bill was called. I came to the floor as quickly as I could, and when I arrived I found a motion had been made to table the bill. I feel that those of us who are for this measure surely must make our case. I do not believe that any Senator should expect to vote on a measure such as this without honest debate.

Let me say, with all due credit and honor to the Senator from Illinois, that rather than that he should be chastised for what he has done, he should be honored because he has brought out some issues that need to be discussed. He has given those of us who are the proponents of the measure an opportunity to speak on the bill and to reply to his charges. Furthermore, he has been most generous with his time. He has yielded again and again to those of us who have wanted to interrogate him.

I, for one, desire to say that if the debate on this measure should take a little time, it would not be time wasted, because just as there are those who think it is bad for the consumers, there are those who believe it is good for the retailers, the manufacturers, and the general economy of the country.

I also desire to pay tribute to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for his defense of the customer, and particularly his comments concerning the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The fact of the matter is that we got ourselves into a parliamentary situation which was due to no one's judgment, but was just a matter of happenstance and unfortunate circumstances.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is most fair in the position he has taken, and I believe he is entirely right in saying that matters which are of great moment to the people should be fully discussed. The Senator has been fearless in standing and fighting when he has been in the minority, and certainly he appreciates, as all of us do, that it is unfair to expect any measure to be voted upon without giving those who are opposed to it an opportunity to state their case, so that not only the Members of the Senate but the people may judge. It is unfortunate that so many Members might have made up their minds without hearing the debate. In some cases their minds may have been made up because of pressure or political appeal rather than on the merits of the issues involved.

I am very much interested in hearing what the Senator has to say. Perhaps he will convince me that I should join his side. My mind is not closed. I think we should have an opportunity to make the case clear in the RECORD, for anyone who might want to study it in the future or read it at the present time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I know his keen interest in the question of our price laws, antimonopoly laws, and all matters which pertain to our commerce. I shall still respect his judgment if he opposes me.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that perhaps one of the reasons why some Senators have made up their minds and do not require a great deal of additional debate is that the country lived for many years under this kind of an act? The Supreme Court held a certain portion of it to be unconstitutional, on a technicality, which technicality this bill would correct. Therefore, I think many of the proponents, although welcoming an adequate debate, did not feel that it would require an exhaustive debate as it would if it were an entirely new piece of legislation with which they were unfamiliar. The dome of the Capitol has not toppled; the Washington Monument still stands, although the Nation did have this kind of a law for a great many years. I think 1 percent of the retail commodities are trademarked items, and those-trade-marked items which are under fair-trade contracts have very little bearing on the general economy or the cost of living.

They are merely items that help to preserve the integrity, the ability, and the soundness of the small businesses of America. I do not remember any cases of small businesses growing into gigantic trusts or monopolies because of a fair-trade act. I do not think the people need to worry about the small-business man becoming an ogre that will destroy them because of the interpretation this bill places on the antitrust act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma because he has made comment on a subject concerning which I hope to say a few words.

What are we attempting to do in this proposed legislation known as the McGuire bill, or, as others call it, the fair-trade bill? It is not something that is new, because we have been living with fair-trade laws ever since the Miller-Tydings Act, and many years before. This bill seeks to do just one simple thing, namely, to restore in the Federal enabling statute the meaning which I believe the Miller-Tydings Act had when it was passed in 1937. I would refer to the dissenting opinion submitted by Mr. Justice Frankfurter in which Justices Black and Burton concurred. Justice Frankfurter summarized his objections to the Court decision when he said, in May of 1951, speaking for two of his learned colleagues and for himself, a learned judge:

Every one of the 42 State acts which the Miller-Tydings amendment was to back up—the acts on which the Miller-Tydings amendment was to place a stamp of approval—contained a nonsigner provision. As demonstrated by experience in California, the State acts would have been futile without the nonsigner clause. The Court now holds that the Miller-Tydings amendment does not cover these nonsigner provisions. Not only is the view of the Court contrary to the words of the statute and to the legislative history, it is also in conflict with the interpretation given the Miller-Tydings amendment by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Department of Justice, and by practically all persons adversely affected by the fair-trade laws. * * * Where both the words of a statute and its legislative history clearly indicate the purpose of Congress, it should be respected. We should not substitute our own notion of what Congress should have done.

In other words, Justice Frankfurter says that the legislative history of the Miller-Tydings Act made it perfectly clear that the so-called nonsigner clause was a very definite part of its intendment.

So, what this bill attempts to do is to plug the loophole which the Court said it found in the Miller-Tydings Act. It is intended to set at rest the doubt which

has been raised by the Supreme Court's decision. It does not alter the laws of any of the 45 States which have fair-trade laws.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does it in any way impose anything upon any State or any person?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It does not, in any way whatsoever, impose anything upon anyone or any State that was not considered to be in the original Miller-Tydings Act.

May I point out that the then Attorney General, Thurman Arnold, testified before a committee of the Congress asking for the repeal of the Miller-Tydings Act. He said it included the nonsigner clause which the Court said it did not include.

What are we called upon to do? To clarify the law. In other words we are to overrule in the Congress the split decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that what we are trying to do by this bill is simply to take notice of or to recognize acts which have been passed by 45 of the States?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If there is anything wrong about this bill, the trouble can be traced to the respective State legislatures, back home among the people, which passed the various State acts. The States wanted to have those acts passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Again the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Congress now is simply saying to the States, "We recognize your wish in this matter, so we shall pass enabling legislation in order to protect commodities which move across State lines."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. The very matter of which the Court took judicial notice in 1950 and 1951, in the Wentling case and in the Schwegmann case, the nonsigners' clause, is the subject matter which in 1939 and 1940 was rejected by the Court. Again what the Senator from Alabama has said is wholly true, that the bill would require no change to be made in the laws of the States. As a matter of fact, the McGuire bill, so far as Federal fair-trade policy is concerned, would do nothing whatsoever to the fair-trade acts of 45 States. It would take nothing away from any of the State acts. It would overcome the court decisions, so that it would be truly an enabling Federal statute.

I may say to Senators who have tonight raised their voices in opposition to the Miller-Tydings Act that they have had almost 17 years in which to raise their voices. I should have said 15 years, because the act has been on the books since 1937. Many States of the Union had fair trade laws before 1937. But the Miller-Tydings Act has been on the statute books since 1937. The California statute contained a proviso known as the nonsigner's clause, of which so much has been made tonight; namely, that if a particular manufacturer signed up with one firm, all others would be in the same group, even though they did not sign. The law is clear, and has been upheld by the courts since 1933. I desire to make it perfectly clear that decision after decision in the Supreme Court, in the circuit courts, and in district courts has upheld the constitutional validity of State acts. There is not a shadow of doubt as to their legality or constitutionality.

I conclude this portion of my statement by asking why, all at once, there is a torrential outpouring of criticism of fair trade, when, in fact, we have been living under it in America; when, in fact, the rules of competition have been legalized in America; when, in fact, the retail business of America has been improved because of fair trade laws; when, in fact, State after State has proved that the laws work well when they are subject to the closest scrutiny of consumers, manufacturers, and retailers at the State level.

I heard tonight the cry about the consumer. Where does the consumer have a better opportunity to be heard than in his own State legislature? These statutes are State laws, administered by the States, which have an obligation to the citizens and consumers of the States.

If the consumer thought he was getting a bad deal because of a fair-trade law, he would have gone to his legislature. Yet it may be noted in the RECORD that not one State legislature has repealed a fair-trade law, nor has there been any substantial request for the repeal of such a statute. In fact, additional statutes have been passed in order to protect against predatory interests in the retail field.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few minutes ago the able Senator made reference to the fact that the Miller-Tydings law was passed in 1937, and he said something about the number of States that had passed fair-trade laws up to that time.

I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the first fair-trade law was passed by California in 1931. By the end of 1936, 14 States had passed such laws. In 1937, the same year in which the Miller-Tydings law was passed, 20 more States had passed such laws, making a total of 42 States.

In the excerpt from the Schwegmann case, from which the Senator read a few minutes ago, Mr. Justice Frankfurter made reference to the fact that when the Miller-Tydings Act was passed, 42 States had fair-trade laws, to which the Miller-Tydings Act was applicable, and that all of them contained a nonsigner provision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may supplement the Senator's remarks by saying that it had been clearly understood by the lower courts, and also by the Federal Trade Commission, which today opposes this bill—and it is a matter of their own official records—and it was likewise clearly understood by the Department of Justice, that the Miller-Tydings Act included, through its provisions and its legislative history, enabling authority for the nonsigner clause. That is a matter of of record.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I was very much interested to hear the Senator say that the matter of fair-trade laws is left entirely up to the State legislatures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The States are not compelled to accept this kind of law. If they do not desire this type of fair-trade law, they do not have to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator be willing to have the same principle apply to the Fair Employment Practices Commission?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator, but the Fair Employment Practices Commission measure is not enabling legislation; it is substantive legislation. When we are considering substantive legislation, I shall expect the Senator from Louisiana to give me vigorous opposition, because I know that he always feels that the States ought to have the opportunity to regulate local affairs, and the Senator has been so persuasive and eloquent throughout the years that I have been moved closer and closer to his position. I have even altered my ideas about FEPC with respect to local and State authority. If the Senator will remain with me, I venture to say that he will join with Senators who support the McGuire bill, which provides enabling legislation for the States. Otherwise he will learn that instead of having a bill providing local responsibility and the exercise of State authority to do economic justice in respect to States, he will get a bill like the Celler bill, which is being proposed here, which would empower Government agencies to check on every commodity to determine whether or not there was a 6-percent mark-up, or whether this commodity or that commodity was to be included.

Ah, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana, we States' righters have got to stand together tonight. We have got to stand together on these questions. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. I am pleased to hear that the Senator has made so much progress in his belief that the States should determine so many questions for themselves. I hope his views on the FEPC will come around to the idea of leaving the decision with respect to such a matter to the States, to leave it up to the people.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the very able, eloquent, and eminent Senator from Louisiana that if 45 States of the Union are as much in favor of FEPC as they are in favor of fair trade, I think the Senator will have pulled all my teeth and whittled down all my fangs, and I shall have to give up the fight.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Could the Senator enlighten the Senate, and in particular the junior Senator from Oklahoma, as to the approximate percentage of items

moving at retail which come under fair-trade laws? My impression is that the figure is about 1 percent, but I know that the Senator from Minnesota has given a great deal more study to the question than I have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must confess that I do not have accurate statistics on that question, but I know that out of the total volume of retail trade, it is a very small proportion. I believe the total volume of fair-trade products which have been sold in the past calendar year was something like $6,000,000,000 out of a total national income of approximately $278,000,000,000. That gives a good idea of what the amount of sales of fair-trade commodities would be. I would say they would amount to from 1 to 2 percent.

Mr. MONRONEY. So all the hubbub, worry, and fear are being created by a volume of from 1 to 2 percent of the business. Unless the senior Senator from Illinois can amend his loss-leader amendment, and after reading the amendment, I do not see how that can be done, without a redrafting of the whole measure, he would compel 100 percent of everything moving in the retail trade to be under the long arm of the Federal law. That would include sugar in the grocery stores, and sugar has never borne even a 6 percent mark-up. Many other items historically have never carried a 6 percent mark-up.

But this proposed substitute would force everything except distress merchandise to be sold at cost, plus at least six percent, without having anything to do with the protection of trade-marked items whose value a manufacturer has established through national advertising costing millions of dollars, in an effort to maintain fair trade on a nationally advertised product at a nationally advertised price, when any imitator or other manufacturer can produce an equal or corresponding competitive product without being under fair trade.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I think he has pointed out the real differences between the Douglas amendment, or the Celler bill, and the McGuire bill, the bill presently under consideration. That is a distinct contribution.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is accurate when he states that about $253,000,000,000 worth of goods are sold at retail.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I did not say that. I said that the total national income was over $250,000,000,000, and that the total amount of retail sales of fair-trade goods was around $6,000,000,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. The total goods sold at retail would be considerably under $100,000,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. So the trade-marked goods would not be 1 or 2 percent, but perhaps in excess of 6 percent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In terms of volume of sales, I think the Senator is right. In terms of items covered, the percentage might be different. I think we should look at the facts, and I shall see that we get the facts, because there is no use conjecturing.

In 1950 the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, in the Wentling decision, weakened the fair-trade structure by holding that the enforcement of a fair-trade law in any other State having a fair-trade law constitutes an unlawful burden upon and an interference with interstate commerce. Under this decision mail-order houses and other retailers who sell across State lines are permitted to disregard the fair-trade laws of every State but their own.

All they have to do is to obtain a badge of innocence from their own State, and go out and literally commit economic murder. They have a type of immunity in going from one State to another. All they have to do is to behave at home. They can raise all the dickens they want to away from home. Abe Martin once said that all men are alike when they are away from home. This is exactly what is being attempted with this bill. It is said, "So long as you behave in Kansas, you can go to Nebraska and have a good time wrecking the whole economic marketplace."

That does not make sense. I do not propose to be any kind of lawyer, but that is the rule of the jungle. It is the rule of the bully. It is the rule of the bad boy, who acts like a pious, innocent soul at home, but the minute he gets out of town he starts having himself a junket, a good, frisky time, getting both himself and everybody else into trouble.

What we are trying to do under the McGuire bill is to say, "Your conduct at home shall be the same as your conduct when you leave home. If you are an economic gentleman in Kansas, when you visit your brothers and sisters in Nebraska, be an economic gentleman there." That is all we are saying under the McGuire bill.

I thought I would like to go into the legal problems, because I think they have caused a great deal of trouble. I cannot imagine anything else that has caused as much furore. We have been waiting 15 years to hear the speech tonight by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. We have been waiting 15 years to hear what the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] has said, and 15 years to hear others. All at once we are hearing speeches about how terrible a fair-trade law is when, so far as I have been able to find out, no petitions have been filed by any consumers with respect to fair-trade laws. At least none have been brought to my attention.

Not many legislatures have had referendums, recalls, or initiative votes on the part of the citizenry on this subject, directed to the legislature or the governor. This has been an open subject. There has been no closed book. There has been no iron curtain. Everyone has had an opportunity to be heard. What has actually happened is that the retailer has been better off, the manufacturer has been better off, and the consumer has been better off. I am going to prove tonight that the argument which has been made about this being a bad bill for the consumer is an argument which cannot be based upon statistical facts or long-range good public policy.

Let us take another look at the subject of fair-trade laws. The Congress of the United States is a policy-making body. The legislatures of the respective States make policy in their sovereign areas. The Congress of the United States has established policies on many occasions which cannot be justified on the basis of dollars and cents, or profit-and-loss ledgers. Congress has at times made policies which are surely discriminatory. For example, the Congress of the United States treats a corporation one way and treats a farm cooperative another way. I am for that. I think that is good public policy. I think we need farmers' marketing cooperatives, and I think farmers' marketing cooperatives need some protection in order to flourish and grow for the benefit of the American farmer. However, I receive letters saying, "You give them special treatment." Perhaps that is right. However, the simple fact is that that is public policy.

There are other public policies. The Reclamation Bureau has a public policy. It says that a person cannot hold more than 160 acres of irrigated land upon a reclamation project. Can anyone in this body prove to me that a 160-acre farm is more economical than a 400- or 500-acre farm? As a matter of fact, the public policy of this country favors the family-sized farm. Can anyone prove by economic statstics that the family-sized farm is more economical to operate, or a better functional unit? As a matter of fact, statistics prove that a large corporation type farm can produce commodities more cheaply. It can produce larger quantities. It is more manageable from all the technical points of view. It is possible to have a better, more efficient system. But, my colleagues, America is not interested in the corporation farm as a part of its economy. America places a social value upon the family-sized farm, and we pay a price for that social value, a price which I am willing to pay, and everyone else is willing to pay. We could have farms of 100,000 acres or 50,000 acres, with absentee ownership and management, but that does not build the kind of America we want.

Public policy has something to do with other things besides dollars and cents. I have heard the argument to the effect that the consumer may save himself a few dollars if there are no fair-trade laws. Let us accept that thesis for the purpose of argument. Let us assume that the argument is correct, although I think I can prove that it is not. But even if it were correct, that does not tell us that that is the thing to do. It does not tell us that that is the kind of policy we should have.

I suppose it could be proved that if an employer could work people 60 hours a week, with a whip in his hand, he might be able to get more production. But we are not interested solely in production. We are interested in people living the good life. So we limit the workweek to 40 hours, as a matter of public law.

We establish a rule of time-and-a-half for overtime, so that employers will be encouraged to limit employment to 40 hours a week. We have many principles and policies which are social policies, and political policies, for the purpose of what? For the purpose of building the kind of society that America wants.

We are talking about a political, economic, and social decision tonight. We are not necessarily talking about whether some penny-pinching person is going to be able to save half a cent on a loaf of bread. We are talking about the kind of America we want. Do we want an America where, on the highways and byways, all we have is catalog houses? Do we want an America where the economic market place is filled with a few Frankensteins and giants? Or do we want an America where there are thousands upon thousands of small entrepreneurs, independent businessmen, and landholders who can stand on their own feet and talk back to their Government or to anyone else, in case they feel that they are being unjustly treated.

We want an America in which private property is meaningful. We want an America which preserves its property values—at least where there is equal opportunity to preserve the value of property. I submit that the best argument for a fair trade law is not what it does in terms of prices or profits. The best argument for a fair trade law is the kind of America it helps to preserve. The reason fair trade laws came into being was the cheap, cut-rate, pineboard store, backed by large financial interests which were able to step into the marketplace and drive the little merchants out of business, one after another, breaking up town after town and village after village, wrecking the whole system of freeholders and free enterprises in this country.

If this bill costs America some dollars, it is still a good bill. If this bill costs America hundreds of thousands of dollars in increased prices, it is still a good bill. Why? Because we need free, independent business in this country.

Mr. President, there is no use talking about competition if we are not going to have things to compete with. There is no use talking about free enterprise if the enterprise system is not going to have any freedom within it. All we have to do to find out what happens is to fail to have such a law on the statute books as is here proposed and when a depression comes let the law of the jungle prevail.

The argument is made that there was a time when we needed a law such as this, but not now. Let me tell Senators that the same thing can be said about other laws. I have heard people say there was a time when the labor movement needed collective bargaining, and that there was a time when they needed the right to organize and the right to the union shop, but not now, because they are big and strong. Mr. President, how long will they remain big and strong if the labor laws are repealed? It is true of farmers, too. I have heard people say that there was a time when they needed price supports, but they are now all well off and they no longer need price supports.

Mr. President, the time when we need such laws on the books is when we do not have to use them. The very fact that we do not have to use a law indicates the fact that it has done its job.

The fair-trade law has proved itself for 15 years, and it has put order into the market place. It has protected thousands of business places in America. I remind Senators that the people who operate these business places are also consumers. They have sons and daughters and uncles and aunts and cousins and nephews and nieces who consume goods.

If America ever loses its family-size farms, if we are ever willing to pay the price of failure to keep the family-size druggist, the merchant, or the hardware dealer in business, and if we are ever willing to put dollars above sound public policies, America's freedom will be gone. Our freedom and our property and human values are preserved by such principles. They are not preserved by cheap or cut-rate catalogs. No cut-rate catalog will ever take care of America's independence.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has said something about the possible cost in money. I am not so certain that it will cost money. I should like to ask the Senator to comment on this statement which was included in the report of the Small Business Committee with reference to fair-trade law:

> Fair-trade items have increased in price 10½ percent since 1939, while the cost of living, according to the Department of Labor, has risen more than 85 percent.

Does that indicate that fair-trade laws have cost the consumer money?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It surely does not. I want to give further emphasis to what the Senator has said. My own university, the University of Minnesota, which we believe has a very good school of business administration, has compared the prices of 50 leading drug items before fair trade and under fair trade in 1939.

Prof. H. J. Ostlund of the University of Minnesota's School of Business Administration compared the prices of 50 leading drug-store products before fair trade, namely, during the depression years, and under fair trade in 1939. He and his associates did the job State by State. They found that consumers paid 1 percent less, on the average, for these products under fair trade than they paid in the prefair-trade depression days.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. With further reference to the expense under fair trade, we all know that there is no fair-trade law in the District of Columbia. Yet the District of Columbia, month after month, has the highest living cost in the United States, according to the labor index. If fair trade were the guilty party, the District of Columbia surely would have a lower figure. The Senator is also aware of the fact that a manufacturer who spends millions of dollars on a trade-marked resale price item is not going to sit back complacently and let the industry undersell him on that item. He has too much involved, and he will replace that item with a fast mover, because it is all based on the mass-production system.

There is plenty of competition in the retail field. Anyone who has ever gone into it has found that out. Anyone who goes into the grocery, hardware, or furniture line will find that the retail industry, of all industry, means what it says when it talks about the free competitive enterprise system, because that is where competition is at its keenest, and it is competition which will always keep prices down. Fair trade is no barrier. Even if General Electric made a fair-trade refrigerator and Frigidaire made a fair-trade refrigerator, the two could not get together and fix the profit on an electric refrigerator. The bill prohibits that kind of price fixing. However, within the Frigidaire licensed dealers and within the General Electric licensed dealers, the price is maintained on their particular product.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. One of the big mistakes that is made is in confusing capital goods with consumer goods. In the retail field there are literally thousands of commodities which the small retail pharmacists must handle. He handles as many as 25,000 separate items to take care of the people who come into his store. I am talking about a small store, in a medium-sized town.

Mr. President, with respect to the charge of collusion that has been made, it would take an Einstein to figure out how any collusion could occur. With that many commodities there is all kinds of competition. Let us take a refrigerator like Kelvinator. Kelvinator makes not only the Kelvinator refrigerator, which is trade-marked, but also a brand which it makes for sale through a catalog house to persons of lesser income. There is all kinds of competition. This bill specifically outlaws any horizontal price fixing such as that to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred in such detail and in such plan and analytical language.

Mr. President, I can argue the statistics of this bill, and I am prepared to argue statistics for a long time. I have lived fair trade. I think I feel this subject much more deeply than any other political issue. I do not care whether the druggists are for or against it. I know that people who have supported me have told me, "Don't you be for this bill." Mr. President, I am for this bill, because I remember when we did not have such a law. I saw people literally lose their economic lives before we had a fair-trade law. I saw them driven out of business. I do not want to go back to the rule of the jungle in order to give someone a chance to buy a tube of tooth paste for 2 cents less, while destroying the whole fabric of our economic system.

Some say that we must protect the consumer. It is no way to protect the consumer by driving competitors out of

the field. Senators may remember the little produce houses that handled butter, eggs, and chickens, which they bought from the farmers. The houses were owned independently by local people. Sometimes as many as four or five of them stretched across the country from one county seat to another. Then Armour, Swift, and Fairmount came along, put trucks out on the road, started to pick up the chickens and the eggs and the butter, and paid a better price for the produce than the local produce operator could pay. Pretty soon they drove the local operators to the wall, and they bought their businesses at 50 cents on the dollar. They drove them all out of business. Today all over the Mid-West—and I suppose it is true also in the South and in the Northeast and in the far West—instead of seeing small independent produce companies, operated by one family, which contributed to the school board and the PTA and the local lodge, the business is done by the big chain outfits, operating clear across the country. What happened to the farmer after they ran out the little fellow? They said, "We have been paying you a high price long enough, and now we will pay you a lower price."

That is exactly what will happen, once we get rid of the fair-trade laws.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Earlier in the evening the Senator from Illinois said, I believe, that enactment of this fair trade bill would cost American consumers several billion dollars a year. Will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota comment on what he believes the Senator from Illinois was actually talking from—what set of figures, what statistics, what supporting evidence the Senator from Illinois was offering to the Senate in support of his contention that enactment of this bill would result in costing the consumers of the country an additional several billion dollars a year?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the Senator from Illinois was speaking from statistics prepared by the Federal Trade Commission, and he was using certain analytical studies which have been made by the Federal Trade Commission.

I happen to disagree with those statistics. I thank the Senator from Washington for bringing this point to my attention, because I have spent a great deal of time working on this subject, and it is included among a few pet projects which I have. In fact, I have spent a very great deal of time in studying the fair trade laws, and I wish to submit to the Senate my facts on this subject.

Mr. CAIN. Then does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that an argument such as the one submitted by the Senator from Illinois must be destroyed, in order to satisfy the natural concern of American consumers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is correct. In fact, we have to point out that the figures which have been submitted here cannot be fully substantiated.

Let me say here, however, that if the fair trade law should cost more in terms of consumer prices, I still say it is a good "buy," because we have to think of both today and tomorrow.

Mr. CAIN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota indicated that he thought enactment of this bill would add some hundreds of thousands of dollars to consumer costs. I can readily understand such a figure.

However, there is a fundamental and very large difference between "some hundreds of thousands of dollars" and the "several billion dollars" to which I have just made reference, as previously mentioned by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There certainly is. My figures were given in only general terms; I was not trying to be accurate.

But now let me give some case studies which have been made.

I have the highest regard for the figures which have been submitted; but enough figures to fill a library have been collected on this subject.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Minnesota obviously must have a very high regard for the Senator from Illinois, who has offered figures to which I have referred, but at the same time the Senator from Minnesota could have neither regard nor respect for figures which in the aggregate amount to several billion dollars a year of added cost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, let the RECORD show clearly that I did not speak of billions of dollars. I quoted from an article in Fortune magazine, which certainly is not a magazine that is biased against big advertisers or against those who have trade-marked brands, and therefore certainly Fortune magazine is not biased against the advocates of resale price maintenance. However, the article in Fortune magazine said that the cost of the present measure would be from $750,000,000 to $1,000,000,000 a year; and, Mr. President, in colloquial language "that ain't hay."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am going to point out to the Senator that "that ain't hay," and also that although I have the greatest regard for Fortune magazine, yet it is known as somewhat of an intellectual vehicle for the Luce empire.

I do not think we need be concerned about whether Fortune magazine is a magazine for the big advertisers, because Fortune magazine has a little track of its own, and lets the others run their own show.

Let us consider the figures which I have here. First of all, let us consider the Federal Trade Commission's studies which have been made. As I said earlier in the debate with the Senator from Illinois, the Federal Trade Commission takes figures at the depth of the cut-rate situation, when prices were below cost, and then compares those prices with the regular prices of the commodities, and thereby gets great margins or differences between the two. In other words, it is something like telling a person how to gain weight, after he has been for 30 days on a diet of crackers and water, and has gotten down to virtually nothing but skin and bones. If at that time someone gives him milk, water and sugar, in 2 weeks he will have gained 20 pounds or more. Then it might be said, "All one need do is live on milk, water, and sugar."

Of course everyone knows that when one has starved until he is about to collapse and is in the depths of despair, a little milk, sugar, and water will prevent complete malnutrition.

On the other hand, when we obtain the proper figures, we begin to obtain the proof; and that is what I shall submit.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me, for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Would not the figures prepared by the Federal Trade Commission, to which the Senator from Minnesota referred when he said those figures showed a great margin or disparity, be similar to the figures arrived at in showing an increase in the price of wheat from 30 cents a bushel to 60 cents a bushel, at which point it might be said that the price of wheat had increased 100 percent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Of course, in such a situation it might be said that a price increase of 100 percent had been had, and that therefore everything was wonderful.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator from Illinois was out of the Chamber, I paid him a tribute—I wish to assure him of it now—which is justly deserved by him for the way he opened the debate on this bill. I apologize that we who are proponents of the bill did not do a better job in joining the issue. Certainly the Senator from Illinois was absolutely correct in the criticisms he leveled against us.

A little earlier I said that one of the best research marketing agencies in the United States has made a study of this matter. Certainly it is one of the large agencies.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who knows a great deal about these matters from his former association with the advertising business, collaborated by saying that the Nielsen agency is one of the foremost research agencies, and is known throughout the United States for its independent research and its economic studies for the benefit of business institutions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. A few moments ago the Senator from Minnesota spoke of farm parity prices. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with me that if there had not been farm parity prices, there might have been a depression?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. McFARLAND. The small-business man and the farmer must have some protection.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. The small-business man and the farmer are the ones who have helped make our Nation great.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona is correct; they have been the backbone of our economy.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. How long does the Senator from Minnesota intend to speak?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not speak very long, let me say. I took the floor tonight only because I felt that the admonition given by the Senator from Illinois was appropriately given, namely, that those of us who are the proponents of this bill should at least submit our argument in favor of it, so that those who are the opponents can "work it over."

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. But the Senator from Illinois admitted that we had full advice on the matter when he made the motion to lay the bill on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President; I do not want the Senator from Illinois, my friend, even to have to answer that statement, because I know that when he made the motion to lay the bill on the table there was not much else he could do, other than permit the Senate to pass the bill; and so the Senator from Illinois made the motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from Illinois could have spoken, as he did afterward, for 3½ hours before he made the motion.

Mr. President, I believe all Senators have made up their minds in regard to this bill. When the Senator from Minnesota concludes his presentation, which has been a very able and constructive and very convincing one—and I do not believe there is any question that the Senate will pass the bill—I believe we should adjourn and go home for tonight, for the hour is now 25 minutes to 11.

Then we can begin the session tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, and can continue until 3 o'clock or even 4 o'clock the following morning, or to whatever time is required in order to pass the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In order to have the RECORD correct, I wish to say that the 3 hours during which the Senator from Illinois was on his feet were not consumed by him alone. I am an accomplice to that alleged crime, if it is one; I was deeply involved. In addition, a number of other Senators took a great deal of the time of the Senator from Illinois. In fact, I sympathized with him for the way we were jumping up, asking him to yield; but I was so interested in the subject that I was tempted to join in the argument.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not our good friend, the Senator from Arizona, whistling to keep up his courage as he goes through the woods, when he says this bill is going to be passed, anyway? Is not the Senator from Arizona giving us a good example of self-induced optimism? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to say a kind word for the Senator from Illinois.

On the other hand, I must agree with the final, judicious, and considered judgment on the part of the majority leader, for I am confident that the bill will be passed, and I am confident that it should be passed.

That is all the more reason why I believe the opposition should have a chance to have its "say." If one is so sure, I believe he should be given all the time in the world.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Illinois thinks the Senator from Arizona is whistling, let us vote now on this bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Those of us who have been observing the actions of the majority leader can understand why he is the majority leader, for he proceeds in accordance with the theory of "if you have the votes, vote."

But, of course, those who do not favor a measure take the position that if they do not believe the measure has sufficient merit, they should let it be debated a while, to see if its weaknesses cannot be developed.

Senators whose desks are virtually covered with telegrams from druggists and grocers no doubt would like to have the vote on this bill taken at once.

On the other hand, those of us who have become convinced of the faults of the bill think it reasonable and proper for a moderate amount of time to be used in debating the bill and in disclosing its weaknesses and faults.

We desired to hear the debate, to hear the issue developed, in order that we might be more confident in our own mind that we were doing the right thing. This measure has been under consideration for a part of 1 day. I have known of measures that were not nearly so important, which took 2 or 3 weeks. Certainly the debate on this issue will not take more than perhaps 2 days. But I do not think it reasonable, after one Senator has made a speech—and the only speech I heard has been against the bill—to suggest that all debate be closed immediately, and that the Senate proceed to vote at once, before we know what we are doing, before the bill has been debated, and before we have had a full hearing.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to raise an entirely different question, because the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Oregon are on opposite sides of this bill, up to this moment, although I may say I find the Senator from Minnesota very convincing on certain points. I want to protect the Senator from Minnesota from another standpoint. I have asked to have the ticket tear-sheet brought in, and I believe that one of the attachés of the Senate is looking for it. But, in case it does not get here before a recess is taken—and something tells me that the Senate is soon going to recess——

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has that feeling, has he?

Mr. MORSE. I have that feeling.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have been feeling that way, myself.

Mr. MORSE. I understand from one of the employees that the ticker is carrying a story stating that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] voted to lay this bill on the table. I thought I might give the Senator from Minnesota an opportunity to correct that, because we all know that the Senator from Minnesota voted against laying it on the table; and, if that is on the ticker—and I have been advised that it is—I think in fairness to the Senator from Minnesota I should give him an opportunity to have the statement corrected now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon. If either the Associated Press or the United Press ticker service inferred that the Senator from Minnesota voted to lay this bill on the table, it has committed an error, and I know that either of them will properly and promptly correct it. I have a high regard for those two press services. So I ask them to do so, to check the wires, to see that everything is in good shape.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. If an error has been committed in that regard, it will not be the first error that has ever been committed. I have been made a little happy. I thought my good friend from Louisiana had his mind made up, and that he was going to oppose this bill. I am glad he has an open mind. If he is seeking enlightenment, I shall be glad to suggest that the Senate remain in session tonight as long as he desires in order that he may listen. If he listens, I am sure he will be convinced; and I earnestly hope that he has an open mind. I thought he was against the bill, but since I believed we had enough votes without his, and was not worried about it. Of course, I should like to have him vote right, because the druggist and the small-business people of Louisiana who are struggling, trying to make a living, would want him to be right. So I am willing to give my good friend from Louisiana plenty of opportunity, and I do not want to cut off any debate unduly. I merely thought he had his mind made up. I am happy to find that that is not the case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator from Arizona I feel sure that the Senator from Louisiana is simply being a gentleman, as he always is, and is being courteous in listening to me, because, as the good reverend said, "There are very few souls saved after the first 15 minutes of the service" and I did not see the Senator hit the sawdust trail.

I am afraid he has simply dedicated himself to this economic evil.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope the Senator is wrong. I hope the Senator from Louisiana is not beyond redemption. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I certainly hope that my good friend from Arizona will hear what few words my friend from Minnesota may have to say. The Senator from Louisiana has always felt that if we could see to it that the small merchants acquired their goods at the same price the large concerns were paying for the same commodities, we would be able to protect the little fellows, and they would not have to have a fair-trade law to provide for the fixing of prices with which they would be required to compete.

I am afraid the Senator from Arizona did not have an opportunity to hear enough of the previous debate, because all the small-business associations, who are urging us to vote for this bill, were at that time urging us to vote against the basing-point bill, or to vote for an amendment that would protect all the independent merchants. I propose to offer some of those amendments, and I hope at that time we may be able to persuade the Senator from Arizona to go along with us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to complete the point that was brought up by the Senator from Oregon, following which I am going to yield the floor. I was talking about the Nielson study, and I bring this to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator know whether the State of Louisiana has a fair-trade law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely it has—and it is a good one.

Mr. McFARLAND. Fine. That is perhaps why the Senator wants to deprive the other States of the privilege of having one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The trouble is, there are 44 other States that have them, and I am afraid the Senator is thinking Vermont, Missouri, and Texas might apply a little heat in his State.

I referred to a study with reference to consumer prices, and I want this item to be perfectly clear for the RECORD. The Nielson study compares prices gathered from 45 fair-trade States with the prices consumers paid for the very same products, in Missouri, Vermont, Texas, and the District of Columbia. The study analyzed the prices of fair-trade drug products of various kinds, products typically used for consumer bait by price jugglers. In the non-fair-trade States, they can be sold at any price or even given away. I should like to stress the fact that the prices used at that time by Neilson were collected for purposes quite unrelated to fair trade. These surveys took in all the druggists in the United States, rather than a selected few. Through the agencies employed, a representative sampling was taken of 770 stores of all types. The Neilson study covered a 6 months' period, from March through August of 1951, rather than an hour or a day, as in the case of the Federal Trade Commission studies. The results show over-all average prices, weighted to reflect the volume of goods sold at each price. Thus the survey shows the consumers as a whole, and what the consumer's as a whole paid in fair-trade and non-fair-trade areas during the 6 months' period. I should like the Senator from Washington to listen to this. Specifically, consumers under fair trade in the 45 fair-trade States paid an average of 1.4 cents less per volume-product.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator want to finish his speech or would he like to have the floor in the morning?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the lateness of the hour, I am willing to take my seat and take my chances on being heard, if I need to be heard again.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to make a suggestion in order that the Senator may have the floor again. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes the Senator from Minnesota may have the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Arizona withhold the motion, in order that the present occupant of the chair may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to withhold it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In his capacity as a Senator, the present occupant of the chair asks unanimous consent that pages 213 to 226 of the annual report of the Senate Small Business Committee be printed at this point in the RECORD. It deals with the fair-trade law.

There being no objection, the pages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER X. FAIR-TRADE LAWS

Fair trade may be defined as a system which allows the owner of a trade-mark or a brand name to set minimum resale prices on his product. Statutes sanctioning resale price maintenance agreements apply only to products which are in free competition with similar commodities. In addition, they apply only when the retailer employs the good will of the manufacturer, by use of the name, to help him in selling. The statutes sanction only "vertical" agreements. They exclude "horizontal" agreements between manufacturers, producers and all parties who would normally be in competition with each other.

The year 1951 was a crucial one for small business and the proponents of fair-trade laws. In May the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the now famous Schwegmann[1] case. The decision all but upset 20 years of progress in the field of fair-trade legislation. It set off a series of events that threatened for several weeks to bring back the old price wars. It appeared for a time that the decision had destroyed all the work that had been done in the preceding 20 years to protect manufacturers, retailers, and consumers alike from the evils attendant upon cut-throat competition. A survey undertaken by Dun and Bradstreet disclosed that as of the middle of June, price cutting was on the wane. During the remainder of the year there was no significant trend to extend price cutting.

But the Schwegmann decision remained the law. It cut away the heart of the Miller-Tydings Act and the price-maintenance statutes enacted by the State legislatures. The door was open to the complete destruction of fair-trade laws. At year's end, friends of fair trade were marshaling their forces. Small-business retailers were especially active in the campaign to reinforce the legislation which they felt they so urgently needed if they were to survive.

It will be the purpose of this chapter to review the history of fair-trade laws and their impact on small business and to appraise the outlook for small business in the light of the Schwegmann decision.

THE CASE FOR FAIR TRADE

The first advocates of fair-trade legislation were the manufacturers of name brand articles. They found that they were becoming the victims of loss-leader selling, a system whereby a retailer would advertise a popular name brand product at a low price in order to attract customers into his store. The manufacturer found that sales of his product in other outlets would suffer because the buyers were going to the store that advertised the lower price. In many cases the name brand article was being sold below cost. A large retailer could afford to do this because the customers who came to his store to buy the bargain would also buy other merchandise which returned a high profit. The small merchant could not afford this practice because his sales of other merchandise would not compensate for the loss he would have to take on the name brand item. The result was that the small merchant would lose business to his larger competitor. The manufacturer would also lose business because the small merchant and many others like him would be forced to drop the name brand item. Another result was that the item became cheap in the eyes of the consuming public. Buyers reasoned that if one merchant could sell it at a price substantially below that previously advertised, then the merchants who sold it previously and the manufacturer must have been making an excessive profit at the expense of the consumer. Oftentimes competition among large retailers of the item would precipitate price wars which would result in further contraction of the manufacturer's number of outlets.

There was the case of the Ingersoll dollar watch, a name brand item which was extremely popular several years ago. It was a very serviceable watch. It was nationally advertised as selling for $1 and the price became part of the name. Some retailers throughout the country decided to use the Ingersoll watch as a loss-leader. They began to sell it for less than a dollar. The price went down and down as competition increased, until it was finally selling for 57 cents, far below the wholesale price. The retailers who were selling it at that price were making up their losses on sales of other merchandise in their large stores. People who came to buy the watch rationalized that

[1] *Schwegmann Bros. et al.* v. *Calvert Distillers Corp.* (341 U. S. 384).

there must be other similar bargains in a store that would sell an Ingersoll dollar watch for 57 cents. The proprietor thus succeeded in selling at a profit a number of other items.

Small-business retailers were forced to drop the Ingersoll dollar watch. They could not sell it if they charged more than 57 cents, and they could not afford to sell the watch at that price and take the loss involved in each sale. The result was that the manufacturer lost his market and was forced out of business. Having been forced out of business and compelled to release the workers in his plant, he realized the evils of loss-leader selling. He became a leader in the fight for fair-trade laws. The consuming public also lost because they were no longer able to buy a serviceable watch for a dollar.

It may thus be argued that fair trade yields benefits for everyone—the manufacturer, the small-business retailer, and the consumer. It assures the manufacturer a steady market for his product. It does not give him an unfair advantage or a monopoly, because, even with the protection of fair-trade legislation, he must compete successfully with other manufacturers of the same or similar products. If he does not maintain the quality of his product or if he fixes the price too high, he loses out to his competitors in spite of fair-trade laws. But fair trade does protect him against the evils of loss-leader selling and the possible destruction of his product and his business through price cutting.

Fair trade benefits the small retailer by placing him on an even footing with all other retailers of the same item, large and small. His margin of profit is fixed to yield him a fair return, and he is protected from destructive competition from others who might be able to afford to use the item as a loss-leader.

The consumer benefits in a number of ways. He knows, for example, that an item covered by fair-trade legislation may be purchased at a standard price wherever he goes to buy it. Fair trade eliminates the necessity for "shopping around." He knows, too, that the price is fair. By the very nature of fair-trade laws, a price-fixed item cannot succeed unless it competes successfully with similar items produced by other manufacturers. In the drug field fair-trade items have increased in price just 10½ percent since 1939, while the cost of living, according to the Department of Labor, has risen more than 85 percent. Fair trade also assures the consumer that a qualified product will remain on the market. It will not be lost to the consumer through loss-leader selling.

The advantages of fair trade prompted support not only from manufacturers of name brand articles but also from retailers and consumers. The depression following 1929 gave impetus to the movement for legislation which would allow the fixing of minimum resale prices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF FAIR TRADE

California was the first State to enact fair-trade legislation. In 1931 the California Legislature passed a statute[2] allowing a manufacturer to establish resale prices on his product. The statute was binding, however, only on those retailers who signed an agreement with the manufacturer. This proved completely ineffective since retailers not signing such agreements were free to sell the product at any price. In 1933 California amended its statute[3] to provide that an agreement entered into by a manufacturer and a retailer was binding upon all other retailers who had notice of the agreement. This amendment was the so-called nonsigner clause which, in effect, allowed a manufacturer or wholesaler to fix a minimum resale price for his product. Every fair-trade law thereafter passed by any State contained this nonsigner clause.

By the close of 1936, 14 States had passed such laws. In 1937, 28 more States passed them. There are fair-trade laws today in 45 of the 48 States. Only Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia have remained outside the fold.

The Louisiana statute[4] contains a typical nonsigner clause:

"Willfully and knowingly advertising, offering for sale, or selling any commodity at less than the price stipulated in any contract entered into pursuant to the provision of section 1 (sec. 9809.1) of this act, whether the person so advertising, offering for sale, or selling is or is not a party to such contract, is unfair competition and is actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby."

Such statutes were valid and enforceable so long as their effect was confined to goods moving intrastate. Where products moving interstate were involved, the statutes ran afoul of Federal law. The Sherman Act,[5] passed by Congress in 1890, declared illegal "every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations."

Under this act, price-maintenance contracts would be illegal. Any attempt on the part of a manufacturer to enforce such a contract in interstate commerce would be enjoined. The manufacturer or anyone else attempting to enforce the contract would be subject to civil and criminal penalties, and no court would enforce it. Fixing minimum prices, like other types of price fixing, was illegal per se under the Sherman Act.

In 1911, the Supreme Court considered the question of resale price maintenance agreements in the case of *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *Park & Sons Co.*,[6] and held them illegal under the Sherman Act. The case involved a suit brought against a nonsigner. The Court held that an agreement to maintain resale prices was a "contract * * * in restraint of trade," which was contrary to the Sherman Act.

THE MILLER-TYDINGS ACT

Supporters of fair trade tried for several years to remove the Sherman Act obstacle from the path of the fair-trade movement. A number of bills were introduced in Congress. In 1929, the Capper-Kelly[7] fair-trade bill was offered. It permitted resale price maintenance on specified classes of commodities by declaring that no such "contract relating to the sale or resale" shall be unlawful. The bill did not contain a nonsigner clause. It merely legalized an agreement "that the vendee will not resell the commodity specified in the contract except at a stipulated price."[8] It became the model for the California law passed in 1931.

The Capper-Kelly bill was reintroduced in the Seventy-second Congress.[9] It did not pass.

In 1936, Senator Tydings introduced his first bill in the Seventy-fourth Congress. It followed substantially the Capper-Kelly bills and did not contain a nonsigner clause. It legalized "contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices or other conditions for the resale" of a commodity. The second Tydings bill was introduced in the Seventy-fifth Congress. The House then had under consideration the Miller bill[10] which contained practicaly the same language as Senator Tydings' bill.

The Miller-Tydings Act[11] was enacted in 1937 as an amendment to section 1 of the Sherman Act. It provided that "nothing herein contained shall render illegal, contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale" of specified commodities when "contracts or agreements of that description are lawful as applied to intrastate transactions" under local law.

Despite the absence of a nonsigner clause in the Miller-Tydings Act, the Department of Justice apparently has not instituted any prosecutions under the Sherman Act since 1937 because of enforcement of fair-trade laws against nonsigners. This does not appear to have been an oversight on the part of that agency. It has been fully aware of the import of the Miller-Tydings Act. In hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee, Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold called for repeal of the Miller-Tydings Act because it made legal the nonsigner provisions of the State fair-trade laws.[12]

Until the decision in the Schwegmann case, and in spite of the absence of the nonsigner clause in the Miller-Tydings Act, there did not appear to be any question but that the nonsigner provisions were within the act. The contention that they were not within the act was raised in only two reported cases after 1939. In both cases, the argument was rejected.[13]

THE SCHWEGMANN CASE

In the light of the legislative and judicial history of fair trade legislation, the Supreme Court's decision in the Schwegmann case[14] was a shock to advocates of fair trade. A brief statement of the facts in that case will serve to demonstrate the dilemma it created for the fair-trade movement.

The original suit was brought by Seagram Distillers Corp. and Calvert Distillers Corp., Delaware and Maryland corporations engaged in the distribution of gin and whisky. The respondents were Schwegmann Bros., operators of a New Orleans supermarket. Seagram and Calvert had price-fixing agreements with over a hundred Louisiana retailers whereby they tried to maintain uniform retail prices for their products. Under these agreements the retailers promised to sell the products of Seagram and Calvert at not less than the prices stated in the distributors' schedules.

Schwegmann Bros. had refused to sign one of these agreements and were selling the products of Seagram and Calvert at cut-rate prices. Under the Louisiana fair-trade law,[15] Schwegmann was bound by the agreements entered into by Seagram and Calvert with the other Louisiana retailers and was guilty of unfair competition. Seagram and Calvert sought an injunction against Schwegmann, relying on the Miller-Tydings Act. They argued that the prohibition of the Sherman Act against price-fixing agreements had been immunized by the Miller-Tydings Act so long as such agreements were valid under State law.

Seagram and Calvert won an injunction in the district court and the court of appeals affirmed.[16] The Supreme Court reversed the court of appeals, saying that nothing in the

---

[2] Cal. Stat., 1931, ch. 278.
[3] Cal. Stat., 1933, ch. 260.
[4] La. Gen. Stat., secs, 9809.1 et seq.
[5] 26 Stat. 209.
[6] 220 U. S. 373.
[7] S. 240, 71st Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 11, 71st Cong., 1st sess.
[8] H. Rept. 536, 71st Cong., 2d sess.
[9] S. 97, 72d Cong., 1st sess.; H. R. 11, 72d Cong., 1st sess.
[10] H. Rept. 382, 75th Cong., 1st sess.
[11] 50 Stat. 693, 15 U. S. C., sec. 1.
[12] TNEC Hearings, pp. 18162–18165.
[13] *Calamia* v. *Goldsmith Bros., Inc.* (299 N. Y. 636 and 775; 87 N. E. 2d 50 and 687); *Pepsodent Co.* v. *Krauss Co.* (56 F. Supp. 922).
[14] See note 1, supra.
[15] See note 4, supra.
[16] 184 F. 2d 11.

Milleyr-Tydings Act sanctioned the enforcement of price-fixing agreements against nonsigners. The Court reviewed in detail the legislative history of the statutes, both State and Federal, and concluded that the Miller-Tydings Act exempted from the Sherman Act only "contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices for the resale," and that nonsigners were not within the scope of the act.

Mr. Justice Douglas, writing for the Court, said:

"The Miller-Tydings Act expressly continues the prohibitions of the Sherman Act against 'horizontal' price fixing by those in competition with each other at the same functional level. Therefore, when a State compels retailers to follow a parallel price policy, it demands private conduct which the Sherman Act forbids. Elimination of price competition at the retail level may, of course, lawfully result if a distributor successfully negotiates individual 'vertical' agreements with all his retailers. But when retailers are forced to abandon price competition, they are driven into a compact in violation of the spirit of the proviso which forbids 'horizontal' price fixing.

"A real sanction can be given to the prohibitions of the proviso only if the price maintenance power granted a distributor is limited to voluntary engagements. Otherwise, the exception swallows the proviso and destroys its practical effectiveness.

"The contrary conclusion would have a vast and devastating effect on Sherman Act policies. If it were adopted, once a distributor executed a contract with a single retailer setting the minimum resale price for a commodity in the State, all other retailers could be forced into line. Had Congress desired to eliminate the consensual element from the arrangement and to permit blanketing a State with resale price fixing if only one retailer wanted it, we feel that different measures would have been adopted—either a nonsigner provision would have been included or resale price fixing would have been authorized without more. Certainly the words used connote a voluntary scheme. Contracts or agreements convey the idea of a cooperative arrangement, not a program whereby recalcitrants are dragged in by the heels and compelled to submit to price fixing. * * *

"We could conclude that Congress carved out the vast exception from the Sherman Act now claimed only if we were willing to assume it took a devious route and yet failed to make its purpose plain."

A dissenting opinion was submitted by Justice Frankfurter, in which Justices Black and Burton concurred. Justice Frankfurter summarized his objections to the Court's decision when he said:

"Every one of the 42 State acts which the Miller-Tydings amendment was to back up—the acts on which the Miller-Tydings amendment was to place a stamp of approval—contained a nonsigner provision. As demonstrated by experience in California, the State acts would have been futile without the nonsigner clause. The Court now holds that the Miller-Tydings amendment does not cover these nonsigner provisions. Not only is the view of the Court contrary to the words of the statute and to the legislative history, it is also in conflict with the interpretation given the Miller-Tydings amendment by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Department of Justice, and by practically all persons adversely affected by the fair-trade laws. * * * Where both the words of a statute and its legislative history clearly indicate the purpose of Congress, it should be respected. We should not substitute our own notion of what Congress should have done."

THE PRICE WAR

The Supreme Court's decision in the Schwegmann case was announced on May 21, 1951. On May 29, the R. H. Macy Co. of New York, the world's largest department store, announced in full-page newspaper advertisements that it was reducing its prices on 5,978 price-fixed items by 6 percent. The advertisement referred to the Supreme Court's decision in the Schwegmann case and said that the store would add other items to those being reduced in price. Macy's competitors announced that they would meet the reductions.

During the following 3 weeks sales in New York department stores increased 20 percent. The newspapers carried daily accounts of the progress of the price war. (See table I.) Department stores added hundreds of sales clerks and comparison shoppers to meet the competition. There were reports of shoppers injured in the rush to buy bargains. Stores posted changing prices on bulletin boards.

TABLE I.—*Trend of prices for day at 3 stores in "war"—Table indicating the original fixed prices of typical items, the prices at which they opened yesterday and the closing prices at Gimbel's, Macy's, Abraham & Straus. Where stocks were exhausted the latest price quoted is given, where obtainable, for purposes of comparison*

Item	Fair trade	Gimbel's		Macy's		Abraham & Straus	
		Open	Close	Open	Close	Open	Close
Toastmaster	$23.00	[1] $14.72	[1] $14.72	[1] $14.72	[1] $14.72	[1] $14.72	[1] $14.72
Sunbeam Mixmaster	46.50	[1] 26.59	[1] 26.59	[1] 26.59	[1] 26.59	26.59	26.59
Dormeyer Mixer	46.50	30.55	28.68	46.50	30.55	[2]	[2]
RCA-45 record attachment	12.95	8.24	8.24	8.44	8.24	8.24	8.19
Lewyt vacuum cleaner	89.95	58.63	58.63	[3]	[3]	[2]	[2]
Webster three-speed player	88.24	61.09	40.37	61.09	59.99	61.09	59.99
Men's Palm Beach suits	29.95	[1] 16.94	[1] 16.94	[3]	[3]	[1] 17.94	[1] 17.94
Men's Springweave suits	49.50	[1] 29.69	[1] 29.69	[3]	[3]	[1] 29.95	[1] 29.95
Men's Sunfrost suits	39.95	[1] 24.29	[1] 24.29	[3]	[3]	[2]	[2]
Waterman fountain pen	3.95	[1] 2.11	[1] 2.11	[3]	1.98	[3]	[3]
Underwood typewriter	68.60	[2]	[2]	[3]	[3]	[2]	44.95
Novel, From Here to Eternity	4.50	1.94	1.79	1.94	1.79	1.94	1.79
Proctor steam iron	15.45	[2]	[2]	[2]	12.95	13.11	13.11
Coffeematic percolator	29.95	21.69	20.34	20.39	21.69	21.69	21.69
Regina mixer	64.50	44.39	44.39	[2]	44.39	[2]	39.95
Bayer aspirin (100's)	.59	.18	.18	.19	.19	.17	.17
Ronson lighter	6.60	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.65	4.65

[1] Latest price reported; item out of stock.
[2] Not reported.
[3] Item out of stock.

Source: New York Times, June 5, 1951.

The price cuts took place largely in household appliances, drugs, and cosmetic specialties, men's clothing, and alcoholic beverages. The Sunbeam Mixmaster, listed at the fair-trade price of $46.50, was selling for as little as $26.59, which was below the wholesale price. A best-selling novel, listed at $4.50, was sold below cost at $1.79. A well-known brand of men's suits, regularly selling at $49.50, sold for $29.69 before supplies ran out.

Manufacturers of fair-trade articles threatened to withhold their product from the stores selling them at the lower prices. The stores avoided this bottleneck in the early stages of the price-cutting campaign by buying from independent jobbers.

Small retailers complained that they were losing all of their business to the stores involved in the price war. It was reported that Macy's, which normally sold 3.3 percent of the Mixmasters in New York, sold 56.2 percent during the 10 weeks following the start of its price cutting. Abraham & Straus, a large Brooklyn department store that normally sold 2.5 percent of the Mixmasters sold in Brooklyn, reportedly sold 59.6 percent during the price war.

One druggist in Queens, N. Y., succeeded in obtaining an injunction against Macy's under the New York fair-trade law and forced Macy's to discontinue selling 10 different items at reduced prices on the ground that they moved only in intrastate commerce and therefore were not affected by the Supreme Court's decision in the Schwegmann case.

But victories for the small retailer were few and far between. Generally, in the New York area their business suffered through the concentration of sales. It was estimated that 20,000 of the approximately 105,000 small retailers in the New York area would have been forced into bankruptcy if the price war had continued for 6 months.

The price war threatened for a time to spread to other cities. Reports from cities such as Denver, Detroit, Philadelphia, Boston, Cleveland, and Houston showed a tendency on the part of some large retailers to start cutting prices themselves in order to reduce their heavy inventories.

DUN & BRADSTREET SURVEY

The effects of the New York price war on small retailers was brought forcefully to the attention of your committee. Independent merchants and storekeepers by the score came to the committee asking for assistance. They told of the effects the price war was having on them, how they were losing trade, and how the large department stores were winning a monopoly on sales of many items. They reported that, unless the price war ended, many of them would be forced out of business.

By the time the price war had made evident its effects on small-business men, however, reports coming to your committee indicated that the war was subsiding. In the 3 weeks following Macy's announcement of its intention to cut prices on fair-trade items, most of the popular items were out of stock and the manufacturers had made good their threats to withhold further deliveries to the price cutters. In addition, the initial rush to buy the bargains appeared to have let up. The original demand had been satisfied and customers no longer seemed so eager to buy.

Recognizing the continuing danger of price wars, however, and cognizant of the possibility of their spreading to other sections of the country, the chairman of your committee met with the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report in a conference with Mr. A. D. Whiteside, president of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. As a result of the conference, Dun & Bradstreet undertook a survey of the principal trading centers of the country to determine the scope of price cutting. The main portion of the survey covered the period from May 28, the day before Macy's announced its price cuts, to June 16, when the price war appeared to have subsided. A follow-up

survey was conducted on June 25 to test the trend in price cutting.

The survey sought to determine the sections of the country where price cutting was in effect, the number of stores in each community involved, and the lines of merchandise in which reductions were being made.

The survey indicated that from May 28 to June 16, some 825 stores in 43 of 123 trading centers had set prices on one or more items of merchandise below the resale price recommended or set by the manufacturers of the merchandise. With few exceptions, only a small number of stores were reported engaged in price cutting in any one of the 43 cities. Only 8 cities reported 10 or more stores cutting prices below the manufacturers' resale prices, and 20 cities reported less than 4 stores cutting prices. (See table II.)

Number of cities reporting	Number of stores in each city pricing merchandise below manufacturers' resale price
20	Less than 4.
6	4 to 5.
9	6 to 9.
2	10.
6	More than 10.

Light electric household appliances were found to be the items most commonly sold at the lowered prices. Next in order of frequency of sales were cosmetics and drug specialties, heavy electric household appliances, men's wear, and alcoholic beverages. (See table III.)

Line of merchandise	Cities reporting price cutting
Light electric household appliances	29
Cosmetics and drug specialties	23
Heavy electric household appliances	14
Men's wear	4
Alcoholic beverages	4

It was interesting to your committee to note that although a total of 825 stores were reported to have cut prices on fair-trade items, there were approximately 77,200 stores in the survey cities which might be said to handle one or more of the lines of merchandise affected by the type of price cutting reported in the survey. Table IV shows this breakdown in the stores survey. (See table IV.)

Kind of business:	Number of stores
Department stores	933
Variety of stores	5,723
Men's and boys' clothing	9,648
Family clothing	3,294
Furniture	9,184
Household appliances	6,331
Hardware	8,081
Drug and proprietary	20,662
Liquor	13,280
Total	77,241

Source: U. S. Census of Business, 1948: Retail Trade.

The committee was also interested to note that there was no clear geographic clustering of communities engaging in price cutting. The survey showed, for example, that several major communities in the neighborhood of New York, including Albany, Hartford, Trenton, and Philadelphia, reported no price cutting in stores in those communities between May 28 and June 16. Table V sets forth complete statistics on the results of the Dun & Bradstreet survey.

TABLE V.—*Price cutting of fair-traded merchandise, May 28 to June 16, 1951*

[In 123 cities of the United States and for 5 classes of merchandise]

City	Total number of stores cutting prices	Merchandise lines in which prices were reduced: Heavy electric household appliances	Light electric household appliances	Men's wear	Cosmetics and drug specialties	Alcoholic beverages
Akron, Ohio	8				X	
Albany, N. Y.	0					
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	7		X		X	
Allentown, Pa.	4	X	X	X	X	
Amarillo, Tex.	0					
Asheville, N. C.	0					
Atlanta, Ga.	0					
Austin, Tex.	0					
Baltimore, Md.	7		X		X	
Bangor, Maine	0					
Billings, Mont.	0					
Birmingham, Ala.	0					
Boston, Mass.	0					
Buffalo, N. Y.	0					
Butte, Mont.	7				X	
Canton, Ohio	0					
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	8	X	X			
Charleston, S. C.	0					
Charleston, W. Va.	0					
Charlotte, N. C.	2				X	
Chattanooga, Tenn.	0					
Chicago, Ill.	0					
Cincinnati, Ohio	3				X	
Cleveland, Ohio	0					
Columbia, S. C.	0					
Columbus, Ga.	0					
Columbus, Ohio	0					
Dallas, Tex.	0					
Davenport, Iowa	0					
Dayton, Ohio	0					
Denver, Colo.	300	X	X		X	X
Des Moines, Iowa	0					
Detroit, Mich.	175	X	X			
Dubuque, Iowa	0					
Duluth, Minn.	2				X	
El Paso, Tex.	0					
Erie, Pa.	0					
Evansville, Ind.	0					
Fargo, N. Dak.	0					
Fort Wayne, Ind.	0					
Fort Worth, Tex.	0					
Fresno, Calif.	1	X				
Grand Rapids, Mich.	0					
Green Bay, Wis.	0					
Greensboro, N. C.	0					
Greenville, S. C.	4	X	X			
Harrisburg, Pa.	4		X		X	
Hartford, Conn.	0					
Houston, Tex.	0					
Huntington, W. Va.	0					
Indianapolis, Ind.	0					
Jackson, Miss.	0					
Jacksonville, Fla.	0					
Kansas City, Mo.	4		X			
Knoxville, Tenn.	0					
La Crosse, Wis.	0					
Lincoln, Nebr.	4		X			
Little Rock, Ark.	1		X			
Los Angeles, Calif.	0					
Louisville, Ky.	2		X	X		
Macon, Ga.	0					
Madison, Wis.	0					
Manchester, N. H.	0					
Memphis, Tenn.	0					
Miami, Fla.	4		X			
Milwaukee, Wis.	0					
Minneapolis, Minn.	0					
Mobile, Ala.	2		X			
Nashville, Tenn.	0					
Newark, N. J.	3		X		X	
New Haven, Conn.	0					
New Orleans, La.	21				X	X
New York, N. Y.	100	X	X	X	X	
Norfolk, Va.	1		X			
Oklahoma City, Okla.	30		X		X	
Omaha, Nebr.	10	X	X		X	
Peoria, Ill.	0					
Philadelphia, Pa.	0					
Phoenix, Ariz.	1	X	X			
Pittsburgh, Pa.	0					
Portland, Maine	0					
Portland, Oreg.	8	X	X	X	X	
Providence, R. I.	2		X			
Raleigh, N. C.	0					
Richmond, Va.	0					
Roanoke, Va.	0					
Rochester, N. Y.	0					
Rockford, Ill.	0					
Sacramento, Calif.	8		X		X	
Saginaw, Mich.	0					
St. Louis, Mo.	0					
St. Pl. Maurice	0					
Salt Lake City, Utah	0					
San Antonio, Tex.	0					
San Diego, Calif.	3				X	
San Francisco, Calif.	6		X		X	
Savannah, Ga.	2	X	X			
Scranton, Pa.	3	X	X			
Seattle, Wash.	0					
Shreveport, La.	10				X	X
Sioux City, Iowa	1		X			
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.	1	X				
South Bend, Ind.	0					
Spokane, Wash.	9		X		X	
Springfield, Ill.	3				X	
Springfield, Mass.	0					
Springfield, Ohio	0					
Syracuse, N. Y.	0					
Tacoma, Wash.	0					
Tampa, Fla.	50					X
Terre Haute, Ind.	0					
Toledo, Ohio	0					
Topeka, Kans.	0					
Trenton, N. J.	0					
Tulsa, Okla.	1		X			
Waco, Tex.	0					
Washington, D. C.	0					
Wheeling, W. Va.	0					
Wichita, Kans.	2				X	
Wilmington, Del.	0					
Winston-Salem, N. C.	0					
Worcester, Mass.	1	X				
York, Pa.	0					
Youngstown, Ohio	0					
Total	825	14	29	4	23	4

A second survey, conducted by Dun & Bradstreet on June 25 and 26 in the same 123 cities covered in the first survey, indicated that since June 16 there had been no significant increase in the cutting of prices below resale prices set by manufacturers. Five cities in which no price cutting had been reported as of June 16, reported one or more stores engaged in such price cutting after June 16. Two additional cities reported increases in the number of stores participating in price cutting, but the total number of stores involved in each city was only two. Conversely, it was reported that price cutting, reported as of June 16, had been discontinued in three cities and, in three additional cities, the number of stores engaged in such practices had been reduced.

On the basis of the Dun & Bradstreet survey, your committee concluded that price cutting was on the wane as of the end of June. A close watch was kept on the situation throughout the balance of 1951 and no significant trends toward extension of price cutting were noted. Many of the leaders in the campaign to cut prices were quoted during the latter part of May and early June as being opposed in principle to the loss-leader type of retailing but stated that the lead of others forced them into the price war. They expressed relief when the price war tapered off. Many of the large department stores which were most active in the price war, including Macy's of New York, later signed price-maintenance agreements with manufacturers and thus, in effect, admitted the efficacy of fair trade. As of year's end, prices of fair-traded items had for the most part been restored to their previous levels and the threat to small retailers had diminished, for the time being at least.

NEW FAIR-TRADE LEGISLATION

Friends of fair trade were understandably shocked by the Supreme Court's decision in

the Schwegmann case and alarmed by the price wars that followed. They recognized the fact that the Schwegmann decision had practically nullified the fair-trade statutes enacted in the legislatures of 45 States in the past 20 years. They realized that unless the nonsigner clauses of the statutes could be given effect in interstate commerce, the statutes were utterly ineffective. They were not reassured by the collapse of the price-cutting epidemic. They recognized a continuing danger to the fair-trade movement and took action to plug the loophole created by the Supreme Court in the Schwegmann decision.

A large segment of the small-business community, led by the National Association of Retail Druggists, drafted a bill designed to restore fair trade to full effectiveness. Sponsored by Representative JOHN A. MCGUIRE, the bill was introduced in the House in October." It proposes an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act which would validate the operation of minimum resale price contracts on all distributors selling trade-marked brands in interstate commerce. The McGuire bill has been referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House. Although drafted under the leadership of the NARD, the bill has the active support of a number of other groups, including the retail jewelers, book sellers, tobacconists, hardware dealers, auto accessory dealers, and appliance merchants.

The American Fair Trade Council, Inc., a group of fair-trade advocates made up largely of manufacturers of fair-trade items, has announced its intention to submit a separate bill to Congress early in 1952. Their bill is aimed at amending the Sherman Act. It would provide in part that no one outside of a fair-trade State may offer for sale, or sell, or deliver in any such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, any product in interstate commerce at any price less than the fair-trade price lawfully established in the State.

CONCLUSIONS

The events of the past year in the field of fair trade have been of grave concern to your committee. In particular, the Schwegmann decision and the ensuing price wars were viewed as matters of tremendous import to small business. Had the price wars continued, they could have done incalculable harm to countless small businesses. The memory of the early 1930's and the great numbers of small, independent concerns that were then lost to the economy directly as a result of similar price wars is still fresh. The possibility is strong that the damage to fair trade wrought by the Schwegmann decision might well precipitate similar business failures should our economy suffer a sudden reversal.

Business Week magazine summarized the situation in an article published in its June 16, 1951, issue. Noting the progress made by small retail merchants in the past decade and the factors contributing to that progress, Business Week said:

"Fair trade has also been another major prop for the small, independent merchant during the past decade. This has been particularly true in the drug and jewelry businesses. Under the fair-trade umbrella, the small merchant has been protected from price cutting and provided with a healthy mark-up

"The end of fair trade on a national scale now throws this advantage into reverse. How much it will hurt the small retailer remains to be seen. But it's sure to leave its mark."

Your committee is hopeful that the members of the business community will recognize their responsibilities in this situation and that they will realize the dangers inherent in loss-leader selling and cutthroat competition, that they will realize that such practices can result only in damaging the whole economy. It is not only the small independent merchant who suffers in a price war. The manufacturer and the consumer also suffer. And the leaders of price-cutting campaigns should realize that injury to other segments of the retail trade cannot benefit them. Gains realized from loss-leader selling are short-lived. The practice is a vicious one and defeats itself. No merchant, no matter how large, can afford to continue loss-leader selling indefinitely. He must engage in other practices in order to recoup his losses. And such other practices of necessity require that he sell other merchandise at high profits. The consumer must sooner or later discover the fallacy of the loss-leader selling technique, and then the retailer loses the good will of his customers and their patronage. The good sense and recognition of their responsibilities should impel the overwhelming mass of the business community to the logic and wisdom of fair trade.

Your committee intends to keep a close watch on fair trade during the coming months. It will scrutinize closely the efforts of the business community to police itself. It will also be vitally interested in the progress of pending legislation on fair trade. The advantages of fair trade are evident, and your committee will be awake to any opportunities in the legislative field that would renew the stability and security of small business. The Nation's economic well-being depends to a large extent on the vitality of America's small businesses. Threats of price wars must be eliminated if that vitality is to endure.

[11] H. R. 5767, 82d Cong., 1st sess.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT RELATING TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS ESTABLISHING MINIMUM RESALE PRICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY AUTHORITIES DURING PERIODS OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue certain emergency authorities during periods of national emergency. I request that the bill, together with a statement in explanation thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3448) to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue certain emergency authorities during periods of national emergency, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 213 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 214) is amended by inserting after the words "in time of war" the words "or national emergency."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 216 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U. S. C. 217) is amended to read: "In time of war, or of emergency proclaimed by the President, he may utilize the Service to such extent and in such manner as shall in his judgment promote the public interest, and he may by Executive order declare the commissioned corps of the Service to be a military service."

SEC. 3. This act shall be effective on and after July 4, 1952. Existing regulations promulgated by the President pursuant to section 216 of the Public Health Service Act prior to the effective date of this act shall remain in force and effect from the effective date of this act until repealed, modified, or superseded as may otherwise be authorized by law.

The statement presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill would extend to periods of national emergency as well as of war (1) the authority of the President to declare the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service to be a military service and (2) the authorization for payment of a $250 uniform allowance for junior officers reporting for active duty.

For many years commissioned officers of the Public Health Service have been appointed, paid, promoted, and retired under laws identical or similar to those applicable to officers of the medical departments of the Army and Navy. Since World War II, Public Health Service officers have also been extended military status and military benefits on a par with members of the other armed services.

It is essential that these physicians, dentists, research scientists, sanitary engineers, and public health administrators continue to be so treated. They are subject to discipline; they can and are ordered to undesirable posts of duty on a moment's notice; they are keymen in the defense against bacteriological warfare; and they could, almost without exception, earn far more in private life than they are now getting. They have been successfully recruited largely because, as commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, they would be treated on the same basis as their opposite numbers in the Army and Navy.

The principal individual benefits which are derived from military status are widow's benefits, Government life insurance, the death gratuity, and the uniform allowance for junior officers. Loss of military status for the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service would mean the loss of all these benefits. In effect, the Public Health Service would then be the only one of the uniformed services without some type of death benefit.

Inasmuch as these authorities are currently in effect, there would be no additional appropriations required to support the comparatively minor expenditures authorized by the provisions of this bill.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional matters were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER:

Article entitled "Vets Oppose Turner as U. N. Historian," published in the Cleveland Catholic Universe Bulletin, June 27, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:
Editorial entitled "Who's the Aggressor?" published in the Washington Daily News, July 1, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:
Article by Dorothy McCardle entitled "No Wonder He Didn't Choose."

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 2, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALASKA

Frieda A. Davey, Naknek, Alaska, in place of Martha Monsen, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Carl E. Erler, Streator, Ill., in place of E. G. Zilm, retired.

INDIANA

Wayne M. Crider, Greenfield, Ind., in place of Marshall Winslow, retired.

Dean I. Lauver, New Carlisle, Ind., in place of F. J. O'Laughlin, transferred.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Condon, Brockton, Mass., in place of A. A. Hendrick, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Casimir A. Rakowski, Mount Morris, Mich., in place of B. J. Lawson, removed.

Laura A. Grettenberger, Okemos, Mich., in place of O. K. Grettenberger, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Clarence E. Arnold, Saltillo, Miss., in place of A. J. Roper, transferred.

MISSOURI

Estella C. Lawrence, Fenton, Mo., in place of C. A. Lawrence, deceased.

MONTANA

George N. Westland, Frazer, Mont., in place of M. M. Westland, retired.

NEBRASKA

Harold S. Conroy, Shelton, Nebr., in place of Martin Slattery, resigned.

NEVADA

Irene B. McCormick, Empire, Nev. Office established February 16, 1951.

NEW JERSEY

John P. Panella, Mendham, N. J., in place of E. L. McMurtry, retired.

David B. Morgan, Paterson, N. J., in place of T. L. Kelley, retired.

John L. Malley, Trenton, N. J., in place of E. J. Jennings, deceased.

NEW YORK

Gladys B. Clust, Burdett, N. Y., in place of C. T. Burnett, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Robert L. Dobry, Pocasset, Okla., in place of L. V. Doke, transferred.

OREGON

Samuel R. Veatch, Cottage Grove, Oreg., in place of N. J. Nelson, Jr., retired.

Franz L. Kranenburg, Prairie City, Oreg., in place of R. H. Sullens, deceased.

VIRGINIA

James E. Harris, Ewing, Va., in place of D. V. Richmond, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hazel M. Pritt, Ward, W. Va., in place of G. L. Powers, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Ruth Steinert, Waukesha, Wis., in place of J. J. G. Laing, deceased.

Donald J. Heim, Waunakee, Wis., in place of John Michels, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

John A. Davis (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensign in the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, as previously nominated and confirmed.

Clifford A. Lindell (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps in the Navy:

Dwight M. Frost
Charles R. Henkelmann
Norbert E. Rosenwinkel

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps in the Navy:

LIEUTENANT

Sylvester E. W. Spann, Jr.

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Joseph E. Musser

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

Stella P. Branam	Doris M. McSpadden
Catherine D. Challenger	Naomi J. Naten
Mary F. English	Mary M. Nelson

The following-named officers to be lieutenants in the Nurse Corps in the Navy:

Grace E. Beach	Myrtle T. Harris
Dorothy M. Durham	Betty G. Rupert

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Deck:

Thomas B. H. Askin, Jr.	Francis L. Looney
Delbert F. Barbee	Joseph P. Madeo, Jr.
Louis S. Brackney	Edgar H. McCanless
Rowland E. Burnham	Curtis J. Rozell
Robert S. Dodge	Kenneth H. Ruecker
Charles R. Kidd	William LeR. Strong
Joseph Koch	Barent P. Winant III
	William E. Wise

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Ordnance:

Douglas G. Christy	Lloyd E. Murdock
James H. Forrester	Robert Riba
Dwight E. Hubbard	Dean E. Roberts
Robert G. Jackson	Frank Saxton
James E. Lippincott	James Stelfox
John D. Mullin	Edward H. Weaver

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Administration:

Charles W. Benson	John D. O'Kane
Richard T. Fowler	Glen A. Snell
Richard E. Gerlach	Everett B. Sorensen
Vito J. V. Gustaff	John P. Stradtman
Otis A. Henson	Louis M. Wahrmund
Vincent Kozlowski, Jr.	Charles H. Webster
Thomas LaC. Law	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification, Engineering:

Robert W. Addis	Harry E. Conrad
Arthur L. Babine, Jr.	Ralph E. Davis
Robert W. Fisher	Robert N. Ratenburg
Howard A. Gire	Landrum E. Ravan
Richard W. Ingersoll	Mervin Rowland
Karl D. Kaiser	William D. Russell
Luther Lefler	George C. Thomas
Frederick F. McWilliams	Guy LaM. Thompson
	James D. Turner
Lee J. Maus	Lander H. Turpin
Mallie B. Moore	Elmer E. Walker
Joseph J. O'Rourke	Cecil E. Wood
Herbert J. Peters	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Hull:

Robert D. Allen	Burton K. Perl
Donald A. Christensen	Edward C. Raymer
Alonzo C. Jarrett	Howard K. Selby
Robert M. Johnson	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Electronics:

Jerry E. Callaghan	Gerald E. Murphy
Andrew Clark	Charles H. Pogson
Robert E. Craig	Beckom U. Sneed
Edwin H. DeFriez	Homer L. Walker
Clement Dersin	Francis C. Waterloo
Theodore Y. Dunn, Jr.	John Wilkens, Jr.
Walter M. Paver	Searle W. Woods
Forrest E. Metz	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Operations Aviation:

Peter S. Miller	Ralph G. Rayburn
Gerald P. Pulley	James W. Wheeler, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Ordnance Aviation:

Arthur T. Kasehagen
Wilmer N. Northup, Jr.

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering Aviation:

Phillip S. Arp	Vern A. Miller
Wallace A. Dahlen	"J" W. Mitchell
Joseph W. Gray	William C. Moss, Jr.
Leo L. Hamilton	William N. Perry
Joseph D. Hirs	William F. St. Clair
Glenn A. Hunter	Robert D. Witty
Fred M. Mhoon	

The following-named to be ensigns in the line in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Electronics Aviation:

William J. Bowen	Randall C. Roush
Robert O. Louden	Chesley E. Willis, Jr.
Douglas H. Roberts	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Supply Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only:

Ralph H. Boyd	Daniel M. Rhodes
Albert N. Lockwood	Alvin LeR. Vandegriff
Thomas P. Needham	John L. Wells, Jr.
William D. Rains	

The following-named to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps in the Navy, for limited duty only:

Raymond P. Fail, Jr.
Van B. LaRue
Herron Oldham

LINE

Ensign John R. Parker, SC, United States Navy, for permanent appointment as ensign in the line of the Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Anthony F. Arpaia, of Connecticut, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1957.

Martin Kelso Elliott, of Indiana, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1956.

Charles D. Mahaffie, of the District of Columbia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1958.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Abe Murdock, of Utah, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term expiring December 16, 1957.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Jonathan B. Bingham, of New York, to be Deputy Administrator for Technical Cooperation.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Maurice Sanchez to be United States attorney for the district of New Mexico.

POSTMASTER

IDAHO

James F. Hughes, Boise.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who art daily crowning our lives with Thy grace and goodness, grant that we may be blessed with more of Thy infallible wisdom and invincible strength.

May we be strong and valiant for the truth and courageous in championing every legislative program that will bring a larger measure of prosperity and happiness to our country and all mankind.

We pray that all the laws which we are enacting may be the expression of Thy divine will. May we find our joy and delight in using our blessings and resources to help make life less difficult and burdensome for needy and struggling humanity.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant who faithfully ministered here for so many years in spiritual things and whose soul now dwells with Thee in eternal blessedness. Grant unto the members of his bereaved family the consolation of Thy grace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 86. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a committee to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KNOWLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MINE-SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I understand a rule was granted this morning for consideration before adjournment of mine-safety legislation. I think this is one of the most important matters to come before this session of the Congress. I hope the Members will see fit to give their support to mine-safety legislation.

Each morning as I come to the House I pause to look at the news ticker in the Speaker's lobby. For the past week every morning I have seen reports of mine disasters somewhere in the United States. There have been fatal accidents on two straight days in Pennsylvania. A few days ago there was an explosion in West Virginia.

We think only of major disasters, in which over a hundred lives are taken, but since the first of the year more men have lost their lives in coal-mine disasters than were taken in the terrible disaster at West Frankfort last year. It is high time for the Congress to act. I congratulate the Committee on Education and Labor for its approval of this legislation, also the Rules Committee, and I congratulate the House leadership for scheduling mine-safety legislation for consideration on the floor tomorrow. I hope and pray it will receive an overwhelming vote of approval from the membership of the House.

JUDGE HAROLD M. KENNEDY

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, United States District Judge Harold M. Kennedy of the eastern district of New York announced his intention to, and, in fact, did resign to return to the private practice of the law.

This is another example of a good judge who has one of the most brilliant legal minds of any on the bench in the country being forced to return to the private practice. Judge Kennedy has served well and faithfully for 8 years and, prior thereto, was for 5 years United States attorney. He has made a remarkable record. I point this out in the hope that the House will before we adjourn act favorably on pending bills revising upward the Federal judiciary salaries and another bill to provide annuities for the widows of Federal judges. By doing this we will more and better attract to and retain on the Federal bench the quality of men and women we desire.

MANAGEMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 8130, which was taken from the Committee on Expenditures and re-referred to the Armed Services Committee lies chloroformed in the archives of that committee; but I am delighted to report to the House that the bill has received prominent attention in the Senate and the principles of the bill have been included as a rider in the Armed Forces appropriation bill.

The entire bill was offered and the Senate has assured us that the bill in its entirety will be considered in the next session of the Congress. This legislation should have been enacted in this session of Congress to bring about efficiency in management in the affairs of the armed services at the Pentagon.

If the conferees of the House desire efficiency in management and procurement they will I hope concur with the Senate amendment.

MINE-SAFETY LEGISLATION

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon we heard certain Members of this House castigate the Rules Committee very unjustly. I come to the defense of the Rules Committee at this time because in my opinion that committee went out of its way to grant every consideration not only to the Committee on Education and Labor of this House but to every Member of Congress who desired to appear either in support of or in opposition to the bill.

I am happy to report to the House this morning, that the Rules Committee in executive session, having a quorum for the first time since they began to hold hearings on the mine safety bill, reported an open rule on that bill which will provide 2 hours debate. I commend

the Rules Committee for its prompt and cooperative action.

THE LATE DR. JAMES SHERA MONTGOMERY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all Members of the House of Representatives learned with a great deal of grief and sorrow of the passing last night of the Chaplain Emeritus of the House of Representatives, Dr. James Shera Montgomery, who served as Chaplain of the House of Representatives from 1921 to 1950, passed away last night, after a long illness.

Dr. Montgomery was a man of profound and deep Christian faith and spiritual insight. He was a man who had a great, compassionate love and affection for the House of Representatives and for its Members, whom he served year after year during that period. I am sure that all Members of the House join me and thousands of others in expressing our very sincerest sympathy to all the members of his family and to his many friends.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the gentleman from Tennessee in expressing keen regret at the death of Dr. Montgomery. He was the Chaplain when I first came to Congress back in 1924, and as a young man I admired the genuine Americanism and philosophy he set forth in his daily prayers as well as his deep consideration of all the Members of Congress. His prayers were always a great inspiration to us, and won lasting fame not only among us but throughout the country. A great American, a great churchman, a great man who loved humanity is gone. I join with the gentleman from Tennessee in expressing my regret at his passing.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of the House who does not deeply feel the loss of Dr. Montgomery. All of us have been enriched, encouraged, and inspired by his spiritual grace. He was the very embodiment of love and charity. Dr. Montgomery was truly a man of God. He was truly God's devoted servant. His face radiated the beauty of his thoughts and the complacency of his mind and soul from his faith in God and love of his fellow men.

I had many, many personal visits with Dr. Montgomery. Just to be in his presence, if not a word were spoken, strengthened and inspired me. By the pure might of his noble spirit he lifted our eyes to see only that which is good.

There shall ever live with me and my wife the occasion on which Dr. Montgomery baptized our daughter. My family has lost in Dr. Montgomery a man we deeply loved.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding the late Dr. Montgomery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Montgomery really served his day and generation.

His was a compelling and pleasing personality.

He served this House in a dignified and fine way. I miss him very much. He was an appreciated and fine friend.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of this House of Representatives had a profound feeling of grief and sorrow at the passing of our beloved chaplain emeritus, Dr. James Shera Montgomery.

From the time I came to Congress 27 years ago until he retired I received inspiration and comfort in his daily warm greeting and kindly manner. He had a warm love and affection for all of us and showed it in his countless acts of kindness.

We shall miss him greatly. All of us who knew him were enriched and inspired by his spiritual grace. I want to join with his thousands of friends in expressing my sincere sympathy to the members of his family.

PREVENTION OF MAJOR DISASTERS IN COAL MINES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 720, Rept. No. 2369), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7408) to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what the President of the United States intends to do with respect to the request by the Congress last week relative to the use of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to inquire why the President has not invoked the Taft-Hartley Act in the steel strike. When the President addressed the joint session of Congress he solicited our advice. He, in effect, promised he would use the Taft-Hartley Act if the Congress told him to do so.

Both the House and the Senate, in the Byrd amendment and the Smith amendment to the Defense Production Act, have earnestly told him to use the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. We did so by substantial majority votes in both bodie This action represents an expression of the will of the people. Yet the President continues to ignore it and the critical situation confronting the country grows steadily worse.

When the President summarily seized the steel industry, even without statutory or constitutional authority to do so, he justified this extraordinary action on the ground that the stoppage of steel production for even 1 day would be felt in Korea. He said that unless continued production of steel were insured, our whole rearmament effort would be jeopardized. He emphasized how critical steel, every day's production, was so vital to our whole national defense. In this the President was supported by Secretary of Defense Lovett and General Collins.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is now 4 weeks since the steel industry was struck by the United Steel Workers, and still the President refuses to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act.

I wish to call special attention to the fact that we are facing a very serious situation with respect to iron ore, and no one can estimate the loss in steel production for an entire year by an inadequate ore supply. Unless iron ore mining is resumed at once, there is serious danger of a grave shortage of iron ore next winter.

It must be taken into account an important factor in meeting the country's ore supply need for steel production purposes is transportation. Iron ore must be mined during the summer season that it may be transported on the Lakes. There is not enough rail capacity to be able to ship sufficient quantities by rail. We are thus not only losing precious iron ore production of itself but precious time for transportation purposes. When the Lakes freeze over for around 5 months ore shipment is necessarily suspended.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the President's failure to act now is depriving the country its stockpile of iron ore necessary for next winter's steel production. He is making it impossible for the country to have maximum steel production next winter by each day of delay.

Moreover, with each day of delay the country is facing the possibility of a real food shortage. We are approaching the canning season, which has its peak in August and September. There is not sufficient tinpate available to can at the customary peak. Large quantities of food will spoil, and the entire country will be deprived of its normal supply of canned food for an entire year.

And yet the President has not invoked the Taft-Hartley Act. Is the entire Nation to suffer simply because the President has promised Mr. Murray that he would not invoke the act?

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

PETRUS VAN KEER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3389) for the relief of Petrus Van Keer.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JERRY J. LENCIONI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1422) for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jerry J. Lencioni, of Geneva, Ill., the sum of $5,012.17, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of injuries sustained when a plane he was piloting crashed on August 5, 1942, at which time he was an aviation cadet in the United States Naval Reserve and participating in a civilian pilot training course sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Administration but was not entitled to full medical care and hospitalization at Government expense due to his inactive-duty status: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETROIT AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2232) for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

P. DIACON ZADEH

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 685) providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 8159) for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 8159) entitled "A bill for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh," now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARET D. SURHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1711) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan, of Dunkirk, N. Y., shall be considered and conclusively presumed to be the lawful widow of the late Joseph D. Surhan for the purpose of receiving benefits under any law of the United States relating to widows of veterans of World War I, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan any benefits to which she is entitled as the lawful widow of the late Joseph D. Surhan, a deceased veteran.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. C. ISRAEL COMMODITY CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2075) for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc., New York, N. Y., the sum of $7,582.57; plus interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning on December 13, 1945, and ending on the date of enactment of this act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said company against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid (under protest) by such company on December 13, 1945, as damages for alleged violation, in connection with the sale by such company of imported chocolate bars, of price regulations established by the Office of Price Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2171) for the relief of Robert E. Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert E. Robinson, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $2,970. Such sum represents the loss sustained by Mr. Robinson when his household goods were shipped by the Weather Bureau on the Alaska Railroad barge *No. 738* and were lost when that barge ran aground off Cape Spencer: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures "$2,970", strike out the period and insert, "and to pay the sum of $450 to Gerald L. Harris."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert E. Robinson and Gerald L. Harris."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2181) for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims (a) to hear the claims of the Trust Association of H. Kempner, of Galveston, Tex., against the Government of Germany and nationals of Germany for reimbursement for losses alleged to have been sustained as a result of the sale of certain cotton by such trust association to certain mills in Germany during the years 1923 and 1924, and to determine the amounts of any such losses, and (b) to determine the total of the various amounts wrongfully paid out of the Trust of Germann & Co. while its property was being administered by the Alien Property Custodian.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed (a) to credit the Trust of Germann & Co. with an amount equal to any amounts found by the Court of Claims under clause (b) of the first section of this act to have been wrongfully paid out

of such trust, and to charge such sum against the War Claims Fund, created by section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, or against any other funds or property of the Government of Germany or of nationals of Germany in the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States or which may hereafter come into the possession or under the control of the Government of the United States, and (b) to pay, to the Trust Association of H. Kempner, out of such war claims fund or such other funds, the amounts so credited to the Trust of Germann & Co. and so charged against such war claims fund or such other funds, or so much thereof as does not exceed the amount of any losses found by the Court of Claims under clause (a) of the first section of this act to have been sustained by the Trust Association of H. Kempner: *Provided*, That such payment shall not be made unless and until such trust association executes and delivers to the said Trust of Germann & Co. a complete assignment of all claims and demands of the said Trust Association of H. Kempner against the Government of Germany and nationals of Germany arising out of the sale of such cotton during the years 1923 and 1924.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 3, after the period, insert "*Provided*, That such payment shall not be made unless it leaves such war claims fund in a position to discharge all payments therefrom authorized and directed to be paid under the War Claims Act of 1948.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA GABRIEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2780) for the relief of Clara Gabriel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitation placed upon the time within which notice of claim for return of property may be filed under section 32 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is hereby waived in favor of Clara Gabriel, a citizen of Germany, and her claim for return of her share of the estate of Teresa Gabriel (Alien Property Custodian file No. D-28-9051; vesting order No. 5981) shall be received, considered, and acted upon under such section 32 (a), if she files such notice of claim for return with the Alien Property Custodian not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. After considering and acting upon the claim of the said Clara Gabriel as provided for in the first section of this act, the Alien Property Custodian shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount, if any, to which the said Clara Gabriel is entitled under such section 32 (a), and the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the said Clara Gabriel, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amount so certified, in full settlement of all claims of the said Clara Gabriel against the United States for the return of her share of the estate of Teresa Gabriel (Alien Property Custodian file No. D-28-9051; vesting order No. 5981).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD JOE DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2972) for the relief of Harold Joe Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold Joe Davis, Tulsa, Okla., the sum of $16,748. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harold Joe Davis against the United States arising out of the permanent injuries he sustained, as a civilian, while serving in line of duty under orders of the United States Navy as fire chief of the United States naval air station, Dutch Harbor, Alaska, during enemy air attacks which occurred on June 3 and 4, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$16,748", and insert "$10,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JANE P. MYERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Jane P. Myers, widow of John A. Myers (XC-3759774), a World War II veteran, who was killed in action on July 28, 1944, the amount of compensation which would have been payable to her on her own behalf and on behalf of her infant son if evidence of her marriage to the veteran and of the birth of her son had been furnished to the Veterans' Administration in strict conformity with the provisions of said regulation.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Jane P. Myers, of Raton, N. Mex., the sum of $953, representing the amount of compensation she would have received for the period beginning January 1, 1945, and ending March 27, 1946, had her claim filed within 1 year after the date fixed by the Department of the Army as the date of the death of her husband, Staff Sgt. John A. Myers, been completed by the timely filing of certified copies of her marriage certificate and of her child's birth certificate: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR STAVELEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3502) for the relief of Arthur Staveley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Arthur Staveley, of Warwick Neck, R. I., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for damages sustained as a result of an accident which occurred when a plane, operating out of the United States naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I., crashed in front of his home on November 2, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN JIM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4296) for the relief of Franklin Jim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Phillip Jim and Ella Jim, as legal guardians of the person and estate of Franklin Jim, a minor full-blood Pawnee Indian, the sum of $5,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from injury to his left hand on October 10, 1945, which was caught in the presses of a sorghum mill being used on the grounds of the Pawnee Indian School near Pawnee, Okla., during a period when he was a student at said school, was 13 years of age and was assigned the task of attending said sorghum mill by the school authorities, who were employees of the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to

exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of money appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Phillip Jim and Ella Jim, as legal guardians of the person and estate" and insert in lieu thereof "the legal guardian."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA BASIN ORCHARD ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4398) to confer jurisdiction upon the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon all claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp. (all corporations of Washington) against the United States arising out of the flooding, during the period beginning June 1, 1939, and ending April 30, 1940, of certain real property owned by the said Columbia Basin Orchard in Grant County, Wash., insofar as such flooding was the result of certain drilling operations carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation in the course of its investigations preliminary to the construction of a dam and an equalizing reservoir in the Grand Coulee.

SEC. 2. All claims against the United States within the purview of the first section of this act shall be forever barred unless action is begun thereon within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIO MERCADO TOLEDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5207) for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,060 to Julio Mercado Toledo, who was injured on March 9, 1944, when struck by a United States Army truck, in Ponce, Puerto Rico. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR J. BOUCHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Arthur J. Boucher, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as an employee of the Boston Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass., in July 1944, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "1944", insert "and his claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXEI FRANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5538) for the relief of Alexei Frank.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MARY FOX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6738) for the relief of Mary Fox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill, S. 2630.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Fox, Hialeah, Fla., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mary Fox against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by her on January 25, 1945, when a Miami Transit Co. bus in which she was a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Southwest Fifth Avenue and Southwest Sixth Street, Miami, Fla., the operator of which Army vehicle was not acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Similar House bill H. R. 6738 was laid on the table.

MRS. MURIEL J. SHINGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6788) for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery, of 11543 South Paramount Boulevard, Downey, Calif., the sum of $305.15. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Shingler's Hatchery against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of approximately 1,795 baby chicks which were contained in a shipment of 9,000 baby chicks mailed by the said Shingler's Hatchery on November 30, 1950, at Downey, Calif., to Peterson Feed & Supply Co., Tucson, Ariz. Such shipment was not insured by employees of the Post Office Department although such insurance was requested by the said Shingler's Hatchery prior to the time such shipment was made. Such claims are not cognizable under the provisions of title 28 of the United States Code relating to tort claims against the United States by reason of section 2680b of title 28 of the United States Code exempting from such provisions those claims arising out of the loss, miscarriage, and negligent transmission of postal matter. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIO VALENSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7094) for the relief of Pio Valensin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $452 to Pio Valensin, Route 2, Box 684, Galt, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of a fire caused by a United States Weather Bureau balloon on September 27, 1951. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. JOSEPH W. FURSTENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2893) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg, Toms River, N. J., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Furstenberg against the United States arising out of the loss of a registered letter mailed by the said Mrs. Furstenberg at a United States naval post office in Argentia, Newfoundland, on June 28, 1949. The said Mrs. Furstenberg mailed such letter, which contained $2,000 in cash, in reliance on the assertion of a postal employee in such office that registered mail was the safest way to send such money. Although the declared value of such letter was $2,000, and although the said Mrs. Furstenberg paid a registration surcharge which was based on such declared value, the said Mr. and Mrs. Furstenberg have heretofore been reimbursed only $1,000, which is the maximum amount payable under existing law for the loss of any one piece of registered mail: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES OLIVER FARLOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4841) for the relief of James Oliver Farlow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of James Oliver Farlow, of Wehadkee, Ala., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from personal injury sustained on March 2, 1945, while working as a junior packer at the Eight Hundred and Twenty-ninth Army Air Force Specialized Depot, Gadsden, Ala., is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AGNES TURKETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5519) for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Turkett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Mrs. Agnes Turkett, of 50 Lancaster Street, Albany, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of a fall in the post office at Albany, N. Y., on November 27, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COOPER TIRE & RUBBER CO.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 699) for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 8255) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Cooper Tire & Rubber Co." now pending in the House of Representatives, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of such sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants: *Provided*, That it shall not be a defense on the part of the Government that the acts of the Government which are alleged to have damaged the claimant were done by the Government in its sovereign capacity.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. BRAUND

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 700) for the relief of John J. Braund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 4507) entitled "A bill for the relief of John J. Braund" now pending in the House of Representatives, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STELLA JEAN STATHOPOULOU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 54) for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stella Jean Stathopoulou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER DUSCHINSKY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 523) for the relief of Walter Duschinsky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Walter

Duschinsky, who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the appropriate immigration quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding those provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, relating to date of application for an adjustment of immigration status, the alien, Walter Duschinsky, may, at any time within 6 months following the effective date of this act, apply to the Attorney General for the adjustment of his immigration status, and notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of the said section 4, other than those relating to the status at the time of entry, such alien shall, if he is otherwise qualified under the provisions of said section 4, be deemed to be a displaced person within the meaning of said section 4."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAI HSUEN TAN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1037) for the relief of Wai Hsuen Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. NICOLA M. MELUCCI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1324) for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Nicola M. Melucci shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PANAGIOTES ROUMELIOTIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1470) for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Panagiotes Roumeliotis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the appropriate immigration quota for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THORVALD NIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1513) for the relief of Thorvald Nin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940, Thorvald Nin shall be held and considered to have retained his United States citizenship regardless of any period of residence outside the United States prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEVTINA OLSON AND TATIANA SNEJINA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1580) for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSVALDO CASTRO Y LOPEZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1639) for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Osvaldo Castro y Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELINA BRANLUND

The Clerk called the bill S. 1724) for the relief of Elina Branlund.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elina Branlund shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHEE SONG WU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1731) for the relief of Rhee Song Wu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Rhee Song Wu, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Sylvester W. Booker, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISAKO WATANABE AND HER DAUGHTER, IRENE TERUMI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1846) for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Misako Watanabe and Irene Terumi, the Japanese financée and minor child of George T. Maruno, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Misako Watanabe and Irene Terumi may be eligible for nonquota immigration visas if found to be otherwise admissible under the

immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the said Misako Watanabe and the said George T. Maruno occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUKIO NIIMURA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1863) to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act, the minor child, Yukio Niimura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tech. Sgt. Donald E. Wilson, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIDI GERALDINE CONNELLY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2066) for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Heidi Geraldine Connelly, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Chester C. Connelly, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA WEILAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2067) for the relief of Maria Weiland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Maria Weiland, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. John P. Fowler, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MATHILDE KOHAR HALEBIAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2084) for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mathilde Kohar Halebian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIGUEL NARCISO OSSORIO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2334) for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Miguel Narciso Ossorio shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Miguel Narciso Ossorio becoming a public charge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JIMMY LEE DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3007) for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Jimmy Lee Davis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Billie Davis, citizens of the United States and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jimmy Lee Davis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAREN CHRISTENE EISEN MURDOCK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3008) for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Karen Christene Eisen Murdock, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. David L. Murdock, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 76.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-5637630, Arron, Stanley Lionel Harvey or Lionel Arron or Lionel Lewis or Lanny Lewis.
A-6919639, Aguinaga-Roa, Dolores or Dolores Roa-Aguinaga.
A-5733503, Airaldi, Gino.
A-4781158, Aliprandini, Adolph.
A-4619917, Amino, Namizo.
A-3013389, Buzash, John or Ionos Buzas.
A-3407249, Castiglione, Vito.
A-6300476, Collins, Roy Warner.
A-5253274, Dave, Pranujam Magan.
A-2892866, DeArriola, Carmen Martinez or Carmen Martinez De Hernandez.
A-7366874, DeOrtega, Refugio Hurtado.
A-6268906, DeTorres, Edelmira Rico.
A-7278062, Dinos, Costanti.
A-8057905, Doralp, Ali Maksud.
A-3957070, Doyle, Marie Evangeline Pauline (nee Comeau).
A-7016907, Epstein, Rosetta (nee Rosa Rea Yaskransky).
A-4022832, Escamilla-Garza, Aniceto.
A-4022839, DeEscamilla, Guadalupe Rodriguez-Ramirez.
A-5927281, Fitzgerald, Marie Therese.
A-7415077, Forst, Otto.
A-3956626, Freire, Jose Maria Nunes.
A-3857278, Gafore, Abdul Bin alias Bin Gafore or Abdoel Bin Gaffor.
A-4467639, Goodman, Dorothy Ellen (nee Jeffery) formerly Thompson.
A-6864682, Greenwood, James Thomas.
A-3657585, Guillette, Aline Marie Rose.
A-2424730, Gutierrez, Elvira Quevedo alias Elvira Quevedo alias Elvira Quevedo Lopez.
A-1701756, Haggis, Ernest Charles.
A-4394802, Hamaguchi, Shinichihamaguchi or Chinichi.
A-1246360, Hiob, Arthur.
A-4389106, Heins, Hilde.
A-4389109, Heins, Karl.
A-6038911, Herrera, Tomas or Tomas Herera-Juarez.
A-7244212, Houmis, Georgias Ioannis alias George John Houmis.
A-7094782, Huber, Reinhart Edward.
A-5202899, Iglesias, Jose Perez.
A-5390705, Jakabovits, Leopold alias Leon Jacoby or Leopold Weiss or Weis.
A-2215505, Jelovich, Marian Michael.
A-5429535, Jensen, August William.
A-5377014, Kammerer, Jacob John or Kammer.
A-9699587, Karatassos, Emmanuel Ignatios.
A-6587993, Karhu, Heikki.
A-4461329, Kettle, Maisie June (nee Grieve).
A-4341726, Kuluris, Theodore Demetreu or Theodore Kuluris or Theodore Dimitriou.
A-5062399, Laborie, Charles Victor Marie or Charles Labore.
A-7450422, Lackey, Andree Nogret.
A-3042012, Lopez, Manuel Varela.
A-7118320, Martinez-Gonzalez, Salvador.
A-8065108, Mathes, Nicholas Thomas.

A-8057907, McGlaun, William Norman, formerly Willi Reuter.
A-5983762, McVeigh, Keith Roderick.
A-7841686, Mena-Medina, Victor Manuel.
A-6855874, Mendoza, Eduardo Pintuan or Alfred Mendoza.
A-5087671, Michelson, Arthur Nikolai or Arthur N Lanes or Arthur Michelson or Nikolai Michelson or Henry Paula or Hans Kastein.
A-7145134, Montelongo, Salvador Cisneros.
A-7145112, De Cisneros, Manuela Barrera.
A-1100557, Nardo, Andrea Damiano Di alais Guiseppe Delicato.
A-6982508, Oehler, Gerald.
A-9765750, Otero, Jose.
A-1009033, Pagonis, Peter or Petros Nicolas Pagonia.
A-8065202, Paschal, Gertrud Lisbeth Munzke.
A-3805920, Peribolaris, Constantinos or Konstantinos Perivolaris.
A-5137461, Pouderoyen, Dirk Van or Dick Van Panderoyen.
A-2894080, Proios, Constantinos John.
A-6268613, Radewitz, Frederick alias Friedrich Radiewitz or Fritz Radiewitz or Frederick Radiewitz.
A-5249987, Riggs, Elmire Marie formerly Labelle (nee Drouillard).
A-8057738, Rolle, Alexander.
A-1598061, Rylak, Michael or Michael Rilyak or Joe Bader.
A-8021047, Salazar y Rosillo, Maria Eugenia.
A-8065201, Salvagni, Romana P.
A-8065558, Schmidt, Gerhardt.
A-7777068, Siu, Rene Kui Sang.
A-6935912, Sozener, Talat Mehmet.
A-4305963, Telenkevich, Roman or Rom Levoff or Roy Levoff or Rom G. Leveff or Roman Levoff.
A-5947913, Toftbo, Christian Marius Hansen or Christian Hansen.
A-7270021, Trailov, Michel Aurel.
A-3738998, Tsolakis, Alexander Nicholas or Alexander Tolakis.
A-5716753, Uruburu, Dionisio.
A-7520905, Wallace, Tane Sato.
A-7927523, Warnock, Margaret Sophia.
A-4871361, Weidemann, Paul Friedrich Wilhelm or Paul Whitman.
A-4095822, Weski, Richard or Richard Edward Bock.
A-4422466, Young, Frances Annie.
A-7188521, Zapata-Estrada, Eliodoro.
A-7189192, Gonzalez de Estrada, Juana.
A-9777456, Ali, Jobed.
A-6059403, Alvarado, Reyes.
A-6255531, Anter, Zeki.
A-5280826, Ansaldi, Vincent John.
A-2111959, Assini, Nicola.
A-1849521, Barisci, Nicola.
A-5468680, Berryere, Edmund Adam or Edward A. Beurjay or Eduard A. Beurgey.
A-8015669, Brown, Barbara Lee.
A-4502440, Cazes, Sara (nee Tovi).
A-49113252, Charlebois, Amable.
A-4459280, Chrysogellos, Constantinos or Kostantinos Chrysogelos or Gust A. Heyogelos.
A-7399025, Chung, May Ong Soo Hoo or Mrs. Kei Thing Chung or May Chung.
A-7034870, Corby, Dolores Marie.
A-5721062, Cords, Warner John.
A-8065109, Cortina-Lugo, Amelia Isabel.
A-5097419, Crone, Bernward Clemmens.
A-5438270, Crone, Emilie Preis.
A-2294159, Cymbalak, Paraska (nee Eylicz).
A-1461428, De Acosta, Bonifacia Gonzalez Jiminez Vda.
A-1824135, Deluca, Antonio.
A-6075376, Depositar, Carlito Menez.
A-1969177, De Rivera, Elivra Meraz.
A-1738155, De Sotelo, Felicitas Pettet.
A-6260968, De Yapor, Suzanne Boulos Vda or Suzanne Boeles.
A-7415334, Evans, Stanley Arthur Eugene.
A-7141714, Fagiolo, Gaetano Mario.
A-7375898, Garcia, Emeterio.
A-7999537, Chavez, Santos.
A-1194519, Ghio, Gino Stefano.
A-7439155, Hadjipapas, Daniel A. or Daniel Apostle Hadjipapas or Daniel Papas.
A-4378525, Harris, Eugene Oscar.
A-8065110, Hollweg, Michael.
A-7010933, Isaac, Joseph Arthur Lionel Mac.
A-4898215, Kikunaga, Sunao or Sunao Uchimura or Joe Sunao Uchimura.
A-7491914, Kommas, Georgios or George Komas.
A-5820528, Law, Baw King.
A-2879426, Leisner, Solomon David or Sol or Solly Leisner.
A-6239049, Lindner, Josephine Mary Bernadette formerly Konetzke (nee Judek).
A-4112473, Malone, Patrick Joseph.
A-7450415, Mamakos, Anna (nee Tsampa).
A-7476956, Marshall, Katharine, formerly Katharina Roider or Kathie Roider.
A-8001108, Martinez-Cunpian, Ignacio.
A-3359515, Matsumoto, Iwaichi.
A-7417121, Maxeiner, James Christian or Wolfgang Christian Maxeiner or Wolfgang Wagner.
A-7417122, Maxeiner, Regine Lieselotte or Regine Lieselotte Wagner.
A-1616724, McLeod, Albert Gordon.
A-3047457, Miles, Asten, Newton.
A-3972375, Mukai, Masutaro.
A-5471793, Nakamura, Fumio.
A-5127656, Neblett, Fitzgerald.
A-3105729, Nicolas, Francisco Espiritu.
A-5693482, Nobis, Stanley Paul or Sammy Baker.
A-5874658, Paksoy, Ali B.
A-6978312, Palmer, Dorothy Helen or Helen Dorothy Sage.
A-7476662, Panagoulias, Leonidas Panagiotis.
A-6491555, Pedraza, Lois Luna or Luz Luna or Lois Luna.
A-1879627, Perez, Amable (nee Rodriguez Vigil).
A-5305029, Pfennig, Ewald Edmond.
A-7240126, Pieczynski, Jacqueline formerly Jacquelene Vanden Abeele or Vanden.
A-4097984, Plistakas, Constantinos or Costas.
A-6432753, Samarrai, Saleh Mahdi.
A-7117999, Sanchez, Tomas Sanchez.
A-8065160, Sconion, Esther A. or Esther Anna Petratschek.
A-4840284, Serrano, Maria Vicenta Sanz or Sister Mary Frances.
A-2231536, Soza-Farias, Eduardo.
A-7244173, Staples, Stanley Sewell.
A-4972300, Teagle, Betty Elliott.
A-4035079, Torres, Manuel.
A-4035017, Torres, Manuela.
A-6110841, Valero-Delgado Jesus.
A-5916783, Weston, Joseph Reginald.
A-1680255, William, Carmen Rosas or Carmen Rosas De Ramirez.
A-7383179, Adams, Angela (nee Angelina Anderson).
A-6196547, Akselrad, Solomon Bernard.
A-5642579, Alley, Katherine (nee Toews).
A-6151392, Alvarado-Cano, Flavio Pastor.
A-8082311, Anderson, Frank Batchelor.
A-7130227, Atilano, Francisco.
A-7130226, Atilano, Ana Maria.
A-7071882, Barron, Anni or Anni Naumann De Barron or Anni Naumann.
A-7445972, Barron, Gloria or Glorida Naumann.
A-3239152, Bond, Margaret Virginia.
A-3221771, Bowditch, Roy Oliver.
A-1851396, Burt, Doris nee Caley.
A-7982124, Calwood, Reginald.
A-5906357, Carlstrom, Isak Asle.
A-5395968, Carstens, Frederick Adolph.
A-6960468, Carver, Charles Emanuel or Charles Emmanuel Carver.
A-7999438, Ceballos, Ricardo or Ricardo Ceballos-Flores.
A-7841748, Chen, George.
A-7178974, Chien, Chin Chang.
A-7873618, Ciccone, Ann Niccore (nee Anne Nykorchuk).
A-7726223, Cochran, Dorothy Helen (nee Reeves).
A-1811011, Cole, Frederick.
A-7287827, Cortez, Pablo Martinez.
A-7287826, De Martinez, Manuela Covarrubias.
A-5860916, Dahl, Sara Mathilda.
A-5860915, Dahl, Reinert Andreas.
A-8065587, De Carmona, Amada Davila.
A-7137146, De Gomez, Guadalupe Alvarez.
A-8065586, De La Cruz, Ofelia Sanchez.
A-4696639, Demko, John.
A-6318631, De Nino, Domitila Cardoza.
A-7469079, De Reyes, Salvadora Valencia.
A-3568850, De Saiza, Tomasa Garcia or Tomasa Garcia-Ruiz.
A-5043988, Dittman, Frank.
A-5664179, Doherty, Daniel.
A-5505784, Dyer, James Wilson.
A-7089740, Elkins, Gertrude or Gertrude Blanc-Paques (nee Gertrude Braun).
A-7439842, Engel, Ervin or Erwin Engel.
A-7962193, Engelstad, Sigfred Leonard.
A-7983345, Evangelatos, Gerassimos or Gerassimos Gregorio Evangelatos.
A-7388544, Fleming, Maria Elizabeth (nee Smith).
A-5287014, Francescon, Vincent alias Vincent or Vincenzo Francescon Centa.
A-3181040, Fritz, Frank or Franz Fritz or Fereenc Fritz.
A-2978254, Galotolo, Giosue.
A-7978754, Garcia-Armendariz, Lorenzo.
A-4368320, Garganese, Mario.
A-6989455, Goldstein, or Manuel Goldstein.
A-6093692, Greenfield, Ann or Alfrida Alice Coats.
A-7278037, Guerrini, Edoardo.
A-7276309, Guerrini, Ivo John.
A-7439759, Guerrini, Mary Morgene.
A-1318742, Haktsian, Sam Souren or Souren Haktsian.
A-3767437, Hayes, James or James Edgar Hayes.
A-5714984, Hennings, Bruno Christian.
A-4057457, Hirsch, Eugen.
A-5057006, Hon, Chan or Hon Chan alias Hon Tsang Jen Hon.
A-7127511, Ibarra, Rafael Villarreal.
A-8065619, De Villarreal, Guadalupe Mendez.
A-4396904, Ivulich, Steve.
A-7240871, Jalomo, Julio.
A-7185318, Jersky, Albert.
A-4256768, Johnson, Herbert Henry.
A-8065653, Johnson, Paul Stephen Van or Paul Stephen Adams.
A-5358800, Kaufman, Jack.
A-7961885, Kisser, Joseph J.
A-7173937, Kwong, Lun Esun.
A-7173938, Kwong, Chu Hsin Te.
A-5714630, Lee, Chen Hwang.
A-5746859, Leszczynski, Franciszek or Frank Bawrs or Bowrs.
A-7903007, Lo, Sophie Chang.
A-6932090, Lo, Chaun Ming.
A-7366934, Long, Wolf Dieter.
A-6757511, Loza-Samano, Jesus.
A-7036622, Marcil, Claire Yvette.
A-7145863, Marques, Antonio Rosario.
A-5720963, McCrossan, Edna Margaret or Edna May McCrossan (nee Edna May Gerard).
A-8014971, McLean, David Scott.
A-3354568, Michalas, Andrianna (nee Karamaludis) or Anna Michalas.
A-6971394, Mihalik, Dorothy Esther or Dorothy Ester Clark or Dorothy Esther Normore.
A-6163611, Miranda, Silviano Linares.
A-5387212, Moore, Archibald Alexander.
A-6405500, Murillo-Urrutia, Andres or Andres Urrutia.
A-7476968, Myllyluoma, Aaree or Millbrooke.
A-8031687, Naval, Vivencia Cortes.
A-6030070, Nicolas-Nosser, Roberto.
A-7243439, Octavo, Maria Midoriza or Midorisa Octavo.

A-7388945, Padilla-Acosta, Arturo or Arturo-Padilla-Lopez.
A-1776480, Parisi, Antonio.
A-6304394, Piaskowski, Vera Knittel.
A-4367073, Pike, Samuel Wilfrid.
A-6122624, Pineda, Pablo Lara alias Pablo Pineda-Lara.
A-5642393, Pitman, Edith.
A-4130346, Poy, Chin Gem or Gem Poy Chin.
A-3080744, Ramirez-Madrenas, Jose alias Jose Miramontes-Madrenas.
A-7222463, Raynor, Ernest Albert or Cecil Rose.
A-7483247, Reyes-Torres, Luis.
A-7115960, Riederer, Bertram.
A-4804177, Romano, Vittorio.
A-7097846, Rosenthal, Chajem.
A-3241243, Rossel, Carl Kastor R.
A-6916253, Salcido, Ana.
A-6916259, Salcido, Cruz.
A-1592819, Samuel, James Joseph or James J. Samuel or James Samuel or Samuels.
A-5060340, Savalli, Pierto Francesco Vittorio.
A-3319534, Savarese, Salvatore Francesco.
A-5041385, Schneir, Fred.
A-4355081, Schneir, Rose.
A-4358547, Serkovsky, Paul.
A-2275131, Setian, Yebrakse.
A-3740348, Simon, Harry Hollingsworth or Harry Simon.
A-4894923, Skou, Niels Adam.
A-6036506, Slonlecki, Frank Roman.
A-7896040, Smith, Consuelo Wood (nee Consuelo Coscolluela) formerly Consuelo Wood.
A-4432788, Spanopoulos, Christo George or Christ George Nicoff.
A-6587910, St. Clair, Alice May (nee Stearns).
A-2836148, Stone, Idris William.
A-7491031, Tammerk, Heino.
A-6433599, Tejada, Enrique Manuel.
A-2643864, Temelco, Bogoia or Simeon Bogoia Temelco or Andrianos Dauliane or Dimitre Elia.
A-1877205, Ternowcky, Metro or Mitro Tarnowsky.
A-6797621, Theobalds, Thomas Richard.
A-7675220, Treharne, Arthur.
A-7174592, Troupos, Gerasimos or Jerry Gresto Troupos.
A-9799902, Ventura, Morris Malki.
A-3418149, Villa, Jesus.
A-3255727, Wallace, Mary C. or Maria Caratachea-Murillo or Mary Eleanor Caratchea.
A-4454542, Watari, Fujiko Ono.
A-5834187, Waterbury, Annie Adela nee Tomich or Anna Adele Talmadge.
A-8065852, White, John Henry.
A-7995813, Ybarra-Beltran, Jose or Jose Beltran Ybarra.
A-4710509, Zeissel, Johan or John Zeissel or Johan Ziessel or John Zeissel or John Giessel.
A-2031378, Zerbes, George.
A-3411714, Zitz, Peter or Peter Zic.
A-3561557, Altman, Morris or Moses Chaim Altman.
A-7383102, Avila-Alamillo, Vicente.
A-7982087, Avilez, Robert G. or Roberto Gonzalez.
A-5522969, Barton, Donald Eugene formerly Donald Eugene Danis.
A-7967508, Benavides, Martin Gomez or Jose Bocanegra.
A-6589860, Bien, Edward M.
A-7991289, Bien, Frederick S.
A-3928521, Bostwick, Mary or Baszczak (nee Skulmouski).
A-3928527, Bostwick, Anthony or Baszczak.
A-3515051, Bruninga, Charles Martin Lambertus or Charles Martin Brunings.
A-7172911, Buday, Joseph.
A-4852574, Cairo, Raffaele or Ralph Cairo.
A-6226066, Capo-Porcel, Jaime.
A-6815867, De Capo, Maria Luisa Carrasco Masia.
A-2974118, Casanova, Amelia Amalia Battalian.
A-6027147, Chew, William.
A-6862662, Chun, Young Sil formerly Young Sil Song.
A-5067874, Colantonio, Michele or Michael Colantonio.
A-7636645, Cons-Sierra, Salvador.
A-8021744, De Cons, Apolonia Jalomo or Maria Preciado Apolonia Jalomo De Cons.
A-2590881, De Arreguin, Maria Luisa Lopez.
A-8021433, De Carrizal, Imelda Ramirez or Imelda Ramirez-Melgarejo.
A-8022381, De Ceja, Jessie Ramirez or Jessie R. Ceja.
A-7032178, De Chavez, Ramona Alvarado or Ramona Alvarado.
A-5537926, De Dobbelaere, Jules Gerard.
A-3600370, De Lagunas, Tomasa Avia.
A-4506242, De Nardis, Giuseppe or Francesco Maenza.
A-5173731, De Urias, Dolores Valenzuela Vda.
A-5695363, Diaz, Gregorio C.
A-3248479, Eastman, Albert Edward.
A-4468846, Eisenkraft, Leib or Leo Eisenkraft.
A-3178194, Ernst, Christine Emily (Nee Pfeiffer) or Christina E. Ernst or Christine or Christine Emilia Ernst or Christina Emily Ernst or Geliert or Christine Ernst.
A-3397989, Fizuleto, Joseph Sime or Sam Filston.
A-7112445, Floyd, Frank formerly Frank Gunther Helden.
A-6936800, Floyd, Margit formerly Margit Froeschle.
A-6936798, Floyd Vera formerly Vera Froeschle.
A-7222858, Gabbard, Caroline Bartley.
A-2152960, Garza-Solis, Maria Celia.
A-3093169, George, Paul S. or Pavlos Stergos Georgas.
A-8057526, Giberson, Harold Donald.
A-2245088, Gonzalez, Candido Munumer.
A-2432886, Gonzalez-Cacio, Francisco.
A-5095262, Guaneri, Domenico Vincenzo or Dominick V. or Domenico or Vincent Guaneri or Guarnieri.
A-6086734, Gutierrez-Valdez, Eliseo.
A-6086735, Gutierrez-Valdez, Engracia.
A-6340356, Halekakis, Catherine or Halecakis.
A-3516979, Henrich, Michael.
A-552630, Hoffman, Julia or Yulia Hoffman (nee Schneider).
A-5150213, Homling, Elizabeth.
A-4321700, Huntsinger, Muriel Lottie Gilmore.
A-4514532, Iannoti, Rosa.
A-7450575, Irwin, Marian Kirstine nee Plummer.
A-7828444, Kann, Hubert.
A-4691765, Karabetian, Karabed.
A-6950224, Kazemir, Ileg or John Kazemir or Ivan Kazemir or Iwan Kazemir of Alex Casmer.
A-4612811, Kelley, Margaret Mary (nee McLellan).
A-4594506, Kotlowski, Sepp Theodor or Sepp Haase.
A-4871440, Koroneos, Anastasios or Tom Koronas.
A-5403367, Kotler, Malka or Molly Kotler.
A-7140426, Kozuchowicz, Murray or Moszek Kozuchowicz.
A-6253764, Kuber, Shriniwas Ramchandra.
A-9024247, Laakso, Yrjo Tuomo.
A-4058990, La Fontaine, Maurice.
A-4502672, La Fontaine, Marie Anne.
A-6486996, Latam, Arthur Wallace.
A-6942810, Lazanis, Antonions or Anthony Lazanis.
A-7193919, Lemacks, Roger Emile.
A-1921296, Livanos, Demetrios or James.
A-2675323, Lui, Mock Yu or Mock Shee or Mrs. Chew Tin Hang.
A-6778171, Maher, Margaret or Margaret McCluskey.
A-7273981, Mauga, Lisi or Lisi Atoa Mauga.
A-7284205, McCord, Louise or Nan Louise Ling.
A-5387769, Meofas, Markos Demetrius or Mydfyas.
A-7978913, Millstead, Joyce Louise or Joyce Louise Livingstone.
A-6609065, Nassr, Farid Selim.
A-5456318, Navarro-Castellano, Elias.
A-7092849, Negr, Fong Foo or Fong Poo Ngar or Nagn or Nger.
A-7994324, Ocampo-Arivaldo, Alejandro.
A-7995672, De Ocampo, Maria Inez Loza.
A-6309970, Olivarez, Hipolito or Hipolito Olivarez-Martinez.
A-7112390, Pizano-Pizano, Jesus.
A-7961855, Radabaugh, Margaret Georgina (nee Harmon).
A-8082937, Ramos, Fredy Requilman.
A-7392116, Ramos-Gomez, Alfredo.
A-5169343, Reis, Francis Elizabeth (nee Kuntz).
A-7279544, Rice, David.
A-7809128, Rodriguez-Carreon, Victoria or Victoria Rodriguez.
A-3764147, Salamone, Anthony.
A-3659910, Salamone, Bettina.
A-6887723, Santos, Eulogio Gamboa Delos.
A-5315431, Sarkissian, Mariam or Maron.
A-7022058, Sauve, Jack Robert.
A-2253351, Sawyer, Anne Mary or Anna Mary Zauner.
A-7859006, Siprut, Marcus.
A-7915114, Sloan, Judithe Hilda.
A-3920557, Snyder, Goldie Jennie.
A-5882285, Stettinius, Alois Max.
A-5920446, Stevens, Isabelle or Isabelle Boyd.
A-6159612, Tchou, Jen-yen or Robert Jen Yen Tchou.
A-4685129, Timpano, Rosarina or Rosarina (Rena) Grispo.
A-6281312, Velasquez, Inez.
A-6281309, Velasquez, Estevan.
A-6281310, Velasquez, Socorro.
A-6281311, Velasquez, Consuelo.
A-2847879, Viscovich, John Mario.
A-1939436, Wehkamp, Rosalia Lauria or Rosalia Lauria or Rose Loria.
A-1361297, Wiley, Gwendoline Freda or Anderson or Tarchuk or Gross (nee Gibbons).
A-6140022, Winter, Jean or Jane Nicol.
A-6610610, Wong, Levinia Mah (nee Mah You Bow).
A-3462496, Zorrozua, Julian or Juan Julian Zorrozua.
A-4642179, Olazabel, Florentino Fernandez.
A-6497497, Roski, Bernhard Bruno.
A-5133230, Ades, Mary.
A-6096661, Balgobin, Frank Fitzgerald.
A-6643640, Balgobin, Pearl Lina (nee Rampersaud).
A-5097931, Ballis, Athanasios or Balis or Athanatios Balis.
A-3943358, Ciocca, Nicola.
A-5405881, Di Meglio, Maria (nee Eraso).
A-5880437, Flores-Carrera, Paz or Paz C. Flores or Paz Flores.
A-1386464, Gambera, Peter.
A-6549981, Girard, Dorothy formerly Strike.
A-7203083, Gonzalez, Hilario or Hilario Gonzalez-Lopez.
A-7203082, Gonzalez, Benito.
A-1924383, Hall, Eileen Haswell (nee Haswell) or Massey.
A-4533972, Higa, Kameko.
A-4343489, Ho, Beyne.
A-5163122, Kwartz, Michael Joseph.
A-7286275, Lew, Alfred.
A-4278368, Liljeback, Eric Daniel.
A-6289673, Louda, Svatava.
A-3861135, Malinow, Charles or Charles Malinoff.
A-7902278, McPherson, Keith Ivan.
A-5428637, Nobumoto, Zeichi or Kumaichi Kakimoto or Kumaso Kakimoto.
A-2884897, Pagonis, Constantinos or Gust Pagonis or Gustas Pagonis or Gust N. Pagonis.
A-3556858, Rodriguez, Gerardo H. or Gerardo Rodriguez or Gerardo Herrera Rodriguez or Lale Rodriguez.
A-7145663, Rojas, Vicente.
A-3656758, Rubinstein, Jenny Hermane.

A-2642843, Rutkowski, Witold Feliks.
A-2383051, Rutkowski, Natalia.
A-9782898, Sanles, Ricardo Gomez.
A-7558952, Seki, Yoshiko.
A-9073679, Skultety, Julius Harry.
A-5699758, Smith, Jean.
A-6925979, Sturgeon, Ethel Smith or Ethel Belt.
A-1901786, Vela, Lazaro Francisco or Frank Vda.
A-7383891, Wilson, Raymond Murdoch.
A-6026025, Horvat, Marica or Marijana Ivana Frischauer or Marianne Grossmann.
A-2002057, Friedrich, Louise Martha also known as Louisa or Luise Friedrich.
A-7828192, Koutroulis, Antonios.
A-7828193, Koutroulis, Catherine.
A-6624327, Dwyer, Patrick John.
A-7519920, Cohen, Erna Elsa or Erna Elsa Kahl.
A-7517302, Cohen, Friedrich or Friedrich Cohen.
A-5669440, Shamash, Jack Edward.
A-7240574, Balouris, Ionis also known as John Balioures.
A-6857643, Eisenberg, Emanuel.
A-7445919, Kloss, Wanda Victoria.
A-7886757, Kloss, Theodore Peter (Durbacz).
A-4211013, Chillemi, Sebastiano.
0300-24315, Yuan, Chien Shiung or Chien-Shiun Wu Yuan.
A-6717384, Halabi, Nour Eddine.
0300-314686, Birbach, Lars Ernesto.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 24, line 14, insert the following:
"A-4531462, Szilvassy, Joseph.
"A-6920123, Ortiz-Torres, Manuel or Manuel Ortiz.
"A-9632210, Tountasakis, Zania Nikonos or Zonnis Tountaosakis.
"A-7821493, Ridgeway, Tong Suk Lee nee Lee aka Dong Shuk Lee Ridgeway.
"A-4813240, Gallagher, Marjorie Alice (nee Hopkins).
"A-7385522, Haring, Olga Munk.
"A-7385518, Haring Tibor James."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERKKI MAINIO SAKARI SALO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1126) for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELGA JOSEFA WILEY

The Clerk called the bill H. R. 1159) for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley, German wife of Harold Wiley, a United States citizen and member of the United States Armed Forces, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in her case of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK GEORGE BOUGHTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1707) for the relief of Frederick George Boughton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Frederick George Boughton, of Windsor, Ontario, Dominion of Canada, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFONSO GATTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2217) for the relief of Alfonso Gatti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Alfonso Gatti, as of July 31, 1949, the date he entered the United States legally as a visitor. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota of Italy for the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alfonso Gatti shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TOWA TANOUE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2352) for the relief of Mrs. Towa Tanoue.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Towa Tanoue, a former resident of the United States and the mother of veterans of World War II. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, Mrs. Towa Tanoue shall be held and considered to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. OLYMPIA CUC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2601) for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, warrant, or order of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien, Mrs. Olympia Cuc, wife of Charles Cuc, a United States citizen residing in Detroit, Mich. The said Mrs. Olympia Cuc shall not be subject hereafter to deportation by reason of the same facts and circumstances upon which such warrants or orders have been issued. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Olympia Cuc shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Olympia Cuc shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUI KIN CHUN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3426) for the relief of Sui Kin Chun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Sui Kin Chun, the minor unmar-

ried child of Violet Mew Chun, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LAU HONG SHEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3523) for the relief of Mrs. Lau Hong Shee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, Mrs. Lau Hong Shee, shall be held and considered to be a returning resident alien.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORBERTO LINAZA YRIGOYEN AND MARIA JOSEFA MASEDA LOPEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4561) for the relief of Norberto Linaza Yrigoyen and Maria Josefa Maseda Lopez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Norberto Linaza Yrigoyen and Maria Josefa Maseda Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNGO TSUTSUMI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5180) for the relief of Jungo Tsutsumi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jungo Tsutsumi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGARETTE G. COOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of Mrs. Margarette G. Cook.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WINSTON BROS. CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5841) for the relief of Winston Bros. Co., and the Utah Construction Co.; Roy L. Bair & Co.; James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terteling & Sons., Inc.; and T. E. Connolly, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render findings of fact as to the amount of increased costs, if any, incurred by the following named contractors as a result of, or attributable to, the disruption or delay of construction work schedules under the following numbered Bureau of Reclamation contracts, respectively, arising out of, or connected with, insufficiency of appropriated funds for payment of normal construction contract earnings during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948: Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co., contracts Nos. 12r-16197 and 12r-16796; Roy L. Blair & Co. and James Crick & Sons, contract No. 12r-16203; J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc., contract No. 12r-16745; and T. E. Connolly, Inc., contract No. 12r-16311.

SEC. 2. The court shall cause such findings to be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each contractor named in the first section of this act the amount, respectively, set forth in such findings.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co.; Roy L. Bair & Co., and James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terterling & Sons, Inc.; and T. E. Connolly, Inc., for losses in connection with contracts Nos. 12r-16197 and 12r-16796; 12r-16203; 12r-16745; and 12r-16311, with the Bureau of Reclamation during the year 1948: *Provided*, That any suit brought under the provisions of this act shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of the approval thereof.

"Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRENE PROIOS (NEE VAGIANOS)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4760) for the relief of Irene Proios.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Irene Proios (nee Vagianos) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREGG TED LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5206) for the relief of Gregg Ted Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Gregg Ted Lewis (Georg Schram), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Fred T. Lewis, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOUNG WAI KIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5618) for the relief of Young Wai Kit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924 as amended shall be held to be applicable to Young Wai Kit, the minor unmarried child of Yong Quock Tung, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEINZ KARL DOEGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5435) for the relief of Heinz Karl Doege.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Heinz Karl Doege may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRACY ANN CORLEY (ELISABETH LECORCHE)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6515) for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor

child of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Robert C. Corley, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISAMI YOSHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6712) for the relief of Hisami Yoshida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Hisami Yoshida, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Roy Martin Siegert, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment.

On lines 5 and 6 strike out the words "any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship," and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSE MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6903) for the relief of Rose Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Rose Martin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Colonel and Mrs. L. A. Burbank, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIYOSHI NABESHIMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6904) for the relief of Kiyoshi Nabeshima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act, the minor child, Kiyoshi Nabeshima, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Robert L. Meiver, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND SCOTT HILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6915) for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Raymond Scott Hill, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Johnson Hill, Jr., citizens of the United States. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act, the said Raymond Scott Hill may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUNKO ARIMA AND YURI ARIMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6942) for the relief of Junko Arima and Yuri Arima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Junko Arima and Yuri Arima, the minor children of Teruko Arima, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALD A. AND LYNN W. ROEHM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6978) for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Capt. and Mrs. John F. Roehm, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEVORK ZOHRAB BANDARIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6983) for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gevork Zohrab Bandarian (also known as Gowerk Buneriyan and George Z. Sandarian and George Zachary Sandarian) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIYAKO TODA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7054) for the relief of Miyako Toda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Miyako Toda, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Kenneth J. Hendershot, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROL R. GRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7477) for the relief of Carol R. Gray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Carol R. Gray, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Handy Gray, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA BOSCO LOMONACO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7565) for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Anna Bosco Lomonaco, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Lomonaco, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNALYN EARLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7665) for the relief of Annalyn Earley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Annalyn Earley, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Douglas C. Earley, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE LUISE ELFRIEDE STEINIGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7667) for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the moral turpitude clause in section 3, of Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, an immigration visa may be issued to Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger, the fiancée of Sgt. Daniel P. McMenamin, United States Air Force: *Provided*, That she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws and regulations.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the marriage between the said Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger and her fiancé, Sgt. Daniel P. McMenamin, United States Air Force, occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES I. CHATTIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6274) to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Charles I. Chattin a patent in fee for the following-described lands allotted to him on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in Montana: Lot 8, section 34, township 34 north, range 6 west and the northwest quarter southeast quarter section 32, township 34 north, range 6 west.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WONG GOOK YING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6938) for the relief of Wong Gook Ying.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Wong Gook Ying, the minor, unmarried child of Mrs. Wong Mar Suey Gong, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOZIE LINCOLN DONALSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6969) to effect entry of a minor child adopted by United States citizens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act, the minor child, Bozie Lincoln Donalson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. Bozie Lincoln Donalson, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER ROUSETOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7164) for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Metritikas, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GISELA HELEN SNOWDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7713) for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gisela Helen Snowdy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROF. WERNER RICHTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7833) for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of subsection (b) of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, shall not be held to be applicable to Prof. Werner Richter: *Provided*, That the said Prof. Werner Richter return to the United States for permanent residence within 2 years following the effective date of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the name "Richter", insert "and Prof. Max Horkheimer."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "Prof. Werner Richter" and insert "persons."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEOPOLD LAUFER AND ELFRIEDE LAUFER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7850) for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Adam Roth, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HILDEGARD HOBMEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8163) for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the alien, Hildegard Hobmeier, the German fiancée of Melvin C. Fehnel, sergeant in the United States Armed Forces and a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Hildegard Hobmeier is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Melvin C. Fehnel, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Hobmeier, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Hildegard Hobmeier, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Hildegard Hobmeier as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LAND IN RUSSELL COUNTY, ALA.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2582) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a sufficient time at the tolerance of the Speaker to say a few words about the voluntary retirement of the gentleman from California, Mr. JACK ANDERSON, my colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of you know that one of our colleagues from the California delegation, Mr. JACK ANDERSON, is voluntarily retiring from Congress this year.

We regret to see Mr. ANDERSON retire from Congress, but we realize he feels that it is necessary to go back to California to manage his business, that of an orchardist, growing the finest pears in the United States. In fact, the finest quality pears in the world according to Jack.

Mr. ANDERSON has served in the United States Congress for nearly 14 years. He came here in the Seventy-sixth Congress. He has served with distinction as a member of the Armed Services Committee, originally the Naval Affairs Committee. He distinguished himself in a study in collaboration with his colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] in cataloging the materials used by the armed services, and that study when it is completed will save this Nation millions and millions of dollars. He has always made himself available for service and has given genuinely of his advice and counsel to new Members of Congress. He was a loyal and dependable member of the Republican policy committee and his judgment on party matters was frequently sought. JACK ANDERSON was a third generation native of California. His father served as a member of the California Legislature. We will miss him here in the House and we hope he will enjoy good health and success during his retirement.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], came here with me in the Seventy-sixth Congress and was sworn in on January 3, 1939. He came from a very important agricultural undertaking which he has had to let get along as best it could in recent years. It is my understanding that the gentleman's pear orchard in California ships as many as 165 carloads to the eastern markets every year, and that is indeed a substantial undertaking.

We regret very much having him leave the House of Representatives but we can fully understand that the time can indeed arrive when enough is enough. I am sure there are other in the Congress who would like to retire from Congress, for economic reasons, but they cannot bring themselves to make the break. JACK ANDERSON and his charming wife and daughter will be missed very much by all of us. We wish Jack the best of luck in all his undertakings, and will expect him to return from time to time so that he may not be accused of doing the old soldier act by just fading away.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the announcement a few months ago by the gentleman from California that he had decided not to run for reelection was just as much of a surprise to the Members of the California delegation as it was to the other Members of Congress. He will be greatly missed. We know this now, but it will be only after his return to his pear orchards and the rolling hills of San Juan Bautista that the people of the State as well as the people in Washington will know how much he did for them, quietly and effectively.

All of the time JACK ANDERSON has been in Congress he has been our delegation's leader in all matters relating to the State's agriculture. When he came to Congress, 70 percent of California's economy was agricultural. Now that we have gained in population, and balanced agriculture and industry, agriculture still remains the greatest single interest and often the greatest problem of our Representatives.

His contacts, his friendships, and his influence have meant more to all parts of the State than is generally realized.

We wish him all the success in the world. We envy him the prospect of sitting on his patio and looking over the blossoming pear orchards, and we bespeak for him the best of hunting and fishing for many long years to come.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to express my sincere regrets at the determination of my good friend from California, JACK ANDERSON, to retire from Congress. He has been a splendid public servant, serving with honor and distinction as a member of the committees supervising our national-defense preparations. He worked with diligence and great ability. The knowledge he contributed was an invaluable contribution to the committees. He has assiduously applied himself to all phases of his work as a legislator. He won the respect and admiration of his followers through his unfailing courtesy and his outstanding ability. As he returns to California we hope that he may enjoy many, many years of happiness and health.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with our colleagues from California and others in the House in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from California, JACK ANDERSON. I sincerely regret to see Jack leave this distinguished body.

It has been my pleasure to have known him these 12 years I have served in the Congress. He is my friend. I have always observed him to be fair. We know of his capabilities and the outstanding service he has rendered not only to his own district and State but to the United States of America.

He has performed faithfully and well his duties. We will miss him here; the country is losing a great public servant.

I wish for him, his wife, and family, joy and happiness and continued success.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, JACK Z. ANDERSON has served in the House of Representatives for 14 years. Curiously, his congressional career is a sort of contradiction. In 1938, when the Republicans were looking for a candidate in the district in which Jack lived, they drafted him. He was not very enthused about seeking the job, but he was persuaded to try for it.

More interesting is the fact that he was at that time an organizer for the Associated Farmers. This was a group of rugged individualists engaged in agriculture who took a militant stand and attitude in the protection of their industry and in safeguarding their rights. At that time it was not supposed to be good politics to have the name of an Associated Farmer on the petition of any candidate, to say nothing of having an Associated Farmer as an actual candidate himself. I venture to say that most of the people who voted for Jack in his first try for Congress had some qualms about doing so because of the fact that he was an Associated Farmer.

Then he had another odd circumstance, which was not according to the orthodox methods of doing politics in California. As everyone knows, Mr. Hoover, the last Republican President, had gotten into considerable disfavor by the continual, and in my opinion, unwarranted and sometimes unreasonable criticism by the leading men in the New Deal party. They were able, by incessant criticism, to establish in the mind of a great part of the public that Mr. Hoover was personally to blame for the great depression of 1929. I think that any objective person will realize that this blame was unwarranted. Forces were at work, which neither Mr. Hoover nor anyone else could have controlled, that finally culminated in the great depression of 1929.

So in 1938 Mr. Hoover was still in disfavor with many people. He was one of the great supporters of and made a great speech for JACK ANDERSON in San Jose.

Then other odd and contradictory circumstances of our friend developed. Being a farmer at the time he came to Congress, he determined that the proper place for him would be on the

Agriculture Committee. But his aspiration in that regard was frustrated because there was no vacancy on the committee and he did not get the assignment. He was placed on some minor committee. Later he got a chance to go on the Naval Affairs Committee with the understanding that as soon as an opening occurred on the Agriculture Committee he would get that opening. On the Naval Affairs Committee he became a very active member and also became intensely interested in the matters which that committee considered. Consequently, when later he was offered a place on the Agriculture Committee he refused to relinquish his post on the Naval Affairs Committee and remained on it until the present day.

All these odd and contradictory incidents in the congressional life of JACK ANDERSON, I believe, could be properly termed highly constructive and fruitful contradictions.

His knowledge of agriculture prompted his later selection as chairman of the California delegation Committee on Agriculture. Here he has done a magnificent piece of work for his State and for California agriculture.

I doubt if there is anyone in this House who would question the assertion that JACK Z. ANDERSON is a very constructive and capable Congressman. I believe this is primarily due to two outstanding traits in his character. First, he gets along very well with people. He has a faculty of winning the confidence of the men and women with whom he deals. No matter how much he may differ with, or perhaps be disappointed at, the conduct of a fellow Member, he always respects the views of his colleague and continues to be friendly and agreeable to that colleague. He knows how to get along with people and people have confidence in him. Part of this is due to his absolute integrity. I will mention merely one case which I think is typical of the character of JACK ANDERSON. He once made some very violent, and later it turned out to be unreasonable, criticisms of the Veterans' Administration personnel at the Palo Alto Hospital in California. He based his criticism on facts and statements furnished him by people in whom he had confidence. Later it was shown and proven to Mr. ANDERSON'S satisfaction that his criticisms were unwarranted. He promptly and publicly confessed that he had been misled and apologized for making these unreasonable criticisms. When the truth became known, he promptly took steps to establish himself on the side of the truth.

Also, JACK ANDERSON is a very hard and effective worker. He takes care of the chores of his constituents. He takes his committee work seriously and participates regularly and actively in the work of the committee of which he is a member. He is beloved by all his colleagues in the House who know him at all. He has offered some very constructive legislation as well as participating in the drafting and preparation of many bills which have become law. He was the author of the Del Monte Naval Graduate School. He is the author of the single armed services catalog, which I think is a very important bill and which was developed and finally came to fruition through the continual drive and effort of JACK Z. ANDERSON.

Our friend can look back on his congressional career with much pride and satisfaction. He has hundreds of devoted friends in the Congress who are very sorry he is leaving us. He has thousands of admiring and satisfied constituents who would like to see their Congressman continue to represent them. I do not believe he has a critic in the House of Representatives, and yet he is a man who takes a very positive stand for the convictions which he holds. In what better position could a fellow leave the House of Representatives than to know that his colleagues who have served with him, who have known him intimately, are all his friends. Those of us in our delegation who have served with him for a number of sessions of Congress are sorry to lose this congenial friend and capable worker. We wish him every success that his ability, his loyalty, his energy and courage so richly deserve.

JACK ANDERSON has one minor vice. He claims he is a very good fisherman. He and the Speaker frequently go on fishing trips. However, some of us would prefer to take the word of our beloved Speaker as to JACK ANDERSON'S skill as a fisherman rather than the statement of Mr. ANDERSON himself.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HILLINGS].

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying tribute to a great statesman, one of our very fine colleagues in this House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. The House is going to miss him when he voluntarily retires and the State of California will miss his services a great deal.

Those of us who came here as new Members of the House in recent years are going to particularly miss him as will those who come hereafter as new Members of this body. I know of the many occasions that Mr. ANDERSON has sat with us who were serving as freshman Members of the House of Representatives, and we are grateful to him for his advice and counsel.

We wish him Godspeed in his plans for the future.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tributes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON]. My colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] has expressed my sentiments so well that I merely want to echo his remarks and to say that there are many of us here who have known and appreciated the fine quality of his statesmanship. We are sorry he is leaving the House. During the 10 years I have been a Member he has been a helpful friend and a wise counselor. I wish we had more men like JACK ANDERSON.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I would not want this opportunity to pass without saying a word in reference to the fine work that JACK ANDERSON has done as a Member of the House of Representatives. I have worked with him intimately with reference to legislation that came from the Committee on the Armed Services and I have always found him to be fair-minded, very agreeable, very congenial in our work. He has done a good constructive job as a member of the committee so far as national defense is concerned. The Armed Services Committee is losing a most valuable member and I am losing a very fine friend.

I deeply regret that he has made up his mind to leave the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with those who are paying a measure of tribute to the gentleman from California, Mr. JACK ANDERSON. I do not think there is a Member of the Congress who numbers as many friends on both sides of the aisle as does JACK ANDERSON, of California. The country will miss his far-sighted statesmanship and the Congress will miss the great ability which he has always shown in his service here. But his friends will probably miss him more than anyone else. JACK ANDERSON'S door has always been open to his friends, and, as I say, you would find just as many Members from the other side of the aisle in Jack's office as you would from this side of the aisle. He is a great fellow and we all wish him Godspeed on his return to California and private life.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in these wonderful statements being made about our beloved colleague, JACK ANDERSON. I recall, too, on many occasions that I met him in the corridors with this mutual greeting: "Good morning, Mr. Curley." Jack will be missed. The tenor of the remarks from both sides of the aisle this morning indicate that Jack is able to rise above party and point of view. He has left with us a record worthy of emulation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my sincere appreciation for the counsel and advice and the helpful cooperation which I received on coming to Washington as a Member of this body from our colleague JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California. His decision to retire from Congress was a great blow, I assure you, to the whole California delegation and I know is also shared with all Members of Congress with whom he has served.

JACK ANDERSON is the third generation of native Californians, whose heritage has been so closely identified with the development of California and the West and particularly with our agricultural economy. JACK ANDERSON is a typical Californian and has been an important personality with the specialty agricultural crop production which has formed the background of California prosperity and was the mecca of attraction for the

great migration that has builded the West.

For many years JACK ANDERSON has been Chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee of the California delegation and his knowledge of our problems made him extremely helpful to all of our Members. In his energetic leadership he was most helpful in apprising the Members of Congress and the affected agencies of our problems and enlisting their sympathetic consideration.

His service on many committees of this body, and particularly the Armed Services Committee of which he is an outstanding member, did credit to himself and honor to the State of California, as well as the district he was privileged to represent.

The 14 years he has so ably served this country, I know, has left an impression on him which will never be forgotten and I am sure that his interest in the welfare of his State and Nation will not be diminished because of the severance of his ties here in Washington. I expect that as the years go on, his interest will remain keen and that on occasions we may see him in Washington where we may counsel with him on the problems that will continue to be ours.

I know that his duties and responsibilities at home prompted his decision to retire from Congress and I sincerely wish for him happiness, contentment, and pleasurable success in again assuming his business responsibilities.

God bless you, Jack. We hope to see much of you in the years to come.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to join in the many tributes which have been paid to our distinguished colleague, my good friend, JACK ANDERSON. I was particularly impressed with what the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] had to say about what a good neighbor Jack is, because when I first came to this body, 12 years ago, Jack was my neighbor. I spent many happy hours visiting with him and he with me. We shall all miss him a great deal. Again I join in the fine tributes which have been paid to his leadership here and his statesmanship as a Member of this body.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join in this appropriate tribute to JACK ANDERSON, a distinguished citizen of my native State of California. I have had the privilege these three terms of serving on the Committee of Armed Services with him, where he is a most valuable and experienced member. I also had the privilege of serving with him, he being the chairman of the special subcommittee dealing with agriculture in California on occasion. He always serves efficiently and industriously. I also have had the pleasure of serving on the Hébert subcommittee with him.

I wish Jack many, many years of good health and continued prosperity. He deserves time to catch a lot of fish and loaf in his pear orchard. He certainly is one of the most distinguished citizens of California and Members of this great Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress, like the gentleman from Louisiana, 12 years ago, Jack and I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs. When they created the Committee on Armed Services, he took his place on that committee with me. I have had great pleasure in working with Jack during my tenure in this Congress. He has made a great contribution to his State and to the Nation as a whole. Of course he merits the rest he has chosen. He has been industrious on our committee. He is intellectually honest at all times, and indefatigable in his application to his tasks. We shall miss him. I know Jack will have a much less arduous time at home. Those of us who will remain here for the indefinite future will look back on the happy hours we have spent with Jack, in rendering the service of which we were capable in company with one of the greatest Americans who has ever served in this body.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the encomiums which have been heaped upon our colleague, JACK ANDERSON. After all, he is my neighbor in a different sense, in that our districts adjoin. I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Subcommittee on Agriculture in the California delegation. Although he is recognized as an expert on matters of national defense, I know of no man who has rendered a greater service than he to California agriculture, because of his intimate knowledge of it and its problems, and the facility with which he could find the solution for many of the trying problems on the national level. I am certain the rest he takes is well deserved, as the gentleman from South Carolina has said. I know of no more beautiful part of California in which to take a rest than in beautiful San Benito County, which typifies perhaps more than any other the spirit of the Old West. I am certain we all wish the squire of San Juan Bautista a long and happy life in those beautiful surroundings.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret Mr. ANDERSON'S decision to retire from Congress this year. This is my first term in the House. Ever since I arrived in Washington JACK ANDERSON has been helpful, cooperative, and considerate. He has never been too busy to lend me a helping hand or consult with me in helping to solve some problem I might have. We all know of his splendid work on the Committee on Armed Services. I have had the personal opportunity to work with him on the California delegation Subcommitee on Agriculture. I believe all of California's agriculture owes a debt of gratitude to him for the fine work he has done in its behalf. At this time I express my appreciation for his fine contribution to this country and my regrets at his retirement from Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join in expressing my appreciation of the great service which our colleague, JACK ANDERSON, has rendered while he has been a Member of this House. He brings to every gathering into which he enters a very happy personality, which makes the work of the gathering a pleasant one and produces an easier and quicker result, even when opinions vary very definitely. His effective, direct, and efficient manner has helped solve many important problems.

As JACK ANDERSON returns to his home in the hills of San Juan Bautista and spends his time in his home and with his family, accumulating pears and converting them into a more useful form of exchange, I want him to know that we are going to miss him and his shining countenance.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives, and certainly California and its delegation will miss the wonderful services rendered by JACK ANDERSON who is voluntarily retiring from Congress.

Jack has a unique record here in the House of Representatives because he only talks when he knows what he is talking about, so when he talks he has some real knowledge to impart to his fellow Members. He differs from some of our colleagues in that he does not love to talk just to be talking and therein lies his effectiveness. When Jack becomes interested in legislation and really desires to put it over, he accomplishes that end because not only can he logically present his case, but he has the respectful ear of each of the hundreds of friends he has made since he entered Congress in 1939.

We from California will miss Jack and also his charming wife.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. I, too, want to join with Jack's friends to wish him a happy life in his retirement. We in the Committee on Armed Services, of course, will miss Jack. His contribution in this legislative body has not been on the basis of partisanship of any kind, or on a political basis. He always arrived at his conclusions on the basis of what was best in the national interest and security of our country. I especially want to wish him a happy life in his retirement.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this opportunity go by without saying with what surprise and disappointment I heard from JACK ANDERSON'S own lips that he did not intend to come back to the Congress. I pride my-

self upon the knowledge that he is a very good friend of mine, as I am sure he is to every Member of the House of Representatives who has had the opportunity to become acquainted with him. California has been very fortunate in having a Representative of the caliber and character of JACK ANDERSON here in the Halls of Congress. He was always energetic. He attacked every problem, which he was confronted with, in a statesmanlike manner and with a broad viewpoint. He was affable and congenial in every respect toward everyone. I feel that while we on this side of the House do not like to see too many Republicans on the other side, if we have to have them, however, there is nobody we would like to have more than men of the caliber, character, and congeniality of JACK ANDERSON, of California. I wish for him every success, comfort, and treasure that life can possibly bring to him and his family.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join in all the splendid tributes being paid to our good friend, JACK ANDERSON, which he so richly deserves. My association with JACK ANDERSON has been very close throughout the years, and there has developed between us a very strong feeling of friendship. I entertain for him a deep feeling of respect and admiration not only for JACK ANDERSON the man and the gentleman, but JACK ANDERSON the legislator. I sincerely hope that God will bless him with many, many years of life ahead and that those years will be years of happiness and success.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, throughout my years of service here in the House of Representatives, I have always regretted the decision of Members to retire from this body. I wanted them to stay on. No Member in my time has retired whose retirement I regret any more than that of my good friend JACK ANDERSON of California. That is because through the years I have been privileged to know him and work with him I have found him to be one of the finest men who ever served in this body.

I join with others in wishing him the best of everything and expressing the hope that from time to time he will find it possible to come back and visit with us, and possibly if we go out his way we can look him up, because I am sure we will not want this to be the end of the association and friendship which we all prize so highly.

JACK ANDERSON has been a colleague always willing to shoulder more than his share of the burden faced by the House of Representatives in these troublesome times. By the same token, he has never shirked his responsibilities to the larger welfare of the Nation, nor neglected, as is so obvious in the confidence displayed by his electorate, the needs and wishes of the people he has been elected and reelected—time and again—to represent. He has been an excellent Congressman, and I am sorry to see him take his leave.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with all of the complimentary references made today to the character and services in Congress of our distinguished colleague, JACK ANDERSON, who is voluntarily retiring from public life. It has been my privilege to know and serve with JACK ANDERSON for nearly 10 years. Our association has been very close as friends, on legislative matters, and on the many mutual interests of our districts.

JACK ANDERSON during the entire time that we have served together has been chairman of the agriculture committee of the California delegation which has the obligation of representing and speaking for the complicated and diversified problems of California agriculture. No man in our delegation has been better qualified for that chairmanship. JACK ANDERSON is not only a Congressman of outstanding ability but is a practical farmer who knows from first hand and from many years of experience the problems of California agriculture. The loss of his leadership is going to be an especially hard blow to the many agricultural interests in California who have looked to him as their leading spokesman and those of us who served with him on our agricultural committee are going to miss his splendid leadership and sound judgment in agricultural matters.

As one of the ranking leaders in point of service from California, JACK ANDERSON'S seniority, prestige, and many friendships in the House are going to be severely missed by the people of California. No man in the California delegation is held in deeper affection on both sides of the aisle or has more profound respect of the membership of the House. It is well known that he has enjoyed a special friendship with our beloved Speaker, SAM RAYBURN, with whom he has been a fishing companion for many years. The former speaker of the House and present minority leader, the able and respected JOE MARTIN, is one of JACK ANDERSON'S best friends. The chairman of his own committee, the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CARL VINSON, has many times written special letters of appreciation and commendation to JACK ANDERSON on the splendid service he has given on that important committee. The list could be continued at great length but it is sufficient to say that JACK ANDERSON in the period of his service in Congress has earned and holds the affection and admiration of everyone in the House.

It is especially regrettable when a man of outstanding ability and established seniority who has a thorough knowledge of the complicated business of our modern Federal Government retires from the Congress and thus deprives his own district, his State, and the Nation of his service. It is especially important during this period of our history to have a man like JACK ANDERSON who combines all of those qualities and in addition always votes for and supports the measures which he thinks are fundamentally in the best interests of the Nation. There are men on both sides of the aisle in the House in whose hands we could safely entrust the affairs of the Nation with confidence that the national interest would always be their first consideration. JACK ANDERSON is one of them. His friends here not only regret the fact that he has retired from Congress because of the loss of the close personal association with him but also because his leaving is a loss to the Nation. I join with his many friends in wishing him and his charming wife, health, happiness, and leisure to enjoy them in the years ahead.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the time allowed the California delegation to extend this word of good-by to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

I ask unanimous consent that all other Members be allowed the privilege of revising and extending their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that our esteemed colleague and my valued friend, Congressman JACK ANDERSON, is leaving the Congress. He has been an able, honest, distinguished, and outstanding Congressman. He has rendered most conspicuous and unselfish service to the House Armed Services Committee, upon which I enjoyed the great privilege of serving with him. He has been vitally interested in the national defense at all times and an indefatigable worker in helping to establish impregnable armed strength for the Nation.

He was always a gracious gentleman, a considerate, friendly colleague, and a very diligent, effective, and useful Member of Congress. I am very sorry, both for personal and public reasons, to learn of his departure from this body after such distinguished, illustrious service. I hope earnestly that he will have many more years of outstanding success in his chosen work and true happiness and contentment among his friends and his beloved family.

May fortune shower her very choicest blessings upon him.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, there have been and will be many well-deserved tributes paid to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], my good friend and colleague. In the time I have known JACK ANDERSON, both as my Representative and as the Representative of the district adjoining mine, I have found him to be very understanding, tolerant, and friendly. His retirement at this time will be a loss not only to the Nation but to all of us who have known and worked with him personally. Because of the direct interest in Agriculture and his fine work as chairman of the agricultural subcommittee of the California delegation, it has been my privilege to work closely with him on

many problems which are identical in our districts. I am happy for the opportunity of acknowledging my indebtedness and to express my thanks. JACK ANDERSON leaves the Congress with the highest esteem, respect, and friendship that I believe any man in the California delegation has ever had. So let me take this opportunity to say to JACK ANDERSON that I wish him all possible success and godspeed in his chosen endeavors.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that JACK ANDERSON is retiring from Congress. Jack has been a good and patriotic Representative. He has fine common sense. He has served well and faithfully. From a personal standpoint I regret his going. We have been close personally. He is a good and true friend. To him and his lovely family go my friendliest good wishes.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my special privilege to have been associated with the affable gentleman from California [Mr. JACK ANDERSON] during the time I have been a member of the Armed Services Committee. I have always found the gentleman from California to be a most gracious individual. He has been a vital factor in the operation of the Armed Services Committee; he has constantly applied himself to the problems at hand and has never deviated from that line in the interest of national defense. He has worked vigorously to maintain our great structure of national defense and at the same time has tried to curtail waste and inefficiency. To that end he was responsible for the enactment of the single Federal Catalog for the armed services, which was accomplished only after 5 years of hard fighting. I consider the gentleman from California a friend and I hope I shall have the privilege of keeping that friendship for many years to come. I wish him well and I know that the good Lord will shower on him his many graces.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it was with sincere regret that I learned several months ago that my good friend, the Honorable JACK Z. ANDERSON, of California, had decided to retire from public life and had elected not to be a candidate for reelection to the Eighty-third Congress.

Since my election to this body in 1946, I have known Mr. ANDERSON and have found him to be a most able legislator and one who has, on every occasion, placed the welfare of this country far above the desires and demands of organized groups and has never sought personal favor or gain. Not only are people of the Eighth Congressional District of California losing a great American, but we in this House who will serve in the Eighty-third Congress will lose a man whose stability in these troubled times has always been a source of personal comfort to me.

I know that every Member of this House joins with me in wishing for JACK ANDERSON a happy and full, rich life in his retirement from public life.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, as a Floridian I would like to take this opportunity to add a word of praise and tribute to a distinguished Californian and our capable colleague, JACK Z. ANDERSON, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress this year. I have come to know, appreciate, and respect Jack in the short time of my first term in the House of Representatives. It was easy for me, a freshman, to recognize the fine quality of statesmanship in JACK ANDERSON, who for 14 years has served in Congress with honor and distinction. His service on many committees of this body, and particularly the Armed Services Committee, of which he is an outstanding member, did credit to himself, to the Nation, the State of California, as well as the district he was privileged to represent. Jack's energetic leadership has won for him the high esteem in which he is regarded by all Members of this House. The aisle intersecting this body proved no barrier to the warm friendship enjoyed by Jack and his fellow Members. As a Democrat and a Floridian I highly treasure the friendship of JACK ANDERSON, a Republican and Californian. The life of a Congressman is hard but it is a rewarding one, in many respects. One of my rewards has been to know and serve with Jack—for, to me, he typifies the finest qualities of a public servant. The State of California and the United States is losing a great Congressman. I wish for him, his wife, and family joy, happiness, and continued success as he turns from pairing in Congress to growing pears in California.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with real personal regret that I comment on the fact that our California colleague, JACK ANDERSON, who has been a real neighbor to San Francisco for many years, will not be back with us in the Eighty-third Congress. Though Jack and I disagreed on many issues, I might say it was a pleasure to disagree with him because there was never any rancor or unfriendliness. I always knew where he stood, and he always knew where I stood, and we did not let it interfere with our friendship. I know that JACK ANDERSON worked ably and hard for his district, and never permitted himself to be diverted from acting according to the best of his beliefs and understandings. I respect and admire Jack for those traits—I enjoyed working with him in Congress, and I envy him a little now that he will be spending full time back in the great State of California.

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF AND HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, of course all the Michigan delegation joins in every word that has been said about our good colleague, Mr. ANDERSON of California, known to most of us as "Jack."

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Michigan has two men who are now retiring who have rendered long, able, and patriotic service to this House, and to Michigan and the Nation. In behalf of Michigan Members, on the Republican side at least, I want to lift the remarks which have been made in praise of our colleague JACK ANDERSON who so richly deserves the tribute which has just been paid him and to add of Mr. ROY WOODRUFF who has served more than 30 years in this House and of Mr. BILL BLACKNEY, who has served 16 years, both of Michigan, equal tribute is justly due.

AMENDING TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. JENKINS.

ARTHUR McPHAUL

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to House Resolution 717, Eighty-second Congress, he did, on today, July 1, 1952, certify to the United States attorney, eastern district of Michigan, Detroit, Mich., the refusal of Arthur McPhaul to testify and to produce certain records, correspondence, and memoranda, before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpena duly served upon him by direction of the said committee.

SAUL GROSSMAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that pursuant to House Resolution 718, Eighty-second Congress, he did, on today, July 1, 1952, certify to the United States attorney, District of Columbia, the refusal of Saul Grossman to testify and to produce certain records, correspondence, and memoranda, before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpena duly served upon him by direction of the said committee.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House, and offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas in a case pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, entitled "*Mallonee et al. v. Fahey et al.*, No. 5421," in which the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, represented by the Department of Justice, and the Federal

Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, as well as other litigants were interested; and

Whereas the parties above-named and others had entered appearances by attorney; and

Whereas on the 17th day of November 1950, when the court was calling for the appearance of the parties desiring to be heard, the following occurred: (as appears from the transcript of record in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in a case entitled *"John H. Fahey et al., appellants* v. *Ronald Walker, Special Master, appellee,* and *Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, appellant* v. *Ronald Walker, Special Master, appellee"*;

"The COURT. No; I do not want to wait. In any event, that is all the parties that have been notified.

"Mr. Fischbach, counsel for the special subcommittee of the Committee on Executive Expenditures of the House of Representatives, is here. Mr. Fischbach, it was at your suggestion yesterday that I made the minute order and sent the wire. Do you have a statement to make?

"Mr. FISCHBACH. I do. Also I would like to enter my appearance as counsel.

"The COURT. Excuse me just a moment until we get through with this other matter."

* * * * *

"Mr. FISCHBACH. My name is Hyman I. Fischbach. My office (20308) address is 52 Wall Street, New York City.

"I appear as special counsel, if the court please, for a subcommittee of the Committee on Executive Expenditures of the House of Representatives. The subcommittee has entrusted to it a matter which involves the public interest, and it is obliged to report to the Congress on the administration of the Home Loan Bank Act in the twelfth district"; and

Whereas the said Hyman I. Fischbach, appearing as special counsel for a subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, appeared in opposition to the position taken by the Home Loan Bank Board and by the Department of Justice, which in the proceedings above indicated, appeared in opposition to the position taken by the counsel for the subcommittee, and

Whereas the said Hyman I. Fischbach had no authority to appear either for the Congress or for the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or for the subcommittee thereof; and

Whereas the Journal and records of the House and of the committee show no such authority, except as he may have been authorized by the chairman of the subcommittee; and

Whereas under the rules of the House, Members of the House are not permitted to appear, even when subpenaed by the court, without the permission of the House. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That hereafter neither counsel for committees of the House, nor for subcommittees of the House, enter appearance or participate in any litigation as counsel for the House, a committee of the House, or a subcommittee of the House, unless such action has been authorized by the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution provides that the Members shall not be answerable in any other forum for what is said upon the floor of the House. It has been the custom of the House from the beginning that when its Members were subpenaed to appear in court they must ask the permission of the House to appear.

In this particular case an attorney for a subcommittee appeared in court and intervened in proceedings where the Department of Justice and the Home Loan Bank were adversely interested.

I do not care to discuss this issue at length. The purpose is stated in the resolution. The purpose is to prevent hereafter any subcommittee employing an attorney, or an attorney of a subcommittee or a committee for that matter appearing in litigation without the consent of the House.

The reason for that is that the subcommittees and the committees of the House are the servants of the House; and certainly, if a Member is not permitted to appear as a witness without the consent of the House, neither a subcommittee nor a committee should be permitted to be represented in court by an attorney without the consent of the House.

If any other rule is to prevail the House and its committees will find themselves involved in disputes and legal proceedings with the executive branch of the Government as well as with individuals and subject to the orders of the judicial branch issued by the courts to which we have submitted ourselves.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not want to discuss this matter at length, but I will yield briefly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman want to restrict it to an attorney of a subcommittee or a committee? I should think he would want to include any other employee of a committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. To appear in court?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I assume that no committee or subcommittee would send into court a member of the staff who was not an attorney.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Some investigators are not attorneys; that is the point I want to bring out.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very briefly.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I recall that the attorney for the Kefauver committee was permitted by the Congress to practice law privately at the same time he was acting as attorney for the committee; what about that situation? And I believe it would be preferable to deny any application for waivers by attorneys, legal staff, and committee law members from practicing law while on such committee staff and have each of them ask permission of this House to appear in any court for any reason whatsoever while employed in such capacity.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will not comment upon what the other body or any committee of the other body should do over there.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Waivers have been granted by this House for members of a committee to continue practicing law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My point is that neither a committee nor a subcommittee, both of which are servants of the House, should assume to be represented in any court proceedings except as the House has authorized it. That is all there is to the resolution and that is the only purpose I have in offering it at this time. The attorney who appeared in this case was without authority to do so and he was not entitled to recognition by the court.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the hour.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports on the bills S. 2128, to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes; S. 2252, to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks; S. 2938, to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; and S. 3066, to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 715 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7817) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill H. R. 7817, which would authorize the sum of $35,000,000 as an emergency flood-control fund. This money has already been appropriated.

On account of the devastating flood that occurred last spring on the Missouri River and in various localities along the Mississippi River, the urgency for this authorization is very imminent. This situation exists by reason of the fact that there have been so many flood disasters this past spring.

I do not think there is any opposition to the rule.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, as has already been stated, there is no opposition to the rule, and, so far as I know, there is no opposition to the legislation. I prefer to speak on the rule rather than later when we go into committee or when we consider the bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, this is not new legislation. The practice began as long ago as 1936, 16 years ago. Every year or nearly every year Congress has provided for the Corps of Army Engineers an emergency fund amounting to several million dollars, which has gradually increased until this year because of unprecedented floods throughout the country, mainly on the Missouri, Mississippi, and Arkansas Rivers, more money is needed. It has been fixed at $35,000,000 as already stated.

In order that the House may have some idea of the amount of damage that has been done by floods this year, it is only necessary to point out that 209 villages and cities were affected adversely by these floods and more than 100,000 people displaced, more than 38 railroads blocked, including bridges, and many interstate and State highways ruined. When the engineers have no money immediately on hand to provide against flood damage or to repairs to open highways or railroads, of course, the necessity for this fund is immediately seen. As already stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], the money has been appropriated a little ahead of time, and the purpose of this legislation is to legalize or authorize the expenditure of the money which has already been appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the legislation will be unanimously adopted and the bill pass.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am very much interested in having this bill passed. We had some very devastating floods in California this year that ruined hundreds and hundreds of acres of very fine agricultural land.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman that more than 2,000,000 acres of farm land have been inundated or flooded by devastating floods which have caused many emergency cases, and which will be taken care of under this legislation.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that about a month or a month and a half ago the Michigan delegation, whose districts border upon the Great Lakes, addressed a letter to Governor Williams asking him to petition the President to make available to those flooded areas funds from this emergency bill under discussion here today. In my own district, Monroe County, which borders on Lake Erie, they have suffered disastrous floods in recent years. In Estral Beach, in my district, 80 homes were inundated by the very severe storm of March of this year. The situation is exactly as the gentleman says. This authorization bill should be passed to back up the appropriation bill that has already been passed.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I wish to heartily endorse the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Michigan. I think that the flood damage in the United States is one of the major problems that this Congress must deal with. I am certainly in favor of this legislation, but I would like to see this body initiate a new program to appropriate money for flood projects that have been ready for years but cannot get going because of the national emergency. I think the national emergency is right here in our own land where we are having these devastating floods in all sections, by the ravages of these floods that inundate not only the farm land but the cities and towns of America. I certainly wish to endorse what the gentleman says.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This is a general emergency flood bill, is it?

Mr. DONDERO. For the entire United States. It is an emergency fund granted to the Army engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. For instance, we had a flood on the Tombigbee; that is separate from the inland waterways. Would that be covered by this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. It would be.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is most timely that we get the authorization fixed up. We, in the Red River Valley, have been disturbed because we have a condition there of levees being uncompleted and no money available for the completion of the levees. A large part of the valley is now exposed. We have not had a major flood since 1945, but in the due course of things we are due to have a flood within a short period of time ahead, and it does give us some assurance that if we do have an emergency fund, that we can draw upon it in the event it is needed badly.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the purpose of the fund.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wish to commend the gentleman and to state to him that my district, which is touched by both the Minnesota and Mississippi Rivers, in the past 2 years has had serious floods affecting about 12 communities, a bad flood in 1951, and in some respects a worse flood in 1952. I express to the gentleman and his committee my deep personal appreciation for the action they have taken.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman's remarks are much appreciated.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. I am in accord with the gentleman's bill.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that we should take action forthwith to do all in our power to stop these floods which have been plaguing our country for the past number of years. These floods have left in their wake famine, pestilence, disease and poverty, and many of our good citizens have been left homeless.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak with relation to another flood which we must prevent from coming even close to our country, and that is the flood of enemy airplanes that might come to the United States via the territory to the north.

The Senate by restoring a great portion of the moneys that the Air Force needs to build up to a great many wings by 1954 has placed a terrific barrier in the way of any attempted flood of enemy planes which might be possible without these air defense wings.

Let us enhance our defense by affording the opportunity to the Air Force to continue its build-up and to prevent stoppage of its vital functions of maintaining air superiority. It is now common knowledge that many Russian planes in the past few months have invaded the air over the North American Continent having flown at high altitude across Alaska into Canadian territory. The Canadian defense spotters are doing a fine job but because of a lack of personnel are not doing a thorough one. We must not afford the enemy any opportunity to attack us and find us lacking an Air Force superior to theirs.

In order to gain air superiority action began immediately after the submission to the Congress of the 1952 public-works program to develop the current military public-works program. A rapid expansion of the Air Force was under way. The Air Force in September of 1951 justified its program on a 95-wing basis and appropriations were made on this basis. As you well know, a decision was soon made to expand the Air Force to 143 wings. This rapid expansion involved a terrific amount of labor and effort on the part of the Air Force staff. Requirements have constantly changed over the years due to the development of new aircraft and new tactics. It was on a basis of what is the minimum essential for the safety and security of our country

that this new program was developed. These new installations are an attempt to provide the minimum operational requirements of an increased air arm. It has only recently been reported by General LeMay that the Russians have 40,000 aircraft at their disposal. It is therefore essential that our construction program provide the runways and maintenance shops for the increase in our Air Force because aircraft without facilities and runways to accommodate them cannot be used in an effective manner. Just as it is said that an Army marches on its stomach so is it true that an air force is only as good as the logistical support, maintenance, and repair facilities that support it.

Strong ground support, air cover, and air superiority are vital to our plan for the defense of Western Europe. Such support cannot be provided without a network of air bases to provide flexibility of use. The network of bases in Western Europe and north Africa will be a strong deterrent to any attack by an aggressive nation.

It must be realized that this appropriation is a down payment for this construction and that we must make the remaining funds available soon after convening at our next session. Never before in the history of our Nation has a problem like this confronted us. It is unique in all of its phases. This rapid rise in the strength of our Air Force is recognized by all Americans as vital to our security and we must not let it fail due to failure on our part to provide the essential construction for our Air Force.

The first and predominant consideration is to support the Air Force in its sorely needed build-up of base structures to match plans and personnel. This must be done and is the least that can be expected of the Congress. We must not retard the build-up of the striking power of our Air Force and must provide funds consistent with their determination as to what is the minimum necessary for our defense.

The Air Force must have the funds to build facilities costing $1,516,000,000. This figure was the result of much screening and pairing. It will be necessary to provide an additional $1,622,000,000 in a supplemental at the beginning of the calendar year 1953. It has been testified that the Air Force cannot further reduce the program and still be in a position to maintain our security. By providing this amount we can return to our respective homes and communities knowing that we have done at least what our military has requested as the minimum necessary for our defense.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have another subject I want to discuss. I have learned since coming on the floor today that 38 Members of this body will leave this historic chamber either through defeat, voluntary retirement, or because they have been nominated to the United States Senate. On our Committee on Public Works the ranking majority member is one of those 38. I speak of the Honorable HENRY LARCADE, of Louisiana, who has determined voluntarily to withdraw from Congress at the end of this session.

It has been my privilege to work and serve with Mr. LARCADE for many years. I have always found him to be a courteous, kindly, and considerate gentleman, modest in all that he says and does, but one of the hardest-working Members of this body. He lives in Opelousas, La.

It so happens that because of his assignment and my assignment on the Committee on Public Works of the House we were thrown together in very close association. I refer to the subcommittee on flood control. The House will miss his service. The Nation will lose a patriotic and able legislator. He viewed the country's needs and progress from a national viewpoint. Mr. LARCADE is a gentleman who has been blessed with a personality that sells itself to all with whom he comes in contact. He is one of nature's noblemen.

We wish him well as he retires from public life. In whatever he may do, whatever activity he may engage in, as he leaves the Congress of the United States I know he has the good wishes of all of his colleagues in this House, for his health, his happiness, and his success in the future.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. On behalf of the citizens of my great State, I should like to express our appreciation of the magnificent tribute the gentleman has just paid my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

As the gentleman well knows, my State is so designed by nature that there is probably no area in this great country of ours more dependent upon legislators who understand the problems of flood control and the problems of developing our rivers and our harbors. The Mississippi River cuts through the State of Louisiana and there reaches the great Gulf of Mexico. To the north we have the Red River and its tributaries, and the Atchafalaya Basin, and all of that area. Mr. LARCADE comes from that area, southwest Louisiana, which has been affected over the generations by floods and sometimes by disasters.

He leaves a great gap in our State delegation. It is with deep concern and regret that we see him go. I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that he would not be retiring had it not been for the tremendous effort he has exerted on behalf of this whole country as well as his own State, to such a point that his health has been impaired and his physicians have advised that he must seek less arduous duties.

I should like to pay great tribute to his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] who at all times has cooperated with Mr. LARCADE in projects for the benefit and advancement of our people.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, during the few short years that I have been here, the House has appropriated billions of dollars for flood relief and flood control. The people of Michigan have been silent most of that time, taking their losses, paying their own way. We have seen our lake shore, especially the lake-shore line of the west side of Michigan, and its beaches which I know about personally, washed away and the people suffer a great deal of damage. We have seen cottages and houses, when I say houses, I mean houses, not shacks or small make-shift dwellings on the bluffs washed down into the lake and destroyed with resulting damage of hundreds of thousands of dollars. That damage was especially burdensome all along Berrien, Van Buren, Allegan, and Ottawa counties and counties north to the Straits. We have had no protection and nothing has ever been appropriated for the relief of the people there. If we are to continue to appropriate money, as we have in the past, for flood control and protection against excessive water damage it is time that those who live around the lake shore be given some aid. Some protection. Especially is this true if the damage comes in part from water diverted from Hudson Bay.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan, who is my warm and able friend, that the Committee on Public Works has already passed a resolution authorizing the beginning of a complete survey of the entire lake levels to see if some solution cannot be found to hold down that high water, and thereby prevent the damage that has been done.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is fine as far as it goes. The gentleman who is ever vigilant in protecting the people of our State has had a part in many a major project in which Michigan has been interested—and which, because of his efforts, has benefited our people as well as the people of the Nation. But if one is sleeping in one of these homes along the lake shore, and during the night the waters wash out the foundation, it does not help you any before you go into the lake to know that the Government intends to sometime consider aiding you. That is the thing that our people are kicking about. They have spent much of their money—they have spent a great deal of their own money trying to stop the damage caused by high water, and I think it is long past time the Federal Government stepped in as long as we are helping everybody else everywhere in the country.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to learn from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that they have some legislation to remedy the situation. But regardless of whether there is or not, I want to heartily endorse what the gentleman who now has the floor has said about the conditions that prevail with reference to the shore lines of Lake Michigan, particularly the Illinois area. If we are going to take into consideration all of these improvements, which I think they probably ought to do, and rightly so, and help people elsewhere on flood control, some consideration ought to be given to this

subject matter which the distinguished gentleman from Michigan has been discussing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly when Michigan and Illinois are paying such a large share of the taxes that keep the Federal Government operating. If we are to rebuild every country in the world when and often when it does not suffer from disaster, we should do something for our own people who suffer so grievously but through no fault of their own.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might also speak concerning the retirement of our colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]. During the time I have had the opportunity to serve in this Congress, I have been able to observe the fine work that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has done not only for the people of Louisiana and the people of the lower valley of the Mississippi, but the people of the entire United States. He has a breadth of vision as to the future of our country, and the work that can be accomplished through the development of our natural resources, which would be a credit to any man serving in this body. His retirement will be a great loss to the people of the Mississippi Valley and the Nation.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in the statements being made about HENRY LARCADE. For the past 6 years, it has been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Public Works. He is diligent and reliable and as great as they come. The country and the Congress have lost by reason of his retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that HENRY LARCADE is retiring from the Congress. He will be missed by all of us.

He has served his people and his country well and faithfully. His character is of a high order and his statesmanship of the best type.

We all wish him and his family many pleasant years together.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned that our beloved colleague and my very good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has decided to retire from Congress—that he will not seek relection this year. His decision to retire means that he will soon be taking the rest that he so justly deserves, yet I cannot forego this opportunity to express my sorrow that he is leaving the House where he has served so ably and well for the last 12 years.

HENRY LARCADE has been a Member of this distinguished body for six terms, and I know of few men who have so conscientiously and vigorously served his constituency and his country as has he. He is indeed a man of deep conviction, and one with a passionate devotion to the general welfare. In all his public acts, he has always placed the national interest above sectional and partisan interest and above personal advantage. This is the essence of statesmanship, and HENRY LARCADE is a statesman of the highest type.

During my three terms in Congress, I have had the pleasure and privilege of working with HENRY LARCADE on the House Public Works Committee, where he has functioned as chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee. I therefore know first hand of the long hours of toil and grueling work that he has spent in this position. I know that during January last he was ordered by his physician to take a rest to preserve his health, yet he cut short this period of rest to return to Washington because his congressional and committee duties called him. As chairman, he has always been kind, considerate, patient, and understanding, and ever seeking to find the correct answer to the perplexing problems of national policy. It has been a privilege to work with him and have him as a friend.

HENRY LARCADE is a great American. As a Member of Congress, he has done his duty and done it well. Now he steps down from the high office and the hectic life of a national legislator to rest and quiet and peace. In retiring from the office where he has served so honorably, he leaves behind many friends, among whom I am proud to be one. He goes with the best wishes of all of us, and I wish him every joy and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to express my deep and sincere appreciation to Congressman LARCADE for his diligent efforts not only as a most active member of the committee, but especially in acknowledgment of his conscientious service as chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of rivers-and-harbors projects.

It was with genuine regret that I learned of HENRY LARCADE'S decision to retire from Congress. From my observation of Henry over the years, I know that there was no more active Member of the House and certainly none who was more constantly on the alert to preserve and protect the interests of the people of this Nation. This devotion was not confined to his native State of Louisiana but covered all corners of the United States.

Of course, Henry was always aware of the problems which confronted the people residing in the lower Mississippi Basin and I assure you that there was no finer or more successful advocate on their behalf than HENRY LARCADE. This is understandable when one realizes that Henry himself was the victim of floods along the Mississippi many years ago and knew what it meant to fight for several days and sleepless nights to protect levees and evacuate victims from flooded areas.

I am convinced that it was largely through the work of HENRY LARCADE here in Congress that the Mississippi Valley and New Orleans and other areas in the State of Louisiana have not suffered from a flooded Mississippi River for many years.

I know that HENRY LARCADE will be missed in Congress, for, in addition to being a Trojan for work, he was a gentleman of integrity, thoughtful, kind, and considerate. Not only his bright ties but his genial personality added color and luster to every occasion.

I wish HENRY LARCADE and his charming wife many years of sublime happiness and quiet solitude away from the turmoil of busy Washington in peaceful Louisiana.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great privilege and honor to be able to add my tribute to those already paid to our beloved and highly respected colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable HENRY LARCADE, on the eve of his retirement as a Member of this House.

Although I have been directly associated with him as a member of the Committee on Public Works but a comparatively short time, it has been long enough for me to become keenly aware of the sterling qualities of this fine American statesman, for he is as truly entitled to wear that mantle of greatness as any man whom I ever have known.

His retirement is a distinct loss to this honorable body, for his has been counsel and leadership that it is indeed difficult to replace. The Committee on Public Works has found in this ranking majority member a source of wisdom, understanding and vision that is so sorely needed in these critical times. His great mind and his background of wide experience, coupled with good sound common sense in a degree too rarely found these days, have won him the confidence and esteem of his colleagues rarely equaled in the Congress.

The people of his district, his State, and his Nation are the beneficiaries of his generosity in giving to them 12 years of the kind of service that the founders of this Nation intended to be the qualities of a public servant. His is a most enviable public record.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I join in voicing the deepest regret that he has decided to retire from the membership of this House. We shall miss him sorely. He has builded well a true monument of real greatness. May an all-wise God attend him graciously in his future years.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not add my word of praise and commendation to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE]. I have been a member of the committee only a short time, but during that time I have found him to be considerate and broad minded and interested not only in the development of his own district, but in the development

of worth-while projects all over the country. I am sure the Congress will miss him very much.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying my respects to our good friend, HENRY LARCADE. Mr. LARCADE and I came to the Congress in the Seventy-seventh Congress together. I have known him and enjoyed his friendship and learned to love him over the years that we have served here together. I do not know of any man in the House of Representatives who is more hard working and more conscientious than our good friend, HENRY LARCADE. I wish him good health and happiness.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my respects to Mr. HENRY LARCADE. When I first came here I had the privilege of serving on the then Committee on Territories with him. I was a member of the Larcade committee that was sent out to make an investigation for statehood for Hawaii. I am certain that the findings of that committee under the diligent leadership of Mr. LARCADE stand out as one of the finest things of its kind that has ever been done in the Congress.

I came to know Mr. LARCADE at that time and I have a deep-seated affection for him. He has rendered a great service as a Member of this body.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleague from Mississippi has taken the floor to speak a few words of praise for our friend and neighbor, HENRY LARCADE. I think that what the gentleman has said reflects the sentiments of the entire Mississippi delegation. Certainly I, for one, join him in expressing our thanks to HENRY LARCADE for what he has done for our State as well as for his own. We are all sorry that he has decided to leave this Congress, and we wish him well in the future as he returns to his native Louisiana.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my regret that my very great friend, HENRY LARCADE, is retiring from public life in Washington.

When I became a member of the Committee on Public Works I had an opportunity to become well acquainted with HENRY LARCADE. He was always very thoughtful, considerate, and cooperative, and had a keen appreciation of the problems of all those who appeared before the committee. Serving on the committee with HENRY LARCADE has been a real pleasure, his genial personality and fellowship often contributed to the pleasure of our mutual associations. I regret that he is leaving the Congress, and I desire to express to him my very best wishes for a continued career and the best of health.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. HENRY LARCADE has a great capacity for making friends. He won our affections by his ardent charm, his personality, his kindness, and his generosity. He won our admiration by his diligence, his performance of duty, and his sincerity and forthrightness, and great ability. The highest praise that I would pay to him is that he has the affection and regard and good wishes of every member of the Public Works Committee and every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have served with HENRY LARCADE during my service in Congress. He was originally on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and we found him to be very industrious. He was one of the finest men that I have had occasion to serve with in the Congress. We might well say that he is a typical southern gentleman. He is always affable, ready to be of assistance, an indefatigable worker, and one with whom it was a great pleasure to serve. I will certainly miss the opportunity to be with him in the years to come, if I am fortunate enough to be returned myself next year.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the House at the time HENRY LARCADE first came here. I remember Henry came straight from the Louisiana State Legislature. He was born and lived in that section of Louisiana which is French in civilization and in background and in customs and in traditions. It is a delightful section of the United States in which to live. Henry brought with him to this Congress at that time the freshness and enthusiasm of that remarkable section of the State of Louisiana.

I thought at first perhaps Henry took his duties a little lightly, but as he grew in stature and assimilated the duties and responsibilities of the office of Congressman, HENRY LARCADE took them much more seriously. During the last few years when he has been a Member of the House, he has worked entirely too hard for his own physical health. He has accomplished a great deal. He carried in his mind and in his heart the needs of those who dwell in the lowland sections, the river sections of the United States, and he accomplished a great deal of good, not only for the people of Louisiana but for them all over the United States.

He leaves Congress now on the advice of his own physician. I know he is going back to that delightful section of the United States and that he will enjoy with real full appreciation his return to his home in Louisiana.

Henry came from Opelousas, which is located in the heart of the Atchafalaya River area. It was this part of Louisiana from which my own forebears came years ago. The very fact that his home was located in the very heart of the lower Mississippi Valley brought to his mind of course the many problems of flood control and navigation. He wanted to be a member of the flood control group and when his committee assignments finally gave him this break, he put his every energy and effort into this great work. Louisiana is richer as a result of the efforts of HENRY LARCADE in Congress and the Nation likewise has profited from the zeal and the sincerity of his advocacy of the cause of Old Man River. I hope he enjoys his retirement as he languishes in the radiant sunshine of south Louisiana in the blissful fellowship of his lovely wife who has always joined him in every one of life's ventures.

I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for this opportunity of expressing my appreciation for the friendship of my retiring colleague, HENRY LARCADE.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi and I am glad to have this opportunity to say a word for my good friend HENRY LARCADE. I am sorry to hear of his leaving this body. I had not known it before. I knew that his health was not so good. Perhaps he is doing a wise thing.

I served with HENRY LARCADE on the old Rivers and Harbors Committee before it was the Public Works Committee. I had an opportunity to see him in action. He is a great American, a fine American who, although of the opposite political party, was always very fair and helpful in our discussions.

I think the Congress is losing a first-class man, and I am sure that he is going to be missed by all of us.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I desire to join those who are paying tribute to Congressman LARCADE. It is with deep regret that I see him leave this body. I have learned to admire his patriotism. He has demonstrated by the record he has made that he is one of the outstanding Members of this body. I have learned to regard him as being a man who can be depended upon at all times to live up to the courage of his convictions and to stand for what in his opinion is for the best interest of this country. It is with much regret that I see him leave.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, addressing myself to the rule, I trust and hope that it will be adopted.

I am very much concerned with flood control conditions throughout the United States, but particularly in my own district where two creek systems, the San Lorenzo and the Alameda are creating a hazard in one of the most rapidly developing areas in the United States.

In the Livermore Valley that is drained by the Alameda Creek system

there is located the Camp Parks Air Force Base and an installation of the Atomic Energy Commission. This valley is a tilted bowl, the out-fall lip of which is formed by the so-called Hayward Fault. Due to this retardant, water can and does gather in the valley. Last year it threatened the efficiency of one of the installations heretofore mentioned.

The great danger that threatens, unless we find an immediate solution, is that caused by the moving of about a hundred thousand people into this valley and the sewage problem that came with them. Pollution is always a menace in rapidly growing areas. Proper and effective drainage removes it.

The State of California and the county of Alameda have cooperated in this field. Certain surveys must be completed in order to guide procedure. One survey needs but very little money to complete and I am hopeful that out of this $35,000,000 funds can be made available to take care of this acute situation. I sincerely trust that the rule and the bill will both be adopted.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the resolution on this side.

Mr. MADDEN. There is no objection to the resolution on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 7817) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $35,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of the Army may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Acts for specific purposes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been explained during consideration of the rule. As has been stated, it is merely authorizing legislation and the money has already been appropriated by the Congress by virtue of Public Law 371.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 676, Rept. No. 2405), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the seaward boundaries of the States and the continental United States and the Territory of Alaska in order to determine the proper criteria for fixing the seaward limits of the inland or internal waters of the United States, and the seaward boundaries of the United States and Alaska.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, its territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of this week, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MOTOR CARRIER SECURITIES

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 713 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of the bill S. 2360, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

As far as I know, there is no objection to the bill; certainly there is no objection to the rule.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side and I know of no objection to the rule.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2360) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 214 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by (1) striking out the figure "$500,000" in the first proviso and inserting the figure "$1,000,000" in lieu thereof, and (2) striking out the figure "$100,000" in the first proviso and inserting the figure "$200,000" in lieu thereof.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, there is no objection to the bill. There was no objection in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and there is no request for time on our side.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to confirm what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], said. This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I know of no objection to the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGRICULTURAL EXEMPTION FOR MOTOR CARRIERS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 714, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2357) to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the time to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order S. 2357 to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities," and for other purposes.

I know of no objection to the rule and I know of no objection to the bill.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Member of the Pennsylvania delegation, the Honorable HARDIE SCOTT, has decided not to run again for his present position in the House of Representatives. Mr. SCOTT came to Washington in the Eightieth Congress. He is one of our most honored and respected Members. He serves upon the very important Committee on Banking and Currency. Whatever the factors which persuaded him not to run again, they are beyond my understanding, but the fact remains that he will be missed in this body. He has done an excellent job for the people of his constituency, for the city of Philadelphia, and for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Those of us who know him best, namely, the members of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, will miss him greatly, and I know he will be missed by this entire body to which he contributed so greatly. He is well educated, and he is a most capable Representative for the people of his city and State.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of the Eightieth Congress HARDIE SCOTT came to us. He came wonderfully well equipped, experienced in law, along with a very fine education. He entered upon his duties here with a zest and fervor that few new men have shown. He was made a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he assiduously devoted himself to that work, following his line of work, in which he has shown great aptitude. He endeared himself to the members of the Republican delegation of Pennsylvania. He has been loyal and faithful to his work. We will miss him, and we wish for him as he retires to his first love of the law every success, and I am sure that the good wishes of all go with him.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other members of the Pennsylvania delegation in paying tribute to our colleague, HARDIE SCOTT. I had known HARDIE SCOTT for some period of time before coming to Congress. He is a highly successful and respected member of the Philadelphia bar. He made a great personal financial sacrifice when he decided to come to Congress. I feel that he has given, not only to the members of the Pennsylvania delegation, but to the Members of Congress his best thinking on all legislation which has appeared not only before his committee but the House. When the Pennsylvania delegation would meet, it was always with great interest that we would listen to HARDIE SCOTT, when called upon to keep us informed on the business before the Committee on Banking and Currency. His keen, analytical mind would pick out the heart of the bills before that committee and the issues which would be presented to Congress.

I sincerely hope that with his return to the practice of law that he will continue to have an excellent future in that field. His leaving Congress will be keenly regretted not alone by the Pennsylvania delegation, but by all of the Members of the House.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, in my first term in the House I have had a great admiration for my friend, HARDIE SCOTT. He has been a constructive legislator, a close, fine and fair friend. I shall miss him very much. I think he is one of the men we have all looked up to in the Pennsylvania delegation.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, HARDIE SCOTT came to Congress at the same time I did in the Eightieth Congress. Since that time we have been firm and fast friends. I have watched his work here. He is a quiet and effective worker. He has made a great contribution to the deliberations of this body. We shall miss him not only for his work but for his engaging personality. I hope he will have every success in the practice of law. He will always have the affection and high regard of those who served with him in this body.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing my regrets that Mr. SCOTT is not returning to Congress. I have served with him on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and have become much better acquainted with him as a result of that association. It has given me an opportunity to appraise and appreciate his ability. He is a quiet, industrious, conscientious member of the committee and the House. I am sure we will miss his pleasant association socially as well as officially here. I join in expressing my hope that he will be contented and happy in his retirement, and be successful in anything he attempts to do.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, I too join in this expression of regret that our fellow Pennsylvanian, HARDIE SCOTT, has decided not to run again for Congress but to return to the private practice of that profession for which he is so well qualified—the law.

HARDIE SCOTT has been one of the very fine, conscientious members of our Pennsylvania delegation, and his friendly spirit has made him admired and respected by all who know him.

In our delegation meetings his reports of the activities of the important Banking and Currency Committee of which he is a member were both clear and complete.

One of America's great needs is for more of its qualified young men to enter the field of politics, and if every young attorney who is as well qualified for the job as HARDIE SCOTT accepted as his public duty the quest of a period of service in Congress, our country would be much better governed.

We of the Pennsylvania delegation will miss his fellowship, the Banking and Currency Committee will miss his counsel, and the people of his district will look far before they find a more friendly and sincere Representative. I join my colleagues in wishing him only the greatest success as he continues to serve the people of his district in other ways.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in expressing our sincere regret at the voluntary departure from this Chamber of HARDIE SCOTT of Philadelphia. Mr. SCOTT has been a faithful, conscientious and hard working Member of this body. While serving here, he had but one purpose, to serve his day and generation to the best of his ability. That service has been constructive and

valuable to his constituents and to the country.

His departure is a great loss. All wish him continued success, good health and prosperity.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, to me it is always a matter of special regret when one of our newer and younger Members elects to retire from our presence, yet I am not unmindful that in many instances there are other considerations which must be respected.

Such a Member is HARDIE SCOTT, who came to us from the city of Brotherly Love—Philadelphia—in the Eighty-first Congress.

His work here in the Congress during that and the present session have earned for him the highest respect, not only among his fellow members of the Banking and Currency Committee, but among the wide circle of friends he has made in that time.

HARDIE SCOTT brought to the Congress a fine mind and a solid background of experience in private life to fit him for the duties of a legislator.

Those of us who have known him best well realize that beneath that quiet demeanor lies a strong character coupled, happily, with an intelligent approach to the complex problems of our modern society.

HARDIE SCOTT's record in the Congress does him high credit. He has demonstrated by his grasp of fundamental issues and by his close attention to duty that he is the type of public servant we can ill afford to lose in these difficult times.

I join with others, who have appreciated the contribution he has made here, in wishing him well in whatever new endeavors he may undertake and in full confidence that his experience among us will, in turn, help him along the happy and satisfying journey of a long and useful life.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] may have permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon there have been several farewell addresses with reference to Members who will not be candidates for reelection in the coming November election. The State of Ohio will lose two Members, both of whom have served for several terms. Naturally we are sorry to lose them. Through daily association with them we become attached to our colleagues. We want to say a good word about them. Dr. WALTER BREHM came to the Congress about 10 years ago. He came from the district that adjoins my district. In the last session of the State legislature, his district was cut up and they added two counties to my district, and two counties went to Mr. SECREST'S district, and two went to the sixth district. For that reason Dr. BREHM will not be a candidate for reelection this year.

Since Dr. BREHM'S district adjoins mine, naturally we had a great deal in common. And of course, we got along very well together. When he first came to Congress, he was living in Hocking County, which is a county in which the coal-mining industry is the principal industry. He asked that he be permitted to serve on the Committee on Education and Labor. Being the dean of the Ohio delegation, and a member of the committee on committees, I was able to get him that assignment where he served with a great deal of credit and satisfaction to his constituency and to the country. Dr. BREHM was very regular in his attendance upon the sessions of Congress and was always well posted as to legislation that was being considered. He had a great deal to do with the legislation known as the mine safety bill which Congress will consider tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, CHARLES ELSTON from the First District of Ohio, down in Cincinnati is going to leave us, too. Before coming to the Congress, he had achieved for himself the distinction of being one of the foremost lawyers in the great city of Cincinnati. CHARLIE ELSTON has a quality of mind that has impressed itself on everybody who knows him. His incisive way of understanding intricate problems of law and government has made him a very valuable Member. His work on military matters has made him a master of that subject. I am sorry to see him go. He has been a very valuable Member and his place will be hard to fill.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take up too much time. There are several other Members from the State of Ohio who wish to be heard.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] may be permitted to extend his remarks, immediately following my remarks, and that all other Members from the State of Ohio have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with nearly 40 Members retiring this year the Congress and the country will lose the vast treasures of experience from which we have drawn down through the years, and I want to join with the Members of the House in wishing them long and continued activity with the folks at home.

Mr. Speaker, among those retiring is the Honorable CHARLES H. ELSTON, of Cincinnati, who made a distinguished record as a lawyer throughout Ohio, and his coming to the Congress added a wealth of background and experience which he shared with his colleagues. His many contributions will stand as a monument to his work in the Congress, especially his efforts on the Military Code of Justice for those serving in the Armed Forces. I well remember my coming to the Congress, and the gracious welcoming hand of CHARLIE ELSTON, and I want to join in the best wishes of his many friends in the Congress.

And Mr. Speaker, another Member of the Ohio delegation is retiring this year and I was happy of his being one of our colleagues when I came to the Congress. The Honorable WALTER E. BREHM, of Ohio, made a distinguished record in the Ohio Legislature and he shared that experience with his colleagues here in the Congress, where he served with great sincerity. We will miss his association here, and there goes with Doc the best wishes of his colleagues here in the House.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio such time as he may desire.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Congressman WALTER BREHM, known to his colleagues and many friends as Doc BREHM, in the Ohio Legislature prior to our coming to the National House of Representatives. Doc at that time exemplified the same attitude toward his duties that he has since he became a Member of the Congress. He has been very alert and has capably represented the people of his district. His untiring efforts as a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the Congress will long be remembered. I join with my colleague in extending to Congressman BREHM and to Lucille Brehm, his splendid wife, our best and most sincere wishes.

Relative to my colleague, Congressman CHARLES ELSTON, it was not my privilege to know Congressman ELSTON prior to coming to Washington. But on the first day that I became a Member of Congress, I learned of the high esteem in which Congressman ELSTON is held by his colleagues. He has been an exceptionally capable member of the Committee on Armed Services, and he has been a guiding hand for many of us, particularly in the field of military problems. He is especially recognized as having a keen and analytical mind—and willing to always give a helping hand whenever needed. This was especially recognized when the Speaker of the House of Representatives appointed Congressman ELSTON on the Joint Committee of Atomic Energy. His valuable work on these committees will long be remembered.

I extend to Congressman ELSTON and his good wife Zelda our very best wishes for a continued successful life.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I have known Dr. WALTER BREHM, of whom the gentleman has just spoken, for many years. I first became acquainted with

him in 1939, when I was speaker of the Ohio House of Representatives and Dr. BREHM came to the Ohio house representing his country. He requested that he be assigned to one of the most powerful, yet one of the most difficult committees upon which one might serve in the Ohio House of Representatives. As things worked out I was able to assign him to that committee, where he did remarkably good work. Some of the legislation which he was instrumental in having adopted in Ohio is still serving, and will serve for years to come, the best interests of the people of the State of Ohio. I need not tell the Members of Congress the courageous and good work he has done on the Committee on Education and Labor here. That is known to you. I am sure that Dr. BREHM's constituents regret to see him leave the Congress.

I would like to say a word or two about my very good friend, CHARLES ELSTON, from Cincinnati. I, too, have known him for a long, long time. He came to Congress before I did, and I need not extol his virtues to Members of Congress. I think, however, I should place on the RECORD this statement. CHARLES ELSTON is recognized as one of the best lawyers in the State of Ohio. His contribution in his capacity as a patriotic citizen and as a lawyer has been monumental in the Congress. His imprint on military justice will live long after CHARLEY ELSTON has left this Congress, and it will result in the enlisted men, as well as the officers, in our armed services receiving the justice to which they are entitled. I say that literally hundreds of thousands of people from the State of Ohio regret the choice CHARLES ELSTON has made. We hope that we may have his advice and counsel always, and he will come back to visit us often.

Mr. JENKINS. I thank my colleague.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, all of us were elected to this body for the first time, once. All of us experienced a somewhat confused feeling within our hearts and minds on our first day in Congress. I shall never forget meeting CHARLEY ELSTON on that first day and hearing his words of advice, in which he said, "Don't let it get you down, Bill. Just do your best." CHARLEY ELSTON has been an inspiration to me. I sincerely regret his leaving.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] himself. I am sure the membership will want to hear what may be CHARLEY ELSTON's last speech in this body.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, my only regret at the moment is that I do not have sufficient words to express my thanks for the tributes paid me by my colleagues this afternoon. It goes without saying I deeply appreciate their kind remarks.

Fourteen years of service in the Congress of the United States has been a rich experience. It is an honor I shall never cease to cherish. Nor shall the depth of my affection for the Members of the House ever dim. Particularly does that apply to the members of the Ohio delegation, the Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with whom I have been so closely associated.

Although I am retiring from the House of Representatives at the end of the present session, I shall continue to take an active part in the affairs of Government. The experiences I have gained here necessarily will be helpful.

Since its creation, the Congress of the United States has been designated the greatest legislative body in the world. It has earned and preserved this title largely because of the loyalty, the diligence, and the devotion to duty of its membership. It is a privilege to have served with so many able men and women. My best wishes shall be with you always.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point of the RECORD in encomium of these our Ohio friends who will not be with us next year, and that I may revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, It was my distinct pleasure, back in February of 1950, to appear as speaker on a Lincoln Day program in Lancaster, Ohio, in the district represented by my friend, WALTER BREHM.

On that occasion I learned of the high esteem in which he is held by the folks who have sent him down here to the Congress.

That esteem is understandable to me and it is understandable to everyone here who knows WALTER BREHM.

He has capably fulfilled his obligations to his constituents and to the Nation; he has been a diligent member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

One need only consider the background of WALTER BREHM to appreciate the substance of his character. With his heart set on a higher education he worked in the steel mills and the oil fields after graduation from high school. Such determination was not to be denied, and as a result of initiative and hard work he was graduated into the profession of dentistry.

His election to the Congress of the United States was preceded by public service as a member of the Ohio State Legislature, an experience which gave him a fitting background for his duties in this Chamber.

I count myself among the many friends who will miss WALTER BREHM in these halls and I join them in wishing him deserved happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly the need to make these remarks today, as they concern my very good friend and colleague of many years. The Honorable CHARLES H. ELSTON, of the First District of Ohio, after serving 14 consecutive years in the House of Representatives, has decided to retire, and return to his first love, the practice of law in Cincinnati.

I became acquainted with CHARLEY ELSTON when he was a young member of the staff of the prosecuting attorney of Hamilton County, Ohio, in 1917. At that time I was court messenger for the late Judge Smith Hickenlooper, and Judge Frank R. Gusweiler, of the old superior court of our county, and was studying law at the same time. Well do I recall listening to the cases tried by Charley in those days. I knew then that he would some day become one of the best trial lawyers in our city and State, and it was not too long after he left the prosecutor's office in 1925 that my prediction was borne out.

During World War I, he enlisted in the aviation service of the United States Army, and has since that time been a real student of air power.

In the year 1938, Charley and I campaigned together for the first time, and we came to Congress together in January 1939. As a first termer, he was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee at the request of the late Congressman Walter G. "Ham" Andrews, of New York, who was the ranking Republican member of the committee at that time. Congressman Andrews knew of CHARLEY ELSTON's reputation as a trial lawyer, and of his knowledge of military affairs, and of air power, in particular. Charley served on that committee with distinction, and took a leading role in legislation creating the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which committee he became a most active and valuable member.

In January 1947, when the Armed Services Committee was organized, Charley and I were both placed on that committee, and sat side by side during the Eightieth Congress.

Congressman Andrews called upon Charley to head the "Legal" subcommittee during that Congress. The subcommittee made many investigations and held many hearings under his chairmanship, and to Congressman ELSTON goes the credit for the present workable Court Martial Code of Justice. This is one of the finest legal tasks ever done by any committee of Congress.

Congressman ELSTON has been faithful in his attendance at the meetings of the Armed Services Committee and has always been on the alert to save money for the taxpayers without in any way impairing our defense.

It is with deep regret that I see CHARLEY ELSTON leave the Congress. He has made many valuable contributions to the betterment of his Government during his 14 years of service. Men of his ability and integrity are not easily replaced, and in times such as these we need men of his caliber in our legislative bodies. The Halls of Congress will miss him.

I wish him long life, good health, and happiness for himself and his loved ones.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, one of the more melancholy aspects of the closing days of any Congress lies in the realization that some of those we have cherished as good friends will not return as Members.

Beyond that, we know we shall miss the fine talents of CHARLES H. ELSTON

who has so conscientiously served the First Congressional District of Ohio.

With his background as a lawyer, CHARLEY ELSTON has brought to this Chamber the benefits of a well-trained legal mind, coupled with a willingness to contribute a full measure of his time and energies to the broader concepts of national welfare.

All of us are fully aware of the rigorous duties attendant upon membership on the Armed Services Committee. These have been times of great strain and stress for all our people and it is safe to say that none of us has been more mindful of his great responsibilities in the field of legislation than our good friend, CHARLEY ELSTON.

It is a matter of personal regret to me that he is leaving this great activity, but it is my sincere hope that the coming years will bring him continued success and happiness.

CHARLEY ELSTON has been a devoted and faithful public servant in his years down here, making those personal sacrifices to his assignment as a Member of the Congress which so many are called upon to make.

I know he will not forget the many pleasant associations he has made in these halls; certainly we shall not forget him.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, for almost a century the four walls of this Chamber have witnessed the coming and going of men and women who have given of themselves to formulate the laws of this great Republic of ours. The stream of government flows steadily on, the individual rides upon it like a leaf, sometimes through heavy rapids, sometimes drifting down calm and peaceful waters. For some years past the current has been swift, even cruel betimes, taking its toll in overexertion, in overstrain upon the capacity to endure.

Each year a few of our number pass beyond our orbit. Each year others, wiser perhaps than many of us, decide to relinquish their responsibilities here and reassume their home obligations.

This year 38 of our members have announced their decision not to return to Congress. How we shall miss them all.

During the now more than 12 years since I have represented the great Twenty-second District of Ohio here in this House—for some years the largest constituency in the land—it has been my privilege to work very closely with the stalwart CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey. What a power has been his. What a strength he has given at every turn. Working under him on the great Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which he was chairman during the Eightieth Congress, has been a never-to-be-forgotten privilege. Thank you, Charles, for the warmth of affection that lies between us and for being you.

Back more than 20 years, when I came to Washington as wife to one of the finest of men, ROY WOODRUFF and his lovely wife, Daisy, gave me their friendship. It has meant much to me down the years, especially since I have had to stand on my own feet upon this historic floor. God keep you both, my dears, and give you many happy years together.

May I take this opportunity, my good friend and colleague "Uncle BOB" DOUGHTON, to tell you how much your charming courtesy has meant to me in these years when I have been privileged to sit across the aisle from you. It is men such as you who have made this country great—it is such as you who give our youth an example of what a true gentleman is. I do thank you for the warmth of your never-failing courtesy toward me and trust you will permit me to say here in the midst of those who respect and honor you, that the deep affection I have for you will warm my heart as long as Heaven permits me to live.

There are many others I have not known as I wish I might have known them. To you all I would give the hand of fellowship, saying God speed you in whatever it is that you go forth to do.

Ohio, too, loses two of its good men. One of them, "Doc" BREHM, has been called upon by the cold process of redistricting, to accept the parceling out of his counties to others. You have been a grand sport about it, Doc. I join with your other Ohio colleagues in wishing you and your sweet wife many years of happy companionship and good fortune.

We shall miss you sorely, CHARLES ELSTON, more than any words of mine can tell. Yes; 14 years is a long time to take out of your personal living and give it to your country as loyally as you have done, but I know how joyously you have given them. Most earnestly do I hope that you take with you a deep sense of satisfaction in work well done—work that has meant greater strength for America. It will be a long time before the Committee on Armed Services will find anyone so able.

To all of you who leave us as this Eighty-second Congress closes, I would say "good luck"—do not forget us—come back whenever you can, and may Heaven bless you, your loved ones, and our beloved country.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a lonesome feeling to realize that so many good friends are leaving the House.

Dr. WALTER BREHM has been my next-door neighbor in Ohio in that he represented the district next to mine. I was born in the district he represents. His wife and my wife were in college together. His brother, Dr. Wayne Brehm, in Columbus is an old friend of mine. Our personal ties have been close. When Dr. BREHM came to Congress he asked for, and received, an important and difficult assignment, membership on the Committee on Education and Labor. This was a post of honor and of danger, politically, because passions are aroused over the controversial matters that come before that committee. Dr. BREHM carried on with courage and independence, letting the chips fall where they may. This characterized his work on the floor. In his contacts with all of us he was friendly, kindly, witty, and philosophical. We will miss him in the corner seat in the Chamber that he always occupied.

CHARLEY ELSTON, who is also leaving us, came to Congress when I did, in the Seventy-sixth Congress. He left a brilliant law practice, could return to it now if he wished. I personally hope he will take it easy after his years of labor here. He has earned some leisure.

We were freshmen together. He was on Military Affairs then on the Armed Services Committee, before, during, and after World War II. Although he participated in much important legislation, I feel that perhaps his greatest work was on the military justice bill, which is a permanent monument to his keen legal mind, his sense of fair play, his common sense.

Having CHARLEY ELSTON on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been a comfort to me. In that work he knew things I was not permitted to learn, but I had confidence in his ability to learn all the facts, then make wise decisions. He leaves here a monument of work well done, a great circle of friends who admire and respect him. He leaves a gap in the congressional front that will not be easily filled.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret I learn that Hon. WALTER BREHM and Hon. CHARLES ELSTON have determined not to seek reelection to Congress. I had the pleasure of serving in the Ohio State Legislature with Dr. BREHM, and I recall quite vividly his fine contribution in the legislative halls at Columbus to the government of the State of Ohio. Although I have only been a Member of Congress for one term and he has been here much longer, I am sure he made that same fine contribution of service to his district and his country during the terms he has served in the National House.

While my acquaintance with Mr. ELSTON was limited to this current term, I immediately found in him a combination of the qualities of industry, honesty, and intelligence which in my opinion make the type of Congressman so urgently needed in the national scene today. He represents the conscientious worker who is willing to make the necessary sacrifices which office holding requires and at the same time cheerfully performs his duty without any display of showmanship which is so often mistaken for statesmanship.

Both of these colleagues have constantly given to me the benefit of their experience as National Legislators and because of my affectionate regard for them I regret their departure from the Halls of Congress. Because of the years of public service which they have given to their districts and Nation, I know that their passing from the scene will be a loss to this House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, we have all been listening to the tribute paid to Members of Congress who are about to leave us. Michigan will lose two men from this body, and I can say of both that they are really Nature's true noblemen. One of them has served 17 terms in this House, or 34 years. I speak of the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Bay City. The other, the Honorable WILLIAM BLACKNEY, of Flint, Mich.

I have compiled and have before me a few remarks to give something of his remarkable record.

Mr. Speaker, ROY ORCHARD WOODRUFF, of Bay City, was born at Eaton Rapids, Mich., on March 14, 1876, of Scotch-Irish-English parentage. He received his education in the public schools of Eaton Rapids and the Detroit College of Medicine, graduating from the dental department in 1902, and engaging in practice in Bay City.

He enlisted in the Spanish-American War as a private in Company G, Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and served through the Santiago campaign. Mr. WOODRUFF was delegated by ex-President Theodore Roosevelt to raise a battalion of infantry for his division for service overseas in World War I, which he tendered the administration. When the division was denied service, Mr. WOODRUFF entered the Second Officers' Training Camp at Fort Sheridan, Ill., and was graduated a first lieutenant of infantry. He was assigned to the Three Hundred and Eleventh Ammunition Train. He was promoted to captain just prior to sailing for France with the Eighty-sixth Division, and was made major of infantry while on duty in France, where he served 11 months with the AEF. He was honorably discharged at Camp Dix, N. J., in August 1919, after which he returned to Europe and spent 6 months investigating conditions in England, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland. He returned to the United United States in March 1920.

Mr. WOODRUFF is married and has two children, Mrs. Ronald Houck and Devere. The latter served 4 years and 4 months in World War II, attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel.

In 1911, Mr. WOODRUFF was elected mayor of Bay City, serving one term, and was elected to the Sixty-third Congress on the Progressive ticket. Following military service, he was elected to the Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, Eighty-first, and Eighty-second Congresses on the Republican ticket. His congressional service has been of longer duration than that of any other resident of Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF is a member of the Ways and Means Committee and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Mr. WOODRUFF served for many years as chairman of the Republican conference and on the National Forest Reservation Commission.

He is the dean of the Michigan delegation in this House. A stalwart American and an advocate of American principles. He leaves behind a brilliant record as an able legislator and especially for his statesmanlike services as a member on the Committee of Ways and Means of the House.

Our best wishes go with him for his health and future happiness.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, ROY WOODRUFF and I came to the Sixty-third Congress together. During all of our service together we have been good friends. He is a statesman of a high order and a patriot of the best type. I will miss his warm friendship and his wonderful personality. His is a fine and good soul.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every freshman Congressman in the early days of his service here finds those sturdy veterans among the membership to whom he looks in admiration.

For me, ROY WOODRUFF was such a veteran when I came to the Congress in 1935.

The years have not dimmed my respect and admiration for the manner in which he has served his constituency in Michigan and the Nation as a whole.

There are comparatively few men who can look back over a period of service as long and eventful as that enjoyed by my good friend from the great community of Bay City.

There is wisdom that can come only through experience, and when we realize that ROY WOODRUFF has been ably conducting the duties of his office through 17 sessions of the Congress we can appreciate the wealth of legislative background that is being lost to the House of Representatives through his retirement.

It was partly that background which made ROY WOODRUFF a capable and valued member of the tremendously important Committee on Ways and Means. But it was also his depth of understanding of the American system—the system which has made this country great—which made it possible for him to make his splendid contributions to the work of this body.

My guess is that his retirement from the Congress does not mean the end of unselfish devotion to the cause of his fellow men. No one who has spent such a great portion of a lifetime in this Chamber can remain unmindful of other opportunities in private life to be of service to mankind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the decision of ROY WOODRUFF to terminate his long and honorable congressional career casts a shadow upon all of us. It particularly saddens those of us who through the years have enjoyed his warm and generous friendship. ROY WOODRUFF was a fine, lovable person. He liked people and he liked to assist them. In particular, he was fond of young people and through his kindly aid and assistance made it possible for some of the younger Congressmen to be successful.

He was a trained legislator and was conversant with the many complicated national policies.

As chairman of the Republican conference, as a member of the policy committee, and as a member of the Ways and Means Committee he served with ability and distinction. He was one of the men I relied upon and one who never failed me.

Such friends are rare, and while I am sad to see him leave the scene of so many fruitful years, I rejoice in the rest he has so richly earned. We all wish for him many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1940, one of the first men who extended his hand in greeting was the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable ROY O. WOODRUFF.

Congressman WOODRUFF, in my opinion, exemplifies the fundamental requisites of a public official: He is able, forceful and respected by all, and is one who always has time to listen to the problems of his fellow men and to give wise counsel if it is requested.

ROY WOODRUFF's able leadership as a Member of Congress will be missed by the people of his district, the people of his State, and the people of this Nation.

I join with the others in wishing for him and his splendid wife a continuing enrichment of their lives upon retirement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the Nation are losing a fine public servant with the voluntary retirement of ROY WOODRUFF. His enviable record totaling more than 30 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives is a mark to shoot at for all in the future. Many will try but few will approach the achievements of the dean of the Michigan delegation.

I am personally indebted to ROY WOODRUFF for his kind assistance and helpful aid, particularly when I was a first term Member of the House. Without Roy's thoughtfulness in my early days in the Congress I would have had a much more difficult time. Unfortunately I can only repay him in words for his many kindnesses.

It is my sincere hope that Roy and Mrs. Woodruff will enjoy many years of health and happiness. They deserve it for both have given unselfishly of their time and effort on behalf of their constituency.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as the second session of the Eighty-second Congress approaches adjournment and the congressional service of Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF comes to a close, I join with my colleagues in extending him the praise that is his due in recognition of his outstanding service.

It has been my privilege to serve as a junior member of the Committee on Ways and Means for the past 6 years, and throughout that time I have had many occasions to seek his counsel and guidance as a senior member of that committee. Mr. WOODRUFF has been most generous in giving his time and attention to me at all times. His example of diligence and loyalty to the people it has been his privilege to serve as their Representative in Congress and to his duties in Congress and as a member of the Committee on Ways and

Means has been an inspiration to all of us. His record will stand out brilliantly in the pages of our history.

I extend Mr. WOODRUFF my best wishes for his highly deserved enjoyment of many years of pleasant leisure and active association with his host of friends.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a rather sad moment for me in farewell to eulogize my colleague and friend, ROY ORCHARD WOODRUFF, of the Tenth District of Michigan, who for such a long time has served so faithfully and well in the best interests of his State. Michigan was fortunate, indeed, to have had a man with the character, ability, and over-all stature possessed by my good friend. It was a great advantage for me as a majority member to advise and work with him in the fulfillment of our duties as members of the Committee on Ways and Means. As a member of the minority, Mr. WOODRUFF occupied a position of great influence, not only in the committee having jurisdiction over all tax and revenue matters but also with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Our complete understanding at all times, free of any partisanship or political advantage, whenever the best interests of Michigan or of our people were involved, frequently made it possible for us to obtain concessions for the business, industry, and people of our great State which would not have been possible had we been dealing on a purely partisan basis.

When first the announcement that he was retiring was made by my distinguished colleague, I was shocked and saddened and, upon regaining my equilibrium, I discussed the matter with him in the hope that he might find it possible to reconsider this momentous decision. Unfortunately, the die was cast and seemingly there was no turning back. I know that this announcement was a shock, not only to the good people of the Tenth District but to all the people of Michigan, because his seat in Congress, his position of influence with the membership of this House, and particularly the influence which he wielded in the Committee on Ways and Means, will be almost impossible to fill for many years to come. His district will have to strive its level best to replace a man whose services it would be impossible to overestimate.

I want to pay my humble tribute to the character, the ability, the diligence, and productiveness of my good friend and colleague and to express the wish that God will grant him many years of health as he enjoys his well-deserved rest.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that any Member who has had a chance to know ROY WOODRUFF will say that he is a high-class gentleman.

The Committee on Ways and Means held a meeting some time ago which was attended by all of its members. Shortly before that time the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] had announced his intention of not running for reelection. That meeting was attended by all the members regardless of party. At that meeting due regards were given to the fact that several members of the committee would not be back as Members of the next session of Congress.

Later the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee held a goodbye party for Mr. WOODRUFF at which we took turns in expressing our regards for him. He has served a greater number of years in Congress then any other Republican with the possible exception of Mr. REED.

Of course, I join in all the fine things that have been said about our distinguished colleague today.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, particularly those from Michigan, may have the privilege of extending their remarks in the RECORD in regard to our colleague from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], who is also retiring voluntarily from the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to learn of the retirement of a very close friend, the Honorable WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, of Michigan.

Bill, as he is affectionately known, and I have had many things in common, and I am reluctant to accept the fact of his retirement. He has really been an excellent Member of Congress and I am certain that the people of his district are not familiar with his many accomplishments because of his innate modesty.

Although I regret that Bill is leaving these halls, I compliment him on making his choice to return to his children, his grandchildren, and his home friends, and to become better acquainted with them and with his library, of which he so often speaks. Bill can be assured that we will not forget our friendly associations with him, and I hope that he will not forget his friends here. The best of luck to you, friend Bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am truly sorry that my good and able friend, BILL BLACKNEY, has decided not to come back to us next year. But I extend him my warmest wishes for continued health and happiness in the years that lie ahead.

With the indulgence of this body I would like to make a brief allusion to both our biographies to point up the parallel nature of our careers—coincidental items which contribute to my affection for the distinguished Congressman from Michigan.

Both of us were born in very small communities—WILLIAM BLACKNEY, in Clio, Mich., I in DeMotte, Ind. Both of us graduated from law school and practiced law—yes, and both of us came into political careers through the door of a prosecuting attorney's office. And both of us came to the Seventy-fourth Congress as freshmen.

For me, BILL BLACKNEY will always be remembered as a loyal and stanch comrade-in-arms. Well do I recall the situation when we were taking our places in this Chamber. Of all the minorities we have seen in this arena, the position of the Republican members was certainly the most minor. It was said, facetiously, that we could caucus in a phone booth. That was almost a fact.

Down through the years we have survived the political storms, witnessing together the vicissitudes of many sessions.

WILLIAM BLACKNEY'S services will be greatly missed by his constituents; his counsel and experience will be sorely missed by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. I hope he will return to see us often.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that our good friend and fine public servant, BILL BLACKNEY, is voluntarily retiring from the Congress at the end of this term. BILL BLACKNEY has been a conscientious and constructive member of the important House Committee on Armed Services. His service on that committee covered a trying period in our Nation's history, an era when the best men were necessary for the formation of a constructive national defense policy. BILL BLACKNEY contributed greatly during those years to the strength of our military program. He will be sorely missed.

After the many years as an invaluable Member of the House, BILL BLACKNEY deserves a long period of health and happiness. I join his many friends in wishing him well.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to observe the actions of my good friend and colleague WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, of the Sixth District of Michigan, from the time he was first chosen as a Representative to Congress. While we are of opposite parties, and frequently did not see eye to eye on issues, I must say as a parting tribute, as he chooses to retire, that there is not a Member on the floor of this Congress who is more sincere and devoted to the welfare of the electorate than is my friend, WILLIAM BLACKNEY. In serving with him over these many years it was my privilege to enjoy his kindness and friendly understanding.

In his retirement the great State of Michigan loses an influential member of the Armed Services Committee, wherein he played a most important part. He was known for his diligence and helpfulness in formulating legislation upon which the very safety of our country depended. Toward this objective he has at all times contributed more than his share; frequently, be it said, at great sacrifice to his meager physical strength. But WILLIAM BLACKNEY was not one to calculate the cost. His concern first and above everything else was the needs and effect of any and all legislative proposals. He was always on the job when his counsel and assistance were needed. The advice which he could give, gained from experience over the many years, was invaluable and many of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle were influenced by his expressed views. His patriotic service, to say naught of the fine personality which he possessed, will be missed first in committee and then among the general membership of this House. It is difficult to see how his place

can be filled without loss to the people. In his departure I extend to him my heartfelt wishes and the prayerful hope that he will find comfort and happiness in his retirement for many years to come.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that there is not more time under this rule for remarks regarding our colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]. I know that every Member on the floor would like to express the same sentiments that have been expressed today with reference to the gentleman, but unfortunately we have only a certain amount of time under the rule, which has expired.

May I say that there is no objection to this rule on the minority side.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2357) to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act, be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clauses (4a) and (6) of subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act are amended by inserting after "agricultural" in each such clause the following: "(including horticultural)."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3168) to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That so much of section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to adjustments to basis of property for depreciation, etc.) as precedes the word 'Where' is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(B) in respect of any period since February 28, 1913, or exhaustion, wear and tear, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion, to the extent of the amount—

"'(i) allowed as deductions in computing net income under this chapter or prior income tax laws, and

"'(ii) resulting (by reason of the deductions so allowed) in a reduction for any taxable year of the taxpayer's taxes under this chapter (other than subch. E), subchapter E of chapter 2, or prior income, war-profits, or excess-profits tax laws.

but not less than the amount allowable under this chapter or prior income tax laws. Clause (ii) of this subparagraph shall not apply in respect to any period since February 28, 1913, and before January 1, 1952, unless an election has been made under subsection (d).'

"SEC. 2. Section 113 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to basis of property) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(d) Election in respect of depreciation, etc., allowed before 1952: Any person may elect to have clause (ii) of subsection (b) (1) (B) apply in respect of periods since February 28, 1913, and before January 1, 1952. Such an election shall be made in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, shall be irrevocable, and shall apply in respect of all property held by the person making the election at any time on or before the date on which the election was made and in respect of all periods since February 28, 1913, and before January 1, 1952, during which such person held such property or for which adjustments must be made under subsection (b) (2). An election by a transferor, donor, or grantor made after the date of the transfer, gift, or grant of property shall not affect the basis of such property in the hands of the transferee, donee, or grantee. No such election may be made after December 31, 1952.'

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply in respect of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1938. Provisions having the effect of such amendments shall be deemed to have been included in the revenue laws respectively applicable to taxable years ending after December 31, 1981, and beginning before January 1, 1939."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON, if this is the so-called Camp bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, there is no objection on our side with reference to this piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. T. HEARD

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2582) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard, which was on the Private Calendar this morning, but to which an objection was made.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey to W. T. Heard, his heirs and assigns, all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described tract of land situated in Russell County, Ala., upon payment by the said W. T. Heard of the fair market value of such tract of land as determined by the Secretary of the Army:

DESCRIPTION OF TRACT

Start at the point where the east boundary line of Central of Georgia Railroad right-of-way and the north boundary line of section 27, township 16, range 30, intersect and running thence north eighty-four degrees fifty-one minutes east a distance of two thousand two hundred seventy-seven and six-tenths feet to establish a beginning point; running thence north eighty-four degrees fifty-one minutes east a distance of five thousand forty-seven and five one-hundredths feet along said north boundary line of said section 26 to an iron stake; thence running south forty-seven degrees forty-one minutes west a distance of sixty-nine and thirty-one-hundredths feet; thence running south forty-three degrees seventeen minutes west a distance of one thousand three hundred forty-one and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence running south thirty-seven degrees twenty-six minutes west a distance of three hundred eleven and fifty-two one-hundredths feet; thence running south forty-three degrees sixteen minutes west a distance of four hundred fifty-nine and thirty-six one-hundredths feet; thence running south forty-five degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of four hundred thirty and ninety-eight one-hundredths feet; thence running south fifty-two degrees thirty-five minutes west a distance of three hundred seven and fifty-six one-hundredths feet; thence running south fifty-four degrees thirty-three minutes west a distance of seven hundred fourteen and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence running south forty-eight degrees forty-five minutes west a distance of one thousand two hundred ninety-four and eighty-five one-hundredths feet; thence running north twenty-six degrees twenty-three minutes west a distance of three thousand two hundred forty-six and three-tenths feet to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. There shall be reserved to the United States an easement for the use of the air space over the property authorized to be conveyed by this act to the extent that the full utilization of the Lawson Air Base at Fort Benning requires the use of such air space.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that whenever the Congress declares a state of war or national emergency, or the President declares a state of national emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of the Army, with the approval of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, that the property authorized to be conveyed under this act is necessary or useful for military purposes or for the national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation of making payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof for the duration of such state of war or such national emergency and for 6 months thereafter. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such national emergency plus 6 months, the property shall revert to the owners thereof, but the United States shall have no obligation to restore the property in any way.

SEC. 4. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservation and condition contained in section 2 and 3 of this act.

SEC. 5. The sum received by the Secretary of the Army as consideration for the conveyance authorized by this act shall be deposited by him in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO STUDY RESPECTIVE TRIBES, BANDS AND GROUPS OF INDIANS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 706, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 8) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, SIKES, RILEY, GORE, FERNANDEZ, FLOOD, FURCOLO, CANNON, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, SCRIVNER, DAVIS of Wisconsin, PHILLIPS, and COTTON.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, House resolution 706 makes in order House Joint Resolution 8. This joint resolution authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government. This is the Indian bill of rights. I know of no objection to the rule and I ask for its adoption. As a matter of fact, I know of no objection to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, there is merit to the resolution now before the House and to the bill offered by the gentlewoman from Utah, which would authorize a study to be made by the Department of the Interior as to the Indian tribes of the country that should be relieved from Federal wardship.

I rise at this time to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is also pending before the House and reported out of the Committee on Rules the Ellsworth resolution which provides for an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House. I feel that the Members will agree that we do not go far enough in the Bosone bill now before the House. It has been the duty of the Bureau of Indian Affairs for many years to make this study and such studies have been made in the past. I refer particularly to a document of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate of February 8, 1947. The then Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Zimmerman, reported that they made such a study, the exact study that is being asked by the resolution now before us.

Back in 1947 they set up those Indian tribes that could be relieved of wardship at that time. There were a number of them in group 1. Then they had a group 2, that would be within a period of 10 years; then a group 3, which would go over a period of a much longer time.

Nothing has been done, even on the report of 1947, when this study was made as to what group should be released from wardship. I believe it is a futile and idle thing to ask the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, to make this study on their own. I believe it is the duty of the Congress. It is our responsibility to make this investigation and to go further than attempting to find out which tribes might be released from wardship. We should make an investigation of the charges we have all heard from time to time about the conduct of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Under the Ellsworth resolution there would be an investigation. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the Ellsworth resolution is a combination of a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and also the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. They have been combined into a single resolution at this time. That resolution would require the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to do these things:

First, list all those tribes which are qualified to handle their own affairs.

Second, propose legislation which would terminate in an orderly fashion Federal restrictions and controls over those tribes.

Third, list those States in which the committee feels all Federal control over Indians can be discontinued and recommend legislation to accomplish this.

Fourth, report to the Congress which functions of the Indian Bureau can, without harm to the Indian tribes, be ended, transferred to other Government agencies, or assigned to the States.

Fifth, the committee shall recommend legislation which would make it possible to grant competency status to those Indians who are now classified as incompetent.

Those are the main objectives of the Ellsworth resolution, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, should be considered at this time when we are considering the resolution of the gentlewoman from Utah.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I am glad to be able to report to the gentleman and to the House with respect to the resolution of which the gentleman from Ohio speaks, House Resolution 698, which is referred to as the Ellsworth resolution, that I have the assurance of the majority leadership that it will be programed for this afternoon, with a very minor amendment or two in it. I think it would satisfy the gentleman's ideas on that subject.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand that it will be considered with the pending legislation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is not in itself, as I understand, germane to this particular piece of legislation. It merely relates to the same things but with a different approach. All I can say to the gentleman is that it is my understanding that the joint Ellsworth-Bow resolution will be programed during the afternoon, and I hope adopted, whether or not this joint resolution is enacted, and I assume it will be enacted.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate what the gentleman from Oregon has said. Certainly that is the purpose of my appearing here. I feel there is merit to the resolution of the gentlewoman from Utah. I do feel that the Ellsworth resolution should be considered.

Upon the statement made by the gentleman from Oregon that it will be programed, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr Speaker, House Joint Resolution 8 represents a change in our fundamental attitude toward the American Indian. It would in effect establish a new policy in regard to the Indian.

For more than 100 years, it has been the policy of the Government to take care of the Indian and although from time to time the Indian Bureau has taken a positive approach to this matter of wardship, such approach has been dependent largely upon the leadership of the Bureau at the particular time.

The basic policy has been to take care of them and to continue them in wardship with the hope that sometime something would happen and the Indian

would assume the same rights and responsibilities of any other American.

This resolution would be a notice to all concerned that Congress expects the Department of Interior and the Indian Bureau to drop its policy of merely looking after the Indian and to look at the wardship program as being something which must eventually be abandoned. It further charges the Indian Bureau with the responsibility of preparing the Indian for the end of wardship. This resolution will not free any Indian or any tribe of Indians. Specifically, it directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the tribes and groups of Indians in this country and to decide which of them are ready to be taken out from under Government supervision and given the control and management of their own affairs and which are not.

The resolution would require that the Secretary recommend suitable legislation which would remove from Government supervision those Indians who are capable of self-government. It would then be incumbent upon the Congress to assure itself that the Indians were ready and that the plan was sound and then to pass the necessary legislation.

This resolution would also require the Secretary to list those who are not ready to assume the management of their own affairs and to develop plans for getting these Indians in position to take care of themselves.

This resolution does not contemplate immediate action except in those cases where immediate action is advisable and justified.

It may be years or even decades before all of the Indian tribes are in position to manage their own affairs, but it certainly is time that the American Government took a positive stand and adopted a positive policy of making the Indian capable of self-government as quickly as possible.

And I want it to be thoroughly understood that this resolution is not an investigation of the Indian Bureau nor is it an investigation of anything. It merely is a statement of positive policy and a directive to the Secretary of the Interior to come up with plans for putting this positive policy into effect.

It has been my observation that the Indian, more than anything else, wants to live like the white man. He appreciates the standard of living, the freedom of action and the self-reliance of the white man. I am confident that if we will give the Indian education and training, he can hold his own with the white man. This has been proved time and time again industry, in business, and in the professions. Yet many Indian children find it possible to attend only schools maintained by the Indian Bureau and some them find it practically impossible to attend school at all. Surely our Government can and should do much more in the field of educating and training the Indian than we are doing.

Three years ago I was told I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a resolution to actually adopt a policy of taking American Indians off of wardship. Now many others have joined me in this program or have adopted similar programs of their own. I am glad to see this renewed interest in the proposition of making the Indian a self-reliant American citizen.

I do not know how many laws we have enacted in behalf of some phase of the Indian welfare, but such laws can be counted by the hundreds, and yet in spite of all this legislation and in spite of the fact that the Indian Bureau has been in existence for these many decades, we have tended to undermine the confidence of the Indian in himself rather than to build that confidence.

I think that the fact that the American Indian is still on wardship is something for which we have only ourselves to blame. By our policy for the last 100 years we have been unfair to the Indian and to the taxpayer.

Now I do not want these remarks to be construed as being critical of the present Indian Bureau. The fault rather is with us in Congress who have not insisted upon a more positive approach to the matter of wardship. From time to time those in charge of the Indian affairs have shown vision and energy in dealing with the problems and in trying to make the Indian self-reliant, but because we have not had a definite, positive policy, evidently the efforts made in one Indian Bureau Administration was lost in another.

In the interests of fair dealing to the Indian and in the interests of fair dealing to the American taxpayer, I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as heartily endorsing House Joint Resolution 8, introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE]. I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and I have had an opportunity to serve as chairman of the subcommittee on a great many hearings. Congresswoman BOSONE is to be congratulated and commended for bringing this legislation before the Congress and no one has shown as great interest in the welfare and development of our Indians as has Mrs. BOSONE.

It is my opinion that this legislation will place the responsibility on the Department of the Interior, where it belongs, to bring before the Congress a full and complete report as to which tribes or bands of Indians are capable of being emancipated and of managing completely their own affairs.

I have been surprised that some Indians do not want to be taken from under supervision of the Government as it appears that some of them would like to have all the rights, benefits and privileges of citizenship, but do not want to assume the responsibility that goes with it by the paying of taxes, but I must say that these are very much in the minority. Certainly we want to be very particular and careful in relieving American Indians of Government supervision and when they are no longer wards of the Government they will, of course, suffer many hardships and inequities, and some of them will be taken advantage of by unscrupulous persons, but I am convinced that after they have had control and management of their properties, monies, and affairs they will, from the school of experience, be in a position to take care of themselves and their assets, as is the white man.

This legislation directs the Secretary of the Interior to make a study as to the qualifications of different Indian tribes, bands, and groups, and to report to the Congress the results of this study, together with recommendations. It calls for an appropriation of $50,000. It is my confirmed opinion that this will be money well spent and while this legislation does not take the Indian from under Government supervision, it is certainly a step in the right direction.

I understand there is also a resolution referred to as the Ellsworth resolution, calling for such a study and for an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In my opinion, it would be helpful to have both of these resolutions approved, but I must say that I have had an opportunity to hear and observe the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Hon. Dillon S. Myer, on many occasions and I have the highest regard for him, his ability and integrity.

The job of removing the Indians from Government wardship is of great importance to all the American taxpayers and to all the American Indians and it should be done in a very orderly manner. I heartily endorse the legislation as proposed by Mrs. BOSONE and I again congratulate and commend her for bringing this before the Congress.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I desire to announce that after this bill is disposed of the Ellsworth resolution will be in order.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, for the 16 years I have been in Congress I have been on the Indian Affairs Committee. In view of what has not been done for them, I do not know that that is much to my credit. I do know, however, that I have given 16 years and more of study to the Indian problem with which the country is confronted. Nobody can say that I have shown a lack of interest in Indian matters.

In regard to the particular legislation before us, I find we of the committee are all agreed on the essential idea of a study but differ as to who should do it. That is, somebody ought to make a study of the Indian situation and see how many of them are capable of managing their own affairs and taking their full place as American citizens instead of being under wardship. There are more than 300,000 Indians in this Nation. We could divide them into three classes. There are Indians who are perfectly

competent to fit into the American way of life among our citizens. I can think of some of them in that class as I have lived among those Indians. On the other hand, and at the other extreme, there are Indians sometimes called wild Indians, who are not yet capable because of one reason or another, of fitting into the American way of life. Then, of course, there is a broad zone between.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot take shotgun action in regard to these Indians and treat them all alike. There must be a study and treatment adjusted accordingly. I do not like the word "I investigate." We have used that word until it is threadbare. Investigation has come to imply something probably criminally wrong. We do need a study and that is one thing that is provided by the present bill. I have studied both bills, House Joint Resolution No. 8 introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah, Judge BOSONE, which I favor, and I have also studied a little less in detail, however, the bill soon to be offered by the gentleman from Oregon. I think either of those bills will serve a useful purpose. I want to say to my friends who are advocating the latter bill who say the Department has not done its duty by way of studying, as the gentleman has just said, that congressional committees—and I have just admitted that I have been on one for 16 years—have not done much better. The problem is a very great and complex problem. I do not know whether the Department of the Interior can do a better job than a committee of the Congress or vice versa.

I do think, because of my connection with the committee, the job ought to be done for I have had many young men, Indian GI's, come and say, "Release us from wardship." They want the full privileges of citizenship which they have a right to have. On the other hand, I have had aged men of various tribes come and say, "Do not cast us out. Do not put us upon our own." They felt they were not competent to take care of themselves. We have Indians of that class and they are not necessarily all old men, but of course the aged Indians are more likely to be in that class.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman who is the distinguished chairman of our Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, and who has done so much for the Indians, has mentioned the bill introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] and the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH]. Would the chairman say that he feels that both bills should be passed by the Congress, and that one is not incompatible with the other?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; I would be glad to say that. I think that is true. It would be carrying on two studies at the same time, but that could be done. Too much knowledge and information cannot be obtained on this problem.

Mr. BOW. Is it not true that a subcommittee working under the gentleman's committee, Mr. Speaker, would have the opportunity then to have made available to them the study being made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that would be the case, and it would be profitable to have it so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a worthy purpose back of House Joint Resolution 8 and likewise House Resolution 706, which of course is the rule that we are talking on, and the one to be presented by our colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

To start with, we are asking the Department of the Interior to do something which they are supposed to have done, which they should have been doing all these years, making a study insofar as the emancipation of the Indian is concerned.

We have held hearings in our committee for weeks, and there are bills on the Consent Calendar now which have for their purpose some of the first steps in emancipating the Indians in the various States. Certainly I think it is in line that both resolutions be passed, because the Committee on Indian Affairs will be making its study at the same time the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be making its study. It will be a fine opportunity to get the two viewpoints together. Otherwise, we are not taking the program alone as presented by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. So if we want to approach this from a fair basis, I think we should have the information obtained from both sources.

Personally, I think the most disgraceful record in American history is the way we have treated the Indians. So this is a subject which to me is every bit as important as throwing the money down the rat holes over in Europe and other places. We should take care of our own people. That is why I think both of these resolutions are worthy of consideration and adoption.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] is recognized.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (H. J. Res. 8) be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make a study of the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction in order to determine the respective qualifications of such Indians to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government. The Secretary shall report to the Congress the results of such study together with such recommendations as he deems advisable. In particular, the Secretary shall—

(1) specify not later than the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress which tribes, bands, and groups of Indians are, in his opinion, qualified to be relieved of all supervision and control by the Federal Government in the management of their affairs; state the reasons for his opinion that such Indians are qualified; and submit specific legislative proposals (prepared with due regard for the legislative forms and procedures of the Congress) to accomplish the orderly and expeditious termination of all such supervision and control by the Federal Government over such Indians; and

(2) review not later than the first day of the first regular session of the Eighty-third Congress all current programs undertaken by the Department of the Interior for the purpose of accomplishing, as soon as practicable, the orderly termination of all supervision and control by the Federal Government over those tribes, bands, and groups of Indians which are, in his opinion, not at this time qualified to be relieved of supervision and control by the Federal Government in the management of their affairs; set forth any additional programs which it may be necessary or advisable for the Department to undertake in the future for such purpose; and submit specific legislative proposals (prepared with due regard for the legislative forms and procedures of the Congress) to accomplish the orderly termination, as soon as practicable, of all such supervision and control by the Federal Government over those Indians determined not to be qualified at this time.

The Secretary is authorized to expend during the fiscal 1952, without regard to the provisions of law regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service, $75,000 from any appropriations available for activities or projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to initiate and conduct the study authorized herein, and there is hereby authorized to be expended annually hereafter such additional sums as may be required to carry on such investigations and determinations, out of funds appropriated and made available annually for activities or projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 4, strike "second" and insert "third."

Page 2, line 16, strike "third" and insert "fourth."

Page 3, line 11, strike "$75,000" and insert "$50,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to talk about some "Indians" who will not be back next year because they decided voluntarily to quit Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this occasion, on which we pay tribute to nearly twoscore colleagues who are voluntarily choosing not to return to Congress next year, is to me one of regret, both personally and from the standpoint of the welfare of the Nation.

I qualify that expression of regret in only one particular. This occasion does have the one happy aspect that it enables our friends and colleagues to know the high esteem in which they are held.

It is our opportunity to tell them how much we think of them, how highly we treasure their friendship and our years of association, while they are able to enjoy hearing and knowing it.

But, I repeat, it is a matter of personal regret to me, as I know it is to all of us, to know that our association here is drawing to a close.

What is vastly more important is the loss which the Nation suffers in the retirement of these men. It is a sad commentary indeed when men of this high caliber retire in such numbers in a single year.

I believe these voluntary retirements may, in every instance, be attributed to one of two reasons—either the inability longer to stand the financial drain and burden of the office or the inability longer to stand the physical drain and burden of the office.

Here are nearly twoscore faithful servants of their constituents and of the Nation, most of whom have been in Congress less than the 16 years it has been my privilege to serve, who are finding, for one or another of these reasons, that they are unable longer to remain in office.

Regardless of party, these men have served faithfully, diligently, and capably. They have been underpaid and overworked. They have been subject to the abuse of irresponsible and illinformed attacks, including the attacks of some so-called press and radio commentators.

I am not at all sure that either their constituents or the American people fully understand and appreciate the loss which the Nation and the Congress sustains in their retirement. I know their colleagues in Congress do appreciate this loss of experience, of ability, of devotion to public service.

Many of the members retiring for financial reasons will step into substantially better paying positions, positions in which compensation is more nearly commensurate to the talents and abilities and devotion which have been at the service of the American people all these years. Someday, perhaps, the American people will understand that it is penny wisdom, but pound foolishness, which underpays its representatives in Congress.

I cannot forebear to mention, also, that one of the heavy drains on the physical stamina and health of these retiring members is the terrific demands, not alone of the job but of the pressures and pressure groups which are a part of the apparently inevitable climate in which all Members serve.

There is not time, even though there is the inclination, to call the roll personally of my retiring friends and colleagues—men on both sides of the aisle. There are LEONARD ALLEN and HENRY LARCADE of Louisiana; TOM PICKETT, of Texas, and CHARLES ELSTON, of Ohio, and JACK ANDERSON, of California—and all the rest.

I content myself with offering a few special words of tribute to two close friends and colleagues from Michigan, ROY WOODRUFF, one of the most able, forceful and respected members of the Ways and Means Committee, a Member of this House for 34 years, will be greatly missed by all of us and by none more than his Michigan colleagues.

Roy served one term before the First World War, having been elected on the Bull Moose ticket in 1912. I am proud of the fact that my acquaintance with ROY WOODRUFF goes back many years before I ever imagined that I might myself someday serve in this House. In fact I managed his campaign in the west end of his district in 1920 when he ran for reelection after his military service in World War I.

As every Member here knows, ROY WOODRUFF is the perfect example of a man who has worn himself out in the service of his district and his country. He is still keen, alert, and a great deal wiser than most of us ever will be, but his poor health over the past 2 years makes it imperative that he retire.

I would be presumptuous indeed if I were to try to put into words what the Members of this House or I, personally, think of ROY WOODRUFF. But I think he knows—if his innate modesty will permit him to acknowledge the fact—the high esteem, respect, and affection in which he is held by all of us.

My other retiring colleague from Michigan, BILL BLACKNEY, after 16 years' service in this House, is stepping out to take life easier and to devote his time and attention to his children and grandchildren. He has only recently known the sorrow of losing his life's companion, and I commend him on his devotion to his family which I know has played an important part in his decision to retire at this time.

I doubt if BILL BLACKNEY will ever completely retire from politics. No doubt he will be out on the hustings to support his party's nominee for his successor. Coming from a predominantly labor district, by his ability, his integrity, and his close contacts with labor—particularly as an instructor in the General Motors school—he has won the respect and support of his district. Here in Congress we are going to miss BILL BLACKNEY greatly.

Time forbids my paying personal tribute to each of our retiring colleagues. But there is an ancient line of commendation and acknowledgment which expresses my feelings and that of the other Members of this House with respect to each and every one of our voluntarily retiring colleagues: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have waited around for 3 or 4 days to make the few remarks I am going to make this afternoon for and on behalf of someone unable to speak for and on behalf of himself in this forum.

Mr. Speaker, on June 26 the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, FRANK BOW, in his enthusiasm in behalf and for the Puerto Rican Constitution, and because of his interest in the Puerto Ricans, had this, among other things and in substance, to say about one of my South Carolinians, particularly one of my constituents. I impute no maliciousness to the distinguished gentleman and accuse him of nothing unfair other than the fact that I say categorically his information, I believe, certainly is erroneous. I believe that if I were to make some remarks about any of your constituents which you did not believe to be founded upon good information, you would want to do the same thing that I am doing, and I am doing it.

The distinguished gentleman in his remarks spoke of Leonard D. Long, of Charleston, South Carolina, the greatest city on earth, who went to Puerto Rico to build houses for the Puerto Ricans. As you probably know, housing in Puerto Rico is a difficult undertaking. Mr. Long went to Puerto Rico when no other American would go down there and took along his equipment to build houses for these unfortunate people. Those of you who have been in Puerto Rico as I have been have seen this group of people who had to live in houses built on stilts, and the like. Mr. Long took his equipment down there, and after certain promises made by those in authority, did a good job, in my opinion, and in my belief. I understand he was promised certain tax refunds or rebates or certain promises made by virtue of the fact that he went down there and performed this great undertaking and took this great chance.

Then as time went on this agreement was not fulfilled. One thing led to another, and the question is now in the courts, where it should be. That is where Mr. Long wanted it to be. But the gentleman from Ohio in his exuberance said this, and I quote:

> It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that a one-man lobby, Leonard D. Long, of South Carolina, has succeeded in thwarting the aspirations of more than 2,000,000 American citizens in Puerto Rico. This man is being sued by the Government of Puerto Rico for $1,000,000 in unpaid taxes.

I do not know that he is being sued. He was trying to get the agreement that the people promised him. What is wrong in that? Mr. Bow went on:

> He has publicly threatened to use his money and influence to defeat the constitution which the people approved on March 3, 1952, by a 4-to-1 vote.

I think Mr. Long is being paid an unjustified compliment. I doubt that he has all that influence in Puerto Rico.

I shall not discuss the Puerto Rican constitution. I certainly was not for it lock, stock, and sinker. I think we did a pretty good job when we amended it a little bit. When I cast my vote to allow the drafting of a constitution I did not say the sky was the limit. But when it is said that Mr. Long is going in and trying to thwart the will of the Puerto Rican people, I do not think he has that much influence. I know he does not have that much money. He does not have such sinister motives.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BRYSON. Was the gentleman implying that we have a citizen in South Carolina of such great power and wealth that he can thwart a whole nation of people in their desire to change their form of government?

Mr. RIVERS. That is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates. I do not believe Mr. Long has any feelings of that character, and I know he does not have that influence.

Mr. BRYSON. Has Mr. Long been given the privilege of having this controversy investigated?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Long's brother wrote a letter to my distinguished friend on June 25.

Mr. BRYSON. That is the former State Senator from Charleston, S. C.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. BRYSON. With whom I had the privilege of serving in the State senate?

Mr. RIVERS. I am sure of that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD the letter to which I have just referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

JUNE 28, 1952.

Congressman JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: I have tried repeatedly to reach you over the phone since Friday, but have been unsuccessful. There come a time in a man's life where he is helpless by virtue of the laws of the land to protect himself from unscrupulous and unprincipled attacks against himself and his family. Such a situation has presented itself to me in connection with the unscrupulous attacks of Representative Bow against my brother, Leonard D. Long. I refer you to the June 26 issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8242, wherein Representative Bow makes false and malicious statements against my brother, and by implication charges that he tried to buy his way through the Government of Puerto Rico, and that illegal connection has existed between my brother and representatives of the FHA.

I have talked to MENDEL RIVERS and he states he intends to answer Mr. Bow and I feel sure that JENNINGS DORN will join Mendel in denouncing the unprincipled attack on a member of my family.

I am sure that my brother or no member of my family has any objection to a thorough investigation of any connection we may have had with anybody representing the Federal Housing Administration. As for the implication that L. D. has tried to buy his way in Puerto Rico, this is maliciously false. If you will read the article, you will find Mr. Bow says he was in Puerto Rico on the day of the election, and you will find a personal letter from Luis Muñoz-Marín set forth in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD addressed to Mr. Bow. I make no suggestions nor do I advance implications in reference to the apparent friendship between Representative FRANK T. Bow and the Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín. To me, however, it is beyond understanding for any man who claims he is an American to uphold the hand of Luis Muñoz-Marín, when the records show that Luis Muñoz-Marín refused to take the stand at a political meeting in Puerto Rico until the American flag was taken from the stand. How any Member of the United States Congress could favor a man who denounces our flag is beyond me.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON on several occasions in the United States Senate has charged the Governor with the act of refusing to speak from the stand until the American flag was taken down, and he has not as yet denied the charge, for in fact he cannot, as there were too many witnesses. The Britons have an expression, "God save the King." Perhaps we should paraphrase "God save the American flag."

Joe, you know me, and I believe you know my family. This man Bow has sought to injure us. We cannot speak from the floor of Congress. We have got to rely on our friends to defend us from unscrupulous attacks.

With kindest regards, and best wishes, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

J. C. LONG.

Mr. RIVERS. He says he welcomes an investigation. That is normal procedure. I am confident that if an investigation is made, and that is one way to determine the issue, certainly Mr. Long would have his rebuttal. When a statement is made on the floor of the House, Mr. Long is without a defense. That is where old RIVERS comes in.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I, too, am well acquainted with the Long family of Charleston, S. C. I think they are men of the highest character, ability, and integrity. It is my understanding that L. D. Long went into Puerto Rico at the urgent request of the people and the government of Puerto Rico to alleviate a situation there which was desperate, the need of adequate housing in that great territory of the United States. Leonard Long performed that duty admirably and built the houses for the people. Mr. Long did an excellent job. I wish more of our great businessmen could go to undeveloped areas of the world and show the people the advantages of free American enterprise.

Unfortunately, it seems that in this day and time many of our Territories and many foreign nations invite and encourage American capital to come in, and then, once it is there, they wish to destroy the very system that has made possible this great development. The government of Puerto Rico should honor its promises to Mr. Long and live up to the letter of all agreements.

I understand also that Mr. Leonard Long welcomes the opportunity of a hearing before any investigation that this Congress might conduct. I urge that all parties in this Puerto Rican controversy be given a fair and impartial hearing. I am sure any committee would be impressed by Mr. Long's great work and efforts to aid the people of Puerto Rico.

I also agree with the gentleman about some sections of this constitution which was submitted to this House and the other body. We certainly would not want to put our stamp of approval on a constitution which was socialistic in nature, as the one brought before the House.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Long does welcome an investigation. I believe the gentleman from Ohio is a little late in bringing this thing before the Congress, because we have only 1 week left and this week is going fast. "Time's awasting." I will join with him in the next session of Congress, if my people favor me by returning me here after the November elections, in seeking an investigation, but unless and until that is done, let us not throw stones at people who cannot throw stones back. If anybody throws any stones at me I can take care of myself. I may not do the best of anybody in the House, but I will not do the worst, I will tell you that.

I want the House to know that my constituents will be very glad to have an investigation to find out about these charges that are made against their reputation. Until that time comes, I do not believe my good friend would want to needlessly, uselessly, and without sufficient information cast a reflection on the name of one who cannot speak for himself.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. My good friend from South Carolina is worried about whether he is coming back in November. I will be glad to come down and speak on every street corner for him, if he thinks it will do any good.

Mr. RIVERS. The gentleman had better wait until after election. I am grateful for that.

Mr. SHAFER. I was just hoping that the gentleman would come up to my district and speak for me, and do the kind of job he did about a year and a half ago when we opened the Percy Jones Hospital. I have not had any worries since that speech made by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Seriously I was not speaking of PAUL SHAFER, Republican. I was speaking about PAUL SHAFER, American; but I am grateful for the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. SHAFER. I am very glad that the gentleman put it that way. A lot of these boys around here are wearing these buttons saying, "I am a Republican." I do not wear them. I would not put one of them on. If I could not come out and wear a button for the guy I am for in the Republican Party, I would not wear any button, so I have dispensed with those that have been given to me.

Mr. RIVERS. I am grateful for the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. SHAFER. I am for TAFT.

Mr. RIVERS. And I am for RIVERS.

Mr. Speaker, I cast no reflection upon my distinguished friend. He is a great friend of mine, but I am sure he is willing for an investigation to be made, and I will join with him in that. I do want to say to him with all the politeness of which I am capable, I am sure his information is wrong. If it is found to be well founded in the future, I will be willing to go about in the normal and orderly process for that to be established. I just want to correct this statement. He said:

I wonder what the people of South Carolina would say if we passed a law requiring them to submit any amendment to their constitution. Would not the ghost of 1861 rise and fight again?

Mr. Speaker, it just so happens that this Congress has nothing to do with what we do with our constitution in South Carolina at any time. The ghosts will not fight again, the RIVERS' will fight all the time.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my lifelong affection for the American Indians, together with my feeling that our great Nation has never done its fullest duty toward them, together with the fact that some 50 or more members of that great tribe of American Indians named the Osages honored me by allowing me to sit with them in the great Congressional District in Los Angeles County, Calif., which I represent, causes me to ask this time to present to you the results of that conference. They asked me to tell you some very important facts. In speaking about the purport of House Joint Resolution 8, authored by the distinguished Congresswoman Mrs. BOSONE, of Utah, on January 3, 1951, I will say that my friends, this group of Osage Indians, desired me to tell you very emphatically and clearly that they do not desire to have all supervision and control by the Federal Government in the management of their affairs removed. In support of this fundamental position which they take with reference to the purport of House Joint Resolution 8 and also House Resolution 698, by Mr. ELLSWORTH, which I am informed will come to the floor of this House within this very hour, my Indian friends tell me that they have been greatly blessed by the gift of God Himself in the form of production of mineral wealth from their lands in the State of Oklahoma and elsewhere. That therefore, because there will evidently be continuing great wealth from these same lands over a long term of years; and, because they naturally want this wealth to be succeeded to by their children, their grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, they ask me to insist that this wealth be always protected by the Federal Government against the machinations, the corruption, dishonesty, fraud, connivance, and the speculation which they say will normally result in the handling of their lands and business affairs arising from the great profits thereof, if their group does not have the continuing beneficent guardianship of Uncle Sam. During the 2 hours that Mrs. Doyle and I were in conference with them at their request on this problem in the important city of South Gate, Calif., just prior to the June 3 primary election, they made it crystal clear to me that they not only had no objection to the Nation of the "Great White Father" being their guardian, but they courteously insisted that I communicate to you, my distinguished colleagues, that they vigorously desired the continuance of that guardianship. Being a lawyer in civil practice myself before I became a Member of this great legislative body, I naturally asked them how the termination of such guardianship and their receiving certificates of competency at the hands of Uncle Sam would possibly cause them loss or make them or their heirs subject to the dishonesty, connivance, fraud, and cheating of others not lawfully entitled to receive any of the proceeds of this great natural resource and wealth; to wit, oil and petroleum products. In answer to my query they said that they had been informed the proposal was that a corporation or holding company would be organized and that all their lands be joined in such ownership and control; that certificates of ownership, or capital stock, whichever the case should be, would be issued to them. This, they said, would make it fairly easy over a term of years for them and their children, grandchildren, and so forth, to lose control and ownership of this great resource and continuing source of prosperity for the Osage Indians and their heirs, and lawful successors in interest.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I was much interested in what the gentleman had to say, but does not the gentleman feel that it is the duty of this country to get all of these people out of guardianship at the earliest possible opportunity?

Mr. DOYLE. Certainly it is the duty of the United States Government to not only get out of guardianship of the Indians, but it is also equally a trust that the United States Government not get out of guardianship over any Indian that needs protection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Is it not a fact, as far as the Osages are concerned, that their concern is over the loss of their head rights to the oil properties, and under the Ellsworth resolution that will be considered this afternoon the Congress could protect those head rights and still remove them from supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs? I agree with the gentleman that we must protect the Osages and their head rights in their oil interests so that they will not be the victims of outside groups.

Mr. DOYLE. They made it clear to me they knew of no way by which they could be protected as well as by the United States Government.

They stated that it was reasonably certain that under such circumstances the capital stock representing their holdings or the certificates of beneficent interests, or whatever other written documents might become evidence of their ownership in these mineral lands, or the income therefrom, would be the subject of barter, of trade, of purchase, of larceny, theft, embezzlement, and forms of dishonest dealings and machinations by dishonest and designing persons. Therefore, I implore the congressional committee in charge of such matters and the Secretary of the Interior and his associates to respectfully regard and heed this position by the Osage Indians. I respectfully and vigorously urge that the officials of all Government agencies responsible in the matter also see to it that the Osage Indians are not dismissed to "go it for themselves" in the handling of their vast wealth derived from oil deposits. My Indian friends made it clear to me that they did not want "full," or any relief of the "supervisions and control by the Federal Government in the management of their affairs." Relying therefore on the information and facts given me as I state, and because of their statements and representations to me, I here and now claim that the Osage Indians, at least so far as the southern California group is concerned, be considered and held to be as one of those great "groups of American Indians" which at this time, and at no time, "shall be held qualified to be relieved of supervision and guidance in the management of their oil affairs by the Federal Government."

In making this last statement of fundamental premises, I refer to House Joint Resolution 8 on page 2 thereof, beginning at line 21 thereof, where you will note I have used almost the exact language of the Bosone resolution. These friends told me that there are over 200 Osage Indians in my native State of California and that in some cases whites have already bought "headrights" which interfere with the natural protection of their oil deposits. Furthermore, they said that they believed there was a law whereby a white citizen could inherit these "headrights" and that more than one-half of the surface rights of the Osage Indians have already been sold, that already millions of barrels of oil have been taken from these oil deposits on their land. They also informed me that the Allotment Act of 1906 took up all the mineral rights and they believed the youngest Osage Indian receiving under this Allotment Act was 44 years of age and that there were about 2,200 owners of "headrights" who receive distribution of oil each month. Furthermore, they frankly admit that one splendid element which enters into their position is the fact that under the beneficent guidance of Uncle Sam there is no present cost of protection for such control. But they claim that over a term of years they would find it impossible to hire and employ individual persons who would do as able and honest a job in protecting their rights as has Uncle Sam. They did not claim to me that the handling of their affairs was perfect by any means, but they repeated to me that even making allowances for just complaints, they nevertheless had found the protection and management accorded them by Uncle Sam as extremely beneficent, fair, and necessary. But since my time is up I will ask a few minutes more of time about this matter in debate when House Resolution 698 by Mr. ELLSWORTH, of Oregon, comes up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], as well as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]. I was wondering if it is within the contemplation of the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Oregon that if it would be determined to give certificates of competency to the Osage Indians, and thereby, by their receiving certificates of competency the Government would not be in a position to exercise supervision over the lands which have oil under them. I was wondering if this was not

a step in the direction of taking away from the Indians who own the land in common, the protection of the Department of the Interior with reference to the disposition of oil leases.

Mr. BOW. I would say to the gentleman that in our discussion with members of the Osage Tribe I would feel we should bring in legislation in any report that the committee makes, or the Department of the Interior makes, some provision to continue Government control over the Osage Indians to carry out the interests of those people. I think we must protect the headright interest of the Osage, and that would certainly be my intention.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very glad to hear that, because it is my understanding that the members of that tribe have overwhelmingly voted not to have the Government protection taken away from them.

Mr. BOW. I understand that the Bureau of Indian Affairs is now making some study to make recommendations, and I called the Commissioner within the last week requesting him to be sure that we did protect the headrights of the Osage. I hope that when they make a study and make a report they will keep in mind the necessity of proper protection of those fine people.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a matter they may have forgotten. In the Seventy-ninth Congress I happened to be a member of the Indian Affairs Committee. As I recall, at that time the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER], myself, and other members of the committee spent considerable time in the preparation of legislation to set up an Indian Affairs Commission with a life of 10 years. I believe that Commission has been set up. They were charged with the adjudication of the fiscal affairs of the Indians and their claims against the Government. It was further provided that when they had completed their work we would have legislation to declare the Indians, presently wards of the United States, to be citizens of the United States. I am curious to know whether this proposal by the gentleman from Oregon infringes the rights of the Indian Affairs Commission that has been set up and to what extent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 698 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to (1) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has performed its functions of studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians to determine their qualifications for management of their own affairs without further supervision of the Federal Government; (2) the manner in which the Bureau of Indian Affairs has fulfilled its obligations of trust as the agency of the Federal Government charged with the guardianship of Indian property; (3) the adequacy of law and regulations to assure the faithful performance of trust in the exchange, lease, or sale of surface or subsurface interests in or title to real property or disposition of personal property of Indian wards.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable, including (1) a list of the tribes, bands, or groups of Indians found to be qualified for full management of their own affairs; (2) legislative proposals designed to promote the earliest practicable termination of all Federal supervision and control over Indians; (3) a listing of functions now carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which may be discontinued or transferred to other agencies of the Federal Government or to the States; (4) names of States where further operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be discontinued; (5) recommended legislation for removal of legal disability of Indians by reason of guardianship by the Federal Government; (6) findings concerning transactions involving the exchange, lease, or sale of lands or interests in lands belonging to Indian wards, with specific findings as to such transactions in the State of Oregon; (7) recommendations to the Attorney General for action by the Department of Justice if the committee finds any violation of trust in the disposition of property of Indian wards; (8) recommended legislation designed to achieve faithful performance by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the obligations of guardianship for the benefit of Indian wards.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any other member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: Page 1, line 5, after the word "Affairs", strike out the comma; and after the word "with" in the same line strike out the word "particular."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DELANEY: Page 2, line 23, after the word "Oregon", strike out the semicolon, insert a period, and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and to myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this is the Ellsworth resolution; it is a companion resolution to the Bosone resolution.

I know of no objection to either the rule or the bill.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], chairman of the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier today, these are companion bills. I see no reason why they should not be carried out concurrently.

I am a little disturbed about the present bill, for it states:

The Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to—

Certain matters. That is directive language. As chairman of that committee I am worried about this directive because I find no provision for money in the bill. True, for other purposes and uses my committee has certain funds that have been furnished it by the Congress. As I understand it, it is not likely at this late day that the Committee on House Administration will meet any further in regard to allowing money required for this investigation. At the present moment, the committee does not have any funds to carry on this investigation as the funds already voted it are for quite a different purpose.

I wonder how to get out of this dilemma? I wish someone could offer an amendment to insert an amount of money in the bill which would take care of it, as in the companion bill for the cost to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that certainly should be done and would have been done in drafting the resolution were it not for the fact that under the rules of the House, as I understand them, the Rules Committee does not have authority to bring out a resolution asking for money. Such a resolution must come from the Committee on House Administration. Assuming this resolution will be approved, if the gentleman will take his request to the Committee on House Administration immediately, this afternoon or tomorrow, that committee, realizing the circumstances, would certainly treat the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as courteously as it has all other committees. We are coming near adjournment, but there is still ample time to have such minor action taken by that committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has been but 24 hours since the House provided money for an investigation by the gentleman's committee. Does he want some more money?

Mr. MURDOCK. That money that was provided yesterday was for a study of our public-land laws, which sadly need it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand; but is the gentleman's committee going clear afield on three or four subjects? He has had money voted him within 24 hours.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true. I am glad to say that the committee has dealt with financing that particular problem; but this resolution calls for an exhaustive study of the various Indian reservations. There are 17 Indian tribes in the State of Arizona alone.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I would not speak for the committee; and if the Congress votes an investigation, I imagine that the committee would be willing to furnish some money; but I wonder how far we are going on investigations? This Congress has already spent more money on investigations than any other Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I said earlier, I do not like that word "investigation."

Mr. LECOMPTE. What should it be?

Mr. MURDOCK. The word in the bill is "investigation," but the proposal is to study and to make a report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The resolution says "investigation."

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to know if the gentleman from Arizona will answer the question I asked about the status of the Indian Affairs Commission, whether it is functioning, and what it is doing, if it is about the same as we are doing in this resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. According to legislation that the gentleman himself helped enact some years ago, we have a Commission, but it is to accept claims up to a shut-off date. It has many claims before it, but that refers only to claims on the part of Indian tribes. This is a broader study and involves looking into the internal affairs of each tribe to see whether or not they are able to manage their own affairs and escape the wardships they are under now.

Mr. BAILEY. Do I understand the gentleman to say this is to implement the intent of that Commission? When it was set up, I was advised then and the committee thought when the fiscal affairs of the Indian tribes were adjudicated we would declare them all to be citizens of the United States. Is it the intention of this resolution to see whether that is possible at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK. In a general way, that is true. This is a broad study. As I recall, all of my colleagues on the Indian Affairs Committee feel that the time has come when the American Indian ought to be permitted to do his own business, financially and otherwise, although some of them are not able to do so yet with safety to their own welfare.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Would an amendment be in order at this time authorizing the expenditure of funds or an appropriation of funds in this resolution?

The SPEAKER. It is not usual for the Committee on Rules to report a resolution having anything to do with funds. As the gentleman from Oregon said, that is a matter for the Committee on House Administration to determine.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the gentleman from New York when he brought up this resolution, I will endeavor to give a brief explanation as to how the resolution happens to be on the floor at this time.

In the first place the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] early in this session prepared and introduced House Resolution 571 calling upon the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate certain things with reference to Indians and the activities of the Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior. It just so happened that almost on the very same day I, too, had introduced a resolution directing the committee to make an investigation of certain Indian land transactions in the State of Oregon which appeared, at least, to have been very irregularly conducted and which, in my judgment, required looking into by a congressional committee. There has been considerable publicity on the west coast regarding these land transactions, but I do not believe the matter should rest at that point. It seems to me that there is danger of Indians being further mistreated, if not defrauded, in the west coast area and perhaps in other parts of the country. Therefore I introduced the resolution early in this session to have such an investigation conducted.

When I discovered that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] and I, had introduced resolutions at almost the same time, having to do with the same general subject, I discussed the matter with him, and we agreed to put the two subjects, the two ideas, into one resolution. With his consent, which I am grateful for, I introduced the combined resolution in my own name, being a Member of the Committee on Rules, whereupon it was favorably reported by the Committee on Rules, and is before us today.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the subject of the resolution is one that very much needs study by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I do not believe that the chairman of that committee need be too concerned about obtaining the necessary funds. The investigation can be undertaken this year. If it so happens that the committee feels it has not completed its investigation with funds which it may obtain this session, I am sure a similar resolution can be passed next year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time so that we might find out the program for tomorrow. I think it has been changed somewhat.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Consent Calendar will be the first order of business. The unfinished business is the matter that was pending last night; that is, the resolution reported out of the Committee on House Administration, relating to the Cox special committee. Then suspensions will be in order: There is the mine inspection bill; there is the bill providing for increase in annuities for those Government employees who retired before a certain date. There is the FHA bill. That is a bill relating to the Federal National Mortgage Association, commonly known as Fannie May. I think it relates to increasing their purchasing and lending authority. My information is that it was unanimously reported out of committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Then there is the bill H. R. 6241, reported out of the Committee on Ways and Means, to refund taxes paid on certain liquor that was destroyed during the flood. It came up several days ago on a unanimous-consent request for its consideration, as I recollect.

Of course, there will be several conference reports tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand there are five conference reports ready for consideration tomorrow on appropriation bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What part of the program will they fit in?

Mr. McCORMACK. They will fit in following the suspensions. There may be as many as eight conference reports.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The conference reports will follow the suspensions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. The Colmer resolution will be the first order of new business, to be followed by the judgeship bill.

HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 2

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may have until midnight tomorrow to file reports on the bill (H. R. 7494) to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for

other purposes, a bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]; the bill (H. R. 1950) to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]; and the bill S. 1271) to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board.

None of these bills is controversial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to call the attention of the House to the fact that there has been some talk about the funds to implement this investigation under the resolution. I should like to remind the Members that during the consideration of the Interior Department appropriations bill there was an item of $150,000 provided to set up a planning staff to make a study within the Department of the Interior. At that time an amendment was offered to strike the $150,000 from the appropriation bill upon the representation that this investigation was under consideration. The Committee on Appropriations accepted that amendment and struck the $150,000 so that the investigation should be made by the House itself. So by this action we have saved $150,000 in the Interior appropriation bill. When we go to the House Committee on Administration we will not have to ask for anywhere near the amount of $150,000 to carry on this proper investigation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] a question or two about the Osage Indians. The gentleman was present on the floor a few minutes ago, when I spoke about the Osage Indians conferring with me a few weeks ago at Southgate, Calif. I take it from the gentleman's statement that the committee has already been considering the question of protecting the headrights of the Osage Indians for all time. Is that correct?

Mr. BOW. That is correct. There has been consideration of it. The Osage have been before the committee and presented the problem of their headrights. They have also talked to individual Members. I might say to the gentleman that one of the members of the tribe, Mr. G. V. Labadie, who is an Osage and an attorney representing them, has corresponded with the gentleman from Ohio relative to the language of the bill and whether or not the Osage would be protected. I have answered those questions that have been submitted by the Osage, to the effect that when any plan came through that would give competency to the Osage, that legislation should then be considered which would continue the custodial rights of the Government over the Osage on the lands to protect them in their mineral rights and their interest.

Mr. DOYLE. So I take it from the gentleman's answer, that it is already the considered opinion and is recognized by the great congressional committee, that these headrights must be forever protected as long as there is production of oil from those lands?

Mr. BOW. I will say to the gentleman, I cannot speak for the committee, but it would be my opinion that that is the present view of the committee; or at least it is the view of one member of the committee for whom I am now speaking.

Mr. DOYLE. In view of the gentleman's knowledge on the subject, do you know of any grounds for objection to such a policy?

Mr. BOW. I know of none. I think they should be protected.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman. And since I previously discussed the position of the Osages whom I have the honor to know, a few minutes ago as we discussed House Resolution 8, I will not now repeat.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House in conference on the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDING TAX LAWS APPLICABLE TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2605, an act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. O'HARA. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia would explain what the bill does?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which has passed the other body, and which was reported by the House committee with an amendment. It involves several minor changes in the tax laws of the District, principally with respect to the amount of interest charged on delinquent taxes, and outside of those minor changes in the tax law, it relates largely to the office of the Board of Tax Appeals for the District. The Board of Tax Appeals under the reorganization bill, which went into effect in the District yesterday, as a matter of fact, is abolished. It is anticipated that in the absence of this legislation, the District Commissioners would set up another board which would be appointed, and be under the domination of the District Commissioners. The fact is that the Board of Tax Appeals is really a court which decides the rights as between the District Commissioners and the citizens in the matter of the payment of his taxes. Therefore, it would not be exactly fair for that Board to be under the domination of one party to the controversy with respect to the payment of taxes. So the committee has devised an amendment which is printed in the bill, which would set the Board of Tax Appeals up as a court, as an independent body independent of the District Commissioners who are a party to all litigation that comes before the court. Does that explanation sufficiently explain the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes. That is the change, I think, which was made in the original plan proposed at the insistence of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia to appoint a Court of Tax Appeals, which would be presided over by one individual sitting in the capacity of judge, who would be completely independent from the District Commissioners so far as his decisions are concerned. Would the gentleman agree with that statement?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I may say the Bar Association of the District of Columbia has been very much interested in getting this legislation through. I think that is the reason the gentleman from Minnesota and I both are here trying to straighten this matter out.

Mr. O'HARA. It is also true, I believe, that this legislation was reported out unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it was unanimously reported, and the amendment was also unanimously reported.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to contain a more complete explanation of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia. Section 1 would amend existing law to provide an effective 3-year period of limitations for the assessment of personal property taxes, in the absence of fraud or the failure to file a personal property tax return. Under present law, there is a 2-year period of limitations, but it is

ineffective since by its terms it is inapplicable where a return is incorrect, whether in good faith or otherwise.

Section 2 of the bill consists of four subsections designed to reduce interest on various delinquent taxes from 12 percent to 6 percent per annum or from 1 percent to one-half of 1 percent per month; namely:

First. On delinquent estate and inheritance taxes. The District is already protected by the executor's or administrator's bond or by a lien on real estate.

Second. On delinquent unemployment compensation contributions. As an aid to better enforcement, section 6 of the bill would provide for procedure for collecting these contributions. At present it is necessary to institute suit for collection.

Third. On delinquent sales and use taxes. It also eliminates the assessor's discretion to reduce interest to 6 percent per annum. The assessor's discretion to waive the 5-percent penalty is retained as in existing law.

Fourth. On income-tax deficiencies asserted under the 1939 District of Columbia income-tax law which remained in effect through 1946. Though that law has been repealed as to 1947 and later years, it is still in effect as to prior years. The present rate of interest on income and franchise taxes is 6 percent under the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947.

All of the above reductions in interest rates would become effective July 1, 1952.

Section 3 of the bill consists of three subsections, each making a procedural change with respect to the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia:

First. Under existing law the Board of Tax Appeals does not have jurisdiction of an appeal unless the tax has been paid under protest in writing. The requirement of a written protest serves no useful purpose and has on occasion served to trap taxpayers and leave them without remedy. Subsection (a) simply eliminates the requirement of a written protest.

Second. Under existing law the findings of the Board of Tax Appeals have "the same effect as a finding of fact by an equity court or a verdict of a jury." In *District of Columbia* v. *Pace* (320 U. S. 698), the Supreme Court criticized the above-quoted provision as ambiguous in that it at the same time provided two inconsistent rules for reviewing findings of the Board. Subsection (b) of section 3 corrects this situation by making decisions of the Board reviewable by the United States court of appeals in the same manner and to the same extent as decisions of the United States district court in civil actions tried without a jury. This gives the court the same scope of review for decisions of the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia as it now has for decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

Third. Subsection (c) of section 3 would amend existing law to make it possible for a taxpayer to appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals from an increase in his real property tax even though he has not contested the assessment before the Board of Equalization and Review, unless the taxpayer has been notified in writing that his assessment is being changed. Under existing law, a taxpayer is not entitled to actual notice that an assessment is being changed. Upon receipt of his tax bill, it is too late for him to appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals unless he has in some way learned of the proposed action of the Board of Equalization and Review and has contested the change in assessment before the latter Board. This amendment will afford taxpayers a real, rather than a theoretical, right of appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals.

Section 4 of the bill has as its general purpose providing procedures for obtaining refunds of overpaid taxes where no such procedure now exists. This is done by adding a new section 14 to title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, consisting of five subsections; namely:

(a) Authorizes the filing of claims for refund with the Assessor within 2 years after payment. Upon disallowance of a claim in whole or in part, the Assessor is required to notify the taxpayer by registered mail and the taxpayer then has 90 days from the date of mailing within which to appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals. If the Assessor does not act upon the claim within 6 months after it is filed, the taxpayer has 90 days after the expiration of such 6-month period within which to file an appeal to the Board of Tax Appeals. If the Assessor does not act upon the claim within 6 months, the taxpayer's time for filing an appeal begins to run; he may not then wait until he receives a notice of disallowance and file his appeal within 90 days after the mailing of such notice. This refund procedure is not made available as to real property taxes, since under section 3 (c) of this bill the taxpayer is given an adequate opportunity to contest an increased assessment at the time it is made and since the usual issue is one of valuation which can best be determined at the time of assessment. This subsection does not change existing refund procedure with respect to the income, franchise, sales, and use taxes.

(b) Grants the Board of Tax Appeals jurisdiction to determine whether there has been an overpayment of tax and to order it to be refunded or credited, whether the proceeding before the Board is an appeal from a deficiency assessment or an appeal from the denial of a claim for refund, provided that the taxpower has filed a timely claim for refund or that the taxpayer's petition asserting the overpayment has been filed in response to a notice of assessment issued prior to the expiration of the period within which the taxpayer could have filed a timely claim for refund. Thus, where the proceeding before the Board is an appeal from the disallowance of a claim for refund, it might determine that there has been an overpayment, but it could not order a refund unless the claim had been timely filed. On the other hand, where the District has made a deficiency assessment—which must be paid as a condition precedent to filing an appeal to the Board—the Board would have jurisdiction to determine not only that the deficiency was not due and hence should be refunded but also that the tax had already been overpaid prior to the payment of the deficiency. The Board must determine whether the right to recover the overpayment has been timely asserted. The right to such overpayment will have been timely asserted if the taxpayer has filed a timely claim for refund; or, even if no claim for refund is ever filed, if the notice of deficiency assessment is issued within the period during which a timely claim for refund could have been filed, and the petition appealing from such deficiency assessment and asserting the overpayment is filed within the applicable 90-day period for filing an appeal. The provisions of subsection (b) are applicable with respect to all proceedings before the Board of Tax Appeals, including the income and franchise taxes levied under the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 and the sales and use taxes.

(c) Provides a saving clause, preserving for taxpayers their common law remedy to sue in the local courts for the recovery of taxes paid under duress. If, however, the taxpayer has elected to appeal to the Board with respect to an overpayment, he may not also litigate the same question in the local courts.

(d) Provides for the payment of interest at the rate of 4 percent upon overpayments refunded, whether the refund is made administratively or by order of the Board of Tax Appeals or by order of a court of competent jurisdiction, and whether the overpayment refunded resulted from an original payment of tax or from the payment of a deficiency assessment. A distinction is made, however, between overpayments resulting from original or voluntary payments of tax by a taxpayer and overpayments resulting from the assertion of a deficiency or additional tax by the District. As to the former type of overpayment, interest begins to run on the date on which the District is apprised of the fact that an overpayment is claimed to have been made. If an overpayment is credited rather than being refunded to the taxpayer, the date of crediting is intended to be treated as the date of refund for purposes of computing interest, since the crediting of an overpayment where authorized is a constructive refund to the taxpayer.

This subsection (d) of the new section 14 is intended to apply to all overpayments of taxes, including income, franchise, sales, and use taxes, and thus modifies existing law.

(e) Provides that, to the extent that interest or penalties were paid in connection with an overpayment of tax, such interest or penalties constitute a part of the overpayment.

Section 5 of the bill would change the name of the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Tax Court and would authorize the member thereof to be called judge; it makes it clear that the Board—or Court—is independent of the assessing and taxing authority of the District. It would authorize the Commissioners to appoint a member of the bar to act as judge of the Tax Court—now

called Board of Tax Appeals—in the event that the single judge thereof should be unable to sit or should disqualify himself, or in the event of a temporary vacancy. If the office of judge should become vacant, no person or persons could be appointed to fill that vacancy temporarily for a total of more than 120 days, except that any person temporarily filling such vacancy shall complete the hearings commenced before him during such period and shall decide the cases heard. This should provide an adequate period for selecting a permanent appointee. Since the District will be a party to all proceedings before the Tax Court, it is provided that no employee of the District or of the Federal Government may be temporarily appointed under this provision.

Section 6 of the bill would amend existing law to permit the District Unemployment Compensation Board to collect unemployment compensation contributions from delinquent employers by using the same summary collection procedure—including distraint—now available to the collector of taxes for collecting personal-property taxes. At present this Board is limited to a civil action for collection and the Board may still use that method. In clear cases of liability, however, there is no good reason why the Board should not have available a more speedy and drastic remedy.

Section 8 of the bill would make effective July 1, 1952, the amendments made by section 2—reduction of interest on delinquent taxes and unemployment-compensation contributions. The other sections of the bill would become effective upon their enactment into law.

The purpose of the amendment adopted by the committee—section 7—is to restore the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia to the independent status which it enjoyed prior to submission to Congress of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952. To prevent the rights of litigants from being adversely affected by Reorganization Plan No. 5 having gone into effect prior to the enactment of this section, and to provide for the appointment of a member of said Board in the event that said Board shall have been abolished prior to the enactment of this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 9, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and notwithstanding the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952, relating to the District of Columbia, the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be abolished, and, if prior to the enactment of this act it has been abolished, it is hereby reestablished. In either event, the functions of the said Board of Tax Appeals transferred to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by said Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 are hereby retransferred to said Board of Tax Appeals or to said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished, to be exercised in the same manner, to the same extent, and under the same provisions of law as if said Reorganization Plan No. 5 had never gone into effect, except only as such provisions of law may be modified by this act.

"All petitions, answers, or other pleadings, documents, or papers filed with, and all actions taken by, and all decisions rendered by, the person, persons, office, or agency to which said Board of Commissioners may have redelegated the functions of said Board of Tax Appeals, between the effective date of said Reorganization Plan No. 5 and the enactment of this act, shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as if filed with, taken by, or rendered by, said Board of Tax Appeals or said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished.

"If, prior to the enactment of this act, the said Board of Tax Appeals shall have been abolished, the said Board of Commissioners shall appoint an individual to act as the member of the said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished, said appointment to be made in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended, including any amendments made by this act."

Page 15, line 19, strike out "7" and insert "8."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 12 strike out lines 1, 2, 3 and 4, and insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended, is amended by striking out in the second paragraph thereof the numerals and words $8,000 per annum,' and inserting in lieu thereof the numerals and words '$13,000 per annum'; and is further amended by adding thereto the following new paragraph."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment which is a corrective amendment of the bill which was reported out of the committee and has been suggested to me to be offered by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

The salary as is suggested by the amendment, it is my understanding, is the salary of that of a municipal court judge. For that reason it is suggested that inasmuch as the judge of the District of Columbia Tax Court will be acting in a full time capacity and he must have a great deal of knowledge, not only of law but must be otherwise ably qualified.

It is my understanding that Mr. Joseph Morgan, a very able lawyer, who was formerly president of the District of Columbia Bar Association will be judge of the Tax Court on the adoption of this law. I might say further that one of the concerns which we have had in the setting up of this legislation is that we have been confronted with the recent Reorganization Act which went into effect at midnight last night as affecting the reorganization of the Government of the District of Columbia. So that is was imperative in the consideration and passage of this bill that it should be passed subsequently to the going into effect of the Reorganization Act.

I hope the amendment will be adopted and the bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the amendment. It seems to me a court of this much importance should be entitled to at least the salary of the judge of the court of least rank, that is a municipal court judge. That is all the amendment offered by the gentleman does, and I interpose no objection to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSES AND SUBSISTENCE OF FEDERAL OFFICERS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2545) to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman briefly explain the bill?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the title gives a rather excellent description of the bill. It permits the various agencies to call as witnesses in cases in which the Government is a party in interest certain Government officials and employees, and when they call those witnesses from one agency this permits the agency in which they are employed to advance the per diem expenses and travel expenses, and then have that advancement reimbursed by the agency which originally called the witness.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe this was brought up by reason of a ruling of the Comptroller General.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes; in fact the Department of Justice approved this so as to resolve any difficulty.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, be amended by the addition of a sentence reading as follows:

"In any case which does not involve its activity, any department or agency may advance or pay the travel expenses and per diem allowance of its officers or employee summoned as a witness on behalf of the United States, and later obtain reimbursement from the department or agency properly chargeable with such witness' travel expenses."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDGAR L. DIMMICK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3707) for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Line 11, strike out "not receive" and insert "cease receiving."

Line 11, strike out "heretofore."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this simply means that he cannot draw two salaries at the same time?

Mr. LANE. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, these Senate amendments are strictly technical in nature, and the author of the bill is in agreement with them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON RELIGION AND RURAL LIFE

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an editorial appearing in the Christian Century, an undenominational publication. This calls attention particularly to the formation of a new organization, the National Committee on Religion and Rural Life. The headquarters of this new organization is in Richmond, Ind., in my district.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. My attention has been previously called to the organization of this very fine group in the gentleman's district. I happen to know Mr. Hamilton, who is the executive secretary. They are doing a great work in the field of rural education and rural service. When men like Father Ligutti, of the Catholic faith, and Stanley Hamilton, of the Quaker faith, can get together and agree on a program of that kind, it is bound to succeed.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman and wish to express complete agreement with the sentiments he has expressed.

I do also want to say that this to me represents the very finest kind of Christian service, and the rewards for this type of service will be very important not only to this country, but in our efforts abroad.

The editorial is as follows:

PROTESTANTS AND CATHOLICS IN UNITED RURAL LIFE BODY

Why is it possible for Catholics and Protestants to work together on rural problems as they seem unable to do in regard to other matters? One of the truly impressive Christian achievements of the postwar period was CROP—the Christian Rural Overseas Program. This partnership between Church World Service, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and the Lutherans has recently been dissolved, but not for reasons of incompatibility or rejection of the principle of cooperation. (Church World Service is carrying on the CROP enterprise.) Now the disappearance of this united project has quickly been followed by organization of a National Committee on Religion and Rural Life, with its incorporators and board drawn in equal numbers from the Rural Life Association and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. The program by which this new body intends to bring the ministry of religion to bear on rural needs both in this country and abroad is not so important as the fact that these Protestants—most of them Quakers—and Catholics mean to do it together. We hail this combined effort, which for the present will have its headquarters at Quaker Hill, Route 28, Richmond, Ind. We wish that the spirit and method of cooperation would spread to other areas of Christian social action. Apparently it can do so where there is a true will to cooperate. Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, executive secretary of the NCRLC, represents such a will. There must be many others working to bring Christianity to bear on social problems who have the same spirit. What they need is the same imaginative courage.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to refer to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], on the floor of the House last Saturday, in which he took Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to task for a statement the great general and public leader made some time ago, to the effect that we need not fear the Russians anymore than we fear polliwogs swimming down a muddy stream.

Now, I realize that General Eisenhower needs no defense by this humble Member of the House. I realize that no criticisms of the gentleman from Massachusetts can detract from, just as no praise from me can add to, the luster of the glory Gen. Dwight Eisenhower won, not only for himself, but for American and allied fighting men in the cause of freedom throughout the world in the recent great war. But I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts would want me to set the record straight, and will thank me for doing so.

I looked up the quotation mentioned by the distinguished majority leader. He was referring to a statement that General Eisenhower made off the cuff in a news conference, to representatives of Sigma Delta Chi, a journalistic professional fraternity to which I have the honor to belong. The general had been asked the question as to whether we should fear the military potential of Soviet Russia. I quote his words, as reported by that esteemed and accurate newspaper, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch:

If we are deserving of the heritage of freedom, there is no more reason to fear 190,000,000 backward people living on the Eurasian Continent, surrounded by captive and recalcitrant states, than there is to fear polliwogs swimming down a muddy creek. • • •

There is a lot of scary talk about Russia, but I do not believe every Russian is 14 feet high. The American people working together can conquer all the problems that face the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, taking all those words together, and putting them in their proper context, does that indicate that General Eisenhower was going back on all that he has said to us in Congress and to the American people, about the need to strengthen our defenses to keep our Nation strong? Of course not. The gentleman from Massachusetts very properly referred to the speech General Eisenhower made to Members of this Congress after that historic tour of European capitals, in which, as Mr. MCCORMACK says:

He made a strong speech warning us of the danger of communism.

Mr. MCCORMACK also quite correctly says of General Eisenhower:

Again when he spoke at Abilene, he made a very strong, powerful speech, calling the attention of the people of America to this international conspiracy that threatened nation after nation and which had as its ultimate object the United States of America.

In those remarks, the gentleman from Massachusetts has correctly analyzed the position of General Eisenhower. Anyone able to read or to listen knows by this time that General Eisenhower favors defending the freedoms of this Nation and the right of freemen everywhere. To question that fact, on the basis of an off-the-cuff remark, lifted out of context at that, is simply ridiculous.

Let me explain to the gentleman from Massachusetts, that out in the Middle West, where General Eisenhower grew up, and where we live close to God's nature, we frequently refer to animal life to illustrate our points. A man may be called as "strong as an ox," or "wise as an owl," or "sleek as an eel," or weak as a polliwog." Occasionally one hears the expression "stubborn as a mule," and particularly do we hear that expression now in my great State of Missouri, when discussions veer around to the lamentable lack of leadership under which this Nation is suffering. Now I have not checked with General Eisenhower, but I am confident that he had in mind the contrast between our great military potential and that of the Soviet Union; the great contrast between our standard

of living, our educational progress, our industrial power, and that of those Russian and the satellite people so tightly enslaved by the the Communist tyranny.

Would the gentleman from Massachusetts say General Eisenhower is wrong in that estimate? I cannot believe he would. For everyone knows of the difference in our actual and potential strength. It is true that we in America do need a revival of that strength which has eroded from our national life under weak, visionless, appeasing leadership, namely the moral and spiritual strength that made us a great nation in the first place and without which all material strength will fail.

Mr. Speaker, I say General Eisenhower is right. We need not fear the Russian people, if we just utilize the great strength that is ours. He rightly says that they are surrounded by captive and recalcitrant states. The people in those captive states are restless, disillusioned, living in dread and fear of the secret police and the concentration camp, longing for the day when they may rise up and shake off the yoke of Kremlin enslavement. When we again have in this Nation leadership of vision and courage, we shall utilize this great asset, the burning desire of these captive peoples for liberation. We shall add it to the military and economic strength which General Eisenhower has done so much to build in the NATO countries and throughout all Europe.

I could not help thinking, while the gentleman from Massachusetts was speaking and casting his aspersions upon an illustrious leader of war and peace, how easy it is for blind devotion to partisan politics to lead us into strange statements and strange ways. I could not help thinking that if President Truman had had his way, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower would now be an aspirant for the Presidency on the New Deal ticket. If that had happened, would the gentleman from Massachusetts have attempted to place the same construction on the chance remark of General Eisenhower that he has?

Again I say, the man who by his brilliant leadership of the forces of freedom in the greatest war of history has written his name high on the roster of those whose deeds will live after them, needs no defense from this Member of the House. But I take this occasion to subscribe to General Eisenhower's words, which the gentleman from Massachusetts failed to quote:

> The American people working together can conquer all the problems that face the Nation.

WILLIAM OATIS

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, this Congress passed the Beamer resolution in behalf of William Oatis. He remains in a Czechoslovakian prison and Czechoslovakian imports continue to come into the United States. These imports have been reduced by GATT agreement that restores the older and higher import duties and also by the elimination of United States consular invoices.

However, I have learned that most of the present imports from Czechoslovakia come as privileged imported goods in foreign-trade zones. This situation needs correction not only to further implement the intent of this Congress to sever economic relations with that country as long as Oatis is imprisoned, but also to correct this privileged status condition for all imports.

For this reason I have introduced a bill to make certain amendments.

Under section 3 of the Foreign Trade Zones Act, as amended by Public Law 566, Eighty-first Congress, an importer is permitted to ship his goods into a foreign-trade zone and request a privileged status for them. The collector has the goods appraised and determines the amounts of internal revenue taxes and import duties payable at the rates in effect at the time the importer asks for the privileged status.

The importer can leave the goods in the zone as long as he wishes. He can, at any time, bring his goods from the zone into the domestic market, on payment of the duties previously determined. He can do this even though the rate of duty applicable to the goods has been increased after he got the privileged status but before the goods are released from the zone.

Suppose, for instance, the domestic producers of product X bring an escape-clause action under section 7 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1951, and convince the Tariff Commission that they are threatened with serious injury from import competition. Suppose, also, that the President agrees with the Commission's recommendation that the import duty should be increased. The President issues a proclamation increasing the rate, effective 30 days thereafter.

In the 30-day interval, the importers can ship as much of product X as they desire into a foreign-trade zone and request a privileged status. They can leave the goods in the zone, without payment of duty, as long as they wish and, when they decide to market them, pay only the lower duties previously in effect, thus avoiding the increase that has been proclaimed under the escape clause.

Thus the increase in tariff protection could be nullified for an indefinite period by use of the extraordinary privilege now existing under section 3 of the Foreign Trade Zones Act.

On the other hand, a case can be made for some of the features of the first proviso of section 3. Frequently importers are confronted with very difficult questions as to the dutiable value or classification of the goods. It seems reasonable to permit determination of these questions while the goods are in a zone, the same as if they were stored in a bonded customs warehouse. My amendment would permit such determinations while the goods are in the zone.

However, no reason is apparent why the importer should be given a vested interest in the rate of duty that may be in effect when he requests the privileged status and there are good reasons why he should not continue to get such a vested interest.

In passing, it might be noted that when Congress increased certain excise taxes in the Revenue Act of 1951, it provided that the increased rates should apply to goods that have a privileged status in the foreign trade zone—see sections 496 and 497. In that case, Congress had to include a specific provision to prevent a great windfall through section 3 of the Foreign Trade Zones Act. If, in a future tax-increased law, Congress should forget to include such specific provisions, the automatic windfall would occur.

I can see no reason at all for giving a privileged status to imported goods so far as internal revenue taxes are concerned and propose to eliminate that feature of the Zones Act completely. In the case of import duties, I want to continue the privileged status where it is justified, but to repeal it so far as rates of duty are concerned.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

PROGRESS REPORT ON REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, since the reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government were submitted during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress in 1949, I have on several occasions commented on the subject of reorganization. I have called attention to the very real progress that has been made in carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. At the same time, I have noted that much remained to be done.

There continues to be great interest in the subject of reorganization of the Federal Government, both in Iowa and all through the rest of the country. No doubt the scandals in the present administration, which have been brought to light largely as a result of congressional investigations, have convinced the American people as nothing else could have done of the need for more effort in this field. At this time I should like to review the accomplishments already made in executive reorganization, and to point out some of the steps which are still to be taken.

ACTION TAKEN IN EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

First of all, let us review briefly the more significant steps which were taken in the direction of better organization of the Federal Government during the Eighty-first Congress.

Probably the most important of such actions was the passage of the Reorganization Act of 1949—Public Law 109—under which the President was given authority to transmit reorganization plans

to the Congress. Under the terms of this law, a reorganization plan goes into effect in 60 days after submission unless a majority of the total membership in either House of Congress disapproves.

Thirty-five reorganization plans were submitted by the President under the Reorganization Act during the Eighty-first Congress. The changes accomplished in this manner include, first, transfer of the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor; second, improvements in the internal organization of the Post Office Department, the Civil Service Commission, the Maritime Commission, the National Security Resources Board, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Departments of Justice, the Interior, Commerce, Labor, and Treasury; third, transfer of the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President; fourth, transfer from the General Services Administration of (a) the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce, (b) functions concerning assistance to school districts and water-pollution control to the Federal Security Agency, (c) advance planning and management of war public works to the Housing and Home Finance Agency; fifth, transfer to the General Services Administration of certain building and space management functions, and State Department functions relative to statutes at large and certain other official documents; sixth, transfer of Alaska and Virgin Islands public works functions to the Secretary of the Interior; seventh, transfer of employees' compensation functions from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor; eighth, transfer of the Maritime Commission to the Department of Commerce and creation of the Federal Maritime Board; ninth, transfer of the Federal National Mortgage Association from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency; tenth, transfer of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation loans for factory-built homes to the Housing and Home Finance Agency; and, eleventh, coordination of administration of labor standards.

Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1949 which would have reorganized the National Military Establishment was superseded by legislation. Two plans which would have created a new Department of Welfare or a Department of Health, Education, and Security were rejected, as were plans to alter the internal organization of the Department of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board. A plan to transfer the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of Commerce was also disapproved by the Congress. The plan to change the internal organization of the Department of the Treasury first was rejected, but when resubmitted in altered form it was approved.

It is worthy of note that of the reorganization plans submitted by the 1949 act, only one—that to create a new Department of Health, Education, and Security—has been rejected by the House. The other rejections were by the Senate.

In addition to the reorganization plans, there were at least 40 laws enacted during the Eighty-first Congress dealing with matters treated in the Hoover Commission reports. Public Law 152, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, established the General Services Administration, with important powers in respect to the purchase, utilization, storage, and disposal of property, the keeping of records, the management of Federal buildings, and related housekeeping activities. Three other acts clarified or amended the provisions of the statute.

Fiscal matters received attention in the form of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 which improved budget, accounting, and auditing methods. Other acts amended the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, authorized the President to rescind unexpended appropriation balances, and amended the National Security Act relative to the armed services fiscal programs—Public Law 216.

Personnel management in the Federal Government was the subject of 10 bills which were enacted into law. The Civil Service Classification Act was completely revised—Public Law 429; the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House were increased; executive salaries were raised; a uniform system of longevity salary increases for the postal service was established; per diem allowances were increased; special provision was made for medical manpower in the armed services; efficiency rating systems were revised; provisions for suspension and discharge of Federal personnel were set up; the Civil Service Retirement Act was expanded; and the settlement of accounts of deceased Federal employees was facilitated.

Several agency reorganizations or changes in operating procedures were accomplished by legislation during the Eighty-first Congress. The State Department was reorganized under Public Law 73; the Post Office Department was the subject of acts to improve its internal administration and financial control; the organizational structure of the Department of the Army was revised; an Under Secretary of Defense was authorized; provision was made for financing the operations of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; the President was authorized to delegate certain functions, as was the Civil Aeronautics Administrator; the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency was improved; and the organization, management, and operation of the Panama Canal also was improved.

In the field of research significant progress was made by laws which created the National Science Foundation—Public Law 507—to develop national science policy; authorized the establishment of research institutes on various diseases; expanded the research facilities and training of personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; and provided for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information.

Social welfare was also the subject of some legislative enactments. The social-security program was substantially amended and expanded. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act was amended in regard to educational institutions, and provision was made for the disposition of veterans' housing projects. The Hospital Survey and Construction Act—the Hill-Burton Act—was extended to 1955, and an appropriation authorization was granted to States for advance planning of public works.

In addition to the legislative measures just noted, nine bills relating to recommendations of the Hoover committee passed the Senate, but were not passed by the House; conversely, the House passed five bills which were not approved by the Senate. There were also a number of bills which were reported by the various committees of the two Houses, but on which no further action was taken during the Eighty-first Congress.

The Bureau of the Budget estimated that approximately 120 of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission could be put into effect by administrative action alone, requiring neither reorganization plan nor legislation. The agencies immediately began to study and put into effect such of the recommendations as could be implemented by administrative action. It is safe to say that a large majority of the recommendations of this nature have been put into effect.

To insure that the work of reorganization be continued, the President by Executive Order 10072 established an Advisory Committee on Management Improvement to assist in creating a Government-wide improvement program. Agency heads were directed by the order to make systematic reviews of the economy and efficiency of their operations. Substantial progress has been made in establishing a performance budget as recommended by the Commission. The General Services Administration has made important contributions to Government economy by its activities in coordinating Federal housekeeping activities.

Several of the Departments, including State, Defense, and Post Office, have made major revisions in their internal organization in line with the Hoover Commission reports. The Bureau of the Budget, the Treasury Department, and the General Accounting Office have cooperated on problems of fiscal management. The Civil Service Commission and several agencies have made significant changes in personnel policies by administrative action. It should be noted that administrative reorganization has continued through the Eighty-second Congress, although at a somewhat reduced tempo.

ACTION TAKEN BY THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS TO JULY 1, 1952

During the first session of the Eighty-second Congress only one reorganization

plan was submitted to the Congress: That to reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by replacing its five-member board with a single Administrator. Since the plan was not disapproved by the Congress, it went into effect on April 30, 1951.

Thus far in the second session five reorganization plans have been submitted by the President. Plan No. 1 of 1952, now in effect, placed the collectors of internal revenue under civil service and made other changes in the internal organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Plans No. 2, 3, and 4 of 1952 would have placed approximately 20,000 additional postmasters, customs collectors, and United States marshals under civil service by removing the necessity for Senate confirmation. These plans were rejected by the Senate on June 18. Plan No. 5 of 1952 deals with the reorganization of the District of Columbia, a subject not covered by the Hoover Commission.

Six laws related to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission were enacted during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. Public Law 150 gave statutory basis to the organization of the Air Force. The salaries of Government employees, including postal employees, were increased. Obsolete statutes pertaining to records management and Government property were repealed. Finally, Public Law 233 increased postal rates to provide additional revenue to apply against the postal deficit.

At the end of the second session, five bills had been passed by the Senate but not yet acted upon by the House. S. 658 to reorganize the structure and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission has been passed by both Houses, but the conference report has not yet been considered. In all likelihood it will pass this week. A bill, S. 1135, to modernize civil service recruitment and examining procedures, is now under study by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This bill would require veterans to receive a passing grade on civil-service examinations before preference points were added.

Bills to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and a Commission to Study Administration of Overseas Activities were passed by the Senate, but returned for reconsideration upon the request of Senator ELLENDER. Another proposal to separate Federal subsidies from airline mail rates was approved by the Senate but has not yet been approved by the House.

Thus far in the second session only two bills related to the Hoover Commission recommendations have been enacted into law. Public Law 298 provides that the Civil Service Commission shall make routine loyalty investigations of new employees in certain sensitive agencies. Although this point was not specifically mentioned in the Commission's reports, it is in line with the general principles set forth by the Commission. The Federal Catalog Act was cleared for the President on June 24 and provides a single Federal Catalog system to be developed by the Department of Defense to replace individual systems now in use by Federal supply agencies.

Several other bills are pending before the Congress, including a series presented by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report which includes all the major recommendations not yet adopted. Hearings on these bills were held by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments during June, but no further action has been taken. There are a number of bills on which some action has been taken, including:

S. 101 which would authorize emergency reorganizations of Government agencies necessary to national defense and security was passed by the Senate, which companion bill H. R. 1545 was rejected by the House;

S. 1139, passed by the Senate, and included in the House hearings in June, would redefine the duties of chairmen and fix the tenure and political complexion of membership of the regulatory agencies;

S. 515, reported to the Senate, would abolish the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

H. R. 5350, which would revise the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, has been passed by the House;

H. R. 4323, passed by the House, would authorize the General Services Administrator to enter into certain lease-purchase agreements;

H. R. 7405, approved by the House, would provide for a single supply system for all armed services;

H. R. 4924, also passed by the House, would transfer to the General Services Administration functions relative to the acquisition and assignment of motor vehicles and control of office furniture; and

H. R. 1180, passed by the House and reported to the Senate, would facilitate research and development work by the armed services. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has recently held hearings on four bills affecting the Veterans' Administration and related to the Hoover Commission recommendations. Many other bills are under consideration by the committees of both the House and the Senate.

SUMMARY OF WORK YET TO BE DONE

The progress already made in carrying out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission is most commendable. It is estimated that from 55 to 60 percent of the recommendations have now been put into effect. The great majority of the least controversial proposals have been adopted.

Nevertheless, after nearly 4 years, much still remains to be done. Little has been done to change the organization of the Executive Office of the President. Federal field services are certainly in need of more attention than they have yet received. Public-works functions continue to be a matter of controversy and disagreement. Little has been done on the problem of organizing land- and water-resource functions, or that relative to Federal business enterprises. Although progress has been made in the fields of personnel management, budgeting and accounting, and the postal service, there is still room for much improvement.

We should realize that there is no one, final, permanent solution for many of these problems. We cannot reorganize the Federal Government once and for all and then sit back and watch it operate as it should. There will be a continuing need for study of the organization and operations of the Government so that they may be changed to more effectively deal with changing circumstances. The organization of the Federal Government must not be overly rigid, and in a sense the task of reorganization is one which will never be finished.

Another important thing for us to remember in connection with the Hoover Commission proposals is that some of them probably should be modified or rejected. The Commission made recommendations which represented a majority opinion, not unanimous opinion, and many of their proposals are subject to valid criticism. The Commission itself expected that both the Congress and the Executive would devote further study to its recommendations before adopting them. Then, too, it has been 5 years since the Commission began its work, and many changes have taken place in those years. Some of the recommendations may no longer be valid in the light of changed conditions.

The essential thing, however, is that there should be no slackening in our efforts to improve the administrative structure of the Federal Government. The continuing international crisis makes it even more imperative that our Government function as efficiently as possible. The public support aroused for the Hoover Commission proposals has been gratifying. It will be even more gratifying if that support continues during the next Congress. The stimulation which the Hoover Commission has given to the States, many of which, including Iowa, have established "little Hoover Commissions" to study State governments, has been a most significant byproduct of the Commission's study and reports.

As I have said on previous occasions, all these activities emphasize the importance of the efforts made already and the necessity of bringing the work nearer completion.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS ON HOUSE REPORT NO. 2356

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foodstuffs and Cosmetics, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] filed House Report No. 2356. It is my desire at this time to ask unanimous consent to file minority views on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that other members of the com-

mittee may wish to file minority views, and I ask unanimous consent that that permission may also be granted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CONGRESS SHOULD REQUIRE PORT AUTHORITY TOLLS TO BE REDUCED WHEN CONSTRUCTION COSTS ARE PAID—NO POOLING OF TOLLS SHOULD BE ALLOWED

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the Congress a type of legislation the Congress of the United States has permitted to exist to the detriment of hard working men and women of America.

I refer specifically to port authority legislation. Legislation resulting from a compact between two States to speed up transportation by the construction of bridges and tunnels to service the needs of commuters, users who, by paying tolls, pay the construction costs.

Recently, I had the honor to appear before the distinguished Senate Public Works Committee in opposition to S. 2188 and S. 2187 which would create the Delaware River Port Authority.

I opposed this legislation because it sought to use toll revenues from erected bridges and tunnels across or under the Delaware River between Camden, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa., to build facilities unrelated to bridges or tunnels.

My congressional district is in Hudson County, in northern New Jersey. We are plagued and exasperated with the wicked practices of the Port of New York Authority, made possible by tolls collected from three facilities: The Holland tunnel, Lincoln tunnel, and the George Washington Bridge. With the surplus toll revenues from these facilities, the Port of New York Authority has built "white elephants," and it continues to build them on the backs of the working men and women who use these tunnels and bridges.

I do not want the surplus toll revenue collected from tunnels and bridges which are to be constructed between Camden, N. J., and Philadelphia, Pa., to be used for any other purpose, than to pay for the cost of construction of the facilities. This done, the tolls should be reduced to an amount to provide for upkeep and maintenance on a yearly basis.

Here is how we feel about the Port of New York Authority in northern New Jersey: A letter to me from the mayor of Union City, N. J., the Honorable Harry Thourot, reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Union City, N. J., May 1952.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Thirteenth District, New Jersey,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your letter of May 9, with reference to the hearings to be held in Washington on House Joint Resolution 375 "to rescind the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey, creating the port authority, and for other purposes."

I have been and always will be unalterably opposed to any agency such as the port authority or any other authority, created by the people's representatives and supported by public funds, that usurp the power and sovereignty of our Government while competing against taxpaying private enterprise.

It seems to me that the very heart of our constitutional government is being violated not only by the creation of these quasi-public groups but economically as well. Their operations are a double tax on the taxpaying public in that the taxpayer must pay for all the services rendered to this agency by municipal officials such as street lighting, policing, snow removal, street maintenance, sanitary and storm water sewer installation, and all the other essential services paid for by property owners, while at the same time, if the citizen taxpayer uses the facilities of the agency, they must pay an excessive toll fee in the case of the port authority.

This may be all right if the authority had stayed entirely within the scope of its original intent, but it has strayed far afield from that purpose and we now find this authority operating tunnels, bridges, bus terminals, truck terminals, airports, docks, warehouses and within these facilities we find every type of merchandising in direct competition to taxpaying businessmen.

To describe the harm both physically and financially done to Union City by the construction of the approaches to the Lincoln tunnel would require volumes. However, what has been done cannot be rectified, but there is no doubt that some other governmental body can be saved from the same experience, if this agency is curbed from further expansion and encroachment on State or local governments. Better still, let this agency complete what they were supposed to do at the outset, and stay just at that job until it is completed.

I deeply regret not being able to personally present my view, but in any case I am most assuredly opposed to this type of Government by remote control.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY THOUROUT, *Mayor.*

Here is a letter sent to the Honorable Thomas Dewey, Governor of the State of New York, on June 1, 1951, by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York. Listen:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 1, 1951.

Hon. THOMAS E. DEWEY,
The Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR DEWEY: In a recently launched program of activity which this association believes exceeds the statutory powers conferred upon it, the Port of New York Authority is offering to construct industrial buildings for rent or long-term lease on surplus acreage at International, Newark, and Teterboro Airports. A reproduction of the letter circulated by the authority to prospective tenants and lessees is enclosed.

The association's view that these projected "industrial developments" are clearly outside the definition of terminal and transportation facilities, the assigned field of the authority, is upheld in an opinion by Mr. Laurence Arnold Tanzer, copy of which also is transmitted herewith.

Aside from its evident illegality, the association is opposed to the authority's proposed industrial construction program because:

I. By reason of the real-estate-tax exemption the authority enjoys, the proposed operations would compete to the disadvantage of privately owned fully taxable industrial property.

II. International Airport, only one of the three that is in this State, being owned by the city of New York and operated by the authority under lease, is tax-exempt. Because this property and hundreds of millions of dollars of others are not on the assessment rolls, the real-estate-tax rate of nonexempt holdings is set proportionately higher to provide the revenues sought by the city. Thus, New York property owners, who therefore must pay higher taxes, in effect, wold be compelled to subsidize their own competition.

III. The acreage involved evidently is surplus and not usable for airport purposes; therefore, it should be returned to the city, which in turn might offer it for sale to private industrial developers. Thus, the city could obtain partial recovery of its capital investment and restore the surplus acreage to the tax rolls. (In this connection, the association has asked Mayor Impelletteri to seek modification of the lease to accomplish these purposes.)

For the reasons cited, the association contends that the program initiated by the Port of New York Authority is not in the best interests of the people of the State of New York. Accordingly you are respectfully urged to—

1. Inform the New York commissioners of the port authority that you disapprove its program of unassociated industrial development; and

2. Exercise your statutory power of vetoing the action of the New York commissioners if and when this activity comes to you for approval through the minutes of the authority, which must be submitted in accordance with chapter 700 of the laws of 1927.

An indication of any action you may contemplate and your comments or suggestions with regard to this matter will be welcomed and appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH A. SINCLAIR,
Secretary.

Can you imagine that? The port authority actually invites industry to come to it for industrial buildings to be put up on tax-exempt land condemned by the port authority—it has the power of eminent domain. The municipality lost this land—a tax ratable loss—but the Port of New York Authority reaps the harvest at the expense of the municipality, the taxpayers and the private businessman. I do not want these things to happen to the people of south Jersey or Philadelphia, who will be the predominant users of the bridges and tunnels to be built by the Delaware River Authority.

Recently, new legislation has been introduced in the House, H. R. 8315 and H. R. 8316. The two bills provide for the creation of the Delaware River Joint Commission—a mere change of name; they subject the commission's bonds to the tax laws of the United States. This is an excellent provision. The Port of New York Authority bonds are tax-exempt. However, the legislation fails badly in its toll provisions. It does not limit use of tolls collected to the payment of the cost of construction, with a subsequent reduction to an amount for upkeep and maintenance, but permits the unrestricted use of these tolls for

the erection of unrelated facilities, which experience—Port of New York Authority—has shown to be white elephants.

Remember, no bondholder of port authority bonds has ever been known to lose money, even though the facility upon which the bonds are issued is a losing proposition. They can do this because they divert the excess toll revenues from the bridges and tunnels to pay for these white elephants and hence can meet maturing obligations. All the time the people who use these paying facilities—Holland tunnel, Lincoln tunnel, George Washington Bridge—must suffer a high toll to pay bondholders on a bus terminal, or a trucking terminal.

Members of the House, here is a letter sent to many industrial firms in the United States. It is an un-American invitation of the Port of New York Authority to industry in the United States. This letter is on port authority stationery. It is un-American because it competes with private enterprise:

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N. Y., March 1951.

GENTLEMEN: We have available at our New York International, Newark, and Teterboro Airports, considerable acreage which we are setting aside for industrial development.

Besides having the advantages which your company would enjoy by locating in the industrial suburbs of New York, the additional convenience of air freight, air travel, and arterial trucking routes would accrue to your company's benefit.

We are projecting plans for construction of one-story industrial-type buildings with paved-out areas equal to building area; thus affording adequate room for loading, parking, and expansion.

The port authority is prepared to construct a building for your new plant which may be leased to you on a long-term basis, provided certain financial and responsibility requirements can be met.

In the event you are interested in locating in the industrial area of any of our airports, I will be pleased to furnish more specifically the details of such a move.

Very truly yours,
JOHN H. BEEMAN,
Industrial Agent.

The abuses of the port authority show the Congress how this type legislation adversely affects:

First. The municipality where facility is constructed.

Second. The taxpayer in the area of the authority operation.

Third. Private enterprise.

Mr. William A. Sternkopf, Jr., a certified public accountant, of 921 Bergen Avenue in Jersey City, N. J., submitted the following statement for the record. It clearly indicates that the huge financial operations of the Port of New York Authority are chiefly supported by the surplus toll revenues from the Holland tunnel, the Lincoln tunnel, and the George Washington Bridge:

WILLIAM A. STERNKOPF, Jr.,
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANT,
Jersey City, May 13, 1952.

Hon. JOHN V. KENNY,
Mayor, City Hall,
Jersey City, N. J.

DEAR SIR: On May 9, 1952, Maurice J. Frager, special counsel to the city of Jersey City, in a telegram to the executive director of the Port of New York Authority requested that the city's auditors be given immediate access to those records of the port authority pertaining to "financial structure, income, operating expenses, reserve funds and the funded debt." In his reply telegram the executive director advised that he had instructed the port authority's comptroller to hold himself available in his office for the convenience of the auditors of Jersey City at 8:45 a. m. on the following Monday, May 12, 1952.

Accordingly, on the date and at the time agreed, the undersigned, as auditor for the city of Jersey City, went to the offices of the port authority at 111 Eighth Avenue, New York City, and was cordially received by not only its comptroller but also its director of finance. These gentlemen were extremely courteous and cooperative, but the time available within which to obtain the information sought was extremely limited. With the aid of charts they described the organization of the port authority and its various facilities operated in the "port district," the geographical area within which the port authority's activities must be confined, and explained the nature and functioning of its rather complex operational accounting system. Needless to say, the lack of time precluded any detailed or comprehensive examination of the port authority's financial and accounting records which necessarily are intricate and voluminous in view of the extensive operations of its numerous facilities. Consequently, it was necessary to limit the present examination to a review of the port authority's annual financial report for the year 1951. This report was prepared primarily for investors and investment dealers but will be incorporated in the more detailed prescribed annual report to the Governors of the States of New Jersey and New York when the latter is published at a later date.

As explained by its comptroller and as indicated in its 1951 annual financial report, the financial operations of the port authority are recorded on the basis of facilities in operating accounts, reserve fund accounts, or capital accounts. All facilities are classified in one of the following three major categories according to the type of bonds with which the facility was financed:

1. Facilities financed by general and refunding bonds.
2. Facilities financed by air terminal bonds.
3. Facilities financed by marine terminal bonds.

A review of the 1951 report disclosed that the gross operating revenues realized from all facilities during that year amounted to $50,270,380 and that, after deduction of $21,065,565 for operating expenses, the net operating revenues of all facilities totaled $29,205,815. After adding $294,026 for other income and charging off $11,345,908 for normal debt service, the net revenues from all facilities amounted to $18,153,933.

An analysis of net revenues and reserve fund operations was prepared by the port authority's comptroller to show the detail with respect to each facility and each class of facilities. This analysis is set forth in the accompanying exhibit A and is summarized in the following tabulation:

	General and refunding facilities	Air terminal facilities	Marine terminal facilities	All facilities
Gross operating revenue	$40,864,214	$7,078,111	$2,328,055	$50,270,380
Total operating expense	13,308,916	5,983,841	1,771,808	21,064,565
Net operating revenue	27,555,298	1,094,270	556,247	29,205,815
Other financial income	253,581	35,648	4,797	294,026
Total revenue	27,808,879	1,129,918	561,044	29,499,841
Obligatory debt service	9,456,585	1,708,823	180,500	11,345,908
Net revenue	18,352,294	[1] 578,905	380,544	18,153,933

[1] Deficit.

As evidenced by footnotes (a) and (b) in exhibit A, neither other income nor debt service could be apportioned to the individual facilities and, hence, could only be shown in total for each class of facilities. Due to numerous refundings in prior years, neither the bonded debt nor the debt service thereon could be readily identified with the specific facility financed thereby. The joint statutes, enacted by New Jersey and New York to govern the operations of the port authority, only require that the records show the bonded debt for each class of facilities.

As exhibit A will disclose, in addition to the debt service charge of $11,345,908 against the operations of the three classes of facilities, there was an additional debt service charge of $4,625,424 against the reserve funds. This was offset in part by income of $498,539 from reserve fund investments. The report showed that the total 1951 debt service charge of $15,971,332 consisted of:

Interest on funded debt	$5,181,332
Payments of serial maturities	10,790,000
Total	15,971,332

Examination of exhibit A also will reveal that substantially all the net operating revenues of the port authority for the year 1951 were derived from its operation of the Holland and Lincoln tunnels and the George Washington Bridge. Furthermore, these bridge and tunnel facilities have been responsible for most of the operating revenues in past years. Yet, despite this fact, the joint statutes enacted by the States of New Jersey and New York to govern the operations of the port authority do not permit this bi-State agency to enter into agreement providing for payments in lieu of taxes to those municipalities wherein these bridge and tunnel facilities have a terminus. On the other hand, these statutes specifically prescribe that such agreement may be made with respect to the agency's inland and marine terminals. In view of the earning capacity of these bridge and tunnel facilities, it would seem that in the interest of equity and justice the statutes should permit the port authority to make payments in lieu of taxes to those municipalities wherein these facilities have a terminus.

In reviewing the 1951 financial report, it was observed that at December 31, 1951, the port authority's reserve fund accounts consisted of cash and security investments amounting to $32,956,670 which was reserved for the following funds:

Fund; Dec. 31, 1951:	
General reserve	$23,717,200
Special reserve	9,050,181
Marine terminal reserve	189,289
Total	32,956,670

It was pointed out by the comptroller that the general reserve fund balance at all times must be at least 10 percent of the bonded indebtedness outstanding and that the aggregate balance of the reserve funds always must be at least equal to the total debt service for the succeeding 2 years. The report showed that at December 31, 1951, the outstanding bonded indebtedness amounted to $237,172,000, while the debt service for 1952 and 1953 totaled approximately $25,000,000. The financial report further indicates that at the close of 1951 there were no sinking

funds or reserves other than the aforementioned.

The net change in all reserves during the year 1951, according to the report, amounted to $1,530,148 and consisted of the following additions and deductions:

Additions:	
Net revenues from operating facilities per exhibit A	$18,153,933
Income from reserve fund investments	438,539
Total	18,592,472
Deductions:	
General reserve debt service per exhibit A	4,625,424
Adjustment to reduce cost of reserve fund securities to market	761,856
Debt retirement acceleration	11,675,044
Total	17,062,324
Net change in reserve funds	1,530,148

It should be noted that of the net revenues realized from operating facilities during 1951, $11,675,044 was used to accelerate debt retirement of $11,563,000 and to pay the call premium thereon. As evidenced by the following tabulation, revenues similarly used since 1945 for debt retirement acceleration have aggregated in excess of $50,000,000:

Amount of accelerated debt retirement

Year:	
1945	$1,833,631
1946	1,562,070
1947	2,598,322
1948	9,469,053
1949	7,197,417
1950	17,113,000
1951	11,675,044
Total	51,448,537

Finally, according to the 1951 financial report at the end of that year, the total investment in facilities amounted to $393,239,400, while the funded debt totaled $237,172. The investment in facilities was analyzed in the report as follows:

1. Facilities financed by general and refunding bonds	
Holland tunnel	$54,047,479
Lincoln tunnel	86,619,833
George Washington Bridge	71,578,740
Bayonne Bridge	13,097,162
Goethals Bridge	7,345,493
Outerbridge crossing	9,910,079
Port authority building	16,435,182
P. A. bus terminal	23,129,706
Grain terminal	1,866,186
Columbia Street Pier	1,008,286
New York truck terminal	9,992,707
Newark truck terminal	8,171,053
Miscellaneous	217,604
Total	303,414,510
2. Facilities financed by air terminal bonds	
La Guardia	$5,855,341
Newark	24,402,744
New York International	42,671,943
Teterboro	6,661,439
Total	79,591,467
3. Facilities financed by marine terminal bonds	
Port Newark	10,233,423
Total investment in facilities	393,239,400

Although the financial report does not show the amount of bonded indebtedness outstanding against the investment in each facility, due to the numerous refundings in prior years, it does reveal the following amounts related to the total investment in each class of facilities:

Class:	*Bonded debt outstanding*
General and refunding facilities	$152,772,000
Air terminal facilities	74,400,000
Marine terminal facilities	10,000,000
Total funded debt	237,172,000

During the year 1951 the report shows that new financing amounted to $12,000,000 while the debt retired totaled $23,266,000 which included the accelerated debt retirement of $11,563,000 mentioned hereinabove.

In conclusion, then, the following recommendation is deemed to be in order in the light of the foregoing and in view of the fact that the time available made even a cursory examination a physical impossibility.

The House Judiciary Committee and the New Jersey State Legislature should be requested to do that which may be necessary to cause to be made (A) a complete and detailed examination of the financial accounts and records of the Port of New York Authority for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not it is conducting its operations in conformity and in compliance with the statutes jointly enacted by the States of New Jersey and New York to govern such operations and, also, for the purpose of determining the nature, extent, and propriety of all expenditures made by the port authority; and (B) a thorough review of the joint statutes referred to in paragraph (A) above for the purpose of suggesting and drafting whatever amendatory legislation may be required to eliminate any injustice or inequity with respect to the collection and use of revenues by the port authority and to remove any restrictions with respect to agreements providing for payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities wherein the port authority's bridge and tunnel facilities have their terminus.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM A. STERNKOPF,
Registered Municipal Accountant.

EXHIBIT A

Detail of net revenues and reserve fund operations, year ended Dec. 31, 1951

	Gross operating revenue	Total operating expense	Net operating revenue	Other financial income [1]	Net revenue	Obligatory debt service [2]	Net revenue
General and refunding bond facilities:							
Holland tunnel	$11,031,669	$3,516,657	$7,515,012				
Lincoln tunnel	9,851,366	2,691,480	7,159,886				
George Washington Bridge	11,813,941	1,918,585	9,895,356				
Bayonne Bridge	1,098,954	204,867	894,087				
Goethals Bridge	960,949	164,156	796,793				
Outerbridge crossing	959,880	349,714	610,166				
Port authority building	2,137,173	1,234,371	902,802				
Columbia St. Marine Terminal	229,154	107,274	121,880				
Port authority grain terminal	470,003	314,858	155,145				
New York truck terminal	303,712	1,023,760	[3]720,048				
Newark truck terminal	339,356	85,994	253,362				
Port authority bus terminal	[4]1,668,372	[4]1,697,200	[3][4]28,828				
Miscellaneous	[2]315		[2]315				
Total general and refunding facilities	40,864,214	13,308,916	27,555,298	$253,581	$27,808,879	$9,456,585	$18,352,294
Air terminal bond facilities:							
LaGuardia Airport	2,091,523	1,754,892	336,631				
New York International Airport	3,222,248	2,311,375	910,873				
Newark Airport	1,028,940	1,200,836	[3]171,896				
Teterboro Airport	735,400	716,738	18,662				
Total air terminal facilities	7,078,111	5,983,841	1,094,270	35,648	1,129,918	1,708,823	[3]578,905
Marine terminal bond facilities: Port Newark	2,328,055	1,771,808	556,247	4,797	561,044	180,500	380,544
Total all operating facilities	50,270,380	21,064,565	29,205,815	294,026	29,499,841	11,345,908	18,153,933
Reserve funds				438,539	438,539	4,625,424	[3]4,186,885
Net revenues and reserve fund operations	50,270,380	21,064,565	29,205,815	732,565	29,938,380	15,971,332	13,967,048

[1] Other income includes interest on invested funds and gain or loss from sales of securities; the assets are maintained for the complete fund and no apportionment to facilities.
[2] Other deductions include interest on outstanding port authority debt and retirements of debt; debt charged to the complete operating fund and no apportionment to facilities.
[3] Deficit.
[4] Includes period of operation as a general reserve fund facility.

Now we come to the "white elephants" the Port of New York Authority built "on the backs of the working people who use the three paying facilities" of the Port Authority of New York, namely, the Holland and the Lincoln tunnels and the George Washington Bridge.

Here is a letter from the Honorable Meyer Ellenstein, director of the department of revenue and finance in the city of Newark, N. J.:

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND FINANCE,
Newark, N. J., March 12, 1952.

Hon. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AL: With further reference to your resolution asking for a complete

investigation of the activities of the Port of New York Authority, I am submitting additional information that I think will help you and the members of your committee.

About 2 years ago (1949) the port authority completed the construction of two truck terminals at a cost of $10,000,000 and $8,000,000 each; one located in Manhattan and the other in Newark. For some time prior to the completion of these buildings the port authority endeavored unsuccessfully to make agreements with over-the-road-trucking companies to use the terminals. The principal obstacles seem to have been the inability of the port authority and the A. F. of L. teamsters unions to agree on the question of jurisdiction and trucking interests refused to agree to the handling of the freight by port authority on the loading platform, as well as the rates that the port authority was attempting to have the trucking interests pay for the use of the terminal. Excessive pilferage at the depot was also a contributing factor.

Last April the port authority found a way to put the Newark terminal to use. It prevailed on the United States Army Air Force to lease the building as an AAF depot for preparing material for shipments overseas. The lease provided that the United States Government would pay port authority $421,000 a year rental and in that way the port authority put one white elephant to work with the help of Uncle Sam. Attached hereto is a clipping from the New York Times, March 11, 1952, announcing the closing of the $10,000,000 Port of New York Authority truck terminal for reasons given in the port authority press release. This was done after the port authority had tried unsuccessfully to unload the second white elephant on the United States Post Office Department.

For a third example of how the port authority is able to unload itself of bad investments, I call your attention to the construction of two freight transit sheds constructed by the port authority at the port of Newark, costing $2,500,000. These buildings were completed about 2 years ago and for more than a year the port authority, through advertising and other means, tried to obtain tenants for those two buildings. Again they were unsuccessful and excepting for a small volume of cargo that passed through the transit sheds, the two sheds were seldom used. However, once again the United States Government came into the picture and relieved the bi-State agency of another bad investment. This time they used the Port Newark Army Base as a means for obtaining tenants for the two transit sheds. I have previously written to you concerning the USAAF and port authority agreements for the lease of the Army base to AAF for $2,000,000 for 5 years, notwithstanding that the AAF could have recaptured it by paying $30,000 a year for 5 years to the port authority.

Prior to the port authority making the lease with the AAF it was necessary to oust the Newark Tidewater Terminal, Inc., tenants of the Army base since 1936, which the port authority did in April 1951 through condemnation proceedings. Two of the most important tenants of the Newark Tidewater Terminal, Inc., were the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. and the Luckenbach Steamship Co., who were paying the terminal company approximately $200,000 annual rent. When the Tidewater lease was condemned it forced the two steamship companies to seek other berths and shed space at Port Newark. The only suitable facilities at the port to meet the steamship companies' requirements were the two idle cargo transit sheds previously referred to, and so a lease was made by the port authority with the two steamship companies for approximately $125,000 each, annually. In this way the port authority was relieved of two more bad investments indirectly by an assist from Uncle Sam.

For further information concerning these port authority deals and the tremendous power of the port authority, I would suggest that your committee call as witnesses, viz: J. A. Lehman, president, Lincoln Tidewater Terminal, Inc., Kearny, N. J. Mr. Lehman was formerly vice president of the Newark Tidewater Terminal, Inc., lessor of the Army base at Port Newark since 1936, and prior to the AAF taking possession in April 1951; Arthur N. Granzen, president, Bay Terminals, Inc., 25 William Street, Newark, N. J.; A. R. Hall, president, A. R. Hall Lumber Co., South Dock Street, Port Newark, Newark, N. J.; L. H. Jamouneau, 36 Halsey Street, Newark, N. J.

As previously mentioned to you, I am very anxious to cooperate with you and your committee so please do not hesitate to call on me at any time for additional information.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

MEYER ELLENSTEIN,
Director.

Mr. Ellenstein discloses the Holland tunnel story in the following statement; in addition he explains the tax privilege immunity the Port of New York Authority enjoys to the detriment of the municipality, from a tax ratable loss standpoint:

STATEMENT OF COMMISSIONER MEYER C. ELLENSTEIN, DIRECTOR OF REVENUE AND FINANCE, NEWARK, N. J., TO BE READ AT HEARING TO BE HELD IN OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI, WASHINGTON, D. C., ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1952

When the port authority was established 31 years ago, its essential purpose was to function as a commission for the construction and management of bridge and tunnel facilities necessary for the protection and extension of the natural advantages afforded by the port of New York. The Holland tunnel, built by a predecessor agency, was later turned over to the port authority, and has been its only truly and consistently profitable venture throughout its entire history. The port authority has built one additional tunnel and four bridges. As you know, under the original formula prescribed for its operations, each project was to be so planned as to be self-sustaining, with the toll charges from each bridge and tunnel pledged to secure and to be used only for interest and principal payments on the bonds by which the project was financed, and for operation and maintenance costs. Each undertaking was to stand on its own feet. Thus, the 50-cent toll at the Holland tunnel was calculated to pay off the cost of the tunnel (approximately $50,000,000) in about 20 years; to leave a surplus for the support of maintenance and operation costs, and to permit the removal of the toll at the end of the 20-year period. It was not even suggested that the users of the tunnel would continue to pay a toll no longer needed for the purposes of the tunnel, in order to finance unprofitable bridges, to say nothing of other ventures of great variety and totally unrelated to the functions of a tunnel and bridge commission.

To prevent defaults in the bonds issued to finance its unprofitable bridges, the port authority cooked up the plan to permit the pooling of all of its revenues, including of course those from its only money-making operation—the Holland tunnel. This plan was sold to the legislatures of the two States, and resulted in the adoption of the General Reserve Act—an outright deviation from the original mandate that each venture must support itself. In this way the millions of people who use the Holland tunnel are compelled to pay for the white elephants which the port authority has on its hands, contrary to the letter and spirit of the commitments made when the tunnel was built.

There appears to be no limit to the ambitions of the port authority which apparently conceives that it is permitted entry into almost every kind of operation belonging to the field of private commerce and industry.

The port authority enjoys tax exemption. Applied to publicly owned bridges and tunnels this is a legitimate immunity. However, the port authority has used the tax exemption feature to unfair advantage in competition with private enterprise. On what basis can there be any justification for the extension of such benefits to a large office building in which space is rented to tenants for the operation of private business activities. Even a municipality must pay taxes on this kind of property, and municipal ownership of such buildings ordinarily occurs, not as the result of voluntary action but through unavoidable tax foreclosure.

But its misuse of the tax-exemption feature has been carried much further. Industrial areas of tremendous size have been acquired by the port authority. This property has been and is being rented to operators of all kinds of business and industry. How can others who conduct similar activities, viz—piers, warehouses, truck terminals, cocktail bars, restaurants, bowling alleys, etc.—on privately owned taxable property compete on an even basis with port authority lessees renting property which is not taxed? The same question may be asked with respect to the port authority's direct entry into operations such as it conducts in connection with its commercial warehouses, its grain terminal, and its truck terminals and bus terminal. And what of the crippling losses of tax revenues suffered by our municipalities because of the acquisition by the port authority of large sections of local property for its nonpublic ventures?

This is a matter of grave consequence. In Newark the port authority has taken over 2,750 acres—one-fifth of the total area of the city—and Newark, in area one of the smallest cities in the Nation, has a total of only 23 square miles with a population close to 450,000. In the 4 years since this invasion of the city's sovereignty Newark taxpayers find themselves being gradually strangled, in terms of their tax burden, by the port authority octopus. The taxable value of improved property, no longer taxed because it is subject to port authority domination, is about $10,000,000. This includes buildings occupied by private enterprise as port authority tenants; additional property acquired by the port authority since it took possession of the airport and seaport area; and the new port authority truck terminal which was intended to compete with 33 taxpaying, privately owned truck-terminal operators located in the city. The foregoing is exclusive of the value of the land occupied by the port authority.

The truck terminal was completed 2 years ago, but it has never been operated as a truck terminal for several reasons: First, the truck operators refused to make contracts with the port authority for the use of the terminal; and second, the port authority refused to enter into an agreement with the A. F. of L. Truckmen's Union covering the employment of union members at the terminal; so, the $8,000,000 building was not used until April 1951, when the United States Army Air Force made a 5-year lease with the port authority at a yearly rental of $421,754, with annual renewals extending to 1956, thereby relieving the Port of New York Authority of another white elephant.

Another example of the power of this supergovernment is demonstrated in the recapture of the United States Army Base property located at port Newark. The base was built in 1917 by the United States Government at a cost of $12,000,000. It was bought by the city of Newark in 1936 for $2,000,000, payable over a period of 15 years.

The contract of sale provided a recapture clause that permitted the United States Government to take back the property in the event of a national emergency by paying Newark at the rate of 3 percent per annum of the total amount paid to the United States Government by the city up to the time of the recapture. The United States Army Air Force exercised this right in 1942 and the city received 3 percent of $600,000 per annum that had been paid the United States Government, or $18,000 annually until 1946 when this property was returned to Newark by the United States Army Air Force.

During April 1951, the United States Army Air Force again exercised its option to recapture the property which had been included in the port authority lease with the city. In spite of the fact that the United States Government was obligated to pay Newark 3 percent of $1,000,000 (the total amount that had been paid by the city up to the time the United States Government took possession for the second time, in April 1951), or $30,000 a year, an agreement was made between the United States Army Air Force and the port authority whereby the United States Government agreed to pay the port authority $500,000 a year for 5 years, or $2,500,000, when it could have had the property for 5 years by paying $150,000. Why was this agreement made at the higher rental and why was the city of Newark, purchaser of the Army base from the United States, not included in the negotiations? I think you will agree with me that the deal should be investigated to the fullest extent and let the chips fall where they may.

Again, referring to the tax-exemption advantages employed so unfairly, the port authority has held other immunities that have set it uniquely apart from all other governmental levels.

State laws require the governing bodies on all levels to conduct their business at public meetings. The courts sit in public; the legislature meets in public; the county freeholders and the municipal councils and commissions conduct their sessions in public. But not the port authority. It is a notorious fact that the public and the press have not been permitted to be present at the meetings of the members of the port authority. If there is anything that can be said in support of this unorthodox and high-handed practice, it has not come to my notice.

Both of the States under which the port authority functions are subject to civil-service laws. That is also true of most of their large municipalities and of a great many of the smaller ones. In all branches of Federal, State, county and municipal government there are numerous laws extending job preference to veterans. The port authority is not subject to these civil service and veterans' preference requirements, and in building its immense staff it has been entirely free from all of the legislative regulations designed to insure the maintenance of the merit system in public employment.

The special privileges and unbridled powers which the port authority has managed to gather unto itself may account for some of the ruthless practices in which the agency has indulged. As in the case of other totalitarian forms of government, the port authority appears to believe it is sufficient unto itself and free from the limitations ordinarily applicable to public affairs.

The huge program which the port authority has under way for the expansion of Newark Airport, and for the increase of air traffic in the heart of one of the most thickly populated cities in the country, is an example of the disregard the port authority evidences for the people of Newark and Elizabeth, thousands of whom have consistently opposed this expansion program.

Another example of the port authority's disregard for promises it makes, but seldom keeps, is the agreement between the city of Newark and the port authority for the leasing of the Newark Airport and seaport, requiring the keeping of separate books, records and accounts in regard to the financing, refinancing, construction, operation and maintenance of the Newark Marine Terminal and the Newark Air Terminal, and the right to inspect same by the Director of Revenue and Finance.

Each year since the agreement became effective, the city has engaged public accountants to examine the records of the Port of New York Authority insofar as they relate to the Newark airport and seaport. The accountants have reported to me that the records for the two Newark projects are not kept separate, as stipulated in the agreement, and furthermore the port authority has refused to permit Newark auditors to examine the payrolls as they relate to the airport and seaport. In my opinion, this is undoubtedly a violation of the agreement, and I have requested our corporation counsel to advise me if there is basis for voiding the contract.

The record of the port authority's invasion of the city of Newark, of the relinquishment of one-fifth of the city's total area to a public body which enjoys extraordinary powers of government but which is subject to almost none of the obligations of government, of the astounding entry of the port authority into competition with private industry in the city of Newark, makes one of the most amazing stories in the annals of municipal government.

In conclusion, ladies and gentlemen of the House, you will agree that I have fairly put before you the evils and loopholes in port authority legislation now before the Congress.

I want these bridges or tunnels for the convenience of the people of South Jersey and of the Philadelphia area; but I do not want the people victimized. I do not want them to be an instrument for the privileged insiders who buy port bonds—I do not want profits made on an unsuspecting public under the guise of port development. Private industry and private capital should finance projects nonrelated to bridges and tunnels. I am for high-speed transportation in this area. These bridges and tunnels will do just that.

The Honorable John V. Kenny, mayor of Jersey City, has made the strongest case yet against the Port of New York Authority; he points up the excessive cost to municipalities which have had no compensation in lieu of taxes for land taken by the Port of New York Authority; he believes, as I do, that a thorough investigation of the books of the Port of New York Authority is warranted to determine whether it is complying with the law of the legislatures of New York and New Jersey, nay, even that of the United States.

These abuses should teach us not to be so loose and eager to give consent to such State compacts until they have been properly studied, investigated, and hearings held. Listen to Mayor Kenny:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN V. KENNY, MAYOR OF JERSEY CITY, N. J.

It is my considered opinion that a review of the port authority is of utmost importance. In the interest of all taxpayers and citizens, a Federal probe should be conducted of all the financial accounts and other records of the Port of New York Authority in order to ascertain whether it has been acting in accordance with the statutes of New Jersey and New York which provide its unique powers.

The State of New Jersey and, more particularly, the county of Hudson have been too long the suffering stepchild of this powerful and extremely prosperous body. For example, although two of its most profitable enterprises, the Holland and Lincoln tunnels, are located in Hudson, our county has been without representation on the port authority commission for many years. But this is a matter that pales in comparison with the financial hardships imposed when the port authority descends upon Hudson communities and begins to seize land which would normally provide millions of dollars in tax ratables. The loss of ratables in the face of a port authority installation, such as a vehicular tunnel, however, is not the only weight heaped upon the shoulders of the taxpayer. There are other financial burdens on the surface unapparent to be borne by municipalities such as Jersey City in its role as a terminus for the Holland tunnel.

The undeniably excessive flow of truck and auto traffic engendered by the tunnel in this city has resulted in great expenses, carried solely by the taxpayers of the municipality, additional personnel for the department of public safety paid for by the city, and by the constant wear and tear on the city streets, to say nothing of the dangers to the citizens from the countless vehicles which are part of the toll on our community.

The port authority has been totally indifferent to these problems through the years, and should at long last be required to own up to its obligation by providing for payments in lieu of taxes to municipalities wherein the authority's bridge and tunnel facilities have their terminus.

The port board can well afford to assume these municipal obligations. According to a report submitted to me yesterday by City Auditor William Sternkopf, Jr., pertaining to the port authority's financial structure and income, I am informed that its net revenues, after all expenses, including debt service in 1951, amounted to $18,153,933. This is no small sum indeed for a multitenacled quasi-official organization which reaps rich gains from such installations as the Holland and Lincoln tunnels, and is also in the business of operating truck and bus terminals, airports, bridges, and ports.

It is my fervent hope that this Federal committee will recommend an exhaustive examination of the Port of New York Authority, taking such steps as are necessary to make the board more responsive and compliant to the will of the people.

Incidentally, the Bureau of Public Roads and the Bureau of the Budget have submitted reports on this Delaware River Joint Commission; these bodies are not in favor of the unrestricted use of bridge and tunnel tolls. They feel as I do, that such tolls should be used for the erection of necessary bridges and tunnels, and no more. Also, that eventually these facilities become toll free, or a small toll charged for maintenance and upkeep.

Given the power of unrestricted use of toll revenues, the Delaware River Joint Commission could attempt to do what the Port of New York Authority is trying to do as reflected in an editorial in the New York World Telegram-Sun, of Tuesday, June 10, 1952, entitled "Inviting Trouble." Here it is:

INVITING TROUBLE

A number of Queens residents are protesting the proposal to construct a drive-in movie at Idlewild International Airport.

They base their protests on three grounds—the safety hazard, the traffic complication, and competition with private business.

Taking these in inverse importance, private business complains that the project would pit a public agency, the Port of New York Authority, against individual enterprise. The authority wouldn't operate the theater but the lessee would get the advantages of the agency's special tax status.

To be self-supporting airports must develop sources of revenue beyond flight operations. But critics cannot see carrying this to the extent of a drive-in theater on the fringe of an airport, catering to those who do not come to the field in connection with its flying operation.

Also important is the question of what such a project might do to traffic along the crowded Belt Parkway. City officials already have turned thumbs down on a project to locate a drive-in on the parkway somewhat nearer the city. They found it would add to the already serious congestion on that important link between Brooklyn and Long Island.

Most important of all is the objection based on the safety factor. As projected, the drive-in would be located directly in line with a major runway, although some 2½ miles from its end.

If successful, the drive-in could bunch 1,000 cars, each carrying gasoline, in direct line of operations on the edge of an airport.

Much as we sympathize with the port authority's attempt to make the airports self-supporting, it seems to us that the agency is sticking its neck way out in looking for the comparatively few additional dollars the proposed drive-in would yield. On the safety angle alone this project should be scrapped.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Congress of the United States is 1,000 percent against the abuses existing in the operations of the Port of New York Authority and I am sure the Congress will not permit them to exist in the Delaware Commission legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a list of various items of testimony to further prove my point if the Congress calls for them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 45 minutes.

THE GREAT ISSUES

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I feel that every citizen of the United States is confronted with and concerned in the desire to preserve the basic liberties which have made our country what it is. Some may be more alert than others; but fundamentally, and at some time before our great national election in November, every citizen will have the same feeling.

You have heard it said, "You have never had it so good."

You have heard it said that the voters have been bought with their own money.

You have heard it said that the American form of government as we have known it is gone—that the people have been drugged into acceptance of something different.

I cannot believe that the American people are ready to sell their heritage of freedom for the discredited shackles of socialism—or worse, communism.

THREE GREAT ISSUES

The American people approach the 1952 campaign with the greatest political issues of modern times facing them. I want to talk to you about these issues.

ISSUE NO. 1

It is my opinion that the greatest of these issues—and the most fundamental—can be summed up in just four words: Lack of national security.

Americans at various periods of their history have experienced fear for their economic security—fear for their pocketbooks.

For the first time since 1776 they are experiencing fear for their national security—fear for their lives.

Even in the dark days of the American Revolution, the American people never lost faith in the outcome. Today as a nation we are assailed by propaganda, doubts, and insecurity.

Due to the blundering of our so-called leaders—to their policies of appeasement and softness—we have witnessed the Soviet Union expand its domination, in less than 6 years, from 170,000,000 to 800,000,000 people.

At the same time we have witnessed American prestige and American leadership deteriorate on an alarming scale.

The effect on our people has been devastating.

Americans now go to bed wondering if they will see the dawn. They look at their homes wondering when they will be reduced to rubble. They gaze upon their children, wondering more whether they will be alive than whether they will be outstanding citizens.

Under this administration, fear and propaganda for fear has become a national policy.

ISSUE NO. 2

The second great issue can be summed up also in four words: Lack of Executive leadership.

Never in the history of our Nation has America had so little leadership when it is so badly needed, both in the field of international relations and domestic affairs.

On the international scene, we have been outbargained, outsmarted, and outmaneuvered. We have been humiliated as at no other time in our history.

The American people are asking themselves: For this price is the only answer endless war and endless bloodshed?

ISSUE NO. 3

The third great issue can be summed up, too, in four words: Lack of public morality.

This issue is far deeper than mink coats, deep freezes, and flasks of perfume. It is an issue that goes to the very fundamentals of our social system. It hits our homes, our communities, and our churches.

It gives little comfort to hold up the defalcations of hangers-on and petty bureaucrats when the whole philosophy of a government is based on appeal to the pocketbook and the belly, instead of to the heart and mind.

How can we expect idealism and morality to survive when a government itself is dedicated only to the principles of materialism?

We as citizens will fail in our duty if we do not grasp this issue in its broadest implications.

Petty crime is the work of petty people, but godless materialism can lead only to social suicide.

Yes, we have the issues. We must have the courage to meet them.

The three great issues—lack of national security, lack of executive leadership, and lack of public morality—are interlocked and interwoven.

We must resolutely and realistically appraise the attitudes and problems they have created; determine what changes are necessary; seek the wisdom and the sound leadership to bring us out of the deep evil bog into which we as a nation are sinking; and build up our strength—not only of arms but of character and purpose.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Our whole military program is one of grave concern, both as to the production of armament and the soundness of the thinking of our military leaders.

On June 18, 1952, one of my colleagues said on the floor of the House that according to an analysis made in March of this year:

Our over-all defense production program was lagging behind schedule by 30 percent to 50 percent;

In the field of jet propulsion our production of planes lagged as much as 70 percent for fighters;

Production of jet bombers was 65 percent behind schedule;

Our light tanks were 25 percent behind schedule;

Our medium tanks were 70 percent behind schedule.

The truth is defense production lag has become so embarrassing that the Pentagon revised its production schedules by imposing what has been called a stretch-out. This is a polite word for substituting failure for success. When you read in the newspapers today that our armaments production is "up to schedule," they are talking about the so-called stretch-out schedule, not the original schedule.

In Korea our airmen are fighting a 1952 war with an obsolete 1949 Air Force because of the production breakdown.

Complaints are coming from the fighting soldiers in Korea of rationed and insufficient ammunition.

Blundering and stupid leadership is the cause. A house cleaning is the remedy.

PEOPLE INDIGNANT

Never have I seen our people so outraged and indignant as they are today over the revelations of fraud, fixing, and influence peddling in the Federal administrative agencies. Every new report of congressional investigation reveals the present administration as a tragic era of blunder and plunder.

The hit-or-miss policies, in programs which get nowhere, pile up new mountains of debt, extend our military commitments far beyond our national resources and mortgage the generations yet unborn.

Out of this muddle of incompetence flows the broad stream of immorality,

corruption, fixing, and rake-off, as characterized by mink coats, deep freezers, 5-percenters, influence peddlers, and tax scandals.

Never before in American history has there been such a shocking lack of elemental honesty and probity in public administration.

The socialistic New Deal-Fair Deal party has been too long in office. Power-grabbing bureaucrats have become fat and lax. Corruption thrives on their callous political indifference to the public welfare.

We cannot run this country on the basis of the secret pay-off.

Public office is still a public trust, and there is much evidence that the American people intend to restore the great American tradition of faithful public service when they go to the polls this year.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

The American people have been made the victims of the biggest flim-flam game in American history.

The so-called Defense Production Act or Price Control Act could be called the Defense Reduction Act. We do not have an Office of Price Stabilization, we have an Office of Political Spongers.

It is a bench warmer's paradise for 12,000 OPS political appointees, who will help produce another phantom vote for the administration, come next November 4.

The so-called Defense Production Act is another step on the journey down the road to socialism and the destruction of the American free-enterprise system.

We would do well to listen to one Hermann Goering, the chief architect of nazism in Germany. Goering was interviewed in jail by an American commentator, Mr. Henry J. Taylor. Here is what a badly disillusioned ex-high potentate of nazism had to say:

> Your America is doing many things in the economic field which we found out caused us so much trouble. You are trying to control people's wages and prices—people's work. If you do that, you must control people's lives. And no country can do that part way. I tried it and failed.
>
> No country can do it all the way, either. I tried that too, and it failed.
>
> You are no better planners than we. I should think your economists would read what happened here.

These are the words of Hermann Goering. Who could be so blind as to argue that the way to have liberty abroad is to destroy it at home?

REDS SHELTERED

It has been said that 10 years went by between the time the Government had absolute proof Hiss was a Communist and the time he was convicted.

When public morals break down, communism enters. That is why Communists and fellow travelers, I believe, are still serenely at work in many of the agencies in the Federal Government. With no strong moral principles guiding the administration, Reds and wobblies of every stripe have found haven on the Government payroll.

Communist infiltrations have been exposed consistently by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for 14 years, but the President lightly dismissed these exposures—for example, in the Hiss case, with a contemptuous comment, "Red herring."

In 1950, Congress passed the Security Act to force the removal of Communists from the Government payroll. President Truman promptly vetoed this measure, and it had to be passed again by both Houses by a two-thirds majority. That was done. That law is not being applied and enforced with spirit and determination.

Communist traitors gave our priceless atomic secrets to the spies in the Kremlin.

Secretary of State Acheson did not turn his back on Alger Hiss, but he did not hestitate to turn his back on Douglas MacArthur. Truman announced publicly that Acheson would be his Secretary of State as long as he remained in the White House.

From 1933 onward communism was sheltered, protected, coddled, and befriended in New Deal-Fair Deal Washington. Today that shocking national betrayal is shielded from public view by the secrecy and censorship of Truman's iron curtain.

Freedom will not be snuffed out—the great heart of America will speak again.

TAX AND SPEND

The people cry out under the load of taxation.

The President continually recommends higher and higher taxes. His new budget is by far the greatest in the peacetime history of any nation in the world.

The Government spending takes close to one-third of the national income. This means that everybody with a job works every third day for the Government.

This mad and reckless spending in Washington has given us the 50-cent dollar. The purchasing power of earnings vanish faster under Truman's inflation than wage adjustments can be realized. We are neither at war nor at peace. We are mobilized for war, paying for war, but denied the fruit of victory. Through June 20, 1952, we have already suffered 110,611 battle casualties in Korea, in a "police action" which has now extended longer than World War I.

As a veteran of World War I, I know how our boys in Korea must resent the President calling their sacrifice a "police action" rather than he openly admitting he has blundered into another all-out war.

Our military program and overseas aid during the last 6 years have mounted to almost $150,000,000,000, all for the professed purpose of containing communism. Yet during those years we have seen communism spread its Red tentacles from 200,000,000 Russians to 800,000,000 persons in Europe and Asia.

The Kremlin has expanded its dominion four times, while the Truman-Acheson policy has devoured the American wealth in a Punch and Judy diplomatic game with the cruel imperialism of communism slavery.

Under Roosevelt and Truman we have given away more than $100,000,000,000 in overseas gifts and grants. We have depleted our forests, our mines, and our precious natural resources half a century ahead of the calendar.

Today every man, woman, and child in this land carries a debt load of $1,700, his per capita share of the Roosevelt-Truman national debt of $257,000,000,000. This debt amounts to almost $7,000 for each and every one of our 36,000,000 families.

A married couple with two children who had a $5,000 income in 1939 would need a net income of over $11,500 in 1952 to be as well off.

WAR PARTY

During the past 50 years, we have had five Republican Presidents. Not one of them had a battlefield casualty reported during his term of office. But what of our three more recent Democratic Presidents? Under Woodrow Wilson, we had 334,734 battle casualties. Under Franklin D. Roosevelt, we had 994,893 battle casualties. Under Harry Truman, we have had more than 110,611 casualties in the police action in Korea.

Here is the box score on Republican peace since 1900, showing the battle casualties under each Republican President:

Theodore Roosevelt	0
William H. Taft	0
Warren G. Harding	0
Calvin Coolidge	0
Herbert Hoover	0

And here is the casualty box score on the Democratic wars since 1917, a period of only 35 years, or one generation:

Woodrow Wilson	334,734
Franklin D. Roosevelt	994,893
Harry S. Truman	110,611
Total casualties	1,440,238

Here you have the official record of the "peace party," as these war makers call themselves. Over press, radio, and television, they cry "peace, peace, peace—we will make the peace," but all they produce is war, destruction, and chaos.

In 1916, Woodrow Wilson was elected for a second term on the slogan "he kept us out of war." Six months later, we were in World War I.

In 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt said over a Nation-wide radio broadcast: "I have said this before and I shall say it again and again and again—your boys are not going to be sent into foreign war." Within 14 months, we were in World War II.

On June 1, 1950, President Truman told his White House press conference that he believed the world was closer to peace than it had been in 5 years, and this cheery utterance made headlines the world around. Twenty-four days later the shooting started in Korea. And in the next 24 months more than 110,611 American boys were killed, wounded, or missing on the Korean battlefields.

In the perspective of history the Democratic promise of peace has become a certain omen of war.

The first half of this century in America has created a war party. Every time that party comes to power, the shooting starts—and the American taxpayers foot the bills, both for war and reconstruction—for both friends and foes alike.

It is a great shell game. And the American people now see clearly through this gigantic hoax of the men who are always babbling peace and making war.

CRUSADE OF PATRIOTISM

There is a sense of patriotic devotion in this favored land today which, I am certain, transcends all narrow considerations of pary or faction. As Americans we are guardians and custodians of a precious heritage—the heritage of freedom under law. We must not stand by idly and watch a band of reckless, desperate political schemers and planners dissipate our wealth, our power, and our national glory and strength.

Democrats, Independents and Republicans—men and women are joining hands, regardless of past party affiliations, in a new alliance of constitutional rededication to restore the true pattern of honest, faithful representative government. The Republican Party is the instrument of that redemption and rededication.

Only a strong and solvent America can hope to hold back the black night of godless communism. Bankruptcy and ruin are Stalin's aims for America. The Truman deficits are all water on Stalin's wheel.

Let us have done with the corruptionists, the wobblies, the Reds, and the socialistic squanderers in Washington. We still have an ample reserve of good, old-fashioned American common sense to see us through.

The American people know what is the matter.

All they need is a government in Washington which will faithfully and honestly translate their wants, their wishes, and their real needs into effective national policies and programs.

Freedom is not dead. It has only been drugged and doped by fraud, fakery, deceit, and demagogic promises of peace.

But the people are alert.

This year of 1952 will see the little men of blunder and plunder swept away like so many broken sticks before the rush of a mighty river of American patriotism.

The war party will be swept from power.

CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. J. Res. 492) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed and bound for the use of the House 1,500 copies of CANNON'S Procedure in the House of Representatives, by CLARENCE CANNON, to be printed under the supervision of the author and to be distributed to the Members by the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That, notwithstanding any provision of the copyright laws and regulations with respect to publications in the public domain, CANNON'S Procedure in the House of Representatives shall be subject to copyright by the author thereof.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MINERALS AND METALS, PART NO. 1, MANGANESE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 327) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to have printed for its use 500 additional copies of a hearing entitled "Strategic and Critical Minerals and Metals, Part No. 1 Manganese," hearings before a Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Public Lands during the Eightieth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRAYERS BY THE CHAPLAIN, REV. BERNARD BRASKAMP

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 458) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a House document the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States from February 1, 1950, to the end of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "first session of the".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEWSPRINT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 542) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, five hundred additional copies of the report entitled "Newsprint," being House Report No. 505, part 1, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWS PERTAINING TO VETERANS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 563) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a compilation of laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the Eighty-second Congress to be prepared by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, be printed as a House document, as a supplement to House Document No. 78 of the Eighty-first Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike "first" and insert "second."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ACTIONS OF CONGRESS ON HOUSING

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Your Congress and American Housing—the Actions of Congress on Housing From 1892 to 1951," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "and that 1,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ROAD TO INDUSTRIAL PEACE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 693) to authorize the printing of The Road to Industrial Peace as a House document, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript, "The Road to Industrial Peace," be printed with illustrations as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, after the word "illustrations" insert the words "in black"; after the word "document" change the period to a comma and insert the words "size ten and one-fourth by fourteen and one-half inches, with the cover printed in three colors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOUNGSTOWN SHEET & TUBE CO. ET AL. v. CHARLES SAWYER

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Ad-

ministration, I call up the resolution (H. Con. Res. 235) providing that the briefs for the Government and others and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case, be printed as a House document; and that additional copies be printed, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the briefs for the Government and the companies and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case (*The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. et al.*, v *Charles Sawyer* (Nos. 744, 745), including such briefs for the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers et al., as amici curiae, be printed as a House document; and that 3,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEARINGS ON INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary not to exceed 7,500 additional copies of part 1 and subsequent parts of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations," held before a subcommittee of the above committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the resolution providing money for the Cox investigating committee come up tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. It will come up following the Consent Calendar.

GOING HOME

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a political saying in America that is almost as old as the life of this country, and it is most applicable to the Congress of the United States. You have heard it countless times, and briefly it is this, "Few die and none resign."

This means that in the Congress of the United States there has been a tendency to stay as long as we can, until the Great Maker or the electorate calls us home.

I do not believe this saying holds true as strongly today as it once did, because in my 6 years in the House of Representatives I have seen a number of my fellow Members decide to quit, to retire, and go home. That is what I have decided to do. So today, my friends, this is my brief swan song as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

I go home with heart-warming friendships that I have made in this House Chamber, as well as in the Senate of the United States. I go home with a certain feeling of regret because of my fine friends and associates here, but I go home with deeper faith in the American way of life, in the Government of the United States of America, and in the future of our country and its ever-increasing leadership of the free world against the slave world. And more important, I go home with the full conviction that if the people of this Nation will maintain the quality of the membership that now comprises the Congress of the United States, democracy will live on in the hearts of men and our country will flourish, whatever the obstacles may be.

The reasons for my voluntarily leaving Congress are compellingly personal. I have interests that call me back. I have two sons who have chosen to follow my own professional career. My older son is now joining me in the practice of law in my home town of Hendersonville, N. C., that garden spot of the world, in what we love to call "The land of the sky." Another son is soon to follow in the same footsteps. These are the principal reasons why I am going home.

I go back to North Carolina with great respect for my fellow Members of the House and for the Democratic leadership of this Chamber: Speaker SAM RAYBURN, that great son of Texas; Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a New Englander for whom we of the South hold such a high regard; for that pleasant and indefatigable son of Tennessee, the Democratic whip, PERCY PRIEST. These men and other leaders have given us rare guidance in troubled times in the House of Representatives. My only hope is that the people of our country realize the excellence of this leadership, as well as the fact that the rules of our House of Representatives gives a much greater degree of speed and efficiency in legislating for the welfare of the Nation.

The Congressional Reorganization Act did much to streamline the entire Congress of the United States but it did not go far enough. I have nothing but the utmost respect for that great arm of the Congress known as the United States Senate, for the high degree of integrity and character of the men who make up that august body, and for their judgment and their fundamental Americanism. However, my friends of the House, I cannot help but depart with some feeling of alarm at the legislative delays and bottlenecks that confront Congress today. I have the feeling that some satisfactory substitute must be found to meet the challenge of unlimited debate which some believe to be all important. My prediction is that one day a way will be found to further streamline our Congressional procedure to keep up with the fast moving world, and remove us from the burdens of certain rules of antiquity.

To continue to follow indefinitely an old custom, however honored it may have been in the past, is simply erecting a monument to the race of the hare and the tortoise. The House is the hare and the Senate is the tortoise in the legislative race of the United States today.

While I do not know the answer, I am sure it will be discovered. We might find some help if more thought is given to the words inscribed upon the Speaker's platform before which I stand—Union, justice, tolerance, liberty, peace.

While I have paid tribute to the Democratic leadership, I would not fail to speak well of the fine leadership of the Republican side of the aisle, for which I have greatest admiration and respect. These are fine, worthy, sincere Americans, and are a credit to their party and to the position they hold. I remember Honorable JOE MARTIN as he swung the gavel in the Eightieth Congress when I was a freshman, and Honorable CHARLIE HALLECK, who served so well and so fairly in the position of majority leader at that time. Nor would I fail to mention Honorable LESLIE ARENDS, now minority whip, for the forthright and sincere leadership which he has given his party, and the cooperation extended to all of us.

Politically, I have always been associated with the Democratic Party and have subscribed to its basic principles, which to me are designed to accomplish the most good and the most public service, for the most people in our country.

However, I have tried always to keep my country ahead of my political party, and in my votes as a Member of the House of Representatives I have cast my ballot for that which I thought was best. I have not been one who felt his political party was always right. The people and their welfare come first, and I can leave Congress with a feeling of pride that I have never been a rubber stamp for anyone.

Political parties are a necessary part of our Government. Our country is blest by the two-party system, because here we are not cursed by the diffusions of splinter parties that in other countries make it difficult at times to form a government.

As Democrats we should fight for the principles of our party just as the Republicans should fight for their principles. But on the floor of this House I find it gratifying to see so many colleagues voting their convictions, their judgments, regardless of the party line.

The United States of America has a great destiny of world leadership ahead of it, and if we maintain our fundamental faith and courage and our National defense and our economic security we shall fulfill that destiny. We must fulfill that destiny, not only for ourselves and for our succeeding generations, but for the other nations of the world that want to remain free. You can look back over the pages of history,

to Genghis Khan and the Tartars and the Mongols, to the days when conquering races ripped Europe apart. Yet, Europe rose again. Today, we face a threat more dangerous than history has ever presented, the threat of world communism, the threat of the Politburo of the Kremlin to the free world.

These merchants of murder and salesmen of slavery who inhabit the Kremlin want to wreck and enslave the free world.

Let us all stand and be counted—counted upon to play our logical roles, the best roles of which we are capable, against the Communist phonies and liars and rats who are at large in the world.

In all these undertakings we should ever keep before us the necessity that whatever action we take and whatever assistance we extend to other nations of the world must be done within solvency. We cannot afford to wreck our own economy in a desire to be of assistance to other peoples of the world. If we are to be strong materially, we must be strong economically, and if our economy falls apart and we become insolvent, the Government of the United States as we know it today will sink into oblivion and over its faltering ashes will be erected a government of dictatorship that will not be easy to displace.

It is good to be charitable, even sometimes to the point of sacrifice, but before we should be charitable we should first be just. And we are not just when we bend our economy to the breaking point.

Forgive me my friends if I seem to be utilizing this occasion in the role of an adviser, but I have spoken a few simple things that are in my heart as I say farewell to the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States.

I am proud to have been a member of the delegation from North Carolina, headed by our beloved and venerable dean, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. He is a great American and worthy of all the honors that have been bestowed upon him by the people of his State and the Members of this Congress. He and I are leaving here together. We are going back to the mountains of North Carolina "from whence cometh our strength." We are not going to retire. We are not going into seclusion. We are not going out of politics. We are just going home.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri, for 1 day, on account of official business.

Mr. MAGEE, for 1 day, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. POLK and to include a letter from Mr. Joseph W. Fichter, past master of the Ohio State Grange and member of the executive committee.

Mr. MAGEE and to include a statement by Rev. George S. Reuter, Jr., of Holden, Mo.

Mr. HERLONG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. EBERHARTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLMES and to include a letter from Otis C. Moyer.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include a letter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GROSS and to include an editorial.

Mr. LOVRE in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. JENISON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for research into and development of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in inaugural ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louis H. Emfinger; and

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 2, 1952, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1624. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, Department of State, transmitting the sixth semiannual report of the United States Advisory Commission on Information, dated July 1952, pursuant to section 603 of Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress, an act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations (H. Doc. 526) was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 720. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7408, a bill to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-ninth Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines; without amendment (Rept. No. 2369). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 676. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate and study the seaward boundaries of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. S. 2922. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 2406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7722. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 8373. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Joint Resolution 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; without

amendment (Rept. No. 2411). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 327. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to have printed for its use additional copies of certain hearings; without amendment (Rept. No. 2412). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 458. Resolution to print the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States from February 1, 1950, to the end of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 2413). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 542. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 505, part 1, Eighty-second Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2414). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 563. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the Eighty-second Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 2415). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 589. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Your Congress and American Housing—The Actions of Congress on Housing From 1892 to 1951," as a House document; with amendment (Rept. No. 2416). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 693. Resolution to authorize the printing of "The Road to Industrial Peace" as a House document; with amendment (Rept. No. 2417). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 235. Concurrent resolution providing that the briefs for the Government and others, and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case be printed as a House document; and that additional copies be printed; without amendment (Rept. No. 2418). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 59. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearing entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2419). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MACK of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 2422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board; with amendment (Rept. No. 2425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee of Conference. S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934 (Rept. No. 2426). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 1950. A bill to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 7494. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7917. A bill for the relief of Agnes Ishikawa and Shiroi Moriyama; without amendment (Rept. No. 2371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso; without amendment (Rept. No. 2372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2373). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2374). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini; without amendment (Rept. No. 2375). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 2377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori; without amendment (Rept. No. 2378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura; without amendment (Rept. No. 2379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 2380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2381). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis; without amendment (Rept. 2382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson (junior); without amendment (Rept. No. 2384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean; without amendment (Rept. No. 2385). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata; without amendment (Rept. No. 2386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere; without amendment (Rept. No. 2387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida; without amendment (Rept. No. 2388). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise; without amendment (Rept. No. 2390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2391). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior; without amendment (Rept. No. 2392). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 709. A resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Dewey J. Crites, Jack Mayta, and

James Willette; without amendment (Rept. No. 2394). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; with amendment (Rept. No. 2395). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5376. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; with amendment (Rept. No. 2396). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5485. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski; without amendment (Rept. No. 2397). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5541. A bill for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 2398). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7365. A bill for the relief of Clifford Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2399). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7868. A bill for the relief of Felix Garcia and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2400). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7687. A bill for the relief of Jack Carpenter; without amendment (Rept. No. 2401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7827. A bill for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; without amendment (Rept. No. 2402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8001. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8205. A bill for the relief of Homer C. Boozer and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 81. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8443. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 8444. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEAMER:

H. R. 8445. A bill to amend the Foreign Trade Zones Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 8446. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce the retirement age from 65 to 60, to provide that widows may become entitled to benefits thereunder at age 50, and to increase monthly insurance and lump-sum death payments thereunder by 20 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 8447. A bill authorizing appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of certain members of the Armed Forces who died as a direct result of active service on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8448. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to provide for a refund of premiums in certain cases where the insured failed to apply for a waiver of such premiums; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. R. 8449. A bill to prevent the application or exercise of monopoly power by employers and labor organizations in their dealings with employees, to amend the antitrust laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 721. Resolution declaratory of committee's authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 722. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 698; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 8450. A bill for the relief of Pasquale De Leonibus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty E. Lamay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8452. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence M. Augustine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 8453. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw (John) Waz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

783. By Mr. BUSH: Petition of Rotary Club of Lock Haven, Pa., for immediate action by the Federal Government in the construction of flood-control devices in the valley of the West Branch of the Susquehanna River; to the Committee on Public Works.

784. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James I. Hadar, New Brunswick, N. J., relative to a redress of grievances involving violation of civil rights, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John C. Millian, D. D., district superintendent, Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Holy and Great God of all nations and peoples, we bow here in humble reverence before Thee asking Thy divine blessing for the living of this day. Make us spiritually sensitive that we may clearly discern Thy divine leading. Broaden our minds that we can accept Thy truth. Bestow upon us moral courage that we fail not to speak and act for right and righteousness. May we during this day be worthy of this great Nation founded upon Thy moral and spiritual laws.

May there go out from these legislative halls such acts and messages of love and understanding that all the world will be brought to oneness of mind and unity of purpose that will enable Thy holy spirit to bring peace on earth, good will to all men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 1, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 523) for the relief of Walter Duschinsky, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2605) to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1126. An act for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo;

H. R. 1159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Frederick George Boughton;

H. R. 1711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2171. An act for the relief of Robert E. Robinson and Gerald L. Harris;

H. R. 2181. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 2217. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2352. An act for the relief of Mrs. Towa Tanoue;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc;

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of Clara Gabriel;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg;

H. R. 2972. An act for the relief of Harold Joe Davis;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 3426. An act for the relief of Sui Kin Chun;

H. R. 3502. An act for the relief of Arthur Staveley;

H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lau Hong Shee;

H. R. 4296. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor;

H. R. 4398. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.;

H. R. 4561. An act for the relief of Norberto Linaza Yrigoyen and Maria Josefa Maseda Lopez;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vahianos);

H. R. 4841. An act for the relief of James Oliver Farlow;

H. R. 4909. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 5180. An act for the relief of Jungo Tsutsumi;

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Gregg Ted Lewis;

H. R. 5207. An act for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo;

H. R. 5435. An act for the relief of Mrs. Karl Doege;

H. R. 5519. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Trukett;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5841. An act for the relief of Winston Brothers Co. and the Utah Construction Co.; Roy L. Bair and Co. and James Crick and Sons; J. A. Terteling and Sons, Inc., and T. E. Connolly, Inc.;

H. R. 6274. An act to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6712. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 6788. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 6903. An act for the relief of Rose Martin;

H. R. 6904. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Nabeshima;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6938. An act for the relief of Wong Gook Ying;

H. R. 6942. An act for the relief of Junko Arima and Yuri Arima;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7054. An act for the relief of Miyako Toda;

H. R. 7094. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol B. Gray;

H. R. 7565. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7817. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier;

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; and

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 235) providing that the briefs for the Government and others, and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Steel Seizure case, be printed as a House document; and that additional copies be printed, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a printed report on the Agricultural Experiment Stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, to be substituted for the typewritten report on the same subject matter, transmitted to the Senate on January 2, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INFORMATION

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Information, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission dated July 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain employees of the Department of the Treasury who, while in the course of their official duties, suffered losses for personal property by reason of war conditions and whose claims for such losses have been considered and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury upon the recommendation of a Treasury Claims Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Service for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CERTIFICATIONS OF COST OF REHABILITAION AND REPAIR OF CERTAIN PUBLIC AIRPORTS DAMAGED BY MILITARY FORCES

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at certain public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938 RELATING TO EXEMPTION OF AIR CARRIERS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the exemption of air carriers in certain cases from the requirement of filing contracts with the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Newark Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, Newark, N. J., signed by Hans Holborn, chairman, relating to support for the United Nations, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Atlantic District of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, at Bronxville, N. Y., relating to the forcible return of Korean prisoners of war, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the western branch, American Public Health Association, Berkeley, Calif., signed by L. Amy Darter, secretary-treasurer, relating to medical care for Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the Governors' Conference at Houston, Tex., signed by Frank Bane, secretary, relating to the exemption from State and local taxation the activities of private contractors performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

A resolution adopted by the Grand Lodge, Order of Sons of Italy in America, at Swampscott, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to grant American citizenship to parents of any person who has served honorably in the services of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, CIO, Washington, D. C., signed by James B. Carey, president, relating to an investigation of the General Electric Co., and its relations with its employees, and so forth (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A cablegram in the nature of a memorial signed by Jose Garcia, of Sabana Grande, Puerto Rico, remonstrating against the so-called Johnston amendment to the constitution of Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS C. BUCHANAN TO BE COMMISSIONER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION—TELEGRAM FROM MAYOR OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the State of Wisconsin deeply deplores the unfortunate action of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in failing affirmatively to recommend the nomination of Commissioner Thomas C. Buchanan for another term on the Federal Power Commission.

We deplore the fact that his nomination experienced such delay in the committee, so that we are now confronted

with the fact that, with but a few days of the session remaining, the possibility of bringing up the nomination on the floor for debate seems dim.

Prior to the action by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I had been pleased to receive a fine telephone call from the distinguished chief executive of my State, the Honorable Walter P. Kohler, Jr., who urged my vigorous support for Commissioner Buchanan. Governor Kohler made this request not just for an individual but as a matter of principle—in view of the fact that Chairman Buchanan, as a matter of principle, so loyally protected the interests of Wisconsin consumers and consumers elsewhere throughout the Nation, particularly in the Phillips Natural Gas Rate case.

I enthusiastically assured Governor Kohler of my full support of Commissioner Buchanan.

I have been happy, moreover, to receive a telegram from the mayor of Milwaukee, the Honorable Frank P. Zeidler, on this same issue.

I believe that Government agency personnel who faithfully perform their duties should be rewarded for their efforts, rather than punished.

I do not reflect on those of my colleagues who happened to vote against the renomination or against a report one way or the other, but I do present this frank judgment of the senior Senator from Wisconsin and of the people of my State. I earnestly hope that his nomination may still be brought up or, that if it is not, that he will receive at the very minimum an interim appointment.

I send Mayor Zeidler's telegram to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Your enthusiastic support of the public's interest in just natural gas rates as demonstrated by your activity in the Phillips case prompts me to urge that you do all in your power to support the continuation of Commissioner Buchanan as a member of the FPC.

FRANK P. ZEIDLER,
Mayor of Milwaukee.

TREATY-MAKING FUNCTIONS OF CONGRESS—AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION—RESOLUTION OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF KIWANIS, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, among the happiest and most fruitful experiences of my life have been my associations with and my membership in Kiwanis. For over a quarter of a century, I have worked in the organization and I have watched it grow.

There is no other organization that surpasses Kiwanis in its desire to preserve those things which are American. It is always inspired by the highest patriotic motives.

Among the resolutions adopted by the International Convention in Seattle this year is one dealing with a proposed amendment to our Constitution. I believe that it deserves the careful attention of Congress and of the people of this country. Under the direction of its able and aggressive president, Claude B. Hellmann, of Baltimore, Md., Kiwanis has again sponsored and supported a number of resolutions which are aimed at the goal of keeping America strong. The particular amendment to which I wish to call attention deals with the important functions of Congress in making treaties. I call attention of all members of the Senate to this important proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

7. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas there is pending in the Senate of the United States a Senate resolution to the effect that an amendment be made to the Constitution of these United States for the purpose of clarifying the effect of any action by the Senate of the United States in respect of the treaty-making power, reading as follows:

"A provision of treaty which conflicts with any provision of this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such treaty: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Kiwanis International endorse in principle the suggested amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties and executive agreements, designed to prevent the treaty-making power from being used as a means of amending the Constitution and Bill of Rights."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 2320. A bill to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2051); and

H. R. 6544. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 2052).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 5055. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053);

H. R. 7952. A bill to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054); and

H. R. 8170. A bill relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2657. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414); with amendments (Rept. No. 2058).

S. 2815. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement damages to public airports resulting from military operations; with amendments (Rept. No. 2068).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 3438. A bill to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056); and

S. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

H. R. 850. A bill for the relief of Mary Isumi (Rept. No. 2059);

H. R. 880. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi (Rept. No. 2060);

H. R. 5618. A bill for the relief of Young Wai Kit (Rept. No. 2061);

H. R. 6278. A bill for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi (Rept. No. 2062);

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm (Rept. No. 2063);

H. R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian (Rept. No. 2064);

H. R. 7667. A bill for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger (Rept. No. 2071);

H. R. 7833. A bill for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkeimer (Rept. No. 2065); and

H. R. 7850. A bill for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer (Rept. No. 2066).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 3435. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections; without amendment (Rept. No. 2069).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2300. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational drama and music programs in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2072).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2999. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the public interest; with amendments (Rept. No. 2073).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 8222. A bill to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2074).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

H. R. 5350. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2075).

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report an original resolution increasing the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 347), reported by Mr. RUSSELL from the Committee on Armed Services, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT ON STUDY OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION RELATING TO STORAGE AND PROCESSING ACTIVITIES (S. REPT. NO. 2048)

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 256, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to investigate storage and processing activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and alleged dealings in gas and oil interests by employees of the Farm Credit Administration, a report on the study of Commodity Credit Corporation relating to storage and processing activities, which was ordered to be printed.

PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS IN MILITARY PROCUREMENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2070)

Mr. MOODY, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report on the participation of small business in military procurement, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY, JEFFERSON BARRACKS, MO.—INTERIM REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 2049)

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I submit, pursuant to S. Res. 251, authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations, to carry out certain duties, an interim report, relating to the disposal of surplus property at Jefferson Barracks, Mo. It is a unanimous report which the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has made to the Committee on Government Operations concerning its investigation into the sale of Government-owned surplus property at Jefferson Barracks, Mo. This subcommittee, since its creation in 1948, has made a number of investigations into the improper activities of influence peddlers in government. The subcommittee has also made a number of reports to the Senate dealing with the same subject. I am of the opinion that these inquiries which have spotlighted the corrupt and improper activities of these peddlers of influence have assisted in alerting the Congress and the public to the problem which existed. The subcommittee from time to time has also made various recommendations and suggestions with a view of curtailing and, if possible, eliminating the influence racket.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, as a result of our investigation into the sale of certain surplus property at Jefferson Barracks, which is covered in the report just submitted to the Senate, and in the light of other inquiries by our staff, the subcommittee has found that our criminal laws are not adequate to deal with these influence peddlers. Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to strengthen our criminal laws in this regard. I am happy to point out that each of the other six Members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has joined with me in cosponsoring this bill.

The bill would invoke criminal penalties against, first, those who would engage in actual influence peddling; second, those who would hire or attempt to hire influence peddlers; and, third, those who would solicit business for an influence peddler.

The criminal penalty in this bill is a $5,000 fine or 2 years in prison, or both. In addition there is a civil penalty providing for the recovery of triple damages in those cases where persons offer or actually pay money to influence peddlers. There is also an informer section in this proposed statute which is very similar to the informer sections found in our internal revenue and similar laws.

While I realize that it is too late in this session of Congress for any positive action to be taken on the bill, I and the other members of the subcommittee are of the opinion that the passage of this or similar legislation will serve as a strong deterrent to those who would engage in the business of selling or buying influence in Government affairs. The purpose in introducing the bill at this time is to give the Congress opportunity to study this proposed legislation prior to the next session of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3450) to safeguard the operations of Government agencies from certain pernicious influences, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HOEY (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 11 of title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Bribery and Graft," is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 224. Payment or acceptance of consideration for exertion of improper influence upon Government officer or employee:

"Whoever, directly or indirectly, offers, gives, or agrees to give to any other person any money or thing of value for attempting, purporting, promising, or undertaking to exert improper influence upon any officer or employee of the United States with respect to his performance or nonperformance of any act incident to his official duty relating to any official matter; or

"Whoever, directly or indirectly, receives or consents or agrees to receive from any other person any money or thing of value for attempting, purporting, promising, or undertaking to exert on behalf of such other person any improper influence upon any officer or employee of the United States with respect to his performance or nonperformance of any act incident to his official duty with respect to any official matter; or

"Whoever, directly or indirectly, solicits or procures the payment or transfer to any person of any money or thing of value by any other person for attempting, purporting, promising, or undertaking to exert, on behalf of such other person, any improper influence upon any officer or employee of the United States with respect to his performance or nonperformance of any act incident to his official duty with respect to any official matter—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

"As used in this section—

"(a) the terms 'person' means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, or other legal entity;

"(b) the term 'improper influence' means influence (1) arising from a personal, business, professional, fraternal, or political relationship asserted by any person to exist, directly or indirectly, between such person and any officer or employee of the United States, and (2) asserted by such person to be or to have been effective to obtain, from or through the intervention of such officer or employee, with respect to any official matter (A) special, more expeditious, or more favorable consideration or action than that obtainable in the ordinary and regular conduct of public affairs, or (B) action, decision, or disposition more favorable than that warranted by the merits of such matter;

"(c) the term 'official matter' includes—

"(1) the actual or proposed execution of any contract or commitment by any agency of the United States;

"(2) the actual or proposed procurement of any property of any agency of the United States;

"(3) the actual or proposed sale or disposition of any property by any agency of the United States;

"(4) any claim of or against the United States;

"(5) any loan or other financial assistance by any agency of the United States; and

"(6) any question, matter, cause, proceeding, or controversy pending for decision or determination before any court or agency of the United States; and

"(d) the term 'property' includes any interest in real or personal property, and the rendition of service other than the personal services of one individual."

(b) The section analysis appearing in such chapter is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"224. Payment or acceptance of consideration for exertion of improper influence upon Government officer or employee."

SEC. 2. (a) Any person who offers, gives, or agrees to give to any other person, or who receives, or consents or agrees to receive from any other person, any money or thing of value in violation of section 224 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be liable to pay to the United States a penalty in an amount equal to three times the amount or value of such money or thing of value.

(b) Such penalty may be recovered in a civil action brought by the United States in any district court for a judicial district in which the defendant resides, is found, or transacts business, and all process in any such action may be served in any such district. In any such action subpenas issued by such court may run into any other judicial district.

(c) Any person who furnishes to the Attorney General, any officer or employee of the Department of Justice, or any United States attorney original information leading to the recovery from any other person of any penalty under this section may be awarded and paid by the Attorney General from the amount so recovered a compensation equal to 10 percent of the penalty so recovered.

(d) As used in this section, the term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, or other legal entity.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3449. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the establishment of the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad Co.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. NIXON):

S. 3450. A bill to safeguard the operations of Government agencies from certain pernicious influences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HOEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3451. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Henry Holcomb Bennett and in commemoration of Flag Day, 1953; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3452. A bill for the relief of Svetoyar Peodorovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 3453. A bill to credit the Oglala Sioux Tribe with the proceeds of Oglala Sioux tribal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3454. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 3455. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3456. A bill providing for the construction of a highway and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 3457. A bill for the relief of Francisco Alvarez Suarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROGRAM OF FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a brief summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and apppropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3455) to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The summary presented by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED STUDENT AID ACT OF 1952

Under the bill, Federal aid would be made available to selected students in higher education in the form of scholarship stipends. The bill would also provide for Federal insurance of loans to students made by institutions of higher education. The institution, however, could assign its rights under such insurance to a financial institution as security to obtain funds for making loans to students.

Any high-school graduate would be eligible to apply for a scholarship. From among those applying, those showing greatest promise would be granted certificates showing that they are American scholars. Stipends would be granted to the neediest among these scholars, the amount of the stipend varying with the demonstrated need of the recipient, but not exceeding $800 per academic year. The recipient could attend any bona fide college or university of his choice which admits him; and so long as he continued in good standing at the educational institution, his stipend would be paid directly to him in installments suited to the demands of the academic year.

During a time of active hostilities or when found by the President to be necessary in the interest of national defense, at least 60 percent of the stipends must go to students engaging in studies which are determined in a manner prescribed by the President to be related to the national defense or defense-supporting activities. Scholars receiving stipends thus earmarked must, in general, continue their studies in the designated fields if they wish to continue receiving their stipends.

The stipends are subject to annual renewal for the normal course of time necessary to complete the work for the first post-high-school degree, the amount of the stipend being fixed each year in terms of the financial need of each student.

The bill would authorize appropriations not exceeding $32,000,000 for scholarship stipends for the fiscal year 1953, $64,000,000 for the next year, $96,000,000 for the third year, and $128,000,000 thereafter. Each State would be allotted a proportionate share of the funds available each year, the amount being based on the number of high school graduates in the State and the number of youths between the ages of 18 and 21. The number of persons aided would depend on the amount of money appropriated by Congress; but the bill contemplates that when the program is in full operation approximately 50,000 to 60,000 men and women will enter college or university each year with the aid of Federal stipends of varying amounts.

Scholarship commissions in each State would receive applications from students, conduct the objective examinations to select the abler among the applicants, assess the financial need of those qualifying as scholars, and certify to the Commissioner of Education the persons eligible to be certified as scholars and those among the able whose financial need justifies the payment of a stipend, with the amount of the stipend in each case.

A national council on student aid, composed of twelve persons representative of individual, organizational, and professional interests in education and of the public, would advise and assist the Commissioner in the development of principles to guide the State commissions in the selection of persons for scholarship certificates and stipends, and on other important policy matters arising in the administration of the act. Provision is also made for consultation between the Office of Education and the various Federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Defense, which operate special programs of aid to undergraduate and graduate students. The bill is so drawn as to assure full coordination of the Federal scholarship program with other federally supported programs which aid students in higher education, such as the proposed ROTC program.

The loan insurance program would eventually be self-financing, with the participating colleges and universities paying insurance premiums in to a revolving fund established in the United States Treasury out of which 80 percent of the loss on each insured student loan would be paid. The interest rate charged the student would be geared to the average interest paid on marketable United States Treasury obligations (now between 2¼ and 2½ percent). The institution would be permitted to charge the student this rate plus an additional amount of not more than 1 percent, plus the insurance premium charged by the Federal Government one-half percent or less), maximum of about 4 percent.

The student would not have to start repaying the principal of his loan until 4 years after he completes his education, and then would be given an additional 6 years to repay it. The institution could charge an additional 1 percent interest beginning at the time payments on the principal become due.

With their losses thus insured by the Federal Government, it is expected that the educational institutions would have no difficulty in borrowing money from banks or other financial institutions with which to make loans to students. They could if they wished use their own funds or student loan funds over which they have control.

Any student would be permitted to borrow from educational institutions up to $600 a year and up to $2,400 in the aggregate. The total principal amount of new loans to students covered by insurance under the act in any fiscal year would be limited to $10,000,000.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the state of war. The joint resolution is on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that a brief explanation of the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The explanation is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT

Senate Joint Resolution 165 was reported favorably on June 12, but it was set aside by the action of the Senate in amending a similar House resolution, House Joint Resolution 477. Subsequently, however, the Senate conferees on this measure yielded on all of their amendments. Among these amendments was one which would authorize temporary continuation of the military status and benefits for the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service. This same authorization is included in Senate Joint Resolution 165 as item 9, lines 18–19 on page 3. The sole purpose of the proposed amendment is to extend this authority relating to the Public Health Service in the same manner and for the same period of time as provided for the other emergency powers covered by the conference report on House Joint Resolution 477.

For many years commissioned officers of the Public Health Service have been appointed, paid, promoted, and retired under laws identical or similar to those applicable to officers of the medical departments of the Army and Navy. Since World War II Public Health Service officers have also been extended military status and military benefits on a par with members of the other armed services.

It is essential that these physicians, dentists, research scientists, sanitary engineers, and public health administrators continue to be so treated. They are subject to discipline, they can and are ordered to undersirable posts of duty on a moment's notice; they are key men in the defense against bacteriological warfare; and they could, almost without exception, earn far more in private life than they are now getting. They have been successfully recruited largely because, as commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, they would be treated on the same basis as their opposite numbers in the Army and Navy.

The principal individual benefits which are derived from military status are widow's benefits, Government life insurance, the death gratuity, and the uniform allowance for junior officers. Loss of military status for the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service would mean the loss of all these benefits for its 2,500 officers. In effect, the Public Health Service would then be the only one of the uniformed services without some type of death benefit.

Inasmuch as these authorities are currently in effect, there would be no additional appropriations required to support the comparatively minor expenditures authorized by the provisions of this amendment.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1126. An act for the relief of Erkki Mainio Sakari Salo;

H. R. 1159. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helga Josefa Wiley;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Frederick George Boughton;

H. R. 1711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2171. An act for the relief of Robert E. Robinson and Gerald L. Harris;

H. R. 2181. An act for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner;

H. R. 2217. An act for the relief of Alfonso Gatti;

H. R. 2352. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tovia Tanoue;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Olympia Cuc;

H. R. 2780. An act for the relief of Clara Gabriel;

H. R. 2898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph W. Furstenberg;

H. R. 2972. An act for the relief of Harold Joe Davis;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 3426. An act for the relief of Sui Kin Chun;

H. R. 3502. An act for the relief of Arthur Staveley;

H. R. 3523. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lau Hong Shee;

H. R. 4296. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Franklin Jim, a minor;

H. R. 4398. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the Columbia Basin Orchard, the Seattle Association of Credit Men, and the Perham Fruit Corp.;

H. R. 4561. An act for the relief of Norberto Linaza Yrigoyen and Maria Josefa Maseda Lopez;

H. R. 4760. An act for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vahianos);

H. R. 4841. An act for the relief of James Oliver Parlow;

H. R. 4909. An act for the relief of Arthur J. Boucher;

H. R. 5180. An act for the relief of Jungo Tsutsumi;

H. R. 5206. An act for the relief of Gregg Ted Lewis;

H. R. 5207. An act for the relief of Julio Mercado Toledo;

H. R. 5435. An act for the relief of Heinz Karl Doege;

H. R. 5519. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Trukett;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5841. An act for the relief of Winston Bros. Co. and the Utah Construction Co.; Roy L. Bair & Co. and James Crick & Sons; J. A. Terteling & Sons, Inc.; and T. E. Connolly, Inc.;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6712. An act for the relief of Hisami Yoshida;

H. R. 6788. An act for the relief of Mrs. Muriel J. Shingler, doing business as Shingler's Hatchery;

H. R. 6903. An act for the relief of Rose Martin;

H. R. 6904. An act for the relief of Kiyoshi Nabeshima;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6938. An act for the relief of Wong Gook Ying;

H. R. 6942. An act for the relief of Junko Arima and Yuri Arima;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7054. An act for the relief of Miyako Toda;

H. R. 7094. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin;

H. R. 7565. An act for the relief of Anna Bosco Lomonaco;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer; and

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hohmeier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6274. An act to authorize the issuance of a patent in fee to Charles I. Chattin;

H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7817. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "Economic Problems of the Free World," delivered by George A. Sloan, chairman, United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce, over the coast-to-coast network of the Columbia Broadcasting System, on Thursday, June 5, 1952.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Article entitled "A 25-Year Job Ahead in Europe," published in U. S. News and World Report for July 4, 1952, being an interview with David Lawrence by the staff of the U. S. News and World Report concerning his visit to Europe.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Winning essay entitled "The Importance of the Investor in our National Economy," submitted by Miss Laura Coburn, of Truth or Consequences, N. Mex., in national high school essay contest conducted by the Investors' League.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Stephens Retires," published in the New York Times of June 30, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "We Can Prosper Without War Orders," written by J. K. Galbraith,

professor of economics at Harvard University, and published in the New York Times Magazine for June 22, 1952.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Report by Mrs. James M. Northrup, radio and television chairman, to Convention of General Federation of Women's Clubs, Omaha, Nebr., May 15, 1952.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1952 — CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. DONALD PENDLETON, VICE CHAIRMAN, SALARY STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday I had occasion to have an exchange of correspondence with Mr. Donald Pendleton, Vice Chairman of the Salary Stabilization Board, with reference to certain language offered by me during the conference on the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952 having to do with section 403 (c), which is the section that sets forth the functions of the Salary Stabilization Board.

I ask unanimous consent that, following my remarks, the text of Mr. Pendleton's letter to me and my answer to him be printed in the body of the RECORD. The exchange of correspondence is intended to clarify my purpose in offering the amendment, and I believe it should be made a matter of record so that others who may be interested may have the opportunity to read my interpretation of my amendment.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 1, 1952.

Hon. IRVING M. IVES,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. IVES: May I request your confirmation of our interpretation of certain language in section 403 (c) of the Defense Production Act as amended by the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952. We understand that this language was offered by you to the joint conference. The language is as italicized in the following quotation:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the stabilization of the salaries and other compensation of persons (not represented in their relationships *or eligible to be so represented* with their employer by duly certified or recognized labor organizations) employed as outside salesmen or in bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacities, as such terms are defined in the regulations issued in pursuance of section 13 (a) (1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, or as supervisors, as defined by the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, shall be administered by the Salary Stabilization Board and the Office of Salary Stabilization as presently established within the Economic Stabilization Agency, or any successor agency, subject to the supervision and direction of the Economic Stabilization Administrator." (Italics supplied.)

It is our interpretation that the words "or eligible to be so represented" are intended to clarify the continuing jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board over hourly paid and salaried workers who do not fall within the categories specified in the section, regardless of whether or not they are represented by duly certified or recognized labor organizations in their relationships with their employers. Such employees have, of course, always been under the jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board.

If this interpretation is correct we should appreciate a letter from you to that effect.

Very truly yours,

DONALD PENDLETON,
Vice Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

Mr. DONALD PENDLETON,
Vice Chairman, Salary Stabilization Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PENDLETON: This will acknowledge your communication of July 1 in which you request my confirmation of your interpretation of certain language in section 403 (c) of the Defense Production Act, as amended by the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952.

The underscored language was offered by me to the joint conference and, as you know, was adopted. Your interpretation that the words "or eligible to be so represented" were intended by me to clarify the continuing jurisdiction of the Wage Stabilization Board over hourly-paid and salaried workers who do not fall within the categories specified in the section, regardless of whether or not they are represented by duly certified or recognized labor organizations in their relationships with their employers, is correct.

As you pointed out, such employees have, of course, always been under the jurisdiction of the Board, and it was my intent that they continue to be under the jurisdiction of the newly constituted Wage Stabilization Board.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING M. IVES.

TUNA FISH INVESTIGATION BY TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a notice from the Tariff Commission of a general investigation under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen. This action has been taken at the request of the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the notice as ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON—PUBLIC NOTICE—TUNA FISH INVESTIGATION UNDER SECTION 332 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

By direction of the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate on June 26, 1952, the United States Tariff Commission, on the 30th day of June 1952, instituted a general investigation under the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of the domestic tuna industry, including the effect of imports of fresh or frozen tuna fish on the livelihood of American fishermen.

The purpose of the investigation is to determine the facts relative to the production, trade, and consumption of tuna fish in the United States, taking into account all relevant factors affecting the domestic economy, including the interests of consumers, processors, and producers. Upon completion of the investigation the Commission will submit a report of the results thereof to the Senate Finance Committee. Such report will include a statement of findings as to the effect upon the competitive position of the domestic tuna fishing industry of the present duty-free entry of fresh and frozen tuna.

A public hearing at which all interested parties will be given opportunity to express their views will be held in connection with this investigation. The time and place of such hearing will be announced at a future date.

I hereby certify that the above investigation was instituted by the United States Tariff Commission on the 30th day of June 1952.

DONN N. BENT,
Secretary.

PRINTING OF BRIEFS FOR GOVERNMENT AND OTHERS, AND RECORD FILED IN SUPREME COURT IN STEEL SEIZURE CASE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 235, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the briefs for the Government and the companies and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case (*The Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company et al., v. Charles Sawyer* (Nos. 744, 745)), including such briefs for the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, et al., as amici curiae, be printed as a House document; and that 3,500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF REVISED EDITION OF CANNON'S PROCEDURE IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 492) authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FAIR TRADE PRACTICES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, H. R. 5767.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To this bill the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has offered an amendment in the nature of a complete substitute. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Perhaps I am an optimist this morning, but I am hopeful that we may conclude consideration of the bill before the day is over. I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and they have agreed to a call of the calendar today as far as they are prepared, if we complete action on the pending bill early enough. That would help us along with our program tomorrow. So I am giving notice that if we should finish with the pending bill in time, the calendar, at least in part, will be called.

AMERICAN MILITARY POLICY IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Mississippi wishes to make a few remarks. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we should immediately intensify and extend to the division level the training of the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa, and give the very highest priority to fully equipping these troops at the earliest possible time for their use on Formosa and in Korea. If communism is to be stopped in Asia, we must develop Asiatic manpower to do the job, and Formosa is the place to begin. I do not intend to renew the argument as to whether or not General MacArthur was right as to these troops. From the evidence it seems clear to me that the troops were not ready for use in April 1951, but they can be made ready for battle action far more rapidly than is now being done. I am confident they would be ready for battle duty and usable in Korea now, and at the same time be able to protect Formosa now, if we had concentrated on this purpose for the last year.

The American people are more than willing to do their part; but it becomes more apparent every day that the American people will not and should not continue indefinitely to furnish the manpower to defeat communism in Asia.

As a definite start, a more extensive and stepped-up training program and eventual use in Korea of the Chinese Nationalist troops now on Formosa should be a No. 1 item in the plan for a continuation of the Korean war. This involves, first, a policy decision by the United Nations. The United States should take the lead with a firm stand for such a policy determination. I am told, but I do not know, that we have not taken this step because of objections in the United Nations; other reasons assigned are that United States policy has been to the contrary. I am not interested in the reasons. I am not interested in blaming anyone. I am interested only in results.

I believe our military department will rapidly forge these soldiers into formidable military strength if given the matériel and heavy equipment. Many divisions with real strength can thus be made ready for action in Korea, and at the same time leave sufficient strength for a proper defense of Formosa.

Recently I noticed an editorial from the Washington Post of June 24 which stated, among other things:

> The most that can be expected of his forces (Chiang's) in any circumstances is that they defend Formosa; and even this, apparently, they are now ill prepared to do.

This statement is not true, because its author has not been sufficiently informed. The truth is that there has never been a firm policy decision made to promptly train and fully equip these men for full-fledged battle action, even on Formosa, much less on Korea. Thus 2 years have been largely lost. I heard General Bradley's statement at a recent closed-session briefing of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and absolutely nothing was said by him which precludes the idea of a stepped-up training and equipping schedule on Formosa and the eventual use of a good portion of these troops on Korea.

The United States Seventh Fleet stands by in defense of Formosa. The United States Air Force can be made available if necessary. The Chinese Nationalist Army even as now constituted presents a strong defense on Formosa in view of the other support. These three facts make Formosa secure from attack. The training and full equipping of the troops on Formosa should have a priority rating equal to any spot in the United Nations, and above that of NATO, because thousands of American men have been dying in Korea, and this is a direct way to substitute actual military forces for some of our men in Korea.

Mr. President, I am informed that the Chinese troops on Formosa have the makings of a splendid army of fighting strength when equipped and trained on a division level. I am informed that their morale is good and that they are willing to fight.

The United States now has more than 3,600,000 men under arms; they encircle the globe. I do not pretend to know the exact number, but we all know that it is above 3,500,000. We are building more and more military installations at many places in the world at a cost of billions of dollars; further billions for maintenance and operations. The cost of much-debated, so-called foreign military aid is far exceeded by the cost and operations of our own military installations in many parts of the world. Our armed services personnel are by far the highest paid of those in any nation in the world. The cost of the salary, clothing, food, medical care and supplies of the average serviceman in the United States is approximately $3,500 per year, while the same cost to our potential and actual enemies is less than $250 per person per year. Including heavy equipment, installations, planes and ships, our military costs per man total $10,000 a year. In addition, we go a long way toward carrying the American standards of living for many of our servicemen abroad, and rightfully have dependency allowances for many of them. Further, each veteran has certain provisions set forth by law that will involve the expenditure of large sums of money for many years to come.

I recite these facts to emphasize that in the years immediately ahead the cost of maintaining such a far-flung network of military power at our own expense is going to be more than our economy can stand. To materially reduce these expenditures, it is going to be necessary to reduce the personnel of our own armed services. Our annual military cost will be staggering as long as our military personnel is large. For these reasons, if for no other, we should concentrate immediately on a plan of rapidly training and completely equipping the Nationalist forces on Formosa.

But there are further reasons. The Communists have built up tremendous military forces in Korea during the recent 12 months of peace talks. The chances for a true peace seem to grow more remote each day. We have furnished approximately 90 percent of the money, approximately 90 percent of the blood, and approximately 90 percent of the casualties so far in this far-away struggle in another continent beyond the Pacific. This is reflected by almost 20,000 graves of United States soldiers made within the two short years since June 24, 1950. In addition, there are 13,000 missing American troops, with only 3,198 of them reported alive by the Communists. In addition to the foregoing, 78,000 Americans carry the scars of actual combat in this war. And in spite of these facts, our enemies now have more troops, more fire power and more destruction arrayed against us in Korea, than at any other time of the war.

The American people always have carried out their part of any agreement, and always will, but we cannot and will not indefinitely carry such an unreasonable share of the burden of the Korean war. We must make plans for the future of the war based on the likelihood that there will be more and further large-scale fighting.

I repeat, this is a matter of high-level policy. The potentialities of extensive military power for use in Korea exist in the Chinese Nationalist troops on Formosa. We have greatly delayed the delivery of matériel and necessary military equipment to the island. We have failed to give the matériel and equipment the priority it deserves. I am told that the delivery of matériel to Formosa is running on approximately the same percentage level as the delivery of matériel for

the military program in Europe. This is not enough. There is not a fighting war going on in Eprope. American men are not dying in Europe. They have been dying by the thousands in Korea. Given the equipment and supplies and high priority, and I believe that our military authorities will soon create a fighting army in Formosa for use in Korea, keeping Formosa safe all the while. I repeat, this is a policy decision to be made by the United Nations under the leadership of the United States.

Specifically, I propose, first, increase the size of the United States military personnel administering training to the Chinese Nationalist troops; second, increase the amount of equipment allotted to these troops so as to include full-scale equipment on a division level; third, make the entire project of training and full battle equipment for these troops a speed-up program of the highest priority; fourth, formulate now whatever policy decisions are necessary for using these Nationalist troops in Korea, when they are properly prepared.

The American people are willing to do their part, but they will not and should not carry indefinitely such a large part of the burden of this war. They will not indefinitely furnish manpower for a war where available manpower from other sources is not made usable.

I wish specially to thank the Senator from Minnesota for his kindness in yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Mississsippi for his statement, with which I am in hearty accord. I ask the Senator whether, from the dollar and cents standpoint, it would not cost us much less to equip the Chinese divisions than it costs to equip our divisions, and would not at the same time provide the additional advantage of giving us Asiatic troops to fight the Communist movement in the Far East?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is eminently correct. I do not have a compilation of the figures before me, but I do know that the cost would be far less to train those men up to the fighting division level than it would cost to train and equip our own troops. As the Senator says, we must have Asiatic manpower to help stop the spread of communism in Asia.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator for his splendid statement.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to express my great satisfaction that the problem has been so clearly stated on the floor by the Senator from Mississippi. He has posed the problem in the clearest and most comprehensible terms in which it has been stated on the floor in my recollection. I should like to ask the Senator whether he does not believe it to be reasonable, desirable, and even necessary to proceed along political, psychological, and spiritual lines, at the same time we strengthen our military force in Korea.

What I am referring to is the proposals which I have made on the floor from time to time, that the terms of peace should be unilaterally offered and sold to the people of North Korea by every possible means. Does the Senator from Mississippi understand what I have in mind? I am trying to find the word which is related to schizophrenia and expresses the idea that the mind is divided into two halves which never come together. That is the word I am looking for.

Mr. WELKER. Schizophrenia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It sounds like a paradox to the Chair.

Mr. WELKER. Schizophrenia. It refers to a divided personality.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the disease. I am looking for the word which explains the mental situation which exists when the disease does not exist. The word I am searching for is "dichotomy."

I shall now return to the subject of my brief remarks, which is that if we think of the problem not as a dichotomy but as a dilemma, and remember that the classic remedy for a dilemma is to grasp both its horns, it seems to me that if we grasp both of the horns of the present dilemma, which are the movement toward peace and a strengthening of our resistance and our capacity to resist, there is hope for peace in the world.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the statement of the Senator from Vermont. In the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi there could not be a stronger moral effect or greater dynamic force working in the Asiatic mind than to have some of the Chinese troops from Formosa actually in combat in Korea. I believe the Chinese and Koreans blend together; they go together and they work together. I believe that something like that is necessary in order to build up a better morale.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Vermont without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

A PROGRAM OF GUARANTEED DISARMAMENT

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I shall not take more than 2 or 3 minutes at the most.

During the last session of Congress a number of Members of the House and the Senate became interested in the program of guaranteed disarmament. Previous to the sessions of the United Nations Assembly in Paris it was finally accepted by our State Department as an American policy. It is evidently a policy involving great difficulty in the formulation of plans and having them accepted. Yet, on the other hand, it has tremendous strength in the fact that there is a deep desire in the hearts of all peoples everywhere that something should be done in the way of guaranteed disarmament.

It had been my intention to speak to this body on the present status of the movement in the United Nations, on its possibilities, its difficulties, and its hopes; but the session is coming to a close, and I shall not be able to do so.

I have been fortunate enough to find in the magazine Atomic Scientists News for May 1952, such a good review of the subject on which I had hoped to speak, that I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROSPECTS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

(By Robert W. Frase)

The international control of atomic energy and the reduction and control of other armaments are now to be treated as integral parts of one general problem by the new Disarmament Commission of the United Nations, established by the General Assembly in January 1952. Are the prospects for progress any better in the new Commission than they were in the two previous separate U. N. Commissions on Atomic Energy and Conventional Armaments, which reached an impasse about 3 years ago and have been marking time since then?

Realistically considered, even the most optimistic possible answer would be that the new Commission has the advantage of more rational terms of reference, but this advantage may be more than counterbalanced by the present state of international suspicion and distrust. The debates in the last U. N. Assembly strongly suggest that the creation of the Disarmament Commission was more an incident in the propaganda battle than the reflection of a belief that negotiated disarmament was a promising way out of the present East-West conflict and arms race. This conflict has now become such an all-out affair—embracing political, economic and military activities in all quarters of the globe—that it seems unlikely that agreement can be reached to reduce or to sterilize the military aspect of the conflict, and thus in essence to agree to compete only in the political and economic spheres, unless it can be logically demonstrated that this way may be a feasible way out which serves the interests of both parties. Like a law case, or a labor dispute, the parties in conflict will not consider an agreed settlement in place of a court case or a strike unless such settlement offers an acceptable compromise alternative to the uncertainty of total victory.

A HISTORICAL COMPARISON

It may be helpful here to review the essentials of the one example in recent history of an international agreement on arms limitation, which was accepted because it did appear to serve the interests of the signatory powers, the Washington Treaty of 1922. There were a number of reasons why it was possible to conclude this treaty to limit major naval vessels whereas other disarmament efforts have thus far failed. The negotiations took place and agreement was reached soon after the close of the First World War and before new power rivalries became intense. All three major parties—the British, Americans, and Japanese—were then on relatively good terms; their interests were not yet in acute conflict in any part of the globe. The limitation of major naval vessels seemed to offer a way of perpetuating this state of affairs, and at the same time to save each of the parties a large amount of money.

Given the then existing state of military technology and the geographical situation of the three principal parties, the limitation of major naval vessels made each of the three militarily supreme in the area of its major

interest—Britain in the Commonwealth, Japan in the Western Pacific, and the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Even if any two of the parties had combined their naval forces permitted under the Treaty, the position of the third party in its home waters would, with the aid of its fortified bases, have been relatively strong. All these circumstances combined to create the one historical case in which arms limitation seemed to be the obvious and natural solution for the problems of each of the major parties at interest.

THE PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE BALANCE OF POWER

The current prospects of reaching an arms limitation agreement appear far less promising than at the time of the Washington Treaty. The present balance of power is so complex that there is no relatively simple way—as there was in the case of the Washington Treaty—of substituting an agreement for a lower level of armaments for the present competition in arms. However, analysis of the present and prospective power balance does tend to show that victory for either side is by no means assured, that the present competition in arms has no discernible "natural" stopping point and that a war might well lead to the exhaustion and impoverishment of all the major participants. Thus there would appear to be a rational reason for both sides to explore seriously what might be worked out in the way of an arms limitation agreement, even though this might be a lengthy process with no simple formula now in sight.

There is and has been since the end of World War II a certain balance of power as between Russia and her satellites and the West. It is a new kind of military balance, but it has shown a considerable durability in surviving crises like the Berlin dispute and the Korean war. In Europe, the most important and active area of conflict, this balance has consisted essentially of United States air-atomic power against the superior ground forces of the U. S. S. R. Since about two or three years after the close of World War II, the Red army has been in a position to overrun all of continental Europe and the United States has presumably had the power to destroy most of the major Russian cities and industrial centers by atomic bombing. Thus the Russians could not have moved on Europe except at the probable cost of losing their cities and major industries.

In the last 2 years this power balance has been changing and becoming more complicated, and it promises to become even more so. The West has been aware, especially since the first Soviet atomic test in the autumn of 1949, that its atomic advantage might become relatively less great—not only by the growth of the Soviet atomic stockpile, but by increased Russian defensive strength in interceptor jet aircraft, antiaircraft artillery and radar warning systems. There might thus conceivably come a time when the Russians could inflict about as much atomic damage on some partners in the Western alliance as they would receive in a war; and this might encourage the Politburo to move aggressively against continental Europe in the expectation that the threat of Soviet atomic retaliation would prevent Western use of atomic weapons.

But if Russia could catch up in the atomic field, so could the West in the field of ground forces and supporting tactical air forces in Western Europe. Western Europe, through NATO, could build a ground defensive force capable of preventing the occupation of Europe by the Red Army. Thus the simple postwar balance of United States air-atomic power against the Red Army would be replaced by a dual balance: Western ground forces against Eastern ground forces and Western air-atomic power against Eastern air-atomic power.

The Russians have obviously not appreciated the prospect of this new dual balance of power. Presumably they do not care about balance and would prefer to have a preponderance of power on their side. Perhaps they may fear that if Western Germany were rearmed and allied with the West they could not match the West on the ground. Or they may feel that they can never quite come up to the West in the air-atomic field with a much smaller total industrial capacity and more restricted access to world uranium deposits than the West possesses.

At any rate, the Soviets have been endeavoring to weaken the Western effort to achieve a new dual balance by a fairly complicated series of military and political measures. The obvious main points in their strategy appear to be:

1. To increase their ground forces to offset whatever the West is able to build up in Western Europe and thus to continue their superiority in this field.

2. To slow down the development of Western ground forces in Europe by a series of political measures, including their "peace offensives," their use of local Communist Parties to undermine political morale in key countries of Western Europe, and increasingly attractive offers of unification to Germany designed to keep Western Germany from going into the NATO coalition as an armed partner.

3. To sap the military and economic strength of the Western coalition by various political and military activities in other areas of the world, as for example in Indochina and Malaya. These activities could conceivably be stepped up still further. If their Chinese allies were to agree to go all-out, with the help of Russian armaments, in support of the forces opposing the French in Indochina, and continental Southeast Asia were lost to the West, the loss of the tin and rubber from these areas might have a most serious effect, both economically and militarily.

4. To build up Soviet defensive strength in the air as a shield against possible United States atomic bombing. Apparently considerable success has already been achieved in the quantity production of the MIG jet fighter, which although short in range would in good weather be deadly against the large piston-engine bombers which have thus far made up the bulk of the United States long-range atomic bombing fleet. (On the other hand United States atomic production is being vastly expanded and the MIG is presumably ineffective at night or in bad weather; so that on balance the Soviets may not really have caught up much in this area.)

5. To increase Soviet atomic production. There are some reasons to be hopeful that restricted sources of uranium and a limited industrial system strained by other requirements may have held down Soviet atomic-bomb production to a level well below that of the United States. On the other hand for Soviet purposes a much smaller supply of bombs than the United States possesses might prove adequate (1) as a blackmail threat to destroy the large cities of Western Europe, and (2) as a means of preventing the landing of overseas troops in Europe in a war by bombing of ports and amphibious landing operations.

THE CASE FOR ARMS LIMITATION

This analysis of the present and prospective balance of power is sketchy and could be elaborated in much greater detail, but perhaps enough has been said to indicate that this is no simple and easy equation from which it is possible to predict with confidence that the West will surely succeed in its efforts and the Soviets will fail in theirs. If anything the problem promises to become more complex as Germany and Japan regain control of their own destinies and have an opportunity to maneuver to promote their own interests.

Beyond this, and of major importance, it is difficult to see where a stopping point can be reached in competitive armament. There is a unique feature in atomic armament which will tend to perpetuate an arms race indefinitely: unlike other weapons, atomic bombs do not become obsolete or deteriorate. Improved bomb mechanisms may have to be substituted for older models from time to time, but the basic nuclear explosive will last for decades and thus the stockpiles will continue to grow indefinitely. Various published estimates placed the United States production of atomic bombs 2 years ago at 50 to 100 a year. With the apparent improvements in efficiency in the utilization of U-235 and plutonium, and the expansion of production facilities which have since been announced, that production rate may well be tripled or quadrupled by the middle of this decade. The Russians are presumably making every effort to match this production. When it is considered that something of the order of 50 atomic bombs delivered on target would equal the destruction of German cities caused by bombing with conventional explosives in World War II (housing for 7,500,000 persons destroyed) a rough measure is provided of the magnitude of the potential destruction which is being added to year by year in atomic stockpiles.

THE TASK OF THE NEW COMMISSION

This unique feature of an atomic arms race should in itself provide a great incentive to the new U. N. Disarmament Commission to get on with its work; for there seems to be no conceivable way other than by international agreement by which the continued accumulation of these bomb stockpiles can be halted and reversed. Somewhat paradoxically, however, it seems probable that the new Commission will make more progress if it concentrates its initial efforts on the development of an arms reduction and control scheme for nonatomic weapons. Since neither side has put forth any substantive plan for conventional armaments, it may be possible to get ahead here without haggling over hardened points of dispute such as exist in the atomic energy field. This task in itself will be neither easy or short. Some of the work of the League of Nations can be used as a starting point, but military techniques have so changed in the past two decades that the problem must be considered almost de novo.

If a start is made with nonatomic armaments the three basic questions to be explored are:

1. What armaments are to be reduced and controlled? Should an attempt be made to reduce and control everything, setting up a quota for each country in every category from pistols to heavy bombers? Or should reduction and control be limited to major weapons like tanks, heavy artillery, and bombing aircraft? Toward the end of its long deliberations the League of Nations seemed to be moving in the direction of concentrating on the control of major weapons.

2. What arms quotas are to be permitted to the various signatory countries and on what basis are these quotas to be set? The United States delegation at the last Assembly session in Paris suggested using population and national income as a base for setting national quotas of armaments and armed forces. For example, national armies might be limited to 1 percent of total population and armaments expenditure to, say, 5 percent of national income. This proposal might prove as useful a starting point as any but final agreement on quotas would most likely be far more detailed and specific.

3. Once agreement is reached on these two major substantive questions of what

arms are to be limited and what quotas are to be permitted each participating country, it would then be in order to proceed to the questions of implementation. Here the two major points are the timing for the placing of agreed quotas into effect, and the inspection or supervision required to assure that the arms quotas were being complied with. Thus far the discussion and controversy in the U. N. over the past several years—both on conventional armaments and on atomic energy—has revolved almost exclusively around these implementing questions of timing and supervision. There has been no negotiation—and in fact hardly even a proposal by one side or the other—on what arms and armed forces are to be permitted and how much of each is to be allotted to the various signatory countries.

If after thoroughly exploring the problem of limiting and controlling conventional armaments the new Commission turns again to atomic energy, the atomic control problem will almost certainly appear in quite a different light than it did when the old Atomic Energy Commission ceased active work in 1948. If the Russians have agreed to an inspection system which appears adequate to enforce limitations on other armaments, much the same system would probably serve the purpose of policing an atomic control system as well. It would also then be necessary for the Disarmament Commission to take up all the unfinished business of the old AEC. For example, what quotas of atomic production are to be permitted in each country or geographic area? The U. N. Majority Plan is silent on this point—it provides only that there shall be some kind of "strategic balance" in the geographical distribution of atomic production facilities, and hints that until production of electric power by means of atomic energy has proved itself technically and economically, atomic production shall be kept at the level required for research, which is a tiny fraction of the present level. What is to be done with the present atomic stockpiles and the atomic production facilities like the United States plants at Hanford and Oak Ridge and their Russian and British equivalents? The existing large facilities for producing U–235 and plutonium for bombs would probably be worthless or nearly so for the economic generation of electric power by means of nuclear fuel. The Majority Plan has nothing to say on these points either. Finally, is it possible, now that atomic production has proceeded on a substantial scale for some years, to devise a system which can account accurately for all past production of atomic explosive and thus provide reasonable assurance that no significant amount of fissionable material has been secreted away for future aggressive use? This again is a problem of which the Majority Plan takes no special cognizance, and it is a question which grows more serious as the years go by and production increases and stockpiles accumulate. In brief, the U. N. Majority Plan—which is less a plan than a partly completed outline—would require some months of work to complete, to bring up to date, and to fit into a larger program of limiting other armaments and armed forces as well.

SUMMARY

The circumstances surrounding the creation of the new Disarmament Commission were not the most auspicious, but it is some gain that it exists. The problem of creating an artificial balance of power by agreement at reduced level of armaments has perhaps never been more complex and difficult than at this time. Yet it would seem to be in the interest of both sides in the present world conflict to devote serious attention and their best talent to this enterprise.

The present and prospective high-armament balance of power is building up an enormous destructive potential, which could be set off by an accident, a miscalculation, the pressure of internal politics, a minor ally, or a partly irrational man in power like Hitler. Progress is most likely to be made in the Commission by starting with an attempt to develop a modern plan for conventional armaments. The half-finished atomic-control problem could then be taken up in a new perspective in which many of the old points of dispute might prove to be irrelevant.

The new Commission has been handed a long and difficult task if it really works at it, and the effort may come to nothing. On the other hand, this is a very cheap insurance policy for the west and for humanity; it requires the investment of the time of a few first-rate men. The alternative on the most optimistic assumption is some years or decades of a garrison economy for many countries—on the most pessimistic, an inferno which has no historical counterpart.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

REPORT ON KOREA AND THE FAR EAST

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, one day last week I had the pleasure and privilege of attending a luncheon at the Capitol which was tendered in behalf of a young GI who had just returned from Korea, where he had served for 7 months. The young soldier gave to those of us who were present, including a number of Senators, his version of conditions in Korea, particularly with respect to the morale of our troops and many other conditions related to the war in Korea.

I was so favorably impressed with the young man himself and also with his remarks, his comprehension of the true conditions over there, and his description of them, that at the time I wished that all Members of the Senate might have had the pleasure of hearing his report. Since that was impossible, I asked the young man to give me permission to place in the RECORD a summary of his remarks, so that all Senators and all others interested might have an opportunity to read what he had to say.

Mr. President, I withhold the identity of the young man, although I should like to give it. But he is still in the military service, and for reasons which I deem proper and best, I withhold his identity. But I wish every Senator might have heard his remarks.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of his remarks be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON KOREA AND THE FAR EAST

I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

You might be interested in what I found to be the general views of the GI's I was in touch with in Korea, and in some of my own convictions as a result of my service in the Far East. I realize there are aspects of these matters on which you have far more information than I, but nevertheless these GI opinions may prove helpful.

II. GENERAL OPINIONS

A. It was right for us to get into Korea

1. It temporarily saved southeast Asia.

2. We are gaining valuable military experience through it.

3. We are learning how to fight as a United Nations Army. It is a great and historic army fighting in Korea, and I am proud to have been a part of it.

B. Present morale is not too hot

1. There is frustration over the stalemate and the indecision of the peace talks. GI's often turn off the radio in disgust when any mention is made of the peace talks. GI's do not understand why we cannot blockade the Chinese coast effectively, bomb Manchuria, and use at least some troops from Formosa. It seems to them we need to decide whether we are fighting a war or not. If we are, it appears ridiculous to the ordinary soldier that we cannot hit the enemy's source of supply. The danger of spreading the war by such action seems to him to be less than the danger of defeat if we do not take such action.

2. Strikes at home make the GI feel, rightly or wrongly, that people are so preoccupied with their own self-interests, that they seem to have forgotten that we are fighting a war. The shortages due to the shipping strike in New York last autumn could be felt in Korea within 2 weeks.

C. South Korean Army not enough

The training is going ahead well for the ROK Army, and they have fought successfully with our troops. However, it is fairly certain that even a large, well-trained and well-equipped ROK Army could not hold the Chinese Communists alone.

D. The Communists have a superior ideological strategy

They have a united, forceful plan which is ideological as well as military and economic.

This is perhaps best illustrated in the difference between the North and South Korean fighters. The North Korean is usually a fanatical fighter. Some of this is due to the fact that he is forced to fight. However, there is certainly a core of Communists who fight because of their ideology. This was also shown by the incident in Koje.

It is this ideological aspect of the war that America does not seem to understand, nor has she fully developed the weapons to fight this kind of war. The containment of communism alone is far too inadequate a goal for the free nations. Nor is anticommunism alone adequate. We need an ideological strategy to inspire the peoples of Asia to fight for the basic principles of freedom with more passion than the Communists fight for their principles.

III. PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

A. Morale and moral standards

We could do far more to create high morale in the Army if we fought for a high moral standard. The most obvious example is whether a soldier is expected to live clean.

When this point is brought up, we in the Army say that we try to educate the men through pictures and talks, and show them the consequences of moral laxity. But in the end, we say we must protect the troops by giving them prophylactics. The net result is that the soldier gets the idea that it is expected that he will go out with a woman, and the Army will protect him. Purity is not to be expected. We accept defeat before we even start to fight.

From my observation, most soldiers in Japan have relations with women, and the situation is similar in Korea. These facts are equally true in relation to black-market operations. If we would fight for a high moral standard and live it from the top down, I am sure the troops would respond with a new self-discipline in their lives. This would most certainly lift morale to a new and permanent high and give us an Army in which the American people could have complete confidence and which could tackle any job that came our way.

We need to see the vital relation between morals and morale. This cannot be left to the chaplains or to lectures. It must be the conviction of the whole chain of command.

B. A fighting faith

We need to give the troops a fighting faith We have in the democratic heritage, if we live it, an inspiring goal for men everywhere. Inspired democracy has a moral backbone and it needs the same fight for high moral standards.

I talked frankly with the GI's about these ideas and the need for the strength of God to live them out. I often quoted the statement of William Penn: "Men must be governed by God or they will be ruled by tyrants." I found a very positive response to the challenge of living it out together. I told them that I was an ordinary guy with all the temptations they had and that I made lots of mistakes, but that through moral rearmament I had found a way to live this out, and I found them deeply interested.

C. A winning idea

If we fought in this way for moral standards and a fighting faith, we would have the groundwork for a winning idea and a better ideological strategy. If our Army were ambassadors of this kind, they would inspire far more the South Koreans and be able to win over more Communists.

There is no reason why the American Army should not be ambassadors of inspired democracy in the world.

I know that many of these problems go back to our life at home but in an army there is a real opportunity to take specific steps to change the situation and to give men something really worth living for.

CREATION OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Road to Economy" which appears in today's Washington Post. The editorial pertains to Senate bill 913 and a companion bill in the House of Representatives, which it is expected the House will consider today. These bills would create a joint committee on the budget.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROAD TO ECONOMY

The House of Representatives will have a chance today to enact a long overdue reform which should bring about real economy in the monstrous costs of Government. This is the Colmer bill, H. R. 7888, creating a joint Senate-House Committee on the Budget. Such a committee would have a staff of experts who could dig into the mountain of Government money requests more effectively than busy Congressmen and Senators can hope to do.

A companion to the Colmer bill, the McClellan bill, has already passed the Senate. In some ways the House version is an improvement; it would, for example, get rid of politics in the appointments of the staff director and deputy director. In other respects the House version may be less practicable than that of the Senate. The important thing now is not for the House to quibble over details, but to pass the bill and let minor differences be ironed out in conference. If Congress enacts this piece of forward-looking legislation before it adjourns, it will be providing a practical means for the economy it has so often preached.

PROPOSED LIMITATION OF TAXICABS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—STATEMENT BY ASSOCIATED TAXICAB OPERATORS, INC.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding a proposed limitation of taxicabs in the District of Columbia. The statement was prepared by the Associated Taxicab Operators, Inc., and was presented to me this morning, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, for inclusion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF ASSOCIATED TAXICAB OPERATORS, INC., REGARDING LIMITATION OF TAXICABS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, JULY 2, 1952

The Associated Taxicab Operators, Inc., a professional taxicab operators organization, is vitally concerned about the plight of the individual taxicab driver in the District of Columbia, who—because of certain existing conditions—is not able to earn an income adequate to maintain a minimum standard of living.

Although cognizant that this Congress will shortly adjourn, we nevertheless take this opportunity to bring to your attention some of the facts which are causing the taxicab industry in Washington, D. C., great concern.

There are over 10,000 licensed taxicabs in the District of Columbia. This great number—greater than the number in any city in the United States regardless of size—has created a competitive situation in the city that has become desperate. The number has exceeded the saturation point, both from the standpoint of economic interest of the driver and the traffic situation in the city. It is imperative that some legislation be enacted to give the Public Utilities Commission the power to limit and regulate the number of taxicabs operating in the District of Columbia.

In a recent talk to the taxicab drivers at a meeting sponsored by this organization, the Director of Vehicles and Traffic for the District of Columbia, Mr. George E. Keneipp, urged all drivers of taxicabs to operate on the fringe areas of the city when seeking passengers. In order to alleviate the congestion in the downtown areas, which Mr. Keneipp stated had become hazardous because of the number of vehicles on the streets, drivers were requested to cruise in sections of the city where they would be more likely to find passengers.

A recent survey by our local traffic director indicated that about 56 percent of the taxicabs passing a certain point were empty. This means that less than half the taxicabs operating on the streets at the time of the survey were "paying their way."

It is the belief of our organization that one of the major causes of the disproportionate number of taxicabs operating on the streets of Washington is the direct result of the absence of proper legislation empowering the Public Utilities Commission to adequately control and regulate the taxicab industry.

Over 80 percent of the members of the taxicab industry have expressed the desire for some form of limitation and regulation of their industry. This is contrary to the wishes of most industries, but this industry has learned that sometimes it is desirable to have "milestones" to guide it, and to assure that every member has an opportunity to earn an adequate income.

We are asking that when this Congress reconvenes, it make a study of the situation in the taxicab industry in the District of Columbia and determine what measures—legislative or otherwise—should be taken to remedy a situation that has become intolerable to the majority of the taxicab industry members.

FAIR-TRADE PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may have to be absent from the Senate at the time when the vote is taken on the fair-trade bill. I feel that I should announce my position on that bill. If I were present and voting, I certainly should support the bill.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding this time to me.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to continue with the debate which was developing last evening in reference to the pending bill. For a moment I shall summarize some of the arguments I attempted to make last night, and I shall try to place the bill in its proper focus.

First of all, House bill 5767 seeks to do only one thing, namely, to restore, by means of Federal enabling statute, the meaning which I think all the evidence leads one to believe the Congress intended the Miller-Tydings Act to have when it was passed in 1937.

The McGuire bill establishes no new Federal fair-trade policy. It adds nothing whatsoever to the fair-trade acts of the 45 States. It takes nothing away from any of those State acts. It overcomes two court decisions, so that it may be truly regarded as an enabling Federal statute. If we can ever get these points understood generally, I think there will be no argument about this bill.

The pending bill changes no Federal policy. It changes no State law. It adds nothing whatsoever new to the fair-trade policy. It has only one purpose, namely, to clarify a law which the Supreme Court found, by a split decision, not to cover certain practices.

Therefore, Mr. President, the purpose of the pending bill is only to plug the loopholes in the Federal Miller-Tydings Act, which is a measure to enable the States to carry out fair-trade practices.

There is a great hue and cry as to what the bill will do to consumers; but I ask any Member of this body, either present at this time or yet to come to the

floor, to point out to me what was so wrong with the fair-trade program from 1937 to 1951. From 1937 to 1951, it was clearly understood by the Department of Justice, it was clearly understood by the Federal Trade Commission, it was clearly understood by 45 States, it was clearly understood by every agent of this Government, that the fair-trade policy included all fair-trade laws of every State and between the States. Now, all at once, I hear a blistering attack upon the program of fair-trade legislation. I hear that it has been bad for the consumer. I hear that it is a violation of the antitrust laws. Yet, Mr. President, I submit that for 17 years these laws have been in effect. I submit there has been no popular demand that these laws be repealed. In fact, I submit that at this time the State legislatures are passing more laws, rather than fewer; and I submit that during this period of 17 years the policy of Congress has been, in many areas, to make some rules establishing fair competition in the economy.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Minnesota is on that subject, will he inform me how many State legislatures throughout the Nation have passed such fair-trade laws or adopted such fair-trade regulations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Forty-five of the States.

Mr. WELKER. Forty-five of them?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The first law was passed in 1931 in California. It was clarified in 1933 as the result of a court decision. By the time the Miller-Tydings Act went on the statute books, 42 States already had passed some form of fair-trade-practice law.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from Minnesota be kind enough to point out the three States which have not passed a fair-trade law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The three States are Vermont, Texas, and Missouri, in addition to the District of Columbia, a Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think there has been in the Senate any better friend of the consumer than the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota. His record will so show. He has tried to keep prices down, by means of price controls. He has supported effective price controls. He has done the things we ordinarily believe to be good for the consumers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have tried to do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota think that in the long run this bill will hurt or will help the consumers?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say with all the sincerity at my command that if I thought this bill in the long run would hurt consumers, I would be opposed to the bill and would fight it.

I honestly believe that this bill, even in the short run as well as in the long run, is good for the consumers in every respect—good in terms of the prices consumers will pay for the commodities they buy, and good for the economy of America in which the consumers will live.

All the Senate is being asked to do by means of this measure is to clarify the law, which seemed to be perfectly clear and was operating well for a period of 15 years. I can place in the RECORD, as I did last night, a statement of the position of the Attorney General of the United States, a statement of the position of the Federal Trade Commission, a statement of the position of lower courts, and a statement of the position of innumerable Government officials, all of whom take the position that the Miller-Tydings Act included action between the States, in the States, and the nonsigners of the so-called contracts between manufacturers and retailers. To make it even more simple, it worked and it worked well. As I look over this body of Senators who represent the various States, I dare say that when they go back to their respective States they will never have a delegation call upon them to suggest that the fair-trade law of any State should be repealed; in fact, I have no doubt that person after person will say to them that the fair-trade laws should be kept on the books.

Mr. President, I have heard about consumers. In the department stores, in the retail establishments, more than 10,000,000 gainfully employed persons are working. These are the people who are the breadwinners for their families. Mr. President, a cut-rate, blind-bird, jungle-law economics operator does not pay his clerks. That is the kind of business that keeps them under poverty wages. It is the kind of operation that calls them to work at 9 o'clock in the morning, sends them home at 10 o'clock because there is no business, and calls them back at 2.

When there is fair trade, Mr. President, there are reasonable rules of competition in the market. There is opportunity for reasonable rules of employment and for reasonable wages and reasonably good living conditions. The simple truth of the matter is that the fair-trade law, by regularizing certain competitive practices, by restraining predatory interests, by making it possible to have some semblance of economic decency in the market place, has been the best friend that the workingman ever had, because the workers—and there are 10,000,000 of them in retail establishments—have for the first time in a long while had a chance for a secure job at reasonably good wages, and have had a chance to know they are not going to be knocked out by some predatory interest that would destroy the entire economic market area, if it could have its way.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I have listened to the very learned debate of my friend from Minnesota, and I should like him to tell me, as a Senator from Idaho, what effect this bill will have upon certain giant concerns, say in New York, California, or Illinois, with tremendous buying power, who engage in the merchandizing field and who have gradually come to my State. I am thinking of the small, independent market and the small, independent drug store, which have been a part of the community since the beginning of our State. What effect will this legislation have upon those concerns coming in to compete with our small merchants? I am mindful of the fact that my distinguished friend has covered this subject before, but since this is the start of a new day in the debate, I should like to hear the observations of the Senator in understandable language, so I may send the message to my people at home.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator from Idaho, in view of the recent Supreme Court decision in the Schwegmann case, and the circuit court of appeals decision in the Wentling case, that if this bill does not pass, small independent merchants of the Senator's State will be at the mercy of any large chain operation that has great financial resources, great opportunities to buy in large markets, and to distribute through many outlets. The small, independent operator will be at the mercy of loss-leader sales, of competition, and competitive practices that can drive him to the wall at any time the big operator wants to do it.

However, if this bill is passed and becomes law, fair-trade standards will give the independent operator in the Senator's State a chance to survive. It will at least give him equality of opportunity in the competitive practices of the market place. It will mean that certain named items will carry a minimum resale price, and whether it is sold in the largest department store in Idaho, or in the smallest retail outlet in Idaho, it cannot be sold below that minimum price, which is a very low price. Such a law will give them a chance to live. It does not guarantee, I may say to the Senator, that the independent operator will survive, but it means that he will not be killed off by unfair, unprincipled practices.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator agree with me that the action of the Idaho State Legislature, and the legislatures of other States, in adopting fair-trade laws and a minimum-profit law—6 percent in Idaho, as I understand—was solely and fundamentally for the purpose of protecting the small independent merchants who have to exist by virtue of doing business in competition with the giant concern?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about it, and that is what has happened in 45 States. The legislatures of those States are relatively close to the people,

and it is entirely true that the State legislatures have made a safe political and policy decision in saying, "We believe it is important for Idaho, Minnesota, Michigan, and Arizona that independent enterprise be maintained as a part of the American economic and political structure." I believe so, too. I say that the consumer will be letting himself into a fool's paradise if he allows an economic policy crowd out hundred of independent merchants, only to see the market gobbled up by one or two large outfits. We will then see who sets the prices. There will be no competition?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator will agree with me, and, I think, all the other sponsors of this bill, that we are interested in protecting the consumer as well as everyone else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. WELKER. But is it not a fact that when the giant store uses the device of a loss leader, as we have observed them do time after time, it will make up the loss on the next item the consumer buys?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator has put his finger on the fallacy of the argument advanced by the opposition last night. Perhaps for the purpose of showing the difference between fair-trade prices and non-fair-trade prices, the difference between fair-trade prices and cut-rate or loss-leader prices was recited. An effort was made to get the United States Senate to believe that these cut-rate prices were uniform throughout the United States, and that every small store in the United States was giving away Alka-Seltzer or mixmasters, when, in fact, every time a store gives something like that away, it recovers the loss on some other article. It can be proved statistically that when there are loss-leader items in a business establishment, the gross profit on other items is stepped up.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator from Minnesota does not know does he, of many small merchandising concerns that engage in the practice of giving away anything to the consumer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the Senator that any merchant who engages in the practice of giving away things and can still continue in business, still pays overhead, still pay his employees, and still maintain his family, is a merchant that does not exist.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I have been very much interested in this colloquy. The Senator from Minnesota has just answered the very question I was going to ask, as to whether, in the long run, it would be damaging to the interests of the consumer if a situation were allowed to develop in which the small businesses were driven out of the market by loss leaders and price cutting.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be most damaging to the consumers' interests.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator has already answered the question. I appreciate his having yielded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Furthermore, Mr. President, some people try to argue about this fair-trade bill as if we were talking about articles which are not in competition, as if we were talking about capital goods or producers' goods, as if we were talking, for example, about five or six major steel plants that produce 95 percent of all the steel. Mr. President, we are talking about the producers of consumer goods—hundreds of producers, thousands of producers.

We are talking about a competitive relationship in the retail field, where, first, there are hundreds and hundreds of outlets; second, thousands and thousands of merchants seeking the business; and third, hundreds aind hundreds of producers of every single commodity, and only a small portion of those hundreds are in the fair-trade field. As a matter of fact, less than 6 percent of the total dollar volume of the retail business is in fair-trade items, and less than 2 percent of the total number of consumer items is in the fair-trade field.

Until a man stands behind the counter, until he has to meet this kind of cutthroat competition and, at the same time, take care of his family, pay his bills, and maintain his business establishment, he can never appreciate what it means to be under the rule of the jungle in the market place with the cutthroat artist driving out the independent merchant.

Mr. President, as a matter of record, let me say that I recall the president of one of the largest concerns in this country telling someone in the retail business, "We can come into your town, put a store on the corner, and lose money for 20 years, if we want that corner and want to drive you out of business. We can lose money for 20 years, and we will be there and you will be out." Why was that, Mr. President? Because that concern had 400 stores in the United States where they had already performed that kind of an operation.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask the Senator one further question, which may lead him far afield from his present discussion. The Senator from Minnesota is mindful of the fact that there are many distinguished members of the legal profession in this body. I wonder if the Senator realizes that many of those leaders of the bar—I happen to be a member of the bar—some of them, perhaps, opponents of this measure, have seen fit in their respective jurisdictions to adopt and fully practice the minimum-fee schedule of the States in which they practice law.

I am wondering if the Senator could give to the Senate his version of the philosophy of those Senators who feel they should adopt a minimum-fee schedule in their law practice and resist such a thing in the field of merchandise?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy the Senator asked that question. It is perfectly true that the bar associations, in order to legitimatize practice, have a minimum-fee schedule. I am not condemning it; it is simply a recognition of the fact that there are members of the legal profession who are willing to wreck the whole code of ethics of the profession.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator realizes that the minimum-fee schedule is adopted to protect the client, does he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; and to give a semblance of order, decency, and ethics to the profession. The bill which we are discussing would apply the same principle in the field of wholesaling, retailing, and manufacturing.

Mr. President, there is virtually only one argument that can be made against the bill; namely, that it will increase consumers' prices by stifling competition. I submit that the burden of proof of that argument rests on the opponents of the bill, because since fair trade has been in practice, instead of competition being diminished, it has been augmented. There are more establishments doing business today, more processors of goods and services doing business today, than there were prior to the time of fair trade. Competition has not been stifled.

I have not heard any Senator on the floor condemning the Ford Motor Co. for its agency-franchise system. I have not heard anyone condemn the General Motors Co. for its agency-franchise system. If this practice has been legitimate why should fair trade, which is merely another form of vertical price maintenance, suddenly wreck the country, especially since it has been on the books for 15 years without doing so?

Mr. President, I was reading yesterday about the fair-trade program in relation to some of the studies which have been completed. The charge has been made that the fair-trade program would cost the American consumers anywhere from a billion to two billion dollars. This has been branded as a $2,000,000,000 lie. The surveys consist of shopping around for customer-bait items, or loss leaders offered by certain stores at certain times in certain places. They have been made by shopping around for information to fit a preconceived conclusion, and are not based upon normal marketing practice. When a lady goes downtown to shop in a drug store, and she is led into that store by a loss-leader item, she usually buys more than just one item. The purpose of the loss-leader is to get her to buy something else. She is not going around like Hawkshaw, with a spyglass, looking to see whether there is a loss-leader in a certain store, and then driving 10 miles to pick up a loss leader in another store.

I say to those who, in order to prove their case, present alleged facts about how much the bill will cost the consumer, that every housewife in America does not have as much time as has an investigator from the Federal Trade Commission, to run around from one State to another to see if she can buy a roll of toilet paper in Utah for less than she has to pay for it in New Jersey. The American housewife is a busy lady. She usually has two or three children at home, and when she goes to market, she gets all her goods in the one market.

Once the merchant gets the customer into the store, he has better than a 50–50 chance to sell merchandise at high mark-ups, which cover the cost of the loss leader. There will never be any proof whatsoever that a loss-leader item is not compensated for by a high-gross-profit item in the same establishment. The simple truth of the matter is that where there is a loss leader, there is a compensatory price on other items. There are compensatory items in the same place in order to take up the gap. There has never been anyone in the world who has been able to make money by giving away services and goods.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I take it from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that he disagrees with the philosophy of some opponents of the bill that a large New York store now doing business in the Senator's State and in my State is actually engaged, in a great portion of its business, on a very high-grade basis from the standpoint of the consumer. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do disagree with that philosophy.

Mr. WELKER. The Senator realizes, does he not, that it is necessary to make at least a 20-percent profit in order to break even, and that the New York merchant doing business in Idaho is not engaged in the merchandise business for love?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Even though the New York merchant might love Idaho and all its people, he is not going to love them enough to give up his surplus profits in the name of the consumers' interest.

All that is being attempted by this bill is to provide a reasonable, decent code of ethics in the market place. I have spent a good deal of time examining into many so-called flash studies, which assume that in the absence of fair trade all the retailers in the country would sell national brand merchandise at consumer-bait prices.

If, for example, the Federal Trade Commission finds one store that is selling a $1.50 hot-water bottle for 19 cents in a non-fair-trade area like Washington, D. C., do Senators know what the Federal Trade Commission assumes? It assumes that every drug store in all the non-fair-trade areas in the United States, is selling hot-water bottles at 19 cents. Then they go to a fair-trade area and see that hot-water bottles are selling for 89 cents, and they say, "There is a 70-cent difference."

Anybody who wants a hot-water bottle will say, "I will buy the 19-cent bottle." But while the merchant has you in his store, he will say, "I know that for a sore back a hot-water bottle is going to help you, but may I suggest Dr. Smith's remedy?" That remedy, which cost 20 cents, will sell for $2. Because the dealer is a good salesman, he will sell that remedy, or he is not on the job.

That is what is meant by companion sales. No one ever made a dime giving his services away. No one ever made money in business by selling items at prices below cost. Every item sold below cost has to be compensated for by selling additional items above cost, and far above cost.

Fair trade has increased the output of American producers. It has not stifled production; it has augmented production. It has not placed a burden upon the consumer by giving less variety to choose from. He has a greater variety to chose from. Some day we are all going to have to make up our minds. I hope the day is at hand.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that this type of law is especially needed for the reason that there has not been any real enforcement of the antitrust statutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Department of Justice, which has been taking a dim view of fair trade, and the Federal Trade Commission, which has been opposing fair trade, would really devote their energies—their full, total energies—to the enforcement of the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Antitrust Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act, they would not need to worry at all about fair trade.

Mr. LANGER. So far as the Senator knows, is it not true that ever since Congress passed the first antitrust statute, away back in 1890, not a single defendant has ever been sent to the penitentiary or to jail for violation of the antitrust statutes, under any administration, Republican or Democratic?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator is correct. I am not positive of that, but I believe he is right.

Mr. LANGER. There was one exception—the case of Eugene Debs, whom the Government put in jail some 50 or 60 years ago. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think he was sent to prison because he had some ideas.

Mr. LANGER. Would not the Senator say, further, that if the antitrust laws had been vigorously enforced, it might be that the proposed statute would not be needed?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that had they been enforced in the very beginning, that would be true. Let me say that we are all involved in the whole free-enterprise system sometimes. People become a little avaricious and predatory. Once in a while our moral values become mixed up in the economic practices of the marketplace. The trouble with all the classical, orthodox economists is that they forget who runs the economy. The people run it.

We have great spiritual leaders telling us to cease doing the things that violate moral standards, and to put spiritual values above material values. But there are a great many material values left in the world. Unfortunately, the American economic picture and the American economy are not fully in balance. It is not a world in which everybody receives fair play, so it becomes necessary for the States and the Federal Government to try to inject fair play into the marketplace by certain rules of law. We are merely trying to recognize reality.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator comes from the northwestern section of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator knows what happened in the dairy industry, where, almost over night, one outfit got control of practically every dairy selling ice cream.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. That occurred in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know that one company went around appealing to the consumers to buy, saying, "We will give you 2 quarts of ice cream for a quarter"? But when they put the small ice cream dealers out of business, they stopped selling ice cream at 2 quarts for a quarter. They sold it at large profit.

Mr. LANGER. I may say further to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that the big outfits are not satisfied with just controlling markets in the United States, but they extend their operations farther and farther and into country after country and thus get a monopoly not only in the United States, but also in the entire world. I ask the Senator if that is not true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have evidence to prove that there are cartels of that kind.

Mr. LANGER. There are concerns such as Lever Bros., which does business in 64 nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. They control the market for fats and oils in 64 countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. We have evidence indicating that since the Schwegmann case was decided, in New York City a large dress manufacturing company, which has been in the dress manufacturing business for years, has also opened retail outlets. Dress manufacturing had been their whole life history, but when the fair-trade law was outlawed in the Schwegmann case, what do Senators suppose that company began to sell? They began to sell mixmasters and other electrical devices. They started to sell in a dress shop every item a woman might

want around her home. At what price did they begin to sell? They sold the items at practically below cost, as loss-leader items.

The legitimate appliance dealer, who had been working all his life to build up a business in the sale of electric fans, washing machines, electric ironers, and mixmasters, found himself in competition with a dress company down the street which was marking up the price of dresses. Once they got the ladies in among the dresses, everything was fine and dandy. They made so much from dress sales they could afford to give them three mixmasters for nothing. The ladies were induced to come inside by offering them electric fans, toasters, washing machines, ironers, and other home appliances at prices either below cost, or just a few cents above cost, which meant that any legitimate merchant in competition would be driven out of business.

Let me answer the argument which was made here last night. The question was asked, "Why is it that the price wars have stopped in New York City?" In the first place, they have not all stopped. In the second place, the Macy-Gimbel war stopped when Mr. MCGUIRE of Connecticut introduced his bill in the House of Representatives. Macy and Gimbel are going to lie low for a little while. They are going to wait and see whether we allow the fair trade laws to be emasculated. If we do, they will go at it again.

Furthermore, in a depression period, if we ever have one—pray God we do not—or in any period of regression, without fair trade practices, the people who would practice loss-leader sales, the people who would wreck the normal practices of the market place, will be doing just that. Hundreds of young men who have made investments in small establishments will find their business liquidated. That is not good public policy.

When a young man starts in business, if he borrows money from the Government or from a bank, we demand that he pay 4 percent interest. We have fair trade for the bankers. The Government of the United States, through the Federal Reserve System, says that the interest rate will be so much, whether in good times, bad times, winter, summer, spring, or fall.

There are many thousands of retail establishments all over the United States. Are we going to pull the props out from under them? Are we going to say to a young man, "You are just getting a start. You have been out of the Army for only 3 or 4 years. Your interest rate is high. Your help is unionized, farm products have price supports, and you have all kinds of fixed charges. But Mr. Small-Business Man, do you know what we are going to do to you? We are going to let the catalog house come in. We are going to let some big outfit from somewhere else come in, with its huge capital and reserves and buying power. We are going to let it pull the rug out from under you." Not with my vote, Mr. President.

I stated that I wish to conclude with a few words on the subject of social policy. I am not at all impressed with the fact some people feel that the only way to protect the consumer is to see that he gets a cheaper price. I say to the consumer protectors, "If you want cheaper prices, the Senator from North Dakota and I know that one way to get them is to ruin the American farmer. Do not give him a chance to live. Make a peasant out of him. Let him work 20 hours a day and produce cheap food for people who want cheap prices."

Sometimes cheap prices mean cheap ideas, a cheap country, and a cheap people. What America needs is reasonable prices, with a reasonably balanced economy and a reasonably good opportunity to survive.

There are people, even on the farm, who do not want to pay good wages for workers because if they can get cheap labor and receive reasonably high farm prices, they can make huge profits. There are always people who are anxious to see that their little side is well protected. That is normal. I am not being critical. That is natural. One of the first laws of nature is self-preservation. I see nothing wrong with a man taking care of his own temple—his body, his mind, and his soul.

Let me say to my good liberal friends that they cannot ask the Government of the United States to buy only goods which have been manufactured by workers who received the prevailing wages; they cannot ask the Government of the United States to buy only goods made by union labor; they cannot ask the Government of the United States to maintain price supports for farmers and give workers the right of collective bargaining, which means that they set the price for their labor with their employers, and then say to the small retail merchant, "We do not care about you. You can go out and be gobbled up."

I hear people ask, "Don't you believe in competition?" I do, but let me add a qualifying not. I believe in fair competition. There would be no competition in the ring between any Member of the Senate and Joe Louis. That would be murder. There would be no competition between a small town high school football team and Notre Dame. Supposedly there would be 11 men on each side, but there would be no competition. That would be athletic madness. I am simply saying that we want fair rules of conduct. That is what fair trade does. It does not eliminate competition, but it says that competition shall not be between a 200-pound man with big muscles and broad shoulders, and a 6-year-old child. That is not competition.

Fair trade says, "It makes no difference whether you are big or little. It makes no difference whether you are from New York, Texas, Minnesota, or California. It makes no difference whether you have reserves of a billion dollars, or reserves of $10. If you are going to sell Kolynos toothpaste you are not going to sell it for less than a certain price. We are going to give everyone a chance to survive."

The Congress determined that the farmer needed farm cooperatives to protect himself. We cannot compare the treatment of cooperatives with the normal economic treatment which we give to the rest of business. We were for farm cooperatives because we needed farm cooperatives. We are for the family-sized farm, because America needs the family-sized farm. No one can prove, on the basis of economics, that the family-sized farm is more economical to operate than the 50,000-acre corporation farm. But we do not want corporate farming. We want family-sized farming, because family-sized farming produces good citizens, and good citizens are the only hope of freedom and democracy. So we pay a price for it. I am willing to pay that price.

We would like to have in America independent banking, so we have laws on the books to protect independent banking. We would like to have in America a fair wage for every man and woman in the market place, so we have a Fair Labor Standards Act, which provides a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour. Many people are trying to get around that law. They say, "Don't include this group of workers, or that group." The more we weaken the Fair Labor Standards Act, the more meaningless it becomes.

My argument is that a policy decision must be made. It has been made. A policy decision was made in America in 1930. It was made in many States from 1931 on. In 45 States a policy decision was made. The decision is simply that the future well-being of the American business economy and the American political economy depends on hundreds of small landowners and entrepreneurs. I do not want to see my America become an America which is ruled by a monopoly not only in the producers' lines but in the retailers' lines. Anyone who really believes in free enterprise today, anyone who really wants to protect the free-enterprise system, will do it by giving free enterprises a chance to live. I was born in the free-enterprise system. I lived for a great part of my life in it, and I hope to live out my life under that system. I know that the free-enterprise system depends on something else besides words. It depends on giving people a chance to live.

Mr. President, that is my argument. I submit that for 15 years America has made its position perfectly clear on fair trade. Forty-five States have made their position perfectly clear, and thousands of merchants and hundreds of thousands of consumers have done likewise. What more do we want, Mr. President?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a Senator from North Dakota I am very proud to compliment the Senator from Minnesota for so truly representing the spirit of the Northwest in his usually fine analysis of a problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his compliment, and I thank him for his support and participation in the debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with my argument in opposition to the pending bill I wish to pay my sincere compliments to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the very able argument he has presented, both last night and this morning, in support of his position on the bill.

When the bill came before the Senate yesterday afternoon, and there was an immediate demand for a vote, without even one proponent of the bill extending to the Senate what I thought it clearly was entitled to, namely, an explanation of the bill, and an argument in chief in support of the main provisions of the bill, I was greatly saddened. I thought the Senate was doing itself great damage in following such a course of action. It was my opinion then, and still is, that if the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] had not immediately proceeded with his discussion in opposition to the bill, even prior to any explanation of the bill by its proponents, the bill would have passed the Senate. I do not think it is good for the Senate to follow that kind of procedure.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Was the Senator on the floor at the time when I rose as a proponent of the bill and said I had a speech which I should like to make on the subject, and offered to make a speech in explanation of the bill, and the Presiding Officer thereupon suggested that the speech be printed as a statement in the RECORD? It was not a lack of willingness to explain the bill. Because of the temper of the Chamber, with cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" "Vote!" the Presiding Officer suggested that my speech go into the RECORD. It was after my offer to explain the bill and after the suggestion of the Chair that the Senator from Illinois proceeded with his remarks.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say very frankly to the Senator from Connecticut that I was on the floor, and if the Senator from Connecticut tells me that such procedure as he describes took place, I know it took place. But I wish to say if it took place it took place at a time of such confusion that even though I sat on the floor of the Senate I was not even aware of the fact that it was taking place, because at the time one could not hear. I was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Connecticut arose to discuss the bill. I saw the Senator from Connecticut arise but I could not hear a word he said, and I thought he had simply inserted something in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I saw a page boy take some papers from the Senator and carry them to the desk. It was very confusing.

Mr. BENTON. I was confused myself in the midst of cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" "Vote!" and I was led to believe that the bill was about to be passed. I am not one to make a speech on behalf of a bill if the bill is about to be passed and if my speech is unnecessary.

Mr. MORSE. I can well understand such parliamentary strategy on the part of my good friend from Connecticut. But I return to my major premise, that even under those circumstances it is not good for the Senate to pass legislation, even when from a parliamentary standpoint it is possible to speed a bill through the Senate without any explanation of it at all.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I share the Senator's approbation of the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to join with him in complimenting the Senator from Illinois for taking the floor, in view of his strong feelings on the subject, and in so vigorously presenting them to the Senate last night.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his remarks. Nevertheless, irrespective of what the Senator from Connecticut has said I am still of the opinion that the procedure which was followed yesterday afternoon prior to the speech of the Senator from Illinois was a procedure which, in my opinion, was not good for the Senate. I do not think such a procedure strengthened the prestige of this body as a deliberative body. I am glad that we now have a record, so ably presented by the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators who have spoken in favor of the bill. I believe a judgment can now be made, not only by the Members of the Senate but by the public as well as they read the RECORD, as to whether those who support the bill had the better of the argument or whether those opposed to the bill were on the right side.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, may I ask one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. I may say that the RECORD of yesterday will not show the colloquy between me and the Chair, as I have just stated it, because in line with what happened later in the evening, I withdrew my speech from the RECORD, feeling, in the light of the presentation of the Senator from Illinois, that I would wait to make my own presentation today. So I am glad to have this chance to make the RECORD clear, because my remarks do not appear in the RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator from Connecticut has made it clear. I think the Senator will have to agree with me that comments made by other Senators during the debate last night, indicate that I was not alone in my understanding that there had been no offer of an explanation of the bill on the part of any proponent of the bill or any argument in support of the bill. Certainly that was the situation last night.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish the Senator from Oregon to know that, as shown on page 8738 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday, I did mention the very point the Senator from Oregon has discussed, namely, the contribution the Senator from Illinois made in discussing this measure. I have strong feelings about the comments which were made last night about the Senator from Illinois, in regard to an alleged filibuster.

I wish to say now, regardless of my feelings about this bill, that both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Louisiana, as of last night, and today the Senator from Oregon, are doing a service for both the proponents and the opponents of this measure. We need a legislative history, no matter what happens.

I regret that for a brief moment yesterday I was out of the Chamber, making a long-distance call, and could not return to the Chamber before I heard the bell ring. Had I been in the Chamber at that time, I certainly would have risen and said a few words, even though I was not in charge of the bill.

Of course, Mr. President, I happen to be merely one of the proponents of the bill, but seemingly the leadership on this side of the presentation has fallen to me, by default.

I want the Senator from Oregon to know that I, for one, feel that we should not have a quick vote, but should have thorough discussion on a measure so vital as this one.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to make additional comments about the speech made yesterday by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I wish to join the Senator from Oregon in his remarks. I join him in his position that there should be full and complete debate and a full and complete understanding on the part of every Senator before a vote is taken.

Yesterday, as perhaps the Senator from Oregon realized, I was very much in the minority in the case of several votes on the treaties which were quite voluminous. I doubt if many Members of the United States Senate have read those treaties.

I join with the Senator from Oregon, my friend and neighboring colleague, in saying that I shall never cast a vote on the affirmative side of any measure that I do not believe I thoroughly understand. I would rather vote "no" than vote for something I do not thoroughly understand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I believe it is the duty of each one of us to follow that course of action when in doubt. I believe we best represent our constituents by voting "no." When we have had an opportunity really to study a measure so that thereafter we can honestly say to our constituents that we knew enough about the measure to vote for it, that is one thing; but in the absence of such an understanding, our vote should be in the negative. I completely agree with that view of representation of our constituents.

Mr. President, I also wish to say, on the particular subject matter that has just been brought up, that in my judg-

ment, it was most unfortunate that there was not prolonged debate on the treaties which were ratified yesterday, because I believe they affect vitally the future of our country, and with them we shall have to live for a long time. So I believe a much more extensive legislative history should have been made on them than was made.

Let me say that I did have time, the night before to study the treaties and satisfy myself that I would be justified in voting for the treaties. But if I had not had time to do so, I feel sure that I would have been justified in following the course of action the Senator from Idaho has recommended.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say that if I were willing to yield to the persuasive influence of the Senator from Minnesota, I would vote with him on the pending bill, for in my judgment, he is not only one of the most persuasive Members of the Senate, but he is one of the most persuasive men in America. When I listen to him, I always have to keep checking the major and the minor premises in his arguments, for if I do not, there is no doubt about what my conclusion would always be: It would be the conclusion of the Senator from Minnesota.

So, again I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota on one of the most persuasive speeches I have ever heard; but I wish to say that he did not persuade me; he was not quite persuasive enough, so far as his premises were concerned, to convince me.

However, his speech was a brilliant forensic endeavor. Let me also make clear that when I say it was a great forensic endeavor, I mean it was also a sincere endeavor, for in my judgment, no one could speak with greater sincerity and conviction than the Senator from Minnesota has spoken in making his presentation on this bill.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota may be correct; I am not so sure but what I may be wrong, for I make many mistakes. One cannot sit in the Senate and be confronted with the multitude of issues which constantly arise, and be forced to work under the necessary limitation on the time available to us for study without making mistakes in judgment now and then. The test is whether the mistake is merely a mistake in judgment. So long as it is only a mistake in judgment, and so long as we demonstrate that we do not make the same mistake twice, but that we learn from our experience, then I think our constituencies should not find fault if we make a few mistakes.

This may be one of my mistakes, but I do not think so, for the reasons which I shall set forth in this speech.

Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Minnesota said a few minutes ago in regard to the charge of filibuster which was made last night on the floor of the Senate. Personally, I shall ignore the charge, because I am satisfied that it was not made by any Senator who really intended to wrong a colleague.

Of course there has not been a filibuster on this bill, and there is not going to be one. The Senator from Minnesota and I are joint authors of a resolution which previously has been submitted to the Senate, to outlaw filibusters.

Although there is a dispute as to the interpretation of the facts, Mr. President, nevertheless I repeat that I have never participated in a filibuster, and I shall not do so today.

There are those who still say that a speech of more than 10 hours in length which I made back in 1947 on the President's veto message on the Taft-Hartley bill was a filibuster. Nevertheless they cannot find in that speech a paragraph which did not relate to the subject matter then before the Senate. That speech was given with full notice to the Senate that all I sought was a delay on the vote for the period of time the Senate would necessarily have to permit to pass if a cloture petition were filed, namely, 2 days. That is all I asked for. I asked for a delay on that vote, as the RECORD will show, from Friday afternoon until Monday at 2 p. m. In fact, before the beginning of that so-called prolonged debate, which has been called by many a filibuster on my part, I said that at that time I was willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to have the vote taken on the following Monday afternoon, at 2 o'clock, because I wanted to have the week end, and a good many of my colleagues in the Senate wanted to have the week end, to study further the veto message on the Taft-Hartley bill. As the RECORD will show, I also said that I wanted the people of the United States to have the week end in which to consider the import of the President's veto.

The veto had just been read when immediately there was a demand that the Senate vote on the veto message on that very day. I said that procedurally that would be unwise, and that I did not think it would be fair to the Senate or fair to the country. I asked that we have the week end in which to consider the veto message.

The RECORD will show that I was told that I would either agree to an immediate vote on the veto message, on that very Friday afternoon, or I could begin talking.

Mr. President, I cannot be intimidated. So I said to the then majority leader of the United States Senate that if that was the way he wanted it, that was the way he would have it, and that we would talk only for the period of time the vote would have been delayed if a cloture petition had been filed. The cloture procedure in the Senate exists for the purpose of protecting minority interests, and I shall always endeavor to protect minority interests in the Senate by affording them, if I can, adequate time to discuss the merits of any issue pending before the Senate. Whenever there is an attempt in this body to deny to the minority opportunity to express their views on any issue, be it a civil-rights issue, a tax issue, a military issue, a treaty issue, or any other issue the junior Senator from Oregon will fight in order that the minority may have adequate time in which to discuss the merits of the issue. In 1947, at the time of the so-called Morse filibuster on the Taft-Hartley veto message, I stated to the majority, time and time again, on the floor and in the cloakrooms, "You are making a great mistake in trying to ram this down our throats without giving us adequate time to discuss it during reasonable hours of Senate sessions. We will vote Monday at 2 o'clock, if you agree; if you do not, you will vote not before Monday at 2, because we are not going to be intimidated and told that we have to vote before that time, and 2 o'clock on Monday represents a reasonable postponement."

That, Mr. President, is the record of that case. What happened? Let the RECORD speak for itself. We started talking. The junior Senator from Oregon talked a little more than 10 hours, and he never departed from the subject matter during the 10 hours. Mr. President, I am advised by officials of the Senate that it is the only so-called filibuster speech in the history of the Senate that could be reprinted in toto, as it was reprinted, containing not a paragraph not relating to the subject which was before the Senate. Our group that talked through that Friday, Friday night, and most of Saturday finally won our procedural battle, because late on Saturday the Senate agreed to accept our offer to vote on Monday at 2 p. m.

Mr. President, I have made that little explanation again this morning because of the comment which was made on the floor of the Senate last night about a filibuster having been started in connection with the pending bill. I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to filibusters, and that so far as my conscience is concerned, I have never participated in a filibuster, although I have made some rather lengthy speeches in the Senate, which some of my colleagues thought might be of the same family as the filibuster.

Mr. WILEY. Perhaps a second cousin.

Mr. MORSE. No, I think a first cousin. [Laughter.] But, Mr. President, those speeches have been directed to the subject. They have dealt with the merits of the issue.

I come now to the next point I desire to make regarding the matter of procedure in the debate today. I want a vote on this measure; and I hope a vote can be taken this afternoon. I told the majority leader last night that I had no intention of preventing a vote. But I intend to make my case against the bill, and so I say that, in inserting much of what I would otherwise read into the RECORD—I probably shall insert as much as two-thirds of it without reading it—I am doing it because I think it necessary to have a legislative record—a view which is shared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—so that the President may have before him a complete record as to the conflicting views in the Senate of the United States when he comes to consider the question of whether the bill should be vetoed.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the bill will pass—I think, by a large majority of the Senate. I do not know whether the President will veto the bill, but I do not know of any time since President Truman has been in the White House when he has knowingly walked out on the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice in the enforcement of the antitrust and antimonopoly laws. I cannot and do not speak for the President of the United States, but I can guess as to what I think he will do, being probably biased somewhat in that guess by what I think he ought to do. I guess he will veto it, because I think he ought to veto it. In view of the possibility of a veto, I think those of us who oppose the bill owe a duty to the Chief Executive to make a record upon the basis of which he might obtain some help in his analysis of the bill and the preparation of his veto message.

Mr. President, I have one other point to make on the matter of procedure, because when I objected to a unanimous-consent agreement last night I expected that some of my colleagues, and people outside the Senate as well, would misinterpret my motivation. I opposed a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this measure, and I shall continue to oppose it. But I shall keep faith with the majority leader, as I told him last night, by permitting this bill to come to a vote, so far as I am concerned, I hope, by midafternoon today.

Why have I not consented to an agreement to vote on the bill? There are two reasons. I am not going to consent to a unanimous-consent request that involves an attempt to speed through the Senate of the United States a measure when we do not even have on our desks the printed proceedings and hearings of the committee regarding it. In my opinion that is not good procedure, and to consent to such a request is to aid and to abet what, for the want of a better term, I would call steam-roller tactics in the Senate of the United States in the passage of legislation. I do not think that is good for the Senate.

Mr. President, we do not even have before us a report of the committee that really advises us as to the merits and demerits of this bill. The committee takes no position on the merits or demerits of the bill. It has met the formality of filing a committee report, though to me, at least, it is not at all a helpful report. It raises a few questions, but it does not provide the answers. So, Mr. President, I do not intend to consent to unanimous-consent requests to vote on measures which are presented to the Senate by a committee in such an inadequate fashion; and I told the majority leader so. The majority leader is a good friend of mine. He has been very kind about this matter. I do not have to tell the Presiding Officer, because he did not sit very far from the Senators who were engaged in the colloquy last night on the floor of the Senate around my desk, that great persuasion was brought to bear on the Senator from Oregon to yield on this point. In the same spirit of kindness as that in which the persuasion was used on me, I politely said, "I shall not agree to it now, tomorrow, or at any other time." That is my position.

Second, Mr. President, I refused last night to consent to the request for unanimous consent regarding this bill, not only because I think it has been presented to the Senate in an inadequate way so far as the committee report and so far as making available the committee hearings are concerned, but because I consider that we have gone entirely too far in the matter of unanimous-consent agreements. In my judgment, the growing tendency in the Senate of the United States almost to insist upon the transaction of business on the basis only of unanimous-consent agreements is doing great injury to the procedure of the Senate.

In support of my belief that we are doing great damage to the procedure and the standing of the Senate by the great increase in the number of unanimous-consent agreements, I wish to make the following observations:

It has long been the proud boast of Members of the Senate that it is the greatest deliberative assembly on earth. This boast was probably true in the days of those mighty men of old—Webster, Clay, and Calhoun. It rang true likewise in the more recent days of Borah, Norris, and "Old Bob" La Follette.

Sometimes, to be sure, debate in the Senate rises to a high level of excellence when we deal with great questions of sectional passion or of national survival. Witness the so-called great debates of the last session on troops for Europe and far-eastern policy.

Moreover, Senate debate often serves the valuable purpose of screening and sifting measures passed by the House when the Senate is performing its important function as a chamber of revision.

Although the Senate is often referred to as "the most august deliberative body in the world," it seldom really deliberates. Why is this so? "All of us know," remarked Senator Lucas during the debate on the ECA bill in the last Congress, "that in the afternoon very often there are not a dozen Senators on the floor of the Senate listening to the discussion; for when they know how they will vote on the amendments, they will not sit in the Senate Chamber all afternoon and listen to the discussion, but will be working in committees where they should be."

Part of the answer to my question, I suggest, lies in the fact that policies are seldom determined by speech making in the Senate because they have already been formulated in the committee rooms. Decisions arrived at in committee, where the Senate really deliberates, usually control legislative action on the floor. So that debate in the Senate is, after the fact, so to speak, designed more to air opinions than to decide courses of action.

But that is not always true, and it should not always be true. On many occasions, and I use the term "many" advisedly, my votes on the floor of the Senate have been changed as the result of debate. I think that is true of every Member of the Senate. I believe we should revise the procedural rules of the Senate which deal with the hours for the sessions of the Senate, in such a way that we will perhaps meet fewer hours a week, but when we meet we shall meet to debate and to discuss, and we shall not have our energies and attention dissipated by committee meetings going on at the same time.

At the same time I realize that many of the speeches we make here, when they are dilatory in purpose, are usually intended more for the ears of the country than in the hope of converting our colleagues whose minds, I fear, are already made up on most of the major issues of legislation.

Part of the explanation for the decline of the Senate as a truly deliberative body also lies, I believe, in the random and irrelevant character of our discussions here. Hardly an afternoon passes in this Chamber but what the debate ranges far and wide on many extraneous matters entirely irrelevant to the pending business before the Senate.

Such, for example, as the speech which I am now making. It is being made, however, Mr. President, because it relates to a point which has been raised in the course of the debate on the pending bill in an attempt to persuade and convince the junior Senator from Oregon that he should enter into a unanimous-consent agreement on the pending measure, and I make these comments to explain why I shall not do it in this instance.

The majority leader repeatedly pleads with us to keep the debate "on the beam" of the unfinished business until it has been finished. Yet Senators do not hesitate to go off on long irrelevant tangents with carefree nonchalance. In an amusing speech in this Chamber last year the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] urged us to adopt a rule of germaneness such as the House of Representatives has had since 1789. But his resolution still lies in that graveyard of parliamentary reform: the Committee on Rules and Administration. How can the Senate deliberate on statehood for Alaska, for example, when its attention is diverted to Greece and Turkey, the oil reserve situation, General Eisenhower's position in regard to Spain, and other matters, which the RECORD will show were the subject matters of speeches made on the floor of the Senate during the debate on the Alaska statehood problem?

Mr. President, it is a fact not to be denied, I think, that the Senate of the United States has in recent years been losing its hold on the confidence and respect of the American people. "Has Congress broken down?" ask the editors of Fortune in the February issue of that magazine which is entirely devoted to a notable series of articles on the Government of the United States of America. Their answer is "Yes, it has broken down." The National Committee for Strengthening Congress reviews our procedural performance during the past session and finds that we lack unity of

command, coordination in policymaking, and the machinery for formulating fiscal policy. Political scientists warn that Congress is "at the crossroads" and "on trial." The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] writes that a twentieth-century Congress is needed and outlines a program of reform. The complaint is universal that the public business is not being dispatched as it should be. The Senate is criticized for its unlimited debate, its tolerance of dilatory and obstructive tactics, and its frequent absenteeism. Critics say that our procedures are antiquated, that minority rule prevails in this body, that we operate by alternating fits of coma and convulsion.

There are many reasons that might be given for this unhappy condition. But there is one in particular to which I desire to invite the attention of the Senate today, and that is the practice of making unanimous-consent agreements. I feel that the increasing number of such agreements in the Senate during recent years has been an unfortunate trend in Senate procedure, first, because they have been made with respect to matters which, in my opinion, have not yet been adequately discussed and aired on the floor, and, second, because they give rise to absenteeism in the Chamber and hence further impair the opportunity for a full exchange of views on the merits of important measures. I would like now to trace the history of the development of this practice in the Senate by way of background for my criticism of the present procedure.

Mr. President, it is not only the procedure of the Senate that I would criticize. In the next session of Congress I desire to discuss on an appropriate occasion some other procedural reforms for conducting the business of the Senate, which I think should be effected, such, for instance, as the installation of an electric voting machine. When we think of the waste of time, the hours spent in quorum calls and in roll calls, we cannot, Mr. President, in this modern era justify that inefficiency. I think an electric voting board would have some other beneficial effects, too, because in order to vote Senators must be here and must be ready to vote. Not much time is allowed for instructed votes under that procedure. But such reforms as that, Mr. President, can await a discussion come the next session of Congress. At this time, however, the question of unanimous-consent agreements has been raised in such a manner as to justify my making a record of my objections to them as a common practice, not that I will not agree to unanimous-consent agreements when I think the surrounding facts and circumstances of a given debate justify a unanimous-consent agreement. But as a general practice, I think they are bad; and as a general practice, I intend to continue to be "tough" when it comes to requests for unanimous-consent agreements.

As to the nature and history of the practice, let me say that, in contrast with the strict and complicated procedure of the House of Representatives, the Senate's ways of doing business are simple indeed. Under our ancient code, which has not been revised since 1884, business is considered either upon the call of the calendar of bills and resolutions or under the schedule of unfinished business. The calendar is supposed to be called under rule VIII on Mondays, but in practice it is only called following an adjournment or by unanimous consent and the Senate usually recesses from day to day. As a result, calls of the calendar have dropped off since the late war from 19 in 1947 to 15 in 1948 to 16 in 1949 to 10 in 1950 to 13 in 1951—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 7, remarks of Senator HENDRICKSON, pages 9720–9722, on infrequent calling of the calendar. With the postwar decline of calendar calls, nearly all of the major business coming before the Senate is now being done under unanimous-consent agreements fixing the time for voting on the unfinished or pending business. For the regulation of its procedure the House of Representatives has erected a stronger framework. Its chief features are the previous question and the hour rule for regulating time; the five calendars and the two committees of the whole for classifying business; and the Committee on Rules for selection.

A unanimous-consent agreement to vote, as we all know, is a procedure for the taking of a final vote on a specified date upon the passage of a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereof. Prior to 1914, when the rule—rule XII, paragraph 3—governing this procedure was first adopted, by a vote of 51 to 8, these were gentlemen's agreements which were governed by custom and were not enforceable by the Chair, although they were never violated. Since 1914 unanimous-consent agreements have operated as orders of the Senate and have been enforced by the Chair. They are a device by which Senators tie their own hands, so to speak, by unanimously agreeing to limit debate on a matter to a specified time. A single objection blocks any such agreement.

Research reveals that the custom of fixing a time for ending debate and taking the vote dates back at least to the Twenty-ninth Congress, 1845–47, when an unsuccessful attempt was made to induce the minority to fix a day for taking a vote on the Oregon bill, which had been debated 2 months—Clara H. Kerr, the Origin and Development of the United States Senate, 1895, page 64.

Wrote Kerr in 1895:

> Usually, when there is no factious opposition, and the majority have been willing to grant to the minority a reasonable time for debate, there has been no difficulty in securing such unanimous consent. It has come to be the custom to thus fix the time for taking the vote on all the revenue bills, and the practice doubtless contributes much to the rapidity with which the Senate can transact business.

In the years following the War Between the States, repeated efforts were made—several of them by southern Senators—to allow the Senate, after a bill had been debated for a reasonable time, to fix a time for closing debate and taking a vote, but none of these attempts to limit debate by rule received favorable committee action. Furber records 70 entries in the Senate Journal between July 27, 1850, and February 26, 1891, when proposals for limiting Senate debate by various devices were made, such as the previous question, the 5-minute rule, fixing a day certain, et cetera—George P. Furber, Precedents Relating to the Privileges of the Senate of the United States — 1893 — Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 68, Fifty-second Congress, second session, pages 217–230. Several of these efforts proposed to fix a time for closing debate by a simple or special majority vote; none of them would have required unanimous consent. These efforts having failed, the only recourse was to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate and fix a time for voting on individual measures.

Such agreements were evidently not difficult to secure, according to Haynes, if the issue was not bitterly divisive and if the majority allowed a reasonable time for debate—George H. Haynes, The Senate of the United States: Its History and Practice—1938—page 396. Writing in 1898, L. G. McConachie, the historian of congressional committees in the nineteenth century, reports that the statement that "half our business is done by unanimous consent" is about as true now as in the days of Lyman Trumbull who represented Illinois in the Senate from 1855 to 1873. According to Senator Platt, who served in the Senate from 1897 to 1909, there were but two ways of getting a vote in those days; by unanimous consent to fix a time for action and by "sitting it out"—L. G. McConachie, Congressional Committees—1898—pages 302–303.

Senator Roger Q. Mills, who represented Texas in the Senate from 1892 to 1899, and who was a strong advocate of majority rule and the previous question in the Senate, wrote an eloquent article for the Washington Post on the Senate in Pressing Need of Reform which appeared in that newspaper on April 11, 1896. It is significant of the tortoise-like progress of the Senate's procedure that his article describes the situation that faces us in this body today as accurately as when it was published 56 years ago. On the subject I am now considering, Senator Mills had this to say—Washington Post, April 11, 1896, page 21—

> The Senate is over a hundred years old, but the first of all lessons of importance [majority rule] has not yet been thoroughly learned. It reaches its vote on all questions like the historic Diet of Poland, by the unanimous agreement of the whole, and not by the act of the majority. The refusal to exercise this natural right of the majority is the principal cause of the troubles which have aroused the displeasure of the country. If a small minority determines that a bill shall not be passed, there is no rule by which it can be put to vote.

How long, O Lord, how long must the Senate wait for majority rule!

Although the published records of the Senate do not disclose the frequency with which resort was had to unanimous-consent agreements over the years, the

notes of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, show 30 such agreements were made during the 30-year period between 1884 and 1914, when the rule regulating the practice was adopted, in connection with which points of order were made.

(See exhibit A.)

That is such a significant statement of fact with regard to the subject I am discussing, namely, that we have been going too far afield in the matter and have been entering into too many unanimous-consent agreements in recent sessions of the Congress, that I wish to repeat the last sentence.

Although the published records of the Senate do not disclose the frequency with which resort was had to unanimous-consent agreements over the years, the notes of the Parliamentarian, Mr. Watkins, show 30 such agreements were made during the 30-year period between 1884 and 1914, when the rule regulating the practice was adopted, in connection with which points of order were made.

That was on the average of one a year—quite a difference from what our present practice is. It has almost reached the point where we have a unanimous-consent agreement at least once a week. Sometimes unanimous-consent agreements come so fast that for periods of time we have one a day.

There must have been many more such agreements during this period which did not give rise to points of order. That is, gentlemen's understandings—nonenforceable agreements.

The Parliamentarian also has record of some 30 unanimous-consent agreements made after the adoption of the 1914 rule in connection with which points of order were raised. They are scattered over the years from 1915 to 1931, inclusive.

(See exhibit B.)

There has been abundant evidence, since the adoption of the cloture rule in 1917, according to Haynes, that—

> Senators much prefer to end debate and get to a final vote by way of a unanimous-consent agreement with its appeal to senatorial courtesy, rather than under the compulsion of a cloture, which may prove a precedent of evil omen (Haynes, op. cit., p. 1961).

The old practice was to debate a matter for a reasonable time and then agree to limit the time for debate on amendments and to fix a time for voting on amendments and final passage. Time was not divided or controlled under the former practice. But under the modern, postwar practice, unanimous-consent agreements are made to close debate on almost every major bill; it is now standard practice to divide and control the time; and 50 percent of the agreements require motions and amendments to be germane to the business under consideration. The development of the requirement of germaneness in the last 2 or 3 years is regarded as a safeguard against the attachment of civil rights riders.

POSTWAR INCREASE OF PRACTICE

A survey of the Senate Journal shows that extensive use has been made of unanimous-consent agreements during the past 5 years. There have been more than 100 times since 1946 when we have agreed to limit debate by this procedure. The device has been employed to bring debate to a close on scores of bills dealing with major national and international issues, on proposed amendments to the Constitution, as well as on simple, concurrent, and joint resolutions.

(See exhibit C.)

Unanimous-consent agreements in the Senate, 1947–52

Year	Number	Time divided and controlled	Germaneness required
1947	10	14	1
1948	9	9	4
1949	9	9	3
1950	35	32	19
1951	26	27	20
1952 [1]	3	3	3
Total	102	93	49

[1] January only.

On the question whether or not sufficient time for adequate debate has been allowed before these agreements have been ordered and become effective, I asked the Legislative Reference Service to compute in the case of each of these postwar agreements, first, the interval of time from the day when a bill or resolution became the unfinished business of the Senate to the day when a unanimous-consent agreement was ordered with respect to it; and, second, the time interval between the date when the agreement was ordered and the date when it became effective. The results of this computation show that the first time interval has averaged 6.1 calendar weekdays, excluding Sundays, and that the second interval has averaged 2.9 days. In other words, 9 days on the average have been available since 1946 for the debate of subjects which have been brought under the control of unanimous-consent agreements. To be sure, not all this available time has actually been used to debate the pending business of the Senate because the Senate has not been in session every weekday and because much of the available time has been consumed by the discussion of topics quite irrelevant to the pending business. Yet, 9 days on the average have been available to those who cared to use it for the discussion of matters upon which debate has been limited by this procedure, assuming, of course, that there were a sufficient number of votes to keep the Senate in session each day.

Whether or not 9 days is enough time for adequate debate of a matter is a question of individual judgment, but in my opinion, in respect to most issues, it certainly is.

DEFENSE OF THE PRACTICE

Opinions will vary as to the amount of time which should be consumed in the Senate in considering a bill. Some students of Senate procedure have defended the use of unanimous-consent agreements as a useful device for expediting the transaction of business in the body. For example, Roland Young, who had been a member of the Senate staff, wrote in 1943—This Is Congress, 1943, pages 142–143:

> To one unacquainted with senatorial folklore this method of closing debate may seem cumbersome, but, oddly enough, it is quite effective. An individual Senator, or bloc of Senators, or a minority party does not ordinarily wish to be responsible for completely stopping a legislative program by refusing to give the required consent to close debate. For when someone objects to the program, the objector can easily be identified and held publicly accountable. While the Senate passes some legislation only after debate is exhausted, it passes other legislation in a very brief time by the unanimous consent of the Members. Unanimous consent allows the Senate to spend large amounts of time on what may interest it at the moment; it allows it to pass much legislation in a very small amount of time; and it allows individual Senators to secure favors—such as agreeing to recommendations for appointments—from their colleagues.

Prof. Lindsay Rogers, of Columbia University, long a close observer of Senate procedure and a defender of unlimited debate in that body, wrote in 1926—The American Senate, 1926, pages 185–186:

> Unanimous-consent agreements are frequent also to fix an hour at which the Senate will vote on a pending proposal of great importance. There must be some definite expectations as to when action will be taken; Senators wish to be present to be recorded on the roll calls. There must also be safeguards against surprise; those having a particular bill in charge must not call for a vote when those who desire to speak are not present. These requirements can sometimes be met by informal announcement of the leaders' intentions and by notices that particular Senators desire to make speeches before a vote is taken. To get some business through, however, more formal action is frequently necessary. As the Senate rules now stand—with a closure provision that is unworkable except in emergencies—there must be some safeguard against endless delays by reason of individual idiosyncracies. Hence it is a familiar practice for unanimous-consent agreements to be entered into that the Senate will vote on a certain day, or that after a certain day speeches will be limited. These usually suffice to secure action. This in reality is a species of closure.

CRITICISM OF PRACTICE

On the other hand, it may be argued that excessive use has been made of this device during recent years; that what is needed is not greater speed of Senate action, but more thorough consideration of legislation; that too frequent use of the device impairs the deliberative function of the Senate and so destroys the very reason for its existence; that the widest possible debate upon public questions is all the more desirable since extended debate is no longer possible in the House of Representatives; that there should be some place where the merits of a measure may be thoroughly threshed out in debate and where, through such debate, the public may receive education regarding the desirability of proposed action; and that the Senate is the only practicable place where such debate can take place.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks without reading an exhibit entitled "Exhibit A," and referred to in the footnotes of the manuscript. It is headed "Unanimous-consent agree-

ments prior to adoption of amendment to rule XII on January 16, 1914, and in connection with which points of order were made."

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT A

Unanimous-consent agreements prior to adoption of amendment to Rule XII on Jan. 16, 1914, and in connection with which points of order were made

Date	Number of bill	RECORD page
Apr. 7, 1884	S. 398	2682, 2698
Feb. 3, 1885	H. R. 5481	1218
Feb. 17, 1885	H. R. 2550	1797
May 4, 1886	H. R. 5887	4132
Mar. 3, 1887	S. 1883	2618
Sept. 6, 1888	H. R. 11336	8343
June 17, 1890	H. R. 5381	6167
June 26, 1890	H. R. 982	6530
Aug. 26, 1890	H. R. 9416	9143
July 1, 1892	S. 51	5707
Mar. 3, 1897		2730
May 4, 1906	H. R. 12987	6369
Jan. 10, 1907	S. 5133	877
Do	S. 5135	880, 881
July 5, 1909	S. J. Res. 40	4105-4107
Feb. 28, 1911	S. J. Res. 134	3638
Aug. 1, 1911	H. R. 2983	3435
May 2, 1912	S. 5382	5739
July 2, 1912	H. R. 20182	8559
July 10, 1912	S. Res. 315	8811
Aug. 9, 1912	H. R. 21869	10583
Aug. 21, 1912	S. 5137, S. 957	11433
Jan. 9, 1913	S. 4043	1256
Jan. 31, 1913	S. J. Res. 78	2344
Feb 5, 1913	S. 8033	2593-2595
Feb. 10, 1913	S. 4043	2920
Feb. 14, 1913	S. 8103	3154
Mar. 1, 1913	H. R. 23673	4426
Mar. 2, 1913	H. R. 23673	4561-4563
Dec. 6, 1913	H. R. 7207	352

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, without reading, an exhibit entitled "Exhibit B," and headed "Unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate (made since 1914)."

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT B

Unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate[1] (made since 1914)

Date	Number of bill	Record page
Jan. 23, 1914	S. 48	2163
Do	do	2177
Aug. 5, 1914	H. R. 15613	13304
Oct. 17, 1914	H. R. 18891	16794
Jan. 11, 1915	H. R. 19422	1357
Feb. 29, 1916	S. 3331	3282
Mar. 13, 1916	S. 1417	3992, 3993
Apr. 8, 1916	H. R. 12276	5720
Apr. 18, 1916	do	6353
Dec. 16, 1916	S. 1082	422
Feb. 24, 1917	H. R. 20573	4149
Mar. 1, 1917	H. R. 20632	4633
Jan. 15, 1918	S. J. Res. 101	881
Dec. 16, 1919	S. 3284	912
Dec. 15, 1920	S. 3944	1958, 1959
July 5, 1921	S. 1039	3348-3351
July 20, 1921	H. R. 7294	4115
Aug. 23, 1921	H. R. 8117	5514, 5515
Aug. 3, 1922	H. R. 7456	10997
Aug. 18, 1922	do	11584
Nov. 24, 1922	H. J. Res. 270	131
May 10, 1924	H. R. 6715	8267
Feb. 20, 1925	S. 33	4237
Feb. 21, 1925	S. 3011	4320
May 27, 1926	S. 2607	10169
Feb. 2, 1927	H. R. 11768	2770
Feb. 4, 1927	do	2945, 2946
Mar. 3, 1927		5482
Jan. 21, 1931	H. R. 15275	2296, 2297

[1] The above unanimous-consent agreements were made after the adoption of the amendment to the rule (12) on Jan. 16, 1914, and in which cases points of order were made in connection therewith.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a document entitled "Exhibit C," documented in the manuscript, and headed "Unanimous-consent agreements in the Senate, 1947-52."

There being no objection, the exhibit was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT C

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS IN THE SENATE, 1947-52

1947

Investigation of national defense program, Senate Resolution 46.

Establishing ceiling on 1948 expenditures, Senate Concurrent Resolution 7.

Portal-to-portal bill, H. R. 2157.

Motion to recommit nomination for AEC.

Nominations for Atomic Energy Commission.

Assistance to Greece and Turkey, S. 938.

Amending the National Labor Relations Act, S. 1126.

Federal Labor Relations Act of 1947, S. 1126 (3).

Relief assistance to war devastated countries, House Joint Resolution 153.

National Science Foundation Act of 1947, S. 526.

Reduce individual income-tax payments, H. R. 1.

Provide support for wool, S. 814.

Investigation of postmasters' appointments, Senate Resolution 81.

Amending the ICC, S. 110.

Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, H. R. 3020.

Nomination for United States district judge.

Interstate water rights on the Colorado River, Senate Joint Resolution 145.

1948

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin agreement, Senate Joint Resolution 111.

Oleomargarine tax bill, H. R. 2245.

Southern States regional education compact, House Joint Resolution 334.

Motion to recommit nomination of War Assets Administrator.

Atomic Energy Act of 1946, S. 1604.

Amending the ICC, S. 110.

Selective Service Act of 1948, S. 2655.

Extend President's authority in Tariff Act of 1930, H. R. 6556.

Regulation of consumer installment credit, Senate Joint Resolution 157.

1949

National Labor Relations Act of 1949, S. 249.

North Atlantic Treaty.

Basing point bill, S. 1008.

Interior Department appropriation bill for 1950, H. R. 3838.

National Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1950, H. R. 4146.

Nomination, Chairman of the Munitions Board.

Foreign Military Assistance Pact of 1949, H. R. 5895.

Career Compensation Act of 1949, H. R. 5007.

Nomination, Assistant Secretary of State.

1950

Oleomargarine bill, H. R. 2023.

Equal-rights amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 25.

Election of President and Vice President amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 2.

Committee on Small Business, Senate Resolution 58.

Construction of dam on Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, S. 75.

Cotton and peanut acreage allotments, House Joint Resolution 398.

Displaced Persons Act, H. R. 4567.

Housing Act, S. 2246.

Amendment to Natural Gas Act, S. 1498.

Displaced Persons Act, H. R. 4567.

Amendment to Economic Cooperation Act, S. 3304 (2).

Amendment to Economic Cooperation Act, H. R. 7797.

Pricing systems and freight absorption practices, S. 1008.

Establishment of foreign trade zones, H. R. 5332.

Continuation of rent control, S. 3181.

Extension of social security, H. R. 6000.

Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6567.

Continuation of rent control in the District of Columbia, S. 3776.

Amendment of Hatch Act, H. R. 1243.

Amendment of Mutual Defense Assistance Act, S. 3809.

Reorganization Plan No. 24 of 1950, Senate Resolution 290.

Reorganization Plan No. 22 of 1950, Senate Resolution 299.

Appropriations for the support of the Government, H. R. 7786 (2).

Priorities and allocations, S. 3936.

Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950, H. R. 7941.

Internal security, S. 4037 (2).

American-flag shipping on Great Lakes, H. R. 8847.

Temporary extension of rent control, Senate Joint Resolution 207.

Amendment to Railway Labor Act, S. 3295.

Emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia, S. 4234.

Prevention of acquisition of assets of certain corporations by other corporations, H. R. 2734.

Order for recesses and consideration of certain conference reports.

1951

Renegotiation of contracts, H. R. 1724.

Assignment of ground troops for service in Europe, Senate Resolution 8.

Universal military training, S. 1 (3).

Assistance to States in public-health services, S. 445.

Armed Forces to Europe, Senate Resolution 99.

Housing for national defense, S. 349.

Dispersal of public buildings, S. 218.

Farm-labor bill, S. 984.

Food aid to India, S. 872.

Dam on Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, Ariz., S. 75.

Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, 1952, H. R. 3709.

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1952, H. R. 3880.

Amendments to Defense Production Act of 1950 and Housing and Rent Act of 1947, S. 1717.

Basing-point bill, S. 719.

Interior Department appropriation bill, 1952, H. R. 3790.

Exclusion from gross income of income from discharge of indebtedness, H. R. 2416.

Agricultural appropriation bill, 1952, H. R. 3973.

Contempt resolutions, Senate Resolutions 119 and 120.

State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary appropriation bill, H. R. 4740.

The Mutual Security Act of 1951, H. R. 5113.

Defense Appropriation Act of 1952, H. R. 5054.

Separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, S. 436 (2).

Revenue Act of 1951—corporate tax increases, H. R. 4473.

Revenue Act of 1951—limitation on certain amendments, H. R. 4473.

Emergency Professional Health Training Act of 1951, S. 337.

1952

District of Columbia home-rule bill, S. 1976.

Repeal of fats and oil provisions of Defense Production Act of 1950, S. 2104.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum which was prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The memorandum is entitled "Motions To Limit or Close Debate by Unanimous Consent."

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTIONS TO LIMIT OR CLOSE DEBATE BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

(Citations are to the Journal of the Senate)

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JANUARY 5, 1937

Page 79, February 2, 1937: On motion by Mr. Robinson and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at the conclusion of the debate on the committee amendment, the Senate proceed to vote thereon.

Page 125, February 24, 1937: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that on tomorrow, beginning at 3 p. m., no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution.

Page 139, March 2, 1937: On motion by Mr. Pittman and by unanimous consent, ordered, that after the hour of 1 p. m. on tomorrow no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the pending joint resolution, nor 15 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Page 452, July 31, 1937: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that when the Senate meets tomorrow no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill or any amendment and that at not later than 3 p. m. the Senate shall vote.

Page 476, August 4, 1937: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes on the bill or more than once nor longer than 15 minutes upon any amendment.

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, NOVEMBER 15, 1937

Page 46, December 16, 1937: Mr. BARKLEY submitted a request for a limitation of debate and the final disposition of the bill, to which Mr. McNary objected.

Page 48, December 17, 1937: Mr. BARKLEY submitted a request for unanimous consent that during remainder of consideration of the bill no Senator speak more than once nor longer than 5 minutes on the bill or any amendment. Mr. Bankhead raised a question as to the presence of a quorum. A quorum being present, Mr. BARKLEY's request was agreed to.

SEVENTY-FIFTH CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION, JANUARY 3, 1938

Page 162, February 14, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 3:30 p. m. on Monday next, the Senate proceed to vote on the conference report.

Page 168, February 15, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that on tomorrow, prior to 1 p. m., the time for debate be equally divided between proponents and opponents of the motion to close debate on the pending bill.

Page 218, March 14, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. on tomorrow, the Senate proceed to vote without further debate on the amendment proposed by Mr. Walsh and any amendment that may be proposed thereto.

Page 240, March 28, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 1 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on the pending amendment and that debate be equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

Page 243, March 24, 1938: On motion of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending bill no amendment embodying antilynching be in order; that vote on any pending amendment be not later than 3 p. m. Monday and that not later than 5 p. m., if motion to recommit is rejected, Senate vote on the bill, time for debate to be equally divided.

Page 259, March 29, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 12:30 tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote without further debate on the pending bill and any amendments that may be proposed thereto.

Page 276, April 5, 1938: On motion by Mr. Holt and by unanimous consent, ordered, that consideration of the reported amendment be postponed until tomorrow and voted upon at not later than 1 p. m.

Page 282, April 6, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 5 p. m. today the Senate proceed to vote on all amendments to the bill * * * and on its final passage.

Page 289, April 8, 1938: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that when the Senate concludes its business it take a recess until tomorrow at 11 a. m. and that no Senator shall speak longer than 20 minutes on the pending bill or on any amendment and that at not later than 1 p. m. the Senate shall proceed to vote thereon.

Page 336, April 29, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning at 12 o'clock on Monday next no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes on the bill nor more than once or longer than 10 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Page 429, May 28, 1938: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that after today no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution nor more than 15 minutes in the aggregate on any amendment thereto.

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION JANUARY 3, 1939

Page 74, January 27, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that Mr. MCKELLAR may propose amendment and that not later than 3 o'clock p. m. on tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote upon the amendment, his time to be equally divided between proponents and opponents of the amendment.

Page 222, April 10, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 2:30 p. m. Monday the Senate vote on the pending amendment, the time to be equally divided between proponents and opponents.

Page 312, May 17, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote at 3:30 p. m. on the bill and all amendments.

Page 360, June 7, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 3 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on the bill and amendments.

Page 401, June 24, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 12:30 Monday the Senate vote on the pending amendment.

Page 418, June 28, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the joint resolution nor more than 15 minutes on any amendment.

Page 431, June 30, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the conference report, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the report and that at not later than 5 p. m. on July 5, the Senate shall proceed to vote on the report.

Page 474, July 13, 1939: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 1:05 tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

Page 462, July 17, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 3 p. m. Monday the Senate vote on the bill and amendments.

Page 521, July 21, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill (10 minutes on any amendment).

Page 555, July 29, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill (nor on amendments).

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1939

Page 15, October 9, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on motion to recommit the joint resolution, time to be divided equally.

Page 26, October 24, 1939: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than 45 minutes on the joint resolution nor more than 45 minutes in the aggregate on any amendment.

SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS, THIRD SESSION, JANUARY 3, 1940

Page 118, February 13, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes.

Page 159, March 9, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote on the pending amendment at not later than 2 p. m. Monday.

Pages 161–162, March 11, 1940: Mr. BARKLEY requested unanimous consent that Senate vote without further debate on the bill by 5 p. m. next day—Mr. Bailey objected.

Page 178, March 18, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 3 p. m. Monday the Senate proceed to vote on the bill.

Page 204, March 29, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at 4 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on pending amendment.

Page 209, April 1, 1940: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that after 12 tomorrow no Senator shall speak longer than 20 minutes on the pending bill or any amendment.

Page 213, April 2, 1940: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that on the convening of the Senate tomorrow no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the pending amendment.

Page 216, April 3, 1940: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the previous day's limitation of 15 minutes debate be applied to any amendment to the pending amendment.

Page 219, April 3, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning at 12:30 tomorrow no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes during pending of amendment.

Page 222, April 4, 1940: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning at 1 p. m. tomorrow no Senator shall speak longer than 15 minutes on any amendment to the joint resolution.

Page 251, April 15, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 1:30 tomorrow the Senate vote on the bill.

Page 330, May 14, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 4 p. m. tomorrow Senate vote on the pending concurrent resolution.

Page 427, June 13, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution.

Page 433, June 4, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution.

Page 436, June 15, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 15 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Page 541, August 6, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during consideration of the pending joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes.

Page 569, August 24, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during pendency of the amendment no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill.

Page 577, August 27, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that no Senator shall speak more than 15 minutes during pendency of any amendment nor more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill.

Page 648, September 11, 1940: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes on the bill or amendment.

Page 689, September 18, 1940: On motion by Mr. Harrison and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 4 p. m. tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JANUARY 3, 1941

Page 187., May 7, 1941: On motion by Mr. HAYDEN and by unanimous consent, ordered, that no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the pending amendment.

Page 194, May 13, 1941: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote on the pending resolution by 5 p. m. tomorrow, debate to be equally divided between proponents and opponents.

Page 226, May 26, 1941: On motion by Mr. Byrnes and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 2 p. m. Tuesday, June 3, the Senate vote on the bill.

Page 281, June 27, 1941: On motion by Mr. Byrnes and by unanimous consent, ordered, that upon the development of a quorum after the convening of the Senate tomorrow a vote be taken on the pending amendment, and at not later than 1 p. m. on any other amendment and upon the bill itself.

Page 344, August 1, 1941: On motion of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning August 4 no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution or on any amendment.

Page 347, August 4, 1941: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote not later than 1 p. m. tomorrow on the pending amendment, the time to be equally divided between proponents and opponents.

Page 422, October 21, 1941: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on the bill.

Page 444, November 7, 1941: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning at 5 p. m., no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 10 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Page 499, December 16, 1941: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote on the pending bills and any amendments not later than 1 p. m. tomorrow.

SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, JANUARY 5, 1942

Page 138, March 25, 1942: On motion by Mr. McNary and by unanimous consent, ordered that after the hour of 3:30 p. m. on March 26, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the resolution or any amendments or motions.

Page 143, March 26, 1942: On motion by Mr. McNary and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending resolution no Senator shall speak in the aggregate more than 30 minutes on the resolution and all amendments and motions relating thereto.

Page 192, May 5, 1942: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 3 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed, without further debate to vote on the committee amendment. The time for debate from convening of Senate until the vote to be equally divided between Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. BARKLEY.

Page 222, May 20, 1942: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the motion to reconsider be agreed to and that a yea-and-nay vote be taken, without further debate, on the questions of agreeing to the committee amendments.

Page 456, October 24, 1942: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the amendment proposed by Mr. Norris, and all amendments thereto, debate shall be limited to the amendment and no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes.

Page 457, October 24, 1942: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment, or amendment thereto, or on the bill, or any motion pertaining thereto.

Page 477, November 20, 1942: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending bill, until 1 p. m. Monday next, the time for debate be equally divided between opponents and proponents of the bill.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, JANUARY 6, 1943

Page 101, March 10, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on the pending amendment.

Page 112, March 17, 1943: On motion by Mr. Clark, of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate vote not later than 2:30 p. m. tomorrow on all amendments to the pending bill.

Page 128, March 26, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, as in executive session, that at not later than 5:30 p. m. on Tuesday next the Senate proceed to vote upon the nomination of Rear Adm. Emory S. Land to be a member of United States Maritime Commission, time for debate to be divided between proponents and opponents.

Page 245, May 28, 1943: On motion by Mr. GEORGE and by unanimous consent, ordered, that on Tuesday next the Senate vote not later than 2:30 p. m. on pending amendment, the time to be divided equally between proponents and opponents.

Page 247, June 1, 1943: On motion by Mr. GEORGE and by unanimous consent, ordered, that upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution nor more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment.

Page 284, June 10, 1943: On motion by Mr. RUSSELL and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on any amendment or on the bill.

Page 286, June 11, 1943: On motion by Mr. RUSSELL and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the order of the Senate limiting debate apply to any motion pertaining to the bill.

Page 323, June 25, 1943: On motion by Mr. Clark of Missouri and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 1 p. m. tomorrow a vote be taken on the amendment proposed by him, the time to be equally divided.

Page 362, July 3, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 1 p. m. on Monday next, the Senate vote on the pending motion.

Page 371, July 5, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

Page 378, July 7, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 12:45 tomorrow the Senate vote on all amendments to the bill and on its final passage.

Page 473, November 5, 1943: On motion by Mr. CONNALLY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the resolution or any amendment.

Page 513, December 3, 1943: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Page 534, December 13, 1943: Mr. Tydings requested unanimous consent that at not later than 4 p. m., Monday next, the Senate vote on the joint resolution and all amendments.

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the provision of rule XII requiring a quorum call be waived. Mr. Tydings' request was then agreed to.

SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, JANUARY 10, 1944

Page 50, February 2, 1944: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that not later than 12 o'clock noon tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendment.

Page 52, February 3, 1944: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning at 2 p. m. tomorrow, and during further consideration of the pending bill, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Page 110, February 11, 1944: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that Mr. La Follette be recognized for debate on the convening of the Senate tomorrow and that upon the conclusion of his address, and during further consideration of the bill, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Page 301, August 10, 1944: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during further consideration of the pending bill, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or any amendment.

Page 460, November 24, 1944: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending amendment, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the amendment or on any amendment thereto.

Page 483, December 5, 1944: On motion by Mr. HILL and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 1 p. m. on tomorrow the Senate vote on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

Page 496, December 12, 1944: On motion by Mr. HILL and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 3 p. m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to vote on pending amendment, debate to be equally divided.

Page 507, December 13, 1944: On motion by Mr. HILL and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate vote on pending amendment, time to be equally divided.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, JANUARY 3, 1945

Page 98, March 6, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending amendment no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes.

Page 147, April 3, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at 12:30 tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote by yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the report.

Page 155, April 9, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill on any amendment thereto.

Page 240, June 6, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 1:15 p. m. on Wednesday next the Senate proceed to vote on all amendments to the pending bill. The time for debate to be equally divided between proponents and opponents.

Page 246, June 8, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending joint resolution no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the joint resolution or any motion or any amendment thereto.

Page 257, June 15, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that beginning with the session of the Senate on Monday next and during the pendency of the committee amendment no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the bill or the amendment.

Page 259, June 18, 1945: On motion by Mr. GEORGE and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow, the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendment, the time for debate to be equally divided.

Page 261, June 19, 1945: On motion by Mr. GEORGE and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill nor more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on any amendment thereto.

Page 292, June 29, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the vote on the motion to close debate be taken immediately following appearance by the President of the United States before the Senate on July 2.

Page 331, July 18, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that immediately after a quorum call upon the convening of the Senate tomorrow, the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the pending amendment.

Page 337, July 20, 1945: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote upon the joint resolution and any amendment proposed thereto.

SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, JANUARY 14, 1946

Page 58, February 7, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the vote on the motion to close debate be taken at 4 p. m. on Saturday next.

Page 186, April 30, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the consideration of the committee of conference * * * be postponed until 2 p. m. and that a vote be taken on the question of agreeing to the report at not later than 4 p. m. today.

Page 205, May 7, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendment and that beginning at 12 tomorrow the time for debate be equally divided.

On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, the unanimous-consent agreement was modified to provide that the time for debate be 1 hour and 45 minutes and that the vote be taken at not later than 2:45.

Page 211, May 9, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 3 p. m. tomorrow the Senate shall proceed to vote without further debate on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto.

Page 251, May 24, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending legislation no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or any amendment thereto.

Page 251, May 24, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the vote on the motion to close debate on the pending measure be postponed until 5 p. m. tomorrow.

Page 251, May 24, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the Senate proceed to vote on the pending amendment without further debate at not later than 1 p. m. tomorrow, the time for debate to be equally divided.

Page 264, May 29, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered that the Senate proceed to vote not later than 5 p. m. today on any proposed amendment striking out section 7 of the bill (settlement of industrial disputes), the time for debate to be equally divided.

Page 264, May 29, 1946: On motion of Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered that following the disposition of the matter involved in section 7 and during the further consideration of the bill, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or any amendment thereto.

Page 298, June 10, 1946: On motion by Mr. LaFollette and by unanimous consent, ordered, that further debate on the bill and all amendments and motions relating thereto be ended at not later than 5 o'clock p. m. today, and that at not later than 3:30 an amendment to be proposed by Mr. BYRD be in order, the time remaining for debate to be controlled and divided.

Page 304, June 12, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or any amendment thereto.

Page 375, June 27, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the conference report, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour.

Page 424, July 11, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending amendment no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the joint resolution or the amendment.

Page 443, July 15, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at not later than 2:45 p. m. today the Senate proceed to vote on the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Page 458, July 19, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that at 1 p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on the pending joint resolution, with the understanding that the Senate shall not proceed to consider other legislation in the interim.

Page 458, July 19, 1946: On motion by Mr. Radcliffe and by unanimous consent, ordered, that the time for debate tomorrow on the pending joint resolution be equally divided between the proponents and opponents.

Page 467, July 20, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that when the Senate concludes its deliberation today it stand in recess until 11 a. m., Monday, and that not later than 3 p. m. that day the Senate proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto, that the time for debate be equally divided.

Page 498, July 26, 1946: On motion by Mr. BARKLEY and by unanimous consent, ordered, that during the further consideration of the pending bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 15 minutes on the said bill or any amendment thereto.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have made these remarks on the unanimous consent problem because of the fact that I objected last night to a unanimous consent request in connection with the pending bill. I wanted, for reference purposes, a full statement of my position on the whole procedural matter involving unanimous consent agreements, and my explanation as to why it is that under such circumstances as existed in the Senate yesterday in connection with the pending bill it is not to be expected that the junior Senator from Oregon will ever give his consent to a unanimous consent agreement.

But I will give unanimous consent on the merits, in each individual instance, when I am satisfied that the Senate has been supplied by the committee reporting the bill with the printed proceedings of the hearings on the bill and a committee report which goes to the merits of the bill and there has been adequate time allowed the minority for debate. I feel that each Senator should have before him at least an official Senate record on the merits or demerits of proposed legislation, which, if he wants to keep faith with his representative obligations to his constituents, he can use to reach a fair and independent judgment as to how he should vote on an issue. But when pains are not taken to supply each Member of the Senate with that kind of material, which is true in regard to the

bill now pending before the Senate, I will never give unanimous consent, because I cannot reach any other conclusion than that to give unanimous consent under such circumstances would mean that I would be participating in what I would consider to be steam-roller strategy on the floor of the Senate to rush a bill through the Senate without adequate consideration.

I will not do that. I made that very clear last night in the little exchange of points of view which I had with the majority leader and other members of the majority party. I wanted the RECORD to show today that the reason was not that the junior Senator from Oregon wanted to delay a vote on the bill. He did not propose to sit here and be a party to what he considered would have amounted to rushing a bill through the Senate without even having before the Senate an official document from the committee dealing with the merits or demerits of the bill. We do not have even the printed hearing proceedings on the bill.

This bill is of tremendous importance to the American people—to all the American people, businessmen as well as consumers. I wish now for a few minutes to turn my attention to the bill itself.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before the Senator does so will he yield for a question or two?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator recall my proposal to the Senate that a commission be established, appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with certain outside members, to make a report with regard to a full and complete revision of the Senate rules?

Mr. MORSE. I may be mistaken in my recollection, but I think the RECORD will show that even on the floor of the Senate I assured the Senator from Connecticut of my wholehearted endorsement of his suggestion. I know that in private conversations in the past, in talking about this subject in general, I have made it clear to the Senator from Connecticut that I completely agree with the approach he is making to this need for an improvement and modernization of the procedures of the United States Senate.

Mr. BENTON. Sixteen Senators joined me in submitting the resolution, and it is my recollection that the distinguished Senator from Oregon was one of them.

Mr. MORSE. I believe so, but I am not sure.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, does the Senator from Oregon have any idea as to how, between us, we might exercise some influence on the Committee on Rules and Administration and its distinguished chairman so that we could get a report from the committee and have action taken on the resolution before we leave the city on Saturday?

Mr. MORSE. I am not very good at influence. However, I shall be very glad to discuss the subject with the Senator off the floor.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, would the Senator agree that one of the subjects which needs examination is the question of the application of television to the sessions of the Senate; and does he recall that I have suggested—and I hasten to say that I would oppose televising all sessions of the Senate—that certain sessions, even running into the evening, covering certain key debates, as in the Australian Parliament, be put on television, in order that the American people might be exposed to such debate and thereby get a better understanding of the great issues which are discussed in this body?

Mr. MORSE. I am aware of the fact that such is the view of the Senator from Connecticut. I have on many occasions publicly stated that I would support televising some of the major debates of the Senate. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to discuss the bill, I shall be very happy to discuss off the floor the problem of reforming the procedures of the Senate.

Mr. President, the McGuire bill is not merely enabling legislation intended to allow the various States to control their own intrastate commerce. States already have and always have had that right. When Congress interferes in purely intrastate matters as it did in the NRA, the United States Supreme Court in the Schechter case unanimously held the NRA unconstitutional, not only because it was an illegal delegation of authority, but also because Congress was legislating on purely intrastate matters. The McGuire bill seriously weakens the Sherman Antitrust Act and all our other procompetition laws. It is proprice fixing. In the broad concurrent zone where the States and Congress may both legislate, the United States Congress should not, even if it can, abdicate its control of interstate commerce. As I have said, all of our antitrust laws are procompetition. The McGuire bill is proprice fixing. It is irreconcilably at war with all our traditional affirmative policy and legislation to preserve competition and free enterprise. The harm to the public of fixed, rigged prices will be very great. Of the total national income of over $250,000,000,000, about $150,000,000,000 represents retail trade. No less than 10 percent, or about $15,000,000,000, is retail trade in branded merchandise which would be directly affected by this bill. The best estimates as shown at the House and Senate hearings indicate that resale-price maintenance would increase prices no less than an average of 12 percent on all branded goods. This would force the consuming public to pay between $1,800,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 a year in higher prices on branded goods if this bill should be enacted.

The press of the country is almost unanimously opposed to this price-fixing bill. The United Press, the Scripps-Howard Press, the Kansas City Star, the New York Herald Tribune, the New York Times, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, the Denver Post, the Richmond (Va.) News-Leader, the Washington (D. C.) Post, and the Washington (D. C.) Daily News, Fortune magazine, and many other periodicals, are all strongly opposed to fair-trade rigged prices as very harmful to the public generally, especially during this period of high inflation. It is conceivable that the entire press of the country is in this instance opposed to the public interest in favoring free and competitive pricing? When retailers face their suppliers, wholesalers, and manufacturers, they want to buy under conditions of competition which is natural and proper. What makes price competition good among manufacturers and wholesalers and harmful among retailers?

My good friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and my good friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] yesterday recalled the depression of 1930 as a reason for favoring this bill. No one expects that kind of a recession or depression within the next 6 months, or even within the next 2 or 3 years. Why then, must we rush this bill through the Senate before the Members of the Senate have even had an opportunity to examine the Senate hearings on the bill? Is it necessary to yield to the pressure and desire for haste which is responsible for this hasty lack of consideration of a bill which may seriously impair the living standards of many of the 155,000,000 consumers? Is there any need for this great rush to push this bill through in the closing days of this session even before the printed hearings have been made available to the Members of the Senate? It is interesting to recall that the Miller-Tydings Act of 1937 was rushed through as a rider to a District of Columbia appropriation bill. President Roosevelt denounced the Miller-Tydings Act at the time although he felt he had to sign the appropriation bill.

In hearings before the Celler committee more than 40 university professors signed or submitted statements in the hearings before the House Judiciary Committee last February 1952. All of these university men in economics, marketing and law, opposed all of the bills in favor of resale price maintenance. The record of the House hearings will show that these included men from the Yale Law School, Harvard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Chicago, Northwestern, Washington University, and all the way to California, where Dean E. T. Grether of the business school at Berkeley, Calif., also filed a statement opposing all forms of fair trade price fixing.

University faculties seem as unanimous as the press is in asking that our antitrust laws not be weakened by destroying competition on the retail level on branded merchandise. Much has been said of cutthroat competition or the "law of the jungle" price cutting. The Celler bill outlawing below-invoice selling and the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] outlawing below-invoice plus 6-percent retail sales is an adequate answer to the loss-lead argument. Under the guise of abolishing the "loss lead," this bill gives us unregulated, uncontrolled, private price fixing, which has been and will be

abused to the detriment of the public. The worst provision in this bill is the so-called nonsigner clause. That is the provision by which a price-maintenance contract between a manufacturer and any one retailer becomes automatically binding on all retailers in the same State who sell the product, regardless of the fact that many are self-service and, therefore, have a lower operating cost which they desire to pass on to the retail level.

As Fortune said in the March 1952 issue:

> To coerce a retailer into a contract he has never seen, let alone sign, is bad law. Giving special protection to a special group is not exactly new in United States history, but that does not alter the fact that it is bad economics.

The article goes on to say that 22 fair-trade lawyers guided the hand of Congressman McGUIRE when this bill was drawn. This is the bill we are asked to rush through without adequate debate and without even an opportunity to examine the Senate hearings, which have not yet been published and which we do not have. Our opinion cannot be any better than our information, and we have no right to substitute mere opinion or a yielding to pressure groups when the facts can and should be had. Possibly retailers, the Fortune article suggests, should be more volume conscious and less high-protected-margin conscious. In a release dated June 2, 1952, from the office of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], six simple but very important questions were asked. Before debate on this bill ends, we should have clear and complete answers to Senator JOHNSON'S important questions, which I here quote in full:

> There are a few elementary questions which should be discussed in this hearing by the proponents and the opponents. They are:
>
> 1. Does price-fixing at the resale level in States having fair-trade laws promote or destroy competition?
>
> 2. Will the interest and the very existence of small retailers in fair-trade States be secured and protected from the unfair competition of the large chain stores by the passage of this legislation?
>
> 3. If the Senate passes H. R. 5767, the McGuire bill, what is the position of the consumer? Is he denied the opportunity of purchasing a "bargain" on any brand name or trade-mark product which otherwise he might enjoy?
>
> 4. Would this bill reverse the action of Congress in creating OPS by enabling the States to set a minimum instead of a Federal ceiling price on brand names or trademark products for resale?
>
> 5. What are the advantages or disadvantages of the loss leaders and how would it affect the sale of trade-mark or brand-name articles?
>
> 6. How much money will this legislation cost the unorganized consumer and how much additional money will it put into the treasury of manufacturers, wholesalers or retailers?
>
> There are many other questions involved which this committee hopes may be cleared up by this hearing.

It may be, Mr. President, that the committee cleared them up, but if it did the evidence was not made available to the Senate. I had hoped that we would have before us the printed hearings of the committee so that we could judge for ourselves whether the committee had cleared up the questions.

These questions should not be ignored. The Senate and the public are entitled to have them answered fully and frankly. Here are a few other simple questions that were asked in the Senate hearings and also in the Celler hearings to which we should have complete answers before we vote on this bill:

First. If a cash-and-carry super store has lower costs, should not the public be permitted to benefit—in lower prices—from all such lower-cost methods of doing business?

Second. In the situation above why should all be required to sell a so-called fair-traded item at the same retail price?

Third. If competition among producers of an item is good for the public, why should competition among retail sellers of that item be denied?

Fourth. Has any pressure group ever campaigned for price-fixing privileges except to make prices higher than they are under free competition?

Fifth. What real and specific evidence is there that truly meritorious articles have ever been driven from the market by price competition?

Sixth. If a merchant wants to locate a store outside the city limits, operate at lower costs, price accordingly, and therefore sell at lower prices because of his lower costs, what good reason is there to deny him that right and forbid the public that benefit, and would not legislation directed toward this end be held invalid by the Supreme Court as an unconstitutional deprivation of property without due process of law?

As I said, by my speech along with that of the Senator from Illinois, I intend primarily to make a record on which the President, I hope, may base a veto message.

I wish now to say a few words in terms of rebuttal, and then I shall send to the desk two amendments to the bill. Before I finish my remarks, I shall present my arguments in support of the amendments, so that I will not take the floor again after I have concluded my speech, but have the amendments called up and voted on. As I have made clear to my colleagues, I do not intend to delay a vote on the bill today.

Point 1: The Humphrey argument that just as the Government sets price supports for agriculture and passes wage and hour acts for labor, so also should it protect the small-business man.

Mr. President, because I do not accept as sound the argument of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, I think these observations in rebuttal should be made, at least for the record.

There are several answers to this point:

(a) In the case of farm price supports and minimum wages, it is the Government which determines what is a reasonable and fair support price or minimum wage. The Government does not, as would be true under resale price maintenance, turn the matter over to the farmers, to let them determine their own support prices, and to the workers to let them determine their own minimum wages. By having the Government set these minima in agriculture and labor the public interest is protected, and the Government is acting in the interest of the public. Congress, in setting farm price supports, considers the interests not only of the farmers themselves, but also of processors, distributors, and—above all—of consumers. In setting minimum wages, it considers not only the interests of the workers, but also the interests of the employer and, again, of the consumer. But under resale price maintenance the establishment of minima is exclusively done by the parties at interest—those who would gain by high prices. There is no mechanism whereby any consideration can be given to the consumers, or to small-business men, of whom there are many, who dislike resale price maintenance.

(b) The mechanics are different in still another respect. If the resale-price maintenance principle was to be applied to agriculture—to use an extreme and a really absurd example, but to illustrate the point, Mr. President—one farmer in each wheat-growing State could enter into a contract with, let us say, General Mills; and the price in that contract would govern the price paid by General Mills to all other farmers for their wheat. General Mills might enter into such a contract with a big, mechanized wheat farm, a factory in the field, and might establish in the contract a low price for wheat—a price which would break the back of the average small farmer. Yet under the resale price maintenance principle, all farmers, large and small, would have to sell to General Mills at that established contract price. In this connection, it must be remembered that the bill before us gives the manufacturer the right to set not merely a minimum price, but a stipulated price, as well.

Mr. President, the word "stipulated" is not so little in its implications, and I shall soon direct one of my amendments to that word.

Hence, in the example I have given, General Mills could set not merely a minimum price, but a stipulated price—and it would be exactly that price which each farmer would be paid by General Mills for his wheat—if we could correctly assume the absurd situation in which that kind of procedure would be applied to agriculture. However, I cite it to illustrate my difference with the Senator from Minnesota in regard to the principle he defended last night.

POINT 2. SENATOR HUMPHREY'S ATTACK ON FTC STATISTICS (P. 8933)

Next, Mr. President, my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, was very critical of some of the Federal Trade Commission's statistics. He may be correct, but I wish to make these observations about his comments. I do not know where the statistics he criticized are to be found.

Would the Senator from Minnesota kindly indicate where the figures of the FTC are to be found? He has criticized the FTC figures as being fallacious. But he gave no citation. I have not had a

chance to check the RECORD to see whether the Senator from Minnesota cited documentation for his criticism.

I have gone over the FTC report on resale price maintenance, and I found no misuse of proper statistical techniques, such as the Senator from Minnesota has described, and which he criticized last night.

All that the FTC did was to compare prices before resale price maintenance and immediately after resale price maintenance. I wish to say that the source of my information is the Federal Trade Commission itself, because I checked with the Commission this morning. After listening to the Commission's explanation, Mr. President, I can see no impropriety in a comparison of prices before resale price maintenance and prices immediately after resale price maintenance.

There is no impropriety in such a comparison. They did not compare the before resale-price maintenance prices with the printed or posted ones, as opposed to the resale-price maintenance prices. They compared the prices before resale-price maintenance with the resale-price maintenance prices themselves. That is what the Commission should have done. Such a comparison should not be based upon some printed bulletin, as an indication of the intent. The comparison should be based upon the actual practice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was the one who originally introduced the comparative material which is to be found on page 8719 of the RECORD for yesterday. I turned back to sources, and quoted the material from Knoxville, Tenn.; Michigan; and New York City.

For the sake of the record, I think it should be stated that the Knoxville study was made by Charles W. Lewis, director of the bureau of business research, University of Tennessee, and was published in his monograph entitled "Price Maintenance in Knoxville, Tenn., Under the Tennessee Fair Trade Act of 1937." The prices which were used for this study were the average advertised prices during those periods in cut-rate chain drug stores. The series was composed of 122 items.

The Michigan series was compiled by Edgar H. Gault, professor of marketing, School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, and was published in his brochure entitled "Fair Trade With Special Reference to Cut-Rate Stores in Michigan." The prices used for the study were taken from newspaper advertisements during the fall of 1937 and the fall of 1938. The series was composed of 160 well-known branded items which the author described as typical during those periods.

The New York series was compiled by Duncan Holthausen, of the staff of Dun & Bradstreet.

So these statistics were arrived at by means of independent students and studies, and were gathered together and presented during the House Judiciary Committee hearings held in connection with that committee's study of monopoly power during February of this year.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois very much for clarifying the record on that point and for making that contribution.

POINT 3. HISTORY OF PRESSURE, (A) TO GET RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE LAWS ORIGINALLY PASSED AND (B) TO GET THE PRESENT BILL ENACTED

I believe that at this point in my remarks I should provide some material on the history of what, for a better term, I shall call pressure to get resale price maintenance laws passed originally and to get this particular bill passed.

With respect to the original resale price maintenance laws, I have taken certain material from the Federal Trade Commission's report on Resale Price Maintenance. I believe it is of interest, and I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Early in the Commission's investigation a letter was written to the secretary of state of each of the 44 States that had enacted resale price maintenance laws, requesting a transcript of testimony at hearings on the 'fair trade' bills. In case it was impossible to furnish a transcript of testimony, they were requested to furnish the names of persons and organizations appearing to testify either for or against the legislation. Each of these officials stated in answer to the first request that, so far as they knew, no record was kept of testimony before any legislative committee. Only four of these officials were able to give any definite information as to whether or not hearings were held. The information as to these four States was as follows:

"In Nebraska the bill was introduced by seven members of the legislature. At the hearings two men favored and two opposed its passage. No information was given as to the interest represented by any one of the four.

"In Massachusetts the proponents at the hearings were representatives of the druggists, liquor dealers, tobacco distributors, and grocers. No opponents were mentioned.

"In Alabama hearings were relatively short. The bill was sponsored primarily by the Retail Druggists Association. Very little opposition developed.

"In Illinois there were no hearings on the bill."

In this connection, there is also a very interesting finding by the Commission concerning the subject of typographical errors, which sheds some light on the rapidity with which these State bills were passed by these State legislatures.

On page 68 of the Commission's report it is stated as follows:

"The California law of 1931, as amended by addition of the nonsigner clause in 1933, became the model followed by a number of other States. Later the National Association of Retail Druggists developed a model law, patterned closely after the California act, but embodying certain corrections and changes in phraseology. This model was enacted by numerous States, with little or no change in the wording of its essential provisions. In the framing of the acts of a few of the States, both the California and the National Association of Retail Druggists models appear to have been considered, with the result that laws differing in phraseology from both, yet containing essentially provisions of both, were enacted.

"How closely the California law was followed by other States is indicated by the fact that a stenographic error in the California law was copied in the laws adopted by 11 States, notwithstanding the fact that, as finally pointed out by a New Jersey court, the error in transcription made the wording of an important section of the law unintelligible."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, some material regarding the history of what I consider to be the pressure movement to get this particular bill passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immediately following the decision of the Supreme Court in the Schwegmann case, the National Association of Retail Druggists took active steps to draft remedial legislation. Originally planned as an amendment to the Miller-Tydings section of the Sherman Act, this legislation was drawn to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act solely for the purpose of bypassing the supposedly unfriendly House Judiciary Committee and placing it in the hands of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. To assure that the legislation would not fall into the hands of the former body, members of the association were directed to barrage Congress with letters requesting that Members vote against any move to re-refer the proposed statute (H. R. 5767) to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Once it was evident that H. R. 5767 would remain with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, another avalanche of letters from members of the National Association of Retail Druggists beseiged members of the committee to hold prompt hearings and to issue a favorable report on the bill. This was done despite the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary had long since announced that fair, thorough, and comprehensive hearings on bills pending before it would be held with dispatch.

After H. R. 5767 was favorably acted upon by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, attention was focused directly upon the Rules Committee, and again members of the association were told to flood the members of the Rules Committee with requests to issue a rule, and friends of members of the Rules Committee were urged to contact these members personally for the same purpose.

Even now, Members of Congress have been alerted for the campaign which must be waged to push the legislation through the House of Representatives and have been told to stand by for the clarion call to overwhelm the Congress with mail urging passage of H. R. 5767.

The accompanying chronological survey of events recorded in the trade press, bulletins and announcements of responsible officials, discloses with utmost candor the facts set forth above and reveals how, in this instance, legislative procedures are being determined not by the Rules of the House but by a vocal group of highly organized retailers who believe that the orderly procedures of Congress can be subverted by outside pressures.

LEGISLATIVE DRAFTING

May 21, 1951:

Decision of Supreme Court in *Schwegmann Bros.* v. *Calvert Corp.* (341 U. S. 384 (1951)).

May 25, 1951, John Dargavel:

"There is only one organization with the experience and the leadership that are needed to direct effective unified activities to amend the Miller-Tydings Act. The NARD led the fight that resulted in the Miller-Tydings Act. * * * Right now attorneys of exceptional capabilities are busy on the determination of the phraseology of the amendment. * * * The NARD is also at work on the details of the plan of action for the organized activities to bring about the enactment of the nonsigner amendment" (NARD Journal, June 4, 1951, pp. 814, 823).

June 18, 1951, NARD Journal:

"Draft legislation for introduction in Congress, amending the Miller-Tydings Act so that it will cover the nonsigner clause in interstate commerce, has been developed by Herman Wallier, legal counsel to the NARD and a veteran fighter for fair trade" (p. 962).

INTRODUCTION AND REFERRAL

October 29, 1951, Drug Trade News:

"Fair-trade supporters representing many industries have stamped their official O. K. on a Congressional bill (H. R. 5767) introduced by Representative JOHN A. MCGUIRE (Democrat, Connecticut) that would validate the nonsigner clauses of State fair-trade laws through an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act rather than the Miller-Tydings Act as had been originally planned.

"The last-minute change in policy on the bill is viewed as an attempt to insure early action on fair-trade legislation. By amending the FTC Act instead of the Miller-Tydings Act, the bill is diverted from the hostile House Judiciary Committee to the friendlier House Interstate Commerce Committee, headed by Representative ROBERT CROSSER (Democrat, Ohio), who promises early action on it when Congress reconvenes" (p. 1).

November 1951: American Druggist:

"By use of legislative strategy, the bill was kept away from the House Judiciary Committee which is regarded as being hostile to fair trade. Representative CELLER, Democrat of New York, who is chairman of the Judiciary Committee, is one of the leading opponents of fair trade on Capitol Hill, and it was anticipated that he would do everything in his power to bottle up new fair-trade legislation.

"To keep it away from the Judiciary Committee, the bill was written as an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act rather than the Sherman Antitrust law. The House Interstate Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over legislation dealing with the Federal Trade Commission while the Judiciary Committee handles amendments to the Antitrust act" (p. 73).

PREVENTION OF TRANSFER

January 14, 1952, Drug Topics:

"At press time, a spokesman for the Interstate Commerce Committee, told Drug Topics that Mr. CELLER and Chairman ROBERT CROSSER of Interstate Commerce plan to meet early this term to decide which committee will handle the McGuire bill.

"He said various members of the committee feel the bill is an 'encroachment' on the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee since it would directly amend the FTC Act, rather than the Sherman Act, as a means of setting aside the recent Supreme Court Schwegmann decision which outlawed the nonsigner clauses of State fair-trade laws in interstate commerce" (p. 24).

February 4, 1952, John Dargavel:

"I have just received a report from Washington that hearings on H. R. 5767 (the NARD fair-trade bill) have been scheduled to open on February 4. It is good news indeed. It tells us that we won the fight to prevent the transfer of the bill from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Judiciary Committee of the House and also that the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce responded to the wishes of the druggists in particular and the retailers in general everywhere in the United States.

"You members gave us magnificient cooperation. Your responses to the appeal I sent out for action on January 9 amounted to an avalanche of letters and telegrams" (NARD Journal, p. 183).

February 4, 1952, Drug Trade News:

"Mr. CELLER has abandoned efforts to have jurisdiction over the McGuire bill transferred to his committee. He has let it be known that he is 'not interested in the McGuire bill,' which will remain with the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee" (p. 1).

"This decision of Mr. CELLER's can be characterized as a victory for the National Association of Retail Druggists, since druggists from all over the Nation have been deluging Members of the House with telegrams and letters demanding their support for keeping the McGuire bill in the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committe" (p. 33).

HEARINGS

January 7, 1952, NARD Journal:

"The next action on the bill will be to have it scheduled for a hearing before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the members are ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio; LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas; J. PERCY PRIEST, of Tennessee; OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas; DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida; ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York; THOMAS B. STANLEY, of Virginia; WILLIAM T. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania; JOHN A. MCGUIRE, of Connecticut; F. ETHEL CARLYLE, of North Carolina; JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi; PETER F. MACK, JR., of Illinois; HOMER THORNBERRY, of Texas; LOUIS B. HELLER, of New York; KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama; MORGAN M. MOULDER, of Missouri; HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of West Virginia; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; CARL HINSHAW, of California; LEONARD W. HALL, of New York; JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota; ROBERT HALE, of Maine; JAMES I. DOLLIVER, of Iowa; JOHN W. HESELTON, of Massachusetts; HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., of Pennsylvania; JOHN B. BENNETT, of Michigan; RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, of Illinois; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado; JOHN V. BEAMER, of Indiana; and HARMAR D. DENNY, JR., of Pennsylvania.

"It is urgent that the druggists in the respective districts of the above-listed members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce request a hearing on H. R. 5767 early in 1952" (p. 12).

February 18, 1952, Drug Trade News:

"The decision of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to hold hearings came suddenly after earlier indications that it would not hold hearings until a later date. Originally, the committee scheduled a 1-day hearing for February 4 to hear Maurice Mermey, director of the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, but NARD built pressure, plus the insistence of Mr. MCGUIRE on immediate action, resulted in the decision to continue the hearings under the Priest subcommittee.

"In persuading the committee to hold immediate hearings, fair-trade proponents felt that they had 'put one over' on Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, who previously (January 18, 1951) had announced public hearings on several fair-trade bills before his committee, beginning February 13" (p. 18).

FAVORABLE REPORT

February 4, 1951, John Dargavel:

"More letters on H. R. 5767 urgent.

* * * * *

"Our next move centers on the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Accordingly, I call on you druggists to write to them that it is vital to the system of small business to issue a favorable report on H. R. 5767. The legislative procedures are such that a favorable report is essential to prevent serious obstacles to enactment of H. R. 5767.

"The members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are * * *.

"You druggists located in the respective districts of the above-listed Representatives can be of particular assistance right now. You are their constituents and they will give special attention to letters they receive from you. Hence, today, write to them that you expect a favorable report on H. R. 5767. The stake is great and failure to write to them might help to sound the death knell for fair trade" (p. 183).

February 25, 1952, Drug Topics:

"One of the significant developments in the fair-trade struggle is the apparent power of the NARD in Congress. Congressmen from all over the country have been swamped with telegrams and letters demanding action on the McGuire bill" (p. 63).

March 3, 1952, Drug Trade News:

"Much of the opposition which developed in the Interstate Commerce Committee to hasty action on H. R. 5767 was brushed aside by Representative MCGUIRE in his efforts to get a fast, favorable report on his bill.

"It was reported that Representative ROBERT CROSSER, committee chairman, and Representative J. PERCY PRIEST, chairman of the seven-member subcommittee on fair trade, urged a go-slow policy to see what Representative CELLER and his monopoly subcommittee would do.

"However, Mr. MCGUIRE, assisted in large part by a flood of letters and telegrams from retail druggists to their Congressmen, was able to whip his bill through the subcommittee and force the full committee to schedule the executive meeting on February 27.

"As reported by the subcommittee H. R. 5767 would amend section 5a of the Federal Trade Commission Act" (p. 23).

RULES COMMITTEE

February 28, 1952, special NARD bulletin:

"We urge all of you in the States and districts which the members of the House Rules Committee represent to do everything possible to create a flood of telegrams and letters to these Congressmen. The Rules Committee can break or make H. R. 5767. If a rule is not granted, the bill never will come up on the floor of the House. So you can see that this is one of the most important efforts we have to make. We urge your complete and wholehearted cooperation in getting telegrams and letters in to the members of the House Rules Committee.

"Those of you who happen to know a member of the Rules Committee personally should call him long distance to urge him to do all he can to have a rule for H. R. 5767 granted at an early date. We must work fast because the Rules Committee will be asked for a rule within the next few days."

March 3, 1952, NARD Journal:

"I now call for more help from you druggists.

"(1) Time is a serious factor in the fight to bring about the enactment of H. R. 5767. The bill must be granted special consideration—a rule—from the Rules Committee or it will be buried toward the bottom of the calendar in the House—and there it will repose untouched through the months left of the life of the Eighty-second Congress. Many of you druggists are constituents of the members of the Rules Committee—they are listed on page 338 of this issue of the NARD Journal. It is vital to the cause of fair trade that you wire or write them at once to support special consideration—a rule—for H. R. 5767. You may know well or be among the intimate friends of a Congressman on the Rules Committee. Then please telephone him right away. The fate of the bill hangs in a balance. Failure to procure the necessary responses from you druggists in the States of Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, New York, Ohio, Ore-

gon, Texas, Virginia, and Washington, will spell death for H. R. 5767. I am confident you will come through with a flood of telegrams and letters to the members of the Rules Committee" (p. 335).

FINAL PASSAGE

February 18, 1952, NARD Journal:

"Then in that event the next move will center on your and every Representative in Congress. You will be called on at the proper time to help flood the House with letters and telegrams in support of H. R. 5767. I know you will respond as you did in January to block the scheme to have the bill transferred to the Judiciary Committee of the House" (p. 251).

February 25, 1952, Drug Topics:

"STILLWATER, OKLA.—A 'push-button' plan of action to spur passage of the McGuire fair-trade bill has been organized in Oklahoma, Elbert R. (Pete) Weaver, secretary of the Oklahoma Pharmaceutical Association told Drug Topics.

"According to this plan, 150 druggists from over the State have been appointed to serve as members of a contact committee. Through this committee, druggists in every town in the State can be alerted within a few hours when the time comes to give Congressmen an extra nudge in order to get the fair-trade bill through.

"The plan was put into effect recently when Oklahoma druggists sent 178 telegrams over the State, opposing a motion to refer the McGuire bill to the House Judiciary Committee.

"The wires went to 178 keymen in the pharmaceutical association and secretaries of other trade associations, who followed up with a similar barrage of telegrams to their membership. * * *

"This year, we are going to pass a new fair-trade law. When the order comes for more messages to Congressmen, we are going to contact our contact men, and we know they will act quickly" (p. 40).

March 3, 1952, NARD Journal:

"Once H. R. 5767 is granted special consideration (a rule) the bill will in a short time be sent to the floor of the House. Accordingly, it is also important to contact every Congressman. It must be done with speed. They should be urged to take stand in support of H. R. 5767" (p. 335).

POINT 4. COERCION TO IMPOSE RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the history of resale price maintenance is, in my judgment, a history of pressure by retailers and sometimes by manufacturers to impose resale price maintenance on those who wish to sell for less. Sometimes the pressure is applied by manufacturers against retailers who do not wish to sell at resale price maintenance prices, and sometimes it is applied by retailers against manufacturers who do not wish to observe resale price maintenance in the case of their products.

The manner in which manufacturers who do not wish to engage in resale price maintenance in the case of their products have been coerced is illustrated by the case of Pepsodent. The method by which the manufacturer of that product was persuaded to return to the fold of resale price maintenance was eloquently described by the executive secretary of the Northern California Retail Druggists Association, at the Thirty-seventh Annual Convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists, in September 1935.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have that statement printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Mr. Chairman, fellow druggists, the Pepsodent Co. was operating in the State of California under the California Fair Trade Act. In all the time that they were operating under the Fair Trade Act they made no attempt to enforce their contract and like a bolt of lightning from the blue sky, they informed us that the California fair-trade contract was canceled, and the general sales manager, Mr. Kermott, came out to California, called upon me in the California office to make excuses and he had with him one of the California salesmen. I expressed my heartfelt sympathy to the two young men who were in my office because I told them they would have the toughest time any salesmen had had in any territory. We passed a resolution at our meeting and we published that resolution in our journal, and we sent that resolution to every member in California in which we urged and advised them to discontinue the sale of any product that had canceled their fair-trade contract. Brothers, it was a slap in the face of our Fair Trade Act. It makes no difference what firm it was. It was unwarranted. It was the first cancellation. And to my great delight and the great delight of our executive committee all the druggists in California refused to sell Pepsodent toothpaste or Pepsodent products. They put them in the basement. Some were enthusiastic enough to throw them into the ashcan. I wouldn't bring this out except that I want you to really understand how the sales of Pepsodent products in all of California dropped off." [1]

The lesson taught by the druggists to the Pepsodent Co. were readily employed to convince other producers that adoption of resale price maintenance agreements with retailers would be to their decided advantage. Said one manufacturer with regard to the compelling reasons prompting him to adopt said resale price maintenance on his products:

"The retail outlets, particularly the independent retail druggists, through their State associations and many of them individually, pressed us to establish minimum retail prices for our products from the time the respective States enacted so-called fair-trade laws. Pressure similarly was put on us by drug wholesalers and their associations." [2]

Reported another maker of articles sold through retail drug outlets:

"The retail price maintenance contracts we have made were made and any wholesale 'price maintenance contracts, agreements, or arrangements,' if any, which we may make in the future will be to enable us to get wholesalers' and retailers' cooperation and to cause wholesalers and retailers to discontinue discriminating against us in favor of our competitors who have either voluntarily or at the insistence of wholesalers and retailers, already entered into resale price maintenance contracts, agreements, or arrangements." [3]

John Dargavel, executive secretary of the NARD, writing to the sales company of a manufacturer of toilet preparations on February 10, 1936, in an effort to influence its selling policies, referred in a veiled manner "to the Pepsodent Co. and some others in regard to what concerted action by the druggists of this country did to their volume" and threatened that "if we start a campaign through our journal, carrying it through the officers of each State and local association in this country, you are going to find that it will cause you more trouble and take away more business from you than you had ever realized." [4]

Dr. Corwin Edwards, then economic consultant to the Department of Justice, summed up many of the boycotting activities which had at that time occurred under resale price maintenance legislation in a special memorandum written to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division on February 10, 1941.[5] Stated Edwards:

"Meanwhile, every effort was made to throttle public discussion and to intimidate business opposition. In California an aspirin manufacturer was forced by boycott to issue resale-price contracts against his will. The druggists' intention to coerce was indicated in the following language: 'This aspirin is a sort of Napoleon in the patent-medicine army, but then even the great Frenchman met his Waterloo when the rest of Europe got together, decided that they had enough of him, and cooperated against him.' In the same State the manufacturers of Pepsodent toothpaste, who had experimented with resale price contracts under the California law, decided to withdraw these contracts, apparently under advice of counsel who believed that the contracts violated the antitrust laws. Thereupon the druggists organized a campaign to put Pepsodent under the counter and to switch customers to other brands. This campaign was so effective that the offending company made public apology at a subsequent convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists and, as a token of its contrition, subscribed $25,000 to a fund to lobby for resale price maintenance in other States. On one occasion an expression of opposition to resale price maintenance by the New York Times and the New York World-Telegram led to an effort by organized druggists to demoralize the dealers who distributed these papers, by selling them at less than 3 cents. On another occasion Harper's magazine carried an article against resale price maintenance and thereupon received a letter from a druggists' association in a midwestern city, demanding information as to whether Harper's endorsed the views expressed in the article and indicating that if these views were not repudiated they intended to sell Harper's at a substantial discount, presumably in an effort to create trouble among its distributors. Within the last 2 months the newspaper PM in New York has carried a series of articles against resale price maintenance, and the same tactics of intimidation have been attempted by the sale of PM at less than its customary price. The editors, having more sense of humor than some of the other victims of this policy, ran a photograph of a cut-rate advertisement in a store and gave it the caption 'The best bargain in the city'." [6]

The case of the Luce magazines is even more flagrant. Claiming that Time and Fortune had proven, through their editorial policies, to be enemies of fair trade, the NARD Journal, in a recent message from its executive secretary, proclaimed in banner headlines: "Luce magazines your enemies!"

[1] Cited in Federal Trade Commission Report on Resale Price Maintenance (1945), p. 143.

[2] Id., p. 167.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Id. p. 166.

[5] TNEC, Final Report and Recommendations, 77th Cong., 1st sess. (1941), exhibit No. 2793, p. 233.

[6] Cf. Business Week, March 3, 1952: "Fair-trade war * * * has been declared by druggists on St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Paper's anti-fair-trade cartoon started it. Fair-trading druggists in St. Louis are cutting prices—on the Post-Dispatch, a leading anti-trade newspaper * * *. Suddenly, placards appeared in drugstore windows all over St. Louis, announcing that the Post could be had for 4 cents daily and 13 cents on Sunday (it normally sells for 5 cents daily, 15 cents on Sunday)."

Thereupon denouncing these publications for various activities, the NARD sounded the following clarion call for manufacturers and retailers to boycott:

"How long do you druggists intend to continue to serve as peddlers of periodicals you know to be subversive to your individual and collective welfare and also to the consumers? How long will it be before manufacturers in the drug field cease to go along with magazines out to bring destruction to fair trade?"

Boycotting activities have by no means been confined to the National Association of Retail Druggists. The following invitation to boycott recently appeared in a leaflet published by a prominent wholesaler of drug products and distributed to retailers under the heading: "What should believers in fair-trade laws do now?

"Retailers should refuse to patronize wholesalers or other suppliers who are not in sympathy with the fair-trade laws. (An example would be a wholesaler who refused to sign a manufacturer's wholesale fair-trade contract and then offers you a cut price or greater discount than allowed under the fair-trade contract.) If you patronized such a wholesaler you would be an enemy of fair trade."

Manufacturers have not been the only victims of collective action on the part of retailers in seeking to obtain fair trade by coercion. Drug Topics, a trade publication in the drug field, pointed out in an editorial in its July 30, 1951, issue how boycotting of recalcitrant retailers would be "helpful action" in preserving fair-trade prices. Said this journal:

"If all wholesalers, acting in their individual capacities, would refuse to sell outlets which did not maintain fair-trade prices, the outlook would become much more promising. * * *

"Once a price violator is denied goods, or is cut off for his refusal to comply with the invoice notice, he is likely to reshape h's selling operations so as to comply with fair-trade principles" (p. 38).

How secretaries of State and local associations of druggists could assist in maintaining prices by "persuading" retailers to refrain from cutting prices on fair-traded articles was described in the NARD Journal of July 2, 1951:

"The secretaries of state and also the local associations of druggists can do much to help prevent extension of price wars," it advised.

"Many owners of drug stores have been persuaded to refrain from copycat slashes of fair-trade minimums a la Macy's Department Store in New York City. One of them was induced to be sensible after he had made a kick-off through the newspapers of the community" (p. 1032).

As Mr. Morison, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, explained to the committee when his attention was called to this action, "It indicates the beginning of a violation of the Sherman Act."

Efforts to restrain the pricing policies of competing retail outlets received the personal endorsement of John Dargavel, executive secretary of the NARD, in his message printed in the NARD Journal of April 18, 1949. Describing a fringe of druggists who were cutting prices as "wreckers of fair trade," Dargavel informed readers that "Violations stimulate agitation against the system of stabilized prices and out of it may come a Nation-wide movement of consumers to bring about the end of fair trade." Worried lest this disaster occur, he proclaimed openly that "The chiselers and cheaters among the druggists must be made to see the light" (p. 589).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what about the effect of fair trade on prices?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is it not important to get the wording and our semantics correct? Instead of saying "fair trade" should we not say "resale price maintenance laws"?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Illinois is completely right. I have been using this misnomer, "fair trade," because it has come to have this special meaning on the floor of the Senate. The definition of the subject matter which we have under debate is exactly as the Senator from Illinois states it.

POINT 5. THE EFFECT OF RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE LAWS ON PRICES

Numerous studies have shown that prices in States which have resale price maintenance laws are substantially higher than prices on the same items in adjoining States that do not have such laws. To the same effect studies have shown that following the imposition of resale price maintenance laws prices have risen. The evidence of this question is summarized by the Celler committee report.

I ask unanimous consent to have the summary printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resale price maintenance has often guaranteed equally high returns for wholesalers and retailers. On insulin, for example, "The price set by Eli Lilly & Co. * * * guarantees the retailer a 50 percent gross profit on cost and 25 percent profit on cost to the wholesaler," Samuel Rosenthal, owner of retail drug outlets in the District of Columbia, told the House committee. A hasty glance at the advertisements appearing in any random issue of a trade publication such as the American Druggist reveals retail profits on fair-trade items such as the following: "Dolcin, 44.3 percent profit; Argyrol, up to 57½ percent profit; Kessling fever thermometers, 45 percent profit; Wyanoids, up to 50 percent profit; Ampho-Jel, up to 53.4 percent profit; Dichloricide moth crystals, up to 42 percent profit; Breck, 40 percent profit; McKesson & Robbins: 'You get an average of 50 percent profit.'"

How high fair-trade profit margins adversely affect the consumer is illustrated by a study of 208 major items in which selling prices in the 45 fair-trade States is compared to prices at which such commodities can be purchased in the non-fair-trading areas of Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. The composite selling price for all of these products in fair-trade States totaled $945.10 compared to only $740.86 in the non-fair-trade jurisdictions. Profits for the retailer in fair-trade States was 38.5 percent while in non-fair-trade areas it was only 21.5 percent, a saving to the consumer in non-fair-trade locations of 17 percent.

A survey appearing in the St. Louis Star-Times on April 19, 1951, also discloses how consumers pay more for liquor products which are sold under resale price maintenance agreements in the State of Illinois than they do across the border in non-fair-trade Missouri. Prices for 35 different fifths of nationally advertised liquors cost only 139.67 in St. Louis while consumers paid $22.25 more, or $161.92, in Illinois, a difference of 15.9 percent.

Mr. MORSE. A recent price comparison shopping tour for 10 items of ordinary consumption purchased in drug stores cost a total of $8.23 in Virginia and $8.80 in Maryland under resale price maintenance laws and only $7.05 in the District of Columbia without such a law, savings of 17 and 25 percent, respectively.

Similarly, the subsequent table comparing prices of important products sold on a resale price maintenance basis in drug stores in 45 States with prices for the same items presently prevailing in the District of Columbia is another graphic illustration of why the consumer is heavily penalized by resale price maintenance legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Fair-trade price	District of Columbia price
Aspirin:		
100 Bayer	$0.89	$0.46
100 Squibb	.54	.47
100 St. Joseph	.49	.43
100 APC Co	.39	
Toothpaste:		
Colgate	.47	.33
Ipana	.47	.33
Pepsodent	.47	.39
Phillips	.39	.27
Squibb	.47	.39
Lyons	.47	.33
Ammident	.53	.47
Chlorodent	.69	.53
Afco	.47	.39
Pebammo	.49	.39
Shaving cream:		
Colgate	.53	.47
Barbasol	.39	.33
Palmolive	.53	.41
Burmashave	.40	.33
Molle	.43	.37
Noxzema	.59	.47
Mennen	.53	.43
Gillette	.43	.37
Williams	.47	.37
Hair tonics:		
Wildroot	.48	.43
Kreml	.57	.43
Vitalis	.49	.33
Vaseline	.47	.39
Jeris	.49	.39
Lucky Tiger	.48	.39
Liquid shampoo:		
Admiration	.49	.43
Breck	.60	.53
Wonder	.48	
Drene	.57	.47
Kreml	.59	.47
Laco	.43	.39
Conte Castille	.49	.33
Packers	.48	.43
Watkins Coconut	.48	.39
Richard Hudnut	1.00	.79
Wildroot	.48	.44
Woodbury's	.43	.29
Halo	.57	.43
Fitch	.59	.47
Deodorants:		
Veto	.59	.53
Arid	.63	.47
Fresh	.59	.43
Sanite	.39	.38
Chad	.43	.39
Coty	1.00	
Hush	.49	.43
Mum	.59	.39
Odorono	.48	.37
Barz	.39	.33
Five-day pads	.59	.47
Ydoro	.59	.43
Zipp	.59	.47
Stoppette	.69	.47
Dyrad	.49	.37
Mennens	.59	.41
Amolin	.59	.47
Heed	.59	.47
Hand lotions:		
Hinds	.49	.39
Italian Balm	.45	.37
Cashmere Bouquet	.43	.37
Frostilla	.47	.43
Jergens Lotion	.49	.31
Tushay	.49	.33
Pacquin	.49	.39

Source: Standard Drug Co., Washington, D. C.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the effect of resale price maintenance in fos-

tering violations of antitrust laws is one of the major reasons for my intention to vote against the bill. As one who has at least dealt with and studied to a considerable extent the whole problem of antitrust violations in this country, and who is convinced that we are rapidly moving in the direction of monopolistic control of large segments of American economic life, I think we ought to stop, look, and listen before we, here and now, vote for a bill which, in my judgment, will weaken the antitrust laws of the country. I believe the position taken by the United States Department of Justice in testimony by their witnesses on the House side, and in public pronouncements which have been made in opposition to this bill, deserves the very careful consideration of the Members of this body. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks the materials which I wish to offer in opposition to this bill—a bill which, in my opinion, will weaken the antitrust laws and the administration of the antitrust laws.

There being no objection, the materials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 6. RESALE PRICE MAINTENANCE FOSTERS VIOLATIONS OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS

While section (f) of H. R. 6925 purports to prohibit horizontal agreements among retailers, among wholesalers, or among manufacturers under the act, this language is at best a piece of wishful thinking. By making resale price maintenance agreements applicable to nonsigners, there is no meaning whatever to this bit of legislative double talk. The Federal Trade Commission pointed out very clearly to the committee the effect which resale price maintenance would have upon the time-honored principle of antitrust policy condemning horizontal price-fixing agreements among competitors. Said the Commission:

"Moreover, when the nonsigner clause is added to resale price maintenance, the effect is the de facto nullification of our Federal laws against horizontal conspiracy, notwithstanding the fact that the proposed legislation expressly prohibits horizontal price fixing. Nothing is more clearly established in Federal policy than the principle that horizontal price fixing shall not be tolerated. The proposed legislation pays lip service to that principle, yet its effect would be that a minimum price fixed by contract with one retail distributor would become the minimum price for all other retail distributors of the manufacturer's product who were placed upon notice of the existence of the contract. The rigidity and uniformity of the price would be exactly that of the most rigid horizontal price-fixing conspiracy; the level of the price would be likely to be at least as high as in a horizontal conspiracy; and the public control over the reasonableness of the arrangement would be as nonexistent as in the case of a horizontal conspiracy." [1]

It is clear that insofar as economic effect is concerned, there exists no difference between a horizontal price-fixing arrangement among competing retailers on the one hand, and a price agreement between one manufacturer and one retailer which is in turn binding on all competing retailers on the other. As a practical matter, expediency would dictate that conspiring retailers should hereafter achieve their illegal objectives through the now legalized device of having a manufacturer enter into a resale price maintenance agreement with a single retailer which would henceforth apply to the sales of all competitors. In this context, the prohibition against horizontal price conspiracy now becomes meaningless.

That this law will encourage violations of the antitrust laws on a wholesale basis is not just idle speculation on our part. Past experience under the Miller-Tydings law yields abundant evidence of resale price maintenance legislation serving as a cloak to conceal price fixing and other undesirable activities in restraint of trade.

In 1942, the Colorado Wholesale Wine and Liquor Dealers Association was indicted by the Department of Justice under section 1 of the Sherman Act for engaging in a conspiracy to fix retail prices of liquor sold in the State of Colorado. Retail prices, it was charged, were agreed upon, out of State producers were persuaded to enter into fair-trade contracts embodying agreed-upon prices, and wholesalers and producers refusing to comply were boycotted. Pleas of nolo contendere were filed by the defendants and fines were imposed.

Similarly, the National Association of Retail Druggists, today the loudest advocate of fair-trade legislation, was fined in 1947 on a plea of nolo contendere to an indictment charging them with having engaged in a conspiracy to fix the retail and wholesale prices of drug items, to eliminate price competition among retail druggists, and to restrain competition. This conspiracy was perpetrated despite the existence of a consent decree filed in 1907 perpetually enjoining the association from engaging in such activities as boycotts, etc. Methods employed by the NARD to achieve its illegal objectives were summarized for the committee by the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, as follows:

"They threatened to refuse to handle, or to boycott, or to urge their customers and prescribing physicians to accept substitutes for drug-store items, where margins of profits had not been approved, and refused to carry in stock, boycotted, and urged their customers to accept substitutes for such drug-store items; agreed to sell drug-store items whose retail prices had been established by producers at prices not below those so established and sold said drug-store items at prices not below those so established; persuaded, induced, and compelled producers of drug-store items to establish wholesale prices in relation to the retail prices demanded by defendants; threatened producers with lack of cooperation in the sale of drug-store items on which the wholesale prices were not established at levels bearing the relation to retail prices demanded by defendants and refused to cooperate in the sale of such drug-store items." [2]

The National Wholesale Druggists' Association was also indicted under the Sherman Act for conspiring to raise, fix, and stabilize wholesale selling prices of drug items. Alleged devices utilized to further the objectives of the conspiracy included lack of cooperation with recalcitrant manufacturers, boycotts, and refusals to sell from or carry in stock. Again, nolo contendere pleas were filed and fines levied.

In the *United States* v. *New York State Pharmaceutical Association*, the National Association of Retail Druggists was again indicted, this time in conjunction with the New York State Pharmaceutical Association and others, for fixing, stabilizing, and maintaining the retail and wholesale prices of drug-store items through the adoption of uniform prices and methods of sale, interchange of information, boycotts, and blacklists. Pleas of nolo contendere and fines also ended this litigation.

Proceedings involving the abuse of resale price maintenance legislation are extensive. The Department of Justice has brought cases of a similar nature against the Tri-State Record Dealers Association, the Record Dealers Association, and has currently pending cases against the Allegheny County Retail Druggists' Association and the Sunbeam Corp. Proceedings instituted by the Federal Trade Commission where resale price maintenance was an important factor include docket No. 4526, Law Book Publishers Co.; docket No. 4900, refractories case; docket No. 5448, rubber manufacturers group; docket No. 5734, Mid-Atlantic Distributors Corp. (which just recently has been appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit); docket No. 5635, cycle jobbers; docket No. 5636, American Dental Association; docket No. 4093, Wholesale Liquor Distributors Association of northern California, et al.; docket No. 4132, Western Confectioners Association; docket No. 4168, National Retail Liquor Package Stores Association.

The success of the antitrust agencies in the above ligitation belies the serious competitive problems raised by the exemption of resale price maintenance programs from the antitrust laws. The Department of Justice was quoted in 1945 as having said that "if its Antitrust Division had sufficient men and money to examine every resale price maintenance contract written under State and Federal legislation, and to proceed in every case in which the arrangement goes beyond the authorization of the Tydings-Miller amendment, there would be practically no resale price maintenance contracts."

The Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, Mr. Morison, confirmed this view as of the present by averring that from the experience of the Antitrust Division the vast majority of resale price maintenance contracts, if examined fully, would be found in violation of the antitrust laws. A study of how resale price maintenance has operated in practice goes far to reinforce Mr. Morison's conclusion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for further material by way of rebuttal to the argument of my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], in regard to the matter of analogy between support prices and this bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement of Matt Triggs, assistant legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, relative to House bill 5767, on June 4, 1952.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The opportunity of expressing the viewpoints of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to H. R. 5767 is appreciated.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is an organization of 1,452,210 farm families located in 47 States and Puerto Rico.

The American Farm Bureau Federation opposed the enactment of the original Miller-Tydings Act and since then has periodically reiterated its opposition to resale price maintenance legislation.

At the most recent annual meeting of the federation at Chicago in December 1951, the following resolution on this issue was developed by the house of delegates:

"So-called fair-trade pricing legislation is inconsistent with the maintenance of the principles of a free competitive economy. Flexible and freely moving prices are an important element of these principles. We oppose legislative efforts to require nonsigners of fair-trade contracts to comply with their provisions. We favor legislation to eliminate fair-trade pricing provisions of law."

[1] Hearings, February 14, 1952.

[2] Hearings, February 13, 1952.

Our basic objection to price-maintenance legislation is our belief that flexibility of prices achieved by the interaction of supply-and-demand factors in a free market is a fundamental feature of a free competitive enterprise system.

The distinguishing feature of American private enterprise system, as compared with other economic systems, is our belief in the principle of competition. We are one of the few nations which has established competition as an economic ideal by legislation prohibiting practices or conspiracies to interfere with competition. This is an all-important element contributing to the vitality and dynamic growth of our society. It is the heart of our capitalistic system. Legislation which would restrict competition in the field of distribution is inconsistent with the most successful operation of the competitive enterprise society.

Many other private enterprise economies do not have this concept. Much of the effort of their business and governmental leadership is in the direction of the establishment of Government-industry agreements, the development of cartel arrangements, the enactment of programs to mitigate the effects of competition, the furthering of measures to protect individuals in this category or that from competitive pressures with their supposed harmful effects. By such devices they tend in the direction of providing an umbrella for the inefficient and of reducing the pressures and the incentives for increased efficiency which is so vital a part of the American economic pattern. The intermixture of public and private endeavors to regulate competition and fix prices has in many other countries been the forerunner of planned economy or socialism.

It is a basic defense of the profit system that competition compels the passing on to the consumer of any savings which may be made by efficient distribution. The enactment of H. R. 5767 would, in some measure, destroy this fundamental defense of private enterprise and serve as an argument for similar ventures in the regulation of competition in other fields.

We are opposed to all forms of price fixing, but the nonsigner provision incorporated in H. R. 5767 is, in our opinion, a particularly undesirable form of price fixing. One distributor, by contracting with a manufacturer, may establish marketing margins with which every other distributor must comply. It is contrary to our concept of contractual relationships to require people to comply with contracts to which they are not a party and with respect to the terms of which they have had no voice.

Any retailer who is able to serve the public more efficiently than other retailers, whether due to managerial ability, volume, location, or for any other reason, should be encouraged, not prevented, to reflect such reduced costs of operations in his prices and by such means keep competition alive and active.

A consumer who is willing to shop in less exclusive stores or who is willing to accept less service (credit, delivery, or other service) than is available elsewhere should have the opportnuity to participate in the savings thus made.

It appears that most of the support for fair-trade legislation comes from the belief that it is helpful to small individual retail stores. We believe this is fallacious. If margins are held unduly high on some articles by fair-trade practices, this only increases the ability of low-cost retailers to compete more aggressively in pricing other articles, or providing better service, or to be more effective in merchandising display and advertising, or to provide better trade-in valuations.

On the contrary, so-called fair trading will be harmful to many small retailers. Many small concerns are insufficiently capitalized. They must have their stores in less desirable locations. They must do with less expensive fixtures and furnishings. They are unable to provide the credit, delivery, and other services that larger stores furnish. To bring customers to their shops, they must be permitted to compete on a price basis.

Furthermore, the existence of fair-trade programs with their guaranteed margins induces many competing retailers to carry such items who would not otherwise do so. An outstanding example of this is the extent to which grocery stores have undertaken the distribution of many fair-trade articles.

We know of no convincing evidence to indicate that those retail trades which have generally resorted to fair-trade price practices have been more profitable than those retail trades which have not, nor do we know of any evidence that retail trade has been made profitable in those States having resale price maintenance legislation than in those States which do not.

Resale price maintenance provisions of law provide a framework which may be used to implement undertakings and agreements contrary to the letter and spirit of antitrust legislation, and beyond the limitations contemplated by Congress. The United States Department of Justice has concluded, as a result of its experience with "fair trade" legislation, that "the Tydings-Miller Act does not serve the purposes which were urged upon Congress as a reason for its passage in that it sanctions arrangements inconsistent with the purpose of the antitrust laws, and becomes a cloak for many conspiracies in restraint of trade, which go far beyond the limits established in the amendment." The legislation would provide a mechanism for organized retail groups to bring concerted pressure upon manufacturers and wholesalers, in many instances supplemented by economic reprisal, to force such manufacturers to undertake a "fair trade" pricing program.

It may, perhaps, be demonstrated that price cutting is a practice that is occasionally harmful to other retailers, or to manufacturers, but H. R. 5767 does not endeavor to discriminate between loss-leader types of sales and legitimate price reductions; rather, it groups all price reductions together, labels them as unlawful practices and prohibits them.

The question which is frequently asked of us is "How can farmers oppose 'fair trade' legislation when they are in favor of price-support programs?"

There are some very obvious and important differences between price support and "fair trade" legislation.

Flexible farm price support programs, as set forth in the Agricultural Act of 1949, are intended to prevent disastrously low farm prices. They are not intended to fix prices. They are intended to permit a free market above floor levels established at 75 to 90 percent of parity. They leave agricultural prices generally free to fluctuate in response to free-market conditions.

Farm price supports are comparable to minimum wages for labor or loss-leader legislation for the distribution trade.

The latest annual meeting resolution of the American Farm Bureau Federation on this point states that:

"Farm price supports are an appropriate and necessary protection against unreasonable price declines. It is not, however, the responsibility of the Government to guarantee profitable prices to any economic group * * * We do not believe that action to raise the level of price support above that now provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949 is in the long-run interest of farm people."

Pursuant to this policy, the American Farm Bureau Federation has opposed in this Congress efforts to increase the level of price support by three different bills heard a few weeks ago by the Senate Committee on Agriculture. We have opposed the Brannan farm program, which would endeavor to establish a responsibility of the Government to fix and guarantee prices for farm products at profitable levels. We will continue to oppose any efforts which may be made to increase the mandatory level of price support above that now provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949. We believe this position is entirely consistent with our opposition to so-called fair trade legislation.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, therefore, recommends your opposition to the enactment of H. R. 5767.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think Mr. Trigg's statement is a clear rebuttal of the argument of the Senator from Minnesota. We should remember that farm parity supports may decline if industrial prices decline. There is no such protection to the public in the private price fixing in the McGuire bill. It will cost the public $2,000,000,000, a year.

Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the RECORD an article from one of the great newspapers of our land, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. Let me say that the Post-Dispatch, in my judgment, has a magnificent journalistic record in placing before the public, as it discusses the great controversial issues of American public life, information of primary importance. This great newspaper fights for the public interest and the welfare of the Nation in keeping with the best of newspaper traditions. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article entitled "The Customers Didn't Write," an article written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., first published in the New York Herald Tribune, and later republished in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Saturday, May 17, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CUSTOMERS DIDN'T WRITE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in the New York Herald Tribune)

Events in the House of Representatives on May 8 were the climax to a perfect lesson in how an organized group of citizens who want anything from Congress should go about getting it.

The group of citizens in this case was the Nation's druggists, the manufacturers and wholesalers of drug-store products, and some other retailers and manufacturers.

What they wanted was fair trade—the system under which a manufacturer or wholesaler can set the minimum retail price of his article in a State by signing a contract with a single retailer in that State.

Though fair-trade laws are State laws, the druggists—who completely dominated the fight for fair trade—needed congressional action because a Supreme Court decision of last May largely nullified the effectiveness of the State laws.

The druggists needed from Congress a law validating the nonsigner provision—the provision which makes all retailers, including the majority who do not sign specific fair-trade contracts, abide by the fair-trade price as if applies to goods shipped across State lines.

The administration was heartily against the bill, as evidenced by vigorous testimony from the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission.

Most of the press (conservative and liberal) was against it, and two of the four

leading Washington newspapers campaigned actively against it.

Though there are two points of view about its effect on consumers, it has the agreed effect of keeping prices up in some cases.

But when the House voted, 196 Members supported the bill and only 10 opposed it.

The steamroller vote was only the culmination of a story that had begun during the first session of this Congress last fall.

The drug industry lobbyists, contemplating their strategy for a bill to nullify the Supreme Court decision, were well aware (1) that the original Federal fair-trade legislation had been in the form of an amendment to the antitrust laws, (2) that all legislation regarding the antitrust laws is considered by the Judiciary Committee, and (3) that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, of New York, is an inveterate foe of fair-trade legislation.

So the lobbyists got their lawyers to draw up a bill amending the Federal Trade Commission Act instead. The FTC is under the executive jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, headed by Representative ROBERT CROSSER, of Ohio, a friend of fair trade.

Then they got Representative JOHN A. MCGUIRE, of Connecticut, to introduce their bill, and the chief hurdle was passed.

The bill went to the Commerce Committee. Hearings began soon after Congress reconvened in January, a subcommittee was promptly appointed to continue the hearings, and the McGuire bill rolled out of the committee on February 27, virtually unchanged.

Meanwhile, the Judiciary Committee, which had been bypassed, attempted a rearguard action by promptly reporting out a bill of its own which would restore fair trade but which contained a group of four limiting provisions.

When debate in the House began, it became clear immediately that there would be no effective opposition to fair trade as such. The only fight was over which bill to approve, with some private fair-trade advocates urging the Judiciary Committee's bill as containing more protection for their interests.

But the drug people had told the constituents to tell their Congressmen that the McGuire bill was the only one that would do the job. The Congressmen were so informed. And the result was that when voting began, the substitute bill was knocked down 111 to 12.

Other amendments were offered. Sensing their strength, the bill's managers cut down debate to as little as 3 minutes on some of them. They were all turned down by voice vote or overwhelming standing votes.

The whole thing took only a little over 2 hours, and the McGuire bill was passed and sent to the Senate (where there is a chance of another committee juggling act, incidentally, because the chairmen of the two committees there are in reverse positions regarding fair trade).

Mr. CELLER, almost the only fair-trade opponent who took the floor, asked plaintively if there wasn't anyone in the House trying to protect the consumers. But, as the drug spokesmen frankly pointed out, the letters from their people arrived and letters from consumers didn't.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the RECORD ought to show the names of some of the leading authorities in our country in the fields of law, economics, and business administration who are opposed to the bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks materials setting forth their names and some of their comments in regard to their opposition to the bill.

There being no objection, the material and comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO FAIR-TRADE LEGISLATION

(Submitted by M. A. Adelman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Yale University Law School; Kenneth S. Carlston, University of Illinois College of Law; J. K. Galbraith, Harvard University; Harold C. Havighurst, Northwestern University School of Law; Edward S. Mason, Harvard University; Fritz Machlup, Johns Hopkins University; W. Rupert Maclaurin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; John Perry Miller, Yale University; Prof. Frank Kennedy, University of Iowa Law School; Prof. Carl Fulda, Rutgers University Law School; James A. Rahl, Northwestern University School of Law; Lloyd G. Reynolds, Yale University; Eugene V. Rostow, Yale University Law School; O. Glenn Saxon, Yale University; Louis B. Schwartz, University of Pennsylvania Law School; George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University; James Tobin, Yale University; John Thompson, Yale University Law School.)

We are opposed to legislation undoing the effect of *Schwegemann Bros.* v. *Calvert Distilling Corp.* (344 U. S. C 384 (1951)). In fact we support the outright repeal of the Miller-Tydings Act. Resale price maintenance has no place in a society which depends on the competitive market as a major instrument for determining price and output. Whatever appeal the device may have had in a depression, there are no sound arguments in its favor under present and prospective circumstances of near-inflation and of high-level employment.

The original passage of the Miller-Tydings Act, and of the State fair-trade laws to which it gave scope, rested on an erroneous analysis of the depression. The depression was a time when prices fell. Therefore, the supporters of fair-trade laws contended, we can raise prices by law, and end the depression. This was the same case advanced for the NRA, the Smoot-Hawley tariff, and other devices of protection against the consequences of depression. The argument was incorrect. Fixing retail prices, in the face of inadequate demand, could only cut the volume sold, further intensify the depression and complicate the task of recovery.

At the present time, the economy is working under the forced draft of the rearmament program, and the price system should operate to extract every possible ounce of production from industry and agriculture to absorb and offset the volume of purchasing power left in the pockets of consumers after taxes. Even after the bulge of the rearmament program is passed, the economy will in all probability be kept at high levels of employment and economic activity by the policies of business and government. Business should be required to compete vigorously for its share of the public's purchasing power. There is no excuse in a capitalist economy for the subsidy of price fixing in the ordinary distribution of food, drugs, clothing, and other consumers goods. Existing law offers fully adequate protection against genuinely predatory and cutthroat competition.

The drive for price fixing by law comes from some groups of retailers who obtain their supplies through the older channels of wholesale distribution. They want to sell in their local markets under monopolistic conditions—that is, free of price competition. Not only do they want to eliminate competition with each other. They also typically oppose the growth of chain stores, mail-order houses, cooperatives, department stores, and other techniques of distribution which have over two generations greatly increased the degree of competition in, and reduced the costs of the distribution of consumers goods in almost every local market of the United States. Experience proves that the efficient retailer, if he gives good service, can compete with the chain store and make a reasonable profit. There is no ground of public policy for restricting the development of the newer methods of distribution which have so greatly reduced the social cost of distribution in this country.

Unless competition in distribution is preserved and encouraged by law, consumers may well be deprived of most of the advantages of technological progress in production. Retail price maintenance is characteristic of economic practice in Western Europe, and is an important factor in the relatively slow rise in the standard of living of Western European countries. It has been regarded as contrary to the policy of the antitrust laws since Justice Hughes celebrated opinion in the Dr. Miles Medical Co. case in 1911. In a long line of cases the Supreme Court has held that devices for retail price maintenance are illegal—and that the overriding policy of the Sherman Act in favor of competition (*Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission* 71 S. Ct. 240, 249 (1951)) qualifies and limits even the exception of the Miller-Tydings amendment, so as to confine it to the narrowest possible ground. (*United States* v. *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* 321 U. S. 707 (1944); *United States* v. *Frankfort Distilleries, Inc.* 324 U. S. 293 (1945)).

Resale price maintenance is incompatible with the principles of a market economy. This is a good time to abolish it. The repeal of the Miller-Tydings amendment now would put the economy into a better position to meet the pressures which future changes in supply and demand relationships may call for more flexibly and more effectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement, in opposition to the pending bill, by Wendell Berge, of the District of Columbia bar, former director of the Antitrust Division of the United States Department of Justice.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WENDELL BERGE BEFORE THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON H. R. 5767, JUNE 4, 1952

For more than 15 years I have had a deep interest in opposing all efforts to nullify the application of the Sherman Act to resale price maintenance agreements. For 10 years I was a member of the staff of the Antitrust Division and later for nearly 4 years was assistant attorney general in charge of that division. As a result of this experience I gained some appreciation of the serious impact of so-called fair-trade laws upon the basic effectiveness of Federal antitrust legislation. The purpose of my appearance today is to add to the record a brief statement of my own convictions on this subject.

I shall not undertake to outline the history of the judicial decisions outlawing resale price maintenance, or of the efforts of the States, goaded on by powerful lobbies, to neutralize these court decisions. Such matters are well known to this committee. Nor is it necessary for me to recite the history of the Miller-Tydings Act which legalized to a limited extent resale price maintenance in interstate commerce. You are fully familiar with the Miller-Tydings Act and its background.

I do want to state, at the outset, that I am opposed to H. R. 5767, which undertakes to make effective in interstate commerce the so-called nonsigner clause which was held

by the Supreme Court in *Schwegmann Bros. v. Calvert Corp.* (341 U. S. 384) not to be authorized by the Miller-Tydings Act.

In the early days of the Sherman Act resale price maintenance commonly meant an agreement or agreements between a producer and dealers providing that the dealers would agree to observe prices dictated by the producers. In the leading case of *Dr. Miles Medical Co. v. Park & Sons Co.* (220 U. S. 373), the Supreme Court held that such agreements were illegal under the Sherman Act. Later, however, the Court affirmed the right of a producer to refuse to deal with particular dealers provided there was no agreement respecting price maintenance involved. *United States v. Colgate & Co.* (250 U. S. 300.) This, of course, left the door open to refuse to deal with price cutters in the absence of an agreement to maintain prices. But in *Federal Trade Commission v. Beech-Nut Packing Co.* (257 U. S. 441) the Court in effect held that any effort to police retailers to assure that they were observing suggested prices was illegal. Thus, for some years the test of legality seemed to be whether or not on the facts, an agreement to maintain prices or enforcement methods, in the absence of specific agreement, existed.

But there was strong sentiment among manufacturers, particularly those who made and marketed branded products, to seek the right legally through contracts to dictate resale prices. The so-called fair-trade movement started with the first Fair Trade Act passed in California in 1931. This act, however, merely legalized resale price maintenance agreements in intrastate commerce. The really significant fact in the growth of fair-trade legislation came with the development of the so-called nonsigner clause. This clause, as you know, provides that if prices are set by agreement between a manufacturer and a dealer, thereafter all dealers in the State are bound by the dictated price. They do not voluntarily undertake any contractual obligation but, nevertheless, they are bound. California adopted this nonsigner clause in 1933 and thereafter, I believe, all State laws that were enacted contained it. By 1941 45 States had fair-trade laws.

It is my belief that the essentially undemocratic character of the nonsigner clause escaped the attention of the American people until the Schwegmann case last year. I think that many people believed that the policy of resale price maintenance might be a debatable policy, but they thought of it in terms merely of legalizing voluntary agreements between producers and dealers. Many people felt that resale-price maintenance in any form was an inadvisable restraint because it prevented competition on the dealer level. A series of resale-price maintenance contracts could have the same effect so far as dealer competition was concerned as horizontal agreements between dealers fixing prices. And, of course, such horizontal agreements were illegal per se under numerous court decisions applying to the Sherman Act.

But it occurs to me that in most of the policy discussion the importance, and the basically undemocratic character of the nonsigner clause, was overlooked. Not only had the type of resale-price maintenance condemned in the Dr. Miles case been legalized by the State fair-trade laws, but under those laws dealers having no desire to be brought into a system of resale-price maintenance or any economic interest in participating, were legally forced to accept it at the risk of losing their product, and in some instances at the risk of criminal prosecution. Thus, by the simple act of making a contract with a single dealer in a State a producer could force every dealer in that State to accept and abide by the dictated price. No more effective way of eliminating price competition on the dealer level can be imagined.

As Alfred Friendly, a reporter for the Washington Post, stated in an article in the Post last Sunday, June 1, 1952:

"Thus, if one manufacturer of a trademarked item agreed with one retailer of the item in Maryland that the article will be sold for $1 at retail, no other retailer in the Free State could sell it for less than $1, regardless of whether he approved the contract price or not.

"It is self-evident, of course, that such an agreement—and the law that would permit it—is exactly 180 degrees opposite the philosophy and spirit of the national antitrust policy.

"The bill is advanced ostensibly to protect small business, the heart and essence of the free enterprise system. Yet it would deny small businesses all opportunities to act freely in their main field of action, price. They would remain not independent retailers, but would become conduits for disposal of a manufacturer's product, at the price the manufacturer sets, without leeway to attract customers by lower prices, or to convert what economies and efficiencies they develop into lower prices and higher volume."

The fair-trade movement grew rapidly in the 1930's but its effectiveness was impaired by the fact that fair-trade contracts were not valid in interstate commerce. Hence the movement to amend the Sherman Act which resulted in the Miller-Tydings Act.

As Assistant Attorney General Morison has pointed out, all that the Miller-Tydings Act did was to amend section 1 of the Sherman Act to provide that vertical minimum price fixing contracts shall not be in violation of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act when such contracts involve: (1) Trade-marked or branded commodities, (2) which are in competition with other similar commodities, and (3) when such contracts are valid under the State law of the place of resale.

Thus, as he says, the act speaks only in terms of "contracts or agreements" and makes no reference to nonsigners. In *Schwegmann Bros. v. Calvert Corp.* (341 U. S. 384), decided May 1951, the Supreme Court held that persons not parties to agreements establishing minimum resale prices are not bound by those agreements even though the State of resale does have a law binding nonsigners. The Court pointed out that the Miller-Tydings Act sanctions contracts or agreements between a distributor and one or more retailers to fix minimum prices, if State law permits, but added:

"When they seek, however, to impose price fixing on persons who have not contracted or agreed to the scheme, the situation is vastly different. That is not price fixing by contract or agreement; that is price fixing by compulsion. That is not following the path of consensual agreement; that is resort to coercion."

The Court also stated that when a State compels retailers to follow a parallel-price policy, it demands private conduct which the Sherman Act forbids. After examining the legislative history of the Miller-Tydings Act, the Court went on to say that "we cannot find that the distributors were to have the right to use not only a contract to fix retail prices but a club as well."

I think that the Schwegmann case is absolutely sound, and it is surprising that the point was not raised until nearly 15 years after the enactment of the Miller-Tydings Act.

Let us consider the real significance of the nonsigner clause. Whether the economic reason for utilizing the clause in a particular case is pressure from the dealers or from the manufacturer, the effect, once the clause has been adopted in a single contract, is to put the whole retail industry of a given State under absolute price dictation. There is no factor in such a situation to protect the public interest. Competition does not operate to protect the public interest because competition is eliminated by the nonsigner clause. There is no public representative in the transaction to protect the public interest as in the case of Government price regulation.

We are all familiar with the tendency of American businessmen to resent price regulation—the constant lashing at the old Office of Price Administration and the present Office of Price Stabilization. Any regulatory agency that undertakes to set prices is in for a tough time. And yet, those public regulatory agencies that have taken such a beating have been agencies of the Federal Government whose powers are subject to termination by Congress and whose every act is subject to public accountability. They operate under standards laid down by congressional authority.

But all such factors to protect the public are absent in a scheme of price regulation in which the ultimate sanction is the nonsigner clause. The price may or may not be reasonable. But it is imposed on a whole retail industry by a single contract to which most of the retail industry is not a party. There is no administrative or judicial review as to the fairness of price. It is hard to imagine a more absolute form of economic dictatorship.

Although the original impetus for fair-trade legislation came from manufacturers interested in protecting their brand names, the chief interest shifted and the later pressure for fair-trade legislation has come largely from the organized retail groups who saw in this device a means of legally eliminating price competition. Thus there have been many instances where retail interests have employed their combined power to coerce manufacturers to give them fair-trade contracts. This coercion has not infrequently been accompanied by threat of boycott.

But, on the other hand, the retailers themselves may often suffer by the enforcement of prices imposed by the manufacturers which require such a low margin of profit that the retailers cannot profitably operate. With the vast power of national advertising a manufacturer can build up such good will for a particular product that a retailer must carry such product whether or not he desires to do so. There are, for example, in the drug field many products where national advertising has created a good will for a particular brand name that is not possessed by other competing products of fully equal merit. The local druggist must carry the product which has the benefit of national advertising. Under fair-trade contracts containing nonsigner clauses, the manufacturer can, in effect, force the retailer to handle these nationally advertised brands at a ridiculously small margin of profit or even at no profit at all.

The present bill, it should be noted, not only permits the manufacturer to dictate minimum prices but it also permits him to prescribe stipulated prices if such are authorized by State law. This provision could well work against the interest of the retailer. Thus, one manufacturer and one retailer could agree upon a stipulated price—that is a maximum as well as a minimum—which would apply to all retailers.

Under this provision, suppose that a manufacturer find one big cut-rate drug store willing to operate on a very small margin of profit and contracts that a certain vitamin capsule product shall sell at a stipulated price of $2.98 per bottle. That price then becomes binding upon every druggist in the State. The margin may be much too low for the small druggist to handle the capsules at a profit, but because of the nationally advertised brand name of the product, the small druggist must carry it as a service

to his customers and sell it at an unprofitable price.

As Mr. Friendly has said in his article:

"Multiply (such examples) by a few hundred of the brand-name items which every druggist deals in, and the result is obvious: the little fellow goes to the wall, and the cut-rate octopus, against which the bill is supposedly directed, takes over all the business.

"For this reason, and from other evidence (chiefly the contributions of big drug manufacturers to the lobby for the McGuire bill), there is considerable reason to believe that the small druggists have been made the unwitting frontmen for the manufacturers in the lobby campaign."

In a free economy the conflicting interests of the consumer and the retailer find their proper level through the forces of normal competition. It should not be our interest to give the consumer the benefit of products sold at an uneconomically low price nor to give the retailer the benefit of uneconomically high prices. But under fair trade both injustices occur. In some instances the manufacturer uses his power to impose on an industry prices so low as to be unfair to retailers. In other instances the retailers succeed through their organized associational activity in forcing manufacturers to raise prices above a normal competitive level. I understand, for example, that the record before the House committee showed that the National Association of Retail Druggists put on an organized effort to force manufacturers to increase profit margins on certain items, and I assume similar evidence has been or will be produced here.

The proponents of fair-trade legislation have managed to stir up a great deal of emotional sympathy by identifying themselves with the small independent retailer as against the larger so-called predatory chain stores. I hold no brief for the chain stores. Indeed, I was in charge of the Antitrust Division when the action against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. was instituted at Danville, Ill. That case was based upon a number of alleged discriminatory and monopolistic practices, and in the criminal action the Government's position was sustained. The civil action is still pending.

But because chain stores may in some instances attain monopolistic proportion in their industry does not demonstrate that our method of retailing must necessarily be frozen in the nineteenth century pattern. There are undoubtedly some economic discriminations enjoyed by certain chain operations, especially when they exceed a certain point in expansion, that must be neutralized by legislation. But it is my opinion that the independent retailers are barking up the wrong tree when they seek to impose compulsory vertical price control upon a large segment of American industry in their effort to overcome what they believe to be the unfair advantage of other forms of distribution.

For example, it is a well-known fact that the resale price maintenance of branded goods is wholly ineffective as against the larger chain operations. If a manufacturer undertakes to fix a price on a nationally advertised brand which is distasteful to a large chain operation, that chain has the facilities to introduce new brands at its own price and the power to advertise them in competition with the older established brand. The small independent druggist is often dependent, as I have previously pointed out, upon nationally advertised brands and must handle them at whatever price is dictated. But the chain store can introduce its own brand at a cheaper price and exert all its sales effort on behalf of its own brand. I am sure that plenty of economic testimony could be introduced to the effect that resale price maintenance is ineffective in neutralizing certain advantages of chain stores.

A great deal of the complaint of the proponents of the McGuire bill is against so-called loss-leader practices. They contend that the McGuire bill, or legislation similar to it, is necessary to stop loss-leader sales which they claim injure the good will of a product and also result in unfair competition on the retail level.

I am not going to question that the McGuire bill would, if enacted into law and vigorously enforced, eliminate loss-leader sales in respect to the commodities to which the bill would apply. But I contend that it goes much further than is necessary to eliminate loss-leader sales. In order to stop this practice of loss-leader sales, you do not need to throw the baby out with the bath; you do not need to eliminate all price competition at the retail level. The problem of loss-leader sales should be dealt with separately, as such. Perhaps it could be done by the Federal Trade Commission under existing law or, if necessary, by adding specific provisions to the Federal Trade Commission law dealing with the subject of loss-leader sales.

But I am also impressed with a bill introduced in the House of Representatives on March 11, 1952, by Chairman CELLER, of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I refer to H. R. 6986, a bill to amend the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act for the purpose of prohibiting loss-leader sales. I am attaching a copy of that bill as an appendix to this statement but I shall not read it. In summary, the bill would add a new section to the Clayton Act which would define the term "loss-leader practices" to mean selling a commodity, or advertising or offering a commodity for sale at retail below the delivered cost of the commodity to the seller except that it does not include any of the following sales, or any advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

(a) Any sale for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given.

(b) Any sale of commodities which are substantially damaged or deteriorated, when plain notice of that fact is given.

(c) Any sale by officers acting under order of the court.

(d) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or for prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

(e) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention by the seller could be expected to result in loss.

(f) Any sale which reasonable business practices require a seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

(g) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.

Any loss-leader practice which affects commerce is then declared to be unlawful and actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby. Such person is given a right to sue for treble damages in the district courts of the United States, as provided in section 4 of the Clayton Act.

The above are the principal provisions of the Celler bill, but there are subsidiary provisions which may be examined by reading the bill in full.

In addition, section 2 of the Celler bill is to my mind very important in that it repeals the Miller-Tydings Act by amending section 1 of the Sherman Act so as to restore the text of section 1 as it existed before the Miller-Tydings amendment of August 17, 1937. I think there is no need for the Miller-Tydings Act, especially if the complaints against loss-leader sales can be met.

I think that time has demonstrated that the Miller-Tydings Act was a mistake. It has tended to make price competition less effective at the retail level. If we believe in competition as the primary regulator of price, and if we believe in passing economies in distribution on to the consumer, then there is no more reason why price competition should be eliminated at the retail level than at the wholesale or manufacturing level. If, on the other hand, we believe in eliminating competition at the retail level, why should we not be consistent and permit horizontal agreements between competitors, not only eliminating price competition, but competition in other matters, such as the rendering of service.

I hope that a bill similar to the Celler bill will be introduced in the Senate and that it will be given preferred consideration. I also hope that no final action is taken on the McGuire bill until a Senate bill similar to the Celler bill is considered and disposed of. I think that if a bill similar to the Celler bill is enacted, it will eliminate any necessity for further consideration of the McGuire bill.

There are several details concerning the McGuire bill which should be briefly noted. Although the Miller-Tydings Act only legalizes agreements prescribing minimum prices, the McGuire bill also applies to stipulated prices; in other words, specific or maximum prices as well as minimum prices.

The McGuire bill does not purport to be a direct amendment of the Miller-Tydings Act (which, in turn, was an amendment to section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act), yet the effect of the McGuire bill is to create an immunity greater than that of the Miller-Tydings Act itself, since the McGuire bill legalizes agreements relating to stipulated prices in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce.

Indeed, if one wanted to be critical of procedural matters, this method of amending the Sherman Act indirectly through an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act is subject to criticism. The Schwegmann case rested on an interpretation of the meaning of the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act: the case held that such amendment did not legalize the nonsigner clause. The McGuire bill is solely an attempt to nullify the Schwegmann decision. Why did the lobby not seek to amend the act which was involved in the Schwegmann decision—the Miller-Tydings Act? Instead, the McGuire bill is directed to the Federal Trade Commission Act and reaches the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act only by reciting in the language amending the Federal Trade Commission Act, that "nothing contained in this [Federal Trade Commission] act or in any of the antitrust acts shall render unlawful et cetera." That is certainly a back-handed method of cutting down the Sherman Act.

In conclusion, I want to call attention to the fact that practically all the newspapers of the country which have commented on this matter have opposed this and similar bills. There has been repeated strong editorial comment from at least three of the four Washington papers. The same can be said for newspapers in many other cities. In addition, there have been many consumer organizations, authorities in law and economics from faculties of many of our leading colleges and universities, and many other experts in the field of price economics who have testified against this bill, or signed letters and public statements opposing the bill.

So far as I know, there has been no support for this bill except from special interests who think they would benefit from the enactment of the bill. I am not aware that any independent experts have testified in favor of the bill in either the House committee hearing or here.

I am sure that the committee must be in receipt of resolutions, petitions, and the like, from groups of citizens who are interested

in opposing this measure simply from the viewpoint of the public good. Informed consumers everywhere are against this bill, but we are all aware that consumers as a group are not highly organized or articulate, certainly not in comparison with the National Association of Retail Druggists or the American Fair Trade Council.

I urge that this committee and the Senate of the United States not be stampeded by high-pressure lobby tactics into approving a bill so obviously against the public interest.

TEXT OF THE CELLER BILL, H. R. 6986, AS INTRODUCED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MARCH 11, 1952

A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss-leader sales

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 27. (a) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'delivered cost' shall mean invoice cost to a seller less the value of discounts received by a seller in money or the equivalent, plus the cost of transportation incident to delivery to the seller, and plus applicable excise and sales taxes to the seller.

"(2) The term 'seller' shall mean a vendee, as used in this act, who purchases for resale.

"(3) The term 'loss-leader practice' shall mean selling a commodity, or advertising or offering a commodity for resale at retail at a price below the delivered cost of the commodity to the seller except that it does not include any of the following sales, or any advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of that fact is given to the public.

"(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"(C) Any sale by an officer acting under an order of court.

"(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.

"(b) Any loss-leader practice which affects commerce is hereby declared to be unlawful and actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby.

"(c) (1) Any person injured in his business or property by any loss-leader practice hereby declared to be unlawful may sue therefor in any district court of the United States, as provided in section 4 of this act, or in any State court of competent jurisdiction, and recover threefold the damages by him sustained, and the costs of suit, including a reasonable attorney's fee. Any person threatened with injury by any loss-leader practice shall be entitled to injunctive relief against such threatened injury in any court of the United States, as provided in section 16 of this act, or to sue for and have such relief in any State court of competent jurisdiction when and under the same conditions and principles as injunctive relief against threatened conduct that will cause loss or damage is granted by courts of equity in that State, under the rules governing such proceedings, and upon the execution of proper bond against damages for an injunction improvidently granted and a showing that the danger of irreparable loss or damage is immediate, a preliminary injunction may issue.

"(2) Section 15 of this act (providing for suits by United States district attorneys to restrain violations of this act) shall not apply with respect to any loss-leader practice.

"(d) (1) Nothing contained herein or in any of the antitrust acts shall render illegal any contract or agreement prohibiting a seller from reselling at a price below his delivered cost, any commodity which bears, or the label or container of which bears, the trade-mark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others, when contracts or agreements prescribing minimum prices are lawful under any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which such resale is to be made, or to which the commodity is to be transported for such resale, or for delivery to a vendee pursuant to a sale.

"(2) Nothing contained herein or in any of the Antitrust Acts shall render illegal the exercise or enforcement of any right or right of action created by any statute, law, or public policy now or hereafter in effect in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, which provides in substance that willfully and knowingly advertising, offering for sale, or selling any commodity at less than the minimum prices prescribed in any such contract or agreement whether the person so advertising, offering for sale, or selling is or is not a party to such contract or agreement, is unfair competition and is actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby: *Provided, however*, That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply where the minimum price prescribed in such contract is higher than the delivered cost to the seller: *And provided further*, That the rights or right of action created by or under such contracts and agreements shall not apply to any of the following sales, or advertisement or offer in connection therewith:

"(A) Any sale of a commodity for the bona fide purpose of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing dealing in such commodity or of discontinuing the seller's business, when plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"(B) Any sale of a commodity which is substantially damaged or deteriorated in quality if plain notice of the fact is given to the public.

"(C) Any sale by an officer acting under an order of court.

"(D) Any sale to any association organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(E) Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

"(F) Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

"(G) Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory."

SEC. 2. That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Every contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, is hereby declared to be illegal. Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination or conspiracy shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, without my taking the time to read it, a very able memorandum by Corwin D. Edwards, economic consultant of the Department of Justice, in connection with the bill pending before the Senate.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, February 10, 1941.

Memorandum for Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division.

Re grounds for the repeal of the Miller-Tydings amendment which authorizes resale price contracts.

The passage of resale price legislation has become a classic example of the use of misrepresentation by a pressure group. Since this group has boasted of its achievements, there is no longer any doubt about what happened. The so-called "fair trade" laws which legalized resale price legislation in the States were drafted and urged by lobbyists for organized retail druggists and were enacted with practically no support from any other source. Druggists were organized under captains, district by district, to bring pressure to bear upon legislators. Care was taken, however, to describe their bill as one generally supported by entire retail trade of the State. The bill was given the ambiguous and appealing name of "fair trade" law. A systematic effort was made to prevent public hearings and to secure the enactment of the bill without public debate. This effort was successful. There was a public hearing on the bill in only 3 States out of the first 32 in which it was passed, and in one of these the hearing followed the passage. Indeed, there was so little consideration of any kind that, although the original draft of the bill contained a stenographic error which made utter nonsense out of one of the most important provisions, this error appeared without change in the statutes of 11 States before it was caught and corrected. Another stenographic error, not quite so serious, was included in the laws of 17 States. Some members of State legislatures subsequently told consumers' organizations that they did not know what they were voting on.

Meanwhile, every effort was made to throttle public discussion and to intimidate business opposition. In California an aspirin manufacturer was forced by boycott to issue resale price contracts against his will. The druggists' intention to coerce was indicated in the following language: "This aspirin is a sort of Napoleon in the patent-medicine army, but then even the great Frenchman met his Waterloo when the rest of Europe got together, decided that they had enough of

him, and cooperated against him." In the same State the manufacturer of Pepsodent toothpaste, who had experimented with resale price contracts under the California law, decided to withdraw these contracts, apparently under advice of counsel who believed the contracts violated the antitrust laws. Thereupon the druggists organized a campaign to put Pepsodent under the counter and to switch customers to other brands. This campaign was so effective that the offending company made public apology at a subsequent convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists and, as a token of its contribution, subscribed $25,000 to a fund to lobby for resale price maintenance in other States. On one occasion an expression of opposition to resale price maintenance by the New York Times and the New York World-Telegram led to an effort by organized druggists to demoralize the dealers who distributed these papers, by selling them at less than 3 cents. On another occasion Harper's magazine carried an article against resale price maintenance and thereupon received a letter from a druggists' association in a midwestern city, demanding information as to whether Harper's endorsed the views expressed in the article and indicating that if these views were not repudiated they intended to sell Harper's at a substantial discount, presumably in an effort to create trouble among its distributors. Within the last 2 months the newspaper PM in New York has carried a series of articles against resale price maintenance, and the same tactics of intimidation have been attempted by dealers of PM at less than its customary price. The editors, having more sense of humor than some of the other victims of this policy, ran a photograph of a cut-rate advertisement in a store and gave it the caption "The best bargain in the city."

The campaign of misrepresentation became the basis of the lobbying to amend the Sherman Act. The draft amendment was urged upon Congress with argument that it did not involve any acceptance of resale-price maintenance as a Federal principle, but merely committed the Congress to the view that if States desired to authorize resale-price maintenance the Federal control over interstate commerce should not stand in the way. The State laws were described as though they consisted merely in grants of authority for manufacturer and retailer to agree upon the resale price of branded goods. Actually, there is not one of the State statutes which is limited to such a grant. A statute of that kind was tried in California, and proved to be a miserable failure because many retailers would not sign such contracts. All of the State laws now provide that when a manufacturer and retailer sign a resale-price contract all other retailers who have notice of the contract price must refrain from selling below that price. In other words, these State laws give to manufacturer and retailer the right to coerce the retailer's competitors by fixing the resale price of these competitors against their will. There is no provision for public hearing, for standards in the establishment of the price, for any process of appeal of the nonsigner, or any other safeguard such as is always included in a plan for price fixing by public authority. (The State of Wisconsin is an exception to this rule. Its law provides that the State may set aside contracts which establish unreasonable price.) Thus, the price-fixing power granted to private individuals by State laws is far greater than that which any Federal public official may exercise. Moreover, many of the State laws empower the contracting parties not only to fix minimum prices but to prevent the giving of premiums, to control various other terms of sale, and to require the purchaser in his turn to fix minimum prices if he resells. It is doubtful that half the Members of Congress who voted to amend the Sherman Act were aware that State laws in question granted authority broader than the fixation of a minimum price.

The Senate and the very text of the amendment demonstrate that those who amended the Sherman Act had been misinformed about the status of nonsigners under the State laws. The amendment explicitly prohibits agreements between retailers to fix minimum resale prices. Yet in practical effect such agreements would not be as severe a restraint upon competition as a grant of power to a single retailer to make an agreement with a manufacturer which then becomes binding upon all other retailers. When persons are bound by law, they do not need to be bound by contract. It is inconceivable that Congress would have enacted the prohibition upon agreements if it had intended to sanction coercion. Indeed, the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary concerning this amendment, which was later incorporated in the majority report of District of Columbia upon the appropriation bill to which the amendment was attached as a rider, described the State resale-price laws merely as statutes to authorize resale-price contracts, and added:

"The States acts are in no sense general price-fixing acts. They merely authorize a manufacturer or producer to enter contracts for the maintenance of his price, but they do not compel him to do so. In other words they are merely permissive. They do not authorize horizontal contracts, that is to say, contracts or agreements between manufacturers, between producers, or between wholesalers, or between retailers as to the sale or resale price of any commodity."

If this committee had been informed that the State laws require every retailer to maintain the same price upon a commodity covered by a contract, it could not in candor have described these laws as merely permissive nor have emphasized the point that horizontal agreements among retailers were not authorized.

It is noteworthy that the advocates of the Miller-Tydings amendment were unable to pass it as a separate bill and eventually secured its enactment by attaching it as a rider to the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. In signing the bill, the President described this method of enactment as a vicious practice, said that he hesitated to approve the rider which weakened the antitrust laws, and expressed the hope that the bill "will not be as harmful as most people predict."

The campaign of misrepresentation has continued since the amendment of the Sherman Act. Although Congress was told that it was not being asked to express a view upon the merits of resale price maintenance as such, but merely to liberate the States to follow their own policy, it has ever since been told by the same lobbyists that in amending the Sherman Act it did express approval of resale price maintenance and that therefore it is inconsistent in refusing to pass a bill establishing resale price maintenance in the District of Columbia. But a campaign of misrepresentation becomes increasingly difficult as time passes; thus far no such bill has been passed.

Resale price maintenance has failed in both of its mutually conflicting announced purposes. When the State laws were tested in the Federal courts, they were represented as statutes which allowed a manufacturer to protect the good will attaching to a brand by making contracts concerning the resale price of articles carrying the brand. Thus described, the bill is intended to defend the manufacturers' property rights. Actually this interpretation of the bill was mere pretense. In the words of the counsel for the Illinois Pharmaceutical Association, "the fair-trade movement is a retailers' show, with a manufacturers' sign or label over it." The bill originated with retailers, was backed by a retailers' lobby, was passed by retailers' pressure, and has been used by retailers to force the issuance of contracts whether the manufacturer wants them or not. Retail organizations in the drug trade and elsewhere have used white lists of manufacturers issuing contracts, and black lists of manufacturers who do not, in an endeavor to coerce those manufacturers who are reluctant. Repeatedly the officials of retail drug organizations have had to urge their own members not to be too hasty in boycotting manufacturers who announce retail prices lower than the retailer thinks satisfactory. Most manufacturers using resale price contracts would rejoice at the opportunity to get rid of the so-called protection of their property which these contracts afford. They would like to control their own sales policy rather than have it dictated to them by organized retail groups.

A different purpose for the statutes was urged upon Congress and State legislators. They were told that resale price maintenance contracts were necessary to enable the small independent retailer to survive against the competition of the large chain. The legislation was presented as a part of the effort to defend little business and to avert monopoly in retailing. Actually this announcement of purpose involved a mixture of misrepresentation and self-deception. In the first place, though the independent retailer may be threatened in some industries, he was not actually threatened in the drug trade. The number of independent retail druggists was increasing during the period when the plight of the independent was being urged on behalf of this legislation. The average life of an independent drug store is greater than that of almost any other kind of retail store. The mark-up realized upon drug products is higher than that of almost any other kind of retail store. The mark-up realized upon drug products is higher than that upon other fast-moving retail lines, so much so that organized retail druggists are now trying to prevent the handling of packaged drugs by grocery stores which are attracted by the relatively high margin upon this merchandise. The statistics of the drug trade make it clear that there never was a major problem of the survival of the small druggist. Hence it has not been surprising to discover that the whole effort to represent the resale price maintenance laws as measurers directed against chain stores was a deliberate perversion of fact. The chains themselves supported these laws, although they were very careful to keep themselves in the background. There was no campaign of chain store opposition similar to the campaign against the taxation of chain stores. Instead, the secretary of the National Association of Chain Drug Stores testified before committees of the House and Senate in favor of the Miller-Tydings amendment.

Subsequent experience has made it clear that resale price legislation is admirably designed to further the interests of the drug chains. In their early days, when they were seeking a foothold, some of these chains were fond of cutting prices upon national brands. Once they became established, however, they lost interest in this kind of price cutting. They could draw trade by the prestige of their name and the size of their stock. Desiring a reputation for low prices, they continued their price cuts upon some items and particularly upon products which were allowing an unusually large retail mark-up. But the managers of the chains were afraid of the small independent cut-rate stores, sometimes described in the trade as pineboard stores, which sold fast-moving drugs items at a very low mark-up, with a minimum expenditure for rent, store decoration, and the arts of salesmanship. We have in Washington, for example, at least on independent cut-rate store which sells packaged drugs much more cheaply than any chain.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DIGITIZED

Indeed it sells so cheaply that one of the chains which established a competing store near this independent in an effort to drive it out of business was careful not to use its own chain name upon this competing store. Parenthetically, it is reported that to the chain's surprise and embarrassment its own cut-rate establishment, expecting to lose money while driving out the independent, has actually made money at the same low level of prices.

Resale price maintenance has served the chains in two ways: first, it has relieved them from the competition of the pineboard independent and thus protected them from the newest and most effective channel through which fast moving packaged drugs can reach the consumer at low prices. Second, it has enabled the chains to organize a low-price raid against any independent drug store without fear of retaliation. This second effect is due to the recognition which chains have established for their own private brands. With national brands of drug products price controlled, the chain can collect substantial margains upon such products while reducing the price of its own private brands whenever it desires to use them as leaders or to make a raid upon the national brand business enjoyed by other stores. Since these other stores are bound not to cut prices upon the national brands and do not control private brands which have acquired prestige through extensive advertising, retaliation by the victims is not possible. Thus the most obvious effect of resale price maintenance upon the relations between chain and independent is to deprive the independent of a price cutting weapon still available to the chain. The complacency with which chains have accepted the operation of the State laws is no doubt partially due to this fact.

The actual effects of resale price maintenance have been those which are to be expected from private price fixing conspiracies unregulated by public authority, whether or not they enjoy the sanction of law. Some of these effects were summarized by Mr. Isador Lubin, Commissioner of Labor Statistics and a member of the Temporary National Economic Committee, in a letter transmitting to the chairman of the Committee Monograph No. 1, entitled "Price Behavior and Business Policy." Mr. Lubin said:

"This report indicates that there are certain important rigidities in retail prices, which prevent them from being reduced freely, and to which this Committee may well direct its attention. I refer to the so-called fair-trade laws which have been enacted by 44 States and to the Miller-Tydings Enabling Act which legalizes resale price maintenance contracts in interstate commerce. I refer also to the Unfair Practices Acts which are on the statute books of about half the States and which, while purporting merely to prohibit sales below cost, seem to lend themselves to highly restrictive activities. Further, in some lines of trade, particularly in certain drugs, there appear to be unduly wide margins between the cost of ingredients, the sale price at wholesale, and the price to the consumer."

The report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, like other impartial studies, indicates that resale price contracts have hurt the consumer. Pineboards, chains, and independents which were operating under the pressure of competition in the downtown areas of large cities have raised their prices very substantially. The consumer who cannot afford high mark-ups upon drug items, or who is willing to seek out the most economical source of supply, has lost his opportunity to save money. Outlying drug stores which enjoy a neighborhood monopoly have often found it worth while to cut their prices slightly in order to announce that they are not being undersold.

Druggists determine the amount of selling effort they will spend upon a product in the light of the size of the operating margin which the manufacturer is willing to establish between his wholesale price and his fixed resale price; and under this pressure, manufacturers have begun to bid for business by raising the retailer's margin. The pages of the drug journals contain advertisements by some manufacturers calling attention to the fact that their contract resale prices guarantee operating margins as high as 50 and 60 percent of the retail price. Upon most products the margins are not as great; but many margins are probably lower than those which will be eventually established, for the officials of the retail organizations have frankly recognized that the safest way to raise prices is in a series of small increases spread over a period of time.

Naturally, higher margins have increased the profits of the drug business and already the druggists have begun to worry about the handling of drug items by grocery stores and about an increase in the number of drug stores. In Massachusetts, a State law which formerly required the State to grant a drug license upon proof of proper qualifications was recently changed to make it optional with the State authorities whether they will grant such a license, and the reason for the change was said to be a desire to limit the number of druggists. Organized retailers are seeking to make it unlawful for packaged drugs to be handled except through drug stores. The alternative is plain—either outsiders will push into the business of selling drugs until, in spite of his sheltered position, the druggist loses in average volume of sales what he has gained in wider margins, or else further steps will be taken to give a limited group of retail establishments a vested right to profits. Whichever happens, druggists who are blocked from competing with each other on a basis of price will be forced to compete by carrying larger stocks, displaying goods more lavishly, and thus raising the actual cost of distribution. The consumer is sure to lose; in the long run it is doubtful that the druggist will gain.

Resale price contracts have also been used widely in the gasoline industry, the liquor industry, the tobacco industry, and in bookselling, and sporadically in the sale of household appliances, musical instruments, and jewelry. In Ohio they have been used to prevent competition by retailers in selling certain kinds of food. It is still too early to see how much of American industry such contracts may eventually cover.

The economic grounds for repeal of the Miller-Tydings amendment are clear in the foregoing discussion. They are set forth in greater detail in appendix C, which contains a part of a speech which I made in 1939 before the American Economic Association. In addition there are persuasive legal reasons for repeal. The amendment has encouraged flagrant violations of the Sherman Act which it does not actually sanction. This situation is a consequence of the misrepresentations already described. When Congress passed the Miller-Tydings Act, the great body of retailers in the drug industry supposed that they had been given congressional authority to get together to fix resale prices and to force the reluctant into line. Actually they had been given no such authority. The facts had been misrepresented to Congress, and Congress had passed a statute which granted what had been asked for but not what was actually wanted. The gap between what is lawful and what is being done under the color of law has been visible ever since. Congress forbade competitors to get together to fix resale prices, extending its sanction to vertical but not to horizontal price fixing. In practice it is nearly always impossible for one manufacturer to establish a system of vertical price fixing unless he can be sure that his competitors will do likewise; and a single price-fixed commodity is exposed to the inroads of competing commodities when these articles can be sold for less than the fixed price. Consequently, horizontal collusion in violation of the law has been an indispensable part of the movement for resale price maintenance. Wholesalers' and retailers' committees have sought to force all competing manufacturers to issue contracts and have set up systems for the review and approval of contracts issued. The effort to keep nonsigners in line has been a collective undertaking of the competitors of those nonsigners, many of whom were nonsigners themselves. Although Manufacturer Jones and Manufacturer Smith cannot agree with each other about prices without violating the Sherman Act, they have found a ready means of evasion by which each makes an identical agreement with Retailer Brown. If the Antitrust Division had the men and the money to examine every resale price contract which has been written under the cloak of State and Federal legislation, and to proceed in every case in which the arrangement goes beyond the authorizations of the Miller-Tydings amendment, there would be no resale price problem, for there would be practically no resale price contracts. In the absence of such wholesale law enforcement, the system of resale price legislation has become a breeding ground for restraints of trade such as Congress never intended to sanction and did not sanction.

Attached as appendix A is a detailed statement concerning the limitations involved in the Miller-Tydings amendment and the various devices prevalent under resale price maintenance which typically violate the Sherman Act as amended. Such devices are prevalent in the issuance and enforcement of most resale price contracts.

There is also attached as appendix B a copy of recent decision by the Court of Appeals of Ohio, throwing out one resale price case because of collusion not contemplated in the statute. This case illustrates the fact that even the State laws, which enforce an effectual collusion among retailers, do not sanction the collusion among producers or wholesalers which is actually generated by such legislation. Although this proceeding also illustrates the fact that nonsigners have a remedy at law with which to defend themselves against collusive arrangements by those who supply them, it is neither practical nor fair to depend upon the ability of a small retailer to uncover such price-fixing conspiracies and to carry the burden of legal costs necessary to deal with them.

The simplest and most effective way to restore competition in such cases is to repeal the Miller-Tydings amendment. Such action would not strengthen the chains against the independents—indeed, it might have the opposite effect. It would not threaten the existence or the prosperity of independents as a group, for these were not in jeopardy when the act was passed and are not in jeopardy now. It would restore competition in retailing, destroy the unlawful monopolies and restraints of trade which now use this amendment as a pretext for their existence, and make it once more possible for the ingenuity of American business to decrease the charge to the consumer for the distribution of goods.

CORWIN D. EDWARDS,
Economic Consultant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, certainly there is one article I wish all Members of the Senate had time to read before voting on this bill, though I know the time is not going to be available to them. Nevertheless, it ought to be in the RECORD. It is a very fine article entitled "A Chance for Really Fair Trade," which was published in the

March 1952 issue of Fortune magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHANCE FOR REALLY FAIR TRADE

Hearings have begun in Washington on several bills to restore the so-called fair-trade laws, which the Supreme Court knocked out in the Schwegmann decision handed down last May. That decision, it will be recalled, touched off some spectacular price wars, mostly in New York and mostly centering around Macy's, a bitter and articulate foe of legalized price fixing. For six giddy weeks consumers had a field day and then the wars petered out.

Whether Macy's was as wise as it was smart remains to be seen, for the big spree provided the powerful fair-trade lobbyists with precisely the ammunition they needed to mobilize congressional sentiment behind new and holeproof legislation. The American Fair Trade Council (the manufacturers' group) and the National Association of Retail Druggists began pamphleteering for a new Federal law that would restore the nonsigner clause, the heart of the whole fair-trade controversy. Their strategy was to introduce a new bill in Congress just before it adjourned in October and then put the heat on the local Congressmen as soon as they set foot in their home districts. With 22 NARD lawyers guilding his hand, Congressman JOHN A. MCGUIRE, Connecticut Democrat, completed H. R. 5676 last October 17. Actually, Congressmen MORANO and POULSON had each introduced a fair-trade bill in June, but when these were referred to Judiciary, chairmaned by anti-fair-trader EMANUEL CELLER, no great things were expected of them. The McGuire bill was designed for introduction into the more sympathetic Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

The fair traders went right back to the grass roots, or as their campaign guide for fair trade counseled them, to "where the bodies are." The homeward-bound Senators and Representatives got the full treatment. Their local offices were deluged with some of the 150,000 pieces of background literature mailed out by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade. In hundreds of personal contacts with their old friend, the druggist, or the friends of that old friend, they were told that the fate of little businessmen everywhere depended on fair trade, that the drugstore was an American forum to be cherished as one should cherish liberty itself, and that the consumer must be protected from the depredations of the price cutter. The success of the 12-week program may be summed up in the words of one Senator not so safely back in Washington. Asked whether he would vote against fair trade, his comment was: "I don't bleed good."

THE HEART OF THE MATTER

Why is it that the fair traders have no difficulty whatever in mustering formidable political support, while the arguments against fair-trade legislation can apparently be swept aside or ignored with political impunity? Fair trade is bad economics, bad law, and bad politics. Fair-trade legislation clearly violates the spirit of the Sherman Antitrust Act, which law carries immense magic with the voters. It is legislation that runs completely counter to the pocketbook interests of the voter as consumer. It is true that the neighborhood druggist occupies a unique place in the hearts of Americans. He is a local institution to which Americans are willing to trust their children, their health, and their troubles. But there just are not enough votes in the independent druggists and other interested small retailers to account for the indisputable political pressure behind fair trade. Is there some uncorrected abuse, some deeply felt fear, that fair trade satisfies, however awkwardly?

The easy answer is, of course, that small business is being threatened, and the small-business man is a universally appealing American symbol. The small retailer, and the neighborhood druggist in particular, did take a terrible beating during the great depression. The Miller-Tydings Act, the basis for the State fair-trade acts, was essentially a depression measure to meet a depression situation. It is extremely unlikely that we will see in our lifetime anything comparable to the thirties.

A repetition of last June's fancy price cutting also seems unlikely. Manufacturers have been busy signing individual resale price agreements with retailers and even Macy's has been forced to accept them in order to get certain brands of merchandise. (Sunbeam showed how serious it was about price maintenance by filing a $6,000,000 triple-damage suit against Macy's, charging that the store had unlawfully restrained trade by using mixmasters as loss leaders.) The economics of retailing seemed as well behaved without "fair trade" as "fair traders" claimed it had been with it.

But if the driving force behind "fair trade" is a mystery, at least there is nothing obscure about what needs to be done. Opposition to "fair trade" legislation should center on one thing and one thing only. That is the provision by which a price-maintenance contract between a manufacturer and one retailer is binding on all retailers in the same State who sell the product. No one can take exception to a manufacturer's right to police his own distribution. But to appeal to the Government for assistance in policing a price structure is bad political theory. To coerce a retailer into a contract he has never seen, let alone signed, is bad law. Giving special protection to a special group is not exactly new in United States history but that does not alter the fact that it is bad economics.

WHAT'S THE ALTERNATIVE?

As matters now stand, "fair trade" seems likely to pass this spring, or perhaps it will slip through in the something-for-everybody days just before the July conventions. The Celler committee began hearings February 13 on three pro "fair trade" bills and one against it. The Celler hearings, as announced, were to be all-inclusive with testimony both for and against "fair trade" by the most competent experts. Meanwhile, however, the Interstate Committee, at the prodding of the druggists, had announced hearings on the McGuire bill 9 days earlier than those of the Celler committee.

The druggists' tactics, obviously, are to rush the McGuire bill through the Interstate Committee before the Celler committee has had a chance to complete its hearings. The affair is strongly reminiscent of a previous stratagem when they slipped the original "fair trade" statute (the Miller-Tydings Act) through Congress by attaching it as a rider to an appropriations bill.

In the event the McGuire bill is favorably reported by Interstate, and gets past the Rules Committee, the opponents of price fixing are afraid that legislative timidity will permit passage notwithstanding the logic brought to bear against it. Such an eventuality has even produced a backstage split in the ranks of the Federal Trade Commission, once of a single mind on how to combat "fair trade." Part of the staff is still in uncompromising opposition; but an equal important number, though still opposed to "fair trade" as such, are murmuring about "politics being the art of the possible." Since permanent prohibition of "fair trade" seems politically impossible to them, they hope to work out a compromise.

Briefly, their proposition is to provide small business with special protection by rewriting section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act so that loss-leader selling by producers would be illegal even though prices were cut "in good faith" to meet competition. With loss leaders thus prevented at the producer level, the policing of loss-leader selling at the distributor level could be handled by triple-damage civil suits.

Unfortunately the remedy in this instance is almost as bad as the disease. The Supreme Court, in the Standard Oil of Indiana case, has already confirmed the right of a producer to price-cut, even though injury to competition might result, if the cut is motivated in good faith by a desire to meet the price of a competitor. Prevention of this competition among producers in order to forestall a bill that would restrict competition among distributors is merely robbing Peter to pay Paul.

RECIPE FOR PRICE CUTTING

The way to handle the predatory price cutter—and there is such a species, if increasingly rare—is through enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission Act, Robinson-Patman Act, the Sherman Act, by individual non-statutory agreements, and through civil suit brought by manufacturers, not by a statutory price-fixing scheme, which rides roughshod over all dissenters. If more is needed, now is the time to investigate and establish clearly the need. But the fact that the original Miller-Tydings Act was passed as a rider, the fact that the new bill is being hurried through with unseemly speed, does not make for confidence in the validity of the legislation.

The truth is that the small retailer, particularly the druggist, would do better to channel his energies and enthusiasm away from pseudo-panaceas like fair trade and into new marketing methods. He needs to become, as Prof. Joseph Klamon of St. Louis' Washington University put it, "less margin-conscious and more volume-conscious." A fixed set of minimum prices will not, for example, neutralize the competition of the joint grocery-and-drug store. These really formidable competitors operated on the sound belief that the housewife (if given the opportunity) will buy drugs along with her daily food purchases, are increasing in number. Chain food stores are putting in drug counters and chain drugstores are opening complete food sections. The 85-store Owl Drug chain has three on the west coast and its sister subsidiary, Liggets (125 outlets), will shortly experiment with two in the East. The time seems to be approaching when everyone will sell everything. The best defense for the small druggist is keener merchandising, continued reliance on service, the extension of credit, and convenience of location.

Through all the oratory that beclouds rather than illuminates the status of the American small retailer, one fact is clear. The fair traders have never been able to prove that price competition has caused more merchant bankruptcies in non-fair-trade States than in those where prices are policed. Under the circumstances they would render a service to their colleagues, themselves, and the free-enterprise system by combatting the merchants' real antagonists—low volume, lack of mobility, inertia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I were to be limited to but one source material in opposition to this bill, and if I were told, "That is all you are going to have time to read," in order to get the main reasons for saying that the bill should not be passed, I would select the very able statement of Dr. Joseph M. Klamon, professor of marketing,

School of Business and Public Administration, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., made before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on June 4, 1952. He is well known throughout this country for what some call a crusade against so-called fair-trade legislation by the Federal Government. His testimony speaks for itself. In my judgment, it is the best rebuttal that can be offered to the proponents of this bill. I think it is devastating rebuttal, and, on the basis of that testimony alone, after listening to the proponents of the bill, I would still vote against the bill. I ask unanimous consent to have Professor Klamon's statement before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPOSITION TO THE McGUIRE RESALE PRICE FIXING BILL, H. R. 5767

STATEMENT BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, BY DR. JOSEPH M. KLAMON, PROFESSOR OF MARKETING, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

My name is Joseph M. Klamon. I wish to thank the committee for permitting me to appear in opposition to the McGuire price fixing bill. I live at 7464 University Drive, University City, Mo. Since September 1929, for the past 23 years I have taught marketing and related business courses at Washington University. I am professor of marketing in the school of business and public administration in our university. Prior to returning to St. Louis I was a tutor at Yale in economics, professor of economics and chairman of the department at William and Mary, instructor in marketing and business policy in the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration, associate professor of economics at Carnegie Institute of Technology, and visiting lecturer at the University of Pittsburgh. Although I am not, at my own request, presently speaking or serving in that capacity, since 1934 I have served as marketing consultant to the consumers group in St. Louis, which was originally set up by Prof. PAUL DOUGLAS, now Senator from Illinois. This group has continued to function after the NRA ceased to function on a local level. I received the LL. B. from Washington University and the M. A. J. D. and Ph. D from Yale University. I also held a fellowship in 1926 in the Harvard Law School. I am opposed to the price fixing bill before you for in reality it will amend to the point of destruction the Sherman Act and the rest of our antitrust laws.

The price fixing bill before you, the McGuire bill, has only one purpose and that is by legislation to reverse the Schwegmann and Wentling cases and thus to destroy by legislation the restoration of competitive pricing on branded merchandise, which occurred as a result of the Supreme Court's decisions in the above two cases. I am opposed to the enactment of this so-called fair trade bill, but which in reality is price fixing on branded merchandise because it is entirely antithetical to the Sherman Act. If enacted into law it will seriously and adversely affect the living standards of a large portion of our population. It will cost the public no less than $2,000,000,000 a year. It will reach into the pocket of every man, woman, and child and be the equivalent of a 10 percent tax, virtually a 10 percent sales tax on all branded goods purchased. We must have either price fixing or price freedom. More than 40 professors signed or submitted statements in opposition to price fixing bills in recent hearings before the House Judiciary Committee. These included faculty members who major in marketing, business, and government legislation. They included professors from Yale, Harvard, MIT, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, the University of California, and many others. Farm groups testified in opposition to price fixing. So did the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and staff members of the Federal Trade Commission.

Various labor groups and civic organizations have always opposed these price-fixing bills, which seriously impair consuming buying power, particularly during a period of high inflation. It is idle to suggest that the aggressive lobbyists of the retail druggists and brand name manufacturers are conducting this very expensive pressure campaign in order to help the public get lower prices for branded goods. The price-fixing bill before you is advocated by trade groups such as the NARD and similar trade associations who are interested in legislation to benefit only their members and not the public.

I hold no brief whatever for any particular channel of distribution. I have always been opposed to any legislation in favor of price-fixing or legislation that would weaken our antitrust laws and our competitive economy. I should suggest that your committee consider the desirability of securing the views on the proposed price-fixing bills before you from economists and professors of marketing in perhaps the 200 leading universities. Those who would destroy our antitrust laws and reverse by legislation the Schwegmann and Wentling cases have never been able to secure as many as five or six, if any, economists of national repute to testify that their bills for fair-trade price-fixing are in the public interest. The Miller-Tydings Act since its enactment has cost the consuming public many billions in higher fixed prices on branded goods. Legislation of this sort that is the equivalent of a 10-percent to 12-percent sales tax collected by retailers and manufacturers of branded goods, for themselves, should not be enacted without adequate information from disinterested experts as to whether or not such legislation is truly in the public interest.

Consumers are entitled to adequate information, competitive pricing on all goods, branded or unbranded, and the widest possible choice under such conditions of competition. I have been for many years unalterably opposed to all forms of price fixing, vertical or horizontal, when practiced by individuals and trade groups. Such price fixing by and on behalf of retailers, manufacturers or trade groups is essentially featherbedding. Featherbedding appears to be a form of business racketeering. It is invariably inimical to public interest and the consuming public. Featherbedding is no less harmful whether practiced by labor, agriculture, manufacturers, retailers, or any one else. The bill before you is essentially featherbedding, price fixing in behalf of retail druggists, brand name manufacturers, and others handling branded merchandise. It is designed to lessen, not widen, consumer choice. It is further designed to condition and police coercively and by compulsion the pricing practices of lower-cost, volume merchandisers; firms who are content with a smaller margin on an immense volume rather than a maintained high margin on a lesser volume.

About 12 years ago there was a bill introduced in the House known as H. R. 1. It was the Patman chain-store bill. It never became law. It attempted to carry the Indiana and Louisiana graduated tax on multiple retail outlets, a step further by multiplying such increasingly severe taxes by the number of States in which a chain did business. This would have taxed A & P, for example, 60 percent of its gross dollar receipts when at that time its average gross margin was ony 16 percent. This, of course, was not an attempt to regulate but to destroy a competitor. I suggested at the time that this type of legislation represented simply another effort to hold back the dawn, to halt the inevitable as I believed then and believe now that the giant superstore in food and drugs is here to stay. Restrictive legislation of this variety as enacted on a State level boomeranged.

The development of the immense food and drug superstore would probably have come in any event. However, legislation of this sort simply gave the chains and the independent superstores a tremendous shove in the direction in which they were headed anyway. In 1929 A & P was the first food chain to cross a billion dollars in volume. They did this in some 16,000 stores. Now they sell about $3,000,000,000 annually in approximately 6,000 stores. The restoration of fair trade by writing the compulsory nonsigner clause into Federal law will, in my judgment, even if legal, which is very doubtful, likewise boomerang. For super food stores, attracted by the high fixed margin on drug proprietaries and sundries have been moving and are now moving into the handling of drug items with incredible speed. The Nielson Service of Chicago and the Progressive Grocer of February 1952 indicate clearly that super food stores in the last 3 years have tripled the volume of drug items, proprietaries, and sundries that they are handling. Since the NARD the retail-drug lobby which boasts that it secured the enactment of the Miller-Tydings Act as well as 45 State fair-trade laws has been in the forefront of fair-trade price-fixing efforts, it may be of some interest to see the effect of maintained margins upon independent retail-drug stores.

Super food stores respect the maintained margins on drug items, as they have had to do in the past. However, they have such an enormous volume of traffic through their food stores that they are thus enabled to give their customers very attractive buys on many other items and then make available drug, proprietaries, and sundries on a self-service basis at or close to recently maintained prices.

The most important trend in drug marketing in the last few years has been the increasing sale of drug products in food stores. Four percent of the sales volume of the average supermarket, doing a business of better than $250,000 a year on a self-service basis, now comes from drug proprietaries alone. There are some 15,000 such supermarkets. Practically all of these now handle drug products in varying degrees. More eye-opening is the revelation that drug sales per square foot is as much as 4 to 1 over certain grocery departments. Sales of drug products in supermarkets were three and one-half times as great in 1951 as they were in 1948. Colgate reports 55 percent of its dentifrice sales are in food-store outlets. In Springfield, Mass., three supermarkets sell more Pepsodent than the top 15 drug stores in the city. A few of the more striking developments in the field of marketing in the past few years have been the establishment of branches of department stores in neighborhood shopping centers; the rack jobber or rack operator and perhaps most significant the movement of nationally advertised drug products through grocery supermarkets. The movement of these drug products through super food stores is easily the most important development in such stores since the handling of meats and produce in grocery stores.

According to the Grey Advertising Agency, women visit supermarkets at least four times as often as they visit drug stores, and signifi-

cantly, women visit drug stores more often than department stores from whose housewares and hosiery departments the supermarkets will soon be taking a bigger bite. A move which will bear watching is the drug-grocery recently opened in California and operated jointly by Mayfair Markets and the Owl Drug Co. This is still in the experimental stage, and too early to tell if it constitutes a trend or an exception. The retail drug lobby, the NARD, and the brand name manufacturers lobby, the American Fair Trade Council of Gary, Ind., have been most active in promoting price fixing fair-trade laws and destroying competition in branded merchandise by legislation on a Federal and State level. This has tended to interest and attract other merchandisers in handling such margin-protected, price-fixed drug and other name-brand items. The rack jobber or rack operator as a result has recently had a surprisingly rapid growth. The margin on drug proprietaries is 30.5 percent to 33 percent on an average. On drug sundries it may be a few percent more.

The average margin in food supers is close to 16 percent or 17 percent, in some instances a little less, rarely more. The rack operator keeps his 15 percent plus an additional 6 percent to 8 percent as he offers the food super store about 22 percent to 24 percent average on drug proprietaries, and about 30 percent to 33 percent profit on drug sundries. The rack operator, therefore, in placing and servicing nationally advertised, fast-moving drug proprietaries and sundries in food stores takes his regular jobbers' or wholesalers' margin of about 15 percent plus an additional 6 percent to 8 percent on the drug items for servicing the drug rack in food stores. Dewing & Co., a rack operator, now services over 3,000 food stores in California alone with drug products. There are some 175 or more rack operators in the country. There has been a geographical expansion from the far West to the Midwestern States, then to the Southeast, then to the Mid-Atlantic, and lastly to the New England States. Recently there has been an association formed of these rack operators composed of the leading rack jobbers in the country with a former Kroger executive who pioneered drug products in Kroger stores heading this group.

One purpose of this association appears to be to get a better margin from manufacturers of nationally advertised items in order to give them a wider margin and greater leverage. The alert chains have watched the rack jobbers closely, learned all they could from them, and are now demanding that manufacturers of nationally advertised drug items sell them directly. This the manufacturers are only too glad to do and have had to do simply because they must have their nationally advertised products available and on display on a self-service basis or otherwise wherever the traffic and volume happen to be. Wholesalers in the drug field have, of course, been alert to what the rack jobber means to them in the movement of drug items through food stores. Some wholesalers have been quick to engage in rack jobbing activities themselves, taking the normal wholesaler's margin plus the same amount that the rack jobber has taken for servicing super food stores. Naturally, the independent retail druggist has taken a dim view of the activities designed to move greater quantities of nationally advertised drug, proprietaries, sundries, and other items through food stores, and in some instances has attempted to resist the movement of such drug items through food stores, all, of course, to no avail. It will do the retail druggist no good to attempt to take a change of venue from the free market of open competition to the political arena on either the Federal or State level, as is here attempted. There is tremendous traffic in practically all food stores.

Consumers seem receptive and desire to purchase packaged drug products in food stores. Super food stores seem interested only in about 100 or more of the fastest moving nationally advertised items. The average gross on food store products as indicated is around 15 percent to 17 percent. The average profit on drug items is almost twice that on food percentages. It is apparent that the movement of drug products in food stores is here to stay and perhaps to grow. Kroger's latest estimate is that its drug business last year was about $12,000,000 with its dollar profits per square foot of floor space exceeded only by three other departments—canned goods, meat, and bread. Other giant food distributors in the field include National Tea Stores, American Stores, Food Fair, Safeway, and last to enter the field, A & P, which is now testing drug and toiletries sections in a cross section of its stores.

In general it may be said that food store sales of drug products have moved most rapidly during the last 2 to 3 years and is a trend that cannot be arrested, nor is it a distribution factor that can be overlooked. The retail druggist himself will have to fight this new-found competition based on mass traffic movement through food stores, not with price fixing or other restrictive legislation, but with better merchandising of drug products in his store. The average druggist, it seems, finds it difficult to grasp the importance of turnover, which to the food merchandiser is of major importance. Too many druggists are high margin and price fixing conscious and not sufficiently volume conscious. Too many druggists display canned goat's milk, Wample's Remedy No. 82, Father John's Medicine, and a few other so-called profitable items whose rate of inventory turnover is often one time a year or less. The retail drug lobby, the NARD, and many of its members tends to look at the percentages which cannot be put in the bank instead of the dollars resulting from volume which pay bills. This refers mostly to the NARD and many of its independent druggist members and not to the alert super store chain or independent operator who runs his business as a business and not as a college of pharmacy.

Many proprietors of drug stores today are pharmacy school graduates with unfortunately little or no training or understanding of merchandising principles and the methods of operation and the formulas that will pay profits over the long term. The real solution to the problems confronting manufacturers of brand name merchandise and the retail druggist are not to be found in amending or destroying our antitrust laws with various price-fixing devices involving the policing of the pricing policies of lower-cost and perhaps more efficient distributors, but rather in better merchandising. In the Progressive Grocer of February 1952 the lead article featured on the cover and in detail from pages 50 through 58 has a few high lights that may be of interest. Among these are the following: 85 percent of stores surveyed (food supers) $300,000 or over annual volume as well as smaller stores now handle drugs and toiletries compared with 37 percent in 1941. This department adds about 2 percent to total store sales and 4 percent to total store gross margin. They sold an estimated $340,000,000 in drugs and toiletries in 1951 and indications are that they will continue to grow in these departments.

Leading drug and toiletry brands are now readily available to food stores from many sources, including manufacturers who are naturally pleased to exploit this added channel not only because of the added volume, but because it gives manufacturers leverage in bargaining with less fear when facing the demands of the NARD. Superfood operators find it pays to give drug department preferred high-traffic location. Drug sales per square foot of floor space in food stores are double over-all store average and the dollar margin is four times the store average because margin on these items is twice the average margin on all other food items. Most food stores support fair-trade prices for drug and toiletries and the average margin on these is 30.5 percent. It increases their ability to give greater values on items not fair traded, thereby increasing traffic, volume, and over-all gross profit. Sixty-four percent of the stores in the Progressive Grocer survey report drug sales up 22 percent over the previous year, and 47 percent of the stores in this survey plan to enlarge and improve the drug department in 1953. In a free economy capital naturally tends to flow where it may be most profitably employed. The above merely proves again that a fixed and false price level tends to defeat itself by inviting competition if not immediately in price competition, then by attracting other distributors to handle the product who then will give greater values in unbranded merchandise. The idea that sharp price competition in branded merchandise will automatically cause a quality dilution harmful to the public has no basis in fact.

Fair trade price fixing is but 20 years old. We have had thousands of national brands and hundreds of nationally advertised brands long before fair trade. Indeed, price competition may well cause emphasis upon greater quality in brand names. Manufacturers will not be inclined to destroy wide consumer acceptance and good will predicated upon known quality. Then, too, minimum quality standards may be had without price control. The basic assumption on the part of the American Fair Trade Council that a manufacturer should be able to write himself a ticket granting immunity from our antitrust laws merely by branding one or more of his products would seem difficult to justify. It is frequently argued that the aggressive use of loss leaders justifies fair trade price fixing. The two are, of course, entirely separate. If loss-lead selling were an evil instead of merely one of many sales promotional devices, it could be stopped by unfair sales acts alone or so-called fair trade practices acts aimed directly against below-invoice sales. Fair traders talk no end about the evils of loss-lead selling and then ask for the unrestricted right to fix sky-high margins on all branded merchandise. Present antitrust laws and powers of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, and Federal Trade Commission appear to be adequate to handle predatory price cutting designed to destroy competitors. The absence of any factual basis to justify the bills before you because of loss-lead selling and severe price wars is best evidenced by two items. First, the spectacular price wars that occurred right after the Schwegmann decision of May 21, 1951, ended in less than 2 months. Indeed, they did not even extend to many parts of the country. This proves that business does not commit suicide very often. Second, there is not a single price war of any major significance at the present time in any large city in the country.

There is no evidence whatever indicating a greater mortality among small retailers in free-trade Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia than in fair trade territory. The States that do not have fair trade laws have not had any greater degree of mortality among marketers who did not enjoy the price fixing that prevailed in other States.

In the effort to enact a fair trade law in the State of Missouri, one of many, which came to an abrupt end with the U. S. Supreme Court Schwegmann decision of May 21, 1951, the American Fair Trade Council sent speakers in many parts of Missouri to tell Missourians that industry was staying out of Missouri because of the absence of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

fair trade and because of our excellent antitrust laws. The St. Louis Chamber of Commerce repeatedly stated that there is no basis whatever in fact for this assertion. Indeed, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce which strongly opposed a fair trade bill on many occasions proved that St. Louis with about one-third the population of metropolitan Chicago had over $300,000,000 in new industry and expanded industry which was greater than we ever had had and greater than Chicago's dollar total for the year. At the time the AFTC suggested Missouri was going downhill industrially because manufacturers were boycotting the State for lack of fair trade, our industrial area was about to be declared a scarce labor area for housing and other purposes, so great was our industrial expansion and our labor shortage. It is significant that all of our larger newspapers in the State, the Kansas City Star, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Globe-Democrat, and the Star-Times before it was purchased by the Post-Dispatch for many years all strongly opposed fair trade price fixing. Missouri is indebted to its newspapers, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, and to our State law enforcement officers, Attorney General J. E. Taylor, and former Assistant Attorney General H. Jackson Daniel and their staff for enforcing our antitrust laws and preventing manufacturers and retailers from treating Missourians as if we had a fair trade law. I asked former Assistant Attorney General Daniel and our attorney general to summarize Missouri's experience with antitrust violations which they consented to do. The following is significant as indicating what those who would destroy our antitrust laws really want. I include the communication below:

FEBRUARY 6, 1952.

DR. JOSEPH M. KLAMON,
Clayton, Mo.

DEAR DR. KLAMON: As per our conversations, I am enclosing herewith a brief summary of my impressions, as a result of my experiences in the office of the attorney general of the State of Missouri, during the years 1949–51. During the principal part of my appointment as an assistant attorney general, I was either in charge of or intimately connected with the prosecution of cases arising under the antitrust law of the State of Missouri.

In the antitrust division of the attorney general's office, we had a number of skilled and trained investigators, whose function it was to inquire into and report on possible violations of the antitrust statutes. I read all of these reports, talked to witnesses, and prepared informations in the nature of quo warranto, with a view toward ousting those engaged in antitrust violations from the State of Missouri. The first six or seven informations that were filed resulted in the defendants (respondents) entering into consent judgments and paying penalties which ranged from $2,500 to $50,000, depending upon the size of the offending corporation and/or the gravity of the offense. The next group of defendants, being five or six in number, have apparently determined to fight the issue through, and their cases are now pending in the Supreme Court of Missouri. The issue in those cases is whether or not vertical price fixing violates the antitrust statutes of Missouri. While it is true that that specific issue has never been directly determined by the Supreme Court of the State of Missouri, it was the unequivocal opinion of the attorney general that the statutes clearly prohibit "any corporation from fixing or regulating the price of any article whatsoever" and that the language in those cases involving horizontal price fixing was sufficiently broad to condemn vertical price fixing. Since the McGuire bill and others of the similar nature are concerned with vertical price fixing, this summary will be confined to that particular field.

Missouri does not have a fair-trade statute. Each and every one of the surrounding States, as well as a vast majority of the rest of the States of the Union, do have such statutes. It was our experience that manufacturers, wholesalers, jobbers, and retailers, by and large, treat Missouri as a fair-trade State. Whether this attitude resulted from a flagrant disregard for the antitrust laws or whether it was induced by the lack of prosecutions from 1927 to 1949 is unknown, but in any event, the feeling that Missouri could be considered a safe fair-trade State was universal among manufacturers, jobbers, etc. It was our experience the manufacturers and jobbers sent to their customers suggested price lists, and we found in a number of instances that when an occasional retailer deviated from the minimum price suggested by the manufacturer or distributor, that he would be forthwith cut off from any direct supply of that article. The only reasonable deduction from this course of conduct, of course, is that the minimum prices were not suggested but were mandatory. When a retailer, who had been cut off for lowering prices below the suggested minimum, had brought this to the attention of the Attorney General, our investigation would then uniformly reveal that the manufacturing company had been consistent in punishing any retailer who deviated from the minimum price schedule. Occasional attempts were made by certain manufacturers, who were more discreet than others, to police prices in a more unostentatious manner. During the trial of the cases now pending in the Supreme Court where witnesses could not testify that they had been directly warned about prices, they did, however, state that there was a tacit understanding in the trade that certain products could be cut and others could not. Where the manufacturer directly policed prices in a vigorous manner, the usual practice was to have salesman, during the course of his periodic visits to his customers throughout his territory, observe shelf prices and report by wire to the manufacturer any apparent price cutting. Advertisement in local newspapers were closely watched and clippings indicating price cutting were forwarded to the manufacturer or distributor by salesmen and also by competitors, usually small retailers. The testimony in the cases now pending in the Supreme Court uniformly revealed that price fixing in the State of Missouri is a two-way proposition, i. e., that the manufacturer himself may not have been particularly anxious, in most case, to maintain prices but that small retailers of his product were. In an effort to cooperate with the small retailers, the manufacturer, who would otherwise have been indifferent, often took upon itself the duty of policing and maintaining minimum prices. Large retailers and volume merchandisers, by and large were not interested in maintaining fair-trade prices but small retailers and others who have adopted the classical 40 percent markup were the chief proponents of fair trade within the State of Missouri.

These low-volume retailers receive considerable assistance, not only from manufacturers but from certain fair-trade councils, retail druggists' associations, etc., who flooded the State of Missouri, each time the fair trade bill came before the assembly, with pamphlets, speakers, and financial assistance. These pressure organizations had a number of approaches. One was to the inefficient high-cost, low-volume merchandiser and was an out and out appeal to his selfish interest; that is, if retail minimum prices are not maintained, you will be outmarketed and outsold by the larger-volume buyers. The second was an appeal to chambers of commerce, etc., on the apparently plausible theory that manufacturers would be less likely to locate in the State of Missouri, if they did not have the protection of a fair trade law. The first approach needs no explanation. The second, however, is open to considerable criticism. Investigation revealed that manufacturers, by and large, were not interested in maintaining fair trade prices, unless there was considerable pressure by small retailers, and that actually any plants which failed to locate within the State of Missouri, had other and more compelling reasons for so doing. The phenomenal growth of industry in Texas, which is a non-fair-trade State, lends substantial support to the view that this latter approach is fallacious and incorrect.

The activities of the attorney general, in filing these antitrust proceedings, were noteworthy in many respects, but particularly in the following: When we filed an antitrust suit against the Seagram distillery, the very next day, after the announcement of the filing of that suit appeared in the press, the price of liquor in St. Louis collapsed and spiraled downward for several days. When we filed our next antitrust suit, prices in many drug products also fell and continued to fall until they had reached a competitive level. Not only was the reaction on prices noticeable but the policing methods became more cautious and in many cases disappeared altogether. Price reduction then began to appear all along the line on many previously fair-traded items. A few months after the announcement of our first prosecution, the Star-Times made a comparative price study on a number of previously fair-traded items in St. Louis, and across the river in Illinois, and found that for the most part, prices in Illinois where fair trade was still strong, were uniformly anywhere from 10 percent to 15 percent higher, resulting in a saving to the people of Missouri of uncalculated proportions and scope. Shortly before I resigned from the office of the attorney general to resume the practice of law, our investigators were noting substantial difficulty in finding any more violations and what few violations we did find had principally occurred before the announcement of our vigorous antitrust prosecutions.

Either fair-trade practices are now completely at a standstill in Missouri among manufacturers, distributors, and retailers, or else policing and maintenance methods have become so skillful and under the table that we are unable to detect them. The torrent of propaganda and informational literature speech making continues, however, and it may be assumed that the fair-trade bill will be again presented to the assembly on an even more pronounced and desperate scale. The fair-trade bill being, of, course, the very antithesis of free competition, it is believed that the assembly of the State of Missouri, an island of free competition, will again reject the cloak-and-dagger tactics of the so-called fair-trade proponents.

Respectfully,

H. JACKSON DANIEL,
Former Attorney General (Assistant), State of Missouri.

The activities that resulted in successful legal action for violation of the Missouri antitrust laws would be legalized if the bills before you to reverse the Schwegmann and Wentling cases were enacted into law and if Missouri likewise modified or destroyed its antitrust laws. Fortunately, this has not occurred, and if the problem is approached from the standpoint of public interest and on the high level of statesmanship that caused Congress to enact our antitrust laws is maintained, none of the price-fixing bills will be recommended.

It is suggested by those favoring fair trade that retail prices on branded goods are not greatly increased. I find it difficult to believe, however, that brand-name manufacturers represented by the AFTC and the Drug Retail lobby and the NARD in putting over the Miller-Tydings Act and in organizing an intensive campaign which secured fair trade in 45 States and until the Schwegmann and

Wentling cases established the sanctity of price-fixing and wider retail margins—I find it difficult to believe that all of this very expensive activity was only concerned with helping the consumer and the public interest. All of this activity and all of the activity in introducing the McGuire bill and in introducing the price-fixing bills presently before you involves spending a vast amount of money and effort in the interest of sheer altruism.

It is hardly necessary to point out that it is the sworn duty of the attorney general of Missouri, Texas, and every other State to enforce the laws of that State. Because Attorney General J. E. Taylor, of Missouri, and the attorney general of Texas, took steps to end flagrant price-fixing activities in violation of State antitrust laws, the Fair Trade Council of Gary, Ind., denounced our attorney general in a letter dated October 4, 1950, for operating a "speed trap." Note the assumption that there is nothing wrong with price fixing and an absence of competition on branded merchandise, and the implication that if our attorney general has an idea that the Missouri antitrust laws should be strictly enforced both against vertical and horizontal price fixing that he is thereby persecuting violators. The great Champ Clark is reported to be the author of Missouri's excellent antitrust laws. The language in the law is crystal clear, very broad, comprehensive, and in my opinion Attorney General Taylor is entirely correct in believing that they declared illegal not only vertical but also all forms of horizontal price fixing. I asked Mr. Daniel, former assistant attorney general, if he would kindly request Attorney General Taylor to write me his recent experience in enforcing the law in Missouri against illegal price fixing. I here set forth the letter from our attorney general in Missouri:

STATE OF MISSOURI,
OFFICES OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Jefferson City, Mo., February 5, 1952.

Dr. JOSEPH M. KLAMON,
University City, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Mr. Jack Daniel has requested us to submit to you information concerning my enforcement of the Missouri antitrust laws, particularly with respect to vertical price-fixing practices in this State.

Since December 23, 1949, this office has filed 15 suits charging violation of the Missouri antitrust laws. Four of these actions involved horizontal price-fixing arrangements. The 11 remaining involved vertical price fixing. Of those 11 cases 7 have been concluded on the basis of stipulations entered into by the respondents and the payment by the respondents of various sums into the State treasury. No evidence was taken in any of those cases. The cases and amounts paid in settlement are as follows:

Supreme Court, No. 41839—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General, relator,* v. *Seagram-Distillers Corp., a corporation; All-State Distributors, Inc., a corporation; Stickney-Hoelscher Cigar Co., a corporation; and McKesson and Robbins, Inc., a corporation,* respondents. Fines: Seagram, $35,000; All-States, $2,500; Stickney-Hoelscher, $2,500; McKesson-Robbins, $2,500.

Jackson County Circuit Court—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General, relator* v. *Peter Digiovanni and Joseph Digiovanni, Co-Partners, Doing Business as Mid-West Distributing Co.,* respondents. Fines: Each, $1,250; aggregate, $2,500.

Cole County Circuit Court, No. 12213—*State ex rel. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General,* v. *International Cellucotton Products Co.* Fine: $50,000.

Supreme Court, No. 42050—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General, relator* v. *Faultless Starch Co., respondent.* Fine: $7,500.

Supreme Court, No. 42177—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General,* v. *Central States Distributors, Inc.* Fine: $2,500.

Cole County Circuit Court—*State ex rel. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General,* v. *Ironrite, Inc.* Fine: $6,000.

Supreme Court, No. 42186—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General,* v. *Swift & Co.* Fine: $10,000.

The Digiovanni case in the Jackson County Circuit Court was a companion case to the Seagram-Distillers Corp. case filed in the Supreme Court and involved Seagram products.

The Central States Distributors case and the Ironrite case are companion cases, both involving Ironrite ironers.

The case against Swift & Co. involved only the Swift product Vigoro.

In addition to the above cases, there is one case which is still pending in the Supreme Court, *State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General, realtor,* v. *Authorized Motor Parts Corp., et al., respondents,* in which five of the nine respondents have stipulated for decree of ouster from illegal practice and the payment of $2,500 each, or $12,500 for the five respondents. This case involves price-fixing practices in the distribution of Champion spark plugs.

In the following cases evidence has been presented to a special commissioner appointed by the supreme court. No report has been made by the Commissioner in any of the cases. They are:

Supreme Court, No. 42152—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, Attorney General, realtor,* v. *Miles Laboratories, Inc., McKesson & Robbins, Inc., The McPike Drug Co., C. D. Smith Drug Co., St. Louis Wholesale Drug Co., and Meyer Bros. Drug Co., respondents.*

Supreme Court No. 42185—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, attorney general,* v. *Armour & Co.*

Supreme Court No. 42407—*State ex inf. J. E. Taylor, attorney general, relator,* v. *Authorized Motor Parts Corp., Beck & Corbitt Co., Fred Campbell Auto Supply Co., Cities Service Oil Co., General Auto Parts Co., Hayes Automotive, Inc., Kansas City Automobile Supply Co., Myers Motor Equipment Co., and Phillips Petroleum Co., respondents.*

The case of *State ex rel. J. E. Taylor, attorney general,* v. *Sunbeam Corp.* is pending in Jackson County Circuit Court. No hearing has been held in that case.

We are enclosing herewith copy of a statement prepared for use before the Missouri State Senate in connection with senate bill No. 42, proposing the adoption of a fair-trade act for the State of Missouri. No hearing has been held on this bill by the senate committee and I have not used the statement, but you might find it of interest.

If there is any further information that you would like to have concerning any of the above cases or the activities of this department, please let us know and we will be glad to cooperate with you.

Yours very truly,

J. E. TAYLOR,
Attorney General.

The proponents of fair trade point out as the public relations man of the retail drug lobby, Mr. Mermy, did on February 4, 1952, in the hearings on the McGuire bill that while 45 States have enacted fair trade laws, not one has repealed such a law. This is supposed to be evidence that price fixing laws on branded goods are in the public interest. If the retail drug lobby and the brand name lobby were as efficient in marketing as they are in applying coercive political pressure they would not need this political crutch to protect them from inefficiency in distribution. Once they succeed, it is almost impossible to restore competitive pricing in the public interest. This is certainly no evidence that such a law promotes public welfare. The opponents of fair trade in Missouri were to be heard before a legislative committee in Jefferson City toward the end of May 1951. Like a breath of fresh air, the Supreme Court on May 21, 1951, held the nonsigner clause invalid in the Schwegmann case, and the effort to enact a fair trade bill in Missouri lost much of it organized drive. Attorney General J. E. Taylor prepared a statement in opposition to Missouri Senate bill No. 42, the proposed fair trade bill in our State. It has never before been published or used, and it is so apropos and pertinent to the bills before you seeking to legalize the nonsigner clause and reverse Schwegmann that I here set forth the statement referred to in the above letter from the attorney general:

"STATEMENT BY J. E. TAYLOR, ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF MISSOURI, AGAINST THE FAIR TRADE BILL FOR MISSOURI

"Senate bill No. 42 proposes the adoption of a so-called Fair Trade Act for the State of Missouri. The essential purpose of the bill is to enable a manufacturer to require that his products be sold at retail at a price not less than a minimum which he may specify.

"Missouri has been a regular target for the advocates of fair-trade legislation since the movement received the benefit of exemption from the Federal antitrust laws upon the enactment by Congress of the Tydings-Miller amendment in 1937. That act, incidentally, was passed as a rider to a District of Columbia appropriation act after the House and Senate had failed to act on a bill directly covering the subject. President Roosevelt, on signing the bill, denounced the practice of attaching extraneous rider clauses to bills and expressed his fear that the law would lead to increased prices to consumers. Experience under the law has shown such fear to have been justified.

"Despite the regular efforts to obtain passage of a fair-trade law in this State, the people and the legislature have recognized that fair-trade legislation is inconsistent with the free enterprise economy of which we are justly proud and have refused to subvert the welfare of the people as a whole to that of a special few.

"Undaunted by their rebuffs in this State, advocates of the legislation are now engaged in a vigorous campaign for the passage of Senate bill No. 42. The campaign is being directed by the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., of Gary, Ind., and the Fair Trade Education Bureau of New York.

"The president of the American Fair Trade Council is John W. Anderson, who is also president of the Anderson Co., of Gary, Ind., a corporation which engages in the manufacture of automobile accessories. The American Fair Trade Council is an association of manufacturers, all, or practically all, of which are located outside the State of Missouri. Mr. Anderson recently solicited membership in the organization among manufacturers all over the United States by means of a deliberately misleading letter in which my action in enforcing the antitrust laws of this State was described as 'a lucrative speed-trap operation.'

"The organization last year held its annual meeting at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City. At that meeting various manufacturers pointed out the results of their operations under fair-trade laws. A representative of G. & C. Merriam Co., publishers of Webster's Dictionary, pointed out that, before fair trade, the $20 Webster's International Dictionary was sold for as little as $12.34, but that with the advent of fair trade the price was restored to the $20 figure. Just how the purchaser benefited by this increase under fair trade was not explained.

"The report also contains a statement by a representative of Ronson Art Metal Works, Inc., a manufacturer of cigarette lighters, which operates under fair trade. This statement shows how under fair trade a merchant is deprived of his right to operate his business as he sees fit. The statement is as follows:

"'We have a lighter fuel under the trade name of "Ronsonol" which is fair-traded

at 25 cents. Let's say, for example, that they take our minimum-price lighter which is $6 and sell the combination for $6.19. We immediately put a stop to that.'

"Equally enlightening is a statement made at the meeting by Mr. Ivan D. Tefft, attorney for the Parker Pen Co. Mr. Tefft stated:

" 'Now (under fair-trade laws) the terms "price cutters" and "price cutting," when applied to a merchandiser are synonymous with law violator and no one likes to be adjudged a law violator.'

"Thus, under a fair-trade law, a Missouri merchant would not only lose the right to operate his business as he saw fit, but he would be a law violator should he attempt to do so.

"The Fair Trade Council has recently written its members outside Missouri requesting that they write their customers here and suggest that the customers see, write, wire, or telephone members Senate Criminal Jurisprudence Committee, urging that Senate bill No. 42 be reported out promptly for favorable action by the Senate. Missouri retailers have been flooded with such letters received from their out-of-State suppliers. A number of them have undoubtedly written members of this committee in response to these urgings from the outside manufacturers.

"Another part of the campaign has been a series of speeches delivered throughout the State by Mr. David Molthrop. Mr. Molthrop's position is described as community relations consultant for the Anderson Co. This is the company of which Mr. John W. Anderson, president of the American Fair Trade Council, is president. Mr. Molthrop's speech, which has been delivered before numerous civic organizations throughout the State, is described as a speech on attracting industry to the community. Two of Mr. Molthrop's points, as reported in the press, are:

"(1) 'Back your chamber of commerce to the fullest and the activities of its industrial committee.'

"(2) 'Support your local inventors. Fruition of their ideas means more jobs and more payrolls for your community.'

"However, Mr. Molthrop's purpose in coming into this State has not been merely to voice such obvious recommendations. The main point in his address has been that the enactment of Senate bill No. 42 is the most important factor in the obtaining of any industries for the State of Missouri. He has attacked the enforcement of the antitrust law. He has stated that a number of industries have refused to locate in Missouri because of the absence of a fair-trade law. The press reports of these speeches, however, disclose the specific mention of only one industry which has declined to locate in Missouri because of the lack of a fair-trade law. By coincidence that industry is the Anderson Co. Mr. Molthrop stated that that company proposed to build a $600,000 plant in Missouri, but erected an addition to its Gary plant instead after learning of the situation here. Just where the Anderson plant was to have been located has never been stated.

"If any answer is needed to Mr. Molthrop's statement in this regard, one need only point out that the Ford Motor Co. is now engaged in the construction of a $40,000,000 plant in Clay County. Numerous large industrial plants are under construction in St. Louis, including a $6,000,000 plant by Groves Laboratories and a large plant by Procter & Gamble.

"Mr. Molthrop delivered his speech before the Springfield Lions Club and that organization immediately passed a resolution appointing a committee to support the enactment of Senate bill No. 42. Members of that organization, in order to see the fallacy of Mr. Molthrop's argument, need only have reminded themselves that the Lily Tulip Cup Co. now has under construction in Springfield a plant costing several million dollars. That company evidently was not deterred by Missouri's lack of a fair-trade law.

"Why is all of this pressure being put on this committee by firms and organizations located outside the State of Missouri? The answer to me appears to be an obvious one. Forty-five States have enacted fair-trade legislation. No such legislation is found in Texas, Vermont, District of Columbia, and Missouri.

"The St. Louis Star-Times recently published articles in which prices of certain items on sale in Illinois under fair trade were compared with the prices of the same items in the State of Missouri. A survey of 50 drug items showed that the Illinois fair-trade price was approximately 12 percent higher than the price in Missouri. A survey of the prices of liquor showed that prices in Illinois are nearly 16 percent higher than in St. Louis.

"The proponents of fair trade are anxious to eliminate the remaining few States which have failed to enact fair trade legislation, in order to remove any basis for comparison of prices in fair trade and non-fair-trade States, because any such comparison always shows that prices to the consumers invariably are higher under fair trade laws. Furthermore, should fair trade laws be enacted in all States, there would be no limit to the extent to which the manufacturers might increase the prices of their products. The fair trade laws always render lip service to the antitrust laws by prohibiting combinations of manufacturers, but it is much simpler for manufacturers to combine and fix the price of their products when they know that their retailers can be forced to sell their products for whatever price they might fix.

"Missouri has a strong, effective antitrust law. For more than 50 years it has operated for the best interests of the people of this State. Any weakening of it by a 'fair trade law' is contrary to the best interests of the people. Therefore, I submit that this committee should resist the pressure of selfish out-State interests, and refuse to approve Senate bill No. 42."

Those who are responsible for the current effort to destroy the Schwegmann and Sunbeam-Wentling cases, to destroy by Federal legislation the restoration of competitive pricing in interstate commerce through the de facto repeal of the Sherman Act, and our other antitrust laws, should give us clear, simple answers to a few questions relative to the bills before you, which they have sponsored and introduced:

1. If a cash and carry super store has lower costs, should not the public be permitted to benefit (in lower prices) from all such lower cost methods of doing business?

2. In the above situation, why should all be required to sell a so-called fair-traded item at the same retail price?

3. If competition among producers of an item is good for the public, why should competition among retail sellers of that item be denied?

4. Has any pressure group ever campaigned for price-fixing privileges except to make prices higher than they are under free competition?

5. What real and specific evidence is there that truly meritorious articles have ever been driven from the market by price competition?

6. Why should the retail drug lobby, the NARD, set up permanent headquarters in the District of Columbia Press Building and the brand-name manufacturers' lobby, the American Fair-Trade Council, set up headquarters in the Mayflower Hotel in Washington and spend large sums of money to lobby for the McGuire bill before the Commerce Committee and all the bills before this committee, other than the Curtis bill, to make the public pay more than they now pay for aspirin, tooth paste, liquor, appliances, drug items, and almost any other branded item?

7. How much money have these and other lobbies been supplied with and how much have they spent and do they intend to spend to enact the above bills into law and to destroy the Schwegmann and Wentling cases, and, specifically, by whom has this money been provided?

8. If a merchant wants to locate a store outside the city limits, operate at lower costs, price accordingly, and therefore sell at lower prices because of his lower costs, what good reason is there to deny him that right and forbid the public that benefit and would not legislation directed toward this end be held invalid by the Supreme Court as an unconstitutional deprivation of property without due process of law?

9. If the public is deceived by loss-leader prices, what would prevent equal deception as to fair-trade prices which are and have always been rather exorbitant?

10. If we grant monopoly price privileges to the select few responsible for most of the bills before you and also for the McGuire bill, who is going to regulate those prices to make certain that the public is not mulcted by the price fixers?

11. Is the Keogh bill, H. R. 6367, intended to regulate or to destroy and prevent interstate commerce in branded goods, mail-order fashion, at any price below a State fair-trade minimum?

12. Is it not probable that the United States Supreme Court would hold H. R. 6367 invalid on the ground that this does not regulate but destroys interstate commerce done by a mail-order house, and that such a bill would interfere with the inherent property right one has to conduct a lower-cost operation and to price accordingly for the benefit of the public?

These are but a few of many questions that suggest themselves the moment anyone attempts to modify or to destroy the affirmative faith in competitive pricing as evidenced in our Sherman Act and other antitrust laws. The Boston conference on distribution of last year developed a number of points that are very pertinent here. The public interest would seem to require that we should repeal the Miller-Tydings Act, as the Curtis bill before you proposes for we must have the complete restoration of the right of a distributor to set his own prices on his own property when he offers it for resale. We are here concerned with basic principles of national policy that should promote the public interest and that are vital to the future of efficient marketing. For many years there has unfortunately been conspicuous failure to recognize that competitive price making among distributors is just as vital to the public as competitive price making among producers.

A number of disinterested studies indicate clearly that about one-half of the final retail price in many fields represents distribution costs. It would seem difficult logically to maintain that factory prices should be competitively determined and that the cost of distributive services should not. If price competition among producers is good for the consuming public, then price competition among distributors serves an equal and perhaps an even more important public purpose for today the greater weight is not so much in production as it is in distribution. Does it make sense from the public standpoint to effect significant economies in manufacture and then to dissipate a great part of such lower unit cost in inefficient distribution perpetuated by an absence of competitive pricing in marketing? The Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act is a radical and dangerous denial of the fundamental principles of competition be-

cause it makes lawful the destruction of price competition among distributors in the sale of certain branded merchandise. The Miller-Tydings Act represents affirmative governmental interference in behalf of restraint of trade and is clearly diametrically opposed to the principle in the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act. The real issue of high price fixing has not been settled by the Schwegmann decision. It can be settled by enacting the Curtis bill into law and thus repealing the Miller-Tydings Act which was slipped through Congress as a rider to a District of Columbia appropriation bill. President Roosevelt denounced it at the time and would have vetoed it had he had the item veto.

On the production side we depend upon competition to weed out the inefficient and to reward the progressive manufacturer who finds a new way to produce the same or better article at a lower cost, and to pass on to the public a part of such saving. What is it that makes a similar operation inimical to public interest when it occurs in distribution? The public must have adequate information and competitive prices and have the unrestricted right to shop for values at all times and on all goods, branded and unbranded, particularly now when we have the greatest degree of inflation we have ever had in the history of the country and when the dollar buys less than it ever has before. Competition is a great economic and social force. To be sure, it is not wholly painless in operation. But we cannot wisely curb it on the theory that lower costs for products and services are necessarily against the public interest because some producers and sellers cannot meet them. These are some of the contentions not only of economists at the Brookings Institution, the Harvard Graduate School of Business, Dr. Q. Forrest Walker, economist of R. H. Macy & Co., but they are, of course, elementary and fundamental principles of economics that are taught everywhere.

No one can study the history and development of fair-trade laws, the various State laws imposing cost plus restraints on retail price competition, unfair sales acts, and a number of other restraints on the price making freedom of distributors, without being impressed with the dangers which now seriously threaten national progress toward lower costs and more efficient distribution. If we believe sincerely in free enterprise, it becomes readily apparent that these restrictive pricing devices are definitely not in the public interest. They occur only when higher cost distributors take a change of venue from the market place of open competition to the political arena. They are essentially political devices designed to secure the votes of a small minority of distributors and manufacturers interested in trade restraint on branded goods, at the expense of the entire consuming public. The wide-awake competent small merchant and the giant independent super store such as Schwegmann in New Orleans and Doc Webb in St. Petersburg, Fla., does not need price protection. And the incompetents in distribution cannot possibly attain economic salvation by such means. We should actively promote healthy price competition among distributors as well as producers.

Restraint of price competition has never been in the public interest and has never served any useful purpose. It tends to shrink markets, not to broaden them, just as the Keogh bill before you and all other bills before you other than the Curtis bill are intended to do. The growth of the rack jobber or rack operator is merely one of the later examples of the fact that ironclad price rigidity can never capture more than part of the market. Even if the fair traders succeed only in part, they reap a rich harvest at the expense of the public. As a matter of enduring national policy we are not interested in restricted markets and reduced production. Pricing policy and the freedom to price competitively is perhaps one of the most crucial of all future marketing problems. In facing this problem it may be well to bear in mind one crisp sentence from the majority opinion in the Dr. Miles case: "The complainant having sold his product at prices satisfactory to itself, the public is entitled to whatever advantages may be derived from competition in the subsequent traffic." This is the best answer to the brand name manufacturers who attempt to maintain that they can give themselves immunity from the Sherman Act by merely putting on a cloak on the package, or a brand name. If that is all that is necessary to avoid our antitrust laws, there will, of course, be an endless multiplication of brands and the manufacturer and marketer of unbranded merchandise will then want to know why he cannot operate in similar fashion.

I am in favor of the Curtis bill and favor the immediate repeal of the Miller-Tydings Act because price maintenance agreements throw a monkey wrench into free enterprise, penalizing more efficient dealers. We must have competition not only between producers and dealers of similar goods, but also between retailers of identical brands. Trade restraint, rigid prices, and margins are functional featherbedding and like all featherbedding seriously injurious to competitive free enterprise. If we do not repeal the Miller-Tydings Act and if we do approve the bills before you, we shall accomplish the defacto repeal of all of our antitrust laws. I strongly support the position taken before you by the Federal Trade Commission spokesmen and by the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice. I believe the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have well earned a salute of gratitude from the consuming public for having maintained the national policy and tradition in favor of competition and opposed to all forms of price fixing.

Recently the national income has been running well in excess of $275,000,000,000 a year. The volume of all retail trade is at the rate of $150,000,000,000 annually. When fair traders attempt to minimize the damaging effect of price fixing on consumers, they deliberately dilute the percentage of dollar volume fair-traded items by including many commodities that are not price-fixed in retail trade. The percentage may vary a small amount, but perhaps the best conservative estimate of the volume of branded goods fair traded before Schwegmann was approximately 10 percent of the total volume of retail trade, or $15,000,000,000. On the basis of a number of disinterested studies (not inspired by any trade group and not self-serving, or purchased special pleading) the average increases on prices on branded goods, on price-fixed fair-traded items, is not any less than 10 percent to 12 percent. This means that on drugs, appliances, liquor, and all other fair-traded goods, the American public prior to the Schwegmann decision, paid no less than $1,500,000,000 to $1,800,000,000 extra each year. This is the virtual equivalent of a 10 percent to 12 percent Federal sales tax on such items levied not for the benefit of the Public Treasury, but the groups of retailers and manufacturers who have sponsored most of the bills before you.

In January and April of 1949, Fortune magazine conducted a survey of prices on many items in the District of Columbia and comparable prices on such identical items in surrounding fair-trade territory. On the basis of this and other surveys Fortune conservatively estimated that fair trade was costing the American public no less than $750,000,000 annually. This study was made about 3 years ago and needs to be brought down to date. The St. Louis Star-Times conducted two surveys on prices in St. Louis where we have no fair trade and nearby Illinois that has a fair-trade law. Both of these studies will be made available to your committee, and while it is true they are flash surveys, they indicate clearly that average prices on liquor in Missouri are approximately 16 percent lower than in nearby Illinois, and that average prices on many drug items are no less than 12 percent lower than in Illinois.

Shortly after the Miller-Tydings Act was passed R. H. Macy & Co. of New York surveyed over 4,000 items sold under conditions of fair trade and before fair trade. This was one of the widest surveys conducted, and although it may come from an interested source, it indicated that the price of cosmetics as a result of fair trade price fixing had been raised 8.6 percent; drugs, 15.8 percent; liquors, 11.8 percent; books, 17.5; and miscellaneous items, 16.0 percent. In all the mass markets the survey indicated fair-trade laws have raised prices and have placed an added burden on the consuming public. The Chairman of the Department of Marketing in the School of Business and Public Administration of Temple University, Mr. Myron S. Heidingsfield, in a survey and article published in Women's Wear Daily of July 5, 1951, indicated that his study in Philadelphia, Pa., showed that most fair-traded items, particularly in appliances, were priced 20 percent too high for the average consumer, and that a number of devices had been resorted to by consumers, manufacturers, and retailers to get around fair trade price fixing restrictions in Philadelphia even before Schwegmann.

It would not be overstating the case to say that the annual overcharge to the public as a result of fair trade in 45 States has been closer to $2,000,000,000 a year than any other estimate that can be made. Approximately 200 discount houses in New York City alone the year before the Schwegmann case was decided sold more than $450,000,000 in brand-name appliances in violation of the New York Fels-Crawford fair-trade law. The savings to the public cannot be measured alone by the average 15 percent lower price than the fair-trade minimum for the marketing practices and prices of the competitors of the discount houses were obviously conditioned downward by the immense volume the discount houses were doing. The public saved no less than approximately $75,000,000 a year in lower prices on branded appliances bought in discount houses alone. This gives but a fair idea of the immense public benefit resulting from competitive pricing. The fair-trade laws are still on the lawbooks of 45 States and remain valid in intrastate commerce and also in interstate commerce, but do not apply to nonsigners. Such laws would be reactivated in a manner extremely harmful to public interest if the nonsigner clause should be upheld if enacted into law. This would mean that recalcitrants could be "dragged in by the heels" and their pricing policies policed by competitors to destroy competition and harmful to the public.

I do not believe the United States Supreme Court would declare legal the compulsory, coercive pricing imposed by the nonsigner clause, but would hold such action to be a possible violation of the inherent right of any businessman to operate at the lowest possible cost and to price his merchandise accordingly. The statistical data of Mr. Maurice Mermy, the public relations man for the NARD, given in support of the McGuire bill on February 4, 1952, would seem to have little, if any, value. His data was designed to show that fair trade does not result in appreciably higher prices to the public. This data is anything but convincing because the number of items in the various surveys he relies on are not given; nor do we know who conducted these surveys because for the most part he speaks of disinterested surveys but does not identify them; nor does he give

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

the size of the sample, nor do we know when and in what cities and on what items and on what days the surveys were made, or whether the data is derived from comparable metropolitan areas. In statistics as in economics and in law and in some other fields, as Dean Roscoe Pound once pointed out, it is not too difficult to take a train that will get you where you want to go. As indicated, I find it difficult to believe that the American Fair Trade Council and the retail drug group, the NARD, two of the major organizations presently spending vast sums to restore fair-trade price fixing, and to destroy our anti-trust laws, are at all dumb or do not know what they are after. On the contrary, they are well financed, well organized, and understand perfectly what they want—and I trust that the members of your committee understand equally well what they want and whether their bills are truly in the public interest. Their activities, according to the AFTC, are solely in the public interest and are not propaganda but truly educational work designed exclusively to promote the public interest.

I sometimes wonder how far the art of rationalization and self-deception can go. The AFTC states in a letter, to all members, of October 4, 1950, that all financial contributions and membership dues to the Fair Trade Council are for purely educational activities. It advises its members in the above letter that any money paid to the Fair Trade Council is a deductible item and tax-exempt. In this letter of October 4, 1950, the Fair Trade Council also advises and suggests that the advertising agencies handling its members' accounts may be asked or invited to pay a certain percentage of the advertising agencies' 15 percent to support the Fair Trade Council. This letter contained a sharp attack by the AFTC on the attorney general of Texas and the attorney general of Missouri and offered to help its members in fighting antitrust prosecutions. The letter of October 4, 1950, from which the above is taken must have been forgotten when in a later letter to all Fair Trade Council members, dated January 7, 1952, it solicited contributions from its members not for educational purposes, but on the basis of the actual financial interest of all members in fair trade. It would appear to be such a comfort when education and self-interest can properly go hand in hand; when patriotism and increased profit synchonize so beautifully. To be sure, it may sometimes be a bit difficult to draw the line, to know just where patriotism ceases, and self-interest begins. However, that is a matter that we need not concern ourselves with at this time.

Under conditions of competition that type of production and distribution will tend to survive which performs its function most efficiently, wins wide consumer acceptance, and therefore deserves to survive. The resistance of established producers and distributors to new techniques that may lower costs and give the public better values is easy to understand. There were riots and bloodshed in Scotland when textile machinery was introduced. Toll roads resisted railroads and the rails in turn have resisted lower cost methods of transportation. The department stores providing certain marketing advantages to the public were denounced as iniquitous institutions encouraging the public to buy on credit and thus go into debt. Perhaps there is a point there that we ought not to pass over too lightly? Chain-store merchandising was likewise resisted just as the movement of food stores into meats and produce was not welcomed by competitors. Retail druggists made many efforts to resist and are still making such efforts to resist the movement of drugs, sundries, toiletries, and similar products through super food stores. I trust and believe that your committee will weigh with the utmost care not only the requests of the NARD and the AFTC, but also what I believe to be the excellent recommendations of the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division. I should think it unnecessary to urge you to look beyond those who seek to destroy competition—those who seek special privileges for their groups—and instead to keep your eyes steadily on the 150,000,000 consumers who are trying to fight inflation, buy under conditions of competition, protect their living standard, and make their 50-cent dollars go a little further. I trust and believe that your recommendations will be in the public interest and designed to protect our national policy against horizontal and vertical price fixing, and our national faith in the American free competitive economy, without which it would be very difficult for political democracy to survive.

I shall make available to your committee in a few days a number of exhibits from my file on the matters before you, showing the attitude of the press and also some data on comparative price studies. The following editorial appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch December 27, 1951:

"ANOTHER FAIR TRADE SCHEME

"It is an old tactic of pressure groups, faced with an unpleasant Supreme Court ruling, to try to get Congress to legalize what the Court has already declared illegal. And that is what the American Fair Trade Council hopes to do when Congress convenes. The council has drafted a proposed law to permit fair trade which, by any other name, means price fixing. Last May the Supreme Court ruled that retailers who do not sign fair trade contracts with manufacturers do not have to observe the minimum retail prices which the manufacturers set for their goods. In short, the retailers could charge what their purses and prospects allowed them to. This, of course, applies to goods in interstate commerce. The ruling knocked the wind out of a lot of efforts to fix retail prices. Moreover, the Justice Department later warned it would prosecute if it caught manufacturers trying to gang up on small retailers to make them sign the so-called fair trade contracts. So now the fair trading lobby wants to amend the Sherman Act, and there is irony in this. The Sherman Act is intended to help protect free competition. The amendment is intended to help cripple it. For the measure would make the manufacturers' retail prices binding on all retailers, whether or not they sign contracts and whether or not the goods are even in interstate commerce. Congress will quickly discover that such a bill would defeat the intent of the antitrust laws, the Supreme Court decision, and the Justice Department. It would help those few who fear that economic competition is dangerous business."

On February 7, 1952, the Wall Street Journal carried the following editorial which put the matter on some of the bills before you in rather clear fashion. The editorial reads as follows:

"THE FAIRNESS OF FAIR TRADE

"As was to be expected, friends of the so-called fair-trade laws are working in Congress to rehabilitate them. A Federal statute declares that where State-made law enables a manufacturer to bind all retailers to a fixed resale price by making a contract with a single retailer, the Federal Government will not object. But last year the United States Supreme Court ruled that no person can be bound by a contract to which he is not a party.

"Thereupon retailers all over the country reduced their prices on a great variety of merchandise. The reductions spread to goods which had not been price-fixed through fair-trade contracts and for a time the price cutting assumed the characteristics of an irrational price warfare. In a few weeks the war burned itself out, but without quieting the clamor that the Supreme Court decision had left small retail businesses at the mercy of their more effluent and therefore more powerful competitors.

"The court decision coincided with events which would doubtless have lowered selling prices in its absence. The buying mania that followed the outbreak of war in Korea had had two unsettling results. Consumers in general were more than usually well supplied with goods of many sorts while distributors had accumulated unusually large inventories. The latter had to move their goods against rising consumer resistance and price cuts were the only effective motive power.

"Now indignant protest rises against what Chairman PATMAN of the House Small Business Committee calls 'deceitful and misleading price cutting.' This is a reference to the 'loss leader,' the offering of one or a few items at prices near or below cost as a means of luring buyers into a store. The idea is, of course, that once inside they will buy other goods not similarly marked down. They are assumed to be that dumb.

"Partisans of fair trade frankly say they are out to overturn the Supreme Court decision in practical effect. It is hard to see how they can restore the dangerous privilege of manufacturers or wholesalers to control the actions of thousands of merchandisers without their consent and even against their will. The Supreme Court has said that such a power is beyond the law and certainly it should be. But in their heyday the fair-trade laws and the contracts under them did not completely freeze prices for the goods involved. There were then many indications—and complaints, too—that this putative method of protecting small business was breaking down. Traders who were active in defeating them were called chiselers and other hard names, which didn't bother them much.

"Fair trade practices as heretofore in use are potentially dangerous. They invite manufacturers and distributors of competing articles to enter into understandings to maintain prices higher than would otherwise prevail. Carried far enough, they would defeat the efforts of lawmakers and administrators to prevent unreasonable restraints of trade, which are the hallmarks of monopolism. A congressional regard for the safety of small business is proper enough, but the stake of all consumers in a free market cannot be ignored."

Ninety percent of the membership of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce is made up of small businesses. The large retail stores do not constitute 2 percent of its membership according to Frank E. Lawrence, secretary of the chamber of commerce. However, because the chamber strongly opposed the retail druggists' fair trade bill for Missouri, the Missouri retail drug group resigned from the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce. A two-column story announcing this action appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 17, 1951. On the next day the Post-Dispatch carried the following editorial:

"THE DRUGGISTS WALK OUT

"The Retail Druggists' Association of Greater St. Louis got its ideas pretty thoroughly confused in the attack on the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce with which it withdrew its membership in that organization. Herman P. Winkelmann, executive manager of the druggists' association, denounced the chamber's opposition to the so-called fair trade law, a misleading name for a price-fixing device. He said the chamber 'is strictly big business and controlled by big business, principally the large retail stores.' We do not think Mr. Winkelmann can prove that there is anything wrong about bigness in business unless the bigness is used to destroy competition. The manager of the druggists' association is, however, all in favor of destroying competition, not by bigness,

but by price fixing under the guise of fair trade. The law, the association advocates, would enable druggists and manufacturers to fix prices at which a product could be sold. The chamber of commerce deserves commendation for the sensible and courageous attitude it has taken toward fair trade legislation. Fair trade is a device to soak the consumer and the chamber believes it is poor business. Do the druggists who are members of the Retail Druggists' Association think they are improving relations with their customers by this display of organized effort to deprive their customers of competitive prices?"

Remove the coercive pressure of organized retailers and often, not all, but many manufacturers lose interest in fair-trade price fixing. Often these manufacturers have reluctantly yielded to the demand to price fix, fair-trade fashion their brands, only to find they have priced themselves out of a good part of the market, thus necessitating the sale of multiple and/or unbranded merchandise, or private retailers brands, in order to utilize idle-plant capacity. Manufacturers have not forgotten the Pepsodent experience; nor has the retail drug group forgotten it. Manufacturers have been faced with a demand for a maintained resale price and margin. Then the demand takes the form of a request for a wider margin; then efforts are made to force manufacturers, for example, not to sell drug items in food stores. Until some manufacturers begin to wonder if they or their retail outlets control the manufacturers marketing policies. Some manufacturers of drug items are happy to see more of their products move through food stores, directly, by means of rack operators, or otherwise; for in this fashion the power of such groups as organized retail druggists to force manufacturers to do their bidding, ala Pepsodent fashion, is lessened.

Moving with the organized precision of a Panzer division, groups of interested retail druggists and brand name manufacturers, such as the Fair Trade Council of Gary, Ind., have successfully used enormous political pressure in first lobbying through Congress, first, the Miller-Tydings Act, and then, with the same tactics, adequately financed, lobbied through the State legislature, 45 fair trade laws, in all States except Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the Federal District of Columbia. Shortly after the Miller-Tydings Act was passed, these groups successfully pushed through 17 State legislatures, fair-trade laws. Prof. Malcolm P. McNair, of Harvard, pointed out in the April 1938 Journal of Marketing that 10 of these State laws enacting fair-trade price fixing copied the same stenographic error into their State statute. This would seem to give some idea of the organized pressure of interested groups for such legislation.

The constitutional right of citizens to assemble and peaceably petition their legislators for redress of grievances is so fundamental and important that there is no abuse too great to bear rather than to infringe upon that right. However, in some proper way, Members of Congress and of State legislative bodies, must find means to protect themselves from such political pressure and coercion, so that they may legislate fearlessly in the public interest, without threats of political reprisal of interested lobbies. I should suggest frequent and very detailed financial reports of all regular professional lobbyists as a start in the right direction. We must not confuse these organized and heavily financed pressure campaigns of interested manufacturers and retailers with the public interest.

In an Ohio Court of Appeals case, *Serer* v. *Cigarette Service Co.* (74 N. E. (2d) 853), decided toward the end of 1947, it was held that in this case the Ohio unfair "Cigarette Sales Act, prohibiting a wholesaler from selling cigarettes at less than cost to wholesaler" with intent to injure competition, was declared unconstitutional. It was held that the act divested a cash and carry wholesaler of property rights, of advantages inherent in the cash and carry method of doing business. I do not know what may have happened in this case if it was appealed; nor do I know if there was any attempt to meet the objections by legislation, of the court decision in this case. It does serve, however, to indicate that courts are aware of the inherent property right that an individual may have in doing business with a lower operating cost factor, and the inherent property right to price accordingly; and that efforts by legislation or otherwise to deprive an individual of such right, may be an unconstitutional deprivation of property without due process of law. The above may be of interest relative to H. R. 6367 introduced by Mr. KEOGH, as an amendment to the Sherman Act of 1890. There is no misunderstanding the intent and purpose of this bill. It is aimed directly at reversing by legislation the Sunbeam-Wentling case that arose in Palmyra, Pa.

Briefly, Wentling is no Sears or Montgomery-Ward. These giant mail-order houses have their own private brands, such as All State, Cross Country, Kenmore, Silvertone, and others. Wentling appears to be essentially a discount house operator doing business in name brand merchandise, mail-order fashion. He sold Sunbeam Shavemasters at $17.25 when the fixed fair-trade minimum price in fair-trade territory was $23.50, a saving to anyone who would order from Wentling by mail, of $6.25. In the lower United States district court those interested in fair trade won a complete victory but on appeal a three-man United States court of appeals sitting in Philadelphia reversed the lower court. It was held that Wentling would have to respect the Pennsylvania fair-trade minimum in intrastate trade, but could sell in interstate commerce for any price that he wished. Then of course Schwegmann came along May 21, 1951, to give Wentling added freedom to price competitively in interstate commerce, since he was a nonsigner and could not be "dragged in by the heels" to price as fair-traders wanted him to. Now the Keogh bill, H. R. 6367, obligates a mail-order dealer, such as Wentling to respect fair-trade minimum prices on branded goods and prevents any mail-order house from selling in interstate commerce below any fair-traded minimum price, even though he is not party to such contract. This would permit Wentling to do busines in Palmyra, Pa., but effectively destroys all of his interstate, mail-order business. This does not regulate interstate commerce; it clearly destroys it. Why would anyone in his right mind sit down and take the time and effort necessary to order by mail a branded product, even if Wentling absorbed shipping charges, when with no effort at all a buyer can get immediate delivery by going to any retail outlet and buy the branded product at the same price, have the opportunity to examine the product and take it home at once?

The full import of the Keogh bill would seem to be rather shocking. In a release from the American Fair Trade Council temporary headquarters, suite 773, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., the AFTC proudly states that the "council has participated in the long series of discussions and studies which have brought about this draft regarded by the council as legislatively leakproof and economically sound." The above AFTC bulletin goes on to say the Keogh bill "has as its primary intent and certain effect, among other objectives in which consumers have a vital interest or stake," "the restriction, in the public interest, of the growth of retail monopoly, than which there is no form of monopoly more oppressive and to the public in general." "In fact, H. R. 6367," continued Mr. Anderson (head of the AFTC), "may quite properly go down in history as the Keogh antimonopoly law." This seems to be taking in quite a lot of territory. I find it difficult to believe that this bill is quite equal to the discovery of the principle of the wheel or the discovery of fire or the invention of printing. Perhaps the lady doth protest a bit too much. It should be noted that the AFTC (as above quoted in its release of February 3, 1952) now speaks not only as the trade group speaking for 5,000 brand-name manufacturers, one of the most effective and aggressive trade groups promoting fair-trade price fixing and attempting to destroy all antitrust laws, but now also is the advocate of wage earners, consumers, and the public interest. This assumption that what brand-name manufacturers and retailers want in the way of private control of pricing policies is automatically in the interest of the public is a fallacy that the advocates of fair trade almost invariably fall into.

I do not believe that Congress after careful reflection will ever pass this bill frankly and clearly intended to destroy competitive pricing of branded goods in interstate commerce. If Congress should ever do so, I do not believe that any President, of whatever political party, would ever sign such a bill, if the device of a rider, to a bill the President cannot veto, is not used; nor do I believe the United States Supreme Court would sustain it.

Mr. John Anderson, of the AFTC, in the above release of a little over a month ago, calls the Keogh bill "legislatively leakproof and economically sound." If it is ever enacted into law, I should prefer to await the judgment of the Supreme Court relative to its constitutionality; just as I should prefer to await the judgment of disinterested professional economists as to its economic soundness. My own view is that it is neither sound law nor economics. Indeed, it seems rather shocking. I should like a detailed explanation as to how you fight monopoly by preventing a low-cost mail-order house from selling a branded appliance for several dollars below the fixed higher price of a higher-cost distributor, in interstate commerce. From the standpoint of the public interest and consumers, the Keogh bill is easily one of the worst introduced at this session of Congress, though it does have some keen competition for that honor; chiefly from the bills presently before you to validate the nonsigner clause. I should venture to suggest that if H. R. 6367 is enacted by Congress, the United States Supreme Court, at the first opportunity, would declare the law invalid, on the ground that it does not regulate but destroys the free flow of commerce between the States and also that it deprives an individual of property without due process of law, in that it prevents a mail-order operator from enjoying his inherent right to do business on a lower-cost basis and price accordingly.

The bills before you to reverse Schwegmann and validate the nonsigner clause are far worse than the NRA ever was. It was a fatal weakness of the NRA that it illegally delegated legislative authority relative to pricing policies and other practices to NRA code authorities. It was declared unconstitutional by a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court. The Court also held the retailing of chickens in New York was not interstate commerce. A basic weakness of the NRA was the belief that the industry that is to be regulated shall be the regulator. However, other groups were represented in the NRA. It had the appearance of a public body, although practically all NRA code authorities were dominated by trade groups. Many economists asserted that 90 percent of the enthusiasm of trade groups for the NRA was primarily motivated by a desire to engage in practices involving collusive restraint of trade and price-fixing

practices that were and are illegal under our antitrust laws.

It may be of interest to point out that the St. Louis consumer group, organized under the NRA successfully fought retail coal price fixing of Retail Solid Fuel NRA Code Authority No. 32 in St. Louis, and that the successful fight of the St. Louis consumer group to destroy coal-price fixing in our market led directly to the resignation of the National Coal Code Authority as well as the local code authority. This consumer organization, of which I was a charter member, with Bishop Scarlett and Father W. F. Mullally and a number of others, appointed by Prof. PAUL DOUGLAS, then with the NRA Consumers Council, functioned as a local body since 1934. In the past 18 years it has also fought high fixed retail milk prices, and on many occasions has defended the excellent Missouri antitrust laws whenever attacked by those who tried to introduce fair-trade price fixing into Missouri. The St. Louis consumer group has grown over the years and has many allied and affiliated civic bodies. Its constituent members represent organizations with a total membership of over 145,000 in the St. Louis metropolitan area.

I have served as its marketing consultant for many years, I have declined nomination to national consumer organizations as I do not have the time to serve on such bodies. Our local group of St. Louis consumers has no world shaking program, it has never advised the State Department on how to run its business, it is not interested in Spain, and wouldn't know how to start to make the world over. However its members and its executive committee does understand the Missouri antitrust laws, the Federal antitrust laws, and what all price fixers are up to. We have been interested exclusively in adequate consumer information about quality of products, and also very much interested in preserving free competitive prices against all efforts of trade restrainers. It is not too difficult to identify such groups, for sooner or later they suggest modifying our State antitrust laws; just as the bills presently before you fail utterly to achieve their true purpose, unless you agree to an end or destroy the Sherman Act and our other antitrust laws.

I should hesitate to trust the wisest and most benevolent bureaucrat with the compulsory pricing powers and the policing of competitors prices. Much less would I trust such compulsory pricing powers to private interested, unregulated trade groups, without any public authority to check abuses, Even public regulatory bodies do not always succeed in safeguarding adequately public interest. What justifies the assumption that the unregulated, vast pricing powers that go much further than the NRA ever permitted, may not be abused. I think such fair trade price fixing powers, eliminating competitive pricing on many branded items by legalizing vertical price control, and making nonsigners conform and not compete, would inevitably and unquestionably be abused. Either we want competition or we do not. If we are to legislate in the public interest then the bills before you to validate the nonsigner clause must be defeated, and the Curtis bill, to repeal the Miller-Tydings Act should be enacted into law.

Adam Smith was a professor of philosophy and a famous Scot. His great book on The Wealth of Nations is one of the classics of all time. Adam Smith is the father of political economy. You may be interested in one of his widely used quotations. This in no way disparages many excellent activities of trade groups. It is very pertinent, however, relative to resale price maintenance activities.

Adam Smith in his Wealth of Nations said: "People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices. * * * Though the law cannot hinder people of the same trade from sometime assembling together, it ought to do nothing to facilitate such assemblies, much less to render them necessary."

The late Prof. Frank Fetter of Princeton University often said, "Whenever you hear any trade group advocate fair trade, it is time for all hands to be on deck for the Republic is in danger."

In a 600-page study for the Twentieth Century Fund, Dr. George W. Stocking of Vanderbilt University and Professor Watkins have this to say relative to retail maintenance. The following quotation appears on page 330 of this book published in 1951, on Monopoly and Free Enterprise:

"Originally price maintenance was designed to prevent price-cutting dealers from exploiting the brand good will of manufacturers at the manufacturers' expense; currently it is used to prevent price-cutting dealers from upsetting the rigged market for price-maintained goods to the detriment of organized retailers with a vested interest in noncompetitive distribution. From the standpoint of the public interest in revitalizing competitive forces, resale price maintenance is objectionable whatever group sponsors it. It deprives low-cost distributors of the competitive advantage of superior efficiency, and thereby deprives consumers of their full share of the benefits from improved business organization and less costly merchandising methods. In many manufacturing industries it restricts opportunities for the launching of new enterprises, or the expansion of old ones, by fostering trivial differentiation of products, irrational choice of goods by consumers, and uneconomic allocation of resources."

Those interested in resale price maintenance often refer to the pricing practices of motorcar manufacturers as a justification for fair trade. It is evident, however, that rigid retail prices are impossible to enforce wherever there is a significant trade-in problem. In motors, in a sellers' or buyers' market, the evaluation of the used car, the purchase of accessories, and frequently outright premiums or discounts provide the necessary leverage for competitive prices and consumer shopping for values.

In the food trade, relatively few food products have been placed under minimum resale price contracts. This is due to the prevalence of giant super food stores, of which there are over 15,000, the prominent place of retailers' private brands, and the fact that not for long can any food get too far out of line competitively for which there is a fairly acceptable substitute.

Fair trade is a contradiction in a free-enterprise society. If manufacturers are to tell retailers the minimum prices at which to sell products, what incentive is there for more efficient distribution? For more efficient retailing? In no case was a fair-trade law ever enacted as the result of a request of any disinterested civic group. These laws did not come as the Sherman Act did, as a result of widespread public demand for the preservation and protection of the public against collusive pricing, horizontal and vertical. Resale-price fixing, particularly during the present high inflationary period, is extremely harmful to living standards, and invariably results in sharply higher fixed prices on many branded items—drugs, appliances, liquor, and any number of other branded goods. Had it not been for the press in Missouri, the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, farm groups, and various civic groups, those interested in enacting a fair-trade law in Missouri would likely have succeeded in our States, as they did in 45 others. Certainly the organized groups sponsoring fair-trade laws tried often enough and hard enough, and I expect they may try again. For they may suffer any number of defeats, but need succeed only once. As one put it, during a period of high prices and low-purchasing power of the dollar, it is rather difficult to force many families with Third Avenue incomes to pay Fifth Avenue prices. People do not regard themselves as lawbreakers merely because they are obliged to shop for the better values and better buys. There is no mystery that surrounds the rise of 200 discount houses in New York City that did an annual volume in branded appliances of over $450,000,000. The wonder is they did not arise sooner and grow faster. Neither should we be surprised at the sharp increase in the number of rack jobbers, moving drug items through super food stores; just as drug stores took tobacco business from tobacco stores and candy trade from confectionery stores. If the public likes one step, self-service shopping, day and night, for food, drug, meat, bakery, and other items, that is the way it most certainly will be. Lower cost dealers and manufacturers, and rational buyers will find a method of circumventing artificial road blocks to competition.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, I desire to read and very briefly discuss two amendments I shall call up later this afternoon, after action shall have been taken on the Douglas amendment. I shall support the Douglas amendment, because I think it meets the major argument of the Senator from Minnesota. The Douglas amendment involves a great question of public policy—yes, I believe it sets forth the duty devolving on the Congress to protect the small-business man from the type of economic blackmail involved in loss-leader tactics. The small-business man does not need protection from fair competition. He needs protection from economic coercion, duress, and monopolistic dictation of his economic opportunities to do business. We do have a public interest, Mr. President, in the economic practices of any group which, if allowed to go unchecked and uncontrolled, would work a great injustice on businessmen, on consumers, and on any other group to the detriment of which the practice is promulgated.

I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has put his finger on that area of legislative duty in regard to which Congress is called upon to take action. It is the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, in my judgment, that gives the small-business man the protection from the kind of economic blackmail the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] so eloquently discussed in his very persuasive speech of last night and this morning. But, Mr. President, the answer to the great evils, the great injustices, the great wrongs, which the Senator from Minnesota deplores so eloquently, is not to turn over to the retailers and manufacturers the power, legislatively unchecked, to fix prices.

The action that should be taken by legislation, as the Senator from Illinois has proposed, is to make clear that chain-store groups and manufacturers who use the kind of economic blackmail which characterizes the loss-leader technique violate sound public policy. It should be made clear to them that the practice exceeds competitive rights; that it is not in keeping with the principles of American justice, for men must so

conduct themselves in a society of self-governing people as not to wrong their neighbors. Those are sound jurisdictional and juridical bases for the principle of the Douglas amendment, but, frankly, Mr. President, I have not been able to make the jump in reasoning that my good friend from Minnesota makes when he says that because there are many instances in which great injustice is being done the small retailer by the chain-store groups, and by the loss-leader proponents, therefore, we should pass legislation which, in effect, in my opinion, would take from under the purview and the check of a sound antitrust legislative program those who would profit from the adoption of resale price maintenance legislation.

So, Mr. President, I can support enthusiastically the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, but I cannot go along with the Senator from Minnesota as he proposes in the pending bill to give too much unchecked economic power, to those who seek the advantages of the pending bill.

In the course of the afternoon, Mr. President, without further comment on the amendments other than what I now make, in the interest of saving time, I shall call up, after the Douglas amendment is disposed of, two amendments, one of which is as follows:

On page 2, line 24, after the word "resale", insert "*Provided, however*, That such minimum or stipulated prices as are prescribed in such contracts or agreements shall, after due consultation with representatives of persons substantially affected by such contracts or agreements, have been determined to be fair and reasonable by a duly constituted board or agency of the State in which such minimum or stipulated prices are to be charged."

In support of that amendment——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Permit the Chair to state that the Douglas amendment has been offered as a complete substitute. Should it be adopted, then, of course, the amendment which the Senator from Oregon is suggesting would not be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the parliamentary situation. I shall vote for the Douglas amendment. If it is agreed to, that ends it, so far as I am concerned.

I shall talk with the Senator from Illinois as soon as I finish these remarks in regard to my amendments to see if he thinks any revision of them might be worked into his substitute. If his substitute fails, I shall offer these two amendments to the bill proper.

The purpose of the first amendment is to insure an impartial determination as to the reasonableness of prices established in resale price maintenance contracts which are legalized under the bill.

Under the present bill, the manufacturer, providing only that he sign a single retail price maintenance agreement with one outlet in a given State, is able to determine the prices for fair-traded commodities. There is no one to say whether these prices are fair either to the small merchant or to the consumer.

The record shows that in many instances retailers have been victimized because large manufacturers have failed to provide them with adequate margins under resale price maintenance contracts. Conversely, consumers have at times been injured because of the extraordinary high prices set by the manufacturer.

To permit manufacturers to set prices without consultation with either groups of retailers or groups of consumers, is to authorize the exercise of power far greater than that which the Government has lawfully employed in support of its price-control activities. Ceiling prices established by Government agencies must be prefaced by consultations with representatives of industry and with other persons affected thereby. Elaborate appeal procedures have been established for persons aggrieved by price setting thereunder.

My amendment provides that the prices set in resale price maintenance contracts shall have been determined to be reasonable by a State agency after consultation with persons affected by resale price maintenance contracts or agreements. The consultation provision I have taken practically verbatim from the Defense Production Act of 1950 whereby Congress provided procedural safeguards for those affected by Government regulations fixing prices. I think it only fair that we extend these same safeguards to those whose prices are fixed pursuant to resale price maintenance contracts.

The second amendment I shall offer, Mr. President, is as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "or stipulated."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "or stipulated."

Page 2, line 12, strike out the words "or stipulated."

Page 2, line 14, strike out the words "or stipulated."

Page 3, lines 21 and 22, strike out the words "or stipulated."

In regard to this amendment, I wish to say that as I understand, the purpose of so-called fair-trade legislation is to provide a minimum or floor for the independent merchant in order to assure him at least an adequate profit on many of his important selling items. Thus the Miller-Tydings Act, which the Congress passed in 1937, legalized contracts "providing for the establishment or maintenance of minimum resale prices." As I read the McGuire bill, however, it appears that it goes one step further and legalizes contracts which provide for "stipulated" prices.

I can see where it might be highly desirable to establish minimum retail prices as we have established minimum farm prices and minimum wages. However, I seriously question the desirability of authorizing so-called stipulated prices which, in effect, sanction the fixing of maximum as well as minimum retail price levels. To permit the establishment of maximum or stipulated prices is unadulterated price fixing by private businessmen with no public control and no public check, that really take care of the interests of the consumer, whereas, when we do something analogous to it, as the Senator from Minnesota was seeking to argue last night in regard to farm-support matters, we are doing it through the Government, with a Government check, and with the Government constantly in control of the procedure and determining what the minima shall be.

Permitting manufacturers to set ceiling prices as well as minimums is certainly not in the interests of the retail merchant. Mr. Herman Nolen, vice president of McKesson & Robbins, Inc., informed Mr. PRIEST'S subcommittee that independent merchants would be driven out of business if they were required to sell at the minimums prescribed by the manufacturer and were not permitted to sell some products at higher than established retail levels. Let me quote you verbatim what the vice president of McKesson & Robbins said:

I don't think that I would be talking out of school, but I can tell you this: That if every distributor sold at fair-trade minimums and I am including ourselves, we would starve to death. We have got to sell some products at more than the fair-trade minimums, because the fair-trade minimums are not high enough. When a manufacturer sets a fair-trade minimum he is not thinking of us or the retailer, he is thinking of himself and, "Where will I sell the most products?" (hearings on H. R. 5767, p. 121).

I think that was a very frank, objective, truthful statement made by the vice president of McKesson & Robbins, but I believe it proves my point as to why it is desirable to strike out of the bill that little catchy word "stipulated"; with all of its implications for economic rape of the American consumer.

While independent merchants may need the safeguards of minimum floors on the selling of their stock, I believe it would be highly detrimental to the welfare of small business to permit the manufacturer to set price ceilings as well as price floors. Minimum prices to protect our small retailers is one thing; ceiling or stipulated prices is another. To sanction price fixing of this nature by the manufacturers would saddle retailers throughout the country with a private OPA answerable to no man or government.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I urgently ask the Senate to adopt this simple amendment which would strike out the word "stipulated" wherever appearing in the McGuire bill and thereby confine the bill to its original purposes—that of guaranteeing a minimum price to our small retailer.

Mr. President, I close by saying, as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, that while I do not deny that there is much that can be said on the affirmative side of the bill, it is my honest judgment that when we weigh the pros and cons of the bill, the public interest, the consumer interest, yes, the interest of the businessman himself, calls for a negative vote.

I say that, Mr. President, because I am worried about some signs I think I see developing in the American economy. I believe we are moving too far down the road toward a regulated economy. We can have a regulated economy that takes a variety of forms; we can have a regulated economy by a bureaucratic government that seeks to exercise unchecked, discretionary, and arbitrary power over

the economic life of all the American people; we can have a regulated economy, too, if we yield to the growing monopolistic control over more and more segments of American business.

To the druggists and the food merchants who are so displeased with the junior Senator from Oregon because he would not agree to commit himself to vote for the McGuire bill, let me say that I shall continue to fight for their right to free competition, but it must be free competition.

As to the growing tendency toward monopolistic controls in the United States, the sad fact is that the small merchants—such as the druggists and food merchants—are not nearly so free economically as they think they are.

I think the bill is an economic wolf in sheep's clothing; and if the small merchants let in the wolf, it will devour their economic freedom.

Mr. McCARRAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know that a number of Senators are anxious to address the Senate on other than pending matters, but their remarks should more properly come after the disposition of the regular business.

I believe Senators are anxious that we proceed with the consideration of the bill, so in order that that may be done I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] the debate be limited on the bill as follows:

One hour on the bill, the time to be divided equally between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; that there be a limitation of 40 minutes on each amendment, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Minnesota, in the event he is opposed to the amendment and if he favors the amendment, then the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader or anyone whom he may designate; and that all amendments shall be germane.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I see no reason why we cannot vote on the measure today without a unanimous-consent agreement. There is an amendment I might offer, which has been debated before, but it might require a greater amount of time for debate than that proposed.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time would the Senator require? The main purpose that would be accomplished by the agreement would be that the remarks of Senators must be germane to amendments or to the bill. Other speeches would follow. I am willing to stay as late as any Senator desires to talk, but I should like to make it possible for the Senate to conclude today at an early hour. If the Senator from Louisiana desires a longer time to discuss his amendment, I will agree to an exception in that case.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that we should be able to vote on the measure today, but I feel that rather than debate under a limitation, we should simply debate the bill. Then when the Senate is ready to vote, we can proceed to vote. I know of no Senator who is particularly anxious to delay a vote. At this time I would object to a limitation of debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret very much that the Senator objects, because I would be willing to make an exception in the case of his amendment and to give him the time he needs. The purpose of the unanimous-consent agreement is to provide that remarks made during the consideration of the bill shall be germane to the issue. Senators would then know when they might rely on having an opportunity to make other speeches. Senators have been very cooperative about the situation. Many have stayed until late in the evening in order to be able to make their speeches and not interrupt the regular procedure. I hope the Senator from Louisiana will state a time which would be satisfactory in which to debate his amendment.

Mr. LONG. So far as I am concerned, I shall be happy to vote on the measure today, and I hope the Senate can do so. I do not see any reason why we should not be able to do so. However, at this time, I would not wish to agree to a unanimous-consent agreement on limitation of debate.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS DURING EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 161)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a minute?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it has been the custom of the Foreign Relations Committee at the end of each Congress to prepare a fairly comprehensive report, in accordance with the provisions of the Congressional Reorganization Act, outlining the activities of the committee for the 2-year period. At the present time, the staff of the committee is working on the report of our activities for the Eighty-second Congress, and I hope that the report will be completed some time during the month of July or early August. At this time I would like to ask the permission of the Senate to file this report after the Senate adjourns and to have it printed as a Senate document. While I do not know just now exactly how long the report will be, it will probably run between 60 and 80 printed pages.

I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the committee may file its report when it is ready, and to have it printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks that following the adjournment of the Senate, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations may be printed as a Senate document, consistent with provisions of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator from Texas meant to include a request that the report might be filed within a reasonable time, which I take to mean July or August.

Mr. CONNALLY. We think we can have it ready during the month of July, or early in August.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest that the unanimous consent request be modified to make it a date in August, if that is agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Make it the 15th of August.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that the report may be filed not later than the 15th of August, and printed as a Senate document. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT NO. 2050)

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I submit pursuant to Senate Resolution 366, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the Internal Security of the United States, a report on the Institute of Pacific Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that I may be allowed to complete my presentation without interruption.

Mr. President, 25 years ago a small group of men interested in the Far East made a deal with Russia.

On the face of it, this arrangement provided for nothing more than an exchange of scholarly information and for cooperation with other nations interested in the collection and dissemination of factual data about the North Pacific area.

Today we know that from that deal in Moscow there developed an operation, directed by the Soviet, that was a major factor in the loss of a valuable ally to the United States.

We find that, as an outcome of that project, initiated in 1927 and activated in 1934, our Government agencies have been infiltrated by persons whose allegiance is with Communist Russia. Our official secrets have been bared to agents of the Soviet; loyal and sincere men have been driven from their diplomatic posts; and, under the cloak of public office, messages have been written and words spoken that have tended to weaken this Nation's position in world affairs.

Even further than that, we have learned that there have been placed in teaching positions in various colleges and universities persons whose minds have been warped by communistic influences; and that our youth has been supplied with textbooks and reference volumes that twist and color facts to aid the Kremlin in its dreams of world conquest.

Mr. President, some 18 months ago, under a mandate of the Senate to seek out and expose subversive activities in

the United States, the Judiciary Committee, through its Internal Security Subcommittee, began an examination of the operations of the Institute of Pacific Relations, described as a scholarly research organization, privately financed.

It has been the settled practice of this committee to reserve its conclusions, with respect to the substance of testimony that is taken, until the conclusion of the hearings on the particular matter under investigation. We have done so in this case. But the time has come, Mr. President, to report on what we have found.

This has not been a pleasant job, Mr. President, even though we were dealing with persons who hold themselves out to be scholars of high integrity and lofty purposes; persons who have held themselves out as worthy of our trust to train our youth, to write our textbooks, to advise our statesmen, to help solve our international problems.

The impressive list of members boasted by the American unit of the Institute of Pacific Relations, including many persons of great intellectual attainments, marked business achievements or demonstrated statesmanship, should have assured us of unemotional and objective atmosphere in which to conduct our study.

But, as our hearings progressed, we learned that the membership of the Institute of Pacific Relations generally, and in fact most of the trustees, of whom there were some fifty—like the chairman of the board and major officers of the organization—participated only casually in the operations of the institute. In fact, these officials and members knew little about it except what they could learn from its publications, and appear to have been grossly misled by these.

Some of those who sought to act as spokesmen for the institute in their appearances before the Internal Security Subcommittee dropped their masks of scholarly objectivity and factual concern, and replied with invective and calumny, with misrepresentation and falsehood, to our requests for information.

We were faced with evasions, refusals, and barefaced lies, in our efforts to learn about the Institute of Pacific Relations, its people, its accomplishments, its affiliations, and its objectives.

But we persisted, Mr. President, and today we are ready to report our findings, together with certain recommendations—findings supported by written documents and sworn testimony, and recommendations amply justified by the record of our hearings.

This report, which I have filed with the clerk, covers 226 printed pages. The testimony which we have taken in public hearings and under oath, runs to more than 5,000 printed pages, counting exhibits. At this time I shall but touch on the high lights of our examination and our findings.

Responsibility for the day-to-day operations of the American Council and of the international IPR organizations is in the hands of an executive secretary and a secretary-general, who direct a relatively small staff of writers, researchers, editors and various office help. The secretariats of the national and international group work closely together and appear to be interchangeable in the lower levels, at least.

Though there are 10 national units in the international organization, our concern was, of course, only with the American Council, as the unit of the United States was called, and in the Pacific Council, or international organization, as its activities impinged on matters of concern to this country. Therefore, as I speak of IPR, I shall be referring to the American Council, or the joint administrative operation.

The Institute of Pacific Relations was founded in 1925 by a group of religious leaders, scholars, and businessmen of Honolulu, who wanted to know more about the resources, problems, and intergovernmental relations of the far eastern countries.

Within a year, this group had discovered that the field was huge and that the record on many basic facts of the area was either woefully inadequate or totally lacking.

It was then decided to inaugurate an international group for cooperation and continuing research, seeking financial support, not only from individuals and industries but from such sources as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp.

In that effort it has spent, in the course of 26 years, more than $2,500,000, of which United States sources provided about 77 percent.

It has published two periodicals, and financed various studies and the printing of books and pamphlets in considerable quantities, all devoted to the subject matter of the far-eastern area.

The IPR thus became, within 10 years, an outstanding source of information about the North Pacific area and came to be regarded as almost the sole authority readily available for basic data on the Far East.

The chief functions of the International Institute of Pacific Relations appear to be promotion, programing, and the conduct of a biennial conference of IPR officials and members and—in late years—Government officials, preferably of policy-making rank.

Mr. President, that is the physical picture.

Officials and prominent members of IPR insist that is the whole picture; but the evidence adduced under oath in our year-long study reveals another.

Over the often dull and unchallenging patina of scholastic respectability there appears a ruby tone. In the mid-thirties, an element entered the IPR that soon became a controlling force, shaping the organization's programs in a way that contributed to the loss of China to communism.

I am convinced, from the evidence developed under oath in this inquiry, that, but for the machinations of the small group that controlled and activated that organization, China today would be free and a bulwark against the further advance of the Red hordes into the Far East. That is the way I read the record.

We have not taken any of the statements of our witnesses at face value. Each has been examined meticulously in the light of other testimony, of masses of documentary material, of historical records, and of such intelligence as the subcommittee could obtain from experts in research and political fields.

Among these experts we necessarily called upon ex-Communists, for these disillusioned persons are almost the only source of evidence of what transpired behind doors closed to the rest of the world. We have had the help of some Government agents who posed as Communists at the risk of their lives to gain a knowledge of Soviet methods and subversive plans.

We have recorded hearsay testimony as would a court in seeking to determine if a conspiracy exists, and we have measured it by every available test, and sought to give it proper weight.

We have been told repeatedly that the Institute of Pacific Relations has been investigated before and has received a clean bill of health. Reference has been made to a purported investigation in 1945 which the IPR staff performed for itself; to the Tydings hearings of 1950, which were not centered either on IPR nor primarily on individuals connected with it; and to a partial examination of IPR files by the FBI.

I think I may dismiss the IPR staff's purported investigation without comment, except to say the record shows no real investigation was in fact made. The Tydings hearings involved IPR only casually, and its chairman said that committee could not possibly go into the IPR matter. The FBI, which is not a reporting agency, has had no way to make a record on these matters or to expose them.

The Internal Security Subcommittee has made every effort to draw all the threads together, and to give every person who desired to testify an opportunity to do so. When the testimony has been pertinent, it has been placed on the open record, as has all that which IPR officials and its representatives desired to introduce.

Now, what have we found?

In the first place, we have testimony linking 46 IPR persons with the world Communist conspiracy. Eight more operated as Soviet agents.

W. L. Holland, executive officer of the IPR, when testifying under oath before us, would recognize as a Communist only 1 person in the list of 46, even though several of them had refused on grounds of self-incrimination to deny or affirm party membership; and even though every person named in the list had been identified as a Communist by at least 1 witness, in sworn testimony. Holland acknowledged that the testimony may indicate there could have been an attempt to use the institute for communism a good many years ago, but he defended even those staff members who refused to say whether or not they were Communists.

He would only affirm that their writing and other work for IPR was good and he found no ground for criticism of their conduct as IPR employees. At the time

of this statement several dozen members of the active IPR family had been identified in sworn testimony as Communists. Evidence had placed them in well-known Communist fronts or had shown their writings in Communist publications.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to continue with my remarks.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wondered whether the Senator would yield for a quorum call, so that there might be more Senators on the floor. Perhaps some Senators would wish to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Nevada. For example, if they thought anything was wrong with the report, now would be the time for them to ask questions with respect to it, while the distinguished Senator from Nevada is on the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, my experience with quorum calls during the past few days has convinced me that either a quorum is not developed, or if one is developed Senators do not remain on the floor. Senators are very busy on committees.

Mr. FERGUSON. I notice that the Senator from Nevada is alone on his side of the aisle. Perhaps some other Senators on his side of the aisle may wish to ask him some questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would rather continue with my remarks. The reason for my haste in the matter is that I must attend a meeting of the conference committee on the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. The other conferees are waiting for me and I wish to get to the conference as quickly as possible.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the committee I know that the Senator from Nevada wishes to get to the conference as soon as possible.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Mr. Holland gave us a list of 30 publications of the IPR which he declared were taken at random. But in this random selection there do not appear any such names as Israel Epstein, Harriet L. Moore, Guenther Stein, Chi Chao Ting, Chen Han-seng, Kathleen Barnes, Marguerite Stewart, Julian R. Friedman, Michael Greenberg, Andrew Grad, or even Owen Lattimore. Every one of these wrote repeatedly for Institute of Pacific Relations publications, while many of those on Mr. Holland's so-called random list had but a single literary contribution each.

Mr. Holland gave us another list of writers who, he says, are well known for their opposition to communism. It is not at all the case that all of these writers are well known for their active opposition to communism. And apart from the question whether some of them may not have been slightly pro-Communist at one time, there is no doubt many of them were merely non-Communist, rather than anti-Communist. But, Mr. President, a pro-Communist plus a non-Communist still leaves a Communist balance.

For many years officials of the Institute of Pacific Relations courted the Soviet. Finally, on a vist to Moscow in 1934, Edward C. Carter, then newly appointed secretary general, managed to meet Constantine Oumansky, newly graduated from the Soviet Military Intelligence School. Oumansky was interested, and the Soviet unit was activated a few months later with the blessing of high quarters.

Immediately Carter envisioned a huge library of Russian literature to add to IPR prestige. His chief subordinate, William L. Holland, conjured up a Japan and China under Soviet control, and IPR staff people were given a glowing picture of future relations with the Red regime. But the announcement was labeled "confidential," and the fact that the deal was made with a Soviet military intelligence officer was ordered forgotten.

One witness who appeared before us, Igor Bogolepov, a former counselor in the Soviet Foreign Office, saw the U. S. S. R. council of the Institute of Pacific Relations at work. At first, he said, they were typical researchers and students. Then, in the middle 1930's, the personnel changed, he said. The researchers disappeared, and in their places were people from military intelligence and the foreign office. The Institute of Pacific Relations had become a double-track affair: propaganda going out, and information coming back.

Right there, Mr. President, let me digress slightly to say it may be that Bogolepov flashed a revealing light on our troubles with the Soviet, when, during the course of his testimony before us, he observed that, if you learn the wrong things about the Soviet Union, your thoughts also are wrong. In the secret files of the Soviet Foreign Office, he said, is a memorandum by Molotov—a primer for Russia's propaganda campaign.

He quoted this:

> We have to influence non-Communists if we want to make them Communists, if we want to fool them. So we have to try to infiltrate the big press.

Here is the way some of our other witnesses viewed the Institute of Pacific Relations:

Raymond Dennett, former executive of the American council of IPR, said of the Institute of Pacific Relations:

> I do not think it was an objective research organization.

Prof. Kenneth Colegrove, of Northwestern University, thought the Institute of Pacific Relations was "nothing less than a propaganda organization."

Prof. William M. McGovern, of Northwestern, said the magazine Pacific Affairs was "trying to advocate the Stalinist approach."

Prof. David N. Rowe, of Yale, described Owen Lattimore, editor of Pacific Affairs, as the "principal advocate of Stalinist ideas in the field of far-eastern studies."

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Willoughby, Chief of Intelligence of the Far East and U. N. commands, said: "The conclusion could be arrived at" that the Japanese unit of the Institute of Pacific Relations was "used as a spy ring for Russian Communists and the Red Army."

Prof. Louis Budenz, of Fordham University, said that in Communist circles the American Institute of Pacific Relations was described as—

> The little red schoolhouse for teaching certain people in Washington how to think with the Soviet Union in the Far East.

Alexander Barmine, former brigadier general in the Red Army, called the Institute of Pacific Relations a "cover shop for military intelligence work in the Pacific area."

Not on the testimony of any one witness, but on the basis of the numerous excerpts I have cited and many, many more supporting facts in the record, the subcommittee finds it impossible to avoid a conclusion that the Institute of Pacific Relations has not maintained the character of a nonpartisan organization of scholarly inquiry, as its spokesmen have pictured it. It appears, rather, that the Institute of Pacific Relations came to fit, very early in its history, the character of an international cover-shop, as another witness called it.

IPR spokesmen deny there has been any Communist influence acting in, or through, the organization; but in the next breath they assert that, if any such influence is found, it cannot be charged to IPR as such because its constitution forbids any political activity. The defenses are inconsistent, Mr. President.

The organization boasts that Senators and Congressmen have been IPR members, yet it cannot claim that these eminent personages were more active in its affairs than Frederick V. Field, Harriet Moore, Lawrence Rosinger, or Chao-Ting Chi, all of whom were identified as Communists by honorable witnesses before our subcommittee.

William L. Holland, chief executive officer of IPR, submitted a list of 20 distinguished Americans who, he said, have participated actively in the work of the American council of IPR. It is expected, of course, that the standing of these persons will be considered in any attempt to determine the political purity of the organization. But I am sure Mr. Holland will not contend that these persons were more active in the IPR and more representative thereof than Joseph Barnes, Len DeCaux, Chen Han-Seng, Kathleen Barnes, Philip Jaffe, William Mandel or Guenther Stein, all of whom have been identified as Communists.

Frederick Vanderbilt Field, scion of a wealthy and prominent family, well educated, but so closely identified with various Communist activities and interests that even Edward C. Carter and William L. Holland admitted he was at least pro-Communist, was a powerful figure within the IPR.

Edward C. Carter told William L. Holland, in 1940, that Frederick V. Field, alone, could speak for the American council.

Testimony of several witnesses placed Field in the Communist Party long before he became executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House in 1941.

He was described as the political commissar for the Communist Party in far-eastern affairs.

Field wrote for the Daily Worker and other Communist publications under his own name in 1941 and later, but it was

not until 1947 that he resigned from the board of trustees of the Institute of Pacific Relations. He did that at the request of Carter, the secretary general, after the board of trustees had voted 14 to 1 against a demand that he resign. He is still a dues-paying member of the IPR, and until recently was custodian of its old files.

It is a peculiar commentary on the character of these people that Field held such power, or was held in such esteem in Institute of Pacific Relations circles that Edward C. Carter, Owen Lattimore, Lauchlin Currie and William T. Stone recommended him and worked for his appointment as a military intelligence officer during the war. His service would have been in connection with a strategic bombing survey. Fortunately, he was not appointed.

Frederick V. Field was an active member of the Institute of Pacific Relations. He wrote nineteen articles for the Institute of Pacific Relations periodicals between 1932 and 1952. He also wrote two Institute of Pacific Relations books on economic subjects. He proposed and ordered, over the objection of the executive committee, publication of the Henry Wallace book, Our Job in the Pacific, which Mr. Lattimore wrote and which the Communist party pushed.

The Institute of Pacific Relations records are filled with suggestions and solicited advice from Field to other members of the staff.

Institute of Pacific Relations spokesmen excused all Field's leftist activities with the observation that his activities with the Institute of Pacific Relations were beyond reproach.

Probably the true explanation of Field's long association with Institute of Pacific Relations lies in the testimony of one witness who reported that the other trustees would not vote him out, because they did not know how they could continue to raise money if they did so. Field acknowledged under oath that he had met several deficits for the organization.

It is the subcommittee's view that Field was no less a Communist at his desk in the Institute of Pacific Relations offices than when he reported to the Politburo of the American Communist Party, or handed in his column to the Daily Worker.

The evidence shows that the Institute of Pacific Relations family did not confine their energies to the one organization, but became interested and active in numerous organizations within the orbit of far-eastern affairs. Among these were:

The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy and its publication, Spotlight on the Far East. Both the organization and its magazine have been labeled subversive by the Attorney General. Even Lattimore and Holland acknowledged a pink tinge there.

The China Aid Council, described by witnesses as Communist-created and labeled a Communist-front by a congressional committee.

Amerasia, which was organized, according to one of the witnesses before the subcommittee, by the Communist Party; operated by T. A. Bisson, Owen Lattimore, Chi Chao-ting, Kate Mitchell and Frederick Vanderbilt Field, all intimate members of the IPR family. Most Senators will recall the incident in 1945, when hundreds of documents from secret Government files were seized in the Amerasia offices, and will need no further identification of the magazine.

China Today, a magazine published by the American Friends of the Chinese People; again with Bisson, Chi, and Maxwell S. Stewart as editors, Jaffe and Field as publishers. Lattimore had declined a place on the editorial board of this magazine, with the explanation that the magazine was more obviously partisan than Amerasia. Louis Budenz said China Today was designed by the Communists to influence other organizations.

The American Russian Institute, cited as subversive by the Attorney General, and Allied Labor News, which was described to the subcommittee as completely controlled by Communists.

All these associated—and often interlocking—organizations had some publishing or public-relations functions, as did IPR.

But research, writing, and publishing were not the only activities of the IPR. In truth, a study of the testimony indicates that a considerable portion of the IPR energies went into public relations, lobbying, propaganda and related activities.

Perhaps I should say here that the committee does not regard public relations work as an evil. It is concerned with this activity on the part of the Institute of Pacific Relations primarily because the IPR spokesmen have denied any attempt on the part of the organization to influence public opinion.

The spearhead, idea men, and active participant in this phase of the institute's activities was Mr. Edward C. Carter, who was for more than 20 years its chief executive officer and is still a trustee of the institute.

One witness described Carter as a promoter by temperament. His activities bear out that description. He seems to have been tireless in getting and taking ideas, reaching out for contacts, looking for funds and new organizational connections, traveling and meeting all over the world—pushing and shoving and exerting and encouraging. I think I may offer the comment that the general tone established by such people is not that of scholarship and research. There were others on the staff who were promotion-minded, but Carter was the epitome of IPR promotional activity.

One of the most fertile fields for any promotion effort is the educational system, and the IPR was by no means neglectful of this area.

Its opportunity was great. As Owen Lattimore pointed out, there were in the 1930's very few sources of information on the Far East, and the IPR publications were the only ones which specialized in that area.

Teachers and students interested in the Pacific were almost compelled to become members of the Institute of Pacific Relations—to obtain its publications. But the IPR did not rest there. It drew students or young scholars to its staff, trained and indoctrinated them, sent them abroad, and often aided them to get jobs elsewhere in business or in Government.

IPR and the Far Eastern Association controlled funds for publication of books and pamphlets. There also was a fine system for promoting the new books. The IPR family for some years had a virtual monopoly on the review of books on the Far East for several big eastern papers. Doing both writing and reviewing, they operated as a sort of mutual-admiration society.

But, Mr. President, while the colleges and universities were being thoroughly cultivated, there was no neglect of students and teachers on the lower levels. Literally millions of pamphlets were put out by IPR for high-school use, and programed for the elementary schools. A kit of promotion material went along with each order. The armed services bought several hundred thousand IPR pamphlets for the citizen-soldiers heading for the Far East.

Radio, the movies, the lecture platform, luncheon clubs, cocktail parties, discussion groups, and big-scale conferences all received a share of IPR attention. There even was projected a series of dinners—listen to this—and a staff of technical experts for the San Francisco Conference on the United Nations.

The record is replete with evidence that Owen Lattimore and Edward C. Carter were recipients of much special attention and many special privileges at the hands of the Soviet group. But testimony of Barmine, Bogolepov, and Poppe shows these Russian IPR people to have been operatives of the Comintern and of Soviet military intelligence, first, and scholars last, if at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to ask one question of the Senator. I should like to ask whether, when the technique of the IPR was being examined, the testimony showed that they attempted to have their views read by State Department officials as well as by Senators of the United States, in order that they might influence legislation along certain lines.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has stated the matter correctly.

Mr. President, Carter and others were particularly assiduous in defending the Russian purge trials in print and from the platform. On one occasion Carter was host for a dinner, which Philip Jessup attended, for the purpose of hearing Constantine Oumansky, then counselor of the Russian Embassy, talk about the trials.

Lattimore published an article by Mary Van Kleeck, identified as a Communist, defending the trials, and wrote an editorial attacking an article by an anti-Communist who wrote on the other side of the issue.

There are many similar instances where the IPR writers and publications have taken up the cudgels for the Russians, and the opportunities were ample: On the Nazi-Soviet pact, the invasions of Poland and of Finland. The theme

of Soviet superiority runs through the pamphlets and books published in such numbers by the institute and promoted in the schools and colleges of this country.

Owen Lattimore was the first of the IPR crowd to find an important place in Government. A friendship with Lauchlin Currie and his mastery of the Chinese language helped him get President Roosevelt's nomination in 1941 as political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek, who was in the midst of his troubles with the Chinese Communists and trying to get American help to keep them in subjection. Currie at the time was one of the White House assistants.

One of the first to know about this appointment of Lattimore to advise Chiang was Oumansky, the Russian Ambassador, with whom Carter and Lattimore had a 2-hour luncheon 11 days before the appointment was officially announced and at least a week before the Chinese Embassy was informed of the appointment.

From that time on Owen Lattimore moved steadily through Government circles. He was a close friend of John Carter Vincent, another protégé of Lauchlin Currie, the Soviet spy ring's White House informant.

In 1945 Lattimore published a book called Solution in Asia. It painted the Communist area as a happy land compared with Nationalist-governed territory, and it suggested a political compromise between the two factions, based on a coalition government.

This book of Lattimore's was praised by the Communists, plugged in their book stores, and sent to the current party leaders as representative of the party viewpoint. Follow this thought through, Members of the Senate. I shall dwell on it in another way later.

This man Lattimore seemed to have formed an early affinity for the Communists, or else the Communists generated an appreciation for his peculiar talents long before they were recognized in this country.

An interesting side light on Lattimore's life came to view in the testimony of Brig. Gen. Alexander Gregory Barmine about an incident in 1935 while he was a Soviet military officer charged with planning a series of secret munitions dumps in China. Follow this closely, Mr. President.

Barmine, now employed by the Voice of America, told the committee that General Berzin, then chief of Soviet military intelligence, proposed that they use "our men" to operate the project. The expression "our men," Barmine explained, meant, to him, members of the Soviet military intelligence. Among those whom Berzin proposed to use were two Americans, one of whom he names as Owen Lattimore.

When they talked again about the project, Barmine said, Berzin had decided that these men could not be used because they were with the Institute of Pacific Relations, and the institute was too valuable as a cover shop to be interfered with. Barmine said he understood IPR was being used, or was to be used, by the Russians in the countries on the Pacific where the Soviet was not yet recognized.

The project did not go through, but Barmine said those were the first American names he had heard, and they remained in his mind so that several years later, when he was testing Gen. Walter Krivitsky on his knowledge of America, where they both planned to go, he asked Krivitsky if he knew those two men. The general told him, Barmine said, that he did know them as people with the Institute of Pacific Relations and that they were still "our men."

Earlier Lattimore's name turned up again when the Russians wanted someone to promote the Mongolian Republic, so-called, into the League of Nations.

Mr. Bogolepov, the former Soviet Foreign Office counselor, told us that he first ran across Lattimore in the Library of the Institute of World Economics and Politics in Moscow, and asked who he was. Bogolepov was interested because matters were being discussed with Lattimore which Bogolepov regarded as highly confidential. He was told, Bogolepov said, that Lattimore was not Comintern—not quite Comintern—but that it was all right to discuss these matters with him.

Several months later, Bogolepov said, he was reporting to Litvinoff in an official Soviet meeting on the possibilities of obtaining recognition for the Mongolian Republic, and Litvinoff remarked that it would be necessary—listen to this—to prepare the terrain. The point then was to decide who would take on that campaign. Bogolepov said Litvinoff asked the question of the officer on the Mongolian desk, but before he could reply added, "Lattimore, perhaps?"—and it was decided officially that Lattimore would be given the assignment.

In this connection it should be noted that former Ambassador William C. Bullitt testified before the committee that while he was United States Ambassador in Moscow in 1936 Lattimore called on him and asked him to urge President Roosevelt to recognize the Mongolian Republic, assuring him that it was a fully independent nation. Actually, Bullitt said, the area was under rigid Soviet control, though Soviet agents had set up a phony local government.

Lattimore continued to insist over a period of years that Outer Mongolia was an independent nation, though he, himself—I again draw the attention of the Senate to this—recognized Soviet domination by seeking Soviet permission to visit in Outer Mongolia.

The Internal Security Subcommittee is convinced that Owen Lattimore, beginning some time in the 1930's, was a conscious and articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy. The subcommittee is convinced that Lattimore testified untruthfully before us on at least five different matters, and we have recommended that the Justice Department submit to a grand jury the question of whether he committed perjury.

Lattimore and John Carter Vincent, the latter then Chief of the China Division of the State Department, and a veteran of 20 years' service as a Foreign Service officer in China, were the Currie selections as companions for Henry Wallace on his China mission.

Louis Budenz testified that the choice of these two men was regarded by American Communist leaders as favorable to the interests of the Communist Party; that Lattimore and Vincent could be counted upon to lead Wallace.

An effort was made by several witnesses, including Henry Wallace, to challenge this view, but Vincent acknowledged on examination, based on his own reports of the Wallace conversations with Chiang, that he, Vincent, directed the course of these conferences and determined the subject many times. Under oath Vincent said he did influence the Wallace mission.

Vincent was a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations for only 1 year. He was a trustee during that period, but paid no dues. Nevertheless, the record is replete with instances—most of which Vincent said he could not recall—in which he was consulted by IPR executives. He arranged a reception at Blair House for some of their foreign members; manuscripts were sent him for review; his advice was sought on arrangements by which IPR could participate in the U. N. Conference at San Francisco; and many other evidences of contacts with him were drawn from the IPR files.

Vincent acknowledged that he was the drafting officer for two of the three papers which constituted the directive to Gen. George Marshall when he went to China in 1944, to try to make peace between the Nationalists and the Communists. Vincent testified it was his idea that the Chinese Communists should be given representation in the Government as the price of peace, and that the Marshall directive also provided that American aid should be withheld from the Chinese Nationalists until they agreed to take the Communists into the Government.

This was our left-handed intervention in the Chinese Civil War since, following the Vincent-devised directive, General Marshall cut off all supplies to Chiang Kai-shek, including even those purchased by the Nationalists, and thus let the Soviet-armed Communists take over.

Meanwhile, Owen Lattimore was busying himself with letters to the President and a call at the White House to urge a revision of United States policy which would give the Communists a share in the Chinese Government. The Communists, of course, had already indicated to Marshall that they would be satisfied with nothing less than a share that would give them real strength.

Coincident with this activity, the Communist Party organs were harping on the same theme. They also had begun to denounce those who would retain the Japanese Emperor as a means of establishing a peace with Japan, and Lattimore was writing and speaking along this line.

At that time the persons in the Department of State most concerned with far-eastern policy, were Joseph Grew, Joseph W. Ballantine, and Eugene Dooman. In 4 months all had been replaced and John Carter Vincent had

become director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, as well as head of the China desk. Vincent also was made chairman of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee. He entered the scene too late, apparently, to toughen the policy already established for post-surrender administration of Japan. The Coordinating Committee, however, turned out a document which sought to stiffen that policy, and Lattimore wrote a report for the Pauley mission which would have contributed to a hard peace for Japan.

In January 1945 the IPR organized one of its international conferences. It was described by the then executive secretary of the American council as a trial balloon for the United Nations Conference in San Francisco.

Raymond Dennett, executive secretary of the American council, tried to line up the proper Government representation, but ran into trouble and had to let Currie handle the situation. Apparently he made out all right, for the people whom Dennett wanted, including many of the 30 whom Philip Jessup recommended, were on hand. Jessup presided and Owen Lattimore was the most vocal, and the dominant conferee.

It was at this Conference that Lattimore and two members of the IPR staff stirred up the British, French, and Dutch delegates by attacks on the colonial system, and Lattimore put in a few thousand words in furtherance of his campaign to do away with the Japanese Emperor.

Alger Hiss, then in charge of plans for the U. N. meeting, recommended that copies of the Conference report be made available to each delegation and encouraged IPR participation on the fringes, with their people posing as technical advisers.

With Hiss as the head of the Government's postwar planning program, many Institute of Pacific Relations people found places in the organization, and the institute exerted its influence through at least two round-table discussions on China, with the usual carefully selected roster. This was during the United Nations meeting.

With considerable difficulty, the subcommittee was able to get a view of the State Department's 1949 Conference which was advertised as a prelude to review of our policy toward China.

Though it had quite a build-up, there was a distinct impression on the part of some of the conferees who testified before the subcommittee that not only was the policy already determined, but that the conferees were carefully chosen to make a record which would support that policy.

Chairman of the Conference was Philip Jessup, an active member of IPR. One of his 2 associates and 17 of the 25 persons invited were members of the IPR family. These included Lawrence K. Rosinger, a writer who refused to testify before our committee that he was not a Communist Party member, and, of course, also included Lattimore. These two led the discussions and spearheaded what one witness, a participant, called the prevailing group.

The three points which received the greatest stress were recognition of the Chinese Communist Government, establishment of normal trade relations between Communist China and the United States, and the breaking of what the Conference called the Nationalist blockade; that is, Chiang's attempt to hold the Communist troops in check.

The Subcommittee on Internal Security regards this as one clear instance in which persons connected with the IPR sought to be influential in shaping American foreign policy. The fact that public opinion prevented the Department from carrying out fully the policy the IPR group urged does not in any way detract from this view.

It is from these and many other revealing episodes that the subcommittee has concluded that the effective leadership of IPR worked consistently to set up actively cooperative and, where possible, confidential relationships, with persons in Government charged with the determination of foreign policy. It is also the subcommittee's view that the sustained policy of IPR was to place in Government posts persons associated with the organization, and also other persons of whom the effective leadership of IPR approved.

The subcommittee has taken additional testimony on a matter involving John Paton Davies, a highly placed State Department employee, and has submitted this testimony to the Justice Department for consideration in connection with an earlier transcript. The new testimony was not made public.

The subcommittee is satisfied that Davies testified falsely regarding a recommendation he made for the employment by a sensitive Government agency of certain persons having known Communist connections.

The subcommittee is asking the Justice Department to lay before a grand jury the question of whether perjury was committed before the subcommittee by Davies.

In addition to these matters, the subcommittee is making the following recommendations:

First. That a thorough study be made by the Committee on the Judiciary, in cooperation with the Department of Justice, of the Espionage Act and related legislation with a view to determining what revisions may be necessary to deal effectively with present-day security problems.

Second. That the Committee on Government Operations undertake an investigation to determine the need for and proper scope of legislation to require departments and agencies in the executive branch to make available to congressional committees upon proper request material from their files.

Third. That consideration be given to investigation by some appropriate agency of the following:

(a) Possible Communist infiltration into and influence upon the Treasury Department and other agencies forming and administering fiscal and monetary policies and affairs of the United States;

(b) The role of Alger Hiss in foreign affairs and the foundation of foreign policy of the United States and his influence on personnel decisions in the State Department;

(c) The extent to which persons actively associated with the pro-Communist core of the IPR have been employed by any agency of the Government, and the activities and influence of any such persons still so employed; and

(d) The extent to which contributions by American charitable, scientific, and educational foundations have aided Communist or pro-Communist activity in the United States.

Mr. President, the work of the Judiciary Committee, carried on over a year and a half, has been justified beyond all question in bringing to the American people a realization of how enemies of our form of government have operated to gain access to the policy-forming branches of our Government. It is important that the American people may be awakened to what dangers may be lurking near, what techniques may still be employed against us in an effort to effect the destruction of our way of life, and of this very Nation itself. In days that might be ahead, when great stress and great trial could be visited upon the people of this land, it is well that we have before us the full record of the past and take to heart the lessons which may be drawn from that record.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT NO. 2050, RELATING TO INSTITUTE OF PACIFIC RELATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I may have the indulgence of the Senate, the Senator from Nevada has submitted a committee report on the Institute of Pacific Relations. We may have additional copies of the report printed if we give the order when the report goes to the printer. Therefore, I submit a resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies, and request its present consideration. If we do it in this way some money will be saved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 346) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary 5,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 2050, entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations."

Mr. McCARRAN. I may say in that regard my recollection is that approximately 7,500 applications have been received for the hearings of the subcommittee on this subject. Therefore, I am justified in saying that additional requests will be made for the report. I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 346) was considered and agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the last session of the Eighty-second Congress is about over. I find it fit and proper to say a few words on behalf of a great Senator. I have served in this body under the leadership of the late Joe Robinson, the Vice President, the late Senator Kenneth Wherry, Senator Lucas; and last session and this session under the able leadership of the junior Senator from Arizona, ERNEST McFARLAND.

I enjoyed serving under the grand persons who preceded him, but I believe I can voice the sentiments of the entire body when I say that Senator McFARLAND has given a fine account of his stewardship. Never have I seen such patience, fair play, and the exemplification of all that leadership requires as have marked the service of the junior Senator from Arizona as majority leader.

I believe I can also express the opinion that even the minority Members, down in their hearts, hope and wish that he will continue to lead the majority in the Eighty-third Congress. I know that I express the opinion of the entire membership by wishing Senator McFARLAND and his lovely family well.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Mexico on his moving tribute which is so well deserved by our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to thank both the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Connecticut for their kind remarks.

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE—REPORT BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, before I address myself to the fair-trade bill which has been under discussion since yesterday at 6 p. m., I should like to call the attention of the Senate to one of the most significant reports to be filed at this session of Congress. I am referring to the unprecedented and carefully documented interim report on the Katyn Forest massacre, filed today in the House of Representatives by the select committee headed by Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana.

The findings of Representative MADDEN's committee, which was authorized to investigate the mass murder of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest of Russia, are unanimous that the massacre in the late spring of 1940 was the terrible handiwork of the Russian secret police.

The committee has also concluded, on the basis of the evidence, that the Soviets had plotted this criminal extermination of Poland's intellectual leadership as early as the fall of 1939—shortly after the invasion of Poland by Russia. The committee finds, in short, that it was a monstrous and calculated plot—a fantastic crime of immense proportions that will rank with the worst of history's infamies. I do not believe there has been anything like the Katyn Forest massacre since Genghis Kahn and Tamerlane.

At this point I wish to pay a sincere tribute to Representative MADDEN and the members of his committee and its staff for the painstaking work that has gone into this interim report, for the careful and detailed manner in which they have sought out and sifted the evidence available, and for their judicial assessment of this evidence. I urge my colleagues to study the report.

It is not my purpose, in this brief statement, to review that evidence because the report will be available to all Members of the Congress today for them to read themselves. I do wish to comment, however, on some of the significant ramifications of the report.

For the the first time in history, so far as I can determine, a committee of Congress and its staff have gone abroad in the sole pursuit of evidence from foreign nationals and to hold open hearings on foreign soil on an international question. This unprecedented and painstaking procedure, quite aside from the necessity of such procedure, has a tremendous long-range significance because of its effect on possible future adjudications of this international crime.

With rare foresight, the committee has not only taken such verbal foreign evidence under oath, but has also then recast the evidence in the form of individual written depositions sworn to before American consular officials in each of the countries where the evidence was taken. I have questioned the committee counsel, Mr. John J. Mitchell, as to the validity of such procedure. He has assured me that while this is pioneering and unique in the procedures of a congressional committee, it conforms wholly with the requirements of international law.

The significance of this procedure will be immediately apparent to the Congress, I am sure.

The committee has also unanimously recommended that this testimony, these depositions, this evidence, and these findings should be presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations, with the end in view of seeking action before the International World Court of Justice against the Soviet Union for a crime in violation of the great general principles of law recognized by all civilized nations.

The committee further urges that the President of the United States instruct the American U. N. delegation to press for the establishment of an international commission which would investigate other mass murders and crimes against humanity. I wholeheartedly, and with all the energy at my command, join the committee in its recommendation to President Truman.

This is a course which millions of Americans of Polish descent, as well as of others with recent European nationality origins, have long urged and recognized as a necessary step in the hoped-for prevention of future mass crimes by outlaw nations.

As the committee has pointed out, it has only scratched the surface as far as the numerous horrible crimes against humanity are concerned. The committee believes the United Nations will have failed in its obligations until it exposes to the world that the Katyn Forest massacre is a definite and diabolical part of the totalitarian plan for world conquest through ruthless mass extermination of peoples or of their intellectual leaders.

As all of us know, the first thing the Communists do when they seize any country is to suppress its universities and the vehicles of education and exterminate its intellectual leadership.

Thus the legal and judicial procedures pioneered by this committee here, as well as in Europe, may well be of the utmost significance in the months and years ahead.

One other aspect of today's findings has an immediate significance that could transcend the importance of the specific crime under examination. As the committee itself has recognized, there is a striking similarity between what happened to the Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and the events now taking place in Korea. Let me quote directly here from the committee's findings:

> We unanimously agree that this committee would be remiss in its duties to the American people and the free people of the world if it failed to point out that the identical evasions by the Soviets to the Polish Government while the Poles were searching for their 15,000 missing officers in 1941, appear again in the delaying tactics now being used by the Communists in Korea.

The conclusion is fearsomely evident that the Katyn Forest atrocities could prove to be a blueprint for Korea. Just as the Soviets failed for almost 2 years to account for the missing Polish officers, so to this day the Communists in Korea have failed to account for many thousands of captured United Nations soldiers, including 8,000 Americans listed last July by General Ridgway as atrocity victims. This is a sad and awful thought for us Americans, on the eve of our Fourth of July.

I quote further from the report:

> The Communists' delaying tactics in the Korean peace talks may be from the same cloth as the nebulous replies received from the Soviets by the Poles in 1941 and 1942 while they searched for their missing officers.

Manifestly, Mr. President, the facts and findings of this committee cannot be ignored by the free peoples of the world. Manifestly, the free peoples of the world must begin at once to do everything they constructively can do about these findings. They represent a great milestone in the long and tortured path toward the establishment of international law and order on a world scale, and under which, some day, we may hope that the barbarous practices

brought to light in this report may be forever eliminated by the combined moral power of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

It is a tribute to the organized groups of Americans of foreign origin that they have been among the first to recognize and to plead for the objectives which Representative MADDEN and his associates have now formally recommended to the Congress of the United States. Without the interest and activities of our Americans of Polish descent, this epoch-making report would never have been initiated. I am very happy to have this opportunity to salute them today.

FAIR-TRADE PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has returned to the floor. Indeed, my preceding comments on the remarkable report filed today in the House of Representatives were made at that point in the hope that the Senator from Minnesota might be able to return to the floor before I proceeded to discuss the bill now before us.

DISCUSSION OF FAIR-TRADE BILL

I wonder how many of our colleagues know how intimately the junior Senator from Minnesota knows whereof he speaks when he talks to us about fair-trade practices as applied to retail stores. The Senator from Minnesota is the only ex-pharmacist in the United States Senate. I remember once meeting him on his way to a druggists' convention, and later discovering the pride the druggists of America take in their ex-pharmacist in the Senate, as indeed they should as he is one of its most eminent and eloquent Members. Once when I was talking with him about his own background, he said to me, "Until I was 25 years old, I practically had never set foot outside a drug store." It was at the age of 25, and this is an interesting comment upon his background, that he left his father's drug store in Huron, South Dakota, to depart for academic studies at the University of Minnesota. This was his great decision, of course, which made him mayor of Minneapolis, and which later caused the people of Minnesota, in gratitude for his great public record as mayor of Minneapolis, to elect him, by a margin of a quarter of a million votes, to the United States Senate, as the first Democratic Senator to be elected in Minnesota since the Civil War.

Mr. President, without being unduly discursive, I wish to observe that I think I also know something about the field of business activities which this bill affects. For several year, as a young man, I spent more than 8 hours every day at a typewriter and in the field with people who worked in retail stores, developing material for writing advertisements for Drug Topics, Hardware Age, Progressive Grocer, and countless other journals of the trade press. The earliest of my 13 years in the advertising business began as a $25- and later $50- and $100-a-week copywriter, writing trade-paper advertisements; and one cannot write good trade-paper advertisements unless he spends a large part of his time in the field talking to the dealers whom he is trying to advise and persuade. This advertising experience of mine followed more than 2 years as a salesman selling cash registers and other articles, and spending all day, and frequently far into the evening, working with the retail trade, trying to learn its problems. So I feel I have a special background which qualifies me to speak on this bill. But, in addition to this background of my own, in addition to the fact I have spent a good part of my life in the business community and as a business man, I have had a further special interest in the bill. My distinguished colleague in the other House, Representative JOHN MCGUIRE, of Wallingford, Connecticut, is the original sponsor of this fair trade bill. Indeed, it is known as the McGuire bill. Representative MCGUIRE has achieved a national reputation among those interested in this subject as a result of the hard work he has done in developing his bill and bringing it to the point of being debated today in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, this bill is regarded as vital to the future of our independent retail merchants. In my opinion, however, it is not a bill to be urged upon economic grounds alone though it seems that most of the discussion about this bill thus far has fallen into the field of economics. I suggest, Mr. President, that the bill, in addition to interesting distinguished economists, should perhaps more appropriately, or with equal appropriateness, interest sociologists and political scientists, whose views have not found expression in the discussion of this bill. I might question only one aspect of the presentation of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] last night and this morning. His eloquent words on this subject certainly moved all who heard them. However, I myself do not think—and I doubt whether the Senator from Minnesota would advance it as a prior argument—that the major justification for this is to protect the weak from the strong. The Senator from Minnesota used some very marvelous metaphors this morning. He spoke of protecting the canary from the eagles. He spoke of what Joe Louis would do to any Senator who got in the ring with him.

He referred to what would happen to a high school football team if it found itself opposing Notre Dame. Mr. President, I admit that I should be for killing the canary, annihilating the high school football team, and letting the poor Senator wish he had never gotten into the ring, and regret it on his death bed, if need be, if I thought those things were actually in the public interest. I believe this bill should be urged solely because it serves the public interest, not because it may seem to be in the interest of the certain grocers, druggists, hardware stores, or other retailers whose representatives have been before committees of the Congress, advancing their own case from the standpoint of their own problems as they see them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to concur in the thought expressed by the Senator, because the substance of my argument, which preceded the statements to which the Senator has referred, was that we are making basically a social and a policy or political decision; and certainly what we must consider is the total economy, and what is good for the total general welfare, rather than for any specific individual as such.

Mr. BENTON. I am very glad to have the Senator so express himself, and that is why I must say I was somewhat surprised when he ended his argument with the canary, the high school football team, and the Senator in the prize ring, because the gist of his argument last night and the gist of his argument this morning, up to that point, was that there must be considered first the interest of all the 155,000,000 American people.

(At this point Mr. BENTON yielded to Mr. SPARKMAN to ask questions of Mr. HUMPHREY. The colloquy which ensued, was, on request of Mr. BENTON, and by unanimous consent, ordered to be printed at the conclusion of his remarks.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I feel that the major mistake which is being made by many people who are discussing the bill and by its opponents is that they talk about it too much in economic terms. I agree that it must be talked about in economic terms. There may be a price which the economy should not pay even for important social and political benefits. However, in my judgment it is very doubtful whether, if we take a long-term instead of a short-term view, there is any price involved which the American people will ever pay for the benefits which accrue to them from this bill.

Incidentally, the figures quoted last night by my friend, whom I admire so greatly, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on the profits of pharmaceutical houses, such as Lilly and Abbott Laboratories, have nothing to do with this bill at all as people who work in the drug trade will testify.

However, over and above the economic arguments there is the overriding fact that our independent retail businesses, usually family businesses, are a vital part of the fabric of our social and political life. They play a large part in determining our economic attitudes in this, our free American society.

Yes, Mr. President, it is the millions of independent owners and proprietors of small businesses who bring support and strength to our free institutions, our social, political, and economic attitudes.

They are the ones who will fight to the death against collectivism in all its terrifying forms. They should and must be preserved.

Mr. President, in October 1944, Fortune magazine published an article which I wrote, entitled "The Economics of a Free Society." I should like to hope that the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. BENNETT], in writing his book 2 or 3 years ago about our free economy, may have had this article called to his attention.

Fortune magazine stated:

The 12-point statement on the opposite page and the exposition of policy that follows were prepared by Mr. BENTON at the request of the Research Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. Though Mr. BENTON assumes responsibility for these documents, they have of course been approved in principle by top leaders of the CED and its economic advisers.

Mr. President, at that time I was the founding Vice Chairman of CED's Board of Trustees. Mr. Paul Hoffman was Chairman.

I deem certain sections of the policy statement relevant to our discussion today with reference to the pending bill. CED, as many Senators know, is dedicated to higher levels of productivity and employment. Yet CED recognizes that a healthy political and social environment is essential to sound economic progress. Indeed, Mr. President, Americans seek sound economic progress in order to create a sound and healthy political and social environment. The economic aspect is the servant of the social and political aspects, rather than the other way around.

In that CED statement—as I recall, it was the first of the CED papers printed for wide publication—I stated:

In the United States there are 4,000,000 or more farm enterprises, more than 1,000,000 self-employed who work as their own bosses, more than 2,000,000 private businesses with one or more employees. These provide enormous opportunities for innovation and experimentation. After the war—

That was written in 1944—

America must create an economic climate that will develop millions more. Can any centrally controlled economy hope to maintain the dynamic drive, the ingenuity, or the diversity of creative impulse of these millions of enterprises? Their persistent search for improvement results in progress: better products and services adapted more closely to the desires of the buyers at ever lower prices. The driving energy of private incentive thus serves the economic good of the Nation as a whole.

The effect of this drive for improvement is clearly visible in the history of the last 40 years. Since 1900 new and better machines and better methods have more than tripled manufacturing output per man-hour of work. For the economy as a whole, output per man-hour in recent decades has been increasing at the rate of 2½ percent per year.

Mr. President, most students of our economy agree that the welfare of the small independent businessman is essential to a healthy political and economic climate in the United States. A very high percentage of our innovations and discoveries originates in small independent business. On this count alone, independent businesses pay off and justify their existence. They do so by means of the new kinds of competition they develop against the larger, well-established firms. This develops our American standards of productivity.

A high percentage of the innovations in selling and merchandising in the retail trades in the last 25 years has come out of Texas, the Southwest, and California. Is that because in Texas, the Southwest, and California there are great concentrations of economic power in the chain stores? No, not at all, Mr. President; it is because in Texas, the Southwest, and California there have been more initiative, greater enterprise, a larger number of independent operators, and more enterprising and independent businessmen who have been using their ingenuity in new ways, in an effort to develop their own welfare; and in that way, of course, they have developed the American economy.

Our economy is not merely one of producing at the lowest possible cost; it is not merely one of getting the goods on the shelves of retail stores at the lowest possible cost. Our economy also consists of very important techniques of selling, of promotion, of so-called merchandising. The latter techniques, which have played such a large part in developing the high standard of living in the United States, owe much of their development to the independent businessmen who seek and find new, fresh, original angles by means of which they can compete with large businesses.

Mr. President, I do not favor pampering the small-business man, and I do not wish to subsidize him. I oppose many of the proposals made to Congress by the so-called small-business organizations who advocate certain forms of pampering and subsidization of small business.

On the other hand, certainly we must not permit the small-business man to be ruthlessly put out of business by practices which develop monopolies of a type which, as our history shows, often can readily learn how to exploit the public.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate whether it wishes to accelerate the trends toward monopoly and lack of widespread competition. I am sure the Senate will answer that it does not wish to accelerate those trends. However, if we fail to pass this bill, we gravely risk accelerating them, with consequent unfortunate and unhappy effects on the American economy and on the American people as a whole.

As suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, just as the family farm is regarded as a great and integral part of our American life, and just as we prefer it because it undergirds what we like to call our American way of life, as opposed to Soviet type of collective farms, or the large farms which have been developed in certain of our Western States, even though the latter may be more efficient and may produce more food at lower cost, so also do we Americans regard as a great national asset the million or so independent, family-owned retail businesses. Indeed, they are a far greater assets than any 10, 20, 50, or 100 chainstore systems, with a comparably large annual volume of sales, could possibly be.

So it is not only because of the economic importance of small independent business, which is the subject around which most of this debate has centered, but it is also because such business is the very warp and woof of our social and political fabric, that I have been proud to serve on the Senate Small Business Committee.

I instituted the clinics which the committee has carried all over the country, to aid and assist small business in its efforts to compete with large business. More recently, I have been active in tax hearings, aimed at the special problems of small business, in Bridgeport, Newark, and Los Angeles. Shortly I, as well as other members of the Senate Small Business Committee, expect to have major recommendations growing from these hearings. There are at present major injustices and inequities in our tax laws, as they are applied to small, independent business, and most particularly as they are applied to new business. These must be corrected in the next session of the Congress.

But to get back to my CED statement in Fortune, as Fortune said:

Mr. BENTON's drafts, completed after criticism and advice from the research committee and its leading economists, will now go out to 2,000 CED community chairmen for local discussion and distribution to the 50,000 members.

In that statement I said:

Further, a free market open to the development of new, independent enterprises will continue to provide an economic basis for political freedom. Such a market breeds the millions of rival producers and sellers who do not need to cater to private or public overlords. They help keep the balance on the side of freedom and against the arbitrary exercise of economic power. They provide the competition that minimizes the need for Government regulation and operation. They provide an element of balance that counteracts potential dangers to our democratic institutions.

Lack of competition stifles the free market. So-called monopoly practices of business, labor, and Government, which remove the necessity of trying to undersell a competitor or to match or improve on his quality, induce complacency. Such practices have no place in a free-enterprise system designed to serve the common good. They require Government action either to remove their source or, where monopoly is essential to public service, to regulate them in the public interest.

Mr. President, I believe that the Members of this body who wish to encourage "the balance on the side of freedom and against the arbitrary exercise of economic power" should support this bill. Those who wish "to minimize the need of government regulation and operation" should favor this bill. Those who wish to prevent in the United States the development of monopoly power of the kind which inevitably leads to government regulation, should favor this bill.

Representative MCGUIRE has achieved a national reputation for his leadership in this area. I congratulate him.

Mr. President, we have been discussing some of the misinformation which has been spread abroad about this fair trade bill. It is my belief that many great

organizations have been led to oppose this bill when in my judgment they would be in favor of the bill if they understood better its long-range importance and its long-range effects. There is widespread misunderstanding of the economic impact of the bill, and there has been far too little discussion of the social and political significance of the bill.

As I have previously suggested, this bill does not permit a manufacturer under State law to regulate his retail prices, and it does not regulate competition among manufacturers, among wholesalers, or among retailers. Such price fixing is strictly illegal, and will continue to be a violation of the criminal statutes, for which violations men can go to jail and, indeed, should go to jail.

The figures submitted yesterday evening by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] are reflections of what I choose to think are in part short-run effects of fair trade practices. Under the impact of the new type of competition which would develop with the enactment of this bill, those figures would alter greatly and at an accelerating rate with each passing year.

Mr. President, I was active in business in the early thirties. At that time, as a young man in the advertising business, I was responsible for developing advertising for a large number of well-known national food and drug brands. As the depression deepened, many manufacturers made the mistake of trying to hold up their prices. Many thought that merely by more advertising they could obtain the volume required.

In part, because of this, the private brands developed enormously, starting with the depression in 1929, and accelerating in 1930, 1931, and 1932. The development of those private brands forced down the prices of the manufactured products. If the products on which at that time, 20 years or so ago, I was working, such as Palmolive soap and Maxwell House coffee, had not brought down their prices to meet the competition of the private brands, they would have slowly faded away. This illustration which we see as we look backward into the history of the grocery and drug trade shows what would happen under this bill if manufacturers tried to hold their retail prices at too high a level or at an exorbitant level. There is a big incentive to the manufacturer to get his retail prices down.

Mr. President, this bill, of course, specifically includes provisions which cannot be misunderstood, provisions requiring free and open competition with articles of similar class produced by others.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I desire to comment very quickly on the substitute measure offered last night by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. To those of us who have had experience in retail merchandising, the amendment offered by him raises a great many complicated questions. A similar amendment, of course, was overwhelmingly rejected by the House, I assume, because it raised so many complicated questions. The bill offered by the Senator from Illinois as an amendment applies to all articles of commerce, not merely to the relatively small number of items, the trademarked and branded items, which would fall under the fair-trade bill.

Furthermore, its exclusions seem to me to be most ambiguous. The proposed substitute tells the retailer that he must charge his delivered cost, whatever that may mean, plus 6 percent; and it then excludes a long list of items, such as items damaged or deteriorated in quality—whatever that may mean. It excludes items sold exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes—which is a puzzling loophole to many retailers. It excludes perishable commodities, and also commodities if their further retention by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss.

Mr. President, who is to determine what is reasonable? Who is going to determine whether the inventory of a commodity must be liquidated in order to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy?

It seems to me that the substitute bill, if placed on the statute books, would open up a veritable paradise of activity, not for the consumer to enable him to get better goods at lower prices but for the accountants and lawyers and others who add overhead to the cost of operating a retail establishment, and who by so doing keep the prices up.

A most interesting omission—and there may be many exclusions which should be written into the substitute, but have not been written into it—is a very manifest one. Suppose the price drops on what a merchant has bought. In this country we operate, or are supposed to operate, on a profit-and-loss system. I do not want to guarantee every retailer that he will get his cost plus 6 percent on every item. I do not propose to take the loss out of the profit-and-loss system. If a retailer goes to the Chicago merchandise fair and makes the mistake of buying chairs at $10 a chair, and when he gets back to his home town he finds that his competitor has been smart enough to go to Grand Rapids and buy the same chair for $5 a chair, is retailer No. 1 to be prohibited from cutting his price in order to compete with retailer No. 2? Or suppose the manufacturer from whom the first retailer bought his chair at $10 is then forced to lower the price to $5, since an identical chair can be bought for $5, must the retailer who earlier bought the chair at $10, under the proposed substitute still sell his chair for $10 plus 6 percent, even though he can replace it for $5?

Such a bill, in my judgment, Mr. President, could take the bargain basement out of every department store. It would radically change retailing methods. It would violate the whole principle of turn-over applied to retail merchandising, in which the smart, aggressive retailer, when his goods do not sell, wisely reduces them 10 percent a week, or 10 percent a day, let us say, until he moves them off his shelves.

To me the substitute bill goes further in fixing prices at the expense of the consumer and in eliminating the competition about which the Senator from Illinois spoke so eloquently last night, than anything proposed or suggested in the fair trade bill which is now pending before the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted that the Senator from Connecticut has made these pertinent comments on the so-called loss leader bill which the Senator from Illinois presented last night as a substitute, because surely that bill needs to be fully discussed. I must say, however, that that bill applies to all articles of commerce except those that are exempted, which are limited in number.

Mr. BENTON. And which are hard to identify.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And which are hard to identify. There really are no standards by which they could be identified.

Mr. BENTON. There are no standards.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is, as compared to the pending fair-trade bill, which applies only to trade-marked articles and the brand-name articles, which articles may be fair-traded only when the manufacturer and the retailer wish them to be. In other words, it is not at all mandatory. There may be manufacturers who do not want to fair-trade every commodity they produce, who do not want to break their plant and machinery, in which event they are subject to all types of competition, and to all types of price fluctuation. But the Douglas proposal says that there shall be no loss leaders, that there must be 6 percent added. It appears to me that the fair-trade measure is much less inclusive and is much more exclusive than the one proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. Yes, if I may first make a comment. In my opinion, there can be no doubt of the correctness of the position of the Senator from Minnesota. I will go even further. There are certain to be plenty of manufacturers who will not have anything to do with this fair-trade bill. The bill applies only to a limited number of trade-marked items. The great proportion of manufacturers will not operate under this bill, and their goods will in no way be restricted on prices.

Most assuredly, all smart merchants today often sell goods under cost.

Only the stupid merchant expects to get his cost back on each and every item. The proposed substitute bill would, in my opinion, penalize the small merchant and reward the stupid; which is exactly the kind of problem we are so often facing, when we are considering legislation in the Congress, and which we must be on guard against.

I am now glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, against whom I hate to argue on any question, and I have not done so very often since we have both been in the Senate, makes the statement that

the fixing of prices becomes effective only when the manufacturer and the retailer want them to be effective? I think that is not accurate. I believe it to be a source of weakness in the present system of State fair-trade laws that when the manufacturer of the trade-marked or branded article enters into a price agreement with one retailer, all the other retailers or distributors of that article are thereupon bound to maintain that price. They have no option; they must maintain the price, even though they were not parties to any agreement, and even though they objected to it. They are nonetheless completely bound by the provisions of the bill.

I do not believe the extent of the provision was fully appreciated at the time fair-trade acts were passed in many States. It certainly was not fully understood by this Senator who was Governor of the State and signed the bill setting up the fair-trade practice. It was my understanding at that time that the manufacturer of the branded article could make contracts with substantially all the distributors or retailers handling the article, and it was perfectly fair to expect them to live up to the terms of the contract. I do not understand, nor do I believe it was contemplated, that the signature of one retailer would bind all the other retailers in the State.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator have any knowledge of how often in the State of New York it actually happens that a manufacturer will make a deal with only one retailer which would have this effect on all other retailers?

I ask that question because any manufacturer who knows what he is doing does not make an open agreement with one retailer unless he is on the way to make such an agreement with other similar retail outlets he can reach and sign up. Otherwise, if he discriminates between similar types of outlets, he can ruin his distribution system.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no record of the exact number, but I am quite certain that in very few instances have specific contracts been entered into between the manufacturer and all the retail outlets. If it be true, as the Senator from Connecticut alleges, that such contracts are entered into with all the retailers, then, of course, there is no need of this bill, because they would constitute binding contracts which would be enforceable. If the Senator and I agree to maintain a certain price, and we both affix our signatures to the agreement, I do not think any law is necessary. There is merely a contractual relationship.

Mr. BENTON. That may be true, but to the manufacturer the problem is serious. He would like to reach all his retail outlets. If, of the 50,000 drug stores which exist in this country—17 years ago, when I left the advertising business I knew how many drug stores there were, and there were approximately 50,000—if 500 of the 50,000 did not sign up, even though 49,500 did sign up, the 500 of the type described by the Senator from Minnesota last night can completely demoralize the 49,500. Further, there is the heavy cost of reaching and persuading the 49,500 to sign up.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Once again, Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that I shall insist on the regular order of business, in the interest of saving time.

Mr. BENTON. I do not object to that. As a matter of fact, I shall conclude my remarks in another 3 or 4 minutes, unless I am interrupted further with questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the nonsigner clause was understood to have been included in the Miller-Tydings Act as passed in 1937, according to the interpretation of the then Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Thurman Arnold?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to have that pointed out. Certainly there has never been in the Department of Justice a more vigorous and rigorous proponent of enforcing the antitrust laws than Mr. Thurman Arnold, one of our great public servants.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that there were two court cases in which a so-called nonsigner clause, under the terms of the Miller-Tydings Act and the State fair-trade acts were contested, and that in each of the two cases the court held they were legal and were in no way contrary to the Sherman Antitrust Act?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to have that information placed in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the annual report of the Federal Trade Commission those two cases are fully discussed?

Mr. BENTON. Yes.

I wish I had, but I do not have, the figures to show the percentage of American manufacturers whose goods go into the hands of the ultimate consumer through direct sale or authorized dealers, and who are able to control their prices without any special legislation or fair-trade laws either at the State or Federal level, but the percentage must be large. All companies selling direct to the consumer control their prices and they are usually identical in every hamlet and city of the Nation.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica sells for exactly the same price everywhere because the company completely controls its distribution. Automobile companies control the distribution of automobiles through authorized dealers. All companies that own their own retail outlets or that deal with a small number of outlets or regularly franchised dealers, with which they can enter into the kind of contracts suggested by the Senator from New York, have found that it pays to have a fixed price that is identical; and no charge, to my knowledge, has been leveled against any such business that it is in any way harmful to the competitive factors we are seeking to encourage in American life.

If a lady customer does not like what the direct salesman of the Real Silk Co. charges for stockings, she can go to Macy's and buy her stockings. If she does not like Ford's prices, she can go to Plymouth.

All we are now trying to do apply that same principle, at the option of the manufacturer, to those relatively few lines of branded merchandise which have been found by practice to be subject to grave abuses which are not in the public interest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that in 1936 the Supreme Court, in a unanimous decision, declared that fair-trade laws, including nonsigner clauses, were within the purview of the act?

Mr. BENTON. I know the Senator from Minnesota is a distinguished pharmacist, and I am beginning to welcome him as distinguished legal counsel.

The Senator from Minnesota has compiled an article on fair trade, containing arguments pro and con, in three very interesting pages which have come to me and which I presume were sent to other Members of the Senate.

Important as are the pro arguments, I do not regard them as being so important as are some of the arguments for the bill which the Senator and I have advanced in this floor debate and which I choose to call social and political arguments. In the Senator from Minnesota's statement, he lists 14 points which show the strong economic arguments for the bill from the standpoint of the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent to have this interesting statement printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, based upon my own business background, as well as upon my many years as a student of the American economy, as vice chairman of the Committee for Economic Development and in other roles, I urge upon the Senate the passage of the bill now before us. I hope that not too much further debate will be indicated, and that passage of the bill will not be further delayed.

EXHIBIT A

ARGUMENTS, PRO AND CON, ON FAIR TRADE

1. The McGuire bill is said to be a blanket approval of State fair-trade laws. Any State can pass or amend a fair-trade law without the competition requirement of all present State fair-trade laws.

The McGuire bill is Federal enabling legislation only, to permit the States to realize the full effectiveness of laws which they consider necessary to their welfare. The McGuire bill specifically includes a provision requiring "free and open competition with articles of similar class produced by others." Should a State remove such a restriction from its fair-trade act, then the McGuire bill would no longer be enabling insofar as that particular State is concerned.

2. Fair-trade prices are alleged to be too high. Efficient retailers are said to be able

to sell fair-traded products below fair-trade prices and make a profit.

Popular national brand goods, which are fair-traded, are sold for less, on the average, in the fair-trade States than in the non-fair-trade area of the United States. Predatory pricing retailers like to shade the price on articles whose value is as familiar to the consumer as the worth of a dollar bill. Competitors, however, cannot permit these retailers to get a reputation for underselling them. This is what starts exhausting price wars so damaging to small business.

3. Fair trade, it is said, is bad for small business because it has encouraged supermarkets to stock fair-traded drugstore items which, so the charge goes, give the supermarket an invitingly high profit margin.

Supermarkets are now stocking drugstore items not only in the fair-trade States, but also in such non-fair-trade areas as Texas, Missouri, Vermont, and the District of Columbia. Furthermore, they are stocking such items as hosiery, housewares, and apparel, most of which are not fair-traded. Obviously this trend among supermarkets to expand the variety of their merchandise offerings has nothing to do with fair trade.

4. Efficiency in distribution must not be thwarted by fair trade in the mistaken notion, runs the observation, that it will help small business.

The revolution in retailing of the past decade shows clearly that efficiency in distribution has not been thwarted. During the 21 years of fair trade, small business has flourished side by side with the great growth of chains, supermarkets, and other giant retailers. And efficiency of operation has been vastly improved. Fair trade did not prevent these developments.

5. Vertical resale price maintenance provided by fair trade is bad for the economy, say theorists.

If that be so, Congress should prohibit vertical resale price maintenance based on other legal frameworks like consignment selling and exclusive franchises. There is plenty of evidence that vertical resale price maintenance is good for the economy because it assures the existence of plenty of competitors. The automobile industry, which pioneered mass production, has from the very beginning sold its cars on the basis of vertical resale price maintenance.

6. There is no public instrumentality, say opponents, to test the reasonableness of fair-trade prices.

If by public instrumentality is meant a Government bureau, the charge is correct. Of course, the consumer is herself the public instrumentality because she determines by her daily decisions to buy or not to buy this or that product whether its price is reasonable and its quality up to the standard she expects.

7. Henry Ford has shown retailers that consumer prices are lowered through efficiency.

He certainly has. Henry Ford also demonstrated that mass production depends upon mass distribution. He got mass distribution by requiring all his dealers to sell Ford cars at his suggested prices. With this protection against predatory price cutting assured, more and more men were willing to invest their savings in Ford dealerships.

8. High-priced lobbyists, it is alleged, are putting over fair trade through pressure tactics.

Not lobbyists but small business, earnestly convinced that its survival depends upon effective fair trade, are petitioning Congress. The number and vigor of their petitions reflects the scope of support for fair trade and the intensity of small business' convictions concerning it.

9. Consumers, opponents charge, would be against fair trade if they knew what is going on.

That's a matter of opinion. Friends of fair trade believe that consumers in purchasing fair-trade products in ever-increasing volume are voting "yes" on fair trade every time they step up to a retail counter. To say that consumers have permitted themselves to be hoodwinked for two decades is to underrate their intelligence.

10. Fair-trade prices do not allow for differences in operating costs, one professor notes.

Fair-trade prices reflect the average of operating efficiency. That's how all business works. The chain organization doesn't permit its more efficient outlet to sell the same goods for less than its outlets which are not so efficient. No retailer gives the quick-buying shopper lower prices than it gives the slow buyer, despite the lower cost of selling the speedy shopper.

11. Why worry about fair trade now that price wars have stopped, ask opponents of the McGuire bill.

Price wars haven't stopped; they break out all the time although, fortunately for small business, there has been no recurrence on the gigantic scale of the June 1951 price wars. Without effective fair trade, however, small business lives at the whim and mercy of irresponsible operators who will start price wars when it suits their purpose to do so.

12. Manufacturers, it is charged, go on fair trade not because they believe in it but because they are pressured into it by retailers.

This is untrue, as anyone who is closely identified with manufacturers who practice fair trade, can testify. Additional evidence is supplied by the fact that many manufacturers who do not use fair trade nevertheless voluntarily practice its guiding principle, resale price maintenance, through consignment selling and exclusive franchise arrangements. There was a total estimated of $158,000,000,000 in retail sales in 1951. Of these $36,000,000,000 in annual United States retail sales were made by some type of price maintenance, and fair trade accounts for but $6,000,000,000 while the remaining $30,000,000,000 is accounted for by other legal means of resale price maintenance.

13. The nonsigner clause dragoons unwilling retailers, it is said, into observing the provisions of a contract to which he is not a party.

Fair trade is a State-by-State system of fair competition. The fair-trade contract does not require any retailer to carry any manufacturer's goods. The retailer is bound by the terms of a fair-trade contract only when he buys goods in the knowledge of the fair-trade limitations upon them, as the Supreme Court noted in its 1936 unanimous decision upholding the State fair-trade acts.

14. The McGuire bill contains no sharp standards of definition of "free and open competition," it is noted.

This is true. It is also true that the plaintiff in every fair-trade case at bar must first prove to the court's satisfaction that his product is in free and open competition. The courts have traditionally defined competition, in respect of all statutes involving it, in the light of facts adduced in each specific case at bar. Insofar as fair trade is concerned, the courts have sometimes found that free and open competition did not exist and that, therefore, a specific product could not be fair traded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Douglas amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. WELKER obtained the floor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished acting minority leader that I desire to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Idaho may yield to me for about 4 minutes, so that I may speak upon the pending measure.

Mr. WELKER. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that I favor the legislation which is the order of business before the Senate at the present time. I have listened to the arguments, pro and con, and I wish to point out that the fair-trade laws of 45 States were seriously weakened not only by the Supreme Court's Schwegmann decision, but also by the Wentling decision of the Third United States Circuit Court of Appeals. This latter decision also bears the authority of the United States Supreme Court, since it was appealed to the high court and sent back to the third circuit court, with the Schwegmann decision cited as guidance.

The Wentling decision holds that the enforcement of a State fair-trade act in any other State having a fair-trade law constitutes an unlawful burden upon, and an interference with, interstate commerce. The Wentling decision's practical effect is to permit mail-order houses and other retailers who sell across State lines to disregard the fair-trade laws of 45 sovereign States.

Legally, the Wentling decision creates this anomaly: A merchant who is not permitted to commit an act of unfair competition under his own State's fair-trade law can nevertheless commit such an act in another State.

In short, he can defy another State's fair-trade law if Congress fails to remedy this anomalous and untenable situation.

Paragraph (4) of H. R. 5767 would overcome the Wentling decision in the following language:

> (4) Neither the making of contracts or agreements as described in paragraph (2) of this subsection, nor the exercise or enforcement of any right or rigat of action as described in paragraph (3) of this subsection shall constitute an unlawful burden or restraint upon, or interference, with, commerce.

This provision does not establish a Federal fair-trade policy. Like H. R. 5767 in its entirety, paragraph (4) simply recognizes the rights of States to establish and carry out policies to restrain unfair competition as they define it, within their borders, including transactions in which goods have moved in interstate commerce. The provision reflects the intention of the Congress to make the State fair-trade laws fully effective with respect to interstate commerce.

In passing H. R. 5767 as enabling legislation designed to effectuate State policy in an area touching on interstate commerce, Congress will not be departing from precedent. Congress has already enacted a number of statutes to harmonize its power over interstate commerce with the rights of the States, under the Constitution. These statutes include the Webb-Kenyon Act, the Ashurst-Sumners Act, the United States Warehouse Act and the Miller-Tydings Act. This latter act is still constitutional and effective under the restricted

interpretation of the Supreme Court in the Schwegmann decision.

Two decisions of the United States Supreme Court are relevant to this problem of how much Congress may harmonize its power over interstate commerce with the rights of the States. In 1945, in International Shoe against Washington, the Court said:

> It is no longer debatable that Congress, in the exercise of the commerce power, may authorize the States, in specified ways, to regulate interstate commerce or impose burdens upon it.

In 1917, in Clark Distilling Co. against Western Maryland Railway Co., the Court said:

> Where the subject of commerce is one as to which the State may constitutionally restrict, prohibit, or regulate in order to prevent harmful consequences, and for the protection of property rights, Congress may, if it sees fit to put forth its power and aid, to so regulate interstate commerce, so as to prevent that commerce from being used to impede the carrying out of the State policy.

Amendments have been proposed to H. R. 5767 which seek to meet the Wentling decision by an approach which, it is believed, would establish a Federal fair trade policy and a Federal cause of action. It is significant that the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the House of Representatives and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not find these amendments acceptable.

Mr. President, the simplest and soundest solution to the problem posed by the Wentling decision is provided in H. R. 5767. That is one of the reasons why I shall support the proposed legislation. It occurs to the Senator from Kansas that when 45 States in our great country have passed fair-trade laws, when 45 State legislatures have passed upon them, when 45 governors have signed such measures into law, this type of proposed legislation is in harmony and keeping with the great and preponderant majority of the commonwealths within our Republic.

During the delivery of Mr. BENTON'S speech,

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota one or two questions in order to be absolutely clear in my own mind, and in order that the RECORD may be absolutely clear. I propound these questions to the Senator from Minnesota, because I know of the great interest he has in this proposed legislation, the work he has done on it, and his understanding of the facts and the background. Therefore, I should like to ask his opinion on these two questions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be glad to answer the Senator's questions if I can.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have always been much concerned about horizontal resale price-maintenance agreements which have been considered illegal. Do I correctly understand that this bill does not make that type of agreement lawful?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. This bill does not make lawful the type of agreement to which he refers. It is entirely clear from paragraph (5) of section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended by this bill, that horizontal resale price-maintenance agreements such as between a wholesaler and a wholesaler, or between a retailer and a retailer, or a manufacturer and a manufacturer, are not made lawful. They are illegal and subject to prosecution. It is only vertical resale price-maintenance agreements which are exempt from the antitrust laws when they meet the requirements of paragraph (2).

Mr. SPARKMAN. It would dispel any misunderstanding concerning lawful vertical resale price-maintenance agreements and unlawful horizontal resale price-maintenance agreements if the Senator from Minnesota would explain further for the RECORD the differences between the types of agreements.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I talked with the Senator about this matter, and I want to be very accurate. I have gone into it very carefully. Under this bill, a lawful vertical price-maintenance agreement is one entered into by the producer of a trade-marked or branded commodity, and the immediate or subsequent resellers of such commodity in the chain of distribution from producer to ultimate consumer, whereby the minimum resale price at either the wholesale or retail level, or both, is prescribed. If, for example, when a producer, who sells to distributors, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, makes a resale price-maintenance agreement relative to a commodity made by him and bearing a trade-mark or brand, with a distributor, wholesaler, or retailer who resells such commodity at either the wholesale, or retail level, there exists a vertical resale price-maintenance contract which would be lawful under the bill if the requirements of paragraph (2) are met.

On the other hand, if one wholesaler enters into a resale price-maintenance agreement with another wholesaler prescribing the price at which they both sell a trade-marked or branded commodity which they both buy from the producer, that agreement would be horizontal and would not be made lawful.

In other words, wholesalers getting together on a price are acting illegally. For a manufacturer to get together with other manufacturers to maintain prices is illegal, but for a manufacturer to say that a certain product will sell at a certain price from the manufacturer down to the retailer is legal under the limitations prescribed in paragraph (2) of section 5 (a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

In general, the test of whether a resale price-maintenance contract is vertical is if the contract is between a seller and buyers who resell the original seller's product; whereas, the test of whether a resale price-maintenance contract is horizontal as if it is between competing sellers between whom the relation of buyer and seller or reseller does not exist as to the product involved.

It is important to keep this distinction in mind, because many producers of trade-marked items sell them to consumers, retailers, and wholesalers alike.

Under the bill, such firms may make resale price-maintenance contracts with both wholesalers and retailers because such contracts are vertical, that is, between sellers and buyers. While in one sense firms in this position function not only as producers but also as wholesalers and retailers, they may still lawfully make contracts with other wholesalers and retailers, when in making such contracts they act as producers of a trade-marked or branded commodity, rather than as wholesalers and retailers entering into forbidden horizontal resale price-maintenance contracts with other wholesalers or other retailers.

This question has been discussed in many colloquies on the floor, and I am happy to have it formalized by interrogation. But it should be clearly noted that price fixing between producers, price fixing between wholesalers, and price fixing between retailers is unlawful and should be prosecuted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the bill does not propose anything which would change that illegality.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. My admonition to the Federal Trade Commission and to the Justice Department is to keep a careful weather eye open on the kind of horizontal price-maintenance agreements which are entered into, because those which are illegal should be prosecuted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator for setting the record straight.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There is some doubt in my mind as to the parallel which has been described. When a large concern fixes a price and another concern fixes the same price, then, in pursuance of the resale price-maintenance agreement, the public has no choice in price competition between the commodities. From a table placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I notice that as to hand lotions of well-known brands, such as Hinds', Jergen's, and others, 4 out of 7 of them were selling at 49 cents, the fair-trade price. I notice that with reference to deodorants 8 out of 18 of the better-known brands were selling at the same price.

Is there anything in the bill which would tend to outlaw or prevent producers of similar articles setting the same price in the absence of any proof that they had conspired to do so?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The burden of proof would rest with the prosecution. They would have to be able to prove that there was collusion or some type of conspiratorial activity. I would say that the items to which the Senator from Illinois referred sold for the same price before fair trade as they did after fair trade. Hinds' honey-and-almond cream sold for 50 cents before and after fair trade.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator speaking of the situation in Washington?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am speaking of the national price prescribed by the manufacturer.

Mr. LONG. That does not mean that the product sold for the same price at retail, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. But the retail price placed on the commodity by the manufacturer was the same prior to fair trade and after fair trade.

I think the Senator has pointed up a possible abuse, and I believe it is the job of the Federal Trade Commission and the law enforcement officials of the Government carefully to watch for any sub-rosa agreements or any collusive action. I would join with the Senator from Louisiana in attempting to expose any such violation.

Mr. LONG. The Senator knows that in the basing-point debate it was developed that with reference to the delivered-price system, it was very simple for those who had been found guilty of conspiracy and of monopolistic practices to make the same price without giving the public the benefit of competition. It would be fairly easy to determine whether they were in a conspiracy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator is correct about that. The more national advertising there is establishing a uniform market for a commodity, the more possible it is to get a uniform price. It is definitely one problem that has to be carefully watched. I do not minimize it. As one of the proponents of the bill, I say it is the responsibility of Congress and of the agencies of Government to see to it, by careful analysis and scrutiny, that there is no horizontal price-maintenance agreement. I want none of it. I want it to be carefully investigated and checked.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not a fact that there is genuine major-league competition in nationally advertised products. Manufacturers are not going to gamble millions of dollars in advertising a product which is priced out of range of competitive markets. There will be more price variations in noncompetitive prices in unadvertised lines than in the major-league competition. The pending bill, as I understand—and I ask the distinguished Senator, who is an authority on the subject, if it is not true—makes it absolutely unlawful for any manufacturer to conspire or to arrange with another manufacturer to fix prices.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Absolutely.

Mr. MONRONEY. The pricing agreement affects one manufacturer's line.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. His line is in strong competition with another manufacturer's line, because there are two giant competitors in one industry, one striving to outdo the other on price, on value, and on attractiveness of package. It is the cream of the merchandising field that meets in the major-league competition.

I believe the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, who is one of the Nation's great advertising experts, will testify to the fact that no national advertiser could possibly think of advertising a product which was not competitive in price and quality.

Mr. BENTON. If I may comment on the Senator's statement, one of the points that seem to have been overlooked throughout most of the discussion, and certainly throughout most of the discussion by opponents of the bill, is the long-range certainty that competition will develop. If immediately under fair-trade laws price discrepancies seem to emerge as to certain established national brands, and they may—and in some cases they may emerge to a greater extent than we would approve—still there comes then the effect of the kind of competition between manufacturers outlined by the Senator from Oklahoma. Other products and other brands will then come into the market and will narrow the gap and narrow the margin, so that what might be true during the first year will be far less true during the second, and will be eliminated over a period of 3, 4, or 5 years.

The long-range development of new kinds of competition under the fair-trade laws was not emphasized last night by the distinguished Senator from Illinois in his very brilliant and moving presentation, and, to my knowledge, it has not been emphasized by any of the opponents of the bill. So I will agree with the comments just made by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut, who has had years of experience in the advertising business and knows all the secrets of advertising, that one of its objectives is to promote competition, promote expanding markets, and to promote new enterpreneurs in the different fields. Fair trade has done just that.

One point should be made. So far as branded articles or trade-marked articles are concerned, we find that there are articles of equal quality made by the same company which are not fair-traded, not branded, but frequently are produced in some of the same factories with those which become trade-marked. So there is that kind of competition. For example, a refrigerator company may make a trade-marked refrigerator which carries the name, reputation, and background of the company. Yet it may make another refrigerator which can be sold to the lower-income market, which is a competitive article, but still provides refrigeration, good facilities, and thereby competition to the trade-marked commodity.

Mr. BENTON. If under fair trade the prices of some items go temporarily out of line, or if the margin goes out of line, a fear of which the Senator from Illinois indicated last night in his remarks, let me say, first, that new trade-marked proprietaries will develop advertising to compete at a lower price; and, secondly, private brands of a high quality will be promoted by dealers in competition with the advertised brand, and will pull prices down, or the manufacturer will lose his market.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is a fact that in today's market, in the case of most fair-trade articles I know about or have had experience with, the manufacturer puts a lower mark-up on an article or accepts a lower percentage of profit, because he must say to the retailer, "I am giving you this service to help you sell. You do not have to create a market; I have created a market for you by my national advertising. Therefore, you take a 5, 10, or 20 percent lower mark-up, because this product is easier to sell. You do not have markdowns to take."

Therefore, I believe the claim that this bill will raise the cost of living and make consumers pay more falls, because it simply is not in line with the facts with respect to fair-trade items that I know anything about.

Mr. BENTON. The Senator is profoundly right with respect to the fact that the narrowest margins are on the heavily advertised lines. This would be true even under fair trade. But as I pointed out yesterday, if one takes to a drug counter a prescription to be filled, the mysterious symbols on the prescription do not tell him anything about what is inside nor do they indicate that the mark-up might be many hundred percent—not a mere 30 or 40 percent. For something on which the ingredients may cost a penny or two, to make up as the prescription, the druggist may charge a couple of dollars. The same thing perhaps can be bought in a Vick's vapo-rub bottle for 15 cents. That is the way drug merchandising is done. When one goes into a department store, such as Macy's, one can perhaps buy Bayer aspirin for 6 percent less than the usual price. But when one goes upstairs to the furniture department, where he cannot turn over a chair and look at the trade mark on the bottom, and has no standard by which he can contrast the chair with other chairs—well, Macy's obviously has to get its profit margin. It may be 6 percent less or it may be 16 percent more. If they had not secured adequate profit margins how could they have become the largest, fastest expanding department store in the United States? Profits have to come from somewhere. If they are able to sell Bayer aspirin at a low price, their tremendous margin of profit is made elsewhere, in the furniture and jewelry departments, let us say, and on other unbranded merchandise, as to which the customers do not have a definite standard of comparison. Manifestly their efficiency in buying, selling, and operating also contribute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One of the issues which gives me grave concern over the measure is that it is my understanding that if retailers get together and agree that they will sell, let us say, Jergen's lotion, for perhaps 35 cents, although it was not to be sold for a price less than 49 cents, that would be conspiracy in restraint of trade, it would be against the law, and those retailers would be subject to prosecution under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

Mr. BENTON. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. LONG. On the other hand, if any of them singly signed a contract with Jergen's, agreeing with Jergen's rather than agreeing among themselves, they could accomplish exactly the same effect which Congress saw fit to outlaw as far

back as 1890 as being against the public interest. That is a question which seriously concerns me.

Mr. BENTON. If I may comment on that briefly, it was suggested last night that when the manufacturer, the wholesaler, and the retailer become accustomed along vertical lines to fixing the price at the level fixed by the manufacturer, this will further accelerate present tendencies in our economy for horizontal deals and fixing of prices among groups of retailers, groups of wholesalers, and groups of manufacturers.

I share the concern of the Senator from Louisiana. The Congress pays lip service to competition, but will then starve the Federal Trade Commission for funds, will refuse the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice money it ought to have with which to hire lawyers to do the needed job and to foster competition on a horizontal basis.

I am the first to admit that with the passage of the pending bill, there may develop a greater danger that certain trends, which today are all too manifest in most areas of our economy, may be accelerated. It behooves the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division to raise their voices, to seek friends on Capitol Hill who can get them larger appropriations, to get improved personnel if they can, and to move in even more aggressively to enforce the antitrust laws.

I see the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] on the floor. I was startled by his comment yesterday that nobody had ever gone to jail for violation of the antitrust laws. If that be true, it indicates the lack of aggressiveness with which those great laws have been enforced, laws which have been so essential to the development of our economy.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the criticism the Senator is making should not be aimed at the enforcement agencies as such. It should be aimed at Congress, because Congress has been the culprit in this instance, for not providing funds to enforce those laws.

For example, Congress finally passed a law to prohibit mergers that would have the effect of creating monopolistic conditions, but appropriated no money to enforce the law. So if there is no money to enforce the law, and if we do not hire a police force, how is the law to be enforced? Violations will go on in spite of the law.

Mr. BENTON. Congress is constantly debating, and frequently passing, legislation which saps at the vitality of these laws. I shared the fear just expressed by the Senator from Louisiana when I started to study this fair-trade bill. Many an evil, under the fair, euphemistic, and alluring phrase "fair trade," has been concealed in the laws of the States. I studied the bill in detail before I satisfied myself that the benefits which would accrue to the American people from the bill would considerably outweigh any danger which may be implicit in any acceleration of habits in the business community in the direction of violations of the antitrust laws.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate what the Senator from Connecticut has said. As he knows, both from my public statements and my private conversations with him, I recognize that the bill is not foolproof. I have said again and again that there are many apprehensions over some features of so-called fair-trade laws. However, I wish to make it crystal clear that the junior Senator from Minnesota has repeatedly voted to increase the funds and personnel of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, just as the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators have done. I believe in the enforcement of the laws. I believe that they should be vigorously enforced. Furthermore, I wish to say to the Federal Trade Commission, which Commission opposes a fair-trade law, that it has yet to present a really positive, constructive alternative which is workable. I submit that it is its job to do so, and in the meantime to continue to keep a weather eye on the practices under fair-trade legislation. It is my intention in the next session to call upon Congress to appoint a type of watch dog joint committee to watch over the whole matter of the practices and usages under the fair-trade law, and at a later time to report back to the Congress in case there is need for any amendments. This is not to say that the pending bill would not be effective. I think it would be.

I wish to conclude my part by saying that what we are talking about is what has been on the books for 15 years. This bill proposes no change in the law which has been on the books for 15 years, up until the time of the Schwegmann case, when the Supreme Court said, in a split decision, with three great Justices—Frankfurter, Burton, and Black—dissenting, that the Court felt that the nonsigners clause in State contracts was not provided for in the Miller-Tydings Act.

Last night the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] suggested what he considered to be a weakness in the bill—and the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Louisiana referred to the same point—namely, that if one manufacturer signed with one retailer all the others would be bludgeoned into position.

The fact of the matter is that that is not the way the law would work. That is nothing but theory. It has no relevancy in practice. When a manufacturer signs with a retailer, he notifies every other retailer in the country. If he does not, the courts will not uphold fair-trade practices with respect to that particular commodity. That has already been prescribed by court decision. In other words, if a retailer does not have complete information presented to him by the manufacturer, he cannot be held accountable under a fair trade practice law.

Furthermore, the professional journals of all retail groups make it their business to inform every retailer as to the manufacturer's price and the resale price. There is nothing to compel the retailer to sell the commodity at all. If he does not like the price of Jergens lotion he does not have to sell it. There are other products to be sold. There is no compulsion whatsoever on him, and he is not subject to any prosecution if he cuts the price, unless he has been fully informed as to the contractual relationship between manufacturer and seller. Let that be a matter of record.

Mr. BENTON. Most certainly he does not have to put Jergens lotion in his window or on his counter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. BENTON. He may not sell 10 percent as much of it as he would if he put it in his window and on his counter, and instructed his clerks to push it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator if he knows of any other way to attain justice for the American people in this matter except by passing the pending bill?

Mr. BENTON. I like the way the Senator puts the question. Instead of stating it in terms of justice to the grocer, the druggist, and the hardware merchant, he speaks of it in terms of justice to the American people. I shall devote the remainder of my remarks largely to that point. I think the bill should be considered from the standpoint of the interest of all the American people, and on that basis should be passed by the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. When the Senator from North Dakota was chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we considered the question of excess employees. As chairman of that committee I consulted the head of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Freer, to find out how many cases were pending before the Federal Trade Commission which had been before it for more than 3 years without any decision. Would the Senator be surprised to learn that there were more than 300 cases over 3 years old?

I learned something further, I will say to my distinguished friend from Connecticut. Take the case involving spark plugs. Twenty years ago there were 40 spark plug companies. One of them brought an action before the Federal Trade Commission, claiming that it was being discriminated against and that the antitrust law was being violated. Would the Senator be surprised to learn that that case has been pending before the Federal Trade Commission for 15 years without a decision? There has been no decision unless one has been handed down within the past few weeks.

Mr. BENTON. I am not in the least surprised. While I shall not now undertake to defend the Federal Trade Commission, because I am sure it may have been negligent in many ways—most human institutions have been—yet let me say that as a member of the Small Business Committee I have received evidence that the FTC has been starved for staff and starved for funds. The responsibility therefore rests to a large extent on

the Congress. Perhaps the situation is also due in part to certain practices within the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I agree wholeheartedly with the Senator from Connecticut. The Federal Trade Commission has had an inadequate sum of money with which to do a big job. It has been starved for funds ever since I first came to the Senate. Time and time again, after the Bureau of the Budget had recommended more money, and after the Appropriations Committee had recommended more money, its appropriations have been cut down $1,500,000 or $2,000,000, in spite of everything we could do on the floor of the Senate.

Looking at my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] I remember that 30 years ago we heard much about Frank B. Kellogg, the great trust buster from the State of Minnesota. I took occasion to look up the record, and I was astounded to find how very little had been done. As a matter of fact, 99 percent of it was newspaper notoriety. Apparently some experts had been employed to build him up. As a matter of fact, until a very short time ago the Department of Justice did not have sufficient funds to enforce the antitrust statutes. The situation was taken up with the former Attorney General, Tom Clark, now a distinguished Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The amount of money which that agency had, up until the time he took office, was pitiful. Those who control monopoly have somehow or other gained control in the Government. The Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice have been hamstrung. That is why I am delighted to have this entire debate take place, and to have all the facts brought out.

Mr. BENTON. I am very glad also, and I hope that the result will be renewed vigor on the part of the Federal Trade Commission. I believe that this bill today is further warranty for more aggresive efforts on its part to move in and get the needed funds, leadership, and manpower to do the job which ought to be done.

I may say that Frank B. Kellogg was my maternal grandfather's pageboy when he was the Democratic leader of the Minnesota State Senate. I never have learned what made a Republican of Mr. Kellogg. When the Senator mentioned his name, that was the first time I had thought of him in many years.

Mr. HUMPHREY rose.

Mr. BENTON. Does the Senator from Minnesota wish to ask a further question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask the Senator one question along the line of the questions of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. BENTON. Let me make one personal comment which occurred to me when I was listening to the Senator from North Dakota.

The first job I had after I secured a college degree was as a salesman for the National Cash Register Co., which enjoyed a world-wide monopoly, not only in the United States, but everywhere in the world.

My first day as a salesman was spent sitting in the office reading a pamphlet which every salesman had to read on his first day. The pamphlet was written about Mr. John H. Patterson, and his practices. Mr. Patterson, who developed this great company, is widely called "the father of scientific salesmanship."

The pamphlet contained the story of the antitrust suit against John H. Patterson around 1913. It described his famous knockout department, in which he had his so-called knockout men who were hired to go forth whenever a new competitor came out with a cash register. Mr. Patterson invited the competitor to come to Dayton and look at what was called the morgue. In the morgue were cash registers of every type, all of which had been knocked out. They had been made by approximately 40 companies which had vanished over the dim horizon.

If a competitor could not be prevailed upon to go into some other line of business the knockout men would open up stores alongside of his sales offices and sell cash registers at any price, perhaps for as little as a dollar, in order to put the competitor out of business. If that did not work, the men of the knockout department would seek to hire the competitor's agents at higher salaries and commissions. If that did not work they would bribe the freight agents of the railroad companies to see to it that the competitor's shipments never went through. If that did not work there were instances in which they would train their salesmen to go into stores and drop sand into the competitor's machines. If that did not work there were cases in which they would hire thugs to take the competing salesmen down a back alley and knock them out. At any rate, they knocked out all competitors.

Mr. President, that was my first day's reading as a salesman for the National Cash Register Co., which had just employed me. The reason I had to read the pamphlet was that John H. Patterson had been sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary. Because of his work in the Dayton flood in 1913, in which I seem to remember that he turned out rowboats at the rate of one a minute for a day or two, his sentence was suspended. But in case any of the practices were resumed he could be put forthwith into jail. In other words, if I as a salesman made the mistake of dropping sand into a Remington Rand cash register the owner of my company might be put in jail.

Seemingly his fear of jail was such that every new salesman had to read the pamphlet on his first day of employment.

Mr. President, I tell that story because although persons have not gone to jail for such practices there has been the fear of jail and there has been the threat of jail. There is no doubt that the fear and the threat have had a tremendous effect on the attitude of American business.

If that fear and that threat had more teeth and if more people had actually gone to jail, we would have an even more vital competitive system. The reason we do not have it is in part due to the fact that Congress is subjected to pressure from forces which do not want the antitrust laws enforced.

Whenever we debate an adequate appropriation for the Federal Trade Commission and other agencies, men who are afraid of jail and afraid that their practices may be investigated, move in on Congress, and work in such a way as to have the budget figures cut so that the work of the agencies may be retarded.

Does the Senator from Minnesota have a final question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Following the colloquy between the junior Senator from Connecticut and the senior Senator from North Dakota, I should like to invite attention to the fact that the coauthors of the Robinson-Patman Act were the distinguished late Senator Robinson and our colleague in the House, Representative PATMAN. WRIGHT PATMAN is known as one of the greatest defenders of the antitrust laws and the antimonopoly laws in this country. He has led the fight in session after session of Congress and has gained for himself a reputation second to none. Yet WRIGHT PATMAN of the House of Representatives, and cosponsor of the Robinson-Patman Act, is a valiant sponsor and proponent of the bill which the Senator from Connecticut is now discussing.

When I hear Senators on the floor tell of their fear as to what the bill would do if enacted into law, by killing competition and hurting consumers, I say this: Here are men like the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, with a lifetime of service to consumers, workers, and independent business people—and I have put in a few years on it myself—who rally to the support of the bill on the basis of equity and fair play.

I wanted to give that information to the Senator because we are not alone in this fight. They are the men who have spent a lifetime of service in the cause.

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to join in paying tribute to Representative PATMAN, with whom I have the honor of serving with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to say one word about the pending bill. I think it is a good bill. I think it ought to be passed; and I am hopeful that the Senate will pass it during the afternoon.

Mr. LEHMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, one of its assistant reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake;

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;

S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims; and

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation."

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1310) amending the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., secs. 4f–4o), providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 59) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings entitled "Institute of Pacific Relations."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5198. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior; and

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi;

S. 1863. An act to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national;

S. 2066. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2545. An act to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency;

S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard;

S. 2630. An act for the relief of Mary Fox;

S. 2637. An act for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Penagiotis Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas;

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; and

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock.

ADDITIONAL HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5198) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FULTON COUNTY, GA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8272) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported an identical bill, and it is on the calendar as No. 1764, Senate bill 3367.

We are concerned merely with the right-of-way for one of the trunk-line highways in the Georgia highway system. It is necessary for the county to purchase the land. I have assured the Senator from Oregon that Fulton County is paying full value for this property; not 50 percent, but 100 percent of the value.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that I am perfectly satisfied that the so-called Morse formula has no application whatever to this bill, and I urge its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3367 is indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN TAX LAWS APPLICABLE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2605) to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia, which were, on page 12, strike out lines 1 to 14, inclusive, and insert:

SEC. 5. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended, is amended by striking out in the second paragraph thereof the numerals and words "$8,000 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof the numerals and words "$13,000 per annum"; and is further amended by adding thereto the following new paragraphs:

On page 14, after line 8, insert:

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and notwithstanding the provisions of Reorganization

Plan No. 5 of 1952, relating to the District of Columbia, the Board of Tax Appeals for the District of Columbia shall not be abolished, and, if prior to the enactment of this act it has been abolished, it is hereby reestablished. In either event, the functions of the said Board of Tax Appeals transferred to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by said Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1952 are hereby retransferred to said Board of Tax Appeals or to said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished, to be exercised in the same manner, to the same extent, and under the same provisions of law as if said Reorganization Plan No. 5 had never gone into effect, except only as such provisions of law may be modified by this act.

All petitions, answers, or other pleadings, documents, or papers filed with, and all actions taken by, and all decisions rendered by, the person, persons, office, or agency to which said Board of Commissioners may have redelegated the functions of said Board of Tax Appeals, between the effective date of said Reorganization Plan No. 5 and the enactment of this act, shall have the same force and effect for all purposes as if filed with, taken by, or rendered by, said Board of Tax Appeals or said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished.

If, prior to the enactment of this act, the said Board of Tax Appeals shall have been abolished, the said Board of Commissioners shall appoint an individual to act as the member of the said Board of Tax Appeals as hereby reestablished, said appointment to be made in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as added by the act of May 16, 1938, and as amended, including any amendments made by this act.

And on page 14, line 9, strike out "SEC. 7," and insert "SEC. 8."

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, Senate bill 2605, heretofore passed by the Senate, has been passed by the House, with two amendments. I suggest that the Senate accept the House amendments; and I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, has the Senator conferred with ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. HUNT. The staff has brought the matter to me. I thought they had conferred with the ranking minority member. I cannot say that they did.

Mr. CASE. Do the two House amendments relate to matters which were considered when the bill was before the Senate and which were before the Senate committee?

Mr. HUNT. They are not matters of great importance, but I should be very much pleased to have the clerk read the amendments and then have them discussed.

Mr. CASE. The amendment could be read, or the Senator could state their substance.

Mr. HUNT. The purpose of the first amendment is to reestablish the Board of Tax Appeals, which is a one-member Board, consisting of a judge. Reorganization Plan No. 5, which we have just approved and which went into effect night before last, at 12:01 o'clock, made such a change that this Board of Tax Appeals was definitely placed under the jurisdiction of the District Commissioners. It is the thought of all concerned, including the Commissioners, that this should be a separate and distinct board, not under the jurisdiction of any other department of government. The House has provided, therefore, that this particular Board, which as I say, consists of one man, a judge, not be under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners. That is one amendment.

The other amendment is that the present salary of $8,000, with certain increases which now make the salary of the judge $11,800, be amended by striking out "$8,000" and inserting "$13,000." Those are the two changes.

Mr. CASE. Does that salary correspond with others of the same rank?

Mr. HUNT. I understand that it does.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1310) amending the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 4f–4o), providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purposes of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1941, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE II—PREVENTION OF MAJOR DISASTERS IN MINES

"DEFINITIONS AND EXEMPTION

"SEC. 201. (a) For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'Board' means the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review created by section 205.

"(2) The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Mines.

"(3) The term 'certified person', when used to designate the kind of person to whom the performance of a duty in connection with the operation of a mine shall be assigned, means a person who is qualified under the laws of the State in which such mine is located to perform such duty, except that in a State the laws of which do not provide for such qualification, the term means a person deemed by the operator of such mine to be qualified to perform such duty.

"(4) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communications between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any other State, Territory, or possession, of the United States, or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any Territory, possession, or through any other State or through any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country.

"(5) The term 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

"(6) The term 'duly authorized representative of the Bureau' means a person appointed under section 109 of title I or under section 212 of this title, and authorized in writing by the Director to perform the duties of a duly authorized representative of the Bureau as provided in sections 202, 203, and 206 of this title.

"(7) The term 'mine' means an area of land including everything annexed to it by nature and all structures, machinery, tools, equipment and other property, real or personal, placed upon, under or above its surface by man, used in the work of extracting bituminous coal, lignite or anthracite, from its natural deposits in the earth in such area and in the work of processing the coal so extracted. The term 'mine' does not include any strip mine. The term 'work of processing the coal' as used in this paragraph means the sizing, cleaning, drying, mixing and crushing of bituminous coal, lignite or anthracite, and such other work of processing such coal as is usually done by the operator, and does not mean crushing, coking, or distillation of such coal or such other work of processing such coal as is usually done by a consumer or others in connection with the utilization of such coal.

"(8) The term 'operator' means the person, partnership, association or corporation operating a mine and owning the right to do so.

"(9) The term 'permissible', as applied to equipment used in the operation of a mine, means equipment to which an approval plate, label, or other device is attached as authorized by the Director under section 212 (a), and which meets specifications which (A) are prescribed by the Director for the construction and maintenance of such equipment, and (B) are designed to assure that such equipment will not cause a mine explosion or mine fire.

"(10) The term 'premises' when used in referring to the premises of a mine, means the land within the mine's area of land.

"(11) The term 'rock dust' means pulverized limestone, dolomite, gypsum, anhydrite, shale, talc, adobe, or other inert material, preferably light colored, (A) 100 percent of which will pass through a sieve having 20 meshes per linear inch and 70 percent or more of which will pass through a sieve having 200 meshes per linear inch; (B) the particles of which when wetted and dried will not cohere to form a cake which will not be dispersed into separate particles by a light blast of air; and (C) which does not contain more than 5 percent of combustible matter, nor more than a total of 5 percent of free and combined silica (SiO_2).

"(b) This title shall not apply to any mine in which no more than 14 individuals are regularly employed underground.

"INSPECTIONS

"SEC. 202. (a) For the purpose of determining whether a danger described in section 203 (a) exists in any mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, or whether any provision of section 209 is being violated in any such mine, or whether any such mine is a gassy mine as prescribed in section 203 (d), the Director shall cause an inspection of each such mine to be made by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau at least annually. The Director shall also make, or cause duly authorized representatives of the Bureau to make, such special inspections of such mines as may be required by section 203 (c) and section 206, and such other inspections of such mines as he deems necessary for the proper administration of this title.

"(b) (1) In order to promote sound and effective coordination in Federal and State activities within the field covered by this title, the Director shall cooperate with the official mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States.

"(2) Any State desiring to cooperate in making the inspections required under this

title may submit, through its official mine inspection or safety agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this subsection. Such State plan shall—

"(A) designate such State mine inspection or safety agency as the sole agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State and contain satisfactory evidence that such agency will have the authority to carry out the plan,

"(B) give assurances that such agency has or will employ an adequate and competent staff of inspectors qualified under the laws of such State to make mine inspections within such State,

"(C) give assurances that upon request of the Director or upon request of an operator under section 203 (e) (1), the agency will assign inspectors employed by it to participate in inspections to be made in such State under this title, and

"(D) provide that the agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as the Director may from time to time require.

"(3) The Director shall approve any State plan or any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection. He shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

"(4) Whenever the Director, after reasonab'e notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that in the administration of the State plan there is—

"(A) a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the State plan; or

"(B) a failure to afford reasonable cooperation in administering the provision of this title,

the Director shall notify such State agency of his withdrawal of approval of such plan and upon receipt of such notice such plan shall cease to be in effect.

"(5) No inspection of a mine shall be made by a representative of the Bureau under this title in any State in which a State plan is in effect unless a State inspector participates in such inspection in accordance with such plan, except where, in the Director's judgment, an inspection is urgently needed to determine whether a danger described in section 203 (a) exists in such mine, and participation by a State inspector would unreasonably delay such inspection.

"(c) The Director, any duly authorized representative of the Bureau, any State inspector assigned in accordance with a State plan, and any independent inspector appointed under section 203 (e) (3) shall be entitled to admission to any mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, for the purpose of making any inspection authorized under this title.

"FINDINGS AND ORDERS

"SEC. 203. (a) (1) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine as authorized in section 202, finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall also find the extent of the area of such mine throughout which such danger exists. Thereupon he shall immediately make an order requiring the operator of such mine to cause all persons, excepting persons referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such findings and order shall contain a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such danger, and a description of the area of such mine throughout which persons must be withdrawn and debarred.

"(2) No order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to eliminate the danger described in the order; (B) any public officials whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal technical consultant, or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(b) If such representative of the Bureau finds that any provision of section 209 is being violated and that the conditions created by such violation do not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall find what would be a reasonable period of time within which such violation should be totally abated. Such findings shall contain the provisions of section 209 which he finds are being violated and a detailed description of the conditions which cause and constitute such violation.

"(c) (1) The period of time so found by such representative to be a reasonable period of time may be extended by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau from time to time upon the making of a special inspection to ascertain whether or not such violation has been totally abated. The Director shall promptly cause a special inspection to be made: (A) Upon the expiration of such a period of time as originally fixed; (B) upon the expiration of such a period of time as extended; and (C) whenever an operator of a mine, prior to the expiration of any such period of time, requests him to cause such a special inspection to be made at such mine. Upon making such a special inspection, such representative of the Bureau shall find whether or not such violation has been totally abated. If he finds that such violation has not been totally abated, he shall find whether or not such period of time as originally fixed, or as so fixed and extended, should be extended. If he finds that such period of time should be extended, he shall find what a reasonable extension would be. If he finds that such violation has not been totally abated, and if such period of time as originally fixed, or as so fixed and extended, has then expired, and if he also finds that such period of time should not be further extended, he shall also find the extent of the area of such mine which is affected by such violation. Thereupon he shall promptly make an order requiring the operator of such mine to cause all persons in such area, excepting persons referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such finding and order shall contain the provisions of section 209 which are being violated and a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such violation, and a description of the area of such mine throughout which persons must be withdrawn and debarred.

"(2) No order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to abate the violation described in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal or technical consultant or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(d) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine, as authorized in section 202, finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or finds methane by use of a permissible flame safety lamp or by air analysis in an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, he shall make an order requiring the operator of such mine to comply with the provisions of section 209 of this title which pertain to gassy mines, in the operation of such mine.

"(e) (1) If an order is made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the operator of the mine may request the agency designated in the State plan to assign a State inspector to inspect the mine. The State inspector assigned in accordance with such request shall inspect such mine promptly after the request is made.

"(2) No order shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect unless a State inspector participated in the inspection on which such order is based and concurs in such order, or an independent inspector appointed under paragraph (3) concurs in such order. If the State inspector does not concur in such order, the operator of the mine, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who proposes to make such order, or the State inspector may apply, within 24 hours after the completion of the inspection involved, for the appointment of an independent inspector under paragraph (3). Within 5 days after the date of his appointment, the independent inspector shall inspect the mine. The representative of the Bureau and the State inspector shall be given the opportunity to accompany the independent inspector during such inspection. If, after such inspection is completed, either the independent inspector or the State inspector concurs in the order, it shall be issued.

"(3) Within 5 days after the date of receipt of an application under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the chief judge of the United States District Court for the district in which the mine involved is located (or in his absence, the clerk of such court) shall appoint a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry to serve as an independent inspector under this subsection. Each independent inspector so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and related expenses.

"(4) An order made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect shall not be subject to review under section 206, but shall be subject to review under section 207.

"(f) Notice of each finding and order made under this section shall promptly be given to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, by the person making such finding or order.

"NOTICES

"SEC. 204. (a) All findings and orders made pursuant to section 203 or section 206, and all notices required to be given of the making of such findings and orders, shall be in writing. All such findings and orders shall be signed by the person making them, and all such notices shall be signed by the person charged with the duty of giving the notice. All such notices shall contain a copy of the findings and orders referred to therein.

"(b) Each operator of a mine shall maintain an office on or near the premises of such mine and shall maintain thereon a conspicuous sign designating it as the office of such mine. Each operator of a mine shall maintain a bulletin board at such office or at some conspicuous place near an entrance of such mine, in such manner that notices required by law to be posted on the mine bulletin board may be posted thereon, be easily visible to all persons desiring to read them, and be protected against damage by weather and against unauthorized removal. The operator shall maintain on such bulletin board a conspicuous sign designating it as the bulletin board of such mine. Notice of any finding or order required by section 203 or section 206 to be given to an operator shall be given by causing such notice, addressed to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, to be delivered to the office of such mine provided for in the first sentence of this subsection, and by causing a copy of such notice to be posted on the bulletin board of such mine provided for in the second sentence of this subsection. The requirement of the preceding sentence that a notice shall be 'addressed to the operator of the mine to which it pertains', shall not require that the name of the operator for whom it is intended shall be specifically set out in such address. Addressing such notice to 'Operator of mine', specifying the mine sufficiently to identify it, shall satisfy such requirement.

"(c) The Director shall cause a copy of each such notice to be mailed immediately to a duly designated representative of the employees of the mine to which it pertains, and to the public official or agency of the State or Territory charged with administering State or Territorial laws, if any, relating to mine safety in such mine.

"CREATION OF REVIEW BOARD

"SEC. 205. (a) An agency is hereby created to be known as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, which shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be 3 years, except that the terms of office of the members first appointed shall commence on the effective date of this section and shall expire one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. A member appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such unexpired term. The members of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses. The Board, at all times, shall consist of one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal-mine operators, one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal-mine workers, and one person, who shall be chairman of the Board, who shall be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry or shall have had at least 5 years' experience as a practical mining engineer in the coal-mining industry, and who shall not, within 1 year of his appointment as a member of the Board, have had a pecuniary interest in, or have been regularly employed or engaged in, the mining of coal, or have regularly represented either coal-mine operators or coal-mine workers, or have been an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior assigned to duty in the Bureau.

"(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. Whenever the Board deems that the convenience of the public or of the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, it may hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Board.

"(e) The Board shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of a secretary of the Board and such legal counsel as it deems necessary. Subject to the civil-service laws, the Board shall appoint such other employees as it deems necessary in exercising its powers and duties. The compensation of all employees appointed by the Board shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(f) Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and official actions of the Board can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least two members; but any one member, or any two members, upon order of the Board, shall conduct any hearing provided for in section 207 and submit the transcript of such hearing to the entire Board for its action thereon. Every official act of the Board shall be entered of record, and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public.

"(g) The Board shall hear and determine applications filed pursuant to section 207 for annulment or revision of orders made pursuant to section 203 or section 206. The Board shall not make or cause to be made any inspection of a mine for the purpose of determining any pending application.

"(h) The Board is authorized to make such rules as are necessary for the orderly transaction of its proceedings, which shall include requirements for adequate notice of hearings to all parties.

"(i) Any member of the Board may sign and issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books and documents, and administer oaths. Witnesses summoned before the Board shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

"(j) The Board may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding pending before it, at any stage of such proceeding. Reasonable notice must first be given in writing by the party or his attorney proposing to take such deposition to the opposite party or his attorney of record, which notice shall state the name of the witness and the time and place of the taking of his deposition. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose, and to produce books, papers, or documents, in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce like documentary evidence before the Board, as provided in subsection (i). Witnesses whose depositions are taken under this subsection, and the persons taking such depositions shall be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(k) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person under this section, the Federal district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States, and after notice to such person and hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Board or to appear and produce documents before the Board, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"REVIEW BY DIRECTOR

"SEC. 206. (a) Except as provided in section 203 (e) (4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (a) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and to report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not danger throughout the area of such mine as set out in such order existed at the time of making such special inspection. If he finds that such danger did not then exist throughout such area of such mine, he shall make an order, consistent with his findings, revising or annulling the order under review. If he finds that such danger did then exist throughout such area of such mine, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(b) Except as provided in section 203 (e) (4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (c) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds there was no such violation he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds there was such a violation he shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the making of such special inspection. If he finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, he shall find whether or not the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, fixed under section 203, should be extended. If he finds that such period of time should be extended, he shall find what a reasonable extension of such period of time would be. Thereupon he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and then he shall make an order, consistent with his findings, revising the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at the time of such special inspection, and that such period of time should not be extended, he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and he shall then make an order, consistent with his findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(c) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (d) may apply,

not later than 20 days after the receipt of notice of such order, to the Director for annulment of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make or cause to be made such investigation as he deems necessary. Upon concluding his investigation or upon receiving the report of such investigation made at his direction, the Director shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine, or whether or not methane was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open workings of such mine, when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(d) The Director shall cause notice of each finding and order made under this section to be given promptly to the operator of the mine to which it pertains.

"(e) Except as provided in section 202 (e) (4), at any time while an order made pursuant to section 203 or this section is in effect, or at any time during the pendency of a proceeding under section 207 or section 208 seeking annulment or revision of such order, the operator of the mine affected by such order may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. The Director shall thereupon proceed to act upon such application in the manner provided in subsection (a), (b), or (c) of this section.

"(f) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Director under this section, all actions which the Director or his representatives are required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved.

"REVIEW BY BOARD

"SEC. 207. (a) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to subsection (a), (c), or (d) of section 203 may apply to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for annulment or revision of such order without seeking its annulment or revision under section 206. An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 206 may apply to the Board for annulment or revision of such order: *Provided, however,* That an operator applying to the Board for annulment of an order made pursuant to subsection (d) of section 203 or pursuant to subsection (c) of section 206 shall file such application with the Board not later than 20 days after the receipt of notice of such order.

"(b) The operator shall be designated as the applicant in such proceeding and the application filed by him shall recite the order complained of and other facts sufficient to advise the Board of the nature of the proceeding. He may allege in such application: That danger as set out in such order does not exist at the time of the filing of such application; that violation of section 209, as set out in such order, has not occurred; that such violation has been totally or partially abated; that the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, as fixed in the findings upon which such order was based, was not reasonable; that the area of the mine described in such order as the area affected by the violation referred to in such order is not so affected at the time of the filing of such application; or that the mine described in such order is not a gassy mine. The Director shall be the respondent in such proceeding, and the applicant shall send a copy of such application by registered mail to the Director at Washington, D. C.

"(c) Immediately upon the filing of such an application the Board shall fix the time for a prompt hearing thereof.

"(d) Pending such hearing the applicant may file with the Board a written request that the Board grant such temporary relief from such order as the Board may deem just and proper. Such temporary relief may be granted by the Board only after a hearing by the Board at which both the applicant and the respondent were afforded an opportunity to be heard, and only if respondent was given ample notice of the filing of applicant's request and of the time and place of the hearing thereon as fixed by the Board.

"(e) The Board shall not be bound by any previous findings of fact by the respondent or by any other representative of the Bureau. Evidence relating to the making of the order complained of and relating to the questions raised by the allegations of the pleadings or other questions pertinent in the proceeding may be offered by both parties to the proceeding. If the respondent claims that danger or a violation of section 209, as set out in such order, existed at the time of the filing of the application, or that methane has been ignited or found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the burden of proving the then existence of such danger or violation, or that methane has been ignited or found in such mine as set out in the order under review, shall be upon the respondent, and the respondent shall present his evidence first to prove the then existence of such danger or violation. Following presentation of respondent's evidence the applicant may present his evidence, and thereupon respondent may present evidence to rebut the applicant's evidence.

"(f) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203 (a), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing shall find whether or not danger throughout the area of such mine as set out in such order existed at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such danger did not then exist throughout such area of such mine, the Board shall make an order consistent with its findings, revising or annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such danger did then exist throughout such area of such mine, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(g) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203 (c), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If the Board finds there was no such violation, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds there was such a violation, the Board shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, the Board shall find whether or not the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, fixed under section 203 or 206, should be extended. If the Board finds that such period of time should be extended, the Board shall also find what a reasonable extension of such period of time would be, and shall immediately also find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time of the filing of such application and the Board shall then make an order, consistent with its findings, revising the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application, and that such period of time should not be extended, the Board shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at such time, and shall make an order, consistent with its findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(h) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment of an order made pursuant to section 203 (d) or 206 (c), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, as set out in such order. If the Board finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(i) Each finding and order made by the Board shall be in writing. It shall show the date on which it is made, and shall bear the signatures of the members of the Board who concur therein. Upon making a finding and order the Board shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by registered mail to all parties or their attorneys of record. The Board shall cause each such finding and order to be entered on its official record, together with any written opinion prepared by any member in support of, or dissenting from, any such finding or order.

"(j) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Board under this section, all actions which the Board is required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 208. (a) Any final order issued by the Board under section 207 shall be subject to judicial review by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the mine affected is located, upon the filing in such court of a notice of appeal by the Director or the operator aggrieved by such final order within 30 days from the date of the making of such final order.

"(b) The party making such appeal shall forthwith send a copy of such notice of appeal, by registered mail, to the other party and to the Board. Upon receipt of such copy of a notice of appeal the Board shall promptly certify and file in such court a complete transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was made. The costs of such transcript shall be paid by the party making the appeal.

"(c) The court shall hear such appeal on the record made before the Board, and shall permit argument, oral or written or both, by both parties. The court shall permit such pleadings, in addition to the pleadings before the Board, as it deems to be required or as provided for in the Rules of Civil Procedure governing appeals in such court.

"(d) Upon such conditions as may be required and to the extent necessary to prevent irreparable injury, the United States court of appeals may, after due notice to and hearing of the parties to the appeal, issue all necessary and appropriate process to postpone the effective date of the final order of the Board or to grant such other relief as may be appropriate pending final determination of the appeal.

"(e) The United States court of appeals may affirm, annul, or revise the final order of the Board, or it may remand the proceeding to the Board for such further action as it directs. The findings of the Board as to facts, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

"(f) The decision of a United States court of appeals on an appeal from the Board shall be final, subject only to review by

the Supreme Court as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"MINE-SAFETY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) Duty to comply: Every operator of a mine, and every person who is on the premises of a mine for any reason whatsoever, shall comply with the provisions of this section, except those provisions which impose no duty, obligation, or responsibility upon such operator or such person.

"(b) Every operator of a mine which, on or after the effective date of this title, is, or which, immediately prior to the effective date of this title, was, defined, classed, classified as, or determined, deemed, judged, held, or found to be, a gassy or gaseous mine pursuant to and in accordance with the laws of the State in which it is located, and every operator of a mine which, immediately prior to the effective date of this title, was operated as a gassy mine, shall comply with the provisions of this section which pertain to gassy mines.

"(c) Roof support: The roof and ribs of all active underground roadways and tadeways in a mine shall be adequately supported to protect persons from falls of roof or ribs.

"(d) Ventilation: (1) All active underground working places in a mine shall be ventilated by a current of air containing not less than 19.5 percent of oxygen, not more than 0.5 percent of carbon dioxide, and no harmful quantities of other noxious or poisonous gases. The volume and velocity of the current of air shall be sufficient to dilute so as to render harmless, and to carry away, flammable or harmful gases. In bituminous-coal and lignite mines the quantity of air reaching the last open crosscut in any pair or set of entries shall not be less than 6,000 cubic feet a minute, except that the quantity of air reaching the last open crosscut in any pair or set of entries in pillar sections may be less than 6,000 cubic feet a minute if not less than 6,000 cubic feet of air a minute is being delivered to the intake end of the pillar line. In anthracite mines the quantity of air reaching the face of each working place shall be at least 200 cubic feet a minute for each man working in the place and as much more as may be required to dilute, render harmless, and sweep away noxious or dangerous gases, smoke, and fumes. In robbing areas where the air currents cannot be controlled and measurements of the air cannot be obtained, the air shall have perceptible movement.

"(2) If the air at an underground working face in a mine, when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, contains more than 1.0 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, changes or adjustments shall be made at once in the ventilation in such mine so that such air shall not contain more than 1.0 percent of methane.

"(3) If a split of air returning from active underground working places in a mine contains more than 1.0 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, changes or adjustments shall be made at once in the ventilation in such mine so that such returning air shall not contain more than 1.0 percent of methane.

"(4) If a split of air returning from active underground working places in a mine contains 1.5 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, the employees shall be withdrawn from the portion of the mine endangered thereby, and all power shall be cut off from such portion of the mine, until the quantity of methane in such split shall be less than 1.5 percent. However, in virgin territory in mines ventilated by exhaust fans, where methane is liberated in large amounts, if the quantity of air in a split ventilating the workings in such territory equals or exceeds twice the minimum volume of air prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection and if only permissible electric equipment is used in such workings and the air in the split returning from such workings does not pass over trolley or other bare power wires, and if a certified person designated by the mine operator is continually testing the gas content of the air in such split during mining operations in such workings, it shall be necessary to withdraw the employees and cut off all power from the portion of the mine endangered by such methane only when the quantity thereof in the air returning from such workings exceeds 2 percent, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas.

"(5) In a gassy mine, air which has passed by an opening of any unsealed, abandoned area shall not be used to ventilate any active face area in such mine if such air contains 0.25 percent or more of methane; but if this sentence cannot be complied with in such mine on the effective date of this section, such mine may continue to be operated after such date as it was operated immediately prior to such date, for a reasonable time until future mine development and ventilation of such mine can be changed to comply with this sentence. In no event shall such air be used to ventilate any area in such mine in which men work or travel if such air contains more than 1 percent of methane. For the purposes of this paragraph, an area within a panel shall not be deemed to be abandoned until such panel is abandoned.

"(6) In a gassy mine, air that has passed through an abandoned panel which is inaccessible for inspection, or air that has passed through a similar abandoned area which is inaccessible for inspection, or air which has been used to ventilate a pillar line, or air which has been used to ventilate an area from which the pillars have been removed, shall not be used to ventilate any active face area in such mine; but if this sentence cannot be complied with in such mine on the effective date of this section, such mine may continue to be operated after such date as it was operated immediately prior to such date, for a reasonable time until future mine development and ventilation of such mine can be changed to comply with this sentence. In any event shall such air be used to ventilate no area in such mine in which men work or travel if such air contains more than 1 percent of methane.

"(7) In a gassy mine, within 4 hours immediately preceding the beginning of a coal-producing shift, and before any workmen in such shift other than those who may be designated to make the examinations prescribed in this paragraph enter the underground areas of such mine, certified persons designated by the operator of such mine to do so shall make an examination, as prescribed in this paragraph, of such areas. Each person designated to act as such a mine examiner shall be directed to examine a definite underground area of such mine, and, in making his examination, such examiner shall inspect every active working place in such area and make tests therein with a permissible flame safety lamp for accumulations of methane and oxygen deficiency in the air therein; examine seals and doors to determine whether they are functioning properly; inspect and test the roof, face, and rib conditions in the working places and on active roadways and travel ways; inspect active roadways, travel ways, approaches to abandoned workings and accessible falls in active sections for explosive gas and other hazards; and inspect to determine whether the air in each split is traveling in its proper course and in normal volume. Such mine examiner shall place his initials and the date at or near the face of each place he examines. If such mine examiner, in making his examination, finds a condition which he considers to be dangerous to persons who may enter or be in such area, he shall indicate such dangerous place by posting a danger sign conspicuously at a point which persons entering such dangerous place would be required to pass. No person, other than Federal or State mine inspectors or persons authorized by the mine operator to enter such place for the purpose of eliminating the dangerous condition therein, shall enter such place while such sign is so posted. Upon completing his examination such mine examiner shall report the result of his examination to a person designated by the mine operator to receive such reports, at a designated station on the surface of the premises of the mine or underground, before other persons enter the underground areas of such mine to work in such coal-producing shift. Each such mine examiner shall also record the results of his examination with ink or indelible pencil in a book kept for such purpose at a place on the surface of the mine designated by the mine operator. No person (other than a certified person designated under this paragraph) shall enter any underground area in a gassy mine, except during a coal-producing shift, unless an examination of such area as prescribed in this paragraph has been made within 12 hours immediately preceding his entrance into such area.

"(8) In nongassy mines, an examination as prescribed in paragraph (7) shall be made at least once in each calendar day during which coal is produced. Such examination shall be made within 4 hours immediately preceding the beginning of the first coal-producing shift on such day.

"(9) The underground working places in all mines shall be examined for hazards by certified persons designated by the mine operator to do so, at least once during each coal-producing shift, or oftener if necessary for safety. In a gassy mine, such examinations shall include tests with a permissible flame safety lamp for methane, and oxygen deficiency. In all underground face workings in a gassy mine where electrically driven equipment is operated, examinations for methane shall be made with a permissible flame safety lamp by a person trained in the use of such lamp before such equipment is taken into or operated in face regions, and frequent examinations for methane shall be made during such operations.

"(10) In a gassy mine, immediately before a roof fall is made in pillar workings, such workings shall be examined to ascertain whether methane is present. If in such examination methane is found in amounts that can be detected with a permissible flame safety lamp, a roof fall shall not be made until such gas is removed.

"(11) In a gassy mine, all workings which are abandoned after the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, shall be sealed or ventilated. If such workings are sealed, the sealing shall be done in a substantial manner with incombustible material. One or more of the seals of every sealed area shall be fitted with a pipe and cap or valve to permit the sampling of gases and the measuring of hydrostatic pressure behind such seals. For the purposes of this paragraph, workings within a panel shall not be deemed to be abandoned until such panel is abandoned.

"(e) Coal dust and rock dust: (1) Coal dust, loose coal, and other combustile materials shall not be permitted to accumulate in dangerous quantities in active underground workings of a mine.

"(2) Where underground mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust into the air, water, or water with a wetting agent added to it, or other effective method shall be used to allay such dust at its source.

"(3) All underground mines, except those mines or areas of mines in which the dust is too wet or too high in incombustible content to propagate an explosion, shall be rock-dusted to within 40 feet of all faces, and, if open crosscuts near such faces are less than 40 feet therefrom, such crosscuts shall be rock-dusted.

"(4) In mines partially rock-dusted or in mines that are required to start rock-dusting, haulageways and parallel entries connected thereto by open crosscuts shall be rock-dusted. Back entries shall be rock-dusted for at least 1,000 feet outby the junction with the first active entry. Inby this junction, the rooms, entries, and crosscuts shall be rock-dusted.

"(5) Where rock dust is applied, it shall be distributed upon the top, floor, and sides of all open places and maintained in such quantity that the incombustible content of the combined coal dust, rock dust and other dust will not be less than 65 percent. Where methane is present in any ventilating current, the 65 percent of incombustible content of such combined dust shall be increased 1 percent for each 0.1 percent of methane.

"(6) Paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of this subsection shall not apply to anthracite mines.

"(f) Electrical equipment: (1) All electric face equipment used in a gassy mine shall be permissible, except that electric face equipment may be used in a gassy mine even though such equipment is not permissible if, before the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, the operator of such mine owned such equipment, or owned the right to use such equipment, or had ordered such equipment. Permissible electric face equipment in use in a gassy mine shall not be replaced by electric face equipment which is not permissible except that (A) permissible and nonpermissible electric face equipment in use in a mine may be interchanged within such mine, and (B) explosion-tested cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars purchased before permissible cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars became available, may be used to replace permissible cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars.

"(2) In a gassy mine, permissible junction or distribution boxes shall be used for making multiple-power connections in working places or other places where dangerous quantities of methane may be present or may enter the air current, except that where nonpermissible junction or distribution boxes are in use, or on order, on the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, their use may be continued until such time as replacements are made.

"(3) In a gassy mine, explosion-tested cable-reel locomotives shall be equipped with two-conductor trailing cables.

"(4) In a gassy mine, trolley and feeder wires shall not extend beyond the last open crosscut and shall be kept at least 150 feet from pillar workings.

"(g) Fire protection: (1) Each mine shall be provided with suitable fire-fighting equipment, adequate for the size of the mine.

"(2) After every blasting operation performed on shift, an examination shall be made to determine whether fires have been started.

"(3) Underground storage places for lubricating oil and grease in excess of 2 days' supply shall be of fireproof construction.

"(4) Lubricating oil and grease kept in face regions or other underground working places in a mine shall be in portable, closed, metal containers.

"(5) Underground structures (transformer stations, battery-charging stations, substations, permanent pump rooms, etc.) installed in a mine after the effective date of this section shall be of fireproof construction.

"(6) Welding, cutting, or soldering with arc or flame in underground face regions in other than a fireproof enclosure shall be done under the direct supervision of a certified person who shall test for methane before and during such operations in gassy mines and shall make a diligent search for fire after such operations in all mines. Rock dust or suitable fire extinguishers shall be immediately available during such welding, cutting, or soldering.

"(h) Miscellaneous: (1) The drilling and sealing of oil and gas wells penetrating coal beds or underground workings of mines shall be done in compliance with State statutes.

"(2) Whenever any working place in an underground mine approaches within 50 feet of abandoned workings in such mine as shown by surveys made and certified by a competent engineer or surveyor, or within 200 feet of any other abandoned workings of such mine, which cannot be inspected and which may contain dangerous accumulations of water or gas, or within 200 feet of any workings of an adjacent mine, a borehole or boreholes shall be drilled to a distance of at least 20 feet in advance of the face of such working place. Such boreholes shall be drilled sufficiently close to each other to insure that the advancing face will not accidentally hole through into such workings. Boreholes shall also be drilled not more than 8 feet apart in the rib of such working place to a distance of at least 20 feet and at an angle of 45 degrees. Such rib holes shall be drilled in one or both ribs of such working place as may be necessary for adequate protection of persons working in such place.

"(3) In a gassy mine, smoking shall not be permitted underground, nor shall any person be permitted to carry smoking materials, matches, or lighters underground.

"(4) In a gassy mine, persons underground shall use only permissible electric lamps for portable illumination.

"(5) Black blasting powder shall not be stored, handled, or used underground in a mine; but for a period of 6 months after the effective date of this section, this paragraph shall not apply to any mine in which the storage, handling, or use of such powder is expressly permitted by a statute of the State in which such mine is located.

"(6) Mudcaps (adobes) or other unconfined shots shall not be fired underground in a mine. However, in anthracite mines mudcaps or other open, unconfined shots may be fired, if restricted to battery starting when no gas or fire hazard is present, and if it is otherwise impracticable to start the battery; likewise, in anthracite mines open, unconfined 'shake' shots in working places and other places in pitching veins may be fired, when no gas or fire hazard is present, if the taking down of loose, hanging coal by other means is too hazardous for men working in such places. Only permissible explosives shall be used for such open, unconfined shots in anthracite mines.

"(7) Every hoist used to transport persons at a mine, other than hoists used in excavating shafts or slopes, shall be equipped with overspeed, overwind, and automatic stop controls unless a second engineer is on duty. Every hoist used to transport such persons shall be equipped with brakes capable of stopping the platform, cage, or other device for transporting persons when fully loaded; and with hoisting cable adequately strong to sustain the fully loaded platform, cage, or other device for transporting persons, and have a proper margin of safety. Cages or platforms which are used to transport persons in vertical shafts, except cages or platforms which are also used to transport coal, shall be equipped with safety catches that act quickly and effectively in an emergency, and the safety catches shall be tested at least once every 2 months. Every hoist that is used to transport persons at a mine shall be inspected daily. No engineer shall be required for automatically operated cages or platforms.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 210. (a) Any operator of a mine notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 or section 206, requiring him to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who willfully fails to comply with such order shall be fined not more than $2,000.

"(b) Any agent of an operator of a mine, knowing of the making of an order requiring such operator to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who willfully directs, authorizes or causes any person, other than one who is lawfully authorized to enter or be in such area, to enter or be in such area while such order is in effect, shall be fined not more than $2,000.

"(c) Any person, knowing of the making of an order requiring an operator of a mine to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who enters such area or remains therein while such order is in effect, shall, unless he is a person who is lawfully authorized to enter or be in such area, be fined not more than $2,000.

"(d) Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any coal mine subject to section 202 who refuses to admit the Director, any duly authorized representative of the Bureau, any State inspector assigned in accordance with a State plan, or any independent inspector appointed under section 203 (e) (3) to such mine, pursuant to section 202 (c), shall be fined not more than $500.

"EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

"SEC. 211. (a) No State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title or which may become effective thereafter, shall be superseded by any provision of this title, except insofar as such State or Territorial law is in conflict with this title, or with orders issued pursuant to this title.

"(b) Provisions in any State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title, or which may become effective thereafter, which provide for greater safety of persons on coal-mine premises, in connection with a particular phase of coal-mining operations, than do provisions of this title, which relate to the same phase of such operations, shall not be construed or held to be in conflict with this title. Provisions in any State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title, or which may become effective thereafter, which provide for the safety of persons on coal-mine premises in connection with phases of coal-mining operations concerning which no provision is contained in this title, shall not be construed or held to be superseded by this title.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed or held to supersede or in any manner affect the workmen's compensation laws of any State or Territory, or to enlarge or diminish or affect in any other manner the common law or statutory rights, duties or liabilities of employers and employees under State or Territorial laws in respect of injuries, occupational or other diseases or death of employees arising out of or in the course of employment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 212. (a) Whenever the Director determines that the construction of any equipment conforms to specifications prescribed by the Director which are designed to assure that such equipment will not cause a mine

explosion or mine fire, he shall issue a certificate to the manufacturer of such equipment (1) stating that such equipment has met such specifications, (2) authorizing such manufacturer to attach an approval plate, label, or other device approved by the Director which indicates that such equipment conforms to such specifications, and (3) authorizing such manufacturer to attach an identical approval plate, label, or other device to all identical equipment.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil-service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this title; and to fix, subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the compensation of officers and employees so appointed. No person shall be assigned or appointed to perform the duties of a duly authorized representative of the Bureau unless he has the basic qualifications of at least 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal and is recognized by the Bureau as having the training or experience of a practical mining engineer in those essentials necessary for competent coal mine inspection.

"(c) The Director shall submit annually to the Congress, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular session, a full report of the administration of his functions under this title during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall include, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this title, together with such findings and comments thereon and such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem proper.

"EXCLUSION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 213. The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply to the making of any order pursuant to this title, or to any proceeding for the annulment or revision of any such order.

"AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 214. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not exceeding $3,000,000 in any fiscal year, as may be necessary for the due execution of this title.

"SEVERABILITY

"SEC. 215. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1941, is amended by striking out "or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or by both".

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1941, is amended—

(1) By striking out "during the calendar year in which the request is made or during the preceding calendar year" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the 6-month period immediately preceding the date on which the request is made".

(2) By adding at the end of such section the following new sentence: "Whoever willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $500."

SEC. 4. The act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1941, is amended—

(1) By inserting immediately after the comma at the end of the enacting clause the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Federal Coal Mine Safety Act'."

(2) By inserting immediately below the matter inserted by paragraph (1) the following:

"TITLE I—ADVISORY POWERS RELATING TO HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS IN MINES"

(3) By striking out "this act", wherever appearing therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "this title."

(4) By striking out "That the" at the beginning of the present first section and inserting in lieu thereof "SEC. 101. The."

(5) By redesignating the presently designated sections 2 to 12, inclusive, as sections 102 to 112, respectively.

(6) By striking out "section 1" in the presently designated section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101."

(7) By striking out "section 1 or section 2" in the presently designated sections 3 and 4, and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101 or section 102."

(8) By striking out "section 3" in the presently designated section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103."

(9) By striking out "section 6" in the presently designated section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 106."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines."

Mr. NEELY. I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would the Senator state what the House amendment does to the Senate bill?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, to my sincere regret, it substantially impairs certain safety provisions and diminishes the general efficacy of the Senate bill. The measure, as amended, provides much less than the miners deserve and much less than the author of the Senate bill desires. But we are unfortunately confronted with the necessity of accepting the House amendment as a condition precedent to the enactment of any remedial mining legislation by the present Congress.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator state whether this is the so-called McConnell bill?

Mr. NEELY. The amendment embraces the McConnell bill.

Mr. CASE. And it was passed by the House today, as I understand, by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. NEELY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

FAIR-TRADE PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

NEED IS TO STOP LOSS LEADERS; NOT TO PERMIT PRICE FIXING

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment is on the desks of the Members of this body, and I ask the Members in the Chamber to read it. It would meet the assigned reason which is advanced in support of the private price-fixing bill, which is now the unfinished business before this body. The one argument which the advocates of the resale-price-maintenance or private price-fixing bill have made is the need for stopping the so-called loss leaders; namely, that unless action is taken, it is possible for large druggists and chain stores to sell nationally advertised branded goods for less than wholesale prices. Loss leaders draw into the large chain stores customers who seek a bargain, and who, when they are in the store, are then charged higher prices for other goods.

In other words, the argument is made that the loss leader is used as a "come on" to draw in the sucker. It is said that it is necessary to have private price-fixing on goods, or resale-price maintenance, in order to check these loss leaders.

That is the one argument which is advanced in support of this extraordinary bill, whose Senate paternity is unknown, whose record is obscure, and which comes to us with doubtful credentials.

AMENDMENT AFFECTS SAME PRODUCTS AS M'GUIRE BILL

Mr. President, if that is the real reason, my amendment meets the situation, because it outlaws the loss leader. It says that it is illegal—and I call this point to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]—for branded goods or articles to be sold for less than the wholesale price plus 6 percent.

I invite the attention of the sponsors of the pending bill to the fact that the amendment would really prohibit loss leaders.

The amendment applies to the identical groups of goods which the private price fixers would put into effect for their commodities as well. The amendment is confined to trade-marked and branded goods. I ask my good friends in the Senate to look at page 2, lines 7 to 10 of my amendment, where the term "loss leader" is defined as being a commodity "which bears, or the label or container of which bears, the trademark, brand, or name of the producer or distributor of such commodity and which is in free and open competition with commodities of the same general class produced or distributed by others."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to finish this portion of my statement.

In other words, the precise commodities covered by the pending bill of unknown Senate paternity before us are those covered by my amendment.

Now I yield for a question.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator also ask the Senators to read the exceptions created, particularly E, F, and G on page 3?

After reading those exceptions, the value of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would seem to be wholly nebulous.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment exempts perishable commodities if further retention would cause loss to the seller. This is reasonable.

On this floor we recently exempted perishables from OPS regulation. I believe my good friend from South Dakota voted for the exemption on fresh fruits and vegetables. Is the Senator from South Dakota saying that his vote was wrong?

Mr. CASE. I believe the Senator provides so many loopholes in the exceptions that no effective remedy would be provided.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The amendment contains a workable definition which exempts perishables if holding them would cause a loss. It also exempts sales where inventories are liquidated to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy. In such cases, selling below cost is justifiable and not really a loss leader. It also exempts seasonal sales and clearance sales which are in accordance with normal business practices, such as selling winter clothing in the summer. In all other transactions sales may not be made for less than the wholesale price, plus 6 percent.

Mr. President, this amendment will furnish the acid test as to whether the assigned reasons behind the bill are in fact the real reasons. If the assigned reasons are the real reasons, then I hope the sponsors of the bill will vote for my amendment, because it will give them protection.

A SENATOR. Vote!

Mr. DOUGLAS. It does not provide for private price fixing. Mr. President, did I hear "vote" from the other side of the aisle? I hope we will not debate under the shadow of the guillotine.

M'GUIRE BILL AFFECTS NONSIGNERS AS WELL AS SIGNERS

My amendment does not provide for private price fixing. That is the real purpose of the bill before us. The real purpose of the bill, which nearly passed last night, is to give to manufacturers of trade-marked and branded commodities the power to fix the prices of all goods which they sell. Those manufacturers control those prices, not merely for those who sign contracts with them but for all those who do not sign the contracts as well.

In other words if in one of the 45 resale-price-maintenance States one retail dealer of a given branded line signs a contract with a manufacturer to charge a minimum price or a stipulated price, then all the retail outlets in that State must charge that minimum or stipulated price, which may be either a floor price or a dictated price. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] earlier today hinted at what might be meant by the term "stipulated price." All that is necessary is to get the consent of 45 retailers, 45 men handling commodities, scattered in as many States. Then the power to fix the final price of the product is turned over to the private manufacturer. Mr. President, that is an extraordinary conferring of public power. In my judgment the bill is unconstitutional because it delegates legislative powers to private individuals. It turns over to private agencies the fixing of prices. This is contrary to the Supreme Court decision in the Schechter case.

It is also a direct repeal of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act. Therefore the bill is much more than a mere enabling act as has been asserted.

M'GUIRE BILL CAUSES CONSUMER TO PAY HIGHER PRICES

It, of course, results in higher prices to the consumers. I ask my colleagues to read the RECORD for yesterday and to go over the figures I then placed in the RECORD. This material will be found on page 8719 and subsequent pages. Those figures show that in the field of drugs, prices in the resale-price-maintenance States are from 15 to 20 percent higher than corresponding prices in the adjoining States which are not resale-maintenance States.

There are still four jurisdictions in this country, thank the Lord, which are not resale price maintenance States or jurisdictions. They are Vermont, Missouri, Texas, and the District of Columbia.

Here in the District of Columbia, drug prices are approximately 20 percent less, on the average, than drug prices in Virginia and in Maryland, which are resale price maintenance States.

In my own State of Illinois, drug prices are at least 12 percent higher in East St. Louis than they are in St. Louis, across the Mississippi River, in a nonresale price maintenance State.

In Oklahoma, a resale price maintenance State, prices are higher than prices in Texas, which is a nonresale price maintenance State. Everywhere in the drug business the comparisons are clear.

Although most of this discussion has been phrased in terms of the drug business, let me say that the drug industry is not the only one that is involved. The liquor industry is involved in this matter, because it wants high resale prices for its products. It knows that the demand for those products at any one time is relatively inelastic. The household appliance industry and the sporting goods industry and a whole series of other industries are involved in this matter.

Fortune magazine, which is a conservative magazine, has estimated that three-quarters of a billion dollars a year is at stake in connection with this proposed procedure.

THE STAKE OF THE MANUFACTURER IN STOPPING RETAIL COMPETITION

While the retail merchants have been doing most of the talking in support of the McGuire bill, the manufacturers of the trade-marked and branded products have been putting up the real money, why do they want this bill? They want to get a high manufacturers' price and then let the retail merchants in as junior partners. They are afraid that if we get competition in prices, that the reduction in retail prices to the consumer will force lower manufacturers' prices. They are, therefore, using the merchants as buffers to protect them from competition.

SCHWEGMANN CASE GAVE HOPE

Mr. President, last year the Supreme Court gave us some hope; it declared that although contracts between signers were still effective, and although a retail merchant who agreed, in a signed contract made with the manufacturer, not to sell a commodity for less than a given price, continued to be bound by that contract, such a contract did not bind the nonsigners. In the Schwegmann case the Supreme Court gave to the consumers an opportunity for the nonsigners to give lower prices to the consumers, and then allowed the manufacturers and the nonsigners to work out their own private arrangements, under the common law.

The pending bill would close that door of hope. The pending bill would reverse the decision of the Supreme Court. The pending bill would say that contracts are binding not only on signers, but also on nonsigners—a principle which seems to me to be thoroughly wrong.

The pending bill would result in a higher cost of living, not merely in the case of drugs, but in the case of all the other commodities I have mentioned.

M'GUIRE BILL A BLOW AT THE AMERICAN FAMILY

The pending bill is a blow at the American consumer and a blow at the American family.

Mr. President, I believe that all of us more or less realize that fact.

But who are the consumers? The consumers are the 155,000,000 American people, the 45,000,000 American families. Enactment of the bill would mean an additional annual cost of $5 a year for each person—or a total of $750,000,000 or $1,000,000,000. A man who loses $5 a year—or who loses 1½ cents a day—and a family that loses $20 a year, which is taken from it at the rate of 6 cents a day—do not know they are being hurt. They do not know that that money or their economic lifeblood is slowly being filched from them. But it is.

Enactment of the pending bill will mean that the consumers will have to pay higher prices for aspirin, for vitamins, and for the precious drugs which in some instances mean the difference between life or death, the difference between health or sickness. It will cause higher prices for liquor, for sporting goods, for certain types of advertised foods, for household appliances, and so on.

However, that money will be slowly taken away from the American people; and since it will be taken away in only small quantities from any one person, the consumer will not know about it, will not protest, will not be articulate, and will not be organized.

CONSUMER INTEREST UNORGANIZED; SPECIAL INTEREST IS STRONG

On the other hand, the groups who are going to make the $750,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 a year as a result of enactment of this bill are powerful and are

very well organized. The telegrams have been streaming into our offices and the lobbyists have been thronging the corridors.

I do not attack them for doing that, Mr. President. The United States Government maintains the right of petition for businessmen as well as for workers; for those who sell products, as well as for those who buy them. There is nothing wrong with what they are doing. But I ask my colleagues not to mistake the pressure of the lobbyists for the interests of the American people. I ask my colleagues to remember that over the United States the 45,000,000 families of Americans will lose by the enactment of this bill, even though a few thousand or possibly a few tens of thousands may gain by the bill. I ask my colleagues to remember the still, small voice of the American people.

Mr. President, without indulging in mock heroics, let me say that I know it is an extremely hazardous thing politically for one to take the floor of the Senate and oppose this bill. In a given State, only a few consumers will know the issues involved, or will particularly care. There are no votes and no political prestige in opposing the bill or in voting for my amendment. But the special interests supporting the bill will be deeply concerned and will resent our action. We can expect to lose ground by defending the interests of the consumers.

So here is a very classic case of a diffused general interest coming into conflict with a powerful and concentrated special interest. All of us are sufficiently experienced in politics to know what generally happens when that occurs.

But, Mr. President, this body also has a sense of stewardship. We are not only politicians; we have the welfare of our Nation at heart.

AMENDMENT IS FAIR

Mr. President, we have had a chance to think over this measure and to weigh the alternatives.

My amendment would meet the legitimate case of those who are sponsoring the pending bill. My amendment would protect them from loss-leaders, as I believe they should be protected. My amendment is liberal in its definition of a loss-leader.

When this amendment was proposed in the House of Representatives, it merely provided protection against sales below wholesale prices. The pending amendment, however, provides protection against sales which affect commerce which are below wholesale prices, plus 6 percent. In other words, my amendment would permit a 6-percent markup for distribution costs.

In the House the amendment covered all commodities. The pending amendment is confined to branded or trademarked commodities, or the very same group that is covered in the pending bill, and these only if they affect commerce.

AMENDMENT WOULD NOT PERMIT PRICE FIXING

The pending amendment meets the legitimate complaints of the retail merchants, but it heads off private price-fixing.

So, Mr. President, we have the choice between whether we wish to have a competitive society or whether we wish to have a monopolistic and controlled society.

The competitive society about which we speak so frequently and so eloquently has in it elements of roughness. In a competitive society the inefficient are eliminated. The efficient survive, but the very process of competition makes people more efficient than they otherwise would be. The very fact that they have to meet competition stimulates people to an added effort, and is an inducement to added ability.

So, Mr. President, on the whole, a competitive society is one in which the whole level of production and of efficiency is higher than in a protected and monopolistic society. Such is the society in which we say we believe; but we tend to believe in it for the other fellow. Competition is good for the other fellow; but most people want for themselves protection, security, high prices, price rings and combinations, which we disguise under such terms as "fair trade." We do not really believe in competition, if we favor a bill like this. What is destroying free society, is in part, this tendency for each and every special group to want protection for itself—and to get it—because they are interested in that particular piece of legislation and are willing to sacrifice the general interests of the community as a whole.

So, Mr. President, I am going to close. I think, as a result of today's and yesterday's debate, the issues are now fairly well known. The measure was not rushed through as it seemed at one time it would be. We have had a chance to consider it.

I appeal to my colleagues to remember the silent citizens, the people who have not had the money to come to Washington, to stay at the elaborate hotels, to send telegrams, or to throng the galleries and lobbies—the people who have not had the money to organize, but who will pay the piper. I ask that we consider the silent American citizens, 45,000,000 families, who will pay the price.

PRICE FIXING DOES NOT HELP SMALL MERCHANTS

I would like to point out that in the States of Vermont, Missouri, and Texas, and in the District of Columbia, no more druggists have failed proportionately than in any other State, and that my amendment would give them still more protection.

As a matter of fact, so far as druggists are concerned, their share of the consumers' dollar has shrunk from 4 cents to 3 cents during the operation of the Miller-Tydings Act, when it was thought that nonsigners must comply with prices fixed by the manufacturers involved in this bill.

Why has the druggists' proportionate share of the market declined? One of the main reasons is that high mark-ups on price-fixed drugstore items encourage the grocery chains such as A. & P. and Safeway to carry these items. Ten years ago only 10 percent of the supermarkets carried these items. Now over 85 percent carry them. The grocery chains like this price fixing. But it doesn't help the druggists.

LET US HAVE FAITH IN FREE AND FAIR COMPETITION

I would prevent private price fixing. Let us have faith in competition. We can protect small business from arbitrary financial power, as has been done under the Robinson-Patman Act. The Senator from Louisiana and I sought on the floor of this body to preserve the Robinson-Patman Act. Let us not, however, permit private price fixing which hurts the consumer. We can stop the evil, namely, loss leaders which serve no valid competitive purpose; but it is not necessary to permit price fixing in order to do it. There is no reason why we should burn the barn in order to roast the pig. There is no reason why, in order to cure a minor ailment, we should swallow a major dose of poison.

I hope my amendment in the nature of a substitute will be adopted and the bill itself will be defeated.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President I have spoken previously on this question, but I want to express myself again, although briefly, in the light of the very fine debate that has taken place.

We have heard within the past 24 hours as fine a discussion of the issues as I have heard on any question that has come before the Senate. There was a tendency at first to try to drive this bill through by main force. Fortunately, however, that effort was abandoned.

I would be the last to pretend that all the virtue is on one side of this argument. Indeed, as I told the Senate last night, I have never approached a question in which I was in greater doubt as to the correct course to be followed. In order to take the position which I have finally decided on, namely, to oppose the fair-trade bill, I have had to reverse an established position I took while Governor of New York when I signed into law one of the first fair-trade laws adopted by any State.

Mr. President, I see very clearly the virtues in the fair-trade law now pending before us, and I can well understand and appreciate the arguments of my friends and colleagues, the junior Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, the junior Senator from Michigan, and others. They are moved by deep concern for the welfare of the small-business men of America, the druggists, the grocers, and others.

I share their concern. I, too, am moved by the plight of the small-business man. I know the difficulties he confronts in the face of ruthless competition from large chains and huge merchandising organizations. I want to do everything in my power to protect the interests of these small-business men and to defend them against unprincipled and destructive competition where such competition is palpably unfair and where it is designed to drive these small-business men to the wall and to eliminate them as a competitive factor. I can understand that ruthless price competition by large organizations with huge resources can, in the end, reduce, but not enhance, free competitive enterprise.

But, Mr. President, there are other ways of getting at the problem than by means of fair-trade legislation. Indeed, there are better ways, more effective ways. We can, for instance, give the protection of the law to small-business men against the unprincipled use of the "loss leader." We can prohibit more effectively than we already do discriminatory selling by the manufacturer to the retailer and thus assure that every retail seller gets the same article at the same cost.

O Mr. President, there are many ways whereby we can protect the small-business man. And we should pursue those ways. As the junior Senator from Minnesota has said, the protection of the small-business man is a social obligation. I want to do everything in my power toward that end.

But, Mr. President, the way of fair-trade legislation is not the right way.

The effect of this legislation is to give big manufacturers—the manufacturers of brand-name products—the unqualified power to fix prices and to set aside the economic laws of the competitive system. These big manufacturers get the chief benefit from the fair trade laws. They are given the authority to fix with finality the price which the consumer must pay. This is an authority which, if it is to be removed from the market place at all, should be reposed only in public hands, never in private hands.

It is a well recognized economic principle that price fixing is the ultimate evil in the throttling of competition. It is one of the worst manifestations of monopoly. Our whole body of anti-trust legislation is aimed at price fixing.

The Government should get into the the price fixing field only with the greatest reluctance and only where it is absolutely necessary. But the Government must never give the protection of law to price fixing by private agreement, by the fiat of manufacturers and big business. When we do that, we are attaching, as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois said the other day, the last chains to the body of competitive enterprise.

And, Mr. President, it is not correct to say that only big chains and big stores are interested in selling at lower prices. There are many small stores with small overheads which can and do attract customers by taking a small margin of profit. Fair-trade laws cripple these small businesses and handicap them in their efforts to survive and to grow.

I have heard fair-trade legislation compared to minimum wage legislation and to farm parity legislation. That comparison is a false one. The minimum wage law sets a floor under wages, and permits free collective bargaining, and individual bargaining above that floor.

But the fair-trade law permits a single manufacturer to sign a contract with a single dealer and thus to establish the minimum price for that article wherever it is sold in that State. The Government is not setting the minimum price. It is authorizing the manufacturer to set that price. No bargaining is involved. No public determination is involved.

The same is true, in even greater measure, in regard to parity prices for farm products.

A general law aimed at helping a particular class is always dangerous; its effects may and usually do far overlap the group at whom the law is aimed and creates effects which are by no means helpful or desirable. It is obvious that the fair-trade laws are very costly indeed to the people of the country.

When I signed the New York fair-trade law, we were trying to work our way out of the depression. Goods were plentiful and dollars were scarce. It was an emergency measure and I said at the time I signed it—and that was in 1935—that it was not a perfect bill and was very much subject to improvement. I am now convinced that other measures should be taken to protect the small-businessman and to promote his interest. Fair-trade legislation is wrong in principle and at this time will do more harm than it will do good.

I hope the Congress will think today of the interest of that forgotten man and that forgotten woman of America, the consumer. He and she are the victims of this legislation. I know that the consumers are not organized and there is no such thing as a consumer's vote. Yet we dare not forget them. There are 155 million of them in America and they, too, must have their defenders among us.

I hope the substitute offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] will be adopted and that the fair-trade bill, as it is now presented, may be defeated.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, whatever its merits may be, or whatever may be said about the bill which is before the Senate, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Illinois as a substitute ought not to be adopted. I question very much whether Senators, if they knew all that is in the amendment, would vote for it. It is bottomed on making over-the-counter sales interstate commerce, and it contains this sentence:

> Any loss-leader practice which affects commerce is hereby declared to be unlawful and actionable at the suit of any person damaged thereby.

In other words, it is bottomed on the premise that over-the-counter sales are interstate commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I should prefer to finish my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. CASE. The substitute provides for triple damages and for obtaining injunctive relief either in a court of the United States or in a State court.

There are several exceptions, however, which persons sued or against whom an injunction might be sought could offer as a defense. There are exceptions listed from (A) to (G). I particularly invite attention to paragraph (E) which provides as follows:

> Any sale of a perishable commodity if further retention of the commodity by the seller could reasonably be expected to result in a loss to the seller.

When I mentioned this awhile ago in the colloquy with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], he pointed out that he had made an exception of perishable products in the Controls Act. Of course, the Controls Act rests upon the interpretation of an emergency and the effect upon the national defense of the policy of control. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of it, at least it rests upon a national-defense provision, and not at all upon the premise that over-the-counter sales are interstate commerce. Courts have generally acted on the theory that over-the-counter sales are intrastate business. If they are to become interstate business, and the concern of the Federal courts, with the exceptions as here proposed, the amendment, if adopted, would bring about a regular lawyers' field day.

Another exception is as follows:

> Any sale which reasonable business practices require the seller to make in order to liquidate an inventory of a commodity to avoid insolvency or bankruptcy.

Mr. President, the judgment of all the many retail dealers may vary as to what would be necessary as a reasonable business practice to liquidate an inventory. Certainly that would suggest to any person the possibility of extended if not endless litigation.

Another exception is as follows:

> Any seasonal clearance sale made in accordance with customary business practices in order to dispose of excess inventory.

Mr. President, are we going to ask the Federal courts of the country to determine as to all the retailers in the country when it is proper and in good faith to have a sale in order to dispose of an excess inventory? Are we going to make every little-business man subject to suits in Federal courts, either for triple damages or for injunctions, when he determines that he has an excess inventory and wants to have a sale, in order to determine whether he has a valid defense against the action proposed?

Mr. President, it seems to me these illustrations point out the extreme confusion that would result, the endless litigation and the endless harassment of small business throughout the country, and the overturning of all the precedents which have held that over-the-counter sales are intrastate business rather than interstate business.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope, whatever Senators may think about the basic bill which is before the Senate, they will not accept this substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the McGuire bill, H. R. 5767, seeks to do just one simple thing, namely, to restore in a Federal enabling statute the meaning which I believe Congress intended the Miller-Tydings Act to have when it passed that act in 1937. It is significant that prevailing interpretations and court decisions during a 13-year period following passage of the Miller-Tydings Act enabled the State fair-trade laws to be effective.

The McGuire bill establishes no Federal fair-trade policy. It adds nothing

whatsoever to the fair-trade acts of 45 States. It takes nothing away from any of these State acts. It overcomes two court decisions so that it may be a truly enabling Federal statute.

In 1951 the United States Supreme Court, in the Schwegmann decision, weakened the State fair-trade structure by holding that nonsigners, so-called, could not be bound by fair-trade contracts when interstate commerce was concerned because the Miller-Tydings Act did not contain a specific nonsigner clause. The McGuire bill does contain a specific nonsigner clause.

Late in 1950 the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, in the Wentling decision, weakened the State fair-trade structure by holding that enforcement of a State fair-trade act in any other State having a fair-trade law constituted an unlawful burden upon and interference with interstate commerce. Under that decision mail-order houses and other retailers who sell across State lines are permitted to disregard the fair-trade laws of every State but their own. The McGuire bill contains a specific provision, in paragraph (4), which clearly overcomes the Wentling decision.

Much conflicting testimony has been adduced as to the merit or lack of merit of fair trade. This testimony can properly be weighed by every State legislature. We are not called upon to weigh it here, because we are here dealing not with Federal fair-trade policy, but with an enabling act which recognizes the rights of the States to regulate their own internal affairs in an area in which they are competent to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to join issue with the Senator from Illinois on his amendment. I have listened to his eloquent and persuasive argument, but I must say his argument is filled more with words of eloquence than with persuasive words of fact. Let us clear up a few points—and I do so with the best of friendship and understanding.

The Senator from Illinois has insistently asked, What about the paternity of the bill? The paternity of the bill is in the tradition of a great American-Irish name, or Irish-American name—McGUIRE—Representative McGUIRE, of Connecticut. Let there be no doubt as to its legitimacy. It is an honorable name, and the proposal is an honorable one from an honorable man.

The bill passed the House of Representatives, and the amendment which the Senator from Illinois now offers was, in substantially the same form, overwhelmingly defeated in the House of Representatives. That is point number one.

Point No. 2. I may go farther back into the paternity of this measure. The measure had as its grandfathers the late Senator Robinson, of Arkansas, and a present Representative from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN. Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, is known as a friend of the consumer, and is one of the most able proponents of antimonopoly and antitrust legislation in Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to continue for a moment. Well, all right, I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator has identified the paternity of the bill in the House, but would he tell us who left it at the doorstep of the Senate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should be delighted to do so. I am sure the Senator from Illinois is familiar with the legislative processes. When a bill has passed the House, it comes to the Senate. It was laid before the Senate by the Vice President, who for a long time has fought for fair trade and whose first assignment as a Representative in Congress was as chairman of a subcommittee where he heard a man who then was a lawyer, but later was a great liberal Justice of the Supreme Court, Brandeis, who came to Washington and pleaded with Representative BARKLEY for fair trade legislation.

I put myself on the side of Brandeis, on the side of Oliver Wendell Holmes, on the side of WRIGHT PATMAN, on the side of the Miller-Tydings Act.

I shall document for the distinguished Senator from Illinois what this is about, because the Senator from Illinois has argued today, in this year of our Lord 1952, about a bill which has been on the statute books since 1937. From 1937 until 1951, when the Schwegmann case was decided, there was not a bit of doubt about what the Miller-Tydings Act covered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield? I know he wants to be fair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did the Miller-Tydings Act have a single thing to say about nonsigners?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it did. I would review for the Senator the decision of the Supreme Court in the Schwegmann case.

In my review, I shall cite from the record of Justice Frankfurter, with the assent and concurrence of Justice —— and Justice Burton.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is this the minority opinion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator accepts the minority opinion when it suits his purpose——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I accept the minority opinion only as to facts, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, not now.

In hearings before the Temporary National Economic Committee, Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold called for repeal of the Miller-Tydings Act because it made legal the nonsigner provisions of the State fair-trade laws.

I cite to the Senator from Illinois pages 18162–18165 of the Temporary National Economic Committee hearings.

Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold had no doubt at that time about the nonsigner clause of the Miller-Tydings Act.

The Federal Trade Commission in its report repeatedly said the nonsigner clause was in the Miller-Tydings Act. The Department of Justice repeatedly said the nonsigner clause was in the Miller-Tydings Act. All the court cases said so. Here is the documentation: *Calamia* v. *Goldsmith Bros., Inc.* (299 N. Y., 636, 775; 87 N. E. (2d) 50, 687); *Pepsodent Co.* v. *Krauss Co.* (56 F. Supp. 922).

There are two court cases, one Supreme Court case and one Federal district court case, which are clearly identified with the nonsigner clause in the Miller-Tydings Act.

Justice Frankfurter, with Justice Black and Justice Burton, concurring, had this to say——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was that the majority opinion?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; minority or majority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But there are nine Justices on the Supreme Court. The Senator from Minnesota has identified only three. What did the other Justices say?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The other Justices said it did not. There is no doubt about that. I am simply saying that the legislative history of the Miller-Tydings Act clearly points out that it did. No one has quoted the minority on the courts any more than has my distinguished friend. He has been a great follower of Brandeis, Oliver Wendell Holmes, and minority after minority. Those are the men who have spoken up in behalf of fair trade.

Listen to Justice Frankfurter:

As demonstrated by experience in California, the State acts would have been futile without the nonsigner clause.

That was demonstrated in the year 1931, and the act was amended in the year 1933.

In 1936, the Supreme Court, by unanimous decision, upheld the constitutionality of the nonsigner clause in the State fair-trade laws.

Continuing with the minority opinion:

The Court now holds that the Miller-Tydings amendment does not cover these nonsigner provisions.

This is the minority, speaking of the majority of the Court.

Not only is the view of the Court contrary to the words of the statute and to the legislative history, it is also in conflict with the interpretation given the Miller-Tydings amendment by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Department of Justice, and by practically all persons adversely affected by the fair-trade laws.

The minority of the Court continues:

Where both the words of a statute and its legislative history clearly indicate the purpose of Congress, it should be respected. We should not substitute our own notion of what Congress should have done.

I submit that there is a considerable amount of logic in the argument of the Senator from Minnesota, supported by a considerable amount of fact. The very premise upon which the Senator from Illinois bases his case is one Supreme

Court decision, a 5-to-3 split decision, after what? After 14 years of successful application of the Miller-Tydings Act and the 45 State fair-trade laws. I will rest my case upon what I consider to be valuable experience that was not at any time criticized. I have yet to hear a speech on the floor of the Senate, in the 4 years I have been here, against fair trade. In 3 of those 4 years the same supposedly vicious law which was supposedly going to wreck the consumer was on the statute books. It did not wreck the consumer.

There are other people who are interested in the consumer. We are all interested in the consumer. I submit that there is no body of factual evidence to prove that the consumer has been injured by fair-trade laws. I say that the evidence of the Federal Trade Commission in this instance is not evidence that is based upon normal trade practices, normal buying habits, normal merchandising practices, or normal purchasing habits of consumers. Why do I say that? Because the Federal Trade Commission, in its sampling, took samples at a particular hour of the day, on a particular day of the week, and in a particular store.

Let me give some fair samples, and let us see whether or not fair trade has increased prices.

Starting back before fair trade, the University of Minnesota School of Business Administration made a survey. I think it would have as much objectivity in this matter as most people would—surely as much as the Federal Trade Commission, surely as much as any private entrepreneur group. The University of Minnesota School of Business Administration made a survey in the matter of fair-trade practices. Prof. H. J. Ostlund, one of the most eminent men in the field of business administration, compared the prices of 50 leading drug-store products before fair trade, that is, during depression years, with prices under fair trade, in 1939, after normal prices had gone up.

He took prices in the depression years, when prices were abnormally low, before fair trade, and compared them with prices in 1939, which was the best prewar year in terms of the price structure. He and his associates did a job State by State. They found that consumers paid 1 percent less, on the average, for those products under fair trade than they paid in the prefair trade, depression days. That takes us up to 1939.

Let us see what has happened since 1939. A survey was made by A. C. Neilsen & Co. A. C. Nielsen & Co. are employed by hundreds of merchandising firms throughout the United States, to obtain nothing but factual data. Such a survey provides a method by which to check commodity sales, to see what the relationship is between price and volume of sales, and so forth. A. C. Nielsen & Co. is a reputable concern. Never has its honor or integrity been contested.

Upon request they put their 1949 and 1951 price figures back in the IBM machines in order to ascertain what consumers in the 45 fair-trade States, taken as a whole, paid for a list of the best known national brand drug products, as compared with the prices paid by consumers in the non-fair-trade States for the same products.

Over-all, in 1949 the consumer in the fair-trade States paid one-tenth of a cent less, on an average, per product than did her non-fair-trade sister. In 1951, during a 6 months' period, the fair-trade State consumer paid 1.4 cents less per product, on the average, than the non-fair-trade consumer did.

Whose figures are we to take? The Federal Trade Commission has been opposed, since the begining of fair trade, to a fair-trade law. It was opposed when the law was enacted. It has been obtaining figures in an effort to prove that the law did not work. The Nielsen Research Agency is neither for nor against fair trade. It has a job to do, and its job is to present economic data to producers, to manufacturers, to processors, and to wholesalers, so that they can understand what is happening in the market place. This is an objective business. If the Nielsen firm should become prejudiced one way or another, it would lose its clients.

There is no basic evidence to show that the consumer would be damaged. Let me tell the Senate one thing which would damage the consumer. The consumer is damaged when hundreds of outlets for products are lost. Let me give a good example. One of the best examples is Ingersoll watches.

We used to be able to buy an Ingersoll watch for a dollar. Let no one tell me that the price went up because of inflation, because the Ingersoll Watch Co. went out of business long before that. Ingersoll watches were nationally advertised to sell for a dollar. Some of the predatory boys wanted to sell them for 57 cents, which was exactly 13 cents less than the cost; and they sold them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator realize that this loss leader would be outlawed by my amendment, which is the pending business?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am coming to that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator should realize that, rather than riding off in all directions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that while he is a good economist, he is a poor businessman. No businessman in the world could live on 6 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Minnesota want to guarantee a profit?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; the Senator from Minnesota does not want to guarantee a profit, but he would like to see the kind of economic system under which someone could possibly make a profit.

What happened to the Ingersoll watch? Let us see how good it was for the consumer. The Ingersoll Watch Co. products were taken up by people who used them for loss leaders. The Ingersoll Watch Co. lost every little outlet it had around the country, and pretty soon it had to lay off its employees. It could not pay its bonds. It could not take care of its overhead. It had to quit producing that item entirely.

During the price wars Macy's sent out their buyers to retail establishments and bought materials from retail establishments, brought them to Macy's, and practically gave them away, in a nonsensical, idiotic price war between Gimbel's and Macy's which threatened the lives of hundreds of outlets in New York. When did the price war stop? When Mr. McGUIRE introduced his bill. Knock this bill out, and see what will happen. Mr. McGUIRE introduced his bill in September last year. It was then that the price war stopped. Macy's and Gimbel's will start the price war again the minute this measure is defeated, if that should unfortunately happen.

Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois says that his amendment would take care of the brand names and outlaw loss leaders. I say to the Senator from Illinois that his amendment is mandatory. According to his amendment, he is going to see to it that on every item there is a profit of at least 6 percent.

Speaking of the consumers' interest, the fair-trade bill is voluntary. There is no compulsion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is a compulsion on the nonsigner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wait a minute. I will come to that. I merely say that when a manufacturer manufactures a product he has a right to place a minimum resale price on it. If someone is to sell that product, he must sell it for that minimum resale price. There is no compulsion upon the manufacturer to establish a minimum resale price. If he thinks he can obtain better volume, make more money, and get more customers with no fair-trade price, he does not have to establish it; but he establishes it because it is good for him; it is good for the outlet; and it is good for the consumer.

Let us come to the nonsigner clause. The same argument to which we have listened was made in 45 States. The situation which I have described has been true since 1933 in California. It was true in 42 States before the Miller-Tydings Act in '37, and it has been true every day of a year up until 1951. I may say again that the New York law contains one of the best nonsigner clauses in the United States. In other words, if a manufacturer signs with one outlet at a set price, the protective clauses in the law protect a retailer who has goods in his store before the agreement is signed. If he has such goods on his shelves, he is not held to the fair-trade price with respect to those goods.

In the second place, all sellers of fair-trade items must be notified when a contract is signed. The standard-trade practice is for a producer to send out contracts to every seller.

Thirdly, Mr. President, the trade journals publicize the fact of these contracts.

Mr. President, I would say that the most conclusive argument is the one which the Senator from Connecticut provided earlier today. What kind of United States do we want? What kind of country do we want? I go right back

to the 15 years of history which is on my side, rather than 15 hours of talk. I have 15 years of history on my side. I say, without fear of successful contradiction, that the trade practices since 1937 have been better than they were before. I say that since 1937 the prices on the fair trade items have gone up less than the prices on non-fair trade items. It does not do any good to say, "Oh, but they were all padded ahead of time." That is no argument at all. As a matter of fact, since 1937 there has been less increase in the prices of fair trade items than in the prices of non-fair trade items. The cost of living index has shot up 85 percent since 1939, and the price on fair trade items has gone up only 16 percent.

Mr. President, how does one justify the talk about the harmful effect which a fair trade law would have on the consumer? I say that the fair trade law is good for the consumer. The fair trade law reduces prices. The fair trade law regularizes market practices. The fair trade law promotes production. Increased production reduces prices, and reduced prices work for the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. President, those are my arguments. They may be only assertions, but they can be backed up with many more facts than the assertions which were made on the other side.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us how the bill which he is advocating would affect consumer cooperatives, which put out their own brands of items which are virtually identical with the advertised brands, except for the label? Would the bill have any effect at all on such cooperatives?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would have no effect at all on cooperatives.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the practice on the part of the consumer cooperatives had a great deal to do with holding down the price of fair-trade items in the last 15 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say that I am in favor of consumer cooperatives. For every brand under fair trade there are 100 other items.

Mr. AIKEN. Which are virtually identical.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We have a choice. In other words, it is not as if there was only one car to buy, only one tooth paste to buy, or only one piece of candy to buy. The choice is almost unlimited. There are many types of face powder that can be bought, and the competitive brands are not limited to one outlet, either. I dare say that there are a great many more manufacturers of cosmetics than there are women in the country who use them. The country is loaded with cosmetic manufacturers. They come and go. There is certainly a great deal of competition in that line.

What amuses me very much is to hear people talk about stifling competition. Mr. President, there is plenty of competition. Let us not worry about competition. Rather, let us look for customers. There is plenty of competition, and one must always figure every angle to get money in the cash register.

I hear a great deal of talk about fair trade squelching competition. Anyone who makes such a statement should spend 1 month in a retail store. Let him go into a drug store, grocery store, or a hardware store, with a great Western Auto Supply store, a Montgomery Ward store, or a Sears, Roebuck store facing him immediately across the street. There his store sits, the John Smith store, practically surrounded by that kind of competition. Mr. President, that is real competition. Let us not worry about competition. A man who is in that position does not have to worry about competition. All he must worry about is survival.

I think I am stating common sense. I do not know whether it is all written out in books, but it is common sense.

Mr. President, I am here to say that we do not have to worry about competition. No one in a general merchandising store need worry about competition. What he has to worry about is whether customers will come into the store and whether the price of cream goes up, or whether the price of wheat, cotton, or hogs goes up. That is competition, Mr. President. He will have to figure all the angles to get customers into his store and to try to keep his store open. He will give real service, Mr. President. He will deliver everything in order to get customers in and out of his store. That is what I mean by competition.

The fair-trade program has given an opportunity to these merchants to serve their communities.

It is very nice to talk about competition, but in order to have competition, we must have competitors.

Mr. President, what kind of competition is it if all one has is the competition of a big monstrous chain, which has driven everyone out of business or lets someone stay in business by sufferance?

The kind of economic situation which promotes competition is when there are dozens of people in a community all trying to sell the same products to the same customers, and all trying to give better service. That is competition. It is not something to be described; it is something to be felt and to be experienced. There is plenty of competition in the retail business. There is plenty of competition in the wholesale business. There is plenty of competition in the manufacture of consumer goods. I submit that there is no evidence that can be produced to the effect that in the retail business competition has been stifled since the passage of the fair-trade laws. I submit that when we have retail outlets by the hundreds we have better competition and lower prices; and I submit, likewise, that when we have predatory business practices we lose outlets, and ultimately it means less competition and higher prices.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. With respect to the competition which exists between the large mail-order houses and the local stores, would the price of the large mail-order houses be controlled, or would they be enabled to sell patented varieties of merchandise at less than that at which the local stores are required to sell? We know there is no law now, but in order to make sure of getting a supply of a certain product a local merchandiser does sell at what is called a suggested price. It pretty nearly has the force of law, even though it is not a law. In other words, a mail-order house comes along with a 2,000-page catalog, and an item which is being sold locally at the suggested price of $1.25 is listed in the catalog for 93 cents. What effect would the bill have on such a situation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The bill will have this effect. It will require that where there are trade or branded names on which fair-trade prices have been established the mail-order house will sell them at those prices in any State, just as the local retail man is required to do. However, it is not inflexible. For example, a minimum resale price may be a little higher than the suggested retail price. The fair-trade price is a minimum retail price. There may be flexibility of 10 to 15 cents on a dollar item.

Mr. AIKEN. The fair-trade price may be less or more than the suggested price?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. Mr. President, I rest my case.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senate is about to vote on the Douglas substitute to the pending bill; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr.

LODGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 69, as follows:

YEAS—12

Aiken	Green	Murray
Connally	Lehman	Neely
Douglas	Long	Pastore
Frear	Morse	Smith, N. C.

NAYS—69

Bennett	Hendrickson	McClellan
Benton	Hennings	McFarland
Brewster	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Md.	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Kerr	Sparkman
Eastland	Kilgore	Stennis
Ecton	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Langer	Underwood
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Welker
George	Maybank	Wiley
Gillette	McCarran	Williams
Hayden	McCarthy	Young

NOT VOTING—15

Anderson	Kefauver	Nixon
Carlson	Lodge	Russell
Dirksen	Malone	Seaton
Duff	McMahon	Taft
Fulbright	Millikin	Tobey

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, earlier today the junior Senator from Oregon introduced into the RECORD evidence in support of his contention that distinguished economists and teachers of law in our universities are opposed to fair trade.

I can hardly let the opportunity pass without having inserted in the RECORD an article on the fair-trade question published in the November 1951 issue of the Detroit Law Journal. The article is written by Dr. Walter Adams, an associate professor of economics at Michigan State College, which has one of the leading economics departments in the country. I am proud to say that Dr. Adams, who holds a doctor of philosophy degree from Yale University and who enjoys a national reputation as an expert on small business, lends vigorous support to the arguments which I presented yesterday before the Senate on behalf of fair trade and the McGuire bill.

Mr. President, if the Senators will take time to read this short article, which is an economic analysis of the Schwegmann decision of the Supreme Court, I am confident that many objections raised against fair trade will be answered. Let me emphasize again that if we lived in the best of all possible worlds, fair-trade laws would probably not be necessary. If the antitrust laws had been enforced effectively prior to 1936, the Miller-Tydings Act probably would never have been enacted.

Mr. President, the sad fact is that the antitrust laws have not been enforced in such a way as to give the small merchant the protection he needs for his survival. Until we reach a stage in our national economic development when we can prove to the small-business man that he is effectively protected against unfair practices, unfair discriminations, and monopolistic exploitation, I think we should have the safeguards for the independent druggist, the independent petroleum dealer, the independent furniture dealer, and the neighborhood grocer which are embodied in the McGuire bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Schwegmann Case: An Economic Comment," written by Dr. Walter Adams, and published in the November issue of the Detroit Law Journal, be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCHWEGMANN CASE; AN ECONOMIC COMMENT [1]

(By Walter Adams) [2]

Despite a threatened Presidential veto, Congress—on August 17, 1937—passed the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Antitrust Act.[3] The amendment legalized resale price maintenance with respect to trade-marked or otherwise identified goods sold in interstate commerce, provided that such goods were resold in a State which had a fair-trade law. The amendment further provided that the making of a resale price maintenance agreement was not to be considered an unfair method of competition within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act. While thus sanctioning vertical price fixing, the Miller-Tydings Act nevertheless specifically prohibited horizontal agreements concerning the price of goods sold in interstate commerce.[4]

Immediately upon passage of the act, the antitrust agencies—joined by such divergent groups as Business Week and Consumers Union, Fortune, and The Nation—began to urge upon Congress the repeal of the Miller-Tydings law. Thurman Arnold, speaking for the Antitrust Division, made the following recommendation to the temporary national economic committee (February 12, 1941):

"The Department recommends the repeal of the Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act which was passed in 1937 * * *. This amendment has been in effect a little more than 3 years. Already the record shows that it does not serve the purposes which were urged upon Congress as a reason for its passage, that it sanctions arrangements inconsistent with the purpose of the antitrust laws, and that it becomes a cloak for many conspiracies in restraint of trade which go far beyond the limits established in the amendment."

The Federal Trade Commission, after an exhaustive investigation of the problem, concurred with Mr. Arnold's recommendation on the grounds that "resale price maintenance, legalized to correct abuses of extreme price competition, is subject to use as a means of effecting enhancement of prices by secret agreements and restraint of competition by coercive action on the part of interested cooperating trade groups of manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers in such ways and to such an extent as to make it economically unsound and undesirable in a competitive economy * * *. The Commission believes that the consumer is not only entitled to competition between rival products but to competition between dealers handling the same branded product." [5]

When it became apparent that little could be accomplished by way of pressing for legislative action, the opponents of fair trade turned to the courts and instituted a number of cases to test the legality of resale price maintenance. These efforts bore fruit when the Supreme Court, on May 21, 1951, announced its decision in the Schwegmann case. By declaring the so-called nonsigner clause to constitute a restraint of trade under the Federal antitrust law, the Court dealt a crippling blow to the Miller-Tydings Act and to the fair-trade laws of 45 States.

Speaking for the Court majority, Justice Douglas held that—

"If a distributor and one or more retailers want to agree, combine, or conspire to fix a minimum price (under the Miller-Tydings Act), they can do so if State law permits. * * * They can fix minimum prices pursuant to their contract or agreement with impunity. When they seek, however, to impose price fixing on persons who have not contracted or agreed to the scheme, the situation is vastly different. That is not price fixing by contract or agreement; that is price fixing by compulsion. That is not following the path of consensual agreement; that is resort to coercion." [6]

The Court also ruled that when retailers are forced, as they are under the nonsigner clause, to abandon price competition, they are driven into a compact which violates the injunction of both the Sherman Act and the Miller-Tydings Act against horizontal price fixing. For these reasons the Court concluded that resale price maintenance arrangements are enforceable only when based on contracts freely entered into between manufacturers and retailers or between distributors and retailers.

The decision was jubilantly received, especially since 2 weeks after its announcement a price war of major proportions was touched off in New York City's department stores. And when the "massacre of Thirty-fourth Street" spread to San Francisco, Baltimore, Memphis, Newark, Harrisburg, and other cities, it appeared as if the removal of fair-trade regulations had indeed been the primary force in reestablishing price competition on the retail level. A new freedom had apparently been won by the merchant and renewed protection accorded to the consumer. In the absence of fair trade, it was argued, lower prices—or at least more

[1] This case is also set forth in the U. S. Supreme Court summary section. Ed.

[2] Doctor of philosophy in economics, Yale University; economic consultant to the Small-Business Committee, U. S. House of Representatives, 81st Cong., 2d sess.; economic consultant, U. S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess.; associate professor of economics, Michigan State College.

[3] The veto never materialized because the Miller-Tydings Act was attached as a rider to an appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. President Roosevelt reluctantly signed the measure into law (50 U. S. Stat. 693 (1937), 15 U. S. C., sec. 1 (1948)).

[4] Vertical price fixing is accomplished through agreements between manufacturers and wholesalers, wholesalers and retailers, or manufacturers and retailers. Horizontal price fixing, by contrast, is achieved through agreements among manufacturers, among wholesalers, or among retailers. Thus, a pricing contract between General Electric and its retail outlets would be a vertical agreement, while an understanding between General Electric and Westinghouse would constitute a horizontal agreement.

[5] Report of the Federal Trade Commission on Resale Price Maintenance, 1945, p. LXIV.

[6] *Schwegmann Bros. et al. v. Calvert Distillers Corp., Schwegmann Bros. et al. v. Seagram Distillers Corp.* (341 U. S. 384, 71 Sup. Ct. 491, 95 L. Ed. 684 (1951)); (rehearing denied June 4, 1951).

competitive prices—were in prospect for an inflation-weary buying public.

In spite of these optimistic predictions, it should be pointed out that the Schwegmann decision is of relatively minor economic significance; that resale price maintenance is not—and never has been—a primary factor in determining prices on the retail level; that, after the initial flurry of price competition is over, prices will return to their former level; and that, in retrospect, the Schwegmann opinion might turn out to be a Pyrrhic victory allowing the enemies of competition to reinstitute some of their former techniques for the lessening of competition and the elimination of smaller competitors. Briefly stated, the reasons for the above contentions are as follows:

First, it seems likely that the recent price war in New York is attributable primarily to the swollen inventories under which wholesalers and retailers had been suffering rather than to the removal of "fair-trade" regulations. While the latter might have been the immediate stimulus for releasing the supercharged inventory pressure, only a logician guilty of the post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy could argue that the Schwegmann opinion was "cause" and the New York price war "effect." A more sober and unemotional estimate of the situation is perhaps to be found in the view of a department store official who commented:

As soon as the competition is sold out, we raise our prices. * * * This thing will simmer down to 300 or 400 items to be used as loss leaders." [1]

It seems reasonable to expect, therefore, that when some of the inventories accumulated during the scare buying period of last fall have been liquidated, the retail price situation will once again return to normal.

Second, it should be recognized that resale price maintenance never did affect more than 10 percent of the commodities sold at retail; that, after enactment of the Miller-Tydings law, manufacturers—as a matter of policy—tried primarily to limit price competition in leader advertising rather than to raise prices above the level at which their larger customers were selling normally; that the provisions of the Miller-Tydings Act have, by and large, been rather effectively circumvented by chains and department stores; that, therefore, the anti-social effects of resale price maintenance have been exaggerated out of all reasonable proportions.

Third, it is self-evident that if a manufacturer insists on continuing resale price maintenance on his product, he is at liberty to do so regardless of the nonsigner clause. As long as manufacturers are free to select their own customers—a right guaranteed under section 2 of the Clayton Act—they can impose "fair trade" covenants on their retail distributors. Already Goodall-Sanford, Eversharp, and Haspel Bros. have announced—in spite of the Schwegmann decision—that they will withhold goods from Macy's presumably because of the latter's uncooperativeness in enforcing the suggested minimum retail prices. Other manufacturers may follow suit in order to prevent the use of their products as loss leaders by large-scale distributors.

Fourth, it may reasonably be contended that the Miller-Tydings Act—being a depression-born measure—was aimed primarily at controlling excessive loss-leader merchandising and sales below cost by chains and department stores, a practice which threatened eventually to result in the evaporation of many independent retail outlets. The act was designed to check a practice which had all the earmarks of an unfair and deceptive trade method, especially when used by large concerns to eliminate weaker competitors; a practice which was often employed as a means of price discrimination for the express purpose of lessening competition. While it is unfortunate perhaps that competition in the retail field had to be protected by a law which does not distinguish too clearly between price competition which is in the public interest and price competition which is economically unsound and inimical to the survival of independent firms, nevertheless "fair trade" appeared as the only practicable means by which the desired goal could be accomplished. Had the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division done a better job in preventing predatory and sharpshooting practices the effect of which was to lessen competition, passage of the Miller-Tydings Act might never have been necessary and its retention today no longer reasonably justified.

Fifth, and most important, it may be contended that the trade restraints embodied in the fair-trade laws are petty, minor, and insignificant when compared to the influence of monopolistic organizations and monopolistic practices on other levels of industry. It may also be contended that the consumer interest can be protected more vigorously by prosecuting horizontal agreements (tacit or otherwise) on the manufacturing level than by cracking down on vertical price fixing between manufacturers and retailers. It may be suggested that the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, and all the organs of public opinion who denounce the not so fair fair-trade laws might devote greater attention to the dissipation of concentrated economic power in vital sectors of the economy instead of attacking a statute which affords the little fellow some measure of protection against price competition (of both the predatory and the socially desirable variety).

In conclusion, one may query why, in an economy where many strategic areas are infested by monopoly and oligopoly; in an economy where the concentration of economic power is no less today than it was when the first antitrust law was passed 60 years ago; in an economy where labor, agriculture, and a variety of industrial pressure groups have succeeded in insulating themselves against the rigors of competition through exemption from the antitrust laws; why, in such an economy, we attempt to reestablish competition first in an industry where the small, independent merchant is predominant. Without attempting to justify the Miller-Tydings Act, the State fair-trade laws, or any other restraint on competition; without criticizing the legal basis for the Schwegmann opinion; one may nevertheless conclude that, given an effective enforcement of the antitrust laws prior to 1937, the Miller-Tydings Act would probably not have been needed; that, once the act was passed, it exerted a relatively insignificant effect on retail prices; that the outlawing of the nonsigner clause is, therefore, not likely to bring substantial benefit to the consuming public, and finally, that, if our goal is the fostering of greater competition in the American economy, a more auspicious starting place than the retail trade might have been chosen.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have proposed two amendments. I ask to have amendment No. 1 read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 24, after the word "resale," it is proposed to insert: "*Provided, however*, That such minimum or stipulated prices as are prescribed in such contracts or agreements shall, after due consultation with representatives of persons substantially affected by such contracts or agreements, have been determined to be fair and reasonable by a duly constituted board or agency of the State in which such minimum or stipulated prices are to be charged."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have only a few words to say on this amendment. I explained it this morning. In my opinion, one of the greatest weaknesses in the bill in its present form is that it permits the private manufacturer and the private retailer to do what I consider to be price-fixing, with no check whatever upon their judgment. I think that certainly a procedure should be provided which will permit of some review, to determine whether the prices they have fixed are fair and reasonable. I propose that it be done by the appropriate State agency within each State, having within its jurisdiction this whole matter of fair trade.

I shall not ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment. However, I should like the courtesy of a recorded vote on the amendment which is to follow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana desire to have the amendment read in full by the clerk?

Mr. LONG. No. I shall explain the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD, without reading.

Mr. LONG'S amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 2 of an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 2. (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in or affecting commerce, in or affecting the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in or affecting commerce, or to discriminate between or among different commodities or similar commodities of different grade and quality by reselling at retail in or affecting commerce any commodity at less than net cost of such commodity delivered to the retailer's place of business where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States or any Territory thereof or the District of Columbia or any insular possession or other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or knowingly receives the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall prevent differentials which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are

[1] Quoted in Business Week, June 9, 1951, p. 23.

to such purchasers sold or delivered: *Provided, however,* That the Federal Trade Commission may, after due investigation and hearing to all interested parties, fix and establish quantity limits, and revise the same as it finds necessary, as to particular commodities or classes of commodities, where it finds that available purchasers in greater quantities are so few as to render differentials on account thereof unjustly discriminatory or promotive of monopoly in any line of commerce; and the foregoing shall then not be construed to permit differentials based on differences in quantities greater than those so fixed and established: *Provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent persons engaged in selling goods, wares, or merchandise in commerce from selecting their own customers in bona fide transactions and not in restraint of trade: *And provided further,* That nothing herein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned, such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process, or sales in good faith in discontinuance of business in the goods concerned.

"'(b) Upon proof being made, at any hearing on a complaint under this section, that there has been discrimination in price or services or facilities furnished, the burden of rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing justification shall be upon the person charged with a violation of this section, and unless justification shall be affirmatively shown, the Commission is authorized to issue an order terminating the discrimination: *Provided, however,* That unless the effect of the discrimination or sale below cost may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or the furnishing of services or facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914 (15 U. S. C. A., sec. 13), as amended."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana understands, he believes, the logic of the fair-trade bill, most of which is based on the theory that it is necessary to protect individuals against loss-leader items. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that some protection is justified and is reasonable, and should be provided, if it can be done in a proper manner. When a merchant uses a loss leader, it amounts to a form of discrimination as against his other commodities. Some commodities he is selling at a very high price, and the loss leader is sold at a loss, in order to lure customers into the store, so that when they are there the proprietor can sell them some other article, or articles, at a high price. That merchant is discriminating as between commodities, in order to lure people into his store. We have the Robinson-Patman Act, which is designed to outlaw certain price discriminations. It outlaws price discriminations in the sale of a commodity when the result is to injure competition. The Federal Trade Commission is charged with the responsibility of enforcing that act. It is the position of the Federal Trade Commission that price discriminations in the form of loss leaders should also be outlawed, simply by outlawing discriminations between commodities.

The pending bill would change the Robinson-Patman Act by adding the additional language "or to discriminate between or among different commodities or similar commodities of different grade and quality, by reselling at retail in or affecting commerce any commodity at less than net cost of such commodity delivered to the retailer's place of business."

Of course, there would be exceptions in instances where in good faith a person is discriminating, and in which event he would, himself, have a defense. For example, if he were going into bankruptcy, or if he were proposing a seasonal inventory.

Mr. President, my amendment would do the independent retailer far more good than the McGuire bill, perhaps 50 times as much good, because trademarked items are not the only items which can be sold as loss leaders in order to lure people into a store. Let us consider sugar, for example. If granulated sugar is being sold at, let us say, 50 percent of the retail price, it can be used quite as much as a loss leader as a trade-marked article that is well known. There are many other items of that sort, ordinary standard commodities, items not subject in any way to a fair-trade law, which can be sold as loss leaders.

Let us consider, for example, the filling-station operator. In the city of Detroit it was found that the filling-station proprietors were seeking protection because gasoline was being sold to certain chains at a price far below what the ordinary filling station was being charged. This bill would not do anything to protect the filling-station operator. It would perhaps help a few retail druggists, but it would not substantially help the filling-station operator, because gasoline is not an article susceptible of fair-trade treatment.

The amendment I am offering would have the effect of reversing the Standard Oil of Indiana Co. decision, by providing that good faith would be a complete defense, except in cases where it could be shown that the effect of the discrimination was to injure competition as distinguished from the individual competitor. An individual competitor would be able to go into court, under my amendment, to protect himself, and to sue for treble damages, if someone were injuring him through the loss-leader practice.

It would then be possible for the defendant to plead as a defense that he was meeting competition in good faith, unless it could be shown that the discrimination was injuring not only him but competition in the entire market area.

For years the Federal Trade Commission has recommended this type legislation to meet the problem of loss leaders. This amendment, if adopted, would do far more good than would the proposed fair-trade bill. The reason why I say that is because the amendment I am offering would see to it that independent merchants would acquire their goods at substantially the same prices at which the large merchants acquired their goods.

My amendment would give the little fellow the same price which the big one gets. A small merchant selling Ipana and other brands of toothpaste would go out of business with a mark-up of 5 or 10 percent, if his large competitors were selling for the same price with a mark-up of perhaps 50 percent.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with the approach this fair trade makes to the problem, because it is diametrically opposed to the theory of our antitrust laws. The Sherman Antitrust Act says that a person cannot conspire with another to reduce competition or to create a monopoly. He cannot conspire where it would be in restraint of trade. Then we come to the Miller-Tydings amendment, under which, taking Ipana toothpaste again as an illustration, if two druggists get together and agree that they will not compete in connection with Ipana toothpaste, that is against the law, but, on the other hand, under a fair-trade law if the producers of Ipana toothpaste have an agreement with either one of the two druggists, that is lawful, but it is then unlawful for other merchants to sell at a different price.

Mr. President, it is my purpose to see that we have competition in this great country, and it is also my purpose to see that the little fellow has a chance to compete with the big fellow. My amendment proposes the same thing the independent merchants were supporting 2 years ago when the junior Senator from Louisiana was fighting the basing-point bill because it would legalize price discrimination. Merchants were writing Senators in support of the position I was taking. I hope they will support the position I am now taking. I understand they have been saying, "If the Senate adopts this amendment, the bill will be tied up in conference and we will not get a bill."

Without this amendment, this bill might have the effect of completely undermining the antitrust laws. If we apply one principle to the little fellow, we should be willing to apply the same principle to the large concern. I think this measure would result in inflicting more injury on the small retailers than it would furnish help to them. On the other hand, I think my amendment would be a far better approach and would give greater protection to the independent retailers in the long run.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House has passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks; and

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion;

H. R. 3707. An act for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick;

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; and

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

FAIR-TRADE PRACTICES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5767) to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment No. 2 may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 1, line 7, to strike out the words "or stipulated"; page 1, line 8, to strike out the words "or stipulated"; page 2, line 12, to strike out the words "or stipulated"; page 2, line 14, to strike out the words "or stipulated"; page 3, lines 21 and 22, to strike out the words "or stipulated."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in my argument this morning I endeavored to demonstrate that another serious weakness in the pending bill is the stipulated price which would permit entrepreneurs to enter into an agreement fixing prices, which I think constitutes a great evil. I made my argument against it this morning. If we really want to come somewhere near improving this bill so that it will carry out a reasonable public interest, we should eliminate the so-called stipulated prices and leave only minimum prices. I have not heard anything from any of the proponents of the bill which, in my opinion, justifies the word "stipulated" in the bill. I think they have made their case from the standpoint of their major premises, which I believe to be fallacious. I think the weakness is that the bill would permit prices to be fixed by businessmen, without any public check.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a sufficient number seconding the request.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on the pending bill I want to say only a word.

The bill should have gone to the Judiciary Committee of the Senate when it came from the House. It is an amendment to the Antitrust Act. The antitrust laws should be studied and reviewed by a committee having the proper jurisdiction. I sought at the time to have the bill referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was not referred to that committee.

The bill was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which had a perfect right to report the bill, since it had been referred to that committee. The bill was reported without recommendation.

If after the bill had been reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a motion had been made to refer it to the Committee on the Judiciary, time would not have been available to enable the latter committee make a proper study of the bill, and the Committee on the Judiciary would have been accused of burying the bill. For that reason, I have not made such a motion, nor has any other member of the committee.

The bill is now before the Senate for a vote. I say there should be a study made in all respects, of the antitrust laws, and it should be made by a proper committee having jurisdiction to do so. The time is not now available for a study; hence no motion has been made, and hence the vote on this amendment to the antitrust law must now be taken by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are we now about to vote on final passage of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the final passage of the bill.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and that pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Maryland.

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts, [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—64

Bennett	Hendrickson	Magnuson
Benton	Hennings	Martin
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Bricker	Hill	McCarran
Bridges	Hoey	McCarthy
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	McClellan
Byrd	Humphrey	McFarland
Cain	Hunt	McKellar
Capehart	Ives	Monroney
Case	Jenner	Moody
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Murray
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Dworshak	Kem	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kerr	Pastore
Ecton	Kilgore	Robertson
George	Knowland	Schoeppel
Hayden	Langer	Smathers

Smith, Maine	Underwood	Williams
Sparkman	Watkins	Young
Stennis	Welker	
Thye	Wiley	

NAYS—16

Aiken	Frear	Neely
Connally	Gillette	Saltonstall
Douglas	Green	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Long	
Flanders	Morse	

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Kefauver	Russell
Butler, Md.	Lodge	Seaton
Carlson	Malone	Taft
Dirksen	McMahon	Tobey
Duff	Millikin	
Fulbright	Nixon	

So the bill (H. R. 5767) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to authorize the establishment of a Joint Committee on Fair Trade Practices, for the purposes of further study of the measure just passed; and I also submit a resolution directing the Select Committee on Small Business to make further and continuing studies in the same field.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 87), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Fair Trade Practices to be composed of three Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not more than two of the members from each House shall be members of the same political party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selections. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make continuing studies of all problems involved in fair-trade practices and matters related to fair-trade practices. The joint committee shall, from time to time, make such reports to the Senate and the House of Representatives with respect to its studies as it may deem appropriate and shall make a final report to the Senate and to the House of Representatives on June 30, 1954.

(c) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(d) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

(e) The joint committee shall cease to exist on June 30, 1954. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee.

The resolution (S. Res. 348), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That (a) the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized and directed to establish a subcommittee thereof which shall make a comprehensive study of all problems involved in fair-trade practices and matters related to fair-trade practices.

(b) The subcommittee shall make such reports to the Senate with respect to its studies as it may deem appropriate, and shall make a final report to the Senate on June 30, 1954.

Sec. 2. (a) The subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such places and times, to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The subcommittee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable. The subcommittee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and establishments of the Government.

(c) The subcommittee shall cease to exist on June 30, 1954. The expenses of the subcommittee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the subcommittee.

COMPROMISED TAX CASES IN THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, every time a large tax case is settled through a compromise agreement the millions of other taxpayers are forced to make up the difference.

It has always been my contention that the American taxpayer, who is forced to bear this additional burden, has a right to know who is getting by without paying all his taxes.

Greater publicity of all compromise settlements plus an independent audit would be a major step toward breaking up the widespread corruption and political fixing which has been exposed as existing in the Treasury Department.

When the officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue know that the American people are scrutinizing their decisions, we can be assured that they will be much more careful to see that the tax laws are administered on an equitable basis.

It was with this thought that for the past several months I have been endeavoring to reveal to the American people some of the inner operations of this Bureau; and I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that many of us have been greatly shocked by what we have found.

Recognizing that it would be impossible to examine all these cases, I have been trying to assemble a record of those cases in excess of $250,000 each, upon which a compromise had been made during the past 10 years.

I have made no attempt to check the merits or demerits of any of these proposed assessments. Nor shall I pass any opinion. I merely state the cases and suggest that each taxpayer compare these settlements with the manner in which his own tax case has been handled.

In each instance I am giving the date of the compromise agreement, the name and address of the taxpayer, the names of the officials representing the Government, the original amount of the proposed tax assessment—including penalties and interest—along with the amount for which it was settled, and the years involved.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a list of some of these cases.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Approval date	Name and address	Chief counsel, commissioner, secretary	Tax due	Compromise settlement	Years involved
May 1, 1950	Canal Loan & Jewelry Co., 914 Canal St., New Orleans, La.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	$569,712.88	$227,487.04	1941–45.
Do	Berger, Alex, 5529 South Tonti St., New Orleans, La.	do			1941–45.
		Alex Berger	384,018.64		
		Israel Berger	256,765.54		
		Samuel Berger	102,072.37		
		Meyer Berger	35,708.79		
		Abe Berger (deceased)	101,966.37		
		Mrs. Yetta Berger	102,072.37		
		Mrs. Sarah W. Berger	24,791.19		
		Total	1,009,455.27	422,512.96	
Aug. 23, 1943	Aberle, Alfred J. (liquor dealer), 207 West 106th St., New York, N. Y.	Leming (acting), Helvering, John L. Sullivan	436,830.82	7,800.00	1931.
Dec. 1, 1949	Associated Novelties Corp., 42-53 21st St., Long Island City, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	1,712,813.31	600,000.00	1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944.
May 5, 1944	Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Nunan, Sullivan	474,487.14	62,280.50	1940.
Nov. 23, 1951	Acme Summit Mills, Inc., 245 8th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Dunlap, Lynch	452,857.56	240,000.00	1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947.
June 19, 1944	Bucksbaum, William, Boxwood Farm, Spring Lake, N. J.	Wenchel	678,567.62	300,000.00	1929.

Approval date	Name and address	Chief counsel, commissioner, secretary	Tax due	Compromise settlement	Years involved
Mar. 24, 1947	Commercial Forgings Co., 3709 East 91 St., Cleveland, Ohio.	Wenchel, Nunan, John J. O'Connell, Jr.	$526,416.51	$150,526.36	1941 to 1944, inclusive.
Oct. 28, 1942	Consolidated Water Co., First National Bank Bldg., Utica, N. Y.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	786,793.08	25,000.00	1934 to 1938, inclusive.
Jan. 17, 1949	Hayes, T. Frank, 118 Prospect St., Waterbury, Conn.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	509,185.04	5,000.00	1931 to 1937, inclusive.
Oct. 24, 1950	Hemp & Co., Inc., Macomb, Ill.	do	387,229.48	195,777.63	1943 to 1945, inclusive.
Sept. 14, 1943	Johnson, Walter W., transferee of Union Construction Co., 351 California St., San Francisco, Calif.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	1,377,635.40	12,000.00	1918–21.
May 26, 1950	Josselson Bros., Inc., Ashland, Ky. Transferees of Josselson Bros., Inc.: Alex Josselson, Sara Josselson, 2711 Seminole Ave., Ashland, Ky. Alex and Sara Josselson, address as above, transferees of Alex and Sara Josselson: Willard and Irma Patrick. Julius Josselson, 2711 Seminole Ave., Ashland, Ky. Annyce Baum, 511 South Serreno Ave., Los Angeles, Calif. Louis and Fern Solomon, 5636 Forbes St., Pittsburgh, Pa. I. A. Johnson, 1840 Winchester Ave., Ashland, Ky.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	[1] 427,000.00	75,000.00	1943.
May 24, 1951	Kaplin, David J., 168 Keeline Ave., Council Bluffs, Iowa.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	335,271.82	282,078.05	1943–47.
June 23, 1949	Lowe, Walter J., 420 Par Ave., Orlando, Fla. (formerly of Gas City, Ind.).	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	535,406.50	64,000.00	1932–44.
Do	Lowe, Nola, 420 Par Ave., Orlando, Fla. (formerly of Gas City, Ind.).	do	888,021.76	1,000.00	1932–36, 1938–44.
Oct. 8, 1946	McCloskey Grant Corp., 20th St. and Indiana Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	549,182.07	100,000.00	1942–43.
Mar. 28, 1950	O'Sullivan Rubber Co. (predecessor), Winchester, Va., and/or O'Sullivan Rubber Corp. (successor), Post Office Box 603, Winchester, Va.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	611,734.16	475,000.00	1943–46.
Sept. 22, 1944	Saven Corp., 3266 Penobscott Bldg., Detroit, Mich.	Wenchel, Nunan, Garth (acting)	2,072,233.52	75,000.00	1928–29.
Nov. 1, 1948	Wilkoff, David L., 2922 Grant Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	376,133.05	267,551.85	1940–41 and 1943–45.
May 24, 1950	Buff, estate of Louis F., care of Calvin P. Bartlett, 53 State St., Boston, Mass.	do	478,186.92	99,718.10	1929–41.
May 10, 1949	Greenberg, Leo et ux., 165 Lafayette Ave., Passaic, N. J.	do	445,145.23	75,000.00	1943–46.
Sept. 28, 1950	Greenberg, Murray, 160 Irwin St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Graham	455,756.04	75,000.00	1942–44.
Feb. 16, 1951	Jones, estate of Charles L. Jones, Ersie C., executrix 300 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	597,788.39	87,828.87	1941–42.
Sept. 30, 1948	Kittay Bros., Inc., care of Sam Kittay, president, 43 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Graham	527,923.09	260,000.00	1941–43.
May 4, 1944	Leebove, estate of Isaiah J. H. Graham, administrator, D. B. N., care of Virgil W. McClintic, 500 South Main St., Mount Pleasant, Mich.	Wenchel, Nunan, Sullivan	579,213.01	24,500.00	1932–38.
June 2, 1947	The Robinson Foundation, Inc., as taxpayer and as transferee of 8 concerns, 14 Wall St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	2,250,000.00 [2] 1,700,000.00 3,950,000.00	2,000,000.00	To 1946.
June 22, 1945	Steinreich, Kenneth P., 46 Bretton Rd., Scarsdale, N. Y.	do	909,813.17	25,000.00	1929–32 and 1935.
Nov. 29, 1950	Universal Camera Corp., 28 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	745,115.55 229,797.71	270,000.00 75,000.00	1950. 1942–45.
Apr. 4, 1950	Wadell Engineering Co., 19 Henry St., Passaic, N. J.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	377,574.21	10,011.12	1944–46.
Dec. 14, 1945	Wallick, L. C., Broad and High Sts., Columbus, Ohio.	Wenchel, Sherwood, O'Connell	295,304.70	35,000.00	1937–43.
Dec. 4, 1950	White, Cleveland, J., 907 Lathrop Ave., River Forest, Ill.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	385,042.54	197,549.25	1942–46.
July 8, 1947	Harry E. Jacoby, individually and as transferee of assets of Amazon Hose & Rubber Co., 130 North Jefferson St., Chicago, Ill.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	413,174.28	169,925.00	1941–44.
Jan. 4, 1949	Arch-Bilt Corrugated Products, 51-18 Grand Ave. (corporation), Maspeth, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	609,792.44	525,909.44	1936–37, 1940–42.
Jan. 15, 1943	Borg, John, Hackensack, N. J.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	395,066.69	125,000.00	1929–38.
July 18, 1945	Boyle, estate of William D., care of Roy W. Crimm, executor, 807 Midland Bldg., Kansas City, Mo.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	687,926.80	135,000.00	1932–38.
Nov. 17, 1948	United Importers & Distributors, Inc., 167 Columbus Ave., New Haven, Conn. Acceptance of this compromise was conditional upon acceptance of the following compromise settlements: Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn. Alice Gorby DiAntonio, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 1291 State St., New Haven, Conn. Jennie DiAntonio, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn. Anthony Germe, transferee of Charles DiAntonio, 614 Ferry St., New Haven, Conn. Michael F. O'Connor and Mary G. O'Connor, 180 Yale Ave., New Haven, Conn.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	909,437.23 1,391,005.89 374,788.39 374,788.39 374,788.39 224,247.52 3,649,055.81 867,241.82	431,858.58 10,000.00 5,000.00 5,000.00 5,000.00 5,000.00	1943. 1929–43. 1929–40. 1929–40. 1929–40. 1929–43.
May 3, 1951	Gay, Estate of Norman H., care of Harry Stebbins and Lawrence E. Irell, executor, 810 Roosevelt Bldg., Los Angeles, Calif.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	945,156.76	143,459.81	1942–45.
Sept. 9, 1942	Koch, William, 111 East 56th St., New York, N. Y.	Wenchel, Helvering, Sullivan	[2] 345,895.35	3,500.00	1928–31.
July 17, 1946	West, James W., MacCrellish & Quigley, Trenton, N. J., care of Humbert B. Powell, 2124 Lincoln-Liberty Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.	Wenchel, Nunan, O'Connell	191,469.22 718,134.99 909,604.21	100,000.00	1926–41.
Jan. 15, 1951	Edge Moor Iron Works, Edge Moor, Del., Benard D. Beamish, New Rochelle, N. Y., sole owner.	Oliphant, Fred Martin, Thos. J. Lynch	947,266.83	300,000.00	1943 and 1945.
Dec. 8, 1948	Florence, W. L., Powder Springs, Ga.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	992,597.35	550,000.00	1941–44.
Do	General Desserts Corp., 425 West 13th St., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	1,636,151.49	853,754.86	1942–44.
Oct. 9, 1950	Stadium Yacht Basin, Inc., foot of West 3d St., Cleveland, Ohio.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, John Graham	1,044,550.58	55,000.00	1941–46.
Jan. 16, 1951	Stein Bros. Paper Box Co., 2942 West Carroll Ave., Chicago, Ill.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	585,905.03	375,000.00	1942–45.
Oct. 24, 1950	Stewart & Co., Inc., James, 230 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oliphant, Martin, Lynch	622,074.48	178,567.43	1941–42.
May 3, 1948	Custer, Calvin, care of Griswold & Vargas, First National Bank Bldg., Reno, Nev.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Foley	312,373.56	2,000.00	1929 and 1932–39.
June 28, 1949	Epstein, Anna, Epstein, estate of Joseph G., 3221 Milburn St., Houston, Tex.	Oliphant, Schoeneman, Lynch	1,172,086.32	15,762.78	1943–44.

[1] Approximately.
[2] Does not include penalties or interest.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Appropriations be permitted to report H. R. 8370, the supplemental appropriations bill, after the recess today, if it is not reported before the recess is taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am told that some conference reports will soon be ready. I told several Senators that we would probably not transact any more business today, but it is important to dispose of the conference reports. I have been informed that some Senators desire to address the Senate on other subjects, so if the conference reports are ready by the time the Senators have finished, we will consider some of them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the conference report on the housing bill, which the Senate passed some time ago, has been agreed to by the House and will be sent to the Senate shortly. It contains two amendments which I believe the Senate will accept. I have talked today with the distinguished minority leader of the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to the amendments.

One was in connection with the situation with which the Senator from New Mexico, was concerned, and another was in connection with FHA insurance for State housing built for veterans. The so-called Fulbright amendment which the House struck from the bill is one which I prefer to see in the bill. I shall discuss it further with the Senator from Arkansas and see what he desires me to do.

I also understand that the conference report on the Independent Offices bill will soon be ready.

Mr. President, I am leaving the Chamber to attend a meeting of the Appropriations Committee. As soon as any conference reports are ready, I trust that I will be immediately notified so that I may be present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what the order of business will be tomorrow, I should like to make an announcement. In the morning at 9:30 the calendar will be called from beginning. I am hopeful that an appropriation bill will be reported, and that there will be no objection to considering it, and at least trying to dispose of it tomorrow after the call of the calendar. If the appropriation bill is not taken up, I give notice that we may take up the treaties on the calendar, which will probably not require more than an hour.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Do I correctly understand that the call of the calendar, under the unanimous-consent agreement, will proceed without interruption, or will it be broken into by reports which are privileged and other matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope we may finish the call of the calendar. If any matter is of sufficient importance, the call of the calendar can be interrupted to consider it, but I think it is important to go through with the call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to hear the distinguished majority leader make that statement, because it would help considerably in covering as much ground as possible.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I think I should say to the majority leader that in my opinion it will be very difficult to obtain a quorum on Saturday afternoon. I know of many Senators on this side of the aisle who have arranged their passage to the convention.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder why they should be doing that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WELKER. We are going out there to mix a little paint, to end the rule of the Senator's party.

Mr. McFARLAND. The paint which the Senator's party has mixed in the past few years has not been very good. It has washed off.

Mr. WELKER. If the Senator wishes to see a good brand of paint, or if he wishes to enter into a political argument, let us take a couple of hours for it. However, I felt that in all fairness to the majority leader I should make the statement which I have made.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are going ahead as rapidly as possible and working as hard as possible. That is the reason why I think we should dispose of conference reports this evening, if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senate be in session on Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. There will be a session on Friday.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it planned that the Senate shall be in session all day Friday?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate will be in session Friday. How long the Senate will be in session on Friday will depend to a great extent upon what is accomplished tomorrow.

STEPS TO UNITY

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, history comes full circle. Eleven years ago tomorrow, on July 3, 1941, in one of my few formal speeches in the House of Representatives, I protested the attempts to have the United States link arms with communistic Russia, and I urged that we use our best efforts to have the war called off in Western Europe and let Hitler and Stalin wear each other out.

Yesterday I voted with an overwhelming majority of the Senate to establish peace with the Federal Republic of Germany after a tragic war which I did my best 11 years ago to warn against and to avoid. Today we are spending billions of dollars to restore a balance of power in the world which mistaken leadership did so much to destroy at a terrible and tragic cost to all humanity.

What I said 11 years ago seems now, in retrospect, to be almost prophetic. Because the things I said then do not read so badly today, I wish to read a few excerpts from my speech of 11 years ago.

At that time the President was laying great stress upon the need for national unity. Commenting thereon, I said:

> Substantial unity supports production of defense articles for other democracies when they can be spared from what is needed to equip our outlying posts and to train our men in service. Substantial unity supports aid to Britain, but an attempt to link arms with communistic Russia does not appeal to the American people. Churchill's quick logic is natural for England. Britain is at war with Germany. Hard pressed, she must welcome aid from any quarter. This turn of events, however, changes the base on which our aid to Britain was pledged.

That turn of events was the declaration of war by Germany against Russia.

> Our aid was to be given to encourage the survival of the Four Freedoms in the earth. Do they flourish more in Russia than in Germany?
>
> Today—

This was the question of July 1941—

> is there more freedom of religion in Russia, where communism denies the existence of God and abolishes Sunday, than in Germany, where churches are open, even though there may be an attempt to have the pulpits preach honor for the State and pray for the head of the State as almost the head of the church? Is no church better than a State church? Today, is the system of private property overthrown in Germany or in Russia? Today, is the institution of the family more protected in Russia or in Germany?
>
> These questions suggest the difficulties of achieving a national unity based upon all-out aid for Russia. The truth is that between the Third Internationale of Russia and the Horst-Wessel, Germany's song of world conquest, the people of the United States approve neither one. For years we have been told that communism was not an ordinary political party but an international conspiracy, aiming at world revolution.
>
> Our appropriations bills carry riders denying the use of funds to pay the salary of any Government workers who belong to a society advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. Does anyone seriously think that national unity can be achieved on a proposal to send defense articles to go to Communist Russia, whose disciples are denied pay from the funds that furnish the defense articles?

Then I said, 11 years ago:

> Personally, I think the march on Moscow will destroy Hitler as it did Napoleon. England will blast his bases. Peoples he has swallowed will torment him internally. Russia will exhaust his energies before he can use her oil and wheat. We will rejoice, of course, as free people always rejoice in the overthrow of bullies and tyrants, but, Mr. Speaker, any attempt to make heroes out of the "fellow travelers" who have been boring from positions of influence in this Government will produce neither enthusiasm nor unity.

Then I went on to deal with the subject of production and the organization of national defense.

If there is one thing on which the present war has convinced the people, it is that the nation that commands the air controls the tides of the war. Hardly less in firmness of conviction is the belief that modern war is a war of hard-hitting, fast-moving machines. And the public is not convinced that the full strength of our Armed Forces is properly organized to achieve the maximum results in these fields. The papers are full of demands for a separate Air Force which the recent shake-up in the Army does not meet. The people want a central direction of the Air Force, of Army, and Navy.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, it was not until after the war that we got a separate Air Force.

At that time I called attention to the waste and the lack of coordinated purchasing program, and said:

The public is certainly confused when it hears from one agency that we have enough aluminum and from another that we have not, from one source that we must save on gasoline and from another that there is an adequate supply.

Today, Mr. President, I may point out that the public is confused when it hears from one agency that we need steel, and another agency shows so much indifference about a 4-week shut-down in steel production.

I pointed out:

The confusion grows out of an uncoordinated approach. We need some agency to see the whole problem and to have at its command the full picture of need and supply.

The plan I have in mind calls, first, for a central department of defense, headed by one man, with Cabinet rank. The department of defense will have four subdivisions, a secretary for each. There would be a secretary for land forces—the Army; a secretary for sea forces—the Navy; a secretary for air force—a merger of all aviation units; a secretary for supply—a merger of all procurement and production activities connected with the defense program.

As this point I should like to call attention to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the Defense Production bill, in which he sought to establish a new Under Secretary of Defense who would have charge of procurement. It seems to me that such a change is still very much overdue. I regret that the situation was such that the amendment could not be considered under the rules of the Senate because it proposed legislation on an appropriation bill.

In conclusion, in my remarks 11 years ago I said:

I do not like Hitler's persecutions and his pogroms. I do not like Stalin's conspiracies and his purges. I do not know what the future holds, but we have the lamp of the past. We know that the boundary lines in Europe have been rewritten every 20 years. We know that one war will be called a holy war, the next a crusade. We know that the last war—

This was said in 1941—

was waged to save the world for democracy, to get rid of the Kaiser and German imperialism, and that out of it we got Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini, with nazism, communism, and fascism. That should have cured us of the idea that we could inscribe boundaries or prescribe forms of government. Washington warned us:

"There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

Then I said:

Repeated and insistent reports suggest that Germany has proposed terms which are not unacceptable to England.

They were terms on which the war could be ended.

Mr. President, it was on that basis that I urged that we exert our efforts to have the war called off in the West before we should be drawn into it. That was 5 months before Pearl Harbor. We failed to get the war called off in the West and we saw the continual drift toward war, and in December the events which brought us into it.

Yesterday we saw the picture come full circle, as I have suggested. We saw the ratification of a treaty to establish a peace, which was overdue, with the Federal Republic of Germany. The present occupant of the chair, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] will recall that in the fall of 1947 he as a newspaper correspondent and I as a member of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid of the House traveled on the same ship to Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would comment that it was a most enjoyable trip to Europe.

Mr. CASE. It was a most enjoyable trip. During the trip, as the distinguished Senator from Michigan will recall, the junior Senator from South Dakota was chairman of the subcommittee of the Herter committee which went to Germany and Austria. We spent approximately 6 weeks in Europe, most of it in Germany and Austria, going from community to community, studying conditions.

On our return we made an informal report, which was later written into a formal report on Germany. Some of the passages of the report seem prophetic when they speak of what should have been done then. I should like to read one or two paragraphs from that report. Then I shall ask unanimous consent to have both the speech of 11 years ago and the report printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. In our report on Germany, we called attention to the fact that the burden of postwar Germany was upon the United States.

We said:

The extent to which we direct and determine the life of present-day Germany needs to be realized by every citizen of the United States, as well as the conditions under which we operate and the ways in which we proceed.

As former President Hoover has said, "The United States cannot be indifferent to nor escape responsibility for what happens under the American flag."

Then we said:

It is the conviction of this committee that there can be neither prosperity nor security in a world economy which feeds the German people but fails to win the constructive contribution to world society which they are capable of making.

We made certain recommendations. We recommended:

That the Government of the United States should not recognize as final the boundaries temporarily assigned at Potsdam for occupation purposes. As Secretary Byrnes has said, these agreements were merely provisional and depended upon the final peace treaty to reestablish Germany as an economic and political unit.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, by reason of the fact that we have been unable to secure the cooperation of the fourth power, we have established a peace with only a part of Germany, namely, Western Germany. So that, although we are taking steps, finally, at this late hour, to establish Germany as an economic and political unit, it is a fragment of old Germany and it is based, temporarily, at least, upon boundaries which ought not to be considered as final.

Another recommendation was:

That the states of Germany which are free to do so be encouraged to form a constitutional government at the earliest possible date—

That was late in 1946 or early in 1947, and accomplished only at this late date in 1952—

a government with powers prescribed by and derived from the member states—

That corresponds to the Federal Republic of Germany which has its powers derived from the states, rather than based on other states—

a government which other German states could join when free to do so, and free itself to join any federation of free states looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

Yesterday the Senate sought to make it possible for the Federal Republic of Western Germany to join the federation of free states—in other words, to join the defense community of Western Europe, looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that sometimes it takes so long to get some of these things done. But in order that we may measure the accomplishments which have taken place by the hopes which were expressed 11 years ago, and again 6 years ago, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in its entirety, at this point in the body of the RECORD, my speech in the House of Representatives on July 3, 1941. The speech was entitled "Four Steps to Unity."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR STEPS TO UNITY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am aware that few formal speeches in the House of Representatives register, here or elsewhere, and nothing, perhaps, is more futile than an attempt to voice one's faith on the 3d day of July with so many Members away to join citizens in their home communities in the observance of the Nation's birthday anniversary tomorrow. For those of us, however, who are prevented by distance or other causes from returning home, it seems not inappropriate to give a few minutes thought today to the state of the Nation.

For those of us who are members of the minority party—though I speak wholly on my own initiative and only for myself—times like these lay a double responsibility. We have the responsibility of loyalty; we also have the responsibility of questioning.

The English have a word for it—"His Majesty's loyal opposition." This dual responsibility grows out of the fact that the only test of truth is its ability to stand. One of my old teachers was fond of this phrase: "The integrity of an idea." An idea that could survive examination and reexamination was a good idea, he told us.

The theme for the Nation's birthday, tomorrow, is national unity. It is my purpose to speak of national unity with respect to four fields of national endeavor today. They are: Aid to other nations, production of defense articles, organization of the national defense, and working for peace.

The common difficulty that people have when they talk of unity is that each of us thinks there would be unity if everyone else would only agree with me. The unity most of us have in mind, I presume, is that expressed by the person who said: "We two shall be one and I shall be the one." Probably I shall not escape from that error in some of my remarks today, but I hope to suggest some of the things that can contribute to national unity.

I. AID TO OTHER NATIONS

Substantial unity supports production of defense articles for other democracies when they can be spared from what is needed to equip our outlying posts and to train our men in service. Substantial unity supports aid to Britain, but an attempt to link arms with communistic Russia does not apeal to the American people.

Churchill's quick logic is natural for England. Britain is at war with Germany. Hard pressed, she must welcome aid from any quarter. This turn of events, however, changes the base on which our aid to Britain was pledged.

Our aid was to be given to encourage the survival of the four freedoms in the earth. Do they flourish more in Russia than in Germany?

Today is there more freedom of religion in Russia, where communism denies the existence of God and abolishes Sunday, than in Germany, where churches are open, even though there may be an attempt to have the pulpits preach honor for the state and pray for the head of the state as almost the head of the church? Is no church better than a state church?

Today, is the system of private property overthrown in Germany or in Russia?

Today, is the institution of the family more protected in Russia or in Germany?

These questions suggest the difficulties of achieving a national unity based upon all-out aid for Russia?

The truth is that between the Third International of Russia and the Horst Wessel, Germany's song of world conquest, the people of the United States approve neither one.

For years we have been told that communism was not an ordinary political party but an international conspiracy, aiming at world revolution. Our appropriation bills carry riders denying the use of funds to pay the salary of any Government workers who belong to a society advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Does anyone seriously think that national unity can be achieved on a proposal to send defense articles to go to Communist Russia, whose disciples are denied pay from the funds that furnish the defense articles?

Personally, I think the march on Moscow will destroy Hitler as it did Napoleon. England will blast his bases. Peoples he has swallowed will torment him internally. Russia will exhaust his energies before he can use her oil and wheat. We will rejoice, of course, as free peoples always rejoice in the overthrow of bullies and tyrants, but Mr. Speaker, any attempt to make heroes out of the "fellow travelers" who have been boring from positions of influence in this Government will produce neither enthusiasm nor unity.

There will be no cheers in America when bombers made in the United States of America blast the homes of the people of Finland we wanted to save a year ago.

For these trades and intrigues, familiar to Europe for a thousand years, are foreign to the nature of America. Our meddling in the Balkans has created a situation for which the day of reckoning is yet to come. Why further "interweave our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangling our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor or caprice?" (Washington). Demaree Bess tells us that the Yugoslav leaders sacrificed the present and staked the future of their country upon pledges given them by the American representatives that the American people would bring about the defeat of Germany. He says in the Saturday Evening Post of May 24, 1941:

"The Americans who gave those pledges were fully aware that thousands of miles separated the United States from the Balkans. They knew that we hadn't yet been able to make sufficient munitions for our own defense and the war needs of Britain. They knew that we hadn't yet built sufficient ships in which to carry munitions, but they knew also that the Serbs possessed an almost mystical faith in the power and benevolence of the American people. They used that faith to persuade the Serb leaders to transform their country into a battleground in the Anglo-German war."

Mr. Speaker, national unity can never be produced by that kind of a foreign policy. The American people do not want on their hands the blood of the Yugoslavian Nation nor the tragedy that came to Greece. There is only one safe guide for a foreign policy that seeks a united America. It is that which was enunciated by Monroe when he said that the governments of other countries were their own concern and that the government de facto was the government we recognize.

The needling of revolutions, the promiscuous promise of aid, the encouragement of wars, the underwriting of dynasties or dictators in the Old World are the things that destroy national unity today. There can be national unity on foreign policy today if the keystone of that policy is the preservation of the independence of the United States, declared by brave men 165 years ago tomorrow.

II. PRODUCTION OF DEFENSE ARTICLES

The second field in which national unity is important is that of the production of defense articles. The only people in this country who have been opposed to expediting the production of defense articles are those whose sympathies were with some foreign power.

The obstructions to production have come from two sources—red tape and racketeers. Under red tape I include selfishness and inertia on the part of Government bureaucrats, who have successfully resisted the creation of a unified direction of the national production effort with power to act. Under racketeers I include the profit-counting persons, whether industrialists or labor leaders, who have tied up production.

Mr. Speaker, united support for the production program will come when everyone knows that no favorites are being played. The father and the mother, however, who have seen their boy taken away to learn to use a gun at $21 a month cannot understand this talk of an unlimited emergency when someone else's boy is getting more than that for a 40-hour week, is permitted to strike and delay the production of the gun. You can orate and resolute and fireside chat until you are black in the face, but there will always be something synthetic in the emergency appeal while these conditions exist.

Let me put this straight.

The right to bargain collectively is accepted as a right of labor in normal times. That includes the right to strike, of course. But whenever the state of the Nation is such that an emergency calls for taking a million young men away from their homes, away from their plans, away from their dreams, and putting them into Army training for a year with a liability for 10 years of reserve duty on top of that, that emergency destroys the right to stop production whether on the part of employer or employee, in plants producing needed defense articles. And whenever the National Defense Mediation Board, or a properly constituted department of defense supply, says that further stoppage of work in a defense plant is critically impeding the defense program, there is no right on the part of any men for concerted action to stop or delay production further. Their proper compensation and their conditions of employment or factory use are subjects that can be handled in due time by authorities properly constituted.

On such a basis, Mr. Speaker, you can achieve national unity in the production of defense articles.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The third field in which national unity can be improved is by a reorganization of our national-defense agencies. Several thoughtful proposals have been made. I am working on one such bill which I propose to introduce early next week on this subject.

If there is one thing on which the present war has convinced the people, it is that the Nation that commands the air controls the tides of the war. Hardly less in firmness of conviction is the belief that modern war is a war of hard-hitting, fast-moving machines. And the public is not convinced that the full strength of our Armed Forces is properly organized to achieve the maximum results in these fields. The papers are full of demands for a separate Air Force which the recent shake-up in the Army does not meet. The people want a central direction of the Air Force of Army and Navy.

Similarly, those who have gone into the matter of our procurement are convinced that vast sums are being wasted by the lack of a coordinated purchasing program. The public is certainly confused when it hears from one agency that we have enough aluminum and from another that we have not; from one agency that we are short on power and from another that we have plenty; from one source that we must save on gasoline and from another that there is an adequate supply.

This confusion grows out of an uncoordinated approach. We need some agency to see the whole problem and to have at its command the full picture of need and of supply. Economy and efficiency should result. It is just as important to the taxpayer to save a billion dollars in defense expenditures as to save it in nondefense items.

The plan I have in mind calls, first, for a central Department of Defense, headed by one man with Cabinet rank. The Department of Defense will have four subdivisions, a Secretary for each. There would be a Secretary for Land Forces—the Army; a Secretary for Sea Forces—the Navy; Secretary for Air Forces—a merger of all aviation units; a Secretary for Supply—a merger of all procurement and Production activities connected with the defense program.

The proposal I have in mind may not be the answer, but, Mr. Speaker, some definite action is needed to achieve the national confidence in our defense organization which is necessary for national unity. My proposal will be dropped in the hopper as a contribution toward that end.

IV. WORKING FOR PEACE

The fourth field in which action is needed, if we are to achieve national unity, is that of working for peace.

All history is a mockery if its lessons have not told us that when wars are over the peace has to be won. We have been told—the American people have been told—again and again and yet again—that the program of the administration was a program of aid short of war. Two days ago, however, we were advised that the President no longer said he believed that we could avoid war—he merely hoped that we could.

Mr. Speaker, St. Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, said, "Faith is the substance of things hoped for—the evidence of things not seen." And "faith without works is dead." If we want to avoid war, we must work to avoid war. If we want peace, we must work for peace.

I am not one who thinks the President wants to get us into war; he has had too many chances to put us there. He is driven, however, driven and harassed and cornered by selfish interests that see only a wreck of personal investments abroad or who are so driven by their hatred of Hitler that they demand all America redeem their interests and their feelings regardless of the cost. He is moved, as are we all, by the ruthless bombing of civilians, by the barbarity of total war.

I do not like Hitler's persecutions and his pogroms. I do not like Stalin's conspiracies and his purges. I do not know what the future holds but we have the lamp of the past. We know that the boundary lines in Europe have been rewritten every 20 years. We know that one war will be called a holy war, the next a crusade. We know the last war was waged to save the world for democracy, to get rid of the Kaiser and German imperialism, and that out of it we got Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini with nazism, communism, and fascism. That should have cured us of the idea that we could inscribe boundaries or prescribe forms of government. Washington warned us:

"There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard."

We cannot, today, however, dismiss our connection with the present war for already we have contributed to its prolongation. Its widening tides rock every shore. We now have a responsibility for trying to get it stopped if we really hope to avoid getting into it ourselves. If men hope to avoid war, they must try to avoid war.

On the basis recently announced by Anthony Eden, there is a hope for peace. He said:

"We have no motive or self-interest prompting us to economic exploitation either of Germany or of the rest of Europe • • • No escape can be found for the curse which has been lying on Europe except by creating and preserving economic health in every country."

Repeated and insistent reports suggest that Germany has proposed terms which are not unacceptable to England, terms that include the withdrawal from Syria, Norway, Demark, Greece, and Holland, settlement with Belgium and France on terms mutually acceptable, and disposition of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia at the conference table.

The only attention given such reports in official circles apparently is to say "who can trust Hitler?" It should be obvious that these proposals are not promises but suggestions for concrete action. There is an easy way to test them. Let mutual acts of performance be called for. If one step succeeds, take another and then another.

That is the road to national unity, Mr. Speaker, leadership in bringing the world to peace. And with all the earnestness of which I am capable, I say let the President lead the world to peace and he will have won for himself and his administration a unity and an affection as great, as leadership into war would be disastrous to his fame, his party, and possibly his country.

There will be no glory in leading the Nation into a war it does not want.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House from the time he heard his first Fourth of July speech until he took his oath of office here, has hoped that he might contribute something substantial to the country he loves. Everyone of us has hoped that if, in his time of service the country passed through a crisis, he might do his part well and nobly. Everyone of us has hoped that he would measure up to the responsibility of his time.

There is a demand today for national unity. "Passion may strain, but it must not break our bonds of affection." It is my earnest prayer that each one of us may prove his fitness to serve in this time by contributing to the adoption of those measures which will create true national unity.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the report on Germany, submitted by the subcommittee of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Foreign Aid, be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON GERMANY

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Twice in a lifetime, the German people under evil leadership have upset the stability of Europe and the peace of the world. Today, the United States has a major responsibility for the political, economic, and social life of 46,000,000 German people in the western zones. Whether their capacities contribute to world order or world disorder is largely in our hands. We pay the costs of failure, in any case.

Prewar Germany had 69,000,000 people occupying 181,600 square miles of land, a population density of 382 per square mile. Postwar Germany has 66,000,000 people occupying 138,000 square miles of land, a population density of 477 per square mile. The lands lost were largely food-producing lands plus the industrial area of Silesia. The population, although approximately the same, lacks the skilled labor of 2,000,000 ablebodied men who went to war and have not returned, and of many more who never can return. If these prisoners were added, the German population would reach approximately prewar numbers with 24 percent less territory.

Prewar Germany even under pressure never produced more than 80 percent of her food supplies. The deficit was made up through exchange of goods manufactured by combining rich coal deposits, raw materials, skilled labor, scientific knowledge, and a willingness to work. Today, the major cost of feeding the German people falls upon the American taxpayer and upon the American consumer.

It is impossible to separate the economic problem in Germany from the political. Six million at least, possibly 10,000,000 of the people in postwar Germany, most of whom we are feeding, are persecutees, refugees, or expellees—non-self-suppliers living there because of political decisions.

The boundaries of the four zones were fixed by political decisions; the significance of which is suggested not too inaccurately by the quip that "the Russians got the farmlands; the English got the industry; and the United States got the scenery."

The extent to which we direct and determine the life of present-day Germany needs to be realized by every citizen of the United States, as well as the conditions under which we operate and the ways in which we proceed. We cannot solve the economic problems confronting us unless we make new political decisions.

Four powers—Soviet Russia, England, France, and the United States—occupy Germany today, each in a zone of its own, coming together in an Allied control authority. Berlin, while within the Russian zone, is divided into four sectors. In our sector of Berlin and in our zone of former Germany, the word of our military government is the supreme law, subject to such quadripartite agreements as may have been made. Quadripartite agreement has been difficult to achieve, due to frequent unilateral action by the Soviet Union in her zone or refusal to join in steps which the other powers believe are essential to European recovery. France and Britain have also had differences which delayed action. This has forced the United States to go ahead with such measures in her own zone and in other western zones to the extent that their zonal authorities would join. This policy was announced at Stuttgart by Secretary Byrnes in September 1946, and constituted a partial abandonment of the so-called Morgenthau plan as followed at Potsdam and Yalta.

Since Stuttgart, the United States and England have been moving in the direction of a bizonal administration. Recently the United States took over additional responsibilities in the British zone, chiefly the supplying of 90 instead of 50 percent of the dollar cost of the deficiencies in food, raw materials, and other import costs of the bizone. An integrated staff with a United States representative at the top, but still bifurcated, is to administer the bizonal area although its administrative share and its voice in policy is not commensurate with the share of the load thrust upon it.

This means that, like it or not, the United States is the major occupying power in what once was Germany. Under international law and under conventions of The Hague which we signed many years ago, the occupying power has a definite responsibility that a reasonable subsistence be assured the civilian population.

As former President Hoover has said, "The United States cannot be indifferent to, nor escape responsibility for, what happens under the American flag."

There can be no hope for stability in a hungry Germany. That alone, however, is a negative approach to the problem. The German people have capacity—a capacity to produce goods for themselves and for the wants of the world. The German people have ambition and willingness to work—whether for the welfare or the woe of the world depends upon the direction and opportunity provided.

It is the conviction of this committee that there can be neither prosperity nor security in a world economy which feeds the German people but fails to win the constructive contribution to world society which they are capable of making.

The recommendations made at the outset of this report rest upon economic facts and political situations found to exist by the subcommittee which devoted 4 weeks of intensive travel and study to the conditions in Germany in September and October 1947, and to prior and subsequent study and correlation of information and developments.

While it is recognized that administration is the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government, the Congress is ultimately responsible for the policies of the United States expressed in legislation and for examination of the ways in which policies are carried out. Under present conditions of

world-wide shortages in food and the interrelation of other matters, what the United States does abroad has an inevitable effect upon domestic legislative decisions. Special responsibilities devolve upon the House of Representatives in connection with policies which involve large expenditures. Hence, the scope of the recommendations herein.

The aims of the recommendations are—

1. To enable Western Germany to get on her feet economically and off the backs of the United States taxpayer.

2. To bring the productive capacity of Germany, her people, and her material resources into position to contribute to world stability.

3. To encourage the development of a democratic Germany as a bulwark of world peace.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations will be classified under three heads: Governmental, economic, and social.

Governmental recommendations

It is the view of the subcommittee that the Government of the United States should not recognize as final the boundaries temporarily assigned at Potsdam for occupation purposes. As Secretary Byrnes has said, these agreements were merely provisional and depended upon the final peace treaty to reestablish Germany as an economic and political unit. It seems hardly necessary to point out that Soviet obstruction has been mainly responsible for making such a treaty impossible.

Since action to restore the economic health of Germany is long overdue, the subcommittee, reluctantly accepting the verdict of the London Conference of December 1947 that a single administration for all Germany is not possible at this time, recommends:

1. That immediate steps be taken to make the United States voice in administration and policy of the western zones commensurate with the share of the costs it pays. The latest agreement with the British for bizonal Germany does not do this. The subcommittee feels that Congress should be consulted in the making of agreements involving financial commitments by the United States.

Congress must no longer be confronted with agreements involving commitments requiring congressional appropriations, without prior consultation. Repeated attempts of the Executive to force congressional action by this technique may result in embarrassing the Executive rather than the Congress. In our domestic government as well as in international affairs, cooperation is a two-way street.

2. That our representatives on the Allied Control Authority seek to establish the right to complete freedom of movement for all citizens of Berlin to move to and from the zones with which their residence sectors are affiliated, moving over established routes.

(NOTE.—It is costing the United States $6,000,000 per month to feed its sector of Berlin alone. Additional responsibilities for the British and French sectors will raise this cost to a total of possibly $175,000,000 per year for the city of Berlin alone. The United States is entitled to have this cost reduced by whatever is possible through greater exchange of goods and services between the populations for which it has responsibility.)

3. That the State Department negotiate with France for restoration of the historical identities of Wurttemberg and Baden by permitting the southern portions of those states to join the northern portions as an integrated unit in the economic fusion of the laender in the western zones; and for affiliation of the Saar with France in accord with the plebiscite recently conducted.

4. That the states of Germany which are free to do so be encouraged to form a constitutional government at the earliest possible date: a government with powers prescribed by and derived from the member states, a government which other German states could join when free to do so, and free itself to join any federation of free states looking toward the economic stability of Europe and world peace.

5. That the duties and responsibilities heretofore performed by United States military government in Germany (but not the army of occupation) be turned over to an administration for occupied territories with a director-general to be named by the President and confirmed by the Senate, with powers, duties, and policies prescribed by act of Congress.

(NOTE.—It is the belief of the committee that the German people are capable of working out the details of production and distribution, if told what is expected of them. Great economies in personnel and administrative costs can be achieved by limiting occupation administration to the fixing of goals and limitations with an inspectorate to see that both are observed. The power would be reserved, of course, to protect, at need, law and order and military security through the army of occupation which is and has been distinct from military government. These same principles should be required in other zones where the United States foots the bill.)

6. That the Administration for Occupied Territories be directed to reduce United States personnel and administrative details to a minimum by turning executive as well as judicial and legislative duties over to the several laender and appropriate fusions thereof.

(NOTE.—In view of the repeated protestations of the State Department in the European recovery program hearings, that it is not an operating organization, and in view of the past record, the subcommittee does not believe that transfer of the administration of the occupation on June 30, 1948, is a satisfactory final solution of this problem.)

7. That Congress create a Legislative Advisory Committee for Occupied Territories to work with the legislative bodies of the several German states or a federation thereof in an effort to give all possible assistance to the development of a practicable, workable system of representative government from the smallest local governmental unit to the largest.

(NOTE.—The parliamentary bodies of England and France should be invited to assign like representatives on this Advisory Committee. Membership should be restricted to persons who have a proven understanding of workable and desirable procedures in representative government; e. g., have themselves been elected and reelected to public office by popular vote.)

Economic recommendations

1. That the Allied military governments proceed immediately with a realistic currency reform designed to discourage black-market operations and to encourage the production and distribution of needed food and clothing.

2. That a minimal ration of 2,000 calories be guaranteed children under the age of 15 and that a schedule of incentives for food production be authorized toward accomplishing a like minimal ration for the civilian population as a means toward general recovery.

3. That a special incentive schedule be authorized for the production of coal by permitting Germany to retain for industrial and heating purposes all the coal mined beyond the minimum essential exports of coking coal to liberated neighbors.

4. That restrictions on the production of fertilizer be immediately abolished as an indispensable step in increasing the self-production of food.

5. That the dismantling of plants in the western zones be temporarily suspended in order that the list of those scheduled for dismantling may be restudied by a congressional committee to determine where they can best be used for the economic recovery of Europe, including the German states.

(NOTE.—Officials representing both the Department of State and the Department of the Army have stated that they consider the plants listed for dismantling to be surplus to future German needs, in the light of possible supplies of materials and of manpower. The also hold that it is important to go through with the program for dismantling, in order to avoid the appearance of indecision that would otherwise result. The subcommittee is mindful of these considerations, but feels that the weight of the argument, in view of the fact that the list was prepared before any serious consideration of a European recovery program, requires a review. The provision for Germany of $322,000,000 out of the $6,800,000,000 requested for the first 15 months of the ERP is also so low as to throw into question the soundness of the projected recovery of Western Germany in 1948 to 1949 to only 40 or 50 percent of prewar production levels, when nearly all other Western European countries will be at or higher than prewar levels.)

6. That any supply of new railroad cars for Western Europe be conditioned upon an undertaking by the countries receiving the new cars to increase by a larger number the used cars in serviceable condition returned to Germany, and to drop claims to German cars as reparations. This should apply to the 20,000 new cars projected by the State Department, after scaling down the CEEC requests, to be produced in the United States for Western Europe prior to July 1, 1949.

7. That the proposed Administration for Occupied Territories be authorized to negotiate to stop deliveries of German ships under reparations account and be authorized to acquire surplus ships from the United States Maritime Commission and the War Assets Administration and to charter them under proper operating restrictions to nationals or agencies of the occupied territories for the following purposes: Fishing, transport of relief supplies contributed either by individuals or the Government of the United States, and transport to the United States of salvaged scrap from the harbors and battlefields of Germany for which appropriate credit shall be given on occupation charges.

8. That operation of the Export-Import Agency be turned over to the Germans themselves, under inspection, with freedom to exchange goods with other countries, including the United States, on such terms as they are able to negotiate and to acquire such dollar exchange or other foreign credits, subject to priorities for the production and export of bottleneck items needed for European recovery and to security control over imports.

(NOTE.—This implies the necessary freedom of movement and contractual initiative, subject to the inspection of contracts and factories to conform to policy directives of the Occupation Administration.)

9. That the management of German industry be turned over to its owners under such restrictions as are consistent with occupation policies, allowing full freedom to make such use of raw materials or use of foreign exchange credits as are consistent with agreed-upon claims (such as the coal agreement, and restrictions indicated in recommendation 8 above).

10. That the schedule of levels for the different industries of Germany under the revised level of industry agreement of August 29, 1947, be reviewed in detail by the occupation administration in the light of any

program for European economic recovery, and a report with recommendations for changes be made to Congress by March 31, 1948, and annually thereafter.

Social recommendations

1. That denazification proceedings on all but "major offenders" be ended by May 8, 1948 (the third anniversary of VE-day) through proclaiming full amnesty for all "lesser offenders" and "followers" whose clearance proceedings have not been completed by that date, and that full faith and credit be accorded the holders of this and prior amnesty or clearance cards by all agencies of the United States Government, thereby granting full freedom of movement and the right to work and to enroll in educational institutions and to participate in government.

2. That an effort be made to reduce the burden on the German economy and the occupation by finding homes abroad for so-called displaced persons and the millions of peoples expelled from the former German provinces to the east, as well as from non-German territories under Soviet control.

(NOTE.—The committee wishes to call particular attention to the large numbers of expellees from the Baltic countries, accustomed to hard conditions and a difficult climate, and to the possibilities for settlement of these people in areas where population has been declining, and in western Canada, Alaska, Kenya, Brazil, Argentina, and other lightly populated areas.)

3. That any nation receiving aid from the United States under any program for European recovery holding able-bodied workers as German war prisoners be required to permit their return to Germany before receiving such aid.

4. That any program of social reform in the fields of land management or tenure, social insurance, and public health be subordinated to economic recovery in the occupation administration; that the Germans be required to operate and finance sufficient schools to afford full education opportunity, but that careful supervision be maintained to encourage the development of democratic education; and that the exchange of American teachers and students with German institutions be encouraged by making such programs as the Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Acts available to them.

The committee believes that carrying out these recommendations will go far in putting Germany on her feet, relieve the United States taxpayer of immense occupation costs, bring to the cause of world stability and European recovery the great capacities of the German people and aid much in developing the free states of Europe as a bulwark of world peace and of free institutions.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE FOR GERMANY,
FRANCIS CASE, *South Dakota, Chairman.*
JOHN M. VORYS, *Ohio.*
CHARLES W. VURSELL, *Illinois.*
EUGENE E. COX, *Georgia.*
OVERTON BROOKS, *Louisiana.*

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, today we woo the German people—rightly, in my judgment—for their own sake and for the security of peoples ever where. We seek to place the resources and industry of the German people on the side of the free world.

That is why I rejoice in the action which was taken yesterday by the Senate. It was a late step, but nevertheless a necessary step toward improving the position of strength of our free world. Some may call it a step toward a balance of power, if they wish to put it that way, but at least it is a step to readjust our position of strength throughout the world, so that the forces of tyranny can be curbed, and so that in time, we hope, the forces of freedom can be established everywhere and bring liberty to all peoples, including the people of Russia, and those inside the iron curtain. It is our hope that this can be accomplished without going through another war and without paying again the futile price which was paid in World War I and World War II, for those wars, as we discovered, led to a new crop of problems which seemed to be even greater than the ones they were supposed to end. Mr. President, wars have failed to answer problems. They create problems.

Now we are addressing ourselves to measures in the hope of avoiding war. To that end, I applaud the action taken yesterday by the Senate; and I trust that the other measures suggested will be pursued, until the purposes of the American Republic which was founded on July 4, just 176 years ago, are firmly established.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

During the delivery of Mr. CASE'S speech,

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for an insertion in the RECORD, with the understanding that it will come at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield, but I will say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I hope that when the résumé of my speech of 11 years ago appears in the RECORD he will read it. He will find that 11 years ago I asked for the creation of a Central Department of Defense with four branches, one for air, one for land, one for sea, and one for a Department of Supply. I noted with interest the other day that the Senator from Illinois proposed a fourth Under Secretary in the Defense Department, to handle the Supply Department. I certainly hope that he pursues that objective, and I hope he will read my remarks on the subject which I delivered 11 years ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I promise to read his remarks.

Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1084) to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act, which I ask to have printed and lie upon the table. I request unanimous consent that the text of the amendment may be printed in the RECORD, together with a statement of mine explaining my grounds for objecting to the measure in its present form and for proposing the amendment just submitted, and a letter to Thomas C. Buchanan, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, from the Bureau of the Budget. In order to save the time of this body, I do not wish to consume much time in floor debate on the bill, and hope that Senators may review my statement in the RECORD before voting upon the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, and printed and will lie on the table; and without objection, the amendment and matters referred to by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, statement, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment insert the following: That section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Commission upon its own motion may, or upon application shall, exempt from the provisions of this act a person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural gas and who owns or operates facilities used or to be used for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or for the sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce, or for or in connection with the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire, provided, (1) such facilities do not extend beyond a community or metropolitan area, and (2) all gas delivered or transported through such facilities is ultimately consumed within such community or metropolitan area. To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is granted pursuant to this subsection the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to follow paragraph (9), to be numbered paragraph (10), to read as follows:

"(10) 'Community or metropolitan area' means the area of a community or city, and a zone adjacent thereto, which the Commission upon the basis of commercial, economic, social, or other relevant factors, or upon the basis of facilities, organization, and arrangements for the distribution of natural gas, finds to constitute a community or an area properly integrated for the local distribution of natural gas, and within which the Commission finds that the transportation or sale of gas does not require regulation by the Commission in order to protect the public interest."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I originally objected to S. 1084, and still oppose it in its present form, because I believe it would be prejudicial to the interests of gas consumers. This is because, in my opinion, the exemptions that would be written into the Natural Gas Act by S. 1084 are in one important respect too broad.

The exemptions of stub lines and of the metropolitan area facilities, like those in New York, seem wholly desirable since these operations are clearly local in character, and adequately covered by State regulatory power.

The same cannot be said, however, for the exemption of the gas distribution systems owning extensive high-pressure, interstate, trunk lines (though located wholly within one State), aggregating in the case of the East Ohio Gas Co. over 650 miles of high-pressure long-distance lines. It is this exemption which renders S. 1084 objectionable, in my opinion. If rewritten or amended to exempt only the stub lines and metropolitan area facilities, I would not oppose it.

Contrary to the stated purposes of the bill, as set forth in the committee report, the exemption of extensive trunk lines would, in fact, exempt operations not fully and adequately covered by State regulatory power. It would eliminate Federal jurisdiction that does serve an important public purpose by taking away, (1) the effective right of smaller communities to seek and secure gas supplies and service from the trunk-line carrier, and

the authority of the Federal Power Commission to order and regulate such service under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act; and (2) the power of the FPC to assist State and local commissions by requiring uniform accounting systems, annual reports and inventories, and by investigating production and transportation costs of such carriers in interstate commerce.

I have not been able to make the detailed study of this matter that I would prefer to make before interposing any objection or proposing an amendment to eliminate the objectionable feature of the bill. But I find that the committee did not hold any hearings on the bill, and I have searched its report in vain for any discussion of the importance of the service and accounting requirements of the Natural Gas Act, as applied to such extensive trunk-line carriers of gas. The report does state that Chairman Buchanan raised the question, distinguishing the East Ohio operations from the "stub-line" situation, but the report does not analyze the issue. A subsequent letter of April 21, 1952, to the FPC from the Bureau of the Budget also questions the justification for exempting these extensive trunk lines and concludes that "we cannot recommend enactment of the proposed legislation."

Under these circumstances, I believe the Senate should either hold up action now on the bill in its present form or amend it to eliminate the questionable exemption, pass the agreed-upon provisions, and deal with that debatable exemption only after hearings and full study.

In order that my present grounds for feeling that the exemption of distributors with extensive, high-pressure, trunk lines, even though wholly within one State, is unwise may be clear, however, I would submit the following analysis for the information of the Senate:

BACKGROUND OF THE EAST OHIO CASE

The jurisdictional dispute with East Ohio Gas Co., culminating in the decision of the United States Supreme Court (338 U. S. 464), was not initiated by the Federal Power Commission. It was instigated by the city of Cleveland in 1938 through complaint based upon an affidavit of the then mayor of Cleveland, the Honorable Harold H. Burton, now Associate Justice of the Supreme Court. The city asked the Federal Power Commission to determine the cost of transporting natural gas from the Ohio-West Virginia State line at the Ohio River to the city of Cleveland.

Section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act authorizes the Commission, on petition of State commissions, to determine the cost of transporting gas even where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate. The city of Cleveland has rate-making authority under the Ohio law and was, therefore, entitled to make such request of the Federal Power Commission. A similar complaint was filed by the city of Cleveland in 1942 by its mayor, Frank H. Lausche, now Governor of Ohio, and complaints were also filed by the cities of Akron, Euclid, and Lakewood, Ohio.

One of the important prerequisites to a determination of the cost of transportation is the determination of the original cost of the property devoted to such transportation service. These cities recognized such fact and, therefore, asked the Commission to require East Ohio to ascertain and submit its original cost to the Commission. The Commission directed East Ohio to file an inventory and statement of the original cost of its property used and useful in transporting natural gas to the complainant cities. The company refused contending it was not a natural-gas company under the act and therefore the Federal Power Commission had no authority in the matter. The issue was thus joined, and after hearings before the Commission the litigation commenced which finally ended in the above-mentioned decision of the United States Supreme Court, holding East Ohio a natural-gas company under the jurisdiction of the FPC.

East Ohio does not make any sales for resale, nor does it engage in transportation for hire; therefore, the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission rests entirely on the fact that East Ohio transports natural gas in intersate commerce.

With respect to companies which do not make sales for resale or transport natural gas for hire, the regulatory activities of the Federal Power Commission are limited primarily to (1) services and (2) accounting and depreciation practices. But both of these functions are important as applied to such trunk lines as East Ohio, and both of them would be eliminated by S. 1084. Let us examine each one briefly.

SERVICE PROVISION OF NATURAL GAS ACT

The Natural Gas Act deals with the question of service in section 7 (a) thereof which authorizes the Commission to direct a natural-gas company to extend or improve its transportation facilities, to establish physical connection of its transportation facilities with facilities of, and sell natural gas to, any person or municipality engaged or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural or artificial gas to the public, and for such purpose to extend its transportation facilities to communities immediately adjacent to such facilities or to territory served by such natural-gas company, if the Commission finds that no undue burden will be placed upon such natural-gas company thereby.

Section 7 (b) deals with the abandonment of service by a natural-gas company. Abandonment is not permitted without permission of the Commission after hearing when it finds that the supply of natural gas is depleted or present or future public convenience and necessity so requires.

Under section 7 (c) of the Natural Gas Act, a natural-gas company is required to obtain from the Commission authority to engage in the sale or transportation of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission or to acquire, construct, or operate facilities for such transportation or sale.

Many of the large natural-gas companies are prone to want to serve their large terminal markets and ignore the small cities and towns along their pipelines who desire service. In almost every large certificate case before the FPC several small towns or municipalities intervene in order to obtain a supply of natural gas. Likewise, many such cities and towns have found it necessary to institute section 7 (a) proceedings in order to obtain natural-gas service for their communities.

There is considerable doubt expressed by lawyers that the State regulatory commissions would have power to compel interconnections of interstate facilities and to require the sale of natural gas from such facilities to persons or municipalities engaged in the local distribution of natural gas. In an effort to cure such deficiency there was inserted in S. 1084 a further proviso reading: "*Provided further*, To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is afforded by this subsection the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

Some lawyers take the position that because of the interstate aspects such proviso would be meaningless and of no effect unless the States adopt legislation specifically related thereto and based thereon.

Assuming that such a proviso is legal, moreover, it is believed that it would actually hamper any local distributing company or municipality in obtaining gas service from the lines of such a company as East Ohio. This is believed so, for if such local distributor were to be given service by East Ohio it would subject East Ohio to FPC jurisdiction since it would be making a sale for resale in interstate commerce. Therefore, it seems axiomatic that such companies as East Ohio will resist every effort made to obtain service for the small towns along their high pressure transmission lines. It is to be expected that the State commissions such as the Ohio commission will, after having gotten East Ohio out from under FPC jurisdiction, discourage any move which would change such status. This situation would place the municipalities and small distributing companies at the mercy of such companies as East Ohio. The only way that natural gas service from East Ohio could be secured would be the acquisition of the distribution system by East Ohio thus obviating any necessity of making a sale for resale. The amendment of the act as proposed in S. 1084 would put tremendous leverage in the hands of East Ohio and other companies similarly situated to force the sale of small distribution systems.

The legislative history of the act clearly reveals that the need for this Federal authority to compel service and require the necessary connections with trunk-line facilities was one of the important reasons for the enactment of the Natural Gas Act. Many communities were refused service even where the pipelines had excess supplies of gas and the States had no power to deal with the situation. (Cf. Final Report of FTC, Senate Doc. 92, 70th Cong., part 84A; hearings on H. R. 11662, 74th Cong., p. 155; hearings on H. R. 4008, 75th Cong., pp. 47, 66, 67, 68.) This still remains one of the vital functions of the FPC. In fiscal 1950 the Commission received 14 applications under section 7 (a) of the act. In fiscal 1951 there were 39 such applications filed. Rate regulation, which admittedly does not apply to companies situated as East Ohio is, is not the only important objective of the Gas Act. The powers to compel service under section 7 are also vital, and in my opinion it would be contrary to the consumers' interest to surrender this power over such interstate truck lines and create again a gap in the effective power of any governmental agency to require this utility service to consumers.

I hardly need point out that this exemption might well induce other local distributors with extensive trunk lines to rearrange their physical properties and legal status within a single State so as to acquire similar freedom from this Federal authority and thus increase their opportunities to buy up local distribution systems near their high-pressure lines at distress prices, by simply refusing to furnish their excess gas supplies on request.

For these reasons related to the Federal power over services, the exemption afforded distributors owning extensive trunk lines by S. 1084 seems to me highly objectionable.

COST ANALYSIS AND ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE NATURAL GAS ACT

The cost-analysis provisions of section 5 (b) of the act, under which the East Ohio case itself was started, was designed to authorize the FPC to assist State and local commissions in just such cases, even where the FPC itself had no rate-making power. The House report (H. Rept. 709), 75th Cong., p. 5) stated:

"Subsection (b) authorizes the Commission, upon its own motion, or upon the request of a State commission, to investigate and determine the cost of production or transportation of natural gas in cases

where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate governing the transportation or sale of such natural gas. This subsection applies only to cases involving transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, and will greatly aid State commissions in their rate-making proceedings."

It is difficult to see why we should now surrender this authority to assist local commissions, particularly in the face of the record that a number of Ohio communities themselves filed the complaints seeking this aid in the East Ohio Gas Co. case.

The committee's report, in justifying the exemptions that would result from S. 1084, relies heavily upon the claim that the accounting requirements under the Natural Gas Act are costly, wasteful, and duplicative, as applied to such companies as East Ohio. It would appear to me, however, that the argument exaggerates the burdensome and costly effects of these requirements and minimizes the value of them to the continuing work of the FPC.

East Ohio has vigorously resisted control of its accounting and depreciation practices by the Federal Power Commission asserting that it is fully regulated in such respect by the Ohio Commission. East Ohio was one of the companies investigated by the Federal Trade Commission who found that the accounts of East Ohio contained write-ups of utility property in excess of $15,000,000. (See S. Doc. 92, 70th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 83, p. 1695.) In its opinion (6 FPC 176) the Commission said, with respect to East Ohio's objection to the Commission's accounting orders:

"They are the Commission's general accounting orders, issued under sections 8 (a), 10 (a), and 16, which require installation of the uniform system of accounts, reclassification, and original cost determination, and annual and statistical reports. To these orders, East Ohio objects because the cost of compliance is claimed to exceed $1,500,000, and on the ground that the data sought can have relevancy, if to anything, only to the regulation of its local rates, a function reserved to the State of Ohio.

"To sustain these objections, we would have to shut our eyes to all provisions of the Natural Gas Act, save those relating only to rates. For example, uniform accounting is necessary to effective regulation under section 7. And original cost is a necessary incident to the establishment and maintenance of such a uniform system. In this connection, the legislative history of the Natural Gas Act indicates that, in 1935, the investment accounts of East Ohio reflected write-ups amounting to $15,454,511.65.

"One of the objections to these orders is that requests for accounting data and requirements that accounts be kept may not extend beyond facilities subject to our jurisdiction under the act. This argument, however, the Commission has previously considered and rejected (*Re Billings Gas Co., et al.* (G-152, G-153, G-154), 2 F. P. C. 288, 289-290, 35 P. U. R. (N. S.) 321; *Re Northwestern Electric Co.* (IT-5642), 2 F. P. C. 327, 330-331, 36 P. U. R. (N. S.) 202). To the position there taken, we adhere.

"As to cost of compliance, that alone is no bar. Furthermore, we believe that effective regulation in the public interest provided for by Congress, the objective of the orders, is justification for legitimate cost of compliance. And, in any event, the unsupported estimate of cost of reclassification and original cost studies is not convincing, for our experience with other companies with greater property investment indicates that this estimate is considerably exaggerated.

"Finally, protection of the public interest requires uniform accounting by natural-gas companies, as was contemplated by Congress in the Natural Gas Act. To provide effective regulation of such companies, we must have information available from a uniform system of accounts. Otherwise, such regulation cannot be maintained on a national basis."

It appears from Administrative Order No. 44 of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio that on April 15, 1942, before the FPC had taken any action in the proceeding, the Ohio Commission ordered that the system of accounts prescribed by the FPC for natural gas companies be made applicable to natural gas companies operating within the State of Ohio if they or their affiliates are or may be subject to the jurisdiction of the FPC. Form No. 10 filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission by Consolidated Natural Gas Co., parent of East Ohio, showed that East Ohio had adopted the FPC system of accounts in 1942 pursuant to an order of the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio. Thus it appears that East Ohio has, since 1942, been following the FPC system of accounts pursuant to a requirement of the Ohio Commission. If this is the case, it is difficult to see why East Ohio has at the same time been maintaining, in the courts, in the halls of Congress and through various publications, that the FPC has been encroaching upon the jurisdiction of the Ohio Commission through insisting that East Ohio follow the Federal Accounting System with a resultant compliance cost of from $1,500,000 to $2,000,000.

If the cost analysis section of 5 (b) has the value that Ohio communities attribute to it and if the accounting requirements are as important to the FPC work, and as little burdensome as this summary indicates, I believe we should not now exempt such distributors with extensive trunk-lines from the act as S. 1084 would do.

ALTERNATIVE TO S. 1084

With the assistance of the Legislative Counsel's office I have prepared an amendment in the nature of a substitute which would preserve the desirable exemptions for stub-lines and metropolitan area facilities, but would not apply to distributors with extensive, interstate trunk lines.

The so-called stub-line cases while analagous in principle to East Ohio are very different on a factual basis. Most of them, according to my information, are short lines of from three to fifteen miles in length which run from the interstate pipeline to serve a single community or two or three small communities. The question of service to adjacent communities could hardly arise in any of these cases. The grounds for the metropolitan area exemption seem equally clear.

My proposed amendment accomplishes these exemptions by permitting the FPC on its own motion, or requiring it on application, to exempt from FPC jurisdiction persons engaged in the local distribution of natural gas and also engaged in the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce or in the sale or transportation for hire of natural gas in interstate commerce, provided the facilities therefore are confined to a community or metropolitan area and a zone adjacent thereto, and provided also that the Commission find, based on certain criteria the particular transportation or sale does not require regulation by the Federal Power Commission in order to protect the public interest.

It will be noted that the amendment does not refer to facilities within a single State, as does S. 1084, and that the exemption is limited to companies who distribute natural gas within a community or metropolitan area and a zone adjacent thereto. This language would exempt the small stub-line companies but would leave, subject to Commission jurisdiction, the large interstate pipelines such as East Ohio and several other companies similarly situated. There are a number of instances where local distribution companies serve on both sides of State lines and the language of the amendment would serve to exempt such companies whereas S. 1084 would not.

The language leaves to the FPC the same discretion as to all cases that is embodied in S. 1084 as to the New York situation which is dealt with in the metropolitan area proviso.

CONCLUSION

If the Senate takes any action on this measure at this session, I hope it will go no further than the amendment I am proposing. It is designed to accomplish the objectives on which all parties seem agreed. It defers the objectionable, or at least debatable, aspects of the measure for more considered action after hearings on the questions which I have discussed and which were raised by Commissioner Buchanan and the Bureau of the Budget. I present this amendment in the hope that we shall not surrender Federal authority that is important to the continuing protection of consumers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1952.

Hon. THOMAS C. BUCHANAN,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Mr. Leon M. Fuquay.)

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: This will acknowledge receipt of the copy of a report which you transmitted to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 1084, a bill to amend sections 1 and 2 of the Natural Gas Act which bill is in the nature of a substitute for S. 1084, introduced in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. Your report included draft language proposed as a substitute for the above measures.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the Natural Gas Act so as to exempt the East Ohio Gas Co. and other gas companies similarly situated from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. In addition, the proposed substitute to S. 1084 would amend the Natural Gas Act so as to permit the Commission, under certain conditions, to exempt from its jurisdiction certain facilities serving metropolitan areas.

As your report notes, the transportation of natural gas by East Ohio was held by the Supreme Court in *F. P. C.* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.* (338 U. S. 464), to subject East Ohio to regulation under the Natural Gas Act. The Bureau of the Budget does not believe that the justification for relinquishing jurisdiction over companies situated as East Ohio has been made clear. We understand that the Federal Power Commission, under existing authority, has jurisdiction over various aspects of companies such as East Ohio and can require such companies to follow specified accounting practices and to submit required reports. The enactment of legislation divesting the Federal Power Commission of this jurisdiction might have the effect of hampering the Commission in carrying out its responsibilities under the Natural Gas Act.

We recognize that legislation which would exempt the so-called stub lines from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction may be desirable. However, we do not believe that it has been demonstrated that it is necessary in dealing with the stub lines problem to exempt from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction companies such as East Ohio, which operate an extensive network of major trunk lines and whose operations may exert a substantial influence on the Commission's regulatory activities under the Natural Gas Act. In the absence of information justifying the proposed substitutes to S. 1084, which exempt companies such as East Ohio from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, you are advised that we cannot recommend enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the so-called New York facilities amendment.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER W. JONES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

DR. BION R. EAST

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on September 7, 1948, Dr. Bion R. East accepted appointment as Assistant Chief Medical Director for Dental Service of the Veterans' Administration. Dr. East reluctantly severed his connection with Columbia University to accept this invitation to public service in the interest of the veteran and the taxpayer. At Columbia he was associate dean, faculty of medicine, and executive officer, department of dentistry, an assignment to which he was particularly well fitted by his years of experience in the private practice of dentistry, public health, and professional educational fields. At present he is on leave of absence from the university as professor of dental public health practice in the school of public health.

The invitation to head the Dental Service of the Veterans' Administration presented a challenge and an opportunity to work for the improvement in the health services rendered to veterans. Although his acceptance entailed sacrifices and meant a heavy burden on his time and energy, personal considerations were not allowed to interfere in his decision.

There can be no question that his selection was most fortunate, and that the interests of the veteran and the Government, during his tenure, have been served in a very outstanding manner. Although prevented by some legislative and administrative blocks from fully accomplishing his objectives, his untiring efforts have been responsible for many improvements in the Dental Service. These include:

The appointment of outstanding specialists as consultants for use in furthering the training of full-time dentists, in providing veterans with efficient modern dental care;

The establishment of a training program which provides for post-graduate training of full-time employees at universities, and the use of recognized authorities in special fields for lectures at Veterans' Administration installations;

The development of the VA dental residency program at selected hospitals. This program is now under way at several stations, and is to be expanded;

The creation of a prosthetic training center in Washington, D. C., for advanced training of dentists and dental technicians in this field;

The planning and development of a dental training center, to be located in one of the new Chicago VA hospitals for training of VA dentists in oral diagnosis, periodontia, oral surgery, operative and prosthetic dentistry;

The reduction of dental outpatient treatment backlogs, which had formerly caused great delay in treatment of veterans, to an almost current state at this time. The use of VA clinics in providing dental examinations has allowed greater choice by the veteran of home town dentists for his treatment;

An increase in professional efficiency, by bringing into better balance the ratio of subprofessional to professional personnel, with a resultant conservation of professional man-hours;

Improved diagnostic service in VA hospitals by initiating a change in policy which now requires dental examination of all hospitalized veterans wherever possible;

Improved integration of the dental service in the over-all health services of the Department of Medicine and Surgery to insure more effective treatment for the veteran beneficiary. This includes a program for integrating dental care of psychotic and tubercular patients with their over-all treatment to expedite their return to useful citizenship or to increase the comfort and over-all health of those for whom a cure cannot be anticipated;

More effective field supervision, with an increased number of supervisory visits to installations and an over-all decrease in expenditures for this purpose.

Many other reforms which have been made have resulted in improved service to veterans, increased morale of dental service employees, more effective use of funds appropriated for dental care of veterans, and improved relations with the public and the profession.

Dr. East has been commended by resolution of the trustees of the American Dental Association, the American Association of Dental Schools, as well as by several State dental societies, for his sound administration of the dental program of the Veterans' Administration.

His unimpeachable philosophy of service, his drive, and his unlimited energy have served to generate a profound respect and cooperation from the employees under his supervision, who appreciate his leadership and guidance.

While the Dental Service of the VA is under his direction, the administration of the dental affairs is being accomplished in a most efficient and capable manner.

ASSOCIATED PRESS REVIEW OF CENSORSHIP PRACTICES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). As chairman of the Anti-Censorship Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, the present occupant of the chair calls the attention of the Senate to a review of censorship practices in all parts of the world, as recently compiled by the Associated Press; and the Chair asks unanimous consent that a short statement be printed in the RECORD, together with an Associated Press article, as published in the Detroit Free Press.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOODY

As chairman of the Anti-Censorship Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I call attention to a review of censorship practices in all parts of the world, recently compiled by the Associated Press.

At no time in our history has the free flow of facts from their source to the people been more important than now when the liberties of men and women everywhere are threatened by the international conspiracy known as communism.

Fortunately, here in the United States, the press, the radio, the television screen, and other media of communication are free, and they are going to remain free. But in other areas of the world, where people desire their freedoms as passionately as we do, the facts never reach the people; they are smothered and stamped out by the cruel heel of dictatorship.

The suppression of news in nations behind the iron curtain is the factor primarily responsible for the enslavement of those peoples, for that is what their present condition amounts to—enslavement. Such practices have spread to dictatorships in this hemisphere, as indicated by the accompanying Associated Press article.

The United States is the leader of the free world and must remain so by vigorous use of its influence. In this field of freedom of information, our Government, through the United Nations, should exercise its maximum pressure against outrages against the principles essential to liberty. Any government which is afraid to let its people have the facts by that act stamps itself as an oppressive government.

I hope those countries where suppression of freedom of information is reported in the Associated Press will reexamine their policy; and that the United States Government will use the full weight of its influence to induce them to do so. This should be one of the most important yardsticks guiding the attitude of our Government toward other governments.

[From the Detroit Free Press of June 29, 1952]

CENSORSHIP TIGHTENS NOOSE ON FREEDOM

Pressures against the free flow of world news increased in the first 6 months of this year. There were some heartening victories, however, by alert newsmen and militant editors over the foes of a free press.

This is disclosed in a semiannual survey of censorship and other conditions hampering the flow of news.

The Soviet Union and Communist China, and the nations that follow Moscow in blind obedience continue to choke off as tight as ever the flow of news from great areas of the world.

In lieu of news comes a constant barrage of propaganda. But this is a challenge to alert newsmen, who patiently sift through thousands of words to find clues as to what is really going on.

In general, the survey shows no censorship easing in countries where it is customarily employed. In some instances this censorship has tightened. Colombia and Venezuela in South America are examples.

A revolution in Bolivia April 9 brought about the death of the biggest newspaper in that country, La Rozon. The new regime of Victor Paz Estenssoro padlocked the newspaper. He promised to reopen the plant, but on June 4 the paper's management gave up and discharged its 300 employees.

Observers could not help but draw a comparison with La Prensa, the independent Argentine newspaper closed down last year by the regime of President Juan Dan. Peron.

In Hamilton, Bermuda, the editor of the Royal Morning Gazette, Edward Thomas Sayer, defied an order of the speaker of the House against publishing an account of a public debate on foreign exchange control.

In Chile, a successful campaign was waged by the press against the arrest of four newsmen for criticizing a cabinet minister. The

men were released and the cabinet minister resigned.

The situation in detail around the world, as revealed in the Associated Press survey:

COMINFORM NATIONS

Censorship in the Soviet Union remains severe for the handful of foreign correspondents in Moscow. They can't send out anything on arrests of Soviet officials or citizens unless it first appears in Soviet newspapers. Also banned are stories on air, train, or ship disasters; specific information on Soviet prices or wages; comment on crowded housing conditions; details on the personal lives of Soviet leaders.

As for the satellite nations, most of the news comes from official radio broadcasts or copies of the rigidly controlled press which reach the outside world.

The domestic press in Russia and all the Cominform nations remains totally subservient to the Communist dictatorship.

WESTERN EUROPE

France: The press is free and there is no censorship of outgoing dispatches. However, four times in May, Communist or pro-Communist newspapers had whole editions seized on charges of inciting to public disorders.

The Government-owned posts, telephone and telegraph system reserves the right to monitor and censor dispatches.

Switzerland: No censorship. The constitution guarantees freedom of the press. A parliamentary commission is studying a proposal to spell out certain limits within which action could be taken against anyone misusing freedom of the press.

Belgium: No censorship.

Italy: There is no censorship on outgoing news and no formal control over newspapers inside the country.

However, ANSA, the semiofficial news agency, is under close political control of the Christian Democrat government and gives preferred treatment to news regarded as favorable to the regime.

Foreign newsmen have noticed an increasing tendency by the Government to press for friendly stories.

Western Germany: Foreign correspondents and the German press are not censored. Occupation authorities have not exercised this year their right to ban publications which endanger the prestige and security of their military forces.

Eastern Germany: The Communist-led government and the Soviet Control Commission enforce strict control of newspaper content along Communist lines. Editorials, news stories, and pictures must conform to directives issued by the government.

Yugoslavia: Premier Marshal Tito's Communist regime employs no direct censorship of outgoing dispatches but it keeps a close check on what is printed abroad. Frequently foreign newsmen who criticize Government policy find themselves attacked in the official press for nonobjective reporting.

Austria: There is no censorship of outgoing dispatches by accredited foreign correspondents.

The Netherlands, Luxemburg, Greece, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Denmark: No censorship.

Portugal: No direct censorship of foreign correspondents, but they are held responsible for what they write. The domestic press is Government-controlled.

Spain: No censorship of outgoing dispatches, but newsmen are held responsible for what they send. The domestic press cannot criticize fundamental laws of the Franco regime or Franco himself, or the Roman Catholic Church.

Provincial officials and cabinet members are not beyond criticism, however.

BRITIAN AND THE COMMONWEALTH

The United Kingdom and the Commonwealth nations of Canada, New Zealand, and Australia maintain their tradition of no censorship.

For the first time in the history of the 42-year-old Union of South Africa, a newspaper, the Guardian, a pro-Communist weekly, was shut down in May because of its political opinions.

Editor Brian P. Bunting denied his paper was a party organ and 5 days later came out with a new weekly, the Clarion, which looked and read just like the Guardian.

The Government took no further action.

India: No censorship of outgoing or incoming dispatches and no attempt to control news at the source. Last year Parliament approved a press law giving the Government power to control news which is "an incitement to crime."

Pakistan: There is no direct censorship of outgoing or incoming dispatches but there is some Government "supervision" of the writing of news by Pakistan nationals.

Ceylon: The Government has at times tried to curb writings of some resident correspondents, especially Indian correspondents writing on the Ceylon-Indian vote controversy.

AFRICA

Tunisia: Censorship is imposed on all incoming dispatches, on everything published in the local French and Arab press.

Censors read all incoming newspapers and frequently ban particular issues.

Outgoing copy is not censored but may be subject to delay and is sometimes "lost."

Algeria: No censorship.

Morocco: No censorship of press or outgoing cables but the latter are usually monitored and often delayed.

FAR EAST

Communist China: The Chinese mainland is still sealed off from the west. Everything sent out is not only censored but is prepared as propaganda for the purpose of deluding, convincing, hiding, or subverting facts.

Formosa (Nationalist China): No censorship of outgoing news. News which is unpleasant to Nationalist rulers is hard to get but there is no restriction against its transmission.

The Philippines: No censorship but the government appears to be tightening up on sources of information.

Japan and Korea: Korean war copy is subject to censorship. There is no censorship of the Japanese domestic press. A rigid press code emphasizes accuracy. In South Korea martial law prevails with the local press under censorship.

MIDDLE EAST

Iran: Foreign correspondents operate under "responsibility" censorship. Outgoing news is not bothered but a correspondent may be called to various ministries to receive complaints about his material.

Turkey: No censorship. But there is a law providing punishment for anyone who harms the dignity of the nation.

Israel: The consorship imposed since the fighting in 1948 is still in effect but refers only to military matters.

Afghanistan: The government says it has no official censorship but foreign correspondents who write anything unfavorable about the present regime have a tough time.

Egypt: Dispatches of foreign correspondents were subject to heavy censorship during the terror riots of last January. Censorship rules are very strict about mention of the royal family, certain top officials, and military matters.

Syria: No official censorship except in times of stress.

Lebanon: The government suspended six papers in June for reporting a government action against Al-Anba, organ of the opposition Socialist Party. The editor of Al-Anba was sentenced to 14 months in jail for libel.

Jordan: There is no continuing censorship but it is applied whenever there is important news about the government.

Iraq: No formal censorship, but foreign newsmen find it hard to get permission to enter the country.

Saudi Arabia: No welcome here for foreign correspondents, even in the area where an American oil company operates.

Libya, The Sudan, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kuwait, Bahrein, Aden: No censorship.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

Thailand and Malaya: No formal censorship, but correspondents may be subjected to pressure from officials.

Indochina: The French military censorship sometimes extends to political subjects.

Burma: No formal censorship.

Indonesia: No censorship of outgoing dispatches. A Dutch national who was AP correspondent in Jakarta was ordered out of the country in May.

CENTRAL AMERICA

Cuba: The successful revolt by the forces of General Batista did not result in censorship.

Haiti, Costa Rica, Mexico, El Salvador: No censorship.

Honduras: No censorship. However, one newspaper, Vanguardia Revolucionaria, of San Pedro Sula, ceased to appear and some radio programs were canceled for attacking the "honor and dignity of individuals."

Guatemala: No censorship except in case of a threat to the security of the Government.

SOUTH AMERICA

Argentina: There is no direct censorship of outgoing or incoming dispatches. But communications companies are held responsible for transmission of undesirable news.

In February the Government decreed that all newsprint imports and deliveries would be made by the Argentine Institute for the Promotion of Trade, which has acquired all newsprint stocks in the country. Rationing of newsprint continues.

A United Press reporter was deported in March.

Uruguay, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador: No censorship.

Venezuela: The unofficial censorship of political news has tightened. Foreign correspondents take their copy to the communications companies, which must clear any having political angles with Government authorities.

The local press submits all political stories to a board of examination prior.

Peru: A July 1949 press decree limits press freedom. The censor keeps a watchful eye on outgoing copy.

Bolivia: La Razon, the newspaper owned by Victor Carlos Aramayo, of one of the country's big mining companies, is a casualty of the revolt by the National Revolutionary Party (MNR) on April 9. It has not appeared since then.

Paraguay: No open press restrictions, but the Inter-American Press Association says that "both in Paraguay and the Dominican Republic the political atmosphere is not conducive to freedom of expression."

Colombia: Censorship tightened the past 6 months in Colombia, which has been under a state of siege since November 1949.

Panama: No censorship. However, two newsmen were arrested during the recent election campaign and sentenced to 15 days in jail for stories considered offensive to the President.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me inquire of the acting majority leader

whether it is the intention to have the Senate take a recess or adjourn after consideration of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That depends upon developments in the House of Representatives. We expect to receive some conference reports. After we conclude consideration of the Executive Calendar, if the Senator from Washington desires to speak—as I have understood he does—we shall be glad to have him speak. Thereafter, if conference reports have not been received, and if no other Senator desires to speak, I shall move that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters in Philadelphia, Pa., reappointment.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert B. Noble, and several other employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). If there are no other reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations from the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Walter L. Greene, of Alabama, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kathryn McHale, of Indiana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Guthrie F. Crowe, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the district of the Canal Zone.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, the nomination of Guthrie F. Crowe, of La Grange, Ky., to be United States district judge in the Canal Zone, is a great honor to the State of Kentucky. Mr. Crowe is a distinguished veteran of World War II, and was commanding officer of a ship which was torpedoed. He and the crew were saved. He is the son of one of the most distinguished attorneys in the State.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], who is unavoidably detained from the floor.

There being no objection, Mr. CLEMENTS' statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CLEMENTS

In the nomination of Guthrie Crowe as United States district judge of the Canal Zone by the President, one of the finest young men in Kentucky's public, or private life, has been chosen. He is the son of the late Robert T. Crowe, who for many years was a distinguished member of the bar in Kentucky and, like his father, is himself an able and conscientious lawyer, having the training, experience, temperament, and judgment essential for the discharge of the duties of a jurist.

During World War II, Guthrie Crowe served in the Navy—both in the Atlantic and the Pacific—having been placed on inactive duty on December 7, 1945, with the rank of lieutenant commander, which he still holds in the Reserve. He was the first World War II veteran to serve in Kentucky as State commander of the American Legion.

It was my privilege, during my tenure as Governor of Kentucky, to appoint him to what I regarded as one of the most responsible appointive positions in our State government, in which exacting assignment he acquitted himself with such efficiency, skill and prudence that he richly merited and won State-wide respect and admiration among the citizens of Kentucky. As in each and every other undertaking—appointive or elective—Guthrie Crowe has done his splendid best, and as United States district judge, district of the Canal Zone, he can be depended upon to discharge his duties in that capacity in a thoroughly conscientious, able, and satisfactory manner.

I attach to this statement an editorial which appeared in the June 30, 1952 edition of the Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., commenting on the pending nomination of Guthrie Crowe, of La Grange, Ky.:

"KENTUCKY MAY BE PROUD OF GUTHRIE CROWE

"Guthrie Crowe, who comes from nearby La Grange, is part of a wholesome new influence in Kentucky politics. As commissioner of the new State police force that replaced the old highway patrol, he has done much to make it a disciplined and efficient body of men. Politics has played a minimum part in its formation and Mr. Crowe's own political ambitions have never interfered with the job he undertook to do. He establishes an excellent pattern in this respect and leaves a challenge for his successor.

"He is a young man to be nominated for the relative backwater of a Federal judgeship in the Panama Canal Zone. But there is no question as to his competence or of the wisdom of the appointment. Kentucky can ill afford to lose a man of this type but all of us must share the pride that must come of his having been singled out early for national preferment."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Guthrie F. Crowe, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the district of the Canal Zone.

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next nomination on the calendar will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ashton H. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

JUDGE OF DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge of the district court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward M. McEntee, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations will be confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of legislative business.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3337) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, com-

missions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 37, 68, and 86 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 17, 19, 46, 48, and 130 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 23, and 26 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 28, and 39 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 41 and 51 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 57 and 66 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4109) to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) authorizing the appointment of a committee to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5198) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 2067) thereon.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS, 1953 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 8983–8989 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona state whether the conference report is the unanimous report of all the conferees on the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was unanimous, except that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] disagreed to the Jensen amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7314, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 2, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 11 to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land over the objection of the local government concerned."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land over the objection of the local government concerned."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 28, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary may contract with cooperatives furnishing classers and other facilities for classing cotton and may pay for such services an amount, some part of which may be in kind, not in excess of the value of the samples."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 39, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 412. Of the total amount made available in this act for personal services above basic rates of the civilian personnel, for transportation of things (other than mail), and for travel of civilian employees, the Secretary is authorized and directed on or before September 1, 1952, to cover into the surplus funds of the Treasury, or return to the capital funds affected, sums equal to 10 percent of the amounts included in the budget estimates for such purposes, less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to:

"(1) employees working in field activities;

"(2) employees paid from funds for research;

"(3) employees of the crop and livestock reporting service;

"(4) the administrative expense limitations for Federal intermediate credit banks

and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury:

"(5) employees paid from funds for marketing services;

"(6) employees of the Rural Electrification Administration;

"(7) employees of the Soil Conservation Service;

"(8) employees of meat inspection and other regulatory services;

"(9) employees of the Forest Service."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 28, and 39.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is the unanimous report of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 8984–8987 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7216, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 2, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 41 and 51 to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, in the discretion of the Commissioners."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ", and the salary of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of grade GS–16 in the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 57 and 66.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see pp. 9022–9026 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1953 — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 8990–8992 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7151, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 2, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 23, and 26 to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That, in computing allotments to States under sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such Act for the current fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment to them as of July 1, 1952, shall be taken into account by (1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allotment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521 (a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section which remains available in the Federal Treasury for payment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously made to it under such section: *Provided further*, That no allotment for this or any succeeding fiscal year under such title V shall be available after the close of such fiscal year except as may be necessary to liquidate obligations incurred during such year."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 28. This deals with the appropriation to the Children's Bureau for grants to States for maternal and child welfare. The House accepted the Senate amendment with the addition of a proviso for clarification.

The motion was agreed to.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9005–9017 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there are very few Senators in the Chamber. So far as I know, no Senator objects to the conference report.

For the most part the conference agreed to the Senate provisions, with the exception that in the organization of the Reserve components the report provides that there shall be a ready and standby and inactive Reserve, with a limit to the size of the Ready Reserve. If any Senator tomorrow wishes to object to any provision of the conference report, the junior Senator from Louisiana will have no objection to reconsidering. I did not believe that there would be any opposition to the conference report. It is upon that basis I hope the Senate will agree to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 8995–9000 of House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. The conference report was unanimously approved by all conferees except the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I talked to him about it in connection with the Jensen amendment, and he knew the report would come before the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7072, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 2, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 37, 68, and 86 to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert: "$1,000,000 of the unexpended balance in this fund on June 30, 1952, is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1953."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment, strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "used", insert "during the fiscal year 1953."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 2 of said amendment strike out the sum "$225,000" and insert "$112,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided further*, That no housing unit constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be occupied by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That the foregoing prohibition shall be enforced by the local housing authority, and that such prohibition shall not impair or affect the powers or obligations of the Public Housing Administration with respect to the making of loans and annual contributions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of said amendment following the words "United States," and before the period, insert a comma and the following: "or to any department, agency, or corporation which does not employ more than two persons at any one time in the performance of functions described in paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 17, 19, 46, 48, and 130.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator would tell us whether any one of the amendments relates to the limitation on the number of public-housing units?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; one amendment limits the housing units for this year to 35,000. The Public Housing Administration cannot go beyond that number without the approval of Congress. They are not limited if Congress approves more units. The question which has been raised by the Senator from Alabama has given me grave concern, because 3 years ago Congress authorized 135,000 units. The conference report limits the number of new starts to 35,000 this year and 35,000 for each year thereafter, unless Congress increases the number. We did the best we could do. The Senator will recall that the House had voted for only 5,000 units. I think it is proper to say that the House conferees were adamant on any number exceeding what I believe was a better than fair compromise—35,000 units.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I certainly do not intend any criticism of the Senate conferees or of the very able chairman.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I did not vote for it. I insisted on the Senate figure of 45,000 units.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have sat in many conferences presided over by the able Senator from South Carolina, and I know the job he does. I realize the futility at this late hour and at this late time in the session of Congress to try to do anything about stopping this provision in the conference report. I do want to call the attention of the Senate to what I consider to be a very bad practice.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Alabama will yield to permit me to make a brief statement, I shall take my seat after making it. I wish the Senator from Alabama to be assured of the fact that in the committee I opposed the amendment, and I did so because the amendment proposed the addition of legislation to the appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I understand and from what I know about the Senator's views on the matter, what I would expect.

Mr. MAYBANK. However, the House was the body which added the legislation to the appropriation bill; and the House even requested a further conference, only last week.

Now the conference report has come to us again.

So I wish the Senator from Alabama, who has labored so hard on public housing legislation, as he has on all housing legislation, to know that so far as I was concerned, I did the best I could, both as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee and as chairman of the conferees, to avoid having such a legislative amendment added to the independent offices appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that is the pending question, Mr. President.

Let me say that I understand that the only amendment about which the Senator from Alabama has spoken is the public housing amendment.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I understand that the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] wishes to speak at this time in regard to another amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, Mr. President; I understand that the Senator from Virginia wishes to make a brief statement at this time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me, to permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the conferees for saving the essence of the Senate provision with respect to the Thomas amendment.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which he would personally make, but for the fact that he has a speaking engagement this evening in Fairfax County.

There being no objection, Mr. BYRD's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

I hope the Senate will not accept the so-called Thomas amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill tampering with Federal employee leave.

I take this position for the following reasons:

1. The amendment is in the nature of permanent legislation attached to an annual appropriation bill providing funds for 1 year.

2. Within the year we have just enacted a new basic Annual and Sick Leave Act, after long and exhaustive consideration by the Standing Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, and thorough consideration on the floor of the Senate. This amendment disturbs the application of that act.

3. In my opinion this amendment would constitute a breach of faith on the part of the Government with its employees, who in good faith have accepted the provisions of the new law as a part of their pattern of living.

4. In its consideration of the independent offices bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee rejected this amendment, and it was not in the bill as it passed the Senate.

5. Some have contended that the amendment would save money. Others have contended that the requirement for additional record-keeping and temporary employment would increase personnel costs. I am reliably advised that the only savings inherent in the amendment would be those resulting from leave lost by employees when it was impossible for them to use it. All other leave would be compensated for whether used or accumulated.

In justice to taxpayers I have repeatedly, and almost constantly, urged reduction in the number of Federal employees through increased efficiency in their employment; and this I shall continue to do at every opportunity. But at the same time in justice to those who work I would adequately and justly compensate all employees who merit it, both in and out of Government, in terms of salaries and wages, in terms of promotion, and in terms of earned leave. I do not think these things should be changed except with proper notice, and proper consideration under proper procedure.

I am familiar with the abuses which attach to excessive accumulation of leave in the Federal Government, and if they are continuing under the new basic act it should be perfected in the orthodox way; not in an appropriation bill. It seems to me that this amendment would penalize those who do not abuse it.

For these reasons I hope the Senate will reject the conference committee proposal to include this controversial leave amendment in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wish to proceed for only a few minutes. I desire to make it clear that I am not directing any criticism at the Senator from South Carolina or at any of the other members of the conference committee or at the Senate itself. I simply wish to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to the practice to which I have referred, which I believe is bad, and which I believe should be discouraged.

In 1949 the Senate passed a measure which constituted basic legislation setting a ceiling on the number of public-housing units to be construed. The average number per annum was set at 135,000, and there was included an escalator provision which would allow that number to be increased when economic conditions justified such action, or to be decreased when that was justified.

Under that escalator provision the number of housing units was drastically reduced last year to 50,000 "starts."

This year the House sent to the Senate a bill providing for a much smaller number—for 5,000, I believe. The Senate voted to increase the number to 45,000. In the conference a compromise of 35,000 was reached. I do not believe anyone could quarrel with that sort of arrangement.

However, I wish to protest against inclusion in this measure of a provision which in effect repeals the Housing Act of 1949 or modifies it to the extent that now, instead of having a variable ceiling averaging 135,000 units a year, we shall have a maximum ceiling of 35,000 units a year. In other words, the Appropriations Committee has taken it upon itself to write legislation which changes materially the basic law. That is bad practice—very bad practice, indeed.

As I understand, the present situation is that whereas this year the President in his budget message recommended to Congress 75,000 units, instead of the 135,000 which normally he would have been expected to recommend, next year, if I correctly understand the situation, the budget will be restricted to a recommendation of not to exceed 35,000 units.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thus, the law has been changed in an appropriation bill. That should not be done. We should see to it that such things do not occur. Similar action could be taken in respect to any other piece of proposed legislation reported by a legislative committee and subsequently enacted into law.

The able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, has the tremendous job of submitting to the Senate from time to time bills and other measures relating to rivers and harbors, flood control, highways, public works, and similar matters. If in connection with such measures action were taken similar to the action about which I now complain, the program in connection with such measures could be completely changed, even after the program had been arrived at after long and careful study by the committee. Similar action could be taken in the case of every other legislative committee and the measures reported by it and subsequently enacted into law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have to return to the Appropriations Committee, where we are working on the supplemental appropriations bill. I have a conference report to submit, and I believe its consideration will require only about 3 minutes. I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama will be so kind as to yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to submit that conference report.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take more than 3 minutes myself.

I also wish to state for the RECORD that this measure contains an amendment similarly relating to the public-housing program. That amendment prohibits any person who is a member of an organization designated by the Attorney General as subversive from occupying a housing accommodation in a public-housing project.

No one would complain if the provision were general in application; that would be all right; but, Mr. President, is it not passing strange that whereas the Government is much more deeply obligated in and concerned with housing bills under the FHA program or the VA guaranteed home-loan program, no one thinks of writing a similar provision into the legislation relating to that program? Are we to suppose that only the poor who are unable to pay normal rents may be subjected to these conditions?

I wish to protest against such a provision, Mr. President. If we are going to apply such a provision to those who are unable to pay the normal rents, and who thus have to live in low-cost housing, let us apply the same provision to those who rely upon the Government to underwrite 80 percent, 85 percent, 90 percent, or 95 percent of the mortgage on the house which they build or which they buy, and in which they live. Let us apply such a provision straight across the board, or else not apply it at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill, as now reported by the conference committee, contains in the authorizing provision relating to the Public Housing Administration a proviso reading as follows:

Provided further, That no housing unit constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be occupied by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General: *Provided*, That the foregoing prohibition shall be enforced by the local housing authority, and such prohibition shall not impair or affect the powers or obligations of the Public Housing Administration with respect to the making of loans and contributions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

Mr. President, unfortunately this particular provision technically was not in conference, and therefore the committee of conference was unable to make any change in this provision, although, for reasons which I shall explain in a moment, the committee felt that this provision should be changed.

Since this provision relates only to the low-rent public housing program, it applies to less than 5 percent of the total housing program. It was apparent, therefore, to the members of the committee of conference that this statutory prohibition against having Communists or other subversives occupy governmental-assisted housing, applied only to this small fraction of the total housing produced with Government assistance. In addition, it would affect only the poor Communists and subversives, and would not in any way affect the well-to-do Communists.

Mr. President, of course the ones we should really be afraid of are the rich Communists. The poor Communists make noise and confusion; the well-heeled Communists perpetrate the in-

sidious ideas and the evil and traitorous plans.

All of us felt, of course, that if any such provision were to be included, it should be applied uniformly to any housing which the Government assists directly or indirectly, if it is to be a really effective provision.

Mr. President, no one knows better than does the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has fought so steadfastly against the Communists, that all Communists should be put in jail. On the other hand, if such a provision as the one to which I have just referred in the pending measure is to be made, it should be applied uniformly in the case of any housing for which the Government provides either direct or indirect assistance.

In any event, it obviously would make much more sense to apply the prohibition to 95 percent of the Government-assisted housing and let the other 5 percent escape than to apply it, as this provision does, to only 5 percent of the total and let the other 95 percent escape.

As a result, the committee of conference, within the limitations on its authority, sought to remedy this defect in the provision included in the act as best we could. We therefore indicated clearly in the conference report that we felt very strongly that the principle embodied in this proviso should be made applicable and applied uniformly to all housing assisted by the Federal Government by loan, grant, insurance, guaranty, or otherwise. Also, the report of the committee of conference specifically requests every agency of the Government which assists housing in any way to adopt and put into effect procedures which, insofar as practicable, will apply this principle to their programs, to put out and keep out Communists, whether they be in FHA housing, whether they be in FHA insured housing, VA guaranteed housing or in section 608 or section 207 rental projects or any other federally aided housing. They all ought to be in jail. But there was no reason for an amendment merely proposing to keep them out of public housing.

Therefore, I want to say to the Members of the Senate that I am thoroughly satisfied that the other agencies of the Government which are administering programs for insuring or guaranteeing loans for housing, such as the Federal Housing Administration, the Veterans' Administration, and the Farmers Home Administration of the Department of Agriculture, can, without any serious difficulty, adopt procedures which will make this principle apply effectively to their programs. I think it is entirely practicable for any of such agencies by regulation to provide that they will not guarantee or insure, nor will they contract to guarantee or insure, any loan made for any housing unit unless the owner or owners of such housing unit agree or, in the case of any loan which is guaranteed or insured, the lender—banks are included—agrees to require the owner or owners of such housing unit to agree, that, prior to the admission of any person to occupy any such housing unit or prior to the sale of any such housing unit, such owner or owners will obtain from the prospective occupant or purchaser, and furnish to such department, agency or instrumentality, a certificate that he is not a member of any organization designated by the Attorney General as subversive. There will be no uncertain words in this report, the result of which might be that the poor people would be penalized while rich Communists live in luxurious FHA apartments—should there be any; and there should not be any in or under the Federal Housing Administration, or anywhere else.

I can see no practicable difficulty involved in such a procedure. Therefore, I shall certainly expect the agencies to comply with the clear intent of the Congress in this matter. I also want to call attention to the fact that such a procedure when put into effect by the agencies would in no way impair or affect the powers and obligations of the agencies with respect to the making of loans, or the guaranty or insurance of loans, or contracts with respect thereto.

I want to assure the Members of the Senate that the committee of conference was keenly aware of its responsibility in a matter such as this and that were it not for the limitations upon our authority, I think certainly we would have changed the proviso included in the act so that the law itself would expressly apply to all Government-assisted housing. However, since we could not do that, but being entirely aware of our responsibility, as I have indicated, we did the best we could by requesting the agencies to take appropriate steps to accomplish the same purpose and, as I have indicated, there is really no question but what if they desire to comply with the intent of the Congress in this respect, they have the power to do so and they can do so.

MR. BENTON IN WISCONSIN, A THOUSAND MILES AWAY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, recently the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] made a speech in the State of Wisconsin, to portions of which I take considered exception. As a result of the speech made in Wisconsin, on yesterday I addressed to the Senator from Connecticut a letter which I now wish to read:

JULY 1, 1952.

The Honorable WILLIAM BENTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR BILL: The reference you made to me in Wisconsin the other day was unnecessary, uncalled for, and just plain foolish. If time permits before adjournment, I shall briefly talk to you from the floor of the Senate. You will be advised of the hour when I speak.

Though we have often differed on public questions, we have been impersonal in the treatment of our differences and I have never publicly mentioned your name except in your presence. I was surprised and disappointed by your Wisconsin comments concerning myself and other Senators who have disagreed with you while never doubting your sincerity or criticizing you by name as a person. In the Senate you endeavor to be known as one who believes in fair play and one who frowns on smear tactics. In my view, you have now earned the right to be known as a political charlatan.

In all seriousness, I urge you to compaign against me in Washington State. I will gladly take the stump with you at any time and in any place. I am reminded of those several occasions when we have shared radio programs together. In those cases I was amused by your willingness to admit how uninformed and unprepared you were. You had better be both prepared and informed if I have the pleasure of finding you in the State of Washington.

In anticipation of our next meeting, I beg to remain,

Most sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN.

Now, Mr. President, there obviously must have been a reason for my writing as I did about the speech, concerning which I have offered nothing up to this moment. I offer it now, in rare good humor, but in all seriousness. I think this RECORD of the Senate ought to indicate, upon occasion, anyway, how the Senator from Connecticut spends his time, and in what fashion. The date line of this portion of a ticker tape is Oshkosh, Wis., and it simply reads as follows:

Senator WILLIAM BENTON (Democrat, of Connecticut), told Wisconsin Democrats President Truman might conceivably seek another term.

He said he didn't think Mr. Truman would run again, "but I guess that he would run—if he had to—to save our party from a candidate who would not run on the great record" of the Roosevelt-Truman administration since 1932.

Parenthetically, I am intrigued to know that the Senator from Connecticut is a monitor concerning the question of how Members of the Senate, other than myself, not only should act but must act, within his party; otherwise they are likely, if he has anything to do with it, to be promptly executed, or excommunicated. The ticker continues:

The Senator, a close political friend of Mr. Truman, dealt out some licks for the "Dixiecrat," wing of his own party and unloaded some caustic remarks about the Republicans, especially his archpolitical enemy, Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, in whose home State he was speaking.

BENTON included MCCARTHY, in "the terrible sextet"—six GOP Senators seeking reelection this year. Besides the Wisconsin Senator, who has sued him for $2,000,000 in a libel and slander action, BENTON named in "the terrible sextet" Senators JOHN W. BRICKER (Ohio), HARRY CAIN (Washington), JAMES P. KEM (Missouri), WILLIAM E. JENNER (Indiana), and GEORGE W. MALONE (Nevada).

It is interesting, is it not, to inquire as to the origin of the characterization "terrible sextet"? The item continues:

"Any similarity between the party of Abraham Lincoln and the party of JOE MCCARTHY is purely coincidental." BENTON said. "It's a semantic accident."

When the Senator from Connecticut finds it convenient, I would appreciate it if he would give the Senate an adequate and clear explanation of the expression "semantic accident." Does the Presiding Officer of the Senate know what the phrase means? I am satisfied

that he can do it, because of his experience with words contained in the Encyclopedia Britannica and other such media of information, as he has been so familiar with them during a good many years in the past. I continue:

The Republicans are calling on the shades of Abraham Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt, but unfortunately they are today the party of BRICKER, CAIN, KEM, JENNER, MALONE, and MCCARTHY.

I find the phrase interesting, "any similarity between the party of Abraham Lincoln," and some of the members of the Republican Party today. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Connecticut to point out the similarity between the Senator from Connecticut and Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, and, for example, Woodrow Wilson. I continue:

BENTON said Democrats have their work cut out, however.

"We must lick the Dixiecrats in Chicago as a preliminary to the TAFT-ites and MCCARTHY-ites in November," he said.

Mr. President, if it is the wish of the Senator from Connecticut to destroy the effectiveness and certainly the outstanding loyalty and devotion to their ideals of those members within his own party called the Dixiecrats, he is at liberty to try it; but, should they have any need to be defended—which I doubt completely—the Senator from Washington, with great pride, will do what he can to defend them, within the Democratic Party, from the attacks of the Senator from Connecticut. I continue:

Of Mr. Truman's plans, BENTON said:

"The President does not want to run again. I don't want him to run. He is determined not to run."

But then he "guessed" Mr. Truman would, if the party nominates a candidate who disavows the New Deal-Fair Deal program.

At least I compliment the Senator from Connecticut upon making it publicly known as to precisely what he is now, politically, and what he expects to be in the future, even though he must overlook no opportunity to do injury and inflict suffering upon some very outstanding men within his own party—those whom the Senator from Connecticut took occasion, in Wisconsin, a thousand miles from here, to call "Dixiecrats." I continue:

But, BENTON continued, "I do not think he will run, because I am positive we Democrats will nominate the right candidate, a candidate who will run on the Roosevelt-Truman record and who will assure us of victory."

BENTON said, "The Republicans seem to have a genius for snatching defeat out of the jaws of victory."

But, he said, "I am confident we shall not try to rival them or outdo them at this stage of the game by nominating a candidate who fails to accept our great, progressive record in its entirety."

BENTON termed MCCARTHY a "sleight-of-mouth artist" and as a "Joseph-come-lately" in the fight against communism.

I presume that the Senator from Connecticut will restate those comments to the Senator from Wisconsin tomorrow.

I read further:

He said that MCCARTHY, despite his communism-in-Government campaign, has had nothing to do with the cases of Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Julian Wadleigh, William Remington, or the trial of 11 Communist leaders in New York.

To what extent the Senator from Connecticut is correct about the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] I am completely unable to say, but this I do know, that the Senator from Wisconsin has staked his complete future political record in a devoted, constant, and continuing effort to rid this Government of Communists, be they the 11 Communists in question or not, or be they the others to whom reference was made by the Senator from Connecticut.

One further thing I know: If the Senator from Wisconsin has not had as much to do with ridding this Government of Communists as he would like to see done, what has the Senator from Connecticut had to do with Alger Hiss, Judith Coplon, Julian Wadleigh, William Remington, or the trial of 11 Communist leaders in New York? Has any Member of the Senate ever heard the Senator from Connecticut rise to his feet before this body and make any reference, complimentary or otherwise, to Alger Hiss? It is unbecoming, I think, for anyone who has never raised his voice with reference to Alger Hiss, to raise that voice a thousand miles away from the Senate against a Member of the Senate who has raised his well-intentioned voice on literally scores of occasions.

As I said in my letter to the Senator from Connecticut, "Please favor me by coming to the State of Washington."

I wanted to write a brief letter. I can extend it now, because if the Senator from Connecticut is not interested tonight in talking about what steps he has taken to rid this Government of such persons as Alger Hiss, he certainly will be required to express himself on that and other related subjects, should he favor the junior Senator from Washington by coming to the State which I so very proudly represent.

I resume reading:

He said MCCARTHY "has been a sleight-of-mouth artist, who, by the technique of the big lie oft repeated, has managed in some quarters to create an illusion that it was he who was responsible for the effort to rid the Government of Communists."

The phrase "sleight-of-mouth artist" is perhaps an apt phrase; but a gentleman who has spent his mature life, or much of it, in the advertising business, which is a legitimate business, becomes, does he not, facile with phrases?

Mr. President, if I am able to do so, I shall certainly attend the committee meeting tomorrow to listen to the Senator from Connecticut tell the Senator from Wisconsin what the former means by the other being a "sleight-of-mouth artist."

Mr. President, I am a friend of the Senator from Wisconsin. I do not believe, nor have I ever heard the Senator from Wisconsin say, that he and he alone was responsible for present-day efforts to rid this Government of communism. All I know is that he has done his best to encourage those in executive authority to get rid of those who premeditatedly and admittedly seek to destroy the fiber, the soul, and the character of the greatest Republic this world of ours has ever known.

I draw no particular significance from this fact, Mr. President, but, again, I found it interesting. I picked up the Congressional Directory this afternoon to learn a little more about the background of those whom the Senator from Connecticut characterized, in Wisconsin, as being the terrible sextet. Though I have served with all of them for the better part of 6 years, I thought I might have overlooked something in their background which might have been heinous, and terrible and it might be disclosed in the Congressional Directory.

Some people serve their country in the Armed Forces of America; others serve the Nation in other and equally laudable ways. In the latter category one finds conspicuously the Senator from Connecticut. I am not raising a question about his patriotism or his loyalty. It is unimportant to me that he never found it convenient or perhaps possible to serve in the Armed Forces. That was and is and continues to be his own business.

Perhaps there is no significance in the fact that when the Senator from Connecticut was determining who was going to be within his "terrible sextet" he made certain—or it may have been merely a coincidence—that each of those whom he was going to attack in Wisconsin had served his country as best he could in the Armed Forces.

For those of my colleagues who have not recently reread the Congressional Directory, I would encourage them to do so. I think it is very refreshing to go back occasionally and find out more about those with whom we serve and, in most instances, so willingly. I chuckle to myself when I say that we actually can determine more about the Senator from Connecticut from reading his autobiography in the Congressional Directory than we can determine about anyone else, for its length is approximately twice that of the space occupied by any other Member of the Senate.

I am not interested in that autobiography. I am almost inclined to put it into the RECORD where it will speak plainly for itself, but I shall leave that to its author.

I shall, however, partly because I am devoted to him and partly because I consider him to be an outstanding American, say that I was distressed by the inclusion in the "terrible sextet" of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. It will not be wasting the time of the Senate of the United States to make several factual references, by way of compliment, to a great American who the Senator from Connecticut, by name, characterized as being "terrible."

The Congressional Directory, at page 102, covers in one of the most brief autobiographies of all those included, the following references to JOHN W. BRICKER:

Mr. BRICKER "served as a first lieutenant and chaplain in the First World War; has practiced law in Columbus since 1920 except when holding public office; served as a member of the Public

Utilities Commission of Ohio for 3 years; attorney general of Ohio for two terms; Governor of Ohio for three terms; was Republican candidate for Vice President in 1944."

As I said at the beginning, so now, I do not speak in anger so much as in disappointment. But I am in part indignant that any Member of the United States Senate would dare, either here or in Wisconsin, or anywhere else, to characterize an American possessed of one of the greatest public records in America's history as being "terrible" in any sense whatsoever. There are things done which the Senator from Washington has no intention of forgiving. Never do I intend to forgive a statement which characterizes that great American, JOHN BRICKER, as being "terrible."

Who are the others? Well, there is JOE MCCARTHY. He is terrible, so says the Senator from Connecticut. Of all the men I have seen defend themselves, the Senator from Wisconsin has been among the more able. I need not spend any time in defending the Senator from Wisconsin. He can take care of himself under any circumstances, and particularly, in any way, shape, or fashion, with the Senator from Connecticut.

However, I should like to reread what some people, called patriots, have said about the Senator from Wisconsin. I have in my hand a citation from C. W. Nimitz, an admiral in the United States Navy, the greatest naval officer in the last war, who on one occasion, I take it to be for cause, had this to say about an American who was then a junior officer in the Marine Corps of the Navy of the United States:

> Capt. Joseph R. McCarthy, United States Marine Corps Reserve, for service as set forth in the following citation:
>
> "For meritorious and efficient performance of duty."

The "courageous devotion to duty" of the Senator from Wisconsin "was in keeping with the highest traditions of the naval service."

Even though the Senator from Connecticut has called the Senator from Wisconsin terrible, I do not find that argument appealing or persuasive in the face of the citation given by a great admiral to a loyal marine captain for meritorious and loyal performance of duty.

Mr. President, I have a great fondness for the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. There are occasions on which I have differed with him strongly, and even fundamentally. But always I have considered the Senator from Missouri to be a man whose character was as exemplary as anyone could wish it to be. He is a man who is God-fearing, honest, and courageous; a man who ventures his political fortunes every day in this Chamber on the basis of his own convictions. I might extend to him many compliments. I would never dare, for it would be false and reprehensible, to place upon him the burden of the word "terrible."

I do not know what the Senator from Connecticut is attempting to accomplish in running around the country for the purpose of raising doubts about the character and integrity or, at least, the reputations of individuals, rather than, as he would always lead us to believe he was devoted to doing while on the floor of the Senate, discussing the issues of the day.

Mr. President, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut is truly qualified to judge who is and who is not terrible. I do not think so, and I am not the slightest bit interested in those who do think so. What I know about the Senator from Connecticut comes by indirection. He makes the point in his autobiography that he has had some connection with the Encyclopedia Britannica. I wish to be absolutely accurate in what I say.

I find on page 19 of the Congressional Directory, written by the Senator from Connecticut, the following reference to the encyclopedia:

> Became chairman of the board and publisher Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., February 1943, and chairman of the board of Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., relinquishing these posts during tenure in State Department and resuming them October 1947.

That reference indicates that as the publisher, the Senator from Connecticut knew exactly what was included in the Encyclopedia Britannica. I was interested in what the Senator's concept of communism was, so I went back to get one of the issues during the early portion of his supervision of that journal. Being a little unsatisfied with what I found, thinking he authorized the inaccurate description of communism at that time because of his inexperience in that field, I studied later issues. I hold in my hand the issue of 1947, which carried this comment about communism:

> In China Communist groups established themselves in the western provinces and fought for agrarian reform and for better educational and sanitary standards. Long hostile to the National Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, they finally made common cause with him against Japanese invasion. Communism in China seemed more an indigenous agrarian revolutionary movement born of the backward conditions of the country and the exploitation of the masses, than an integral part of the worldwide Communist movement which has its centre in Moscow.

We Americans have been fighting those agrarian Chinese reformer Communists in Korea since about the latter part of October 1950. That seems a long time ago. Many men have died, many Americans and many of our allies, since the Chinese Communists wended their farmers' way across the Yalu River to cut down and visit death and destruction on American forces.

I know that this identical reference to communism is carried in later annual issues of the Encyclopedia Britannica. I suppose that fuzzy kind of description of communism entitles the Senator from Connecticut to say publicly in Wisconsin that there are among my associates in the Congress—some think them to be great patriots—some very terrible people whom this Nation must get rid of, else it fails in the achievement of its objectives.

The Senator from Connecticut likewise said in Wisconsin that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] belonged to the "terrible sextette" which must be gotten rid of. The Senator from Nevada is a self-made man. He has grown up in the West. He uses language on occasion which is stubborn, even awkward, often blunt, but nearly always clear. The Senator from Connecticut is the only American I have yet known who has said of the Senator from Nevada, who was a vice national commander of the American Legion—something the Senator from Connecticut would hardly appreciate or understand—that he "is a terrible person."

I have differed with the Senator from Nevada, though I belong to the same party to which both of us owe allegiance, on more occasions than I have differed with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], but I have, first, a respect for the man's determination and honesty, and, secondly, a real affection for the Senator from Nevada.

The Senator from Washington, neither on this occasion nor on any other occasion, intends to let anyone who has so little by way of qualification to judge others characterize those whom I both respect and admire as being terrible.

It has been my impression during some of my experience in the Senate since the junior Senator from Connecticut came to be among us, that he has sought to become the conscience for his Nation. He has always made it plain that he wanted to reestablish in this country a code of high moral and political ethics. He has always stated, in clarion calls, that issues are the important things. He has always let it be known about himself, that he would never be the one to cast the first stone.

The Senator from Connecticut is an entertaining and joyous sort of fellow whose company I willingly state I have enjoyed on many occasions in the past. I do not know that I can be successful in what I now say to the Senator from Connecticut. It is simply that, insofar as it is humanly possible for me to do so, I am going to assist him in becoming interested again in issues rather than men. Insofar as the future is concerned, on each and every occasion when it comes to my attention that he has criticized individuals without what seems to me to be reasonable and legitimate cause, I shall make public mention of that fact and deny, on my own responsibility, that the Senator from Connecticut knows anything about what he is talking about.

Let us use this Wisconsin silliness as an example. The Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Connecticut have had serious disagreements between them for a long time. They have spoken those disagreements in each other's presence on the floor of the United States Senate. There is nothing unusual, nothing indecent, nothing unfair about that. It was perfectly natural—and to some extent courageous, I suppose—for the Senator from Connecticut to go out to Wisconsin to express himself adversely and indignantly about the Senator from Wisconsin and certainly

at a time when the Senator from Wisconsin was not present.

I challenge any Senator—I may be wrong—to rise on this floor now, or after he has read the RECORD, and indicate those occasions on which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], or the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has ever publicly, and off this floor, made a single, solitary personal reference to the Senator from Connecticut. Knowing those gentlemen as I do, it would not be becoming of them; nor do they follow such course as to make malicious references to anyone, including him who wishes to be "holier than thou," unless those references are made in the presence of the person to whom they are addressed.

In the Senate of the United States, in my brief term of 6 years, I have made many friendships. Those friendships will last during the length of my life. I shall guard them zealously. There have also been occasions on which I have sought to end a friendship which, on the basis of someone's conduct, simply is not worth bothering about. I am referring now, and for cause, to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I understand that the acting majority leader has a request in mind to make of me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Washington that the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. HAYDEN, does not yet have available the material he will need. If the Senator will proceed, when he has concluded I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to accommodate the Senator from Arizona at his request whenever he returns to the floor. I was merely expressing the depth of my own disappointment at losing a friend whose company I have enjoyed in a personal way in years gone by. The Senator from Connecticut leaves me no choice. I am not the slightest bit concerned that he included me in any group—he with his background—which he calls "the terrible sextet."

I feel like the Senator from Wisconsin, that we have nothing to worry about from that source.

My distress has come from having the Senator from Connecticut, who believes apparently in the myth of the agrarian Chinese Communist characterizing some of those whom I know to be outstanding Americans as being terrible. It was a foolhardy thing for the Senator from Connecticut to have done in Wisconsin. If he thinks it was not foolhardy, I would urge him to try the same type of smear tactics again.

Mr. President, during the last several years the Senator from Connecticut and I have carried on some infrequent correspondence. I looked it up out of idle curiosity today. I thought for a moment that I would offer it for the RECORD, but then it seemed that it would be a personal approach to what I conceive to be an impersonal subject. That the Senator from Connecticut has over his signature been signally complimentary in times gone by is something that I wish to forget.

I have said nothing about another one of those terrible sextetters. His name is JENNER. He is the Senator from Indiana. Mr. President, there are 96 Members of the United States Senate. If the Senator from Washington had the right to select the personnel who should sit in the United States Senate, he would always make certain that there was a Jenner in it. BILL JENNER, of Indiana, understands and acts by this creed. The individual possessed of courage can sometimes turn out to be a majority.

Mr. President, I have been on this floor among the majority when BILL JENNER thought we were making serious mistakes, and he would fight and literally eat his heart out to show us the error of our ways. I have differed on occasions with the judgment of the Senator from Indiana. Goodness knows, he has a perfect right to differ with mine. But no one, if I can prevent it, will call another great American "terrible."

Mr. President, I want, not my colleagues, for they are aware of it, but more Americans who are not aware of it, to be conscious of the background of the Senator who judges his colleagues to be "terrible."

Mr. President, earlier in my remarks I expressed my surprise over what appears to me to have been the unseeming conduct of the Senator from Connecticut while in Wisconsin. Upon reflection, and after giving more study to the Congressional Directory, as well as to several quotations from the press and the Senator from Connecticut's publicity bureau, I am by no means as surprised as I was. I wish to read all, or a portion, of the biographical sketch of the Senator from Connecticut, which appears in the Congressional Directory. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut, like other Members of the Senate, is completely responsible for what is included in a biography to be printed in the Congressional Directory. If there are any inaccuracies in these references, those concerned may consult the author. I read:

WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Southport, Conn., was born in Minneapolis, Minn., April 1, 1900, the son of Charles and Elma Caroline (Hixson) Benton; attended Shattuck Military Academy, Faribault, Minn., and Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., 1917–18, and was graduated from Yale University with A. B. degree in 1921; while at Yale served in Student Army Training Corps.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. President, but this information indicates that when and if duty and circumstances ever require it, the Senator from Connecticut could become a member of the armed services, as all of the "terrible sextet," to whom the Senator made reference, have been. He might need a refresher course or two, but on the basis of what he learned at Shattuck immediately prior to World War I, and at Yale, immediately following the war, he should be pretty well prepared for the future. That he missed the three wars of his time must be a distressing thought to him.

Worked in New York and Chicago for advertising agencies until 1929, when, in partnership with Chester Bowles (former Governor of Connecticut) founded the firm of BENTON & BOWLES.

They had the ability to make a phrase, and I know from my own knowledge that they did such things extraordinarily well. I read further:

In 1932 established residence in Connecticut where his Benton ancestors had been born for eight generations; resigned as board chairman of Benton & Bowles in 1936 and sold his interest in the firm; became vice president of the University of Chicago in 1937, on a half-time basis, and continued until 1945; served as Assistant Secretary of State in Washington in charge of public affairs from August 31, 1945, to September 30, 1947.

The Senator from Connecticut, a past Assistant Secretary of the State Department, criticizes the Senator from Wisconsin and other Senators. Small wonder, I think. Reading further:

Member of United States delegation at six international conferences, on three occasions as delegation chairman.

If one is going to be in a delegation he had better make up his mind to be the chairman. The Senator, out of six chances, became chairman three times. That is better than par for the course. Few other persons I know could equal such a meritorious public record. He has been helpful in pointing out this great achievement in his autobiography.

I read further:

First General Conference of UNESCO—

In brackets the Senator from Connecticut carefully spelled out United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. That was at Paris in 1946. I read further:

and Second General Conference of UNESCO at Mexico City, 1947; and United Nations Conference on Freedom of Information, Geneva, Switzerland, 1948; member Advisory Committee, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, beginning in 1940, and Vice Chairman, United States Commission, Inter-American Development Commission.

Mr. President, I think I am beginning to understand why the Senator from Connecticut can characterize the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] as being terrible. Perhaps in his travels, which were extensive, he listened more to outside points of view than he gave consideration to domestic appraisals. In having been chairman of three out of six of these delegations he is perhaps qualified to say that a man who has been attorney general of one of the great sovereign States in America for two terms, and who has been a Governor for three terms, is terrible.

I read further from the biography:

Served as Vice Chairman, Committee for Economic Development, and Vice Chairman of CED Research and Policy Committee from 1942 on, except during tenure in State Department.

I do not know what is going to happen to the Senator from Connecticut in his coming campaign. There are those who believe he will not do so well. Should he not do too well, his record in his own language indicates that he leaves the State Department only for temporary periods. I presume he will be made very welcome whenever he cares to return.

I read further:

Became chairman of board and publisher Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., February 1943, and chairman of the board of Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc., relinquishing these posts during tenure in State Department and resuming them October 1947.

Then it says something about his personal business and that he has been awarded several honorable degrees. It then winds up by saying he was appointed to the United States Senate by Gov. Chester Bowles "to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Raymond E. Baldwin, who resigned effective December 17, 1949, and elected November 7, 1950."

Bowles and BENTON—BENTON and Bowles—they are a clever, successful combination through the years.

I am reminded that in his speech in Wisconsin the Senator from Connecticut said he "guessed that Mr. Truman would run if the party nominates a candidate who disavows the New Deal-Fair Deal program."

The Senator now says frankly, "I am a New Dealer and a Fair Dealer." That comment gives me some reasonable measure of surprise. My memory is quite clear with respect to when the Senator from Connecticut became a Member of this body. I thought I had almost remembered what it was he said, but I wanted to be positive that I was accurate, so I had looked up some information which was brought to me.

Following his appointment to the Senate in 1949 he announced that he was a "political independent," and he stated that he would "sit on the Democratic side of the aisle."

In 1952—make no mistake about it—he is a Fair Dealer and a New Dealer, but in his own words, in 1949, when he came to the Senate, he was not certain what he was.

These quotes appeared in a Washington Star article of December 18, 1949. The article consisted mostly of a biography of BENTON, his business experiences, his sojourn in the State Department, and run-in with the Senate and House Appropriations Committees at that time.

The Washington Star of December 1, 1949, stated that BENTON's appointment was a "personal one" and that he was named because Connecticut Democrats could not agree upon any "career Democrat" to replace Senator Baldwin, resigned.

There seems to be some remaining doubt concerning what he is, was, or may become in the future.

I find this reference in a newspaper, which is of some interest to students, on the subject of the Senator from Connecticut. It begins as follows:

An attempt to peddle the talents of Senator BENTON (Democrat, of Connecticut), to the Republican Party in 1947 was revealed yesterday by Representative MORANO (Republican, of Connecticut).

Mr. President, I do not know Representative MORANO. I do not know that what he states is absolutely so, but I am making reference to it in the presence of the person concerned, and he will correct the RECORD if I am inaccurate. I am disinclined to believe in the validity of this comment, because I have read the Senator's biography in which he says, "I am a Democrat." I have read his Wisconsin speech in which he said "I am a New Deal-Fair Deal Democrat." I have read the release he put out in 1949 in which he said, "I am an Independent Democrat."

Now a member of Congress by the name of MORANO says that BENTON was trying to get out of the Democratic Party in 1947. The article written by a Mr. Willard Edwards continues as follows:

BENTON at present is the Truman administration's leading smear propagandist, centering his efforts on a campaign against Senator MCCARTHY (Republican) of Wisconsin, foe of Communists in the State Department where BENTON served as an assistant secretary from 1945 to 1947.

Two men, representing themselves as emissaries for BENTON, approached CARROLL REECE, then chairman of the GOP National Committee, and told him BENTON was seeking the post of publicity director of the committee.

As a member of the Republican Party I feelingly and freely admit that we have a great deal of trouble from time to time. It is nothing, however, to what would have happened if any such offer, if it was made, had been accepted.

REECE confirmed the story. He was told, he said, that BENTON had left his State Department post, burning with a desire for revenge against the Truman administration. The publicity talents of BENTON, a former advertising executive, were available to the GOP, REECE was told.

Reportedly, BENTON was seething with a desire to even the score with the Truman administration because he had been forced to resign from the State Department and felt he had been made the "goat" in the clash between Congress and the administration over the issue of pro-communism in the Department's international information program which he headed. BENTON, it was said, was angry because the administration not only had failed to back him up in the controversy, but had forced him to get out as an appeasement move. In his letter accepting BENTON's resignation, President Truman mentioned BENTON's "difficulties and frustrations."

The Senator from Connecticut was upset by some difficulties and frustrations in his speech in Wisconsin last Saturday.

MORANO said something else of which I have made mention earlier tonight:

Senator BENTON has emerged in the Senate as a champion of ethics in Government with a self-appointed mission to lead the country back to moral and ethical government. He appeared before the Senate Committee on Election Laws, proposing a commission to list the names of people who make contributions of both parties.

MORANO ends with this statement:

His righteous indignation against people who play both sides of the fence is sheer hypocrisy in view of the fact that he himself appears to have been willing to propagandize in behalf of whichever side employed him.

Mr. President, during recent months we have given much thought to, taken some action on, and provided consideration for the subject of communism. As most Members of the Senate know, there has been a move by a good many people throughout the country, whom I personally believe to be very wrong, to repeal the Smith-McCarran anti-Communist law. In a letter written in January 1952, the same Mr. MORANO, a member of the House of Representatives who knows the Senator from Connecticut better than I do, was concerned about the movement to repeal the Smith Act. That was the anti-Communist law under which 11 Communist leaders were recently convicted of advocating the overthrow of the Government of the United States.

Mr. MORANO, seeing no politics in a constant and vigilant fight against communism, addressed a letter to his associate, the junior Senator from Connecticut. In his letter, Mr. MORANO asked the Senator from Connecticut to help him in combating any attempt to repeal the Smith Act.

I quote from a newspaper article by Willard Moore:

In the letter, MORANO said he was aware that BENTON has at times worked closely with the Americans for Democratic Action, and commented:

"I believe that the ADA (which long has barred Communists from membership) is dead wrong in advocating repeal of the Smith Act—a cry set up by the Communists and by groups sympathetic to the Communist cause."

MORANO then appealed for BENTON's help in keeping the Smith law on the books.

In due time, and probably very promptly, the Senator from Connecticut responded to Mr. MORANO's letter and said this:

Thank you for the views expressed in your letter of January 11.

Speaking for myself, I make it a practice not to waste time arguing with Communists because they have demonstrated they never argue in good faith.

The same can also be said of some Members of Congress.

That is a sly sentence. After having said that the Communists never argue in good faith, and for that reason the Senator from Connecticut never argues with Communists, he goes on to say there are Members of Congress who never argue in good faith.

I am not unmindful now that the Senator from Connecticut is he who is an apostle of sweetness and light. He is one who always says that the issue is the thing that counts—never, never talk about a man except to argue with him in his presence on a public question.

That was a very sly and, I think, clever sentence.

May I ask the junior Senator from Idaho, who happens to be sitting here at the moment, if he could tell whether the Senator from Connecticut, in responding to a colleague of his, to a man who was part and parcel of his State's delegation, was for the Smith Act or was against it? Mr. MORANO, the one who received the letter, could not tell. He had asked the Senator from Connecticut a very simple question. He got a very cloudy answer.

Mr. President, I have paid my compliments to the advertising ability of the junior Senator from Connecticut. I am as willing as is the next person to say that a man does not lose his capacity for a particular talent when he moves from private life into public life. I offer but

one example. It ought to be called, I suppose, a tidbit. It is a release—earth-shaking as it is—for Saturday afternoon, October 27, 1951. It went to the press from the office of Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, of Connecticut, room 354, Senate Office Building, Washington. The date line is Washington. Here is the news release. What is its date? October 27, 1951.

On October 27 those Chinese agrarian Communists, who have no connection with an international conspiracy in Moscow, had been spilling the blood of Americans and our friends for better than a year. So here is a pronouncement of great importance to the Nation, as given by the junior Senator from Connecticut, who last Saturday said that six of his colleagues in the Senate were "terrible."

Senator WILLIAM BENTON, discussing the relative merits of campus recreations on Saturday afternoon, offered his opinion today that girls may offer "advantages" over either football or physics.

When one has reason to try to ascertain what offers justification to the Senator from Connecticut to characterize other Members of the Senate as being "terrible," all he has to do is to undertake a little research, and it produces a critic who thinks that girls, on Saturday afternoon, are better recreation than are either football or physics.

Mr. President, let it not be said that I have wasted any of the time of the Senate tonight. I have attempted to do a job that has needed to be done for a long time. This job would be worth doing at any time. Whenever one can point out a phoney he ought to do it.

I have done this job between acts of transacting material business as it has come to the Senate in the form of conference reports.

By way of recapitulation and summary, there are a couple of things the junior Senator from Washington wishes to say. As a candidate for reelection in his own name he does not know that he will be returned to the Senate. I shall do my very best to retain my seat in what I consider to be the greatest opportunity offered to any man or woman on the face of the earth at any age. The respect which I have for this legislative body and the confidence I have in it are beyond description. I may not again have an opportunity to make such a comment.

It is strange indeed, that I am provided with that opportunity by finding it imperatively necessary to be as brutally critical of the conduct of my colleague from Connecticut as I possible can be.

It happens that the Senator from Connecticut is running for reelection. It is not for me to give him any advice. It is not for me to judge whether he will or will not come back to the Senate. I would encourage him however—and I do this against my will—to spend a great deal of time in the State of Connecticut if he aspires to return to the Senate.

I say that I give him that encouragement against my will, because I shall be most disappointed if he does not find it convenient to come out and spend a good long time in the State of Washington. I would like to sit and listen to him deliver in the State of Washington the same speech which he delivered in the State of Wisconsin on last Saturday night.

He and I are both candidates for reelection. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], one of the "terrible sextet," the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], three times governor, and a vice presidential candidate, is a member of the "terrible sextet." The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is another. I am not trying to wave the flag, but BILL JENNER did all he could in two brief years in the last war, as a result of which he was retired for disability.

Then there is the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], another member of the "terrible sextet." They, together with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], are candidates for reelection. I wish each of those five the best of good fortune, because, knowing them so well, I know that they will always serve their country to the very best of their ability.

I have long since stopped worrying about this man on the other side of the aisle, who, if he cannot get rid of the Dixiecrats, who are a pretty proud people themselves, must call other people "terrible"; and if he cannot get away with getting rid of these terrible Republicans, if he is reelected, he will have to gnaw at the entrails of the Dixiecrats who sit in his presence.

So far as the remainder of the night is concerned, I have plenty of places to go, but I am willing to remain here for as long as may be necessary, or go anywhere else, for that matter, should the Senator from Connecticut wish to take the floor and spell out in a little clearer detail why the people of the sovereign States of Wisconsin, Ohio, Missouri, Indiana, and Nevada did not know what they were doing when they selected five loyal, God-fearing men to serve those States in the United States Senate.

Imagine the temerity of anyone, be he smear artist or someone else, who seeks refuge a thousand miles away, when those to be assaulted did not even know that he had been absent, and who, from that vantage point of comparative security and safety, says that those who serve their Nation well are terrible and ought to be eliminated from the Senate of the United States.

I think that for quite a time, so far as the junior Senator from Washington is concerned, he will remember an occasion which arose from something that was evil, because he who did the evil is always prattling about accomplishing the good. "I am holier than thou," states the Senator from Connecticut on every occasion which he can manufacture and he is very skillful in such matters.

I think this is the first time in some time a person in that form has been unclothed; but because of that event I have been given an unexpected opportunity, to say in simple language that the sovereign States concerned have chosen well in BRICKER, MCCARTHY, KEM, JENNER, and MALONE; and though I by no means deny that those States could possibly find within their confines men or women possessed of greater intelligence, knowledge, and wisdom, it is an undeniable fact that the men sent to the United States Senate by those States have never legitimately been characterized as being anything other than what they are—distinguished, splendid Americans in public life.

Mr. President, on a temporary basis I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to be heard, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 o'clock tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 3, 1952, at 9:30 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

FEDERAL HOUSING COMMISSIONER

Walter L. Greene, of Alabama, to be a Federal Housing Commissioner.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

TO BE MEMBERS OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD FOR TERMS OF 3 YEARS, EXPIRING AUGUST 9, 1955

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts.
Kathryn McHale, of Indiana.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Guthrie F. Crowe, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the district of the Canal Zone.

Ashton H. Williams, of South Carolina, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of South Carolina.

JUDGE, DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

Hon. Herman E. Moore, of Illinois, to be judge, district court of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Edward M. McEntee, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John A. Alsbrooks, Sheffield.

ARKANSAS

Carl D. Lynch, Smackover.

CALIFORNIA

Charles Edward Wilson, Keene.
Opal F. Hamilton, Leggett.

GEORGIA

Katherine C. Wimberley, Bainbridge.

HAWAII

Ikuko Jean Nakamura, Ookala.

ILLINOIS

George O. Downer, Downers Grove.
Joseph R. Sester, Genoa.

KANSAS

George K. Shipley, Holyrood.

KENTUCKY

Julian K. Wood, Bagdad.

MAINE

Lawrence M. Glidden, Palermo.

MARYLAND

John F. Stevens, Annapolis.
Edward L. Best, White Hall.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edward J. McCaffrey, Concord.
John F. Murphy, Northampton.
Harold J. Cuff, South Deerfield.
Willard W. Ellis, Yarmouth Port.

MISSOURI

Jerry Crane, Ashland.
James O. Finney, Bucklin.

NEBRASKA

Bruce B. Bohlken, Coleridge.

NEW JERSEY

Harold Vincent Ely, Avon by the Sea.
Eleanor M. Latzo, Dayton.
Joseph P. LaPorta, Williamstown.

NEW YORK

John D. Megivern, Jr., Apalachin.
James W. Maloney, Aurora.
William J. McInerney, Buskirk.
Gerard LeRoy Church, Eaton.
Philip Gerard Donahue, Gardiner.
Myrtle E. Sherman, Genoa.
Audrey Miller, Harris.
Paul A. Lane, Larchmont.
Herman Wood, Long Beach.
Clarence J. Dumas, Malone.
John M. Southard, Massapequa Park.
Ruth M. Darrah, Morrisonville.
Elwyn D. Judd, New Woodstock.
Robert C. Tatem, Old Westbury.
Grace L. Patch, Prattsburg.
James J. Sullivan, Quogue.
Jeannette L. Moran, Rexford.
Peter J. Clark, Richland.
Rene A. Devillers, Schenevus.
Howard C. Green, Sinclairville.
Paul H. Irving, Skaneateles.
John J. Becker, Union Springs.
Gerald W. Churchill, Walden.
Hedwig A. Caldwell, Walker Valley.

OHIO

Albert R. Matuszak, Lorain.

OKLAHOMA

Paul S. Badami, Ponca City.
Opal M. Rone, Smithville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lawrence M. Mulligan, Bristol.
William J. B. Reitz, Cairnbrook.
Howard W. Harrison, Chambersburg.
Homer F. Foreman, Everett.
John A. Duffy, Elwyn.
Alice M. Springer, Glenmoore.
Edmund P. Lawlor, Homestead.
John J. McDonnell, Locust Gap.
Clarence Chester Calvert, Pleasantville.
Charles B. McNamee, Pomeroy.
James Alfred Marquet, Pottstown.
John Alvin Mills, Prospectville.
Paul H. Lewis, Quakertown.
George Clair Cochran, Quarryville.
Homer L. Budinger, Salladasburg.
Kenneth H. Drumheller, Sanatoga.

PUERTO RICO

Olga Rivera de Rodriguez, Gurabo.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Vernon A. Sjerven, Bristol.

TENNESSEE

Oscar V. Smith, Gallatin.
Nedgel R. Leathers, Toone.

UTAH

George E. Brown, American Fork.

WISCONSIN

Walter G. Ready, Bagley.
Roy W. Williams, Brooklyn.
Francis W. Hart, Glidden.
Robert L. Williams, Gordon.
Marie T. Carns, Hazel Green.
Charles W. Kleist, Jr., Horicon.
Alessio C. Loreti, Hurley.
Allen E. Duncanson, Mondovi.
William H. Taft, Necedah.
Byron F. Pope, Phillips.
Vernette M. Means, Rothschild.
John C. Killeen, Slinger.
Frederick E. Shidell, Vesper.

WYOMING

Hugh M. Currah, Shoshoni.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Reverend Cyril Neil McKinnon, S. J., of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., offered the following prayer:

O Most Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, from whom all right authority is derived, and to whom, as to their last end, all actions of individuals and states are directed, grant that the deliberations of this body may be guided by the wisdom of Thy counsels and just judgments. Grant that the fearful responsibilities of this Congress may be discharged in the spirit of divine love.

If the world hate us, we know that it is because we have loved the brethren. For "in this we know the love of God, that He laid down His life for us." Teach us to love not in word nor tongue, but in deed and truth.

May Thy religion be the firm inner wall of our national defense. We fight not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers. In our Declaration of Independence we invoked Thee. We call upon Thee now to preserve us in liberty and peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners; and

H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 3589) entitled "An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled 'Copyrights' with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7800) entitled "An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; and

H. Con. Res. 191. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

SUMMIT LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FORT RENO MILITARY RESERVATION, OKLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1631) to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title to the following-described lands situated in Canadian County, Okla., being a part of the Fort Reno Reservation, is hereby vested in the United States in trust for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Oklahoma:

All of sections 1, 2, 3, and 4, township 12 north, those portions of sections 25 and 26 lying south of the North Canadian River, that portion of the west half of the west half of the northwest quarter of section 26 lying west of the North Canadian River channel change, and all of sections 27, 28, 33, 34, 35, and 36, township 13 north, range 8 west, Indian meridian.

SEC. 2. All of sections 9 and 10 and the west half of section 11 (except that portion which the Secretary of War was directed by the act of May 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 200), to

transfer to the control and jurisdiction of the Attorney General), township 12 north, range 8 west, Indian meridian, are hereby transferred to the control and jurisdiction of the Attorney General, for use in connection with the Federal reformatory at El Reno, Okla.: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this section shall not be construed to deprive or prejudice the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma from asserting such claim or claims for just compensation they may have, if any, for the taking of the lands described in this section.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the governing body of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, may lease or sell all or any part of the south half of section 1 and the south half of section 2, township 12 north, range 8 west, Indian meridian, to the United States for use by the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice in connection with the Federal reformatory at El Reno, Okla. In the event no sale or lease is made to the United States, the lands described in this section, except the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 1, shall be restricted in use to the grazing of livestock.

SEC. 4 (a) Any nonrevocable easement, license, permit, or commitment heretofore granted or made for a specific period of time by the Secretary of War or by the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to certain portions of the lands described in the first section of this act shall continue in effect for the period for which granted or made. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to renew, in his discretion, any such easement, license, permit, or commitment upon such terms and conditions as he deems advisable.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to continue in effect, and to renew, in his discretion, any easement, license, permit, or commitment with respect to the lands described in section 1, which is revocable or of indefinite duration, if, in his opinion, such continuance or renewal is in the public interest.

SEC. 5. With respect to the buildings and other improvements on the lands described in section 1, the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, (1) make such buildings and improvements available to the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes for housing purposes, (2) lease or otherwise make available such buildings and improvements, for governmental purposes, to any department or agency of the Federal Government or to any State or political subdivision thereof, or (3) make such other disposition and use of such buildings and improvements as he deems advisable.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of the Interior may, with the consent of the governing body of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes, make leases or assignments of, or for homestead purposes, issue patents-in-fee to, portions of the lands described in section 1, to individual Cheyenne or Arapaho Indians who performed honorable service in the Armed Forces of the United States in World War I or II. Any such patent-in-fee may cover a portion of such lands of such size, not in excess of 2½ acres in the case of any such individual Indian, as the Secretary may determine.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "Oklahoma", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 13 to 17 down to the word "section" and insert in lieu thereof "and all claims in regard thereto, by said Indian tribes, are hereby extinguished."

Page 3, after line 20, insert the following section:

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is further authorized and hereby is directed to continue in effect, and to renew, so long as the same are used and useful to the Bureau of Prisons for purposes of maintaining sewage disposal plant, water lines, roads to and from the sewage disposal plant, and sewage affluent lakes from the sewage disposal plant, easements, rights-of-way, or permits to that part of section 1, township 12 north, range 8 west, and to that part of the southeast quarter of section 36, township 13 north, range 8 west which at present are used by the Bureau of Prisons for said purposes.

"(d) The Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby authorized to determine, upon such terms and conditions as they may agree to be in the public interest, the number of acres of land described in section 1 hereof, if any, needed and necessary for the conduct of the cooperative research program at present operated thereon by the Department of Agriculture, the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station and Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College: *Provided, however,* That said lands shall not be reserved for said cooperative research program for more than 10 years after approval of this act: *And provided further,* That in the event the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Interior are unable to agree as provided herein they are hereby directed to submit the matter to the President whose decision shall be final."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFER JURISDICTION ON CERTAIN UNITED STATES COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, sitting without a jury, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the State of California against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts expended and to be expended in repairing the damage to levees and other flood-control works of the Sacramento River as a result of the closing of the outlet gates on Shasta Dam by the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, during May 1948.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suit upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. In any suit brought pursuant to this act (whether sounding in tort or in contract) proceedings shall be had, and the liability, if any, of the United States shall be determined, in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of tort claims or contract claims, respectively, against the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "as a result of" and insert "alleged to have resulted from."

Page 2, line 12, strike out "tort claims or."

Page 2, line 12, after "contract claims", insert "or under the Federal Tort Claims Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGES TO REPRESENTATIVES OF AMERICAN STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2042) to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such terms and conditions as he shall determine, the President is hereby authorized to extend, or to enter into an agreement extending, to the representatives of member states (other than the United States) on the Council of the Organization of American States, and to members of their staffs, the same privileges and immunities, subject to corresponding conditions and obligations, as are enjoyed by diplomatic envoys accredited to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1770) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WALTER]. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CANCEL IRRIGATION MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION CHARGES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2646) to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all unpaid irrigation maintenance and operation charges against the lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation, owned by the Trustees of Church Property of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Wyoming, a Wyoming corporation, and described as the north half of the southwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 8, township 1 south, range 1 west, Wind River meridian, Wyoming, are hereby canceled and the accrual of such charges shall be suspended for such period, not to exceed five years, as said lands continue to be held by the present owners.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER TITLE TO CERTAIN PROPERTY TO HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5226) to approve act 178 enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1951, relating to University of Hawaii and the powers of the board of regents thereof, and to vest in said board of regents the fee simple title to all university property.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That act 178, enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii in the regular session of 1951 and entitled "An act to amend section 1943 of the revised laws of Hawaii 1945, as amended, relating to the University of Hawaii and the powers of the board of regents thereof", is hereby approved.

SEC. 2. From and after the effective date of this act the fee simple title to all the real and personal property heretofore or hereafter set aside for or conveyed to the University of Hawaii shall be vested in the Board of Regents of the University of Hawaii.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its approval.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That title to all the real and personal property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii shall be transferred to the Territory of Hawaii."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii title to property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND ACT TO REGULATE INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF FISH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5803) to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

GERING AND FORT LARAMIE IRRIGATION DISTRICT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6723) to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project and with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

TO GOVERN THE HOSPITALIZATION OF MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8086) to govern the hospitalization of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 421) to continue authority for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what is the difference between the Senate and House versions of this joint resolution? A similar Senate joint resolution calls for an appropriation of $10,000,000 annually.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]?

There was no objection.

OFFENSES COMMITTED ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS IN CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3624) to confer jurisdiction on the State of California with respect to offenses committed on Indian reservations within such State.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of California shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations with the State of California to the same extent as the courts of the State have jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State as defined by the laws of the State: *Provided,* That nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any Indian tribe, band, or community, or members thereof, hunting and fishing rights as guaranteed them by agreement, treaty, or custom, nor require them to obtain State fish and game licenses for the exercise of such rights.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 1151 of such title the following new item:

"'1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country.'

"SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 53 thereof immediately after section 1160 a new section, to be designated as section 1161, as follows:

"'§ 1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country.

"'(a) Each of the States listed in the following table shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the areas of Indian country listed opposite the name of the State to the same extent that such State has jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State, and the criminal laws of such State shall have the same force and effect within such Indian country as they have elsewhere within the State:

"'State of	Indian country affected
"'California	All Indian country within the State

"'(b) Nothing in this section shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians within the areas of Indian country listed in this section.

"'(c) Nothing in this section shall deprive any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, community, or group of any right, privilege, or immunity afforded under Federal law, treaty, or agreement with respect to the ownership or taxation of trust or restricted Indian property, or with respect to hunting, trapping, or fishing or the control, licensing, or regulation thereof.'

"SEC. 3. Chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby further amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 1151 of such title the following new item:

"'1162. Application of Indian liquor laws.'

"SEC. 4. Title 18, United State Code, is hereby further amended by inserting in chapter 53 thereof immediately after section 1161 a new section, to be designated as section 1162, as follows:

"'§ 1162. Application of Indian liquor laws.

"'The provisions of sections 1154, 1155, 1156, 3113, 3488, and 3618 of this title, and the provisions of section 2141 of the Revised Statutes (25 U. S. C., sec. 251) shall not apply within those areas of Indian country that are subject to the provisions of section 1161 of this title, nor within those areas of the States named in said section 1161 that are not Indian country.'

"SEC. 5. The courts of the State of California shall have jurisdiction, under the laws of the State, in civil actions and proceedings between Indians or between one or more Indians and any other person or persons to the same extent that the courts of such State have jurisdiction in other civil actions and proceedings: *Provided,* That as long as the title to any real or personal property, including water rights, belonging to any Indian or Indian tribe, band, group, or community is held in trust by the United States or is subject to restrictions against alienation under any law, treaty, or agreement of the United States, nothing in this section shall authorize the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of such property or the adjudication or regulation of its use, or shall confer jurisdiction upon the State courts in any civil action, probate, or other proceeding affecting the ownership, title, possession, or any other interest in such property.

"SEC. 6. Section 1 of the act of October 5, 1949 (63 Stat. 705, ch. 604), is hereby repealed,

but such repeal shall not affect any proceedings heretofore instituted under that section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure,' with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of California civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAS VEGAS WASH AND ITS TRIBUTARIES, LAS VEGAS, NEV.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1020) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas and vicinity, Nevada, to be made under direction of the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made for runoff and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage area, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5065) to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations and within such set allowances as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, officers of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, appointed during the period May 8, 1945, to March 31, 1951, inclusive, after previous service as Naval Reserve officers or Marine Corps Reserve officers, shall be entitled to receive allowances for transportation of dependents and transportation (including packing, crating, drayage, and unpacking) of baggage and household goods and effects, or reimbursement therefor, from home of record to first permanent-duty station.

SEC. 2. Applicable appropriations current at the time of payment shall be available for payments authorized under the provisions of section 1 of this act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Secretary of the Navy" and insert "Secretaries of the Navy and Treasury, with respect to the Coast Guard."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "and Marine Corps", and insert "Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "or Marine Corps Reserve" and insert "Marine Corps Reserve officers or Coast Guard Reserve."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5198) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to transfer, subject to valid existing rights, the following-described property to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior, without reimbursement:

(1) The Department of the Army installation known as Fort Segarra on Water Island which consists of approximately five hundred acres and is described as being situated south of the Island of Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, latitude eighteen degrees nineteen minutes twenty seconds and longitude sixty-four degrees fifty-seven minutes ten seconds, said island being bounded on the northwest, north, and northeast by Gregorie Channel; on the east by Saint Thomas Harbor; on the south and west by the Caribbean Sea, including all of the improvements located thereon.

(2) All of the property known as Crown Mountain air warning site, located in St. Thomas, V. I., which consists of approximately 27 acres together with all of the improvements located thereon.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WITHHOLDING OF OFFICERS' PAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6601) to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last paragraph, under the heading "Miscellaneous", of the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195; 10 U. S. C. 877), appearing at page 177 of volume 27 of the Statutes at Large, is amended to read as follows:

"The pay of officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may be withheld under section 1766, Revised Statutes, on account of an indebtedness to the United States admitted or shown by the judgment of a court, but not otherwise unless upon a special order issued according to the discretion of the Secretary of the Department concerned."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION IN RICHMOND CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7126) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if some member of the committee can advise me as to why this property should be turned over gratis rather than sold? It is a small sum that is involved, but it seems to me it is bad practice to start giving away Federal lands or easements, when they do have some value. According to the report, the Government paid around $375 for the land in the first instance. It would seem to me that the Government might at least recover its original investment. I have no idea when the Government first bought the land. There may have been a terrific increment in its value over the $375 originally paid for the property.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

LOAN OF TWO SUBMARINES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7993) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a similar Senate bill, S. 3337, at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in regard to this measure? I note that it cost approximately $2,450,000 to reactivate and put each of these submarines into serviceable condition. This is more than the $1,000,000 limit set by law, and violates the rules of the consent calendar ob-

jectors committee. May I ask the chairman where this money will come from?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the distinguished gentleman the money comes from the mutual-defense appropriation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will it require any additional appropriation by the United States Government?

Mr. VINSON. I will assure the gentleman it does not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Where will the Mutual Security Administration get the money?

Mr. VINSON. They will get the money from the appropriation the Congress has made to maintain that act.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. My next question is, If we permit this bill to pass on the Consent Calendar, will it necessitate the Congress' appropriating additional money to the Mutual Security Administration?

Mr. VINSON. No, it will not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. With the explanation of the chairman of the committee, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill does violate the rule governing consideration of bills on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for the moment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. I assure the gentleman that it does not violate the standard governing consideration of bills on the Consent Calendar. No money from an appropriation is involved in this bill. The money which is used to recondition these ships has already been appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but you are spending more than a million dollars under this bill, and it does violate the rules so far as the Consent Calendar is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1222) to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 302 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1087) is hereby amended by striking out the following: "except that any member of a Reserve component of the Air Force of the United States shall be entitled to include service as a member of a Reserve component of the Army of the United States performed on or prior to July 26, 1949."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from June 29, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOAN OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS TO GOVERNMENT OF JAPAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8222) to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] will explain the bill, if he may.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill would authorize the President to lend to the Government of Japan, not to exceed 18 patrol frigates and 50 landing craft.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At a cost of $21,000,000?

Mr. PHILBIN. As a result of the loan of these patrol craft to the Government of Japan, American naval personnel will be released from such duty, which we would have to perform otherwise under our treaty obligations.

Mr. VINSON. May I call to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan the fact that the original cost of these vessels to be loaned to Japan, strictly for patrol work, did cost in excess of $21,000,000, but we must have some kind of coast guard patrol there, and that is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman says that the original cost was $21,000,000. According to your report, the total cost of overhauling and repairing these ships for the loan will amount to $21,300,000.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, that is correct. The overhauling will cost $21,000,000, which is money that has already been authorized. They already have the money for the overhauling of these vessels.

Mr. BYRNES. You mean the appropriation was made without any authorization?

Mr. VINSON. No, not a bit. They have the authorization for the overhaul of vessels. We are in this sort of position. If Japan does not do it, then we will have to do it. We will have to do it with American sailors. Therefore, it is in our own interest to loan these ships to Japan for this patrol work, otherwise our American boys will have to be sent there to do the patrol work. The ships are to be turned back to us in substantially the same condition as when they were loaned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean to return them to us like Russia has returned the ships to us?

Mr. VINSON. No, not at all. Not at all. We are in an entirely different situation with reference to Japan than we are in with reference to Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR SUNDRY ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AFFECTING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8177) to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases where relief has been granted or may hereafter be granted to disbursing officers or agents of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department operating under accounts of advances, under the authority of any act of Congress containing no provisions for the removal of charges outstanding in the accounts of advances of such Departments, and in all cases where charges have been outstanding in the accounts of advances of the aforesaid Departments for two full fiscal years and have been certified by the head of the Department concerned to the Comptroller General as uncollectible, such charges shall be removed by crediting the appropriate account of advances and debiting any appropriation made available therefor to the Department concerned: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall in any way affect the financial liability of any disbursing officer, agent, or surety of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897, 898), is hereby amended by deleting the period after the word "loaned" and substituting a colon in place thereof, and by adding the following proviso thereto: "*Provided, however*, That claims for the return or replacement of binoculars under this section shall be filed with the Secretary of the Navy on or before December 31, 1952, and the United States shall be under no obligation to return, replace, or pay for binoculars under this section, for which no claim is so filed. After decision on claims submitted pursuant to this section, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to dispose of any such binoculars held by the Navy in accordance with existing law."

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell to merchant ships, under such regulations as he may prescribe, and at such prices as he may deem reasonable, such fuel and other supplies as may be required to meet the necessities of such ships and as may not otherwise be locally procurable: *Provided*, That such ships, without such fuel or other emergency supplies to be furnished under this authority, are not able to proceed to the nearest port where such fuel and other supplies can be locally procured without endangering the health and comfort of the personnel, the safety of the ship, or the safe condition of the property thereon: *Provided further*, That the funds received from such sales shall, if not otherwise provided by law, be credited to the current appropriations concerned, and the amounts so credited shall be available for expenditures for the same purposes as the appropriations credited.

SEC. 4. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, appropriations chargeable for the transportation of baggage and

household goods and effects of military personnel and civilian employees of departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of general average contributions required in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be available for the payment or reimbursement of general average contributions required in connection with and applicable to quantities of baggage and household goods and effects in excess of quantities authorized to be transported by law or regulation pursuant to law; nor shall any appropriations be so available in any case where the military person or civilian employee concerned (a) is allowed under any law or regulation pursuant to law a commutation in lieu of the actual transportation expenses or (b) has himself selected the means of shipment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 508 OF TITLE 14, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7654) to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the analysis of chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," as amended, immediately preceding section 461 of such title, is amended by striking out the item

"508. Deserters; arrest of by civil authorities; penalties."

and in lieu thereof inserting

"508. Deserters; payment of expenses incident to apprehension and delivery; penalties."

SEC. 2. Section 508 of title 14, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 508. Deserters; payment of expenses incident to apprehension and delivery; penalties.

"(a) The Coast Guard may, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, make such expenditures as are deemed necessary for the apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and prisoners.

"(b) No person who is convicted by court martial for desertion from the Coast Guard in time of war, and as the result of such conviction is dismissed or dishonorably discharged from the Coast Guard shall afterwards be enlisted, appointed, or commissioned in any military or naval service under the United States, unless the disability resulting from desertion, as established by this section is removed by a board of commissioned officers of the Coast Guard convened for consideration of the case, and the action of the Board is approved by the Secretary; or unless he is restored to duty in time of war."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING JURISDICTION TO THE COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3195) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the author of the bill or a member of the committee give me some further explanation of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL JURISDICTION TO PROSECUTE CRIMES ON AMERICAN AIRPLANES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2149) to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(5) Any aircraft belonging in whole or in part to the United States, or any citizen thereof, or to any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or any State, Territory, district, or possession thereof, while such aircraft is in flight over the high seas, or over any other waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and out of the jurisdiction of any particular State."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABOLISHING THE APPEAL BOARD OF THE OFFICE OF CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2199) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Appeal Board established under section 13 (d) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 is hereby abolished: *Provided, however*, That said abolition shall not become effective until 6 months after the enactment of this act or such later date, nor more than 9 months after the enactment of this act, as may be fixed by written order of the Director of Contract Settlement published in the Federal Register. Such an order shall be made only in case the Director finds that it is impracticable for the Appeal Board to dispose of its pending business before the date fixed for abolition of the Board by this act or a previous order of the Director. No such order shall be made less than 30 days prior to the date theretofore fixed for abolition of the Appeal Board.

SEC. 2. (a) Upon the effective date of the abolition of the Appeal Board all appeals and disputes pending therein shall be terminated without prejudice and the right of the parties to pursue such other remedies as are provided by law shall not be affected thereby.

(b) In any such terminated appeal, timely initiated in the Appeal Board, where the period for pursuit of any other remedy pursuant to section 13 (b) (2) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 shall have expired or would expire within 60 days after the effective date of the abolition of the Appeal Board, the period within which proceedings may be initiated in accordance with the said section shall be extended to 60 days after said effective date.

(c) Effective 30 days after the enactment of this act no further appeals or submitted disputes shall be accepted for determination by said Appeal Board.

(d) Where an attempt is erroneously made to file an appeal with the Appeal Board after the time limited therefor by section 1 (c) of this act but prior to the effective date of the abolition of the Appeal Board, said Board shall forthwith return the papers to the person therein named as appellant together with a notice in writing that, pursuant to the terms of section 1 (c) of this act, it can no longer accept such an appeal. Where such an attempt is made in good faith and the appeal would, except for the provisions of section 1 (c) of this act, have been timely and the period for pursuit of any other remedy pursuant to section 13 (b) (2) of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 expires or would expire prior to the expiration of 60 days after the receipt of such notice, the period within which proper proceedings may be initiated in accordance with said section 13 (b) (2) shall be extended to 60 days after the receipt of such notice.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTING FEDERAL PRISONERS IN REHABILITATION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3276) to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 15, 1952 (Public Law 342, Eighty-second Congress), relating to the rehabilitation of Federal prisoners is hereby amended by striking out the words "Federal income, State, and gift taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal income, estate, and gift taxes."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING REDUCTION OF RATING OF TOTAL DISABILITY FOR COMPENSATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6167) to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 25 or more years.

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like a little further explanation of this legislation.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is in conference and has asked me to explain the purpose of this bill.

The bill deals with the existing policy of the Veterans' Administration; that is, where a man has been totally and permanently disabled, a service-connected disability which has existed for a great many years, the Veterans' Administra-

tion nevertheless requires periodic examination to determine whether the condition still exists. After a period of 20 or 25 years it seems inconceivable that a man who was wounded in World War I, for example, who has been classified as permanently and totally disabled throughout all that period of time without exception that there would be any possibility that he would cease to be in that condition. Therefore, this bill provides that at the end of 20 years, after he has been totally and permanently disabled for 20 years, he shall not be required to have such further examination.

As to the cost of it, it will probably save the Government money, because it costs money now to make these examinations and put him through this period of examination.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman familiar with how frequently the Veterans' Administration calls these examinations?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My understanding is, it is done every 2 years.

Mr. FORD. Is that by law or by administrative practice?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. My understanding is that it is my administrative order.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a rating of total disability or permanent total disability which has been made for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, and which has been continuously in force for 25 or more years shall not be reduced thereafter.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "25" and insert "20."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDICINE CREEK RESERVOIR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 51) to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical bill (S. 103) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the reservoir behind Medicine Creek Dam in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska, heretofore known, designated, and referred to as "Medicine Creek Reservoir," shall hereafter be designated and referred to as "Harry Strunk Lake." Any law, regulations, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under and by the name of "Medicine Creek Reservoir" shall be held and considered to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of "Harry Strunk Lake."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 51) was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 1 OF THE ACT APPROVED JUNE 27, 1947 (61 STAT. 189)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7487) to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that there is no report from the Bureau of the Budget, and the Department of Justice opposes the enactment of this bill, I am forced to ask that it be passed over without prejudice unless some satisfactory explanation is made.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman reserve his objection until we can have an explanation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will be glad to reserve the right to object.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would be well to ask the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] to explain the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It seems that the Department of Justice did oppose the bill. There is no report from the Bureau of the Budget; there is little information about it. I am surprised that it should be on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1947, the House had before it a bill to approve the purchase from the Indians of their vast helium reserves. That agreement was tied to another agreement with third parties on which there was a deadline of June 30, by which time it had to be approved or it would fall through.

Many of the Indian people and some of us in Congress felt that the price which the Government was paying them was not adequate. There was only one thing we could do: that was to hold up the bill until we could investigate the price. But the committee of which I was then a member felt that because of the work that had already been done in bringing about these agreements with these third parties, because of the complexity of the matter, and because of the impossibility of investigating the adequacy of the purchase price in time, we thought it best to let the deal go through, but provide by amendment that if after investigation it was determined the price was not adequate they could go into court and get what the committee very properly terms the second installment of the purchase price on this contract.

That amendment was adopted by both the House and the Senate with that understanding and the bill went through for the purchase of those helium lands for some $147,000.

Under that amendment the Indians after investigation—and it is a very complex matter—filed a suit for a more adequate price, but in the same suit they also included other dealings with respect to the same property, which they had a right to do, not under this amendment, but under the general law.

The Department of Justice filed what they called offsets, which they had the right to do under general law.

The purpose of this bill as amended by the committee is to provide that no offsets may be charged against the purchase price of the helium which was provided for in the 1947 bill. With that understanding the committee unanimously reported the bill out, because it would be utterly unfair if we now allowed offsets against the purchase price, when no offsets were contemplated at the time the agreement was entered into. Those of us who were working on it did not anticipate that the Government would claim offsets on the price to be paid to the Indians for this helium. We do not want any bad faith to be shown toward the Indians, and in order to avoid any appearance of bad faith on the part of Congress I offered this bill which, as amended, was reported out by the committee unanimously.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I notice that the Department of Justice opposed this on the ground that they feared that it might be a precedent for future claims. I also notice that the committee report specifically sets out the fact that it shall not be considered as a precedent for future cases. Is that the understanding of the gentleman?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico and yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I might say to the gentleman from Iowa that the matter of offsets still holds in the law, but they are not applied in this case because this is an anomalous case, and therefore will not set a precedent.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, quite frankly I am not satisfied with the explanation yet as to why there should be no offsets. Apparently, the Department of Justice feels that the United States has a legitimate claim and that the United States has been unable to collect what the Department of Justice at least contends is an amount legitimately owed to the Government. I do not see why there should not be an offset in order for the Government to collect on its alleged legitimate claim.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As I tried to explain, the matter arises out of a purchase contract, the matter of purchase and sale, and the Indians would not have agreed to it if they had been advised that the sale involved ancient claims, gratuities, and things of that nature which were to be deducted. They never would have sold to the Government. We did not specifically provide it in the bill because we did not anticipate this would come up. When the Department of Justice came in with

its adverse report the suit about which we are speaking included other claims, and the Department very naturally opposed it, but since that time in conference with the Indian representatives and the Department of Justice we have agreed on the committee amendment that would make it clear there will be no offsets against the purchase price, but no waiver of offsets against any other claims involved in the suit.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McMULLEN. I heard the testimony before the committee on this legislation. As I understand it, at the time the contract was entered into between the Government and these Indians there was no question raised about the matter of offsets. The contract was entered into in good faith, the first payment was made and there was no question about offsets. Apparently the Indians would not have entered into this contract if they had been informed and advised that offsets might be later claimed. This is a situation of the Government dealing with its wards, the Indians, and our committee felt the question of offsets should not be allowed to be set up at this time.

Mr. FORD. Is it not true, however, that if the Indians had not agreed to the sale the Federal Government, having a great need for the helium, could have condemned the property and taken it in that fashion?

Mr. McMULLEN. That is possible, but that question was not raised at the time the Indians entered into this contract. Being wards of the Government, we felt that this question should not be raised.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If the Government had taken the property under eminent domain, then offsets would not have been claimed, as I understand the law, because that also would be a matter of purchase and sale, although forced by law.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. It should be clearly understood that in dealing with the Government for the purchase of this helium gas, the only buyer was the Federal Government. There was no other buyer because this is a nonexplosive gas needed in Army operations. Therefore, the Government bought this helium gas under the contract that was entered into. Now, they wish to get an adjustment on this property. If you will read the contract carefully you will understand that there were a lot of items the value of which could not be determined at the time. In regard to this offset we have amended the bill so that only the offset can be applied to any income to the Navajos as the price to be paid for the helium gas. We did that because offsets were not alleged in the original contract. Therefore, if it is decided to adjust that price, we do not feel that offsets should be allowed in the adjustment.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in light of the explanation, however with some reluctance, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189), entitled "An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes," be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, and the Navajo Tribe of Indians are authorized to enter into an agreement dated December 1, 1945, entitled 'An agreement severing certain formations from oil and gas leases and substituting new leases as to those formations' and an 'Amending agreement', affecting lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., copies of which are published in House of Representatives Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress, first session; and said agreements are ratified and approved. If said Navajo Tribe of Indians shall, after investigation, deem the total consideration payable to it by the United States pursuant to such agreement dated December 1, 1945, as amended, to be in any respect less than reasonable, fair, just, and equitable, said tribe shall be entitled within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act to institute suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of such additional sum as may be necessary to compensate said tribe for the reasonable, fair, just, and equitable value of all right, interest, and property passing from said tribe to the United States under such agreement, as amended. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any suit so instituted and to enter final judgment against the United States therein for such sum, if any, in excess of the total consideration payable pursuant to such agreement, as amended, as such court may determine to be necessary to provide consideration in all respects reasonable, fair, just, and equitable, provided that interest shall be allowed on such sum at the rate of 4 percent per annum from December 1, 1945, to the date of payment and no offsets shall be deducted from such sum. Appellate review of any judgment so entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 250). Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, not more than 10 percent of the amount received or recovered by said tribe in satisfaction of any claim asserted under this section shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claims."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "from December 1, 1945, to the date of payment and no offsets shall be deducted from such sum" and insert "October 20, 1947, to the date of payment and no offsets shall be deducted from any sum determined by the court to be a reasonable, fair, just, and equitable consideration for the right, interest, and property passing to the United States under and pursuant to said agreement of December 1, 1945, as amended: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provision relating to interest and offsets shall not extend to any other claim or claims asserted in any such suit, whether or not the same arise out of the subject matter of said agreement, but such other claim or claims, if any, shall be governed by the law relating to actions brought pursuant to title 28, United States Code, section 1505."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISH CORONADO INTERNATIONAL MEMORIAL IN ARIZONA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7553) to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona, approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if somebody can explain this peculiar situation. In the report it says that no appropriation of Federal funds is requested, yet this bill provides for the creation of an American monument area as soon as possible. Now how do you go about doing this thing without it costing any money?

Mr. MURDOCK. This in effect merely changes the name of a former international memorial down on the border of Mexico at the point where Coronado crossed into our land 412 years ago. It was first called an international monument, so designed by the first enactment with the expectation that Mexico would supply an equal area of land corresponding to that which we set up.

Mr. BYRNES. I got the impression that there was a lot more to this bill than just changing the name because, in the first place, a bill to change the name is a lot simpler than the language of this bill. No. 2: The report from the Department of the Interior seems to say that what we have been doing is waiting for Mexico before establishing this monument; that is was going to be a joint enterprise. The report further states that the Mexican Government has shown a great deal of interest in the proposed memorial but that it has been unable, due to a combination of circumstances, to establish its part of the memorial, and the Department feels that the American area should be established as soon as possible. Well now, that is more than just changing the name, is it not?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; somewhat more. The memorial on our side of the border is already established so far as the site is concerned. It is on public domain. We have set aside a tract of land which we hoped would be matched by Mexico on the Mexican side but has not been matched during these 11 years. There is no money called for in this bill, but the land is there, and there may come a time when structures will be needed and erected, but there are none at the present time and none contemplated.

Mr. BYRNES. What is basically needed as far as this legislation is con-

cerned? What does it do that has to be done?

Mr. MURDOCK. It reaffirms that part of the act of 11 years ago for us to provide a part of the public domain right on the border as a national monument.

Mr. BYRNES. Do you have to reaffirm those things ever so often?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, what we want to do now is to make it a national monument instead of an international monument; that is all there is to it.

Mr. BYRNES. Will the gentleman assure me that this does not involve any expenditure of funds at this time?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will be glad to assure the gentleman of that fact.

Mr. BYRNES. With that assurance, Mr. Speaker, which assurance I think is necessary, because I think that in our fiscal position right now we should limit ourselves to the things that are absolutely necessary, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I note that the bill specifically says that no Federal funds are requested at this time. What about the future? Once it is established, will not the Federal Government be called upon to appropriate funds from year to year to keep this park up? How is it to be financed?

Mr. MURDOCK. Very likely at some future time there will be funds asked for for some structures, but there are none there now, and we will have to wait for a happier time to seek funds for that purpose.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is there an obligation of the Federal Government to do its share along with the Government of Mexico, if the monument is to be maintained?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. If the Government of Mexico ever comes across with its part of the obligation. However, at the present time it is simply a block of land lying along the border set aside from our public domain.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But if the Mexican Government does come across, as the gentleman says, and agrees to this, then there is nothing more for the United States to do except to appropriate the necessary amount of money from time to time; is that correct?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But if the Mexican Government sees fit to come across, but 11 years have passed now without their doing so; so by this measure this is a national memorial.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, with the assurance of the chairman of the committee that it is not contemplated that any further advance will be made in this memorial other than changing its general designation from, an international to a national memorial, and that there is no contemplation of requesting any funds from the Committee on Appropriations either this year or next year, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall be glad to give the gentleman that assurance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 2909) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the words "Coronado National Memorial" are hereby substituted in lieu of the words "Coronado International Memorial" wherever such words occur in the act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630).

SEC. 2. That section 1 of the aforesaid act is hereby amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That said proclamation shall not be issued until the President of the United States shall have been advised through official channels that the Government of Mexico has established, or provided for the establishment of, an area of similar type and size adjoining the area described herein."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7553) was laid on the table.

MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7104) to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085) as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended, is hereby further amended to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide for the payment from trust funds credited to the Menominee Tribe of Indians pursuant to the determination provided by the act of September 3, 1935, of $1,000 to each individual member of the Menominee Tribe of Indians on the Menominee tribal rolls as of December 31, 1951: *Provided*, That payments to minors and such members as are receiving welfare assistance through the social-security program or from the Menominee Tribe shall be made pursuant to regulations to be adopted by the Menominee General Council and approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "Affairs." and insert "Affairs: *Provided further*, That such payment shall be made first from any funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Menominee Tribe drawing interest at the rate of 5 percent and thereafter from funds drawing 4 percent."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPYRIGHTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8273) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 17, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new section 216 to read as follows:

"§ 216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday.

"When the last day for making any deposit or application, or for paying any fee, or for delivering any other material to the Copyright Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday within the District of Columbia, such action may be taken on the next succeeding business day."

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON: After line 12 add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 3 of title 17 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof '216. When the day for taking action falls on Saturday, Sunday or a holiday'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JULY 31, 1947 (61 STAT. 681)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8341) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sections are hereby added to the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by the act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 571; 43 U. S. C., 1946 edition, supp IV, secs. 1185–1188):

"SEC. 5. Deposits of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders when situated on public lands of the United States shall not be subject to acquisition under any law other than this act, except a law providing for the disposition of such materials on specified areas or authorizing their disposition for the purposes and in a manner provided in the Federal reclamation law (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That this shall not prevent the location and patenting under the United States mining laws of lands containing such materials, if such locations are based upon the discovery in said lands of other minerals, specifically named in the notice of location, which are subject to location under the mining laws. Rights acquired under such mineral location and any subsequent patent issued pursuant thereto, however, shall be subject to and shall not interfere with the rights of any purchaser to purchase and remove materials which have been sold under the terms of this Act where such contracts of sale were made pursuant to notice of sale first published prior to the date of the recordation of said mineral location.

"SEC. 6. The provisions of this act insofar as it relates to the materials described in section 1 shall apply to lands in national forests and such materials when situated on national-forest lands may be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the terms, conditions, and limitations of this act, as hereby amended. All moneys received from the disposal of materials by the Secretary of Agriculture under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as other receipts from the land from which the

materials are disposed of. The word 'Secretary,' as used in said act, shall refer to the Secretary of Agriculture where lands within the national forests are involved."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 556) authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for use of the University of Florida for educational purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee if the committee is satisfied with the sale price the Government is getting for this land? I notice the property was acquired by the Federal Government for the price of $309. I do not know just what date that property was acquired, but now the Government is selling the land at a price of $300. I would imagine the property was acquired during a period when land values were depressed, and now when land prices are inflated we are selling it for $9 less. Does anyone have any explanation?

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I am not in possession of information as to when the land was acquired. This is a Senate bill. The committee in its consideration did discuss the question of the transfer and was satisfied with it as being proper and just. As a matter of fact, one of our colleagues on the committee who is very much interested in the bill would have been satisfied if the committee had increased the price, and even offered to pay the difference himself. But, all the circumstances considered, the committee thought the price was a just one.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this is in line with the observation I made a few weeks ago on another bill to the effect that something ought to be done with reference to small matters of this kind so that they could be taken care of without going through all of the expense of the regular legislative procedure. I imagine that it cost more than $300 to pass this bill right now.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey for the payment of $300, subject to other applicable provisions of this act, to the State Board of Education of the State of Florida, for the use and benefit of the University of Florida for educational purposes primarily concerned with conservation of natural resources, land utilization, forestry, biology, botany, and natural history, such portions of the area known as the Welaka Fish Hatchery, Putnam County, Fla., aggregating approximately 55 acres, as he may determine to be excess to the needs of the Department of the Interior and available for the aforesaid purposes.

SEC. 2. The property to be conveyed shall include both the land and the improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the United States reserves the right to remove, at any time within a period of 2 years from the date of approval of this act, any of said improvements constructed by it or financed out of its funds.

SEC. 3. The use of said property shall be subject to all easements, rights-of-way, licenses, leases, and outstanding interests in, upon, across, or through said property which have heretofore been granted or reserved by the United States or its predecessors in title.

SEC. 4. The United States reserves the rights to all minerals upon or in said property, together with the usual mining rights, powers, and privileges, including the right of access to and use of such portions of the surface of said property as may be necessary for mining and removing said minerals.

SEC. 5. Title to or control over the lands conveyed under the authority of this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor, except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. The grantee or its successor may not change the use of the lands from the educational purposes specified in section 1 of this act to another or additional use, except with the consent of the Secretary. If at any time after the lands are conveyed under this act, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than the educational purposes specified in section 1, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States. Such reversion shall be considered effective and established upon the mailing of notice thereof to the State Board of Education of Florida, or its successor, by the Secretary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING NAME OF BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION TO THE COLUMBIA POWER ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6436) to change the name of the Bonneville Power Administration to the Columbia Power Administration.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name of the Bonneville Power Administration, in the Department of the Interior, is hereby changed to the Columbia Power Administration; and the title of the Bonneville Power Administrator is hereby changed to the Columbia Power Administrator. All provisions of law applicable to the Bonneville Power Administration and the Bonneville Power Administrator shall be applicable in the same manner and to the same extent to the Columbia Power Administration and Columbia Power Administrator, respectively. All laws, regulations, and public documents of the United States referring to the Bonneville Power Administration or the Bonneville Power Administrator shall be held to refer to the Columbia Power Administration or the Columbia Power Administrator, respectively.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first month which commences more than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUFUS WOODS LAKE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1989) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington shall hereafter be known as Rufus Woods Lake, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such lake under and by the name of Rufus Woods Lake.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6004) to authorize payment of retroactive salary increase for services rendered by postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department who died between July 1, 1951, and October 24, 1951.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 204, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma followed by "or the rightful heirs or the estate of a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his death."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of July 1, 1951.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That section 23 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 204, 82d Cong.), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning July 1, 1951, and ending with the date of his death.'

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 6 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), and section 4 (b) of the act of October 25, 1951 (Public Law 207, 82d Cong.), are each hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), for services rendered by a deceased officer or employee during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period of such officer or employee which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his death.'

"(b) Retroactive compensation shall be paid, in the manner prescribed by law for unpaid compensation due deceased officers and employees of the Government, for services rendered by any deceased officer or employee during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period of such officer or employee which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his death, if such officer or employee was entitled to an increase in compensation comparable to increases in compensation granted by the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d

Cong.), by reason of administrative action pursuant to the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there are several bills on the Consent Calendar, which have not been on the calendar the required number of days. It might be well to have them considered now, so I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call the remainder of the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have not reached the end of the calendar as yet. Would it not be better to hold such a request in abeyance until we have completed the bills which may properly be considered at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

PAYMENT TO CERTAIN PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS FOR ACCRUED LEAVE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7444) to amend the act of August 1, 1941, to include Public Health Service officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice in the report that the Comptroller General has opposed the enactment of this legislation on the ground that it would be discriminatory. I would like to have an explanation from the committee as to why the committee takes such action in the light of the observation of the Comptroller General.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any opposition by the Comptroller General. This bill will permit the payment of accrued annual leave to Public Health Service officers who entered the armed services prior to November 11, 1943. The House approved on May 6 an appropriation bill, which would grant payment of accrued leave to one of these Public Health Service officers and the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary felt that it would be proper to pass this legislation to prevent a large number of private bills being introduced.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if I may quote from the letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, dated June 13, 1952. This letter is signed by Mr. Frank L. Yates, Assistant Comptroller General of the United States. The letter in its entirety can be found in the committee report. I shall only quote the pertinent paragraph:

It is understood that the commissioned personnel of the Public Health Service has successfully secured full and complete pay and allowance benefits on complete parity with the commissioned personnel of the genuine Armed Forces, and it is not perceived why, equitably, they should secure any greater benefits by contending for those which pertain to civilian employees whose compensation is fixed on an entirely different basis.

In the light of that paragraph, Mr. Speaker, I fail to see how we can permit this legislation to go through on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8006) to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each employee who (1) was transferred, effective as of July 1, 1950, from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and (2) had completed sufficient service during the quarter ending June 30, 1950, to entitle him as of July 1, 1950, if he had not been so transferred, to an annual automatic increase in compensation under the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended and supplemented, or to a longevity increase in compensation under the act of May 3, 1950 (Public Law 500, 81st Cong.), shall, effective as of July 1, 1950, be granted such increase in his rate of basic compensation, and his rate of basic compensation as an employee in a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall, as of such date, be adjusted as follows:

(A) In the case of an employee whose rate of basic compensation on June 30, 1950, was in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of the grade in which his position has been classified under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the increase in compensation granted by this section shall be added to such rate of basic compensation.

(B) In the case of an employee whose rate of basic compensation on June 30, 1950, was less than the maximum scheduled rate of the grade in which his position has been classified under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the increase in compensation granted by this section shall be considered as part of the rate of basic compensation of such employee for the purpose of determining the rate of basic compensation to be established for such employee in accordance with the grade in which his position has been so classified.

SEC. 2. The rate of basic compensation of any employee transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 shall not be reduced by reason of the subsequent reassignment or transfer of such employee to another position in the same grade of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The rate of basic compensation of any such employee which has been reduced for such reason prior to the date of enactment of this act shall be restored, as of the date of such reduction in rate, to the rate which such employee was receiving immediately prior to such reduction, plus any increase in rate of basic compensation to which such employee may be entitled under the first section of this act.

SEC. 3. No retroactive compensation shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this act in the case of any individual not occupying a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation shall be paid (1) to an individual on furlough without pay, for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending with the day immediately preceding the date on which such furlough commenced, and (2) to a retired employee for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending with the date of his retirement.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out beginning with the word "who" down through "1950," in line 4 and insert in lieu thereof "transferred"; line 6, strike out beginning with the comma down through "had" in line 7 and insert in lieu thereof "who has"; line 7, strike out beginning with the word "during" down through "June 30, 1950," in line 8 and insert in lieu thereof "prior to such transfer"; line 8, strike out "as of July 1, 1950."

On page 2, line 6, after the word "shall", strike out the comma and "effective as of July 1, 1950,"; lines 12 and 18 strike out "on June 30, 1950," and insert in lieu thereof "prior to such transfer."

On page 3, line 8, insert after "same" the words "or equivalent rate of pay or"; line 21, strike out "paid" and insert in lieu thereof "paid, if otherwise due under this act."

On page 4, line 1, strike out "and"; line 3, insert before the period a comma and the words "and (3) in accordance with Public Law 636, Eighty-first Congress, for services rendered during the period beginning July 1, 1950, and ending with the date of death."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZATION REPORT OF IRRIGATION WORKS IN CONNECTION WITH CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6163) to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, according to the information at my disposal, the Bureau of the Budget did object to S. 2320. Will the gentleman from Washington explain the situation?

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker it is true the Bureau of the Budget did object to the original bill. However, at the instance of the gentleman from Montana Mr. [D'EWART] the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs wrote an amendment which we are now considering, which is acceptable to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Both the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] can assure the objectors.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. FORD. I note in the information at my disposal that the Department of the Army is of the opinion that the principal provisions of the bill can be accomplished under existing law, with the exception of the provision for financial assistance to irrigation from power revenue. Can the gentleman explain that point of view?

Mr. D'EWART. The amendment strikes out the authorization, except for study and report. The officers of the Bureau argued that this authorization for a study and report was necessary because the report would deal with possible future reclamation construction in connection with an Army engineer dam. The bill will now be limited, as amended, to only a study and report to the Congress for us to consider before any authorization for any construction whatsoever is undertaken.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. All this bill does in its present form is to authorize a study of the irrigation features to be attached to the Chief Joseph Dam project. It does not authorize the project. It simply authorizes the study and sets up the standards under which the study shall be made, with the proviso that the Interior Department will report back to our committee. That is all the bill does. The Army engineers have said they thought there was sufficient authorization in the present law to make the investigation, without a specific authorization, but we have grave doubt about that. The Chief Joseph Dam is being constructed as an Army engineer project. We have grave doubt as to whether or not the Bureau of Reclamation can go on to an Army engineer project and make an investigation with reference to attaching irrigation features without specific authorization by a congressional committee. In any event, the matter is in doubt, and we felt it was better to resolve it by specific authorization, and in addition to that, to set up in the measure the standards by which the study shall be made, and on the basis of which the report shall be made. That is all the bill does. There is no authorization and no project authorized.

Mr. FORD. How much will the investigation cost?

Mr. ENGLE. We have not had an estimate of the amount of the cost, but presumably not very much. The Bureau makes these investigations all the time out of a general investigation fund provided by the Committee on Appropriations. It does not call for a specific appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. FORD. I know that is probably the case, but does not the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, give to the committee the cost of a proposed investigation before such investigation is authorized?

Mr. ENGLE. They did not in this instance, and it was not regarded as sufficiently burdensome to require any special action on it.

The Bureau of Reclamation is provided with a general fund to make these investigations.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretaries of the Army and Interior are authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act for the purposes, in addition to those for which initially authorized, of providing financial and other assistance in the reclammation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Army shall continue to construct and shall operate and maintain the dam and power plant pursuant to the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and control of floods, as modified by the provisions of this act.

(b) In the construction of the dam, provision shall be made for irrigation outlets of such capacity as has been or may hereafter be agreed on with the Secretary of the Interior. Operation and maintenance of the dam and power plant shall be pursuant to arrangements made with the Secretary of the Interior providing, among other things: (1) for the reservation of sufficient power and energy for the pumping of water for the irrigation of lands to be served from works hereafter authorized under the provisions of section 3 of this act, such power to be made available at rates to be established by the Secretary of the Interior; (2) for the disposal, under the provisions of section 5 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), of the remainder of the electric power and energy not required, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army, for the operation of the dam and power plant; and (3) for the release or diversion of water as required under the rights established for the various irrigation divisions of the project.

(c) In determining rates for power and energy to be available as provided in this section, the Secretary of the Interior may allocate to irrigation appropriate portions of the costs of the dam and power plant, and may apply project power revenues to the return of such costs and to other irrigation costs as are assigned for return from power revenues under section 3 of this act to the same extent that power revenues may be so applied under the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto).

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as modified by the provisions of this act, such works as he finds to be feasible for the irrigation of lands in the basin of the Columbia River and its tributaries in Washington between Grand Coulee Dam and Moses Coulee, such works to be accounted for as divisions of the Chief Joseph Dam project. For the purposes of determining the financial feasibility of any such works and of providing for the return of reimbursable costs, the Secretary of the Interior may assign for return from the project's power revenues whatever reimbursable construction costs of such works allocated to irrigation are determined by him to be in excess of the amount that the water users may reasonably be expected to repay under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws.

(b) Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the authority of this section may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), which report shall include findings as to the costs and benefits of the proposed works and findings concerning the part of the costs allocated to irrigation, including costs of the dam and power plant so allocated, which probably can be repaid by the water users, and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant and the various other works that may be authorized pursuant to this act; and, except as modified by the provisions of (a) of section 3, revenues from the dam and power plant and from the various irrigation divisions shall be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "That the Secretaries of the Army and Interior are authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provision of this act for the purpose in addition to those for which initially authorized, to make a study and report to Congress of means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretaries shall be guided by the provisions of applicable reclamation laws.

"SEC. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state, among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may resaonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

"SEC. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN SUITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 168) to extend the statute of limitations with respect to certain suits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of April 22, 1908, as amended (45 U. S. C. 56), is further amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following:

"The time for commencing an action, where an award under any workmen's compensation law has been held, by the highest court of competent jurisdiction, to be invalid on the ground that the injuries were sustained in interstate commerce, shall be extended 1 year from the enactment of this amendment."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF OVERTIME PAY OF SUPERVISORY EMPLOYEES OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6326) to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes", approved July 6, 1945, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime to employees other than supervisory employees who base salaries, exclusive of longevity salary, are more than $4,970 per annum, for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas Day during the month of December, in lieu of compensatory time.

"(d) Supervisory employees shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed in excess of 8 hours per day, and those whose base salaries, exclusive of longevity salary, are more than $4,970 per annum shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and on Christmas Day during the month of December, within 180 days from the days such service was performed."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "is" and insert in lieu thereof "are."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL CANCELING STAMPS FOR USE IN FIRST- AND SECOND-CLASS POST OFFICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7871) to authorize the Postmaster General to grant permission for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, a rule has been granted on this bill. I ask unanimous consent that it may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentleman has been misinformed about the rule.

Mr. MURRAY. If the gentleman will yield, this was just reported out by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and placed on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. BYRNES. I thought it was scheduled to come up on June 30.

Mr. MURRAY. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman has not applied for a rule and has not received a rule?

Mr. MURRAY. No application has been made for a rule.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, this matter presents a rather peculiar problem. Certainly the objective of having a program of propaganda or encouragement in whatever form to get people to vote in the elections is most desirable.

Generally I disagree with the Postmaster General, but in this case I think I am inclined to agree with him that this really is not a proper function of the Post Office Department. Matters of this kind should be taken care of by civic groups, by regular political organizations or anybody else who might determine that it is advisable to put on these campaigns; and, certainly, there are some very worth-while campaigns being put on now. In one of my communities a wholesale effort is being made to get a 100-percent registration and a 100-percent vote in that small community. I think we all laud that effort. But here we are going to ask that the Post Office Department incur additional costs when it is already running in the hole, additional costs of $175,650 to get into this activity. I just do not believe it is a proper governmental function. It is not the kind of expense that is absolutely necessary and essential at this time when our finances are in the condition they are.

Under these circumstances I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. BYRNES. I withhold it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman that all in the world this program does, is to authorize the Postmaster General to furnish special canceling stamps and dies in first- and second-class post offices in order to encourage voting in general elections.

I hope the gentleman realizes the importance of encouraging and calling the attention of the people to cast their vote.

All kinds of slogans are advertised through the Post Office Department; why they even advertise flower festivals in America and festivals over in Hawaii.

Mr. BYRNES. Are we paying for them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. With regard to flower shows and festivals over in Hawaii, the sponsors pay for the dies but the Government pays for the labor of canceling the envelopes. This is, comparatively speaking, a small cost, because after the dies and stamps are made that is the total cost.

This bill was approved unanimously by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service; and I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that in a conversation with the Postmaster General with respect to this proposal when I asked him about it he said he thought it was a good idea and that it ought to go through. It ought to be passed. But what happened? He said later that he had spoken to some of his advisers and they thought there might be some political tinge to it. He did not explain but said he was advised against the approval of it, and that he did not feel he could go along and say, "I approve the bill." This bill has the approval of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Federation of Labor, and other groups. No one appeared before the committee in opposition to the bill and I think the gentleman will agree with me that the cost is comparatively small when compared with the good it will accomplish.

Mr. BYRNES. Let me read the gentleman this paragraph from a letter signed by the Postmaster General, dated May 22 of this year:

Considering all aspects of the situation, including the primary fact that the Post Office Department was established for the transmission of mail matter and not as an instrument for influencing public action, it is not believed that its facilities should be used for the purposes contemplated by this measure.

Further let me quote from a letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, dated June 18, addressed to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

It appears to this office that the Postmaster General has sufficient authority, under the provisions of the act of May 11, 1902 (39 U. S. C. 368), to grant permission for the use, as contemplated under H. R. 7871, of such special canceling stamps or postmarking dies provided at the expense of the permittee.

In other words, they have authority to grant the right to permittees to use these canceling devices already. Why should the Federal Government on its own motion go to this trouble, and at its own expense?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman from Wisconsin is known in this House as being very reasonable. I would like to ask him if he would consider this point: This is not a private matter. This is a patriotic duty that the Post Office Department is asking for.

Mr. BYRNES. The Post Office Department is not asking for it.

Mr. JAVITS. It is very similar to what they use on canceled stamps like "enlist." This is asking the citizens to perform an equally patriotic duty to vote.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say that I was a member of the subcommittee that recommended this bill. We felt it was a patriotic duty just as much as asking the people of the country to buy bonds. It is more important for them to vote. The expense is not great when you consider what it would do. I cannot see why there should be objection, especially in view of the money we are spending on such things as the Voice of America for foreign countries. I think it would be well for us to remind our own people of their duty to register and vote.

Mr. BYRNES. May I say to the gentlewoman from New York that I will be gald to do anything I possibly can to encourage the people to vote. But I do not think that is the issue. The issue is, Shall we have a department of Government engage in that activity?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. What is it they propose to put on these envelopes?

Mr. REES of Kansas. "Register—then vote."

Mr. KEATING. Is that the slogan that is set forth in the bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is the slogan we recommend.

Mr. BYRNES. It is indefinite in the bill. The bill provides that they shall have special canceling stamps or postmarking dies made in order to encourage voting in general elections. You have no control over what they are going to put on there. I think they will be honest and put on something that is reasonable; but the Post Office Department in the past and probably still is to some extent engaging in political activities. This could be misconstrued that they are going to again become engaged in political activities in some way.

Mr. KEATING. The Postmaster General himself agrees with the President and believes that this is an improper activity for a Federal agency to engage in.

Mr. BYRNES. The office of the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, has said they do not favor the bill.

Mr. KEATING. What is the anticipated cost of entering into this propaganda campaign?

Mr. BYRNES. One hundred seventy-five thousand six hundred and fifty dollars and eighty cents, according to the estimate of the Postmaster General.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that this general proposal is supported by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Federation of Labor. There is no so-called propaganda.

Mr. BYRNES. Does the gentleman mean these organizations asked for this bill?

Mr. REES of Kansas. They supported it. The American Legion and VFW came before committee and testified for it. Let me tell the gentleman this: This legislation is not particularly opposed by the Post Office Department. One of the representatives of the Department came before the committee, but he was quite reluctant in expressing his opposition to the proposal. If this legislation is not good, that is something else, and if one gentleman wants to take the responsibility of knocking it out, that is something else, too.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. This bill is sponsored and offered by my good friend, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Very seldom does a bill sponsored by a Member of your side get on the floor of this House. The committee is enthusiastically in favor of this bill. We want to encourage everyone to qualify and vote. As I say, this involves a public duty. We ought to encourage everybody to vote, and the gentleman from Kansas had no political motives in offering this bill. It is nonpolitical, nonpartisan, and I hope your side will let the ranking minority member of the committee get his bill by.

Mr. BYRNES. Permit me to state that I have a high regard for the gentleman from Kansas. When I first came here I served under him on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think he knows of my regard for him. I do not think that is an element, however, that goes to the merits whether a bill is sound or not or whether it should dictate my conscience as to whether it should be passed or not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret, as I am sure many other Members do, that the distinguished Member from Wisconsin has seen fit to object to the consideration of this bill. I have the highest respect for him. I think his argument against the legislation is unsound. Of course, there would be some expense attached to this legislation. It is rather strange, however, that this committee and this House, within the last hour, have approved legislation that will cost this country hundreds of millions of dollars without any question or objection.

The cost of this bill would amount to one-fiftieth of one percent of the amount of appropriations for the Post Office Department in 1 year. The expense of one operation would last for several years, so the expense for 1 year is infinitesimally small. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw his request and permit this legislation to receive the approval of the membership of the House.

This legislation would provide for the use of postal facilities as a medium for the Government to remind citizens, during a 60-day period before a general election, of the date of the election, and of the desirability of exercising their franchise.

I desire to strongly emphasize again this legislation is nonpartisan and nonpolitical. Nothing that can appear on the special canceling stamps or postmarking dies can be designed to help any political organization or party. This was brought out very forcefully at hearings on the legislation before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

As I stated before, representatives of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars testified very strongly in support of this proposal. Examples were presented of the very constructive work already being done by these veterans' organizations, at their own expense, to get out the vote without regard to political complexion. The American Federation of Labor has always insisted that the citizens assume their right and responsibility for voting. In the last issue of their magazine, the American Federationist, there is a statement emphasizing the importance of every citizen casting his vote. A slogan appears on the cover of the magazine entitled "Register and Vote."

The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., one of the largest organizations in the country, and other junior chambers of commerce, have been gravely concerned, as many other public-spirited organizations and citizens are concerned, with respect to the failure of American citizens to exercise their privilege of suffrage. The junior chamber of commerce has made considerable effort to publicize the need and the duty of all citizens to exercise their voting franchise.

Since the Postmaster General is authorized to permit the use of special stamps or postmarking dies, at the expense of the permittee, to advertise such events as flower festivals, Aloha Week in Hawaii, and automobile shows, he should have authority to publicize the need of registering and voting by the general public. The use of a stamp urging citizens to vote is neither specifically included nor excluded by the language of the law.

I would like to emphasize again that this legislation cannot under any circumstances be used to serve the interests of any political party or organization. It is purely to serve the public interest without regard to party affiliation.

I do not think it is necessary to delve into the reasons behind the steady increase in the number of people who are failing to exercise their right to vote. But by the very nature of our office as Members of Congress, the fact of this increase is constantly hammered home to

us. I agree it is unfortunate that people should have to be reminded of the privilege, as well as the responsibility, of casting their votes at election. Incredible as it may seem, only 49 percent of those entitled to vote in the 1948 election actually voted. Enactment of H. R. 7871, of course, will not automatically bring to the polls all of the 39,000,000 persons who failed to vote in the last Presidential election. I do believe it would be one effective means of stirring eligible voters of all parties to more active participation in general elections. For too long people have not been reminded of the dignity and seriousness clothing this privilege of voting.

This legislation is entirely consistent with the past policy not only of the Post Office Department but the executive branch. Presidents regardless of affiliations have always been leaders in urging citizens to vote. Theodore Roosevelt said:

It is not only your right to vote, but it is your duty if you are indeed free men and American citizens. I want to see every man vote. I would rather have you come to the polls even if you voted against me than have you shirk your duty.

Lincoln was not thinking in terms of party policy when he wrote:

It is not the qualified voters, but the qualified voters who choose to vote, that constitute the political power of the state.

Thomas Jefferson wrote "that government is strongest of which every man feels himself a part." If ever political leaders in this country have been united in a common cause, it has been to get out the vote.

I am sure the Members of the House will agree that it most certainly is as much a duty of the Government to remind its citizens of general-election dates and their corollaries, the registration dates, as it is to advertise such matters as flower festivals, and other activities, to say nothing of Aloha Week in Hawaii. To the extent we increase the number of voters who register and go to the polls, to that extent we strengthen our democracy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 554) to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE: CRIMES AND CRIMINAL PROCEDURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6036) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 1151 of such title the following new item:

"1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country."

SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 53 thereof immediately after section 1160 a new section, to be designated as section 1161, as follows:

"§ 1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country.

"(a) Each of the States listed in the following table shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the areas of Indian country listed opposite the name of the State to the same extent that such State has jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State, and the criminal laws of such State shall have the same force and effect within such Indian country as they have elsewhere within the State:

"State of	*Indian country affected*
"California	Agua Caliente Indian Reservation.
"Kansas	Sac and Fox Indian Reservation.
"Kansas	All Indian country within the State.
"New York	All Indian country, including Indian reservations, within the State.
"North Dakota	Devils Lake Indian Reservation.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians within the areas of Indian country listed in this section.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall deprive any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, community, or group of any right, privilege, or immunity afforded under Federal law, treaty, or agreement with respect to the ownership or taxation of trust or restricted Indian property, or with respect to hunting, trapping, or fishing or the control, licensing, or regulation thereof."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3243 of title 18, United States Code, the act of May 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 229, ch. 279), the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1161, ch. 759), and the act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1224, ch. 809), are hereby repealed.

(b) Chapter 211 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by deleting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 3231 of such title the following item:

"3243. Jurisdiction of State of Kansas over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations."

(c) Section 1 of the act of October 5, 1949 (63 Stat. 705, ch. 604), is hereby amended by deleting "laws, civil and criminal," and by inserting in lieu thereof "civil laws."

(d) any rights or liabilities now existing under the statutes or parts thereof repealed or amended by this section shall not be affected by such repeal or amendment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 12, after "New York, all Indian country", insert "including Indian reservations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7721) to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "and (6) those ex-service men and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States during the period beginning April 28, 1952, and ending July 1, 1955 (the period after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan during which persons may be inducted under existing law for training and service in the Armed Forces), and have been separated from such Armed Forces under honorable conditions."

(b) Clauses (3) and (5) of such section 2, as amended, are amended by inserting after "has been authorized)" a comma and the following: "or during the period specified in clause (6) of this section."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after "section 2 (4)" the following: "and (6)."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMEND SECTION 4472 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6521) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of October 9, 1940 (46 U. S. C., sec. 170), is further amended by adding the following paragraph to subsection (7) thereof:

"(e) The United States Coast Guard shall issue no permit or authorization for the loading or discharging to or from any vessel at any point or place in the United States, its Territories or possession (not including Panama Canal Zone) of any explosives unless such explosives are packaged, marked, and labeled in conformity with regulations prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 835 of title 18 of the United States Code, and unless such permit or authorization specifies that the limits as to maximum quantity, isolation and remoteness established by local, municipal, territorial, or State authorities for each port shall be observed. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to limit or restrict the shipment,

transportation, or handling of military explosives by or for the Armed Forces of the United States."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "possession" and insert "possessions."

Page 2, line 1, after "such explosives", insert "for which a permit is required by the regulations promulgated pursuant to this section."

Page 2, line 9, strike out "shall be observed" and insert "shall not be exceeded."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MERCHANT MARINE CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 480) to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 of an act approved August 8, 1947 (Public Law 384, 80th Cong.), relating to merchant marine construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "March 31, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1953."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the call of the Consent Calendar a number of requests were made to have bills placed at the foot of the calendar. Will those bills be called at this time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. They will be called now. The Clerk will report the first of those bills.

PREVENTING SHIPMENT IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF ILLEGAL UNDERSIZED FISH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5803) to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I notice the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] on the floor, and I wonder if he could advise me as to the effect of this bill on the transportation of fish which are caught legally in one State into a State in which, if caught in that State, they would be of illegal size.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I presided over the subcommittee that considered the bill. The question was raised of amending the Black Bass Act, whether it would affect the act as it was intended, and we were assured that it would not happen. The transportation companies were present, and those interested in fish and wildlife were present. All approved the bill as amended. The bill had the unanimous report of the subcommittee and the unanimous report of the full committee. As to the point the gentleman raises, fish legally caught in one State will meet no objection as to their transportation in interstate commerce on going into a State where fish of that size might be illegal if caught there.

Mr. BYRNES. The gentleman can understand that some of the commercial fishermen are interested in this because the legal size of fish in some States varies from the legal size in others. In other words, you might catch a fish 7 inches long in a State where that size is legal and transport it through another State where that size would be illegal.

Mr. BONNER. I can appreciate the gentleman's point, but I assure him that the situation about which he is concerned will not happen.

Mr. WEICHEL. This legislation was designed to stop the sale in interstate commerce of illegal fish; imposes no burden on the movement of legal fish and will aid in the conservation and preservation of fish life for public use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sending, shipping, and transportation in interstate commerce of fish, undersized or otherwise illegal according to the law of the State wherein such fish were netted, taken, possessed, transported, or shipped, shall be a Federal offense.

SEC. 2. Any person, firm, or corporation found guilty of violation of section 1, of this act, shall be fined not less than $100 for the first offense, not less than $200 for the second offense, and not less than $1,000 for offenses thereafter.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the first section of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes', approved May 20, 1926, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows: 'That when used in this act, the word "person" includes company, partnership, corporation, association, and common carrier.'

"SEC. 2. Such act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words 'game fish' wherever they appear therein and by inserting in lieu of such words, the word 'fish'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6723) to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water-right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project and with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have the author of the bill, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] explain this bill to the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The bill is a contract between the Reclamation Bureau and three irrigation districts in western Nebraska and eastern Wyoming, under which they sell their power revenues and rights to revenues for all time to come to the Bureau of Reclamation. The amount of money agreed upon is $6,636,873. That will be applied upon the contract for construction and repayment. It does not require any appropriation.

They had 2 years of negotiations among the members of these three irrigation districts. By a vote of about 95 percent over all the landowners themselves, after meetings in schoolhouses, at corner grocery stores, and so forth, and having heard all the arguments, agreed to the contract. There is some question as to whether they made a good deal, but it is their horse trade and they have asked for it. I hope they may be permitted to go ahead with this agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the irrigation districts.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is it not a fact that this bill will cost the taxpayers over $6,000,000 for facilities which we already own, and by the expenditure of that sum of money we will get absolutely nothing we do not already have?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; I do not agree to that because the farmers irrigation districts out there own this transmission line, and they are trading it to the Government for the revenues which will be derived from now on in perpetuity. They think it is a good horse trade.

Mr. SAYLOR. Is it not a fact that the committee has not received as yet a report from the Bureau nor a report from the Department or from the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I just want the Members of the Congress to know that this is an expenditure which, I think, is absolutely unjustified, but in view of the fact that the majority of the people there have voted for it, I withdraw my reservation of objection at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, when this bill first came up today, it was suggested that it go to the foot of the calendar, in order that those who might be in opposition to it, could be

present. They are now here, and the bill is before the House of Representatives.

The bill has for its purpose approving contracts which were negotiated with the Gering-Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize the execution of these agreements, with the Interior Department.

The farmers of these three irrigation districts, own the power revenues. The farmers of these districts voted better than 90 percent—in some instances 95 percent—for the proposed contract and agreement. The bill has been under discussion with the farmers for 2 years. Many meetings were held. They understand exactly what they are trading. They are trading the power revenues to the Bureau of Reclamation for all time, and in return they receive a credit of $6,636,873 against their construction obligation. This is the decision of those at the grass roots. I agree that because of the REA and other public power projects surrounding their particular projects, they are in a squeeze and feel they are not able to meet the competitive light rates now being offered by the public power districts.

The Department of the Interior will be able to consolidate all of these public power lines, and I believe it will, in the end, reflect in lower rates for the farmers in these districts.

There are some on the committee who felt the bill should not pass; that the farmers were not being treated as they should be treated. I am not sure that they are making a good horse trade, but they have voted to do that after many meetings, and a thorough understanding of the problem. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] will not object seriously to extending to the farmers the privilege of making this agreement. I believe the bill should pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contract with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951; the contract with the Goshen irrigation district, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951; and the contract with the Pathfinder irrigation district, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951, all of which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary), pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U. S. C. 485), are hereby approved and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the United States—

(a) contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project whose lands are not included within the boundaries of a project irrigation district which contracts shall provide, among other things, (i) that said water user shall relinquish his interest in the present and potential power revenues of or related to the North Platte project; (ii) that the power acquisition consideration for each contractor, which shall be the proportionate part of $6,636,873 represented by the ratio of the contractor's irrigable acreage to the total irrigable acreage of the project, as determined by the Secretary, shall be applied as a credit upon the water user's obligation to the United States for construction charges and for future charges for operation and maintenance of project works; (iii) that the miscellaneous revenues accruing to the benefit of the water user, pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 672, 703), shall be retained by the United States for the establishment and maintenance of a fund in an amount fixed by the Secretary to be used by the Secretary for replacement and operation and maintenance of project works operated and maintained by the United States; and

(b) a contract with the Northport irrigation district, which shall be amendatory of the contract of August 19, 1948, between the United States and the district (authorized by the act of Congress dated May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 273)), which amendatory contract shall provide, among other things, (i) that the district shall relinquish its interest in all present and potential power revenues of or related to the North Platte project; (ii) that the district's power acquisition consideration of $403,828 shall be applied by the United States, until that amount has been exhausted, toward the payment of the annual cost of the carriage of the district's water through the Farmers irrigation district canal: *Provided, however,* That the annual payments thus to be made shall in no event exceed $8,000 per year; and (iii) that the proportionate part of the miscellaneous revenues accruing to the benefit of the district, pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924, shall be retained by the United States for the establishment and maintenance of a fund, in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary, to be used by the Secretary for replacement and operation and maintenance of project works operated and maintained by the United States.

SEC. 3. The authority granted in section 2 of this act to make contracts shall continue for 5 years from the effective date of this act, but the power acquisition consideration provided in section 2 of this act for the individual water right contractors and for the Northport irrigation district shall be reduced by whatever amount of net power revenues shall have accrued to the benefit of such individual water right contractors or to the Northport irrigation district after June 30, 1950, by virtue of their not having previously relinquished their respective interests in said power revenues.

SEC. 4. Miscellaneous revenues accruing pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924, on behalf of those who have contracted with the United States pursuant to this act shall be deposited in a special deposit account in the Treasury Department, and such revenues may be expended, as in such contracts provided, for the replacement of the project works operated and maintained by the United States and to supplement funds advanced by the water users to meet annual costs of operation and maintenance of such works.

SEC. 5. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as these are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 9, strike out "States; and" to and including "United States" on page 4, line 8 and insert the word "States."

On page 4, line 13, after the word "contractors", strike out "and for the Northport irrigation district."

On page 4, line 16, after the word "contractors", strike out "or to the Northport irrigation district."

On page 5, line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. No extension, enlargement, or addition of any hydroelectric plant, transmission line, or accompanying works on the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, the Pathfinder irrigation district, or Northport irrigation district shall be built or contracted for until such extension, enlargement, or addition have been authorized by Congress.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3195) granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I previously asked unanimous consent that this bill be put at the foot of the calendar in order to have an opportunity to ask the author of the bill, or a member of the committee, for an explanation of it. On further investigation upon my part, I find that the objection I have has been overcome. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Court of Claims be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment, notwithstanding any statute of limitations, laches, or lapse of time, on the claim of any owner or operator of a gold mine or gold placer operation for losses incurred allegedly because of the closing or curtailment or prevention of operations of such mine or placer operation as a result of the restrictions imposed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 during the effective life thereof: *Provided,* That actions on such claims shall be brought within 1 year from the date this act becomes effective.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSPITALIZATION OF THE MENTALLY ILL OF ALASKA

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 395, the bill (H. R. 8086) to govern the hospitalization of the mentally ill of

Alaska, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I object, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The bill has been passed over without prejudice pursuant to the previous request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

GRANTING OF CERTAIN EASEMENTS TO STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 407, the bill (H. R. 7126) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this bill objected to when it was called previously?

Mr. BYRNES. The bill was passed over without prejudice on the basis of a question I asked which nobody seemed to be able to answer at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman could advise me why this land should be given to the State of California rather than sold for the fair market value.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. This request was made by the people of the State of California with reference to the grant of this one-third of an acre in order that they might complete a highway. The original cost of this land to the Government, the entire tract of 20 acres, was only $30,000, and the land involved here amounts to only $327. There is no objection to it whatsoever.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the benefits which will accrue to the land that is owned by the Government are far in excess of any value of the small amount that may be involved in the particular parcel by virtue of the building of the State highway.

Mr. BYRNES. In other words, my understanding is that it is a mutual arrangement which will be mutually beneficial, and therefore the purchase price of the land here is of no particular consideration; is that correct?

Mr. HINSHAW. It will be beneficial to the Government. I think the Government is making a better deal on it by far.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to donate and convey to the State of California all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land (hereinafter referred to as "Parcel A") located between Railroad Avenue and Castro Street in the city of Richmond, Calif. Such land, which contains approximately two hundred and fifty-seven one-thousandths acre (eleven thousand one hundred and seventy-eight square feet), comprises a portion of lots 22 and 23 in section 14, township 1 north, range 5 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, as shown on the map entitled "Map No. 1, Salt Marsh and Tide Lands situate in the County of Contra Costa, State of California, 1872" (on file in the office of the surveyor general), and is more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the northeasterly corner of lot 2 in block 14 as said lot and block are shown on the map of Osborne's Addition, filed in map book "E", at page 107, in the office of the County Recorder of Contra Costa County; thence along the northerly and northeasterly line of said block 14, north seventy-seven degrees fourteen minutes twenty-eight seconds west, nineteen and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet and north forty degrees forty minutes four seconds west, one hundred fifty-eight and seventy-seven one-hundredths feet to the property line common to the lands, now or formerly, of the United States of America and of the city of Richmond; thence along said common property line north forty-nine degrees nineteen minutes fifty-six seconds east, twenty-five and forty-four one-hundredths feet; thence from a tangent that bears south fifty-six degrees twenty-five minutes twenty-nine and seven-tenths seconds east, along a curve to the right with a radius of two thousand five hundred and fifty-five feet, through an angle of six degrees twenty minutes fifty-one and seven-tenths seconds, a distance of two hundred eighty-three and six one-hundredths feet to the northerly line of block 13 of Osborne's Addition as shown on the map above referred to; thence along said northerly line and the westerly prolongation of said line north seventy-seven degrees fourteen minutes twenty-eight seconds west, one hundred twenty-six and thirty-four one-hundredths feet to the point of commencement.

(b) The land to be conveyed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used by the State of California for the construction and maintenance of a public highway, and for no other purpose.

(c) There shall be reserved to the United States in the conveyance of the land described in subsection (a) all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral deposits in such land, including all materials determined pursuant to section 5 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 to be peculiarly essential to the production of fissionable material, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove such minerals.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to grant to the State of California an easement for the construction and maintenance of a highway embankment, and for the construction and maintenance of trenches and pipes as required for proper drainage, upon, over, under, and across certain land (hereinafter referred to as "Parcel B") which contains approximately four hundred and two square feet and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning for reference at the most northerly corner of lot 13 in block 14 as said lot and block are shown on the map of Osborne's Addition, filed in map book "E", at page 107, records of Contra Costa County; thence along the northeasterly line of said block 14 south forty degrees forty minutes four seconds east, fifteen and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet; thence from a tangent that bears south fifty-eight degrees twenty-four minutes sixteen seconds east, along a curve to the right with a radius of two thousand five hundred and fifty-five feet, through an angle of forty degrees fifty minutes forty-four seconds, a distance of two hundred sixteen and eight one-hundredths feet to the true point of commencement, said point being fifty-five feet measured radially from engineer's station 279+15 on the centerline of the State Highway in the city of Richmond from Garrard Boulevard to Marine Street, IV-CC-69-Rch., thence north thirty-six degrees twenty-six minutes twenty-eight seconds east, twenty feet; thence from a tangent that bears south fifty-three degrees thirty-three minutes thirty-two second east, along a curve to the right with a radius of two thousand five hundred and seventy-five feet, through an angle of no degrees twenty-six minutes fifty-five seconds, an arc length of twenty and sixteen one-hundredths feet; thence south thirty-six degrees fifty-three minutes twenty-three seconds west, twenty feet; thence from a tangent that bears north fifty-three degrees six minutes thirty-seven seconds west, along a curve to the left with a radius of two thousand five hundred and fifty-five feet, through an angle of no degrees twenty-six minutes fifty-five seconds, a distance of twenty feet to the true point of commencement.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to grant to the State of California a temporary easement, to be effective until January 1, 1955, for the construction and maintenance of a highway embankment upon, over, under, and across certain land (hereinafter referred to as "Parcel C") comprising a portion of lots 22 and 23 in section 14, township 1 north, range 5 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, as shown on the map entitled "Map. No. 1, Salt Marsh and Tide Lands Situate in the County of Contra Costa, State of California, 1872" (on file in the office of the surveyor general). Such land contains approximately one hundred and twenty-nine one-thousandths acre (five thousand six hundred and twelve square feet), excepting therefrom the land described in section 2, and is more particularly described as follows:

Beginning for reference at the northwesterly corner of block 13, as said block is shown on the map of Osborne's Addition, filed in map book "E", at page 107, in the office of the county recorder of Contra Costa County; thence along the northerly line of said block 13, south seventy-seven degrees fourteen minutes twenty-eight seconds east, sixty-six and thirty-four one-hundredths feet to the true point of commencement; thence from a tangent that bears north fifty degrees four minutes thirty-eight seconds west, along a curve to the left with a radius of two thousand five hundred and fifty-five feet, through an angle of six degrees twenty minutes fifty-one and seven-tenths seconds, a distance of two hundred eighty-three and six one-hundredths feet to the property line common to the lands, now or formerly, of United States of America and of the city of Richmond; thence along said common line, north forty-nine degrees nineteen minutes fifty-six seconds east, twenty and seventy-seven one-hundredths feet; thence from a tangent that bears south fifty-six degrees seventeen minutes fifty-seven and eight-tenths seconds east, along a curve to the right with a radius of two thousand five hundred and seventy-five feet through an angle of six degrees twenty-seven minutes fifty-seven and eight-tenths seconds, a distance of two hundred ninety and sixty one-hundredths feet; thence south forty-nine degrees fifty minutes east, twenty-seven and seventy-four one-hundredths feet to said northerly line of said block 13; thence along last said line north seventy-seven degrees fourteen minutes twenty-eight seconds west, forty-

three and fifty one-hundredths feet to the true point of commencement.

SEC. 4. (a) The easements granted pursuant to sections 2 and 3 shall include all the privileges and appurtenances necessary for the full enjoyment thereof.

(b) The conveyance of land made pursuant to the first section of this act and the grants of easements made pursuant to sections 2 and 3 of this act shall expressly provide that the State of California will at all times maintain such public highway, embankments, and drainage systems in good order, condition, and repair wholly at its own cost and expense, and that such drainage systems will be constructed and maintained by the State of California in such manner as to provide sufficient and adequate surface drainage at all times from the adjacent or contiguous lands owned by the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 12, change the word "forty" to "four."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUITCLAIM DEED TO CERTAIN LAND IN THE CITY OF CAMDEN

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5954) to provide the release to the city of Camden of all the rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. It would provide a release to the city of Camden, N. J., to title to a small tract of land between streetcar tracks, on which there is to be built a shelter for people waiting to board a streetcar. This is a quitclaim proposition and there is no money involved, as I understand it. It is simply a clearance of title. It was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to donate, convey, relinquish, and release to the city of Camden, county of Camden, N. J., all the right, title, and interest of the United States, if any, in and to certain land conditionally granted to such city by deed dated November 20, 1928 (recorded on October 10, 1930, in the Office of the Register of Deeds of Camden County in book 729 of Deeds, p. 458). Such land, which is located in the city of Camden, county of Camden, State of New Jersey, contains approximately three and four-tenths acres and is more particularly described as follows:

"Beginning at a point formed by the intersection of the northerly line of Collings Road and the proposed westerly line of Mount Ephraim Pike which line is forty feet westerly of and parallel to the center line of said Mount Ephraim Pike and running thence in a straight line along the said northerly line of Collings Road south seventy-four degrees fifty-six minutes fifty seconds west for a distance of about four thousand one hundred and seventy feet to the high-water line of Newton Creek, the above-described line being the southerly line of a strip of land thirty-six feet wide as measured at right angles and extending from the said proposed westerly line of Mount Ephraim Pike in a westerly direction to the said high-water line of Newton Creek being bounded on the south by the above-described line on the east by the said proposed westerly line of Mount Ephraim Pike on the north by a line parallel to and thirty-six feet distant northerly of said above-described line and on the west by the high-water line of Newton Creek."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO FULTON COUNTY, GA.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8272) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This is a bill to legalize an agreement between the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Board of Commissioners of Fulton County, Ga., by which the CAA will transfer to Fulton County, Ga., a tract of land less than one-half acre to be used as right-of-way for highway purposes. An agreement has been made by Fulton County with the CAA and a unanimous report in favor of the passage of the bill was made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The County of Fulton, Ga., will pay in money or in remodeling the remaining property approximately $40,000 for less than one-half acre of land.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. This is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes; it is.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to convey to Fulton County, a political subdivision of the State of Georgia, upon such terms and conditions with respect to relocation or reconstruction of existing buildings and facilities on and near the premises and with respect to such other matters as he may deem desirable, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land bounded and described as follows:

All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in the city of Atlanta in land lots 85 and 108 of the fourteenth district of originally Henry, now Fulton County, Ga., and more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of Stewart Avenue and Wells Street, running thence northeasterly along the southerly line of the property of the United States of America and northerly side of Wells Street twenty-eight feet; thence north no degrees thirty-one minutes nineteen seconds east a distance of sixty-eight feet; thence north no degrees fifty-six minutes forty-one seconds east a distance of two hundred and thirty-three feet to the northerly line of the United States of America property; thence southwesterly along the northerly line of the United States of America property a distance of ninety-three feet; thence south no degrees fifty-six minutes forty-one seconds west a distance of sixty-five feet to the westerly line of the United States of America property and the easterly side of Stewart Avenue; thence southeasterly along the said westerly line of the United States of America property and easterly line of Stewart Avenue two hundred and thirty feet to the northeast corner of Stewart Avenue and Wells Street and the point of beginning; being a portion of premises conveyed to the United States of America by deed from Smith and Simpson Realty Co., dated April 2, 1919, and recorded April 2, 1919, in book 501, folio 560, of the Fulton County records, and currently being used by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for warehouse purposes in the city of Atlanta.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPEALS UNDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FOR EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1271) to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. BARDEN. I shall be glad to.

This bill, S. 1271, amends the first paragraph of section 42 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, Thirty-ninth Statutes at Large, page 742, as amended, and would give employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company the right to appeal to the Federal Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from any decision of the Government of the Canal Zone respecting compensation under the Compensation Act before or after the creation of such Board. This bill will also authorize the Board on its own motion to review any decision of the Governor of the Canal Zone.

Section 42 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, among other things, vested in the President the authority to transfer the administration of the Compensation Act, so far as employees of the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company were concerned, to the Governor of the Panama Canal. This authority was delegated to the Governor by Executive Order 2455, September 15, 1916. A new Panama Railroad Company was formed as a result of the act of June 29, 1948, Sixty-second Statutes at Large, page 1075, which provides

for the Railroad Company to assume the costs of benefit payments made to its employees by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation. Although such provision may be construed as also making available to the Canal Zone employees the existing procedures of the Federal Employees' Compensation Appeals Board, this construction has not been adopted by the Governor of the Panama Canal.

It seems only equitable to give to the employees whose compensation claims are adjudicated by the Governor of the Panama Canal the same right of appeal as was given to other Federal employees when the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board was created in 1946, under Reorganization Plan No. 2, Sixtieth Statutes at Large, page 1095.

As stated before, the present status of these employees is based on provisions of an act passed in 1916 and which was not modified in 1946 when the other Federal employees were given the right to make appeals to the Board.

It was the opinion of our committee that all Federal employees be given the same recourse to appeal, and the purpose of this bill is to rectify the present exclusion of the Panama Canal Zone employees from this right which was due to an inadvertent omission when the Employees Compensation Appeals Board was created under the reorganization plan in 1946.

This bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It puts them on a parity with other Government employees?

Mr. BARDEN. That is exactly it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 42 of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 793) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Employees of the Canal Zone Government and of the Panama Canal Company shall, notwithstanding any such transfer, have the right to appeal to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board from any decision of the Governor of the Canal Zone rendered either before or after the creation of such Board, and such Board shall upon such appeal, and may at any time, on its own motion, review any decision of the Governor of the Canal Zone and in accordance with the facts found on such review, may proceed as in other cases in which it has jurisdiction."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY BY THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2043) to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this is?

Mr. DAWSON. This is the transfer of an existing building that has been used by the Civil Aeronautics Division for the use of the Indian Affairs Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Where is it located?

Mr. DAWSON. It is located in the city of Everett, Wash. It occupies about 0.07 of an acre of land. The land is under a 5-year lease to the Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The present occupant cannot use it?

Mr. DAWSON. That is right; it has been declared surplus, and the Department of the Interior wishes to use it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the General Services Administration is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without reimbursement, a woodframe building located in the city of Everett, Wash., on land leased from the city of Everett, formerly occupied by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Department of Commerce, and now excess to the requirements of the Department of Commerce.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF PROPERTY AT FORT WORTH, TEX., TO THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 3051, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex. This bill is No. 453 on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. DAWSON. This is an interdepartmental transfer of property, in this instance from the General Services Administration to the Navy Department.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department, without reimbursement, the Globe Aircraft plant, Fort Worth, Tex., consisting of approximately 156.6 acres of land and all improvements thereon.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3052) to authorize certain land and other property transactions and for other purposes. This, I may say, is No. 454 on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a similar bill?

Mr. DAWSON. A similar bill, a transfer of property between departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department, without reimbursement, a parcel of land containing eight and five-tenths acres, more or less, being a part of the site of the United States Navy Underwater Sound Laboratory, Fort Trumbull, New London, Conn, together with all improvements thereon and personal property relating thereto, formerly under the jurisdiction and control of the Department of Commerce (Maritime Administration), and now occupied by the Navy Department by virtue of a revocable permit.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department, without reimbursement, a parcel of land consisting of three and nine-tenths acres, more or less, situated at Oceanside, San Diego, Calif., being a part of a sixty-five and forty-seven one-hundredths-acre tract acquired by the Department of Agriculture for use in connection with an emergency rubber project and subsequently reported as excess to the Federal Works Agency, and now used by the Navy Department in connection with the operation of Public Housing Administration project Cal-4900-N.

SEC. 3. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, a 12-inch cast-iron water pipe line extending a distance of two thousand eight hundred and forty feet, more or less, from Chase's Pond to Folly Pond, Kittery, Maine, together with pump house, pumps, and other appurtenances, including the leasehold rights of the United States in the premises on which said property is located, being the same facility formerly under the jurisdiction and control of the Federal Works Agency and known as project No. Me-17-902-F, Kittery, Maine, and which supplies water to the United States naval base.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to transfer to the Navy Department, without reimbursement, the water supply line at the Naval Fuel Annex, Casco Bay, Portland, Maine, extending between Great Diamond Island and Long Island in Casco Bay, consisting of approximately 8,200 linear feet of 6-inch cast-iron pipe and 4,700 linear feet of 3-inch black steel pipe, together with pump house pumps, and all other appurtenances, including appurtenant easement rights.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING RULE X OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 647.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That clause (a) 8 of rule X of the rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

Clause (b) (3) of rule X is amended to read as follows:

"All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Government Operations, or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more."

Clause (1) (h) (1) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this makes but one change in the rules; it provides that a Member of the minority side of the House can serve on another committee other than the Committee on Expenditures.

The SPEAKER. And it changes the name of the committee.

Mr. COX. That is correct.

The committee granted a rule making in order the consideration of this resolution, but upon condition that it would not be filed unless the matter was cleared with the leadership on both sides of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It has been cleared with me.

Mr. COX. The Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader have been approached, and all have agreed that it is a resolution which should be accepted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that also make the Committee on House Administration an exclusive committee for the minority?

Mr. COX. The second clause of the resolution reads as follows:

All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, and the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How does that affect the minority membership of the Committee on House Administration?

Mr. COX. I do not know. This resolution is sponsored by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I request that the gentleman withdraw his request for the moment?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia: This resolution would have no practical effect whatsoever during this session of Congress, would it?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I may say that insofar as the Committee on House Administration is concerned, the resolution will have no effect. It affects only the present Committee on Expenditures and there would be considerable advantage in having it passed at this time, particularly with respect to seniority on committees, if there are vacancies which can be filled by present members of the Expenditures Committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it just a matter of being able to give somebody seniority because of their election?

Mr. COX. I am not the sponsor of the resolution; I am simply trying to cooperate in making possible the disposal of all business necessary to adjournment. The Committee on Rules can call this up under a rule, but I do not believe it is controversial, if the gentleman understood it. I would hate to do that because of the time that would be consumed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I shall not object because I understand it has the approval of the leadership on both sides, but I would like to make one further statement. I think we could very well put in this resolution a clause to the effect that the chairman of any standing committee of the House shall not serve on any other committee of the House. I think that would be quite an important matter in considering these changes.

Mr. HARDY. That concerns another rule of the House already. This resolution has no bearing on that at all.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is not the rule of the House now.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will let it pass.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are several Members on this side who probably will object to the unanimous-consent request unless the Committee on House Administration is taken care of. Certainly there is no justification for continuing the House Administration Committee as an exclusive committee, particularly with the proposed action concerning the Expenditures Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right, if anyone on the minority side wants to object there is no reason why he should not, so go ahead and do so, but you will not get it to apply to the other committees unless you introduce a bill, a resolution or an amendment to this resolution. The Members on the majority side now, as I see it, think they may be in the minority next year, so they want the amendment so they may, if they are on any one of the three named committees, serve on another committee. And it may be that Republicans will still be a minority. For example, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] is a member of the Committee on Armed Services. He has rendered a very valuable service to that committee. He is also a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Because he is a member of both committees those two committees have worked together very closely.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] heads a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which has rendered exceptional service, the work of that subcommittee has resulted in changes in the practices of the Air Force, which in one recent case saved some $80,000,000. Because of his knowledge of what the Armed Services Committee is doing and of what the Expenditures Committee is doing he has the opportunity to suggest and have adopted methods which save the taxpayers' money—prevents the spending of that money. That is just one instance. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] heads another subcommittee and has rendered a like service. Because the majority members of the committee are on other committees as well as on the Expenditures Committee, waste can be anticipated and prevented. If the majority members can give that service there is no reason why minority members should not have like opportunity. Nor is there any sound reason why if the Democrats are in the minority in the Eighty-third Congress the country should be deprived of the services of the two gentlemen named, or of others in like situation. Now if somebody on the Committee on House Administration wants to kill this attempt to aid in the betterment of the service of both of those committees, go ahead; I do not personally care. I was only trying to get a little more coordination and efficiency in the activities of the House committees.

This resolution makes no change in the House Rules except that it changes the name of the committee to comply with the change in name as made by the Senate and a change which permits the minority members of the committee to serve on more than one committee.

The rule as it stands reads as follows:

Clause (b) (3) of rule X is amended to read as follows:

"All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Government Operations, or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to

serve on two standing committees and no more."

The amendment proposed reads as follows:

All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more.

The only purpose and effect of the adoption of the resolution insofar as service on committees is affected would be to, as just stated, permit minority members of the Expenditures Committee to serve on another committee.

It makes no change in the status of the House Committee on Administration.

Objection is now made because a like privilege was not provided for minority members of the House Committee on Administration.

I am a member of the Expenditures Committee. For more than a year this matter has been under consideration. The resolution was introduced on May 21, 1951. A rule was tentatively granted some 2 weeks ago.

It was cleared with the leadership on both sides. Now it is said that I should have included a provision that the minority members of the House Committee on Administration should have been given the privilege of serving on two committees. I have been told by members of that committee that I should have consulted them. On like reasoning I should have consulted the members of the other 18 standing committees.

Is there any reason why I should go around asking the members of the other committees if any of them wanted some change in the House rules as the rules affected their committee? Had I done so they probably would have told me that if they did they would send for me or tell me.

I was looking after the interests of the minority members of my own committee as well as trying to make it possible for the House to retain the advice and service of majority members of that committee should they find themselves in the minority next year.

I have no objection to an amendment which will give the minority members of that committee the same privilege that is asked for my own minority members. But the squawk that has just been made with so much heat because they were not taken care of is without justification when it is remembered that the proposed amendment does not in any way change the present rule insofar as that committee or its members are involved.

I have not the slightest objection to their taking a free ride on this resolution by amendment. Why do they not offer it instead of objecting to present consideration of the resolution?

Why get mad at me because I did not know and anticipate their wishes? I was just trying to take care of my own business, and that I find a job.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I want to say that I concur with the gentleman's remarks, because this does seem to change the existing rules concerning the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; it does not.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. It does; because a member of the minority can serve on another committee, can he not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; he cannot.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman should withdraw his request for the moment.

Mr. COX. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 128]

Abernethy	Feighan	Nelson
Albert	Fenton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Hall,	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Edwin Arthur	Poage
Armstrong	Harden	Potter
Bakewell	Harvey	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Beckworth	Herter	Regan
Belcher	Heselton	Richards
Bender	Hillings	Robeson
Bentsen	Jones, Mo.	Sabath
Bosone	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Brehm	Kennedy	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Kilburn	Stigler
Burdick	Kilday	Sutton
Camp	Larcade	Tackett
Carlyle	Lyle	Teague
Carnahan	McGrath	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Magee	Trimble
Cole, N. Y.	Mills	Watts
Combs	Mitchell	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Morris	Wickersham
Donovan	Morrison	Willis
Engle	Morton	Wolcott
Evins	Moulder	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE FOUNDATIONS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of agreeing to House Resolution 638, to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Select Committee To Investigate Foundations, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 99, noes 37.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 247, nays 99, answered "present" 1, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—247

Aandahl	Eaton	Lucas
Abbitt	Eberharter	McConnell
Adair	Elliott	McCormack
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	McCulloch
Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	McDonough
	Fallon	McGregor
Andresen, August H.	Feighan	McGuire
	Fernandez	McIntire
Andrews	Fisher	McKinnon
Arends	Forand	McMullen
Bailey	Forrester	McVey
Baker	Frazier	Mack, Wash.
Barden	Fugate	Mahon
Bates, Mass.	Furcolo	Mansfield
Battle	Gamble	Martin, Mass.
Beall	Gary	Mason
Beamer	Gathings	Meader
Bennett, Fla.	Gavin	Merrow
Bennett, Mich.	George	Miller, Md.
Berry	Golden	Miller, Nebr.
Betts	Goodwin	Miller, N. Y.
Blackney	Gore	Mumma
Bogge, La.	Graham	Nicholson
Bolton	Grant	Norblad
Bonner	Gregory	Norrell
Bow	Gross	O'Brien, Mich.
Boykin	Gwinn	Passman
Brambiett	Hagen	Patman
Bray	Hall,	Patten
Brooks	Leonard W.	Patterson
Brown, Ga.	Halleck	Philbin
Brownson	Hardy	Phillips
Bryson	Harris	Poulson
Budge	Harrison, Va.	Preston
Buffett	Harrison, Wyo.	Priest
Burleson	Hart	Rabaut
Burton	Harvey	Radwan
Busbey	Hays, Ark.	Rains
Bush	Herlong	Rankin
Butler	Hess	Reams
Cannon	Hill	Redden
Carrigg	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Chelf	Hoffman, Ill.	Rhodes
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Mich.	Richlman
Chiperfield	Hope	Riley
Clemente	Horan	Rivers
Clevenger	Hull	Roberts
Cole, Kans.	Hunter	Rogers, Fla.
Colmer	Ikard	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Jackson, Calif	Rogers, Tex.
Cotton	James	Ross
Coudert	Jarman	St. George
Cox	Jenison	Sasscer
Crumpacker	Jensen	Saylor
Cunningham	Johnson	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Ala.	Scrivner
Dague	Jones,	Scudder
Davis, Ga.	Hamilton C.	Secrest
Davis, Wis.	Jones,	Shafer
Deane	Woodrow W.	Sheehan
DeGraffenried	Judd	Sheppard
Delaney	Kerr	Short
Dempsey	Kersten, Wis.	Sieminski
Devereux	King, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
D'Ewart	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	Lane	Smith, Kans.
Dolliver	Lanham	Smith, Miss.
Dondero	Lantaff	Smith, Va.
Donohue	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Dorn	LeCompte	Stanley
Doughton	Lesinski	Steed
Doyle	Lind	Stockman
Durham	Lovre	Taber

Talle	Velde	Williams, N. Y.
Taylor	Vinson	Wilson, Ind.
Teague	Vursell	Wilson, Tex.
Thomas	Walter	Winstead
Thompson, Mich.	Weichel	Withrow
	Werdel	Wood, Ga.
Thornberry	Wheeler	Wood, Idaho
Vail	Whitten	Zablocki
Van Pelt	Wigglesworth	
Van Zandt	Williams, Miss.	

NAYS—99

Addonizio	Granahan	Morano
Allen, Calif.	Granger	Morgan
Anfuso	Green	Multer
Angell	Greenwood	O'Brien, N. Y.
Aspinall	Hale	O'Neill
Auchincloss	Hand	Osmers
Ayres	Harrison, Nebr.	Ostertag
Baring	Havenner	Perkins
Barrett	Hays, Ohio	Polk
Bishop	Heffernan	Price
Blatnik	Heller	Prouty
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	Ramsay
Bolling	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Buchanan	Howell	Ribicoff
Burnside	Irving	Rodino
Byrnes	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.
Canfield	Javits	Rooney
Case	Karsten, Mo.	Roosevelt
Celler	Kean	Sadlak
Chudoff	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Church	Keating	Shelley
Corbett	Kee	Sittler
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Spence
Denny	Keily, N. Y.	Springer
Denton	Keogh	Staggers
Dollinger	Klein	Tollefson
Fine	McCarthy	Vorys
Flood	Machrowicz	Wharton
Fogarty	Mack, Ill.	Widnall
Ford	Madden	Wier
Fulton	Marshall	Wolverton
Garmatz	Martin, Iowa	Yates
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Yorty

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

O'Toole

NOT VOTING—83

Abernethy	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray
Albert	Harden	Nelson
Allen, La.	Hébert	O'Brien, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.	Hedrick	O'Hara
Armstrong	Herter	O'Konski
Bakewell	Heselton	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Hillings	Potter
Beckworth	Jenkins	Powell
Belcher	Jones, Mo.	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Kearney	Regan
Bentsen	Kennedy	Richards
Bosone	Kilburn	Robeson
Brehm	Kilday	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Kirwan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Buckley	Kluczynski	Sikes
Burdick	Larcade	Stigler
Camp	Lyle	Sutton
Carlyle	McGrath	Tackett
Carnahan	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	Magee	Trimble
Combs	Mills	Watts
Cooper	Mitchell	Welch
Crawford	Morris	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Willis
Dawson	Morton	Wolcott
Donovan	Moulder	Woodruff
Engle	Murdock	
Evins	Murphy	
Fenton		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Robeson for, with Mr. Murphy against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Donovan against.

Mr. Larcade for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Bakewell.

Mr. Trimble with Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Magee with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Mills with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Albert with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Morris with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Cooper with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Brehm.

Mr. Murray with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Sutton with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Tackett with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. BAILEY, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. McDONOUGH changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

STUDIES AND INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 686) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations, authorized by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000 in addition to the amount heretofore authorized by House Resolution 153 and House Resolution 433, Eighty-second Congress, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I know that it is the desire of the House to move promptly today, but this is a resolution in which I am sure the entire membership of the House is interested. It deals with the committee headed by the gentleman from California [Mr. KING], charged with the investigation of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Serving with the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] on this committee are the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to express my personal appreciation, and I am sure the House Members feel the same way, for the remarkably fine job this committee has rendered; and I especially would like to make mention of a statement that has been brought to my attention whereby it was insinuated that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] tied himself to the tails of this particular committee to advance his own personal position. Knowing the gentleman from California as all of us do, we know that is most untrue, because certainly a study of the hearings shows how impartial has been the work of this particular committee.

I have before me, and I will ask unanimous consent to include them as part of my statement, some of the outstanding statements editorially made of the fairness of this committee and its members from both sides of the aisle. I felt that we should take a minute or two to express our gratitude and personal appreciation of the work this committee has done. The members of the committee have risked their political fortunes and criticism perhaps inside and outside the Government because of the courageous work they have done.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of conserving time and space under the circumstances, I shall include a portion of but three of the many commendatory editorials and articles that have come to my attention with regard to the splendid work of Mr. KING's committee.

First. From the editorial section of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Sunday, December 30, 1951, entitled "CECIL R. KING of California Investigates Tax Corruption Thoroughly, but Also Fairly":

As chairman of the subcommittee, KING has been in charge of an investigation that had made more headlines and produced more concrete results than any similar congressional inquiry in recent years. The evidence of loose ethical standards among public officials, dug up by the subcommittee, could be the deciding factor in the 1952 Presidential elections. Despite the clamor and the sensations, KING, a largely self-educated former businessman, has directed the subcommittee with fairness and detachment. He has consistently expressed regard for the rights of witnesses, and on one occasion, at least, virtually pleaded with a youthful witness to "come clean" and avoid the danger of ruining his life.

Second. From the syndicated column of Republican United States Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, one of America's most distinguished women, in the Chicago Sun-Times, entitled "King-Size Investigation":

The King-size of all congressional investigations for exposing corruption is the one being carried out by the King subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. The subcommittee derives its name from its chairman, Representative CECIL R. KING, of Los Angeles. What the group has done in digging out scandals in the Government puts all other investigating committees to shame. It is to be commended for making the most out of what it has—for the public and not just for individual glory and personal publicity of its members.

Third. From an editorial of the Santa Monica Evening Outlook, one of the oldest and most respected daily newspapers in southern California, under date

of February 26, 1952, entitled "The Verdict of the King Committee":

Representative CECIL R. KING, of California, who has headed the congressional committee investigating scandals in the Internal Revenue Department, is a Democrat whose courage and integrity must be admired. For he has now climaxed a fearless probe of conditions which cried aloud for public censure and correction, by placing the blame for these conditions on an inept top administration in Washington. In delivering this scathing indictment, Representative KING has risked his political career, and has certainly cut himself off from any possible favor with the present heads of his party. But while this courageous honesty will consign him to the doghouse, it has won him the wholehearted respect and gratitude of the decent people of this country. We congratulate Representative CECIL R. KING on having made a brave and honorable choice, and on the great ability and fearlessness which he has shown in the conduct of his committee investigation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. As a minority member of the subcommittee on accounts of the Committee on House Administration I want to corroborate what the gentleman has just said. The King subcommittee is certainly deserving of a lot of credit for the manner in which it has proceeded with an investigation which has been of tremendous importance and concern to all of the people of the United States, and certainly to the taxpayers of the United States.

The committee, as far as I have been able to observe, has operated on a strictly nonpartisan basis in carrying out the mandate of the Congress when it was instructed to make the investigation.

I want to commend the chairman, Mr. KING, the ranking minority member from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] and all of the members of the committee whose names have been read, for the very fine job they have done.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, a member of the committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I, too, want to add my word of commendation for the King committee. As a matter of fact, I am not sure that I have been in favor of all the investigations that have been made, but I think the King committee, a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means, has done a splendid job. They have approached their problem in a nonpartisan way, and I am happy to support the appropriation for continuation of their study and investigation.

I do want to say, however, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress it seems to me, has gone quite far afield in their investigations. We have spent more money—a total of over $3,000,000—for investigations of various kinds and character extending from baseball to obscene literature and everything in between.

The chairman of the Committee on House Administration has done well in cutting down the requests of different committees for studies, and he has done a splendid job in holding down the total to as near a reasonable figure as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks a statement of expenditures of the Eighty-second Congress for various investigations and studies, including resolutions that are pending, which I assume will be passed, showing a total of $3,215,000 for studies and investigations with the possibility there will be slightly more before the Congress adjourns:

Investigation funds approved by the House of Representatives, 82d Cong.

Standing committees	$1,985,000
Special and select committees	507,500
Joint committees (House share)	97,500
Appropriations Committee	445,000
	3,035,000
PENDING BEFORE HOUSE, AS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION	
Standing committees	$50,000
Special and select committees	130,000
	180,000
	3,215,000

APPROPRIATIONS

79th Cong	$1,270,219.19
80th Cong	2,187,204.03
81st Cong	1,978,987.90
82d Cong. (including pending resolutions	3,215,000.00

82d Cong.—Appropriations approved by the House for studies and investigations

Standing committees:	
Agriculture	$150,000
Armed Services	150,000
Banking and Currency	50,000
District of Columbia	2,000
Education and Labor	30,000
Expenditures in Executive Departments	360,000
Foreign Affairs	75,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	85,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	80,000
Judiciary	308,000
Public Works	95,000
Un-American Activities	500,000
Ways and Means	200,000
Total	1,985,000
Pending (authorized by House Administration Committee but still pending before House of Representatives): Ways and Means (H. Res. 686)	50,000
Special and select committees:	
Australian Jubilee	10,000
Dorchester Heights	2,500
Chemicals in Foods	75,000
GI Education	75,000
Katyn Forest Massacre	85,000
Small Business	260,000
Total	507,000
Pending:	
Foundations (Cox) (H. Res. 638)	75,000
Campaign Expenses (Boggs) (H. Res. 691)	30,000
Pornographic Material (GATHINGS) (H. Res. 692)	25,000
Total	130,000
Joint committees (House share):	
Consultation Council (Europe)	15,000
Defense Production	45,000
Railroad Retirement	25,000
Navajo-Hopi Indians	12,500
Total	97,500
Appropriations Committee	445,000

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

The Chair hopes that the gentleman from Virginia will ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this resolution. There is more business on the Speaker's desk to be transacted today than we can possibly conclude before 10 or 11 o'clock tonight, if we move with all the expedition possible. If the gentleman from Virginia wants to use up his hour, it is all right with the Chair, of course.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I assure the Speaker that I am endeavoring to cooperate with him in expediting the business now before the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this appropriation for the King Committee. As everyone here knows, it takes a great deal of courage on the part of a committee chairman who is on the same side as an administration, to expose corruption in that administration. Our colleague, Mr. KING, as chairman, with the other members of his committee, has been fearless and diligent in prosecuting investigations into tax evasions and in my opinion deserves the support as well as the commendation of the Congress and the people.

Mr. Speaker, a United Press report carried in the Washington Star of last April 13 a statement of Chairman STANLEY, of the House Administration Committee, critical of a number of investigatory committees of the House. But in respect to the King Committee the article states as follows:

STANLEY said some investigations have been "necessary and worth while." He singled out for particular praise the House subcommittee investigating Government tax scandals. He said the $200,000 appropriated for that inquiry will "ultimately pay huge dividends to taxpayers."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, CECIL R. KING and I were elected to Congress on the same day. I did not know him but soon became well acquainted with him after becoming a Member of the House of Representatives.

In the recent investigation of irregularities and alleged scandals in the Internal Revenue Bureau, CECIL R. KING has shown that he is a real leader. When, as chairman, he opened the first hearing, he was promptly attacked. There were insinuations made against his character and his capacity to conduct this investigation impartially. He promptly asked the committee to investigate him and determine for themselves whether he was the right type of man to

be chairman of this important committee. After considerable investigation, the committee unanimously gave him a clean bill of health.

To fight crime is a difficult and rugged job. I know from experience. CECIL KING has furnished the intelligence, the leadership, and the courage to make the investigation entrusted o him and his committee an outstanding accomplishment in the uncovering of irregularities and crime in a very important department of government. He deserves the thanks of every citizen who believes in honesty in government. He deserves the praise of his colleagues, and he has mine, on uncovering graft and corruption in a very important part of our Government. He deserves praise for insisting on integrity in government so that the people, whom public officials serve as trustees of their interest and welfare, may have confidence that men in public life will safeguard the public welfare. Without integrity, popular government would soon collapse. The leadership of CECIL R. KING in this investigation has given our people renewed confidence in representative government as the protector and guardian of the rights of the people.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remark at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, the funds provided for under this resolution should be granted. In my opinion the King committee has done an excellent job in digging out the graft and corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This is an agency of Government in which the people must have confidence, and the disclosures of the committee clearly indicate that there has been little or no grounds for confidence in the Bureau the way that it has been operating in the past.

While the committee has done a fine job to date there remains much more to be done in the future but without the funds provided herein they would be virtually helpless to go ahead with their work. The resolution should pass unanimously.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the King committee and every member of it for the excellent work they have done. I hope they will continue this work because I feel their job is incomplete. Their work has been constructive, it has been patriotic and if we are going to have a clean, wholesome Government, we need more such work as they are doing in uncovering corruption in official life.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks that the Members have made in commendation of the fine work done by the so-called King committee.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] has done an excellent job. As a result of the investigations and hearings which the subcommittee has held, both the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Department of Justice have gone through housecleanings which have helped greatly to restore the confidence of the public in the administration of our tax laws. The subcommittee was instrumental in speeding up the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Each member of the subcommittee is to be highly commended for the long and arduous work he has performed. The members have been diligent and fair in their work.

As chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, I am very pleased with the manner in which the gentleman from California and the other members of the subcommittee have approached this investigation.

The results which the subcommittee has produced speak for themselves. I urge favorable action on the resolution providing additional funds for the subcommittee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1952

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 691 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 558, considered and agreed to on May 12, 1952, incurred by the Special Committee To Investigate Campaign Expenditures, 1952, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$30,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief comment? I appreciate what the Speaker has said, and I want to expedite matters, too, but I should like to refer to a few things.

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in years gone by candidates for Congress have frequently been called upon by this committee to submit detailed information, most of which is a straight duplication of what we are already required to report to the Clerk of the House. To my mind, it seems to me, nothing really worth while could be accomplished by any such procedure. Secondly, I have had some information to the effect that the committee proposes to set up immediately an expensive staff in connection with this work. It would occur to me that there would be no reason to set up an expensive staff and begin the spending of money until there was something to investigate, and certain work to be done by the committee, which certainly could not exist at this time, so far as I know.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF CURRENT PORNOGRAPHIC MATERIALS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 692) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 596, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Select Committee on the Study of Current Pornographic Materials, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of such experts, clerical stenographic, special counsel, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ASSISTANT PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 725) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House compensation at the basic rate of $2,800 per annum for the employment of an Assistant Property Custodian (electrical and mechanical office equipment), office of the Clerk of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INAUGURAL ADDRESSES, FROM PRESIDENT GEORGE WASHINGTON TO PRESIDENT HARRY TRUMAN

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 726) providing for a collection of inaugural addresses, from President

George Washington to President Harry Truman, compiled from research volumes and state papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much is this going to cost?

Mr. STANLEY. Between $1,000 and $1,200.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What is the need for it?

Mr. STANLEY. I will say to the gentleman that there never has been such a House document printed, and there have been many requests for it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is there any reason why you cannot wait a while longer?

Mr. STANLEY. I know of no particular reason. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

PROVIDE FOR INTENSIFIED RESEARCH IN AIR POLLUTION

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution; into methods for its prevention, and control, and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what does this bill do?

Mr. KLEIN. This was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It provides for research as to the causes of air pollution and how to correct it. It will be done by the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much will it cost?

Mr. KLEIN. About $75,000 or $100,000 a year for 5 years. They expect to be all finished in 5 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report?

Mr. KLEIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas certain industrial processes, the use of certain fuels, and other activities have caused serious air pollution in many areas of the United States; and

Whereas air pollution has caused many deaths and illnesses among the people of the United States and extensive damage to public, industrial, and residential structures, to clothing and personal property, agriculture, forests, livestock, and to other real property; and

Whereas the methods and equipment used in many of the processes that are contaminating the atmosphere are dissipating vast quantities of materials of strategic value that are in critically short supply, such as sulfur, fuels, and various chemical and mineral products; and

Whereas existing knowledge of the causes and effects of air pollution and the methods of its prevention or control is insufficient and intensification of present programs of research and investigation is needed to determine and evaluate the effects of air pollution, to develop methods for eliminating its dangers, and to conserve or recover strategic fuels and mineral products which are wasted by dissemination into the atmosphere; and

Whereas local communities are seeking technical guidance and information to aid them in meeting their responsibilities in combating air pollution; and

Whereas the problem is so widespread and is costing business and industry many millions of dollars annually, its solution is so pressing as to be a matter of national concern: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., (a) That for the purpose of protecting public health, property, and the recovery of fuels and minerals vital to the national defense efforts, the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, and the Secretary of the Interior, are authorized and directed to intensify their respective activities within the scope of their existing statutory authority with respect to the conduct of research, investigations, experiments, demonstrations, and the publication and dissemination of information through appropriate media, relating to the causes and effects and means of prevention and control of air pollution. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Public Health Service, and to the Department of the Interior, such sums for each fiscal year for the next 5 years, following enactment of this resolution, as may be necessary to intensify such activities.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Surgeon General, shall coordinate their activities under this act and cooperate with other Federal agencies and with State and local agencies and other public and private bodies concerned with problems of air pollution, rendering every effort insofar as practicable to aid such State and local agencies in discharging their responsibilities in combating air pollution.

(c) Not later than January 1 of each calendar year after funds are made available pursuant to the authority conferred by subsection (a), the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, reporting through the Federal Security Administrator, and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, shall make to the Congress a report of their activities, including recommendations as to steps which should be taken by Federal, State, and local agencies, private industries, and the general public, to assure safety from air pollution and the most effective utilization of strategic resources.

(d) The Secretary of the Interior, and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, are hereby authorized to enter into such contracts for the performance of research and services as they shall deem necessary to the efficient discharge of their responsibilities under this joint resolution.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 6, strike out "and" and insert after the word "Interior" ", and the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 3, line 4, strike out "and to", insert a comma after the word "Service", and on line 5 after the word "Interior" insert "and to the Department of Agriculture."

Page 3, line 8, strike out the words "and the", insert a comma after the word "Interior", and on line 9 after the word "General" insert "and the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 3, line 19, strike out the word "and", and after the word "Interior" add "and the Secretary of Agriculture."

Page 4, line 1, strike out the "and", insert a comma after the word "Interior", and on line 2 after the word "Service" add ", and the Secretary of Agriculture."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEATHER MODIFICATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2225) to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This bill was sent to the House by a unanimous vote of the Senate. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The bill provides for a temporary Advisory Committee on Weather Control comprised of nine members, including five to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Other members would be the Secretaries of Defense, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, or their designees. The committee's duty would be to conduct a study into various rain-making experiments that have been carried on recently throughout the country, to determine their effects, and to coordinate experimentation in this field.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What change did the Senate make in the House bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This is a Senate bill we have before us. It has already been passed by that body.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did we not have a bill of similar character before the House?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. There were several bills, I understand, before the House. However, as I said, this particular bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are we not overdoing this rain-making? As I understand it there are two of three departments considering the subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. As I understand it, no one in the Government now has anything to do with rain-making experiments. The purpose of this bill is to provide for a study of the rain-making experiments conducted thus far and to attempt to coordinate and assimilate all available information on the subject, as well as to conduct experiments in this activity.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I am trying to get at is, why should more than one department be handling the subject?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The purpose of the bill is to attempt to provide some coordination of a study to see whether rain making has any practical effect upon the weather, to relieve the minds of a lot of people who are worrying about what effect it does have.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much are we going to put into the rain-making research this year?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Government is doing nothing so far as rain making is concerned. This is a study, not an effort to make rain. This is a study of what is being done in the field by both public and private agencies.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is an effort to coordinate the research?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Yes; and to find out what is being done.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When you find out, let me know.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just what does this cost the Federal Government?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It should not cost the Government any more than $100,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withdraw his objection for the moment, and reserve the right to object?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] intend to object?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I do intend to object, and I do now object.

S. 1429

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to S. 1429, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has advised me that the committee will not insist upon the consideration of the bill at this time, until further hearings are held.

AIR TRANSPORTATION TICKET AGENTS

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2690) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by renumbering paragraph (32) as paragraph (33) and by inserting therein a new paragraph (32) reading as follows:

"(32) 'Ticket agent' means any person, not an air carrier or a foreign air carrier and not a bona fide employee of an air carrier or foreign air carrier, who, as principal or agent, sells or offers for sale any air transportation, or negotiates for, or holds himself out by solicitation, advertisement, or otherwise as one who sells, provides, furnishes, contracts or arranges for, such transportation."

SEC. 2. Section 411 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"METHODS OF COMPETITION

"SEC. 411. The Board may, upon its own initiative or upon complaint by any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, if it considers that such action by it would be in the interest of the public, investigate and determine whether any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent has been or is engaged in unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition in air transportation or the sale thereof. If the Board shall find, after notice and hearing, that such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent is engaged in such unfair or deceptive practices or unfair methods of competition, it shall order such air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent to cease and desist from such practices or methods of competition."

SEC. 3. Section 902 (d) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTING REBATES

"(d) Any air carrier, foreign air carrier, or ticket agent, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall, knowingly and willfully, offer, grant, or give, or cause to be offered, granted, or given, any rebate or other concession in violation of the provisions of this act, or who, by any device or means, shall, knowingly and willfully, assist, or shall willingly suffer or permit, any person to obtain transportation or services subject to this act at less than the rates, fares, or charges lawfully in effect, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be subject for each offense to a fine of not less than $100 and not more than $5,000."

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to enlarge or extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board over transportation not subject to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective upon enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1310) amending the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 4f–4o), providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, with an amendment, the amendment being the McConnell bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes", approved May 7, 1941, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE II—PREVENTION OF MAJOR DISASTERS IN MINES

"DEFINITIONS AND EXEMPTION

"SEC. 201. (a) For the purposes of this title—

"(1) The term 'Board' means the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review created by section 205.

"(2) The term 'Bureau' means the Bureau of Mines.

"(3) The term 'certified person', when used to designate the kind of person to whom the performance of a duty in connection with the operation of a mine shall be assigned, means a person who is qualified under the laws of the State in which such mine is located to perform such duty, except that in a State the laws of which do not provide for such qualification, the term means a person deemed by the operator of such mine to be qualified to perform such duty.

"(4) The term 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communications between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any other State, Territory, or possession, of the United States, or between any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any foreign country, or wholly within any Territory, possession, or through any other State or through any Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia or through any foreign country.

"(5) The term 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau of Mines.

"(6) The term 'duly authorized representative of the Bureau' means a person appointed under section 109 of title I or under section 212 of this title, and authorized in writing by the Director to perform the duties of a duly authorized representative of the Bureau as provided in section 202, 203, and 206 of this title.

"(7) The term 'mine' means an area of land including everything annexed to it by nature and all structures, machinery, tools, equipment and other property, real or personal, placed upon, under or above its surface by man, used in the work of extracting bituminous coal, lignite or anthracite, from its natural deposits in the earth in such area and in the work of processing the coal so extracted. The term 'mine' does not include any strip mine. The term 'work of processing the coal' as used in this paragraph means the sizing, cleaning, drying, mixing, and crushing of bituminous coal, lignite, or anthracite, and such other work of processing such coal as is usually done by the operator, and does not mean crushing, coking, or distillation of such coal or such other work of processing such coal as is usually done by a consumer or others in connection with the utilization of such coal.

"(8) The term 'operator' means the person, partnership, association, or corporation operating a mine and owning the right to do so.

"(9) The term 'permissible,' as applied to equipment used in the operation of a mine, means equipment to which an approval plate, label, or other device is attached as authorized by the Director under section 212 (a), and which meets specifications which (A) are prescribed by the Director for the construction and maintenance of such equipment, and (B) are designed to assure that such equipment will not cause a mine explosion or mine fire.

"(10) The term 'premises' when used in referring to the premises of a mine, means the land within the mine's area of land.

"(11) The term 'rock dust' means pulverized limestone, dolomite, gypsum, anhydrite, shale, talc, adobe, or other inert material,

preferably light colored, (A) 100 percent of which will pass through a sieve having 20 meshes per linear inch and 70 percent or more of which will pass through a sieve having 200 meshes per linear inch; (B) the particles of which when wetted and dried will not cohere to form a cake which will not be dispersed into separate particles by a light blast of air; and (C) which does not contain more than 5 percent of combustible matter, nor more than a total of 5 percent of free and combined silica (SiO).

"(b) This title shall not apply to any mine in which no more than 14 individuals are regeularly employed underground.

"INSPECTIONS

"SEC. 202. (a) For the purpose of determining whether a danger described in section 203 (a) exists in any mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, or whether any provision of section 209 is being violated in any such mine, or whether any such mine is a gassy mine as prescribed in section 203 (d), the Director shall cause an inspection of each such mine to be made by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau at least annually. The Director shall also make, or cause duly authorized representatives of the Bureau to make, such special inspections of such mines as may be required by section 203 (c) and section 206, and such other inspections of such mines as he deems necessary for the proper administration of this title.

"(b) (1) In order to promote sound and effective coordination in Federal and State activities within the field covered by this title, the Director shall cooperate with the official mine inspection or safety agencies of the several States.

"(2) Any State desiring to cooperate in making the inspections required under this title may submit, through its official mine inspection or safety agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this subsection. Such State plan shall—

"(A) designate such State mine inspection or safety agency as the sole agency responsible for administering the plan throughout the State and contain satisfactory evidence that such agency will have the authority to carry out the plan,

"(B) give assurances that such agency has or will employ an adequate and competent staff of inspectors qualified under the laws of such State to make mine inspections within such State,

"(C) give assurances, that upon request of the Director or upon request of an operator under section 203 (e) (1), the agency will assign inspectors employed by it to participate in inspections to be made in such State under this title, and

"(D) provide that the agency will make such reports to the Director, in such form and containing such information, as the Director may from time to time require.

"(3) The Director shall approve any State plan or any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection. He shall not finally disapprove any State plan or modification thereof without first affording the State agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

"(4) Whenever the Director, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, finds that in the administration of the State plan there is—

"(A) a failure to comply substantially with any provision of the State plan; or

"(B) a failure to afford reasonable cooperation in administering the provisions of this title,

the Director shall notify such State agency of his withdrawal of approval of such plan and upon receipt of such notice such plan shall cease to be in effect.

"(5) No inspection of a mine shall be made by a representative of the Bureau under this title in any State in which a State plan is in effect unless a State inspector participates in such inspection in accordance with such plan, except where, in the Director's judgment, an inspection is urgently needed to determine whether a danger described in section 203 (a) exists in such mine, and participation by a State inspector would unreasonably delay such inspection.

"(c) The Director, any duly authorized representative of the Bureau, any State inspector assigned in accordance with a State plan, and any independent inspector appointed under section 203 (c) (3) shall be entitled to admission to any mine the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce, for the purpose of making any inspection authorized under this title.

"FINDINGS AND ORDERS

"SEC. 203. (a) (1) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine as authorized in section 202, finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall also find the extent of the area of such mine throughout which such danger exists. Thereupon he shall immediately make an order requiring the operator of such mine to cause all persons, excepting persons referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such findings and order shall contain a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such danger, and a description of the area of such mine throughout which persons must be withdrawn and debarred.

"(2) No order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to eliminate the danger described in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal technical consultant, or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(b) If such representative of the Bureau finds that any provision of section 209 is being violated and that the conditions created by such violation do not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall find what would be a reasonable period of time within which such violation should be totally abated. Such findings shall contain the provisions of section 209 which he finds are being violated and a detailed description of the conditions which cause and constitute such violation.

"(c) (1) The period of time so found by such representative to be a reasonable period of time may be extended by a duly authorized representative of the Bureau from time to time upon the making of a special inspection to ascertain whether or not such violation has been totally abated. The Director shall promptly cause a special inspection to be made: (A) Upon the expiration of such a period of time as originally fixed; (B) upon the expiration of such a period of time as extended; and (C) whenever an operator of a mine, prior to the expiration of any such period of time, requests him to cause such a special inspection to be made at such mine. Upon making such a special inspection, such representative of the Bureau shall find whether or not such violation has been totally abated. If he finds that such violation has not been totally abated, he shall find whether or not such period of time as originally fixed, or as so fixed and extended, should be extended. If he finds that such period of time should be extended, he shall find what a reasonable extension would be. If he finds that such violation has not been totally abated, and if such period of time as originally fixed, or as so fixed and extended, has then expired, and if he also finds that such period of time should not be further extended, he shall also find the extent of the area of such mine which is affected by such violation. Thereupon he shall promptly make an order requiring the operator of such mine to cause all persons in such area, excepting persons referred to in paragraph (2) of this subsection, to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, such area. Such finding and order shall contain the provisions of section 209 which are being violated and a detailed description of the conditions which such representative finds cause and constitute such violation, and a description of the area of such mine throughout which persons must be withdrawn and debarred.

"(2) No order issued under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall require any of the following persons to be withdrawn from, or to be debarred from entering, the area described in the order: (A) Any person whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, to abate the violation described in the order; (B) any public official whose official duties require him to enter such area; or (C) any legal or technical consultant or any representative of the employees of the mine, who is a certified person qualified to make mine examinations, or is accompanied by such a person, and whose presence in such area is necessary, in the judgment of the operator of the mine, for the proper investigation of the conditions described in the order.

"(d) If a duly authorized representative of the Bureau, upon making an inspection of a mine, as authorized in section 202, finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or finds methane by use of a permissible flame safety lamp or by air analysis in an amount of 0.25 per centum or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, he shall make an order requiring the operator of such mine to comply with the provisions of section 209 of this title which pertain to gassy mines, in the operation of such mine.

"(e) (1) If an order is made pursuant to subsection (a) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect, and a State inspector did not participate in the inspection on which such order is based, the operator of the mine may request the agency designated in the State plan to assign a State inspector to inspect the mine. The State inspector assigned in accordance with such request shall inspect such mine promptly after the request is made.

"(2) No order shall be made pursuant to subsection (c) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect unless a State inspector participated in the inspection on which such order is based and concurs in such order, or an independent inspector appointed under paragraph (3) concurs in such order. If the State inspector does not concur in such order, the operator of the mine, the duly authorized representative of the Bureau who proposes to make such order, or the State inspector may apply, within 24 hours after the completion of the inspection involved, for the appointment of an independent inspector under paragraph (3). Within 5 days after

the date of his appointment, the independent inspector shall inspect the mine. The representative of the Bureau and the State inspector shall be given the opportunity to accompany the independent inspector during such inspection. If, after such inspection is completed, either the independent inspector or the State inspector concurs in the order, it shall be issued.

"(3) Within 5 days after the date of receipt of an application under paragraph (2) of this subsection, the chief judge of the United States District Court for the district in which the mine involved is located (or in his absence, the clerk of such court) shall appoint a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry to serve as an independent inspector under this subsection. Each independent inspector so appointed shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and related expenses.

"(4) An order made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) of this section with respect to a mine in a State in which a State plan approved under section 202 (b) is in effect shall not be subject to review under section 206, but shall be subject to review under section 207.

"(f) Notice of each finding and order made under this section shall promptly be given to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, by the person making such finding or order.

"NOTICES

"SEC. 204. (a) All findings and orders made pursuant to section 203 or section 206, and all notices required to be given of the making of such findings and orders, shall be in writing. All such findings and orders shall be signed by the person making them, and all such notices shall be signed by the person charged with the duty of giving the notice. All such notices shall contain a copy of the findings and orders referred to therein.

"(b) Each operator of a mine shall maintain an office on or near the premises of such mine and shall maintain thereon a conspicuous sign designating it as the office of such mine. Each operator of a mine shall maintain a bulletin board at such office or at some conspicuous place near an entrance of such mine, in such manner that notices required by law to be posted on the mine bulletin board may be posted thereon, be easily visible to all persons desiring to read them, and be protected against damage by weather and against unauthorized removal. The operator shall maintain on such bulletin board a conspicuous sign designating it as the bulletin board of such mine. Notice of any finding or order required by section 203 or section 206 to be given to an operator shall be given by causing such notice, addressed to the operator of the mine to which it pertains, to be delivered to the office of such mine provided for in the first sentence of this subsection, and by causing a copy of such notice to be posted on the bulletin board of such mine provided for in the second sentence of this subsection. The requirement of the preceding sentence that a notice shall be 'addressed to the operator of the mine to which it pertains,' shall not require that the name of the operator for whom it is intended shall be specifically set out in such address. Addressing such notice to 'Operator of ——— Mine,' specifiying the mine sufficiently to identify it, shall satisfy such requirement.

"(c) The Director shall cause a copy of each such notice to be mailed immediately to a duly designated representative of the employees of the mine to which it pertains, and to the public official or agency of the State or Territory charged with administering State or Territorial laws, if any, relating to mine safety in such mine.

"CREATION OF REVIEW BOARD

"SEC. 205. (a) An agency is hereby created to be known as the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, which shall be composed of 3 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(b) The terms of office of members of the Board shall be 3 years, except that the terms of office of the members first appointed shall commence on the effective date of this section and shall expire one at the end of 1 year, one at the end of 2 years, and one at the end of 3 years, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. A member appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the death, resignation, or removal of a member prior to the expiration of the term for which he was appointed, shall be appointed only for the remainder of such unexpired term. The members of the Board may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

"(c) Each member of the Board shall be compensated at the rate of $50 for each day of actual service (including each day he is traveling on official business) and shall, notwithstanding the Travel Expense Act of 1949, be fully reimbursed for traveling, subsistence, and other related expenses. The Board, at all times, shall consist of one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal-mine operators, one person who by reason of previous training and experience may reasonably be said to represent the viewpoint of coal-mine workers, and one person, who shall be chairman of the Board, who shall be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry or shall have had at least 5 years' experience as a practical mining engineer in the coal-mining industry, and who shall not, within 1 year of his appointment as a member of the Board, have had a pecuniary interest in, or have been regularly employed or engaged in, the mining of coal, or have regularly represented either coal-mine operators or coal-mine workers, or have been an officer or employee of the Department of the Interior assigned to duty in the Bureau.

"(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia. Whenever the Board deems that the convenience of the public or of the parties may be promoted, or delay or expense may be minimized, it may hold hearings or conduct other proceedings at any other place. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed and which shall be preserved in the custody of the secretary of the Board.

"(e) The Board shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of a secretary of the Board and such legal counsel as it deems necessary. Subject to the civil-service laws, the Board shall appoint such other employees as it deems necessary in exercising its powers and duties. The compensation of all employees appointed by the Board shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(f) Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum, and official actions of the Board can be taken only on the affirmative vote of at least two members; but any one member, or any two members, upon order of the Board, shall conduct any hearing provided for in section 207 and submit the transcript of such hearing to the entire Board for its action thereon. Every official act of the Board shall be entered of record, and its hearings and records thereof shall be open to the public.

"(g) The Board shall hear and determine applications filed pursuant to section 207 for annulment or revision of orders made pursuant to section 203 or section 206. The Board shall not make or cause to be made any inspection of a mine for the purpose of determining any pending application.

"(h) The Board is authorized to make such rules as are necessary for the orderly transaction of its proceedings, which shall include requirement for adequate notice of hearings to all parties.

"(i) Any member of the Board may sign and issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and documents, and administer oaths. Witnesses summoned before the Board shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

"(j) The Board may order testimony to be taken by deposition in any proceeding pending before it, at any stage of such proceeding. Reasonable notice must first be given in writing by the party or his attorney proposing to take such deposition to the opposite party or his attorney of record, which notice shall state the name of the witness and the time and place of the taking of his deposition. Any person may be compelled to appear and depose, and to produce books, papers, or documents, in the same manner as witnesses may be compelled to appear and testify and produce like documentary evidence before the Board, as provided in subsection (i). Witnesses whose depositions are taken under this subsection, and the persons taking such depositions shall be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

"(k) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person under this section, the Federal district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States, and after notice to such person and hearing, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Board or to appear and produce documents before the Board, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

"REVIEW BY DIRECTOR

"SEC. 206. (a) Except as provided in section 203 (e) (4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (a) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and to report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not danger throughout the area of such mine as set out in such order existed at the time of making such special inspection. If he finds that such danger did not then exist throughout such area of such mine, he shall make an order, consistent with his findings, revising or annulling the order under review. If he finds that such danger did then exist throughout such area of such mine, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(b) Except as provided in section 203 (e) (4), an operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (c) may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make a special inspection of the mine affected by such order, or cause three duly authorized representatives of the Bureau, other than the representative who made such order, to make such inspection of such mine and report thereon to him. Upon making such special inspection himself, or upon receiving the report of such inspection made by such representatives, the Director shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such

order. If he finds there was no such violation he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds there was such a violation he shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the making of such special inspection. If he finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, he shall find whether or not the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, fixed under section 203, should be extended. If he finds that such period of time should be extended, he shall find what a reasonable extension of such period of time would be. Thereupon he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and then he shall make an order, consistent with his findings, revising the order under review. If he finds that such violation was not totally abated at the time of such special inspection, and that such period of time should not be extended, he shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time such special inspection was made, and he shall then make an order, consistent with his findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(c) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 (d) may apply, not later than 20 days after the receipt of notice of such order, to the Director for annulment of such order. Upon receipt of such application the Director shall make or cause to be made such investigation as he deems necessary. Upon concluding his investigation or upon receiving the report of such investigation made at his direction, the Director shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine, or whether or not methane was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open workings of such mine, when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, at the time of the making of such order. If he finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, he shall make an order annulling the order under review. If he finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, he shall make an order denying such application.

"(d) The Director shall cause notice of each finding and order made under this section to be given promptly to the operator of the mine to which it pertains.

"(e) Except as provided in section 202 (e) (4), at any time while an order made pursuant to section 203 or this section is in effect, or at any time during the pendency of a proceeding under section 207 or section 208 seeking annulment or revision of such order, the operator of the mine affected by such order may apply to the Director for annulment or revision of such order. The Director shall thereupon proceed to act upon such application in the manner provided in subsections (a), (b), or (c) of this section.

"(f) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Director under this section, all actions which the Director or his representatives are required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved.

"REVIEW BY BOARD

"SEC. 207. (a) An operator notified of an order made pursuant to subsection (a), (c), or (d) of section 203 may apply to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review for annulment or revision of such order without seeking its annulment or revision under section 206. An operator notified of an order made pursuant to section 206 may apply to the Board for annulment or revision of such order: *Provided, however,* That an operator applying to the Board for annulment of an order made pursuant to subsection (d) of section 203 or pursuant to subsection (c) of section 206 shall file such application with the Board not later than 20 days after the receipt of notice of such order.

"(b) The operator shall be designated as the applicant in such proceeding and the application filed by him shall recite the order complained of and other facts sufficient to advise the Board of the nature of the proceeding. He may allege in such application: That danger as set out in such order does not exist at the time of the filing of such application; that violation of section 209, as set out in such order, has not occurred; that such violation has been totally or partially abated; that the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, as fixed in the findings upon which such order was based, was not reasonable; that the area of the mine described in such order as the area affected by the violation referred to in such order is not so affected at the time of the filing of such application; or that the mine described in such order is not a gassy mine. The Director shall be the respondent in such proceeding, and the applicant shall send a copy of such application by registered mail to the Director at Washington, D. C.

"(c) Immediately upon the filing of such an application the Board shall fix the time for a prompt hearing thereof.

"(d) Pending such hearing the applicant may file with the Board a written request that the Board grant such temporary relief from such order as the Board may deem just and proper. Such temporary relief may be granted by the Board only after a hearing by the Board at which both the applicant and the respondent were afforded an opportunity to be heard, and only if respondent was given ample notice of the filing of applicant's request and of the time and place of the hearing thereon as fixed by the Board.

"(e) The Board shall not be bound by any previous findings of fact by the respondent or by any other representative of the Bureau. Evidence relating to the making of the order complained of and relating to the questions raised by the allegations of the pleadings or other questions pertinent in the proceeding may be offered by both parties to the proceeding. If the respondent claims that danger or a violation of section 209, as set out in such order, existed at the time of the filing of the application, or that methane has been ignited or found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the burden of proving the then existence of such danger or violation, or that methane has been ignited or found in such mine as set out in the order under review, shall be upon the respondent, and the respondent shall present his evidence first to prove the then existence of such danger or violation. Following presentation of respondent's evidence the applicant may present his evidence, and thereupon respondent may present evidence to rebut the applicant's evidence.

"(f) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203 (a), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not danger throughout the area of such mine as set out in such order existed at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such danger did not then exist throughout such area of such mine, the Board shall make an order, consistent with its findings, revising or annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such danger did then exist throughout such area of such mine, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(g) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment or revision of an order made pursuant to section 203 (c), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not there was a violation of section 209 as described in such order, at the time of the making of such order. If the Board finds there was no such violation, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds there was such a violation, the Board shall also find whether or not such violation was totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application. If the Board finds that such violation was totally abated at such time, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at such time, the Board shall find whether or not the period of time within which such violation should be totally abated, fixed under section 203 or 206, should be extended. If the Board finds that such period of time should be extended, the Board shall also find what a reasonable extension of such period of time would be, and shall immediately also find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at the time of the filing of such application and the Board shall then make an order, consistent with its findings, revising the order under review. If the Board finds that such violation was not totally abated at the time of the filing of the operator's application, and that such period of time should not be extended, the Board shall find the extent of the area of such mine which was affected by such violation at such time, and shall make an order, consistent with its findings, affirming or revising the order under review.

"(h) If the proceeding is one in which an operator seeks annulment of an order made pursuant to section 203 (d) or 206 (c), the Board, upon conclusion of the hearing, shall find whether or not methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine in an amount of 0.25 percent or more in any open workings of such mine when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, as set out in such order. If the Board finds that methane has not been ignited in such mine and was not found in such mine as set out in such order, the Board shall make an order annulling the order under review. If the Board finds that methane has been ignited in such mine or was found in such mine as set out in the order under review, the Board shall make an order denying such application.

"(i) Each finding and order made by the Board shall be in writing. It shall show the date on which it is made, and shall bear the signatures of the members of the Board who concur therein. Upon making a finding and order the Board shall cause a true copy thereof to be sent by registered mail to all parties or their attorneys of record. The Board shall cause each such finding and order to be entered on its official record, together with any written opinion prepared by any member in support of, or dissenting from, any such finding or order.

"(j) In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted to the Board under this section, all actions which the Board is required to take under this section shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 208. (a) Any final order issued by the Board under section 207 shall be subject to judicial review by the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the mine affected is located, upon the filing in such court of a notice of appeal by the Director or the operator aggrieved by such final order within thirty days from the date of the making of such final order.

"(b) The party making such appeal shall forthwith send a copy of such notice of appeal, by registered mail, to the other party and to the Board. Upon receipt of such copy

of a notice of appeal the Board shall promptly certify and file in such court a complete transcript of the record upon which the order complained of was made. The costs of such transcript shall be paid by the party making the appeal.

"(c) The court shall hear such appeal on the record made before the Board, and shall permit argument, oral or written or both, by both parties. The court shall permit such pleadings, in addition to the pleadings before the Board, as it deems to be required or as provided for in the Rules of Civil Procedure governing appeals in such court.

"(d) Upon such conditions as may be required and to the extent necessary to prevent irreparable injury, the United States court of appeals may, after due notice to and hearing of the parties to the appeal, issue all necessary and appropriate process to postpone the effective date of the final order of the Board or to grant such other relief as may be appropriate pending final determination of the appeal.

"(e) The United States court of appeals may affirm, annul, or revise the final order of the Board, or it may remand the proceeding to the Board for such further action as it directs. The findings of the Board as to facts, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

"(f) The decision of a United States court of appeals on an appeal from the Board shall be final, subject only to review by the Supreme Court as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"MINE SAFETY PROVISIONS

"SEC. 209. (a) Duty to comply: Every operator of a mine, and every person who is on the premises of a mine for any reason whatsoever, shall comply with the provisions of this section, except those provisions which impose no duty, obligation or responsibility upon such operator or such person.

"(b) Every operator of a mine which, on or after the effective date of this title, is, or which, immediately prior to the effective date of this title, was, defined, classed, classified as, or determined, deemed, judged, held, or found to be, a gassy or gaseous mine pursuant to and in accordance with the laws of the State in which it is located, and every operator of a mine which, immediately prior to the effective date of this title, was operated as a gassy mine, shall comply with the provisions of this section which pertain to gassy mines.

"(c) Roof support: The roof and ribs of all active underground roadways and travelways in a mine shall be adequately supported to protect persons from falls of roof or ribs.

"(d) Ventilation: (1) All active underground working places in a mine shall be ventilated by a current of air containing not less than 19.5 percent of oxygen, not more than 0.5 percent of carbon dioxide, and no harmful quantities of other noxious or poisonous gases. The volume and velocity of the current of air shall be sufficient to dilute to as to render harmless, and to carry away, flammable or harmful gases. In bituminous-coal and lignite mines the quantity of air reaching the last open crosscut in any pair or set of entries shall not be less than 6,000 cubic feet a minute, except that the quantity of air reaching the last open cross-cut in any pair or set or entries in pillar sections may be less than 6,000 cubic feet a minute if not less than 6,000 cubic feet of air a minute is being delivered to the intake end of the pillar line. In anthracite mines the quantity of air reaching the face of each working place shall be at least 200 cubic feet a minute for each man working in the place and as much more as may be required to dilute, render harmless, and sweep away noxious or dangerous gases, smoke, and fumes. In robbing areas where the air currents cannot be controlled and measurements of the air cannot be obtained, the air shall have perceptible movement.

"(2) If the air at an underground working face in a mine, when tested at a point not less than 12 inches from the roof, face, or rib, contains more than 1.0 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, changes or adjustments shall be made at once in the ventilation in such mine so that such air shall not contain more than 1.0 percent of methane.

"(3) If a split of air returning from active underground working places in a mine contains more than 1.0 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, changes or adjustments shall be made at once in the ventilation in such mine so that such returning air shall not contain more than 1.0 percent of methane.

"(4) If a split of air returning from active underground working places in a mine contains 1.5 percent of methane, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas, the employees shall be withdrawn from the portion of the mine endanagered thereby, and all power shall be cut off from such portion of the mine, until the quantity of methane in such spit shall be less than 1.5 percent. However, in virgin territory in mines ventilated by exhaust fans, where methane is liberated in large amounts, if the quantity of air in a split ventilating the workings in such territory equals or exceeds twice the minimum volume of air prescribed in paragraph (1) of this subsection and if only permissible electric equipment is used in such workings and the air in the split returning from such workings does not pass over trolley or other bare power wires, and if a certified person designated by the mine operator is continually testing the gas content of the air in such split during mining operations in such workings, it shall be necessary to withdraw the employees and cut off all power from the portion of the mine endangered by such methane only when the quantity thereof in the air returning from such workings exceeds 2 percent, as determined by a permissible methane detector, a permissible flame safety lamp, air analysis, or other recognized means of accurately detecting such gas.

"(5) In a gassy mine, air which has passed by an opening of any unsealed, abandoned area shall not be used to ventilate any active face area in such mine if such air contains 0.25 percent or more of methane; but if this sentence cannot be complied with in such mine on the effective date of this section, such mine may continue to be operated after such date as it was operated immediately prior to such date, for a reasonable time until future mine development and ventilation of such mine can be changed to comply with this sentence. In no event shall such air be used to ventilate any area in such mine in which men work or travel if such air contains more than 1 percent of methane. For the purposes of this paragraph, an area within a panel shall not be deemed to be abandoned until such panel is abandoned.

"(6) In a gassy mine, air that has passed through an abandoned panel which is inaccessible for inspection, or air that has passed through a similar abandoned area which is inaccessible for inspection, or air which has been used to ventilate a pillar line, or air which has been used to ventilate an area from which the pillars have been removed, shall not be used to ventilate any active face area in such mine; but if this sentence cannot be complied with in such mine on the effective date of this section, such mine may continue to be operated after such date as it was operated immediately prior to such date, for a reasonable time until future mine development and ventilation of such mine can be changed to comply with this sentence. In no event shall such air be used to ventilate any area in such mine in which men work or travel if such air contains more than 1 percent of methane.

"(7) In a gassy mine, within 4 hours immediately preceding the beginning of a coal-producing shift, and before any workmen in such shift other than those who may be designated to make the examinations prescribed in this paragraph enter the underground areas of such mine, certified persons designated by the operator of such mine to do so shall make an examination, as prescribed in this paragraph, of such areas. Each person designated to act as such a mine examiner shall be directed to examine a definite underground area of such mine, and, in making his examination, such examiner shall inspect every active working place in such area and make tests therein with a permissible flame safety lamp for accumulations of methane and oxygen deficiency in the air therein; examine seals and doors to determine whether they are functioning properly; inspect and test the roof, face, and rib conditions in the working places and on active roadways and travel ways; inspect active roadways, travel ways, approaches to abandoned workings and accessible falls in active sections for explosive gas and other hazards; and inspect to determine whether the air in each split is traveling in its proper course and in normal volume. Such mine examiner shall place his initials and the date at or near the face of each place he examines. If such mine examiner, in making his examination, finds a condition which he considers to be dangerous to persons who may enter or be in such area, he shall indicate such dangerous place by posting a 'Danger' sign conspicuously at a point which persons entering such dangerous place would be required to pass. No person, other than Federal or State mine inspectors or persons authodized by the mine operator to enter such place for the purpose of eliminating the dangerous condition therein, shall enter such place while such sign is so posted. Upon completing his examination such mine examiner shall report the result of his examinations to a person designated by the mine operator to receive such reports, at a designated station on the surface of the premises of the mine or undergdound, before other persons enter the underground areas of such mine to work in such coal-producing shift. Each such mine examiner shall also record the result of his examination with ink or indelible pencil in a book kept for such purpose at a place on the surface of the mine designated by the mine operator. No person (other than a certified person designated under this paragraph) shall enter any underground area in a gassy mine, except during a coal-producing shift, unless an examination of such area as prescribed in this paragraph has been made within 12 hours immediately preceding his entrance into such area.

"(8) In nongassy mines, an examination as prescribed in paragraph (7) shall be made at least once in each calendar day during which coal is produced. Such exmination shall be made within 4 hours immediately preceding the beginning of the first coal-producing shift on such day.

"(9) The underground working places in all mines shall be examined for hazards by certified persons designated by the mine

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

operator to do so, at least once during each coal-producing shift, or oftener if necessary for safety. In a gassy mine, such examinations shall include tests with a permissible flame safety lamp for methane, and oxygen deficiency. In all underground face workings in a gassy mine where electrically driven equipment is operated, examinations for methane shall be made with a permissible flame safety lamp by a person trained in the use of such lamp before such equipment is taken into or operated in face regions, and frequent examinations for methane shall be made during such operations.

"(10) In a gassy mine, immediately before a roof fall is made in pillar workings, such workings shall be examined to ascertain whether methane is present. If in such examination methane is found in amounts that can be detected with a permissible flame safety lamp, a roof fall shall not be made until such gas is removed.

"(11) In a gassy mine, all workings which are abandoned after the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, shall be sealed or ventilated. If such workings are sealed, the sealing shall be done in a substantial manner with incombustible material. One or more of the seals of every sealed area shall be fitted with a pipe and cap or valve to permit the sampling of gases and the measuring of hydrostatic pressure behind such seals. For the purposes of this paragraph, workings within a panel shall not be deemed to be abandoned until such panel is abandoned.

"(e) Coal dust and rock dust: (1) Coal dust, loose coal, and other combustible materials shall not be permitted to accumulate in dangerous quantities in active underground workings of a mine.

"(2) Where underground mining operations raise an excessive amount of dust into the air, water, or water with a wetting agent added to it, or other effective method shall be used to allay such dust at its source.

"(3) All underground mines, except those mines or areas of mines in which the dust is too wet or too high in incombustible content to propagate an explosion, shall be rock-dusted to within 40 feet of all faces, and, if open crosscuts near such faces are less than 40 feet therefrom, such crosscuts shall be rock-dusted.

"(4) In mines partially rock-dusted or in mines that are required to start rock-dusting, haulage ways and parallel entries connected thereto by open crosscuts shall be rock-dusted. Back entries shall be rock-dusted for at least 1,000 feet outby the junction with the first active entry. Inby this junction, the rooms, entries, and crosscuts shall be rock-dusted.

"(5) Where rock dust is applied, it shall be distributed upon the top, floor, and sides of all open places and maintained in such quantity that the incombustible content of the combined coal dust, rock dust, and other dust will not be less than 65 percent. Where methane is present in any ventilating current, the 65 percent of incombustible content of such combined dust shall be increased 1 percent for each 0.1 percent of methane.

"(6) Paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of this subsection shall not apply to anthracite mines.

"(f) Electrical equipment: (1) All electric face equipment used in a gassy mine shall be permissible, except that electric face equipment may be used in a gassy mine even though such equipment is not permissible if, before the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, the operator of such mine owned such equipment, or owned the right to use such equipment, or had ordered such equipment. Permissible electric face equipment in use in a gassy mine shall not be replaced by electric face equipment which is not permissible except that (A) permissible and nonpermissible electric face equipment in use in a mine may be interchanged within such mine, and (B) explosion-tested cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars purchased before permissible cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars became available, may be used to replace permissible cable-reel locomotives and shuttle cars.

"(2) In a gassy mine, permissible junction or distribution boxes shall be used for making multiple-power connections in working places or other places where dangerous quantities of methane may be present or may enter the air current, except that where nonpermissible junction or distribution boxes are in use, or on order, on the effective date of this section or the date such mine became a gassy mine, whichever is later, their use may be continued until such time as replacements are made.

"(3) In a gassy mine, explosion-tested cable-reel locomotives shall be equipped with two-conductor trailing cables.

"(4) In a gassy mine, trolley and feeder wires shall not extend beyond the last open crosscut and shall be kept at least 150 feet from pillar workings.

"(g) Fire protection: (1) Each mine shall be provided with suitable fire-fighting equipment, adequate for the size of the mine.

"(2) After every blasting operation performed on shift, an examination shall be made to determine whether fires have been started.

"(3) Underground storage places for lubricating oil and grease in excess of 2 days' supply shall be of fireproof construction.

"(4) Lubricating oil and grease kept in face regions or other underground working places in a mine shall be in portable, closed, metal containers.

"(5) Underground structures (transformer stations, battery-charging stations, substations, permanent pump rooms, etc.) installed in a mine after the effective date of this section shall be of fireproof construction.

"(6) Welding, cutting, or soldering with arc or flame in underground face regions in other than a fireproof enclosure shall be done under the direct supervision of a certified person who shall test for methane before and during such operations in gassy mines and shall make a diligent search for fire after such operations in all mines. Rock dust or suitable fire extinguishers shall be immediately available during such welding, cutting, or soldering.

"(h) Miscellaneous: (1) The drilling and sealing of oil and gas wells penetrating coal beds or underground workings of mines shall be done in compliance with State statutes.

"(2) Whenever any working place in an underground mine approaches within 50 feet of abandoned workings in such mine as shown by surveys made and certified by a competent engineer or surveyor, or within 200 feet of any other abandoned workings of such mine, which cannot be inspected and which may contain dangerous accumulations of water or gas, or within 200 feet of any workings of an adjacent mine, a borehole or boreholes shall be drilled to a distance of at least 20 feet in advance of the face of such working place. Such boreholes shall be drilled sufficiently close to each other to insure that the advancing face will not accidentally hole through into such workings. Boreholes shall also be drilled not more than 8 feet apart in the rib of such working place to a distance of at least 20 feet and at an angle of 45 degrees. Such rib holes shall be drilled in one or both ribs of such working place as may be necessary for adequate protection of persons working in such place.

"(3) In a gassy mine, smoking shall not be permitted underground, nor shall any person be permitted to carry smoking materials, matches, or lighters underground.

"(4) In a gassy mine, persons underground shall use only permissible electric lamps for portable illumination.

"(5) Black blasting powder shall not be stored, handled, or used underground in a mine; but for a period of 6 months after the effective date of this section, this paragraph shall not apply to any mine in which the storage, handling, or use of such powder is expressly permitted by a statute of the State in which such mine is located.

"(6) Mudcaps (adobes) or other unconfined shots shall not be fired underground in a mine. However, in anthracite mines mudcaps or other open, unconfined shots may be fired, if restricted to battery starting when no gas or fire hazard is present, and if it is otherwise impracticable to start the battery; likewise, in anthracite mines open, unconfined 'shake' shots in working places and other places in pitching veins may be fired, when no gas or fire hazard is present, if the taking down of loose, hanging coal by other means is too hazardous for men working in such places. Only permissible explosives shall be used for such open, unconfined shots in anthracite mines.

"(7) Every hoist used to transport persons at a mine, other than hoists used in excavating shafts or slopes, shall be equipped with overspeed, overwind, and automatic stop controls unless a second engineer is on duty. Every hoist used to transport such persons shall be equipped with brakes capable of stopping the platform, cage, or other device for transporting persons when fully loaded; and with hoisting cable adequately strong to sustain the fully loaded platform, cage, or other device for transporting persons, and have a proper margin of safety. Cages or platforms which are used to transport persons in vertical shafts, except cages or platforms which are also used to transport coal, shall be equipped with safety catches that act quickly and effectively in an emergency, and the safety catches shall be tested at least once every 2 months. Every hoist that is used to transport persons at a mine shall be inspected daily. No engineer shall be required for automatically operated cages or platforms.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 210. (a) Any operator of a mine notified of an order made pursuant to section 203 or section 206, requiring him to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who willfully fails to comply with such order shall be fined not more than $2,000.

"(b) Any agent of an operator of a mine, knowing of the making of an order requiring such operator to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who willfully directs, authorizes or causes any person, other than one who is lawfully authorized to enter or be in such area, to enter or be in such area while such order is in effect, shall be fined not more than $2,000.

"(c) Any person, knowing of the making of an order requiring an operator of a mine to cause persons to be withdrawn from, and to be debarred from entering, any area of such mine, who enters such area or remains therein while such order is in effect, shall, unless he is a person who is lawfully authorized to enter or be in such area, be fined not more than $2,000.

"(d) Any owner, lessee, agent, manager, superintendent, or other person having control or supervision of any coal mine subject to section 202 who refuses to admit the Director, any duly authorized representative of the Bureau, any State inspector assigned in accordance with a State plan, or any independent inspector appointed under section 203 (e) (3) to such mine, pursuant to section 202 (c), shall be fined not more than $500.

"EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

"SEC. 211. (a) No State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title or which may become effective thereafter, shall be superseded by any provision of this title, except insofar as such State or Territorial law is in conflict with this title, or with orders issued pursuant to this title.

"(b) Provisions in any State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title, or which may become effective thereafter, which provide for greater safety of persons on coal-mine premises, in connection with a particular phase of coal-mining operations, than do provisions of this title, which relate to the same phase of such operations, shall not be construed or held to be in conflict with this title. Provisions in any State or Territorial law in effect upon the effective date of this title, or which may become effective thereafter, which provide for the safety of persons on coal-mine premises in connection with phases of coal-mining operations concerning which no provision is contained in this title, shall not be construed or held to be superseded by this title.

"(c) Nothing in this title shall be construed or held to supersede or in any manner affect the workmen's compensation laws of any State or Territory, or to enlarge or diminish or affect in any other manner the common law or statutory rights, duties, or liabilities of employers and employees under State or Territorial laws in respect of injuries, occupational or other diseases or death of employees arising out of or in the course of employment.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 212. (a) Whenever the Director determines that the construction of any equipment conforms to specifications prescribed by the Director which are designed to assure that such equipment will not cause a mine explosion or mine fire, he shall issue a certificate to the manufacturer of such equipment (1) stating that such equipment has met such specifications, (2) authorizing such manufacturer to attach an approval plate, label, or other device approved by the Director which indicates that such equipment conforms to such specifications, and (3) authorizing such manufacturer to attach an identical approval plate, label, or other device to all identical equipment.

"(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall have authority to appoint, subject to the civil-service laws, such officers and employees as he may deem requisite for the administration of this title; and to fix, subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the compensation of officers and employees so appointed. No person shall be assigned or appointed to perform the duties of a duly authorized representative of the Bureau unless he has the basic qualifications of at least 5 years' practical experience in the mining of coal and is recognized by the Bureau as having the training or experience of a practical mining engineer in those essentials necessary for competent coal-mine inspection.

"(c) The Director shall submit annually to the Congress, as soon as practicable after the beginning of each regular session, a full report of the administration of his functions under this title during the preceding calendar year. Such report shall include, either in summary or detailed form, the information obtained by him under this title, together with such findings and comments thereon and such recommendations for legislative action as he may deem proper.

"EXCLUSION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

"SEC. 213. The Administrative Procedure Act shall not apply to the making of any order pursuant to this title or to any proceeding for the annulment or revision of any such order.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 214. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not exceeding $3,000,000 in any fiscal year, as may be necessary for the due execution of this title.

"SEVERABILITY

"SEC. 215. If any provision of this title, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this title, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1941, is amended by striking out "or by imprisonment not exceeding 60 days, or by both."

SEC. 3. Section 5 of the act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1941, is amended—

(1) By striking out "during the calendar year in which the request is made or during the preceding calendar year" and inserting in lieu thereof "during the 6-month period immediately preceding the date on which the request is made."

(2) By adding at the end of such section the following new sentence: "Whoever willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $500."

SEC. 4. The act entitled "An act relating to certain inspections and investigations in coal mines for the purpose of obtaining information relating to health and safety conditions, accidents, and occupational diseases therein, and for other purposes," approved May 7, 1941, is amended—

(1) By inserting immediately after the comma at the end of the enacting clause the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.'"

(2) By inserting immediately below the matter inserted by paragraph (1) the following:

"TITLE I—ADVISORY POWERS RELATING TO HEALTH AND SAFETY CONDITIONS IN MINES"

(3) By striking out "this act" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "this title."

(4) By striking out "That the" at the beginning of the present first section and inserting in lieu thereof "SEC. 101. The."

(5) By redesignating the presently designated sections 2 to 12, inclusive, as sections 102 to 112, respectively.

(6) By striking out "section 1" in the presently designated section 2 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101."

(7) By striking out "section 1 or section 2" in the presently designated sections 3 and 4 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 101 or section 102."

(8) By striking out "section 3" in the presently designated section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 103."

(9) By striking out "section 6" in the presently designated section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "section 106."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to compliment and pay tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], whose bill we are now considering. Mr. MCCONNELL drew up this measure and spent a great deal of time on it with the most worthy and commendable of motives. His purpose was out of consideration of the plight of the men who go underground to toil for the Nation. He has nothing to gain from this legislation except the knowledge that he is helping the miners. He has worked very hard, and diligent and intelligently. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL], has been entirely unselfish in this matter.

Mine disasters, particularly explosions, have occurred with alarming regularity over the years. This is one reason that this legislation is before the House.

This bill interests itself in only five categories of disasters. It should be clearly understood that it does not cover causes of all accidents in mines. Ordinary accidents occur at the rate of about 40 to 50 thousand a year and are caused by an infinite number of reasons. Many of them can be attributed to the miner himself, through carelessness or lack of judgment. Management also has a share in many of the ordinary accidents; but in the case of disasters, which are so much different from the ordinary accidents, it is shown that the victims have no control over the basic causes of the disasters. They are victimized by an environment which they could not avoid and did not create.

It might be pointed out that all of the mine fires and explosions which have occurred in the past 10 years have been caused by one of the following: an excessive accumulation inside the mine of loose coal dust; lack of adequate rock dust; an accumulation of explosive gas in open old works; or inadequate ventilation. Practically all of these disastrous mine fires and explosions can be eliminated, since we are so well informed of the causes. The argument that the cost would be prohibitive is nonsense, because it would not be.

It is interesting to note the number of deaths by States that have resulted from the catastrophes as covered in this bill. For the years 1905 to 1951, inclusive, 9,478 men lost their lives, and included in this number were figures from every coal-mining State in the country.

The opponents of this legislation contend that the Federal Government is infringing on the police powers of the States. In my opinion adequate provision is made against that in this measure. I see no reason why there should be any more infringement here than in other activities in which the Federal Government participates.

The question has also arisen as to why State laws cannot make the necessary provisions for mine safety, rather than the Federal Government. There are several reasons for this. First of all, the States do not have the facilities for the experimental work or the vast information that has been accumulated by the Bureau of Mines on safety matters. The

Bureau of Mines has outlined what is probably the world's best program for prevention of accidents in coal mines. It has conducted research and experimental projects and accident-prevention courses for miners and supervisors. It has volumes of statistics on accident prevention. It is a technical and scientific bureau. As pointed out in the report of the Senate committee, "during these 40 years 29 coal-mining States have enacted an infinite and confusing variety of laws affecting the safety of coal miners. While some States have adequate enforcement of these State laws, in others they have often been carried out in an indifferent and haphazard manner." As long as this condition exists, catastrophes will occur in coal mines.

It might be pointed out, too, that the political pressure upon an inspection service in some States prevents adequate supervision, and the same thing might be said of enacting adequate legislation. Something might be said also of absentee landlordism. The manager of a mine is inclined to take chances in order to accomplish satisfactory production costs. He is constantly being urged by the mine owner to reduce costs. Hence, he is in a dilemma many times as to what he should do. This does not mean to imply that the owner does not wish safety, but safety does cost money and the manager is in a quandary.

The record of safety in the coal mines of the United States is appalling. Our record of slaughter is nearly three times as great as any other civilized coal-mining country. It might be said figuratively that the coal produced in the United States is saturated with the blood of its miners.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Education and Labor has before it H. R. 7408, known as the McConnell mine-safety bill. It is my hope that this great committee will vote this measure out speedily and that this Eighty-second Congress will pass it without opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Labor Committee in the Eightieth Congress, which held hearings on the original Neely-Price bill following the Centralia explosion. I became greatly interested in the problem. There was something totally different about it, from the usual matters that take the attention and study of the Labor Committee. After the hue and cry that usually follows a holocaust of the Centralia type died down and after the usual pleas for corrective legislation by the coal miners and their leaders became lost in the swamp of personal politics and public forgetfulness, I continued to interest myself in this problem. With several colleagues and representatives of the operators and miners, I spent several days in the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana, now so ably represented by my colleague [Mr. BRAY], who spoke so eloquently on this subject on May 27. I inspected many mines, interviewed many miners representing both the employees and the employers. I had no ax to grind, no politics to play. In my district there are no miners or coal operators, so I could look at this problem objectively, without prejudice, fear, or favor entering the picture. Some of the mines I entered were well kept, well conditioned, others dirty and with apparently no attempt being made to condition the works. Yet, all these mines were governed by the same laws, inspected by the same inspectors. I wondered that this could be. My questioning revealed that all of these mines had the same problems, particularly the major ones. Small differences existed, of course, because of the height of the coal, the texture of the roof, and the machinery in use, and so forth, but the problems that cover the major disasters were present in every mine.

I found operators in full support of mine safety legislation and others bitterly opposing it. I visited mines where employers and employees worked in complete harmony on every problem facing them. In other mines the hatred between these groups flared into the open at every meeting and they were constantly at cross purposes. Without exception where relations were amicable and cooperation existed, mine conditions were good. Where hate and suspicion were rampant, conditions were invariably bad. So I came to these conclusions. There should be one over-all law governing safety in coal mining. It should govern large and small mines alike. As I stood hundreds of feet underground and miles away from the only shafts that lead to safety, should an explosion occur, I thought: How ridiculous it is to say that an inspector, trained to his job, wise in the ways of mining, competent to meet the existent problems that beset this industry, must, upon finding dangerous conditions existing that may wipe out my life, the lives of my companions and every one of the several hundred employees in this mine, turn his back upon them, walk up to the management and recommend that they do something about it. How foolish can we get? Obviously, something should be done. Something must be done and I think the McConnell bill, H. R. 7408, is the complete answer to this vexing problem. I am well aware that it does not meet the desires of everyone concerned. I know the miners would like a much stronger, more encompassing bill. I am aware that certain coal operators in the South want no part of any safety bill. I know other operators, while agreeing to the general purposes of H. R. 7408, would like certain sections weakened or strengthened as suits their purpose. But this bill was prepared by members of an Education and Labor subcommittee after weeks of careful study of the subject of mine safety. Our colleagues, AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, chairman of the subcommittee, and SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, ranking Republican member, whose name the bill bears, spent many hours in conferences with coal operators, miners' representatives and Bureau of Mines experts. The members of this subcommittee are to be commended for their success in presenting a bill which fills the widespread public demand for sound Federal mine safety legislation. Federal intervention into mine safety enforcement is inevitable. Each session of Congress it has been set aside because of politics, opposition from certain operators or plain indifference. But each year as some States continue to shirk their responsibilities in mine safety enforcement, the cry for Congress to take action becomes more and more insistent. Put it off today, tomorrow the clamor will be louder.

With each new holocaust, and there will be others, a pressure will build that Congress will find irresistible. The mining States have demonstrated again and again that they cannot or will not take the steps necessary to halt the slaughter of the Nation's miners. To each Congress the States and certain segments of the coal industry come with the plea that the safety of the coal miner is their job and ask us not to interfere. Each year we yield to their arguments and the killing goes on without abatement. And each year the chorus of the public for the Federal Government to do something grows louder and increasingly insistent. I say the time has come for Congress to act, not hastily, not under public pressure, but calmly and judiciously as the subcommittee in charge of this legislation has acted. This is a good bill, a well-thought-out bill. The men who wrote it are not visionaries, or reformers. We should accept this well-planned, carefully conceived bill before we find ourselves farther down the road, faced with a hastily drawn, ill-conceived document that we dare not resist because of public indignation and insistence.

Let us look at this McConnell bill, H. R. 7408. I submit that any Congressman who will study it, without prejudice, will agree that it meets the major problem and deprives no person and no State of any responsibility that they cannot well afford to share with the Federal Government. Here is what it actually does. Study it and see if it is the terrible instrument that its enemies construe it to be:

The McConnell bill permits no governmental bureau or agency to make any regulations.

The McConnell bill contains all of the Federal coal-mine safety provisions which operators would be required to observe.

By the provisions of the McConnell bill Congress itself would enact into law the Federal coal-mine safety provisions which coal-mine operators would be required to observe in the operation of their mines. The McConnell bill would give to no governmental bureau or agency the power to make coal-mine safety regulations of any kind. Only Congress would exercise that power, and only Congress could change the coal-mine safety provisions which it enacts into law.

Under the McConnell bill Federal Government could enforce Federal coal-mine safety provisions covering only a small part of the field of coal-mine safety.

Under the McConnell bill, the jurisdiction of the Federal Government in con-

nection with coal-mine safety is limited to a small part of the whole field of coal-mine safety. The McConnell bill enacts into law only such coal-mine safety provisions as are designed to prevent the causes of major coal-mine disasters, namely, disasters caused by coal-mine explosions, coal-mine fires, coal-mine inundations, and man-trip and man-hoist accidents. The number of these provisions is small.

They require adequate support of roof and ribs in underground roadways and travelways for the purpose of protecting persons riding on man-trips in such roadways and travelways from falls of roof or ribs which might injure them.

They prescribe minimum standards of ventilation of underground areas in mines which must be maintained to provide currents of air sufficient to dilute and render harmless and to carry from the underground areas of a mine explosive or noxious gases which may collect therein.

They require that accumulations of coal dust in a mine must be covered with sufficient inert rock dust so that the combined coal dust and rock dust will not explode or burn. If a small fire or explosion does occur in a mine, adequate rock dusting will keep it from spreading throughout the whole mine or a large part thereof.

They prescribe the kinds of examinations which must be made in all underground mines at specified times to ascertain whether or not explosive gas may have accumulated in such mines and whether other hazards are present.

They require that electrical machinery, when used for certain purposes in underground mines in which explosive gas has been found to exist, shall be of a type which will not permit sparks from the machines to come into contact with the air in the mine, as a precaution against ignition of any explosive gas which may have collected unexpectedly.

They also require that when, in extending underground working areas in a mine, the walls of such areas approach within 200 feet of any abandoned mine workings which cannot be inspected and which might contain dangerous accumulations of water, boreholes shall be drilled at least 20 feet ahead of such advancing walls for the purpose of detecting such accumulations of water and preventing them from inundating the mine.

They also provide that hoists used to transport persons in a mine shall be equipped with adequate safety brakes and safety catches, and that such hoists shall be inspected daily to ascertain if they are in safe working condition.

They also contain a small number of other provisions prescribing simple fire-prevention precautions.

The McConnell bill provides for issuance of a mine-closing order by a Federal coal-mine inspector if, upon inspecting a mine, he finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated.

The language of the provision here referred to is clear. The finding of danger will be made only by a Federal coal-mine inspector under the direction of the Bureau of Mines. The finding can only be based upon facts disclosed by an inspection of the mine. The danger which will justify the issuance of a mine-closing order must be danger that a mine explosion will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it be taken, or danger that a mine fire will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken, or danger that a man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken. These are definite requirements with reference to the kind of a finding which a coal-mine inspector must make before he may issue a mine-closing order. They are quite different than the finding merely of imminent danger to the safety of employees, which the Neely-Price bills would require as the basis of a mine-closing order.

The McConnell bill provides no criminal penalties for violation of the mine safety laws. It allows reasonable time for stopping violations, and requires issuance of mine-closing orders if violations are not stopped at the end of such time.

The McConnell bill provides that if a Federal coal-mine inspector, upon inspecting a mine, finds that any of the coal-mine safety provisions which the bill enacts into law, are being violated, and finds that such violation does not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall find what would be a reasonable period of time within which such violation should be totally abated. Notice of such finding must be given to the operator. Such period of time may be extended by the inspector upon making a special inspection of the mine if circumstances warrant such extension. If at the end of such period of time the violation has not been stopped, an order to close the mine, or the part of the mine affected by the violation, must be issued.

The McConnell bill provides for appeals from, and review of closing orders before, the Director, the Federal Mine Safety Board of Review, and the Federal courts.

The McConnell bill provides that a coal-mine operator ordered to close his mine, or a portion of it, on either of the two grounds specified in the bill—namely, the existence of imminent danger of a mine disaster, or unabated violation of a mine-safety provision contained in the bill—may apply for annulment or revision of the order either to the Director of the Bureau of Mines or to the Federal Coal-Mine Safety Board of Review. If the operator chooses to apply to the Director the latter must reinspect the mine or have such reinspection made by three Federal coal-mine inspectors, other than the inspector who originally made the closing order, who then report to him. The Director must then make findings, based upon his inspection or the report of the three inspectors, and issue an order annulling, revising, or affirming the original closing order.

The McConnell bill creates a Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review to hear appeals from orders of Federal coal-mine inspectors and the Director. This Board is an independent tribunal consisting of three members appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of these members must be a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine operators, one a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine workers, and one, who must be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry or have had 5 years' experience as a practical coal-mining engineer, and who is also the chairman. Immediately upon the filing of an application the Board must fix the time for a prompt hearing. Pending the hearing the applicant may ask the Board for temporary relief, which the Board may grant. The Board is not bound by any previous findings of fact made by the Director or by any coal-mine inspector. Evidence relating to the making of the order complained of or to the questions raised by the allegations of the pleadings or other questions pertinent in the proceeding may be offered by both parties. The burden of proof rests upon the Director or the inspector. Findings and orders of the Board must be in writing and must bear the signatures of the members who concur.

The bill further states that "In view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted" to the Director and to the Board, all actions which they are required to take "shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

The McConnell bill provides that any final order issued by the Board is subject to review by the United States court of appeals upon the filing of notice of appeal within 30 days after the date of the order. Pending the hearing the applicant may ask the court for temporary relief, which the court may grant. The court hears the appeal on the record made before the Board, and must permit argument, oral or written or both, by both parties. The decision of the court of appeals is final, subject only to review by the United States Supreme Court.

Any time during the pendency of an appeal to the Board or to the court of appeals or while the matter is before the Supreme Court the operator may apply to the Director of the Bureau for annulment or revision of an order.

The McConnell bill would reserve to the States a broad field of coal-mine safety legislation.

The provisions of the McConnell bill which are in conflict with State laws would supersede them. The mine safety provisions of the McConnell bill, however, are limited to coverage of the causes of coal-mine disasters. The McConnell bill provides that those State laws which provide greater safety than do similar measures of the McConnell bill would not be superseded by the Federal law. The McConnell bill further

specifically reserves to the States full power to legislate in all matters pertaining to coal-mine safety which are not covered by the McConnell bill. Thus the McConnell bill reserves to the States the right to legislate in the broad field of accidents involving human failure, and it is in this field that most accidents occur. There will remain in the States ample opportunities and responsibilities to warrant the continued activity of State coal-mine safety enforcement agencies.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the only thing a State bureau has to do to preclude the Federal inspectors from interfering in any way with State enforcement and State law, is to have a good mining law and see that its provisions are strictly lived up to by management. I submit that the McConnell bill will hurt no honest, sincere coal operator or State bureau of mines. No coal operator, large or small, need fear its provisions, if they sincerely desire to protect the men in their employ and if they do not desire or intend to protect their employees, then, I submit, they should not be allowed in the industry.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is the mine-safety bill. A bill came from the Senate which was known as the Neely bill, and there was a companion bill, I believe, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. I appointed the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] as chairman of a subcommittee to handle the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] was the ranking minority member on that committee. They set about working out the problem dealing with the safety of mines. They found that they could not approve of the Neely bill or the Price bill. As a matter of fact, I do not think anyone on my committee would have approved of either of these bills. So they proceeded to work out a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL]. The McConnell bill came to the committee for consideration and it was amended by the committee, putting in my amendments which, in my opinion, are not only proper but show the proper consideration for the States and the fine men who have conducted the State mine-safety programs, and reported out by the committee. Had these amendments not been adopted, I certainly would not be supporting this bill and I doubt if a majority of this House would support it.

I say to the House that if the House desires to enter this field—and I do not have to call to your attention the fact that it is a controversial question as to whether the Federal Government should enter any further into the field of mine inspection—but if the House determines that it is wise and necessary to enter this field further, then I say to you that this act, in my opinion, is as practical and as workable as I believe the committee could produce. It is not forceful entry into a State but it is a very graceful and courteous way to carry on the mine-inspection service which involves so many hundreds of thousands of men all over the country. I do not feel it necessary for me to again express my views on States' rights. They are well known by my colleagues. However, please bear in mind we are dealing here with the lives of human beings.

In this bill instead of the law providing for the Federal inspectors going into a State and brushing aside the State agency and bearing in mind that many of the States have spent a lot of money in their mine-inspection service in which they have considerable pride, and many of them have good workable mine inspection services, this bill provides that in order to promote the cooperation and success of the program, a State may file a State plan with the Federal Bureau, and in that State plan designate the department or State head who directs the mine inspection service and also shows that there is law for providing the service and that they will have available inspectors and that those inspectors will cooperate with the Federal Government. That plan when accepted by the mines simply means that in every case except where imminent disaster appears, the Federal inspector and the State inspector inspect together. If they cannot agree on their findings in the case of mine violations, then the Federal judge in the district may appoint a third person, a mining engineer, an experienced man, and two of three findings are accepted. If there is an appeal from that, it goes direct to the Board, which is set up in this bill for the settlement of those matters. If the Board's determination is not satisfactory, provision is made for a court review. I think every caution has been exercised in the drawing of this bill so as not to go into detailed accidents in mines, and therefore, it was set up so that about four major disaster causes would be given attention for the protection of the miners.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. It stays within what you might say is the common-sense field. It deals with four causes: water, explosions, fire, and the mine-hoist and mantrip. The committee restricted it to that field so as to stay out of the complications and the troubles that you might have if you entered into the general field of accidents.

This act will not stop accidents or disasters, everybody knows that, but it is the hope of the committee and I think the hope of this House that it will provide a team of inspectors, both Federal and State, that will materially cut down and bring to a very minimum the accidents that have been so frequent in mines in the United States, and have taken so many lives of fine hard-working men to date.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I concur most heartily in the statement made by my chairman when he said that this bill will not cut down mine accidents; it certainly will not. We cannot pass an act here in Congress which will stop mine accidents. It is unfortunate that there seems to have grown up over the land the delusion that by passing an act of Congress we can stop anything that is detrimental to the American people, and here we are trying it all over again.

I do not need in expressing my opposition to this bill to say to you that we all regret mine disasters. Those of us who oppose this legislation do not want to be considered opposed to safety measures in mines, or in any other industry, but we do want you to know and understand thoroughly that this is an unjustified intrusion into the rights of the States. It is a means by which the Federal Government is going to control the mines of the United States; make no mistake about that.

This is not a mine safety bill, as such; that is a misnomer; this is a mine regulation bill; it is a bill to regulate the mines of the United States, and it is the first step, I will have you know, toward the regulation of every industry in the land. Look at the record: The Committee on Education and Labor has before it a bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], which has also been introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], providing for Federal safety inspection in all industries.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago we had a Federal inspection-of-mines bill pass the House. It did not carry compulsory powers. We are now operating under that act. Ten years later we come along and we give the Federal Government compulsory power to regulate mines, as this bill before us provides. We will have this bill passed to inspect and make safe all industries and all facilities in all factories, and 10 years later, or sooner, the Federal Government will be regulating every industry and every factory in the land. Then where will be our liberties?

That is the decision you have to make. Do you want the Federal Government to regulate not only the mines but to regulate every factory in the land? Your vote on this bill will be your decision.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Was there any evidence offered in committee that bureaucrats here in Washington can police these mines better than the officials of the various States which are right on the ground?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course not.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which is sponsored not only by the United Mine Workers but by the big mine operators. Why? This combination of great powers is seeking by this legislation to increase their power. John L. Lewis wants to cover into his organization every miner who does not now pay dues to his union. The big mine operators want to reduce competition by closing up marginal operations, by requiring that

all mines that are not now organized be organized so they will have to pay that 30-cents-a-ton tribute to John L. Lewis' welfare fund.

Mr. Speaker, this is another bill which is against the interests of the consumer. You people who live in the big cities might as well realize that all the small mines, all the marginal operations, will sooner or later be closed, and the big mines will be able to charge their own price for coal. You of the big cities are going to have to pay for this bill. This is against your interest, this is against the interest of all consumers.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. We who passed the Hobbs bill a few years ago passed it in order to interfere in the enforcement of law in the States because the local people would not enforce the law.

Mr. LUCAS. That is true, but that cannot be made to apply here.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a fundamental philosophy here which should not be disregarded by Members of the House. I have stated it as briefly as I can. We must beware that we do not enter into a field which would carry us into further centralization in Washington. We think that the basic philosophy of this bill is wrong, that the Federal Government can do something better than the States. The evidence has shown that the States are making tremendous strides in connection with the safety of mines. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] stated that there have been 9,000 deaths in mines since 1900. They are gradually being reduced.

Mr. Speaker, if we are interested in safety why do we not do something about the public highways? Thirty-seven thousand people lost their lives last year on the highways of the country. Can we here in the House of Representatives callously disregard the fact that the States are not enforcing their public safety laws on the highways? The Federal Government contributes to the construction of those highways. Have we not the power and duty to do something about the slaughter that is going on on the public highways today when 37,000 people lost their lives last year, while but 200 lost their lives in mine disasters?

Mr. Speaker, this bill should not be adopted by the House of Representatives. We should make every effort to encourage the States to protect their own citizens, and we in the House of Representatives should cause the Federal Government to remain out of such field. Let us vote down this resolution.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill before you today has evolved slowly. I have usually opposed Federal coal-mine safety bills because I felt that all of them went too far into private operation and also into State regulation. We have had many serious mine disasters in this country, and after every one of them there comes a demand for a drastic piece of legislation. It was with that background that I listened to the hearings before the House Committee on Education and Labor. As certain operators testified, they said that they would be willing to accept a bill provided the Federal Code was written into the bill, so that they would know exactly what the Federal Government could do and could not do. They also brought out the fact that mine disasters can be reduced to a minimum, and they should be classified in a different category than ordinary accidents. Right there I felt I had the germ of an idea, and on the basis of that this bill has evolved.

I have strictly and continually called for a bill, as we have put it together, that would stay clear of the general mine accident field; also the field of health. I felt if those things were left out of the bill then there would be a reason for the State agencies to exist.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCONNELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I want to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] on the good bill that has been brought before this House. I felt, prior to bringing this bill before the House, that there was too much Federal control, but I think that has been eliminated in this bill by the amendment which was introduced by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. So I have no reluctance at all about voting for this legislation, and I hope the House adopts it.

Mr. McCONNELL. The McConnell bill is a bill to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines. Such disasters are generally considered to be accidents in which five or more lives are lost.

There are two distinct classes of coal-mine accidents. There is the class of ordinary accidents which occur from day to day in mines, and which are the result of errors of judgment, inadvertence, defective perceptions, and the like, on the part of the individual mine worker; and there is the class of accidents the occurrence of which usually results in major mine disasters. Accidents in this latter class are mine explosions, mine fires, mine inundations, and man-trip and man-hoist accidents.

The basic causes of the latter class of accidents are well known. Persons who are killed or injured by the disasters which result from such accidents, generally have no control whatever over their causes. The practices and methods of coal-mine operation by which these causes can be eliminated are also well known and are practical. The cost of using them is not at all prohibitive. These basic causes are as follows:

(a) Excessive and unwarranted accumulations of loose coal, coal dust, and other combustible materials in underground areas of mines.

(b) Accumulations of explosive gases in such areas.

(c) Inadequate precautions to prevent inundation or flooding of underground mine workings.

(d) Improper equipment and improper maintenance of such equipment for transporting large numbers of workmen into and through underground workings in mines.

The McConnell bill is intended to prevent major disasters, and its provisions are limited to such as are designed to eliminate the cause of accidents which result in such disasters. It is not designed to protect the general health and welfare of miners. This large field of mine safety regulations is left to the States.

The McConnell bill specifically provides that it will not supersede or nullify State mine safety laws, unless such laws conflict with the provisions of the bill. It further provides that State laws which provide greater safety than the McConnell bill provides shall not be held to conflict with it, and that State laws pertaining to a phase of mine safety which is not provided for in the McConnell bill, shall not be held to be in conflict with it. These provisions leave to States control over the vast field of mine safety and health not related to major disasters and not covered by the McConnell bill.

The bill would enact into law coal-mine safety provisions which coal-mine operators would be required to observe in the operation of their mines. It would grant no authority or power to the United States Bureau of Mines to make coal-mine safety regulations of any kind. Only Congress would exercise that power, and only Congress could change the coal-mine safety provisions which it enacts into law. The number of these provisions is small.

They require adequate support of roof and ribs in underground roadways and travelways for the purpose of protecting persons riding on man-trips in such roadways and travelways from falls of roof or ribs which might injure them.

They provide for classifying a mine as a gassy mine and an appeal from such determination.

They prescribe minimum standards of ventilation of underground areas in mines which must be maintained to provide currents of air sufficient to dilute and render harmless, and to carry from the underground areas of a mine explosive or noxious gases which may collect therein.

They require that accumulations of coal dust in a mine must be covered with sufficient inert rock dust so that the combined coal dust and rock dust will not explode or burn. If an explosion does occur in a mine adequate rock dusting will keep it from spreading throughout the whole mine or a large part thereof.

They prescribe the kinds of examinations which must be made in all underground mines at specified times to ascertain whether or not explosive gas may have accumulated in such mines, and whether other hazards are present.

They require that electrical machinery, when used for certain purposes in underground mines which are gassy mines, shall be of a type which will not

permit electric sparks from the machines to come into contact with the air in the mine, as a precaution against ignition of any explosive gas which may have collected unexpectedly.

They also require that when, in extending underground working areas in a mine, the walls of such areas approach within 200 feet of any abandoned mine workings which cannot be inspected and which might contain dangerous accumulations of water, bore holes shall be drilled at least 20 feet ahead of such advancing walls for the purpose of detecting such accumulations of water and preventing them from inundating the mine.

They also provide that hoists used to transport persons in a mine shall be equipped with adequate safety brakes and safety catches, and that such hoists shall be inspected daily to ascertain if they are in safe working condition.

They also contain a small number of other provisions prescribing simple fire prevention precautions.

The bill specifically exempts from its provisions mines in which no more than 14 persons are regularly employed underground, and it also exempts all strip mines. The bill provides that at least once a year an inspector of the Bureau of Mines shall inspect each mine, the products of which regularly enter interstate or foreign commerce, or the operations of which substantially affect such commerce, and also provides for other special inspections as the Director of the Bureau of Mines deems necessary for the proper administration of the bill. The requirement of annual inspections is a minimum requirement and the bill recognizes the fact that some mines must be inspected more often than once a year.

The bill provides that if a Federal coal-mine inspector, upon inspecting a mine, finds that any of the coal-mine safety provisions, which the bill would enact into law, are being violated, and finds that such violation does not cause danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated, he shall find what would be a reasonable period of time within which such violation should be totally abated. Notice of such finding must be given to the operator. Such period of time may be extended by the inspector upon making a special inspection of the mine if circumstances warrant such extension. If at the end of such period of time the violation has not been stopped, an order to close the mine or the part of the mine affected by the violation must be issued.

The bill also provides for issuance of a mine-closing order by a Federal coal-mine inspector if, upon inspecting a mine, he finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated. The findings can only be based upon facts disclosed by an inspection of the mine. The danger which will justify the issuance of a mine-closing order must be danger that a mine explosion will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken, or danger that a mine fire will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken, or danger that the mine will be inundated immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken, or danger that a man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur immediately or before action which might avoid it could be taken. These are definite requirements with reference to the kind of a finding which a coal-mine inspector must make before he may issue a mine-closing order.

The bill also contains provisions under which Federal and State activities within the field covered by the bill may be coordinated. It provides that any State desiring to cooperate in making the inspections required under the bill may do so my mutual agreement between its official mine inspection or safety agency and the United States Bureau of Mines. It further provides that in States in which such an agreement is in effect no Federal inspector shall make an inspection of a mine unless a State inspector participates in such inspection, and that no mine may be closed by a Federal mine inspector for a violation of a safety provision which does not create danger of an immediate mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident, without the concurrence of a State inspector or an independent inspector appointed by the Federal Court of the district in which the mine is located, who may be appointed when the Federal and State inspectors disagree. It further provides, however, that if in the Director's judgment an inspection is urgently needed to determine whether danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident may occur immediately or before such danger can be eliminated, such inspection may be made by a Federal inspector alone.

The bill provides that a coal-mine operator ordered to close his mine, or a portion of it, on either of the two grounds specified in the bill, namely, the existence of imminent danger of a mine disaster, or unabated violation of a mine safety provision contained in the bill, may apply for annulment or revision of the order either to the Director of the Bureau of Mines or to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review. If the operator chooses to apply to the Director the latter must reinspect the mine or have such reinspection made by three Federal coal-mine inspectors, other than the inspectors who originally made the closing order, who then report to him. The Director must then make findings, based upon his inspection or the report of the three inspectors, and issue an order annulling, revising, or affirming the original closing order. However, the bill provides that in States in which a cooperative agreement is in effect, appeals from mine closing orders to the Director, as herein provided, shall not be made, and that appeals from mine closing orders shall be made directly to the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The bill creates a Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review to hear appeals from orders of Federal coal-mine inspectors and the Director. This Board is an independent tribunal consisting of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of these members must be a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine operators, one a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine workers, and one who must be a graduate engineer with experience in the coal-mining industry, or have had 5 years' experience as a practical coal-mining engineer, and who is also the chairman. Immediately upon the filing of an appeal the Board must fix the time for a prompt hearing. Pending the hearing the applicant may ask the Board for temporary relief, which the Board may grant. The Board is not bound by any previous findings of fact made by the Director or by any coal-mine inspector. Evidence relating to the making of the order complained of, or to the questions raised by the allegations of the pleadings or other questions pertinent in the proceeding, may be offered by both parties. The burden of proof rests upon the Director. Findings and orders of the Board must be in writing and must bear the signatures of the members who concur.

The bill further states that "in view of the urgent need for prompt decision of matters submitted" to the Director and to the Board, all actions which they are required to take "shall be taken as rapidly as practicable, consistent with adequate consideration of the issues involved."

The bill provides that any final order issued by the Board is subject to review by the United States court of appeals upon the filing of notice of appeal within 30 days after the date of the order. Pending the hearing the applicant may ask the court for temporary relief, which the court may grant. The court hears the appeal on the record made before the Board, and must permit argument, oral, or written, or both, by both parties. The decision of the court of appeals is final, subject only to review by the United States Supreme Court.

Any time during the pendency of an appeal to the Board or to the court of appeals or while the matter is before the Supreme Court, the operator may apply to the Director of the Bureau for annulment or revision of an order.

The McConnell bill provides criminal penalties for violations of mine-closing orders. It provides that mine operators, or agents of mine operators, or any other person, knowing of the making of a mine-closing order, who willfully violates such order, shall be fined not more than $2,000. It also provides that persons having control of a mine, who refuse to admit a duly authorized coal-mine inspector to such mine, shall be fined not more than $500.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. I thank the gentleman and appreciate his yielding to me.

I can say in all sincerity that I am just as concerned as other Members of the House are about two things: First of all, the safety of miners, and, secondly, the preservation of our American Republic. On that basis, I have tried to provide for the safety of the miners, but have so hedged the provisions of the bill that we will preserve for the States a large area within which they can continue to operate. I ask your support for this bill.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been in Congress, a short time, I have heard from this side about the encroachment of the Federal executive power on States' rights. Today this bill is as fine an example as I know of as to how they dress things up in their Sunday clothes and come in here to tell you that this is not Federal control. They are coming in the back door to control the mines.

All over the world we read about plans, a 5-year plan in Czechoslovakia, a 5-year plan in Hungary or Rumania or some place else, but I call your attention to one thing: I believe this is the first time that in our legislation we have used the words "State plan." Before you can get any redress under this law, the States must make a plan. And who approves it? A Federal director.

If you want your States controlled, this is a good way to start it. It is a State plan. They talk about this as a disaster bill, but this is a mine regulatory bill.

Listen to the definition of what a mine is and what they can inspect:

> The term "mine" means an area of land including everything annexed to it by nature and all structures, machinery, tools, equipment, and other property, real or personal, placed upon, under, or above its surface by man, used in the work of extracting bituminous coal, lignite, or anthracite.

That is what they can do. They can inspect, and they have to have a State plan to get back and get the Federal control. And who approves your State plan? Your States have to come in here. Your mine inspector is wiped out, because he has to submit a plan to come to Washington and get the approval of a Federal mine director before he can start using any of the procedures that they require in this bill.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I want to first concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] that if you are going to enter into this field of Federal control of your local mines, that this is about as good a bill as can be devised to accomplish that purpose. I congratulate the committee, too, on the way in which they have approached this subject. However, I am opposed to the bill. I think the bill is going to pass. I see the skids greased on both sides of the aisle for the passage of this measure. But I cannot very well refrain from expressing my own views on a subject about which I feel so deeply, and that is the subject of States' rights; that is the subject of whether or not we are going to enter into another field where we are going to send a flock of bureaucrats from Washington to tell your State and your State authorities and your State people and your citizens in those States what they can do and what they cannot do. I think we should give that very serious consideration because when you take this initial step in Federal control of your mines, it naturally follows that you can take the same step with respect to every other industry in your State and in your home town. Then the first thing you know, we will have cause to take over the factories and the stores and other business in your States. If you want a little local home consumption and home control, may I point out to my Republican friends on the other side, do not forget that you are taking the first step to absolute Federal control of everything in your own State—a principle you have always opposed.

In the Committee on Rules, when this question was up, and the Committee on Rules listened patiently for 2 days to the advocates and proponents of this bill, I asked this question of every advocate of this bill who appeared before the committee. I said, "Do you have inspection laws in your State for coal mines?" The answer was "yes."

"Well, what kind of laws do you have?"

"We have good laws."

Then I said, "If you have good laws, why do you need more laws and more Federal control?" I asked the question, "Do you have good inspection?" And I could not get anyone to say that they did not trust their own people to make their own inspections. Now, if they have good laws and good inspections, will somebody say why you need to inject the Federal Government into this subject?

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that we have good laws in the State of Illinois, but we have had 232 people killed, and it was pointed out by the Federal inspectors, that, in 35 instances, in each mine there was danger of murder in those mines, and there was murder.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In other words, the gentleman is saying that in his State he does not have the kind of inspection which he feels he can trust. Because in the State of Illinois you do not have the proper kind of enforcement of your laws, do you think it is right that you should impose this kind of restriction upon the other 47 States which do have good laws and are ready to carry them out? Why should the other 47 States suffer because the State of Illinois does not see fit to employ people who will properly enforce the laws and make the proper inspections? As I say, I think the skids are all set on this bill. I hope everybody is happy with it. I think you are going to pass it, but I just want to express my own views and vote against this bill because the general principle involved here is a very, very important one. Let me remind you that under this bill, a Federal agent can go into your State and shut down any mine in your State over the protest and objection of your State officials.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The reason why the laws of the State of Illinois have not been enforced, and they are good laws, is because of rottenness and collusion in the State administration—and I am not talking about the Democratic administration because it was true under the Republicans.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not deny that things are rotten in the State of Illinois, but I do say that they are pretty good in the other 47 States.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, when are we going to consider returning to the constitutional limitations on this Federal Government? When are we going to quit this utter pretense that here in Washington is the center and the source of honesty, good inspection, lack of corruption, and that we can call on Washington, "Oh, Moloch, seat of goodness, come out and inspect us and our mines in Illinois and other places. We are more corrupt and incompetent in the States to inspect our own mines than the bureaucracy in Washington." What utter rot. What utter pretense.

The real politics in this thing is that the independent mines, the unorganized mines, are producing about one-quarter of the coal in some States. They are working 6 days a week, $12.50 a day, turning out coal. The organized mines are working 2.8 days a week, organized, $17.50 a day, and the people cannot buy their coal. Two-thirds of the inspectors under the mine inspection are ex-members of the United Mine Workers and carry their cards with pride. They are going to determine whether the liberty of the independent coal miner is preserved or whether their liberties are lost; their mines shut down. Coal mining is not an interstate commerce business any more than cotton milling, woolen milling, corn and wheat milling are interstate commerce. Will Congress vote to inspect them against accident? Seventy percent of coal mining is in three States. The State inspectors are against this business of interruption and interference by Federal inspectors. They want to proceed to mind their own business, protect their own people. The companies are not in the business of blowing up their own mines and killing people without regard to human life either. What is the Federal Government going to do that States and business will not do to save life? What mine safety does Washington want that the States themselves do not want and will not insist upon? Let us strike this thing at its heart, which is interference with our liberties in the States to mine coal and take care of their own people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, representing the greatest anthracite-coal-mining district in the world, I wish to take this time to express my approval of the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, representing a great majority of the coal-producing counties in Ohio, I wish to express my approval of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said in getting permission to make these remarks, I represent the largest part of the coal-producing area of the State of Ohio, which is the fourth largest coal-producing State in the Union.

While I do not consider this bill to be a perfect mine-safety bill, I certainly consider it a step in the right direction, and I urge the Congress to approve it, because it does go forward in the field of protecting the lives of the men who work in the mines. As I said in this House on March 4, 1950:

> My first experience with death was one day when I was dismissed from school in the first grade to attend the funeral of the fathers of two classmates who were killed in a stone fall in a coal mine. In 1940 and 1941, in my county, Belmont County, Ohio, there were two major disasters which wiped out the lives of 72 people and 90 people, and in the adjacent county of Harrison, also in my district, another accident killed 38 people, all within seconds. Those people were all heads of families; they were fathers; they were husbands, and their lives were taken. Coal mining is not a pleasant occupation.

Neither is coal mining a safe occupation at best. There are accidents every day in the coal mines which take the lives of one or two men. This bill will not prevent those kinds of accidents, but it certainly will do something toward preventing the disaster-type accidents which occurred in Belmont County in 1940 and 1941 and last December in Centralia, Ill.

Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents make their living in the mines, and I have spent a good deal of my legislative life in trying to bring about safer working conditions for them. I was a member of the Ohio Senate and worked vigorously when the 1941 Ohio mine-safety law was passed. The fact that I have had something to do with the passing of this Federal mine-safety law I will consider another milestone in my career.

I expect to present a plank for the consideration of the Democratic platform committee, urging that the Democratic Party back all possible Federal research for the development of new uses of coal, and as we find new uses and mining employs more people, I will be proud to say that I did all possible to make coal mining as safe as it can be made.

Mr. Speaker, I do not see how a valid argument can be made that this is an intrusion of States' rights, when all we are trying to do is to protect the lives of the men who work in the pits.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of from 30,000 to 35,000 of southwestern Pennsylvania's coal miners, their wives and children, I rise to support this very important bill designed to provide safe working conditions for miners all over America. Passage of this legislation will definitely bring about an improvement in the conditions of their work by reducing the number of disasters and guaranteeing that there will be fewer occasions when men will be taken from their wives and children as a result of indifferent law enforcement by State inspectors.

Mr. Speaker, I never worked in a coal mine but when it became my duty to represent a large number of miners I felt that it was my responsibility to learn something about the conditions under which they worked. Accordingly, since becoming a Member of the Eighty-second Congress, I have gone into five different coal mines. I have visited gassy mines and a nongassy mine; large mines and small mines; mechanized mines and nonmechanical mines where horses are used. I have seen the incredibly fast mechanical miner in operation and I have seen men digging out the coal with picks and shovels. I have always made it my business to go in with a man-trip early in the morning and I have visited the individual workmen "at the face," out where the job of making the day's production is actually done. In each case I have remained for almost the entire shift and have walked many miles underground.

Mr. Speaker, these men who mine the coal are among America's finest citizens. If you want a good lesson in Americanism and human understanding, and if you want a deeper appreciation of the different kinds of people who are in the ranks of labor, just go down into a coal mine and talk to the men. You will find the Poles and the Germans, the English and the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Negroes, the Syrians, the Serbs, and the Italians, and the Slavs, workers all; blackened and sweaty, producing this basic source of power for the defense of the free world.

There is one thing about a coal miner, Mr. Speaker, that sets him apart from many other kinds of laborers. He is a terrific worker. He is the kind of fellow who gets the job done. The average American miner produces 7 tons of coal per man-day. This is just seven times what the miners of England, our nearest European competitor, produce. This amazing production results from the fact that the American miner has always accepted every labor-saving device and every means of mechanical production that would increase his output of coal. He has been a true believer in and promoter of the American way in industry. He has realized that the American system of trying to get rich by producing as much coal as possible is the best way to work. He has, by accepting that system, rejected the old European plan of trying to get rich by producing as little as possible so as to make coal as scarce as possible and thereby keep prices as high as possible. His has been a philosophy of production for plenty and wealth, rather than scarcity and poverty.

Now this American miner has not produced this amount of coal that he does without paying a price, and that price is in the blood and bodily injury of the men who work in the mines, and the suffering and grief of bereaved families. Sadly—and for no good reason—the number of deaths in coal mines in America is almost as far above the number of deaths in European coal mines as our production is above theirs. We kill over 3 men per 1,000 man-years of exposure in our coal mines while Great Britain kills only 1. This is an unnecessary thing, Mr. Speaker, and the bill now before us is designed to eliminate the causes of some of these coal-mine deaths, thereby reducing the price in blood that we have to pay for our high coal production.

I think it should be perfectly plain that this bill will not do for a miner what he must do for himself. Nothing can take the place of individual safety precautions. Sixty-seven percent of the deaths in coal mines are caused by roof falls and cave-ins, and most of these are the responsibility of the individual man. This bill is designed to make sure that the operators are responsible for safe over-all conditions within the mines, and it is designed to prevent mine disasters which are caused by either flood or fire or explosion or man-trip or man-hoist accidents where large numbers of lives are imperiled.

As this point, Mr. Speaker, I quote a letter from Mr. George Gober, president of UMWA Local 6290, and chairman of the mine safety committee. He has some 26 years of mining experience. Mr. Gober has written the following:

> The widows weep and their children have become pathetic, mournful and hapless figures. There is public sorrow at the moment, but we know from harsh experience that it is only a momentary feeling of pity on the part of the public, and this sacrifice, like others before, will soon be forgotten. Shortly after the mine workers bury their dead, the feeling of sorrow will remain only in the breasts of the loved ones who survived; and the mine workers can look forward to the next catastrophe.
>
> Coal mine explosions can be prevented; there is absolutely no reason why any coal mine explosion should occur if all concerned apply known remedies for this matter.

And then Mr. Gober goes on to say:

> Accidents are not acts of God. Accidents are man-made through failure of someone to take proper safety precautions, and it is up to us as an organization, you and I and each of us, to bring into this industry the degree of safety necessary to stop such appalling records as are set out by the United States Bureau of Mines.

Then I think Mr. Gober must have been referring to the fine position of the State of Pennsylvania as far as mine safety is concerned when he said:

> There are many people in this industry especially among those who manage the operations, who believe that accidents cannot be prevented. There are others who know they can be prevented and don't take proper

steps to prevent them. In approaching a matter of this kind, we have all got to realize one thing—accidents in coal mines don't happen—they are caused either by someone failing to do something that should have been done or someone doing something that should not have been done. The Federal Mine Safety Code isn't a perfect instrument. But I say to you, if it was complied with in every respect, at least 90 percent of the accidents that now take place in coal mines (that is, disaster accidents) would cease to take place.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the record of the mining industry in Pennsylvania makes our State a leader among all the States of the Union as far as mine safety is concerned. I believe it is a fair statement that, had all States a safety record and a mine inspection system like the State of Pennsylvania, the United Mine Workers of America would not have had reason to put up such a gallant fight for this legislation. Yet Pennsylvania's mines are not perfect, as is evidenced by the very recent disaster at Carpentertown, Pa., and one up in the hard-coal region only yesterday. It is really an interest in the fellow members of the union and their families all over the country that makes Mr. Gober's letter close with this paragraph. "We, the members of local union No. 6290, Nemacolin, Pa., who are privileged to speak for our dead, and for those pathetic widows and orphans, and for the future safety of our people, challenge this criminal and callous attitude. These killings must stop."

I am proud to represent miners like George Gober and his fellow members of the United Mine Workers of America, Mr. Speaker, and I hope this bill will pass the House at once and very speedily be enacted into law for the sake of all coal miners and their families. In closing, I want to pay a tribute to my two friends from Pennsylvania, Congressman SAM MCCONNELL, whose energy and diligence brought about the House version of the bill, and to Congressman AUGUSTINE KELLEY, also of Pennsylvania, who was the chairman of the subcommittee which was responsible for writing it. These men have worked long and hard in cooperation with the Bureau of Mines, the United Mine Workers, and the operators, and have produced sound, worth-while legislation which is the first step on the way to making America not only the greatest producer of coal but the safest producer of coal as well.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to pass the McConnell bill, H. R. 1310, now before us for consideration, which removes objectionable language in the bills introduced by both Congressman PRICE and Senator NEELY.

This bill only allows the Federal Government to step in and cooperate with State inspectors when conditions in a mine are found to be such that unless they are corrected there is eminent danger of the loss of the lives of miners or great damage to the mines and mine property from floods, etc.

Since the tragic mine disaster in Centralia in 1947, which took the lives of 112 miners, which, in my judgment, would have been avoided if a bill like this had been on the statute books, I have urged that we must strengthen mine safety through the cooperation of Government inspection. This bill will do just that.

The Congress waited and failed to act until the terrible and tragic explosion December last at the Orient mine in West Frankfurt which caused the loss of the lives of 119 miners. Many of us Members then urged the Congress to pass mine safety legislation in this session in the hope of preventing similar disasters in the future and in the hope of giving greater protection every day to those who work in the mines.

I regret that this legislation could not be brought to the House before the closing days of the session and I think it is imperative that we pass it today and send it to the Senate as quickly as possible in order that that body will have a chance to act before adjournment, and I believe they will act favorably.

Mr. Speaker, having spoken a number of times in this session urging that this type of mine safety legislation should be passed, the Members of the House are well aware of my views and I shall not impose upon you today at any length.

We who have lived close to the coal mines in southern Illinois, who have seen the results of these two tragic disasters with such great loss of life and who know that those lives would probably not have been lost if we had had a bill like this on the statute book, believe that the Members of this House are willing and ready to approve this legislation which is long overdue, which, in my judgment, will save the lives in the future of possibly many thousands of miners.

I hope the Members of this House will approve this bill by a big majority.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. I want to go on record as favoring this Federal mine inspection bill because I believe it is needed for mine safety and to guarantee adequate inspections to protect our miners and their families from these recurring mine disasters. This bill will not hinder the operations of mines when they are well and safely run. It is an added protection against recent disasters that would have been prevented with adequate inspections, and by institution of proper remedies after warnings of dangerous conditions had been given. The community and the United States people demand safe working conditions for the miners who perform a basic and necessary task in our economy. My vote for this bill is to help obtain mine safety.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENNY].

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my approval of this bill. I think it is a very fine one and that it should be passed.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district is located in the heart of the great bituminous-coal fields of Pennsylvania, and, having in mind the safety of thousands of miners whom I represent in this body, H. R. 7408, a bill to prevent major disasters in coal mines, most certainly has my full support.

The following statement from the Central Pennsylvania Coal Producers' Association, with headquarters in Altoona, Pa., speaks not only for the coal producers of my congressional district but likewise the miners and their families, all of whom want the protection the provisions of this bill will provide when it becomes a law.

The statement follows:

The McConnell bill (H. R. 7408) will be brought to the floor of the House shortly. It is a mine-safety bill, but it is different from any other mine-safety bill which has heretofore been in Congress.

All mine-safety bills introduced in Congress prior to the introduction of the McConnell bill have been opposed by practically all coal-mine operators, but some of them have been strongly supported by coal miners and by the United States Bureau of Mines.

The McConnell bill is strongly supported by a large segment of coal-mine operators and also by the United Mine Workers of America and the United States Bureau of Mines.

The principal features of bills which coal-mine operators have heretofore found objectionable and have therefore opposed are: First, these bills would have given to a Federal administrative agency full power to make regulations governing every phase of coal-mine operation which such agency might deem necessary to eliminate accidents and diseases in coal mines. The agency would also have power to enforce its own regulations. Secondly, these bills would have given to the administrative agency power to close a mine if it found that a violation of a safety regulation created danger to the safety or health of employees. Thirdly, these bills failed to provide adequate appeal from, or judicial review of, mine-closing orders. Fourthly, State laws pertaining to coal-mine safety would have been superseded and nullified by regulations or orders made by the administrative agency in conflict with those State laws. The McConnell bill contains none of the objectionable features above referred to.

The McConnell bill does not permit any governmental administrative agency to make any regulations prescribing practices to be followed in the operation of mines.

The McConnell bill is not intended to permit the Federal Government to regulate the whole field of mine safety. It is specifically designed to prevent major mine disasters only. A major mine disaster is generally considered to be an accident in which five or more lives are lost. Such disasters usually result from mine explosions, mine fires, mine inundations, or man-trip or man-hoist accidents, all of which are known to be preventable. The McConnell bill specifically enacts into law a limited number of safety provisions, the observance of which will definitely reduce the number of such disasters. These provisions pertain to the ventilation and rock-dusting of underground mines to prevent the accumulation and ignition of explosive gases and coal dust. They also protect against inundation or flooding of underground mines and prescribe precautions to protect against accidents to persons traveling into or out of mines on man-trips or man-hoists.

The McConnell bill permits the United States Bureau of Mines to issue orders closing a mine, or a portion thereof, if a Federal mine inspector, upon inspecting a mine, finds danger that a mine explosion, mine

fires, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident may occur before such danger can be eliminated, and it also permits the Bureau to issue orders closing a mine, or a portion thereof, if the operator fails to stop violating any of the safety provisions contained in the bill after he has been notified of such violation and has been given a reasonable period of time within which to correct the condition which constitutes a violation.

However, the McConnell bill also contains provisions under which Federal and State activities within the field covered by the bill may be coordinated. It provides that any State, desiring to cooperate in making the inspections required under the bill may do so by mutual agreement between its official mine inspection or safety agency and the United States Bureau of Mines. It further provides that in States in which such an agreement is in effect no Federal inspector shall make an inspection of a mine unless a State inspector participates in such inspection, and that no mine may be closed by a Federal mine inspector for a violation of a safety provision which does not create danger of an immediate mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident, without the concurrence of a State inspector or an independent inspector appointed by the Federal court of the district in which the mine is located, who may be appointed when the Federal and State inspectors disagree. It further provides, however, that if in the Director's judgment an inspection is urgently needed to determine whether danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident may occur immediately or before such danger can be eliminated, such inspection may be made by a Federal inspector alone.

The McConnell bill also provides adequate appeals from mine closing orders to the Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, an independent tribunal of three members created by the bill, and for judicial review of orders of the Board by United States Courts of Appeal.

The McConnell bill specifically provides that it will not supersede or nullify State mine safety laws, unless such laws conflict with the bill or orders issued pursuant to it. It further provides that State laws which provide greater safety than the McConnell bill shall not be held to conflict with it, and that State laws pertaining to a phase of mine safety which is not provided for in the McConnell bill, shall not be held to be in conflict with it. These provisions leave to the States control over the vast field of mine safety and health not covered by the McConnell bill.

The McConnell bill was introduced only after the subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor had conducted full and complete hearings on the question of Federal coal-mine-safety legislation. Representatives of the United States Bureau of Mines, the United Mine Workers of America, and coal-mine operators of varying viewpoints gave to the subcommittee the benefit of their knowledge and experience. The McConnell bill was developed out of the information and advice thus obtained by the subcommittee.

The McConnell bill was introduced on April 4, 1952. The subcommittee, by a vote of 6 to 3, reported it favorably to the full House Committee on Education and Labor on May 3, 1952. The full Committee on Education and Labor, by a vote of 17 to 7, voted last Friday to recommend that it be passed by the House. The next day it was taken up at a special meeting of the Committee on Rules. That committee today adopted an open rule allowing two hours' debate on the bill.

If the bill is passed by the House there is ample reason to believe that it will be passed by the Senate before final adjournment.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am highly gratified that the House is today being given an opportunity to express itself on the bill commonly known as the mine safety inspection bill.

While this particular measure, as reported favorably by the Committee on Education and Labor, is not all that could be desired in the way of precautions against mine disasters, nevertheless it is a step in the right direction.

Personally, I had the hope that we would have an opportunity to consider the bill introduced by the gentleman from Illinois, Representative MELVIN PRICE, which in my opinion has provisions insuring much greater safety in every respect from the hazards now incidental to the work of the coal miners.

However, I am pleased to voice my approval of the measure now before us, and feel that it is a great and historic stride forward toward the protection from injury and death of the men who work in the pits, a purpose which I believe will appeal to every citizen as a laudable one.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have already spoken at some length in favor of this mine-safety bill, so I will only take a few moments at this time. This is a good bill and is fair to all. It will save many lives in the mines. This bill has been bitterly fought. It has taken years to finally get this bill this far. In the name of humanity it must be passed. Unless we pass this bill today it may be years before this body again has the opportunity to pass on a mine-safety bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Education and Labor for bringing out this mine-safety bill, and I am heartily in favor of its passage.

Possibly, a stronger bill could have been enacted, but this legislation before us is at least a step forward in the right direction and is probably as much as could be accomplished under the circumstances.

Probably the principal argument against this bill, that I have heard, is that Federal enforcement of mine safety would be in violation of States' rights. But, for my part, I have no difficulty with that question.

When the Constitution was adopted, the individual States surrendered certain rights to the Federal Government, "in order to form a more perfect Union." One of those rights was that of regulating commerce "among the several States." And, under that interstate-commerce clause, it has been held that the Federal Government can act in cases where goods are produced to go into interstate commerce, or that legislation can be enacted on matters substantially affecting interstate commerce.

This legislation for mine safety clearly comes within that category. So, it becomes simply a question of policy, as to whether we should enact this particular bill. I can see no reason to doubt the right of Congress to legislate on the subject.

It seems to me that these hardy men who go down into the depths of the earth and bring out coal, so that the wheels of our industry may turn and our homes be kept warm, are entitled to have a place to work that is as safe as possible. Coal is often said to be the lifeblood of American industry. I see no reason, though, why it must cost such a price in the lives of men and anguish of their loved ones.

It has been testified that, during the last 20 years, more than 1,250,000 miners have been maimed, mangled, or killed in the coal mines. During the first 2 years of World War II, injuries and deaths in the mines were greater than the casualties in all our Armed Forces. In the mine explosion last December at West Frankfort, Ill., 119 men were killed—where Federal authorities had already reported in advance that conditions were dangerous. Eighty of these men had small children, and 111 left widows.

While it is true that most of the States already have mine-inspection laws—and, I feel, a very good law in my own State of Indiana—there are 48 States, with almost as many different laws on this subject.

I feel that mine inspectors in my own State are efficient, but in my State, as in the other States, these inspectors usually hold office for only 4 years. They are easily subject to replacement, and they can fall under pressure much more readily than would be the case with Federal inspectors.

The Federal Government has done extensive research work in mine-safety practices, and we already have Federal mine inspectors. This legislation would authorize the Federal Government to cooperate with the States in the enforcement of safety regulations, and mines could be closed down where there is immediate danger of explosion, fire, flooding, or injury from unsafe man-trip vehicles and man-hoist cages, in the event that satisfactory steps were not taken to correct these unsafe conditions.

The people of this country have great respect for the Federal Government, and I believe that, with this safety law on the statute books, there will be little difficulty in securing compliance with its provisions.

As I said before, while this mine-safety bill does not go as far as it might, still it is a step in the right direction, and I sincerely hope that it can be enacted.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any coal mines in my district yet I have followed closely for the past 2 years the progress of the legislation which is before us for consideration this afternoon.

I remember the disasters in Illinois and I recall the many press dispatches in recent months telling of mine accidents in various sections of the country.

It seems evident that the States have failed to solve the problem of mine safety and in such circumstances I think it is the duty of the Congress to tighten existing mine-safety law by putting enforcement provisions in it.

I congratulate the House Committee on Education on bringing this important legislation to the floor and I want to pay particular credit to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] for his several years of tenacious support and work on mine safety. The legislation we now consider is an outgrowth of the bill the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] introduced in the House in the present and the Eighty-first Congresses.

NEED FOR MINE SAFETY LEGISLATION NOW

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a mine-safety bill, and I am sure all of us are aware of the great number of mine tragedies which have occurred in recent months. Sympathy expressed by Members of Congress to the bereaved families of the dead is not enough. We must show our deep interest in the lives and welfare of these men and their families by a more tangible method—that is, by effective legislation for the elimination of the unsafe conditions and practices in the mines.

Needless to say, coal mining is the right arm of modern industry. Our fellow men work these mines, not only for the support of their families, but to keep our factories going and provide the necessities and luxuries of life.

Directly and indirectly, over 5,000,000 persons derive their living from the coal industry of America. In 1951, over 39,000 men were injured and killed in the bituminous and anthracite fields of our Nation. Can we afford to postpone any longer the strengthening and amending of our laws which affect such a great number of our citizens?

If, however, we want to save money instead of lives, we can go ahead as we are. But if it were your life you were trying to save, neither money nor effort would be spared.

And if we practice the "Golden Rule" we will see that this law is passed today to provide adequate safety rules in our coal mines. I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this legislation for the prevention of major disasters in the coal mines should have the overwhelming support of this House. I do not have any coal mines in my district nor do I have any constituents who are coal miners, but nevertheless, I am very happy to voice my approval in behalf of this worthy piece of legislation. I realize that no legislation is a guaranty against accidents, but such argument advanced by the opponents of this measure is utterly ridiculous, as is the argument of States' rights. This legislation is not an interference with the States' rights principle.

If this legislation is instrumental in saving but one life which might be lost through a possible mine disaster, then it is certainly worth our efforts here today. The importance of this legislation is made very apparent when we review a history and a background of the subject before us.

The hazardous nature of mining was recognized by the Federal Government as long ago as 1865, when a bill to create a Federal mining bureau was introduced in Congress. However, little was done until a series of serious coal-mine disasters after the turn of the century aroused the public to demand Federal action to stop such excessive loss of life. As a result, an act of Congress established a Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior on July 1, 1910, and the act made it clear that the Bureau's foremost activity would be the promotion of health and safety in the mineral industries.

Coal-mine safety laws were passed by most of the then coal-producing States before the year 1890, and the laws gave State inspectors varying powers for obtaining compliance. The earliest State coal-mining law was adopted by Pennsylvania in 1869 and applied to the State's anthracite mines. Inasmuch as little was known at that time about the causes of mine disasters, and the means of preventing them generally were unknown and unavailable, the original laws could not be expected to prevent such disasters.

Practices in the old days of mining were crude and extremely dangerous. Some of these were the use of coal-burning furnaces installed underground to induce movement of ventilating currents through the mine workings; the general use of open-flame lamps for illumination in all mines whether gas or nongassy; and the use of black powder or dynamite for all blasting purposes because no other type of explosive was manufactured. Coal dust was allowed to accumulate throughout the mines, and since it was not known to be explosive, nothing was done to render it inert. The number of fatalities from major coal-mine explosions in the United States from 1901 to 1910 was 3,912. During the same 10-year period, coal production increased from 270,000,000 to 500,000,000 tons, and the employment in the coal mines increased from 448,000 to 725,000.

The need for research into the causes and means of preventing coal-mine disasters, particularly explosion disasters, was acute but there was little official activity in this direction until the establishment of the United States Bureau of Mines in 1910.

One of the first endeavors of the Bureau of Mines was to determine the causes of coal-mine explosions and then find the means for their prevention. Among the first contributions of the Bureau technicians toward the solution of the disaster problem was the introduction in 1911 of permissible explosives, which, when used as recommended by the Bureau, will not ignite gas or coal dust.

The halting progress of the struggle to prevent coal-mine disasters after their causes and the means of preventing them were known and made available as indicated by the record which shows that from 1910 to date a total of 334 major disasters have occurred in the coal mines of the United States causing the death of 6,720 persons. A major disaster, as classified by the United States Bureau of Mines, is one in which five or more persons are killed. Whereas there were no major disasters in the Nation's coal mines in 1949 and 1950, 5 occurred in 1951 causing the death of 157 persons and indicates that what has been done up to now to prevent such holocausts is not enough.

In the act of May 7, 1941, Congress authorized inspection and investigation of coal mines by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of obtaining information and making recommendations relating to health and safety. But that act did not require compliance with the standards or recommendations of the Secretary.

Since that time, Congress has continued to appropriate substantial sums of money with which the Bureau of Mines has continued to develop efficient practical, scientific safety standards. If these standards were adhered to they would sharply reduce all major disasters and fatal and nonfatal injuries.

The legislation before us provides for the issuance of a mine-closing order by a Federal inspector if, upon inspecting a mine, he finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine gas, or manhoist accidents will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated. It is legislation designed to guard the safety of human lives. It is progressive legislation and should be adopted.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am most happy about the passing of the coal mine safety bill today, as Senate bill 1310. I hope that the White House can see its way clear to approve this measure promptly, as it can do immediate good for those men who must work underground.

The hearings on both sides of the Congress were long and thorough and all parties had an opportunity to be heard fully, and I am certain that the Congress has made a wise conclusion after hearing all of such evidence.

I am of the so-called coal regions, and my friends and neighbors have watched this bill and its progress carefully. Our papers and radio stations have reported its travels in detail and in support of its proposals. Those of us who have seen men come out of the mines hurt, dead or diseased by the hazards that can exist under the ground know that no safety can be too much or too great for those who must bring this basic material from its natural state into commerce.

If this bill can save lives, and I am sure that it will, everyone a Member of this Congress for this session can have a just reward and deep sense of satisfaction in recalling that he has helped his fellow man.

The men will never forget this session for this safety, and the Members who have helped this passage will live permanently in the activities and memories of the mines. They are appreciative people and they will know who have helped and will respond decently in appreciation.

Their families who must watch each working day for the safe return to surface will likewise know and demonstrate

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

thanks for this added lawful provision. Many of those families will pray in thanks, I know.

To those Members who are not from any coal community who served on the various committees and to those staff members of both sides of the Congress who have worked and aided in presenting the materials I as a member from a coal community herein extend my heartfelt thanks, and congratulations upon reaching a successful and proper conclusion.

This is decent progressive legislation and I trust that it can be decently administered without any regard for party or selfish interest.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the basic fuel industry in the United States is coal. I have the privilege of representing the great anthracite coal center of Pennsylvania, and I use this time to emphasize to the House and the country the tragic and deplorable condition existing in both the hard and soft coal mines, which permits death, injury, and disaster to be worked upon the men who sweat and toil in the mines.

The roof is bad, the track is worse
The 15th North is on a "squeeze."
The South Old Works are full of gas
Coal dust on the main line to your knees
The air at the face is mighty slow
The loading machine is at its worst
The boss wants a 4-hundred ton today
Say, who in the hell said safety first?

The coal miner who wrote that verse was ridiculing the safety-first sign at the top of a Pennsylvania mine shaft. In Pennsylvania and in other coal-mining States of this country such signs abound. Some are more imaginative, having such bulletins as Think, Work, and Act Safely, Take Care and Be Careful, and so forth, grim reminders of the real, stark dangers that lurk in the earth's recesses, dangers which have reaped a ghastly toll of mining men over the years and which will continue to do so under our present system.

Many of this country's coal operators try to live up to the above-mentioned slogans, but just as many do not. In times of good work and prosperity, a great deal of attention is given this problem. In times of poor work and stress, it is the first program to go by the board. In the hunt for profits and to meet the terrific competition that is always present in the coal industry, the safety program is the first to suffer. Well-intentioned producers are forced to cut corners, and they do so wherever possible. Their greedy conscienceless competition, which is everywhere, then makes no pretense of a safety program, and weak enforcement or none at all, under our present inadequate system, soon leads to a Centralia, or a West Frankfort catastrophe. For a while the Nation gasps and demands the Congress take action. The Congress stirs, speeches are made, bills are introduced, hearings are held, each action coming with a slower and slower movement until suddenly it reaches a spot where it stops and remains on dead center, forgotten by all but a few Members of Congress, a small part of the public, the still-living coal miners, the widows and the orphans of Centralia, West Frankfort, Carpentertown, and all other mines where disaster overtook some of the Nation's coal miners. Not enough to attract attention, not enough to force the passage of legislation past the clutching hands of those who for one reason or another do not want to give the Federal inspectors the power to remove men from a mine when dangerous conditions prevail.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to burden the RECORD with statistics. Over and over again have the tragic figures of the number of coal miners killed and injured each year been called to the attention of the Congress and the public. But I do want to call your attention to the heavy burden carried by the mining people of this country which is further shown in the report of Josephine Roche, administrator of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund, who states that the average miner lives 8.4 years less than the average American. The average age at death of a miner is 55.8 years, as compared with 64.2 years for the country as a whole. The death ratio for the Nation is 10.3 per thousand. For the miners it is 15.1. While we have the most productive miners in the mining world, we also lead in the frequency of mine accidents.

It is time that something be done about this situation. America is stirring on the mine-safety problem in various ways. One of the most heartening developments is that parts of the industry itself are showing active leadership.

In many of the Nation's coal mines, safety first means what it says: careful, competent managers are present to lead and show the way to safer coal-mining methods. This progressive part of the industry believes it is more economical to have "safety first"—to conserve manpower, protect human lives, create better public relations, develop happier customers, raise employees' morale and production, assure lower insurance rates; in brief, safety in the mines is sound economy. Safety first means something to the Union Pacific's Reliance mine No. 7, Reliance, Wyo., whose 575 miners have worked three consecutive years without a single lost-time accident. This, I believe, is a world record in coal mining, and the reassuring part of this example is that it is happening in our time—now. This is an example of real safety first.

By "safety first" we mean what the term implies; first in over-all consideration, first in specific application, first in expense. It means the acceptance of the inescapable factor that safety costs money and that it should have preference and priority over all other costs in the production of coal.

Another example of safety first is the rescue of 240 miners at Peabody mine No. 59, just on the outskirts of Springfield, Ill., on August 16, 1949. Some of you will recall the fire that broke out in that mine. The men were trapped from the normal routes of escape. The fire raged beyond control. In 1946—or 3 years before the fire—Federal mine inspectors had warned the company of the great distance that existed between the men and the air shaft, and they recommended an extra air shaft be constructed close to the functional area of the mine to assure better ventilation and to be used in case of emergencies. The company complied. This proved to be one of the best investments the Peabody Coal Co. ever made. This new air shaft formed the means for 163 of the trapped miners to escape. There were no cages or elevators; no stairs or ladders for the miners to use. A movable hoist was rushed from a Taylorville, Ill., mine—some 30 miles distant—and used to lift the miners out of the pit in a bucket, three men at a time. While the rescue operations were going on, more than 100,000 people, unaware of the near disaster, were enjoying themselves at the Illinois State Fair adjacent to the stricken mine. All the men were saved with only six slight smoke injuries, but no fatalities. This is what we mean by safety first—safety by being prepared for eventualities.

The West Frankfort mine disaster of December 21, 1951, which destroyed the lives of 120 miners, is an example of safety last. It followed the Centralia mine disaster of 1947, which killed 111 miners, and the Old Ben explosion, which cost the lives of 28 men in the same year. According to the report of the United States Bureau of Mines, the catastrophe at Orient No. 2 was caused by a large accumulation of methane which oozed or was forced out of old works into the functional part of the mine. A nonpermissible machine—which means a machine without proper safeguards against fire, heat, and sparks—ignited the gas. The initial blast gained momentum as it fed on pulverized coal dust; it wrecked the operation and the men were doomed. One hundred and twenty men perished, and it could only have been worse if the blast had occurred just a few hours before when the day shift of over 1,000 men had been in the mine.

The C. W. & F. Coal Co. erred in three fundamental things:

First. It permitted large quantities of methane to accumulate and concentrate.

Second. It used nonpermissible mining machines.

Third. It failed to adequately rock dust the roadways so as to smother or localize a gas explosion.

All are in violation of the mining code.

The reports of J. J. Forbes, Director of the Bureau of Mines; Secretary of the Interior Chapman; and John L. Lewis clearly and unmistakably show that the managers of the New Orient mine were flagrantly negligent. The Governor of Illinois has said the company was at fault and so was the Illinois Department of Mines and Minerals. Congressman C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP, whose district includes the stricken mine, told us, his colleagues in Congress, that he was gravely concerned with the large amount of gas that had been permitted to accumulate in Orient No. 2. How the gas was set off was of minor significance, he said. Mine examiners have testified the gas conditions in this mine were a major subject of controversy months before the blast occurred.

The company was warned of the specific dangers. The Bureau of Mines had recommended the old works be sealed off, air driven into the old works, the gas diluted and driven out of the mine and in the process not to pass the lethal current into the functional part of the mine where fire and men could be exposed to it. The Bureau of Mines says it has documentary proof that this specific warning was made at least six different times—months, even years, before the explosion.

But I do not want to dilate on the failure of Illinois to protect its miners or to enforce its mining laws. Illinois is not the only mining State that is negligent in the performance of its duties. Every State in the Union where coal is being mined can tell the same story as Illinois. Poor enforcement of their mining laws, politics in their mining departments, inadequate laws or none at all, can be charged to every mining State in America. And the charges can be documented and proven.

I am a Pennsylvanian and proud of it. We frequently boast of the adequate and progressive laws of our great State. And they are adequate, they are progressive. But they are not the ultimate. They can be improved. And the knowledge that an experienced Federal inspector would be making a check of the condition of their mines would act as a deterrent to any State inspector who might be inclined to shirk his duty or overlook a law violation. Of course, it might hurt his pride, but I prefer the injury to an inspector's pride to a mine explosion or mine injury. Were the Pennsylvania mining laws what some people claim them to be, we would not have had the Carpentertown explosion. Here the State inspection service claimed no gas existed, while the Federal inspectors claimed there was gas in explosive quantities. The death of six miners proved who was right, but the proof was poor recompense for the widows and orphans of these men. Another so-called nongassy mine blew up on March 24 at Gray, Pa., burning two miners severely. This was a "safe" mine operated as nongassy under our adequate Pennsylvania law without preshift examination and with open-type electrical equipment. Another good example that our laws are not perfect was the flooding of a so-called independent or bootleg mine, which drowned five miners near Forestville, Pa. Here was a small mine, one of the many which some of our colleagues are demanding be exempted from any Federal mine-safety law. These men should have been protected, in their ignorance and in their shoestring, substandard operation, by the Pennsylvania inspection service. They should have been warned of the presence of that body of water and forced to drill holes ahead of the face for their own protection. But they were not protected and they died, and I want to say right here that I am opposed to the exemption of small mines as such, from the Federal Inspection Service. Because a man works in a small mine is no reason to declare open season on him. He is entitled to every protection we can give him and I submit that any operator who will not or cannot work his mine safely with every effort being made to protect his employees, should not be allowed to operate in any State in the Union.

In January 1952, Mr. Joseph J. Walsh, deputy secretary of the Pennsylvania Department of Mines, labeled the hard-coal industry's fatality rate per million man-hours of exposure for the year 1951 as 18 percent higher than the 1950 rate and bad. Ninety-one lives were lost in 1951, five more than in 1950. He further stated that—

> While the 1951 fatality rate for the anthracite industry is bad, nevertheless, notwithstanding the physical dangers that confront you—dangers not found in other coal fields—your record is much better than the bituminous-coal industry of the Nation. * * *
>
> There must always be people better than others in the essentials respecting safety in coal mines—people more competent, more hopeful, more kind, and more disposed to service and to duty. So, likewise, it is with coal companies, as the record reveals year after year.
>
> No denying it, there is one practical remedy beckoning all of you, the good and the not so good. As I have said many times, ample and practical supervision on the part of the officials and the miners at the working face is the pivot on which our whole safety movement rests. It is the most powerful weapon that we have in our warfare against the 20,000 or 30,000 dangers which come into being each working day as a result of the orderly operation of the mines in the anthracite field.
>
> Meanwhile, let it be understood that practical supervision is the one indispensable element in a sound and efficient safety program.

I agree with Mr. Walsh. Ample and practical supervision on the part of the officials and the miners at the working face is the whole answer and upon which an adequate safety movement depends. So I am for a Federal mine safety bill. It means more supervision. It means more education. It provides a necessary check upon those States which do not or will not provide adequate protection for their miners. It can harm no one but can do a world of good. Over the years the States and the coal industry have proven either their inadequacy or unwillingness to provide safety for their coal miners. They have had every chance to prove their good faith and the Congress of the United States should at long last step into the picture they have been so reluctant to enter over these disaster-laden years. There is now before the House Education and Labor Committee, H. R. 7408, bearing the name of our colleague, SAM MCCONNELL. This bill written by a subcommittee of the Labor Committee, was prepared under the careful supervision of Congressman MCCONNELL and Congressman KELLEY of Pennsylvania. It has the complete support of United Mine Workers of America, the Bureau of Mines and a majority of the coal industry. It is a good bill, a carefully prepared document which provides Federal protection only against five causes of major disasters. It leaves for the States the fertile field of fatalities and injuries that comprise 60 percent of all these. State inspection service is not interfered with except to a minor degree and this bill in no way would cause State inspection services to be eliminated. Personally, I would support a stronger bill.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take the floor on the coal mine safety bill since the bill has the approval of both the industry and the unions and there should be no question about its passage. However, when I listen to the arguments in opposition to the bill raised on the floor today, and note who the Members are who raise the opposition, I cannot refrain from making a few statements.

Those Members who oppose this humanitarian measure say that it is a violation of the Constitution; that it is an unwarranted invasion of States' rights; that Congress has no business legislating in this field—even to protect human lives. I do not question the motives of any of these individual Members. But, it is very interesting to me to note that those who are arguing against the mine safety bill always oppose any legislation to benefit the working people of this country. They raise the same old cry, "It's unconstitutional—it is an invasion of States' rights." It seems a little peculiar that we can enact any number of laws to put the Federal Government to work for business without hearing that cry, but the minute we take up a bill to protect human life or to extend it, or to protect the rights of the workingman, it becomes an invasion of States' rights and a violation of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States is not dead. It carries within itself the food for growth and continued life. Its provisions are elastic and the founding fathers made it so deliberately. Perhaps they were more alive 165 years ago to the inevitable growth of human institutions and to social progress than are the hide-bound persons who try to thwart every social advance we make today.

I do not and cannot subscribe to the theories of those who try to limit strictly the areas within which the Federal Government may operate. I am not a strict States' righter. Our modern economic and social development has broken down the artificial geographic boundaries of the States to a large extent. Human needs go far beyond little black lines on a map. That fact has been recognized for many years in the adoption of hundreds of Federal laws benefiting both business and labor—the industrial economy and the social economy. There are some, of course, who profess to recognize the fact only where the industrial or agricultural economy is concerned.

Time after time we have set up Federal standards with which the States are required to conform—minimum standards beyond which the State may exercise their individual rights. Any attempt to separate the coal mine safety bill from these previous acts of Congress is completely superficial, and can only be used by destitute minds anxiously casting about for plausible excuses for opposing social progress.

The argument has been made that the mining of coal is a matter completely within the jurisdiction of the State in

which the mine is located, and that it cannot be defined as part of interstate commerce. Raising cattle is strictly a State business if we want to think along those lines. But those who oppose this bill have never raised their voices against the Federal meat inspection laws or the yearly appropriations for control of diseases of cattle. Coal moves across State lines just as fast and to just as great an extent as do cattle. It is a little hard for me to see why in the one case interstate commerce is involved and in the other it is not—perhaps I should ask the opponents of this bill to explain the subtle distinction to me. Any Member of this House can think of a thousand things upon which we have legislated and which are no more, or even less, involved in interstate commerce than mining coal.

The point has been raised that all of the coal mining States have enacted mine safety laws—and that those laws are more or less satisfactory. But it is equally a fact that the enforcement of the law is far from satisfactory in many States—and hundreds of men have lost their lives as proof of that fact. Human life always is and always must be the concern of the Federal Government. When the State fails in its duty there is no reason, constitutional or otherwise, why the United States Government should not assume its responsibility and say to the coal mine operators, "This, at least, you must do."

A good deal of furor has been aroused here on the floor over the fact that the Federal mine inspectors who will enforce this law are all former coal miners and members of the mine unions. I am aware that hatred of labor unions and labor's right to organize blinds a few misguided individuals to almost anything else. But who, in the name of common sense, is better qualified to make an inspection of a mine for unsafe conditions than the men who have worked in the game and know their way around a mine and its machinery?

Mr. Speaker, in the field of international relations we have broken down barrier after barrier as a result of the development of modern communications and transportation and a growing awareness of the common interests of mankind. It is only the Soviet Union and its satellites who persist in keeping an iron curtain between themselves and the rest of the world. That iron curtain is the greatest threat to humanity that modern civilization has ever seen. For us to support the principle of little iron curtains around each and every one of our States is as anachronistic and as threatening to the unity of this country as is the Communist iron curtain to the Western World. I admit and I support the rights of States to control absolutely matters involving only their own special interests. But where there is a common human denominator at stake the Federal Government cannot afford to look away. The lives of coal miners are as precious to the United States as they are to the States in which they live and work. The States have had every opportunity to protect those lives and some have failed. For that reason, if for no other, I shall vote for H. R. 7408, and I ask every socially conscious Member of this House to do the same. The battle cry of the late President Roosevelt, "Human rights or property rights," rallied people in this country before, as it is sounded in this bill it will rally them again.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the House of Representatives will adopt H. R. 7408, which has been introduced by my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

Because many coal mines are located within my district, I have long been concerned with a mine-safety program. I realize that in the past several attempts have been made by the Government to regulate mine-safety, but considerable opposition was generated not only by the operators, but at times by the miners as well.

Mr. McCONNELL's diligent and painstaking efforts in the preparation of his bill have eliminated practically every objectionable feature both to the operator and to the miner. The only objection we hear at the present is that the Government is attempting to regulate the whole field of mine-safety.

I certainly subscribe to the theory that the power of the Government should be decentralized as much as possible, and in the present case if all of the States in which mines are located had been as foresighted as Pennsylvania, there would be no need now for the mine safety bill.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent mine disasters. If we can prevent the death of a single miner, then we have accomplished our goal.

I wish to congratulate Mr. McCONNELL on the splendid contribution he has made to the cause of mine-safety. I am sure that the day will come when both the coal-mine operator and the miner will rise up and call him "blessed."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, as a small boy in Indiana, I can recall vividly standing at the door of a mine while the bodies of 51 coal miners were removed. That experience will remain with me all of my life. The shock and grief which was visited upon that community left an impression which was not forgotten for a decade.

Only 4 years ago I drove from Champaign, Ill., to Centralia, Ill., within a few hours after the lives of 112 coal miners had been snuffed out in one of the worst mine disasters in the history of this country. Again I saw what a major disaster can do to an entire community.

Within the last few months Illinois has had another mine disaster visited upon it, which took the lives of 120 men. This occurred at West Frankfort, Ill., during this last January.

I shall not enter into the controversial matters as to who was at fault for these accidents. It is, however, my considered opinion that we should never allow such a disaster to occur again if it is humanly possible to avoid it.

I believe that the present bill, S. 1310, with the House amendment thereto, is a good bill, which should receive our every consideration today and should be passed before we adjourn here this year. This bill is not the result of hasty and ill-advised opinions of anyone. Committees have been considering this and have heard evidence on it for more than 3 months. It is a thoughtful bill, worked out in our quieter moments, with an earnest desire to correct a serious situation.

I am happy to report that the bill does not rush in with the thought that the Federal Government has a cure-all for everything that can possibly happen in a coal mine. It is legislation which supplements and implements State laws. The finding of danger will be made only by a Federal coal-mine inspector under the direction of the Bureau of Mines. Where the mine laws of the State are stronger than this law, the State law will apply. If a State fails to pass legislation meeting the standards of this law, then the Federal law will prevail. This places a positive duty upon the State to provide good mine laws and see that its provisions are lived up to. However, if the State fails in its duty to the employees of coal mines, then the Federal Government will step in to see that the mines shall be equipped with adequate safety devices to protect mine personnel.

The bill provides that at least once a year an inspector of the Bureau of Mines shall inspect each mine and provides for such other special inspectors as the Director of the Bureau of Mines deems necessary for the proper administration of the bill. The requirement of annual inspection recognizes the fact that some mines must be inspected several times a year. If any State desires to cooperate in making the inspections required under the bill it may do so by agreement between the State mine-inspection service and the United States Bureau of Mines.

This bill likewise provides for the issuance of a mine close order by a Federal coal-mine inspector if he finds there is present danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or a man-trap or man-hoist will occur in such mine immediately, or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated. This is a positive step which the Director of the Bureau of Mines can take immediately to avoid situations such as existed at Centralia and West Frankfort.

One of the most progressive features of this bill creates a Federal coal-mine safety board of review. This board is an independent tribunal consisting of three members appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of these members will be a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine operators, one a person representing the viewpoint of coal-mine workers, and the third must be a graduate engineer with practical experience in the coal-mine industry or have had 5 years' experience as a coal-mining engineer, and who is also chairman of the board. When any matter is requested to be heard the board must fix the time for a prompt hearing. Pending the hearing an applicant may ask the board for temporary relief which the board may grant. This board is not bound by any previous findings made by anyone. Evidence relating to the order com-

plained of will be presented by both parties.

The bill further provides that all final orders of the board are subject to review by the United States court of appeals within 30 days after the date of the order. These are common requirements which protect the rights of both parties in judicial tribunals of the country. I am happy to add my voice to the approval of this measure. To me it is a progressive and historic step forward toward protecting men who work in an unbelievably dangerous occupation. It is a fair bill which in my opinion will save many lives in the mines. During the last 20 years more than 1,250,000 coal miners have been injured or killed in coal mines. During the first 2 years of World War II injuries and deaths in the mines were greater than the casualties in all our Armed Forces. This bill will do a job in correcting a serious situation which has existed for a long time.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7408 deserves the support of all the membership of this House. The States will not lose any of their sovereignty through the enactment of this legislation. On the other hand, the enactment of this legislation may save many lives. I firmly believe that this legislation which provides for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines will bring about greater cooperation between the States and the Federal Bureau of Mines, and will serve as a stepping stone for better mining departments in the various States. Neither will this legislation close down mines or put operators out of business.

In 1941 Congress enacted a law giving the Federal inspector the authority to inspect mines and make recommendations. The evidence is conclusive that much progress has been made in the field of mine safety since the enactment of that law. Last December at West Frankfort, Ill., a mine explosion took 119 lives. The first Federal inspection of that mine was made in 1942. Thereafter and up until a couple of weeks before the explosion 15 inspections had been made by the Bureau of Mines. Thirteen of the inspection reports pointed out that the mine was dry and dusty, and that there was an excessive amount of coal dust accumulated, that the ventilation system was poor, and that the electrical equipment was dangerous. Copies of the reports were forwarded to the State Bureau of Mines in Illinois and to the operator of the mine, but still nothing was done about the explosive condition of this mine.

The record shows that about 10 percent of the total fatalities in the coal mines result from explosions and mine fires. This bill is only designed to save lives and keep miners from being killed in mine fires, mine explosions, mine inundations, and man-trip accidents. We owe the duty to the coal miner to provide legislation that will protect him in his working place from these major disasters, especially since we know how to protect him.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that this measure will receive the necessary votes for passage.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I just want to say that my district is a coal-mining district. I am somewhat familiar with the coal-mining industry and the conditions that obtain in coal-mining communities. I remember on one occasion when we had a terrible accident in one of the larger and well-managed mines. As a result of that accident, I saw 82 dead bodies that had been taken out of the mine. That left a great and lasting impression on me. As I remember the facts, the mine had just been inspected and some of the inspecting force had not left the mine when the accident happened and one of the inspectors was killed.

I hope this bill will do what its proponents say it will do.

I am fearful of Government control but since every State where coal is mined to any great extent have good and sufficient mine inspection laws, I feel that Federal inspection and State inspection can work together. If they do they will complement each other so that each will have the advantage of the experience of the other, on the other hand, if they do not work together this fact will manifest itself quickly and the State legislatures and this Congress can amend the law. I shall vote for this bill in the hope that it may prevent some of the terrible mine disasters that are always threatening. Mining is beyond any doubt the most hazardous of all occupations. Many thousands of men are employed in mining and it is our duty to give them every reasonable protection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I demanded a second on our side of the aisle at the suggestion of the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] because he could not qualify. I am opposed to the bill.

We are again being lashed around and around a vicious circle of occasional argument and temporary expedient. If it could accomplish the expressed purpose I would be for the bill. I do not think we will accomplish that purpose. I do not think we should take the principle that we used in the minimum wage and hour law to justify this subject as being interstate commerce. This is a purely intrastate field in which you are entering. You are saying that no longer can people go to their city councils, their boards of supervisors, or to their State governments and find relief for corruption in the supervision of hazardous conditions which should be controlled at the local level. If they find those dangerous conditions there now they can go to their governor. If they do not like the governor's reaction they can elect another governor from some little community that produces coal. If we say this is the constitutional field of Federal Government then we say—and you know it as well as I—that no longer is that within the field of State government. If it is decided there is corruption in the examination of coal mines after that then the little counties in West Virginia must elect a President and not a new State governor.

Mr. Speaker, I point out to you that the proponents of this bill said in the committee that the only reason for the law was that there is either a failure to enact good local laws or there is a failure to enforce local law through corruption. When pressed for their reasons they have said there was too much influence either by the operators or the unions over local officials. It was the representatives of these same operators and unions that furnished most of the evidence in favor of the bill. That is the fact. Those who improperly influence and corrupt local law enforcement now ask us to completely destroy that authority.

They admitted that if there were local officials with lifetime appointments, their problems would probably be solved. But the men who are inspecting the mines at the local level are taken from a mine for a 4-year term in Government service and expect to go back to some operator for work after the 4-year term. That condition is claimed to affect their murderous decisions.

I say to the gentleman from Illinois that all of the evidence indicates that they would have good inspection at the local level, if they would get their mine inspectors at the local level from Pennsylvania. If Pennsylvania got them from Illinois there would be an improvement. I cannot believe such testimony.

That is all the evidence that supports this bill. They cannot do it at home or they will not do it at home. Every Congressman I have talked to in support of this bill has not indicated to me that they have ever written their local officials about Federal reports of dangerous conditions in mines that have exploded. They never issued a news release in that regard. I say to you it is against the interests of the miner to adopt this program because it moves inspection too far away from their homes.

As we go around this circle we find that now we are on the last lap where the proponents of the bill have decided they will take it up under suspension of the rules and limit debate. The very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] wanted time, other gentlemen wanted time, but they cannot get it. The leadership will not take it up under the rule which would allow 2 hours general debate so that you would understand the subject. No. They choose the method of suspension of the rules. They thus shut off debate and prohibit amendment.

Like the atom and the juice of the grape, there is great legislative power in coal.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FUGATE].

Mr. FUGATE. Mr. Speaker, in 1941 through the Federal Coal Mine Inspection and Investigation Act, the Bureau of Mines was granted the authority, by

the Congress, to make inspections and recommendations regarding mine safety. It was hoped that by advising and cooperating with the States that accidents and deaths in the coal mines of our Nation would be reduced. Such has not been the case.

The fact is that during the fiscal year 1950-51, there were 121,614 violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code. A total of 8,971 mine inspections revealed the presence of serious hazards in 4,380 mines. The owners and operators were notified in each case of the dangerous conditions in their mines, but 89 percent of them did not reply to the letters that were sent by the Bureau of Mines.

These violations included inadequate and hazardous ventilation, dangerous use of permissible and nonpermissible explosives, faulty electrical equipment, failure either to remove or render inert combustible coal dust, and many other dangerous and extra-hazardous practices.

I believe that this condition exists because of the system of inspection and enforcement now in effect. The present 29 coal-mining States have an infinite and confusing variety of laws. It is true that some of the State laws are adequately enforced, but in others it would appear that they have been carried out in an indifferent manner. This statement is substantiated by the fact that during the past 50 years 93,000 lives were lost in the coal mines. Add to this the untold numbers who have been injured and maimed for life, and we can see clearly the problem with which we are faced.

Since December 21, 1951, there have been 100 men killed in the mines. We are all too conscious that on that day, December 21, at Orient No. 2 in southern Illinois, 119 men were killed. They left 109 widows, 175 children, and 17 other family dependents.

These men, these widows, these children are not here today to be heard but their present plight certainly touches the heart and the great humanitarian pulse that beats within this body. Certainly we all agree that these people deserve a better chance to live, to work, and to serve their fellow man.

This bill, however, is not the product of emotion—it has had careful and painstaking consideration by able men. It has been approached from the standpoint of what is best for the entire industry, the worker, and the operator alike. Furthermore, the rights and responsibilities of the several States have been protected. The bill provides for State cooperation in carrying out the Federal law. It expressly provides that no State or Territorial law, effective from the date of the bill or which may become effective thereafter, should be superseded except insofar as the law is not in conflict with the bill, and expressly provides that any provision under such a law which provides for greater safety of persons than do the provisions of this act should not be construed or held to be in conflict. It is also important to note that the enactment of this bill would not permit promulgation of rules and regulations but rather enacts into law those provisions which are designed to prevent disasters only.

The bill also requires that due and proper notice be given the operator when it is found that his mine is unsafe and it spells out what type of notice this should be. It creates a Board of Review and provides that the Board shall not be bound by previous findings of facts by the Director or by any other representative of the Bureau, but provides that it should take evidence on the issues from both sides. If the parties are dissatisfied with the findings of the Board, then such findings are made subject to review by the United States court of appeals for the circuit for which the mine affected is located. The court decision is final, subject only to review by the Supreme Court. It would seem, therefore, that this bill contains ample safeguards to protect both the worker and the operator. There is one other provision in the bill which I think is worthy of notice. That is, that the bill specifically exempts any mine in which not more than 14 persons are regularly employed underground. This means that 4,200 of the 8,100 mines within our country will be exempt by this provision. It is right that these small family-sized mines should be exempt. I think that this provision of the law is fair and equitable. The reasons which support the need for this legislation are not often found in the small mine and to require that they comply with this law which seeks to curb major mine disasters would be oppressive and of little value.

Taken all together, this is a safe, sound, and deserving bill and it behooves this body to enact it into law.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the mine safety bill now before us. I am convinced that it is our duty as representatives of the people of America to do what we can to stop the slaughter of human lives connected with major mine disasters throughout the country.

The progress toward greater safety for all human beings throughout America is a problem close to all of us. The question of greater safety in the coal mines has been debated back and forth for years, and though we have made some progress, yet disasters which claim human lives continue to occur. These disasters are not necessarily a part and parcel of the coal industry. It is estimated that at least two-thirds of them can be prevented by the application of modern safety laws.

The bill before us is a genuine attempt to get at and eliminate those conditions which cause or lead to major disasters. Major disasters customarily occur as a result of mine explosions, wherein the gas near the top of the coal mine becomes ignited and explodes, stirring up the dust in the mines, which in turn explodes, oftentimes causing the death of every person within the area of the mine explosion. Major disasters are also customarily caused by mine fires, mine floods, man-trip and man-hoist accidents.

This bill does not attempt to cover those many accidents, which occur in the mines as an incident to day-to-day operation, in which fewer than five persons are ordinarily killed. Thus this bill continues to leave to State laws, and to mine operation regulations, and to agreements between employers and employees with reference to safety regulations, all that class of accidents not considered as major disasters.

Let us examine some of the arguments of the opponents of this bill:

First, there are those who say that the Federal Government has no business concerning itself with mine safety, and that for it to do so is a direct encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States. This argument is fallacious. When the Representatives of the 13 sovereign States met in Philadelphia during the hot summer of 1787 they wrote a constitution providing for a union of the States, thus giving birth to our great country, the United States of America. They stated in the preamble to the Constitution their purposes, which were, among others, to "form a more perfect union, establish justice, promote the general welfare." The articles of the Constitution written under that preamble provided, among other things, that "the Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes."

In other words, the framers of the Constitution surrendered to the Federal Government the power to regulate interstate commerce.

Now today, under that power, in the exercise of the power to regulate interstate commerce, the Congress proposes to pass the bill before us in an attempt to regulate those conditions within the coal mines of America, which conditions, if left unregulated, customarily lead to explosions and other disasters which take human lives.

As an over-all proposition it cannot be disputed that during the first half of the twentieth century, during the past 50 years, we have made great strides in the promotion of safety in our mines. Today in the coal mines of America we have only about one-third of the disasters that we had in the period of years from 1900 to 1910. That is real progress, for which progressive mine operators, well-trained employees, and State mine inspection and safety departments are entitled to much credit.

However, we still have major disasters in our coal mines. In 1947, 111 people were killed in a mine explosion at Centralia, Ill. On December 21, 1951, 119 people were killed in an explosion at Orient No. 2 at West Frankfort, Ill.

In 1941, this Congress passed a law—Public Law 49—giving the United States Bureau of Mines the right to inspect the coal mines of America for health and safety hazards, and inspections have now been made for a period of 10 years. In practically every disaster in the last 10 years, the record will reveal that in Federal inspections made prior to the disaster, safety recommendations were made which, if complied with by the coal mines involved, would have pre-

vented the occurrence of the mine disaster.

Let us take Orient No. 2 mine at West Frankfort, Ill.: Before the great tragedy occurred in that mine on December 21, 1951, the Federal Government had made 16 inspections of the mine. Thirteen of the reports issued by the Federal inspectors, following these 16 inspections, had pointed out that the mine was dry and dusty, that excessive accumulation of coal dust was present in the working sections and along the haulage ways, and had recommended that these accumulations be removed. Some of these inspection reports had pointed out that the ventilation system of the mine was hazardous and that the electrical equipment used in the mine was dangerous and that the coal dust in the mine was inadequately treated, and that these conditions created serious hazards, similar to those that had caused heavy loss of lives and destruction of property in other coal mines.

The State of Alabama, which produces 2½ percent of the coal mined in America and which produced last year about 13,000,000 tons of coal, and which has one of the better coal-mine inspection laws to be found in the various coal-producing States, has been fortunate in recent years that it has not had serious disasters comparable to Centralia and Orient No. 2 mines. In the last 10 years, we have had only 5 disasters in the Alabama coal mines and, thank goodness, we have had none since July 30, 1948, when an explosion at Edgewater, near Birmingham, snuffed out 11 lives. However, taking the record of loss of lives in coal-mine disasters throughout the State of Alabama, over the period of the past 46 years, our record has not been too good. Nine hundred and thirty-eight coal miners have been killed in mine disasters in Alabama since 1905, and this figure does not, of course, include those killed in accidents in which fewer than five people were killed. During the same period of time—46 years—Illinois, which produces about three times the amount of coal produced in Alabama, has had the exact number of deaths as a result of disasters we, in Alabama, have had.

There is no doubt in my mind, but that the Federal Government has the constitutional right to make coal mine inspections and enforce the bill before us, when it becomes law, if we pass the bill here today.

I happen to be one of those who does not believe because something emanates from Washington it is necessarily good, and I hope very much that we will continue to leave those functions of government which can best be performed by the States and local subdivisions in their hands. However, I have no hesitation in voting for this bill, or any other constitutional enactment, whereby in so doing the chance to preserve human lives is greater than it would otherwise be. In committee, I helped write into this bill its States rights provisions, which provisions provide for cooperation between State and Federal mine inspection services in making inspections, and in enforcing this law.

There should be no conflict, and under this bill, I believe, there will be none, between State and Federal mine inspectors, but their joint actions will have the effect of making the coal mines of America safer than they now are.

Another objection that has been voiced here on the floor to the bill is that it will destroy small coal mine operations. That argument is wholly erroneous. In the first place, the bill exempts all coal mines with 14 or fewer employees underground.

We all realize that coal mining in many areas, and such is certainly true in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which I represent, is a business frequently carried on by small numbers of peoples, some times family groups, some times by people who engage in coal mining for only a few months in the year, and oftentimes by people who have been excluded from employment in the larger mines, because of advancing age, or for some other reason. These little operations are not the coal mines in which disasters customarily occur. For the most part, these mines are shallow, and the ventilation problems are not great. They are most often wet mines and the problem of dust is not great. They are usually nongassy mines. Very few of them have much machinery inside. There are about 8,000 coal mines in the United States and approximately half of these are small mines. It would be a tremendous burden on the Bureau of Mines to make inspections of all of them and would cost a tremendously larger sum than will the bill now before us. These mines are eliminated from the operation of this law, because major accidents, which we have been referring to as disasters, seldom or never occur in them. This bill also exempts from the operation of this law all strip coal mines. They likewise are not mining operations in which disasters customarily occur. As one of those who has worked long and faithfully on this bill, I can say to you that it was certainly not the intention of the framers of the bill to work any undue hardship upon any segment of coal mines, but instead it is a bill aimed at attempting to save human lives.

The coal mines of America are now producing about the same amount of coal they produced in 1910, that is, slightly over 500,000,000 tons a year. The average age of those who work in the mines is between 50 and 55 years of age. Younger men are not going into the mines at the same rate which they formerly did. Many sons of coal miners in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama have told me that they would not work in the mines because of the danger involved.

I am one of those who does not believe that the coal industry is dying. I believe that the production of coal is going to begin rising shortly. The majority of the hydroelectric power inherent in the Nation's rivers has been captured. Our use of electric power is growing by leaps and bounds. Throughout the foreseeable future, a great portion of the power demand must be satisfied through generation of electric power by the use of coal. There are predictions that within the next 5 years our production of coal to satisfy this new use must go up from 500,000,000 tons to about 700,000,000 tons. When we make a genuine attempt to eliminate disasters from their operations, we make the coal mines more attractive as places of employment. Safe coal mines will attract younger people to them as suitable places in which to earn a livelihood.

Of course, this law will not do the job of providing increased safety, just because we put it on the books. The success depends upon reasonable and prudent administration of it by Federal and State mine inspection groups, and more than that, it will depend upon the cooperation of mine operators and mine employees throughout the Nation. I believe it is a reasonable law and I believe it will meet with the cooperation of all concerned. I believe that those of us who help to pass this law will reap the reward in a few years of seeing disasters and deaths in coal mines cut down to a great degree.

This is a chance to make one of the great industries of America safer.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 7408, the mine-safety bill. This measure is designed to bring about the enactment and enforcement of rules and regulations to protect the health and lives of employees in the great coal mines of our country. The United Mine Workers of America has been seeking legislation of this kind since the enactment of the first Federal Mining Code in 1941. They were opposed by some coal operators, coal associations, officials of the various States department of mines and Members of Congress who cried "Federal encroachment" in the field of private enterprise and interference with States rights.

Under the present Federal Mining Code, the Bureau of Mines may only call unsafe conditions in the mines to the attention of the owners. The Bureau has no enforcement authority, and in many instances the mine owners refuse to cooperate with the Federal inspectors. A typical example of this was the recent Orient mine disaster in Illinois. There the Federal inspector reported numerous violations of the Federal and State codes, but once again a coal company put economic value above the value they placed on human life and as a result 119 men made the supreme sacrifice.

There is a variance between the mine-safety bill passed by the Senate and the bill which is presently being considered. Under the Senate bill an operator is permitted to reopen a closed mine 5 days after he has notified Federal officials that criticized defects have been corrected. This would make for expeditious repairs and reopening of a closed mine with a minimum of time lost for the operator and his workers. The Senate also wrote into its bill a provision for reexamination in the event a mine owner charged a particular inspector with bias or incompetency. The House bill would

protect owners from biased or other improper inspection by creating a Federal Mine Safety Review Board to which operators could appeal with final review in the courts. It provides for issuance of a mine-closing order by a Federal coal-mine inspector if, upon inspecting a mine, he finds danger that a mine explosion, mine fire, mine inundation, or man-trip or man-hoist accident will occur in such mine immediately or before the imminence of such danger can be eliminated. The bill would enact into law Federal coal-mine safety provisions which coal-mine operators would be required to observe in the operation of their mines. The bill contains such coal-mine safety provisions as are designed to prevent the causes of major coal-mine disasters, namely, adequate support of roof and ribs in underground roadways and travelways, classification of a mine as a gassy mine, standards of ventilation, coverage of accumulations of coal dust with sufficient inert rock dust so as to prevent explosion or burning, type of examinations to be made to ascertain whether or not explosive gas may have accumulated in such mines and whether other hazards are present.

The bill provides for coordination of Federal and State activities in the field of coal-mine safety. It provides that at least once a year an inspector of the Bureau of Mines shall inspect each mine. This is a minimum requirement and it is recognized that some mines should be inspected more often than once a year. The bill requires that electrical machinery when used for certain purposes in underground mines in which explosive gas has been found to exist, shall be of a type which will not permit sparks from the machines to come into contact with the air in the mine. These are among the main provisions. However, the bill also contains a number of other provisions prescribing simple fire-prevention precautions.

I attended most of the hearings on this bill and heard the testimony presented by the mine owners and the State officials. It is their claim that mine safety is the responsibility of the industry and the States, but in watching the record of the killed and maimed in our mines, the fact remains that neither of these parties has measured up to his responsibilities. It is time for the Federal Government to step in with enforcement powers to see that the job is done. I hope this bill will pass the House today and the Senate and House conferees will quickly agree so that the coal miners of this country will have the same protection afforded to the men working in other industries.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman from California, for the life of me I fail to understand how legislation enacted to safeguard the lives of men or of coal miners is not in his interest. This legislation is to safeguard the lives of the men who dig the Nation's coal.

No one claims that this is a cure-all or that it will prevent all accidents. I had occasion to visit the scene of the mine disasters in southern Illinois, in Centralia, and West Frankfort. I followed through the complete survey and investigation after those accidents, and I can assure this House that had this legislation been on our statute books, those two disasters that claimed almost 300 lives would not have occurred. This legislation certainly is in the interest of the coal miner. Of course there is opposition to it; there is always opposition to good legislation. This House was greatly disturbed at the time of these disasters, but it quickly forgets. How many Members have been watching the ticker tape in the Speaker's lobby during the past week? Almost every day there has been a report of a mine disaster.

On the first day of the Eighty-second Congress, January 3, 1951, I introduced a bill, H. R. 268, calling upon the Congress to enact mine safety legislation such as we are considering here today.

Following the terrible disaster at West Frankfort, Ill., in December of 1951, H. R. 268 became the basis for hearings held by the House Committee on Education and Labor to write legislation which would give enforcement power to the Federal Bureau of Mines. The legislation we have before us resulted from those hearings.

While I naturally feel that the bill I proposed, which was identical to the Neely measure passed in the Senate, provided greater safeguards for the protection of coal miners because it left a leeway for the mine inspection service to define and cope with new types of hazards which might arise in the future but are not now known to exist, I believe we have a good bill before us and I wholeheartedly support it. I urge my colleagues in the House to do likewise.

As I have said we know it is not possible to enact a law that will be an absolute cure-all or will prevent all accidents in the future, but I think I can say without fear of successful contradiction that had this legislation been on the statute books the Centralia, Ill., explosion, March 25, 1947, which took 111 miners' lives and West Frankfort, which took 119 lives, would have been prevented. I can say the same about Carpentertown, Pa., a short time ago and many, many others which did not make the headlines but systematically added to the toll of miners killed and injured because of laxity in enforcement of safety regulations—laxity which in many cases amounted to criminal negligence.

A few days ago I placed in the RECORD a compilation of safety code violations, repeat violations, and safety improvements in the mining industry. This compilation revealed that in a group of mines owned by operators who have voiced disapproval of Federal mine-safety enforcement powers, Federal inspection shows 12,171 violations of the Federal Mine Safety Code were found by the inspectors; 7,435 of these violations had been repeated from one or more previous inspections, which means that these dangerous conditions, any or all of which might have contributed to the injury or death of one or more coal miners, and may have caused a major disaster, have been allowed to remain uncorrected for a period of months or years.

The compilation also shows that 4,915 safety improvements were made, which is about one-third of the total violations found by the inspectors and known to be present by the coal operators.

In addition to their failure to correct these known hazardous conditions and the failure of the States to use their authority to have them corrected, 185 men were killed in the mines of these associations opposing this bill during the year 1951 and up to May 1, 1952.

Every Member of Congress quickly recalls the major disasters such as Centralia and West Frankfort, but already escaped from their memory are the hundreds of disasters claiming lesser number of lives in each explosion. Those of you who follow the news teletype in the Speaker's lobby have seen almost a daily press dispatch on mine disasters for the past week—one in West Virginia, two in Pennsylvania, claiming several lives. January took a toll of 54 miners' lives; February, 37; and March, over 20. Each month takes its toll.

I am supporting this bill today because I believe that by putting teeth into the Federal law we can improve greatly safety conditions in our mines. I am interested in mine safety—as every Member of Congress should be. The mining of coal is important to the economy of our country. It is the duty of Congress to provide adequate safeguard for the lives of those courageous men who dig the Nation's coal.

No segment in America's industrial life has or does contribute more to our industrial progress. And no group of American workers have or do face the hazards in their occupation as the coal miners.

Certainly this legislation deserves approval.

Let us not forget Centralia, West Frankfort, and the hundreds of other mine disasters which since 1883 have taken 100,000 lives and since 1930 have resulted in injuries to 1,305,925 coal miners.

I appeal to my colleagues to act today. Putting teeth into the Federal mine safety law is essential as the most adequate safeguard for the lives of our Nation's coal miners.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LUCAS) there were—ayes 185, noes 37.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania: Amend the title so as to read: "To amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines."

The amendment was agreed to.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7408) was laid on the table.

House Resolution 720 was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., "That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 736c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(c) (1) The annuity of any employee or survivor of a deceased employee who, before the date of enactment of this amendment, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the fund, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following enactment of this amendment, by $36 for each full 6-month period elapsed between the commencing date of annuity and October 1, 1952: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not exceed the lesser of $324 or 25 percent of the present annuity: *Provided further*, That no annuity shall be increased to an amount in excess of $2,000 by reason of the enactment of this amendment.

"'(2) The increases in annuity provided by this subsection shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1955, or on an earlier date under any one of the following conditions, whichever may first occur:

"'(A) At the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, the index for the month of April 1948. In the event that the Bureau of Labor Statistics revises the basis of calculating the Consumers' Price Index, it shall immediately furnish to the Commission a conversion factor designed to adjust to the new basis the index figure of 169.9 described herein, and such adjusted index shall be used for the purposes of this subsection.

"'(B) On June 30, 1953, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in the applicable annual appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1954, or in any prior appropriation act, for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this subsection during the fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

"'(C) On June 30, 1954, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, in the applicable annual appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1955, or in any prior appropriation act for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this subsection during the fiscal year 1955.'

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a body to be known as the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which shall be composed of a chairman appointed by the President and, ex officio, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

"(b) The Committee shall make a comparative study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel and report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1953. Its report, including findings and recommendations, shall include the following:

"(1) the types and amounts of retirement and other related benefits provided to Federal personnel, including their role in the compensation system as a whole;

"(2) the necessity for special benefit provisions for selected employee groups, including overseas personnel and employees in hazardous occupations;

"(3) the relationships of these retirement systems to one another, to the Federal employees' compensation system, and to such general systems as old-age and survivors insurance; and

"(4) the current financial status of the several systems, the most desirable methods of cost determination and funding, the division of costs between the Government and the members of the systems, and the policies that should be followed in meeting the Government's portion of the cost of the various systems.

"(c) The Chairman of said Committee, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, is authorized to procure services pursuant to section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such attorneys and other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 3. Section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 716), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"'Any person entitled to annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commission. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.'"

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the bill now under consideration strikes out all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 2968, and provides that the Lesinski bill, H. R. 8373, which has been reported out by our committee, be substituted therefor. It also provides that no annuity will be increased in an amount of more than $2,000.

The bill, S. 2968, which has already passed the other body, provides that for every 6 months an annuitant has been on the retirement rolls up to October 1, 1952, he shall receive an increase of $36, with a maximum increase of $324, or 25 percent of his present annuity, whichever is the lesser amount.

An employee who retired prior to April 1, 1948, when the new Retirement Act was passed by Congress, would receive the maximum increase of $324, provided his present annuity is $1,296 or more. If his annuity is less than $1,296 per year, then he would receive an increase of 25 percent of the annuity. For instance, if the present annuity of an annuitant is $1,000, he would receive a 25 percent increase, which would be $250 or if his annuity is $1,200 per year, he would receive a $300 increase. Employees who have retired since April 1, 1948, would get $36 for each 6 months of retirement prior to October 1, 1952. For example, if an employee retired on April 1, 1952, he would get a $36 increase only. If he retired on October 1, 1951, he would get a $72 increase, since he would have been retired for two 6-month periods prior to October 1, 1952. Only those retired for at least 54 months before October 1, 1952, are eligible to receive the maximum of $324.

The bill, S. 2968, made no provision for any increase to widows or dependent children of deceased annuitants. It provided that the increase would be charged to the retirement fund but would terminate on June 30, 1954, or on June 30 of any subsequent year unless Congress appropriated the necessary funds with which to pay the increase for the preceding fiscal year.

The bill, S. 2968, also sets up a committee on fiscal policy for Federal civilian retirement systems with the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Board of Governors, and the Federal Reserve System, and the Director of the Budget as members. For some reason the Senate bill, S. 2968, left off the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission as a member of this committee. Our former colleague, and chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service for many years, Hon. Robert Ramspeck, who is now Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, vigorously opposed the enactment of Senate bill 2968 upon the ground that the retirement fund at the present time is not financially or actuarily sound, and that it would not be fair or right to charge any further increase to the retirement fund when it was in such bad financial condition. The Bureau of the Budget supported Senate bill 2968 provided four amendments, suggested and approved by the Bureau, were adopted. These amendments were as follows:

First. To provide increases in benefits to survivors now on the rolls of the Civil Service Retirement system. In other words, to provide increases to widows and minor children as well as to the retired annuitants.

Second. To permit the trust fund to advance funds to pay the increases in benefits for the fiscal year 1953, but to require those advances to be paid from general appropriations made by the Congress of the United States, and also to require appropriations in advance by Congress to pay the increases for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

Third. To terminate the increases entirely on June 30, 1955.

Fourth. To authorize a thorough study of the nature and cost as well as the financing of benefits under all retirement systems for Federal personnel in order to provide a basis for the consideration of present policies in keeping with this broadened assignment. The suggested amendment renames the proposed study group, the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal personnel, and enlarges its membership to six, and makes the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission a member of the committee. It also provides that the other additional member shall be named by the President, and shall be made chairman of this survey committee.

After Mr. Elmer Staats, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, testified before our committee and suggested these amendments, urging the great importance and need for these four amendments, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] who is a valuable and conscientious member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service introduced the bill, H. R. 8373, which incorporates the same benefit provisions and increases for retired annuitants exactly as set forth in Senate bill 2968 and also includes the four amendments or changes suggested by the Bureau of the Budget.

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in executive session voted to report out favorably to the House both the Senate bill 2968 and the Lesinski bill, H. R. 8373. All members of the committee voted to report out these two bills except myself.

My amendment, which will be considered alone since it strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause, is identical to the provisions of the Lesinski bill, H. R. 8373, with the exception that it provides that no increases in any annuity shall cause the annuity to exceed $2,000. The chairman of the Civil Service Commission recommended that the limitation be $1,800 but upon reflection I decided to make the amount $2,000 in my amendment; so that those who are now drawing $2,000 annuity or more will not get any increase under my amendment. It means that those who are drawing annuities of $1,800 today would be eligible to get only $200 increase and those receiving $1,900 annuity would be eligible to get only a $100 increase.

There are over 21,000 annuitants today who are drawing an annuity of more than $1,800 per year. This limitation will save about $4,000,000 per year.

My position on all this legislation is the same as that of Hon. Robert Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission. Personally, I think it is unwise and dangerous to be tampering with our retirement funds by any legislation liberalizing this fund until we know whether this fund is in a safe and sound financial condition.

I said at the opening of these hearings that I opposed any legislation that would liberalize in any way the retirement system until a comprehensive survey was made as to the actuarial soundness of the retirement fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I stated my position clearly and plainly at the opening of the hearings that I opposed any legislation that would further liberalize the retirement system at this time. However, after a month of hearings and after the committee considered about 15 bills liberalizing annuities, the committee did not see eye to eye with me. The committee members were strongly in favor of liberalizing our retirement system. When the vote was taken on S. 2968 and H. R. 8373, I was the only member of the committee to oppose their being reported out favorably by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it devolved upon me to determine what course I should pursue, whether I should request you to recognize me as chairman for the suspension of the rules on this legislation. My personal wishes are that this legislation should be postponed, but in view of the fact that I am the only member of the committee who takes a position in opposition to this legislation, should I attempt to thwart the will of the great majority of the committee by not requesting the Speaker to recognize me for this suspension of the rules? My duties as chairman of the committee sometimes conflict with my personal views and opinions as an individual Member of Congress. So in fairness and with due regard for the opinion and wishes of the other members of the committee I decided to request this suspension of the rules. I can assure you that the official life of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is not a "bed of roses." My views often do not agree with the majority of our committee. The pressure that is brought upon our committee by these various employee groups is terrific and it is getting worse all the time. I, for one, am not afraid, and I will not yield to their pressure when I think they are being too selfish, or when I think they are advocating legislation that is not in the best interests of the economy of our country.

What is the condition of the retirement fund today? At the present time, according to Chairman Robert Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission, the retirement fund lacks $4,875,000,000 of meeting its liabilities. At this time the retirement fund has to its credit a little over $4,400,000,000 and the liabilities of the fund are over $9,200,000,000. During the past 4 years, according to Chairman Robert Ramspeck, there has been a deficit in this fund each year of approximately $450,000,000.

That is a total deficit in the retirement fund for the past 4 years of $1,800,000,000. So with the fund in this condition it is high time that we pause before we further impair the soundness of this fund.

I feel that it is my duty and my responsibility as chairman since the committee with only one vote against it, which was mine, voted to report out both S. 2968 and H. R. 8373, to make this motion to suspend the rules with an amendment; and I will say that my amendment is much better than either the Senate bill 2968 which is before us or the Lesinski bill, H. R. 8373, because my amendment provides that no increases in any annuity shall cause the annuity to exceed $2,000.

Let us see what we have done already for these annuitants who retired before April 1, 1948: These annuitants contributed $240,000,000 to this fund. So far they have received $947,000,000; and according to the life expectancy tables, they will receive $2,186,000,000 ultimately, making a total that these annuitants will receive of over $3,000,000,000 for the $240,000,000 they contributed. In other words, they are getting $12 back for every $1 they put into the retirement fund.

In April 1948 when the new retirement bill was passed Congress gave these annuitants an increase of $300, or 25 percent, whichever is the lesser.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. No; not right now; I will when I conclude.

Congress also provided for those annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948, a free annuity of $600 to their widows. We have a fine, liberal retirement system; I do not want to see it wrecked by undue liberalization. The trouble is that many people who are drawing their annuities look only at the $4,400,000,000 in cash in the fund and shut their eyes to the other side of the balance sheet which shows total liabilities of nearly $10,000,000,000, or a deficit of nearly $5,000,000,000.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics it is reported that there are 4,000,000 families with a smaller annual income than $1,000; that one in every four families headed by a person 65 years of age or over had an annual income of less than $1,000 per year.

Tell me why this Congress should dish out the taxpayers' money, or the money of the retirement funds to annuitants who are getting $2,000 or more today in annuities.

There is one annuitant on the rolls today who is getting $12,500; there are others getting five, six, seven, and eight thousand dollars in annuities.

If there is any justification under the sun for this increase it should be on the basis of need and want; and only those who are really suffering financial distress should be entitled to this increase. That is why I put the $2,000 limitation in my amendment.

I am concerned over the attitude of so many people today that the Federal Government owes them "security or financial protection from the cradle to the grave." Unfortunately today many persons who are Federal employees have the idea that our Government owes them a living after they retire and that it is up to our Government to keep them up

the rest of their lives. Mr. Speaker, we never hear any more about thrift, economy, or "saving for the rainy day"; the only thought today is to just retire and let the Federal Government take care of you.

It is time that we get back on a sound basis in this country and practice thrift and economy. I have offered an amendment which I think is good, it is much better than the bill S. 2968 and I think under the circumstances my amendment is the best that can be worked out. It is my own compromise with my own conscience.

I thought a long time as to whether or not I should ask the Speaker for permission to bring this bill up under suspension of the rules when personally I did not want to do so, but then I thought about my duty and my obligation as chairman of the committee. I was the only one who opposed this legislation. Finally I decided to bring the bill up under suspension of the rules with my amendment, which I hope will be adopted by the House. If this legislation is not considered under suspension of the rules then it is too late at this session to consider same otherwise.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. How much more than $2,000 did the original bill provide as a maximum for an employee?

Mr. MURRAY. The original bill has no maximum. The annuitant who is now drawing $12,500 would get $324 of an increase under Senate bill 2968.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman says that $2,000 is the maximum in his bill.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What do you mean by the $2,000?

Mr. MURRAY. My amendment provides for no increase if it brings the annuitant to more than $2,000. In other words, if the annuitant is drawing $1,900 he would be entitled to $2,000. If he is drawing $2,000 or more he would be entitled to nothing in the way of an increase under my amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under the original bill there was no maximum?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The original bill provided for 2 years for this temporary set-up. The gentleman's bill provides for 1 year?

Mr. MURRAY. For 10 months, until June 30, 1953, unless Congress appropriates the money.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman's bill is for 10 months?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; unless Congress sees fit to make the necessary appropriations for future years after June 30, 1953.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The original bill was for 2 years?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. The gentleman stated it would not affect any annuity above $2,000.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. HERLONG. A man who gets a $12,000 annuity today will not be cut down to $2,000, will he?

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, no, since no present annuity will be reduced in any amount.

Mr. HERLONG. I just wanted to get that straight.

Mr. MURRAY. It provides an increase if it will not bring the total up to beyond $2,000. Those now receiving annuities of $2,000 or more today will get no increase under my amendment, but will continue to receive the amount of their present annuities.

Mr. Speaker, the thorough, comprehensive survey of the retirement system is badly needed. I here quote the testimony by Mr. Elmer Staats, the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in its need and importance:

> There is need for a thorough reevaluation of basic policy for the provision and financing of retirement and other types of similar benefits for all categories of Federal personnel. This involves also the clarification of the relationships among the various staff pension systems as well as between such systems and the basic old-age and survivors insurance system. The Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Federal Security Agency are now carrying on jointly a fact-finding study of existing problems in the relationships between the civil service retirement and the old-age and survivors insurance systems. However, this covers but a small part of this Government-wide problem.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We base this view in part on a preliminary study. The report covered 13 different retirement systems maintained for Federal personnel, with many widely differing plans and provisions. We estimate that obligations to pay benefits are now accruing for all these systems at a yearly rate of over $2,000,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill approved by the committee is what is known as the Lesinski bill. I believe there is only one change. That is the amendment of the chairman of the committee which he has just announced to the House. The amendment placing a limitation whereby anyone presently receiving annuities of $2,000 or more will not be included under the measure. I am also informed that with the exception mentioned, this bill is in line with the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

This bill, as amended, will provide for an increase in civil-service retirement and disability annuities paid to employees or survivors of deceased employees receiving or entitled to receive an annuity on or before April 1, 1952. This increase will amount to $36 for each full 6 months elapsed between the commencing date of the annuity and October 1, 1952, with a limitation of $324 or 25 percent of the present rate, whichever is lesser. No annuity will be increased to an amount in excess of $2,000 by reason of this legislation. The increase will be effective the first day of the second month after the enactment of the bill.

The increased annuities provided in this legislation will terminate on June 30, 1955, or at an earlier date in the event (a) the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for three consecutive months is lower than for April 1948, (b) on June 30, 1953, unless an appropriation is made in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1954 to reimburse the Civil Service Retirement Fund for the cost of the increases provided during the fiscal years 1953 and 1954, or (c) on June 30, 1954, unless an appropriation is made in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1955 to reimburse the Civil Service Retirement Fund for the cost of the increases to be provided for the fiscal year 1955.

The bill creates a Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel to make a comparative study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel and report to Congress.

Annuitants will be permitted to waive increases under a provision designed to protect veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions which would be denied if their annuities exceeded certain amounts.

Our committee heard extensive testimony at which it developed there was a critical need to increase annuities for retired Federal employees. Our committee recommended two bills. One would have increased only the annuities of retired employees. The proposal which we are considering at this time contains the provisions of the two bills recommended by our committee and provides annuities for retired employees and for widows and children of deceased Federal employees.

There are approximately 166,000 Federal employees and 30,000 widows and children of deceased Federal employees who will receive increases under this bill. The cost of the bill for the first year is approximately the same as the cost of the bill as it was approved by the Senate. The difference is made up by the ceiling provision whereby annuities will not be increased so that they will be more than $2,000 per year as a result of the increases provided in this bill.

In my judgment there is considerably more merit in providing increases for widows and children whose annuities in general run only 50 percent of the annuities of Federal employees than there is in paying the increases to persons who are receiving annuities that are admittedly more than the amount necessary to sustain an adequate standard of living even in relatively high-cost areas.

Although the hour is late and the plea has been made that we should accept legislation without amendment, there is no more reason that we should take this action with this legislation than with other legislation which we are presently considering that is equally, if not more important, to the vital interests of this country. No problem is so complex that it cannot be resolved in a proper manner by conference. In my opinion, of course, we have accepted the major portion of the bill passed by the other body and I believe they will not turn against our

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DIGITIZED

amendments on which there is general agreement as to their desirability.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing from various quarters a slogan "We, or they, have never had it so good." Here is a group of good citizens numbering approximately 200,000 who are not "having it so good." They are being required to get along on 50-cent dollars. They are people who, when they went on retirement, had a right to believe their dollars would be worth face value. They lost out through no fault of their own. This is just a small lift for these people. It is an effort to help provide some help, though small, to a fine group of American citizens.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There are a good many widows of Federal employees who are not getting any pension, and they are not having it so good. Has the gentleman's committee given any consideration to providing some relief for them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will say the gentleman has made an important observation. Unfortunately not, but the original bill that was submitted on this question did not even give any additional relief to the widows and orphans of these retired employees. We are at least doing that much under the legislation that we have before us today. I think there is a whole lot more merit in providing increases for widows and children whose annuities in general run about 50 percent of the annuities of Federal employees than in paying increases to persons who are presently receiving annuities amounting to $4,000, $5,000, $6,000, or more. It should be observed that funds under this bill must come from either directly or indirectly from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand the gentleman to say then that the sole purpose of this bill is to assist the recipients by reason of the inflationary forces that are now operating against them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman has stated it correctly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask one other question? Referring to the large civil-service retirement schedule which has been made available, in the gentleman's opinion will this increase, if granted, unduly burden the reserve fund?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, I will say to the gentleman that that is a problem. The reserve fund now, according to the Civil Service Commission—and they are disputed—would require an additional $4 billion to make the fund what is described as actuarily sound. That means putting the fund in line with insurance companies' funds.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman give us his opinion as to whose fault or failure that is?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, I would say the Congress, through the years, has not appropriated the funds to do what it was expected to do under the original law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman say that the Congress has not appropriated the funds, or we did not deduct enough from the workers?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, there may be one other position to take. When the fund was created, these additional charges were not contemplated. The right thing to do is to appropriate money to pay for it as you go along rather than charge it up against a fund that was not intended to take care of these extra charges.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of our Committee.

Mr. RHODES. I believe the members of the committee are all in favor of this amendment, but we voted out the Senate bill mainly because we felt that an amendment would delay the legislation and kill all chances of passage at this session. We wanted to do something for the annuitants this year.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the gentleman will agree that this bill is better than the Senate bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think that on June 30, 1953, this will terminate?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman's judgment is just as good as mine in respect to that question, but unless Congress takes action in respect to it, the law will terminate. That is about the best I can tell the gentleman. It is my personal opinion the act should remain in effect for a longer period, but this is the way the bill is written. The only change in the bill as originally introduced is the limitation of $2,000.

In view of all the circumstances, I think this legislation should be approved by this House and go to the other body, and I am hopeful and feel quite sure there is sufficient time to have it enacted into law before this session terminates. Of course I have no voice with regard to the matter of recess or adjournment. I think this legislation is of sufficient importance that it should be approved during this session. I hope the other body will act accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I believe it is the best thing we can get at this time. I think it is most essential for the annuitants who are now on the rolls that something be done at once for their relief.

I am particularly glad that in this amendment are included the survivors of the deceased employees who before the date of the enactment of this amendment were entitled to be on the rolls. This is very important.

What I should like to address myself to particularly, though, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the fund which we have heard so much about as being actuarially unsound. This is the picture as I see it in the brief time that is allotted to me.

We have in that fund, according to the figures submitted by the Civil Service Commission, over $4,500,000,000. In fact, as of today, I believe it is safe to say it is $5,000,000,000 that is in the fund. This year, with the proposed amendment, we will be spending a little under $190,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if I were in business and an insurance company informed me they had $5,000,000,000 salted down and they were going to spend $190,000,000, I would certainly tell them that they ought to have their heads examined. In other words, I would say, "What are you doing with that money? Why aren't you putting it out to some good use?" For that reason, I do not think it is fair or just to say that this fund is actuarially unsound.

Of course, if every annuitant tomorrow were to collect his or her money, the fund would blow up. What do you suppose would happen if we all went to our banks tomorrow and tried to collect our deposits? It would be the end of the banking system of the United States.

So I believe we are perfectly safe in passing this legislation, and I hope that a study, which this amendment calls for, will be made in the next 10 months and that we will come back with a realistic, businesslike approach to this whole problem, and will also take in the military on the retirement rolls as well in our study.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that this $4,500,000,000 that is in the reserves is drawing interest to help pay for the $190,000,000 in annuities?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Of course; the gentleman is entirely correct. That is why I said my figure was $4,500,000,000. It probably now is up to $5,000,000,000.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. Right at this point it might be interesting to know that the interest this fund earned during 1951 was one-hundred-and-sixty-four-million-dollars-plus. The amount that was paid out to annuitants during 1951 was $185,000,000. It was only $21,000,000 short of the entire amount that was paid out to the annuitants during 1951.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. A moment ago, reference was made to the deficit or the amount of money necessary to make the fund liquid. As a matter of fact, that is not the fault of the Federal Government for not making its annual contribution to the retirement fund and is definitely not the fault of the Federal employees who have made their contribution regularly.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman. He is eminently correct.

So far as the social-security fund is concerned, they have absolutely no reserve and no funds. We know that that fund is absolutely filled with Government I O U's.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Should not the same argument apply to any large insurance company, if it is called upon to pay all of its claims at one time?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Why, of course. Not only that it would mean that we would all simply have to go on a cash-and-carry basis and have no credit setup at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, we all want to provide relief to the retired employees, not as gratuity but as a matter of right. This bill is not just exactly what I would like, but it is the only bill we have a chance of passing at this time under the procedure we have gone through. However, I do believe there is only one question which presents itself at the present time, and that is whether this fund is sound or not. A great deal has been said about it, but I do want to say just a word or two in regard to it. First of all, I do believe the fund is sound, and if the fund is not sound, then the responsibility for it not being sound, or at least part of that responsibility, rests with the Federal Government because, from the years 1921 to 1929, they did not contribute one single solitary cent toward the fund while the employees were contributing all the time. Since the Civil Service Retirement Act went into effect the Federal Government has gone short in its contributions as compared to contributions of the employees, by more than $600 million. So, if there is any unsoundness the Federal Government must take a large portion of the responsibility for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the fund is as sound as the Government itself, because when we pay the money out you have to tax the people in order to pay for the bonds and securities that the fund holds?

Mr. WITHROW. Absolutely; there is no question about it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. If they want to talk about soundness of funds, I think the gentleman should point out that we have an obligation toward the retired Army and Navy officers and enlisted personnel, which costs us over $345,000,000 a year, where they do not contribute 1 cent to the fund.

Mr. WITHROW. That is exactly so. Mr. Speaker, the interest this fund has earned over the period 32 years, which is the time that it has been in existence, has amounted to over $1,000,000,000. The amount of money that has been disbursed out of this fund only amounts to a little over $2,500,000,000 for this same period. So the interest ratio and the earning power of this fund to the entire expenditures of the fund is 2½ to 1. The Federal Government has contributed $2,689,000,000 to the fund, which is more than the entire disbursements from the fund over its entire life. The amount of money that the employees have contributed to the fund plus the interest is the balance in this fund at the present time, and that is over $4,419,000,000. If you would look at the 1951 report of the Civil Service Committee on the retirement fund, you would see that if there is any trend, it is the trend toward a sounder fund, and you must take into consideration it has only been for the last 23 years that the Federal Government has been making a substantial contribution to the fund.

Mention has been made of the railroad retirement fund. It has been held up as a model. But this fund is much sounder than the railroad retirement fund and no one questions the soundness of the railroad retirement fund. The assumption that all Federal employees will force the fund to meet all its responsibilities on a given date is just an unrealistic approach and not worthy of mention. As a matter of fact, if over a period of years this fund had been so unsound, why was it that the Federal Government did not meet its responsibilities and make its contributions to the fund? The answer is obvious—the fund is sound.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is vitally necessary. The cost of living has far outstripped retirement pensions. A material increase is a matter of elementary justice to those who have given their working years to the service of the United States. Also, it is a very important element in the morale of all civil-service workers to note that justice is served in increasing the retirement payments. I believe it will be compromised and liberalized in the conference with the Senate. As it stands now it is inadequate for the urgent needs of those under retirement in the civil-service system. I am impressed with the fact that most of the House conferees see the problem and are anxious to meet and solve it. I am for the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]. I think the House realizes that he has very violent feelings about this particular bit of legislation, but notwithstanding those convictions he, with the magnanimous spirit he has, has brought this bill to the floor for the Members to consider.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield further.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members of the House that many persons representing many of the retired employees of the Federal Government appeared before our committee or sent in statements which proved beyond any doubt that there was great need for some remedy for the mounting cost of living, the resulting lack of purchasing power of the dollar, and the consequent lowering of the standand of living for our retired individuals. These victims of our policies, our policies which over the years have fallen most heavily on annuitants, pensioners, people living on fixed incomes and off savings, are in great need. To meet this great need we come here to consider a bill which will take care of only a small portion of it. It is a little like binding up part of a wound. I am satisfied in my own mind that this legislation has fallen so far short of meeting the needs that we will certainly have to consider similar legislation next year. Possibly some day we will have to go into the matter of establishing escalator clauses in measures of this kind unless we quit the policy of destroying the value of the savings of the people of the United States.

I want to say on behalf of the fund that in every year of its existence the disbursements under the plan have been less than the employees' contributions. Likewise figures worked out on the basis of the Senate bill show that if this bill is passed and the number of employees remain constant and the payments remain constant, it will be the year 2000 or later before the disbursements will be greater than the employees' contributions alone. Therefore, I believe that no Member of this House should feel any hesitancy in supporting this bit of a remedy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of an increase in the pension for retired Federal employees, and although I would prefer the original bill, S. 2968, it becomes necessary under the circumstances because we are considering this under suspension of the rules to support the amendment to the bill which is before the House.

I think we should make it plain that it is the fault of the Federal Government, not the Federal employees, that the retirement fund is not actuarily sound, because the Federal Government has not made the necessary contribution to that fund for a number of years.

There is a question in my mind as to whether the fund has to be actuarily sound, that is any more financially sound than the social-security fund which is certainly not on that basis, or the reserve fund of any of the major insurance companies which would find it very difficult to pay off all claims at one time.

We certainly know that all Federal employees are not going to retire at the same time, and we should have funds on hand to meet all of the necessary obligations to pay an adequate annuity to these Federal employees who do retire, and in my opinion we have sufficient money in the fund at the present time to do this and to allow for the increase which this amendment will provide.

The Federal employees, and especially the postal employees who are among those in the lower-paid brackets, should not be penalized for any fault of the Federal Government for not contributing its share to this fund over the years.

Although this bill will partially correct that fault, it appears very necessary that a thorough, comprehensive and searching investigation and study should be made by the Committee on Retirement for Federal Personnel which this bill creates in order to bring to the Congress all of the facts so that we can act more intelligently on permanent legislation providing for increases for annuity payments to retired Federal employees.

At the present time there are in the United States approximately 172,000 annuitants, many of them residing in my own State of California. Fifty-two percent of them receive less than $1,200 per annum. Forty-one percent receive over $1,200 but less than $2,000. Only 7 percent receive over $2,000 per year.

In view of the tremendous increase in the cost of living and the steady devaluation of the dollar which has resulted in the diminishing buying power of the dollar, the plight of the retired civil service and postal employees who must depend upon inadequate annuities to provide shelter, necessary clothing, food, and medical care has become serious.

Many retirees who have devoted most of their lives to the service of the Government cannot afford adequate medicine, hospital, and other necessities attendant upon advanced age. Many others have been forced to lower their standard of living below the level which would provide them with the necessities of life.

There can be no doubt that the retired Federal and postal employees are certainly in need of this increase in the annuity they now receive, and that their long service entitles them to it, especially in view of the continued increase in living costs.

I urge that the amendment now before the House be adopted.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the adoption of the pending bill to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees. The bill does not go as far as it should in this respect. Unfortunately, the bill has been brought up under a procedure that prevents any amendments being made. It should have been brought up under a rule that would permit amendments that would further remedy the inadequacy of present annuities.

Under the conditions that exist today the retired workers living on pensions or retirement benefits are hard pressed to meet the steadily-increasing cost of living. Prices are going up and the purchasing power of the dollar is going down. Retired workers of all classes, cut off from earning capacity, cannot meet the rising cost of living by increased wages. Their income is frozen. It was fixed when prices were lower and the dollar of greater purchasing value. The only way we can help these retired workers and their dependents is to increase their annuities.

It is not the fault of the retired worker that we are in a period of rising costs and decreasing value of the dollar. This is the result of economic conditions and the weakness and insufficiency of Government fiscal policies. The duty is upon us to recognize the situation that exists. It is our duty to provide annuities that will enable these elderly retired workers to live in some degree of comfort. They have worked faithfully and long and are entitled to more generous treatment. A Nation that gives so lavishly throughout the world, as does this Nation, certainly should be able to care for its own retired workers.

I shall vote for the bill, although I am disappointed that it does not go further than it does in providing relief for all retired workers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity afforded me by my distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. REES], to use the remaining time allotted him under the rules and permit me to conclude the debate on the annuitants measure. I had attended many of the hearings on the matter under consideration and the vital importance of action was indicated by the overcrowded spectator attendance throughout these meetings. No other hearings by our great Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service had such capacity audiences or more attentive visitors as the many outbursts of applause or manifestation of displeasure at remarks made by witnesses which required admonishment from the chairman who was ready to give every witness his or her full time for testimony.

The time element and the suspension of rules procedure, added to the fact that two pertinent bills were reported simultaneously by the committee on Friday past, gave the chairman of the committee [Mr. MURRAY] a choice of bill to present today when recognized to call up a measure providing aid for Federal annuitants. In his opening remarks, the gentleman from Tennessee outlined his reasons for presenting the bill, as amended, and we have a choice of no bill at all or to take the amended version as presented. The House will accept the bill as presented desiring to take action providing a cost-of-living increase in annuities to former civil service workers who have been caught in the inflationary squeeze between rising prices and fixed income.

Mr. Speaker, against the contention of the Chairman of the Civil Service who questioned the soundness of dipping into the retirement fund for whatever increase might be allowed, was the insistence of those who believe that the Federal retirement fund is not required to be solvent at all times and suggested that it was inconceivable that a situation could arise requiring immediate payment of the entire sum. Actuarial soundness of the fund is questioned and this should be inquired into and thoroughly explored in order that necessary corrective action by the next Congress can be taken to protect the fund for those who are now receiving the benefits and to prevent an injustice to those who are contributing each payday believing that their full annuities will be forthcoming when eligible. I shall vote for passage and hope for a satisfactory conclusion in conference in order that a bill might be agreed upon before adjournment of this session.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASES FOR FEDERAL ANNUITANTS

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleagues in the passage of S. 2968, the bill providing cost-of-living increases for retired Federal employees receiving annuities from the civil-service retirement and disability fund. As pointed out by the committees recommending this legislation, the facts are well recognized that the cost of living has materially increased during the past several years, and that persons, such as the great majority of our Federal annuitants whose chief livelihood is dependent upon a fixed income, are hardest hit by this inflationary spiral. An increase in annuities of those already retired from Federal service is justified as a partial offset to the continually decreasing purchasing power of the dollar.

Congress recognized the plight of many of our people living on fixed incomes when it adopted amendments to the Social Security and Railroad Retirement Acts, increasing the amount of the bene-

fits payable under those systems. As long as the inflationary spiral continues, it is only just that we should attempt to alleviate as much as possible this inflationary pressure upon those people now retired from Federal service.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr Speaker, we have before us a bill which is in the nature of a substitute for S. 2968 to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees or their survivors.

While this bill is not 100-percent satisfactory, I believe it should be passed in order that it may go to conference with the Senate bill. I am sure that the conference report will be a great improvement over the present law, and while it may not give all the benefits that the recipients would like, it will give them a substantial increase which will go far toward compensating them for the increased cost of living since their last annuity adjustment.

I am confident that the bill will be approved unanimously by the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is not a Member of this House who has not become acquainted within the last 18 months with the plight of retired Government employees. There is no group in the country which has been caught more severely in the cost-of-living squeeze than retired personnel. This bill will provide relief to retired Government employees, not as a gratuity but as a matter of right.

This increase will amount to 25 percent of the present rate with a limitation of $324, whichever is the lesser. The increase will be effective the first day of the second month after the enactment of this bill.

The committee heard a great deal of testimony of the critical need to increase annuities for retired Federal employees. This proposal which we are considering at this time provides annuities for retired employees and for widows and minor children of deceased Federal employees. There is considerable merit in providing increases for widows and children whose annuities in general run only 50 percent of the annuities of Federal employees. It is admitted that the amount for these dependents is now necessary to sustain an adequate standard of living even in relatively low-cost areas.

No annuity will be increased to an amount in excess of $2,000 by reason of this legislation.

This bill does not exactly meet all of the requirements that I would like. But it is the only bill which we have a chance of passing at this time.

Every Federal employee who is now paying upon his annuity will wonder whether the annuity fund is sound or not by reason of this increase. I want to say just a word or two about that. In my opinion the fund is sound. If the fund is sound then the responsibility is upon us to see that this adequate increase is given to the retired employees.

Interest in this fund over a period of 32 years has amounted to over one billion dollars. There has been only a little over $2,500,000,000 disbursed out of this fund for the same period. The Federal Government has contributed $2,689,000,000 to the fund which is more than the entire disbursements from the fund over its entire lifetime. After examining the 1951 report of the Civil Service Committee I have come to the conclusion that the fund is much more sound than social security.

I have compared this fund with the Railroad Retirement Fund which has often been set up as a model. Without any fear of contradiction I can say that this fund is more sound than the Railroad Retirement Fund. For that reason we are not in any way by this action endangering the fund of those Federal employees who are now paying on their own annuities.

This bill creates a body which I have been advocating for the past 18 months. By the provisions of this bill a committee for retirement policy for Federal personnel is brought into existence to make a study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel. That committee at the completion of its studies will make a report back to Congress with its recommendations. This will eliminate the haphazard manner in which annuities have been handled in the past. It will also have a duty to report periodically on trends in the cost of living and make comparative studies of this fund with other retirement funds throughout the country. One of the duties of this Congress should be to provide a sound dollar of purchasing power. For the plight of these retired people Congress has some responsibility. Many of these people are the victims of our own policy here in Congress. The rise in the cost of living has fallen most heavily on those who live on fixed incomes. Unless we can in some way stop the policy of destroying the value of the dollar we will be faced with the possibility of establishing escalator clauses in funds of this kind.

At least in this bill we are recognizing the situation of these people and are attempting to make provision as best we can and at the same time keep a sound fund which will be just as active 50 or 100 years from now as it is today.

It has come particularly to my attention the situation with reference to retired postal employees in my district. This bill will cover those who have spent so many years of their life carrying the mail for people since the horse and buggy days.

I am happy to support this bill which I believe is not only good for the retired employees but is sound Americanism in the kind of a democracy we live in.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof; the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

By unanimous consent, the bill H. R. 8373 was laid on the table.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, effective as of this date.

Sincerely,

ROY O. WOODRUFF.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SPEAKER RAYBURN: I herewith tender my resignation from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Most respectfully yours,

ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 727) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, with committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act be cited as the "Housing Act of 1952."

SEC. 2. Section 217 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 217. Notwithstanding limitations contained in any other section of this act on the aggregate amount of principal obligations of mortgages or loans which may be insured (or insured and outstanding at any one time) and on the aggregate amount of contingent liabilities which may be outstanding at any one time under insurance contracts, or commitments to insure, pursuant to any section or title of this act, any such aggregate amount shall, with respect to any section or title of this act (except section 2), be prescribed by the President from time to time taking into consideration the needs of nations' defense and the effect of

additional insurance authorizations upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy: *Provided*, That the dollar amount of the insurance authorization prescribed by the President at any time with respect to any provision of title VI shall not be greater than authorized by provisions of that title: *And provided further*, That, at any time, the aggregate dollar amount of the mortgage insurance authorization prescribed by the President with respect to title IX of this act, plus the aggregate dollar amount of all increases in insurance authorizations under other titles of this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section, less the aggregate dollar amount of all decreases in insurance authorizations under this act prescribed by the President pursuant to authority contained in this section shall not exceed $1,900,000,000: *And provided further*, That $400,000,000 of said sum shall be available only for the insurance of mortgages for which no insurance contract or commitment to insure under this act was outstanding on June 30, 1952, and which mortgages (1) cover defense housing programed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency in an area determined by the President or his designee to be a critical defense housing area, or (2) are insured under title VIII of this act, or (3) cover housing intended to be made available primarily for families who are victims of a catastrophe which the President has determined to be a major disaster."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 301 (a) (1) of said act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking the words beginning with "insured after April 30, 1948" and ending with the colon at the end of the first proviso thereof and inserting the words: "insured under this act, as amended, or insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended: *Provided*, That no such mortgage, except defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G) hereof, shall be purchased by the association unless insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952, or purchased pursuant to a commitment made by the association:";

(2) by striking from subparagraph (E) "pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee" and inserting "after February 29, 1952, pursuant to authority contained herein, exceeds 50 percent of the original principal amount of all mortgage loans made by such mortgagee that are insured or guaranteed after February 29, 1952";

(3) by striking the proviso in subparagraph (E) and inserting "*Provided*, That this clause (2) shall not apply to (nor shall any terms therein include) any defense or disaster mortgages as defined in subparagraph (G)"; and

(4) by striking from the proviso in subparagraph (G) "which do not exceed $252,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if applications for such commitments were received by the Association prior to December 28, 1951, or, in the case of title VIII mortgages, if the Federal Housing Commissioner issued his commitment to insure prior to December 31, 1951, but subsequent to December 27, 1951, and if such commitments of the Association relate to" and inserting "and prior to July 1, 1953, which do not exceed $1,152,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments of the Association relate to defense or disaster mortgages. As used in this title III, 'defense or distaster mortgages' means."

(b) Section 302 of said act, as amended, is hereby amended (1) by striking "$2,750,000,000" and inserting "$3,650,000,000"; and (2) by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence of said section ": *Provided*, That not more than $2,750,000,000 of such total amount outstanding at any one time shall relate to mortgages other than defense or disaster mortgages as defined in section 301 (a) (1) (G)."

SEC. 4. Section 313 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by striking out "$60,000,000" in paragraph (a) thereof and substituting "$100,000,000" and by striking out "$50,000,000" in paragraph (b) thereof and substituting "$100,000,000."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 302 (b) of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding after the words "for reuse at other locations" the words "or existing housing built or acquired by the United States under authority of other law."

SEC. 6. Section 611 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes", approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting "or section 313 of this act" immediately preceding the parenthetical clause, and by striking out "to this title" at the end of the parenthetical clause and inserting in lieu thereof "thereto."

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 3 (b) and the first sentence of section 3 (d) of the Alaska Housing Act, approved April 23, 1949, as amended, are hereby amended by striking "$15,000,000" and inserting "$20,000,000."

SEC. 8. Title II of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding the following new section:

"SEC. 218. In any case where an application for mortgage insurance under section 608 of this Act was received by the Federal Housing Commissioner on or before March 1, 1950, and a commitment to insure was issued by said Commissioner in accordance therewith any mortgagee who, prior to the expiration of such commitment, applied for insurance of a mortgage under section 207 of this Act with respect to the same property or project shall receive credit for all application fees paid in connection with the prior application: *Provided*, That nothing therein shall constitute a waiver of any requirements otherwise applicable to the insurance of mortgages under section 207 of this Act."

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed from time to time to credit and cancel the note or notes of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator executed and delivered in connection with loans transferred from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Housing and Home Finance Agency pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 23 of 1950 (64 Stat. 1279), to the extent of the net loss, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, sustained by said Agency in the liquidation of defaulted loans. The net loss shall be the sum of the unpaid principal and advances for care and preservation of collateral, together with accrued and unpaid interest on said principal and advances, and all expenses and costs (other than those subject to administrative expense limitations) in connection with the liquidation of defaulted loans, less the amount actually realized by the Housing and Home Finance Agency on account of such defaulted loans.

SEC. 10. (a) The National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by adding at the end of section 8 the following new section 9:

"SEC. 9. The provisions of sections 2 and 8 shall be applicable in the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.";

(2) by adding "Guam," after the words "District of Columbia," in each place where they appear in sections 201 (d), 207 (a) (7), 301 (c) (4), 601 (d), and 801 (f);

(3) by inserting in section 214—

(A) the words "or in Guam" after the word "Alaska" in each place where it appears in said section,

(B) the words "or maxima" after the word "maximum", and

(C) the words "or the Government of Guam or any agency or instrumentality thereof" after the words "Alaska Housing Authority" in each place where they appear in said section;

(4) by adding at the end of section 713 the following new subsection (q):

"(q) 'State' shall include the several States and Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, and the Virgin Islands"; and

(5) by deleting the words "or Territory" in section 403 (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Territory, or possession."

(b) The Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, is hereby amended by adding a comma and "Guam," after the words "Puerto Rico" in section 7 thereof.

(c) The Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding "Guam," after "District of Columbia," in section 2 (3) and after "Virgin Islands," in section 3 thereof.

(d) The Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 is hereby amended by adding at the end of section 401 the following: "This title shall be applicable in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(e) Section 102b of the Housing Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Such powers, functions, and duties may be exercised in the several States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

SEC. 11. Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) In the first sentence of section 511 immediately following the phrase "July 1, 1951" strike the word "and" and insert at the end of the sentence just before the period a comma and the language "and an additional $100,000,000 on and after July 1, 1953."

(b) In section 512, (1) strike "and 1952" and insert "1952, and 1953", and (ii) strike "and $2,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000 and $2,000,000."

(c) In section 513, strike "and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952" and insert "$10,000,000, and $10,000,000 on July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953."

SEC. 12. Section 903 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Upon application of the mortgagee with the consent of the mortgagor of a mortgage for which a commitment to insure has been issued pursuant to section 203 of this act covering property on which the construction of the dwellings thereon was begun prior to the enactment of this title and the determination of prevailing wages in the locality in accordance with section 212, the Commissioner is authorized, notwithstanding such beginning of construction, to convert such commitment to a commitment under section 908; any charges or fees paid to the Commissioner with respect to such insurance under section 203 shall be credited to charges or fees due the Commissioner with respect to such insurance under section 908; and the determination of prevailing wages in the locality for purposes of section 212 may be made by the Secretary of Labor at any time prior to the insurance under section 908: *Provided*, That such mortgage, or the mortgage covering the same property executed in substitution therefor, is otherwise eligible for insurance under section 908."

SEC. 13. Section 610 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Commissioner is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 608 of this title in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by a State or municipality, or an agency, instrumentality, or body politic of either, of any permanent housing (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection therewith or to serve the inhabitants thereof), constructed by or on behalf of such State, municipality, agency, instrumentality, or body politic, for the occupancy of veterans of World War II, their families, and others: *Provided*, That the principal obligation of any such mortgage does not exceed either 85 percent of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Commissioner or $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property as may be attributable to dwelling use."

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be printed in the RECORD as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill extends the provisions of the Housing Act with reference to the Federal National Mortgage Association. It provides that the purchasing authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association with respect to defense and disaster mortgages shall be increased by $900,000,000. This will release $360,000,000, which is now frozen, for the purchase of GI and FHA nondefense mortgages.

It also increases the insurance authority of FHA by $400,000,000, and provides that the existing unused authorizations may be transfered to titles other than those for which it was originally authorized. It also makes other necessary amendments to general housing statutes.

The bill has been generally demanded by those who are interested in housing. It will furnish a secondary market for housing securities, which is so badly needed to support the defense housing program.

I hope the bill will be passed as reported by the committee.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a part of this bill which I think is very important. The Federal National Mortgage Association, which we commonly call Fanny May, is to be expanded under one of the sections of this bill.

The Federal National Mortgage Association was established a number of years ago as an emergency agency to assist the people of the country in buying houses and homes. When it was established the idea was that Fanny May would provide a secondary market for mortgages on homes throughout the country when there was not money available in the locality for this purpose.

Fanny May has continued year after year with billions of dollars being appropriated and authorized for this secondary market. I realize that under certain emergency conditions the Government must help the people. But, Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly permit the passage of this bill without raising a protest, without saying to the House that we must stop, that we must reexamine this program, and that we must, when we have an opportunity, say that there will be an end to this emergency program. Frankly, if I had my way about it there would be an end to it today.

The parliamentary situation is such that we cannot offer any amendments either to curtail or to eliminate the operations of Fanny May. I am taking this time to state to the House that when the membership returns, whether it be in special session or next year, we must reexamine this program of indirect direct Government loans, because, after all, Fanny May is a method of direct Government loans.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this about the program: There are those who say that when private enterprise cannot do a job then the Government must step in and accomplish that job for the people of the country. But what occurs too frequently is that when private enterprise is beginning to walk, beginning to go forward, along comes the Government with its big stick and knocks private industry down and, therefore, private industry does not have an opportunity to do the job. That is exactly what is happening in connection with the present Fanny May program

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman tell me whether the annual statement of this Federal National Mortgage Association was brought into the committee and discussed?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. No, it was not.

Mr. BUFFETT. Can the gentleman tell us what is the total amount of their assets, their liabilities, their income, and their outgo?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I do not have the figures before me, but I shall ask unanimous consent to include that as a part of my remarks because it is really important that we examine the whole program.

Mr. BUFFETT. Here is a program running into the hundreds of millions of dollars. Was there a fair discussion of it in the committee?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I would say there was little, if any, discussion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. With this proposal becoming involved, what is the total authorization of Fannie May?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Two and three-quarters billion total.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, this Federal Mortgage concern then will be authorized to go into the market and pick up $2,750,000,000 worth of securities.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. That is right. The point is, as I say, that this was to be an emergency program, one which was designed to assist the people, but as it continues to snowball, roll up, with billions and billions of dollars, finally it becomes not a secondary market but a direct Government loan.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I want to commend the gentleman from Kansas for his statement. As he knows, in committee I was inclined to offer an amendment to reduce this figure.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DEANE. But due to the legislative jam we are in, I withdrew the amendment. But I wish to go on record, being a member of the housing subcommittee, as saying that we need to come to grips with this subject and either increase interest rates or do something to take the Government out of direct financing, for that is what it actually is.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his comment, because I know he is very much interested in this program. Throughout the country many veterans are attempting to buy homes. They are finding that the GI-loan program does not furnish them the needed funds. It is my judgment that the reason the veteran is not able to find enough funds to furnish his home is because the Government has arbitrarily held down the interest rate below the going market rate for money. Now that is an illustration of what I mean when I say that the Government on the one side says that we will do what we can to assist private enterprise and then on the other hand use a large club to beat it down.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand this bill, it does do a great deal to relieve this situation, does it not, so far as the veterans are concerned, in getting loans?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. I think the veteran will be able to get loans through the secondary market of Fannie May, but let me say to the gentleman that we do not want to cheapen the dollar which the veteran is spending and, in turn, cost the veteran more money per house. It may be more detrimental than it is good.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SPRINGER. May I just follow up this very quickly? I have a telegram with reference to 300 veterans at Rantoul, Ill., which is right near Chanute Field, and I would like to get the facts as best I can because, as I understand, it does increase the possibility of their getting loans to relieve this situation; is that true or is it not?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. It does that particular thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, Did the organization or the corporation make available to the Committee on Banking and Currency the balance sheets and operating statements of these performances?

Mr. COLE of Kansas. No; they did not. That information is in the hands of the committee, and I will include it in my statement, if it is immediately available.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, as House author of the original bill which established the farm housing loan program, I am particularly happy and proud today to urge the continuation of this worth-while legislation. Since 1949, thousands of farm families have been able to improve their farms, live better, enjoy better health, and obtain better production because of the farm housing loan program.

These improvements were made possible by the Housing Act of 1949 which authorized the Farmers Home Administration to extend financial assistance to the farm owners throughout the country for the purpose of constructing, remodeling, or repairing farm dwellings or other farm buildings. The act is on the statute books as Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, and its farm housing authorities extend only until June 30, 1953, or through a 4-year tryout period. It was anticipated that during these 4 years, Congress would be able to appraise the effectiveness of the program and to decide whether the act should be amended to provide necessary basic authority for an appropriation for one more year.

Let us take a look at what has been accomplished.

Through May 31, 1952, farm housing loans have been used to finance the construction, repair, or remodeling of 11,625 farm dwellings. Over 10,200 other farm buildings, including barns, sheds, poultry houses, milk houses, and other buildings needed for good farming have been built or repaired.

In the time prior to May 31, approximately 13,600 farm owners had received a total of $62,669,300 in housing credit. The report from my State of Alabama is that 721 loans have been made for a total of $3,608,500.

These figures do not represent a great volume of loans. We have proceeded on a very conservative basis. But each loan represents a better home or a better set of income-producing farms for a worthy American farm family. Thirteen thousand farm families are better off today than they were 3 years ago because of this program.

Although the program is intended only for those farm owners who cannot obtain adequate financing from banks or other lenders, it is being operated on a strictly business basis. Repayments are being made on schedule by most of the borrowers. In Alabama the report is that 98 percent of the farmers there who have obtained these loans have met their payments on time. The other 2 percent are less than $200 in arrears, on an average. Interest rates are 4 percent per annum on unpaid balances.

I believe that fact alone is ample evidence of the soundness of this program. If there ever was any question in our minds about the wisdom of making these loans, that doubt has now been erased.

There is really, I believe, only one more question to be answered, so far as any fair appraisal is concerned. Does the need still exist? The recent census gives us the facts we need to settle that point. According to the 1950 census, more than one-fifth of America's 6,500,000 farm dwellings are in a dilapidated condition. More than three-fourths of all farmhouses do not have hot water, private bath, and toilet facilities.

More evidence of the real need for improved farm housing facilities is contained in a recent Bureau of Agricultural Economics report. This report is on the structural level and condition of farmhouses. It showed that 36 percent of the Nation's farmhouses were rated low in 1950, 25 percent were rated intermediate, and 39 percent were rated high. It is significant that nearly two-thirds of the houses with the lowest rating were located on farms that produced in 1949, or were expected to produce in 1950, less than $1,950 each from crops, livestock, and livestock products.

You can find these houses in every agricultural county in the United States. Great improvements in rural living conditions have been made in recent years. But we still have a long way to go before all of our farm families have decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

We, as a Nation, must continue to help our farm families get better homes to live in, and better farm buildings to work in. We are calling upon our farmers to produce more food and more fiber than ever before. They are responding, and are accomplishing the production goals through better use of land, improved utilization of available farm labor, and through intelligent planning and management.

These very improvements in production call for efficient farm plants, and efficient farm plants are not complete without good sets of buildings. The farm housing program thus far has been a boon to greater production, because it offers an opportunity for farm owners to finance the building and necessary repairs or alterations of required service buildings. Farm buildings are production facilities, and must be adapted to the changing requirements of modern agriculture. Building improvements go hand in hand with shifts in production patterns made necessary by the defense effort.

Production and storage facilities on our farms are of great importance in these days when farmers are asked to furnish a tremendous volume of farm products for the markets and for industry. Good farm buildings help farmers utilize efficiently the labor and land resources—and without the type of credit this legislation affords, countless small farmers with limited credit sources would be unable to construct or maintain the buildings they need. Bear in mind that the loans have only been made to erect or repair essential farm buildings.

Among the points to consider in the continuation of this program are these:

First. It offers the opportunity for farmers to build up the values of their properties, to make their farm homes community assets, to safeguard their families' health. Without the program their opportunities to do these things are minimized, for these loans are made only to families who cannot get credit from other sources.

Second. It gives the farmer with limited means the advantage of using his own and his family's skills and labor. He can purchase his materials from the dealer or dealers of his choice, and can employ the labor he chooses. Yet, with help from Farmers Home Administration engineers and other technical assistance, he can and does make his construction meet minimum structural requirements. The money is not thrown away on poor construction or substandard materials.

Third. Like all other lending programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, the farm housing activities are under the watchful eyes of the county committee of three leading local citizens. This is another safeguard against waste and unwise construction.

Fourth. For the first time this program has offered farmers the housing credit advantages somewhat similar to those that have been enjoyed by urban people for many years.

Fifth. It is administered by an agency that has established a Nation-wide reputation of carrying on a good program in agriculture.

Sixth. Farmers Home Administration will continue to use this program, as it has used its other supervised credit programs, to make a maximum contribution to the mobilization effort to which American agriculture is committed.

Seventh. By having good and adequate dwellings, taking good care of production through storage facilities, being able to care for livestock efficiently with better service buildings, and increasing the value of their farms, farmers increase their taxable assets—and better earn the money with which to pay those taxes.

Eighth. The money is loaned to farm owners and is returned, with interest, to the United States Treasury.

As one who has worked conscientiously for the legislation that has made the farm housing program possible, and as one who has watched the progress the farm owners have made during the limited time the program has been in effect, I have felt that it is one of the best of our farm credit programs. It certainly is legislation that Congress can be proud of. I am sure that if greater

loan authorizations had been made over the past couple of years, the entire amount would have been used wisely and would have contributed just that much more to the strength of this country.

I sincerely hope we will see fit to pass the legislation now before this body that will enable the Farmers Home Administration to continue the good work it has carried on so well up to this point.

I believe we are in accord in the belief that the program is in good and capable hands. I believe it is an essential program, and I am sure its continuance is desired by our citizenry throughout the length and breadth of this country.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the membership of the House should know that this so-called Fannie May, the euphonious title for this corporation, files reports as required by law with the Congress every 6 months. The entire history and operation of this organization is always open to the inspection of Members of Congress. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] that this entire situation should be reexamined between now and the time the new Congress meets. He is a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That committee is doing a good job. I hope they will finish their job and bring in a report on which we can act at the next Congress.

I, too, agree that this corporation is one of the few that are making money for the Government. It borrows money at 2 percent and lends it at 4 percent. It has sustained no losses. It has been earning about $50,000,000 per year profit for the Government. Nevertheless, I think this is an instance where the Government should get out of private business as soon as possible. I voted for the present bill in committee on the representation that this would produce more defense, military, and disaster housing. I hope it is going to do that. On that basis, I think we should pass this bill.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, first I should like to concur heartily in the remarks made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. Second, my remarks are going to be addressed to an amendment numbered section 13 to section 610 of the National Housing Act. This amendment embodies the full content of the bill S. 3295, sponsored by Senator HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, and passed in the Senate, which attempts to make available financing for the sale to veterans of permanent veterans' housing constructed by the State of New Jersey and some of its municipalities after World War II. We had quite an extensive program in our State that was very successful. At the present time it is impossible to obtain FHA mortgage loan guaranties in order to permit veterans to take over this housing cooperatively and purchase it from the State and the various municipalities. It will give the same authority now available for purchase of Federal emergency housing. The legislation is supported by the veterans organizations of our State. It affects approximately 3,300 units of housing, and it will provide the means for the individual to become a home owner and get the State and its municipalities out of the housing business.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to disagree with the gentleman from Kansas, but I believe this bill is necessary for several reasons. To begin with, I think if we do not pass it we will be limiting the number of residential housing starts that could be financed during the next fiscal year which we badly need. It has been estimated that 112,500 residential housing starts will be denied if this bill is not adopted. On the other hand, I do not like to see the Government enter into the financial market to establish the rate of interest on mortgages. As long as we have need for housing, and there is certainly a great need for residential housing in the lower-cost brackets, this bill provides for financing residential housing units not to exceed $8,100. I believe this bill is essential to the interest and welfare of the Nation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3066, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time during the balance of the week, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CALL OF BILLS ON PRIVATE CALENDAR ON FRIDAY NEXT

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Friday next to have a further call of the bills on the Private Calendar. Some bills were just reported out yesterday, and I believe that some of them are bills from the other body.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1953

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 493) making supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1953, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the following sum:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution No. 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, $500,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution provides the Committee on Appropriations with funds which, in its opinion, are absolutely necessary to make the proper study and examination of the budget so that we can be prepared when the next session begins to hold the hearings in a satisfactory manner; is that not correct?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct; it is for the purpose of implementing the staff on the Committee on Appropriations, and enable the Congress to do a better job in scrutinizing the budgets and investigating expenses of the Government.

Mr. TABER. And is it not also provided in the resolution No. 11 that these investigatorial reports, except where matters of national security are involved, shall be made available at a proper time to the membership of the House and before the bills are brought to the floor?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct, and it provides for a minimum of an additional staff of 20 members.

Mr. TABER. Is it not 25?

Mr. MAHON. I believe it is 20. Of course, that is a minimum rather than a maximum.

Mr. TABER. There is no maximum?

Mr. MAHON. There is no maximum.

Mr. TABER It is provided also that each subcommittee may have the right to have its investigations and to supervise the investigations that are made?

Mr MAHON. Within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; is this resolution which was just passed on today by the Committee on Appropriations, as I understand, designed to take the place of the Colmer bill, which was scheduled to come up today and which was expected to come up within the next few minutes?

Mr. MAHON. May I say to the gentleman this resolution should not greatly affect the Colmer resolution one way or the other because this provides for a staff to work with the subcommittees in studying the budgets and making

investigations of the executive branch of the Government in connection with the regular work of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It seems to me it has the same purpose, and, of course, I would not like to suggest that that was the purpose in coming out at this particular critical moment, it seems to me the gentleman might well withhold that very recent piece of legislation until the legislation, which has been given consideration, has an opportunity to be heard. I wonder if the gentleman would not withhold his request.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is no doubt but that this is a move to block the McClellan-Colmer resolution. I think this is a step in the right direction, but I think we should dispose of the McClellan-Colmer bills and then take up this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman object to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. NORRELL. No; I do not.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, members of the committee are busily engaged on conference reports working toward the closing of the session. This has been selected as the time to consider this matter, and I hope the gentleman will not object, because it does not run contrary to his own views. I know we should have additional funds and additional personnel for the Appropriations Committee, regardless of any other pending legislation, including the Colmer bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Even though the Colmer bill is passed, the Committee on Appropriations will nevertheless need a staff to assist it in its study of the budget.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

I hope the gentleman will not object, because I know he is not opposed to the legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is not present. It has been understood that his bill would have priority today. I regret deeply to object, and I hope the gentleman will not force me to do so but will defer it until a little later time and we can take up the Colmer bill and dispose of it.

The SPEAKER. Permit the Chair to say that there is a strong probability we will not reach the Colmer resolution today for the simple reason that we have two more suspensions and we have nine conference reports, five of them on appropriation bills.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was relying on the assurance we had from the majority leader. I understand we are in a bad fix. I am not quarreling with anybody.

The SPEAKER. The only thing is the Chair wants the gentleman to understand that the conference reports will take precedence over everything.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am not quarreling with anybody, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MAHON. This is legislation that we should have at this time.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. May I ask whether, if this resolution is passed, the Appropriations Committee will then agree to support the Colmer resolution when it comes before us?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not like to put them on any terms, but in the absence of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for the moment I will have to object.

MERGER OF TWO OR MORE NATIONAL BANK ASSOCIATIONS AND MERGER OF STATE BANKS WITH NATIONAL BANK ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2128) to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the chairman of the committee that the importance of this bill requires considerable time for discussion, and I am disposed to object to the consideration of the bill by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky have some other bills that are not controversial?

Mr. SPENCE. This is not controversial, Mr. Speaker. This was passed by the committee without a dissenting vote, and everybody on the committee was in favor of it.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In view of the fact that it is not controversial, I renew my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2128) to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations," approved November 7, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, secs. 33, 34, and 34a), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof new sections 4 and 5 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) One or more national banking associations or one or more State banks, with the approval of the Comptroller, under an agreement not inconsistent with this act, may merge into a national banking association located within the same State, under the charter of the receiving association.

"(b) The merger agreement shall—

"(1) be agreed upon in writing by a majority of the board of directors of each association or State bank participating in the plan of merger;

"(2) be ratified and confirmed by the affirmative vote of the shareholders of each association or State bank owning at least two-thirds of the capital stock outstanding, at a meeting to be held on the call of the directors, after publishing notice of the time, place, and object of the meeting for four consecutive weeks in a newspaper with general circulation in the place where the association or State bank is located, and after sending such notice to each shareholder of record by registered mail at least 10 days prior to the meeting, except to those shareholders who specifically waive notice;

"(3) specify the amount of the capital stock of the receiving association which will be outstanding upon completion of the merger, the amount of stock (if any) to be allocated, and cash (if any) to be paid to the shareholders of the association or State bank being merged into the receiving association; and

"(4) provide the manner of disposing of any shares of the receiving association not taken by the shareholders of the association or State bank merged into the receiving association.

"If a merger shall be voted for at the called meetings by the necessary majorities of the shareholders of each association or State bank participating in the plan of merger, any shareholder of any association or State bank to be merged into the receiving association who has voted against the merger at the meeting of the shareholders, or has given notice in writing at or prior to the meeting to the presiding officer that he dissents from the plan of merger, shall be entitled to receive the value of the shares held by him if and when the merger shall be approved by the Comptroller. The value of the shares shall be ascertained, as of the date of the meeting of the shareholders of the association or State bank approving the merger, by an appraisal made by a committee of three persons, composed of (i) one selected by the vote of the holders of a majority of the stock, the owners of which are entitled to payment in cash; (ii) one selected by the directors of the receiving association; and (iii) one selected by the two so selected. The valuation agreed upon by any two of the three appraisers shall govern. If the value so fixed shall not be satisfactory to any dissenting shareholder who has requested payment, that shareholder may, within 5 days after being notified of the appraised value of his shares, appeal to the Comptroller, who shall cause a reappraisal to be made which shall be final and binding as to value of the shares of the appellant. If, within 90 days from the date of consummation of the merger, for any reason, one or more of the appraisers have not been selected, or the appraisers have failed to determine the value of the shares, the Comptroller, upon written request of any interested party, shall cause an appraisal to be made which shall be final and binding on all parties. The expenses of the Comptroller in making the reappraisal or the appraisal, as the case may be, shall be paid by the receiving association. The value of the shares ascertained shall be promptly paid to the shareholders by the receiving association, and the shares so paid for shall be surrendered to and canceled by the receiving association. The provisions of this paragraph shall apply only to shareholders of and stock owned by them in a bank or association being merged into the receiving association.

"(c) The corporate existence of the merging association or State bank shall be merged into that of the receiving association. All rights, franchise, and interests of the merging association or State bank in and to every type of property (real, personal, and mixed) and choses in action shall be transferred to and vested in the receiving association by virtue of such merger without any deed or other transfer. The receiving association, upon the merger and without any order or other action on the part of any court or otherwise, shall hold and enjoy all rights

of property, franchises, and interests, including appointments, designations, and nominations, and all other rights and interests as trustee, executor, administrator, registrar of stocks and bonds, guardian of estates, assignee, receiver, committee of estates of lunatics, and in every other fiduciary capacity, in the same manner and to the same extent as such rights, franchises, and interests were held or enjoyed by any merging association or State bank at the time of the merger, subject to the conditions hereinafter provided.

"Where any merging association or State bank, at the time of the merger, was acting under appointment of any court as trustee, executor, administrator, registrar of stocks and bonds, guardian of estates, assignee, receiver, committee of estates of lunatics, or in any other fiduciary capacity, the receiving association shall be subject to removal by a court of competent jurisdiction in the same manner and to the same extent as was the merging association or State bank prior to the merger. Nothing contained in this section shall be considered to impair in any manner the right of any court to remove a receiving association and to appoint in lieu thereof a substitute trustee, executor, or other fiduciary, except that such right shall not be exercised in such a manner as to discriminate against national banking associations, nor shall any receiving association be removed solely because of the fact that it is a national banking association.

"(d) Any national banking association which is a receiving association may issue stock, with the approval of the Comptroller and in accordance with law, to be delivered to the shareholders of a merging State bank or national banking association as provided for by a merger agreement, free from any preemptive rights of the shareholders of the receiving association.

"SEC. 5. As used in this act the term—

"(1) 'State bank' means any bank, banking association, trust company, savings bank (other than a mutual savings bank), or other banking institution which is engaged in the business of receiving deposits and which is incorporated under the laws of any State, or which is operating under the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (except a national banking association located in the District of Columbia);

"(2) 'State' means the several States, the several Territories, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia;

"(3) 'Comptroller' means the Comptroller of the Currency; and

"(4) 'Receiving association' means the national banking association into which one or more national banking associations or one or more State banks, located within the same State, merge."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of November 7, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 34a), is amended by deleting the second paragraph thereof, which reads as follows:

"The words 'State bank', 'State banks', 'bank', or 'banks', as used in this section, shall be held to include trust companies, savings banks, or other such corporations or institutions carrying on the banking business under the authority of State laws."

Mr. CRAWFORD (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky will be recognized for such portion of 20 minutes as he may consume, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be recognized for such portion of 20 minutes as he may require.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported unanimously by the committee. It was requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency. It merely provides a method for the merger of a national bank with another national bank as with a State bank. I do not think it has the opposition of any bank official in any State. It is generally requested by the banks of the country. The bill passed the Senate unanimously, and was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill dealing with the merger of banks.

The controversy, which does exist, deals with the question of the combining of banks of different classifications; namely, those described as national banks and those known as State banks.

The two-way street to which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has referred means that in a combination of national and State banks there should be under law no advantage accruing to either of those two groups so that by the operation of law in a merger no preference should favor the national bank or the State bank. It is a two-way street, working both ways. That is not the result of this legislation, S. 2128, now before you. Under the operation of this law in conjunction with the law which now exists in certain States, including Pennsylvania, which do now have the two-way street, there would be a change, and an incentive on the part of the banks to combine and create national banks as distinguished from a tendency to continue as a State bank. It is that to which I object.

Under S. 2128 the Comptroller of the Currency would be permitted to decide, in his discretion, whether the continuation of two or more national and State banks should be effected under the consolidation provisions or the proposed new merger provisions. Now, listen to this, please: If the Comptroller should decide to place the combination under the old consolidation provisions, the shareholders of all the merging institutions would be given the right to dissent; they would be protected, and that is what I want and what you want.

Here is the important point: If, however, the Comptroller of the Currency should place the combination under the proposed merger provisions of S. 2128, the bill now before us, the Comptroller would then deny the right to dissent to shareholders of the receiving or continuing national bank.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. I think the gentleman is in error when he says that the stockholder could not dissent.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Shareholder is what I said.

Mr. SPENCE. The original provision was that the stockholders could dissent, but it requires two-thirds for ratification.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am speaking of the minority shareholder, the dissenting shareholder. I say that he would not be protected under this bill if the Comptroller determined that the merger should be decided and operated under this bill. If it were handled under the old 1918 law, he would be fully protected. Over in Pennsylvania today the banks can combine and do combine. They make their choice freely as to whether they wish to be a national bank or a State bank and we should do nothing to disturb that right of choice on the part of combining banks as to what they want. I am, therefore, opposed to this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. It is provided in the bill that the merger must be ratified by two-thirds of the stockholders who hold two-thirds of the stock of each company by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I understand, but there is a third who do not approve. Why should they not be protected in their investment in the bank? They are protected today.

Mr. SPENCE. They are protected here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this is an exceedingly important bill. As I understand the gentleman's statement, the present law now operating with respect to the consolidation of national banks with national banks or the consolidation of a national bank with a State bank or a State bank with a national bank, protects every stockholder of both institutions or all institutions consolidated.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We agree on that. I wonder if the gentleman would agree to yield for the committee to state whether or not it agrees with that?

Mr. SPENCE. I would like to know what the gentleman means.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does he agree that under existing law the minority and majority stockholders are equally protected when there is a merger effected?

Mr. SPENCE. There must be some action taken by a majority. This provides for two-thirds, which is a substantial majority. The dissenting shareholder of the absorbed bank may get

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the value of his stock. I cannot understand how we could require the vote of the entire number of stockholders.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows there are two values of stock in dealing with bank stocks, the book value and the market value. The gentleman knows also that the book value is frequently much higher than the market value. The minority stockholder is not protected so far as book value is concerned.

Mr. CRAWFORD. At the bottom of page 2, line 24, we have this language:

(4) provide the manner of disposing of any shares of the receiving association not taken by the shareholders of the association or State bank merged into the receiving association.

I understand from the language here that at least two-thirds of the capital stock outstanding can do the voting. If the present law fully protects one-third of the stockholders not voting, for instance, in both institutions, the retiring institution and the continuing institution, what will be the situation after this proposal becomes law if the Comptroller of the Currency makes a ruling that the consolidation shall be made under the provisions of this new addition to the law? That is the question the gentleman is raising.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Of course I cannot answer that, but I am informed reliably it would be to the disadvantage of the minority stockholders.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The members of the Committee on Banking and Currency should clear up that point and do it quickly.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is why I objected to the unanimous-consent request. This is an important bill. I know in the State of Pennsylvania, and I am informed in New Jersey and others, as the law exists today, there is no advantage to switch from a national to a State bank, or vice versa. All are treated fairly and equally. I know under certain actions by the Comptroller General, according to this bill, it will be made advantageous to shift it from a State bank, of which we are quite proud in Pennsylvania, to the national level.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, what the gentleman just pointed out, if two institutions have certain assets and certain benefits and good will, and so forth, let them go ahead and make their consolidation on the basis of their then-present status without some particular favor being handed to them by law which induces State banks to consolidate with national banks or national banks with State banks; that is what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That is exactly right, and that present situation will be disturbed so far as Pennsylvania and New Jersey and a number of other States are concerned, under this bill. I will admit that there are some States which do not have the same type of legislation giving the true two-way-street method at the moment as we do in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and several other States. In these States the present situations will be benefited by this bill. The correct answer to this would be to have the States themselves, without interference on the part of the Federal Government, adopt laws similar to those States where we now have established a two-way-street method.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SIMPSON. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. When there is a merger, the stockholders of the smaller bank that is merged either receive shares or cash at the book value at their election under this act. The stockholders of the absorbing bank receive theirs in shares. Now, it may be impossible for the larger bank to pay in cash, because the absorbing bank might not have sufficient funds to pay. I see no objection to that. It seems to me that the stockholders in the smaller bank which is absorbed are amply protected. We must act by majorities, and two-thirds is a majority.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I think it is a different thing to act by majorities in a legislative body and majorities in a corporation where the minorities have their investments and where they need protection and where they should not be overrun by any act on the part of the majority.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Can the chairman tell me who is going to determine the value of the stock?

Mr. SPENCE. The committee of appraisers will fix the value of the stock as they do now.

Mr. GAVIN. But suppose a stockholder was not satisfied and he did not want stock, he wanted cash, under this bill he would not be permitted to get cash.

Mr. SPENCE. This does not change that situation at all with respect to dissenting shareholders of the bank being absorbed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The price of the stock would be determined by the assets of the bank, and they are not permitted to merge unless they meet certain conditions, so that under those conditions the assets and the value of the stock is par.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I wish to make the point that this is a matter that has been handled perfectly in certain States with the two-way street method of operation, and we are here going to disrupt it unnecessarily when the matter can be corrected so easily in the State by State legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if there is an element in this problem here caused by the fact that in many instances, as the result of the way banks are now taxed with respect to their earnings, the way they are controlled by the Comptroller of the Currency, with respect to the ratio of capital to deficit liability, and with their stock selling on the market below book value—I wonder if that problem is the cause of the bill being drafted so that the dissenting stockholder on one side of the proposition is not protected in this new addition as he is protected under the present law, that chislers might move in and perhaps upset mergers and consolidations which should be made effective from the standpoint of sound banking. Is there anybody on the committee who could give us any light on that?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I want to close by saying that we have here a situation which is working out perfectly in those States where the legislatures have enacted legislation permitting free mergers without penalty to any stockholder. All I ask is that Congress keep its hands off and let the State legislatures handle this matter without centering still further in the hands of Washington more power over the money of the citizens of our country.

Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of my objection to S. 2128, I call attention to the following communication from the Secretary of Banking of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
DEPARTMENT OF BANKING,
Harrisburg, March 5, 1952.

Hon. L. H. GAVIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LEE: I am sure that you will recall that the Pennsylvania Banking Department in cooperation with Pennsylvania Bankers Association and the American Bankers Association, started the movement in late 1946 and early 1947 to correct the unfair merger provisions of national banking law. This effort started after the "one-way street" became glaringly clear in the spring and summer of 1946 through the mergers in Pittsburgh which resulted in Peoples First National Bank & Trust Co. and Mellon National Bank & Trust Co. Through the mergers of Peoples Pittsburgh Trust Co. and Union Trust Co., Pittsburgh into the national system, the State banking system in Pennsylvania lost approximately $1,000,000,000.

As you know, Public Law 706 was signed by the President on August 17, 1950, and it established almost complete equity and full reciprocity in the merger of State and national banks under either a State charter or a national charter.

I have given you the foregoing background because the report of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 2128 seems to emphasize time and again that S. 2128 is designed to eliminate some slight disadvantage to the national banking system in some States. No mention is made of the fact that the passage of S. 2128 would again throw out of balance the "two-way-merger street" now so fairly in effect in Pennsylvania in the matter of mergers between State and national banks. I think it is vital to any study of this situation to learn from the Comptroller the exact provisions of merger law in those States in which the Comptroller claims national banks are at a disadvantage. I know that several large eastern States, including New Jersey as well as Pennsylvania, will be adversely affected by this bill, and on behalf of these States strong objection to its passage must be made. It is indicated that "many banking associations desiring merger or consolidation are leaving the Federal system in order to take advantage of the more lenient requirements of consolidation under State law." Let me emphasize that the requirements for merger and con-

solidation under Pennsylvania law, are identical with the existing requirements in national law and it is untrue that any national bank has left the Federal system in Pennsylvania because of an advantage in State law. For many, many years the legislative body of our State has preserved in banking law the fair and carefully weighed principle of giving dissenting shareholders of all constituent corporations to a merger or consolidation, the right to dissent. In my opinion, to do otherwise would constitute the taking of property from some shareholders without due process of law. In my opinion, the Comptroller proposes in S. 2128 to write into national banking law a denial of the right of dissenting shareholders of one party to a merger, thus denying those shareholders the free use of their property and taking property rights without due process of law.

You will note that S. 2128 proposed to leave the language of the Act of November 7, 1918, unchanged and the amendment is accomplished by simply adding additional merger provisions at the end of the said Act. Thus, the passage of S. 2128 would permit the Comptroller of the Currency to decide in his own discretion whether the combination of two or more national and State banks should be effected under the consolidation provisions or the proposed new merger provisions. If the Comptroller should decide to place the combination under the old consolidation provisions, the shareholders of all merging institutions would be given the right to dissent. If, however, he should place the combination under the proposed merger provisions in S. 2128, he would deny the right to dissent to shareholders of the receiving or continuing national bank. I feel strongly that it is improper to place such power in the hands of a Government supervisory agency. We have more than enough government by bureaucracy in many other fields today.

Experience in Pennsylvania leads me to believe that the Comptroller's argument to the effect that "hundreds or thousands of an absorbing bank's own shareholders might demand the value of their shares in cash" in case of a merger, are greatly exaggerated. In the recent merger of Girard Trust Co. and Corn Exchange National Bank & Trust Co. into the Girard Trust Corn Exchange Bank, Philadelphia, dissenting shareholders were insignificant. Of course, both these institutions were approximately the same size, having total assets of about $300,000,000. In the recent merger under existing State and national law, whereby Northeast National Bank of Philadelphia merged into the Pennsylvania Co. for Banking & Trusts, Philadelphia, Northeast's assets were $19,000,000 as compared to Pennsylvania Co.'s total assets of $724,000,000. I know that there were practically no dissenting shareholders in either bank to this merger. So was as experience proves in Pennsylvania, there is absolutely no need for the unusual and new merger provisions proposed in S. 2128. It is my opinion that, unless the Comptroller of the Currency can prove that national banks are at a great disadvantage in the majority of States, both in number and in bank resources, the passage of S. 2128 will again throw out of balance the equitable merger situation now existing between State and national banks. Of course, it is definite that the passage of S. 2128 will work to the great disadvantage of the State banking system in Pennsylvania and I must strongly oppose the bill in the interests of a strong and dual banking system in my State. Should the proponents of S. 2128 succeed in passing this bill so detrimental to Pennsylvania, it will be absolutely necessary for us at the next session of our legislature to rewrite our consolidation and merger provisions to again place the position of State and national banks as to merger in Pennsylvania on a fair and equitable basis. It would be repugnant to me to seek such legislation because I feel shareholders of all merging institutions should not be denied their inherent right to dissent to a merger proposal which seems unfair to them.

With my very best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

L. M. CAMPBELL,
Secretary of Banking.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what causes the gentleman from Pennsylvania to raise objection to this bill. There has been no opposition presented to the committee against the bill; as a matter of fact, when I heard that there might be some opposition on the floor to the bill, I called the American Bankers Association today, and they sent me a communication which I hold in my hand now and which reads as follows:

In accordance with your request for the views of the American Bankers Association on S. 2128, I can advise you that the association has considered this bill and believes it to be desirable and needed legislation.

The fact of the matter is that nothing in this proposed legislation can or attempts to change any State law. All we are trying to do here now is put the national banks on the same footing as State banks in those States that have a law which permits the shareholders of the absorbing bank to demand their cash if they do not want to go along with the merger. In other words, where a bank desires to buy out another bank and they decide to do so by a merger, it must be done under this bill by a two-thirds vote. It cannot be done unless two-thirds of the shareholders of each of the banks consent to it.

This bill provides further that the one-third, if there be that many, or less, dissenting stockholders who do not want to go along with the merger, those of the smaller bank—I say "smaller" because it is usually a smaller bank that is merged into the larger—those of the institution which is being merged into the larger bank will have the opportunity to say, "We want an appraisal of the value of our stocks. Never mind what it is selling on the market for, what is its fair value?" Under the State laws and under this law you will get a fair appraisal, which will fix the actual value, and those dissenting stockholders of the bank being absorbed will be able to get their cash and get out of the picture, and those who want to go along with the merger will remain as shareholders.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] I think, stated the problem very precisely. If you do not pass this bill, you will put the stockholders of the absorbing bank in a position of going in and practically holding up the others by requiring them to buy out their stock at exorbitant figures, because they will say, "We will not go along with your merger unless you give us what we want."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I see the practical problem, not only might the stockholders do that, but suppose you and your friend are presenting a consolidation and I am an entire outsider, and I have my ear to the ground and I hear something is in the wind, and I come in and pick up 15 or 20 or 50 shares for a straightforward hold-up.

Mr. MULTER. That is precisely what this bill would stop if it is enacted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am trying to get clear in my mind.

Mr. MULTER. I urge the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2128?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVERSION, MERGER, AND CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS WITH STATE BANKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2252) to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1950 (12 U. S. C. 214c), is amended by striking out the words "as provided by Federal law" at the end of the section and substituting the words "under limitations or conditions no more restrictive than those contained in section 2 hereof with respect to the conversion of a national bank into, or merger or consolidation of a national bank with, a State bank under State charter."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 9 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT AND SECTION 5155 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2938) to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to interrogate the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in order

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that certain facts may appear in the RECORD to indicate our intent with reference to the pending bill. In the first place, does the chairman believe that the enactment of this bill will in any way injure our dual-banking system?

Mr. SPENCE. No, it will not. I hope we never pass legislation which will do that.

Mr. TALLE. I agree with the chairman that our dual-banking system must be preserved. In the second place, will the enactment of this legislation in any way force branch banking upon States which do not have it and do not want it?

Mr. SPENCE. No, absolutely not.

Mr. TALLE. In the third place, and this is a very crucial point, shortly after the National Bank Act was passed in 1863 certain standards were set up relating to the capital stock of a national bank as against the assets of the bank. Those standards were maintained for 70 years. There was no change until 1933. Nineteen years later, in 1952, it appears to me in view of the devaluation of the dollar, and the great inflation we have had, the Committee on Banking and Currency should undertake a very careful study of the relationship between the capital stock of banks and the risk assets of banks.

Mr. SPENCE. I think that is a proper subject for study, and I think we should give further consideration to it in the next Congress.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I have very high regard for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and very great respect for the Board which manages the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We should remember, when we ask those gentlemen to insure the deposits in our banks, that, in the interest of safe and sound banking, it is essential that adequate standards be established which banks must meet. Specifically, the capital stock requirement should be large enough, so that a bank does not have a small equity on the right-hand side of the balance sheet and a tremendously inflated asset total on the left-hand side. That is very dangerous, and I think the time has come when the Committee on Banking and Currency should look into that matter most carefully. We should make certain that our standards are adequate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out to the membership of the House that the Federal Reserve Board strongly supports this measure. It is supported also by the American Bankers Association, the superintendents of banks, as well as many smaller banks throughout the country.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEANE. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. Does the gentleman from North Carolina agree with me that we ought to give to the officials of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the assurance that we want to stand back of them and establish proper standards with special reference to the ratio of capital to risk assets in the banks whose deposits they insure?

Mr. DEANE. I certainly do. We should at this time go on record commending the FDIC for the splendid job they have done and are doing, for their alertness in advocating the adequacy of capital funds for insured banks. The FDIC is ever alert to the safety of their depositors and in the safeguarding of the deposit-insurance fund. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Reserve Board will proceed with caution in carrying out the provisions of S. 2938. I feel that the rule that now sets minimum bank capital for admitting State banks to membership on the basis of area population is rather arbitrary and unrealistic. The present law prevents sound banks, which are otherwise entitled to membership, and most of which are insured banks, from becoming members of the Federal Reserve System.

A section of the bill repeals the legal requirement of $500,000 minimum capitalization of national or State banks desiring to establish out-of-town branches. The banks, however, would still be subject to the aggregate capital requirements contained in other provisions.

The bill would forbid State member banks to reduce total capital without prior Reserve Board approval. While many member banks are already bound by a condition of membership, it appears desirable to cover this matter by law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the eleventh paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 329), is amended to read as follows:

"No applying bank shall be admitted to membership unless it possesses capital stock and surplus which, in the judgment of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, are adequate in relation to the character and condition of its assets and to its existing and prospective deposit liabilities and other corporate responsibilities: *Provided*, That no bank engaged in the business of receiving deposits other than trust funds, which does not possess capital stock and surplus in an amount equal to that which would be required for the establishment of a national banking association in the place in which it is located, shall be admitted to membership unless it is, or has been, approved for deposit insurance under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The capital stock of a State member bank shall not be reduced except with the prior consent of the Board."

SEC. 2. (a) The third paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 321, third paragraph), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence reading as follows: "The approval of the Board shall likewise be obtained before any State member bank may establish any new branch within the limits of any such city, town, or village (except within the District of Columbia)."

(b) Subsection (c) or section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 36 (c)), is further amended by changing the last sentence of such subsection to read as follows: "Except as provided in the immediately preceding sentence, no such association shall establish a branch outside of the city, town, or village in which it is situated unless it has a combined capital stock and surplus equal to the combined amount of capital stock and surplus, if any, required by the law of the State in which such association is situated for the establishment of such branches by State banks, or, if the law of such State requires only a minimum capital stock for the establishment of such branches by State banks, unless such association has not less than an equal amount of capital stock."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MALT LIQUORS LOST OR DAMAGED BY 1951 FLOODS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6241) to provide for the refund or credit of the internal revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of, first the original taxpayer; second, a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale; or third, a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized and directed to make refund, or (b) allow credit in the case of the original taxpayer if he so elects, in the amount of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors, previously withdrawn, and lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 while such fermented malt liquors were in the possession of (1) the person originally paying the said tax on such fermented malt liquors, (2) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale, or (3) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail. A claim for the amount of such tax shall be filed with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue within 90 days from the date of passage of this act. The claimant shall furnish proof to the Commissioner's satisfaction that (1) the internal-revenue tax on such fermented malt liquors was fully paid; (2) the fermented malt liquors were in the possession of the claimant as above set forth at the time of such loss; (3) such fermented malt liquors were lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the damage sustained as a result of the aforesaid flood conditions; and (4) claimant was not indemnified against loss of the tax paid on the fermented malt liquors by any valid claim of insurance or otherwise.

(c) When the Commissioner, pursuant to this act, makes refund, or allows credit, in the amount of the tax on fermented malt liquors rendered unmarketable, such fermented malt liquors shall be destroyed under the supervision of the Commissioner.

(d) Where credit is allowed to the original taxpayer for the internal-revenue tax previously paid as aforesaid, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized and directed to provide for the issuance of stamps to cover the tax on fermented malt liquor subsequently withdrawn to the extent of the credit so allowed.

(e) The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple bill. It provides for the refund or credit for taxes that have been paid on beer that was lost in floods. We did that same thing for the distilled-liquor people in the Revenue Act of 1951, and it was through an oversight that beer was not included.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time particularly to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island a few questions.

First, what kind of consideration was given to this bill by the committee?

Mr. FORAND. This bill was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee after it was considered.

Mr. GROSS. Were hearings held on the bill, and is there any report on the bill?

Mr. FORAND. There is a report on the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Were hearings held?

Mr. FORAND. I do not know. I do not know if hearings have been held, but the bill was considered in regular order by the Ways and Means Committee and reported out unanimously.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows whether hearings were held on the bill or not.

Mr. FORAND. I told the gentleman I did not know. If there were hearings held I do not know. I do not believe there were.

Mr. GROSS. This applies to losses in what flood?

Mr. FORAND. In the floods during 1951.

Mr. GROSS. And where?

Mr. FORAND. Anywhere in the United States. Justice will apply in one place as well as another.

Mr. GROSS. But who is being reimbursed?

Mr. FORAND. Either the original owner of the beer, the wholesaler, or the retailer who has paid the tax to the Federal Government. He is not being paid for his merchandise, but only the tax that he has paid on the beer is to be refunded.

Mr. GROSS. I am opposed to this legislation because it does not cover others who have similar losses in floods throughout the country, who, for instance, may have paid taxes on storage batteries, tires, gasoline, and other products and commodities which were ruined.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FORAND. When this bill was up before, I asked the gentleman a plain question, whether he had introduced legislation providing for that, and he said he had not. I then told him that I would support any bill he would introduce to provide that type of refund, because I think it is simple justice. If the gentleman introduces legislation of that kind, I will go along with him.

Mr. GROSS. My response is simply this: Your committee considered this bill to pay a certain group of people for loss of taxes paid on one commodity that was lost in a flood. Why did you not include others who lost taxes paid upon merchandise or other commodities lost in floods?

Mr. FORAND. Because this bill was introduced for that one purpose. Anybody was free to offer amendments to include anything else. If I had a dealer in my district and someone would have approached me on that proposition, I would have introduced legislation to cover it.

Mr. GROSS. I have had no heavy losses in my district this year, but we do have a river that floods quite frequently. I contend that what is good for those benefited by this bill is good for everyone else who loses in a flood, and you should have brought under the terms of this proposal all others who lose in floods the products on which Federal taxes have been paid.

Mr. FORAND. I agree 100 percent that this is simple justice, and the gentleman has failed in his duty in not presenting that type of legislation to the committee or to the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I do not yield further. You have plenty of time to discuss that. You have failed in your duty to provide the House with a proper bill. This is discriminatory, and you know it is discriminatory, when you single out one group for reimbursement of Federal taxes.

I am not opposed to reimbursement for Federal taxes already paid upon a commodity lost in a flood—not at all; but I say that when you bring in this kind of bill you should make it applicable to all others who have been as unfortunate. You brought one bill in here at some time or other which reimbursed distillers for taxes paid on their products which were lost. That was discriminatory, and I am here this afternoon asking that the mistake not be made again.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentleman's position is fair. I do not however believe you should defeat this bill because there might be others, but the gentleman is entitled to his own opinion. Are those who pay taxes on things like gasoline, whose product has been completely destroyed not to have their taxes refunded?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly. There were many individual losses on the Missouri River this year, many of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes, there are plenty of losses; but I mean where taxes were paid and then the loss took place.

Mr. GROSS. There have been many cases along the Missouri River where grocery stores were flooded, where cigarettes and tobacco were lost, where service stations were flooded and stocks ruined or lost, on which things Federal taxes had been paid.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has furnished information on tobacco, cigarettes, and so forth. I can see that. But it seems to me that instead of defeating this particular bill—and I do not know who is going to benefit from that, I have no knowledge at all, to me it is just another piece of legislation that has come up, so to speak—that they have made out a case for it. The gentleman concedes that. I agree with the gentleman, so does the gentleman from Rhode Island. It seems to me, if I may suggest to my friend without getting into a controversy—and I shall not—that instead of trying to defeat this bill that next year a bill should be drafted to try to take care of those who have sustained similar losses.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. This bill, and I am sure the gentleman will agree with me thoroughly, this bill opens the door for everybody in a flooded area to come in and attempt to get tax relief. In my district there are thousands and thousands of people who lost their property on which they had already paid taxes. I have farmers whose houses were tipped over in the flood; their property is gone; their land is covered with from 2 to 8 feet of sand, their furniture is gone. If we are going to do this kind of thing and exempt one group, permitting them to get back their taxes, then we have no alternative but to make it applicable to everybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Can the gentleman designate where in this bill there is any relief for the western side of the State of Michigan, along the eastern shore of Lake Michigan for people whose cottages have been washed into the lake; do they get any relief, do they get any refund? This bill should not be one bit discriminatory.

Mr. GROSS. As far as I know they do not.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what is destroyed, somebody has paid taxes and the money has gone into the Treasury, and the Treasury has it, yet the people have lost their property. It is just an ordinary piece of fair play on the part of the Government toward the citizens. Any of these people who have losses and have paid taxes on property should be able to get a refund of those taxes. I think that is the policy of the Government and should be, to play fair with its own citizens. I know there are other losses, perhaps where people have paid their taxes, but all they have to do is to approach their Member of Congress, have a bill introduced, have the matter considered, and if they make out a fair case there is no reason why they should not get a refund.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

With reference to the losses along Lake Erie, there you have an international problem that is being dealt with by an international committee. I have great losses in my district as a result of the high water on Lake Erie and the storms driving the water in and tearing through the walls of houses, but that is an international problem so far.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the revenue department now have authority to refund taxes in instances of this kind without a law?

Mr. REED of New York. They may have.

Mr. JENSEN. Without additional law.

Mr. REED of New York. This is a safer procedure, where we have a hearing on a bill and determine just whether or not there is merit in the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman realize that if this bill is made law there can be thousands of like cases come before this Congress?

Mr. REED of New York. If they are just cases, why should not the Government be fair to its taxpayers?

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the revenue department already has authority under law to make these adjustments.

Mr. REED of New York. Perhaps the gentleman is right, I do not know, but, at any rate, it has been brought here in the regular legislative way.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Surely my good friend from New York is not suggesting that we come in whenever there is a loss out in our district and bring in a bill to the Ways and Means Committee. The Ways and Means Committee would be doing nothing but holding hearings on bills of this nature. I do not believe he wants to do that.

Mr. REED of New York. It is only in those cases where there has been a loss of property upon which the tax has been paid and the property upon which the tax has been paid is destroyed. That is entirely different from many other claims you are talking about where we have the procedure for bringing in the ordinary claims, and having them legislated on. But here is a case where the people have paid a tax to the Government and before they can realize the slightest profit the property is destroyed. It does not matter what the subject of the loss is.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H. R. 6241.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF TWO SUBMARINES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3337) to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the President is authorized to lend to the Government of the Netherlands two submarines for use by that Government until the construction of the first two of four submarines to be constructed by the Government of the Netherlands has been completed, but in no event beyond a period of 5 years. The President shall, prior to the delivery of the submarines to the Government of the Netherlands, conclude an agreement with that Government providing for the return of the submarines in accordance with the provisions of this act and in substantially the same condition as when loaned.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to loan temporarily to the Netherlands two submarines that are now a part of our reserve fleet in a moth-ball status. The bill requires that before they are delivered an agreement be reached with the Netherlands Government that they be returned to the United States at the end of a period of 5 years in the same condition as they were when they were loaned. The reason why we are loaning these ships to the Netherlands is because at this time they are building four submarines and they need these subs so that they can train their crews and build up their submarine forces. The British Government has loaned them four ships and they desire to get these additional two ships which will be converted to snorkel type. It will cost $2,450,000, and the money for the reconditioning will come out of Mutual Security Act funds already appropriated. So the result of it will be that at the end of 5 years we will have two submarines that have been reconditioned, modernized, and the crews of the Netherlands Navy will be able to operate modern up-to-date submarines when they complete the four new ones.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What will happen if during this period these submarines are on loan that one or both of them is lost; will the Dutch Government reimburse us?

Mr. VINSON. I will say that an agreement will be reached that they will be returned in the same condition. The agreement undoubtedly will cover such a loss.

Mr. GROSS. Suppose the submarine is at the bottom of the Atlantic, how could it be returned in the same condition?

Mr. VINSON. I will say that that will be taken care of in the agreement, because it will require that they be returned in the same condition as they were when they were loaned to them.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is the reconditioning work to be done in this country or in the Netherlands?

Mr. VINSON. It will be done in this country.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If we loan these two submarines to the Netherlands, do we have a program to replace them in order to supplement our fleet?

Mr. VINSON. No; we do not need them. They are coming out of the reserve, and we will be getting in return two modern submarines that we loaned to the Netherlands, the reconditioning of which will be paid for out of Mutual Security funds. The sum and substance of it is that we will increase our submarine strength by having two modern submarines; otherwise if this bill is rejected, they would lie in moth balls.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If we allow these to be loaned to the Netherlands, would we increase our national defense in that area?

Mr. VINSON. We certainly will, not only by the two that will be modernized, but by having four which the Netherlands are building.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, how do we build up our fleet simply by this transaction?

Mr. VINSON. This is not for the purpose of building up the fleet. The main objective is to enable the Netherlands to train their crews, and the result of such a transaction will be, as I have just stated, to strengthen our submarine program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that we are adding two submarines to the NATO fleet that we can use against Russia, if necessary?

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. It is also true that we have greatly expanded our submarine facilities in this country and are continuing to expand them very rapidly.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to what the chairman has said. This is a very simple, plain, and clear matter for even a person who runs to understand. It is proposed that we take two of the several submarines that we now have in moth balls and loan them to the Netherlands Government for a period not to exceed 5 years.

Whether you believe in NATO or not, the Netherlands is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and is one of our allies in our mutual defense effort. At the present time she is constructing four submarines. She will have to have submarines already built in order to train men to man the submarines she is building.

As the chairman has pointed out, we propose to take two submarines now in moth balls, with more or less antiquated equipment, and transfer them to the Netherlands, which will modernize them and turn them into snorkel submarines to give their own men training and at the same time to give protection to themselves and our other allies in the North Sea and in distant waters.

If we do not take these submarines out of moth balls, they will perhaps never be used, and eventually we will junk them without any benefit to us, to the Netherlands, or to anyone else.

I can see no reason why anyone should object to this particular measure, which will not only increase our own defense but will help our allies at this rather critical period in our history.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, here we go again around the mulberry bush, dishing out our money and material all over the world, this time in terms of submarines.

The gentleman from Missouri, and I admire him greatly, just said that these are critical times. If that is true we should be husbanding these submarines here at home. We had better be modernizing them and getting them ready for our own use. I am wondering if this is not the first installment we are paying on the recent visit made by the Queen and Prince Consort of Holland to this country.

It does not make any difference out of which pocket you take the money, you are still spending American dollars, not as hard as they used to be, but you are still spending American dollars to give a foreign country expensive equipment we may need very badly. It does not make any difference whether these submarines are modernized out of so-called mutual security funds or whether they are modernized out of funds appropriated to the defense establishment, it is American tax dollars you are spending, and the submarines go to a foreign country. There is not the slightest reason to believe that if one or both of these subs were lost while being used by the Dutch for training purposes that we would get back a thin dime.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the gentleman knows I have opposed most of these expenditures for foreign governments within the Mutual Security Act, but the fact is we have already voted these funds—perhaps not you nor I, but the Congress—and the money that will be used will come out of the mutual security funds that have already been appropriated. Why not use that money in making new submarines out of old submarines? That would help not only the United States but also our allies. It will add to our total strength.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and the mutual security spenders will be back next year with the hue and cry of "Foreigners first." They will be back with the cry, "We spent $2,500,000 on this; now we need $2,500,000 more because we spent that on reconditioning and modernizing submarines for the Navy."

Mr. SHORT. Congress will be here next year to face the situation that then exists.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and I repeat that we will be called upon to appropriate that much more money for so-called mutual security.

Mr. SHORT. But this money has already been appropriated, and these submarines will never be of any use or good to ourselves or our allies unless we take them out of mothballs and put them into action.

Mr. GROSS. What I cannot understand is why the Dutch Government cannot spend $2,500,000 of their own money to put them in shape. These submarines will be handed over to them eventually as a gift, or sold to them at 1 to 10 cents on the dollar.

Mr. SHORT. The Dutch Government is building four submarines now. The reason we should turn our two old submarines over to that Government is so that they can train men to man the submarines they are building.

Mr. GROSS. Why can they not spend the $2,500,000 we are bleeding out of our taxpayers?

Mr. SHORT. I think the economic strength of the Netherlands is not yet quite equal to that of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. If the Netherlands Government cannot stand a $2,500,000 expenditure to modernize a couple of submarines then I question their value as an ally. As a matter of fact, Dutch troops are conspicuous by their absence on the front lines in Korea.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Does not the gentleman agree that if the Netherlands does rehabilitate these submarines even though it is our money that is spent, we will gain that much time in having them converted to snorkel type?

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean to say that we could not recondition these two submarines in this country, if they were needed in active service now?

Mr. CLEMENTE. I do not. The Netherlands Government will use $2,000,000 of our own money to rehabilitate the submarines. The submarines are now in moth balls, with no immediate plan for rehabilitation and we are letting the Netherlands do the work, and thereby we will save time.

Mr. GROSS. If we need these subs let us spend the money to recondition them by using and paying American labor rather than Dutch labor. It ought to be obvious that American labor must be employed if our huge tax levies are to be met.

Mr. CLEMENTE. The submarines are presently in moth balls, and they are not now being considered to be rehabilitated at all.

Mr. GROSS. Then let us keep them there because we may need them very badly some day to defend the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CLEMENTE. We must have the new, superior type of snorkel submarines and if we can get it done now all the better.

Mr. GROSS. These can be made into the new, modern type, can they not? Is that not what the Dutch are going to do? They are going to make snorkel submarines out of them.

Mr. CLEMENTE. In any event, we will gain time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman realize these submarines are being loaned to the Dutch Government for the purpose of training crews? The Dutch are building ships and they have to have crews to man them. Therefore, we will have two additional submarines in commission, and likewise will have the benefit of the ships to be built by the Dutch Government.

Mr. GROSS. I make the prediction to you right here and now that within 5 years or less, there will be legislation introduced in Congress to give the Netherlands these submarines, or sell them to them for 1 to 10 cents on the dollar.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 130]

Abernethy	Hall,	Potter
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Allen, La.	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Regan
Armstrong	Herter	Richards
Bakewell	Heselton	Robeson
Bates, Ky.	Hillings	Ross
Beckworth	Holifield	Sabath
Belcher	Hope	Scott,
Bender	Jones, Mo.	Hugh D., Jr.
Bentsen	Kearney	Sheehan
Brehm	Kilburn	Sikes
Brown, Ohio	Kilday	Stigler
Buckley	Larcade	Sutton
Burdick	Lyle	Tackett
Carlyle	McMillan	Teague
Carnahan	Magee	Thompson, Tex.
Chelf	Mills	Trimble
Cole, N. Y.	Mitchell	Watts
Cooper	Morano	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Morris	Wickersham
Dorn	Morrison	Willis
Doughton	Morton	Withrow
Eaton	Moulder	Wolcott
Engle	Nelson	Woodruff
Evins	O'Hara	
Fenton	Poage	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 346 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING THE LOAN OF TWO SUBMARINES TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill S. 3337?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 187, noes 13.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 7993, was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to announce that the House restaurant will be open this evening for the convenience of the Members.

AUTHORIZING LOAN OF NAVAL PATROL VESSELS TO JAPAN

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 8222) to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan.

The clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to lend to the Government of Japan not to exceed 18 patrol frigates and 50 landing craft suitable for patrol purposes for use by that Government for an initial period of 5 years and upon request of the Government of Japan for an additional period of 5 years. The President shall, prior to the delivery of the vessels to the Government of Japan, conclude an agreement with that Government with respect to the loan of said vessels which shall include provisions for the return of the vessels in substantially the same condition as when loaned.

Mr. McCORMACK (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be printed at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up too much of the time of the House on this bill. I think it is generally understood by the membership. It was very carefully considered by the Committee on Armed Services, and has been unanimously reported by the committee. The Bureau of the Budget has interposed no objection to it. It is not going to cost any money. That is, there is no request for fresh appropriations. It merely provides for the loan for a period of 5 years of the specified number of small naval craft to the Japanese Government for the purpose of patrolling the coastal waters of Japan.

Mr. Speaker, the bill really boils down to just one issue. Unless we pass this bill, and authorize the loan of these vessels, thus permitting the Japanese naval and coast guard forces to make security patrols of their own coasts, then our own naval forces from Korea or elsewhere will have to be assigned to carry out that security task which is so vital to our own defense.

As I stated, that is about the only real issue presented in this legislation. The question is whether the Members of the House would prefer to have this coastal security job done by members of the Japanese Navy, or in the event this measure be defeated, to have that job done by American boys by taking from our forces in Korea, and our naval forces elsewhere, the necessary units to do this vital job. I urge that the House take favorable action.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true these ships will permit the Japanese Navy to organize a coast guard to carry on the security work the gentleman mentioned a moment ago, as well as lifesaving and general services to ships in distress?

Mr. PHILBIN. That is right. It will permit the normal coast guard functions to be performed by the Japanese.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the Members know, the United States has recently signed and ratified a treaty with Japan, and also entered into a mutual security pact with other nations in the Pacific. The able and admirable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] has clearly stated this proposition. Unless we turn these patrol vessels over to the Japanese, where they themselves have the manpower and the willingness and even the eagerness to do the job, then it will fall upon the United States Navy which is now taxed to its capacity in performing the many missions it has in different parts of the world to carry out this work.

Without saying too much in public, I would like to point out that the pressure from Russia from South Sakhalin on Japan and the Japanese people is greater than many people realize. It is highly important, we think, as well as our best military and naval leaders, that we take this action. I trust there will be no opposition to it.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize Members to present conference reports.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. YATES submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2440)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 29, 38, 64, and 65.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 34, 35, 37, 48, 50, and 61, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendmend insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$321,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$348,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$135,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment insert "$23300"; and the Senate agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$23,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,992,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$114,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$83,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$64,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$86,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$179,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$86,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$78,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$147,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$38,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,201,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$254,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,880,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,490,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,555,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,050,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,142,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,800,000" ; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,485,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,460,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,062,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,590,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,140,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$114,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$114,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$840,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,715,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$110,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$105,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,670,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$345,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$105,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,507,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$97,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,537,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,423,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,942,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,025,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$98,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 41, 51, 57, and 66.

SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LESTER C. HUNT,
HOMER FERGUSON,
JOE MCCARTHY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $10,000,000 as the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia instead of $8,600,000 as proposed by the House and $11,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $321,800 for the Executive Office instead of $316,000 as proposed by the House and $327,540 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $7,500 for ceremony expenses instead of $5,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $348,000 for the office of the Corporation Counsel instead of $340,000 as proposed by the House and $356,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates $135,400 for the Purchasing Division instead of $134,000 as proposed by the House and $136,750 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $23,300 for the Board of Tax Appeals instead of $23,000 as proposed by the House and $23,700 as proposed by the Senate.

FISCAL SERVICE

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $1,992,000 for salaries and expenses, Fiscal Service, in stead of $1,972,000 as proposed by the House and $2,012,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Provides that $28,150 shall be paid from the highway fund toward the Fiscal Service instead of $28,000 as proposed by the House and $28,300 as proposed by the Senate.

REGULATORY AGENCIES

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $114,100 for the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board instead of $111,000 as proposed by the House and $117,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $83,600 for the Board of Parole instead of $81,000 as proposed by the House and $86,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $64,400 for the Coronor's office instead of $64,000 as proposed by the House and $64,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $86,500 for the Department of Insurance instead of $83,000 as proposed by the House and $90,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates $179,000 for the Department of Weights, Measures, and Markets instead of $175,000 as proposed by the House and $183,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $86,000 for the License Bureau instead of $85,000 as proposed by the House and $87,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $78,500 for the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House and $82,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $253,000 for Office of the Recorder of Deeds instead of $249,000 as proposed by the House and $257,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $47,000 for the Poundmaster's Office instead of $45,000 as proposed by the House and $49,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $147,700 for the Public Utilities Commission instead of $147,000 as proposed by the House and $148,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates $38,100 for the Zoning Commission instead of $37,000 as proposed by the House and $39,200 as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Amendment No. 20: Inserts clarifying language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $19,201,600 for general administration, supervision, and instruction instead of $18,915,000 as proposed by the House and $19,315,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase allowed above the House figure, $36,600 earmarked specifically for auxiliary educational services.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $254,600 for vocational education under the George-Barden program instead of $247,000 as proposed by the House and $262,324 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $4,880,000 for operation and maintenance of buildings, etc., instead of $4,840,000 as proposed by the House and $4,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC LIBRARY

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $1,490,000 for necessary expenses instead of $1,440,000 as proposed by the House and $1,515,000 as proposed by the Senate.

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $1,555,000 for operating expenses instead of $1,550,000 as proposed by the House and $1,562,500 as proposed by the Senate.

METROPOLITAN POLICE

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $10,050,000 for necessary expenses instead of $9,750,000 as proposed by the House and $10,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Provides that $1,300,000 of the appropriation under amendment number 26 shall be derived from the highway fund instead of $1,280,000 as proposed by the House and $1,860,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FIRE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates $5,250,000 for necessary expenses instead of $5,150,000 as proposed by the House and $5,277,000 as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS' SERVICES

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $80,000 as proposed by the House instead of $120,000 as proposed the Senate.

COURTS

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $1,142,400 for District of Columbia courts instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,164,300 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount allowed above the amount of the House figure, it is the intention of the conferees that $30,000 shall be for jury service and $12,400 for the Juvenile Court.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $2,800,000 for general administration instead of $2,675,000 as proposed by the House and $2,915,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount approved it is the intention of the conferees that $25,000 shall be used for visiting nurses' activities.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $2,485,500 for operating expenses of Glenn Dale Sanatorium instead of $2,450,000 as proposed by the House and $2,521,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates $5,460,000 for operating expenses of Gallinger Hospital instead of $5,400,000 as proposed by the House and $5,532,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $676,875 for medical charities as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35: Permits not to exceed $10 per diem for in-patient care as proposed by the Senate instead of $9 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $4,062,500 for operating expenses instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates $85,000 for capital outlay as proposed by the Senate instead of $65,000 as proposed by the House.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates $100,000 for necessary expenses as proposed by the House instead of $109,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates $4,590,000 for agency services instead of $4,560,000 as proposed by the House and $4,615,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $3,140,000 for operating expenses, protective institutions, instead of $3,040,000 as proposed by the House and $3,236,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

PUBLIC WORKS

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates $80,000 for office of the chief clerk instead of $78,000 as proposed by the House and $81,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates $114,000 for Office of the Municipal Architect instead of $110,000 as proposed by the House and $118,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates $840,000 for Department of Inspections instead of $800,000 as proposed by the House and $879,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $1,715,000 for operating expenses, Electrical Division instead of $1,675,000 as proposed by the House and $1,755,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates $110,500 for capital outlay, Electrical Division instead of $78,000 as proposed by the House and $143,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $105,000 for the central garage instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $110,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Strikes out House language for snow removal. Similar language is inserted later in the bill under the appropriation for the Division of Sanitation.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $2,670,000 for operating expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions instead of $2,620,000 as proposed by the House and $2,722,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $5,056,000 for capital outlay, Street and Bridge Divisions, as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,374,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $1,220,000 for the Department of Vehicles and Traffic instead of $1,175,000 as proposed by the House and $1,265,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $345,000 for the Division of Trees and Parking instead of $325,000 as proposed by the House and $366,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $105,000 for Motor-Vehicle Parking Agency instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House and $120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates $4,507,000 for operating expenses, Division of Sanitation instead of $4,475,000 as proposed by the House and $4,538,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56: Provides that $97,500 of the appropriation in amendment number 55 shall be derived from the highway fund instead of $95,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement. This amendment establishes under the Division of Sanitation authority to expend funds for snow removal which was previously carried under operating expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions. In deleting Senate language in connection with the plan for snow traffic control the conferees avoid giving congressional approval to the plan that was announced last winter, believing that the plan was ill-conceived and is not practical or feasible.

Amendment No. 58: Appropriates $1,537,000 for operating expenses, Sewer Division, instead of $1,492,000 as proposed by the House and $1,582,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates $2,423,000 for operating expenses, Water Division, instead of $2,365,000 as proposed by the House and $2,480,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates $1,942,000 for operating expenses instead of $1,930,000 as proposed by the House and $1,953,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL GUARD

Amendment No. 61: Appropriates $115,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $105,000 as proposed by the House.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS

Amendment No. 62: Appropriates $2,025,000 for necessary expenses instead of $1,975,000 as proposed by the House and $2,092,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Amendment No. 63: Appropriate $98,000 for necessary expenses instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House and $108,200 as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 64: Permits not to exceed $55,000 to be used for automobile allowances as proposed by the House instead of $59,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 65: Permits not to exceed $15,000 to be used for expenses of attendance at meetings and payment of dues as proposed by the House instead of $17,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Reported in disagreement.

In the case of several appropriations having multiple activities, it is the concensus of the conferees that the items appealed by the District officials in their requests for restoration of amounts reduced by the House, represent laudable and worthwhile activities. The conferees, therefore, direct that those activities on which appeals were made, and for which the Senate approved increases, shall be undertaken within the funds herein provided and that other, less-meritorious activities be reduced if retrenchment is necessary in order to carry out the more desirable programs.

SIDNEY R. YATES,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
LOWELL STOCKMAN,
EARL WILSON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7216) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 23, line 12, insert "; and for plans and specifications for an Industrial Home School for Colored Girls to replace the National Training School for Girls, $86,000; in all, $896,000."

Mr. YATES. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I understand it is simply necessary to bring this back to the floor; that there is no disagreement among the conferees.

Mr. YATES. This is a unanimous report of the conferees. The gentleman from Minnesota is one of the conferees and he knows the House and Senate agreed on every item in the conference report, and that each of the managers on the part of the House as well as on the part of the Senate signed the report.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I simply wanted to bring that out. It is simply a technical maneuver that is necessary.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 51, page 31, line 9, insert: ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation and the appropriation 'Operating expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions,' shall be available for advance payments to Federal agencies for work to be performed, when ordered by the Commissioners, subject to subsequent adjustment."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57, page 33, line 13, insert "for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, and for marking electric-light poles incidental to traffic control during periods of ice and snow, in the discretion of the Commissioners."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "for cleaning snow and ice from streets, sidewalks, crosswalks, and gutters, in the discretion of the Commissioners."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 66: page 45, line 21, insert ", and hereafter the salary of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of grade GS-16 in the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 66, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", and the salary of the Budget Officer of the District of Columbia shall be at the rate of grade GS-16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2441)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 23, 25, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 36, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,370,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,756,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$75,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,465,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$29,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said anmendment insert:

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), $310,000, to remain available until expended; and the unobligated balance of the appropriation under this head in the Department of Agricultural Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 135, Eighty-second Congress) is hereby continued available, but not subject to the provision relating to the use of such appropriation included in such Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply to—

"(a) not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) positions filled from within the department;

"(c) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) seasonal and casual workers;

"(e) employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(f) employees working in field activities;

"(g) employees paid from funds for research;

"(h) employees of the crop and livestock reporting service;

"(i) employees paid from funds of the Federal Intermediate Credit Banks, Production Credit Corporations, and the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the General Fund of the Treasury;

"(j) employees paid from funds for marketing services;

"(k) employees of the Rural Electrification Administration;

"(l) employees of the Soil Conservation Service;

"(m) employees of meat inspection and other regulatory services;

"(n) employees of the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1953, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 per centum shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this provision shall again become operative."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 8 of paragraph (b) of said amendment, strike out the word "radio" and insert in lieu thereof "individual or network radio and television"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 11, 20, 21, 28, and 39.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
E. H. HEDRICK,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
HOMER FERGUSON,
(except as to No. 37),
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Marketing Act

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $5,250,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $5,260,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $2,370,500, instead of $2,320,500 as proposed by the House and $2,455,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree that funds for this purpose should be provided by transfer from the Department of the Interior in the future. The additional $50,000 is included in this bill for 1953, since the Interior Department appropriation bill for next year has been passed by both the House and Senate without funds for this work.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4—Payments to States, etc: Appropriate $12,441,208 as proposed by the House, instead of $12,453,708 as proposed by the Senate, and approve $62,500 for Alaska as proposed by the House, instead of $75,000 as proposed by the Senate. It is the opinion of the conferees that there should be no further expansion in research funds for Alaska until a more definite explanation of the additional research proposed is presented to Congress.

Amendment No. 5—Virgin Islands agricultural program: Appropriates $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7—Animal research: Appropriate $3,756,000, instead of $3,681,000 as proposed by the House and $3,816,000 as proposed by the Senate, and provide $75,000 for research on poultry diseases.

Amendment No. 8—Meat inspection: Appropriates $14,160,000, instead of $13,660,000 as proposed by the House and $14,260,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount is agreed to by the House conferees, despite their disappointment at the manner in which the historical pattern of assignment of inspectors was arbitrarily disrupted under the special provision inserted in the 1952 appropriation. In view of the amount approved by the conferees, this historical pattern should be reestablished by the Department and all regular inspection work should be done from appropriated funds.

Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $7,500,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $7,550,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in complete agreement that proposed research on development of products from pine gum should be carried on within the amount approved.

Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $11,465,000, instead of $11,330,000 as proposed by the House and $11,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. The additional funds are approved with the understanding that the Department will give appropriate attention to the various special projects inserted in the bill by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $2,700,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $2,759,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees insist that this reduction be made without reducing the staff of inspectors engaged in quarantine work on oriental fruit fly and other similar programs.

Control of forest pests

Amendment No. 13—Forest Pest Control Act: Appropriates $3,350,000, instead of $3,250,000 as proposed by the House and $3,625,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 14, 15, and 16—White pine blister rust: Appropriate $3,300,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $3,650,000 as proposed by the Senate, and approve amounts for the Forest Service and Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine as proposed by the House.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 17—National forest protection and management: Appropriates $29,550,000, instead of $25,400,000 as proposed by the House and $29,848,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House figure is to meet a special problem created by blown-down timber in western Oregon and southwestern Washington.

Amendment No. 18—Forest research: Appropriates $5,400,000, instead of $5,365,000 as proposed by the House and $5,415,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19—Forest roads and trails: Appropriates $11,000,000, instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. This increase is provided to meet the problem in Oregon and Washington described in amendment No. 17.

Amendment No. 20—Weeks Act: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 21—Special acts: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22—Cooperative range improvements: Appropriates $310,000, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the Senate, and includes a perfecting amendment.

Flood prevention

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $7,750,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. This amount is approved by the conferees with the understanding that a total of $7,000,000 will be used for works of improvement and $750,000 will be used for preliminary examinations and surveys and basin investigations. The conferees are of the opinion that more attention should be given to a comprehensive Nation-wide flood-prevention program in preference to continuation of surveys on individual watersheds.

Conservation and use of agricultural land resources

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $251,754,142 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25: Restores language proposed by the House and deleted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Authorizes $26,754,142 for administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 27: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in disagreement.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33: Appropriate $27,169,129 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $27,135,000 as proposed by the House, and authorize funds for Alaska and Puerto Rico in the amounts proposed by the Senate.

Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $615,000 as proposed by the House, instead of $682,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Research on strategic and critical agricultural materials

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $600,000, instead of $582,000 as proposed by the House and $625,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $109,391,154 as proposed by the Senate to restore capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation based on estimated volume of inventory on hand. Since this action will result only in an internal bookkeeping transaction in the Treasury Department, it should be considered a non-fund appropriation and should not be reflected in any official Government reports as an expenditure or receipt.

General provisions

Amendment No. 37—Section 410: Restores language as proposed by the House with certain perfecting amendments, and eliminates substitute language inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38—Section 411: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate with certain perfecting amendments as proposed by the House. The purpose of these amendments is to permit the Department to provide the same service for individual, nonnetwork radio programs as is provided for the Farm and Home Hour and similar programs.

Amendment No. 39—Section 412: Reported in disagreement.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
E. H. HEDRICK,
FRED MARSHALL,
CLARENCE CANNON,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7314) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on this bill at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 12, line 13, insert ", including not to exceed $15,000 for construction of an addition to the United States Cotton Ginning Branch Laboratory at Mesilla Park, N. Mex."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 24, line 2, insert:

"WEEKS ACT

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the act approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U. S. C. 513–519, 521), $75,000, to be available only for payment toward the purchase price of any lands acquired, including the cost of surveys in connection with such acquisition."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land over the objection of the local government concerned."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 24, line 13, insert:

"SPECIAL ACTS

"For the acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following acts authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from such receipts: Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, act of August 26, 1935 (Public Law 337), as amended, $39,830; Cache National Forest, Utah, act of May 11, 1938 (Public Law 505), as amended, $10,000; San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, Riverside County, Calif., act of June 15, 1938 (Public Law 634), as amended, $22,000; Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests, Nev., act of June 25, 1938 (Public Law 748), as amended, $10,000; Angeles National Forest, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 591), $20,000; Cleveland National Forest, San Diego County, Calif., act of June 11, 1940 (Public Law 589), $5,000; Sequoia National Forest, Calif., act of June 17, 1940 (Public Law 637), $34,850; in all, $141,680."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of a national forest: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of any land over the objection of the local government concerned."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 38, line 1, strike out "*Provided*, That hereafter the Commodity Credit Corporation may contract with cooperatives for classing cotton and may pay for such services an amount not in excess of the value of the samples."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary may contract with cooperatives furnishing classers and other facilities for classing cotton and may pay for such services an amount, some part of which may be in kind, not in excess of the value of the samples."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 39: Page 61, line 12, insert:

"SEC. 412. No appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be available to pay—

"(1) for personal services above basic rates of civilian administrative personnel (except field employees);

"(2) for transportation of things (other than mail); or

"(3) for travel of civilian employees (other than for field operation of action programs), more than 90 percent of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 412. Of the total amount made available in this act for personal services above basic rates of the civilian personnel, for transportation of things (other than mail), and for travel of civilian employees, the Secretary is authorized and directed on or before September 1, 1952, to cover into the surplus funds of the Treasury, or return to the capital funds affected, sums equal to 10 percent of the amounts included in the budget estimates for such purposes, less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to:

"1. employees working in field activities;

"2. employees paid from funds for research;

"3. employees of the crop and livestock reporting service;

"4. the administrative expense limitations for Federal intermediate credit banks and for production credit corporations, or to the appropriation for the Farm Credit Administration except the portion thereof provided by direct appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury;

"5. employees paid from funds for marketing services;

"6. employees of the Rural Electrification Administration;

"7. employees of the Soil Conservation Service;

"8. employees of meat inspection and other regulatory services;

"9. employees of the Forest Service."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. FOGARTY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2442)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 42, 43, and 44.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 31, 35, 36, 37, 39, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,495,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,860,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,673,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,498,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "$28,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$109,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,835,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$387,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$387,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 703. No part of the money appropriated by this Act to any department, agency, or corporation or made available for expenditure by any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 75 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2): *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to personnel engaged in the preparation or distribution of technical, scientific, or research publications, the reporting or dissemination of the results of research or investigations, the publishing of information or other work required by law to carry out the duties of such Department or agency other than work intended for press, radio and television services, and popular publications: *Provided further*, That of the funds herein appropriated for "Promotion and further development of vocational education", not more than $450,000 shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies provided for in this Act;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to employees engaged in law enforcement activities;

"(e) to employees of St. Elizabeths Hospital and Freedman's Hospital;

"(f) to employees of educational institutions;

"(g) to employees of the Vocational Rehabilitation Service of the District of Columbia;

"(h) to employees of the Public Health Service;

"(i) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(j) to employees paid wholly from trust funds, or funds derived by transfer from trust accounts, or to employees paid from appropriations of, or measured by, receipts;

"(k) to employees of the National Mediation Board;

"(l) to employees paid from funds appropriated for the Mexican Farm Labor Program;

"(m) to employees of the Bureau of Employees' Compensation;

"(n) to employees of the Children's Bureau; and

"(o) to employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 per centum shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this provision shall again become operative."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 4, 23, 26, and 28.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
H. M. KILGORE,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
ZALES N. ECTON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendment No. 2—Salaries and expenses: Provides that of the appropriation made available, $1,100,000 shall be available for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $5,495,000 instead of $5,390,000 as proposed by the House and $5,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Columbia Institution for the Deaf

Amendment No. 4: Reported in disagreement.

Food and Drug Administration

Amendment No. 5—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $5,600,000 as proposed by the House instead of $5,637,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Freedmen's Hospital

Amendment No. 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,860,750, instead of $2,831,500 as proposed by the House and $2,890,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriates $18,673,261, instead of $18,223,261 as proposed by the House and $19,123,261 as proposed by the Senate, and provide that the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed $18,498,261, instead of $18,048,261 as proposed by the House and $18,948,261 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have provided that not more than $450,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Amendment No. 9—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,900,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,928,000 as proposed by the House.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendment No. 10—Payments to States: Appropriates $22,250,000, instead of $22,500,000 as proposed by the House and $22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 11—Venereal diseases: Appropriates $9,850,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—Assistance to States, general: Appropriates $16,150,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,370,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 13—Communicable diseases: Appropriates $5,850,000, instead of $5,900,000 as proposed by the House and $5,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15—Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Alaska: Appropriate $1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House, and strike out, as proposed by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Senate, the provision in the House bill authorizing purchase of one passenger motor vehicle.

Amendment No. 16—National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: Appropriates $16,550,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $16,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17—National Cancer Institute: Appropriates $17,887,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $15,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18—Mental health activities: Appropriates $10,895,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19—National Heart Institute: Appropriates $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,600,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20—Retired pay of commissioned officers: Appropriates $1,150,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $3,150,000, instead of $3,300,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Saint Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,520,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,485,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23—Construction and equipment of treatment building: Reported in disagreement.

Social Security Administration

Amendment No. 24—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Appropriates $200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $210,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 25—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance: Provides that not more than $60,500,000 may be expended from the old age and survivors insurance trust fund, instead of $60,000,000 as proposed by the House and $61,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 27—Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: Appropriates $28,600,000, instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House and $27,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: Appropriate $185,000, instead of $200,000 as proposed by the House and $170,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with not to exceed $109,000 to be transferred from the old age and survivors insurance trust fund, instead of $113,000 as proposed by the House and $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of the Administrator

Amendment No. 31—Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator: Appropriates $950,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses, Division of Field Services: Appropriates $1,835,000, instead of $1,870,000 as proposed by the House and $1,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34—Salaries and expenses, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriate $387,500, instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $375,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with not to exceed $387,500 to be transferred from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $375,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36—Working capital fund: Appropriate $50,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $75,000 as proposed by the House, and provide language, proposed by the Senate, making it clear that reimbursements to such fund may be made in advance.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 37—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,317,668 as proposed by the House.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 38—Section 703: Provides that not in excess of 75 per centum of the amount budgeted for information specialists and related personnel shall be utilized for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate, but amended to exempt personnel engaged in certain types of information activities as agreed upon by the conferees.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—Sections 704 and 705: Correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 41—Section 706: Restores the provision of the House bill containing restrictions on the filling of personnel vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year 1953 in positions for which funds are provided by the bill, amended to change the list of exemptions as agreed upon by the conferees, and to provide that when the total number of personnel subject to this provision has been reduced to 90 per centum of the number provided for in the 1953 budget estimates, such 90 per centum shall constitute a ceiling for employment during fiscal year 1953.

Amendment No. 42—Section 707: Strikes out the Senate language providing that none of the funds contained in the act shall be used to acquire or operate any plant, facility, or property unless such action is authorized by Congress.

Amendment No. 43—Section 708: Strikes out the Senate language providing, with certain exemptions, for a 10 percent reduction in the amount budgeted for (1) travel of personnel, (2) personnel services of personnel above basic rates, and (3) transportation of things (other than mail).

Amendment No. 44—Section 709: Strikes out the Senate language providing for two additional positions at grade GS-17, one in the Department of Labor and one in the Federal Security Agency, without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 12, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the compensation of the Solicitor shall be $14,800 per annum."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 4: Page 10, line 20, insert:

"For the construction of a building or buildings to accommodate approximately 25 additional children, $90,000: *Provided, however*, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia enter into contract with Columbia Institution for the Deaf for education of all resident deaf children of the District of Columbia."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 27, line 3, after "expended", insert "of which not to exceed $300,000 shall be used for the construction, equipment, and furnishing of a chapel: *Provided*, That any part of this appropriation may be transferred to the General Services Administration."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: Page 27, line 21, after "fund", insert ", of which $60,000 shall be available until expended for the preparation of preliminary plans and specifications for a building for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, and may be transferred to the General Services Administration for such purposes."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 29, line 15, after "State", insert "*Provided further*, That, in computing allotments to States under sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such act for the current fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment to them as of July 1, 1952, shall be taken into account by (1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allotment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521 (a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section which remains available in the Federal Treasury for payment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously made to it under such section."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amend-

ment insert ": *Provided further*, That, in computing allotments to States under sections 502, 512, and 521 (a) of such act for the current fiscal year, balances in allotments previously made to States which remain available in the Federal Treasury for payment to them as of July 1, 1952, shall be taken into account by (1) adding the total of such balances to the appropriation herein made, and (2) subtracting from each resulting allotment to any State under section 502 (a), 512 (a), or 521 (a) any balance in any prior allotment under such section which remains available in the Federal Treasury for payment to it as of such date but with such adjustments as may be necessary to assure that this proviso does not operate to deprive any State of any balance in an allotment previously made to it under such section: *Provided further*, That no allotment for this or any succeeding fiscal year under such title V shall be available after the close of such fiscal year except as may be necessary to liquidate obligations incurred during such year."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT].

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this time to point out that there is a serious injustice being done to many of the States of the Union in receding to the Senate position on this particular amendment. It so happens that for the child-health programs and the maternal programs and the child-welfare programs in general many of these States which have used their funds carefully have insisted on the counties setting up proper programs, and as a result have established rather sizable unexpended balances. It is the purpose of this amendment to take away from those States their unexpended balances and put the money back into a central pool and redivide it by a formula which may or may not be exactly fair. Most of our larger States, particularly New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois, I feel, have done a very splendid job in conducting these programs, and the result is that the money which they thought technically and theoretically they had in the bank and on which they projected plans for future development of their programs, is now being taken away from them. Therefore I feel that the House is doing a very wrong thing in receding and concurring in the Senate position. I believe while it is too late to take effective action, that when this matter comes up again the States, that have projected programs which they will have to discontinue, should be given more favorable consideration under the formula, because very definitely the child-welfare and the maternal programs of our several States are being severely damaged by having these funds taken away from them and redistributed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of an increase in the pension for retired Federal employees, and although I would prefer the original bill, S. 2968, it becomes necessary under the circumstances because we are considering this under suspension of the rules to support the amendment to the bill which is before the House .

I think we should make it plain that it is the fault of the Federal Government, not the Federal employees, that the retirement fund is not actuarily sound, because the Federal Government has not made the necessary contribution to that fund for a number of years.

There is a question in my mind as to whether the fund has to be actuarily sound, that is, any more financially sound than the social-security fund which is certainly not on that basis, or the reserve fund of any of the major insurance companies which would find it very difficult to pay off all claims at one time.

We certainly know that all Federal employees are not going to retire at the same time, and that we should have funds on hand to meet all of the necessary obligations to pay an adequate annuity to those Federal employees who do retire, and in my opinion we have sufficient money in the fund at the present time to do this and to allow for the increase which this amendment will provide.

The Federal employees, and especially the postal employees who are among those in the lower-paid brackets, should not be penalized for the fault of the Federal Government for not contributing its share to this fund over the years.

Although this bill will partially correct that fault, it appears very necessary that a thorough, comprehensive, and searching investigation and study should be made by the Committee on Retirement for Federal Personnel which this bill creates in order to bring to the Congress all of the facts so that we can act more intelligently on permanent legislation providing for increases for annuity payments to retired Federal employees.

At the present time there are in the United States approximately 172,000 annuitants, many of them residing in my own State of California. Fifty-two percent of them receive less than $1,200 per annum. Forty-one percent receive over $1,200 but less than $2,000. Only 7 percent receive over $2,000 per year.

In view of the tremendous increase in the cost of living and the steady devaluation of the dollar which has resulted in the diminishing buying power of the dollar, the plight of the retired civil-service and postal employees who must depend upon inadequate annuities to provide shelter, necessary clothing, food, and medical care has become serious.

Many retirees who have devoted most of their lives to the service of the Government cannot afford adequate medicine, hospital, and other necessities attendant upon advanced age. Many others have been forced to lower their standard of living below the level which would provide them with the necessities of life.

There can be no doubt that the retired Federal and postal employees are certainly in need of this increase in the annuity they now receive, and that their long service entitles them to it, especially in view of the continued increase in living costs.

I urge that the amendment now before the House be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. SPEAKER, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during the 4 years that I have been chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Federal Security, I have come before this House on numerous occasions to ask for funds for public health.

I have urged the Congress to increase the amounts expended by the Federal Government for the health of our people because I believe that the vigor and vitality of our people as individuals are the keystone of our internal strength and security.

That belief, which I have propounded many times, has grown stronger as I have watched the results of our combined efforts in the field of medical research. Today I would like to report to you where we stand in medical research and tell you why I shall continue to come before you in the future to ask for funds to find the causes and cures of diseases that kill and cripple our population.

Let us look at the toll of illness in this country. At the present time, about one out of every two people who die from natural causes succumbs to heart disease. Over 9,000,000 suffer from some form of heart ailment. Unless we succeed in finding better diagnostic and treatment methods over 1,000,000 people will die from cancer in the next 5 years. I need not tell you about the serious impact of mental illness; it is estimated that more than half the complaints brought to doctors stem from mental and emotional disorders.

The loss of services of people suffering from these diseases and the cost of hospitalizing them is forbidding. Each year heart disease and related illness cost this country $850,000,000. Similarly, costs of cancer run into the billions. Patient care in mental hospitals exceeds $500,000,000 a year. To cite an example, Federal costs for mental illness in veterans' hospitals alone ran over $125,000,000 in 1949. It has been estimated that our Government spends over 85 cents of each dollar allotted for medical purposes on institutional care and less than 4 cents on research. Expenditures for care, which now exceed $1,500,000,000 annually, are outstripping those for control and prevention. We must reverse this proportion. We must build up our knowledge concerning fundamental physical and mental processes so that we can prevent serious illness and thereby reduce the number of cases which come into our hospitals.

During the last 5 years, medical research in this country has made unprecedented strides. Sometime we will look back on these years as a period more to be valued for its medical progress than for its atomic discoveries. And it has not been the Federal Government alone which has made this progress possible. The medical research expenditures of industry have grown by leaps and bounds since the end of World War II.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The scale of medical research in universities has expanded.

The money for research has come from the voluntary donations of millions of people, from the endowment income of universities and medical schools, from the income of drug and chemical companies, from union funds, and from donations by industry to foundations set up for medical research, as well as from tax revenues.

The variety of ways in which the funds for medical research have been raised is a most healthy sign. We have not seen just a Federal program, not an industrial program, nor a union program, but the kind of combined effort which Americans are capable of when they see a goal worth driving for.

I have recommended a steady growth in the medical research appropriations for the National Institutes of Health—the research arm of the Public Health Service. In consequence, there has been a steady expansion in medical and biological investigations in line with the general national growth which I have described. One of the most interesting developments of this period has been the evolution of the National Institutes of Health's Clinical Center from the idea stage to blueprints, to construction. My whole committee has felt a sense of accomplishment as we discussed with the physicians and scientists in charge of planning the ways in which this combined hospital and laboratory can move medicine ahead. The development phase of the clinical center is just about over and the first patients will move into the center next year.

The center will be primarily concerned with the long-term or chronic illnesses such as cancer, heart disease, mental disorders, neurological and metabolic diseases, and certain still-unconquered infectious diseases which are now the main focus of research at the National Institute of Health. Public benefit from research has sometimes been delayed because findings made in the laboratory could not receive rapid clinical evaluation. The clinical center provides the means for correcting this deficiency.

With increasing scientific specialization, clinical and basic laboratory studies have tended to become separated. The center will provide the positive, unifier approach to scientific investigation by which all sides of a problem can be considered at the same time.

The clinical center was planned as a new kind of building with an unprecedented volume of laboratory space to meet the needs of scientific investigation and at the same time provide the best possible hospital care for patients. It is a 14-story research hospital of 500 beds, with twice as much space for laboratories as for patient care.

It will be the largest institution of its kind in the world, giving scientists an exceptional opportunity to pool all their skills and resources in the attack on the major diseases.

But even more important for the country as a whole is the fact that the National Institutes of Health serve as the agent of Congress in distributing some $35,000,000 per year in grants to research and training centers. About one out of every $4 spent for research by the Nation's 79 medical schools comes from these funds.

These funds go right into medical research laboratories all over the Nation. They pay the salaries of scientists. They mean technicians and scientific helpers. They buy the tools and equipment that the scientists have to work with—the microscopes, the mice, the guinea pigs, the drugs, all the miscellaneous equipment that is necessary for laboratory work.

You may ask why this money is necessary. Modern medical research is expensive. There will probably always be the attic investigator and the genius who produces world-shaking ideas with just a pencil. Medical research is now at the stage where measurements must be precise. Individual molecules must be weighed. Particles shorter than the wave length of light must be measured. Substances so similar that they have long been assumed to be identical must be recognized and defined by extremely delicate techniques. For these operations, costly equipment is required—machines that can whirl mixtures at 30,000 revolutions a minute so as to separate the components by centrifugal force; delicate optical instruments that can identify substances by their effect on light; microscopes that use electron beams instead of light to see viruses and other tiny objects that are invisible under the strongest conventional microscopes.

I have seen these machines in operation in university and Government laboratories. They are the means of producing the facts to test ideas, to make observations to challenge old theories, to turn up the unexpected clue that leads to completely new lines of study. Without them, the modern medical research laboratory—more and more a laboratory of chemistry, physics, biochemistry, and biophysics—would be lost. This development is not unique to medical research. Industrial laboratories, which depend ultimately upon their ability to produce for profit, are also increasingly complex and expensive.

How does anybody really know whether this research is worth doing? Some of it may appear far-fetched and some of it does not immediately seem to have anything in particular to do with cancer, with heart disease or with any illness.

I think the answer is found in the results produced over the last 5 years. The strategic national post-war decision to commit more of our resources to medical research is paying off. I had the understanding, as a layman, that once a nerve, or the spinal cord, was cut or wasted away, it was gone for good, that nothing could be done about it. The medical research men now tell me that this standard medical doctrine may no longer be so. New drugs have been found—certain products of bacteria—that permit nerve cells of animals to rejoin after being cut. This has not yet happened in man, but the lead is there to be followed, and it will be tracked down if the funds, equipment and supplies for research are available. If this or another discovery of its kind works out, think of what it will mean to paraplegics—those incapable of movement because of cut spinal cords, for whom little now can be done.

In the mental health field—one of the toughest—great progress is being made. The deep depression that grips tens of thousands of men and women during the change of life need no longer be looked at as a hopeless disease. Two-thirds of the people who enter mental hospitals with this affliction now go home in a year. A few years ago, two-thirds of these pitiful people stayed in mental hospitals until they died.

Some time ago, one out of every ten mental patients in the South was committed to an institution because of the mental effects of pellagra. Now these cases are rare, because it has been found through resarch that deficiencies in diet are the root cause of the disease.

In heart disease—the greatest single cause of death in the country—advances have been dramatic and important. Research in heart surgery is moving ahead at an amazing rate. You have all heard of the life saving "blue baby" operation. Others equally spectacular are possible. Surgeons can cut and remove defective main heart arteries and graft a piece of normal artery removed from a dead person. They can reroute the blood flow in the main paths around the heart to bypass defective vessels. They can operate within the heart itself so that some types of defective valves can operate normally.

In another field of heart illness, an infection of the heart valves that used to be a signed death warrant, can now be recognized and treated so that 80 percent of the patients recover. By the most involved biochemical work being conducted simultaneously by medical laboratories from coast to coast, the conditions responsible for arteriosclerosis—apparently involving particular classes of large molecules found in the blood—are being tracked down. It may be a long time before this complicated problem is solved. The search will be costly. But the search is on, and the answer will be found if we have the same faith that the scientists have and support them in their endeavor.

The stakes in heart-disease research are high. Over 700,000 people—roughly the total population of my State of Rhode Island—died last year of some form of heart disease.

In cancer, even though experts say that a long and rough road still has to be traveled, solid progress is being made. Patients are now safely undergoing cancer operations who would have died 5 years ago. New means of readying cancer patients for operations by changing their body chemistry have been developed. New means of controlling hemorrhage chemically are available.

In addition to surgery, our intensive search for chemicals and drugs that will retard the development of cancers has been rewarded. For example, one of the most poisonous war gases—nitrogen mustard—will restore to health patients with cancer of the blood-forming organs. They are not cured, but they can

go back to their families and their jobs for months or even years. A systematic large-scale hunt for other substances that will be even more effective in other types of cancer is now on. This great search—a collaborative effort of university, governmental, and industrial laboratories—represents a major investment in time, effort, and money. So far, 142 separate groups have examined over 11,000 compounds.

Scientists know more now about chemicals that destroy cancer cells than they knew 15 years ago; they know about chemicals and products of living organisms that kill infection—such as the sulfa drugs and the antibiotics. It is not visionary at all, but rather conservative, to expect more startling advances during the next 15 years in medicine than we have seen in the past 15 years.

These years ahead should be a golden age for medicine. Anyone who has had a chance to contribute even in a small way to this national achievement is a fortunate man. Personally, I feel that what I have been able to do to help medical research is more satisfying to me, more valuable to our citizens, and of greater benefit to the Nation than any other single endeavor of mine as a Member of this House. I shall continue to devote my energies to these efforts in the confidence that you, my colleagues, and I have it within our grasp to do much for the people of America that cannot be done by other means.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have three legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2443)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 40, 42, 98, 103, 105, 123, 131, and 132.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 28, 67, 76, 77, 79, 87, 97, 99, 101, 119, 124, 127, and 129, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$59,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,461,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,475"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,590"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,509,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$479,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$321,450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,408,460"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$88,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$202,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,085,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$142,235"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,053,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,062,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,960,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"Executive direction and staff operations: For necessary expenses in the performance of executive direction and staff operations for activities under the control of the General Services Administration; including not to exceed $97,385 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; $4,140,750.

"Public Buildings Service: For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at the rate of $16,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed $177,335 for expenses of travel; $101,046,030: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

"Federal Supply Service: For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as provided by law; including not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $77,600 for expenses of travel; and the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; $2,154,100.

"National Archives and Records Service: For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law; including preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and not to exceed $23,340 for expenses of travel; $4,868,200."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$37,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$74,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$133,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,536,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$160,425"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$237,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,606,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $455,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of thirty-five thousand dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of thirty-five thousand to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$91,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$230,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,319,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$163,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$974,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$112,620"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$709,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$240,050"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$48,586,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$24,940"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$118,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$235,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,407,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$101,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "not to exceed $78,125 for expenses of travel, National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management; not to exceed $408,925 for expenses of travel, State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,875 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $45,000 shall be available for expenses of travel;"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,225"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,419,500"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,800"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,240,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the same proposed by said amendment insert "$5,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,291,375"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,546,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,530,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$843,382,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$108,791,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$734,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the date named in said amendment insert "July 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,617,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$145,525"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$8,655,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "four hundred"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,921,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,041,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$7,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$25,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,584,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "and $320,200 for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence of cadets at State marine schools, to be paid in accordance with regulations established pursuant to law (46 U. S. C. 1126 (b)); $663,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,509,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$138,105"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 108: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 108, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That administrative expenses not under limitation for the purposes set forth in the budget schedule for the fiscal year 1953 shall not exceed $151,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 109: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows. In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$22,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions shall not exceed $1,775,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 112: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,150"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$146,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 114: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That expenditures for nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed $28,870,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,534,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$697,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $32,722,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 118: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 118, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "not to exceed $142,500 of"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 120: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 120, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,755"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number named in said amendment insert "one"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended by adding at the end thereof and before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That this section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 125: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 126: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 126, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "404"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, 19, 37, 46, 48, 68, 86, and 130.

ALBERT THOMAS,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
NORRIS COTTON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
LISTER HILL,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Emergency Fund for the President

Amendment No. 1—National defense: Reported in disagreement.

Bureau of the Budget

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $3,461,200, instead of $3,314,400 as proposed by the House and $3,608,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $59,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $54,000 as proposed by the House and $64,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Council of Economic Advisers

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $225,000, as proposed by the Senate instead of $208,900 as proposed by the House; provide that the appropriation shall remain available until March 31, 1953, as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to $2,475, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,750 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

American Battle Monuments Commission

Amendment No. 7—Expenses of travel: Authorizes the use of $11,590 for this purpose, instead of $10,300 as proposed by the House and $12,865 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 8 and 9—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11—Construction of memorials and cemeteries: Reported in disagreement.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14—Operating expenses: Strike out the provision of the House authorizing the purchase of automobiles, as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $2,509,350 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,290,500 as proposed by the House and $2,788,200 as proposed by the Senate; and consolidate funds for program direction and administration personnel into one fund as proposed by the Senate instead of providing separate limitations for the District of Columbia and the field as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 15, 16, and 18—Plant and equipment: Authorize the purchase of plant and equipment, as proposed by the Senate; and the purchase of aircraft, including the purchase of not to exceed 225 passenger motor vehicles, as proposed by the Senate; and except from audit contracts with a foreign government, and contracts for source material with foreign producers, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 19—Plant and equipment: Reported in disagreement.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $479,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $426,000 as proposed by the House and $532,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21—Payment to civil-service retirement and disability fund: Appropriates $321,450,000 for payment to the fund, instead of $321,000,000 as proposed by the House and $321,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendments Nos. 22 and 23—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $6,408,460, instead of $6,108,460 as proposed by the House and $6,708,460 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $88,525 for expenses of travel, instead of $78,700 as proposed by the House and $98,350 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are advised that the Federal Communications Commission, under the provisions of title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, are authorized to levy fair and equitable fees in connection with the issuing of licenses. The conferees, therefore, request the Commission to give prompt attention to the matter with a view to levying such fees at the earliest practicable date.

Federal Power Commission

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,085,700, instead of $3,935,700 as proposed by the House and $4,235,700 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $302,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $225,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,053,800, instead of $3,978,800 as proposed by the House and $4,128,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $142,235 for expenses of travel, instead of $126,470 as proposed by the House and $158,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Accounting Office

Amendment No. 28—Salaries: Appropriates $30,100,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $28,600,000 as proposed by the House. The conference committee is in agreement that foreign offices should be established at strategic points abroad. It is the understanding of the conferees that a sum sufficient to enable the General Accounting Office to initiate this program in the fiscal year 1953 shall be used for this purpose.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriate $1,960,000, instead of $1,635,000 as proposed by the House and $2,085,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,062,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 31—Operating expenses: The conferees have approved the House version of appropriation structure for this activity, which consists of separate appropriations and appropriation paragraphs for executive direction and staff operations; Public Buildings Service; Federal Supply Service; and National Archives and Records Service; in lieu of a lump-sum appropriation under the heading "Operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate. The action of the conferees provide a total increase of $3,000,000 in excess of the total provided by the House for these four items, and this sum has been distributed proportionately. Adjustments also have been made to provide funds for expenses of travel somewhat in excess of the limitations proposed in the House bill. In accepting the appropriation structure as contained in the House bill the conferees recognize that a few additional auditors may be required to keep accounts under the four separate appropriations, and due consideration will be given to any request for such personnel (not in excess of 10) which may be submitted at a later date.

Amendment No. 32—Emergency expenses: Authorizes the use of $24,300 for expenses of travel, instead of $21,600 as proposed by the House and $27,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 33 and 34—Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $37,550 for expenses of travel, instead of $33,400 as proposed by the House and $41,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35 and 36—Repair, preservation, and equipment, outside the District of Columbia: Appropriate $9,250,000, instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorizes the use of $74,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $66,000 as proposed by the House and $83,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Expenses, general supply fund: Appropriate $14,536,500, instead of $13,998,000 as proposed by the House and $15,075,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $133,900 for expenses of travel, instead of $119,000 as proposed by the House and $148,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of 5 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House instead of 12 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42—Strategic and critical materials: Authorize the use of $160,425 for expenses of travel, instead of $142,600 as proposed by the House and $178,250 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the House. No funds have been allowed for the construction of storage facilities and it is the decision of the conferees that such facilities shall be secured through the rental of such space. In the event an emergency should arise in this connection which may demand construction of facilities, approval of the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations shall be secured for the expenditure of funds for such purpose.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,606,000, instead

of $3,606,000 as proposed by the House and $5,606,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $237,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $210,000 as proposed by the House and $265,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation on nonadministrative expenses proposed by the House, amended and increased from $374,000 to $455,000.

Amendment No. 46—Defense Community Facilities and Services: Reported in disagreement.

Public Housing Administration

Amendment No. 47—Annual contributions: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate and restores the proposal of the House amended to limit during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of not to exceed 35,000 dwelling units.

Amendment No. 48—Annual contributions—occupancy of housing units by subversives: Reported in disagreement. In applying the principles involved in connection with the amendment to be recommended by the Managers on the part of the House, relating to the housing units under the Public Housing Administration, it is urged that the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration also, insofar as practicable, apply the same principles in the insuring and guaranteeing of loans for the construction and financing of other types of housing.

Amendment No. 49—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $8,000,000, instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Indian Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 50 and 51—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $91,400, instead of $89,300 as proposed by the House and $93,500 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $2,275 for expenses of travel, instead of $2,000 as proposed by the House and $2,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendments Nos. 52 and 53—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $9,319,500, instead of $8,935,000 as proposed by the House and $9,704,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize $230,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $205,000 as proposed by the House and $256,300 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Railroad safety: Appropriate $974,500, instead of $907,000 as proposed by the House and $1,042,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $163,050 for expenses of travel, instead of $145,000 as proposed by the House and $181,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 56 and 57—Locomotive inspection: Appropriate $709,500, instead of $664,000 as proposed by the House and $755,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $112,620 for expenses of travel, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $125,240 as proposed by the Senate.

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics

Amendments Nos. 58 and 59—Salaries and expense: Appropriate $48,586,100 for this purpose, instead of $46,522,200 as proposed by the House and $50,650,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $240,050 for expenses of travel instead of $213,400 as proposed by the House and $266,700 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Amendment No. 60—Land acquisition: Authorizes the use of $24,940 for necessary expenses in connection with land acquisition, instead of $22,375 as proposed by the House and $27,500 as proposed by the Senate.

National Science Foundation

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $4,750,000, instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $6,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $118,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $95,000 as proposed by the House and $142,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Renegotiation Board

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $5,407,800, instead of $4,907,800 as proposed by the House and $5,907,800 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $235,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $180,000 as proposed by the House and $291,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 65—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $101,250 for expenses of travel, instead of $90,000 as proposed by the House and $112,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $36,772,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,597,000 as proposed by the House; and restores the language of the House placing limitations on the several activities of this agency including limitations on funds available for the use of travel adjusted to provide a compromise figure in each instance on the funds which may be used for travel expense.

Amendment No. 68: Reported in disagreement.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendments Nos. 69 and 70—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $2,419,500, instead of $2,274,000 as proposed by the House and $2,565,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize use of $10,225 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,100 as proposed by the House and $11,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 71 and 72—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriate $1,240,550, instead of $1,181,100 as proposed by the House and $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $1,800 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,600 as proposed by the House and $2,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Subversive Activities Control Board

Amendment No. 73—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes the use of $5,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $4,000 as proposed by the House and $7,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tariff Commission

Amendments Nos. 74 and 75—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate $1,291,375, instead of $1,194,750 as proposed by the House and $1,388,000 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $13,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $12,000 as proposed by the House and $15,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 76, 77, 78, and 79: Appropriate $186,027,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $171,270,000 as proposed by the House; authorize the purchase of 220 automobiles of which 150 shall be for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of 110 for replacement only as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $1,546,650 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,375,000 as proposed by the House and $1,718,300 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the provisions of the House requiring a performance bond or satisfactory warranty in connection with the purchase of coal, and placing a limitation on funds available for personal services, as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: Appropriate $843,382,260, instead of $839,382,260 as proposed by the House and $877,382,260 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $3,530,700 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,138,400 as proposed by the House and $3,923,000 as proposed by the Senate. Conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances, and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses, and dietitians.

Amendment No. 82—Hospital and domiciliary facilities: Appropriates $108,731,000, instead of $153,600,000 as proposed by the House and $66,316,000 as proposed by the Senate. The sum of $42,475,000 restored by the conferees is to provide funds to enable the Veterans' Administration to initiate construction of two neuropsychiatric hospitals, one in Southern California and one in Ohio.

Amendment No. 83—Major alterations, improvements, and repairs: Appropriates $8,750,000, instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $9,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendments Nos. 84 and 85—Administrative expenses: Appropriate $734,550, instead of $683,000 as proposed by the House and $786,100 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the use of $9,000 for expenses of travel, instead of $8,000 as proposed by the House and $10,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 86—Reduction in appropriation, National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission: Reported in disagreement.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 87—Persons engaged in personnel work: Exempts from the provisions of the section persons engaged on work as committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime activities

Amendment No. 88—Operating-differential subsidies: Inserts the language of the Senate amendment in lieu of the proposal of the House in connection with the number of voyages for subsidized operators amended to be effective as to new operators on July 1, 1952, instead of July 1, 1951, as proposed in the Senate amendment.

Amendments Nos. 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, and 96—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate a total of $15,617,850 for such purpose, instead of $14,375,700 as proposed by the House and $16,860,000 as proposed by the Senate; provide $8,655,850 for administrative expenses, instead of $8,099,700 as proposed by the House and $9,212,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $145,525 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $130,700 as proposed by the House and $160,350 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the transfer of funds from the vessel operations revolving fund for the employment of 400 employees, instead of 300 as proposed by the House and 500 as proposed by the Senate; provide $1,921,000 for maintenance of shipyard facilities, operation of warehouses, etc., instead of $1,764,000 as proposed by the House and $2,078,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $2,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $2,200 as proposed by the House and $2,775 as proposed by the Senate; and provide $5,041,000 for reserve fleet expenses, instead of $4,512,000 as proposed by the House and $5,570,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which $7,490 shall be available for expenses of travel, instead of $6,650 as proposed by the House and $8,325 as proposed by the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, and 103—Maritime training: Appropriate $3,584,000, instead of $2,795,200 as proposed by the House and $3,990,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $2,474,100 for personal services as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,881,600 as proposed by the House, and eliminate the provision of the Senate excluding from the foregoing amount for personal services the pay of cadet midshipmen; authorize the use of $2,500 for contingencies for the Superintendent as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,500 as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $25,625 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,500 as proposed by the House and $30,750 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the transfer of $72,500 to the Public Health Service as proposed by the Senate, instead of $55,680 as proposed by the House; and eliminate the proposal of the Senate providing for pay of cadet midshipmen, restoring in lieu thereof the House provision for uniforms and textbooks.

Amendment No. 104—State marine schools: Appropriates $663,200, instead of $643,400 as proposed by the House and $1,092,050 as proposed by the Senate; and eliminates the proposal of the Senate providing for the pay of cadet midshipmen at $65 per month and $275 per annum for subsistence, restoring the provision of the House bill providing for allowances for uniforms, textbooks, and subsistence, amended to provide $320,200, instead of $300,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 105: Restores the provision of the House relating to payment for vessels requisitioned or insured by the Government and lost while so requisitioned or insured.

TITLE III—CORPORATIONS

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendments Nos. 106, 107, and 108—Federal National Mortgage Association: Authorize the use of $3,509,500 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $3,371,425 as proposed by the House and $3,647,600 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $138,105 for expenses of travel, instead of $122,760 as proposed by the House and $153,450 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on administrative expenses not under limitation, amended to fix such limitation at $151,000.

Amendment No. 109—Office of the Administrator (prefabricated housing): Authorizes the use of $6,750 for expenses of travel, instead of $6,000 as proposed by the House and $7,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 110 and 111—Home Loan Bank Board: Authorize and use of $22,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $20,000 as proposed by the House and $25,000 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses for examination of Federal- and State-chartered institutions, amended to fix such limitation at $1,775,000.

Amendment No. 112—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Authorizes the use of $4,150 for expenses of travel, instead of $3,700 as proposed by the House and $4,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments No. 113 and 114—Federal Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $146,125 for expenses of travel, instead of $130,000 as proposed by the House and $162,250 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expense, amended to fix such limitation at $28,870,000.

Amendments Nos. 115, 116, 117, and 118—Public Housing Administration: Authorize the use of $11,534,000 of available funds for administrative expenses, instead of $10,455,000 as proposed by the House and $12,613,000 as proposed by the Senate; authorize the use of $697,500 for expenses of travel, instead of $620,000 as proposed by the House and $775,000 as proposed by the Senate; restore the limitation of the House on nonadministrative expenses, amended to fix such limitation at $32,722,080; and authorize the use of $142,500 of available funds for expenses in connection with the sale of certain properties, instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House.

Inland Waterways Corporation

Amendments Nos. 119, 120, and 121—Administrative expenses: Authorize the use of $481,200 of available funds for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $467,330 as proposed by the House; authorize the use of $10,755 for expenses of travel, instead of $9,560 as proposed by the House and $11,950 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the purchase of one and hire of passenger motor vehicles, instead of the purchase of two such vehicles as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 122—Limitation on annual leave, civilian officers and employees: Restores the matter stricken out by said amendment, adding thereto a provision to the effect that the section shall not be applicable to annual leave accumulated prior to January 1, 1952.

Amendment No. 123—Corrects a section number.

Amendment No. 124—Limitation on number of automobiles operated at seat of government: Strikes out the proposal of the House in this connection.

Amendments Nos. 125 and 126—Correct section numbers.

Amendment No. 127—Restriction on compensation of persons acting as chauffeurs: Inserts the proposal of the Senate to except persons on duty in a foreign country.

Amendment No. 128—Reduction in personnel: The conference committee has omitted the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment. The conferees hereby direct the agencies involved under the provisions of this amendment to apply the principles of the Jensen amendment in reducing personnel to a point where they will come within the dollar limitations provided in the bill; and by so doing the principles of the Jensen amendment will soften the reductions required to enable the agencies to operate within the amount of the appropriations provided in the bill as finally enacted.

Amendment No. 129—Fixes a ceiling of $1,600 which may be paid for the acquisition of passenger motor vehicles, with certain exceptions, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 130—Limitation on funds available for personnel engaged in information, publicity, editorial and similar work: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 131—Limitation on funds available for pay above basic rates and for transportation of things: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate.

Amendment No. 132: Corrects a section number.

ALBERT THOMAS,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
NORRIS COTTON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, under the agreement previously entered into, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 7072, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. HINSHAW. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain what was done with the amendment in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; I will attempt to explain that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of our distinguished friend from California, I believe the item in which he is interested is not in the Independent Offices bill now under consideration; it is in the big supplemental bill that is now pending at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. HINSHAW. This is not the bill we considered the other day?

Mr. THOMAS. The other body has not acted on it yet, and it is not in conference at this time.

As far as this bill is concerned, Mr. Speaker, we have four items which were the basis for recommittal of the previous conference report. The other body was quite firm in its opposition on housing. It indicated that it was willing to reduce the 35,000 houses to 25,000 and indicated it might go further if the House would recede from its limitations, which limitations keep the number of units under the control of the Congress. The conferees decided that the language was worth far more than the 35,000 units, and we receded and concurred in their viewpoint.

We added two hospitals at a cost of approximately $42,475,000, one in Ohio and one in California. They are 1,000-bed NP hospitals.

We increased the cost of operating expense for maritime training schools approximately $350,000 in excess of the previous conference agreement.

We put language in the report directing that agencies, in making reductions in personnel, use the principles laid down in the Jensen amendment.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make just a short statement on the part of the managers for the minority. We did not sign the report when it came back the first time, but we have signed this report. This is a compromise. I believe it is the best compromise we could obtain at the present time, and the minority members recommend its adoption.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of this conference report.

I voted to recommit the previous report because in no other way could there be assured a reasonable number of housing units and reasonable consideration for our neuropsychiatric veterans who require hospital construction for their specific disabilities.

This conference report is much more satisfactory than the previous one.

I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the Members thoroughly understand exactly what we are doing in this conference report and exactly what the issue is so far as public housing is concerned.

It will be recalled that on last March 21 the House by a substantial majority voted to limit the number of public housing units to be started during the next fiscal year to 5,000. The bill went to the Senate and there the number was increased to 45,000. The measure then went to conference and the conferees agreed on 35,000.

When the conference report came to the House on June 26, the House refused to accept it. A motion to recommit was approved and the conferees were instructed to insist on the 5,000 figure. So a further conference was held and a report on the outcome is now before us. It again calls for 35,000 units.

That means, Mr. Speaker, that for us to now accept that action of the conferees would be a complete surrender of what the House has done on two separate occasions. We are urged to act favorably because we are approaching adjournment, and we are told that the limitation in the report with respect to commitments in future years is a sort of acceptable compromise. But that limitation language was inserted in the original House bill. It has been in the House bill all the time.

To approve the 35,000 figure now, with a restriction against more than that number in future years, is probably to set a minimum of new units to be commenced each year in the future, of 35,000. That means more and more of this socialized housing in America. It means the advocates of public housing will become more and more entrenched with this socialistic and exorbitantly expensive program. It does not strike at the evil of socialized housing. It endorses it. It is not stopping anything. It is approving and encouraging it.

My colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] on June 26, as the RECORD will show, admitted that public housing is going to cost the American taxpayers $13,500,000,000, and he said "it is 100 percent contribution." But in addition to that, according to the Public Housing Administration, there is a net local contribution, in the form of tax exemption of all public housing which amounts to half of the Federal subsidy. Moreover, the figure does not include the heavy administrative cost of this agency, which will run into hundreds of millions of dollars over the 40-year period. And let no one forget that as this socialistic program progresses the demand will be made for an increase in the present ceiling of 810,000 units.

And let us not forget that the bonds that are sold to finance this public housing program are tax-free. No income taxes are paid on them. It is a juicy deal for the tax dodgers, and it is a rank discrimination against the overburdened American taxpayers who have to pay taxes on their investments.

Mr. Speaker, as I pointed out before, according to the Public Housing Administration itself, each of these units will cost $12,163.20 in direct Federal subsidies. In addition, the local contribution amounts to half of that amount. The total cost of each unit will be $18,244.80. Now, what is involved in this 30,000 units that has been added to the 5,000 units endorsed by the House? The total Federal subsidy on the 30,000 units will be $364,896,000. The total local cost is half of that, or $182,448,000, making a grand total of $547,344,000.

In other words by your vote here today you will decide whether you want to save the American taxpayers that amount of money.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder what Members' attitude would be if we were appropriating $500,000,000 to purchase collectivist farms, to be owned by the Government and rented to so-called low-income farmers at half the rental values? Yet, that is precisely what is proposed except that it happens to apply to housing rather than farms. But what is the difference? Both are socialistic. Both put the Government into a competing business with private enterprise. Both would create political Trojan horses for the management, the operators, who through selection of tenants and sites for the projects could control votes and be vested with political power and influence.

That kind of influence is now, at this hour, being exercised freely by certain public housing managers with respect to the voting of tenants. It has been done in California. It has been done in New York. It has been done in Florida, and it has been done in many places. And it will be done more and more in the future. Local cities have no control whatever over these projects. They are under the exclusive control, once they are created, of the housing authorities and the Federal Government through the Public Housing Administration.

This program is undoubtedly the most socialistic undertaking, of a major nature, ever undertaken by the Federal Government in this country. It is a burden the American taxpayers can ill afford to carry, and it is a deviation from our free enterprise system that we can ill afford to perpetuate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer a motion to recommit this conference report with instructions to our conferees to insist upon the House position of limiting the number of units to be started during the next year to 5,000. Every Member is entitled to be recorded on this all-important issue.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. FISHER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FISHER moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 7072) to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the House provisions on the number of housing units to be commenced in fiscal year 1953, including the limitation on the number of units that may be commenced in subsequent years—item 47.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 51, noes 102.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 160, nays 194, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—160

Aandahl	Elston	McCulloch
Abbitt	Fallon	McDonough
Adair	Fernandez	McGregor
Allen, Calif.	Fisher	McIntire
Allen, Ill.	Ford	McMillan
Andersen, H. Carl	Gary	McVey
	Gathings	Mack, Wash.
Anderson, Calif.	Gavin	Mahon
Andresen, August H.	George	Martin, Iowa
	Goodwin	Martin, Mass.
Arends	Graham	Meader
Barden	Greenwood	Miller, Md.
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Miller, Nebr.
Beamer	Gwinn	Miller, N. Y.
Berry	Hale	Murray
Betts	Hall, Leonard W.	Nicholson
Bishop		Norblad
Blackney	Halleck	Norrell
Bonner	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Ostertag
Bramblett	Harrison, Wyo.	Patten
Brooks	Harvey	Phillips
Bryson	Herlong	Poulson
Budge	Hill	Radwan
Buffett	Hinshaw	Rankin
Burleson	Hoeven	Redden
Busbey	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Bush	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes	Hunter	Rees, Kans.
Chatham	Ikard	Rivers
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Tex.
Church	James	Ross
Clevenger	Jarman	St. George
Colmer	Jenison	Sasscer
Cooley	Jenkins	Schenck
Cox	Jensen	Scrivner
Crawford	Johnson	Scudder
Crumpacker	Jones, Hamilton C.	Shafer
Cunningham		Short
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Simpson, Ill.
Dague		Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Ga.	Keating	Smith, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Miss.
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Smith, Va.
D'Ewart	Latham	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	LeCompte	Springer
Dondero	Lovre	Stanley
Doughton	Lucas	Stockman
Durham	McConnell	Taber

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Talle	Vorys	Williams, Miss.
Teague	Vursell	Wilson, Tex.
Thompson, Mich.	Weichel	Winstead
	Werdel	Wood, Ga.
Vail	Wharton	Wood, Idaho
Van Pelt	Wheeler	
Velde	Whitten	

NAYS—194

Addonizio	Frazier	Miller, Calif.
Andrews	Fugate	Morano
Anfuso	Fulton	Morgan
Angell	Furcolo	Multer
Aspinall	Gamble	Mumma
Auchincloss	Garmatz	Murdock
Ayres	Golden	O'Brien, Ill.
Bailey	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Baker	Gore	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baring	Granahan	O'Konski
Barrett	Granger	O'Neill
Battle	Grant	O'Toole
Beall	Green	Passman
Bennett, Fla.	Gregory	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Hand	Patterson
Blatnik	Hardy	Perkins
Boggs, Del.	Harris	Philbin
Boggs, La.	Hart	Polk
Bolling	Havenner	Preston
Bolton	Hays, Ark.	Price
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	Priest
Boykin	Hedrick	Prouty
Bray	Heffernan	Rabaut
Brown, Ga.	Heller	Rains
Buchanan	Hess	Reams
Burnside	Hoffman, Mich.	Rhodes
Burton	Holifield	Ribicoff
Butler	Holmes	Riley
Canfield	Howell	Roberts
Cannon	Hull	Rodino
Carrigg	Irving	Rogers, Colo.
Case	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Javits	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Jonas	Rooney
Chenoweth	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Judd	Sadlak
Clemente	Karsten, Mo.	Saylor
Corbett	Kean	Scott, Hardie
Cotton	Kearns	Secrest
Coudert	Kee	Seely-Brown
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheppard
Dawson	Keogh	Sieminski
Deane	Kerr	Sittler
DeGraffenried	King, Calif.	Spence
Delaney	Kirwan	Staggers
Denny	Klein	Steed
Denton	Kluczynski	Taylor
Devereux	Lane	Thomas
Dingell	Lanham	Thornberry
Dollinger	Lantaff	Tollefson
Donohue	Lesinski	Van Zandt
Donovan	Lind	Vinson
Dorn	McCarthy	Walter
Doyle	McCormack	Widnall
Eberharter	McGrath	Wier
Elliott	McGuire	Wigglesworth
Ellsworth	McKinnon	Williams, N. Y.
Engle	McMullen	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Machrowicz	Withrow
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Wolverton
Flood	Madden	Yates
Fogarty	Mansfield	Yorty
Forand	Marshall	Zablocki
Forrester	Merrow	

NOT VOTING—76

Abernethy	Hagen	O'Hara
Albert	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poage
Allen, La.	Harden	Potter
Armstrong	Hébert	Powell
Bakewell	Herter	Ramsay
Bates, Ky.	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Beckworth	Hillings	Regan
Belcher	Hope	Richards
Bender	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Bentsen	Kearney	Robeson
Brehm	Kennedy	Sabath
Brown, Ohio.	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Brownson	Kilday	Sheehan
Buckley	Larcade	Sikes
Burdick	Lyle	Stigler
Camp	Magee	Sutton
Carlyle	Mason	Tacket
Carnahan	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, Kans.	Mitchell	Trimble
Cole, N. Y.	Morris	Watts
Combs	Morrison	Welch
Cooper	Morton	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Moulder	Willis
Eaton	Murphy	Wolcott
Evins	Nelson	Woodruff
Fenton		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Welch with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Bakewell.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Watts with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Cooper with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Mills with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. AYRES changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BLACKNEY and Mr. CUNNINGHAM changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. (1): On page 3, line 4, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "the unexpended balance in this fund on June 30, 1952, is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1953."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$1,000,000 of the unexpended balance in this fund on June 30, 1952, is hereby continued available during the fiscal year 1953."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 37, 68, and 86 be considered en bloc. They are technical amendments, and not controversial in any way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Reserving the right to object, why not include the whole list.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think that can be done under the rules of the House. They are not in disagreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 5, line 5, strike out "$619,500" and insert "$400,000."

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 5, line 5, insert "and in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $319,550, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to make such foreign currencies or credit available to the Commission in the amount stated: *Provided*."

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 6, line 4, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 6, line 4, insert "to remain available until expended, and, in addition, the Commission is authorized to utilize for carrying out the purposes of this appropriation, without dollar reimbursement from this or any other appropriation, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States in an amount not exceeding $4,500,000, and the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to make such foreign currencies or credits available to the Commission in the amount stated."

Senate amendment No. 37: On page 24, line 5, insert "including contractual services incident to receiving, handling and shipping warehouse items, and."

Senate amendment No. 68: On page 36, line 3, insert:

"Appropriations for the Selective Service System may be used for the destruction of records accumulated under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, which are hereby authorized to be destroyed by the Director of Selective Service after compliance with the procedures for the destruction of records prescribed pursuant to the Records Disposal Act of 1943, as amended (44 U. S. C. 366–380): *Provided*, That no records may be transferred to any other agency without the approval of the Director of Selective Service."

Senate amendment No. 86: On page 48, line 3, insert: "Reduction in appropriation. The unobligated balance of the funds available for necessary expenses of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission, as authorized by the Acts of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), and May 31, 1949 (Public Law 78), is hereby rescinded effective July 1, 1952, except for necessary liquidating expenses, and such sum shall be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act."

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede and concur in amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 37, 68, and 86.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: On page 9, line 3, insert "That there shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation that portion of the unexpended balances of prior year appropriations included under the appropriation for Operating Expenses which is applicable to Plant and Equipment, and amounts so transferred together with the foregoing appropriation shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 7 of said amendment, strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1953."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 10, line 12, insert:

"Any appropriation available under this act or heretofore made to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

"Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation under this head may be transferred to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent by any such transfers."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of said amendment, after the word "used", insert "during the fiscal year 1953."

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46: Page 26, line 21 insert:

"Defense Community Facilities and Services: During the current fiscal year not to exceed $225,000 of the appropriation granted under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the construction of facilities under such appropriation."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 46 with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In line 2 of said amendment, strike out the sum "$225,000", and insert "$112,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 48: Page 29, line 4, strike out lines 4 to 9, inclusive.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no housing unit constructed under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall be occupied by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General: *Provided further*, That the foregoing prohibition shall be enforced by the local housing authority, and that such prohibition shall not impair or affect the powers or obligations of the Public Housing Administration with respect to the making of loans and annual contributions under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 130: Page 73, line 24, insert:

"SEC. 406. (a) No part of the money appropriated by this act to any department, agency, or corporation or made available for expenditure by any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) functions performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion-picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion pictures, and similar material,

shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

"(b) This section shall not apply: To persons employed by the General Services Administration in the performance of functions or related assisting or supporting functions in connection with the publication of the Federal Register, or to persons engaged in functions of the Civil Service Commission related to (1) the preparation and issuance of materials relating to the recruitment of personnel for the Federal service, and (2) the compilation of the Official Register of the United States."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: At the end of said amendment following the words "United States", and before the period, insert a comma and the following: "or to any department, agency, or corporation which does not employ more than two persons at any one time in the performance of functions described in paragraphs (1) or (2) of subsection (a) of this section."

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO CONTINUE CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS DURING THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY PROCLAIMED DECEMBER 16, 1950, AND 6 MONTHS THEREAFTER

Mr. FEIGHAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2444)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and six months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That notwithstanding the termination on April 28, 1952, of the existence of a state of war with Japan declared December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939 (Proc. 2352, 54 Stat. 2643), and on May 27, 1941 (Proc. 2487, 55 Stat. 1647), and notwithstanding any proclamation of peace with respect to such war—

"(a) The following statutory provisions, and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby, in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war or otherwise where their terms so provide, shall remain in full force and effect until six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), or until such earlier date or dates as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution either generally or for a particular statutory provision or by the President either generally by proclamation or for a particular statutory provision, but in no event beyond April 1, 1953, notwithstanding any other terminal date or provision of law with respect to such statutory provisions and notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency, of the time during or for which authorizations or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed; and acts or events of the kind giving rise to legal consequences under any of those provisions when performed or occurring during the state of war which terminated on April 28, 1952, shall give rise to the same legal consequences when they are performed or occur during the period above provided for:

"(1) Act of December 17, 1942 (ch. 739, sec. 1, 56 Stat. 1053), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1201); and, effective for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, section 1 of said Act of December 17, 1942, is amended by inserting

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

'or the maintenance of the national defense' after 'the prosecution of war'.

"(2) Act of March 27, 1942 (ch. 199, secs. 1301–1304, 56 Stat. 185–186; 50 U. S. C. App. 643, 643a, 643b, 643c).

"(3) Act of July 7, 1943 (ch. 192, sec. 11, 57 Stat. 382; 44 U. S. C. 376).

"(4) Act of July 2, 1940 (ch. 508, sec. 1 (a) and 1 (b), 54 Stat. 712, 713), as extended by sections 13 and 16 of the Act of June 5, 1942 (ch. 340, 56 Stat. 317; 50 U. S. C. App. 773, 1171 (a), 1171 (b)); and the authority thereby granted to the Secretary of the Army is hereby conferred on the Secretary of the Navy, to be exercised by him on behalf of the Department of the Navy, using naval appropriations for the purpose.

"(5) Act of June 5, 1942 (ch. 340, secs. 1, 7, and 11, 56 Stat. 314, 316, 317; 50 App. 761, 767, 771).

"(6) Act of January 2, 1942 (ch. 645, sec. 7), as added by the Act of April 22, 1943 (ch. 67, sec. 7, 57 Stat. 67; 31 U. S. C. 224i).

"(7) Act of March 7, 1942 (ch. 166, secs. 1–12, 14, and 15, 56 Stat. 143–147), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1001–1012, 1014, and 1015), and as extended by section 4 (e) of the Act of June 24, 1948 (ch. 625, 62 Stat. 608; 50 U. S. C. App. 454 (e)). Effective for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, sections 2, 6, 9, 12, and 14 of said Act of March 7, 1942, as they read immediately before the enactment of Public Law 313, Eighty-second Congress, are amended as follows, and, as so amended, are further extended in accordance with section 4 (e) of said Act of June 24, 1948:

"(A) Section 2 (50 U. S. C. App. 1002) is amended by deleting 'interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy' and inserting in lieu thereof 'interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force'.

"(B) Section 6 (50 U. S. C. App. 1006) is amended by deleting 'in the hands of an enemy or is interned in a neutral country' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in the hands of a hostile force or is interned in a foreign country'.

"(C) Section 9 (50 U. S. C. App. 1009) is amended by deleting 'in the lands of an enemy' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in the hands of a hostile force' and by deleting 'such enemy' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such hostile force'.

"(D) Section 12 (50 U. S. C. App. 1012) is amended by deleting 'interned in a neutral country, or captured by the enemy' and inserting in lieu thereof 'interned in a foreign country, or captured by a hostile force.'

"(E) Section 14 (50 U. S. C. App. 1014) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 14. The provisions of this Act applicable to persons captured by a hostile force shall also apply to any person beleaguered or besieged by a hostile force.'

"(8) Act of December 4, 1942 (ch. 674, secs. 2, 3, and 4, 56 Stat. 1039; 10 U. S. C. 904b, 904c, 904d).

"(9) Act of October 26, 1942 (ch. 624, 56 Stat 987; 50 U. S. C. App. 836).

"(10) Act of December 18, 1942 (ch. 765, 53 Stat. 1057; 10 U. S. C. 906 and note, 907 and note).

"(11) Act of June 25, 1942 (ch. 447, 56 Stat. 390–391; 50 U. S. C. App. 781–785).

"(12) Act of October 14, 1940 (ch. 862, 54 Stat. 1125), as amended, secs. 1, 202, 301, 401, 402, and 501 (42 U. S. C. 1521, 1532, 1541, 1561, 1562, 1571). In view of the continuing existence of acute housing needs occasioned by World War II, the emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939, shall, for the purpose of continuing the use of property held under said Act of October 14, 1940, continue to exist during the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection.

"(13) Act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, titles I and II, 56 Stat. 1028), as amended (42 U. S. C. 1701–1706, 1711–1717). Effective for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, the following terms, as used in titles I and II of said Act of December 2, 1942, and the terms 'allies' and 'war effort,' as used in the statutory provisions referred to in section 101 (a) (1) of said Act (42 U. S. C. 1701 (a) (1)), have the following meanings: The term 'enemy' means any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States or of any of its allies. The term 'allies' means any nation, government, or force participating with the United States in any armed conflict. The terms 'national war effort' and 'war effort' include national defense. The term 'war activities' includes activities directly related to military operations.

"(14) The paragraph designated '(2)' which was inserted into the Act of March 3, 1909 (ch. 255, 35 Stat. 753), by the Act of April 9, 1943 (ch. 39, 57 Stat. 60; 34 U. S. C. 533).

"(15) Act of October 25, 1943 (ch. 276, 57 Stat. 575), as amended by section 2 of the Act of April 9, 1946 (ch. 121, 60 Stat. 87; 38 U. S. C. 11a note).

"(16) Act of December 23, 1944 (ch. 716, 58 Stat. 921; 50 U. S. C. App. 1705 and note, 1706, 1707).

"(17) Act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, sec. 5 (b), 58 Stat. 505; 5 U. S. C. 801); and, effective for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, the term 'enemy' as used in section 5 (b) of said Act of July 28, 1945, means any nation, government, or force engaged in armed conflict with the Armed Forces of the United States or of any nation, government, or force participating with the United States in any armed conflict.

"(18) Act of June 27, 1942 (ch. 453, 56 Stat. 461; 50 U. S. C. App. 801, 802).

"(19) Act of October 17, 1942 (ch. 615, secs. 1–4, 56 Stat. 796; 36 U. S. C. 179–182).

"(20) Act of July 15, 1949 (ch. 338, title V, sec. 507, 63 Stat. 436; 42 U. S. C. 1477).

"(21) Act of October 14, 1940 (ch. 862, title V, sec. 503), as added by the Act of June 23, 1945 (ch. 192, 59 Stat. 260; 42 U. S. C. 1573).

"(22) Act of July 22, 1937 (ch. 517, sec. 1, 50 Stat. 522), as amended (7 U. S. C. 1001).

"(23) Act of April 24, 1912 (ch. 90, secs. 1 and 2, 37 Stat. 90, 91), as amended (36 U. S. C. 10, 11).

"(24) The eighth paragraph (designated 'Military traffic in time of war') of section 6 of the Act of February 4, 1887, chapter 104, as that section was amended by section 2 of the Act of June 29, 1906 (ch. 3591, 34 Stat. 586; 10 U. S. C. 1362 and 49 U. S. C. 6 (8)).

"(25) Act of February 4, 1887 (ch. 104, sec. 1 (15)), as enacted by Act of February 28, 1920 (ch. 91, sec. 402, 41 Stat. 456, 476; 49 U. S. C. 1 (15)).

"(26) Act of February 4, 1887 (ch. 104, sec. 420), as added by Act of May 16, 1942 (ch. 318, sec. 1, 56 Stat. 284, 298; 49 U. S. C. 1020).

"(27) Act of June 6, 1941 (ch. 174, 55 Stat. 242–245), as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 1271–1275).

"(28) Act of December 3, 1942 (ch. 670, sec. 2, 56 Stat. 1038; 33 U. S. C. 855a).

"(29) Title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2153, 2154, and 2388. Effective in each case for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, title 18, United States Code, section 2151, is amended by inserting 'or defense activities' immediately before the period at the end of the definition of 'war material' and said sections 2153 and 2154 are amended by inserting the words 'or defense activities' immediately after the words 'carrying on the war' wherever they appear therein.

"(30) Act of May 22, 1918 (ch. 81, 40 Stat. 559), as amended by the act of June 21, 1941 (ch. 210, 55 Stat. 252, 253; 22 U. S. C. 223–226b).

"(31) Act of October 31, 1942 (ch. 634, 56 Stat. 1013; 35 U. S. C. 89 and note and 90–96); and, effective for the period of time provided for in the opening paragraph of this subsection, the terms 'prosecution of the war' and 'conditions of wartime production', as used in said act of October 31, 1942, include, respectively, prosecution of defense activities and conditions of production during the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950.

"(32) Title 28, United States Code, section 2680 (j).

"(b) The following statutory provisions which are normally operative in time of peace shall not be operative by reason of the termination of a state of war on April 28, 1952, but rather (in addition to being inoperative, in accordance with their terms, in time of war) shall continue to be inoperative until six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until such earlier date or dates as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may provide either generally or for a particular statutory provision, but in no event beyond April 1, 1953, any other provision of law with respect thereto to the contrary notwithstanding:

"(1) Those portions of section 37 of the Act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 189), as amended (10 U. S. C. 353), which restrict the appointment of Reserve officers in time of peace.

"(2) The second sentence of section 40b of the Act of June 3, 1916, as added by section 33 of the Act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 41 Stat. 777), as amended (10 U. S. C. 386).

"(3) Act of August 4, 1942 (ch. 547, sec. 10, 56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850i).

"(4) Act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 306, sec. 2, 58 Stat. 624), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1214; 34 U. S. C. 555b).

"(5) Act of March 3, 1893 (ch. 212, 27 Stat. 717; 34 U. S. C. 196).

"(6) Act of June 16, 1890 (ch. 426, sec. 4, 26 Stat. 158; 10 U. S. C. 651).

"(7) Joint resolution of November 4, 1939 (ch. 2, sec. 7, 54 Stat. 8; 22 U. S. C. 447 (a)–(d)).

"(c) The President is authorized to continue in effect until and including April 1, 1953, all appointments as officers and as warrant officers of the Army and of the Air Force which under the following provisions of law would terminate after April 27, 1952, and before April 1, 1953:

"(1) Sections 37 and 38 of the Act of June 3, 1916 (ch. 134, 39 Stat. 189, 190), as amended (10 U. S. C. 358, 32 U. S. C. 19), and section 127a of that Act as added by the Act of June 4, 1920 (ch. 227, 41 Stat. 785), as amended (10 U. S. C. 513).

"(2) Section 515 (e) of the Act of August 7, 1947 (ch. 512, 61 Stat. 907; 10 U. S. C. 506d (e)).

"(3) Section 3 of the Act of August 21, 1941 (ch. 384, 55 Stat. 652), as amended (10 U. S. C. 591a).

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 5 (m) of the Act of May 18, 1933 (ch. 32, 48 Stat. 62; 16 U. S. C. 831d (m)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof 'or, until six months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, or until such earlier date or dates as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may provide but in no event after April 1, 1953, to nations associated with the United States in defense activities'.

"(b) The second proviso of section 1 of the Act of May 29, 1945 (ch. 135, 59 Stat. 225), as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c), is amended to read: '*Provided*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within two years after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown,

be presented within one year after peace is established, but if such accident or incident occurs after December 6, 1939, and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within one year after the termination of that national emergency or April 1, 1953, whichever is earlier.'; and such section as so amended shall apply to the Navy in accordance with section 2 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (ch 597, 59 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C. 222e).

"(c) The second proviso of section 1 of the Act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b), is amended to read: *'Provided*, That if such accident or incident occurs in time of war, or if war intervenes within 1 year after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established, but if such accident or incident occurs after June 23, 1950, and before the termination of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after the termination of that national emergency or April 1, 1953, whichever is earlier.'; and such section as so amended shall apply to the Navy in accordance with section 1 of the Act of December 28, 1945 (ch. 597, 59 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C. 223d).

"SEC. 3. Authority now conferred upon the Secretary of the Air Force under the statutory provisions cited in this joint resolution is hereby extended to the same extent as the authority of the Secretary of the Army thereunder.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed to repeal or modify section 601 of Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, first session, relative to coming into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to real-estate actions by or for the use of the military departments or the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

"SEC. 5. If any provision of this joint resolution, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remaining provisions of this joint resolution, or the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 6. Public Laws 313 and 368, Eighty-second Congress, are repealed without effect upon rights accrued, liabilities incurred, or actions taken thereunder.

"SEC. 7. Sections 1 through 6 of this joint resolution shall take effect June 16, 1952.

"SEC. 8. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Emergency Powers Continuation Act'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and six months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953."

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
E. L. FORRESTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate receded from its amendments and agreed to the joint resolution as passed by the House except that the authorizations are to extend only until April 1, 1953, instead of June 30, 1953, as provided in the House version. The House agrees to this amendment.

EMANUEL CELLER,
MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
E. L. FORRESTER,
CHAUNCEY W. REED,
J. CALEB BOGGS,
PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROOKS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2445)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952'.

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Sections
"Part I. Definitions	101
"Part II. Reserve components generally	201–259
"Chapter 1. Mission and general organization	201–216
"Chapter 2. Appointments and enlistments	217–232
"Chapter 3. Duty and release from duty	233–239
"Chapter 4. Pay, allowances, and benefits	240–245
"Chapter 5. Civil employment	246–247
"Chapter 6. Separation	248–249
"Chapter 7. Administration	250–259
"Part III. Reserve components of the Army	301–304
"Part IV. Reserve components of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard	401–414
"Part V. Naval Militia	501–504
"Part VI. Reserve components of the Air Force	601–603
"Part VII. National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States	701–714
"Part VIII. Appropriations, repeals, amendments, and miscellaneous provisions	801–813

"PART I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 101. When used in this Act—

"(a) 'Duty' means military service of any nature under orders or authorization issued by competent authority.

"(b) 'Active duty' means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States, other than active duty for training.

"(c) 'Active duty for training' means full-time duty in the active military service of the United States for training purposes.

"(d) 'Inactive-duty training' means any of the training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or equivalent training, instruction, duty, appropriate duties, or hazardous duty, performed with or without compensation by members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, or any other provision of law, and in addition thereto includes the performance of special additional duties, as may be authorized by competent authority, by such members on a voluntary basis in connection with the prescribed training or maintenance activities of the unit to which the members are assigned. Work or study performed by such members of the reserve components in connection with correspondence courses of the Armed Forces of the United States shall be deemed inactive-duty training for which compensation is not authorized under the provisions of section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended. Any inactive-duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States, while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or pursuant to any other provision of law, shall be deemed to be inactive-duty training in the service of the United States as members of one of the reserve components specified in section 202 of this Act.

"(e) 'Armed Forces of the United States' means the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including all components thereof.

"(f) 'Member of a reserve component' means a person appointed or enlisted as a Reserve of an Armed Force of the United States or a person who acquires such status by transfer pursuant to law to any of the reserve components specified in section 202 of this Act: *Provided*, That no person shall be a member of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States unless he first be duly enlisted or appointed in the National Guard or the Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, pursuant to law.

"(g) 'Officer' unless otherwise specified, means a commissioned or warrant officer.

"(h) 'Appropriate Secretary' means—

"(1) the Secretary of the Army with respect to the Army;

"(2) the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the Navy and Marine Corps and,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Navy, the Coast Guard;

"(3) the Secretary of the Air Force with respect to the Air Force; or

"(4) the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department.

"(i) 'Competent authority' means any authority designated by the appropriate Secretary.

"(j) 'Partial mobilization' means that action taken by the Congress or the President pursuant to any provision of law, to effect the entry into the active military service of the United States of such units and members thereof, or of such members not assigned to units organized for the purpose of serving as such, of any reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States as are required to effect a limited expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States.

"PART II—RESERVE COMPONENTS GENERALLY

"Chapter 1—Mission and general organization

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby declares that the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States are maintained for the purpose of providing trained units and qualified individuals to be available for active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war or national emergency, and at such other times as the national security may require, to meet the requirements of the Armed Forces of the United States in excess of those of the regular components thereof, during and after the period needed for procurement and training of additional trained units and qualified individuals to achieve the planned mobilization.

"(b) The Congress further declares, in accordance with our traditional military policy as expressed in the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, that it is essential that the strength and organization of the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, as an integral part of the first line defenses of this Nation, be at all times maintained and assured. It is the intent of the Congress that whenever Congress shall determine that units and organizations are needed for the national security in excess of those of the Regular components of the ground forces and the air forces, the National Guard of the United States, and the Air National Guard of the United States, or such part thereof as may be necessary, together with such units of the other reserve components as are necessary for a balanced force, shall be ordered into the active military service of the United States and continued therein so long as such necessity exists.

"SEC. 202. The reserve components are—

"(a) The National Guard of the United States;

"(b) The Army Reserve;

"(c) The Naval Reserve;

"(d) The Marine Corps Reserve;

"(e) The Air National Guard of the United States;

"(f) The Air Force Reserve; and

"(g) The Coast Guard Reserve.

"SEC. 203. The maximum numerical strength of each of the reserve components referred to in section 202 of this Act shall be as authorized by the Congress, or, in the absence of such authorization, shall be fixed by the President.

"SEC. 204. There shall be within each of the Armed Forces of the United States a Ready Reserve, a Standby Reserve, and a Retired Reserve, and each member of the reserve components shall be placed in one of these categories.

"SEC. 205. (a) The Ready Reserve consists of those units or members of the reserve components, or both, who are liable for active duty either in time of war, in time of national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law.

"(b) The authorized aggregate personnel strength of the Ready Reserve shall not exceed a total of one million five hundred thousand.

"SEC. 206. (a) The Standby Reserve consists of those units or members of the reserve components (other than members in the Retired Reserve), or both, who are liable for active duty only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, or when otherwise authorized by law.

"(b) Except in time of war, or unless otherwise authorized by Congress—(1) no unit of the Standby Reserve organized for the purpose of serving as such nor the members thereof shall be ordered to active duty unless the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department) determines that adequate numbers of the required types of units of the Ready Reserves are not readily available, and (2) no other member of the Standby Reserve shall be ordered to active duty as an individual without his consent unless the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department) determines that adequate numbers of qualified members of the Ready Reserve in the required category are not readily available.

"SEC. 207. (a) The Retired Reserve consists of those members of the reserve components whose names are placed on reserve retired lists established pursuant to subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) In accordance with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, reserve retired lists shall be established upon which will be placed the names of those members of the reserve components who make application therefor, if otherwise qualified. Such reserve retired lists shall be in addition to the Army of the United States Retired List, the Air Force of the United States Retired List, and the United States Naval Reserve Retired List authorized pursuant to section 301 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended.

"(c) Members in the Retired Reserve may, if qualified, be ordered to active duty involuntarily, but only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or when otherwise authorized by law.

"SEC. 208. (a) Each person required to serve in a reserve component pursuant to law, shall, upon becoming a member of a reserve component, be placed in the Ready Reserve of his Armed Force for the remainder of his required term of service unless eligible for transfer to the Standby Reserve under subsection (f) of this section.

"(b) Any member of the reserve components in an active status on the effective date of this Act may be placed in the Ready Reserve.

"(c) All units and members of the National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States shall be in the Ready Reserve of the Army and the Air Force, respectively.

"(d) All members of the reserve components assigned to units organized for the purpose of serving as such, which are designated as units in the Ready Reserve, shall be in the Ready Reserve.

"(e) Subject to such regulations as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe, any member of the reserve components may, at any time upon his request, be placed in the Ready Reserve if qualified.

"(f) Except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, any member of the reserve components who is not serving on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States shall, upon his request, be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remainder of his term of service—

"(1) if he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than a total of five years;

"(2) if, having served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for a total of less than five years, he has satisfactorily participated, as determined by the appropriate Secretary, in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve for a period which when added to his period of active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States totals not less than five years or such lesser period of time as the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a Military Department) may prescribe in the case of satisfactory participation in such accredited training programs as the appropriate Secretary may designate;

"(3) if he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than twelve months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, and, in addition thereto, has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than twelve months subsequent to June 25, 1950; or

"(4) if he has served as a member of one or more reserve components subsequent to September 2, 1945, for not less than eight years.

"(g) No member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be transferred to the Standby Reserve without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

"(h) Subsection (f) of this section shall not apply to any member of the reserve components in the Ready Reserve while serving under an agreement to remain therein for a stated period.

"(i) Subject to subsection (g) of this section, any member of the reserve components in the Ready Reserve may be transferred into the Standby Reserve, or into the Retired Reserve if qualified and if he makes application therefor, in accordance with such regulations as the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a Military Department) may prescribe.

"SEC. 209. (a) A person transferred to a reserve component of an Armed Force of the United States pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, shall, if qualified and accepted, be permitted to enlist or accept an appointment in such Armed Force of the United States as he may elect (except that consent of the appropriate Secretaries shall be required for enlistment or appointment as a Reserve of another Armed Force of the United States) and to participate in such programs as are authorized for such Armed Force of the United States. Any such person who enlists or is appointed in an Armed Force of the United States shall be required to perform the remaining period of his required term of service in the Armed Force of the United States in which such enlistment or appointment is made, or in any other Armed Force of the United States in which he subsequently enlists or is appointed. All periods of such participation shall be credited against total periods of obligated service imposed by the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, but no period of time shall be credited more than once.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall be construed to reduce, limit, or modify any period of service which any person may undertake to perform pursuant to any enlistment or appointment or agreement, including an agreement entered into prior to, or at the time of, entering a program authorized by an Armed Force of the United States.

"SEC. 210. All members of the reserve components who are not in the Ready or Retired Reserve shall be in the Standby Reserve.

"SEC. 211. (a) Within the Standby Reserve, an inactive status list shall be maintained. When deemed by competent authority to be in the best interests of the service concerned, members in the Standby Reserve who are not required to remain members of a reserve component and who are unable to participate in prescribed training may, if qualified, be transferred to the inactive status list, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary. Such regulations shall provide for the return of such members to an active status under such conditions as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe.

"(b) Members in the reserve components in an inactive status shall not be eligible for pay, promotion, or award of retirement point credits under Title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended.

"SEC. 212. (a) Each member of the reserve components shall be in an active, inactive, or retired status.

"(b) Members of the reserve components shall be in an active status, except those on an inactive status list, members in the Retired Reserve, and those assigned to the inactive National Guard.

"(c) Members of the reserve components on an inactive status list and members assigned to the inactive National Guard shall be in an inactive status.

"(d) Members of the Retired Reserve shall be in a retired status.

"SEC. 213. (a) Every person who is a member of a reserve component on the effective date of this Act shall be deemed, without further action, to retain his active, inactive, or retired status in his reserve component. Any such member in an honorary Reserve status or an honorary Retired Reserve status when this Act takes effect shall be placed in the Retired Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

"(b) Any person who is on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve when this Act takes effect shall be placed in the Retired Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

"SEC. 214. Except in the case of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, each reserve component shall be divided into training categories according to the types and degrees of training including the number and duration of drills or equivalent duties to be completed in stated periods of time, as the appropriate Secretary prescribes. The designation of such training categories shall be the same for each Armed Force of the United States and the same within the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve.

"SEC. 215. (a) Within such numbers as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, enlisted members of the reserve components may, with their consent, be selected for training as officer candidates, and members so selected shall be designated as officer candidates for the period of such training: *Provided*, That when not in the active military service of the United States, no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so selected, or designated, without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

"(b) Subject to any limitations imposed on the authorized numerical strength of each reserve component, the numbers of officers and enlisted personnel authorized in the various ranks, grades, and ratings shall be the numbers determined by the appropriate Secretary to be necessary to provide for planned mobilization requirements. The appropriate Secretary shall review such determinations not less than once annually and revise them as he deems necessary. No member of a reserve component shall be involuntarily reduced in his permanent rank, grade, or rating as a result of such a determination.

"SEC. 216. (a) The appropriate Secretary shall establish an adequate and equitable system for the promotion of members of the reserve components in an active status. Such promotion system shall, insofar as practicable, be similar to that provided for members of the Regular component of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States. Promotion policies for officers of the reserve components shall be based upon the mobilization requirements of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States in order to provide qualified officers in each grade, at ages suitable to their assignments and in numbers commensurate with mobilization needs. In order that vigorous reserve forces may be maintained, necessary leadership encouraged, and a steady flow of promotion provided, such promotion systems shall provide for forced attrition to the extent necessary.

"(b) The relative precedence of Reserve officers and Regular officers shall be determined in accordance with their respective dates of rank in grade.

"Chapter 2—Appointments and enlistments

"SEC. 217. (a) Subject to the limitation that no person, other than a person who has had prior service in the Armed Forces of the United States or the National Security Training Corps, shall be appointed or enlisted as a Reserve in the Armed Forces of the United States who is not a citizen of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or who has not made a declaration of intent to become a citizen thereof, the appropriate Secretary shall, except as otherwise provided by law, prescribe physical, mental, moral, professional, and age qualifications for appointment or enlistment of Reserve members of the Armed Forces of the United States. No person shall be appointed as a Reserve officer in any of the Armed Forces of the United States who is under the age of eighteen years.

"(b) Women may be appointed or enlisted as Reserves in the Armed Forces of the United States for service in the Army Reserve, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Air Force Reserve, as appropriate, in the same grades, ranks, and ratings, as are authorized for women in the Regular component of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States. Women may be appointed or enlisted in the Coast Guard Reserve as provided in section 762, title 14, United States Code. Any female former officer or enlisted woman of an Armed Force of the United States may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed or enlisted as a Reserve in that Armed Force of the United States in the highest rank, grade, or rating satisfactorily held by her on active duty.

"(c) Except in the case of Adjutants General and Assistant Adjutants General of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, a person who has not held an appointment as a commissioned officer in any of the Armed Forces of the United States, or any component thereof, may not be appointed as a commissioned officer in a grade higher than major or lieutenant commander in any of the Armed Forces of the United States except upon the recommendation of a board of officers convened by the appropriate Secretary.

"SEC. 218. The President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall make all appointments of Reserves in general or flag officer grades.

"SEC. 219. The President shall make all appointments of Reserves in commissioned grades below general or flag officer grades.

"SEC. 220. The appropriate Secretary shall make all appointments of Reserves in warrant officer grades.

"SEC. 221. All Reserve commissioned officers shall hold appointment during the pleasure of the President.

"SEC. 222. (a) To become an officer of a reserve component an individual shall be appointed as a Reserve commissioned officer or Reserve warrant officer of an Armed Force of the United States in a grade corresponding to one of the grades of the Regular component of that Armed Force of the United States and subscribe to the oath prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C. 16): *Provided*, That no person shall become a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States in a commissioned officer or warrant officer grade, hereunder, unless he first be appointed to and federally recognized in the same commissioned or warrant officer grade in the National Guard or Air National Guard in the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and subscribe to the oath provided in section 73 of the National Defense Act, as amended.

"(b) Each person appointed in a commissioned officer grade as a Reserve in an Armed Force of the United States shall be commissioned as a Reserve officer in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, and United States Marine Corps, the United States Air Force, or the United States Coast Guard, as appropriate.

"SEC. 223. Reserve warrant officers shall hold appointment during the pleasure of the appropriate Secretary.

"SEC. 224. After the date of enactment of this Act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term. All officers holding appointments on the date of enactment in the National Guard of the United States, or the Officers' Reserve Corps, or the Naval Reserve, or the Marine Corps Reserve, or the Air National Guard of the United States, or the Air Force Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve shall be considered to hold such appointments as Reserve officers, as the case may be, in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, as appropriate, and in the case of commissioned officers to hold commissions as provided in section 222 (b) of this Act. Each such officer not holding an appointment for an indefinite term on the date of enactment of this Act shall be given an appointment for an indefinite term in lieu of his current appointment if such officer, after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within six months from the effective date of this Act, shall agree in writing to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term. In the event such officer does not so agree in writing, the term of his present appointment shall not be changed by this section. All persons now enlisted in the National Guard of the United States, or the Enlisted Reserve Corps, or the Naval Reserve, or the Marine Corps Reserve, or the Air National Guard of the United States, or the Air Force Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve shall be considered to be enlisted as Reserves in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, as appropriate, without change in the periods of their current enlistments.

"SEC. 225. When not on active duty all members of the reserve components, except those in the Retired Reserve, shall be given physical examinations at least once every four years, or more often as the appropriate Secretary deems necessary, and shall be required to submit personal certificates of physical condition annually.

"SEC. 226. Except as otherwise provided by law, the appropriate Secretary may provide for the honorable discharge, or transfer to a retired status, of members of the reserve components who are found not physically qualified for active duty: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States may be so transferred without the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned. In determining physical qualifications for active duty, due consideration shall be given to the character of the duty to which the member may be assigned in the event he should be ordered to active duty pursuant to law.

"SEC. 227. (a) Except as otherwise provided by law and subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, enlisted members of the reserve components shall be enlisted for such periods as the appropriate Secretary prescribes.

"(b) Unless sooner terminated by the appropriate Secretary, all enlistments as Reserves in the Armed Forces of the United States, in force at the beginning of a war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or entered into during the existence of such war or national emergency, which otherwise would expire, shall continue in force until 6 months after the termination of the war or national emergency, whichever is later.

"(c) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, the period of service of any member of a reserve component who has been transferred thereto pursuant to law, unless sooner terminated by the appropriate Secretary, shall, if such period of service otherwise would expire, be extended until 6 months after the termination of the war or national emergency, whichever is later.

"SEC. 228. To become an enlisted member of a reserve component an individual shall be enlisted as a Reserve of an Armed Force of the United States and subscribe to the oath prescribed by section 8 of the act of May 5, 1950, as amended, or be transferred to a reserve component pursuant to law: *Provided*, That no person shall become an enlisted member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, hereunder, unless he first be duly enlisted in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, subscribe to the oath provided in section 70 of the National Defense Act, as amended, and is a member of a federally recognized unit or organization thereof in the same grade.

"SEC. 229. Except as otherwise provided by this act, no person shall be a member of more than one reserve component at the same time.

"SEC. 230. (a) When an enlisted member of a reserve component is designated as an officer candidate for temporary service in such category, his enlistment or period of service therein is extended by such period as he may remain in such officer candidate status beyond the normal expiration date thereof.

"(b) No person while designated an officer candidate pursuant to this act shall participate in any Reserve Officer Training Corps program of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"SEC. 231. Any Reserve officer whose age exceeds the maximum age prescribed for his grade and classification may be separated, or retained in or transferred to an active, inactive, or, upon his application, a retired status, as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe: *Provided*, That no officer of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so retained or transferred without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia concerned.

"SEC. 232. Persons who are otherwise qualified but who have physical defects, which as determined by the appropriate Secretary will not interfere with the performance of general or special duties to which they may be assigned, may be appointed or enlisted as Reserves in any of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"Chapter 3—Duty and release from duty

"SEC. 233. (a) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of any reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to active duty for the duration of the war or national emergency and for six months thereafter, but members on an inactive status list or in a retired status shall not be ordered to active duty without their consent unless the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a Military Department) determines that adequate numbers of qualified members of the reserve components in an active status or in the inactive National Guard in the required category are not readily available.

"(b) (1) In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, in the Ready Reserve of any reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed twenty-four consecutive months: *Provided*, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the reserve components necessary for the national security to ,be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

"(2) It is the policy of the Congress in view of hardship situations developed by the Korean hostilities that in the interest of fair treatment as between members in the Ready Reserve involuntarily recalled for duty, attention shall be given to the duration and nature of previous service, with the objective of assuring such sharing of hazardous exposure as the national security and the military requirement will reasonably permit, to family responsibilities, and to employment found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The Secretary of Defense shall promulgate such policies and establish such procedures as may be required in his opinion to carry out our intent here declared, and shall from time to time, and at least annually, report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Congress respecting the same.

"(c) At any time, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, in an active status in any reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty or active duty for training, without his consent, for not to exceed fifteen days annually: *Provided*, That units and members of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall not be ordered to or required to serve on active duty in the service of the United States pursuant to this subsection without the consent of the Governor of the State or Territory concerned, or the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard.

"(d) A member of a reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to active duty or active duty for training at any time with his consent: *Provided*, That no member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States shall be so ordered without the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

"(e) A member of a reserve component ordered into the active military service of the United States will be allowed a reasonable period of time between the date he is alerted for active duty and the date on which he is required to enter upon active duty. Such period shall be at least thirty days unless military conditions as determined by the appropriate Secretary do not permit.

"(f) In any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States which requires the ordering into the active military service involuntarily of individual officers of the reserve components who are not members of units organized for the purpose of serving as such, it shall be the policy to utilize to the greatest practicable extent the services of qualified and available officers of the reserve components in all grades in accordance with the requirements of branch, grade, and specialty.

"(g) Insofar as practicable, in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States which requires that units and members of the reserve components be ordered into the active military service of the United States. members of units organized and trained for the purpose of serving as a unit shall be ordered involuntarily into active duty only with their units. This shall not be interpreted as prohibiting the reassignment of personnel of such units after being ordered into the active military service of the United States.

"SEC. 234. Members of the reserve components may with their consent, and in the case of the members of the National Guard of the United States and Air National Guard of the United States with the consent of the governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned, be ordered to or retained on active duty to perform duties in connection with organizing, administering, recruiting, instructing, or training the reserve components. Hereafter, members ordered into the active military service of the United States under the provisions of this section shall be so ordered in the grade held by them in the Reserve of their Armed Force, and shall while so serving, continue to be eligible for promotion in the Reserve of their Armed Force, if otherwise qualified. For the purpose of insuring that members of the reserve components ordered to or retained on duty under this section receive periodic refresher training in the various categories for which individually qualified, the appropriate Secretary may order those members to duty with any of the Armed Forces of the United States or the components thereof, or otherwise as he sees fit.

"SEC. 235. (a) In order that members of the reserve components may remain on or be ordered to active duty voluntarily for terms of service of definite duration, the appropriate Secretary may, except in time of war hereafter declared by the Congress, enter into standard written agreements with members of the reserve components for periods of active duty not to exceed five years. Upon expiration of an agreement for active duty, a new agreement may be effected pursuant to this section. Each agreement shall provide that the member shall not be released from active duty involuntarily during the period of the agreement.

"(1) by reason of a reduction in numerical strength of the military personnel of the Armed Force of the United States concerned unless his release is in accordance with the recommendation of a board of officers appointed by competent authority to determine the members to be released from active duty under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary; or

"(2) for reasons other than that prescribed in paragraph (1) above without an opportunity to be heard by a board of officers prior to such release, unless such release from active duty is pursuant to sentence of courts-martial, unexplained absence without leave of three months duration, or final conviction and sentence to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution.

"(b) Any member involuntarily released from active duty prior to the expiration of the period of service under his agreement (except when such release is pursuant to sentence of courts-martial, or unexplained absence without leave of three months duration, or final conviction and sentence to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution, or when such release is due to a physical disability resulting from the member's intentional misconduct or willful neglect, or when the member is eligible for retirement pay or severance pay under any other provision of law, or when he is placed on a temporary disability retired list, or when he is released for the purpose of accepting an appointment or enlisting in a Regular component) shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to one month's pay and allowances multiplied by the number of years (including any pro rata part thereof) remaining as the unexpired period of his agreement for active duty, such amount to be in addition to any pay and allowances which he may otherwise be entitled to receive. Computation of amounts payable by reason of termination of each such agreement shall be based on the basic pay, special pay, and allowances to which the member concerned is entitled at the time of his release from active duty. Fractions of a month less than fifteen days shall be disregarded and fifteen days or more shall be counted as one month.

"(c) A member of a reserve component who enters into a written agreement under this section shall be obligated to serve for the full period of active duty specified in the written agreement.

"(d) No person shall be offered a written agreement under this section unless the period of active duty specified in the agreement exceeds by at least twelve months any period of obligated or involuntary active duty to which he is otherwise liable.

"(e) Agreements entered into pursuant to this section shall be as uniform as practicable, and shall be subject to such standards and policies as the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy) may prescribe.

"(f) This section shall be effective upon enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 236. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or in time of national emergency proclaimed by the President after the effective date of this Act, a member of a reserve component whose period of active duty expires under an agreement entered into pursuant to section 235 of this Act may be retained on active duty involuntarily in accordance with law.

"SEC. 237. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, members of the reserve components now or hereafter serving on active duty may, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, be detailed or assigned to any duty authorized by law for officers and enlisted members of a Regular component of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"SEC. 238. When units or members of the reserve components are ordered to active duty during a period of partial mobilization, the appropriate Secretary shall continue to maintain mobilization forces by planning and budgeting to insure the continued organization and training of the reserve components not mobilized, and, consistent with the approved joint mobilization plans, to utilize to the fullest extent practicable the Federal facilities vacated by mobilized units.

"SEC. 239. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this Act, the appropriate Secretary may release any member of the reserve components from active duty or active duty for training at any time.

"(b) In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, or in time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, a member of a reserve component who is serving on active duty, shall not be released from active duty except on the approved recommendation of a board of officers convened by competent authority if he requests such action: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable to any Armed Force during a period of demobilization or reduction in strength of any such Armed Force.

"Chapter 4—Pay, allowances, and benefits

"SEC. 240. Subject to th provisions of this Act, members of the reserve components may be ordered to active duty, active duty for training, or other duty with pay and allowances as provided by law, or, with their consent, without pay. Duty without pay shall be counted for all purposes the same as like duty with pay.

"SEC. 241. Members of the reserve components retained or continued on active duty or active duty for training pursuant to law after the expiration of their term of service are entitled to pay and allowances while on such duty except to the extent that forfeiture thereof is adjudged by an approved sentence of a court martial or nonjudicial punishment by a commanding officer, or unless otherwise in a nonpay status pursuant to law.

"SEC. 242. When employed on active duty or on active duty for training with pay and when engaged in authorized travel to and from such duty, enlisted members of the reserve components designated as officer candidates under the provisions of section 215 (a) of this Act shall have the pay and allowances of their enlisted grade, but not less than the pay and allowances of pay grade E-2 under the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended.

"SEC. 243. (a) An officer of a reserve component or of the Army of the United States without component or the Air Force of the United States without component shall be entitled to an initial sum not to exceed $200 as reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment, either—

"(1) upon first reporting for active duty for a period in excess of ninety days; or

"(2) upon completion, as a member of a reserve component, of not less than fourteen days' active duty or active duty for training; or

"(3) after the performance of fourteen periods of not less than two hours' duration each of inactive-duty training as a member in the Ready Reserve of a reserve component: *Provided*, That only duty requiring the wearing of the uniform shall be counted for the purpose of this section: *Provided further*, That any initial uniform reimbursement or allowance heretofore or hereafter received as an officer under the provisions of any other law shall be a bar to the entitlement for any initial sum authorized under the provisions of this section: *And provided further*, That any individual who has served on active duty as an officer of a Regular component of the Armed Forces of the United States may not be qualified for entitlement under this section by duty performed within two years after separation from such Regular component.

"(b) An officer of a reserve component shall be entitled to an additional sum of not to exceed $50 for reimbursement for the purchase of required uniforms and equipment, upon completion of each period after the date of enactment of this Act of four years of satisfactory Federal service as prescribed in title III of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, as amended, performed in an active status in a reserve component and which shall include at least twenty-eight days of active duty or active duty for training: *Provided*, That any period of active duty or active duty for training for a period in excess of ninety days shall be excluded in determining the period of four years required for eligibility under this subsection: *Provided further*, That a person who receives or has heretofore received a uniform reimbursement or allowance as an officer shall not be entitled to the reimbursement provided in this subsection until the expiration of not less than four years from the date of entitlement to the last reimbursement or allowance: *And provided further*, That, until four years after the date of enactment hereof, an officer may elect to receive the uniform reimbursement not to exceed $50 to which he may be entitled under existing regulations issued pursuant to section 302 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, or section 11 of the Act of August 4, 1942, as amended.

"(c) An officer of a reserve component or of the Army of the United States without component or of the Air Force of the United States without component entering on active duty or active duty for training on or after June 25, 1950, shall be entitled, for each time of such entry or reentry on active duty or active duty for training of more than ninety days' duration to a further sum not to exceed $100 as reimbursement for additional uniforms and equipment required on such duty: *Provided*, That the reimbursement provided by this subsection shall not be payable to any officer who, under any provision of law, has received an initial uniform reimbursement or allowance in excess of $200 during his current tour of active duty or within a period of two years prior to entering on his current tour of active duty: *Provided further*, That the reimbursement provided in this subsection shall not be payable to any officer entering on active duty or active duty for training within two years after completing a previous period of active duty or active duty for training of more than ninety days' duration.

"(d) The receipt of a uniform and equipment reimbursement as an officer of one of the reserve components shall be a bar to entitlement to a uniform reimbursement upon transfer to or appointment in another, except where a different uniform is required: *Provided*, That reimbursement for uniforms and equipment upon transfer to or appointment in another reserve component within the limits and under the conditions prescribed by subsections (a) and (c) of this section may be made in accordance with regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is operating as a service in the Treasury Department.

"SEC. 244. Section 501 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended, by substituting a comma for the colon immediately preceding the proviso in subsection (a) thereof, and inserting the following: 'and additionally, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, enlisted members of the above services shall be entitled to rations in kind, or a portion thereof, when the instruction or duty period or periods concerned total eight or more hours in any one calendar day:'.

"SEC. 245. (a) All provisions of law applicable to the Organized Reserve Corps or the Air Force Reserve, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to the Army Reserve and to the Air Force Reserve referred to in this Act, respectively, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to the Officers Reserve Corps and to the members thereof or to officers of the Air Force Reserve and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to officers of the Army Reserve and the Air

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Force Reserve referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to the Enlisted Reserve Corps and to the members thereof or to enlisted members of the Air Force Reserve, and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to enlisted members of the Army Reserve and the Air Force Reserve referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries.

"(b) All provisions of law applicable to the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve), and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this Act, respectively, and to the members thereof and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary officers of the Coast Guard Reserve), and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary officers of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries. All provisions of law applicable to enlisted members of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve), and their dependents and beneficiaries, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to enlisted members of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and of the Coast Guard Reserve (other than temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve) referred to in this Act, respectively, and their dependents and beneficiaries.

"(c) All laws applicable to commissioned, warrant, or enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States, and to their beneficiaries and dependents, not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, shall be applicable to commissioned, warrant, and enlisted members, respectively, of the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States referred to in this Act, and to their beneficiaries and dependents.

"Chapter 5—Civil employment

"SEC. 246. When not on active duty, members of the reserve components shall not be held or considered to be officers or employees of the United States, or persons holding any office of profit or trust or discharging any official function under or in connection with any department or agency of the United States, solely by reason of their appointments, oaths, commissions, or status as such, or any duties or functions performed or pay and allowances received as such.

"SEC. 247. Members of the reserve components, subject to the approval of the appropriate Secretary, may accept civil employment with and compensation therefor from any foreign government or any concern which is controlled in whole or in part by a foreign government.

"Chapter 6—Separation

"SEC. 248. Subject to the provisions of this Act, the discharge of commissioned officers of the reserve components shall be effected at the pleasure of the President, and the discharge of other members of the reserve components shall be in accordance with regulations promulgated by the appropriate Secretary.

"SEC. 249. (a) An officer of the reserve components who has completed three years of commissioned service shall not be involuntarily discharged or separated except pursuant to the approved recommendation of a board of officers convened by competent authority or the approved sentence of a court-martial: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not apply to separation effected under subsection (b) of this section or section 231 of this Act.

"(b) The President or the appropriate Secretary may drop from the rolls any member of the reserve components who has been absent without authority from his place of duty for a period of three months or more, or who, having been found guilty by the civil authorities of any offense, is finally sentenced to confinement in a Federal or State penitentiary or correctional institution.

"(c) A member of a reserve component discharged or separated for cause other than as specified in subsection (b) of this section shall be given a discharge under honorable conditions unless—

"(1) a discharge under conditions other than honorable is effected pursuant to the approved sentence of a court-martial or the approved findings of a board of officers convened by competent authority, or

"(2) the member consents to a discharge under conditions other than honorable with waiver of court-martial or board proceedings.

"Chapter 7—Administration

"SEC. 250. There shall be no discrimination between and among members of the Regular and reserve components in the administration of laws applicable to both Regulars and Reserves.

"SEC. 251. The Secretary of the Treasury with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Navy, and, subject to such standards, policies, and procedures as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force shall make and publish such regulations as he determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Insofar as practicable, the regulations for all the reserve components shall be uniform.

"SEC. 252. Each of the Armed Forces of the United States shall have officer members of its reserve components on active duty, at the seat of the Government and at such headquarters as are charged with responsibility for reserve affairs, in addition to those authorized pursuant to the provisions of sections 5 and 81 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or any other provision of law, within such numbers and in such grades and duty assignments as the appropriate Secretary shall prescribe, to assist and participate in the preparation and administration of all policies and regulations affecting their reserve component. While so serving such officers shall be considered as additional numbers of the staff with which serving.

"SEC. 253. The appropriate Secretary shall detail such members of the Regular and reserve components as may be necessary for effectively developing, training, instructing, and administering the reserve components.

"SEC. 254. (a) All boards convened for the appointment, promotion, demotion, involuntary release from active duty, discharge, or retirement of members of the reserve components shall include appropriate numbers from the reserve components, as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary in accordance with standards and policies established by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) The members of all boards convened for selection for promotion or for the discharge or demotion of members of the reserve components shall be senior to the members under consideration, except that a member of a board serving in a legal advisory capacity may be junior to any person, other than a judge advocate or a law specialist, being considered and that a member of a board serving in a medical advisory capacity may be junior to any person, other than a medical officer, being considered.

"SEC. 255. (a) The appropriate Secretary shall make available to each reserve component such supplies, equipment, services, and facilities of the Armed Forces of the United States as he may deem necessary and advisable for the support and development of the reserve components.

"(b) The appropriate Secretary or his authorized representative may issue supplies and equipment of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States to the reserve components without charging the cost or value thereof, or any expenses in connection therewith, against or in any way affecting the appropriation provided for the reserve components: *Provided*, That the appropriate Secretary finds it to be in the best interests of the United States to issue such equipment and supplies: *And provided further*, That any such equipment and supplies so furnished may, pursuant to this section, be repossessed or redistributed as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe. This subsection shall not apply to supplies and equipment issued to the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, under sections 67 and 84, National Defense Act, as amended, but applies to supplies and equipment issued in addition thereto.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal, limit, or modify in any manner the provisions of sections 67 and 84, National Defense Act, as amended.

"(d) It is the sense of the Congress that the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 be authorized to be implemented immediately upon the enactment of this Act.

"SEC. 256. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall designate an Assistant Secretary of Defense who shall, in addition to other duties, have the principal responsibility for all Reserve affairs of the Department of Defense. The Secretary of each military department and, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, or, as such Secretary may prescribe for his department, the Under Secretary or an Assistant Secretary of such department, shall, in addition to other duties, have the principal responsibility for supervision of all activities of the reserve components under the jurisdiction of that department.

"(b) The Secretary of each military department and, when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury shall designate a general or flag officer of each Armed Force of the United States therein who shall be directly responsible for reserve affairs to the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operation, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, as appropriate. Nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to curtail or infringe upon the present missions and functions of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

"SEC. 257. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of the Secretary of Defense a Reserve Forces Policy Board consisting of—

"(i) a civilian chairman appointed by the Secretary of Defense;

"(ii) the Secretary, the Under Secretary, or an Assistant Secretary of each military department designated pursuant to section 256 (a) of this Act;

"(iii) one Regular officer from each military department designated by the appropriate Secretary;

"(iv) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Army, two of whom shall be members of the National

Guard of the United States and two of whom shall be members of the Army Reserve;

"(v) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, two of whom shall be members of the Naval Reserve and two of whom shall be members of the Marine Corps Reserve;

"(vi) four Reserve officers appointed by the Secretary of Defense upon recommendation of the Secretary of the Air Force, two of whom shall be members of the Air National Guard of the United States and two of whom shall be members of the Air Force Reserve; and

"(vii) a Reserve officer of general or flag officer grade appointed by the chairman of the Board with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, who shall act as military adviser to the chairman and shall serve as executive officer of the Board without vote.

"(b) When the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury may designate a Regular or Reserve officer of the Coast Guard to serve with the Reserve Forces Policy Board but he shall not be a voting member.

"(c) The Reserve Forces Policy Board, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense designated pursuant to section 256 (a) of this Act, shall be the principal policy adviser to the Secretary of Defense on matters pertaining to the reserve components.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or modify in any manner the functions of the committees on reserve policies established pursuant to section 5 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or by this Act: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall prevent a member of those committees from serving as a member of the Reserve Forces Policy Board.

"(e) The semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense as required by the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, shall contain a chapter which shall be a report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board on the status of the reserve programs of the Department of Defense.

"SEC. 258. Each Armed Force of the United States shall maintain adequate and current personnel records of each member of its reserve components, indicating the physical condition, dependency status, military qualifications, civilian occupational skills, availability, and such other data as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe.

"SEC. 259. The Secretary of Defense is directed to require the complete and up-to-date dissemination of information of interest to the reserve components to all members of the reserve components and to the public in general.

"PART III—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE ARMY

"SEC. 301. The National Guard of the United States and the Army Reserve are reserve components of the Army. All officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and all officers and enlisted members of the Army Reserve are Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members, respectively, of the Army.

"SEC. 302. The Organized Reserve Corps is redesignated as the Army Reserve.

"SEC. 303. The Army Reserve includes all Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Army other than those who are members of the National Guard of the United States.

"SEC. 304. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Army Reserve, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Army Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Army Reserve, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Army Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons in the Army Reserve. The husbands of women members of the Army Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

"PART IV—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

"SEC. 401. The Naval Reserve is the reserve component of the Navy.

"SEC. 402. The Marine Corps Reserve is the reserve component of the Marine Corps.

"SEC. 403. The Coast Guard Reserve is the reserve component of the Coast Guard.

"SEC. 404. The Naval Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Chief of Naval Operations. The bureaus and offices of the Navy shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Naval Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

"SEC. 405. The Marine Corps Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Commandant of the Marine Corps. The departments and offices of the Marine Corps shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Marine Corps Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

"SEC. 406. The Coast Guard Reserve shall be organized, administered, trained, and supplied under the direction of the Commandant of the Coast Guard. The departments and offices of the Coast Guard shall hold the same relation and responsibility to the Coast Guard Reserve as they do to the Regular Establishment.

"SEC. 407. For the purpose of considering, recommending, and reporting to the appropriate Secretary on reserve policy matters, there shall be convened at least annually, at the seat of government, a Naval Reserve Policy Board, a Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board, and a Coast Guard Reserve Policy Board. At least half of the members of each such Reserve policy board shall be officers of the appropriate reserve component.

"SEC. 408. The Act of March 17, 1949 (ch. 23; 63 Stat. 14), is amended by striking out the first proviso thereof.

"SEC. 409. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe a suitable flag to be known as the Naval Reserve flag. This flag may be flown by seagoing merchant vessels—

"(a) documented under the laws of the United States, which have been designated by the Secretary of the Navy under such regulations as he may prescribe as suitable for service as naval auxiliaries in time of war, and

"(b) the master or commanding officer and not less than 50 per centum of the other licensed officers of which are members of the Navy or Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 410. The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe a suitable pennant to be known as the Naval Reserve yacht pennant. This pennant may be flown by yachts and similar-type vessels—

"(a) documented under the laws of the United States, which have been designated by the Secretary of the Navy under such regulations as he may prescribe as suitable for service as naval auxiliaries in time of war, and

"(b) the captain or owner of which is a member of the Navy or Naval Reserve.

"SEC. 411. In time of national emergency declared by the President or by the Congress and in time of war, the President is authorized to appoint qualified persons (including persons who hold no Regular or Reserve status) as temporary officers in the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve in any of the several commissioned officer grades, and persons so appointed may be ordered to active duty for such periods of time as the President may prescribe. The appointment of such a temporary officer, if not sooner vacated, shall continue during the national emergency or war in which the appointment was made and for six months thereafter. All such temporary appointments may be vacated at any time by the President. Temporary officers so appointed may, upon application, and, if selected, be commissioned as a Regular or Reserve officer of the Armed Force of the United States in which he served as provided by law.

"SEC. 412. Temporary members now or hereafter enrolled in the Coast Guard Reserve are excluded from the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 413. (a) Members of the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve who have performed a total of not less t an thirty years' active Federal service; or who have had not less than twenty years' active Federal service, the last ten years of which shall have been performed during the eleven years immediately preceding their transfer to a Retired Reserve; may be placed in a Retired Reserve upon their request.

"(b) Except while on active duty, personnel transferred to a Retired Reserve as provided by this section shall be entitled to pay at the rate of 50 per centum of their active-duty rate of pay.

"(c) If a performance of duty for which commended occurred not later than December 31, 1946, officers specially commended for a performance of duty in actual combat with the enemy by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed shall be advanced to the next higher grade when placed in a Retired Reserve. However, officers heretofore holding rank or grade on the honorary retired lists of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve or hereafter holding rank or grade in a Retired Reserve pursuant to this section above captain in the Naval Reserve or above colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve solely by virtue of such commendation, if hereafter recalled to active duty, may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be recalled either in the rank or grade to which they would otherwise be entitled had they not been accorded higher rank or grade by virtue of such commendation, or in the rank or grade held by them in a Retired Reserve.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any person who is not a member of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve on the effective date of this Act.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall terminate twenty years from the effective date of this Act, but such termination shall not affect any accrued rights to retired pay.

"(f) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed as prohibiting any person eligible for retirement under the provisions of this section from retiring under the provisions of any other law under which he may be eligible.

"SEC. 414. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve; to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve; and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, as appropriate, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, as appropriate, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons. The husbands of women members of the Naval Reserve,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

"PART V—THE NAVAL MILITIA

"SEC. 501. The Naval Militia consists of the Naval Militia of the States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 502. The Secretary of the Navy may appoint any officer or enlisted member of the Naval Militia to the rank, grade, or rating for which qualified in the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve.

"SEC. 503. When ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve who are members of the Naval Militia of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia shall stand relieved from all service or duty in the Naval Militia from the active duty date of the orders and for so long as they remain on active duty.

"SEC. 504. Such vessels, material, armament, equipment, and other facilities of the Navy and Marine Corps as are or may be made available to the Naval Reserve and the Marine Corps Reserve may also be made available in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy for issue or loan to the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia for the use of the Naval Militia if—

"(a) at least 95 per centum of the personnel of the portion or unit of the Naval Militia to which such facilities would be made available are members of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve, and

"(b) the organization, administration, and training of the Naval Militia conform to standards prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

"PART VI—RESERVE COMPONENTS OF THE AIR FORCE

"SEC. 601. The Air National Guard of the United States and the Air Force Reserve are reserve components of the Air Force. All officers and enlisted members of the Air National Guard of the United States and all officers and enlisted members of the Air Force Reserve are Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members, respectively, of the Air Force.

"SEC. 602. The Air Force Reserve includes all Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Air Force other than those who are members of the Air National Guard of the United States.

"SEC. 603. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male officers and former officers of the Air Force Reserve, to enlisted men and former enlisted men of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries shall in like cases be applicable respectively to female Reserve officers and female former Reserve officers of the Air Force Reserve, to Reserve enlisted women and former Reserve enlisted women of the Air Force Reserve, and to their dependents and beneficiaries except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the female persons in the Air Force Reserve. The husbands of women members of the Air Force Reserve shall not be considered dependent unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for over half of their support, and the children of such members shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their mother for over half of their support.

"PART VII—THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 701. The National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States are reserve components of the Army and the Air Force, respectively, and references in this Act, in the absence of express provision otherwise, are to be construed accordingly. Whenever joint reference is made to the National Guard of the United States and the Air National Guard of the United States on any matter of common concern together with reference to the Army and Air Force or other component thereof, the reference in the case of the National Guard of the United States shall be construed to be to the Army and in the case of the Air National Guard of the United States to be to the Air Force.

"SEC. 702. (a) The National Guard of the United States shall consist of all federally recognized units, organizations, and members of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, who, in addition to their status as such, are Reserves of the Army in the same commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade as they hold in the National Guard of the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia.

"(b) The Air National Guard of the United States shall consist of all federally recognized units, organizations, and members of the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, who in addition to their status as such, are Reserves of the Air Force in the same commissioned, warrant, or enlisted grade as they hold in the Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, or the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 703. (a) To be federally recognized, a member of the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia must be a member of a federally recognized unit or other federally recognized subdivision of the National Guard or Air National Guard, respectively, and possess the qualifications prescribed by the appropriate Secretary for the grade, branch, position, and type of unit or other subdivision involved, and, in the case of officers, except as provided in section 705 of this Act, successfully pass the examination prescribed by section 75, National Defense Act, as amended.

"(b) Upon being federally recognized, those officers who do not hold appointments as Reserve officers of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States shall be appointed as Reserve officers of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States in the same grade in which they hold federally recognized appointments in the National Guard or Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for service as a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate: *Provided*, That the acceptance of an appointment in the same grade and branch as a Reserve officer of the Armed Force of the United States concerned, by an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, shall not operate to vacate his State, Territory, or District of Columbia National Guard or Air National Guard office.

"SEC. 704. The appropriate Secretary may by regulation authorize the temporary extension of Federal recognition to any officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard who shall have successfully passed the examination prescribed in section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended, pending final determination of his eligibility for, and his appointment as, a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force in the grade concerned. If and when so appointed the appointment shall be dated as of, shall be considered to have been accepted on, and shall be deemed to have been effective from, the date of uch recognition. However, a temporary extension of Federal recognition shall be granted only when the officer takes oath that during such recognition he will perform all Federal duties and obligations required of him the same as though he was appointed as a Reserve officer of the Army or Air Force in the same grade. Such temporary recognition may be withdrawn at any time and if not sooner withdrawn or replaced by permanent recognition upon appointment as a Reserve officer in the same grade, it shall automatically terminate six months after its effective date: *Provided*, That temporary extension of Federal recognition may, as provided in this section, be granted to Reserve officers pending final determination of their eligibility for such Federal recognition.

"SEC. 705. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 75, National Defense Act, as amended, whenever a member of the Army Reserve or Air Force Reserve becomes an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or District of Columbia in the same grade in which he is appointed as a Reserve officer of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States, he shall, subject to such physical examination as may be prescribed, be extended Federal recognition in such grade as of the date of his appointment in the National Guard or Air National Guard and concurrently become a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate, and ceases to be a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve.

"(b) Whenever a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve is duly enlisted in the National Guard or Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and is a member of a federally recognized unit or organization thereof, in the same grade in which he is a Reserve of the appropriate Armed Force of the United States, he becomes a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States and ceases to be a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve.

"SEC. 706. Under such regulations as the appropriate Secretary may prescribe, and with the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned, a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States may be transferred in grade at any time to the Army Reserve or the Air Force Reserve, and such transfer shall terminate his federally recognized National Guard or Air National Guard status. Upon the transfer of any person whose service has been honorable, from the National Guard of the United States or from the Air National Guard of the United States to the Army Reserve or to the Air Force Reserve, he shall be eligible for promotion to the highest permanent grade previously held in the Army or any component thereof or in the Air Force or any component thereof.

"SEC. 707. Unless discharged from his appointment or enlistment as a Reserve officer or Reserve enlisted member, respectively, whenever a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States ceases to hold a status as a federally recognized member of the National Guard or of the Air National Guard of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, he becomes a member of the Army Reserve or of the Air Force Reserve and ceases to be a member of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States.

"SEC. 708. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, warrant officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States may, without affecting such status, hold appointments as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army or of the Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant or first lieutenant without vacating their warrant or enlisted grades and ratings

in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 709. Except when ordered thereto in accordance with law, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States shall not be on active duty in the service of the United States. When not on active duty in the service of the United States, they shall be administered, armed, uniformed, equipped, and trained in their status as members of the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 710. When ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States shall stand relieved from duty in the National Guard and Air National Guard of their respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia from the active-duty date of the orders and for so long as they remain on active duty in the service of the United States. During such active duty in the service of the United States, they shall be subject to the laws and regulations applicable to members of the Army and Air Force.

"SEC. 711. Upon ordering any portion of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States into the active military service of the United States, the President may relieve the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned of such accountability and liability under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe for any United States property theretofore issued to it for the use of such portion of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States.

"SEC. 712. (a) During the initial mobilization, insofar as practicable, the organization of units of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States existing at the date of an order to active Federal service shall be maintained intact.

"(b) Upon being relieved from active duty, insofar as practicable, units, organizations, and individuals shall be returned to the National Guard and Air National Guard in their respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, together with sufficient arms and equipment as determined by the appropriate Secretary to accomplish their peacetime mission.

"SEC. 713. (a) When officers and enlisted members of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States are ordered into Federal service they shall be ordered to active duty in their status as Reserve officers and Reserve enlisted members of the Army or Air Force.

"(b) When the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States is ordered into the active military service of the United States, officers of the National Guard and of the Air National Guard who do not hold appointments as Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force may be so appointed by the President in the same grade and branch held by them in the National Guard or Air National Guard.

"SEC. 714. For the purposes of all laws now or hereafter enacted providing benefits for members of the National Guard of the United States and of the Air National Guard of the United States and their dependents and beneficiaries—

"(a) All military training, duties, and service performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, for which they are entitled by law to receive pay from the United States, shall be considered military training, duties, and service in the service of the United States performed by them as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force.

"(b) The full-time training or other full-time duty performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia pursuant to sections 94, 97, 99, and 113 of the National Defense Act, as amended, for which they are entitled to receive pay from the United States, or without pay as provided in section 240 of this Act shall be considered active duty for training in the service of the United States as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force: *Provided*, That from the date of enactment of this Act such duty for a period of thirty days or more shall be considered active service as members of the Armed Forces for the purposes of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 963) as amended (37 U. S. C. 31a et seq.).

"(c) The inactive-duty training performed by members of the National Guard of the United States or members of the Air National Guard of the United States while in their status as members of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia under regulations prescribed by the appropriate Secretary pursuant to section 92 of the National Defense Act, as amended, or other express provision shall be considered inactive-duty training in the service of the United States as Reserve members of the Army or Air Force.

"PART VIII—APPROPRIATIONS, REPEALS, AMENDMENTS, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 801. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"SEC. 802. Except as otherwise specifically provided, this Act shall become effective on the first day of the sixth month following the month of enactment.

"SEC. 803. The following Acts and parts of Acts are repealed.

"The Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, except for all provisions of title II and section 304 of title III. Notwithstanding the repeal of section 1 and section 4 of title I of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, the Fleet Reserve established by said Act, as amended, shall be composed of persons transferred thereto in accordance with title II of said Act, as amended, including (a) those former members of the Fleet Naval Reserve as a result of sixteen or more years of active naval service who were transferred to the Fleet Reserve in accordance with the said Act, and (b) citizens of the Philippine Islands who were in the naval service or July 4, 1946, or who, having been discharged from the naval service on or prior to that date, reenlisted therein subsequent to July 4, 1946, but before the expiration of three months following discharge. The unrepealed provisions of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended, shall continue to apply to the Marine Corps as well as the Navy.

"The Act of March 17, 1941 (ch. 19, 55 Stat. 43, as amended; 34 U. S. C. 855c–2).

"Section 10 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738; 34 U. S. C. 850 (i)).

"Section 1 of the Act of December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1066; 34 U. S. C. 853c–5).

"The Act of January 20, 1942 (ch. 12, 56 Stat. 10; 34 U. S. C. 853a–1).

Title 14, United States Code, sections 751, 752, 753, and 759.

"Sections 37, 37a, 38, 55a, and 111 of the National Defense Act, as amended.

"The second paragraph of section 56 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 4a).

"Paragraph (b) of section 71 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 4b).

"The last paragraph of section 75 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 113).

"The second sentence of section 77 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 114).

"That portion of section 109 of the National Defense Act, as amended, which precedes the final proviso of the section (32 U. S. C. 143).

"Section 11 of the Act of August 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 738, as amended; 34 U. S. C. 850j).

"Sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Act of December 4, 1942 (56 Stat. 1039–1040; 10 U. S. C. 904b, c, and d).

"Section 117 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 47, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 377).

"Sections 109 and 310 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 (62 Stats. 362 and 374; 10 U. S. C. 378, 5 U. S. C. 627i).

"SEC. 804. (a) The third and fourth paragraphs under the subheading 'Ordnance Stores and Equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' of the Act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72), as amended (10 U. S. C. 371 and 371b), are further amended by striking out the words 'Officers' Reserve Corps or Enlisted Reserve Corps' wherever they appear therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'reserve components of the Armed Forces' and by inserting in the third paragraph after the word 'ordered' where it first appears the words 'to active duty for training, or active duty, or'.

"(b) Section 412 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 721; 22 U. S. C. 1584) shall not apply to any person, not on active duty in the Armed Forces, solely by reason of his having served on active duty or active duty for training as a member of a reserve component within the preceding two years.

"SEC. 805. The Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended (10 U. S. C. 374–377), is further amended as follows:

"(a) Section 115 is amended to read: 'Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Reserve and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall, in like cases, be applicable respectively to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Army Reserve and to their dependents and beneficiaries.'

"(b) Section 116 is amended to read: 'Appointments of Reserve officers for service in the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Army Reserve may be made in such grades and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of twenty-one years and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided*, That female officers appointed pursuant to the Act of June 22, 1944, and honorably separated from the service thereafter may, if otherwise qualified be appointed as Reserve officers in the highest grade satisfactorily held by them in active service.'

"SEC. 806. The National Defense Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

"(a) Section 69, as amended (32 U. S. C. 124), is further amended by striking out the words 'and in the National Guard of the United States'.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"(b) Section 70, National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 123), is further amended by striking out the language contained therein and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'Men enlisting in the National Guard and Air National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia shall sign an enlistment contract and subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

" ' "I do hereby acknowledge to have voluntarily enlisted this day of , 19 , in the National Guard (Air National Guard) of the State of for a period of year(s) under the conditions prescribed by law, unless sooner discharged by proper authority.

" ' "I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and to the State of ; that I will serve them honestly and faithfully against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the Governor of and the orders of the officers appointed over me, according to law and regulations."

" 'The oath of enlistment prescribed in this section may be taken before any officer of the National Guard (Air National Guard) or any other person authorized to administer oaths of enlistments in the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, by respective laws thereof.'

"(c) The first paragraph of section 73, as amended (32 U. S. C. 112), is further amended by striking the words 'and in the National Guard of the United States' and the words 'in the National Guard of the United States and'.

"(d) Section 72, as amended (32 U. S. C. 125), is further amended by striking out the words 'and the National Guard of the United States'.

"(e) Section 76, as amended (32 U. S. C. 115), is further amended by striking out the words 'the National Guard of the United States' in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'his appointment as a Reserve of the Armed Forces concerned' and by striking out the words 'in the National Guard of the United States' in the third sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'as a Reserve of the Armed Forces concerned'.

"(f) Section 78, as amended (32 U. S. C. 132, 133, 134), is further amended by striking out the words 'and in the National Guard of the United States' in paragraph 1 thereof, and by striking out the words 'or the National Guard of the United States' in paragraph 2 thereof.

"(g) Section 81, as amended (32 U. S. C. 172 and 175), is further amended by striking out the words 'The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of officers of the National Guard of the United States recommended as suitable for such appointment by their respective governors, and who have had ten or more years' commissioned service in the active National Guard at least five of which have been in the line, and who have attained at least the grade of colonel. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall hold office for four years unless sooner removed for cause, and shall be eligible to succeed himself, and when sixty-four years of age shall cease to hold such office. Upon accepting his office, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed a major general in the National Guard of the United States, and commissioned in the Army of the United States, and while so serving he shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general, provided by law, but shall not be entitled to retirement or retired pay.' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, by selection from lists of officers of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States recommended as suitable for such appointment by their respective governors, and who have had ten or more years' commissioned service in the active National Guard or Air National Guard or any combination thereof, and who have attained at least the grade of colonel. The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall hold office for four years unless sooner removed for cause, and shall be eligible to succeed himself and when sixty-four years of age shall cease to hold such office. Upon accepting his office, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall be appointed as a Reserve officer of the appropriate Armed Force in the grade of major general, and shall be commissioned in the Army of the United States, and shall be a member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate.' in paragraph 1 thereof, and by striking out the words 'hold appointments in' and inserting in lieu thereof the following words: 'are members of' in paragraph 2 thereof, and by inserting after the word 'States' where it first appears in paragraph 3 thereof, the words 'or the Air National Guard of the United States,', and by striking out the words 'provided in this section' in the last sentence of said paragraph, and in the same sentence after the word 'States' by inserting the words 'or Air National Guard of the United States', and by striking the period at the end of the sentence and adding the words 'or Air National Guard.'

"(h) The seventh paragraph of section 127 (a), as amended (10 U. S. C. 513), is further amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and substituting a colon and adding the following: '*Provided further*, That persons may be appointed as Reserve officers of the Army or the Air Force in times of war.'

"(i) Section 55, as amended (10 U. S. C. 421, 423, 424, 425), is further amended by deleting all of the section except the last sentence thereof; and the last sentence of section 55, as amended, is further amended by deleting the comma first appearing therein and the words 'whether' and 'or the Enlisted Reserve Corps', and by inserting after the words 'Regular Army' the words 'or in the Regular Air Force'.

"(j) Section 58, as amended (32 U. S. C. 4), is further amended by striking the word 'twenty-one' appearing in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'eighteen'.

"Sec. 807. (a) Subsection (b) of section 2 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 is amended by inserting after the words 'in any of the components of the Army;' the words 'all persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves of the Army, including persons transferred to such status under any provision of law;'.

"(b) Section 301 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 is amended—

"(1) by striking out the words 'Organized Reserve Corps' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Army Reserve'; and

"(2) by inserting after the words 'above-named components;' the words 'all persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves of the Army, including persons transferred to such status under any provision of law;'.

"Sec. 808. Section 205 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (34 U. S. C. 854 (d)) is amended by deleting the second proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof: '*Provided further*, That men so transferred to the Fleet Reserve for the four-year period and officers and men otherwise assigned thereto pursuant to title II of this Act, or other provision of law, may be ordered by competent authority to active duty without their consent (a) in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress for the duration of the war or national emergency, and for six months thereafter, and (b) in time of national emergency declared by the President or when otherwise authorized by law; and, except as otherwise provided in this title, shall be under no obligation to perform training duty or drill, and shall be paid in advance $20 per annum: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy may release any member of the Fleet Reserve from active duty or active duty for training at any time, except that, in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress, or in time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President, a member of the Fleet Reserve who is serving on active duty shall be released from active duty only on the approved recommendation of a board of officers convened by competent authority if the member requests such action, if such release from active duty is not during a period of demobilization or reduction in strength of the Navy.'

"Sec. 809. All provisions of law which refer to appointment or enlistment in or transfer to any of the reserve components shall be deemed to refer to appointment or enlistment as a Reserve or transfer to such status in the appropriate Armed Force of the United States. All provisions of law which refer to persons enlisted or appointed in or transferred to any of the reserve components shall be deemed to refer to persons appointed or enlisted as Reserves or transferred to such status in the appropriate Armed Force of the United States.

"Sec. 810. Any right accrued or any proceeding commenced before this Act takes effect is not affected by the provisions of this Act, but all procedure thereafter taken, shall conform to the provisions of this Act.

"Sec. 811. (a) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or modify, in any manner, the authority to order persons or units to active military service or training pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided in section 806 (g), nothing in this Act shall be construed as changing existing laws pertaining to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

"Sec. 812. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this Act for any period prior to the effective date thereof.

"Sec. 813. Section 4 (d) (3) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words 'appointed in the Armed Forces' where first appearing therein and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'appointed under any provision of law, in the Armed Forces, including the reserve components thereof,'. This section shall be effective as of June 19, 1951."

And the Senate agree to the same.

OVERTON BROOKS,
O. C. FISHER,
L. GARY CLEMENTE,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LESTER C. HUNT,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
HARRY P. CAIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the con-

ferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On October 15, 1951, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 5426, relating to the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces of the United States. On June 27, 1952, the Senate considered the House bill and amended it by striking all after the enacting clause and inserting different language as a Senate version.

As a result of the foregoing action on the part of the Senate, many differences between the Senate language and the House language resulted. Many of these differences were technical in nature, such as correction of typographical mistakes, clarification of language and other similar type corrections. In addition, some rewriting was necessary, on the part of the Senate, because almost a year had elapsed between the time of passage of the bill by the two Houses. In the intervening period, Universal Military Training had been presented to the House and had failed of passage. Consequently, some of the Senate provisions written after the failure of Universal Military Training legislation to be enacted into law were necessary and proper. In those instances where the Senate language was more appropriate, the House receded. However, it should be noted that on the main provisions of this bill, the very backbone of the legislation, the House provisions prevail.

The House bill (sec. 234 (a)) provides that members of the Reserve components in an inactive or retired status shall not be involuntarily ordered to active duty unless the appropriate Secretary determines that no qualified Reservists in an active status in the required category are available. On the other hand, the Senate amendment provides that no Reservists on an inactive status list or in a retired status shall be ordered to active duty without their consent unless the appropriate Secretary, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, determines that adequate numbers of qualified members of the Reserve components in an active status or in the Inactive National Guard in the required category are not available.

The purpose of the Senate change was to make this provision a little more flexible, to require the Secretary of Defense to supervise its administration, and to assure that the availability of the Inactive National Guard is not harmed thereby. The House recedes.

Section 255 of the House bill provides that boards for the promotion, demotion, and discharge, etc., of Reservists shall include appropriate numbers of Reservists and that the members of such boards shall be senior to the persons being considered thereby. This provision was modified in the Senate amendment so as to provide more flexibility by allowing the Reserve representation on such boards to be established by regulation, and to authorize medical and legal members of such boards to be junior to the person being considered, except where the person being considered is in the same category. The House recedes with an amendment.

The House bill (sec. 256 (d)) contains a statement that the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 should be immediately implemented. That act authorizes the construction of armories and other Reserve facilities. The Senate bill contains no similar provision. This provision was originally written into the House bill because of the language in Conference Report No. 3026 which accompanied H. R. 8594 in the Eighty-first Congress, which, in turn, became the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950. The language in the report is as follows:

"In agreeing to the compromise position as adopted by the Conferees, it is the intent of the Conferees that none of the funds authorized will be made available through appropriations until such consideration is justified by a lessening of the international tension, and particularly the Korean situation."

The House, in adopting its version, was of the opinion that the National Defense Facilities Act should be implemented because many of the draftees who were inducted shortly after the beginning of Korean hostilities will be coming out of the active service with an obligation to serve in a Reserve component. It is axiomatic that facilities must be provided for the Reserve components if adequate training is to be offered. Since the conference report, which accompanied the bill which was to become the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950, contained the restricting provisions that none of the funds authorized would be made available through appropriations, it was felt that the sense of the Congress should be expressed to the effect that funds should be made available under the authorization of that Act, if justified, for the construction of Reserve facilities. The provision was rewritten for the purposes of clarity. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

The House bill (sec. 260) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Congress legislative recommendations for the promotion of Reserve officers and to equalize benefits of Reservists and Regulars. The Senate amendment deleted this provision, since the Department of Defense has complied and already submitted its legislative recommendations. They are H. R. 7856 and 7002, now pending in the House. Inasmuch as this provision of the bill is no longer necessary, the House conferees agreed to delete the provision. The House recedes.

The bill, as passed by the House (sec. 211), established the inactive status list which would consist of those members of the Reserve components who are unable to participate in training and, in addition, the House bill (sec. 227) provides for persons with physical disabilities which could be remedied within 1 year, to be placed on the inactive status list. The Senate amendment provides that no person who has an obligated period of service shall be placed on an inactive status list. Although the regulations of the Secretary of Defense, which the House bill provided for, should adequately take care of this matter, it was agreed that the Senate language was safer and that personnel with obligated periods of service would, by law, be prevented from transferring to the inactive status list and thus decrease their vulnerability for call to active duty. Furthermore, it was thought, by virtue of their own default, some persons might decrease their liability for active duty by a transfer to the inactive status list and, consequently, the House conferees agreed that the Senate language should prevail. In addition, to make the bill consistent the conferees agreed that the authorization for a transfer for persons with temporary or remedial physical disabilities to the inactive status list should be deleted. The House recedes.

The House bill (sec. 217 (b)) provided that the relative precedence of Reserve officers and Regular officers shall be determined in accordance with date of rank. This provision was deleted from the Senate amendment apparently because it was believed to be more appropriate for inclusion in the Reserve promotion bill. It is true that the matter of precedence is covered in the Reserve promotion bill which has been submitted to Congress, but inasmuch as that legislation has not been acted upon, it was thought that this provision should stay in pending a thorough study of the matter when hearings on Reserve promotion legislation are held. The Senate recedes.

The House bill makes no specific reference to the Inactive National Guard. The Senate amendment retains the Inactive National Guard in its present status, that is, as a special category within the National Guard where those members of the National Guard who are unable to participate in training may be placed for limited periods. The National Guard favors this provision and the conferees agreed that it should be included. The House recedes.

The House bill contains a provision (sec. 215) which would provide that the organization, operation, administration, training, maintenance and supply of each Reserve component shall be integrated with those of the Regular components. The Senate amendment did not contain such an amendment since it was objected to by the National Guard on the grounds that it might tend to federalize the Guard. The conferees felt that the section was merely a statement of policy and denotes something that is already being done administratively, so that the inclusion of the controversial problem was not necessary. The House recedes.

Section 217 (c) of the House bill provides that wherever and whenever Regular officers have been given constructive credit for previous professional training, Reserve officers shall receive the same credit. The Senate amendment contained no provision. The Senate Conferees pointed out that any such legislation should be properly taken up in a promotion bill and inasmuch as the Reserve Officers Personnel Act was pending, the matter should be considered in conjunction with that legislation. Furthermore, the provision of the House bill is very broad and would provide constructive credit for all present and future Reserve officers while the Regular officers, who receive credit in the Navy which was not extended to Reserve officers, were a limited group holding particular assignments at a particular time. The conferees were of the opinion that although the provision in the House bill would benefit a few, it might well discriminate against many. Consequently, it was thought that this provision should be deleted from the bill and made the subject of a special study when hearings on the Reserve Officers Personnel Act are held at some later date. The House recedes.

The House bill repealed the dual oaths now required for members of the National Guard and Air National Guard, because such is a matter for State legislation to provide for State oaths. However, in the hearings before the Senate committee, the National Guard asked that the State oaths for the members of the National Guard and Air National Guard be made a part of this legislation. While it would appear that the State oath is a matter of State legislation, in order to avoid placing a special burden on the States, the Senate amendment continued, with minor amendments, the present oaths for members of the National Guard and Air National Guard. The House recedes.

The House bill (sec. 225) provides that hereafter all appointments as Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term and further provides that present Reserve officers who do not now have indefinite appointments, will have their present appointments automatically changed to indefinite appointments, unless, within 6 months after notification by the Armed Service concerned, which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of the act, they decline to have their current appointments changed. This provision would affect only members of the Officers Reserve Corps of the Army, Air Force Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, since appointments in those components are the only appointments which are not for an indefinite term, as now established by statute. The Senate amendment provides that present Reserve officers will not have the terms of their current appointments changed unless the officer concerned accepts an indefinite appointment. By the terms of the Senate amendment, an officer would be required

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

to accept an indefinite appointment within 6 months after notice by competent authority which is required to be given within 6 months from the effective date of the act. The language difference of the two sections may seem inconsequential, but considerable controversy among the conferees was aroused by this portion of the bill. Finally speaking, the two provisions mean that, as to the House version, an officer will be blanketed into an indefinite Reserve appointment unless he makes some affirmative action to discontinue his Reserve commission and insofar as the Senate amendment is concerned, the officer will not be given an indefinite appointment unless he makes some affirmative action indicating his desire for same.

The House conferees could not help but feel the responsibility they undertook when originally conducting hearings on the Armed Forces Reserve Act and that was to assist the Reservist in every way possible and to remove every stumbling block to his future well-being as a member of a Reserve component. Since the House version would place a greater burden upon the Reserve officer, and indeed might blanket him into the Reserve indefinitely, through error or procrastination on his part, the House conferees agreed with the Senate amendment. The House recedes with an amendment.

Section 257 of the House bill requires a general officer of each Armed Service to be appointed to be responsible for all Reserve affairs of that Armed Service to the Chief of Staff or Commandant, as appropriate. The Senate amendment provided that this provision should not impinge in any way upon the duties of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau in order to meet the National Guard objection that this provision might be construed by the military departments to reduce the status of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. This problem was covered in the House Report and the Senate amendment merely writes into the bill what was stated to have been the House position. The House recedes.

The House bill (sec. 228) provides that all enlistments and all required periods of obligated service in the Reserve components in effect at the beginning of, or entered into, during time of war, national emergency declared by the Congress, or national emergency proclaimed by the President, shall continue for the duration of the war or national emergency and for 6 months thereafter. The Senate amendment did not provide for the extension of enlistments or periods of obligated service during a period of Presidential emergency. It is true that the authority granted by the House bill would allow the Department of Defense to hold in service those persons who had been adequately trained during a threat of hostilities. On the other hand, the Senate conferees pointed out that this authority should not be granted during limited Presidential emergencies, but that Congress should determine whether enlistments should be extended. Inasmuch as the House conferees were strongly in favor of retaining a maximum of control in the Legislative Branch, they agreed to the Senate amendment. The House recedes.

The Senate amendment included provisions that the secretaries of the military departments shall establish adequate provisions with respect to female Reserve officers to insure that such personnel shall not be declared ineligible for appointment or enlistment in the Reserve solely on the basis of having minor or dependent children and that such personnel shall not be discharged involuntarily solely because of the birth or assumption of care or custody of children.

The Senate provisions, in this respect, result from a floor amendment and were never considered by the conferees during hearings on the bill in the House committee. The conferees agreed that additional study should be given to this matter and since it was controversial, hasty action should not be taken. The Senate recedes.

The Senate amendment includes a provision which would credit all service performed as a cadet at the United States Military Academy pursuant to an appointment made prior to August 24, 1912, and all service performed as a midshipman in the United States Navy pursuant to an appointment made prior to March 4, 1913, in determining the amount of retirement pay, including longevity pay, to which officers in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces may be entitled under any provision of law. This provision of the Senate amendment was also offered on the Senate floor and, consequently, did not have study by either committee which held hearings on the Armed Forces Reserve Act. This provision of the Senate amendment would give creditable service to academy graduates, appointed prior to certain dates, for retirement purposes under Public Law 810, Eighty-second Congress. The conferees do not believe that retirement provisions of the Reserve Retirement Act should be opened in this act inasmuch as they can be made the subject of future legislation. The Senate recedes.

The House bill contains provisions (secs. 204–210) which would establish within each Armed Service two categories of Reservists based upon availability for active duty. These categories are known as the Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve. The Ready Reserve would be available for active duty in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress, in time of national emergency declared by the President, and when otherwise authorized by law. The Standby Reserve would be available for active duty only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or when otherwise authorized by law, or to phrase that liability in another way, only in time of full mobilization or when more than the Ready Reserve would be needed. The House was careful to include a limitation so that before any member of the Ready Reserve could be called to active duty in time of national emergency declared by the President, the Congress would have the right to authorize the numbers of persons which would be subject to such call.

The Senate amendment contains no provisions relating to the Ready and Standby Reserves. The effect of the Senate amendment is to leave the Reserve components in the same condition as before the beginning of the Korean hostilities. The House, by passing H. R. 5426, had indicated that it wanted no more of the old Reserve concept but rather the establishment of specific categories so that each Reservist would know his liability for future duty.

There is no doubt that the concept of the Ready and Standby Reserves is the crux of the entire Armed Forces Reserve Act. It was decided to accept the House version of the bill with minor changes, that is, the term of service which would allow a person to transfer to the Standby Reserve would be changed from 6 years to 5 years and a combination of active duty service and Reserve service totaling 5 years would be sufficient to allow a Reservist to transfer to the Standby Reserve and thus complete his period of obligated service under Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

After the recession of the Senate conferees on the concept of a Ready and Standby Reserve, some provisions of the legislation followed naturally. The House bill provided that one of the differences between the two categories was the degree of vulnerability for future recall to active duty. It was established that the Ready Reserve should be called first. Therefore, the House bill contained a provision which would allow the President to call members of the Ready Reserve, but only in such numbers as might be authorized by Congress. Therefore, Congress retains its traditional control, but the provisions of the House bill provided a different method for calling the Standby Reserve by specifying that that category could only be activated after a national emergency declared by Congress. The Senate amendment had no such provisions. It provided that all Reservists should only be called to active duty after a declaration of emergency by the Congress, thus making no distinction between any of the individual members of the Reserve components regardless of their period of prior service. Inasmuch as the Senate conferees had agreed to the House version of a Ready and Standby Reserve concept, the theory of calling the Ready Reserve, as contained in the House bill, was agreed to by the Senate conferees. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

Both conferees of the House and Senate were disturbed about the involuntary recall of both Standby and Ready Reservists and, therefore, wrote two provisions into the bill. The first deals with the involuntary recall of Ready Reservists and has for its intent the protection of all persons in this category and particularly those Ready Reservists who have served in Korea. The provision establishes a policy of Congress because of the hardship situations developed by the Korean hostilities so that attention shall be given to the duration and nature of previous service, to family responsibilities, and to employment found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety or interest. Furthermore, the Secretary of Defense must promulgate policies and procedures as may be required to carry out the congressional intent and, from time to time, and at least annually, report to the appropriate Committees on Armed Services of the Congress respecting same.

The Senate amendment contained a provision which would protect those who had served in the combat zone in Korea from further recall. However, the provision was so written that obvious discriminations would exist. For instance, a veteran of World War II with 5 years combat service who was again recalled following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, but was not assigned to the Korean combat zone, would find himself eligible for recall a third time, before a person who had been drafted and had served some time on the combat zone in Korea. The conferees could not allow such discriminations to exist and, therefore, did not feel that any demarcation line should be drawn between veterans of World War II and Korean veterans. The Senate recedes with an amendment.

The conferees were equally disturbed about the recall of members of the Standby Reserve under the provisions of both the House bill and the Senate amendment. Consequently, it was agreed that except in time of war, or unless otherwise authorized by Congress—(1) no unit of the Standby Reserve organized for the purpose of serving as such nor the members thereof, shall be ordered to active duty unless the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department) determines that adequate numbers of the required types of units of the Ready Reserve are not readily available, and, (2) no other member of the Standby Reserve shall be ordered to active duty as an individual without his consent, unless the appropriate Secretary (with the approval of the Secretary of Defense in the case of a Secretary of a military department) determines that adequate numbers of qualified members of the Ready Reserve in the required category are not readily available.

The foregoing provisions will insure members of the Standby Reserve from recall to active duty before their counterparts in the Ready Reserve have been exhausted, even

though a national emergency by the Congress has been declared.

Finally, the conferees decided that some finite limitation should be placed on the Ready Reserve. The problem was to place a ceiling which would not be too high so that appropriated funds for the training of the Ready Reserve would be spread so thin as to lose effect, nor to make the number so small as to make the striking force of the Ready Reserve ineffective. Consequently, the conferees set a ceiling, on the Ready Reserve, at 1,500,000 authorized personnel strength. It must be remembered that this includes the entire National Guard and Air National Guard and also will include all persons serving on active duty. Furthermore, the authorized strength set herein is a ceiling and can be lowered by administrative discretion.

OVERTON BROOKS,
O. C. FISHER,
L. GARY CLEMENTE,
JAMES E. VAN ZANDT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5426) relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a report on the Reserve bill, H. R. 5426, which passed the House last fall by unanimous consent, and was recently considered by the Senate. During the interval, of course, a great many things have occurred and there are a good many changes in the language of the Senate bill as compared to the House bill. We have gotten together on all of those changes by consent of all the conferees without sacrificing in any way the position of the House of Representatives in the original bill.

We preserved inviolate the fundamental provisions of the bill, which are: No. 1: That we have a Ready Reserve whose degree of vulnerability for call is set forth in the bill. Second, we have a Stand-by Reserve that is in a sheltered position and not callable except in case of all-out war.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Am I not correct in stating, this bill, is what we call the Reserve bill of rights, and is designed principally to eliminate the shabby treatment accorded the Reserves since the beginning of the Korean war?

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this bill goes far toward eliminating the possibility of a recurrence of the disagreeable experiences we had when the Reserves were called into active service at the beginning of the Korean war.

We provide, for instance, in the Ready Reserve, that only in certain ways shall those people be called into active service; and we provide that after 5 years they pass over into the Stand-by Reserve and are not to be called save in all-out war.

We provide in this bill as we did originally when it passed the House, that the Reserves shall not be called except by resolution of Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend, a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, this legislation will eliminate many of the injustices and inequities that the Reserves have suffered in the past.

I merely want to commend both the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for the diligent, intelligent, and painstaking work they have done on this matter.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said it eliminated some of the inequities and injustices; I would like to know whether it embodies any of the provisions of the Winstead bill which is intended to correct some of the vicious inequalities applicable to doctors and dentists who have already served and who now are subject to call and who, if they are called, will serve longer, will perhaps serve in the neighborhood of 3½ to 4½ years, despite the fact that there is a certain classification of doctors and dentists who have not served a single, solitary day.

Mr. BROOKS. I may say to my friend from Michigan that this bill does not embody the Winstead bill. The Winstead bill sought to amend the Medical Draft Act. This bill does not change the Medical Draft Act which is an entirely separate act. The conferees in considering the Winstead bill felt that they could not come within the limitations of the authority they had in considering the House and Senate bills, seek to amend the Medical Draft Act.

There is a lot of merit to what the gentleman has to say with reference to the recall of doctors who went to school either entirely or partially at the expense of the United States and who now are being recalled because they were educated either in full or in part by the United States Government and are required to serve a while. But we did not feel that we had authority to go into the matter of amendments to the Medical Draft Act.

Mr. DINGELL. But it is definitely recognized that there is an injustice to certain classifications of these reservists who are in the medical and dental field.

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. DINGELL. Am I correct?

Mr. BROOKS. There is a great deal to what the gentleman has said. This report does go far toward eliminating general inequities in the recall system. Take for instance the Korean amendment involving the Korean veteran reserves, we provided that the Korean veteran who comes out of that war should be put at the bottom of the list of these Ready Reserves and called only when nobody else who has the same qualifications is available.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When this bill becomes law isn't it a fact we will then go to work on a bill known as the ROTC bill, a promotion bill and a bill establishing an equality of rights and benefits for the reserves and regulars. When these 3 bills are laws then we will have a completely rounded out program for the reserves of this country.

Mr. DINGELL. Does that provide justice for the medical reserves?

Mr. BROOKS. We will take them up in due course. This is the first bill we have been working on to round out the entire reserve program. It is difficult to go ahead with the rest of the legislation, which is so important until this bill becomes law. The Defense Department has sent us the promotion bill, which is awaiting hearings; it sent to us a bill to equalize all of the rights and benefits of the reserves in the Regular Establishment and the ROTC bill, which are awaiting hearings. The Congress will take those bills up, and other bills to equalize all of the inequities of the reserves as against the Regular Establishment and to round out the entire reserve program.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. Does the bill we are working on give the President or the three Secretaries any right to give an enlisted man a dishonorable discharge without a court martial or hearing? It will be recalled that was eliminated here by committee amendment in the House.

Mr. BROOKS. We made no change in the House provision.

Mr. BRAY. As the bill now stands they do not have that right?

Mr. BROOKS. There is no change in that respect.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. The House will never know of the accomplishments of the committee headed by its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]. That committee has worked for many, many hours, and many, many days on an almost insuperable task to reconcile many pieces of crazy-quilt regulations to help the Reserves. They worked many nights burning the midnight oil. This is the first step in a new deal for the men who fight our wars. The House will never realize

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the great step forward which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], has made possible in all categories of our Reserve components. And to all members who served on that committee I want to express my appreciation for the fine job they have accomplished on behalf of this category of fighting men.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman very much. I want to say in conclusion, and I say this advisedly and I want the Members of the House to remember it, that when this bill becomes law as I feel now it must surely become law, you can go home and tell your reservists in all sincerity that we have taken a long step forward in the elimination of all of the injustices and all of the mishandling which lack of law in the past has made possible, and that we have in the framework of this bill a skeleton outline of at least a real, vitalized Reserve for national safety and security.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER submitted the following conference report and statement on House Concurrent Resolution 191, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2446)

The committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. Con. Res. 191) Favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendments, insert the following: "That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

"A-6427738, Abu-Zannad, Fakhri Eddin.
"A-6775706, Albrecht, Bohumil.
"A-9542215, Balodis, Eduards.
"A-6886819, Beck, Helene.
"A-6886821, Beck, Cecile.
"A-6886820, Malek, Serena Beck.
"A-6470386, Bednar, Zdenek Frantisek.
"A-6779245, Berkovic, Isaac.
"A-6780732, Berkovic, Mulvina.
"A-6811594, Cihovicz, Anna or Sister Maria Urbana Cihovicz.
"A-6618832, Czuker, Jan.
"A-6841088, Deutsch, Jozsef Gabor or Joseph Gabriel Deutsch.
"A-6794942, El-Hindi, Ahmad Eff Mohamed.
"A-6870402, Falkowski, Zdzislaw.
"A-6870403, Falkowski, Maria Janina.
"A-6953383, Falkowski, Malgorzata Maria Rosa.
"A-9716783, Falk, Bernard Alojzy.
"A-6503646, Friedman, Evzen.
"A-6389949, Friedman, Ruzena or Rose.
"A-6757652, Goldburd, Zundel.
"A-6757998, Goldburd, Basia.
"A-9652186, Grinbergs, Manfreds.
"A-6780725, Grunfeld, Alzbeta.
"A-6740921, Gurwicz, Meir.
"A-6707452, Gurwicz, Serena.
"A-7095745, Haas, Erzsebet or Elizabeth.
"A-6794993, Heller, Livia.
"A-6702147, Hendeles, Lajzer.
"A-6823660, Hendeles, Moselle (nee Cohen).
"A-7283102, Hrdinova, Milena Marie Anna.
"A-6860904, Iwensky, Saja.
"A-6694231, Kalisz, Icchok.
"A-6905321, Kaplanek, Ruzena.
"A-6760574, Kesler, Michael, or Michael Kesler-Guberman.
"A-7828443, Kostins, Vladimirs.
"A-6481280, Kovacs, Anna, or Maria Anna Crescentia Kovacs.
"A-6403567, Kwan, Wei.
"A-6627366, Kwan, Yun-Sun Hsieh.
"A-6819609, Lazar, Irene Theresa.
"A-6935235, Mach, Antonin.
"A-6704679, Magrys, Janina.
"A-6685998, Malach, Jinkas.
"A-7095744, Maly, Oldrich.
"A-6704677, Michniak, Felicia Theresa.
"A-6937218, Nagy, Tibor Julius.
"A-6983577, Roth, Herman.
"A-6765745, Schneider, Bluma Salzberg.
"A-6762002, Schneider, Chaim.
"A-6854619, Schwerd, Leopold.
"A-6854620, Schwerd, Bernard.
"A-6854621, Schwerd, Abraham.
"A-6804007, Segal, Simon.
"A-6726993, Seidl, Zdzislaw.
"A-6726994, Seidl, Margit.
"A-6704246, Sikora, Genowefa.
"A-6598476, Silbiger, Edith (Edita Silberger).
"A-7053523, Spiegel, Alexander Schlomo.
"A-7053521, Spiegel, Olga Wald.
"A-7941113, Spiegel, Edith.
"A-6759333, Szalai, Georgine Marie Etel Ida or Georgine Szalay.
"A-6636178, Szczepanski, Izrael.
"A-6739561, Szczepanski, Elka.
"A-7841770, Urga, Johans Jekabs.
"A-6775595, Vietorisz, Thomas Adam.
"A-7176736, Walder, Gyula.
"A-7176735, Walder, Ilona Dubik.
"A-6610297, Weinfeld, Ernest.
"A-6662194, Wenger, Szmul.
"A-6654356, Wenger, Kenia.
"A-6991753, Zaleski, Pawel or Paul Zaleski or Edward Novak.
"A-6714888, Zonabend, Zofia Felicja Zawadzka.
"A-6850602, Zupnick, Dora A.
"A-9543111, Altmark, Leo.
"A-6843513, Beer, Susan (nee Eisdorfer).
"A-6609639, Gottlieb, Marcel.
"A-6886816, Halpert, Ludwik or Leonard Halpert.
"A-6911231, Jakobi, Anna.
"A-6708652, Kawer, Benjamin.
"A-6886817, Klecki, Choma.
"A-6490332, Koppel, Izidor or Isidore.
"A-6523412, Kustin, Dina.
"A-7457274, Kustin, Abram.
"A-6523411, Kustin, Galina.
"A-6839294, Laturski, Tadeusz Stefan.
"A-6715860, Mauskopf, Mailich.
"A-6886814, Miller, Akiwa.
"A-6863775, Miller, Anna (nee Brander).
"A-6863774, Miller, Szabsy.
"A-6991757, Pap, Gabor Tivadar.
"A-6991758, Pap, Ilona.
"A-9776585, Partyka, Paul William, also Wilhelm Pawel Partika.
"A-6515510, Skotchko, Evelyn.
"A-6897055, Steinberger, Bela.
"A-6903667, Steinberger, Jeno.
"A-6440950, Verderber, Rachela.
"A-6440951, Verderber, Rechava.
"A-7073952, Wolinski, Edward.
"A-7863546, Wolinski, Henryka Wanda.
"A-6881417, Shapira, Clara.
"A-6361759, Bernardowicz, Wladislaw.
"A-6361760, Bernardowicz, Helena Sosnowitch.
"A-9776569, Burak, Josef Julian.
"A-7849973, Catarahia, Panait.
"A-7841917, Latkovic, Ilija.
"A-6780707, Neuman, Rachel.
"A-9727767, Onichimowski, Saturnin.
"A-6662205, Parkany, Janos.
"A-9543193, Pitka, Andreas.
"A-9556582, Sarr, Ludvig.
"A-7125497, Schick, Bedrich or Fritz Schick.
"A-7052319, Singer, Markus.
"A-7110845, Sinunu, Jacoub Badie.
"A-7095960, Sinunu, Alexander Badie.
"A-6860796, Teleki, Suzanne.
"A-9010488, Vajak, Jacob (Wajak).
"A-6910034, Wallner, Istvan or Stephen Wallner.
"A-6861909, Zanka, Jaroslav or Jerry.
"A-6891829, Bers, Naum Saia.
"A-6704679, Dorosz, Bozenna, Anna.
"A-6771742, Dudum, Manawell.
"A-6704687, Gawel, Zofai.
"A-9801211, Hermits, August.
"A-7079989, Hrdlicka, Richard Frantisek.
"A-6689608, Krajnik, Iszak.
"A-6193516, Lakovic, Rajko S.
"A-6685877, Leibowitz, Nochim.
"A-6676326, Leibowitz, Sara.
"A-9777236, Paala, Evald Aleksander.
"A-9831393, Faju, Arnold.
"A-6291887, Piasecki, Witold Marian.
"A-6291890, Piasecka, Helena.
"A-6691306, Purec, Hersz.
"A-7802322, Saar, Evald.
"A-6794819, Schwarcz, Emil.
"A-6991809, Schwarcz, Ruzena.
"A-7957361, Schwarcz, Maxmilian.
"A-6662192, Stupacezewski, Abram.
"A-9678258, Tapp, Augustine.
"A-9682086, Trella, Felika.
"A-6830450, Awad, Ishak Said.
"A-6499960, Basch, Abraham Hersh.
"A-6383642, Blat, Pinchos.
"A-7118810, Borsay, Maria Anna.
"A-6937571, Borsody, Istvan Karoly or Stephen Borsody.
"A-6937572, Borsody, Charlotte or Sarolta Borsody (nee Herzka).
"A-6937573, Borsody, Eva Katalin.
"A-6937574, Borsody, Hanna Erzsebet.
"A-6771769, Burianek, Otto.
"A-7057913, Calauz, Rozalie Pekete.
"A-6241050, Fen Wu Chi or Cary Wu.
"A-6944214, Hanak, Karla.
"A-6944213, Hanak Michael.
"A-6749974, Hauer, Miklos.
"A-7821840, Ingr, Sergej Jan.
"A-6829981, Klein, Jozef.
"A-6775565, Klima, Slava.
"A-6911181, Kolev, Ilia Gichev.
"A-9836601, Kowalczyk, Wladyslaw.
"A-7427257, Laats, Jyri Georg.
"A-6427743, Lorenzo, Jack Mubarak.
"A-6794698, Machek, Otakar.
"A-6896050, Niculescu, Barbu.
"A-6617281, Odeh, Aziz Salim.
"A-6985602, Perlmutter, Laszlo.
"A-6985601, Perlmutter, Katalin (nee Stern).
"A-7941872, Perlmutter, Aniko.
"A-6232285, Piekarski, Stanislaw Witold.
"A-6851559, Ping, Wong Wai.
"A-6622756, Raad, George Khalik.
"A-6816351, Rybarova, Anna or Anna Rybar.
"A-6344908, Rydz, Zygmunt.
"A-6803953, Rywkin, Mordchai or Mordchai Rivkin.
"A-6855954, Rywkin, Dvosia.
"A-7138279, Klimek, Adolf.
"A-9777307, Sum, Ho.
"A-6231163, Swastek, Franciszek Antoni.
"A-6688244, Szterenzer, Szymon.
"A-6912090, Szterenzer, Sonia.
"A-9663929, Varnag, Enn or Samuel Mool.
"A-74912670, Vesik, Mihkel.
"A-6461146, Vrastilova, Marie Alzbeta or Marie Vrastilova.
"A-7520334, Vymetalik, Henry or Jindrich Alos Mazarek.
"A-6536908, Weisz, Ignatz.

"A-7088157, Ziffer, Walter.
"A-7095722, Ardavanu, Nicolae alias Nicolae Rene Ardavanu.
"A-7095721, Ardavanu, Irina (nee Profeta).
"A-7052394, Benes, Rudolf.
"A-6848038, Chang, Chi-Jen.
"A-1804201, Chang, Wen Ti alias John Wen Ti Chang.
"A-7095968, Duchacek, Ivo.
"A-6694107, Dyksztejn, Idel.
"A-7439091, Fan, Mabel Shun Wha.
"A-6962949, Foris, Peter.
"A-7138234, Gold, Michel.
"A-6689553, Gross, Moric.
"A-6644593, Grunwald, Peter.
"A-6534204, Guttman, Irma.
"A-7717655, Hu, Betty Mayling (formerly Stella Wang).
"A-9582853, Ivellio, Joseph.
"A-6044017, Jablonska, Wladyslawa.
"A-6044580, Jablonska, Eleonora.
"A-6903683, Janicki, Andrzej.
"A-6491962, Kaevats, Ilmar.
"A-6491963, Kaevats, Ella.
"A-6491961, Kaevats, Juri.
"A-6727314, Kann, Eduard.
"A-7184190, Kase, Francis Joseph.
"A-6868638, Klopman, Eliase.
"A-7858008, Klunic, Anton or Tony.
"A-6419788, Laren, Kuno Boris.
"A-6778968, Lauko, Vladimir.
"A-7334744, Lazarevic, Ivo.
"A-9564652, Leppik, Artur or Arthur Lepik.
"A-6729775, Loblovics, Robert.
"A-6549173, Lu, Kuo Chin.
"A-9777296, Lukowski, Zbigniew.
"A-6390519, Macek, Vlado alias Vladimir Macek.
"A-6744210, Macek, Josipa Ivan (nee Jurak).
"A-6744283, Macek, Agnes Ljerka alias Agneza Ljerka Macek or Agnes Macek.
"A-6744284, Macek, Andre alias Andrej Macek or Andre Matchek.
"A-7132174, Mazur, Zbigniew Kandyt.
"A-7248035, Moldoveanu, Toma (Thomas).
"A-7248034, Moldoveanu, Constance.
"A-6481279, Nagy, Maria or Sister Mary Andilia.
"A-6920909, Neumann, Leonie Finali.
"A-6794909, Nubani, Jawdat Ibrahim.
"A-6445457, Okakiewicz, Justyna Joanna.
"A-9528959, Polis, Roberts.
"A-9538292, Rabba, Heinrich Eduard.
"A-7095909, Reimann, Ernest.
"A-7095910, Reimann, Dora (nee Banffy).
"A-7197749, Rekeny, Anna.
"A-6343459, Ranty, Bronislaw George formerly Bronislaw Rubinfeld.
"A-6669273, Rzeszewski, Binem.
"A-6669274, Rzeszewski, Roisa (nee Parriser).
"A-6870015, Sadilek, Zdenek.
"A-9736877, Sai, Rudolf.
"A-9745639, Sarzants, Karlis.
"A-6704468, Schwartz, Peter.
"A-6662195, Semiatychi, Hercel.
"A-6427758, Shiber, Saba George.
"A-6704212, Sibinska, Bozenna (Barbara).
"A-6491960, Siim, Helene.
"A-6491959, Siim, Albert.
"A-6804022, Silberstein, Deszo.
"A-7049560, Silverman, Anna Rudsinsky or Silberman.
"A-6887197, Skala, Imrich.
"A-6887196, Skala, Stefania.
"A-6779237, Slavensky, Pavel, alias Jacob Fralich.
"A-6748490, Steinberg, Gennady Henry Matveievitch.
"A-6508276, Szule, Mihaly or Michael alias Sarossy.
"A-6602324, Szule, Gabriella Morocz.
"A-6497289, Tan, Kim Hoang.
"A-6620586, Tsien, Tang Zing.
"A-9764971, Uhach, Luigi.
"A-6751514, Vanek, Zdenek alias Abraham Grunberger.
"A-9538394, Vesk, Karl.
"A-6803917, Wajnberg, Rywka or Rita Weinberg.
"A-6848669, Lang, Chi Ko.
"A-6403572, Yang, Anchi Wong.
"A-7886918, Ying, Wong Shan (Mrs. B. Y. Woo).
"A-7886918, Woo, Kee Pea or Nancy Woo.
"A-7122699, Zelka, Joseph Yehooda.
"A-9550407, Akula, Nikolai.
"A-7210031, Bartok, Anna.
"A-6760689, Baumohl, Sandor or Alex or Alexander Baumohl.
"A-6461100, Benno, Salman Ezra.
"A-6937370, Bialy, Jerzy Josef.
"A-6798088, Biernbaum, Solomon.
"A-7858185, Bokum, Jozef.
"A-9707201, Boomis, Driscis Zania.
"A-6882107, Brayer, Menachem Mendel.
"A-6576395, Breuer, Emil.
"A-7198815, Chang, Nathan Chong Tsau.
"A-6976880, Chu Bacon.
"A-6523895, Cieplak, Stanislaw Jozef.
"A-6923153, De Warge, Levente (Levente Warga de Sziget).
"A-6712036, Dracoqoulos, John Basil.
"A-6449406, Falkine, Stella or Selima Falkine.
"A-7414979, Fried, Ernst.
"A-6709336, Friend, Balfoura.
"A-6644123, Gottesmann, Maria.
"A-6644124, Gottesmann, Mignon.
"A-6583210, Halata, Vilasta.
"A-6983819, Hecht, Mendel.
"A-6719386, Herskovic, Herman.
"A-7125313, Hodzova, Drahotina.
"A-6627211, Hu, Fu-Nan or (Mrs.) Lan-An Hsu.
"A-6794756, Ilitch, Milorad.
"A-6669708, Ivanoff, Helen Petrovna.
"A-7991219, Kaaman, Hugo.
"A-7879262, Kaddak, Heinrich.
"A-7052316, Kahan, Frida.
"A-7841655, Kahu, Ewald Ewraim.
"A-7121844, Kaibni, Fuad Ibrahim.
"A-6769261, Kaupas, Victor Vladas or Kyburg or Kyburz.
"A-6794761, Keleti, Pierre Georges (George Peter Keleti).
"A-9728279, Kerns, Ansis Roberts or Hans Robert Kern.
"A-7427260, Kielbasa, Joseph.
"A-6949988, Klein, Herman.
"A-6934966, Klein, Edith (nee Edith Roza).
"A-6702193, Koneff, Boris Alexandrovich or Bob or Alexander Koneff.
"A-7858098, Kpo, N. Z. (Shen Ven Yeh).
"A-9514992, Kukk, Alexander.
"A-6881672, Kupferstein, Ervin.
"A-6752980, Lantos, Thomas Peter.
"A-6878013, Levita, Olga or Lewita (nee Spitzer).
"A-7985932, Lillimagi, Arthur.
"A-7095793, Lillimagi, Miralda (nee Norden).
"A-9802602, Lillimagi, Leonard.
"A-7863547, Lozicki, Jan.
"A-6248630, Luts, Heino Alfred.
"A-6830003, Maday, Bela Charles or Bela Karoly Maday.
"A-6803924, Maimon, Yeta (nee Jolan or Janta Berger).
"A-6232254, Maksymow, Jozef John.
"A-9673342, Manni, Otto.
"A-7118623, Marsak, Ivo Vaclav.
"A-7985661, Mensik, Bohumil or Francois Segal.
"A-6497208, Mikulasek, Adolf.
"A-6371452, Miller, Sophia Pavlovna (nee Rumarchuk).
"A-6371454, Miller, Rada Alexandrovna.
"A-6555839, Minoot, Rudolf or Rudolf Minuth.
"A-6610312, Miranker-Miranski, Zalman.
"A-6678556, Noulik, Eduard.
"A-6678557, Noulik, Leida Helene.
"A-6537557, Parna, Jaan Voldemar.
"A-6536276, Parna, Lizette (nee Leinberg).
"A-6597438, Pinter, Szymon.
"A-6554216, Piwowoz, Mojzesz.
"A-6740118, Platovsky, Shoshana.
"A-6819144, Pollak, Rosa.
"A-6606627, Porgesz, Herman.
"A-7463690, Posidel, Bartolo.
"A-6803935, Pressler, Stevan.
"A-9825261, Rachuba, Lidia.
"A-6835860, Rago, Louis Joseph.
"A-7849818, Romm, Carl Calle.
"A-6555819, Schiffman, Rose or Roza Schiffman.
"A-6958445, Sierpowski, Jozef.
"A-6564149, Soltan, Eli Boruch.
"A-6669727, Staub, Edith Bohm.
"A-6685994, Zwarcblat, Chaim or Chaim Schwartzblatt.
"A-6984639, Tasev, Athanas Stoyanov.
"A-6843543, Taub, Solomon.
"A-6987828, Todorov, Theodore Ivanov.
"A-6239889, Veedam, Voldemar.
"A-7934148, Vimb, Evald Ferdinand.
"A-6047249, Wandzel, Adam Arthur.
"A-6634021, Weiss, Zlata.
"A-6819102, Weksler, David.
"A-6811475, Weksler, Golda.
"A-6730652, Wu, Ming An (Man On Ng).
"A-6015116, Zucker, Emilie.
"A-7081670, Ajluni, Raymond Marfuz.
"A-6633726, Alter (Szymon.
"A-6479412, Andre, Laszlo.
"A-6772246, Ayish, Ahmad Shihadeh.
"A-6949331, Bay, Adela.
"A-6694124, Bergsztyn, Benjamin.
"A-6834685, Boucher, Nathalie Alexandrovna Konzenetsova.
"A-6911189, Demeter, Odon Thomas.
"A-6843541, Deutsch, Cheskel Ezekiel.
"A-7469208, Eid, Anisa Gabriel.
"A-6905019, Friedman, Helen.
"A-6905020, Friedman, Gisella.
"A-6694300, Hsi, Kong-Ming (Paul).
"A-7821166, Hsia, Ting Wei.
"A-6534332, Ifland, Miriam Jacob.
"A-9549897, Karner, Rudolf.
"A-6794968, Kawwas, Naim Jacob.
"A-6805585, Klein, Rosita Erdan.
"A-9656333, Konstantin, Roots.
"A-9679936, Koster, Sergei.
"A-7061798, Krunci, Ladislav Antonin.
"A-9825047, Kwiecinski, Stefan Jozef.
"A-6830509, Ledwon, Pawel Josephat or Frater Josephat Ledwon.
"A-6724356, Lomova, Charlotte.
"A-6956129, Lux, Verona.
"A-7178958, Musallam, Abla Eid.
"A-7879625, Musallam, Najwa Sani.
"A-7879626, Musallam, Suad Sami.
"A-6848834, Nagy, Vince.
"A-6848835, Nagy, Elsa (nee Szevera).
"A-6843846, Nagy, Adam.
"A-9758946, Pagan, Luigi Attilio Mario.
"A-6182828, Pennar, Jean.
"A-6555846, Popov, Alexander Ivan.
"A-6347212, Radsepp, Eugen.
"A-7898926, Rannala, Sten Alexander or Sten Alexander Nyholm.
"A-6821776, Resev, Nikolai or Nicholas.
"A-6860784, Rodzinski, Zyzislaw, Jozef.
"A-6860785, Rodzinski, Jadwiga Halina.
"A-7125370, Saar, Max Emil.
"A-6227908, Tubielewicz, Boguslaw, Ludwik.
"A-7955339, Viede, Erich.
"A-7120688, Wang, An-Pang.
"A-7053579, Waldman, Esther (nee Frenkel).
"A-6886822, Waldman, Mendel.
"A-6857570, Weiss, Lilly.
"A-6955111, Absolon, Karel Bedrich Jaroslav Willibald Jindrich.
"A-9825061, Adamska, Jadwiga.
"A-6866913, Adler, Eva (nee Ladislai).
"A-6990725, Arnost, Milan Jan.
"A-6990754, Arnost, Herta Maria.
"A-6990726, Arnost, Milan Jan, Junior.
"A-6990727, Arnost, Thomas Michael.
"A-6690579, Bitker, Alexandra.
"A-6690578, Bitker, Joseph.
"A-6523944, Bitker, Rachel.
"A-6881809, Braun, Isaac.
"A-6985312, Braun, Ruchlia.
"A-6377034, Cassis, Elias George.
"A-7069276, Celemenski, Jacoh.
"A-7457503, Costea, Alexandru Nicolai.
"A-6834663, Djonovic, Jovan Ivov.
"A-6923757, Edelman, David.
"A-6775676, Egyes, Leslie or Ladislav Egyes.
"A-6509231, Einhorn, Zelig.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"A-6830479, El Farra, Mohammad Hussein.
"A-6923780, Erlachtegerecht, Sonia.
"A-6342965, Feldman, Avner.
"A-6852892, Ferlstein, Berta.
"A-6750390, Flac, Mirko.
"A-7841187, Fong, Tham.
"A-6819650, Friedman, Adolf.
"A-6779244, Friedman, Henriette (nee Waldman).
"A-6923761, Geher, Boruch.
"A-7290199, Godt, Israel Avram.
"A-6511096, Gottesman, Arthur Marcell.
"A-6887539, Gunsburg, Samuel.
"A-6794974, Hagher, Tipora Chane.
"A-7283384, Halasz, Elek Miklos.
"A-6689615, Halberstam, Rachela.
"A-6948549, Hoffmann, Jindrich.
"A-6772233, Horewicz, Julius or Juliusz Hozenpud.
"A-6537074, Huang, Yu Pao Hsu.
"A-6597973, Hujczyc, Boleslaw Adam.
"A-6635678, I, Fu Hsiang.
"A-7046037, Kabbani, Ezra Haroun.
"A-7052499, Kertesz, Stephen.
"A-7890872, Kivitis, Pauls Roberts.
"A-6694404, Klems, Ludmila.
"A-6770458, Kooby, Yacoub Sion or Jack Kooby.
"A-6774490, Kopolowitz, Ludwig.
"A-6460702, Novey, Diana (nee Daniela Slabisner or Daniela Lederman).
"A-6794821, Leitner, Hilda.
"A-7073608, Lettrich, Josef.
"A-9537477, Linkgreim, Karl.
"A-6545325, Lewin, Uszer.
"A-7069592, Morvai, Roza (nee Gero) or Rose Morvay.
"A-6868640, Najder, Konstanty Marceli.
"A-6868639, Najder Leontyna Maria.
"A-6442234, Neubert, Marie.
"A-6448804, Ngai, Shih-Hsun.
"A-6567558, Ngai, Hsueh-Hwa.
"A-6335532, Odescalchi, Paul Gabor or Pal Gabor Odescalchi.
"A-6868641, Pasztory, Catherine Sophie.
"A-6713380, Pille, Ado.
"A-6713379, Pille, Linda Marie.
"A-6740254, Rekant, Chaim.
"A-7858333, Rudnyanszky, Olga.
"A-7858334, Klein, Maria Anna.
"A-7244177, Russo, Anna.
"A-6862610, Sayovicz, Mayer.
"A-9738075, Savovic, Niko Mihailo.
"A-7366402, Sitko, Antoni Ludwik.
"A-6954059, Svozil, Metodej.
"A-6954060, Svozil, Vratislava Jana (nee Smekalova).
"A-6780717, Szorenyi, Emma.
"A-7841882, Tamaro, Pietro.
"A-6927968, Tanav, Heino.
"A-6772299, Teleki, Deneb.
"A-6921249, Toeg, Naima or Naima Menashi.
"A-7131201, Tomaszewski, Stefan.
"A-7903396, Valle, Josip or Giuseppe or Joe.
"A-9541986, Viik, Heinrich.
"A-6985631, Votava, Helena.
"A-6965382, Wacholder, Benzion.
"A-6685999, Wajdenbaum, Towia.
"A-6843065, Wajdenbaum, Sara (nee Dawidowicz).
"A-6831434, Wajdenbaum, Samuel.
"A-6847920, Wen, Victor Yen Hsiung.
"A-7053545, Wosnansky, Hannai or Judith Enricht.
"A-6847812, Yao, Cheng Yu.
"A-2687547, Zarko, Martin.
"A-9764376, Babushkin, Moses Alexander or David Alexander Miller.
"A-6737988, Bialestocki, Morduch.
"A-6606121, Bigo, Olga.
"A-6916676, Chou, Yung Hsuan.
"A-6316289, Cukierman, Chil Wolf.
"A-6566966, Cukierman, Frida.
"A-8021211, Cukierman, Mary.
"A-6453859, Culik, Rudolf.
"A-7184427, Decleva, Paul.
"A-6923754, Dembitzer, Chiel.
"A-6923755, Dembitzer, Rafael.
"A-8904617, Epstein, Dydio or Yedidia Epstein.
"A-6884898, Faytelewicz, David.
"A-6760581, Ferdman, Noach or Feldman.
"A-6751442, Ferdman, Mina (nee Brejzman).
"A-6819651, Fono, Andras.
"A-6843558, Hauer, Rozalie (nee Mozes).
"A-6534330, Huang, Helene Te-Yao.
"A-7284228, Hui, Florence A. or Hsiu Chang Hui.
"A-7361083, Hutt, Juri or George J. Hutt.
"A-7056726, Jaksy, Elsa nee Moskovitz.
"A-6472585, Kadvany, Alexander J.
"A-6472586, Kadvany, Louise.
"A-6990739, Konig, Margit (nee Ausch).
"A-6685985, Lejbiker, Jochanan.
"A-6676396, Lejbiker, Sara.
"A-6544517, Leppma, Zoja.
"A-6849327, Leppma, Tonu Ilmari.
"A-6475641, Maly, Gero.
"A-9825230, Mattessich, Giovanni Andrea.
"A-9727771, Paleta, Jan Piotr.
"A-7941871, Popovich, Slobodan.
"A-6537556, Rehepapp, Aleksander.
"A-6819127, Reich, Lilly (nee Fried).
"A-6819128, Fliegman, Agnes (nee Fried).
"A-6740512, Schiffer, Janos Pal.
"A-6775592, Paul Chu Hsuen.
"A-6794729, Szucs, Tibor Istvan or Tibor Stephen Such.
"A-6760678, Tabak, Maier or Maier Fisch.
"A-7398380, Tamm, Meinhard.
"A-6332586, Turnauer, Martin.
"A-7395209, Udvarnoki, Bela, Junior.
"A-7121716, Wang, Kung Fong.
"A-6886837, Wieczorek, Aleksander.
"A-6837931, Yin, Huo-Chin.
"A-7910377, Yin, Log Yuin How.
"A-7099681, Zenki, Petr.
"A-7099682, Zenhl, Pavla.
"A-6622735, Abboud, Fuad Labib.
"A-6613211, Aboody, Albert Moshi.
"A-7354343, Andrassy, Elizabeth Maria.
"A-6897916, Aubrecht, Veroslava Anna.
"A-6877413, Barczykowski, Wladyslaw Mieczyslaw.
"A-7463692, Bercari, Louis.
"A-6805508, Berger, Ilona (nee Hoch).
"A-7828767, Berzins, Karlis Arvids.
"A-7402058, Berzins, Roberts (alias Robert Berson).
"A-6953060, Bondo, Isidore Juda.
"A-6383637, Bronsztejn, Szyja.
"A-9203941, Brus, Tobias Albert.
"A-7201405, Brzorad, Vilem Jan.
"A-6668898, Bursbtyn, Nuchim Benjamin.
"A-7828039, Bussanich, Nicolo.
"A-6829982, Butosi, Janos.
"A-7174556, Ch'en, Shih Chen also known as Flora May Ch'en or Flora May Chun.
"A-6606696, Chiang, Sze Jih.
"A-6491659, Czarnecki, Jan.
"A-7069335, Darnoi, Denis Nicholas.
"A-6685878, Dolinski, Josef.
"A-6984654, Dolinski, Inda.
"A-6697383, Doman, Francis Steve or Ferenc Doman.
"A-7115666, Dowek, Judel.
"A-7115667, Dowek, Elyasz.
"A-6463167, Ehrenfeld, Sandor.
"A-6616297, Elissa, Jeanette Joseph.
"A-6595048, Fajwusowicz, Zalman.
"A-6574575, Fajwusowicz, Ewa.
"A-6574574, Fajwusowicz, Cyla.
"A-6142241, Fang, Pao-Hsien.
"A-6804019, Fernbach, Sarolta (nee Blau).
"A-6819045, Fischman, Helen.
"A-7144010, Gabor, John Michael Joseph.
"A-9769829, Gartman, Stanislaw.
"A-6713261, Gerganoff, Stoyan Tsonu.
"A-6713262, Gerganoff, Zdravko Tsonu.
"A-6819649, Gluck, Hedy Cseszne.
"A-7046277, Goda, Erno.
"A-7046278, Goda, Olga.
"A-6903762, Goldstein, Andrej.
"A-6953264, Goldwag, Matya.
"A-7138289, Goldwag, Sylwka.
"A-7299341, Grabowski, Wojciech Waclaw.
"A-6855674, Gross, John (nee Janos Grosz).
"A-6862640, Gross, Margrit.
"A-6621147, Gutiejzr, Szanja.
"A-6490311, Gutiejzer, Enia (nee Lebensold).
"A-9777256, Gyorffy, Gabriel Emery.
"A-6922075, Haim, Haskel Joseph.
"A-6685996, Halpern, Kalman.
"A-6847991, Hardoon, Hisqail Hougie.
"A-6819097, Hauer, Erwin.
"A-7991864, Hauer, Juresz.
"A-696584, Hauer, Gisella.
"A-6570459, Hendrikson, Oskar Rudolf.
"A-6570460, Hendrikson, Mary Henriette.
"A-6838671, Hendrikson, Matti.
"A-7210071, Hesser, Andre.
"A-6877764, Holt, Charles Chi-Chien, alias Chi-Chien Ho and Kai-Him Ho.
"A-6794990, Horowitz, Tauba Padawer (nee Herschthal).
"A-6534350, Ivanoff, George Georgevich.
"A-6622742, Jbeily, Joseph Ibrahim.
"A-7097890, Jungreisz, Tibor.
"A-6843557, Jurkanski, Blanka Malek (nee Blanka Malek).
"A-0199301, Jurkovic, Vincenc Martin.
"A-7982539, Juskiewicz, Bronislaw.
"A-6383406, Kao, Chao Ming alias Robert Kao.
"A-6991788, Karman, Rozsi alias Rozsi Kohn and Rozsi Farkas.
"A-6622739, Karram, Mussa Hussein.
"A-7129579, Karram, Mariam Mussa.
"A-8021522, Karram, Monia Mussa.
"A-6369727, Kask, Karl.
"A-6985793, Katz, Ruzena.
"A-6990779, Katz, Desider Simonovic.
"A-6524393, Kavardjieva, Lilia Vlachova.
"A-6943767, Klein, Michal or Miksa.
"A-7841916, Kneisch, Luciano.
"A-6803926, Koenigsberg, Eugene or Eugene Konigsberg.
"A-6953005, Kohn, Alexander.
"A-2712646, Koo, Sheu Tse.
"A-9802872, Kowalski, Boleslaw.
"A-98225141, Kozloski, Stanislaw.
"A-6770126, Krek, Mihael (Michael).
"A-5915370, Krek, Amalia.
"A-6043936, Krek, Alex.
"A-8001000, Krotowski, Stanislaw.
"A-8021889, Krowtowska, Alicja (nee Landowska).
"A-9542199, Krumins, Karlis Valdemars.
"A-7841411, Kujovic, Radoslav Radoje.
"A-6390161, Laevsky, Israel Henry.
"A-9582579, Latkovic, Filip.
"A-6537889, Lebovic, Edith (nee Edith Sicherman or Edith Sichermann).
"A-6827138, Lewanska, Franciszka.
"A-6760596, Liebling, Joel.
"A-6765747, Liebling, Zelda.
"A-6330125, Macuka, Darinka.
"A-6286699, Magi, Kaljo.
"A-6662179, Margolin, Mowsza.
"A-6652101, Margolin, Ester.
"A-6652100, Margolin, Ejdla.
"A-6819164, Mayyasi, Sami Ali H.
"A-6837572, Meisels, Fani.
"A-7128147, Mendel, Desideriu.
"A-6771762, Meo, Leila Marie-Thesese.
"A-6620565, Miller, David Solomon.
"A-6620555, Miller, Lydia Semon Rivkin.
"A-6830207, Miodonski, Ted George or Tadeusz Szymon Miodonski.
"A-9635262, Morawski, Jozef.
"A-7383020, Mravak, Dragutin.
"A-8238144, Narel, Aleksander.
"A-9728202, Nestorowicz, Marian.
"A-7849802, Nomm, August.
"A-6992471, Ohmer, Sofka or Sofia (nee Pentcheva).
"A-6929684, Onody, Desider Andrew.
"A-6606301, Orleanski, (Brother) Casimir Karol.
"A-7841141, Natkanski, Wincenty.
"A-0550887, Ostrowski, Ignagy.
"A-7078165, Piatkowski, Juliusz Konstanty.
"A-9825018, Pionko, Jerzy.
"A-7244264, Podlewski, Stefan.
"A-6991768, Prec, Klara Judith.
"A-6794989, Prec, Oldrich.
"A-7886182, Rochowczyk, Jozef.
"A-6700642, Rosenbloom, Elie Samuel,

"A-6496749, Rubin, Anna (nee Halberstam).
"A-6953463, Saltoun, Violette Haron.
"A-7095742, Salzmann, Zdenek.
"A-6984637, Samter, Louise.
"A-6440743, Shohet, Naim Rouben (nee Chohate).
"A-9770509, Siliak, Joosep.
"A-6709294, Smirnoff, Oleg Gabriel.
"A-7809072, Socha, Kazimierz.
"A-6857654, Smutny, Jerzy Mieczyslaus.
"A-6612870, Steinmetz, Heinrich.
"A-6845778, Stenzler, Clara or Klara.
"A-6903753, Sterling, Harry alias Hersch Sterlung.
"PR-947098, Stolz, Jiri.
"A-5914235, Stolz, Marta (nee Bergmann).
"A-7043949, Stolz, Jiri Junior.
"A-7043950, Stolz, Eva.
"A-7828824, Strak, Michal.
"A-6643498, Suchestow, Judyta Jeannette.
"A-9632473, Tamm, Waino alias August Eduard Tamm.
"A-5911908, Tarkas, Erich.
"A-6544383, Tiivel, Jaan.
"A-7138041, Toffler, Arthur.
"A-7138042, Toffler, Lily.
"A-9740112, Trantmann, Otto.
"A-6304578, Tsan, Chu Hsi alias Hsi Tsan Chu.
"A-7676457, Vulicecic, Baldo.
"A-7057932, Vyssokotsky, Sergius Constantine also known as Serge Vyssokotsky.
"A-7057933, Vyssokotsky, Jenny Christine (nee Neggo) also known as Jenny Christine Neggo-Vyssokotsky.
"A-7056048, Weil, Vitezslav.
"A-7056049, Weil, Margaret.
"A-6886848, Weiner, Abraham Abby alias Abraham Abi Weiner.
"A-6619083, Weiss, David.
"A-6551930, Weitz, Louis.
"A-6551931, Weitz, Regina.
"A-7133269, Wen, Chang Hsien (Sister Mary Cyrilla).
"A-6791636, Winkler, Joseph.
"A-6791637, Winkler, Aniela.
"A-6791638, Winkler, Maria Paula.
"A-7415146, Yee, Ping Kou.
"A-7135691, Yin, Huo-Min.
"A-6847817, Yu, Kwok Tung alias Mason Yu.
"A-7802470, Arge, Heinrich Leonhard.
"A-7457686, Betlejewski, Waclaw.
"A-9825097, Bochenski, Michal Walenty.
"A-6897515, Bondo, Ilona Polatsek.
"A-9825180, Bussanich, Martino.
"A-7206034, Cerna, Zorka Maria.
"A-7083852, Chescowski, Nicholas.
"A-1620402, Dambski, Apolonia Maria.
"A-1249547, Dambski, Kazimierz Jozef.
"A-6887744, Dancziger, Ferenc alias Fred Dancziger.
"A-7058911, Drabek, Jaroslav.
"A-7096050, Drabek, Jaromira.
"A-7056912, Drabek, Jaroslav Adolf, Junior.
"A-7351219, Drabek, Jan Adolf.
"A-6805595, Faber, Ruzena (nee Gross).
"A-7354828, Frnadi-Dietl, Fedor.
"A-6938000, Flaks, Jacob, David.
"A-7879332, Friedman, Joseph.
"A-7095797, Gidzinski, Kazimierz.
"A-7074033, Hillel, Victoria Zaharia.
"A-6968051, Hrazdilova, Jirina Marie.
"A-6301097, Jalinskas, Ceslovas.
"A-6301096, Jalinskas, Brone.
"A-6432770, Jaouni, Taysir Muhammad.
"A-6949316, Jiruska, Frantisek Jaroslav.
"A-6635258, Kalnay, George.
"A-6886924, Klein, Emil.
"A-6891807, Lefkovic, Akiba.
"A-7540872, Lew, Katherine.
"A-6924587, Lipnicki, Michael.
"A-9542040, Lucis, Janis.
"A-7054514, Machek, Miroslava (nee Mericka).
"A-7177878, Mikulik, Lubomir.
"A-7049979, Mojsilovic, Blagoje.
"A-6371460, Mul, Hersz.
"A-6762548, Muniak, Jan.
"A-6590279, Orlandic, Pavle.
"A-6899266, Plater - Zyberk, Marguerite Wielopolska.
"A-6960366, Scharl, Maria.
"A-6989080, Silhavy, Josef.
"A-6989078, Silhavy, Amalie.
"A-6989079, Silhavy, Pavel.
"A-6689775, Stanisavljevich, Nikola Dragisha.
"A-6232252, Sukiennick, Mieczyslaw.
"A-7282655, Szefner, Szyfra.
"A-6805582, Teitelbaum, Lipot.
"A-7197697, Tiit, Elmar.
"A-6855683, Tomashevich, George V.
"A-6957361, Tsou, Tcheng-Hoa alias Michael Tsou.
"A-7802495, Vaherpold, Jaan Iver.
"A-7383195, Vikulis, Pauline (nee Gailis).
"A-7143023, Waters, Elmer alias Ervin Wassermann.
"A-6766905, Wulc, Stanislaw, Samuel.
"A-6567543, Yao, Vida.
"A-6694102, Zabare, Jankiel Joseph.
"A-6748822, Brtan, Vladimir.
"A-7095994, Cserna, Eugene.
"A-7095995, Cserna, Zoltan.
"A-7873136, Fermeglia, Sergio.
"A-6704042, Froomkin, Joseph Nathanovich.
"A-9759383, Heinvali, Arnold George.
"A-8001563, Ignac, Stanislaw or Ignac Stanislaw.
"A-7955272, Kanski, Frank (Franciszek Konrad Kanski).
"A-6633720, Karas, Zelman.
"A-6688188, Klein, Tereza.
"A-6588184, Klein, Mauritiu or Mor Klein.
"A-7284783, Lawler, Roland Shang-Yong.
"A-6918456, Moskovitz, Roza Grunfeld.
"A-7138291, Peress, Widad Reuben.
"A-6570439, Photos, Basil John alias Vasilios Ioannis Potos.
"A-9670060, Rebane, Albert Johannes.
"A-6918481, Renner, Teresa.
"A-6912550, Renner, Alexander.
"A-6903689, Sze, Victor Tsu-Ying.
"A-9727426, Tift, Mihkel.
"A-7133284, Tsung, Huai Wei (Sister Mary Innocence).
"A-7809282, Vaga, Matvei.
"A-7809011, Vagvalgyi, Valerie.
"A-7050713, Vracar, Aleksander Mile or Alexander Vracar.
"A-7056849, Wertman, Murray or Motel Wertman.
"A-6923733, Wertman, Isaac.
"A-9803392, Zalitis, Heines Hugo Hermans.
"A-7802092, Abraham, Meir Shaoul.
"A-7802090, Abraham, Maima Sason Chlomo David.
"A-7802091, Abraham, Madeleine Meir Shaoul.
"A-7225058, Botez, Theodor.
"A-6967733, Chiang, Helen T'Ieh-Yun.
"A-7118674, Chu, Chung Ying.
"A-7095953, Feleky, Kornelia.
"A-9748640, Ivin, Josip.
"A-6903776, Jager, Hersz.
"A-64088046, Jarvis, Arnold.
"A-7133264, Kan, Kung Ming or Kan Kung Ming (Sister Mary Irene).
"A-7097823, Kelemen, Peter Andreas George or Peter Kelemen.
"A-7095979, Kovacs, Arpad Imre.
"A-7366481, Krivik, Halina or Halina Pecenka.
"A-7139011, Lengyel, Alexander.
"A-7139012, Lengyel, Suzanne.
"A-7941169, Makkay, Elizabeth.
"A-6721757, Melamed, Mojzesz or Moses or Mosess Melamed.
"A-7356261, Metes, Olivia.
"A-8057878, Paszkiewicz, Roman.
"A-7841140, Polli, Karl Voldemar.
"A-7886676, Reibus, Arnold.
"A-6990741, Reron, Aniela Rosalia Szalay.
"A-6857549, Robitschek, Emmerich.
"A-6843478, Roh, Josef.
"A-6852890, Rosenberg, Miriam Perlstein.
"A-6613209, Saleh, Es-Saleh, Rasim.
"A-7138015, Stawska, Bronislawa.
"A-7802532, Stawska, Anita.
"A-6997928, Stern, Aranka (nee Aufrichtig).
"A-7133283, Tsung, Li Chih (Sister Mary Carmel).
"A-7182599, Zachary, Jadwiga.
"A-7202565, Zajczyk, Baczewa (nee Kuszner).
"A-7139015, Zajlof, Josef Ber.
"A-6689509, Zimmerman, Isaiah Morris.
"A-7197385, Zywialowski, Jerzy Waclaw.
"A-6588202, Akrabova, Boika Svetoslavova or Akraboff.
"A-6985760, Alimanestianu, Dinu-Constantin.
"A-7828348, Alimanestianu, Barbu.
"A-6760577, Arar, Raymond Moise.
"A-7439282, Babarfcich, Albino.
"A-6425831, Bamieh, Nashuh Adib.
"PR-935172, Benes, Bohus Antonia.
"PR-935173, Benes, Mrs. Emile Berta Zedna.
"A-7243448, Bolek, Anastasia (Sister Barbara).
"A-7873185, Brejt, David.
"A-7874914, Bubich, Ludwig.
"A-7057869, Danielewski, Sylvia Jadwige (nee Lakomska).
"A-7057870, Danielewski, Tadeusz Zbigniew.
"A-7069307, Farcasanu, Mihail.
"A-7193848, Farcasanu, Pia Maria.
"A-7174330, Foldy, Ilona Maria.
"A-6942779, Ghilezan, Emil.
"A-7053573, Ghilezan, Rodica.
"A-6534350, Grynberg, Szmul.
"A-6708762, Hager, Nathan Hers.
"A-6627396, Hahn, Chen Kya.
"A-6528724, Halpern, Jakob Salomon alias Jacob Halpern.
"A-6856802, Hollossy, Zoltan.
"A-6856801, Hollossy, Erzsebet.
"A-6618510, Hsiu, Nai Shen.
"A-9825315, Iglinski, Antoni.
"A-6942790, Ipolo, Tania.
"A-6942791, Boulanovsky, Lana.
"A-6620853, Jiranek, Miroslav Vaclav.
"A-6534353, Jouraval, Albert.
"A-5611152, Kari, Johannes.
"A-6159693, Klepfisz, Roza (nee Perczykow).
"A-7193909, Klepfisz, Irena.
"A-7283395, Koo, Jennie Jan_ Yu.
"A-7202262, Krajcirovic, Viliam.
"A-6011300, Kuo, Ping Wen.
"A-6011302, Kuo, Ruth How.
"A-7069364, Kwiatkowski, Alexander Joseph.
"A-6369941, Li, Sing-Bay.
"A-7073735, Lindenbaum, Bronia (nee Swiatlowska).
"A-9683229, Loob, Juri.
"A-6934991, Majer, Salamon.
"A-6354829, Maluga, Ludwik alias Zygmunt Lasota.
"A-6354830, Maluga, Jadwiga alias Monica Lasota (nee Kulinska).
"A-8082936, Mayer, Karol.
"A-6997863, Mayer, Miroslawa (see Jordan).
"A-6526908, Muzaffar, Baha Ed Din.
"A-6742100, Nagy, Joseph Bela Ervin.
"A-4463157, Narajowski, Waclaw Jan.
"A-6967511, Nieu, Chang-Teh T.
"A-6694210, Niu, Frances Teh-I Yin.
"A-6211935, Pai, Sung, Ching.
"A-7890609, Parmac, Philip.
"A-7874962, Pasztory, Balazs Gabor.
"A-6855669, Pinter, Pinkas Majlech.
"A-6285493, Piscikas, Alfonsas.
"A-6534317, Poliak, Aron alias Sam Vech.
"A-6740117, Poliakin, Robert.
"A-6768099, Potasz, Jankiel.
"A-6903698, Sher, Lola (Lola Czarna).
"A-7491017, Slugocki, Wojciech Bratislaw or Wojciech Telesfor Slugocki or Albert Slugocki.
"A-6862612, Stanescu, Alexander Paul.
"A-7097810, Sulkowski, Zdislaw Edward.
"A-6638073, Szabo, Tibor.
"A-6997894, Talacko, Joseph.
"A-7193865, Talacko, Svetoslava (nee Jahl).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"A-7193864, Talacko, Jan.
"A-6961800, Talacko, Anezka.
"A-7367854, Verebes, Salamon.
"A-7367855, Verebes, Margit.
"A-7367954, Verebes, Erzsebet Georgette.
"A-6916040, Wagszal, Chaskel.
"A-6819099, Wagszal, Anna (nee Grunzweig).
"A-6379028, Zablocki, Aron.
"A-6887730, Zand, Mordka alias Mordcha Zand.
"A-7849171, Zand, Braindla alias Brajndla Zand (nee Bruan).
"A-6772225, Ansari, Ibrahim Abdel-Kader.
"A-6694161, Aronovsky, George Nathan.
"A-6887570, Berkovitz, Terez or Berkowitz.
"A-9702512, Chong, Loh Hain.
"A-6694195, Fastag, Azbil Dawid (Phastag).
"A-6933876, Kaczmarczyk, Bronislaus Lawrence.
"A-6992867, Kertesz, Laszlo formerly Laszlo Kohn.
"A-6680587, Kirszencwajg, Michal Hersz.
"A-6680609, Kirszencwajg, Chaim.
"A-6680588, Kirszenswajg, Chana Sura.
"A-7802320, Kustera, Slavko.
"A-6405964, Kwei, Tu.
"A-7138281, Lehman, Morris alias Mieczyslaw Lehman.
"A-7138282, Lehman, Louise alias Ludwika Halberstadt.
"A-7910500, Lehman, Norbert.
"A-6613284, Long, Sam Tack.
"A-6976770, Lonyay, Carl.
"A-6743161, Nordenshuld, Valentine or Valentine Kozakevitch.
"A-6983576, Rajnman, Hersz.
"A-6904295, Rajnman, Fryda.
"A-7283186, Reider, Hani.
"A-7178643, Reider, Tivadar.
"A-7283188, Rieder, Olga.
"A-7095964, Rieder, Zoltan.
"A-7802323, Roman, Ahlberk.
"A-6761967, Schlesinger, Andrei Sanders.
"A-7934030, Skorobogaty, Boleslaw.
"A-6445137, Szabo, Andras (Endre) alias Andreas as Andrew Szabo.
"A-6967644, Tang, Nola I-Nan.
"A-7136909, Veske, Alenander.
"A-6953000, Wiesenfeld, Jacob Reiner.
"A-6984444, Wilner, Abraham.
"A-6983563, Wilner, Gabriel.
"A-6896024, Fisner, Elisabeth.
"A-6618493, Steinfeld, Chana Kovlensky.
"A-6620438, Steinfeld, Avram.
"A-6620440, Steinfeld, Chaim.
"A-6620441, Steinfeld, Eichonon.
"A-6707108, Galas, Emma Roth.
"A-6829041, Gordon, Szepsel.
"A-6937216, Socoloff, Michael Alexander.
"A-6937217, Socoloff, Nadejda M.
"A-7193802, Wedzicha, Wladyslaw.
"A-7193803, Wedzicha, Sabina.
"A-7628630, Klawitter, Aniela.
"A-7384388, Beno, Jan.
"A-7383489, Beno, Zofia.
"A-7383490, Beno, Pavel Stefan.
"A-7383491, Beno, Jan Roman.
"A-6819121, Kaufman, Rozsi (nee Cseszne).
"A-6819123, Neustein, Anni (nee Cseszne).
"A-6585984, Kejaman, Juda.
"A-6704220, Wasilejko, Halina Cristina.
"A-6661938, Ekland, Catherine.
"A-7197376, Herman, Frantisek Ladislav.
"A-6802109, Oselka, Henryk.
"A-6966575, Mascarin, Giovanni.
"A-6249447, Bergmann, Witold Ulrich alias Witold Boleslaw Uderski.
"A-6851463, King, K. Ting.
"A-6484319, Bielecki, Lucjan.
"A-7283195, Tsai, Christiana.
"A-6897686, Vitek, Vera Anne.
"A-6897691, Vitek, Ferdinand Jaroslav.
"A-9550888, Paprocki, Karol.
"A-6740257, Koenig-Mayer, Bernard.
"A-9325008, Gasiorowska, Konstancja.
"A-6887756, Steyer, Danuta.
"A-6887757, Steyer, Marek Tomas.
"A-6887758, Steyer, Stanislaw.
"A-6884228, Low, Laszlo.
"A-7197372, Pei, Tsuyee.
"A-7210069, Britanisky, Leon Gregory.
"A-7210068, Britanisky, Lucy.
"A-7193955, Britanisky, Rose-Marie.
"A-7193956, Britanisky, Mark (Marek).
"A-7828442, Wexler, Dora nee Auer.
"A-7828406, Wexler, Levi Itic.
"A-6917699, Wong, Pao Tee or Wong Pao Tee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
J. FRANK WILSON,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
WILLIS SMITH,
HOMER FERGUSON,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 191) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The amendments of the Senate would have deleted from this resolution certain names of displaced persons where the Senate believed that such persons, although their applications were forwarded to the Congress by the Attorney General with his favorable recommendation, were not possessed of sufficiently strong equities which would warrant the granting of the status of permanent residence.

The conferees have carefully gone over the records of such persons as submitted by the Attorney General and have agreed, upon reconsideration of the merits involved in each individual case, to reinstate a certain number of names while deciding to sustain action taken by the Senate in a number of other cases.

The conferees are now fully satisfied that they can recommend for approval the list of names contained in the accompanying conference report.

In order to facilitate the task of the administrative agencies which, upon passage of this resolution, will have to create records of admission for permanent residence for every one of the aliens whose names appear on House Concurrent Resolution 191 in its final version, the conferees have decided to incorporate in the conference report the entire list of aliens whose records of entry would be affected by this measure.

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
J. FRANK WILSON,
HAROLD D. DONOHUE,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
RUTH THOMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 191 favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATIONS ACT AMENDMENTS, 1952

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(The conference report and statement are as follows:)

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2426)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'Communications Act Amendments, 1952'.

"SEC. 2. Section 3 of such Act is amended by adding after paragraph (aa) the following:

"'(bb) "Station license", "radio station license", or "license" means that instrument of authorization required by this Act or the rules and regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this Act, for the use or operation of apparatus for transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio, by whatever name the instrument may be designated by the Commission.

"'(cc) "Broadcast station", "broadcasting station", or "radio broadcast station" means a radio station equipped to engage in broadcasting as herein defined.

"'(dd) "Construction permit" or "permit for construction" means that instrument of authorization required by this Act or the rules and regulations of the Commission made pursuant to this Act for the construction of a station, or the installation of apparatus, for the transmission of energy, or communications, or signals by radio, by whatever name the instrument may be designated by the Commission.'

"SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out the last two sentences thereof and inserting in lieu of such sentences the following: 'Such commissioners shall not engage in any other business, vocation, profession, or employment; but this shall not apply to the presentation or delivery of publications or papers for which a reasonable honorarium or compensation may be accepted. Any such commissioner serving as such after one year from the date of enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, shall not for a period of one year following the termination of his services as a commissioner represent any person before the Commission in a professional capacity, except that this

restriction shall not apply to any commissioner who has served the full term for which he was appointed. Not more than four members of the Commission shall be members of the same political party.'

"(b) Paragraph (2) of subsection (f) of section 4 of such act is amended by striking out '(2)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(3)'; and such subsection (f) is further amended by striking out paragraph (1) thereof and inserting in lieu of such paragraph the following paragraphs:

"'(f) (1) The Commission shall have authority, subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint such officers, engineers, accountants, attorneys, inspectors, examiners, and other employees as are necessary in the exercise of its functions.

"'(2) Without regard to the civil-service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, each commissioner may appoint a legal assistant, an engineering assistant, and a secretary, each of whom shall perform such duties as such commissioner shall direct. In addition, the chairman of the Commission may appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws, but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, an administrative assistant who shall perform such duties as the chairman shall direct.'

"(c) The first sentence of subsection (g) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows: 'The Commission may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, law books, periodicals, and books of reference, for printing and binding, for land for use as sites for radio monitoring stations and related facilities, including living quarters where necessary in remote areas, for the construction of such stations and facilities, and for the improvement, furnishing, equipping, and repairing of such stations and facilities and of laboratories and other related facilities (including construction of minor subsidiary buildings and structures not exceeding $25,000 in any one instance) used in connection with technical research activities), as may be necessary for the execution of the functions vested in the Commission and as from time to time may be appropriated for by Congress.'

"(d) Subsection (k) of section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) The Commission shall make an annual report to Congress, copies of which shall be distributed as are other reports transmitted to Congress. Such reports shall contain—

"'(1) such information and data collected by the Commission as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the regulation of interstate and foreign wire and radio communication and radio transmission of energy;

"'(2) such information and data concerning the functioning of the Commission as will be of value to Congress in appraising the amount and character of the work and accomplishments of the Commission and the adequacy of its staff and equipment: *Provided*, That the first and second annual reports following the date of enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, shall set forth in detail the number and caption of pending applications requesting approval of transfer of control or assignment of a broadcasting station license, or construction permits for new broadcasting stations, or for increases in power, or for changes of frequency of existing broadcasting stations at the beginning and end of the period covered by such reports;

"'(3) information with respect to all persons taken into the employment of the Commission during the year covered by the report, including names, pertinent biographical data and experience, Commission positions held and compensation paid, together with the names of those persons who have left the employ of the Commission during such year: *Provided*, That the first annual report following the date of enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, shall contain such information with respect to all persons in the employ of the Commission at the close of the year for which the report is made;

"'(4) an itemized statement of all funds expended during the preceding year by the Commission, of the sources of such funds, and of the authority in this Act or elsewhere under which such expenditures were made; and

"'(5) specific recommendations to Congress as to additional legislation which the Commission deems necessary or desirable, including all legislative proposals submitted for approval to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.'

"SEC. 4. Section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ORGANIZATION AND FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMISSION

"'SEC. 5. (a) The members of the Commission designated by the President as chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the Commission. It shall be his duty to preside at all meetings and sessions of the Commission, to represent the Commission in all matters relating to legislation and legislative reports, except that any commissioner may present his own or minority views or supplemental reports, to represent the Commission in all matters requiring conferences or communications with other governmental officers, departments or agencies, and generally to coordinate and organize the work of the Commission in such manner as to promote prompt and efficient disposition of all matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission. In the case of a vacancy in the office of the chairman of the Commission, or the absence or inability of the chairman to serve, the Commission may temporarily designate one of its members to act as chairman until the cause or circumstance requiring such designation shall have been eliminated or corrected.

"'(b) Within six months after the enactment of the Communications Act Amendments, 1952, and from time to time thereafter as the Commission may find necessary, the Commission shall organize its staff into (1) integrated bureaus, to function on the basis of the Commission's principal workload operations, and (2) such other divisional organizations as the Commission may deem necessary. Each such integrated bureau shall include such legal, engineering, accounting, administrative, clerical, and other personnel as the Commission may determine to be necessary to perform its functions.

"'(c) The Commission shall establish a special staff of employees, hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "review staff", which shall consist of such legal, engineering, accounting, and other personnel as the Commission deems necessary. The review staff shall be directly responsible to the Commission and shall not be made a part of any bureau or divisional organization of the Commission. Its work shall not be supervised or directed by any employee of the Commission other than a member of the review staff whom the Commission may designate as the head of such staff. The review staff shall perform no duties or functions other than to assist the Commission, in cases of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which have been designated for hearing, by preparing a summary of the evidence presented at any such hearing, by preparing, after an initial decision but prior to oral argument, a compilation of the facts material to the exceptions and replies thereto filed by the parties, and by preparing for the Commission or any member or members thereof, without recommendations and in accordance with specific directions from the Commission or such member or members, memoranda, opinions, decisions, and orders. The Commission shall not permit any employee who is not a member of the review staff to perform the duties and functions which are to be performed by the review staff; but this shall not be construed to limit the duties and functions which any assistant or secretary appointed pursuant to section 4 (f) (2) may perform for the commissioner by whom he was appointed.

"'(d) (1) Except as provided in section 409, the Commission may, when necessary to the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business, by order assign or refer any portion of its work, business, or functions to an individual commissioner or commissioners or to a board composed of one or more employees of the Commission, to be designated by such order for action thereon, and may at any time amend, modify, or rescind any such order of assignment or reference. Any order, decision, or report made, or other action taken, pursuant to any such order of assignment or reference shall, unless reviewed pursuant to paragraph (2), have the same force and effect, and shall be made, evidenced, and enforced in the same manner, as orders, decisions, reports, or other action of the Commission.

"'(2) Any person aggrieved by any such order, decision, or report may file an application for review by the Commission, within such time and in such form as the Commission shall prescribe, and every such application shall be passed upon by the Commission. If the Commission grants the application, it may affirm, modify, or set aside such order, decision, report, or action, or may order a rehearing upon such order, decision, report, or action under section 405.

"'(3) The secretary and seal of the Commission shall be the secretary and seal of each individual commissioner or board.

"'(e) Meetings of the Commission shall be held at regular intervals, not less frequently than once each calendar month, at which times the functioning of the Commission and the handling of its work load shall be reviewed and such orders shall be entered and other action taken as may be necessary or appropriate to expedite the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Commission with the objective of rendering a final decision (1) within three months from the date of filing in all original application, renewal, and transfer cases in which it will not be necessary to hold a hearing, and (2) within six months from the final date of the hearing in all hearing cases; and the Commission shall promptly report to the Congress each such case which has been pending before it more than such three- or six-month period, respectively, stating the reasons therefor.'

"SEC. 5. Subsection (d) of section 307 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) No license granted for the operation of a broadcasting station shall be for a longer term than three years and no license so granted for any other class of station shall be for a longer term than five years, and any license granted may be revoked as hereinafter provided. Upon the expiration of any license, upon application therefor, a renewal of such license may be granted from time to time for a term of not to exceed three years in the case of broadcasting licenses, and not to exceed five years in the case of other licenses, if the Commission finds that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served thereby. In order to expedite action on applications for renewal of broadcasting station licenses and in order to avoid needless expense to applicants for such renewals, the Commission shall not require any

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

such applicant to file any information which previously has been furnished to the Commission or which is not directly material to the considerations that affect the granting or denial of such application, but the Commission may require any new or additional facts it deems necessary to make its findings. Pending any hearing and final decision on such an application and the disposition of any petition for rehearing pursuant to section 405, the Commission shall continue such license in effect.'

"SEC. 6. (a) So much of subsection (a) of section 308 of such Act as precedes the second proviso is amended to read as follows: 'The Commission may grant construction permits and station licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof, only upon written application therefor received by it: *Provided*, That (1) in cases of emergency found by the Commission involving danger to life or property or due to damage to equipment, or (2) during a national emergency proclaimed by the President or declared by the Congress and during the continuance of any war in which the United States is engaged and when such action is necessary for the national defense or security or otherwise in furtherance of the war effort, or (3) in cases of emergency where the Commission finds, in the nonbroadcast services, that it would not be feasible to secure renewal applications from existing licensees or otherwise to follow normal licensing procedure, the Commission may grant construction permits and station licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof, during the emergency so found by the Commission or during the continuance of any such national emergency or war, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as the Commission shall by regulation prescribe, and without the filing of a formal application, but no authorization so granted shall continue in effect beyond the period of the emergency or war requiring it:'

"(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 308 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'All applications shall set forth' and inserting in lieu thereof 'All applications for station licenses, or modifications or renewals thereof, shall set forth'.

"SEC. 7. Section 309 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ACTION UPON APPLICATIONS; FORM OF AND CONDITIONS ATTACHED TO LICENSES

"'SEC. 309. (a) If upon examination of any application provided for in section 308 the Commission shall find that public interest, convenience, and necessity would be served by the granting thereof, it shall grant such application.

"'(b) If upon examination of any such application the Commission is unable to make the finding specified in subsection (a), it shall forthwith notify the applicant and other known parties in interest of the grounds and reasons for its inability to make such finding. Such notice, which shall precede formal designation for a hearing, shall advise the applicant and all other known parties in interest of all objections made to the application as well as the source and nature of such objections. Following such notice, the applicant shall be given an opportunity to reply. If the Commission, after considering such reply, shall be unable to make the finding specified in subsection (a), it shall formally designate the application for hearing on the grounds or reasons then obtaining and shall notify the applicant and all other known parties in interest of such action and the grounds and reasons therefor, specifying with particularity the matters and things in issue but not including issues or requirements phrased generally. The parties in interest, if any, who are not notified by the Commission of its action with respect to a particular application may acquire the status of a party to the proceeding thereon by filing a petition for intervention showing the basis for their interest at any time not less than ten days prior to the date of hearing. Any hearing subsequently held upon such application shall be a full hearing in which the applicant and all other parties in interest shall be permitted to participate but in which both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence upon any issue specified by the Commission, as well as the burden of proof upon all such issues, shall be upon the applicant.

"'(c) When any instrument of authorization is granted by the Commission without a hearing as provided in subsection (a) hereof, such grant shall remain subject to protest as hereinafter provided for a period of thirty days. During such thirty-day period any party in interest may file a protest under oath directed to such grant and request a hearing on said application so granted. Any protest so filed shall contain such allegations of fact as will show the protestant to be a party in interest and shall specify with particularity the facts, matters, and things relied upon, but shall not include issues or allegations phrased generally. The Commission shall, within fifteen days from the date of the filing of such protest, enter findings as to whether such protest meets the foregoing requirements and if it so finds the application involved shall be set for hearing upon the issues set forth in said protest, together with such further specific issues, if any, as may be prescribed by the Commission. In any hearing subsequently held upon such application all issues specified by the Commission shall be tried in the same manner provided in subsection (b) hereof, but with respect to all issues set forth in the protest and not specifically adopted by the Commission, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the protestant. The hearing and determination of cases arising under this subsection shall be expedited by the Commission and pending hearing and decision the effective date of the Commission's action to which protest is made shall be postponed to the effective date of the Commission's decision after hearing, unless the authorization involved is necessary to the maintenance or conduct of an existing service, in which event the Commission shall authorize the applicant to utilize the facilities or authorization in question pending the Commission's decision after hearing.

"'(d) Such station licenses as the Commission may grant shall be in such general form as it may prescribe, but each license shall contain, in addition to other provisions, a statement of the following conditions to which such license shall be subject: (1) The station license shall not vest in the licensee any right to operate the station nor any right in the use of the frequencies designated in the license beyond the term thereof nor in any other manner than authorized therein; (2) neither the license nor the right granted thereunder shall be assigned or otherwise transferred in violation of this Act; (3) every license issued under this Act shall be subject in terms to the right of use or control conferred by section 606 hereof.'

"SEC. 8. Subsection (b) of section 310 of said Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) No construction permit or station license, or any rights thereunder, shall be transferred, assigned, or disposed of in any manner, voluntarily or involuntarily, directly or indirectly, or by transfer of control of any corporation holding such permit or license, to any person except upon application to the Commission and upon finding by the Commission that the public interest, convenience, and necessity will be served thereby. Any such application shall be disposed of as if the proposed transferee or assignee were making application under section 308 for the permit or license in question; but in acting thereon the Commission may not consider whether the public interest, convenience, and necessity might be served by the transfer, assignment, or disposal of the permit or license to a person other than the proposed transferee or assignee.'

"SEC. 9. Section 311 of such Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 311. The Commission is hereby directed to refuse a station license and/or the permit hereinafter required for the construction of a station to any person (or to any person directly or indirectly controlled by such person) whose license has been revoked by a court under section 313.'

"SEC. 10. Section 312 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS

"'SEC. 312. (a) Any station license or construction permit may be revoked—

"'(1) for false statements knowingly made either in the application or in any statement of fact which may be required pursuant to section 308;

"'(2) because of conditions coming to the attention of the Commission which would warrant it in refusing to grant a license or permit on an original application;

"'(3) for willful or repeated failure to operate substantially as set forth in the license;

"'(4) for willful or repeated violation of, or willful or repeated failure to observe, any provision of this Act or any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States; and

"'(5) for violation of or failure to observe any cease and desist order issued by the Commission under this section.

"'(b) Where any person (1) has failed to operate substantially as set forth in a license, or (2) has violated or failed to observe any of the provisions of this Act, or (3) has violated or failed to observe any rule or regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States, the Commission may order such person to cease and desist from such action.

"'(c) Before revoking a license or permit pursuant to subsection (a), or issuing a cease and desist order pursuant to subsection (b), the Commission shall serve upon the licensee, permittee, or person involved an order to show cause why an order of revocation or a cease and desist order should not be issued. Any such order to show cause shall contain a statement of the matters with respect to which the Commission is inquiring and shall call upon said licensee, permittee, or person to appear before the Commission at a time and place stated in the order, but in no event less than thirty days after the receipt of such order, and give evidence upon the matter specified therein; except that where safety of life or property is involved, the Commission may provide in the order for a shorter period. If after hearing, or a waiver thereof, the Commission determines that an order of revocation or a cease and desist order should issue, it shall issue such order, which shall include a statement of the findings of the Commission and the grounds and reasons therefor and specify the effective date of the order, and shall cause the same to be served on said licensee, permittee, or person.

"'(d) In any case where a hearing is conducted pursuant to the provisions of this section, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the Commission.

"'(e) The provisions of section 9 (b) of the Administrative Procedure Act which apply with respect to the institution of any proceeding for the revocation of a license or permit shall apply also with respect to the institution, under this section, of any proceeding for the issuance of a cease and desist order.'

"SEC. 11. Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"'FACILITIES FOR CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

"'SEC. 315. (a) If any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, he shall afford equal opportunities to all other such candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station: *Provided*, That such licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the provisions of this section. No obligation is hereby imposed upon any licensee to allow the use of its station by any such candidate.

"'(b) The charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes set forth in this section shall not exceed the charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes.

"'(c) The Commission shall prescribe appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.'

"SEC. 12. Such Act is amended by adding after section 315 the following section:

"'MODIFICATION BY COMMISSION OF CONSTRUCTION PERMITS OR LICENSES

"'SEC. 316. (a) Any station license or construction permit may be modified by the Commission either for a limited time or for the duration of the term thereof, if in the judgment of the Commission such action will promote the public interest, convenience, and necessity, or the provisions of this Act or of any treaty ratified by the United States will be more fully complied with. No such order of modification shall become final until the holder of the license or permit shall have been notified in writing of the proposed action and the grounds and reasons therefor, and shall have been given reasonable opportunity, in no event less than thirty days, to show cause by public hearing, if requested, why such order of modification should not issue: *Provided*, That where safety of life or property is involved, the Commission may by order provide for a shorter period of notice.

"'(b) In any case where a hearing is conducted pursuant to the provisions of this section, both the burden of proceeding with the introduction of evidence and the burden of proof shall be upon the Commission.'

"SEC. 13. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 319 of such Act is amended by striking out the words 'upon written application therefor.'

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 319 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof, and the third sentence thereof is amended by striking out 'This application shall set forth' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The application for a construction permit shall set forth.'

"(c) Subsection (b) of section 319 of such act is amended by striking out the second sentence thereof.

"(d) Such section 319 is amended by striking out the last two sentences of subsection (b) thereof, and by inserting at the end of such section the following subsection:

"'(c) Upon the completion of any station for the construction or continued construction of which a permit has been granted, and upon it being made to appear to the Commission that all the terms, conditions, and obligations set forth in the application and permit have been fully met, and that no cause or circumstance arising or first coming to the knowledge of the Commission since the granting of the permit would, in the judgment of the Commission, make the operation of such station against the public interest, the Commission shall issue a license to the lawful holder of said permit for the operation of said station. Said license shall conform generally to the terms of said permit. The provisions of section 309 (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply with respect to any station license the issuance of which is provided for and governed by the provisions of this subsection.'

"SEC. 14. Section 402 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'PROCEEDINGS TO ENJOIN, SET ASIDE, ANNUL, OR SUSPEND ORDERS OF THE COMMISSION

"'SEC. 402. (a) Any proceedings to enjoin, set aside, annul, or suspend any order of the Commission under this act (except those appealable under subsection (b) of this section) shall be brought as provided by and in the manner prescribed in Public Law 901, Eighty-first Congress, approved December 29, 1950.

"'(b) Appeals may be taken from decisions and orders of the Commission to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in any of the following cases:

"'(1) By any applicant for a construction permit or station license, whose application is denied by the Commission.

"'(2) By any applicant for the renewal or modification of any such instrument of authorization whose application is denied by the Commission.

"'(3) By any party to an application for authority to transfer, assign, or dispose of any such instrument of authorization, or any rights thereunder, whose application is denied by the Commission.

"'(4) By any applicant for the permit required by section 325 of this Act whose application has been denied by the Commission, or by any permittee under said section whose permit has been revoked by the Commission.

"'(5) By the holder of any construction permit or station license which has been modified or revoked by the Commission.

"'(6) By any other person who is aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected by any order of the Commission granting or denying any application described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) hereof.

"'(7) By any person upon whom an order to cease and desist has been served under section 312 of this Act.

"'(8) By any radio operator whose license has been suspended by the Commission.

"'(c) Such appeal shall be taken by filing a notice of appeal with the court within thirty days from the date upon which public notice is given of the decision or order complained of. Such notice of appeal shall contain a concise statement of the nature of the proceedings as to which the appeal is taken; a concise statement of the reasons on which the appellant intends to rely, separately stated and numbered; and proof of service of a true copy of said notice and statement upon the Commission. Upon filing of such notice, the court shall have jurisdiction of the proceedings and of the questions determined therein and shall have power, by order, directed to the Commission or any other party to the appeal, to grant such temporary relief as it may deem just and proper. Orders granting temporary relief may be either affirmative or negative in their scope and application so as to permit either the maintenance of the status quo in the matter in which the appeal is taken or the restoration of a position or status terminated or adversely affected by the order appealed from and shall, unless otherwise ordered by the court, be effective pending hearing and determination of said appeal and compliance by the Commission with the final judgment of the court rendered in said appeal.

"'(d) Upon the filing of any such notice of appeal the Commission shall, not later than five days after the date of service upon it, notify each person shown by the records of the Commission to be interested in said appeal of the filing and pendency of the same and shall thereafter permit any such person to inspect and make copies of said notice and statement of reasons therefor at the office of the Commission in the city of Washington. Within thirty days after the filing of an appeal, the Commission shall file with the court a copy of the order complained of, a full statement in writing of the facts and grounds relied upon by it in support of the order involved upon said appeal, and the originals or certified copies of all papers and evidence presented to and considered by it in entering said order.

"'(e) Within thirty days after the filing of any such appeal, any interested person may intervene and participate in the proceedings had upon said appeal by filing with the court a notice of intention to intervene and a verified statement showing the nature of the interest of such party, together with proof of service of true copies of said notice and statement, both upon appellant and upon the Commission. Any person who would be aggrieved or whose interest would be adversely affected by a reversal or modification of the order of the Commission complained of shall be considered an interested party.

"'(f) The record and briefs upon which any such appeal shall be heard and determined by the court shall contain such information and material, and shall be prepared within such time and in such manner as the court may by rule prescribe.

"'(g) At the earliest convenient time the court shall hear and determine the appeal upon the record before it in the manner prescribed by section 10 (e) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"'(h) In the event that the court shall render a decision and enter an order reversing the order of the Commission, it shall remand the case to the Commission to carry out the judgment of the court and it shall be the duty of the Commission, in the absence of the proceedings to review such judgment, to forthwith give effect thereto, and unless otherwise ordered by the court, to do so upon the basis of the proceedings already had and the record upon which said appeal was heard and determined.

"'(i) The court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for costs in favor of or against an appellant, or other interested parties intervening in said appeal, but not against the Commission, depending upon the nature of the issues involved upon said appeal and the outcome thereof.

"'(j) The court's judgment shall be final, subject, however, to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon writ of certiorari on petition therefor under section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code, by the appellant, by the Commission, or by any interested party intervening in the appeal, or by certification by the court pursuant to the provisions of that section.'

"SEC. 15. Section 405 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'REHEARINGS BEFORE COMMISSION

"'SEC. 405. After a decision, order, or requirement has been made by the Commission in any proceeding, and party thereto, or any other person aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected thereby, may petition for rehearing; and it shall be lawful for the Commission, in its discretion, to grant such a rehearing if sufficient reason therefor be made to appear. Petitions for rehearing must be filed within thirty days from the date upon which public notice is given of any decision, order, or requirement complained of. No such application shall excuse any person from complying with or obeying any decision, order, or requirement of the Commission, or operate in any manner to stay or postpone the enforcement thereof, without the special order of the Commission. The filing of a petition for rehearing shall not be a condition precedent to judicial review of any such decision, order, or requirement, except where the party seeking such review (1) was not a party to the proceedings resulting in such decision, order, or requirement, or (2) relies on questions of fact or law upon which the Commission has been afforded no opportunity to pass. Rehearings shall be governed by such general rules

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

as the Commission may establish, except that no evidence other than newly discovered evidence, evidence which has become available only since the original taking of evidence, or evidence which the Commission believes should have been taken in the original proceeding shall be taken on any rehearing. The time within which a petition for review must be filed in a proceeding to which section 402 (a) applies, or within which an appeal must be taken under section 402 (b), shall be computed from the date upon which public notice is given of orders disposing of all petitions for rehearing filed in any case, but any decision, order, or requirement made after such rehearing reversing, changing, or modifying the original order shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to rehearing as an original order.'

"SEC. 16. (a) Section 409 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 409. (a) In every case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, the hearing shall be conducted by the Commission or by one or more examiners provided for in section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, designated by the Commission.

"'(b) The officers conducting a hearing to which subsection (a) applies shall prepare and file an initial decision, except where the hearing officer becomes unavailable to the Commission or where the Commission finds upon the record that due and timely execution of its functions imperatively and unavoidably require that the record be certified to the Commission for initial or final decision. In all such cases the Commission shall permit the filing of exceptions to such initial decision by any party to the proceeding and shall, upon request, hear oral argument on such exceptions before the entry of any final decision, order, or requirement. All decisions, including the initial decision, shall become a part of the record and shall include a statement of (1) findings and conclusions, as well as the basis therefor, upon all material issues of fact, law, or discretion, presented on the record; and (2) the appropriate decision, order, or requirement.

"'(c) (1) In any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, no examiner conducting or participating in the conduct of such hearing shall, except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law, consult any person (except another examiner participating in the conduct of such hearing) on any fact or question of law in issue, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate. In the performance of his duties, no such examiner shall be responsible to or subject to the supervision or direction of any person engaged in the performance of investigative, prosecutory, or other functions for the Commission or any other agency of the Government. No examiner conducting or participating in the conduct of any such hearing shall advise or consult with the Commission or any member or employee of the Commission (except another examiner participating in the conduct of such hearing) with respect to the initial decision in the case or with respect to exceptions taken to the findings, rulings, or recommendations made in such case.

"'(2) In any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, no person who has participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation of such case before an examiner or examiners of the Commission, and no member of the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of the Chief Engineer, or the Office of the Chief Accountant shall (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law) directly or indirectly make any additional presentation respecting such case, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

"'(3) No person or persons engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the Commission, or in any litigation before any court in any case arising under this Act, shall advise, consult, or participate in any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, except as a witness or counsel in public proceedings.

"'(d) To the extent that the foregoing provisions of this section are in conflict with provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, such provisions of this section shall be held to supersede and modify the provisions of that Act.'

"(b) Subsections (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of section 409 are hereby redesignated as subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), (j), (k), (l), and (m), respectively.

"SEC. 17. Section 410 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof, and by inserting in lieu of such sentence the following: 'Except as provided in section 409, the Commission may refer any matter arising in the administration of this Act to a joint board to be composed of a member, or of an equal number of members, as determined by the Commission, from each of the States in which the wire or radio communication affected by or involved in the proceeding takes place or is proposed. For purposes of acting upon such matter any such board shall have all the jurisdiction and powers conferred by law upon the Commission, and shall be subject to the same duties and obligations.'

"SEC. 18. (a) Title 18, United States Code, 'Crimes and Criminal Procedure', is amended by adding the following new section immediately after section 1342:

"'§ 1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television.

"'Whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money or property by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, transmits or causes to be transmitted by means of interstate wire, radio, or television communication, any writings, signs, signals, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.'

"(b) The analysis of chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"'1343. Fraud by wire, radio, or television.'

"SEC. 19. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment, but—

"(1) Insofar as the amendments made by this Act to the Communications Act of 1934 provide for procedural changes, requirements imposed by such changes shall not be mandatory as to any agency proceeding (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) with respect to which hearings have been commenced prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

"(2) The amendments made by this Act to section 402 of the Communications Act of 1934 (relating to judicial review of orders and decisions of the Commission) shall not apply with respect to any action or appeal which is pending before any court on the date of enactment of this Act."

And the House agree to the same.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
HOMER THORNBERRY,
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ERNEST W. MCFARLAND,
LESTER C. HUNT,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
CHARLES W. TOBEY,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and the House agrees to the same.

The differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference are explained below, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of agreements reached by the conferees and clerical and minor clarifying changes.

DEFINITION OF "BROADCASTING"

The Senate bill proposed to rewrite the definition of "broadcasting" in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934. The term is now defined to mean "the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received by the public, directly or by the intermediary of relay stations". As changed by the Senate bill it would have been defined to mean "the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received directly by the general public". In the House amendment the term was defined to mean "the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received directly by the public".

There was considerable discussion in the committee of conference as to how much, and in what respects, the present law would be changed by the Senate and House versions of this definition. The conferees concluded that it was not advisable at this time to make any change in the definition in the present law. The definition, and the interpretations thereof heretofore made, will therefore remain unchanged.

FORMER COMMISSIONERS—REPRESENTATION OF PERSONS BEFORE THE COMMISSION

Section 4 (a) of the Senate bill proposed to add to section 4 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 a new provision providing that any commissioner serving as such after 1 year from the date of enactment of the legislation here proposed could not for, a period of 1 year following the termination of his services as a commissioner, represent before the Commission in a professional capacity any person, including all persons under common control, subject to the provisions of that act, except that this restriction would not apply to any commissioner who had served the full term for which he was appointed. This provision was omitted from the House amendment.

The conference substitute includes this provision from the Senate bill, with only slight language changes. The members of the committee of conference feel that, for this purpose, representation of persons before the Commission includes appearance as a matter of record on applications, briefs, and other matters, as well as personal appearances.

PREPARATION OR DELIVERY OF PAPERS OR PUBLICATIONS BY COMMISSIONERS

Section 4 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934 now provides that members of the Commission "shall not engage in any other business, vocation, or employment." Section 4 (a) of the Senate bill proposed to add at the end of this provision a clause providing that "this shall not apply to the preparation of technical or professional publications for which reasonable honorarium or compensation may be paid." This provision is included in the House amendment with only slight changes.

In the conference substitute the provision has been somewhat modified in order to clarify its purpose and meaning. It is deemed advisable to permit not only the preparation of publications but also their delivery or presentation at, for example, public meetings.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL BY INDIVIDUAL COMMISSIONERS

Section 4 of the Senate bill proposed to amend section 4 (f) (1) of the Communications Act of 1934, relating to the appointment of personnel.

One provision of the bill would have authorized each commissioner to appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, a legal assistant and a secretary, and it was provided that a commissioner could fix the salary of the legal assistant at not to exceed $10,000 per annum and the salary of the secretary at not to exceed $5,600 per annum. In the House amendment this provision was modified so as to omit any reference to the appointment of a secretary. Instead of providing for appointment of a "legal assistant" to be appointed at not more than a specified salary it provided that each commissioner, without regard to the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, could appoint and fix the compensation of a "professional assistant."

The conference substitute, in lieu of these provisions, authorizes each commissioner, without regard to the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, to appoint a legal assistant, an engineering assistant, and a secretary, each to perform such duties as the commissioner shall direct. In addition it is provided that the Chairman of the Commission may appoint, without regard to the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, an administrative assistant who is to perform such duties as the Chairman shall direct.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Section 5 of the Senate bill would have amended section 5 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to include, among other things, a provision requiring the Commission, within 60 days after the enactment of this legislation, to organize its legal, engineering, and accounting staff into integrated divisions to function on the basis of the Commission's principal work-load operations, and into such other divisional organizations as the Commission deemed necessary to handle that part of its work which did not lend itself to the integrated division type of organization. These provisions were included in the House amendment with certain modifications which were mostly for the purpose of clarification and the elimination of certain provisions which seemed to be unnecessary. The conference substitute retains this provision as it appears in the House amendment except that certain language specifying in detail the function of divisional organizations has been omitted as surplusage.

The Senate bill directed the Commission to establish a staff, directly responsible to it, to prepare drafts of the Commission's decisions, orders, and other memoranda as directed by the Commission in the exercise of its quasi-judicial duties. These provisions relating to the establishment of a review staff were considerably modified in the House amendment, but the modifications had to do primarily with details rather than the changing of the basic purposes intended to be accomplished by the Senate bill. In the House amendment it was provided, among other things, that the review staff should perform no duties or functions other than to assist the Commission in cases of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which have been designated for hearing by preparing, without recommendations, a summary of the evidence presented at such hearing, by preparing, without recommendations, after an initial decision but prior to oral argument, a compilation of the facts material to the exceptions and replies thereto filed by the parties, and by preparing for the Commission or any member or members thereof, without recommendations and in accordance with specific directions from the Commission or such member or members, memoranda, opinions, decisions, and orders. In the conference substitute this provision is modified by the elimination of the words "without recommendations," in that part of the provision dealing with the preparation of a summary of the evidence and in that part dealing with the preparation of a compilation of the facts material to the exceptions and replies thereto.

ASSIGNMENT OF WORK, BUSINESS, AND FUNCTIONS

Section 405 of the Communications Act of 1934 now authorizes the Commission, subject to certain conditions and limitations, to assign any of its work, business, or functions to divisions, to individual commissioners, or to boards of employees.

The Senate bill proposed to rewrite section 405 by substituting provisions authorizing the Commission, when necessary to the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business, to assign any portion of its work, business, or functions to an individual commissioner or commissioners or to a board composed of one or more employees of the Commission. It was provided that any order, decision, or report made or other action taken pursuant to any such assignment should have the same force and effect as if made by the Commission. This provision of the Senate bill also contained a proviso that any person aggrieved by any such order, decision, or report could file a petition for review by the Commission, and it was provided that every such petition should be passed upon by the Commission. The Senate provision by making this authority subject to the provisions of the amended section 409 of the act, would have denied to the Commission the authority to assign, under this provision, the function of conducting a hearing in any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act).

The House amendment, in lieu of the Senate provision, contained a section more nearly like that in the present law in that it would have included separate provisions for panels of the Commission.

The provisions on this subject which are included in the conference substitute are substantially the same as the provisions in the Senate bill, except that the provision as to the right of an aggrieved person to file a petition for review has been modified to read as follows:

"(2) Any person aggrieved by any such order, decision, or report may file an application for review by the Commission, within such time and in such form as the Commission shall prescribe, and every such application shall be passed upon by the Commission. If the Commission grants the application, it may affirm, modify, or set aside such order, decision, report, or action, or may order a rehearing upon such order, decision, report, or action under section 405."

PURCHASE OF PLANT AND EQUIPMENT OF UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICANT

Section 6 (b) of the House amendment proposed to add to section 307 of the Communications Act of 1934 a new subsection as follows:

"(f) If the Commission, instead of granting the application of a licensee for the renewal of its station license, grants to another applicant a station license for the same or mutually exclusive facilities, and if the applicant for renewal has operated substantially as set forth in the license and has not willfully violated or failed to observe any of the restrictions and conditions of this act or of any regulation of the Commission authorized by this Act or by a treaty ratified by the United States, then, if the applicant for renewal so requests, the grant of the station license to the other applicant shall be conditioned upon the purchase, by the other applicant, of the physical plant and equipment theretofore used for station purposes by the applicant for renewal, at a price equal to the fair value of such plant and equipment, as determined by the Commission."

No such provision was included in the Senate bill and the provision is not included in the conference substitute. The Senate members of the committee of conference felt that this was too important and far-reaching a provision to enact into law unless interested persons were given the opportunity to present their views on it in a public hearing. They pointed out that the matter had not been brought up in the Senate hearings or during Senate consideration of this legislation.

"NEWSPAPER" AMENDMENT

The House amendment (sec. 7 (c)) proposed to add to section 308 of the Communications Act of 1934 a new subsection (d), sometimes referred to as the "newspaper" amendment, reading as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall not make or promulgate any rule or regulation, of substance or procedure, the purpose or result of which is to effect a discrimination between persons based upon interest in, association with, or ownership of any medium primarily engaged in the gathering and dissemination of information and no application for a construction permit or station license, or for the renewal, modification, or transfer of such a permit or license, shall be denied by the Commission solely because of any such interest, association, or ownership."

The Senate bill contained no such provision, and the provision is not included in the conference substitute. This provision was omitted from the conference substitute because the committee of conference felt that it was unnecessary. It is the view of the conference committee that under the present law the Commission is not authorized to make or promulgate any rule or regulation the effect of which would be to discriminate against any person because such person has an interest in, or association with, a newspaper or other medium for gathering and disseminating information. Also the Commission could not arbitrarily deny any application solely because of any such interest or association.

ANTITRUST PROVISION

Section 10 of the Senate bill proposed to rewrite section 311 of the Comunications Act of 1934. Under the present law the text of that section is as follows:

"SEC. 311. The Commission is hereby directed to refuse a station license and/or the permit hereinafter required for the construction of a station to any person (or to any person directly or indirectly controlled by such person) whose license has been revoked by a court under section 313 and is hereby authorized to refuse such station license and/or permit to any other person (or to any person directly or indirectly controlled by such person) which has been finally adjudged guilty by a Federal court of unlawfully monopolizing or attempting unlawfully to monopolize, radio communication, directly or indirectly, through the control of the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus, through exclusive traffic arrangements, or by any other means, or to have been using unfair methods of competition. The granting of a license shall not estop the United States or any person aggrieved from proceeding against such person for violating the law against unfair methods of competition or for a violation of the law against unlawful

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

restraints and monopolies and/or combinations, contracts, or agreements in restraint of trade, or from instituting proceedings for the dissolution of such corporation."

The Senate bill would have eliminated the last sentence of the section as now in effect and, in addition, would have eliminated the second part of the first sentence, namely, that part which authorizes the Commission to refuse a license or permit to any person which has been convicted of unlawfully monopolizing or attempting to monopolize radio communication through the control of the manufacture or sale of radio apparatus, through exclusive traffic arrangements, or by other means, or of having used unfair methods of competition.

This section of the Senate bill was omitted from the House amendment, but is included in the conference substitute.

To the extent that this section of the conference substitute will eliminate from section 311 of the present law the last sentence, which is quoted above, the committee of conference does not feel that this is of any legal significance. It is the view of the members of the conference committee that the last sentence of the present section 311 is surplusage and that by omitting it from the present law the power of the United States or of any private person to proceed under the antitrust laws would not be curtailed or affected in any way.

With respect to the omission of the provision which now authorizes the Commission to refuse a license under the circumstances above described, the committee of conference agrees with the statement contained in the report of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on this bill, that "the Commission's existing authority under law to examine into the character of a licensee or permittee in granting a license or a renewal is in no way impaired or modified by the change here recommended in section 311 * * *."

ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS

Section 11 of the Senate bill proposed to rewrite section 312 of the Communications Act of 1934, and would have modified somewhat the grounds on which the Commission could revoke licenses and added new provisions authorizing the Commission to issue cease and desist orders in certain specified situations.

The House substitute also proposed to rewrite section 312 of present law. Among other things, it would have provided in most cases that revocation would be permissible only for acts willfully, knowingly, or repeatedly committed. In addition, the modified section would have authorized, for certain specified grounds or reasons, (1) suspension of station licenses for not to exceed 90 days, (2) revocation of construction permits, (3) issuance of cease and desist orders, and (4) imposition of penalties in the nature of forfeitures.

The section as it is retained in the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment insofar as the grounds for revocation are concerned, but the provisions which would have authorized the Commission to suspend licenses or to impose forfeitures have been eliminated. It is believed that the authority to issue cease and desist orders will give the Commission a means by which it can secure compliance with the law and regulations by licensees. As an alternative to revoking the license in case of failure to obey a cease and desist order, the Commission will be able to invoke the aid of the courts, under section 401 (b) of the act, to secure compliance. The courts will be able to enforce compliance through their power to punish for contempt.

FACILITIES FOR CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Section 11 of the House amendment would have amended section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 which relates to the utilization of broadcasting facilities by candidates for public office. The Senate bill did not propose to amend section 315.

Under the present law section 315 provides that if any licensee shall permit any person who is a legally qualified candidate for any public office to use a broadcasting station, the licensee must afford equal opportunities to all other candidates for that office in the use of such broadcasting station; and it is further provided that the licensee shall have no power of censorship over the material broadcast under the section. The House amendment would have provided that equal opportunity must be afforded to all other candidates or their authorized spokesmen also in those cases in which a spokesman for a candidate for public office has been permitted to use a broadcasting station. The House amendment would further have added to the present law a provision providing that the licensee should not be liable in any civil or criminal action in any local, State, or Federal court because of any material in such a broadcast, except in cases where the licensee willfully, knowingly, and with intent to defame, participated in the broadcast. The section as modified by the House amendment also provided that the charges made for the use of any broadcasting station for any of the purposes set forth in the section should not exceed the minimum charges made for comparable use of such station for other purposes. The conference substitute omits the provisions contained in the House amendment with respect to equal opportunity on account of broadcasts made by spokesmen for candidates and the provision above described with respect to liability in civil and criminal actions. The provision with respect to charges made by broadcasters for political broadcasts has been retained but has been modified by striking out the word "minimum." The committee of conference agreed to omit the provision with respect to liability of licensees in civil or criminal actions and the extension of the present law to include spokesmen for candidates because these subjects have not been adequately studied by the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives. This proposal was adopted in the House after the bill had been reported from the House committee. The proposal involves many difficult problems and it is the judgment of the committee of conference that it should be acted on only after full hearings have been held.

REHEARINGS

Section 405 of the Communications Act of 1934 now provides that in case a rehearing is granted the proceedings thereupon shall conform as nearly as may be to the proceedings in an original hearing except as the Commission may otherwise direct. The Senate bill, in rewriting this section, provided that rehearings shall be governed "by such general rules as the Commission may establish: *Provided*, That, except for newly discovered evidence or evidence otherwise available only since the original taking, no evidence shall be taken on any rehearing."

The House amendment, in rewriting the section, did not contain this proviso. The conference substitute retains this provision from the Senate bill but adds an additional provision to the effect that the Commission in case of rehearing may take evidence which the Commission believes should have been taken in the original proceeding.

SEPARATION OF FUNCTIONS

The Communications Act of 1934 does not contain any provisions with respect to "separation of functions" in adjudication cases which have been designated for a hearing by the Commission. Provisions to that effect are contained, however, in section 5 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act. The Senate bill provided that the Commission shall not employ attorneys or other persons for the purpose of reviewing transcripts or preparing intermediate reports of final decisions, except that this shall not apply to the review staff provided for in the Senate bill, and to legal assistants assigned separately to a Commission member who may, for such Commission member, review such transcript and prepare such drafts. The House amendment provided that in any case of adjudication (as defined in Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, no commissioner, and no professional assistant appointed by a commissioner, shall (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law) consult on any fact or question of law in issue, or receive any recommendations from, any other person, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate. The House bill provided further that the afore-mentioned provision should not restrict consultation, or the making of recommendations, between a commissioner and another commissioner or between a commissioner and a professional assistant appointed by him. The House bill also provided that the afore-mentioned provision should not restrict commissioners in obtaining from members of the review staff the limited assistance authorized by other provisions of the House amendment.

The conference substitute omits the aforementioned provisions of the Senate bill and the House amendment and includes in lieu of these provisions the following:

(2) In any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for a hearing by the Commission, no person who has participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation of such case before an examiner or examiners or the Commission, and no member of the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of the Chief Engineer, or the Office of the Chief Accountant shall (except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law) directly or indirectly make any additional presentations respecting such case, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

This provision is included in the conference substitute because the members of the committee of conference are of the definite opinion that all parties should have a knowledge of, and an opportunity to refute, any matter or argument presented to the Commission.

FRAUD BY RADIO

The Senate bill contained a section 19 which would have made punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both, the transmission or the causing to be transmitted by means of radio communication or interstate wire communication, of any writings, signs, signal, pictures, or sounds for the purpose of executing a scheme to defraud or to obtain money or property by means of false or fraudulent representations or promises. The House amendment omitted this section because the House of Representatives had already passed H. R. 2948 containing substantially similar provisions with respect to fraud by radio. The conference substitute includes a provision with respect to fraud by radio which is substantially the same as H. R. 2948 as it passed the House. The provision differs from that originally contained in the Senate bill primarily with respect to the maximum fine which has been reduced from a maximum of $10,000, to a maximum of $1,000.

EFFECTIVE DATE

The Senate bill did not contain any provision which specified the date on which its provisions should take effect. All of its provisions would therefore have taken effect on the date of enactment.

The House amendment provided that, with two exceptions, the act should take effect on the first day of the first month which begins more than 60 days after the date of its enactment. The first exception provided that insofar as the amendments made to the Communications Act of 1934 provide for procedural changes, requirements shall not be mandatory as to any agency proceeding (as defined in Administrative Procedure Act) initiated prior to the date on which the act takes effect. The second exception provided that the amendments made to section 402 of the Communications Act of 1934 (relating to judicial review of orders and decisions of the Commission) shall not apply with respect to any action or appeal pending before any court on the date on which the act takes effect.

The conference substitute provides, generally, that the provisions of the act shall take effect on the date of its enactment. With respect to procedural changes, however, the conference substitute provides that these changes shall not be mandatory as to any agency proceeding (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) with respect to which hearings have been begun prior to the date of enactment of the act. The remainder of the effective date provision included in the conference substitute is the same as the provisions contained in the House amendment relating to the effective date of the provisions dealing with judicial review of orders and decisions of the Commission.

J. PERCY PRIEST,
OREN HARRIS,
HOMER THORNBERRY,
CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
CARL HINSHAW,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 1, Hon. John W. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, made a statement summarizing the financial operations of the United States Government during the past 6 years. The conduct of the Nation's finances is a matter of vital concern to every American citizen. The Secretary's analysis of these finances during the period since he took office in June 1946 is, therefore, of great importance. The highlights of the Secretary's statement are as follows:

First. For the 6 years ending June 30, 1952, taken as a whole, the Secretary reported that the Federal budget has been better than balanced. This means that the total revenues of the Government have exceeded total expenditures. The Government has actually had a budget surplus of more than $3,500,000,000 in these 6 years.

This is the more remarkable, the Secretary pointed out, in view of the sharp changes which have occurred in our economy and in the international climate during this period. These changes have brought with them many complex and difficult problems. Heavy demands have been made upon the finances of the Government. But the funds necessary to finance our defense and security programs have been provided. The credit of the United States Government has been maintained. Our banking and financial structure has continued in a position of unparalleled soundness; and our economy as a whole has proved strongly resistant to the shock of rapidly changing conditions, both here and abroad.

Second. During the past 6 years, the Secretary reported further, the total public debt has been reduced by about $11,000,000,000, from $270,000,000,000 on June 30, 1946, to about $259,000,000,000 at the present time. The budget surplus provided part of the funds used to accomplish this reduction. Most of the remainder came from funds available in the cash balance at the end of World War II financing, in excess of the amount which the Treasury needed to keep on hand under postwar conditions.

Third. In addition to achieving a budget surplus and reducing the total Federal debt by about $11,000,000,000, the Secretary announced that United States Government security holdings of the commercial banking system have been reduced by $24,000,000,000 during the period since June 30, 1946.

These holdings have an inflationary potential; and the sharp cut-back in their amount which has been accomplished since the middle of 1946 has made a significant contribution to the financial health of the economy during these years.

Fourth. An important development which has made it possible for bank ownership of Federal securities to be reduced by a very much larger amount than the reduction in the total debt outstanding, according to the Secretary's statement, has been the increase in savings bond ownership on the part of the American people in the past 6 years.

In June 1946 it was hoped that savings bonds might continue to be a major savings outlet and an important part of the public debt structure. As the postwar period progressed, this hope became a fact. Some bonds were cashed to pay for goods which had been in short supply during the war years, or in connection with other individual expenditure programs. But the wholesale liquidation of savings bonds which had been generally predicted at the close of World War II never occurred. Savings bond ownership, in fact, increased $8,500,000,000—from approximately $49,000,000,000 on June 30, 1946, to more than $57,500,000,000 at the present time. This increase reflected the success of the Treasury's program for encouraging thrift and promoting the widest possible public ownership of the securities of the Government—a program which moves hand in hand with the Treasury's objective of cutting down bank holdings of United States Government obligations.

Fifth. The Secretary pointed out further that the financial policies of the United States Government play an important part in the business life of the Nation; and that these policies during the past 6 years have contributed to a healthy business environment which is totally different from the situation following other major wars in our history. Since the close of World War II, people have gained a new belief in the resilience and strength of the Nation's economic and financial structure. Our American enterprise system, as a whole, has shown that it can adapt itself both to growing civilian needs and to a heavy defense program. Well-maintained confidence in the financial soundness of the Government, in our free-enterprise institutions, and in the prospects for the continued growth and prosperity of our Nation has made possible an unparalleled economic development in this country during the past 6 years.

This confidence is particularly evident in the record volume of new capital investment. Businessmen have been more willing than ever before to risk their capital in building for the future. Their postwar investment in new plant and equipment, up to the time of the Korean attack, totaled nearly $100,000,000,000, exceeding both in dollars and in physical volume the plant expansion of any other similar period in our history. A further great expansion has been made in the past 2 years; in this period the defense program has, of course, been an important influencing factor.

Looking toward the future, Secretary Snyder noted that the possibility of changes in the international outlook must always be given full consideration. Barring serious new developments in this area, however, the Secretary expressed the view that we have every reason to anticipate the continued prosperity and growth of our economy in the years ahead. We are not living in a static economy, but in a strongly dynamic one. Surprisingly few people realize how rapidly our population is growing. Currently our domestic market for all kinds of goods has been enlarged by 2,700,000 people added in the past year alone. This is equivalent to the addition of a new State the size of Florida, or Iowa, or Louisiana. In a country such as ours, with large resources and technical ability, a growing population means an expanding economy.

An equally important dynamic factor is our accelerating rate of growth in new scientific discoveries and new industrial techniques. These promise strong underlying support to industrial activity and new capital investment. With this outlook, one may feel confident about the future business trend.

Sixth. Secretary Snyder, in closing, reviewed the results of the Treasury's most recent financing operation. This operation was undertaken in order to meet the Government's need for funds in fiscal year 1953—a situation brought about largely by the heavy financial requirements of our defense and security program.

The Treasury's "new money" operation, to which the Secretary referred, consisted of an offering on June 19, 1952, of 2⅜-percent Treasury bonds, dated July 1, 1952, and maturing June 15, 1958. The amount of the offering was originally set at $3,500,000,000 or thereabouts. This amount was oversubscribed, however, by more than three times. Subscriptions from nonbank investors alone exceeded the amount of the original offering and were so large that the total allotment had to be expanded in order to provide the minimum allotment announced for commercial banks.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Total subscriptions received aggregated approximately $11,695,000,000. Subscriptions from nonbank investors totaled $3,642,000,000, and these subscriptions were allotted in full. Commercial banks were allotted $507,000,000 of the new securities, and Government investment accounts were allotted $100,000,000, bringing the total finally allotted to $4,249,000,000.

On June 10, at the same time announcement was made relating to the 2⅜-percent bonds, the Treasury announced an offering of an 11-month 1⅞-percent certificate of indebtedness in exchange for certificates bearing the same rate maturing July 1, 1952. Out of a total of $5,216,000,000 in certificates maturing July 1, $4,963,000,000, or over 95 percent, were exchanged for the new certificates.

The success of these recent financing operations is highly gratifying. With continued cooperation on the part of our people, there is every assurance that the finances of the Government can and will be maintained in a sound position, despite the heavy costs of national security under the conditions prevailing in the world today.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there are many Members of the House who are very much interested in the amendments to the Communications Act of 1934. You will recall the consideration that we gave to the various proposals before the House a few days ago on Senate 658.

Your conferees have met and diligently endeavored to come to an agreement that we felt would be about the best that we could hope for at this time. There are many provisions in disagreement. Some are substantial and some, of course, are merely for clarification. But nevertheless, we have endeavored to resolve these differences in a manner so that the basic objectives which we sought to accomplish in connection with these amendments would be accomplished.

If my colleagues will bear with me for just a few moments, I assure you I will not detain you very long, but I do want to remind you that I am going to tell you two or three things that I know you are interested in, because I have had many, many Members of this House inquire about it since we passed this bill in the House a few days ago. This is the first time that any attempt has been made by the Congress to enact any substantial changes in the Communications Act since 1934.

We had a difficult job with the Senate conferees because they had their own instructions and viewpoints from the long, tedious, and arduous study that they made of the subject over a number of years. We had our own opinions about the various matters and controversies. But the basic principles with reference to amendments changing the organization and functioning of the Communications Commission are about the same as they were when we passed the bill in the House except that some clarifying changes have been made.

Section 5 (c), as I told you before, was one of the major sections revising the old Communications Act. It has reference to the staff of the commission. Although there were differences in language between the House and the Senate versions, the basic objective was the same in both provisions. The provisions of the House prevailed in that regard because we agreed that they perhaps met the objective better than the provisions of the other body.

The companion section to section 17 in the House bill was section 15 in the Senate bill. These sections relate to the internal organization of the Commission. The Senate had provided that the Commission would have a review staff and that each Commissioner would have his own legal assistant. The House provided that each Commissioner could have a professional assistant and that the Commission would have the review staff. The functions of the review staff were circumscribed in the bill. It was to function at the direction of the Commission. It was to furnish the Commission the information it should have in carrying out its duties in adjudication cases. At the same time, we said that the Commission should not, in adjudication cases, consult any member of the Commission staff, other than the professional assistant of each Commissioner, except upon due notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

Sharp differences of opinion were presented to the committee regarding the need to separate the Commission from its staff. Commissioner Jones had one viewpoint, and he said that the Commissioners should not under any circumstances be permitted to consult any member of the Commission staff, because there had been, apparently, allegations that some members of the staff rather than the members of the Commission were running the Commission.

The majority of the Commission contended that they should have authority to consult with any member of the Commission staff except those members who were engaged in the investigation or prosecution of the case in question about any question of fact or law on which they needed some information or advice.

In an effort to compromise this difference, we have provided in the conference report that no member of the staff and no person who had participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation of the case before an examiner or before the Commission, and no member of the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of the Chief Engineer, or the Office of the Chief Accountant should make, directly or indirectly any additional presentation respecting such case except upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, and I know that he is interested in this subject.

Mr. COX. Are we to understand that the Jones view prevailed in the commission?

Mr. HARRIS. I cannot say that we went as far as the Jones viewpoint wanted us to go.

Mr. COX. I understand, but what you were concerned with then was making certain that there was a fair determination of questions based upon the merits of the case.

Mr. HARRIS. We think the approach we have made to this will accomplish the objectives that the Jones viewpoint seeks to accomplish.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to my colleague on the committee, who has been very helpful and has shown great interest in this problem.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. I think the gentleman should add to the statement that the consultation with these people on new matters is intended to be prohibited except where the interested parties all can be present and have opportunity to refute.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for calling that point to my attention. If they give notice to all parties concerned, of course, any new and additional matter may be presented.

Mr. Speaker, there has been much interest in the newspaper amendment, so-called. That is one matter in which many Members of the House have been especially interested. We had a rather sharp discussion on it. We felt, and the report so states, that in view of the law, and in view of the interpretation that the Commission has placed upon the law, there is no such discrimination at this time, and if there ever was such discrimination, there is none now.

Therefore, we felt it was not necessary to include this new provision in the law. We do feel that the action of the Senate committee heretofore and of the House in this particular bill clearly restates that it is the intention of the law—and we do not propose to give any leeway at all for the Commission in that respect—not to discriminate against any applicant, whether it be a newspaper or any other applicant.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with reference to the conference report. Is there a statement in the conference report as to discrimination against other agencies for the dissemination of public information?

Mr. HARRIS. There is a very clear and definite statement in the conference report.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the gentleman be kind enough to read it?

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman has a copy of the report, and if he will turn to page 18, omitting the reading of the paragraph, the report states:

> The Senate bill contained no such provision, and the provision is not included in the conference substitute. This provision was omitted from the conference substitute because the committee of conference felt that it was unnecessary. It is the view of the conference committee that under the present

law the Commission is not authorized to make or promulgate any rule or regulation the effect of which would be to discriminate against any person because such person has an interest in, or association with, a newspaper or other medium for gathering and disseminating information. Also the Commission could not arbitrarily deny any application solely because of any such interest or association.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the gentleman say that this statement in the report represents the united opinion of the conferees, and that such statement forecloses such discrimination?

Mr. HARRIS. Not only that, but it is the opinion of the conferees that it was the intention of the law and it is now so interpreted by the commission that no such discrimination was intended to be permitted when the act was originally passed.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. There is one other amendment in which this House is very much interested; that is the section with reference to political broadcasts.

You will recall that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] offered an amendment to the bill, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], who is a member of our committee, offered a substitute for that amendment. Those were amendments that would have contrary objectives. The House took the Horan amendment, which would relieve the licensee or the station of any liability whatsoever under State laws for libelous statements, and would not give the station authority to censor political statements or broadcasts. The O'Hara proposal would have given the station the right to eliminate libelous statements, and would have left it to State law whether stations are liable for any obscene or libelous statements.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does that not place radio stations and television in a category entirely different from newspapers?

Mr. HARRIS. To which one does the gentleman refer?

Mr. DONDERO. I refer to the Horan amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, it would have, I suppose, placed them in a category different from the newspapers. Of course, we could not do anything about newspapers in connection with this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, if they were relieved from liability for libel and slander, is that not an invitation for the lowest kind of campaigning?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the interpretation some have placed on it, yes. There has been much concern expressed about this aspect of the Horan amendment since we passed it in the House some time ago. The conferees felt that it was so important and so highly controversial, and as we had had no hearings on the subject and since it was so involved, we left this matter out of the bill altogether at this time. There was the very definite feeling on the part of all conferees that this is a matter that is so important that it should be taken up at another time after full hearings could be held and the whole matter gone into further. That was the action of the conferees on that particular subject.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. This may not be directly in point, but since the gentleman is so well versed in the communications field, I would like to ask him this question: I represent a district where we have no television licensee as yet. Applications have been filed. We have high frequency allocated channels, but nobody is in business as yet.

Mr. HARRIS. The processing began yesterday.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. I am advised that the large chains who now have the very high frequencies are insisting or will insist, and the Commission is supporting it, the existing broadcasters who have been in business right along, are going to insist, with the support of the Commission, that additional power and increased power be given to the very high frequencies, and if and when that is done the broadcasting chains now in existence will then say this: "Anybody who has coverage as the result of very high frequency, we will not give any of our programs to." If that is done, the little people who have nothing now will have no place at all, after investing millions of dollars in facilities, because there will be no use for ultra high frequency if there is additional coverage over high frequency, and we are right back where we started.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course, this conference report does not go into that. I might say to the gentleman that is a matter within the province of the Commission. The television allocation plan has already been publicized and the gentleman can get it; perhaps he has a copy of it.

Mr. FLOOD. I have.

Mr. HARRIS. From it you can understand what the intention of the commission is in that respect at this time. But we did not go into that subject here. What we do is to establish a procedure which we think sets up standards that the Commission ought to follow in order to have a fair procedure. That is exactly what we do; we try to set up a standard that will accomplish some of the things the gentleman speaks of, and that is fairness to all applicants.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand from what the gentleman has said that the Horan amendment has been left out of the report?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. The entire matter with reference to political broadcasts has been left out with the exception of the McCormack amendment with reference to charges for political broadcasts, and that is that they cannot charge more for political broadcasts than the usual commercial rate. We did strike out the word "minimum" that was in the amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. COX. I take it that it was the consensus of the conferees that if there was to be no censorship of programs it would be unfair to hold stations liable for slander over which they had no control.

Mr. HARRIS. I could not say that to the gentleman, speaking very frankly, because under the present law in some States there is a possibility that a station might be held liable under State law while Federal law prevents the station from eliminating libelous statements.

Mr. COX. Under State law?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, that is true; and we did feel that this whole problem of censorship and liability was so involved that we ought not to try to settle it at this time but rather at a later time when we could give it greater attention and study.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to explain the action of the conference committee on the proposed amendment to the present law, contained in the bill passed by the House, which would have provided that if the Commission, instead of renewing a license on application therefor, granted the facilities, or mutually exclusive facilities, to another applicant, and certain other specified conditions existed, the successful applicant would have to purchase the plant and equipment used for station purposes by the unsuccessful applicant for renewal, if the latter so desired. This would have been so under the amendment only if the unsuccessful applicant for renewal had not willfully violated or failed to observe any of the restrictions and conditions of the act or regulations authorized by the act or by treaty.

This was an amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER], and it was adopted in the committee consideration of the bill.

The members of the committee of conference were not unmindful of the fact that there is an element of hardship involved when a licensee who has complied with the law is refused a renewal of his license because the Commission may happen to find that the public interest would be served by granting to another licensee facilities which make it impossible, at the same time, to permit the applicant for renewal to continue to operate his station.

However, the Senate bill as it came over to the House did not contain any provision which dealt with this problem in any way. The Senate members of the conference committee felt that since the Senate committee had not previously had an opportunity to study the practical situations in which the amendment would operate and what the full consequences of its enactment would be, it would be unwise to enact this provision, or any similar provision, into law until hearings had been held on the subject. Under these circumstances, there was nothing

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the House conferees could do but yield on this provision.

There are other provisions in here that are important, but you can look at the conference report and easily determine what they are.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, sometimes in these hurried conferences at the close of a session we find ourselves in the position of not being able to read a conference report until after it has been printed in the RECORD and of course, we have already signed the documents approving such report filed with the two bodies.

I would like to clarify the meaning of certain words that are contained on page 15 of this conference report in the statement of the managers on the part of the House insofar as my own understanding is concerned; and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] has authorized me to speak in the same way on his behalf. That language is contained in the definition of broadcasting where it will be remembered that in the House version of the bill we made a slight change in the definition of the word "broadcasting" without the intention of making any material change in the definition. Likewise the Senate had made a slight change different from that of the House bill.

In the course of the discussion in the conference the managers for the other body offered certain language to go into the report which was rejected. That language would have intended that the interpretation by the Commission in the Muzak case, to include subscription services as "broadcasting" as a part of the definition of "broadcasting." But that language was not used. The language offered for inclusion in the conference statement of managers but rejected by the conference is as follows:

> The word "general" contained in section 2, subsection (o) of S. 658 was deleted so as not to change the definition of "broadcasting" (except for the deletion of the reference to "relay stations") contained in the Communications Act of 1934 and interpreted by the Commission in the Muzak case to include subscription services.

I find in the second paragraph of the statement of the managers under the definition of the word "broadcasting" the following closing sentence:

> The definition, and the interpretations thereof heretofore made, will therefore remain unchanged.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand that language to mean: not that we give our approval to any definition that has been made by the Commission as in the Muzak case but to leave the matter entirely open.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from California that I share his opinion fully in that respect with reference to that sentence. I feel that it should be made very clear at this point in the RECORD that this does not express any approval whatsoever of any interpretation which the Commission has heretofore made. It does not express approval or disapproval; neither does it suggest how the Commission should interpret or apply the definition in the future. I think we ought to make it very clear that this bill states that the law as it is today remains unchanged, that and nothing more.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is my understanding, and I am glad to have the concurrence of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say that from my own personal viewpoint I do not feel that this sentence in the conference report changes the intention in any way whatsoever. In fact, it is my opinion it does not make any difference whether the language is in or not. I do not think it does any good or harm. I do not think it binds the conferees with reference to intention and I do not think it changes the present law. It was the intention of the conferees not to change the law but to leave it as it is. I think the Muzak case was determined under present law and it is my opinion that they decided it according to present law; consequently it was the intention of the conferees that the present law remain as it is.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to have those words from the gentleman from Arkansas. It will be remembered that the decision in the Muzak case was a memorandum decision on an application for an experimental license, and that the authorization was issued upon the express understanding that it did not constitute a finding by the Commission that the operation authorized would be in the public interest beyond the express terms of the grant.

Mr. Speaker, a letter was presented to the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Ohio, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER, by the Federal Communications Commission, under date of July 25, 1951, on this subject. The last paragraph of that letter is quite important to this point.

On page 3 of the letter it is stated:

> The Commission feels that it will be in a better position as a result of such proceedings to resolve the problem of the proper classification of subscription television as a broadcast service, common-carrier service, or some other type of service.

Mr. Speaker, the entire letter is as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CROSSER: The Commission has your letter of May 24, 1951, in which you request the Commission's opinion with respect to whether or not the term "broadcasting" as used in S. 658, an act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934, would include subscription television services such as phonevision. Your letter also requests the changes in the definition of "broadcasting" in S. 658 which would be required to encompass subscription television services if the Commission should find that the present language of S. 658 is not sufficiently broad.

In the *Muzak case* (8 FCC 581) to which you refer in your letter, the Commission held that the subscriber service there proposed was broadcasting within the definition of section 3 (o) of the Communications Act of 1934. It is important to note, however, that in that case the decision pointed out that the frequency assigned, 117.35 megacycles, was in a part of the spectrum devoted to other than broadcast services and the Commission stated that "* * * if it should develop that a service of this nature is practicable, frequencies therefor would probably have to be allocated from other portions of the radio spectrum." Accordingly, the grant was conditioned expressly that it "is not to be construed as a finding by the Commission that the operation of the proposed station upon the frequency authorized is or will be in the public interest beyond the expression terms of the grant," and that it was on an experimental basis only and subject to change or cancellation without advance notice or hearing.

The question whether a subscription service is broadcasting as that term is presently defined in the Communications Act has not been finally determined. In *Bremer Broadcasting Co.* (2 FCC 79, 83 (1935)) this Commission decided that a coded broadcast could not be considered to come within the definition of broadcasting even though it would appear that any member of the general public could have purchased the code. More recently the question was presented again to the Commission by a petition filed August 8, 1949, by Zenith Radio Corp. requesting authority to conduct tests of phonevision on a limited commercial basis. The Commission granted Zenith Radio Corp. special temporary authority to conduct experimental operations of phonevision. However, the Commission made its grant subject to the express condition that "this action shall not be construed as a determination or finding as to whether or not phonevision or any other existing 'subscription television' constitutes a 'broadcast' service, 'common carrier' service or some other classification. The Commission expressly reserves its determination as to this issue." On November 22, 1950, the Commission also grants special temporary authority to General Teleradio, Inc., to conduct experimental operation of its Skiatron Subscriber-Vision System under conditions similar in nature and purpose to those imposed upon the phonevision grant.

As you are aware, the subscription television services which have been brought to the Commission's attention involve the use of some additional equipment at the subscriber's television receiver and the payment of a monthly or per program charge by the viewer directly to the operator of the service for the privilege of viewing certain television programs. This contracts with the customary broadcast service in which there is no direct charge paid by the viewer and the owner of any standard television receiver can receive any of the programs broadcast. The basic question raised by your inquiry is, therefore, whether subscription television services can be said to fall within that category of services which are "intended to be received directly by the general public." This determination, is one which despite the previous pronouncements of the Commission referred to above, the Commission feels is of such importance and difficulty as to preclude its solution without further detailed consideration on the basis of the fullest possible factual record.

The determination whether a subscription service is broadcasting as that term is pres-

ently defined or whether it comes within some other service will, of course, result in important consequences. The definition of the type of service will bear directly upon the frequencies which might be assigned to phonevision and other subscription television services. If, however, it is determined that subscription services do not properly constitute broadcast services and frequencies outside of the broadcasting bands are assigned to such subscription services, reception on the television receivers presently being manufactured will not be possible. On the other hand, since section 3 (h) of the Communications Act specifically provides that a person engaged in radio broadcasting shall not, insofar as such person is so engaged, be deemed a common carrier, a determination that subscription services come within the definition of broadcasting, in the absence of amendment of section 3 (h), might preclude the Commission from exercising common-carrier regulatory powers over such services, even though further consideration of the matter might indicate that it would be in the public interest for the Commission to exercise such powers over the charges made to the viewing public or other aspects of the subscription service.

The Commission expects that proceedings may be initiated in the near future with respect to the possible establishment of subscription television services on a permanent basis in which the problems raised by subscription television services will be fully explored in the light of the factual data derived as a result of the recent experimental operation of television subscription services. The Commission feels that it will be in a better position as a result of such proceedings to resolve the problem of the proper classification of "subscription television" as a broadcast service, common-carrier service, or some other type of service. As a result of such proceedings it is also expected that the Commission will be able to advise the Congress whether additional legislation is required for the regulation of such service, or whether existing legislation should be modified in any way to take account of this type of service. In the absence of such a factual record, however, the Commission feels that it cannot properly decide the service classification which should be given to subscription television, and that, pending such resolution it would be inadvisable to attempt to draft or adopt legislation defining such services as "broadcasting" or as any other type of service.

By direction of the Commission:

WAYNE COY, *Chairman.*

Mr. Speaker, I desire to give notice at this time that in the next session of the Congress, whenever that may be, it is my intention, if no one else does, to introduce a bill which will provide for a further definition of "broadcasting." I have certain ideas on that which would not include subscription television or subscription radio as broadcasting but probably provide for classification of such service as a common carrier or contract service of some sort. I think it should not be classified in the broadcast field as the Commission has said in the Muzak case that it could be.

I am very happy, therefore, to have these expressions on the part of the Members so that we may have no misunderstanding as to the intention of the conferees.

Mr. HARRIS. I think it is important to make it very clear that in the act of 1924 broadcasting was defined to mean "the dissemination of radio communication intended to be received by the public directly or by intermediary of relay station."

The Senate proposed to change that definition when it passed the act. It would have had it read, "The dissemination of radio communication intended to be received by the general public," leaving out the words "directly or by intermediary of relay stations." I believe the word "directly" was left in.

The House struck out the term "general" and accepted the rest of the Senate language.

In conference there were some questions raised as to whether or not the changing of the word "directly" to precede the term "public or general public" or to follow the word might be subject to some interpretation that we intended to change the meaning of the law. Then the question came up as to what was meant by the use of the term "general." To include it we felt might lead to some interpretation by some, the Commission and its lawyers, and they have good lawyers in this business, that it was intended to change the meaning. Finally, we struck out both provisions of the House and the Senate, and left the law just exactly as it is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has correctly stated the case, and I think in the amendment which I propose to introduce at a subsequent time that I shall propose that "broadcasting" shall mean "the dissemination of radio communications intended to be received by the public without restriction," or words to that effect, which will clearly define the term and make it possible to set this subscription service over into the common carrier or other section of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the entire letter from the Commission to the chairman of our committee at the point where it was discussed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the statement made by my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. I suggested that he might state to the House that he was authorized to say that I was in full accord with the views that he was expressing in order that we might conserve time.

There is only one additional thought that I would express in connection with what has already been said, and that is the language to which he has already referred, namely, the definition and the interpretations thereof heretofore made will therefore remain unchanged. I was fearful that there might be an inference in the language used that there was a concurrence in the decisions that have been previously made. I am not willing to agree that it carries that inference. I think it has been clearly stated, however, that the intention is to leave the language as it is in the present law for the reason that it was most difficult to find language that would express what was in the minds of several of the conferees during the discussion.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING MERCHANT MARINE ACT

Mr. HART submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American Merchant Marine, and for other purposes.

AMENDING THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7722) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this applies to but one individual position, as I understand.

Mr. PRIEST. This applies to one individual and simply places the medical officer on the same plane as the chief dental officer, and one or two others. It was an oversight. The bill was unanimously reported by our committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 206 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 207), is amended by inserting after "Deputy Surgeon General" the following: "and the Chief Medical Officer of the United States Coast Guard."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 86) authorizing the appointment of a committee to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is the normal resolution for the English speaking parliaments' conference?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is, Mr. Speaker. It is the arrangement that has been followed in previous years. It is customary, for Canada as the host nation to invite our representatives. The Senate passed the resolution by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives are authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate and four Members of the House of Representatives, respectively, to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada on the invitation of the Canadian branch of the association and to designate the chairmen of the delegations from each of the Houses to be present at such meeting. The expenses incurred by the members of the delegations and staff appointed for the purpose of carrying out this concurrent resolution shall not exceed $4,500 for each of the delegations and shall be reimbursed to them from the contingent fund of the House of which they are Members, upon submission of vouchers approved by the chairman of the delegation of which they are members.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING, BINDING, AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE STATUTES AT LARGE AND DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4109) to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United State, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 1.

Page 4, line 3, strike out "building.'" and insert "building."

Page 4, after line 3, insert:

"'The Attorney General and the Director in the procurement of law books, books of reference or periodicals may exchange or sell similar items and apply the allowance or proceeds to payment in whole or in part of the cost of the items procured'."

Page 4, after line 3, insert:

"SEC. 7. Section 56 of the Printing Act, approved January 12, 1895 (28 Stat. 609), as amended, relating to the printing and distribution of public and private laws, postal conventions, and treaties in slip form (44 U. S. C. 191), is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 56. The Public Printer shall print in slip form copies of public and private laws, postal conventions, and treaties, to be charged to the congressional allotment for printing and binding. The number and distribution of copies shall be under the control of the Joint Committee on Printing'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks just before the vote on the conference report on the amendment of the Communications Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the chorus of regret which has been expressed by other Members of Congress from California over the voluntary retirement from further service in this House by our distinguished colleague, Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON. This regret is genuine and nonpartisan. It is unanimous in the California delegation on both sides of the aisle. Regardless of past differences over questions of political procedure or legislative policy, all of us have an affectionate regard for JACK ANDERSON and a great admiration for his ability and integrity. I wish for him and his fine family all the future happiness and success which I know are in store for them.

THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10 I introduced House Resolution 681, a resolution to have the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, investigate the postal service and the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, I think this investigation is long overdue and I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD several exhibits to prove this contention:

EXHIBIT 1

MAY 25, 1952.

Hon. WALTER MYERS,
Assistant Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in reference to our meeting with you on Thursday, May 22, relative to your letter of April 17, 1952, to the postmaster of New York City, wherein you directed the positions of dispatcher at the main office be discontinued and the duties now performed be transferred to the main garage. I am submitting the following information for your consideration:

Dispatchers have been assigned at the General Post Office Roadway for the past 33 years, one on each tour. It has proven to be for the best interest of the motor vehicle service that these dispatchers be so assigned. In fact, during the last survey by the post office inspectors it was recommended that three additional dispatchers be authorized, one on each tour, due to the increased volume of mail and other duties performed by these dispatchers.

The duties formerly performed by these dispatchers are now performed by two clerks and a foreman on each tour. It has been recommended that an additional clerk be assigned to each tour and that the foreman be replaced by a general foreman, as a supervisor with more authority, than a foreman.

It is my opinion that these dispatchers have proven their efficient ability in handling our vehicles and personnel during all these years and that it is for the best interest of our service that they continue these duties. Furthermore, it will require of the Department a greater number of personnel to cover these duties and at a cost far greater than if dispatchers are continued at this point.

Thanking you for your kind consideration of this matter, and I can assure you that the morale of our personnel will be increased if this injustice is corrected, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

EVERETT G. GIBSON,
President.

EXHIBIT 2

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
BUREAU OF FACILITIES,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1952.

Mr. EVERETT G. GIBSON,
President, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees,
Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GIBSON: This will have reference to your meeting with me on Thursday, May 22, and your subsequent letter of May 25, relative to the assignment of dispatchers in the vehicle service at the New York, N. Y. post office.

The position of dispatcher involves the checking of trucks in and out of the garage at the beginning and end of tours of duty and the performance of related work such as seeing to it that drivers, mechanics and others properly test vehicles before leaving the garage, which assignments clearly indicate that their duties are confined within the garage areas. In this connection, may I invite your attention to the duties of chief dispatcher as defined in section 14, page 3 of the Rules and Regulations for Government-owned Vehicle Service.

I note that you state that dispatchers for a number of years have been performing duties at the platform and in driveways, and while this may be true, it does not necessarily follow that the same has been an appropriate assignment nor does it relieve the Bureau of the responsibility of changing

the assignment once it has been found to be erroneous. Certainly it cannot be contended that vehicle service dispatchers should assume the responsibilities of seeing to it that mails are appropriately and expeditiously dispatched from loading docks at post offices and stations or at terminals, such duties being within the prerogatives of local postal personnel and employees of the Postal Transportation Service.

In closing it may be stated that it is planned to have representatives of this Bureau visit New York City as soon as conditions here will permit, for the purpose of making a thorough study of the vehicle service in New York, and I can assure you that at that time, as president of the organization, you will be conferred with.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER MYERS.
Assistant Postmaster General.

EXHIBIT 3

MEMORANDUM ON A POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT MATTER REQUIRING CONGRESSIONAL ATTENTION

THE PROBLEM

An administrative order by Assistant Postmaster General Walter Myers has been put into effect at the New York City post office, despite the recommended program of a survey team of postal inspectors and the protests of the postal personnel involved, an order which merits vigorous congressional attention because of the unfortunate pattern this order could, and probably will, set for every other major postal center in the country—unless it is promptly reviewed and rescinded. The order is anything but conducive to economy, to efficiency, and to sound employee and human relations in the postal transportation service. It is arbitrary, unilateral, self-contradictory, and needless.

THE SITUATION

On April 27, 1952, the Assistant Postmaster General, in a letter of instruction to the postmaster at New York City, reversed a successful practice of 33 years of postal transportation by directing that the position of roadway or depot dispatcher in the motor vehicle service be abolished, and the individuals previously performing these duties be (a) transferred to the main garage, and (b) replaced by two clerks under a foreman-supervisor (total three) for each tour of duty. Three men to do the work formerly performed by one with some volunteer assistance. This, in the face of recommendations by expert postal investigators, after a thorough survey of the New York requirements, which advised that the successful dispatcher system be expanded by authorizing additional dispatchers, at least one for each tour of duty, because of the increasing volume of mail and the constantly heavier workload. The local official of the New York City post office concurred in, and urged favorable prompt action on the survey's findings.

Attention is next invited to the attached copies of correspondence, (a) letter of protest to Assistant Postmaster General Myers from Mr. Everett G. Gibson, president of the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, and (b) Mr. Myers' reply, especially Mr. Myers' statement which reads:

"I note that you state that dispatchers for a number of years have been performing duties at the platform and in driveways, and while this may be true it does not necessarily follow that the same has been an appropriate assignment, nor does it relieve the Bureau of the responsibility of changing the assignment once it has been found to be erroneous."

It is here to be noted that Mr. Myers has been the Assistant Postmaster General in charge of this operation for 11 of these 33 years. If he could be wrong for 11 years, could he be right now? It is possible, but the odds are astronomical.

If the obvious must further be emphasized, the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees has neither the desire nor the purpose to be in controversy with their Assistant Postmaster General. On the contrary, the federation would like to support any directive promoting economy, efficiency, and/or morale. In the public interest it must oppose the reverse.

EFFICIENCY

The transportation of the mails locally in any community is a vitally important part of the postal machinery. The positions and the procedure, so radically affected by the order of the Assistant Postmaster General, have been standard since 1919, tested by time, checked and rechecked by official surveys, and operated satisfactorily throughout the entire United States. Proof of this is that, as recently as 1950, after intensive study by postal investigators, 28 additional depot dispatchers were authorized for the Chicago post office to meet adequately the transportation problems of that major railroad and airline center, with its many depots and postal stations.

These dispatchers at New York and Chicago, or in any other major postal center, have identical purposes, duties, and functions. They are charged with the responsibility of insuring that all mail trucks and other motor vehicles at any given point arrive and depart promptly on schedule, in proper operating condition, and that any unusual circumstance or emergency is met by transferring any vehicle from one assignment to another without interruption of service. Another function is to study improvements in motor-vehicle maintenance and transportation to expedite the economical, efficient handling of the mails. Connections, rail, bus, or air, must be met on schedule; carriers must find pouches on schedule in route boxes; commercial and civilian parcels must move quickly and surely; a missed local, State, or continental connection may cause a day or more delay in delivery depending on distance, and the reputation of the postal service suffers accordingly. When the dispatcher and his staff get it, the mail must move. It has, for 33 years.

MORALE OR VICE VERSA?

In New York City, over the years, a considerable number of motor-vehicle service employees have been accumulating know-how and the experience of the duties of a dispatcher, voluntarily, at no additional compensation to themselves and no cost to the Post Office Department, looking forward to the day their seniority, ability, and experience would enable them to be promoted to dispatchers themselves. On one pretext or another, for at least a dozen years, these men have received no recognition whatsoever for the job they have been doing so well. Now, as their reward, they are automatically relegated, by the Assistant Postmaster General's order, back to just driving a truck. As for the depot dispatchers themselves, they are now surplused back into the garage, with no specific duties to perform. Instead:

ECONOMY?

Here is the bookkeeping, all paid for, naturally, out of the appropriations authorized and granted by the Congress for the Post Office Department, based on justifications of budget offered by the appropriate Assistant Postmaster General in hearings before the Appropriations Committee:

1. One motor-vehicle dispatcher, salary $4,470 per year, but now under the new order, to be replaced, on each tour of duty by:

2. Two clerks, salary $4,070 a year each, and one foreman-supervisor, salary $4,787, total $12,927, or:

3. An increase of $8,457 per year for each tour of duty, which is:

4. Three tours of duty, times $8,457, or $25,371 per year of needless, increased expense.

5. In New York City Post Office alone, this totals approximately $125,000 a year. The projection, across the country, beginning with Chicago, becomes a recognizable percent of the mounting postal deficit.

It would be no departure from certain budget practices if the Assistant Postmaster General in charge of this operation would show, in his next justification, the discontinued roadway or depot dispatchers as an apparent saving in his operation, because—

The increased operating costs will be transferred to the budget of the Assistant Postmaster General in charge of clerks and supervisors; and

The Assistant Postmaster General with the displaced roadway or depot dispatchers will ask for at least the previous fiscal year amount; and

The Assistant Postmaster General for clerks and supervisors will request adequate appropriation for his increased personnel requirements; and

The order should be rescinded, and the roadway or depot dispatcher system promptly restored.

Mr. Speaker, exhibit No. 4 is a most moving letter from the widow of a letter carrier. For obvious reasons the name of the writer is withheld.

EXHIBIT 4

Somewhere between 28 and 30 years ago my husband went to work in ——— postoffice and put almost 6 years' time in the course of 8 years. He was always whatever position he held a very conscientious worker, whether the salary was plenty or not, he just had a job to do and always did it. He always stood high in character, morale and efficiency. The time came after a good many years to be (senior) in line for a better position in the postoffice. About 10 or 12 years ago, or maybe more there was an opening for assistant supervisor of mails. Instead of my husband who was in line for the position they put a young man practically out of high school into the position. He was drafted in the last war and served 1 year. Through the Korean situation he was drafted for another year. No one would take the job left behind and finally they asked my husband to take it and promised him there would always be something else on the inside if and when this young man came back. He worked hard for 1 year with no increase in $400 pay as promised. Of course there were all kinds of promises if he would only take the job. He took the job for he had asked to be transferred to the inside and felt this would relieve him of the heavy burden put upon the postman by the one-delivery order. My huband was 62 years of age and was entitled to a lighter job, but when this young man came back they forced my husband back on the route as he could not be happy taking leave and doing nothing when he had a wife and himself to support. He practically begged the postmaster to place him on the inside or promise him something definite on the inside, but the postmaster refused to commit himself and these were the last words I heard my husband say, over and over again, will there be enough for you. He thought I would get $30 a week.

The boys in the postoffice were all for my husband and told me he was let down or as they said, was given a dirty deal. My husband had 7 months sick leave coming which I now lose and could not conscientiously take it and say he was sick when he wasn't. He always said time enough when I am sick. They told him to take sick leave when this young man came back and although he was not sick, the day he took off he took down

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

with the flu. As he stayed on home he became a nervous wreck because he felt he was being pushed out and after 6 weeks said he had to go back to work or go crazy with the thought of nothing to do and with the possibility of no job, no future and no income. I have a letter from a doctor saying he was bodily fit to carry on but not too heavy or strenuous work. He must have lighter work to do.

He went back to work and lasted only 1 hour, because he tried to keep up with regulations and broke down and they knew he was broken in spirit and still would not tell him to take it easy and would not commit themselves on what they would do for him. So he came home and brooded a little over a week and ended it all by his own hands. Now I am a widow by the sudden, horrible death of my husband, with no income and practically no money on hand to pay what little bills must be paid and to pay my mortgage so as not to lose my home. My children are all married and feel like most families do with the taxes and high cost of living that they have enough to do without more burden. I feel at my age I should have the rest of my days in quiet and peace instead of raising their families and living through their family trials at 60 years of age. I had a very active, happy life with my family, which was very strenuous, as I did everything in my married life to help my husband and educate the children. I am not bragging. I loved my family, but do they love me enough to help me in my own home? Mine was a case of woman's work is never done. In almost 40 years I had a very little sleep from 4 o'clock in the morning sometimes to all hours of night. At 25 years of age I had 16 boarders. I had a farm and chickens and cut cords of wood. I have had candy store, dress shop, did tailoring and dressmaking professionally, besides making all the clothes possible for the whole family, even postman's suits for my husband. I have painted house inside and out, hung paper, varnished floors, and even did carpenter work, tended public furnace, helped my husband do janitor work, sold articles from door to door, worked in department stores—there is hardly anything that I have not done, seems almost impossible, but nevertheless is true. This is no sob story, I loved it for the sake of those I loved and for the sake of doing the right thing. I came from pioneer stock who always did things, never sat down and said let the other fellow do it. Today you as everyone else says if you were to see me, wouldn't believe it to look at me.

But, what I am asking you to do if it is possible, to see if you can rush whatever pension I have coming so as to give me breathing spell, until I can establish myself in some pleasant or agreeable situation or position for an independent future. I do hope I will receive a fair income as a faithful postman's wife. I do not want to sell my home or lose it while waiting for a pension.

Sincerely.

I also include exhibits Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8 to prove that all is not well in this Department:

EXHIBIT 5

In an address delivered on June 2, Postmaster General Jesse M. Donaldson denied that the one-trip delivery worked any hardship on letter carriers. An analysis of the records of the United States Civil Service Commission, however, proves the contrary to be true.

The fiscal year 1950 began on July 1, 1949, and ended on June 30, 1950. Obviously, the curtailment order was in effect during this fiscal year only to a very limited extent. The first full fiscal year under curtailment was the fiscal year 1951, which began on July 1, 1950, and ended June 30, 1951. A comparison of the reasons that caused retirement of letter carriers before the curtailment for the fiscal year 1950, and after the curtailment during the fiscal year 1951 clearly reveals that the introduction of one-trip delivery has seriously affected letter carriers.

In 1950, 95 letter carriers retired on reaching the mandatory age of 70. In 1951, only 77 worked until they reached the mandatory retirement age, this in spite of the fact that the total number of letter carriers retiring in 1950 was only 1,157 compared to 1,609 in the fiscal year 1951. The year after the curtailment was inaugurated, 1951, saw the number of disability retirements among letter carriers increase from 329 to 413. The number of letter carriers accepting a reduced annuity at age 55 after 30 years of service jumped from 104 to 201. The number of letter carriers who felt it necessary to retire optionally at age 60 jumped from 483 to 720, and the number of letter carriers who retired optionally with between 15 and 29 years of service at the age of 62 jumped from 116 to 160.

These figures clearly support the contention of the letter carriers that their health is breaking down under the heavy loads imposed on them because of Postmaster General Donaldson's curtailment order of April 17, 1950.

EXHIBIT 6

[From the Danbury (Conn.) News-Times]

TWICE-A-DAY MAIL

Who's in favor of twice-a-day mail delivery? As far as we can learn from what we hear people say, everyone is. The present one delivery a day hampers business, is a draw-back to ordinary living, and hampers social and family communication.

Representative SADLAK, Republican, of Connecticut, believes so strongly in the twice-a-day delivery that he proposes the GOP insert a platform in its plank pledging its restoration. Mail deliveries, in case you may have forgotten were cut to one a day on April 18, 1950. For more than 2 years we have suffered this throw-back to Civil War days. We used to be very proud of the service our United States post office rendered us. Of course the people who work for the post office are not to blame for this restriction. They still work hard and long, and their salaries are far from princely.

We don't care who gives us back the twice-daily delivery system, Democrats or Republicans or both. All we want is the good old two-a-day.

Sent by branch 147, Norwalk, Conn.

EXHIBIT 7

NASHVILLE, TENN., *June 20, 1952.*

DEAR MR. EDITOR: I am enclosing a clipping which was in the Woodbine News, a weekly newspaper printed in Woodbine, a suburb of Nashville.

Here lately the sun has been so hot and this particular route has no place to stop for a drink of any sort. Once you start in on the route it's 4½ hours before you get to where you can eat dinner.

I've been able to work only 2 days since this stroke last Friday. Me—I'm all for two trips again.

Yours truly,

ROBERT L. HARRIS.

[From the Woodbine (Tenn.) News of June 20, 1952]

LETTER CARRIER BECOMES OVERHEATED

Robert Harris, a letter carrier, became overheated while on his route last Friday and fell out at the Morton Avenue and Nolensville Road.

Mr. Harris, whose official title with the Post Office Department is utility man (relieving a regular man each day in the week) became ill and called the main office for someone to finish his route. Harris waited at the relay box in front of the Woodbine Upholstery Co.

Before the substitute had time to get to Woodbine, Harris was unconscious and was taken to the general hospital in an Ellis-Kidd ambulance.

He received emergency treatment and remained in the hospital about 5 hours.

EXHIBIT 8

[From the Carthage (Mo.) Evening Press of June 10, 1952]

NEED TWICE-A-DAY MAIL DELIVERY

Carthage has one a day mail delivery everywhere except on the square itself.

That is the same sort of mail service being received by every town in the United States.

It is just half as good as it used to be when there were deliveries twice a day.

Carthage carriers start out at 8:30 each morning.

Mail that is not in and distributed by that time will not be delivered until the next day.

If a train is late the carriers cannot be held a few moments to wait for it. If they are, some inspector from high places comes in and reads the regulations and riot act and this and that's. Carriers must shove off at 8:30 regardless.

Hundreds of Carthage mothers are anxious for letters from boys in service, some on the battle front. If the letter comes in before 8:30 a. m. they get it that day. If it comes in at 8:45 they wait until next day unless the next day happens to be Sunday, in which case they wait until Monday.

Orders from Washington all this—direct instructions of Postmaster General of the United States.

He says people don't mind—quite happy with one delivery a day. All of which goes to show that he does not know what he is talking about.

The Postmaster General blames it all on Congress of course. But that is talk, talk. There always has been a Congress and there always had been a twice a day mail delivery until the present Postmaster General came in.

Allowed two more men, the Carthage post office could make a twice a day mail delivery, it is said. But they won't get them until the Nation gets a new Postmaster General. Hasten the day.

Of course we would hate to see the fellow thrown out of a job in his old age—if he is old—but we would like much, indeed, to get our mail twice daily.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

KATYN COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, today the Special Katyn Investigating Committee filed its report concluding from its hearings that Soviet Russia is guilty of the mass murders of the Polish officers and civilians in the Katyn Forest.

The report submitted to the House of Representatives is unprecedented in the

history of Congress. When House Resolution 390 was first considered by Congress last September, very few people in the United States or the world remembered the controversy of 9 years ago as to whether the Soviets or Nazis committed one of the most barbarous international crimes in world history.

If our generation had permitted an atrocity of this magnitude to pass without exposing the guilty, future historians would classify the free democratic nations of this generation as indifferent to mass murder and international crimes against humanity.

On behalf of all the members of our committee, I wish to thank the Members of Congress for giving our committee authority to undertake this complex and difficult task which we started 9 months ago. All members of our committee are extremely grateful over the cooperation we received from Government departments, organizations, and individuals in the United States, England, and Europe. Without this valuable aid our work could not have been successful. As chairman, I especially thank each member of our committee and also John J. Mitchell, counsel, and Roman Pucinski, investigator, for their diligent cooperation and long hours of extra work which resulted in the recording of the great amount of evidence, testimony, and exhibits as set out in our hearings. Our committee is already besieged with requests of copies of our hearings and report. These requests come from persons and organizations in this country and abroad.

Today I have also filed a resolution which I hope the Congress will approve. This resolution requests that the hearings, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of our committee be referred to the United Nations for action.

The committee held a series of hearings in Washington, Chicago, London, and Frankfort, Germany. Depositions were also taken in Berlin and Italy.

In the course of the hearings held by our committee to date, testimony has been taken from a total of 81 witnesses; 183 exhibits have been studied and made part of the record, and more than 100 depositions were taken from witnesses who could not appear at the hearings. In addition, the committee staff has questioned more than 200 other individuals who offered to appear as witnesses but whose information was mostly of a corroborating nature.

On behalf of our committee, I hereby submit excerpts from our report:

G. FINDINGS

This committee unanimously agrees that evidence dealing with the first phase of its investigation proves conclusively and irrevocably the Soviet NKVD (Peoples' Commissariat of Internal Affairs) committed the massacre of Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia, not later than the spring of 1940.

This committee further concludes that the Soviets had plotted this criminal extermination of Poland's intellectual leadership as early as the fall of 1939—shortly after Russia's treacherous invasion of the Polish Nation's borders. There can be no doubt this massacre was a calculated plot to eliminate all Polish leaders who subsequently would have opposed the Soviets' plans for communizing Poland.

In the course of its investigation, this committee has observed a striking similarity between what happened to the Polish officers in Katyn and the events now taking place in Korea. We unanimously agree that this committee would be remiss in its duty to the American people and the free people of the world if it failed to point out that the identical evasions by the Soviets to the Polish Government while the Poles were searching for their missing officers in 1941 appear again in the delaying tactics now being used by the Communists in Korea.

This committee feels that Katyn may well have been a blueprint for Korea. Just as the Soviets failed for almost 2 years to account for the missing Polish officers, so to this day the Communists in Korea have failed to account for many thousands of captured United Nations soldiers. Among these are 8,000 Americans whom General Ridgway described as atrocity victims in his report to the United Nations last July, and the estimated 60,000 South Koreans still unaccounted for.

The Communists' delaying tactics in the Korean peace talks today may be from the same cloth as the nebulous replies received from the Soviets by the Poles in 1941–42 while they searched for their missing officers.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

This committee unanimously finds, beyond any question of reasonable doubt, that the Soviet NKVD (People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs) committed the mass murders of the Polish officers and intellectual leaders in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia.

The evidence, testimony, records, and exhibits recorded by this committee through its investigations and hearings during the last 9 months overwhelmingly will show the people of the world that Russia was directly responsible for the Katyn massacre. Throughout our entire proceedings there has not been a scintilla of proof or even any remote circumstantial evidence presented that could indict any other nation in this international crime.

It is an established fact that approximately 15,000 Polish prisoners were interned in three Soviet camps: Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostashkov in the winter of 1939–40. With the exception of 400 prisoners, these men have not been heard from, seen, or found since the spring of 1940. Following the discovery of the graves in 1943, when the Germans occupied this territory, they claimed there were 11,000 Poles buried in Katyn. The Russians recovered the territory from the Germans in September 1943, and likewise they stated that 11,000 Poles were buried in those mass graves.

Evidence heard by this committee repeatedly points to the certainty that only those prisoners interned at Kozielsk were massacred in the Katyn Forest. Testimony of the Polish Red Cross officials definitely established that 4,143 bodies were actually exhumed from the seven mass graves. On the basis of further evidence, we are equally certain that the rest of the 15,000 Polish officers, those interned at Starobielsk and Ostashkov, were executed in a similar brutal manner. Those from Starobielsk were disposed of near Kharkov, and those from Ostashkov met a similar fate. Testimony was presented by several witnesses that the Ostashkov prisoners were placed on barges and drowned in the White Sea. Thus the committee believes that there are at least two other "Katyns" in Russia.

No one could entertain any doubt of Russian guilt for the Katyn massacre when the following evidence is considered:

1. The Russians refused to allow the international committee of the Red Cross to make a neutral investigation of the German charges in 1943.

2. The Russians failed to invite any neutral observers to participate in their own investigation in 1944, except a group of newspaper correspondents taken to Katyn who agreed "the whole show was staged" by the Soviets.

3. The Russians failed to produce sufficient evidence at Nuremberg—even though they were in charge of the prosecution—to obtain a ruling on the German guilt for Katyn by the International Military Tribunal.

4. This committee issued formal and public invitations to the Government of the U. S. S. R. to present any evidence pertaining to the Katyn massacre. The Soviets refused to participate in any phase of this committee's investigation.

5. The overwhelming testimony of prisoners formerly interned at the three camps, of medical experts who performed autopsies on the massacred bodies, and of observers taken to the scene of the crime conclusively confirms this committee's findings.

6. Polish Government leaders and military men who conferred with Stalin, Molotov, and NKVD chief Beria for a year and a half attempted without success to locate the Polish prisoners before the Germans discovered Katyn. This renders further proof that the Soviets purposely misled the Poles in denying any knowledge of the whereabouts of their officers when, in fact, the Poles were buried in the mass graves at Katyn.

7. The Soviets have demonstrated through their highly organized propaganda machinery that they fear to have the people behind the iron curtain know the truth about Katyn. This is proven by their reaction to our committee's efforts and the amount of newspaper space and radio time devoted to denouncing the work of our committee. They also republished in all newspapers behind the iron curtain the allegedly "neutral" Russian report of 1944. The world-wide campaign of slander by the Soviets against our committee is also construed as another effort to block this investigation.

8. This committee believes that one of the reasons for the staging of the recent Soviet "germ warfare" propaganda campaign was to divert attention of the people behind the iron curtain from the hearings of our committee.

9. Our committee has been petitioned to investigate mass executions and crimes against humanity committed in other countries behind the iron curtain. The committee has heard testimony which indicates there are other "Katyns." We wish to impress with all the means at our command that the investigation of the Katyn massacre barely scratches the surface of numerous crimes against humanity perpetrated by totalitarian powers. This committee believes that an international tribunal should be established to investigate willful and mass executions wherever they have been committed. The United Nations will fail in their obligation until they expose to the world that "Katynism" is a definite and diabolical totalitarian plan for world conquest.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

This committee unanimously recommends that the House of Representatives approve the committee's findings and adopt a resolution:

1. Requesting the President of the United States to forward the testimony, evidence, and findings of this committee to the United States delegates at the United Nations;

2. Requesting further that the President of the United States issue instructions to the United States delegates to present the Katyn case to the General Assembly of the United Nations;

3. Requesting that appropriate steps be taken by the General Assembly to seek action before the International World Court of Justice against the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for committing a crime at Katyn which was in violation of the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

4. Requesting the President of the United States to instruct the United States delegation to seek the establishment of an international commission which would investigate other mass murders and crimes against humanity.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I believe the interim report and recommendation filed today with the House of Representatives is an important contribution to the cause of international justice and is proof to the world that the representatives of the American people are willing and ready to assume their proper role in maintaining American moral leadership in the world.

I am confident that the report and recommendations will be overwhelmingly adopted. I wish to make it clear and unmistakable that our committee does not attempt to minimize the Nazi guilt for the many atrocities for which their leaders have been convicted at Nuremberg. It merely confirms the fact that the Communists have been equally guilty of mass murders, of which Katyn is merely one typical example.

Our report and findings have also served to warn the American public and free world of what we may expect from the Communists in Korea in their treatment of our prisoners.

As stated in the report, it merely scratches the surface of the vast field that could be explored to determine the tremendous extent of atrocities and crimes against humanity perpetrated by the Communists and the Nazis. Neither the time nor the limitations of the resolution of the House of Representatives permitted the investigation of the many other instances which were brought to the attention of the committee.

The United Nations, to whom we ask that this report be transmitted, should also look into the fate of the 16 fearless Polish underground leaders, who in March of 1945, were invited to Moscow by Marshal Zhukov under the pretext of begining Polish-Soviet negotiations. There they were treacherously placed under arrest and placed in the infamous Lubianka prison.

This fact was at first carefully concealed by the Russians but was finally revealed during the conference at San Francisco, where it evoked widespread indignation of world opinion.

Under the influence of our appeasement policy, however, this matter was hushed in order not to antagonize the Russians, with whom we thought we could come to an agreement.

After 7 years what was the result of that policy? At least four of these brave leaders have died in jail as a result of the tortures suffered. Others, after release from the prison in Moscow, were again thrown into jails in Soviet-dominated Poland, where they are languishing.

Former Ministers Jasiukowicz and Bien were sentenced in Moscow to 5 years imprisonment. They therefore should have been released and returned to Poland not later than March of 1950. To this day, 2½ years later, there is no sign of life of either of them. Neither is there any news of the fate of the former Minister, Pajdak, who was excused from the Moscow trial because of illness. Seven and one-half years after his arrest he has not returned to Poland, nor has he been heard from.

The United Nations Organization recently adopted a bill of human rights which provides that no individual may be arrested without a proper court determination, that no one shall be deprived of his rights before a public court trial and that no one can be imprisoned longer than provided for in the court's verdict. The Soviet representative refrained from voting because he thought the provisions were not sufficiently democratic and there is no assurance of the execution of the provisions.

It is not time to expose this horrible cynicism of the Moscow Communists, and to show them that the United States respects the decisions in which it participates and is willing and ready to enforce them?

Would that not be the best way to demonstrate to Poland and to the other nations behind the iron curtain that the United States has determined to defend the principles of justice against force?

Action by our Government to determine the fate of these brave Polish underground leaders illegally held by Russia in prisons or concentration camps will do more for the cause of the United Nations than any other propaganda behind the iron curtain, based on promises rather than actions.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, like the other members of the select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and circumstances of the Katyn Forest massacre, I join with them in this unanimous report, which interim report covers the first phase of the hearings in which we have assembled the evidence to establish that the Russian Communist Government and, more idrectly, the NKVD organization is responsible for the mass murders of Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest.

From a study of our interim report, it will be readily seen why we arrived at this conclusion. It is not necessary for me to enlarge upon the material put forth in the interim report.

However, I want to point out that there remains the second phase of the procedure, and while we did go into it in a small way, having heard from four different witnesses connected with the loss of the Van Vliet report, as yet no conclusions have been reached and it will take further hearings in order to arrive at a proper determination regarding the missing American document.

The committee has published the hearings relative to the testimony of General Bissell, Colonel Lantaff, Mrs. Meres, and Col Ivan Yeaton, all of whom were questioned with reference to the missing Van Vliet report, which he made upon his return to this country in April of 1945. As an offhand observation, I could readily see where a report could be mislaid or misfiled, however, in my particular judgment this was a very historical and momentous report as even General Bissell himself testified, and I would think anyone handling it at any point would remember exactly what they did with a paper of such importance.

When we look back just a few years and find that in the G–2 Department of the Army, under General Bissell's command, there were other very vital documents missing, it causes one to raise an eyebrow and wonder if there may be something wrong with that department. Testimony before various congressional committees shows that during the Pearl Harbor investigations many vital documents which were necessary to complete the investigation were destroyed in the G–2 Department of the Army. During the MacArthur hearings it was revealed that a group of Army colonels had made a factual study of our relationship with Russia and advised the Intelligence Department of the Army and the Secretary of State that we should be very careful about entering into any agreements with Russia. These same officers advised the United States against entering into any such agreements and as it has turned out the documentation of that advice is also missing in the Intelligence Department of the Army, General Bissell having been in command of G–2 at the time of its submission. Then, we come down to our own Katyn massacre investigation and find that the most important document concerning the investigation, as far as our American policy with regard to it is concerned, is also missing. I again repeat—it causes one to raise one's eyebrows that so many very important documents are amongst the lost, missing, stolen, or, as the Army would phrase it, "compromised."

During World War II, I can readily see where it might have been in the interests of the United States to suppress evidence we have had on the Katyn massacre in order that we could successfully complete the war. Yet, immediately after the end of the war, I am at a loss to see why we would want to continue to hide the facts surrounding Katyn from the American public. Not alone did our Government have information from Van Vliet, but it also had various other reports from England, such as the Hulls report and the Gilder report, both of which pointed to the Russians. We also had evidence from military attachés from various parts of the world channeled into the State Department, giving us an idea of what the Russians were up to in their mass murders and in their attempt to do away with the intelligensia of allied and neutral nations. With all this information at the end of the war, it is incomprehensible to me why we suppressed these reports. As I understand it, even the OWI and the Voice of America were in the ambiguous position of not being permitted to tell the people of the United States and the rest of the world the truth as they knew it. These are all very interesting points which need to be more fully considered in the second phase of the investigation. If the committee is to do a thorough job it should have further hearings in order to reveal to the public the exact details as to American knowledge of Communist Russia's part in killing off the Polish intelligensia, so that the people can know whether the facts were suppressed through stupidity or with malice aforethought because of Communist sympathies within our own Government.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

NEED FOR FARM RESEARCH

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, probably never before have so many problems and opportunities faced the farmers of the United States. Because of the growing complexity of farming it is becoming increasingly difficult to solve these problems through individual action. It is up to Congress to help find a solution to so many of these problems.

The richness and future well-being of this Nation lies in the farmer. He is the backbone of America, and without him we would have the end of civilization. We must look into the future right now, or we are robbing ourselves of rich agricultural gains, not only for the farmers but for all the American people. This, I believe, will be admitted by most clear-thinking people from whatever walk of life they come, whether rural or urban.

Individual happiness depends on national progress and from the soil we derive all that constitutes wealth. The Nation's production value measures its capacity of prosperity.

Congress must recognize the paramount need for more basic farm research and help now. Subsidies are just temporary help for the present but do not improve future production. Too little research is authorized and we must not fail to give this vital program the support it deserves. We must aid in the discovery of new knowledge so essential to our progress. As we all know, our farmland acreage is lessening all the time, and we must open up new possibilities to keep us ahead of current threats to our production and acquire the knowledge to make our farms more productive to keep up with the growing population of this Nation and the world, for we know that today America is supplying vast quantities of farm products to all the free countries of the world.

I recognize the need of assistance to sectional farmers, and I have gone along with these programs for aid to the growers of peanuts, cotton, tobacco, and the importing of workers from Mexico to help southern farmers. But the need is serious for a long-range program of research keeping in mind the small farmer, as we must remember the combined production of the small farmers totals about four-fifths of the Nation's crops.

One thing that would help the farmers of West Virginia, and the Nation, is the establishment of laboratories for the hoof-and-mouth disease. Congress has already taken steps in this direction by recently appropriating $10,000,000 for this work, and I urged that these laboratories be established as soon as possible.

Perhaps of more importance to the Nation is to make available to every farmer, no matter how large his holdings or how small, the facilities to test his soil to see what is needed for more abundant production. This is especially important to the farmers of West Virginia.

As I stated before, we have done and are doing a great deal for the larger farmer, but what my State needs is protection for the small farmer. Certainly he is entitled to as much assistance as any other group, but I fear we have neglected his plight. I have discussed with the members of the Agriculture Committee the problems of the farmers in West Virginia, and I have urged that a long-range program be worked out for their benefit and for the other small farmers of the Nation. But my particular interest is in the small truck farmer, the dairy farmer, and the fruit and vegetable grower whose products are perishable. I believe the attention of this Congress should be especially centered on this latter group for it is they, to a great extent, who make up the social and religious as well as the economic background of America, and the small communities of the Nation. They must be given attention in our long-range research programs. Down through the centuries those nations surviving and growing stronger have looked far into the future and planned way ahead.

One of the drawbacks in our research possibilities is the time element. No one can foretell how long it will require before visible results are available, and we today demand prompt results which is one reason we lack a full-scale research program. We must keep in mind, too, the rich returns that have already resulted in scientific study and remember that research yields no quick dividends but in the long run our lives will be richer and our people happier when the returns do come in.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. POLK and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $448.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL in two instances, in one to include a statement of the national commander, the American Legion.

Mr. DOUGHTON (at the request of Mr. STANLEY) to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following the passage of House Resolution 686.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN in two instances.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a letter.

Mr. BARRETT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAHON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOLEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. FINE).

Mr. FINE.

Mr. WERDEL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include a letter addressed by him to Mayor Bruner, of Camden.

Mr. SHORT in two instances and to include extraneous matter, and also to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Hon. George Stringfellow.

Mr. JUDD in three instances and to include extraneous matter and further to extend his remarks and include an address by Dr. Moulton, retiring president of Brookings Institute.

Mr. HILL in two instances.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts.

Mr. WEICHEL.

Mr. SHAFER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. CHURCH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an excerpt from a magazine.

Mr. RABAUT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion;

H. R. 3707. An act for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick;

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; and

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorva'd Nin;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi;

S. 1863. An act to effect entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national;

S. 2066. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2637. An act for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas;

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2545. An act to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency;

S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard;

S. 2630. An act for the relief of Mary Fox;

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; and

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ROBESON for the rest of the week on account of illness in his family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1625. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission, June 1952, entitled "Resources for Freedom," volumes 1 to 5 inclusive (H. Doc. No. 527); to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1626. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled 'An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes' "; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1627. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 412 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the exemption of air carriers in certain cases from the requirement of filing contracts with the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1628. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the application to the International Joint Commission, dated June 30, 1952, for approval of certain works in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, and an exchange of notes, of the same date, between the Canadian Government and our own concerning the St. Lawrence project (H. Doc. No. 528); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1629. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, as well as a complete set of the Quarterly Journal of Current Acquisitions, the supplements to the annual report; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 493. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and House Resolution 539, Eighty-second Congress, second session, resolutions to authorize the investigation of the mass murder of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk, Russia (Rept. No. 2430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report pursuant to Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 686. Resolution providing for the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 78, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2432). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 691. Resolution to provide expenses for special committee authorized by House Resolution 558; with amendment (Rept. No. 2433). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 692. Resolution to authorize an appropriation not to exceed $25,000 to conduct the study called for in House Resolution 596, Eighty-second Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2434). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 725. Resolution providing for the employment of an assistant property custodian, Office of the Clerk of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 2435). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2546. An act to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 719. An act to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2438). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 436. An act to provide for the separation of subsidy from airmail pay, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YATES: Committee of conference. H. R. 7216. A bill making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2440). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H. R. 7314. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture (Rept. No. 2441). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee of conference. H. R. 7151. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2442). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee of conference. H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices (Rept. No. 2443). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953 (Rept. No. 2444). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee of conference. H. R. 5426 A bill relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States (Rept. No. 2445). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. House Concurrent Resolution 191. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens (Rept. No. 2446). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1041. An act to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7317. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Report on raw materials (Rept. No. 2449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HART: Committee of conference. S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2450). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5396. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 8454. A bill to provide for State and local taxation of real property which is owned by the United States and leased to private persons, and to prevent the leasing of real property owned by the United States for uses which violate State and/or local law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 8455. A bill designating the period beginning October 5, 1952, and ending October 11, 1952, as National Pharmacy Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 8456. A bill designating the period beginning October 5, 1952, and ending October 11, 1952, as National Pharmacy Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 8457. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 8458. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8459. A bill to designate the supervisory positions of foreman and clerk in charge in the postal field service as senior foreman and foreman, respectively; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 8460. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8461. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to provide the appropriate committees of Congress with staffs adequate to enable them to keep fully informed, at all times, as to the appropriation needs of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 8462. A bill to deny benefits, under the civil service and other Federal retirement systems, to persons convicted of felonies involving improper use of their authority, power, influence, or privileges as officers or employees of the United States or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 8463. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to continue certain emergency authorities during periods of national emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 8464. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8465. A bill to provide an income credit in the case of civil-service annuities received by nonresident alien individuals not engaged in trade or business within the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8466. A bill to provide for the preparation of membership rolls of certain Indian tribes in the State of Oregon, to provide for per capita distribution of funds arising from certain judgments in favor of such tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 8467. A bill for the purpose of erecting in the borough of Bethel, Allegheny County, Pa., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 8468. A bill to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for moderate-income families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 8469. A bill to provide that certain surplus property owned by the United States shall be conveyed to the Board of Control for Southern Regional Education; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 8470. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 8471. A bill to promote the general welfare by organizing a Bureau of Clinics for the treatment of chronic alcoholics and narcotics addicts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 8472. A bill to authorize the President to prohibit or curtail imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7473. A bill to increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disability or death payable under the laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, and to provide for the adjustment of such rates on the basis of the cost of living in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 493. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 723. Resolution requesting the President to forward the evidence and findings of the Select Committee to Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Facts, Evidence, and Circumstances of the Katyn Forest Massacre to the United States Mission to the United Nations for appropriate action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Res. 724. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 2430, Eighty-second Congress, second session, entitled "The Katyn Forest Massacre"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. Res. 726. Resolution authorizing the printing of a complete collection of inaugural addresses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 728. Resolution to amend House Resolution 78, relating to the authority of the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 729. Resolution to amend House Resolution 436, relating to the authority of the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOOD of Georgia:

H. Res. 730. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the publication entitled "The Shameful Years" for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. Res. 731. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 676; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. Res. 732. Resolution to provide for an additional official reporter to House committees; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. Res. 733. Resolution providing further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436 of the Eighty-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8474. A bill for the relief of Angel Ignacio Gongalez-Guirola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8475. A bill for the relief of Raffaele Merlino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8476. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe De Marino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8477. A bill for the relief of Antonio Governante; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 8478. A bill for the relief of Domenico Sallustro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 8479. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gangemi and Anthony Gangemi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8480. A bill for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8481. A bill for the relief of Ilio Di Paolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 8482. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8483. A bill for the relief of Mohamad Ali Sadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 8484. A bill for the relief of Etuyo Eguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 8485. A bill for the relief of Paul Timothy Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8486. A bill for the relief of Isak and Osias Gutwein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

By Mr. MAHON:
H. R. 8487. A bill for the relief of Sagano Joy Mizuyasu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:
H. R. 8488. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Edith Kitcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASON:
H. R. 8489. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Koch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUMMA:
H. R. 8490. A bill for the relief of Fritze Lumholtz Hansen and three minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:
H. R. 8491. A bill for the relief of Azad M. Baloyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:
H. R. 8492. A bill for the relief of Adolf Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:
H. R. 8493. A bill for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

785. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Mrs. Florence C. Leever, and others, urging consideration and passage of the Bryson Bill, H. R. 2188; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

786. By Mr. MUMMA: Petition of Miss Lucetta H. Dunlap, and 10 other members of the Newville (Pa.) Women's Christian Temperance Union, urging proper protection of the spiritual and temporal needs of the Indians in our country; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 9:30 a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. Stanley Lowell, minister, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose grace and guidance have sustained this Nation, we come to Thee today with all its problems, all its possibilities, all its opportunities. Thou hast blessed us with vast resources and good instruments. Bless us again, we beseech Thee, with the wisdom and insight to use them for the true good of men and for Thy glory.

We are not content with what we are. We have, indeed, done the things we ought not to have done, and have failed to do the things we should have done. Make us over by Thy grace from what we are into all we ought to be. Now for this day bring to our legislators that sense of Thee, by Thee inspired, that will give them that vision which is essential to the successful discharge of their tasks. May they, and all of us, do our work, not as unto ourselves, not as unto the Nation, but even as unto Thee.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 1, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 968. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to mutual military aid in an emergency; and

S. 1537. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 14, 22, 23, 30, 49, and 51, to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 21, 24, 25, 27, and 44, to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 169. An act to extend the statute of limitations with respect to certain suits;

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 1508. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California;

H. R. 1631. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3624. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of California civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5226. An act to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii title to property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6036. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country;

H. R. 6136. An act to provide the basis for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6167. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years;

H. R. 6241. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of (1) the original taxpayer, (2) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale, or (3) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail;

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6436. An act to change the name of the Bonneville Power Administration to the Columbia Power Administration;

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay;

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7104. An act to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7487. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189);

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army;

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8177. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan;

H. R. 8273. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday;

H. R. 8341. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681);

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 492) authorizing the printing and binding of revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 2d instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, reported it on July 2, 1952, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 2076) thereon.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting the Thirty-third Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period from April 1, 1951, through December 31, 1951, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 3, 1952.*

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Thirty-third Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period from April 1, 1951, through December 31, 1951.

Since the previous report a Lend-Lease Settlement Arrangement has been concluded with Nicaragua; Colombia completed the payments scheduled under the Settlement Arrangement of April 13, 1950; and Cuba liquidated a residual amount due under the terms of the original Lend-Lease Agreement of November 7, 1941.

Across-the-board negotiations with the U. S. S. R. continued during part of the report period. The course of these discussions is described at some length in the body of the report.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

(Enclosure: Thirty-third Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations.)

REPORT ON UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitting his report on United States Participation in the United Nations for the year 1951, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings of today.)

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a supplemental report on the Missouri River Basin Agricultural Program, which is a supplement to the report on the same subject, transmitted by him to the Senate on September 29, 1949; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (S. DOC. NO. 162)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that committee on unexpended balances, estimated as of June 30, 1952, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Aenon Baptist Church, Rocky Mount, N. C., signed by Richard L. Collins, relating to the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization

"Whereas responsible Federal officials, and military leaders representing the Department of Defense have strongly urged an adequate civil defense organization as a fourth arm of our national defense to serve as a co-equal partner with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and

"Whereas the President of the United States and Federal civil defense officials have requested the Congress of the United States to support these officials and military leaders by providing an adequate appropriation; and

"Whereas adequate financial assistance for civil defense will insure the completion of a strong and effective national civil defense organization, which will be an integral part of, and indispensable to, the national security program; and

"Whereas there now is pending before the said Congress a budgetary request for civil defense purposes, which will, in no small manner, serve to attain this desired goal; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate the amount requested by the President of the United States and the Federal civil defense officials in the pending budgetary request now before that honorable body, in order that there shall be no further delay in providing an effective national program of civil defense at community, State and national levels; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FARM PARITY—RESOLUTION OF MARGARET FARMERS UNION LOCAL, WARD COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Margaret Farmers Union Local of Ward County, N. Dak., relating to 100-percent parity for farmers.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas continued national prosperity depends on the income of the American Farmer; and

Whereas we believe an effective farm program is essential to our national security, will provide a reservoir of goods which protect the Nation against crop failures, and will assure supplies for an even flow of world trade; and

Whereas a good farm income and price support program can serve the interests of all people. It will prevent depressions, build bigger industrial markets and employment, maintain a high-level production of farm commodities, conserve natural resources, maintain reserves for national security, and strengthen the rural community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the members of Margaret Farmers Union Local, Ward County, N. Dak., go on record asking and urging your full hearted support of 100-percent parity for American farmers.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
STANLEY HALL,
CLARENCE HELSETH,
Wolseth, N. Dak.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of May 1952, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, APRIL–MAY 1952, AND PAY, MARCH–APRIL 1952

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

According to monthly personnel reports for May 1952 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In May numbered—	In April numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In April was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	2,560,651	2,549,714	+10,937	$807,304	$788,822	+$18,482
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment	1,245,608	1,242,354	+3,254	407,048	403,459	+3,589
2. National Military Establishment	1,315,043	1,307,360	+7,683	400,256	385,363	+14,893
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,252	2,224	+28	1,005	961	+44
Department of the Army	538,525	539,107	−582	155,194	147,649	+7,545
Department of the Air Force	298,483	292,065	+6,418	87,236	83,100	+4,136
Department of the Navy	475,783	473,964	+1,819	156,821	153,653	+3,168

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number inside continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the Mutual Defense Assistance Program by the State Department, and the component units of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952, and pay for April 1952, and comparison with March 1952*

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	March	April	Increase	Decrease	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture	21,190	22,505	1,315		70,357	73,182	2,825	
Commerce [1] [2]	20,286	20,969	683		55,601	55,638	37	
Interior	18,598	19,372	774		55,861	57,122	1,261	
Justice	12,572	13,006	434		31,664	31,736	72	
Labor	2,903	3,051	148		7,827	7,859	32	
Post Office	162,569	159,495		3,074	521,097	521,811	714	
State	10,130	10,600	470		30,696	31,037	341	
Treasury	31,765	31,161		604	90,402	89,557		845
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	121	128	7		251	250		1
Bureau of the Budget	272	282	10		492	493	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	22	26	4		118	131	13	
National Security Council [3]	11	11			21	23	2	
National Security Resources Board	120	124	4		216	208		8
Council of Economic Advisers	24	22		2	36	36		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	2	2			10	9		1
Office of the Director of Mutual Security	39	54	15		79	77		2
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	70	78	8		141	153	12	
Defense Production Administration	248	263	15		501	501		
Defense Transport Administration	94	107	13		236	233		3
Economic Stabilization Agency	6,841	7,510	669		17,485	17,423		62
Federal Civil Defense Administration	464	540	76		1,001	1,059	58	
National Security Training Commission	3	2		1	8	7		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	[4] 78	82	4		204	209	5	
President's Airport Commission	1	2	1		6	6		
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation	16	26	10		56	57	1	
Renegotiation Board	182	198	16		380	381	1	
Small Defense Plants Administration	73	104	31		192	245	53	
Subversive Activities Control Board	14	15	1		27	28	1	

[1] May figure includes 4,630 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 59 from the April figure of 4,689.
[2] May figure is exclusive of 16,923 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.
[3] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[4] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952, and pay for April 1952, and comparison with March 1952*—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	March	April	Increase	Decrease	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission	$77	$88	$11		155	138		17
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	7	5		$2	11	11		
Mutual Security Agency	1,971	2,072	101		4,781	4,873	92	
War Claims Commission	56	56			160	163	3	
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	82	82			457	455		2
Atomic Energy Commission	2,573	2,934	361		6,394	6,516	122	
Civil Aeronautics Board	266	281	15		589	581		8
Civil Service Commission	1,478	1,534	56		4,296	4,459	163	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	70	77	7		136	135		1
Federal Communications Commission	494	518	24		1,115	1,115		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	411	433	22		1,016	1,030	14	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	213	224	11		362	366	4	
Federal Power Commission	315	329	14		695	695		
Federal Security Agency [1]	11,034	11,317	283		35,563	35,587	24	
Federal Trade Commission	355	358	3		713	696		17
General Accounting Office	2,403	2,470	67		6,174	6,072		102
General Services Administration	8,987	8,798		189	29,309	29,536	227	
Government Printing Office	2,945	2,971	26		7,699	7,678		21
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,056	4,890		166	12,660	12,668	8	
Indian Claims Commission	7	6		1	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	891	947	56		2,059	2,057		2
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	50	3		47	19	13		6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,845	2,991	146		7,874	7,840		34
National Capital Housing Authority	101	109	8		345	349	4	
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	3	3			7	7		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	5	4		1	11	14	3	
National Gallery of Art	89	93	4		305	302		3
National Labor Relations Board	526	554	28		1,190	1,187		3
National Mediation Board	70	80	10		111	110		1
National Science Foundation	36	44	8		107	116	9	
Panama Canal	4,661	3,636		1,025	19,798	19,689		109
Railroad Retirement Board	781	804	23		2,186	2,187	1	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	1,257	1,345	88		2,589	2,560		29
Securities and Exchange Commission	436	449	13		892	888		4
Selective Service System	1,730	1,837	107		8,230	8,185		45
Smithsonian Institution	183	191	8		552	585	33	
Soldiers' Home	127	135	8		719	731	12	
Tariff Commission	98	103	5		198	196		2
Tax Court of the United States	64	63		1	125	125		
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,955	8,494	539		20,933	21,088	155	
Veterans' Administration	54,043	55,985	1,942		176,843	175,123		1,720
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	403,459	407,048	8,702	5,113	1,242,354	1,245,608	6,303	3,049
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			3,589				3,254	
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense [2]	961	1,008	44		2,224	2,252	28	
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	134,806	141,640	6,834		487,850	486,963		887
Outside continental United States	12,843	13,554	711		51,257	51,562	305	
Department of the Air Force:								
Inside continental United States	76,065	79,762	3,697		257,300	263,601	6,301	
Outside continental United States	7,035	7,474	439		34,765	34,882	117	
Department of the Navy:								
Inside continental United States	144,394	147,517	3,123		440,302	441,802	1,500	
Outside continental United States	9,259	9,304	45		33,662	33,981	319	
Total, National Military Establishment	385,363	400,256	14,893		1,307,360	1,315,043	8,570	887
Net increase, National Military Establishment			14,893				7,683	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	788,822	807,304	23,595	5,113	2,549,714	2,560,651	14,873	3,936
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			18,482				10,937	

[1] Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
[2] Includes 201 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency and 34 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	68,406	71,334	2,926	
Commerce [1] [2]	52,112	52,080		32
Interior	48,861	49,779	918	
Justice	31,086	31,159	73	
Labor	7,717	7,749	32	
Post Office	518,931	519,622	691	
State	11,124	11,123		1
Treasury	89,308	88,524		844
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	251	250		1
Bureau of the Budget	492	493	1	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	118	131	13	
National Security Council [3]	21	23	2	
National Security Resources Board	216	208		8
Council of Economic Advisers	36	36		
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion	10	9		1
Office of the Director of Mutual Security	79	77		2
Emergency agencies:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	139	150	11	
Defense Production Administration	501	501		
Defense Transport Administration	236	233		3
Economic Stabilization Agency	17,248	17,185		63
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1,001	1,059	58	
National Security Training Commission	8	7		1
Office of Defense Mobilization	204	209	5	
President's Airport Commission	6	6		
President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation	56	57	1	
Renegotiation Board	380	381	1	
Small Defense Plants Administration	192	245	53	
Subversive Activities Control Board	27	28	1	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	60	57		3
Motor Carrier Claims Commission	11	11		
Mutual Security Agency	1,228	1,213		15
War Claims Commission	139	141	2	

[1] May figure includes 4,630 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 59 from the April figure of 4,689.
[2] May figure is exclusive of 16,923 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.
[3] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952*—Continued

Department or agency	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	16		
Atomic Energy Commission	6,389	6,511	122	
Civil Aeronautics Board	578	571		7
Civil Service Commission	4,290	4,456	166	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	136	135		1
Federal Communications Commission	1,092	1,092		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,016	1,030	14	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	362	366	4	
Federal Power Commission	695	695		
Federal Security Agency [4]	35,245	35,229		16
Federal Trade Commission	713	696		17
General Accounting Office	6,174	6,072		102
General Services Administration	29,215	29,441	226	
Government Printing Office	7,699	7,678		21
Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,534	12,542	8	
Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,059	2,057		2
Missouri Basin Survey Commission	19	13		6
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,874	7,840		34
National Capital Housing Authority	345	349	4	
mission	7	7		
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission	11	14	3	
National Gallery of Art	305	302		3
National Labor Relations Board	1,168	1,165		3
National Mediation Board	111	110		1
National Science Foundation	107	116	9	
Panama Canal	548	540		8
Railroad Retirement Board	2,186	2,187	1	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,581	2,552		29
Securities and Exchange Commission	892	888		4
Selective Service System	7,974	7,929		45
Smithsonian Institution	545	578	33	
Soldiers' Home	719	731	12	
Tariff Commission	198	196		2
Tax Court of the United States	125	125		
Tennessee Valley Authority	20,933	21,088	155	
Veterans' Administration	175,543	173,821		1,722
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	1,180,681	1,183,229	5,543	2,995
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			2,548	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,216	2,211		5
Department of the Army	487,850	486,963		887
Department of the Air Force	257,300	263,601	6,301	
Department of the Navy	440,302	441,802	1,500	
Total, National Military Establishment	1,187,668	1,194,577	7,801	892
Net increase, National Military Establishment			6,909	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	2,368,349	2,377,806	13,346	3,889
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			9,457	

[4] Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Agriculture	1,949	1,848		101
Commerce	3,489	3,558	69	
Interior	7,000	7,343	343	
Justice	578	577		1
Labor	110	110		
Post Office	2,166	2,189	23	
State	19,572	19,914	342	
Treasury	1,034	1,033		1
Emergency agencies:				
Economic Stabilization Agency	237	238	1	
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	2	3	1	
Postwar agencies:				
Displaced Persons Commission	95	81		14
Mutual Security Agency	3,553	3,660	107	
War Claims Commission	21	22	1	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	441	439		2
Atomic Energy Commission	5	5		
Civil Aeronautics Board	11	10		1
Civil Service Commission	6	3		1
Federal Communications Commission	23	23		
Federal Security Agency	318	358	40	
General Services Administration	94	95	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	126	126		
Independent Agencies—Continued				
National Labor Relations Board	22	22		
Panama Canal	19,250	19,149		101
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	8	8		
Selective Service System	256	256		
Smithsonian Institution	7	7		
Veterans' Administration	1,300	1,302	2	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	61,673	62,379	930	224
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			706	
National Military Establishment:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	8	41	33	
Department of the Army	51,257	51,562	305	
Department of the Air Force	34,765	34,882	117	
Department of the Navy	33,662	33,981	319	
Total National Military Establishment	119,692	120,466	774	
Net increase, National Military Establishment			774	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	181,365	182,845	1,704	224
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			1,480	

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during May 1952, and comparison with April 1952*

Department or agency	April	May	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):				
Commerce	677	698	21	
Interior	3,008	2,518	510	
State	178	173		5
Treasury	9,318	9,227		91
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	73	81	8	
General Services Administration	153	119		34
Panama Canal	1,448	1,477	29	
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,090	13,137	47	
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	27,945	28,430	615	130
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment			485	
National Military Establishment:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside continental United States	254,234	253,023		1,211
Outside continental United States	31,100	31,570	470	
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside continental United States	147,246	152,510	5,264	
Outside continental United States	20,390	20,448	58	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside continental United States	295,706	296,833	1,127	
Outside continental United States	25,674	25,930	256	
Total, National Military Establishment	774,350	780,314	7,175	1,211
Net increase, National Military Establishment			5,964	
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	802,295	808,744	7,790	1,341
Net increase, including National Military Establishment			6,449	

TABLE V.—*Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program*

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In March was—	In April was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In April numbered—	In May numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total	$9,226	$8,913	−$313	30,452	31,935	+1,483
State Department	140	143	+3	127	133	+6
Office of the Secretary of Defense	35	38	+3	81	146	+65
Department of the Army	6,938	6,777	−161	22,730	24,146	+1,416
Department of the Air Force	1,168	1,175	+7	4,714	5,078	+364
Department of the Navy	945	780	−165	2,800	2,432	−368

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased 10,937 during the month of May.

The May total was 2,560,651 according to certified reports from the Federal agencies, which were compiled today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Employment increased inside continental United States by 9,457 to a total of 2,377,806. It increased outside continental United States by 1,480 to a total of 182,845. The over-all increase included 4,488 additional white-collar employees and 6,449 employees in industrial categories.

Employment by all civilian agencies of the Government was increased during the month by 3,254 to a total of 1,245,608.

Civilian employment by the Military Establishment increased during May by 7,683 to a total of 1,315,043. Increases were reported in the civilian employment by two of the major components of the Military Establishment—the Navy and Air Force. The Office of the Secretary of Defense reported an increase of 28. The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 582.

The Post Office Department continued its increase in employment for the eighth consecutive month. The May increase was 714. Total Post Office employment was 521,811. The aggregate increase in Post Office Department employment since September was 17,096.

Other major increases by civilian agencies were reported during the month of May by the Agriculture Department with an increase of 2,825, the Interior Department with an increase of 1,261, and the State Department with an increase of 341.

Major decreases were reported by the Treasury Department with a reduction of 845 and the Veterans' Administration with a reduction of 1,720.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 3, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi;

S. 1863. An act to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national;

S. 2066. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2260. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2545. An act to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance or payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency;

S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard;

S. 2630. An act for the relief of Mary Fox;

S. 2637. An act for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Penagiotis Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas;

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis; and

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3458. A bill for the relief of Robert David Franklin (Shunichi Tanimura); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3459. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3460. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 3461. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Diarbekerian and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3462. A bill for the relief of Wilton J. Parker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3463. A bill to authorize a program for runoff and waterflow retardation and soil-erosion prevention for the Pecos River watershed in New Mexico and Texas; and

S. 3464. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. LODGE):

S. 3465. A bill for the relief of Helena Bilinska; and

S. 3466. A bill for the relief of George Khouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3467. A bill for the relief of Lillian Kontou Coussoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (by request):

S. 3468. A bill for the relief of Michele Bevivino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

S. 3469. A bill for the relief of Michael Kay; and

S. 3470. A bill for the relief of Ronald Lee Shields; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a sculptural piece known as "The Pony Express" in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution, the purpose of which is to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2938) to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2938) to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, to make

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the following correction, namely: On page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed bill, in lieu of the language "(b) Subsection (c) or section" insert "(b) Subsection (c) of section."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 168. An act to extend the statute of limitations with respect to certain suits;

H. R. 1508. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California;

H. R. 3624. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of California civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State;

H. R. 6036. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country; and

H. R. 8273. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to the day for taking action when the last day for taking such action falls on Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 8177. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1631. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma, formerly a part of the Cheyenne-Arapaho Reservation, and known as the Fort Reno Military Reservation, for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5226. An act to transfer to the Territory of Hawaii title to property heretofore set aside for the use of the University of Hawaii;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide the basis for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7104. An act to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1085), as amended;

H. R. 7487. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved June 27, 1947 (61 Stat. 189); and

H. R. 8341. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; and

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6167. An act to prohibit reduction of any rating of total disability or permanent total disability for compensation, pension, or insurance purposes which has been in effect for 20 or more years; and

H. R. 6241. An act to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on fermented malt liquors lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such fermented malt liquors were in possession of (1) the original taxpayer, (2) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at wholesale, or (3) a dealer who sells fermented malt liquors at retail; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended; and

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6436. An act to change the name of the Bonneville Power Administration to the Columbia Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Raymond Ross Paty, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, vice Miles N. Pike, resigned.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

James T. Hill, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force;

Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, commanding general, United States Army, Pacific (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. John Reed Hodge, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general;

Maj. Gen. John Taylor Lewis, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. George Price Hays, United States Army, for appointment as commanding general, United States Forces, Austria, with the rank of lieutenant general;

Brig. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, and sundry other officers for appointment and promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Raymond P. Coffman of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general; and

Samuel K. Bird of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Statement prepared by him entitled "The Real Issues."

By Mr. WILEY:

An editorial from the June 19 issue of the Milwaukee Journal with reference to thousands of Government workers and the considerable extravagance in which they indulge.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "The Canal at Mid-Century," from the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of July 2, relating to the Summit (Del.) Highway Bridge.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "New Immigration Law," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune on June 30, 1952.

Article entitled "Eightieth Congress Wasn't So Bad," written by Bruce Barton, and published in the Minneapolis Star on June 28, 1952.

By Mr. LANGER:

Excerpts from report of Highway Safety Conference called by the Governor of North Dakota, and held at Bismarck, N. Dak., on May 12 and 13, 1952.

REQUEST FOR INSERTION OF MATERIALS IN APPENDIX OF THE FINAL EDITION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain miscellaneous materials which I am preparing with regard to the challenges of 1952 and the years ahead in both domestic and foreign affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING LAWS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, which were, on page 9, strike out all after line 24 over to and including line 9 on page 10; and on page 10, after line 9 insert:

SEC. 12. Section 903 (c) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Upon application of the mortgagee with the consent of the mortgagor of a mortgage for which a commit-

ment to insure has been issued pursuant to section 203 of this act covering property on which the construction of the dwellings thereon was begun prior to the enactment of this title and the determination of prevailing wages in the locality in accordance with section 212, the Commissioner is authorized, notwithstanding such beginning of construction, to convert such commitment to a commitment under section 908; any charges or fees paid to the Commissioner with respect to such insurance under section 203 shall be credited to charges or fees due the Commissioner with respect to such insurance under section 908; and the determination of prevailing wages in the locality for purposes of section 212 may be made by the Secretary of Labor at any time prior to the insurance under section 908: *Provided*, That such mortgage, or the mortgage covering the same property executed in substitution therefor, is otherwise eligible for insurance under section 908."

SEC. 13. Section 610 of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Commissioner is further authorized to insure or to make commitments to insure under section 608 of this title in accordance with the provisions of this section any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by a State or municipality, or an agency, instrumentality, or body politic of either, of any permanent housing (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection therewith or to serve the inhabitants thereof), constructed by or on behalf of such State, municipality, agency, instrumentality, or body politic, for the occupancy of veterans of World War II, their families, and others: *Provided*, That the principal obligation of any such mortgage does not exceed either 85 percent of the appraised value of the mortgage property as determined by the Commissioner or $8,100 per family unit for such part of such property as may be attributable to dwelling use."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8 OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT OF MAY 29, 1930

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 736c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) (1) The annuity of any employee or survivor of a deceased employee who, before the date of enactment of this amendment, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the fund, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following enactment of this amendment, by $36 for each full six-month period elapsed between the commencing date of annuity and October 1, 1952: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not exceed the lesser of $324 or 25 per centum of the present annuity: *Provided further*, That no annuity shall be increased to an amount in excess of $2,000 by reason of the enactment of this amendment.

"(2) The increases in annuity provided by this subsection shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1955, or on an earlier date under any one of the following conditions, whichever may first occur:

"(A) At the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, the index for the month of April 1948. In the event that the Bureau of Labor Statistics revises the basis of calculating the Consumers' Price Index, it shall immediately furnish to the Commission a conversion factor designed to adjust to the new basis the index figure of 169.9 described herein, and such adjusted index shall be used for the purposes of this subsection.

"(B) On June 30, 1953, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in the applicable annual appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1954, or in any prior appropriation act, for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this subsection during the fiscal years 1953 and 1954.

"(C) On June 30, 1954, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, in the applicable annual appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1955, or in any prior appropriation act for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this subsection during the fiscal year 1955."

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a body to be known as the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which shall be composed of a chairman appointed by the President and, ex officio, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

(b) The Committee shall make a comparative study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel and report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1953. Its report, including findings and recommendations, shall include the following:

(1) the types and amounts of retirement and other related benefits provided to Federal personnel, including their role in the compensation system as a whole;

(2) the necessity for special benefit provisions for selected employee groups, including overseas personnel and employees in hazardous occupations;

(3) the relationships of these retirement systems to one another, to the Federal employees' compensation system, and to such general systems as old-age and survivors insurance; and

(4) the current financial status of the several systems, the most desirable methods of cost determination and funding, the division of costs between the Government and the members of the systems, and the policies that should be followed in meeting the Government's portion of the cost of the various systems.

(c) The Chairman of said Committee, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, is authorized to procure services pursuant to section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such attorneys and other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 3. Section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 716), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"Any person entitled to annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commission. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. DUFF conferees on the part of the Senate.

WALTER DUSCHINSKY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 523) for the relief of Walter Duschinsky, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding those provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, relating to date of application for an adjustment of immigration status, the alien, Walter Duschinsky, may, at any time within 6 months following the effective date of this act, apply to the Attorney General for the adjustment of his immigration status, and notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of the said section 4, other than those relating to the status at the time of entry, such alien shall, if he is otherwise qualified under the provisions of said section 4, be deemed to be a displaced person within the meaning of said section 4.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is a private immigration bill. The House has amended the Senate bill by substituting different language, placing the beneficiary in the category of an alien eligible to apply for adjustment of status under the Displaced Persons Act. There appears to be no valid reason for objection to the House amendment. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the bill S. 523.

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 76) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which was, on page 24, after line 13, insert:

A-4531462, Szilvassy, Joseph.

A-6920123, Ortiz-Torres, Manuel or Manuel Ortiz.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A-0632210, Tountasakis, Zania Nikonos or Zonnis Tountacsakis.
A-7821493, Ridgeway, Tong Suk Lee (nee Lee aka Dong Shuk Lee Ridgeway).
A-4813240, Gallagher, Marjorie Alice (nee Hopkins).
A-7385522, Haring, Olga Munk.
A-7385518, Haring, Tibor James.

Mr. McCARRAN. This is a resolution dealing with the adjustment of status of certain aliens. The House has amended the resolution by adding seven names. These names have been carefully checked by the staff of the Immigration Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and have been found of equal merit with names previously approved by the Senate. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to Senate Concurrent Resolution 76.

The motion was agreed to.

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the call of the calendar is now in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota.

The Chair will ask that Senators rise and address the Chair, in order that the Chair may know who it is that objects. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill goes over.

The next two bills on the calendar being identical, with the bill to which objection has just been made, in the opinion of the Chair, the same objection applies, and those two bills will be passed over. Calendar No. 228, House bill 36, and Calendar No. 286, House bill 2929, are accordingly passed over.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada objects.

The Chair will again ask Senators to rise and address the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am addressing the Chair as to Calendar No. 296, Senate bill 49.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada objects.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects, and the joint resolution goes over.

S. A. HEALY CO.—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 1590) for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co. was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to send to the desk an amendment to this bill, if I may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has an objection to the bill, which might be met by the amendment which is to be offered, as I understand, by the distinguished Senator from Washington. Therefore, I have no objection to its being considered, to the extent of having the committee amendment acted on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1590) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 11, after the figures "$1,000", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That the said sum of $163,536.93 shall be accepted in full payment of every claim of every kind and character involved in this transaction by the S. A. Healy Co. and the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, from any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the S. A. Healy Co., as the contractor under contracts Nos. NOy-12759 and NOy-12806, amounts not to exceed $51,485.99 and $40,887.97 under the respective contracts, as reimbursement for, and in settlement of claims certified by United States Navy audit for allowance against the United States for increased compensation resulting from action by the Government's Wage Adjustment Board in authorizing increases in the rates of wages payable under the contracts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000: *Provided, however,* That the said amounts herein authorized to be paid shall be accepted in full payment of every claim of every kind and character involved in this transaction by the S. A. Healy Co. and the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the result of this amendment would be to reduce substantially the reimbursement recommended by the committee. In the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, a bill comparable to House bill 1590 was approved by both Houses of the Congress. It was vetoed by the President. The bill, in the first session, as reported to the Senate, included the reimbursement total of $163,536.93. The Senate, by an amendment which was adopted on the floor, reduced the amount involved, and the amendment which I have sent to the desk would do likewise. I ask unanimous consent that, because of the temporary absence of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], this bill go to the foot of the calendar, to be considered at that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2119) to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1376) providing for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects, and the bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 172) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects, and the bill goes over.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska subsequently said: Mr. President, a day or two ago, the Senate overwhelmingly approved two agreements with Germany which many of us hope will usher in a new age of friendly collaboration with our former defeated enemy.

In line with that hope, I believe it is all-important that we pass this bill S. 172, or take some similar action to show the German people that we intend to treat them fairly and as friends.

S. 172 simply provides that we permit German heirs of American citizens to receive bequests of property which have been willed to them by American citizens. At present, thousands of such properties are in the hands of the Alien Property Custodian.

In the usual case, the property is not very large in amount. Mostly, it represents an insurance policy or small savings account, or perhaps a home or business saved up by an American of German extraction, who wants his relatives back in Germany to have a little help on his death.

In a good many cases, the United States Government, through the Alien Property Custodian, has actually seized the proceeds of a GI insurance policy upon which there has been collected premiums from an American soldier or veteran. I do not think the United States Government has any moral right to confiscate the proceeds of an insurance policy which the Government itself has sold to an American soldier on the promise that the policy would go to his relatives upon his death.

Mr. President, the benefits of this legislation, if enacted, would reach into homes in every part of Germany and build more good will for the United States than any other step we could possibly take. I hope it may be passed as an indication of our new relationship with Germany and as a proof of the friendship of the United States toward the German people.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

DESIGNATION OF ORGANIZATIONS AS SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST TO DECEASED PERSONS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1748) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, with reference to the designation of organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(h) The President may designate one or more organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons who, if alive, would be eligible to receive returns under the provisos of subdivision (C) or (D) of subsection (a) (2) thereof. An organization so designated shall be deemed a successor in interest by operation of law for the purposes of subsection (a) (1) hereof. Return may be made, to an organization so designated, (a) before the expiration of 2 years from the vesting of the property or interest in question, if the President or such officer or agency as he may designate determines from all relevant facts of which he is then advised that there is no basis for reasonable doubt that the former owner is dead and is survived by no person eligible under section 32 to claim as successor in interest by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (b) after the expiration of such time, if no claim for the return of the property or interest is pending. Total returns pursuant to this subsection shall not exceed $3,000,000.

"No return may be made to an organization so designated unless it files notice of claim on or before July 1, 1953, and unless it gives firm and responsible assurance approved by the President that (i) it will sell and dispose of and use the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest for use directly in the rehabilitation and settlement of persons who suffered substantial deprivation of liberty or failed to enjoy the full rights of citizenship within the meaning of subdivisions (C) and (D) of subsection (a) (2) hereof, by reason of their membership in the particular political, racial, or religious group of which the former owner was a member and by reason of membership in which such former owner so suffered such deprivation of liberty or so failed to enjoy such rights; (ii) it will transfer, at any time within 2 years from the time that return is made, such property or interest or the equivalent value thereof to any person whom the President or such officer or agency shall determine to be eligible under section 32 to claim as owner or successor in interest to such owner, by inheritance, devise, or bequest; and (iii) it will make to the President, with a copy to be furnished to the Congress, such reports (including a detailed annual report on the use of the property or interest returned to it or the proceeds of any such property or interest) and permit such examination of its books as the President or such officer or agency may from time to time require.

"The filing of notice of claim by an organization so designated shall not bar the payment of debt claims under section 34 of this act.

"As used in this subsection, 'organization' means only a nonprofit charitable corporation incorporated under the laws of any State of the United States or of the District of Columbia with the power to sue and be sued."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 411), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of such sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that return may be made to successor organizations designated pursuant to section 32 (h) hereof if notice of claim is filed on or before July 1, 1953."

Mr. CHAVEZ subsequently said: Mr. President, at the time Calendar 565, Senate bill 1748, was called, I was engaged in looking over the calendar. I desired to object to its consideration, and to ask that it be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1748 was passed will be reconsidered——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, will that bill go to the foot of the calendar for consideration later?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I am asking that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed? The Chair hears none, and it is reconsidered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object to the bill, and ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1260) to authorize the acquisition of property for the establishment of a Federal civil-defense technical training school, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey requests that the bill go over, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 751) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas requests that the bill go over. The bill is passed over.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION REGARDING TESTIMONY BY WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the word "No" to strike out "person" and insert "witness"; in the same line, after the word "from", to strike out "attending and"; in line 7, after the word "producing", to strike out "documentary evidence" and insert "books, papers and other records and documents"; in line 10, after the word "committee", to strike out "established by a joint or concurrent resolution"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "forfeiture", to insert: "when the record shows that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least one member of the minority party having the largest representation on such committee, shall by affirmative vote have authorized that such person be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which, after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, he is nevertheless compelled by direction of the Chair to testify."; in line 12, after the word "no", to strike out "natural person" and insert "such witness", and in line 21, after the word "perjury", to insert "or contempt"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, section 3486, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3486. Testimony before Congress; immunity

"No witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers and other records and documents before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground, or for the reason, that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least one member of the minority party having the largest representation on such committee, shall by affirmative vote have authorized that such person be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which, after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, he is nevertheless compelled by direction of the Chair to testify. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination he is nevertheless so compelled to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"No official paper or record required to be produced hereunder is within the said privilege.

"No person shall be exempt from prosecution or punishment for perjury or contempt committed in so testifying."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend the present immunity statute concerning witnesses who testify before committees of Congress. The present statute has been held insufficient by the Supreme Court, on the grounds that it is not as broad as the privilege provided by the Constitution. The bill here presented is adequate in this regard.

The reason legislation of this nature is urgently needed is that without it, witnesses called before congressional committees can flout the will of those committees and refuse to testify, claiming possible self-incrimination; and as a series of recent court decisions has proved, they can get away with it.

This bill was reported from committee with several amendments, most of them technical perfecting amendments. Subsequently, I offered an amendment, also of a technical perfecting nature.

For the purpose of avoiding confusion, and giving the Senate an opportunity to see the exact language of the bill as it will be if all of these amendments are adopted, I subsequently tendered for printing an amendment in the nature of a substitute, embodying both the committee amendments and the amendment which I subsequently offered. This latter amendment also has been discussed by the Judiciary Committee and has the approval of that committee, I may say.

I now ask, Mr. President, that in lieu of the committee amendments, the Senate may proceed to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by me, to which I have referred. If this is adopted, no further amendments will be necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That title 18, United States Code, section 3486, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 3486. Testimony before Congress; immunity.

"No witness shall be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, and other records and documents before either House, or before any committee of either House, or before any joint committee of the two Houses of Congress on the ground, or for the reason, that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to criminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, when the record shows—

"(1) in the case of proceedings before one of the Houses of Congress, that a majority of the Members present of that House, or

"(2) in the case of proceedings before a committee, that two-thirds of the members of the full committee, including at least one member of each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee,

shall by affirmative vote have authorized that such person be granted immunity under this section with respect to the transactions, matters, or things concerning which, after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, he is nevertheless compelled by direction of the presiding officer or the chair to testify. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which after he has claimed his privilege against self-incrimination he is nevertheless so compelled to testify, or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise.

"No official paper or record required to be produced hereunder is within the said privilege.

"No person shall be exempt from prosecution or punishment for perjury or contempt committeed in so testifying."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McFARLAND subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask that Senate bill 1570, calendar 673, go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill has already been passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true, but the vote by which it was passed can be reconsidered.

Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1570 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 16) to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1475) to amend section 1 of the act to provide aviation education in the senior high schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved December 16, 1941, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 1452) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2137) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2180) to provide for slaughter quotas and allocations of livestock was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR—BILL PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for a consolidated

general appropriation bill for each fiscal year was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to approriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

"(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

"(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2) (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committee of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized when requested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to transmit to said chairman, as soon as possible, a current estimate of the over-all Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year."

Mr. HAYDEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wanted to object to the consideration of Calendar 796, Senate Concurrent Resolution 27.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which it was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 was agreed to is reconsidered, and, on request of the Senator from Arizona, it will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1564) to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1563) to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse or dog racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1624) to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask that that bill go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2116) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that that bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over.

FACILITATION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK BY DEPARTMENTS OF ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

The bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement on this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator reserving the right to object?

Mr. MORSE. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. President, I make this statement in behalf of the Armed Services Committee: The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] has prepared several amendments to House bill 1180 dealing with research and development work. These amendments are restrictive in nature. However, in examining them, we feel that that there is no reason they should not be accepted by the committee and by the Senate, so that the bill may be passed.

I want to make it clear that we have gone into this matter with the assistance of the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee, and I think the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amendments of the Senator from Kansas should be adopted. I hope he will offer them and that there will be no objection to them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I call up amendment A, amendment B, and amendment C which were sent to the desk a few days ago, and which I understand are printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to have them considered en bloc?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Kansas if one of those amendments is to strike out section 7?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Amendment C does that.

Mr. HAYDEN. That section should be eliminated, because it interferes with the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That was the view of the Senator from Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendments were:

On page 2, strike out all in lines 7 to 20, inclusive.

On page 4, line 12, after the period, insert the following: "The Secretary of each of the military departments shall transmit to the Congress reports covering contracts for research or development entered into during each 6 months following the enactment of this act. Each such report shall contain (1) a list of each contract for research or development entered into during such period the total cost of which to the Government will exceed $50,000, and (2) specific information with respect to each such contract, except that specific information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States may be excluded from such reports."

On page 6, strike out all in lines 4 to 12, inclusive.

On page 6, line 13, strike out the section No. "8" and insert in lieu thereof the section No. "7."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, with reference to amendment A, under section 1 of the bill members of committees and panels and advisory personnel could be exempted from the so-called conflict of interest provisions of title 18, United States Code, relating to Federal officers and employees. The amendment A would strike this provision from the bill.

Amendment B would require that reports be made to Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives every 6 months by the Secretary of each of the Military Departments, listing all contracts for research and development in excess of $50,000. Such reports shall contain specific information with respect to any such contract. Provision is made, however, for the exclusion in such reports of specific information pertaining to such contracts which is deemed by the Secretary to be incompatible with the security of the United States.

Amendment C would eliminate from this bill authority to waive certain existing requirements of law with regard to printing in the case of publication of scientific and technical information.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1117) for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over by request.

ALASKA JUNEAU GOLD MINING CO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska subsequently said: Mr. President, I very much hope this bill will be passed since it represents the repayment of only a small part of the sum which I believe is due to a company which cooperated fully and wholeheartedly with the United States Army during World War II at great financial sacrifice, and furnished valuable materials and services without any charge whatever to the United States Government in the interest of winning the war.

The item of chief value furnished by the company to the Army consisted of about 600,000 cubic yards or more of crushed rock for the building of a dock and storage area for the Government. No charge whatever was made for this rock. In addition, the rock was trucked by the company to the site desired by the Government. If this rock had not been secured from the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., it would probably have cost the Government as much as $2 per yard.

On that basis, the company would be entitled to reimbursement of over $1,000,000. The company is not asking for any such sum, since the rock was produced as an incident to its gold mining operations. However, the company has shown that it probably suffered a loss of about $700,000 as a result of keeping the mine operating at a time when all other gold mines had been closed down.

Even so, the company would probably not have presented any claim except for the action of another agency of the Government—the War Labor Board—which in 1944 decreed a substantial wage increase and furthermore ordered that it be made retroactive for a full year. The retroactive portion of this wage increase amounted to about $100,000. Immediately upon being notified of this wage increase, the company closed down.

In all its operations, the company extended every kind of cooperation to the armed services. Mr. Robert Patterson, former Under Secretary of War, has fully conceded the degree of cooperation furnished by the company. Although he felt that the War Department had no legal basis on which to pay this claim, he conceded "there is a certain degree of equity in your position."

The company is now interested in building up a paper-making industry in the vicinity of its plants, but is so in need of cash that it feels it must receive payment on this claim before it can afford to expend funds for engineering work and the like in connection with developing Alaska pulp resources.

This claim has previously been approved by the House of Representatives more than once. It has been carefully studied and hearings held by committees of both Houses. The sum of money asked has been sharply scaled down to meet any possible objection. I strongly feel this is a worthy claim and hope it may be passed today.

SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN OFFENSES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1811) to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was looking at another bill when Senate bill 1811 was called. I have an objection to that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote is reconsidered and, without objection, the bill will go over.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) to authorize the employment of a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed $15,000

per annum was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill will be passed over.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF NAVY DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 1829) to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second paragraph under the heading "Emergency fund, Navy Department" of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended (54 Stat. 383; 34 U. S. C. 526), which reads: "The Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, is authorized to pay all civilian employees appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States, and in Alaska, from the date of their sailing from the United States until they report for duty to the officer under whom they are to serve, and while returning to the United States by the most direct route and with due expedition, compensation at a rate corresponding to their rate of pay while actually employed," is repealed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2441) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over by request.

The bill (S. 539) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will be passed over by request.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 203) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida objects, and the resolution will be passed over.

PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN FOR CERTAIN LAND IN CALIFORNIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue patents to those persons (or their heirs, assigns, or successors in interest) who purchased in good faith, prior to January 1, 1936, lands from Charles A. Gann located in section 1, township 6 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, in accordance with their respective deeds received by them from the said Charles A. Gann, which are not within the south half northeast quarter or north half southeast quarter of section 1, as shown in a plat of survey of section 1, accepted April 1, 1943.

No patent shall be issued under this act unless application therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Interior within two years from the date of enactment of this Act and until the applicant has paid to the United States the cost of survey of the land to be patented.

Each patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of a right-of-way for a forest highway, together with the right of the United States, its officers, agents, or employees, to enter upon the lands patented pursuant to this Act at any time for the purpose of constructing and maintaining such highway.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann."

INVESTIGATION OF IMPROPER AND ILLEGAL CONDUCT IN TRANSACTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) to authorize the appointment of a special investigator and not to exceed five deputies with power to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and to prosecute such conduct where found, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That as used in this act—

(1) The term "Special Investigator" means the Special Investigator nominated and confirmed pursuant to the authority granted by section 2 of this act. The term "deputy" means a Deputy Special Investigater nominated and confirmed pursuant to the authority granted by section 2 of this act. Any deputy shall have and exercise any of the powers hereinafter conferred upon the Special Investigator, to the extent designated by the Special Investigator by order published in the Federal Register.

(2) The term "congressional body" means any committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives or any subcommittee thereof, and any joint committee of the Congress or any subcommittee thereof.

(3) The term "document" includes any item of correspondence, book, paper, file, report, record, or other document.

(4) The term "President" means the President of the United States.

(5) The term "Government business" means official business of any department, agency, or other establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. (a) The President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, (1) a Special Investigator who shall have and exercise the powers, duties, and obligations hereinafter conferred upon him, to serve for a term ending 1 year after the date of approval of this resolution and receive compensation at the rate of $20,000 per annum; and (2) not to exceed five Deputy Special Investigators, to serve under the Special Investigator for terms ending 1 year after the date of approval of this resolution and receive compensation at the rate of $18,000 per annum.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Special Investigator such sums as may be necessary to carry out his functions.

SEC. 3. (a) The Special Investigator is authorized to (a) conduct investigations and studies leading to the detection of, and appropriate action with respect to, any improper or illegal conduct by officers or employees of the Federal Government, or any other persons, relating to the performance of Government business; (b) make recommendations to the President and the Congress for the correction and prevention of improper or illegal acts relating to the transaction of Government business; (c) recommend to the Attorney General the initiation of prosecutions and other legal actions which may be warranted on the basis of facts ascertained in the course of such investigations or studies; and (d) report to appropriate authorities any facts ascertained in the course of such investigations or studies which indicate that removal or other disciplinary action would be warranted with respect to any officer or employee of the Federal Government.

(b) The Special Investigator is authorized to conduct any kind of legal proceeding, including grand jury proceedings, which United States attorneys may be by law authorized to conduct, whether or not he be a resident of the district in which such proceeding is brought.

SEC. 4. (a) In the conduct of any investigation or study undertaken pursuant to his authority, the Special Investigator is authorized to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such documents, as he deems advisable: *Provided,* That the powers granted by this section shall be exercised only while the Special Investigator is authorized, by Executive order, to obtain from any department or agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government such information, documents, and assistance (not including personnel), as the Special Investigator may deem necessary.

(b) In case of failure or refusal on the part of any person to comply with any subpena regularly issued and served under authority of subsection (a) of this section (including failure or refusal to testify fully or responsively respecting all matters concerning which such person may be questioned under authority of this act) the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United States district court within the jurisdiction of which such investigation or study is being conducted, or such person resides to transact business, shall have jurisdiction, upon application of the Special Investigator, to issue an order to enforce such subpena; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in any judicial district wherein such person resides or transacts business or wherever such person may be found.

(c) Witnesses subpenaed under this resolution shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the United States district courts.

(d) The Special Investigator, or any member of his staff thereto designated by him by order published in the Federal Register, may administer oaths or affirmations and take testimony in connection with the conduct of any investigation or study herein authorized.

SEC. 5. (a) Any document obtained by the Special Investigator from any source (including any executive department, agency, or other establishment) under any subpena issued pursuant to authority granted by this joint resolution, or by virtue of any authorization of the President, or otherwise, shall thereafter, except in the case of an executive paper which the President shall declare is required in the interest of national security to be withheld, be held by the Special Investigator, or by the person or agency which thereafter may succeed to the custody thereof, subject to production before any congressional body in compliance with the requirement of any subpena of such body regularly issued and served.

(b) No person having custody of any document shall be excused from producing such document in compliance with the requirement of a subpena of any congressional body, regularly issued and served, on the ground that there has been served upon such person at any time a subpena issued pursuant to authority granted by this joint resolution.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2564) to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over, by request.

EXEMPTION FROM FEDERAL REGULATION OF CERTAIN NATURAL GAS COMPANIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1084) to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717), as amended, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection (c), as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to a person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural gas because of such person's ownership or operation of facilities used or to be used to transport, whether or not in interstate commerce, natural gas received by such person within or at the border of a State to points of consumption within such State: *Provided, however*, That this subsection shall be operative only if none of such facilities is used or to be used for or in connection with the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale or for or in connection with the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire: *Provided further*, That the transportation of gas owned jointly or severally by two or more such persons through such a facility or facilities owned and operated singly or jointly by one or more of such persons, with or without charge, shall not be deemed transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire within the meaning of the foregoing proviso, if such facility or facilities do not extend beyond a single metropolitan area and if all gas delivered or transported through such facility or facilities is ultimately consumed within such metropolitan area: *Provided further*, To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is afforded by this subsection the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

(b) Section 2 of such act is amended by inserting after paragraph (4) thereof a new paragraph (4A) as follows:

"(4A) 'Metropolitan area' means the area within a single State, of a city, or a city and a zone adjacent thereto, which the Commission, upon the basis of commercial, economic, social, or other relevant factors, or upon the basis of facilities, organization, and arrangements for the distribution of natural gas, finds to constitute an integrated community or an area properly integrated for the local distribution of natural gas, and within which the Commission finds that the transportation of gas does not require regulation by the Commission in order to protect the national interest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as amended."

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry I did not hear Calendar No. 1387, Senate bill 1084 when it was called. I should like to have the action on that bill reconsidered for the purposes of explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon to reconsider the action on the bill. The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered. The Senator from Oregon asks for an explanation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I read from the committee report, as follows:

The purpose of the bill as amended by your committee is to exempt from Federal regulation certain companies engaged in the distribution of natural gas whose operations are wholly intrastate and which are fully and completely regulated by the respective States. In order to secure exemption from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction such companies will have to meet specific conditions set forth in the bill. The bill will result in the elimination of costly, wasteful, and duplicative regulation, with ultimate savings to the consumers. In addition, the amended bill will permit the Federal Power Commission, in certain circumstances, to exempt from its jurisdiction companies which own and operate facilities for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire but which are located wholly within a single metropolitan area, within a single State, where all of the gas delivered or transported through such facilities is ultimately consumed within that metropolitan area.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I objected to consideration of Senate bill 1084, calendar 1387, a bill to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

Since my objection was made, I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], because the explanation given of the bill this morning left me in doubt about what the effect of the bill would be upon consumers and rate payers.

Mr. President, I have discovered that this bill is really the result of an agreement between the Federal Power Commission and State utility commissions, and that a great deal of work has been put into the bill, in order to bring the Federal authorities and the State authorities together and to an understanding and a mutually acceptable agreement.

From my discussion with the Senator from Colorado, I am satisfied that the bill is in the interest of the consumers.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my previous objection to consideration of the bill, so that the bill may be considered and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon, before he abandons his objection, will be willing to study certain material which I placed in the RECORD yesterday, and which will be shown on pages 8899, 8900, and 8901, and I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will be willing to modify his request, so that, instead, the bill may be placed at the foot of the calendar, and may be considered later in the day.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was not familiar with the views submitted by the Senator from Illinois. I most certainly wish to read those views.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to withdraw my objection to the bill, but with the understanding, however, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in order to be perfectly certain, let me say that I understand the Senator from Oregon is referring to calendar 1387, is he not?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; calendar 1387.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMISSION TO STUDY RELATIONS BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND OTHER NORTH ATLANTIC NATIONS

The bill (S. 2269) to create a Commission To Study Relations Between the United States and Other North Atlantic Nations was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects and the bill will be passed over.

REGULATION OF PRACTICE OF PHARMACY AND SALE OF POISONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2291) to amend the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons, and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (D. C. Code of 1929, title 20, sec. 2-601, and the following), was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objects, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, when I objected previously, I thought I was objecting to Calendar 1412, Senate bill 3027. I have no objection to Calendar 1397, Senate bill 2291.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 2291?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2291) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons, and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (34 Stat. 176, ch. 2084; 34 Stat. 1006, ch. 2035; and 44 Stat. 1413, ch. 97), are hereby amended as follows:

Section 1: Strike out the words "such permit to be issued for a period of 3 years" and substitute the following therefor: "such permit to be issued for a period of 1 year, except that permits now in effect as issued by the Board of Pharmacy shall continue in effect until their stated expiration date".

Section 5: Strike out the words "shall forward with their application a fee of $10." and substitute the following therefor: "shall forward with their application a fee of $25".

Section 7: (a) Strike out the words "whose license or permit has been issued not less than 3 years prior to the first day of such month," and substitute the following therefor: "whose license or permit has been issued not less than one year prior to the first day of such month,".

(b) Strike out the words "to renew such license or permit in the month of November for a period of 3 years from the 31st day of October immediately preceding the date thereof." and substitute the following therefor: "to renew such license or permit in the month of November for a period of 1 year from the 31st day of October immediately preceding the date thereof.".

Section 8: (a) Immediately following the words "shall elect a president.", insert the following words: "a vice president,".

(b) Immediately following the words "shall have a common seal; and"; insert the following words: "said secretary and".

(c) Strike out the words "as may come before it, commencing on the second Thursday" and substitute the following therefor: "as may come before it, during the second week."

Section 10: Strike out the words "For examination for license as pharmacists, $15, and for each renewal thereof, $3; for a permit for the sale of poisons for use in the arts or as insecticides, $1, and for each renewal thereof, 50 cents." and substitute the following therefor: "For examination for license as pharmacists, $25, and for each annual renewal thereof, $2; for a permit for the sale of poisons for use in the arts or as insecticides, $3, and for each annual renewal thereof, $1".

"The fee for the replacement of a lost, mutilated, or destroyed certificate of license or regulation as a pharmacist shall, when such replacement is approved by the Board of Pharmacy, be the sum of $5; and the fee for the certification of examination grades, where required for reciprocity purposes, shall be the sum of $1."

ELECTION OF DELEGATES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 3027) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. NEELY subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, what is the status of Senate bill 3027?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota objected, and the bill was passed over.

Mr. NEELY. I was informed that it had been passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it was not. The Senator from North Dakota objected.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, would not the Senator from North Dakota withdraw his objection?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from North Dakota give heed to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. NEELY. Will the Senator from North Dakota withdraw his objection to Senate bill 3027?

Mr. LANGER. I will withdraw my objection in order that the Senator from West Virginia may make his statement.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, this bill was, after mature consideration by the committee on the District of Columbia, unanimously approved. Its purpose is to enable the voiceless, voteless people of the District to choose their delegates to national political conventions by means of primary elections.

The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is my dear friend, has long been a peerless champion of the praiseworthy primary election system, and the unrestricted right of the people to choose their public officials. I entreat him to preserve his stainless progressive record by permitting the bill to be passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the very eloquent statement by the Senator from West Virginia, I certainly withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota withdraws his objection. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3027) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments on page 3, line 14, after the word "within", to strike out "three" and insert "one"; in line 18, after the word "ballot.", to insert "Any establishment in which alcoholic beverages are sold or distributed shall be closed during the hours of such election."; on page 7, line 2, after the word "for", to strike out "delegates" and insert "delegates, alternates, committeemen, and committeewomen", and on page 9, line 6, before the word "Expenditures", to strike out "Expenses and"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That national committeemen, national committeewomen, delegates, and alternates from the District of Columbia to all conventions of parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency of the United States shall be elected as provided in this act.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby established a Board of Elections in the District of Columbia to consist of three members, no more than two of whom shall be of the same political affiliation, to be appointed by the President of the United States for the term of 4 years, each appointment thereafter being for the term of 4 years, which Board shall have full power and authority to enforce the provisions of this act and of any regulations promulgated hereunder. The Board shall elect from its members a chairman and a secretary-treasurer, said offices to run for terms of 4 years each. The members of said Board shall be citizens of the United States and shall have been residents of the District of Columbia without voting privileges in any other part of the United States for a period of not less than 5 years prior to their appointment. Vacancies on the Board shall be filled by appointment by the President of the United States, such appointments to vacancies to be for the unexpired term. Each member of said Board shall be compensated at the rate of $20 per day for said duties, not to exceed 10 days during their respective terms of office.

(b) Each member of the Board shall appear in person before the chief judge or the acting chief judge of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and shall take and subscribe to an oath that he will support the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the District of Columbia and will perform the duties of his office to the best of his ability and will enforce the election laws and regulations pertaining thereto. These oaths shall be filed with the clerk of said court.

(c) The Board of elections shall perform all duties necessary to its functions, as follows:

(1) To establish and to define election precincts.

(2) To fix and provide places in each precinct for the registration of voters and for the casting of ballots.

(3) To provide necessary information to qualified voters.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(4) To establish polling places in each precinct and to cause such polling places to be suitably provided with booths and other supplies necessary and convenient in the exercise of the ballot. Such polling places shall in no instance be within 100 feet of any establishment in which alcoholic beverages are sold or distributed, or in which the neighborhood or environment may be such as to hinder, prevent, or discourage in any way the free exercise of the ballot. Any establishment in which alcoholic beverages are sold or distributed shall be closed during the hours of such election.

(5) To appoint and remove registrars, judges, clerks, and other officers of election and to designate the precinct within which each shall serve.

(6) To make and issue such rules, regulations, and instructions consistent with this act as they may deem necessary to the enforcement of its terms; but all such rules, regulations, and instructions shall be published not less than 30 days prior to the primary to which they shall be applicable.

(7) To adopt rules and regulations concerning, and to provide for the establishment of a permanent registry of voters in the District of Columbia, including, subject to the limitations of this act, the conditions under which electors' names shall be carried upon or removed from such registry. Such registry shall be open to public inspection at such reasonable times and places as the Board may direct, and may be used by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the Congress as the official registry of voters of the District of Columbia for the purpose of conducting any election or referendum directed by them.

(8) Any person who may be entitled lawfully to vote at a primary election, and who is absent from the District of Columbia, or who is to be absent from the District of Columbia on the day of such primary election, may, nevertheless, vote in such primary election by applying by mail or agent to the secretary-treasurer of the Board and securing from such officer an absentee ballot, which absentee ballot shall be identical in all respects with the regular ballot used in such election except that the same shall be designated "absentee ballot." Such ballot shall be available for a period of not more than 30 days before the primary election and may be voted between such period and at any time up to and including the day of election.

(d) The Board shall publish and announce the result of such elections within 48 hours from the closing of the polls.

(e) The secretary-treasurer of the Board is hereby authorized and empowered to receive authorized appropriations, to keep a record of the same, and to keep in his custody all funds received incident to the holding of said elections. Within 60 days after the election is held the secretary-treasurer shall publish in a daily newspaper in Washington once a week for 2 weeks a full report of all moneys received and disbursed by him as treasurer of the Board. Any surplus funds shall be held by the secretary-treasurer until his successor is appointed, at which time said funds shall be turned over to his successor who shall receipt for the same.

(f) The secretary-treasurer shall file with the Board a bond executed by an approved surety company in such penal sum as may be fixed by the chairman of the Board conditioned upon the faithful performance of the trust in him reposed. The secretary-treasurer shall have the power to administer oaths to such persons as may desire to file certificates and other papers of the Board; to judges, clerks, registrars, and other election officials; and to persons who may be summoned to testify before the Board.

(g) The secretary-treasurer shall receive besides his compensation as a member of the Board an additional $10 per day for the prescribed duties as such for a period not to exceed 30 days of his terms of office, which duties in all cases shall cover said elections. Registrars, judges, and clerks shall be paid at the rate of $10 per day for work in polling places, such compensation not to exceed 10 days during respective incumbency.

REFERENDA

SEC. 3. The Board of Elections, upon request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or the Congress, is hereby authorized to conduct referenda upon public questions, and the qualified voters, in any referendum so conducted, shall be the persons qualified to vote under the provisions of this act. In conducting any such referendum, the Board of Elections shall register all qualified voters without designation of party affiliation.

NOMINATIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Nominations for delegates, alternates, committeemen, and committeewomen to national conventions shall be made and be certified by at least 100 registered voters of the same political party as the nominee.

(b) No person shall be listed as a candidate for any of the above-named positions, or have his or her name printed on any official ballot, unless a petition, of that number of registered voters of the same political party, shall be presented to the Board of Elections herein provided at least 30 days before the first election held under the provisions of this act, and at least 60 days before any subsequent election.

(c) As many delegates and alternates shall be voted for as are allotted to the District of Columbia by the various national party conventions, together with the national committeeman and national committeewoman of each party.

ELECTORS

SEC. 5. (a) The persons voting at such elections shall be citizens of the United States, 21 or more years of age, have been residents of the District of Columbia for at least 1 year before voting, and must be without voting privilege in any other part of the United States in any manner whatsoever.

(b) All persons desiring to exercise this suffrage shall, before doing so, register not less than 30 days prior to the date fixed for the election of each presidential election year, and receive a certificate of their eligibility to vote.

(c) Every person qualifying to vote shall, at the time of doing so, state his or her political affiliation, which shall be registered, and be permitted to vote only at the election of the party to which he or she has declared himself or herself to be a member.

CANDIDATES

SEC. 6. No person shall be eligible as a candidate for national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate unless he or she is an adult citizen of the United States, has been a bona fide resident of the District of Columbia for 3 years previous to his or her nomination, and has been without voting privilege in any part of the United States in any manner whatsoever.

ELECTIONS

SEC. 7. Said elections shall be held on the first Tuesday in June of each presidential election year and ballots shall be deposited by qualified voters at such places as may be designated by the Board of Elections, who are hereby authorized to take charge of the elections conducted under this act, to appoint judges of election and tellers, and to receive and announce the results of said elections. Polls shall be open from 8 a. m. to 8 p. m. on said election days.

EXPENDITURES

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the funds of the District of Columbia, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Subject to the penalties provided in this act, a candidate for national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(c) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign.

(d) No person shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 in connection with any campaign for election of any national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate.

(e) Every candidate and independent committee or party committee shall, within 10 days after the election file with the Board of Elections, an itemized statement, subscribed and sworn to, setting forth all moneys received and expended, the names of persons from whom received and to whom paid, and the purpose for which it was expended. Such statement shall set forth any unpaid debts and obligations incurred by the candidate or independent committee or party committee with regard to such election, and specify the balance, if any, of election funds remaining in his or their hands.

PENALTIES

SEC. 9. Any person who shall register, or attempt to register, under the provisions of this act and make any false representations as to his place of residence or his voting privilege in any other part of the United States, or be guilty of bribery or intimidation of any voter at the elections herein provided for, or, being registered, shall vote or attempt to vote more than once in any election so held, or shall purloin or secrete any of the votes cast in such elections, or, if employed in the counting of voters in such elections, make a false report in regard thereto, or attempt to vote at the election of delegates of another party than that to which he or she has declared himself or herself to be affiliated, and every candidate, person, or official of any political committee who shall make any expediture or contribution in violation of this act, shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $500, or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2083) to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine was announced as next in order.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5048) relating to the statute of limitations in the case of criminal prosecutions of offenses arising under the internal-revenue laws was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase

agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of not less than 8 or more than 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is a companion bill to the one that was passed over a while ago. The Chair assumes the same objection is made to this bill, and it likewise will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2592) to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill will be passed over by request.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 158) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the taking of private property was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this resolution should not be on the Consent Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada objects. Therefore, the joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5314) to authorize the transfer to the regents of the University of California, for agricultural purposes, of certain real property in Napa County, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2651) relating to telegram, long-distance telephone, and special-delivery and air-mail postage allowances of Senators was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2653) to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2829) to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is objected to by the Public Service Commission of my State. Therefore I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2354) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock-modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2487) to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That no provision of any contract entered into by the United States, relating to the finality or conclusiveness, in a dispute involving a question arising under such contract, of any decision of an administrative official, representative, or board, shall be pleaded as limiting judicial review of any such decision to cases in which fraud by such official, representative, or board is alleged; and any such provision shall be void with respect to any such decision which the General Accounting Office or a court, having jurisdiction, finds fraudulent, grossly erroneous, so mistaken as necessarily to imply bad faith, or not supported by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence.

SEC. 2. No Government contract shall contain a provision making final on a question of law the decision of an administrative official, representative, or board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the amendment was agreed to on June 21, 1952. The question, therefore, is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2115) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1732) to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 10, after the name "Puerto Rico", to insert "Guam"; on page 2, line 6, after the name "Puerto Rico", to insert "the apportionment for Guam"; in line 10, after the name "Puerto Rico", to insert "Guam"; in line 15, after the name "Puerto Rico", to insert "Guam"; after line 17, to insert:

(c) Section 11 (d) (1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C., 1760 (d) (1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'State' includes any of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands."

And in line 24, to reletter the subsection from "(c)" to "(d)."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the amendments were agreed to on June 21, 1952. The question, therefore, is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands."

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR FILING OF EQUIPMENT TRUST AGREEMENTS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS

The bill (S. 3161) to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An explanation is called for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, when the bill was considered several days ago the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] objected to its consideration. After he had investigated the proposal carefully he withdrew his objection.

The purpose is to facilitate recordation of equipment trust cases. At the present time a railroad securing an equipment trust mortgage must record the mortgage in every county through which the railroad passes, which is entirely unnecessary. It involves an expense running into a huge sum of money, because each recordation costs about $500. The equipment trust agreements and other documents are recorded with

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Interstate Commerce Commission, where all interested parties know they can see them, and that serves every purpose better than having them recorded in all the various counties.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 49), is hereby amended by inserting, after section 20b, the following new section:

"SEC. 20c. Any mortgage, lease, equipment trust agreement, conditional sale agreement, or other instrument evidencing the mortgage, lease, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad cars, locomotives, or other rolling stock, used or intended for use in connection with interstate commerce, or any assignment of rights or interest under any such instrument, or any supplement or amendment to any such instrument or assignment (including any release, discharge or satisfaction thereof, in whole or in part), may be filed with the Commission, provided such instrument, assignment, supplement or amendment is in writing, executed by the parties thereto, and acknowledged or verified in accordance with such requirements as the Commission shall prescribe; and any such instrument or other document, when so filed with the Commission, shall constitute notice to and shall be valid and enforceable against all persons including, without limitation, any purchaser from, or mortgagee, creditor, receiver, or trustee in bankruptcy of, the mortgagor, buyer, lessee or bailee of the equipment covered thereby, from and after the time such instrument or other document is so filed with the Commission; and such instrument or other document need not be otherwise filed, deposited, registered or recorded under the provisions of any other law of the United States of America, or of any State (or political subdivision thereof), territory, district or possession thereof, respecting the filing, deposit, registration or recordation of such instruments or documents." The Commission shall establish and maintain a system for the recordation of each such instrument or document, filed pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall cause to be marked or stamped thereon, a consecutive number, as well as the date and hour of such recordation, and shall maintain, open to public inspection, an index of all such instruments or documents, including any assignment, amendment, release, discharge or satisfaction thereof, and shall record, in such index the names and addresses of the principal debtors, trustees, guarantors and other parties thereto, as well as such other facts as may be necessary to facilitate the determination of the rights of the parties to such transactions.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938—IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2213) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was about to request an explanation of the bill. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to speak briefly on this bill which would give the Civil Aeronautics Board the right to levy civil penalties up to $1,000 for violations by airlines of CAB economic regulations. Under the present law, the CAB already has the authority to levy such civil penalties for safety violations. Thus, no issue of safety is involved.

In most instances, I would be inclined to favor such a proposal to strengthen the enforcement powers of an executive agency as is contained in S. 2213. I regret I must oppose it in this case. My reasons are based solely upon a lack of confidence in the Civil Aeronautics Board in dealing with small airline companies. The experience which the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am chairman, has had with the CAB makes it clear that the CAB could not be depended upon to administer such authority judiciously as applied to these small companies.

With the authority it already has, the CAB has taken a series of steps to eliminate or curtail the operations of many small airlines on the grounds that they are guilty of "flying too frequently" or "too regularly"—i. e., they are guilty of giving too much service to their customers. I have little doubt that the new legislation if enacted would be used to speed up CAB's campaign to destroy the small-business segment of the aviation industry. With the additional authority to levy substantial fines for every violation, no matter how minor, CAB would have no trouble at all accomplishing its objective.

Both the public and civil aviation owe a debt to the nonscheduled airlines. It was the nonskeds, established by World War II veterans and surplus military planes and without Government subsidy, which first provided low-cost nonluxury coach travel and made it possible for millions of Americans to fly who had never flown before. Air coach is now an accepted form of transportation. Yet I have no doubt that if the CAB had had the power contained in S. 2213 during the years this new industry was growing, all of the small airlines would have been eliminated and the public would not today be enjoying the benefits of low-cost air transportation.

The most serious action by the CAB restricting the operations of the nonscheduled airlines was an order issued in March of last year limiting them to only three flights a month between major points—obviously a level at which no airline could operate and still stay in business. However, a Florida court ruled against this CAB regulation and the district court of appeals has now referred the case to the Supreme Court. Stymied by the courts, the CAB would now be able to achieve the same result by the enactment of S. 2213. In the light of CAB's past behavior, I can only interpret this bill to be a means that I fear would be used to cripple or kill the small airlines.

One member of the CAB, Joseph P. Adams, has vigorously opposed, in one dissent after another, the decisions of his colleagues to eliminate the small airlines and to stifle competition in aviation. Colonel Adams believes that there is a place in aviation for the small airline as well as the large company, and that such a policy in the long run will result in the greatest benefit to the flying public.

In his dissent in the Transcontinental Coach case, for example, he stated:

> One purpose of this dissent is to represent the interests of the air-coach travelers who annually find their transportation requirements met only by the operation of the irregular low-fare coach operation. I feel it is my duty to speak for them, he added, and meet if possible their demands and need for law-fare, mass-air transportation. I disagree with the majority in their decision to ignore this vacuum in our present transportation system.

Mr. President, I have tried to outline briefly the steps which the Civil Aeronautics Board has taken in its systematic drive to eliminate the small, independent airlines. I believe this legislation would contribute to that plan.

Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for half a minute?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, the Senator from Alabama is entitled to his opinion. However, the bill does not pertain in the slightest degree to the controversy which the Senator mentions between the nonscheduled and scheduled airlines.

The only purpose of the bill is to give the Civil Aeronautics Board a lesser penalty to inflict, in order to bring about better operation. This measure has nothing to do with the power which the Civil Aeronautics Board now has to revoke a certificate, which is a severe penalty. It can also go to the courts and bring criminal prosecutions for willful violations. The Board can do all that now. However, this amendment would provide them with a much lesser penalty, which might make for much better operation of the airlines.

It is directed more toward the scheduled airlines than it is toward the nonskeds. However, if the Senator wants to attack that issue, which does not belong on it, that is his privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alabama objects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Colorado would take his 5 minutes on the bill so that I may reply to his statement.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes; I yield my time to the Senator from Alabama.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 5 minutes and he yields his time to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I started off by saying that normally I would support this type of legislation. I recognize the

merits of it, as outlined by the able Senator from Colorado. But, Mr. President, if given this power the CAB could do with the nonskeds what they have been unable to do so long as the courts have protected them. It does tie in because the regulations which the Civil Aeronautics Board has issued with reference to irregularity of flying were held by the court to be defective. The CAB says the nonskeds can operate, provided they do not operate too frequently. If given the power contained in the bill, the Civil Aeronautics Board could penalize those companies for violations of indefinite regulations and could take action against them, whereas in the past they have been stymied in that direction by the courts.

So far as revoking permits is concerned and so far as putting them out of business is concerned, I could give several illustrations along those lines. The most outstanding case is the one in which the Civil Aeronautics Board ordered the small line which was serving Alaska to discontinue its service after 30 days. There was a near revolt in Alaska because many people depended on the airline for their fresh vegetables and other food. What happened was that when the company saw that it was going out of business at the end of 30 days, and could be choked off at the end of that time, it stopped operations immediately. The Board said that the airline did it in order to embarrass the Board, and that it should have continued to serve to the end of the 30 days. The line was later reinstated by court action. It is still continuing operations.

However, if given this power, the Board could step in with a penalty here and a penalty there, a hundred-dollar fine here and a thousand-dollar fine there, and thus penalize the small lines. Many of the small lines are operated by veterans of World War II to whom the Government sold surplus planes and whom the Government has encouraged to go into business for themselves after the second World War. The Board could step in and put them out of business. I know it might be said that they will not do it. That is the point I wish to make. They have demonstrated by their unfriendliness in the past to the small veteran-operated airlines that they will do it in the future, and I am not willing to take the risk of giving them power, which they may misuse. They have shown their inclination to misuse it, and I am confident that they will again misuse it, as Colonel Adams has so well pointed out in several dissenting opinions.

Therefore, much as I regret to do so, I feel constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard; the bill goes over.

REVOCATION OF WATER CARRIER CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS—BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2364) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water-carrier certificates and permits, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 5, after the word "act", to strike out "or for failure to engage in, or to continue to engage in, the operation authorized by such certificate or permit. The right to engage in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce by virtue of any certificate or permit, or any application filed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, or temporary authority under section 311 (a), may be suspended by the Commission upon reasonable notice of not less than 30 days to the carrier, but without hearing, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 306 (a) or" and in lieu thereof to insert "or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term, condition, or limitation of such certificate or permit, or for willful failure to engage in, or to continue to engage in, the operation authorized by such certificate or permit. The right to engage in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce by virtue of any certificate or permit, or any application filed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, or temporary authority under section 311 (a), may be suspended by the Commission upon reasonable notice of not less than 15 days to the carrier, but without hearing, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 306 (a) or 306 (e) or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 309 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U. S. C., sec. 909) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Certificates and permits shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall remain in effect until suspended or terminated as herein provided. Any such certificate or permit may, upon application of the holder thereof, in the discretion of the Commission, be amended or revoked, in whole or in part, or may upon complaint, or on the Commission's own initiative, after notice and hearing, be suspended, changed, or revoked, in whole or in part, for willful failure to comply with any provision of part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder, or with any term, condition, or limitation of such certificate or permit, or for willful failure to engage in, or to continue to engage in, the operation authorized by such certificate or permit. The right to engage in transportation in interstate or foreign commerce by virtue of any certificate or permit, or any application filed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, or temporary authority under section 311 (a), may be suspended by the Commission upon reasonable notice of not less than 15 days to the carrier, but without hearing, for failure to comply, and until compliance, with the provisions of section 306 (a) or 306 (e) or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, while I was on the telephone, Senate bill 2364, Calendar No. 1613, was called and, in the absence of objection, was passed.

Last week I objected to that bill, and I wish to object to it now.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that we may revert to Senate bill 2364, Calendar No. 1613, and that the vote by which that bill was passed may be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered.

Does the Senator from Vermont now object to consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2355) to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 3300) to establish a Federal Committee on Migratory Labor was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I object to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 991) to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 401) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, which was announced as next in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, last Saturday I asked the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to object to the passage of H. R. 401 in my behalf in order to give me additional time to study the bill.

I do not expect to object to the bill today, but I hope that the Senate will not approve one amendment which is proposed by the committee.

The amendment to which I object is the committee amendment No. 3, on page 2, lines 1 and 2. I feel that the provisions of the bill should be extended not only to those persons permanently admitted to the United States for residence, but also to those who may be lawfully admitted for temporary residence. If

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a student, for example, has been lawfully admitted to this country for temporary residence and enters our armed services and serves our country, I certainly feel that we should extend to him the privilege of becoming a United States citizen.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 401) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "sections 303 and 326 of this act" and insert "section 303"; in line 10, after the word "States", to insert "for a period or periods totaling not less than thirty days"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "admitted", to strike out the comma and "temporarily or otherwise," and insert "for permanent residence"; in line 3, after the word "possessions", to strike out "and including the Canal Zone,"; in line 7, after the word "intention", to strike out the comma and "no certificate of arrival,"; in line 12, after the word "fee", to insert "except that which may be required by State law"; on page 3, line 7, after the word "serving" to insert "actively and"; in line 8, after the word "forces", to insert "and, if separated from such service, that he was not separated under other than honorable conditions"; in line 11, after the numerals "1955", to strike out "The petitioner" and insert "Notwithstanding section 334 (c), the petitioner", and on page 4, line 19, after the word "is", to insert "or has been."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, House bill 401 is designed to grant expeditious naturalization and other benefits under the naturalization laws to aliens who have served, are serving, or who shall serve actively and honorably in our Armed Forces between June 25, 1950, and June 30, 1955, both dates inclusive. The bill is in principle patterned generally after legislation enacted during World War II, and which was carried forward in section 324A of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended. Under that legislation more than 100,000 persons were naturalized, more than 13,000 of whom were naturalized overseas.

As approved by the Senate committee, the bill differs in policy from the bill as it passed the House of Representatives in two significant respects:

First, the bill as passed by the House of Representatives would extend the benefits of the act to certain aliens who have not been admitted into the United States for permanent residence. The committee bill would limit the category of aliens who benefit under the bill to certain aliens who have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence. The purpose here is to prevent naturalization of aliens who jump ship or who otherwise remain in the United States in an illegal status but who succeed in getting in our Armed Forces.

Second, the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives, did not require, as does the bill which the Senate committee has reported, that the alien to obtain the benefits of the act must have served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods totaling not less than 30 days.

Since this bill was reported, Congress has passed the Immigration and Nationality Act over the President's veto. That act, when it becomes effective 6 months from now, will operate to repeal the Nationality Act of 1940. Thus we have a technical situation which must be met by further technical amendments in this bill. In order to meet this situation, I send to the desk the text of an amendment which I now offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendments will have to be acted on first.

Mr. McCARRAN. The amendment which I offer is in the nature of a substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it a substitute for the whole bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following provisions shall be in effect between the date of approval of this act and December 31, 1955, notwithstanding the provisions of section 301 (d) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and section 310 (d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, any person not a citizen, regardless of age, who on or after June 25, 1950, and not later than June 30, 1955, has actively served or actively serves, honorably, in the Armed Forces of the United States for a period or periods totaling not less than 30 days and who, having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States, including its outlying possessions, shall have been at the time of his entering the Armed Forces within any such areas, may be naturalized upon compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws, except that (1) no declaration of intention, and no period of residence within the United States or any State shall be required; (2) the petition for naturalization may be filed in any court having naturalization jurisdiction regardless of the residence of the petitioner; and (3) no fee, except that which may be required by State law, shall be charged or collected for making, filing, or docketing the petition for naturalization, or for the final hearing thereon, or for the certificate of naturalization, if issued: *Provided, however,* That (1) there shall be included in the petition the affidavits of at least two credible witnesses, citizens of the United States, stating that each such witness personally knows the petitioner to be a person of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the United States; (2) the service of the petitioner in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be proved by affidavits, forming part of the petition, of at least two citizens of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States of the noncommissioned or warrant officer grade or higher (who may also be the witnesses described in clause 1 of this proviso), or by a duly authenticated copy of the record of the executive or military department having custody of the record of petitioner's service, showing that the petitioner is or was during the period hereinbefore described a member serving actively and honorably in such forces and, if separated from such service, that he was not separated under other than honorable conditions; and (3) the petition shall be filed not later than December 31, 1955. Notwithstanding section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 or section 336 (c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the petitioner may be naturalized immediately if prior to the filing of his petition the petitioner and the witnesses required by the foregoing proviso shall have appeared before and been examined by a representative of the Service.

SEC. 3. Any person entitled to naturalization under section 2 of this act, who while serving is not within the jurisdiction of any naturalization court, may be naturalized in accordance with applicable provisions of section 2 without appearing before such court. The petition for naturalization of any such petitioner shall be made and sworn to before, and filed with a representative of the Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Attorney General, which representative is hereby authorized to receive such petition, to conduct hearings thereon, to take testimony concerning any matter touching or in any way affecting the admissibility of such petitioner for naturalization, to call witnesses, to administer oaths, including the oath of the petitioner and his witnesses to the petition for naturalization and the oath prescribed by section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940 or section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and to grant naturalization, and to issue certificates of naturalization: *Provided,* That the record of any proceedings hereunder together with a copy of the certificate of naturalization shall be forwarded to and filed by the clerk of a naturalization court in the district designated by the petitioner and made a part of the record of such court.

SEC. 4. Any person otherwise qualified for naturalization pursuant to section 2 or 3 of this act (1) who is or has been discharged under other than honorable conditions from the Armed Forces of the United States, or is discharged therefrom on account of his alienage or (2) who is a conscientious objector who performs or performed no military duty whatever or refused to wear the uniform, shall not be entitled to the benefits of such sections 2 or 3: *Provided,* That naturalization granted pursuant to section 2 or 3 may be revoked in accordance with section 338 of the Nationality Act or section 340 of the Immigration and Nationality Act if at any time subsequent to naturalization the person is separated from the Armed Forces of the United States under other than honorable conditions, and such grounds for revocation shall be in addition to any other provided by law. The fact that the naturalized person was separated from the service under other than honorable conditions may be proved by a duly authenticated certificate from the executive or military department under which the person was serving at the time of separation and such department shall supply such certification.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the amendment.

The adoption of this amendment will permit the provisions of this bill to become effective at once. But this amendment does not make any change of substance in the provisions of the bill as reported from the Senate committee.

Under this amendment, this new law will not become a part of the codified Immigration and Nationality Act. It should not do so, for this is temporary legislation, expiring at the end of 1955. But adoption of this amendment, and enactment of the bill in that amended

form, will permit the benefits of the bill to take effect at once, and to keep it in effect for the entire time for which it is intended to expedite naturalization of aliens now serving in our Armed Forces.

I ask that my amendment be adopted and that the bill be passed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am in full agreement with the purposes of the bill. I think we should offer these privileges to those who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States.

My only objection is that these privileges will not be extended to any except those who have been admitted for permanent residence. Such a provision will debar students or others who come to the United States and who wish to join in the defense of this country and are willing to risk their lives, as are those who have been admitted for permanent residence. Yet such students and other persons in that group would be debarred from the privileges under the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Nevada. That is my one objection to the amendment. I wish the situation to which I have referred could be taken care of.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I would not support the bill if that provision was not in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ENTRY INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN FOREIGN AIRCRAFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1588) to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6 of the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, is hereby amended by striking subsections (b) and (c) thereof and by inserting a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Foreign aircraft not a part of the armed forces of a foreign nation may be navigated in the United States if the foreign nation grants a similar privilege in respect to aircraft of the United States and only if such navigation is authorized by permit, order, or regulation issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board hereunder, and in accordance with the terms, conditions, and limitations thereof. The Civil Aeronautics Board shall issue such permits, orders, or regulations to such extent only as the Board shall find such action to be in the interest of the public: *Provided, however,* That in exercising its powers hereunder, the Board shall do so consistently with any treaty, convention or agreement which may be in force between the United States and any foreign country or countries. Foreign civil aircraft permitted to navigate in the United States under this subsection may be authorized by the Board to engage in air commerce within the United States except that they shall not take on at any point within the United States persons, property, or mail carried for compensation or hire and destined for another point within the United States. Nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be deemed to limit, modify, or amend section 402 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, but any foreign air carrier holding a permit under said section 402 shall not be required to obtain additional authorization under this subsection with respect to any operation authorized by said permit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF STEEL STRIKE

The resolution (S. Res. 328) relative to a settlement of the steel strike and interim resumption of production was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States call upon the parties to the current steel dispute (1) to resume collective bargaining negotiations immediately, (2) to agree upon interim conditions which will make possible the immediate resumption of production pending settlement of the issues in dispute, and (3) to make every effort in the interest of the national welfare and security to speedily resolve the dispute.

The Senate also calls upon the President of the United States to make available to the parties to this dispute the services of any Government agency which the parties to the dispute may request as an aid to collective bargaining thereby to facilitate the resumption of production and the resolution of the dispute.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Chair give us an explanation of the situation in regard to Senate Resolution 328, Calendar No. 1649? That resolution does not seem to have gone to a committee. I ask that we revert to that measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that is the resolution which was submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. All the resolution does is to call on both of the parties to get together and settle the steel strike, and the resolution also calls upon the President to make available to the parties to the dispute the services of the Government agencies. In substance, that is what the resolution provides.

Mr. McCARRAN. I simply wished to know what the resolution was; that is all. I thank the Senator very much.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2915) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and rights-of-way in the State of Wyoming to the town of Jackson, Wyo., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects, and the bill goes over.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO TOWN OF DEDHAM, MAINE

The bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit my usual amendment to the bill, namely, an amendment providing that at the proper place in the bill, the following amendment be inserted: "upon the payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value."

I have been advised by the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] that both the Senators from Maine will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to make a slight correction: I said that I would not object to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 4, after the word "to", where it first occurs, it is proposed to strike out "donate and", and in the same line, after the name "Maine", to insert "upon the payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska conferees on the part of the Senate.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3296) to provide for a commission to regulate the public transpotation of passengers by motor vehicle and street railroad within the metropolitan area of Washington, D. C., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—JOINT RESOLUTION PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the state of war, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I ask that the joint resolution go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3179) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REORGANIZATION OF NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 3190) to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be glad to give an explanation of the bill, but I thought the Senator from New York was going to object to its consideration.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I have had some objections raised to this bill. I am not entirely familiar with the facts involved.

Therefore, I should like to have the bill and the companion House measure, House bill 7502, Calendar No. 1738, placed at the foot of the calendar, so as to allow time for more study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3190 and the companion bill, House bill 7502, Calendar No. 1738, will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 1715, Senate bill 3190, on page 14 of the calendar.

My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], who had some objection to the bill, wishes to make a statement about it and then withdraw his objection. We all realize that any amendment to the bill at this stage would kill it. We would be fortunate if it could be passed by unanimous consent in the House, without amendment.

The bill is very vital to the development of the Metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. All the agencies involved and all the surrounding State areas involved are in agreement. The bill is unanimously reported by the committee. It represents a major step in the proper development of the recreational areas of this section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to reverting to Calendar No. 1715, Senate bill 3190?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I inquire what happened to Calendar No. 1762, House bill 7255?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill was passed. Then the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] asked unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 1715, Senate bill 3190.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill referred to by the Senator from Virginia went to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true; but the Senator from Virginia is now propounding a unimous-consent request to revert to that order of business. The Chair will state that the bill did not go over, but went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand that the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is not yet prepared to make the statement which he wishes to make, so I withdraw the request. However, when the bill is reached, I hope the Senate will substitute the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both bills went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I withdraw my request. I understand that when the bill is reached at the foot of the calendar the distinguished Senator from New York will make a statement, and will not then object.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to commit myself. It is not my present expectation to object, but I do wish to make certain legislative history.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The two bills will remain at the foot of the calendar.

The clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. PASTORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 3190, Calendar No. 1715, a bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes, and also House bill 7502, Calendar No. 1738, a companion measure, may be called up at this time, at the request of the Senator from New York. In a few minutes I must attend a meeting of a conference committee, and I wonder whether these measures can be considered at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that when I asked that Senate bill 3190 and the companion House bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, I did so because I had received very vigorous representations from officials of public-interest groups in the District of Columbia, not against the bill itself, but against the implied revalidation of present law which permits the practice of segregation in the playgrounds of the District of Columbia. Under present law, whose sections are reaffirmed and renumbered in Senate bill 3190, the District Commissioners are authorized to acquire land for playground purposes from the Interior Department. These playground sites are then turned over to the Recreation Board of the District of Columbia. That Board has in the past, and up to now, permitted the practice of segregation in most of the playgrounds.

I agree with the public-interest groups that the practice of segregation in the playgrounds of the District of Columbia is most unfortunate and regrettable. To teach children in the process of play that they are essentially different from—not to speak of superior to—other children on the basis of color is, to my mind, a most reprehensible practice made doubly so when this practice is followed in the Nation's Capital—in the home and center of this great democracy of ours.

Foreign visitors who come to these shores and to the Nation's Capital, who come here to study and observe democracy in action, are frequently shocked and amazed to see this shameful practice of segregation in playgrounds, to see the idea of segregation taught to youngsters at the playground level. We should all be shocked, Mr. President. I know that I am shocked.

I am aware, Mr. President, that the District Commissioners are men of good will and I know that some of the Commissioners at least are eager to see this practice abandoned and are, I trust, working toward that end. I am not well acquainted with the membership of the District Recreation Board, but I hope that every influence which the Commissioners of the District of Columbia have will be used to see to it that segregation is abolished in the playgrounds of the Nation's Capital.

If this were earlier in the session, Mr. President, I would propose and strongly advocate amendment of this bill, and of existing law, to provide either that the playgrounds in the District of Columbia shall be nonsegregated or that no further land shall be transferred from the Interior Department to the District Commissioners until the practice of segregation was abandoned. I wish it were possible to secure such an amendment at the present time.

However, I know that we are on the eve of adjournment. If such an amendment were approved to this bill, I am advised that it would very likely if not certainly prevent the passage of this bill. I would not want to take that responsibility. This is, from all I can learn, an excellent bill. It has taken 3 years to work out. It marks a notable step forward in the planning and beautification of our National Capital. Senators NEELY and PASTORE, who have guided this bill

through committee and here on the floor, would not, I know, want to continue segregation in the District of Columbia playgrounds if they could help it. They are eager to see this legislation passed. So am I. I will make no objection to the present consideration of this legislation, but will only reiterate the hope that I have already expressed, namely, that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the chairmanship of Commissioner Donohue, in whom I have the highest confidence, will do their best to see that this blot on the name of the Nation's Capital is removed at the earliest possible time.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank my friend and colleague, the Senator from New York, for withholding objection to the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7502) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill (S. 3190) is indefinitely postponed.

SCHEDULES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL

The bill (H. R. 7205) to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7471) to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the Mail Equipment Shops in Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I must ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. I wish to talk about it to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I do not feel that that would serve any purpose, because I feel constrained to object, by request, either now or later.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair please advise us as to the status of House bill 7205, Calendar No. 1720, and House bill 7471, Calendar No. 1721?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). House bill 7205, Calendar No. 1720, was passed.

House bill 7471, Calendar No. 1721, was objected to by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, my objection was by request.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 2008) to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I shall be glad to give an explanation.

Section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1949, as amended, provides, in part, that appropriations or funds available for payment of salaries or compensation to persons stationed outside the United States or in Alaska, whose basic compensation is fixed by statute, also shall be available for the payment of additional compensation to such persons, based upon living costs substantially higher than in the District of Columbia. However, under the third proviso of such section, in no event may the additional compensation payable exceed 25 percent of the basic rate of compensation. Senate bill 2008, if enacted into law in its present form, would amend the third provision of section 207, so as to enable the President to authorize the payment of the additional compensation provided under the said section at a rate in excess of 25 percent of the basic compensation of positions in areas where living costs are clearly and substantially more than 25 percent above living costs in the District of Columbia.

The committee is unanimous in its recommendation that Senate bill 2008 be approved by the Congress as expeditiously as possible in order to alleviate the inequities existing with respect to Alaska. However, the committee wishes to point out that increases in excess of the present 25 percent limitation should only be authorized where the Bureau of Labor Statistics has certified, after careful and complete analysis, that a higher authorization is justified. The committee is of the opinion at the present time that such authorization is necessary only in certain areas of Alaska. It also recommends that the Civil Service Commission report at least semiannually to the appropriate committees of the Congress full details and reasons for any authorization in excess of 25 percent.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Do I correctly understand that this bill is expressly limited to employees in Alaska?

Mr. PASTORE. No; it is not. It is general in nature, though the report indicates that it does cover the situation in Alaska.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: If the bill goes beyond Alaska, is it not true that if it were to apply to European areas, and certain other areas outside continental United States, the exchange rate on the amount of salaries received by the employees would be relatively higher, by way of purchasing power, in those foreign countries.

Mr. PASTORE. I am made to understand that it applies only to Territories and possessions, and therefore would not apply to Europe.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If that be the case, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2008) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, as amended (sec. 207 of Public Law 491, 80th Cong. as amended by sec. 104 of Public Law 862, 80th Cong.), is further amended by inserting before the colon at the end of the third proviso a comma and the following: "except that the President may authorize payment of such additional compensation based on living costs substantially higher than in the District of Columbia at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation in areas where living costs are clearly and substantially more than 25 percent above living costs in the District of Columbia."

BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 3177) to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, does the bill go over?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator from California requested that the bill go over.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from New Jersey would withhold his objection, and would yield to me for a question.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the request on the part of the Senator from California that the bill go over is based upon the amendment which was proposed on the last call of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator is entirely correct about that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Since that time I feel that we have drafted satisfactory language. I was hopeful the Senator from California might be present so that I might propose an amendment which would accomplish the very thing he wants done, and would accomplish it by language which I think would protect both the city of Los Angeles and the Federal Government.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and maintenance of project works operated and maintained by the United States.

SEC. 3. The authority granted in section 2 of this act to make contracts shall continue for 5 years from the effective date of this act, but the power acquisition consideration provided in section 2 of this act for the individual water-right contractors shall be reduced by whatever amount of net power revenues shall have accrued to the benefit of such individual water-right contractors after June 30, 1950, by virtue of their not having previously relinquished their respective interests in said power revenues.

SEC. 4. Miscellaneous revenues accruing pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924, on behalf of those who have contracted with the United States pursuant to this act shall be deposited in a special deposit account in the Treasury Department, and such revenues may be expended, as in such contracts provided, for the replacement of the project works operated and maintained by the United States and to supplement funds advanced by the water users to meet annual costs of operation and maintenance of such works.

SEC. 5. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as these are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes."

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared with reference to this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER OF NEBRASKA

Mr. President, I very much hope the Senate will approve this bill today. It is urgently needed by the irrigation farmers in the districts receiving water from the North Platte project located in the northwest part of my State and in the eastern part of Wyoming.

To explain the bill in very simple terms, it provides for the sale by the farmers of these districts to the Bureau of Reclamation of their rights to the revenues from power production from the Guernsey and Lingle Dams at a price agreed upon by representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and by the farmers themselves. No cash appropriation from the Treasury is necessary, however, and this bill will not have any effect whatever on expenditures by the Federal Government. The price agreed upon will simply be credited to the water users against their repayments to the Federal Government.

To illustrate the urgency of this matter, I would like to read to the Senate a telegram I have just received from Mr. Charles Klingman, showing the extreme need for prompt action.

"On June 27 we wired Army engineers in Omaha in part as follows:

"'Another flood visited Gering Valley on June 26. The proportions were almost as great as the 1947 flood. Ostenberg chute and Gering Canal crossing both in precarious danger of going out. Flumes washed out and water overflowed banks and bridge structures. Erosion to land great and most of crops lost.'"

This followed previous flood of May 26 which also did great damage. The damage to the irrigation system in our district alone was more than $250,000. If bills S. 2720 and H. R. 6723 are not passed our economic plight will be almost hopeless. We know you are doing everything you can and we appreciate it.

Acquisition of these power facilities is urgently necessary from the standpoint of the Federal Government to permit it to complete its plans for development of a power network in that area which will provide the benefits of inexpensive power rates to all users in the area. At present, power from these plants is sold for approximately 11 mills per kilowatt-hour. The Bureau of Reclamation has announced, however, that the average price for power to be produced from Missouri Basin hydro plants will be 5½ mills. The project plants will, however, be valuable components of the Missouri Basin system.

No doubt many Senators have voted that the comments of the Bureau of the Budget printed in the Senate committee report contained no recommendation one way or the other as to the advisability of enacting this legislation. The Budget Bureau does, however, raise some question as to the appropriateness of the price which has been set.

I want to emphasize that the price set forth in this bill has already been agreed upon by representatives of the Bureau of Reclamation and by the farmers concerned. The contract has been approved by overwhelming votes of the farmers in the three irrigation districts.

I believe the price set is a fair price—fair to the Government and fair to the irrigation districts. The price is based on the earning value of the properties. The Bureau of Reclamation has shown that the cost to the Government of these power plants can be paid out of anticipated revenues from sale of the power if the long-term program of the Bureau of Reclamation is carried through. Acquisition of these rights is necessary in order to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to coordinate its power-marketing operations.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed Senate bill 2720, Calendar 1739. At the moment that bill was passed, I did not know that House bill 6723 was on the desk. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate H. R. 6723.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6723) to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6723) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed Calendar No. 1739, S. 2720, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which S. 2720 was passed is reconsidered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to inquire if the House bill is identical with the Senate bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I understand it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that at the time action was taken on Calendar 1739, S. 2720, the House bill was not on the calendar. Without objection, Senate bill 2720, is indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3494) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic Bishop of Northern Alaska for use as a mission, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. There are hereby reserved to the United States all rights to minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION OF COMMISSIONERS FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 3438) to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMBERSHIP ON HAWAIIAN HOMES COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 4800) to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF HOMESTEAD LOTS IN HAWAII UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The bill (H. R. 4799) to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

If the Senator from California is to be on the floor later, I express the hope that the Senator from New Jersey will let the bill go to the foot of the calendar and be passed over temporarily, in order that we may return to it later.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest that that course be followed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama request that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

ADJUSTMENT IN COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES TRANSFERRED TO THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 2026) to provide for adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred to the General Services Administration from the Post Office Department pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18, effective July 1, 1950 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that the House has passed a companion bill, House bill 8006, which is presently on the desk. It contains a provision slightly different from the Senate version of the bill. As a matter of fact, it makes it applicable to all future transfers under Reorganization Plan No. 8. I therefore suggest that the Senate consider the House bill, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 8006) to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 8006) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection Senate bill 2026 is indefinitely postponed.

RETROACTIVE SALARY INCREASE FOR SERVICES OF POSTMASTERS

The bill (S. 2457) to authorize payment and retroactive salary increase for services rendered by postmasters, officers, and employees of the field service of the Post Office Department who died between July 1, 1951, and October 24, 1951, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, here again the House has passed a companion bill, H. R. 6004, which includes a category not included in the Senate bill. I therefore suggest that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill and that Senate bill 2457 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6004) to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island whether this covers the salary of postal employees?

Mr. PASTORE. No, it does not. The Senate bill covers civil-service employees, postal employees, and District of Columbia employees; but in the third supplemental bill a group of unclassified employees are taken care of, and this would make it all-inclusive.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I ask what the ultimate cost of this bill will be, in respect to its retroactive features?

Mr. PASTORE. I have the figures only with regard to the Senate version. The estimated cost is $205,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand there are 3,000 employees affected.

Mr. PASTORE. That is about the number, so I am told.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6004) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill 2457 is indefinitely postponed.

APPROVAL OF CERTAIN IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION CONTRACTS

The bill (S. 2720) to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water-right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project and with the Northport irrigation district, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I inquire what became of Calendar 1738, House bill 7502?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill went to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2720?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 3, after line 9, to strike out:

(b) a contract with the Northport Irrigation District, which shall be amendatory of the contract of August 19, 1948, between the United States and the district (authorized by the Act of Congress dated May 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 273)), which amendatory contract shall provide, among other things, (i) that the district shall relinquish its interest in all present and potential power revenues of or related to the North Platte project; (ii) that the district's power acquisition consideration of $403,828 shall be applied by the United States, until that amount has been exhausted, toward the payment of the annual cost of the carriage of the district's water through the Farmers Irrigation District canal: *Provided, however,* That the annual payments thus to be made shall in no event exceed $8,000 per year; and (iii) that the proportionate part of the miscellaneous revenues accruing to the benefit of the district, pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924, shall be retained by the United States for the establishment and maintenance of a fund, in an amount to be fixed by the Secretary, to be used by the Secretary for replacement and operation and maintenance of project works operated and maintained by the United States.

On page 4, line 12, after the word "contractors", to strike out "and for the Northport Irrigation District", and in line 15, after the word "contractors", to strike out "or to the Northport Irrigation District"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contract with the Gering and Fort Laramie Irrigation District, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951; the contract with the Goshen Irrigation District, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951; and the contract with the Pathfinder Irrigation District, which was approved by the district electors on November 15, 1951, all of which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary), pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187; 43 U. S. C. 485), are hereby approved and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the United States—

(a) contracts with individual water-right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project whose lands are not included within the boundaries of a project irrigation district which contracts shall provide, among other things, (i) that said water user shall relinquish his interest in the present and potential power revenues of or related to the North Platte project; (ii) that the power acquisition consideration for each contractor, which shall be the proportionate part of $6,636,873 represented by the ratio of the contractor's irrigable acreage to the total irrigable acreage of the project, as determined by the Secretary, shall be applied as a credit upon the water user's obligation to the United States for construction charges and for future charges for operation and maintenance of project works; (iii) that the miscellaneous revenues accruing to the benefit of the water user, pursuant to subsections I and J of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 672, 703), shall be retained by the United States for the establishment and maintenance of a fund in an amount fixed by the Secretary to be used by the Secretary for replacement and operation

Montana principal meridian, containing approximately four hundred twelve and twenty-two one-hundredths acres.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO WINONA YELLOWTAIL

The bill (S. 2810) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Winona Yellowtail was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Winona Yellowtail a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Northeast quarter of the northwest quarter and the south half of the northwest quarter, section 27, township 8 south, range 35 east, Montana principal meridian, comprising approximately 120 acres.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO ERLE E. HOWE

The bill (H. R. 6556) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN ALLOTTEES ON BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 7302) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REHABILITATION OF PAPAGO TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (S. 107) to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? I understand that it involves an authorization of about $23,000,000.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Papago Indians live in the southern part of Arizona. They are in at least as bad condition as are the Navajo Indians. Their land is eroding rapidly. A person flying across the southern part of the State can see where lands have been developed by white men, but on the Indian side nothing has been done. There are approximately 6,500 Papago Indians, and they are pleading to us to give them better schools and better development of their land. I feel that this is a meritorious bill and that it will help to place the Papago Indians on their feet.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does not section 9 exclude these Indians from social-security payments?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it does not exclude them. It is the same formula as that which we worked out for the Navajo Indians. The United States Government pays a little larger share. It does not exclude them; it helps them.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Some of the agencies were opposed to this measure.

Mr. McFARLAND. This bill contains the same provision which is in the Navajo bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 107) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the economic and social development of the Papago Indians, to provide facilities, employment, and services essential in combating hunger, disease, poverty, and demoralization among the members of the Papago Tribe, to make available the resources of the Papago, San Xavier, and Gila Bend Reservations for use in promoting a self-supporting economy and self-reliant communities, and to lay a stable foundation on which these Indians can engage in diversified economic activities and ultimately attain standards of living comparable with those enjoyed by other citizens, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to undertake, within the limits of the funds from time to time appropriated, under authority of law, a program of basic improvements for the conservation and development of the resources of the Papago Indians, the more productive employment of their manpower, and the supplying of means to be used in their rehabilitation, whether on or off the reservations.

SEC. 2. The foregoing program shall include the following projects for which capital expenditures in the amount shown after each item stated in the following list and totaling $23,000,000 are hereby authorized to be appropriated:

(1) Soil and water conservation and range improvement work, $7,000,000.

(2) Completion and extension of existing irrigation projects and development of feasible irrigation and water-spreading systems, $5,250,000.

(3) Development of opportunities for off-reservation employment and resettlement, and assistance in adjustments related thereto, $250,000.

(4) School buildings and equipment, and other educational measures, $4,000,000.

(5) Hospital buildings and equipment, and other health-conservation measures, $1,300,000.

(6) Common service facilities, $300,000.

(7) Roads and communication systems, $3,500,000.

(8) Domestic water supply, $400,000.

(9) Establishment of a revolving loan fund, $1,000,000.

Funds so appropriated shall be available for administration, investigations, plans, construction, and all other objects necessary for or appropriate to the carrying out of the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably for any expenditures made necessary for unforseen contingencies, but the amount authorized for expenditure for any single item shall not be increased or decreased by more than 20 percent. Such further sums as may be necessary for or appropriate to the annual operation and maintenance of the projects herein enumerated are hereby also authorized to be appropriated. Funds appropriated under these authorizations shall be in addition to funds made available for use on said reservations, or with respect to the Indians of the Papago Tribe, out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the benefit, care, or assistance of Indians in general, or made pursuant to other authorizations now in effect.

SEC. 3. The foregoing program shall be administered in accordance with the provisions of this act and existing laws relating to Indian affairs, shall include such facilities and services as are requisite for or incidental to the effectuation of the projects herein enumerated, shall apply sustained-yield principles to the administration of all renewable resources, and shall be prosecuted in a manner which will provide for completion of the program, so far as practicable, within 10 years from the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 4. Papago Indians shall be given, wherever practicable, preference in employment on all projects undertaken pursuant to this act, and, in furtherance of this policy, may be given employment on such projects without regard to the provisions of the civil-service and classification laws. To the fullest extent possible, Indian workers on such projects shall receive on-the-job training in order to enable them to become qualified for more skilled employment.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to make loans from the loan fund authorized by section 2 hereof to the Papago Tribe for such purposes as, in his judgment, will tend to promote the better utilization of the manpower and resources of the Papago Indians. Sums collected in repayment of such loans and sums collected as interest or other charges thereon shall be credited to the loan fund, and shall be available for the purposes for which the fund was established.

SEC. 6. Any restricted Indian lands owned by the Papago Tribe, members thereof, or associations of such members, may be leased by the Indian owners, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for public, religious, educational, recreational, or business purposes, including the development or utilization of natural resources in connection with operations under such leases. All leases so granted shall be for a term of not to exceed 25 years, but may include provisions authorizing their renewal for an additional term of not to exceed 25 years, and shall be made under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior. Restricted allotments of deceased Indians may be leased under this section, for the benefit of their heirs or devisees, in the circumstances and by the persons prescribed in the act of July 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 745; 25 U. S. C., sec. 380). Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to repeal or affect any authority to lease restricted Indian lands conferred by or pursuant to any other provision of law.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other provision of existing law, the tribal funds now on deposit or hereafter placed to the credit of the Papago Tribe of Indians in the United States Treasury shall be available for advance to the tribe for such purposes as may be designated by the Papago Tribal Council and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 8. The Papago Tribal Council shall be kept informed and afforded opportunity to consider from their inception plans pertaining to the program authorized by this act. In the administration of the program, the Secretary of the Interior shall consider the recommendations of the tribal council and shall follow such recommendations whenever he deems them feasible and consistent with the objectives of this act.

SEC. 9. Beginning with the quarter commencing the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay quarterly to Arizona (from sums made available for making payments to the State under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a) of the Social Security Act) an amount, in addition to the amounts prescribed to be paid to such State under such sections, equal to 80 percent of the total amounts of contributions by the State

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

FINANCING OF WATER SUPPLY PROJECTS IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 4797) to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 4408) to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE OF HAWAIIAN HOME LOAN FUND

The bill (H. R. 4407) to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, of 1920, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN INDIANS

The bill (S. 1238) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eileen Ida Sanders was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The bill (S. 2407) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. I make the same request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

The bill (S. 2453) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make the same request in connection with the next three bills on the calendar, Calendar No. 1750 (S. 2810), No. 1751 (H. R. 6556), and No. 1752 (H. R. 7302), which all relate to the issuance of patents in fee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I have checked the principle involved in Calendar Nos. 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, and 1752, Senate bills 2407, 2453, 2810, and House bills 6556 and 7302, respectively, and I see that they involve patents to Indians in accordance with their rights under existing law, and, therefore, so far as I am concerned, there is no necessity for those bills going to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is Calendar No. 1747, Senate bill 1238 included?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may those bills be considered en bloc in order to save time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bills will be considered en bloc.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO EILEEN IDA SANDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1238) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eileen Ida Sanders which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment at the top of page 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) The lands described in section 1 of this act shall not be sold by the patentee to any purchaser other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the Superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such Agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

(B) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The Superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to Eileen Ida Sanders for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: The south half of the north half and the south half of section 28; the north half of the north half of the north half, and the north half of the south half of the north half of the north half of section 33, all of township 4 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, and containing approximately 600 acres.

SEC. 2. (a) The lands described in section 1 of this act shall not be sold by the patentee to any purchaser other than the Crow Tribe or a member thereof, unless (1) at least 60 days prior to such sale the Superintendent of the Crow Agency shall have been served with notice of the terms thereof and a copy of such notice, together with a description of the lands, shall have been posted by the Superintendent in a conspicuous public place at such Agency and have remained posted for a period of 60 days, and (2) prior to the expiration of such 60 days no bona fide offer in writing to purchase such land upon the terms specified in such notice, or upon terms more favorable to the owner, shall have been made by the Crow Tribe or any member thereof and a copy thereof served upon the Superintendent of the Crow Agency.

(b) A certificate of the Superintendent of the Crow Agency stating that notice of the proposed sale was served upon him and was posted by him for a period of 60 days in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of subsection (a) and that no offer was received in accordance with clause (2) of such subsection, when filed and recorded in the office of the county clerk and recorder of the county in which such lands are situated shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with this section. The Superintendent shall furnish the certificate to the purchaser for filing and recording.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO GEORGE SCOTT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2407) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment in line 8, after the numerals "28", to strike out "east. The", and insert "east; the", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to George Scott for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, south half of the north half and the north half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 2, township 4, south, range 28 east; the north half of the southeast quarter of section 4, township 6 south, range 30 east, Montana principal meridian, containing approximately six hundred forty-five and seventy-six one-hundredths acres.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO DONALD B. BILLEDEAUX

The bill (S. 2453) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux for the following-described lands in the State of Montana: Lots 3 and 4, east half of the southwest quarter, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, section 7, township 34 north, range 7 west; lots 2 and 3 in section 3, township 36 north, range 10 west, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 7; and lot 4 of section 30, township 34 north, range 7 west,

toward expenditures during the preceding quarter by the State, under the State plans approved under the Social Security Act for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the needy blind, to Papago Indians residing within the boundaries of the State on reservations or on allotted or trust lands, with respect to whom payments are made to the State by the United States under sections 3 (a), 403 (a), and 1003 (a), respectively, of the Social Security Act, not counting so much of such expenditure to any individual for any month as exceeds the limitations prescribed in such sections.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE COAST GUARD IN APPREHENSION OF DESERTERS, ETC.

The bill (S. 3145) to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code, to provide the United States Coast Guard with broader authority with respect to the apprehension and delivery of deserters, stragglers, and prisoners, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been called to the attention of the Chair that the House passed a similar bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I think the Senate should act on the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7654) to amend section 508 of title XIV, United States Code, which was read twice by its title.

Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7654) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3145 is indefinitely postponed.

SAFE HANDLING OF EXPLOSIVES TRANSPORTED BY VESSEL

The bill (S. 2702) to amend section 4472 of the revised statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the House has passed House bill 6521 to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel. The House bill and the Senate bill are identical.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I understand that Calendar 1756 has just been called?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because this is highly important legislation—I should like to say that had such legislation been on the statute books 2 years ago the very tragic explosion at South Amboy might have been avoided.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for bringing this proposed legislation before the Senate. I should like to note that this year we passed Senate bill 1429 which was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON]. Unfortunately, that bill is now sleeping in the House committee. I hope that before the session ends they will see the light, send it to the House floor and pass it.

I commend the sponsors of the bill and the committee for bringing this proposed legislation before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6251) to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2702 is indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6245) to amend section 3115, Revised Statutes, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas state who is objecting to the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator objecting is the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CONTINUATION OF SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

The bill (H. R. 6845) to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. The only thing this bill would accomplish would be to continue the suspension of the import duties on metal scrap. I think it was in 1942 that metal-scrap duties were suspended until June 30, 1949, and, again, from October 1950 to June 30, 1952. It merely extends the exemption for a period of 1 year.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I should like to point out that there is little justification for maintaining free entry of lead scrap. The price of lead a few weeks ago fell 4 cents below the OPS ceiling price, and the Tariff Commission, under legislation enacted by the Congress, was authorized and directed to initiate steps to reinstate the duty of 1⅛ cents.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think this bill applies to lead.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; I think it does apply to lead scrap.

Mr. GEORGE. It applies to metal scrap.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does it not include iron and steel, aluminum, copper, brass, and lead?

Mr. GEORGE. It does include lead; that is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to point out that if, within the past 3 days, there was reinstated 1⅛ cents a pound duty on lead, because the price was depressed and because domestic production was being discouraged, at a time when there is need for lead and lead products in this country, it would seem unwise to continue lead scrap on the free list.

I should like to point out, also, that only yesterday Administrator Larsen of GSA announced a program for the purchase of 30,000 tons of lead to be placed in a civilian stockpile later to be made available to civilian users. It seems to me it is unwise to continue lead scrap on the free list, because this is in conflict with policies which have recently been adopted by the administration in connection with increasing the price of lead to the point where we can have greater domestic production.

I should like to suggest that the committee accept an amendment to eliminate lead scrap, because if we proceed in accord with the provisions of this bill we shall not be doing what is consonant with administration policies at the moment in regard to making lead available and establishing a supporting price which will induce expanded domestic production. Will the chairman accept an amendment to eliminate lead scrap?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator may be correct about this item. The bill applies only to metal scrap, and all the representations made to the Committee on Finance were to the effect that metal scrap was in very scant supply, and desperately needed for national defense purposes. I have no specific information as to the item of lead scrap.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. The supply of scrap for making steel is one of the most critical matters affecting our country at the present time. I am not familiar with the situation as to lead scrap, but it is impossible to make good steel without a certain percentage of scrap, and we are now searching everywhere to get it, and any we can get by importation adds that much to the strength of our country.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I appreciate the apprehension and interest of the Senator from Pennsylvania insofar as scrap metal is concerned, but I make an exception as to lead. The situation as to lead is that if Congress takes the action proposed of suspending the duty on lead scrap, we are running counter to the Government's action taken in the last few days to purchase 30,000 tons of lead in this country for a stockpile to stabilize prices.

I realize that we must do everything possible to get scrap metal for national preparedness, and I am bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe it is in the interest of national defense that an ample supply of lead scrap be made available. Certainly our mines cannot produce lead at four cents under the OPS ceiling price.

Some mines are shut down, and the owners of the mines have to pay high operating costs. I believe we should suspend the duty on all kinds of scrap necessary for national preparedness, but I still contend that we should not do anything that will discourage domestic lead scrap gathering. I urge the chairman of the Committee on Finance to accept an amendment exempting lead scrap. I suggest that he take such an amendment to conference.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no information as to this point, but apparently there is no import tax on lead scrap, and I thought no duty, although it was included in the bill because all metal scrap is exempted from duties and import taxes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If lead scrap were exempted, is it not true that there would be a small duty, of 1 1/8 cents on the lead content of scrap—not on all the scrap, but merely the lead content?

Mr. GEORGE. Originally the duty was 2 1/8 cents a pound on the lead content. That included scrap, of course. That was reduced to 1 1/8 cents a pound on the lead content. But under section 3525 of the Internal Revenue Code there seems to be no import tax on lead scrap at this time.

I have had no chance to examine into this particular point. If there is no duty on it, of course the passage of the bill would not be required so far as lead scrap is concerned, and if the Senator wishes to prepare an amendment, or have one prepared, exempting lead scrap, we can send it to the House and give the House an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If there were no duty of any kind on lead scrap, then certainly it would not be necessary to include lead scrap in the legislation which suspended the tariff for the past 2 years.

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true. The Senator may be correct about the matter. I am not entirely certain as to it, but from the best information I now have, there is no import tax on lead scrap, and I thought no duty.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not believe my proposal would in any way discourage the shipment of lead scrap into this country. It would merely mean that the placing of a small duty on lead scrap would have a tendency to increase the price in this country to that extent, and it would encourage the gathering and processing of lead scrap in the United States, instead of our relying entirely upon the foreign metal scrap.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill provides purely for a temporary extension for a year; but if the Senator wishes to prepare an amendment I shall be glad to accept it and take it to conference. However, I think it entirely unnecessary.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then, if there is not, the conference committee could act accordingly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if there is no duty on lead scrap, an act suspending the duty does not amount to anything, and it is just left in status quo, there is no necessity for an amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is correct, no amendment is actually necessary; but I am not sure that my information is entirely correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the committee accept an amendment exempting lead scrap, and take it to conference?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Idaho propose the amendment, so that the clerk may state it?

Mr. GEORGE. The committee could not accept an amendment imposing any duty on lead scrap. Lead is not specifically mentioned, because the bill is merely one extending the original law. The committee will be perfectly willing to take an amendment, if the Senate agrees to it, eliminating lead scrap from the bill. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes. I offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator indicate where in the bill it would go, and what the words would be?

Mr. GEORGE. It would be a proviso, Mr. President.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Providing for the exception of lead scrap from the suspension of duties.

Mr. GEORGE. It could read: Provided, that this act shall not apply to lead scrap.

That would come at the end, because the bill is merely one providing for the extension of an existing act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be a proviso, will it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the words "*Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lead scrap."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IMPORTATION OF FEATHERS OF WILD BIRDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7594) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has an amendment which he wishes to offer. While the committee did not pass on this amendment, it has on various occasions passed on similar amendments, and always favorably. I should like to have the clerk state the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a certain carrillon of 23 bells to be imported for The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say for the RECORD that this has been done for other American universities. The Citadel is a military school, as Senators know, operated by the Federal Government and the State of South Carolina. This amendment would merely remove the duty from these bells, which have been presented as a gift by one of its alumni.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committee has approved similar amendments in the past. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME OF TAX BENEFIT TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES IN CONNECTION WITH CAPITAL GAINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8270) to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to extend the running of the 1-year or 18-month period during the time a taxpayer has to put the gain from the sale of a residence onto a new house, while the taxpayer is serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States during the present emergency.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, at the end of section 2, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Clarification of existing law as to jury trial in actions for recovery of internal revenue taxes.

(a) Nothing in Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 or Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 shall be construed to impair any right or remedy, including trial by jury, to recover any internal-revenue tax alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or any penalty claimed to have been collected without authority, or any sum alleged to have been excessive or in any manner wrongfully collected under the internal-revenue laws.

(b) For the purpose of any action to recover any such tax, penalty, or sum, all statutes, rules, and regulations referring to the collector of internal revenue shall be deemed to refer to the officer whose act or acts referred to in subsection (*a*) gave rise to such action. The venue of any such action shall be the same as under existing law.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, this amendment appears necessary because of the enactment of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

This amendment merely makes it clear that jury trials which have been applicable in suits against collectors are still to be continued with respect to suits against officers where acts would give rise to the same course of action which would have been applicable in the case of the collector. It is made necessary by Reorganization Plan No. 1, which abolished the office of collector. The Treasury has no objection to this provision.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Treasury does not object to this amendment because the position of the Treasury is that the suit survives anyway. I drafted a bill which went to the Judiciary Committee, I believe, to carry out this intention.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that this amendment provides that suits which have heretofore been permitted under existing law against collectors of internal revenue within the various States where the collectors are assigned will still be permitted against whatever officer is the highest local officer to remain within the State? Is that the meaning of the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Georgia to answer the question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the cause of action is preserved against the internal revenue officer whose acts give rise to the cause of action.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr HOLLAND I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if that means that it is assured that the right of action within the State where the collector formerly could be sued, the State of residence of the taxpayer, is preserved to the taxpayer?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is preserved entirely, just the same as under the old law, and before the passage of the Reorganization Act. The right of trial by jury is preserved. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. This means that, regardless of what may be the particular office and what may be the title of the officer, the officer within the State of residence of the taxpayer, to whom the taxpayer actually pays the tax, is, under this amendment, made answerable to the suit of the taxpayer in the district courts of the particular State.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true. The right of action is preserved against the officer whose act gives rise to the cause of action, that is, the officer who wrongfully takes money or who takes money to which the Government is not entitled. The right of trial by jury is preserved in such a situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I congratulate both Senators upon accomplishing that purpose, and I hope the Senate will approve the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TAX TREATMENT OF STOCK BONUSES, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 7255) to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

The bill (S. 2584) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to establish, operate, and maintain on the property now in the possession of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Logan, Colo., a facility for the domiciliary care of veterans eligible for such care under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are authorized to be appropriated.

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill? The title of the bill does not give a clear indication of the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill adds section 457 (c) to the Internal Revenue Code. This section provides that, for purposes of the excess-profits tax, earnings deposited in reserve funds under section 607 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, shall be taken into account to a limited extent in computing the base period earnings credit. The deposited earnings are added to the excess profits net income for any base period year only to the extent that the deposits made or accrued in such base period year exceed the amount of such deposits for the taxable year for which an excess-profits-tax credit is being computed. The amount of deposits in the base period or excess profits-tax period is subject to adjustment, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, to exclude therefrom any amount which is payable to the Maritime Administration for such year as reimbursement of operating differential subsidy.

That was the purpose of the bill as it passed the House. The House bill had the approval of the Treasury Department. The Senate committee added an amendment to the bill, and I shall explain it. It is a simple amendment, although it may be a little confusing in its language.

The committee has added an excess-profits amendment which provides excess-profits tax relief for certain manufacturers using strategic and critical metals as their raw materials where the combination of rising raw material prices and failure of increased manufacturing facilities to be reflected in base period income has given an inadequate base period credit. The relief conforms to the present growth formula under existing law in that the credit as so determined cannot exceed 80 percent of the taxpayer's excess profits net income for 1950.

That amendment was very carefully considered by the committee. This problem was considered by the Senate when the 1951 revenue bill was being debated. But the amendment offered then was somewhat broader than I thought we should accept. Since that time our staff has further explored the problem, and the amendment now offered is much narrower in its scope and effect. I do not believe the Treasury will object to this amendment.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania desires to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. My amendment was submitted the other day, and I desire to offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code (miscellaneous provisions relating to the computation of average base period net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) Companies preserving defense capacity and increasing capacity for manufacturing peacetime products from certain strategic and critical metals—

"(1) Eligibility requirements: In the case of a taxpayer which commenced business on or prior to January 1, 1936, and since such date has been primarily engaged in manufacturing, the taxpayers' average base period net income shall be determined under this subsection, if—

"(A) The percentage of the taxpayer's purchases of raw materials which were strategic and critical metals (as defined in par. (3) was 80 percent or more for each of the taxable years beginning with or within the taxpayer's base period;

"(B) The taxpayer's average monthly excess profits net income (computed in the manner provided in sec. 443 (c) for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the first 24 months of its base period was 250 percent or more of the average monthly excess profits net income (so computed) of the taxpayer for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the last 24 months of its base period;

"(C) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in sec. 444 (d)) as of the beginning of its base period

(when added to the total facilities at such time of all corporations with which the taxpayer has the privilege under sec. 141 of filing a consolidated return for its first taxable year under this subchapter) did not exceed $10,000,000; and

"(D) The adjusted basis for determining gain of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in sec. 444 (d)) on the last day of its base period was 180 percent or more of the adjusted basis for determining gain of its total facilities on the first day of its base period.

"(2) Computation: The average base period net income determined under this subsection for a taxpayer entitled to the benefits of this subsection shall be the amount computed under section 435 (e) (2) (E) and (F) except that there shall be substituted for the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 6 months in the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending December 31, 1949, an amount computed by multiplying the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the 6 months in the period beginning July 1, 1946 and ending December 31, 1946, by the percent determined by dividing the adjusted basis for determining gain of taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in sec. 444 (d)) on December 31, 1948, by the adjusted basis for determining gain of its total facilities on the first day of its base period. The average base period net income computed under the preceding sentence shall not exceed 80 percent of the excess profits tax net income for the taxpayer's first taxable year under this subchapter.

"(3) Definition of strategic and critical metals: As used in this subsection, the term 'strategic and critical metals' means copper and zinc which on January 1, 1945, had been determined by proper authority to be strategic and critical under the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Stock Piling Act and shall include scrap containing such metals."

SEC. 5. The amendment made by section 2 shall be applicable with respect to all taxable years ending after June 30, 1950.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee a few questions?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the bill as it came from the House dealt with the merchant marine, and the amendment which was added by the Senate committee deals with manufactures of certain strategic and critical metals. It seems as though the committee has gone beyond the constitutional powers granted to the Senate, in that revenue bills are supposed to originate in the House. The committee has added metal plants and metal-processing plants to an original provision dealing with the merchant marine.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely incorrect. The bill as it came from the House dealt with only one thing, and that was the base period excess-profits tax credit to which tax-paying shipping companies were entitled.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a modification of the Merchant Marine Act of 1930. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. It is not a modification of the Merchant Marine Act. It is an amendment to the excess-profits tax law. It relates to the average earnings credit which a corporation is entitled to take under the excess-profits tax law.

The Finance Committee amendment to this bill is restricted. It was not believed by the committee that it would meet any objection from the Treasury Department.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask whether hearings were held on the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. Hearings were held on the amendment in 1950. In 1951 an amendment was offered on the floor but it was too broad and our staff was directed to further investigate the matter. The Finance Committee went into the question very carefully this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Were the hearings printed?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; the hearings of 1950 were printed. Since then the matter has been under review by our staff and our committee in executive session.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask how many companies would be affected by the amendment?

Mr. GEORGE. So far as I know, there would not be more than two or three companies affected by it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What companies would those be?

Mr. GEORGE. They would be manufacturers and fabricators of brass. They would be the independent group which does not have its own mines but which has to purchase the raw material it fabricates. The excess-profits tax creates a particularly bad situation for the independent brass fabricator, who has had difficulty in getting the raw material to fabricate his product. The entire relief and benefit is given solely to the fabricators of strategic and critical metals who have operated under conditions which I have broadly described.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I inquire whether my understanding is that the committee considered the matter in 1951, but that either the committee or Congress deferred action because they felt that the subject needed further study or that it was improper?

Mr. GEORGE. Because it needed further study. In the form in which it was presented it would have been applicable to the manufacturers of other than strategic and critical metals. It was a bit too broad. It needed further study. We were not able to agree on the amendment, although it was very vigorously pressed upon us by the same fabricators of metal, particularly copper.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Apparently further hearings did not change the mind of the committee, since further hearings were not held.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, but our staff studied this problem very thoroughly, and the committee believes the amendment which it finally adopted will alleviate some of the hardships involved in this type of case, and have a negligible effect on the revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does this apply to more than one company?

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose it would apply to all manufacturers of critical and strategic metals who meet the test prescribed in this measure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Are not the qualifications "(A)," "(B)," "(C)," and "(D)," and so forth, on pages 3 and 4, such that, in effect, the bill is restricted to virtually one company?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I would say to the Senator from Illinois that the bill is not restricted to one company, but the bill is largely restrictive because of the fact that it applies only to fabricators of critical and strategic metals.

Furthermore, under the provisions of the bill itself, the amendment is restricted to bring it within the scope of the principle of the present relief formulas for growth. That restriction, in effect, requires that the credit so determined cannot exceed 80 percent of the taxpayer's excess-profits net income for 1950.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the amendment would permit these companies—and I rather think that only one company would be affected—to go back 3 years, from 1949 to 1946, in order to obtain a higher earnings base, so that the excess-profits tax for this company, and perhaps for one or two other companies, would be less?

Mr. GEORGE. In the nature of things, the amendment could not affect many companies; but I say to the Senator from Illinois that the amendment affects only the companies which the Senator's committee felt ought to be given relief.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the companies affected are those which had high 1946 earnings, but which thereafter, up to the Korean war, went through a period of declining earnings, so that they wish to get the benefit of the high earnings prior to 1949 as a basis on which their excess-profits tax will be computed?

Mr. GEORGE. There were little independent groups in this country which did not realize sufficient during the later part of the base period because their expansion programs did not begin to become fully effective during that period, and they had to compete with groups who because of their affiliations with producers of metals were not subject to the same hardships as they were.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have great sympathy for independent producers and independent fabricators, but I wonder whether we should make an exception to the general revenue laws for so limited a class.

It seems to me that the instant we begin to legislate for narrowly restricted groups and the minute we begin to make exceptions to general revenue laws for those groups we open a Pandora's box of mischief, because if we grant this privilege or exception to a few fabricators or to one fabricator—one located in Bridgeport, Conn., I believe—that will make it possible for other fabricators to ask to be treated in the same way. They would complain that this favor was extended to a narrow group of companies, and they would ask why it should not be extended to them.

Mr. GEORGE. In the 1951 act we adopted what is known as the growth formula, which has wide general application if the taxpayer meets the conditions of the act.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

This measure is intended to give to these independent fabricators of critical metals, who otherwise meet the requirements of the act, the benefit in effect of the existing growth formula. That is all this measure will do. It is held within principle of the growth formula by a provision to the effect that the credit cannot exceed more than 80 percent of their excess profits net income for 1950.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we make this exception for this narrowly restricted group of companies, what is there to prevent other companies which say they are important to the national economy from asking that a similar exception be made in their case? The instant we begin putting fingers through the dike and letting water through, we open up the possibility that the entire tax structure will be imperiled.

Mr. GEORGE. We have already adopted a growth formula, which the committee believed to be sound, and which I personally believe to be sound. This measure simply brings this narrow group within the growth formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest that it applies the growth formula to a shrinking company, by substituting 1946 earnings for 1949 earnings, and that therefore the issue is of general application.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available has expired.

Is there objection to the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall regretfully have to object to the amendment; but I suggest that if the committee is willing to eliminate this amendment, I would not have objection to the original bill as passed by the House, dealing with the merchant marine, because I believe it is proper that the House originate amendments to revenue measures.

If this matter is important, then the House can originate this amendment next year, rather than have the Senate now, during the concluding hours of the session, interfere with the ordinary procedure in revenue matters.

In short, Mr. President, I object to the amendment; but I do not object to the original bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have never before heard anyone raise the question that the Senate could not amend a revenue bill in any way in which it wished to amend it. The Senate does not originate tax measures, but the Senate has full power and right to amend them. Its power to do this has been upheld by the Supreme Court in construing the provisions of the Constitution.

I do not know what the Senator's objection to the amendment is unless the Senator from Illinois is objecting to the entire bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thought we were on the Consent Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is true insofar as the consideration of a bill or other measure is concerned; but amendments may be adopted by motion. The Senator from Illinois or any other Senator still has a right to object to the bill at a later stage, if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When will that stage arrive?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At any time before final passage of the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] has an amendment at the desk, and it will be stated at this time.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of section 3, it is proposed to add a new section, reading as follows:

SEC. 4. That, effective with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1950, section 433 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of average base period net income) is hereby amended by inserting at the end thereof two new paragraphs reading as follows:

"(18) Adjustment for base period losses from branch operations: In the case of a taxpayer which during two or more such taxable years operated a branch at a loss, the excess profits net income for each such taxable year (determined without regard to this paragraph) shall be increased by the amount of the excess of such loss above the loss, if any, incurred by such branch during the taxable year for which the tax under this subchapter is being computed. As used in this paragraph, the term 'branch' means a unit or subdivision of the taxpayer's business which was operated in a separate place from its other business and differed substantially from its other business with respect to character of products or services. A unit or subdivision of the taxpayer's business shall not be considered to differ substantially from the taxpayer's other business unless it is of a type classifiable by the Standard Industrial Classification Manual in a different major industry group or in a different subgroup of the taxpayer's major industry group than that in which its other business is so classifiable: *Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not apply unless the sum of the net losses of such branch during the base period exceeded 15 percent of the aggregate excess profits net income of the taxpayer during the base period. For the purposes of this paragraph, the aggregate excess profits net income of the taxpayer during the base period shall be the sum of its excess profits net income for all years in the base period, increased by the sum of the net losses of such branch during the base period.

"(19) Rules for application of paragraph (18): For the purposes of paragraph (18)—

"(A) A branch shall be deemed to have been operated at a loss during a taxable year if the portion of the deductions under section 23 for such year which is determined, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary, to be the portion thereof properly allocable to the operation of such branch exceeds the portion of the gross income during the taxable year which is determined under such regulations to be the portion thereof properly allocable to the operation of such branch; and the amount of the loss shall be an amount equal to such excess.

"(B) If the portion of the gross income determined to be properly allocable to the operation of the branch is a minus quality, the amount of such excess shall be the sum of the deductions under section 23 determined to be properly allocable to the operation of the branch plus an amount equal to such minus quantity."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, so far as I am able to ascertain, this amendment would apply only to two companies, the Budd Co., of Philadelphia, and the Sangamo Electric Co., of Springfield, Ill.

What we are trying to do is to meet what seems to be an unfair situation arising because of the excess-profits tax. For example, the Budd Co. went into war production. It had three different plants, all of which were in production. But, during the war, they were getting ready to resume the building of railroad cars. If this branch of the operation had been incorporated, they would have come under the present law, but it was not incorporated. Of course, at that time there was no excess-profits tax to consider. They have had a loss of more than $20,000,000. The Sangamo Electric Co., of Springfield, Ill., which was getting into the work of constructing mica capacitors, is in a similar situation.

Mr. President, so far as I have been able to ascertain, these are the only two companies affected, and it seems just and equitable that they should have this opportunity, because, had they been separate corporations and had there been a holding corporation, they would have come within the provisions of the present law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an example of just what I was speaking about a few moments ago. I was saying that if this were done in one case, it would open the door to similar exceptions for other companies. I do not know the nature of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Pennsylvania, but apparently it refers to another company which is operating two different types of business. The question I should like to ask is this: Should we, in the concluding days of this session, make such provisions for independent companies, through legislation intended more or less for them, thus driving holes in the general tax structure, or should these matters be considered by the Finance Committee with a view to general application? A tax system can be destroyed by individual exceptions. The people who get the individual exceptions are those who are able to put up the most persuasive case and who have the most influence at court. Is that the way we want to frame our tax structure? It seems to me to be an extremely dubious proceeding.

I know that when a Senator rises to make an objection, he puts himself in a very disagreeable position. It looks as though he is both self-righteous and a poor sport, in trying to deny relief to people, and so forth. That is not at all the case, but it would seem that proposals such as this must have a tendency to undermine the tax structure of the country.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, may I have 5 minutes more in which to reply to the distinguished Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regretfully informs the Senator

from Pennsylvania that he has consumed his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank my distinguished friend from Illinois. The purpose of this amendment is to do equity. The Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee put in long hours considering the excess profits tax law. We tried to provide a base which would be fair and equitable to all concerned, both to the Government and to the taxpayer. In these two particular cases, if these corporations had had a holding company and had been incorporated, they would have come under the law as it was enacted; but unfortunately they did not. However, the operations were quite as distinct as if they had been incorporated. For that reason, Mr. President, I feel that it is just and equitable that this amendment be adopted. I hope the Senate will adopt it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in addition to what the Senator from Pennsylvania has stated, I may say that while this is not a committee amendment, it deals with a problem which has been studied by our committee. As a matter of fact, we went into this problem at the time of the passage of the Excess Profits Act. The Senator is quite right in his statement. If these branch operations were carried on under separate corporate charter, the companies involved would receive the relief which this bill grants. Not only is that true, Mr. President, but under the World War II Excess Profits Act they would have received relief under section 722 of that act. All that this amendment seeks to accomplish is that if a company, through a branch, is doing a substantially different and new business, and sustains a loss in that branch, that loss shall not reduce the base-period earnings from its other activities, provided the loss exceeded 15 percent of the aggregate excess-profits income of the base period. Thus the loss must be substantial before the taxpayer can get this relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I desire to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. Section 319 (c) of the Revenue Act of 1951 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Effective date: The amendments made by this section shall be effective on and after January 1, 1951."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, section 319 of the Revenue Act of 1951 extended percentage depletion to additional minerals and increased the percentage for coal from 5 to 10 percent. Subsection (c) provided that the amendments made by section 319 should be applicable "only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950."

Under subsection (c), calendar year taxpayers are entitled to percentage depletion beginning January 1, 1951. They will have the benefit of such depletion for all 12 months in 1951. Thus, a taxpayer with a fiscal year ending November 30 will be denied percentage depletion for 11 months in 1951.

We do not believe Congress intended to discriminate between taxpayers simply because some have a calendar-year period of accounting and others have fiscal-year periods of accounting. Yet under section 319 fiscal-year taxpayers may lose from 1 to 11 months of percentage depletion in 1951.

This discrimination can be eliminated by having section 319 take effect as of January 1, 1951, for all taxpayers, irrespective of their accounting periods.

The amendment which I have offered will accomplish this result.

To my mind, it is the only fair way of treating taxpayers. I hope the amendment will be accepted by the Senator from Georgia.

The Senator from Georgia has been a Member of the Senate a long time, Mr. President, and he has been chairman of the Finance Committee a long time. I do not believe there is any Senator in this Chamber who has half the information about tax matters as has the Senator from Georgia. He is an expert on tax matters. It seems to me we should follow his advice on these questions. He is a perfectly fair and just man. Why should we not accept his proposals concerning tax questions, so that all taxpayers may be treated alike?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as each amendment is added to the bill it adds to my original argument. My good friend from Pennsylvania added an amendment, and the Senator from Tennessee adds another amendment. Is it wise to revise the tax structure, point by point, in this hurried way, on the floor of the Senate, or should these questions receive general consideration by the Finance Committee, which the Senate can consider after hearings have been printed, with the information available?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, may I say that when we increased depletion allowances and added new depletion allowances in the Revenue Act of 1951, we applied the relief only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. We did not take care of fiscal-year corporations for taxable years which began before January 1, 1950, and ended in 1951. Thus a fiscal corporation, whose year ended November 30 would have 11 months falling in 1951 and it would get no relief until the next year. All the amendment seeks to do is to give to the fiscal-year corporations, in computing depletion allowances granted under the 1951 law the benefit of such allowances with respect to that part of their year falling within 1951. All of these amendments, may I say to the Senator from Illinois, cover pure hardship cases, and while they may cover only a few taxpayers, they have general application so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the eminent chairman inform me whether hearings have been held on the proposals of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEORGE. No, we have not had any specific hearings, but we did consider the situation presented by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. We did generally consider the depletion question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with great respect for the eminent chairman of the Finance Committee, for his ability, his character, and his sense of fairness, I most respectfully object to the bill. I am not objecting merely because of the amendment in the committee, but also because of the amendment added by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the amendment added by the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in accord with each of the amendments which have been offered and adopted because I think they do straighten out difficulties which have appeared in the cases of certain classes of taxpayers who are entitled to relief. We knew when we passed the Excess Profits Tax Act that we would find just such cases, and that, unless we were willing to give them relief, the act would bear down much more heavily upon some than upon others, and in a different way upon some than upon others.

If the distinguished Senator from Illinois is going to insist on objecting to the amendments, I am hopeful that the Senators may withdraw their amendments, because the act as it came over from the House would do what the Senate has already done by floor action in 1950, when we considered the original excess profits tax bill. In conference our action at that time was held up because it seemed to require additional study.

As I understand, the House measure has been agreed to by the Treasury itself and has recognized the situation that under the maritime law shipping companies are required to build up deposits, and the House bill is designed to recognize and allow for the fact that, in certain conditions, a shipping company has heretofore built up its deposits in the base period more quickly than it is now contributing to them, so that the excess of its earlier deposits over its present deposits may be regarded as part of its base period earnings and added to its base period income to be used as a credit in computing its excess profit taxes.

We have now apparently reached a situation under which both committees,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, have recognized that the approach in the House bill is eminently fair and badly needed, thus justifying the action of the Senate in the passage of the applicable provision in the Senate bill in 1950.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will to Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may just finish this statement.

I regret to see this action of both committees, now supported by the action of the Treasury, jeopardized by the acceptance of amendments which I am perfectly willing to approve, but which, if accepted, will deprive of relief a large number of ship operators who are entitled to the passage of the bill in its original form.

I hope that those who have insisted upon their amendments may now be willing to reconsider their action, in view of the announcement of the Senator from Illinois that he objects.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is impossible for me to understand how any Senators on the floor would object to an amendment of the kind I have offered. I do not understand the situation. It is most remarkable. Without any knowledge of the subject at all, Senators object. I am not going to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not objecting. I voted with the Senator for his amendment. I voted with the Senator from Pennsylvania, and I voted with the committee for the amendment, which they had attached to the House bill. But I am interested in seeing justice done to a large class of taxpayers who apparently are going to be defeated in the second effort of the Senate and the second effort of Congress to give them relief. I hope that Senators will not insist upon tacking upon the bill, eminently fair and just as it is, a group of amendments which have not been subjected to the same study as has the original House bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois withhold his objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withhold my objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that anyone who desires to be fair can appreciate the position in which the able Senator from Illinois finds himself. I certainly sympathize with the idea that we ought not be adding amendments for individuals or groups of companies. I have no particular quarrel with that practice, but there is one point I should like to submit, and I hope the able Senator from Illinois will listen.

The excess-profits tax can never be a fair tax, for the simple reason that every corporation, as it goes through its history and its life, finds itself in different positions at different times.

Whenever we try to say that we shall use as a base period any 3 years or 4 years or 2 years, we are going to do great damage to a large number of corporations. There is just no escape from that conclusion. It seems to me fair that when it is called to the attention of Congress that under the excess-profits law, an injustice has been done to a group of corporations, or even an individual corporation, because we are here to legislate and protect one man as well as 150,000,000, we ought to correct the injustice because it is almost impossible to write a tax law that is fair to each individual.

I could spend hours in giving examples of excess-profits taxes in World War II and how they worked hardships and injustice. I shall give one example of two companies making the same product. One of them, by virtue of circumstances which existed in the base period, made absolutely no money during the excess-profits period during the war. Another company, because of a condition which existed during the base period, made tremendous profits.

An excess-profits law that is fair cannot be written, because companies, as they go through their histories, have different conditions existing during the base period.

I can understand the viewpoint of the able Senator from Illinois, but at the same time I feel that when an injustice is called to our attention under the excess-profits law, we ought to correct it, whether it be for only one company or for a group, or whether it be for all, because the law in itself is unfair. There is simply no equity in the law. There never can be any equity in the law. I do not know of a better way in which to raise taxes than through an excess-profits law, but, at the same time, it works a terrific hardship on many corporations.

I hope the able Senator from Illinois will withdraw his objection while I agree with his conclusion that we ought not do these things, yet, on the other hand, I do not know of any other way in which justice can be done.

We simply cannot work out an excess-profits law with a base period that is not going to give many a tremendous advantage and result in a terrific injustice to others.

called to our attention, where the com-

I believe that as cases of hardship are plaints are honest, and an injustice has been done, it is the duty of Congress to correct the injustice. I do not believe we should go wild about it, but I think we ought to correct injustices.

I was hopeful that the able Senator from Illinois might withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois insist on his objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it seems very ungracious of me to be compelled to do so. I appreciate the arguments of the Senator from Indiana, but I should like to point out that his arguments apply to any tax bill which applies uniform rules to different people under different circumstances. If, then, by a series of amendments we try to take care of individuals, we get into a tax schedule which ultimately becomes a monstrosity. My suggestion, therefore, is that these questions be the subject of inquiry by the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House in connection with systematic revision of the excess-profits law, if such a revision is needed, rather than through amendments which are more or less hastily brought forward, without hearings, and without the Senate as a whole having full information.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can agree with the Senator in respect to most tax laws, but not the excess-profits tax law, which contains a base period which is arbitrarily fixed. In this instance, I think the base period is 4 years. It is not possible to write a law that will apply equally to every corporation in the United States. Necessarily there will be injustices. It means nothing to the Government, but in all fairness to the taxpayer himself, the situation ought to be corrected, because he is in competition with other companies. If we burden him with something that his competitors do not have to meet, then we put him in a very bad position.

I know nothing about the case cited by the able Senator from Pennsylvania, or the cases with which the able Senator from Tennessee is concerned, but I do know the substance of them pretty well from experience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for debate has expired.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is insisted upon. The Senator from Illinois objects to the present consideration of the bill, so the bill goes over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Florida. The original bill is short, and inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois seems to be adamant in his objection to the amendments to the bill, rather than to the bill itself, I thought I might ask whether the Senators would not withdraw their amendments, and allow us to pass the original bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar 1765, H. R. 8271, go to the foot of the calendar, in order that we may be able to work out the matter of withdrawal of the amendments, and let the bill be passed.

I should like the attention of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The attention of the Senator from Illinois is requested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would agree with me then, because of the late hour in the session, we might allow the bill, Calendar 1765, H. R. 8271, go to the foot of the calendar, so that we might try to work out with those who proposed the amendments to the bill, which is a very worthy bill, the matter of withdrawing the amendments, so that we might pass the original bill, inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois apparently proposes to object to the amendments, but not to the bill itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Washington has correctly stated the purpose of the Senator from Illinois. I have no objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar, but I wish to

make it clear that if it then contains the amendments which have been added today, I shall reluctantly be compelled to object again. But I shall not object to the bill in its original form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. McKELLAR. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PARTICIPATION BY CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN FUNERALS OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7806) to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The Solicitor of the Department of Commerce shall hereafter be designated as the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, and all laws and orders relating to or referring to the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce shall be deemed to relate to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed language would be to cause an administerial change in the designation of the chief legal officer of the Department of Commerce from that of Solicitor to that of General Counsel.

This change is in consonance with the revised organizational structure of the Department, and is more accurate in describing the chief legal officer in the capacity of General Counsel rather than as Solicitor. The title of Solicitor is used for the primary legal officer of the subordinate bureaus of the Department. The change would also be more in keeping with the practices in the legal profession both in and outside of government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial, and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce."

SALE OF LAND IN ALASKA TO VICTORY BIBLE CAMP GROUND, INC.

The bill (H. R. 1558) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 9, after the word "deposits", to add the words "including oil and gas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED AUTHORIZATION FOR ISSUANCE OF BONDS BY CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 5327) to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.) relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF LAND TO BENCH LAND IRRIGATION CO., UTAH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7305) to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon will permit this bill to be passed over for a few minutes until I can get in touch with the author of the bill in the House, Mr. GRANGER. Probably the amendment will not be objected to. I am trying to get in touch with Mr. GRANGER.

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to withhold the amendment; but knowing Mr. GRANGER as I do, I shall be very much surprised if he does not advise acceptance of the amendment, because the amendment is consistent with the report of the committee. However, by oversight, I think, the bill omitted the reservation with respect to minerals and oil and gas. I think it was the intention, as I read the letter from Mr. Doty, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to include such a provision. I think it was taken for granted that such a reservation would be in the bill. My judgment is that it was a matter of oversight that it was omitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon object to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Mr. GRANGER is here, and he says he has no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. There are hereby reserved to the United States all rights to minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN 10-YEAR OIL AND GAS LEASES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2236) to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That any lease issued for a 10-year term in exchange for an oil and gas prospecting permit pursuant to sections 13 and 17 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920, as amended by the act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 674), and prior to amendment by the act of August 8, 1946, and upon which drilling operations were being diligently prosecuted on the expiration date of such lease, prior to the effective date of this act, is hereby reinstated effective from the expiration date of the lease and shall continue in effect for a period of 2 years after the effective date of this act and so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced in paying quantities, if, within 90 days after the enactment of this act, payment is made, under the terms of such lease as reinstated and extended, of any sums due the United States for prior years. This act shall not be applicable to any lands which, subsequent to such expiration and prior to the enactment of this act, have been withdrawn from leasing, leased, or otherwise disposed of.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, this bill has been considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and reported to the Senate. It is identical with a House bill which has already been passed by the House. Both the Senate and House bills were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5788, and that the House bill be substituted for Senate bill 2236.

Both bills were before the committee, but inasmuch as the Senate bill is identical with the House bill, I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair is advised

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that the bill will have to be physically produced from the committee.

Mr. ECTON. I have the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator can produce the bill from the committee, it can be considered now.

Mr. ECTON. I send the bill to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of House bill 5788. Is there objection to the present consideration of that bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5788) to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, Senate bill 2236 is indefinitely postponed.

SALE TO WILLIAM BIG DAY OF LAND ON CROW RESERVATION, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 5917) to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO FRANKLIN YARLOTT

The bill (H. R. 7009) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENTS IN FEE TO CERTAIN ALLOTTEES ON CROW RESERVATION, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 7303) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO VIOLA DELANEY

The bill (H. R. 7301) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO JOHN B. CUMMINS

The bill (H. R. 6681) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS FOR LOCATION OF WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES

The bill (H. R. 4197) to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, T. H., the status of Hawaiian home lands was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I inadvertently objected to H. R. 4197. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the bill (H. R. 4197) to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawashine, on the island of Oahu, T. H., the status of Hawaiian home lands, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATE COMPACT RELATING TO WATERS OF COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

The bill (H. R. 2470) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over. Mr. President, I think I inadvertently objected to Calendar 1776, House bill 4197, which I had no intention of objecting to. However, I ask the Calendar 1777, House bill 2470, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to return to Calendar No. 1776?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Later I shall ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1776, House bill 4197.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, has my colleague asked that Calendar 1777, House bill 2470, be passed over only for so long a time as will be required to reconsider the action with respect to Calendar 1776, House bill 4197, or has my colleague some substantial objection to the passage of House bill 2470?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I object to passage of House bill 2470, for many reasons, but mainly by request.

The bill has been before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I know that members of the committee have given it some consideration. But since the bill has been reported I have received not one, but several, requests from the State of Washington, from people who want to testify on the matter, but who did not have the opportunity to testify. No hearings were held on the bill. A water compact is a very serious matter, which requires a great deal of study. I do not say that the committee did not study the subject as a committee, but many people want to be heard, and I object to the passage of the bill at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I find my colleague's explanation to be most interesting.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Washington?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Wyoming for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that this is not a compact. This is only permission for the States to start negotiations looking toward a compact. I know that my State is very anxious to get the compact negotiations under way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If I may repeat certain information which comes from my State, I understand that preliminary meetings have been held looking toward negotiations for such a compact. My only reason for objecting is that I have had not one but several requests from people who want to testify about what they consider to be a very important subject. In a sense, I am objecting by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington objects. The bill goes over.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3407) to promote the production of vital steel and steel products during the current emergency was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 161) to create a Commission on Labor-Management Relations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution goes over.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN RECREATIONAL FACILITIES FROM TAX

The bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed thereon was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like very much to have an explanation of the bill for the RECORD.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, section 1 removes the tax on bowling alleys and billiard and pool tables maintained on Government property for the benefit of

the Armed Forces where no charge is made for their use and when the exclusive benefit goes to the members of the Armed Forces.

The bill was requested by the Defense Department. The Committee on Finance has recommended two amendments to the bill.

One is contained in section 2 of the bill and fixes the expiration date for filing claims for net renegotiation rebates arising under the World War II statute. Such claims could not be filed until the audit was completed. In the Revenue Act of 1950 this period was extended from June 30, 1951, to October 31, 1951. This time was found insufficient to enable some taxpayers to file their claim and the bill further extends the time to December 31, 1952. I understand the Defense Department feels this should be done.

That amendment was offered by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Another is contained in section 3. That section merely gives an additional period of 12 months for the substitution of the proper party in proceedings before the courts, including the Tax Court, in connection with renegotiation proceedings under the World War II Renegotiation law. It is necessary to substitute a new party because the old renegotiation board has been abolished.

I do not think there can be any valid objection to the two minor amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—let me remark that as the bill came from the House it dealt with taxes on bowling alleys and pool tables. Now the committee has added a change in the Renegotiation Act. It would seem to me to be a hybrid combination, indeed, in that the amendment is really not connected with the original bill.

There is a limit to the nuisance that one can make of oneself to the grave and reverend seniors of this august body. Therefore, I do not intend to object to the measure. I should like to point out, however, that it is really a question of whether the Committee on Finance should take a bill dealing with one subject and tack on amendments dealing with an entirely different subject. If the laws are to be revised, it seems to me they should be revised in a systematic fashion, and not by amendment to an original House bill. I shall not object. I offer what I have said for the consideration of the Committee on Finance and of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Subsection (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act, as amended by section 201 (c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 and by section 617 of the Revenue Act of 1951, is hereby amended by striking out "October 31, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1952."

And on page 2, after line 7, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. Section 201 (h) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 is amended by striking out "twelve months" and inserting in lieu thereof "two years."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes."

ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION, ETC., OF CERTAIN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

The bill (H. R. 7641) to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRAUD AND INDECENCY STATUTES—IMPOUNDING OF MAIL—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5850) to authorize the Postmaster General to impound mail in certain cases was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask what the purpose of the bill is?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The bill was introduced at the request of the Postmaster General. He said that a great deal of matter, such as lottery proposals, get-rich-quick schemes, indecent photographs, and so forth, go through the mail. After the schemes are in the mail, and the first money comes back from the victims the originator of the scheme or of the sale leaves the country.

Being familiar with the Esquire case in which Esquire magazine was impounded, the Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, after the House bill was received, asked the American Bar Association to propose an amendment which would guarantee legal rights to anyone whose property was impounded. The American Bar Association suggested an amendment and the American Newspaper Publishers' Association approved it, feeling that it would protect any legitimate user of the mail. With that amendment the committee has favorably reported the bill, in order to give the Post Office Department a better opportunity to impound mail.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky state whether any standards are provided in the bill to guide the Postmaster General, or does it leave the matter entirely within his discretion?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It gives rather blanket authority to him to impound any mail which is obscene or which has for its purpose defrauding the public or promoting lotteries.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Postmaster General is the sole judge?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct. It is left arbitrarily in his discretion.

There was some doubt about it. However, the Postmaster General said that he and his assistants felt this was a very difficult problem. The acts complained of are performed largely by people who are not citizens of the United States, but come here from another country, and then leave immediately after promoting their schemes. I am sure the Senator understands that we desire to protect publishers of newspapers and magazines and anyone who is in legitimate business. So the amendment was added in order to give the needed relief to anyone who went before a Federal court and asked for the release of such property.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Was the committee unanimous in reporting the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The subcommittee was unanimous. I do not remember about the full committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on that point I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield, if he will.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me say that I objected to the bill and voted against it when it came before the full committee. I did so on the very ground the Senator from New Jersey indicated, namely, that the bill would give the Postmaster General authority to become a censor of everyone's mail. Whatever he might regard as objectionable, he would have authority to impound, under the provisions of this bill; and in that event, the only way the person who sent the mail could get it back would be to file suit in the district court, and in the course of the suit he would have to prove that the Postmaster General had acted capriciously or without proper basis. Such an arrangement would have the effect of declaring such person guilty until he was proved innocent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida object to the bill?

Mr. SMATHERS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have received from one of my constituents a letter which gives me great concern about this bill. I am glad the Senator

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from Florida has objected to the bill. I should like to read the letter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been asked for.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill gives the Postmaster General authority to impound mail addressed to any person against whom proceedings have been instituted in connection with obtaining money through the mail in exchange for any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile material, pending final decision of the issues involved in the proceedings. This means in effect that if the Department independently determines that a book is obscene, and institutes proper administered proceedings, all mail addressed to the publisher may be impounded until final decision of the issues, which may be a matter of years, and which may ultimately establish that the book is in fact not obscene.

Legitimate curbs on traffic in pornography are certainly desirable and, within reasonable limitations, may properly be administered by the Post Office Department when the traffic results in a misuse of the mailing privilege. The need for regulation of this sort cannot, however, justify giving to the Postmaster General the power to impound not only the offending work but all incoming mail in advance of a hearing and determination on the merits. This is in fact the power to control the industry by precensorship in violation of the Bill of Rights and of the basic tenets of our democracy. It is the power of life and death over the publishing industry. Moreover, it strikes not only at the publisher but at innocent third persons whose property rights are thus invaded without due process of law.

REGULATION OF RECTIFYING PLANTS—STATEMENT OF OBJECTION TO HOUSE BILL 6366

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, a bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee has not yet been reached on the calendar. It is House bill 6366, calendar 1798. That bill was reported by the Finance Committee but at the time there were some requests for hearings on the bill. However, the committee overlooked those requests.

As a matter of mere fairness to the taxpayers who are interested in this particular measure, I am taking authority on behalf of the committee to ask that the bill go over, when it is reached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent to have his objection to House bill 6366, calendar 1798 noted at this time. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the objection will be noted when that measure is reached.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Chair very much.

POSTHUMOUS ISSUANCE OF NAVY COMMISSION TO WILLIAM S. COX

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox, a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIMITATION ON JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN BOARDS OF REVIEW—BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6769) to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say this bill passed the House without objection. It relates to a technical provision of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, whereby the discharge of an individual who received a bad conduct discharge as a result of a sentence of a special court martial may have his case readjudicated by an administrative board of review set up under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

As the Senators know, the present court martial system sets up an elaborate appellate procedure—one which was recently completely overhauled and approved by the Congress.

Mr. President, after the Armed Services Committee had also approved the bill, I was advised directly by the American Legion that it had serious objection to passage of the bill.

Therefore, even though I conducted the hearings on the part of the Armed Services Committee, I feel that I must request that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

PAYMENTS FOR ACCRUED LEAVE TO ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL WHO IMMEDIATELY REENLIST FOLLOWING DISCHARGE

The bill (S. 2262) to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a), notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (c) of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, as amended (37 U. S. C. 33 (c)), any payments for accrued leave heretofore erroneously made to any member of the Armed Forces who was discharged after August 31, 1946, for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period are hereby validated.

(b) In any case in which any member or former member of the Armed Forces of the United States has received any erroneous payment which is validated by subsection (a) of this section and has been required to repay to the United States all or a portion of such erroneous payment, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such member or former member, or in the event he is deceased, to the person entitled to receive his arrears of pay in accordance with the act of June 30, 1906, as amended (10 U. S. C. 868), a sum equal to any amount so repaid which has not been refunded to him.

(c) The Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for any payment validated by this act.

ACTIVE-DUTY STATUS FOR UNITED STATES PROPERTY AND DISBURSING OFFICERS

The bill (S. 1393) to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and disbursing officers was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill and may we have some estimate of the cost of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this bill relates to the status of United States property and disbursing officers of each of the several States.

These officers are charged with the receipt and custody of all property turned over to the National Guard by the Federal Government for the use of their particular States.

Prior to World War II, these officers occupied a civilian status. When the Guard was reconstituted after the war, these officers were given an active-duty status under the Emergency War Powers.

The purpose of the bill is to make the current arrangement, which is a temporary one, permanent.

In reply to the question of the Senator from New Jersey, let me state that the bill, when enacted, will not result in an additional charge of any kind.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. None whatsoever?

Mr. HUNT. None whatsoever.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1393), which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, after line 5, to strike out:

Property and disbursing officers: The governor of each State and Territory and the commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia shall appoint, designate, or detail, subject to the approval of the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, a qualified officer of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who is an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia and who shall be the property and disbursing officer of the United States. The President may with the consent of the officer concerned order him to active duty to serve as United States property and disbursing officer in his respective State, Territory, or District of Columbia, and upon relief from assignment as United States property and disbursing officer he shall revert to his National Guard or Air National Guard status. The United States property and disbursing officer shall receipt and account for all funds

and property belonging to the United States in possession of the National or Air National Guard of his State, Territory, or District of Columbia and shall make such returns and reports pertaining thereto as may be required by the Secretary concerned. The Secretaries of the Army and Air Force are authorized, on the requisition of the governor of a State or Territory or the commanding general of the National Guard of the District of Columbia, to pay to the property and disbursing officer thereof so much of its allotment out of the annual appropriation for the support of the National Guard or Air National Guard, as appropriate, as shall, in the judgment of the Secretary concerned be necessary for the purposes enumerated therein. The United States property and disbursing officer shall render, through the Departments of the Army and Air Force, such accounts of Federal funds entrusted to him for disbursement as may be required by the General Accounting Office. Before entering upon the performance of his duties as property and disbursing officer he shall be required to give good and sufficient bond to the United States, the amount thereof to be determined by the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, for the faithful performance of his duties and for the safekeeping and proper disposition of the Federal property and funds entrusted to his care. He shall receive the pay and allowances as provided by law and shall be paid out of funds as appropriated for the pay of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard, as appropriate: *Provided*, That the Secretary concerned shall cause an inspection of the pertinent accounts and records of the property and disbursing officer to be made by an inspector general of his department at least once each year: *And provided further*, That the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force are empowered to make joint rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Property and fiscal officers: The Secretary of the Army, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force and the governor or other authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, may appoint, designate or detail as United States property and fiscal officer, a Regular officer of the Army or the Air Force or a qualified officer of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States who is an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The President may with the consent of the officer concerned, if such officer is not on active duty, order him to active duty to serve as United States property and fiscal officer of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for which appointed, designated, or detailed, and upon relief from assignment as United States property and fiscal officer, if such officer is not a member of a Regular component, he shall revert to his National Guard or Air National Guard status. The United States property and fiscal officer shall receipt and account for all funds and property belonging to the United States in possession of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and shall make such returns and reports pertaining thereto as may be required by the appropriate Secretary. Before entering upon his duties as property and fiscal officer he shall be required to give good and sufficient bond to the United States, the amount thereof to be determined by the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, for the faithful performance of his duties and for the safekeeping and proper disposition of the Federal property entrusted to his care. He shall receive pay and allowances provided by law. The appropriate Secretary shall cause an inspection of the pertinent accounts and records of the United States property and fiscal officer to be made by an inspector general of his department at least once each year. The Secretaries are empowered to make joint rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third paragraph of section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended (32 U. S. C. 49), is amended to read as follows:

"Property and fiscal officers: The Secretary of the Army, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force and the governor or other authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, may appoint, designate or detail as United States property and fiscal officer, a Regular officer of the Army or the Air Force or a qualified officer of the National Guard of the United States or of the Air National Guard of the United States who is an officer of the National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia. The President may with the consent of the officer concerned, if such officer is not on active duty, order him to active duty to serve as United States property and fiscal officer of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, for which appointed, designated or detailed, and upon relief from assignment as United States property and fiscal officer, if such officer is not a member of a Regular component, he shall revert to his National Guard or Air National Guard status. The United States property and fiscal officer shall receipt and account for all funds and property belonging to the United States in possession of the National Guard or Air National Guard of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and shall make such returns and reports pertaining thereto as may be required by the appropriate Secretary. Before entering upon his duties as property and fiscal officer he shall be required to give good and sufficient bond to the United States, the amount thereof to be determined by the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, for the faithful performance of his duties and for the safekeeping and proper disposition of the Federal property entrusted to his care. He shall receive pay and allowances provided by law. The appropriate Secretary shall cause an inspection of the pertinent accounts and records of the United States property and fiscal officer to be made by an inspector general of his department at least once each year. The Secretaries are empowered to make joint rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers, and for other purposes."

PREFERENCE PRIMARIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2570) to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this bill should not be brought up under the 5-minute rule, and I object to present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with a statement I have prepared in support of the bill, and certain statistical tables about the degree of the primary turn-out this year.

There being no objection, the bill, statement, and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 2570) to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the Attorney General is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with any State (1) which shall, prior to January 1, 1956, enact a law specifically authorizing an official or officials of the State to enter into such agreement on behalf of such State, and (2) under the laws of which preferential primary elections are held not earlier than February 1, or later than May 31, of each presidential election year for the purpose of suggesting nominees for President and Vice President to each political party polling a popular vote of more than 10,000,000 in the last preceding presidential election.

(b) Any such agreement entered into under this act shall provide for the payment by the Attorney General to the State of an amount equal to the costs necessarily incurred by the State in conducting any such preferential primary election, but not exceeding 20 cents for each vote cast in such preferential primary election. Any State which is a party to any such agreement shall agree to include on the ballot in any such preferential primary election the names of candidates certified to it by the Attorney General, as provided in section 2 of this act, but nothing contained in this act, or in any agreement entered into under authority of this act, shall be construed as prohibiting any State from including on any such ballot the names of persons other than those certified to it by the Attorney General.

(c) Before entering into any agreement with any State under this act, the Attorney General may, whenever he deems it to be necessary or desirable, require from the chief law officer of the State a written opinion to the effect that such State may lawfully enter into such agreement and can lawfully carry out any obligation assumed thereunder.

SEC. 2. (a) The Attorney General shall certify to any State, pursuant to an agreement entered into under the first section of this act, the names of candidates for inclusion on ballots prepared by such State for use in preferential primary elections to be held in such State for the purpose of suggesting nominees for President and Vice President. No such name shall be certified to any State unless there shall have been filed with the Attorney General, not later than 60 days prior to any preferential primary election to be held in such State, a petition on behalf of the person whose name is so certified (1) signed by at least 500 qualified voters in each of three-fourths of the States entering into agreements under this act, and (2) specifying the political party on the ballots of which it is desired to place the name of such person.

(b) Whenever the Attorney General shall receive a petition which appears to qualify the name of a candidate for President or Vice President, he shall forthwith notify the prospective candidate by the most expeditious means of communication and shall advise such prospective candidate that, unless he requests within 10 days after receipt of such notice that his name not be used, his

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

name will be certified to the several States for inclusion on the ballots of the party specified in such petition which are to be used at presidential preference primaries to be held in such States. If the candidate requests that his name not be used for the purpose of inclusion on the ballots of such party within the above time limit, the Attorney General shall not certify his name for such purpose to any State. If a candidate does not refuse to give his consent to the use of his name within the above time limit, the Attorney General shall certify his name as provided in subsection (a) for inclusion on the ballots of the party specified in such petition.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective on January 1, 1953.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

As the conventions draw near, the needs and demands for electoral reform are becoming glaringly evident. Something needs to be done about our present situation which permits the party professionals to decide who shall become the party presidential nominee by a lot of deals, horse trading, and downright shenanigans. Agreements and compromises in the selection of a presidential candidate are undoubtedly necessary. But when these are made in a public-opinion vacuum, without the voter having any voice at all, the democratic process is not working.

In almost all of the States where charges and countercharges are being hurled and where rival delegations will go to Chicago there was no presidential primary of any kind. There is no way that the people of these States can make their preferences definitely known, and therefore there have been disputes. On the other hand, only a few disputes have taken place in the some 15 States which have presidential-preference primaries. In most of these States the will of the rank-and-file party members has expressed itself in such clear tones that the political leaders risk their future careers by attempting to muffle these clear tones.

The people have been banging at the door of the smoke-filled room for a long time. The 60,000,000 voteless citizens of our nonprimary States have naturally tried hardest to knock down the door of the smoke-filled room. But not only the 60,000,000 voteless have been active. The minority who live in primary States have demonstrated that, wherever given a chance, the people will do their utmost to express their presidential preferences. Now that television enables the presidential candidates to, so to say, visit the people in their own living rooms, the people in those States where they can avoid it will not take any hand-me-down candidates from the political bosses. According to the Library of Congress, three times as many people voted in presidential primaries in 1952 as voted in such primaries in 1948. This is most illuminating. So, also, is the abnormally high percentage of write-in-votes in this year's primaries. Over 11 percent of the voters in the 1952 primaries took the trouble to write in a name other than one which appeared on the ballot. Need we have more proof that the people want to have the presidential-primary system extended?

I should like to have included in the RECORD some tables which the Library of Congress has prepared on primary-vote participation in 1948 and 1952.

If, as I sincerely hope it will, the Senate passes the primary bill, the people will have a foot in the door of the smoke-filled room. This primary bill, which is sponsored by Senators in both parties, will not necessarily rid us of all the evils in our present system of nominating presidential candidates. It directs the Attorney General to negotiate agreements with States planning to hold presidential-preference primaries between February 1 and May 31 of an election year. The States are encouraged to sign agreements with the Attorney General, since if they sign they will receive financial assistance for their election expenses. These agreements would provide for a consideration which is limited to a ceiling of 20 cents for each vote cast in a State presidential-preference primary. In return for this Federal assistance, the States would promise to include on their primary ballot the names of presidential candidates on whose behalf nominating petitions have been signed by 500 voters in three-fourths of the States participating in these agreements. No State is forced to institute a presidential-primary system. Agreements between the States and the Attorney General are to be negotiated at the State's initiative. After the agreements are negotiated, it is the States, not the Attorney General, that decide what type of primary is to be held and the ground rules for this primary.

I am asking that the Senate today pass the primary bill because this bill embodies the spirit of democracy which pervades our national history. As the great President Abraham Lincoln stated in the Gettysburg Address, ours is a "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Our history has been a constant succession of events whereby we have come closer and closer to the attainment of this ideal. The removal of discretionary voting in the presidential electoral college, the elimination of property qualifications, the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, the women's suffrage reforms, and the direct election of Senators have all helped in this direction. We should now be ready to take another step the extension of the preferential-presidential primary.

Presidential preference primaries popular votes in 1948 and 1952

States	1952	1948
California	2,954,791	1,581,440
Florida	[1] 653,333	[3]
Illinois	1,872,435	354,354
Maryland	154,269	[3]
Massachusetts	434,922	123,389
Minnesota	418,789	[3]
Nebraska	318,590	254,573
New Hampshire	136,159	77,946
New Jersey	800,862	10,165
Oregon	392,024	345,898
Pennsylvania	1,290,618	483,724
South Dakota	162,150	64,772
West Virginia	128,026	133,185
Wisconsin	1,018,149	193,071
Total	10,735,122	3,622,117

[1] Democrats only.
[2] Figures unavailable.
[3] No primary held.

Sources: 1948 figures from official reports of secretaries of the States; 1952 figures from official reports of canvassing boards supplemented by newspaper accounts.

Write-in votes cast in Presidential preferential primaries in 1952

State	Total votes cast	Write-ins		Total write-ins
		Democrats	Republicans	
California	[1] 2,954,791			
Florida	[1] 653,338			
Illinois	1,872,435	73,813	159,065	232,878
Maryland	[1] 154,269			
Massachusetts	434,922	64,609	370,313	434,922
Minnesota	418,789	25,569	139,905	165,474
Nebraska	318,590	2,332	142,432	144,764
New Hampshire	136,159	396	3,158	3,554
New Jersey	800,862	967	592	1,559
Oregon	392,024	434	3,574	4,008
Pennsylvania	1,290,618	140,706	175,815	316,521
South Dakota	[1] 162,150			
West Virginia	[1] 128,026			
Wisconsin	[1] 1,018,149			
Total	10,735,122	308,826	994,854	1,303,680

[1] Write-ins prohibited by State laws.

Sources: Official reports from secretaries of states supplemented by official figures published in newspapers.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF NEW YORK OF CERTAIN LAND FOR FORT SCHUYLER, N. Y., MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 4021) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill is passed over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, I objected to the consideration of House bill 4021, Calendar 1788, a bill dealing with submerged lands at Fort Schuyler.

Since then I have discussed with General Mudge, of the professional staff of the Armed Services Committee, the facts involved in connection with this bill.

So far as I am concerned, there is one controlling fact which I did not understand to be involved in the bill.

Because I shall withdraw my objection to consideration of the bill, I wish to make this statement in regard to the bill, so in the future there will be no question as to the basis of my approval of the bill.

This bill involves a piece of property which originally was deeded to the Federal Government by New York, for the specific purpose of military uses. The property has come to be used for the training of maritime officers, from which school the United States Navy obtains a supply of officers for the merchant marine, in connection with the military operations of the Navy, particularly in time of emergency or in time of war.

Some time ago the Senate passed a bill transferring this property to the State of New York, for maritime school purposes, on the basis of the assistance the school was to the United States Navy and to the Federal Government generally.

Apparently a mistake was made in connection with the transfer; the description of the property, in connection with the conveyance, did not include a description of the submerged land on which the docks for service to the school would be built. I have been assured by General Mudge that this bill involves correction of a mistake which was made in connection with carrying out the provisions of a bill which Congress already had passed, and therefore that this bill does not raise any question as to the so-called Morse formula.

Let me say for the RECORD that I am not thoroughly convinced whether the Morse formula was involved in the first transfer. That bill was passed, however, on the representation, so I am advised, that the service the Federal Government would receive from this school, as far as concerns the training of officers for the Navy in connection with the merchant marine, would certainly be a very valuable consideration, and a sufficient one to justify the transfer.

So my withdrawal of my objection to the bill today, Mr. President, has nothing to do, I wish to say, with the question of the consideration which may have been involved when the other bill was passed. Certainly in my opinion, as I said to General Mudge, I am not justified in objecting to the bill now, on the basis of the fact that the Morse formula ought to be applied, inasmuch as the bill seeks only to correct an error in the instruments of transfer connected with the original bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the bill, and I now ask unanimous consent that we proceed to the consideration of House bill 4021, Calendar No. 1788.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I very heartily thank my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for withdrawing his objection.

I am very much convinced that passage of this bill is definitely in the interest of both the State of New York and the Federal Government, who are cooperating so well in the training of officers for the merchant marine.

So I am very grateful to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that we return to House bill 4021, Calendar No. 1788; and I ask that the bill be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none.

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4021) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR WITHHOLDING PAY OF ARMED FORCES OFFICERS

The bill (S. 2727) to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that this bill is identical with House bill 6601, which passed the House yesterday. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be considered at this time, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6601) to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6601. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2727 is indefinitely postponed.

PAYMENT FOR TRANSPORTATION OF HOUSEHOLD GOODS OF CERTAIN NAVAL OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1993) to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service under certain conditions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this bill is identical with House bill 5065, which was passed by the House yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5065) to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5065) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1993 is indefinitely postponed.

PROVISION FOR SUNDRY ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AFFECTING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 3409) to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? I understand there is a companion bill.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this is a technical bill, and it is, I think, either the second or third version of the bill. Previous bills were not acceptable to the committee, because of objections raised by the Comptroller General. These objections have been met in Senate bill 3409, and the bill has been reported favorably by the committee. It has the concurrence of the Comptroller General. It deals with certain highly administrative matters which we have attempted to explain in detail in our report. We did not feel that there were any matters of important policy involved in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. In the main, the bill provides that when the Disbursing Office, for any of various reasons, objects to the payment of certain accounts on the part of the Navy, which were paid in error, the Disbursing Officer shall make available to the accounts of the Navy amounts equal to those which have been inadvertently misadministered or paid out through error.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, much as I should like to go along with the Senator from Wyoming, it appears to me that the proposed legislation is extremely important. I do not think that either the Navy or the Army is going to suffer if it waits 6 months in order to give Members of Congress a chance to look into it. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection momentarily, I can say to him that this bill passed the House yesterday without objection. I should be very happy to go into an extended discussion of the bill at this time, though it is very technical in nature, and involves accounting.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I do not think it should be passed on the Unanimous-Consent Calendar. I know that, on both sides of the Congress, bills were passed at the last session of the Congress, and their passage was later regretted. The Senator from Wyoming states that this is a very technical bill. I should like to know something about the technicalities. It is too important a bill to be considered on the Consent Calendar. With all due deference to the Senator from Wyoming, and assuring him of my desire to assist the committee, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill is passed over.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, when calendar 1792, Senate bill 3409, was called I understand that some Senator objected to the consideration of it. I wonder if I may have unanimous consent for the withholding of that objection until I can make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] entered objection.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico to withhold his objection in order that I may offer an amendment which I would have offered if the bill had not been passed over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

AMENDMENT OF ARMY AND AIR FORCE VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT OF 1948

The bill (S. 324) to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—but is it not the principal purpose of this bill to remove certain inequities presently existing?

Mr. HUNT. That is absolutely the purpose of the bill.

Mr. President, I want again to invite attention to the fact that the bill is identical with the House bill 1222, to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 1222) to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill 324 is indefinitely postponed.

RATE OF POSTAGE ON CERTAIN PUBLICATIONS ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER

The bill (S. 3263) relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think the RECORD should disclose an explanation of this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, in a previous session a bill to readjust postal mail rates was enacted. In that bill, by inadvertence, the rights which apply to certain publications of automobile clubs and other nonprofit organizations which have existed for 25 or 30 years were stricken. At the time the bill was presented on the floor it was explained that it was highly technical and that there might be some inequalities found in the bill. Since that time it has been developed that some of the larger automobile clubs which have a large membership other than in their own city of publication were paying higher rates than they should pay, and this bill simply gives them the lower rate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3263) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act to readjust postal rates," approved October 30, 1951 (Public Law 233, 82d Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The free-in-county mailing privilege and the rates of postage on copies of publications of the second class when addressed for delivery within the county in which they are published and entered as such shall be the same as authorized by existing law: *Provided*, That copies of a publication mailed at a post office where it is entered, for delivery by letter carriers at a different post office within the delivery limits of which the headquarters or general business office of the publisher is located (except any such publication entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932, which retains its entry at the post office where entered on such date), shall be chargeable with postage at the rate that would be applicable if the copies were mailed at the latter office, unless postage chargeable at the pound rates from the office of mailing is higher, in which case such higher rates shall apply."

LEASE OF QUARTERS FOR POST OFFICE PURPOSES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6839) to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will, but I do not think it will do any good.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I understand the objection which the Senator from New Mexico has to the bill applies to an amendment which has to be made to the bill on the recommendation of the committee. My understanding is that if the bill is not amended, the Senator from New Mexico would not object to the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, but it happens that the chairman of the committee who recommended the amendment is not present. I am not going to take advantage of his absence.

If the Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service withdraws the amendment the Senate committee made I should be delighted to agree to the bill, because I think it is good legislation. But, as amended as proposed, it interferes with the standing committee which should handle such legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But Mr. President, the amendment has not been adopted. I am sure it will not be adopted if the Senator will take the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would rather wait until the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, what calendar number are we considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1795, House bill 6839.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF INFLAMMABLE FABRICS, ETC.

The bill (S. 2918) to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to take time to discuss a subject matter I wanted to discuss a few minutes ago in connection with Calendar No. 1792, Senate bill 3409, to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes. If that bill had not been objected to, I would have offered an amendment to correct what I consider to be a very serious injustice which has been shown to two very fine officers in the Naval Establishment.

Mr. President, the amendment that I would offer is designed for the sole purpose of rectifying two long-standing proven injustices of nonpromotion in the Regular Navy that occurred under the hurry-up, rush, wartime administrative procedures of 1942 to 1945.

I wish to say at the outset, Mr. President, that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Georgia, has more than once voiced his favorable view of and support for a measure to accomplish what my amendment, if enacted, would accomplish.

It has been proposed in previous sessions of the Congress by the Senate, but was lost at the end of the session, so far as House action was concerned.

With specific reference to my amendment, he has this week stated, I am advised by Commander Rawlins that he has no objection whatever, the aim being to remove and rectify two established inequities, or injustices. In addition, Mr. President, I feel certain that the aims of my amendment have the full active support of at least six other Senators: the senior and junior Senators from Arkansas, the senior and junior Senators from Michigan, and the senior and junior Senators from Maryland.

One of the two injustices covered by my amendment is that of a Michigan officer, Commander Edward K. Shanahan, United States Navy (retired). I invite your attention to subsection 5 (b), Mr. President. His case, which occurred 10 years ago in 1942, was the subject of protracted intermittent hearings lasting 18 months from December 1947 to June 1949, conducted before a Navy Department board officially called "The

Board for the Correction of Naval Records." This board on June 14, 1949, in a letter to the Secretary of the Navy included the following specific recommendations:

(a) That the Secretary of the Navy initiate such action as may be necessary to completely rectify the established injustice, by effecting the promotion of Commander Shanahan to the rank of captain, United States Navy, with appropriate adjustment of lineal position.

(b) It is contemplated by the board that the above remedy should be accomplished by Executive appointment of the President or, as an alternative by act of Congress; and in either case upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy.

Four months passed. On October 26, 1949, in a reply to the board, the Secretary of the Navy declined to present private legislation for the relief of Commander Shanahan on the ground that general legislation was then pending in Congress "which would afford Commander Shanahan an opportunity for hearing and presumably effective remedy of the inquity claimed." Four months more passed. Then with blithe inconsistency the Navy Department in a hearing before a House Armed Services Subcommittee on February 2, 1950, opposed enactment of the very Senate-passed bill which in October they had said would afford Shanahan an opportunity for relief. This development led a member of that subcommittee to characterize the Navy Department's position as "inconsistent" and "absurd." In that characterization any fair-minded man would concur.

Subsection 5 (b) of the amendment I offer, Mr. President, will give long delayed and clearly well deserved relief to Commander Shanahan for an injustice that occurred 10 years ago in 1942.

I now invite your attention, Mr. President, to subsection 5 (a) of my amendment and to the second of the two established injustices that I aim to rectify. This is the case of a Maryland officer, Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy, retired. He is the only officer in the entire Navy who meets all the qualifications of subsection 5 (a), just as Commander Shanahan is the only officer who meets all the specifications of subsection 5 (b).

The injustice in Commander Rawlins' case goes back 9 years to 1943. It first came to the notice of Congress 3 years ago in 1949 in the form of a private relief bill sponsored by the then chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee. A Senate subcommittee—Senator JOHNSON of Texas, chairman—held detailed hearings on May 31, 1949, and a House subcommittee held protracted intermittent hearings from February to August 1950. The Senate committee report—No. 562, Eighty-first Congress—said in the part:

In the specific case of Commander Rawlins, there was evidence that he was an officer of excellent abilities with a long and favorable record in the Navy. * * * Evidence was submitted to the committee, both in verbal testimony and in the form of letters to the committee by highly placed officials of the Navy Department, including many former superiors of Rawlins, to the effect that they felt an injustice had been done. There was complete unanimity among even the official representatives of the Navy Department that Commander Rawlins was and is qualified to perform the duties of captain. * * * It was the opinion (of the committee) that the case presented in behalf of Commander Rawlins had considerable merit.

The House Armed Services Committee report—No. 3012, Eighty-first Congress—contains these significant sentences:

There is ample evidence in the record that Commander Rawlins may have suffered due to an administrative error. It appears that a letter was missing from his file (i. e. in the Navy Department) which would have refuted a detrimental statement concerning him.

Mr. President, among the high-ranking officers of the Navy who testified in person or in writing in behalf of Commander Rawlins were Admiral Denfeld, former Chief of Naval Operations; Admiral Robert B. Carney, present commander in chief, Allied Forces, Southern Europe; Admiral Thomas C. Hart, retired, former United States Senator; Rear Adm. E. E. Stone; Real Adm. R. E. Wilson; Rear Adm. W. S. Parr, retired; aiso Mr. Hanson W. Baldwin, of the New York Times.

In the light of the long detailed hearings by which it has been established that both Commander Shanahan and Commander Rawlins suffered injustices of wartime non-promotion with their classmate contemporaries, injustices which for too long have gone uncorrected, I urge, Mr. President, the approval of the amendment that I offer. The total retroactive cost will be less than $15,000, plus an estimated continuing total annual cost of less than $1,500.

Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to Senate bill 3409. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 5, insert the following:

"That the President of the United States is authorized and requested—

"(a) to promote any officer of the Regular Navy, active or retired, who—

"(1) was graduated from the United States Naval Academy prior to June 30, 1924; and

"(2) holds the permanent rank of commander; and

"(3) was promoted to the temporary grade of Commander, United States Navy, prior to September 1, 1942; and

"(4) completed 27 years continuous active commissioned service exclusively in the Regular Navy, in the calendar year 1951 without having once had an unsatisfactory fitness report, or had disciplinary action taken against him; and

"(5) holds one or more wartime awards; and

"(6) has been recommended by one or more flag officers of the Navy for promotion to captain;

to the grade of captain, United States Navy, if on the active list, or to the grade of captain, United States Navy (retired), if on the retired list. The date of rank and, if on the active list, the lineal position to be assigned such officer shall be those which such officer would hold if he had, without loss of numbers, been promoted to the grade of captain, United States Navy, simultaneously with the officer who was next junior to him on the then existing list of temporary commanders of the Regular Navy. All requirements of law relative to mental, moral, professional, and physical qualifications for promotion to the grade of captain, on either the active or retired list, for any such officer are deemed to have been met, and no further ones shall be required any conflicting provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding. The pay, allowances, and other emoluments of captain, for any such officer shall be computed from the date on which they would have commenced, if he had, without loss of numbers, been promoted to captain, United States Navy, simultaneously with the officer who was next junior to him on the then existing list of temporary commanders of the Regular Navy. Any officer promoted in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, if in excess of the authorized number in the grade of captain, shall be carried as an extra number in that grade.

"(b) to promote any officer of the Regular Navy, active or retired, holding the permanent rank of commander, who—

"(1) failed of promotion between January 1, 1942, and August 7, 1947; and

"(2) has appealed his case to the Board for the Correction of Naval Records; and

"(3) has been recommended by that Board for promotion to captain, United States Navy, together with appropriate adjustment of lineal position to that which he presumably would hold if he had not failed of promotion;

to the grade of captain, United States Navy, if on the active list, or to the grade of captain, United States Navy (retired), if on the retired list. The date of rank and, if on the active list, the lineal position assigned such officer shall be those which he would hold if he had been promoted to the grade of captain, United States Navy, without ever having suffered loss of numbers incident to nonpromotion between January 1, 1942, and August 7, 1947. All requirements of law relative to mental, moral, professional, and physical qualifications for promotion to the grade of captain, United States Navy, for any such officer are deemed to have been met, and no further ones shall be required, any conflicting provisions of law to the contrary notwithstanding. The pay, allowances, and other emoluments of captain for any such officer shall be computed from the date on which they would have commenced if he had been promoted to captain, United States Navy, without having suffered loss of numbers incident to nonpromotion between January 1, 1942, and August 7, 1947. Any officer promoted in accordance with the provisions of this subsection, if in excess of the authorized number in the grade of captain, shall be carried as an extra number in that grade.

"SEC. 6. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under the preceding section of this act."

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF INFLAMMABLE FABRICS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate bill 2918, which has been stated by title?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object because of the importance of this kind of a measure—may we have a short explanation of what the bill does?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this bill is meant to cure the problem in connection with so-called torch sweaters which burst into flame. Many tragedies have occurred in connection with cowboy outfits that burst into flames. The bill is designed to cure that

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

situation. It has been carefully drawn. As a matter of fact, it has been rewritten three or four times in order to get all interested parties together. We have finally gotten them together. The departments of Government and the components of industry interested are satisfied with the language contained in the bill as it will be amended. There is a committee amendment which will make my statement correct that all parties are agreed upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2918) which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Flammable Fabrics Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise.

(b) The term "commerce" means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation.

(c) The term "Territory" includes the insular possessions of the United States and also any territory of the United States.

(d) The term "article of wearing apparel" means any costume or article of clothing worn or intended to be worn by individuals except hats, gloves, and footwear: *Provided, however,* That such hats do not constitute nor are part of a covering for the neck, face, or shoulders when worn by individuals: *Provided further,* That such gloves are not more than 14 inches in length and are not affixed to or do not form an integral part of another garment: *And provided further,* That such footwear does not consist of hosiery in whole or in part and is not affixed to or does not form an integral part of another garment.

(e) The term "fabric" means any material (other than a fiber filament or yarn) woven, knitted, felted, or otherwise produced from or in combination with any natural or synthetic fiber, film, or substitute therefor which is intended or sold for use in wearing apparel except that interlining fabrics when intended or sold for use in wearing apparel shall not be subject to this act.

(f) The term "interlining" means any fabric which is intended for incorporation into an article of wearing apparel as a layer between an outer shell and an inner lining.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(h) The term "Federal Trade Commission Act" means the Act of Congress entitled "An act to create a Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914, as amended, and the Federal Trade Commission Act approved March 21, 1938.

PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 3 (a) The manufacture for or sale or offer for sale in commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce or for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce, of any article of wearing apparel which under the provisions of section 4 of this act is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The sale or offer for sale in commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation or causing to be transported in commerce or for the purpose of sale or delivery after sale in commerce, of any fabric which under the provisions of section 4 of this act is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(c) The manufacture for sale, sale or offering for sale of any article of wearing apparel made of fabric which under section 4 is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals and which has been shipped or received in commerce shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

STANDARD OF FLAMMABILITY

SEC. 4. Any article of wearing apparel or fabric shall be deemed so highly flammable within the meaning of section 3 of this act as to be dangerous when worn by individuals if any uncovered or exposed part of such article of wearing apparel or fabric exhibits rapid and intense burning when tested under the conditions and in the manner hereinafter provided for.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to establish test methods, procedures and standards for determining the rapid and intense burning of wearing apparel and fabrics and to promulgate such test methods, procedures and standards by publication in the Federal Register. No such test method, procedure, or standard shall be established or promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce unless, in his opinion, such test method, procedure, and standard are adequate for the protection of the public interest.

Until the Secretary of Commerce shall promulgate applicable test methods, procedures, and standards for determining the rapid and intense burning of wearing apparel and fabrics, the test methods, procedures, and standards set forth in the "Recommended Commercial Standard for Flammability of Clothing Textiles, TS–5131" dated April 3, 1952, and circulated for acceptance by the United States Department of Commerce on April 7, 1952, shall be effective.

ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, sections 3, 5, 6, and 8 (b) of this act shall be enforced by the Federal Trade Commission under rules, regulations and procedures provided for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of section 3 of this act in the same manner, by the same means and with the same jurisdiction, powers and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act; and any such person violating any provision of section 3 of this act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in said Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of the said Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this act.

(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for purposes of administration and enforcement of this act.

(d) The Commission is authorized to—

(1) cease inspections, analyses, tests, and examinations to be made of any article of wearing apparel or fabric which it has reason to believe falls within the prohibitions of this act; and

(2) to cooperate on matters related to the purposes of this act with any department or agency of the Government; with any State, Territory or possession or with the District of Columbia; or with any department, agency, or political subdivision thereof; or with any person.

INJUNCTION AND CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 6. (a) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any person is violating or is about to violate section 3 of this act, and that it would be in the public interest to enjoin such violation until complaint under the Federal Trade Commission Act is issued and dismissed by the Commission or until order to cease and desist made thereon by the Commission has become final within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act or is set aside by the court on review, the Commission may bring suit in the district court of the United States or in United States court of any territory for the district or territory in which such person resides or transacts business, to enjoin such violation and upon proper showing a temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted without bond.

(b) Whenever the Commission has reason to believe that any article of wearing apparel has been manufactured or introduced into commerce or any fabric has been introduced in commerce in violation of section 3 of this act, it may institute proceedings by process of libel for the seizure and confiscation of such article of wearing apparel or fabric in any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which such article of wearing apparel or fabric is found. Proceedings in cases instituted under the authority of this section shall conform as nearly as may be to proceedings in rem in admiralty, except that on demand of either party and in the discretion of the court, any issue of fact shall be tried by jury. Whenever such proceedings involving identical articles of wearing apparel or fabrics are pending in two or more jurisdictions, they may be consolidated for trial by order of any such court upon application seasonably made by any party in interest upon notice to all other parties in interest. Any court granting an order of consolidation shall cause prompt notification thereof to be given to other courts having jurisdiction in the cases covered thereby and the clerks of such other courts shall transmit all pertinent records and papers to the court designated for the trial of such consolidated proceedings.

(c) In any such action the court upon application seasonably made before trial shall by order allow any party in interest, his attorney or agent, to obtain a representative sample of the article of wearing apparel or fabric seized.

(d) If such articles of wearing apparel or fabrics are condemned by the court they shall be disposed of by destruction, by delivery to the owner or claimant thereof upon payment of court costs and fees and storage and other proper expenses and upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such articles of wearing apparel or fabrics will not be disposed of for wearing apparel purposes until properly and adequately treated or processed so as to render them lawful for introduction into commerce, or by sale upon execution of good and sufficient bond to the effect that such articles of

wearing apparel or fabrics will not be disposed of for wearing apparel purposes until properly and adequately treated or processed so as to render them lawful for introduction into commerce. If such products are disposed of by sale the proceeds, less costs and charges, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

PENALTIES

SEC. 7. Any person who willfully violates section 3 or 8 (b) of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $5,000 or be imprisoned not more than 1 year or both in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall limit other provisions of this act.

GUARANTY

SEC. 8. (a) No person shall be guilty under section 3 if he establishes a guaranty received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received, that said wearing apparel or fabric is not so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals under the provisions of this act. Such guaranty shall be either (1) a separate guaranty specifically designating the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed, in which case it may be on the invoice or other paper relating to such wearing apparel or fabric; or (2) a continuing guaranty filed with the Commission applicable to any wearing apparel or fabric handled by a guarantor, in such form as the Commission by rules or regulations may prescribe.

(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to furnish, with respect to any wearing apparel or fabric, a false guaranty (except a person relying upon a guaranty to the same effect received in good faith signed by and containing the name and address of the person residing in the United States by whom the wearing apparel or fabric guaranteed was manufactured or from whom it was received) with reason to believe the wearing apparel or fabric falsely guaranteed may be introduced, sold, or transported in commerce, and any person who violates the provisions of this subsection is guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice, in commerce within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

SHIPMENTS FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 9. Any person who has exported or who has attempted to export from any foreign country into the United States any wearing apparel or fabric which, under the provisions of section 4, is so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals may thenceforth be prohibited by the Commission from participating in the exportation from any foreign country into the United States of any wearing apparel or fabric except upon filing bond with the Secretary of the Treasury in a sum double the value of said products and any duty thereon, conditioned upon compliance with the provisions of this Act.

INTERPRETATION AND SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. The provisions of this act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other law. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid the remainder of the act and the application of such provisions to any other person or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EXCLUSIONS

SEC. 11. The provisions of this act shall not apply (a) to any common carrier, contract carrier, or freight forwarder with respect to an article of wearing apparel or fabric shipped or delivered for shipment into commerce in the ordinary course of its business; or (b) to any person manufacturing, delivering for shipment, shipping, selling, or offering for sale for export from the United States to any foreign country an article of wearing apparel or fabric made in accordance with the specifications of the purchaser; or (c) to any converter, processor, or finisher in performing a contract or commission service for the account of a person subject to the provisions of this act, provided that said converter, processor, or finisher does not cause any article of wearing apparel or fabric to become subject to this act contrary to the terms of the contract or commission service; or (d) to any article of wearing apparel or fabric shipped or delivered for shipment into commerce for the purpose of finishing or processing to render such article or fabric not highly flammable under the provisions of section 4 of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 6 months after the date of its passage.

AUTHORIZATION OF NECESSARY APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 13. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

On page 11, after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(i) The term "commercial standard" means a trade standard for flammability established according to the procedures of the Commodity Standards Division of the United States Department of Commerce and promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce.

On page 17, after the word "establish" add a comma and the words "under the presently existing procedures for the establishment of commercial standards,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAXES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3351) to establish a policy with respect to the granting of special exemptions to organizations and corporations from taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment on page 4, after line 3, to add the following new section:

SEC. 6. None of the provisions of this Act shall apply to any bill which would provide a special tax exemption to any property used or to be used exclusively for religious purposes.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the granting of special exemptions to organizations and corporations from taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia should be exercised only in extremely rare instances in which unusual circumstances warrant the granting of such exemptions.

SEC. 2. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, and with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rules of such House.

(b) Any committee of either House to which is referred a bill which would provide a special exemption for any organization or corporation from any taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia may refer such bill to the Attorney General for an investigation and report pursuant to section 4 of this act.

(c) No committee of either House shall report a bill which would provide a special exemption for any organization or corporation from any taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia unless the organization or corporation to which such exemption would be applicable fulfills the qualifications prescribed by section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. An organization or corporation shall be qualified for consideration for a special exemption from any taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia only if—

(a) such organization or corporation has been in existence for at least 10 years;

(b) the activities of such organization or corporation under its charter or bylaws are carried on in all of the States and Territories of the United States, and in the District of Columbia;

(c) no part of the net earnings of such organization or corporation inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

(d) such organization or corporation, and its officers as such, do not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

SEC. 4. Whenever any committee of either House of the Congress refers to the Attorney General a bill which would provide a special exemption for any organization or corporation from any taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia, he shall conduct an investigation of the organization or corporation to determine whether such organization or corporation fulfills the qualifications prescribed by section 3 of this act. Not later than 90 days after any such bill is referred to the Attorney General, he shall submit to the committee which referred such bill a report of his determination under this section.

SEC. 5. The right of the Congress in its discretion to enact legislation providing special exemptions for organizations and corporations from taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia is hereby expressly reserved, and fulfillment by any organization or corporation of the requirements prescribed by this act shall not create or imply any obligation on the Congress to enact such legislation.

SEC. 6. None of the provisions of this act shall apply to any bill which would provide a special tax exemption to any property used or to be used exclusively for religious purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF RECTIFYING PLANTS

The bill (H. R. 6366) to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to authorize the receipt in bond and tax payment at rectifying plants of distilled spirits, alcohol, and wines for rectification, bottling, and packaging, or for bottling and packaging without rectification; and the production in bond and tax payment of gin and vodka at rectifying plants, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] a little while ago noted an objection to this

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

bill and requested that it go over when reached.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I, too, object to this bill and ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the objections, the bill will be passed over.

OVERTIME PAYMENTS FOR POSTAL SUPERVISORS

The bill (S. 3255) to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize the payment of overtime to employees other than supervisory employees whose base salaries, exclusive of longevity salary, are more than $4,970 per annum, for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and Christmas Day during the month of December, in lieu of compensatory time.

"(d) Supervisory employees shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed in excess of 8 hours per day, and those whose base salaries, exclusive of longevity salary, are more than $4,970 per annum shall be allowed compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and on Christmas Day during the month of December, within 180 days from the days such service was performed."

Mr. UNDERWOOD subsequently said: Mr. President, when the bill (S. 3255) to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, Calendar 1799, was passed, it was not known that the House had previously passed House bill 6326. If in order, I ask that the Senate return to that bill, for the purpose of substituting the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will return to the consideration of the bill in question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate by which Senate bill 3255 was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 6326 be substituted, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6326) to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none for the present consideration of the House bill.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6326) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate bill (S. 3255) is indefinitely postponed.

MRS. MILDRED LEWIS MORGAN

The bill (H. R. 728) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VITO RIZZI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 142) for the relief of Vito Rizzi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vito Rizzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEH-JEN LEE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 697) for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Teh-Jen Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED THEODOR EX

The bill (S. 1049) for the relief of Alfred Theodor Ex was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

VERA SARAH KEENAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Vera Sarah Keenan, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Vera Sarah Keenan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEVAN DUROVIC, MARKO DUROVIC, OLGA WICKERHAUSER DUROVIC, AND STEVAN M. DUROVIC

The bill (S. 1159) for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MALICA MACESICH

The bill (S. 1433) for the relief of Malica Macesich was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Malica Macesich, who lost United State citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Malica Macesich shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

PHED VOSNIACOS

The bill (S. 1596) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Phed Vosniacos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United State for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-

control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

V. A. VERHEI—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

The resolution (S. Res. 344) to refer the bill (S. 1609) for the relief of V. A. Verhei to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this resolution simply sends a bill introduced by the junior Senator from Idaho to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and conclusions of law and report back to the Senate so that the Senate may determine whether or not there is any money due the claimant either legally or equitably as a result of the alleged breach by the Government of a contract he held for the repair of certain dikes on the St. Maries River in Idaho. The amount involved is about $40,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 344) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1609) for the relief of V. A. Verhei, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demands as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant: *Provided, however*, That the passage of this resolution shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

LIAN-TONG WEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1613) for the relief of Lian-Tong Wen which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lian-Tong Wen and Kim Fong Chen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees and taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Lian-Tong Wen and Kim Fong Chen."

SISTER ODILIA

The bill (S. 1716) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SHIZU HASEGAWA CROCKETT

The bill (S. 1816) for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Shizu Hasegawa Crockett, the wife of David S. Crockett, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

MRS. SUMAKO EGASHIRA

The bill (H. R. 2635) for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COMDR. EVAN L. KROGH

The bill (H. R. 2713) for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KUNIGUNDE BELDIE

The bill (H. R. 2716) for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAN J. WOJCIECHOWSKI

The bill (H. R. 2856) for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KENJI KUSUMOTO

The bill (H. R. 2906) for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EVELYN CAMPBELL

The bill (H. R. 2913) for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, since the bill calls for an appropriation of $20,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to pay the sum of $20,000 to Mrs. Evelyn Campbell, of Baton Rouge, La., in full settlement of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on April 27, 1946, in Baton Rouge, when she was run into and knocked to the sidewalk by personnel of the United States Navy who were running to board a troop train on which they were traveling under Government orders.

At the time this accident occurred the Navy troop train, proceeding from the west coast to New Orleans and points on the east coast, stopped in Baton Rouge for a period of approximately 1 hour for servicing. During this layover a number of the men left the troop train, with permission, and when the train started to pull out some of the men ran around the train station to board the train. Mrs. Campbell, a lady 63 years old at the time, was standing at one corner of the station with a group of friends. One of the naval personnel ran into her and forcefully knocked her to the pavement, causing serious injuries to her of a permanent nature.

Claimant instituted suit in the United States court for the eastern district of Louisiana under the Federal Tort Claims Act, and the court awarded her a judgment in the sum of $21,018.80. As a basis for the judgment the court found that the serious and permanent injuries suffered by claimant were caused solely by the gross negligence and carelessness of a sailor acting in the line of duty, and consequently that the Government was liable for the tort.

The Federal Tort Claims Act specifically provides that in the case of a member of the military or naval forces of the United States "acting in line of duty" means "acting within the scope of his office or employment." Nevertheless, this judgment in favor of the claimant was reversed on appeal, the court of appeals for the fifth circuit ruling basing reversal solely on the decision that the United States is not subjected to liability for acts of military or naval personnel without regard to the doctrine of respondent superior, as applied in the State where the accident occurred in determining the liability of a private employee, despite the definitional provision in the Federal Tort Claims Act. A petition for certiorari was denied by the Supreme Court.

The committee gives full weight to the ruling of the court of appeals, but recognizes that such ruling depends on a technical, legal viewpoint of the case. Equally concerned with the principles of right and justice based upon equitable considerations, the committee is convinced that this is a case singularly deserving of relief, despite the adverse ruling of the appellate court. The ruling of the appellate court did not disturb the findings of fact by the district court, and it is to be noted that the amount provided in this bill is somewhat less than the amount of the judgment awarded claimant by the district court.

In these circumstances, the committee recommends favorable consideration of this bill.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that upon the notation that the Navy Department has opposed the bill, and what the distinguished chairman has just said with reference to the circuit court of appeals, and then the Supreme Court of the United States denying certiorari in the case, the Senator from Kansas has serious misgivings as to whether the bill should pass.

I have noted what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said to the effect that the findings of the lower court, have not been disturbed, and that the reversal apparently was on the basis of a technical requirement, rather than upon actual facts, which in my judgment, and no doubt the judgment of the committee, would have made the Government responsible for the act. Is that a correct interpretation of the situation?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2913) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNY SCHER

The bill (H. R. 3157) for the relief of Anny Scher was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MIYOKO NAKAGAWA

The bill (H. R. 3275) for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. EMI YASUDA AND HER MINOR SON, KEICHIRO YASUDA

The bill (H. R. 3280) for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL BUSBEY

The bill (H. R. 3334) for the relief of Paul Busbey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARUYO TAKAHASHI

The bill (H. R. 3382) for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORRIS TUTNAUER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Morris Tutnauer, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REUBEN KRAKOVSKY

The bill (H. R. 3564) for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL TSE, JAMES TSE, AND BENNIE TSE

The bill (H. R. 3592) for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF PROFESSIONAL ARTS BUILDING CORP.

The bill (H. R. 3727) for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OLGA MADSEN, A MINOR

The bill (S. 1916) for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Olga Madsen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Aage Boeslund, citizens of the United States and residents of Ogden, Utah.

FRANCESCO CRACCHIOLO

The bill (S. 1927) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Francesco Cracchiolo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JURISDICTION OF CLAIM OF LLEWELLYN B. GRIFFITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2046) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 12, after the word "retired", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, or any other limitation upon the jurisdiction of such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith arising out of the failure of the War Department to certify him for retirement as an emergency officer pursuant to the provisions of the Emergency Officers Retirement Act, as amended (45 Stat. 735), or to retire him as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States, as the facts may justify. In its consideration of such claim, the court shall determine whether or not the said Llewellyn B. Griffith should have been certified for retirement as an emergency officer or retired as a disabled officer of the Regular Army. Should the court decide that the said Llewellyn B. Griffith should have been so certified or retired, judgment shall be rendered in an amount equal to the amount the said Llewellyn B. Griffith would have received had he been so certified or retired: *Provided,* That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the date of the enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeal from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this legislation would confer jurisdiction on the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith as to whether or not he was entitled to be retired under the Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States as the facts may justify.

This claim arises out of the service of the claimant in World War I and has been the subject of dispute over the years.

The committee's files contain documents which set forth both sides of this controversy, and after a consideration of these facts the committee believes that the matter is one for the determination of the court. It is therefore recommended that this legislation be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGIT STOLZ BOHM AND KLAUS SEIGFREID BOHM

The bill (S. 2125) for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Margit Stolz Bohm may be ad-

mitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Klaus Seigfreid Bohm, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of S1c Denzil Ray Bohm, a citizen of the United States.

ANNEMARIE E. PETERSON AND WILHELM ERNST GEISEL

The bill (S. 2185) for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson, and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Annemarie E. Peterson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Wilhelm Ernst Geisel, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Olaf G. Peterson, a citizen of the United States.

MIKI TAKANO

The bill (S. 2303) for the relief of Miki Takano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child, Miki Takano, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. Edward J. McGarvey, a citizen of the United States.

FUMIKO ITO STEWART

The bill (S. 2332) for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Fumiko Ito Stewart, the wife of Theodore M. Stewart, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SIZUKO KATO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2372) for the relief of Sizuko Kato, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "to", to insert "Meechiko", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sizuko Kato, the Japanese fiancée of Pfc. Gust L. Ulrich, or to Meechiko, the minor child of the said Sizuko Kato, and that the said Sizuko Kato and her child shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sizuko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Pfc Gust L. Ulrich, and that she and her child are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato, she and her child shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sizuko Kato and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko."

REV. A. E. SMITH

The bill (S. 2373) for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Reverend A. E. Smith, of Bismarck, N. Dak., the sum of $1,706.40, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for custom duties paid upon the importation of stained glass windows for use in St. George's Church in Bismarck, N. Dak.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof, shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

EMBASSY OF FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2439) to provide funds for the acquisition and maintenance of a German Embassy by the Federal Republic of Germany which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in order to enable the Federal Republic of Germany to acquire and maintain a German Embassy in the District of Columbia, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $300,000 to the Federal Republic of Germany.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object because I think this measure has great merit—for the purpose of legislative history I believe we should have an explanation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill provides for the payment of $300,000 to the Federal Republic of Germany to be used to acquire and maintain a German Embassy building in the District of Columbia.

After the war was over and hostilities against the Germany Government had ceased, the Secretary of State recommended that the Alien Property Custodian sell the German Embassy property which had been vested in the early days of the war, on the theory that the property was unusable and that its continued maintenance by the State Department was an expense unwarranted by any hope that it might be of use to the Government of the United States.

The Japanese Embassy, on the other hand, was used continuously by the State Department and has been returned to the Japanese Government entirely intact and probably in better condition than when it first came under the control of the State Department.

The committee believes that in all fairness the Federal Republic of Germany should be compensated for the loss of its Embassy property and therefore recommends enactment of this bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany."

SADAKO ISHIGURO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2662) for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sadako Ishiguro, the Japanese fiancée of Quentin C. Auerswald, a citizen of the United States who has been honorably discharged from the United States Navy, and that the said Sadako Ishiguro shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sadako Ishiguro is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Quentin C. Auerswald, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

said Sadako Ishiguro as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLICY WITH RESPECT TO CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS MADE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2907) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CAROL R. GRAY

The bill (S. 3060) for the relief of Carol R. Gray was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—there is on the calendar House bill 7477, which is precisely the same measure, and I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7477?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7477) for the relief of Carol R. Gray was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3060 will be indefinitely postponed.

ANDREW ALEXANDER NARA AND MARY KIMBERLY NARA

The bill (S. 3162) for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Captain and Mrs. Edwin A. Nara, citizens of the United States.

ROBERT ROYCE FARKAS

The bill (S. 3193) for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Robert Royce Farkas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. William W. Farkas, citizens of the United States.

MEKARU TATSUBO

The bill (S. 3248) for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mekaru Tatsubo, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Corp. Charles T. Wright, a citizen of the United States.

PAUL D. BANNING

The bill (S. 3277) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,236.41, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $422.35 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $428.46 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $30.70 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of $14.90 shall be credited in the accounts of Don Iler, regional disbursing officer, New York, N. Y., such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees or former employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeit bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell, Ben Binkley, Ottmar W. Epple, Adele Froussard, Caroline O. Gesner, Agatha M. Joy, Rosetta H. Little, James A. Metzger, Mary L. Milhollin, Edith G. Mohr, David R. Mooney, Jr., and Joseph C. Zoellner, $10 each; Bertha M. Barrett, F. H. Bowden, Jr., Joan Conrad, Mary Jane Davis, and Edward J. Jerge, $20 each; and Ashton J. Daussat, A. L. Schwemm, Joe V. Vandiver, and Mildred F. Whartenby, $30 each.

SADIE BADIR ELLIS NASSIF-AZAR ET AL

The bill (S. 3280) for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Mr. and Mrs. George Ellis, citizens of the United States.

CHIU BUT YUE

The bill (S. 3281) for the relief of Chiu But Yue was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chiu But Yue, the minor child of a United States citizen father, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

BEVERLY JANE RUFFIN

The bill (S. 3284) for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Beverly Jane Ruffin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Major and Mrs. James C. Ruffin, citizens of the United States.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION FIRMS—REFERENCE OF BILL TO COURT OF CLAIMS

The resolution (S. Res. 343) referring the bill (S. 3326) for the relief of certain construction firms to the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this resolution? I note that in the aggregate it involves an amount of $1,284,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this resolution is to refer the bill S. 3326, for the relief of six contractors named in said bill, to the Court of Claims, and to authorize the court to report to the Senate such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the validity of the claims of these contractors, and such amounts as may be legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants. The resolution provides that its passage shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government.

Claimants were engaged in construction work on the Columbia Basin project under contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation. These contracts extended over a period of several fiscal years. In August of 1947 scheduled work keyed to the project program was interrupted and slowed down due to the lack of funds for continuation of the program as originally scheduled.

The disruption of the work schedules imposed added costs on the contractors, recognized but not reimbursable by the Bureau of Reclamation. The added costs form the basis of these claims.

In the recent past the Congress has acted directly to provide reimbursement in similar circumstances. The Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior suggest differentiations in this case, and for that reason the committee determined that the matter should be referred to the Court of Claims for judicious appraisal of these claims.

In these circumstances, and for the reasons stated, the committee recommends adoption of this resolution.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. There is a dispute, is there not, as to whether or not the slow-down in the work resulted from Government insistence, or whether it was voluntary? Is that the reason for these claims?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. There is some question about certain substantial losses, is there not?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is not the reason for these claims, but there is a dispute as to whether or not lack of funds caused the slow-down.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3326) for the relief of certain construction firms, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States, to the claimants: *Provided, however*, That the passage of this resolution shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

HANNAH CRUMET

The bill (S. 3343) for the relief of Hannah Crumet was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Hannah Crumet, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Robert R. Crumet, citizens of the United States.

TONY MARCHIONDO

The bill (H. R. 657) for the relief of Tony Marchiondo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN MICHAEL ANCKER RASMUSSEN

The bill (H. R. 707) for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIS A. BAKKEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Harris A. Bakken, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$3,692.80" and insert "$3,692.02, plus interest which has since accrued"; and in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "$3,692.80" and insert "$3,692.02, plus interest on such sum."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN GEORGE PAPAILIAS

The bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of John George Papailias was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELVIRA SUZANNE OOSTERWYK

The bill (H. R. 954) for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHU BUD YICK

The bill (H. R. 963) for the relief of Chu Bud Yick was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHELBY SHOE CO., OF SALEM, MASS.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) in full settlement of the claim of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass., against the United States for losses sustained by it as a result of contract No. W 19–074qm–4207, dated May 21, 1946, with the Procurement Division of the Department of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $84,498.98 to the clerk of the United States district court for the district of Massachusetts who shall use such sum (1) to pay to each unsecured creditor of said Shelby Shoe Co., after giving notice and upon demand therefor, as provided in subsection (b), the unpaid balance of his claim against such company appearing in schedules heretofore filed, under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Act, in the Shelby Shoe Co. bankruptcy case, No. 70372, and (2) to pay the balance of such sum, after making the payments authorized in (1) and deducting all incidental expenses incurred in the disbursement of such sum, to said Shelby Shoe Co.; but nothing contained herein shall authorize the payment to any such creditor of interest on the unpaid balance of his claim against such company.

(b) Upon receipt of the sum herein authorized to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury, said clerk shall cause notice to be published not less than once in each of three successive weeks in one or more newspapers of general circulation, and a copy thereof sent by registered mail to the last known address of each of the creditors described in subsection (a), advising such creditors of the provisions of this act. No such creditor shall be entitled to any payment under this act unless he shall file with said clerk a written claim therefor within 3 months after the date such notice shall be last published, or the date such notice shall have been mailed to his last known address, whichever is the later.

(c) No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill, in view of the amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this claimant was an old established shoe manufacturing company. During the war it converted its entire manufacturing facilities to the production of shoes for the Army. Following the war the Army, being well pleased with the product of the company, urged the company to take one more contract, which contract would contain the so-called escalator clause to protect the company on account of rising costs of labor and materials. The company was entitled to submit a claim against the Army for a redetermined price on each shipment. These claims were subject to Army audit and had to be submitted 45 days apart.

The company filed six different claims during the period of the contract, but the Army for reasons doubtless beyond their control was unable to pay the additional amounts for periods ranging from 88 days to 208 days. As a result, the working capital of the company was completely frozen and on August 3, 1948, the company was forced to invoke the provisions of chapter 11 of the bankruptcy act.

The amount of the claim has been audited by an independent firm of certified public accountants, and it contains no items of profit. The bill also provides that any unsecured creditors who have not been paid in full may make claim against the amount to be appropriated in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATE OF C. G. ALLEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen, which had been reported from the Committee on Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$937.75" and insert "$550."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MR. AND MRS. CHARLES FUXMAN AND THEIR TWO DAUGHTERS

The bill (H. R. 1448) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIE-ANTOINETTE KERSSEN-BROCK

The bill (S. 2311) for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HENRYK KRAMARSKI

The bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Henryk Kramarski was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to state that if ever there was a deserving immigration case, this is it. I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for giving the bill such prompt attenton. In order that there may be in the RECORD a statement of the merits of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the statement made by Representative CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, who represents my congressional district, when he appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in connection with this bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE WOLVERTON, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is CHARLES A. WOLVERTON. I am a Member of Congress representing the First Congressional District of New Jersey. I appear in support of H. R. 1490, a bill for the relief of Henryk Kramarski, which I introduced January 12, 1952.

The bill provides that, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Henryk Kramarski, Camden, N. J., who arrived in the United States on the steamship *Coral Sea* at Philadelphia, Pa., on December 3, 1947, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of visa fee and head tax. Any bond outstanding in his case shall be canceled. Upon such payment, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland for the first year such quota is available.

There has never been any case that has come to my attention that is more deserving than this one of Henryk Kramarski. It has all the elements that stir one's soul to the very depths. This case has a tremendous appeal to everyone who believes in justice for a downtrodden human being, who looks with hope and expectancy to this committee that by its action can save him from a return to the horrible experiences that have been his in his homeland of Poland under the influence of the cruel overlords that have and do now rule in his country. There never has been, nor will there ever be, a case more meritorious presented to this honorable committee than that which involves the future welfare of this 19-year-old Polish boy. Nor, will there ever be an individual who will more sincerely and gratefully appreciate your favorable action, nor be more certain of justifying by his future conduct the confidence you may place in him. I can truthfully say that no one who has ever come before your committee has had such generous and wholehearted support and good wishes from public officials, business, civic, religious, and fraternal organizations and leaders of an entire community, as has been accorded this young man. The large number who have come to Washington this morning prepared to testify in behalf of the character, integrity, and future usefulness of him gives some slight evidence of the great interest taken by the community and its leading citizens in behalf of this boy.

The pertinent facts in the case are as follows:

Henryk Kramarski was born November 16, 1930, in Batanowicze, Poland, where his father was employed as a forester. His mother died when he was 8 years of age. In 1942, at the age of 11, the German invaders separated Henryk from his father and two older sisters and sent him into slave labor into Germany. Later a family informed the applicant that his father and two sisters were killed by the Germans. In May 1945 he escaped from the German farm and attached himself to the United States Army at Coblenz, performing the duties of an orderly, errand boy, and kitchen boy. Subsequently, he was placed in the UNRRA camp at Nuremberg where he remained until October 1947, when he was urged to return to Poland and transportation was arranged for him. Upon return to Poland, the applicant tried repeatedly to locate his father and sisters through the Polish Red Cross at Szczecin (Stettin) but was finally convinced that they were dead. He then did odd jobs, as steady jobs were not available. He decided to come to a port city and get a job around the docks. In Gdynia he worked around the dock for a week doing odd jobs, but this was not sufficient to sustain him. He decided to come to the United States where he hoped to get a job with the aid of some of his former GI friends. He hid aboard the steamship *Coral Sea* and arrived in Philadelphia on December 3, 1947. After a hearing on December 5, 1947, before the board of special inquiry in Philadelphia, he was transferred to Ellis Island.

The applicant pleads for admission into the United States for the purpose of remaining permanently in this country, because he cannot return to his native village, as that is now Russian territory. He would be beaten and tortured for having run away from that country. He also fears that he will be sent to Siberia because he is Catholic and because he is not in sympathy with communism. He has spent 9 months in a division of Buchenwald concentration camp reserved for those who attempted to escape slave labor. He has endured strain beyond his physical strength, and his hands bear permanent scars from slave labor in Germany. He knows that Poles sent to Siberia do not return. He fears that return to Poland, at this time, would end in imprisonment, while his anticommunistic views would result in severe tortures and certain death.

The applicant's apparent sincerity during the initial hearing on December 3, 1947, had evoked general interest of the examining board and he was encouraged to seek the representation of the International Institute (social agency), Philadelphia, Pa., in his behalf.

Although the applicant was found excludable under the immigration laws, the Board of Appeals on March 15, 1948, noted in their opinion: "We have, on rare occasions, permitted stowaways who are minors to enter on parole for future adjustment of their immigration status. However, this has been done only where there is an absolute showing that some responsible person or agency has accepted the obligations of parole, both financial and otherwise." Subsequently Rt. Rev. Magr. Arthur B. Strenski, St. Joseph's Church, 1010 Liberty Street, Camden, N. J., offered to act as parole sponsor. In addition, Mr. and Mrs. John Okulicz, 1510 Mount Ephraim Avenue, Camden, N. J., offered the applicant a home and care and submitted affidavits of support with documentary evidence substantiating economic assets and ability to provide a proper home for Henryk Kramarski. The prospective parents and sponsors not only have an excellent standing in the community as upright, respected, and patriotic citizens, but they have successfully reared their own daughter, 28 years, wife of World War II United States Army major, and their son, 33 years, Lt. Comdr. John Okulicz, in the medical service of the United States Navy.

On November 22, 1948, Henryk Kramarski was paroled under bond of $500 to Mr. and Mrs. John Okulicz, 1510 Mount Ephraim Avenue, Camden, N. J., where he now resides. The applicant has assumed a filial role to his foster parents and has made an excellent adjustment, not only in his foster home, where he assists with furniture-store chores, but also in his community contacts. Under the wise guidance of his foster mother, he has met desirable young people of his own age. He attends the Wilson School, Seventh and Delancy Streets, Camden, N. J., for study of English, where he has progressed considerably beyond other recent arrivals from foreign countries. He also takes guitar and accordion lessons to spend his free time pleasantly and profitably. He keeps in close contact with his parole sponsor, Right Reverend Monsignor Strenski, and has evidenced a strong sense of moral responsibility and obedience. He accompanies his foster parents to mass on Sundays and accepts suggestions and corrections from his foster parents. As a result, their charitable interest has evolved into personal affection for the boy. Henryk Kramarski has become welded into this family group.

During his 11-month stay at Ellis Island, pending decision on this case the applicant has won the confidence, admiration, and affection of his coworkers and superiors. At the time of his parole, he had been entrusted with the keys to the food supplies which was a responsibility beyond his years. From his wages of $1 per day at Ellis Island, he had purchased his own clothing and had a saving of $60 at the time of his release. The Ellis Island authorities had strongly recommended his parole. The applicant's innate desire to conform to requirements of those in authority and his efforts for self-support through honest toil have been noted by his Army contacts and have been confirmed by his superiors at Ellis Island where his behavior and adaptability were under observation from December 5, 1947, to November 22, 1948.

The applicant has no family or other ties in Poland. He is virtually a refugee of World War II, a displaced boy, whose only memory of human kindness experienced since his forced removal from his father's home and loving guidance and care at the tender age of 10, was with the United States Army to which he attached himself as civilian employee and had loyally served from 1944 to 1947. His impression of ideas and ideals of freedom and the American way of life have impelled him to take the risk of a stowaway to reach this haven for "the shipwrecked unfortunates"—as he terms himself. These same convictions make it impossible for the applicant to return to Poland, as they are anti-Communist and would expose him to certain persecutions. Furthermore, he faces prosecution in Poland for having left that country without permission. The applicant has mentally and spiritually adopted this country for which to him the United States Army stands as a symbol. He courageously determined to reach America where, with the help of his former GI friends, he hoped to start a new life after 7 years of danger and insecurity. The very thought of returning to the Communist-controlled Poland causes the applicant severe mental anguish

and fearful anxiety resulting in deep despair.

The applicant, Henryk Kramarski, begs that you give his plea for immigration status an early and favorable consideration to enable him to adjust himself to legal entry into the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1490) for the relief of Henryk Kramarski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AROKIASWAMI ARUMAI SINGH

The bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LINDA AZAR KARAM BATROUNY

The bill (H. R. 1477) for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. TOMIKO MUNAKATA MILLHOLLIN

The bill (H. R. 1718) for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORA FUNG WAH MIU WONG

The bill (H. R. 1814) to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FONG BAT WOON AND FONG GET NAN

The bill (H. R. 1838) for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAHAN ABDO HAJ MOUSSA

The bill (H. R. 1843) for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MALKE KRESEL MOHRER

The bill (H. R. 1849) for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAOKI AND YOSHIKI SAKAMOTO

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOOD SERVICE OF EVANSVILLE, INC.

The bill (H. R. 2405) for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like particularly to ask whether the bill takes into account the creditors' claims which are outstanding.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall make an explanation of the bill. I believe it will cover the item referred to by the Senator from Kansas.

This bill awards the sum of $11,317.27 to an Indiana corporation for losses sustained as the result of the breach of an oral agreement which the corporation had with the post exchange officer at Camp Breckinridge, Ky. The corporation under the oral agreement was obliged to furnish hot sandwiches to be dispensed in machines in the several branches of the post exchange at Camp Breckinridge, and in order to perform its part of the oral agreement the corporation was compelled to invest large sums of money in machines, supplies and foodstuffs.

The corporation performed its part of the oral agreement satisfactorily and yet 60 days after the oral agreement was made the post exchange officer abruptly terminated the oral agreement. The corporation was unable to dispose of its holdings or to secure new markets because of this abrupt termination of its services. As a consequence the corporation became hopelessly insolvent and was placed in receivership on January 13, 1951.

A House Judiciary subcommittee held hearings on this claim and after hearing the testimony of the post exchange officer, that subcommittee characterized his testimony as "evasive" and the House report on this bill states that the post exchange officer failed to satisfy the subcommittee of his sincerity or fair dealing. The committee has recommended this legislation because it feels that the Congress should alleviate the unnecessarily harsh treatment which this American organization has received, by reimbursing this corporation in part for the losses which it has suffered as a result of the arbitrary action of the post exchange officer.

The bill does not specifically take care of the outstanding creditors. They have recourse, however, to proper remedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2405) for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE M. SANGER

The bill (H. R. 2447) for the relief of George M. Sanger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIMITRA GAITANIS

The bill (H. R. 2606) for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. DAVID M. JU

The bill (H. R. 3774) for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WONG SEE SUN

The bill (H. R. 3778) for the relief of Wong See Sun was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALDO VALLESSA

The bill (H. R. 3810) for the relief of Aldo Vallessa was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. PETER COPEYON

The bill (H. R. 3858) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCO BERARDI

The bill (H. R. 3969) for the relief of Franco Berardi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. MANUEL MAGTALIS GERONIMO AND DR. RITA VILLAROMAN GERONIMO

The bill (H. R. 4001) for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO AND FRANCESCO LO SCHIAVO

The bill (H. R. 4128) for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER HELENA GINAL, SISTER ANNA SZOLDRSKA, SISTER ANNA GLUCHOWSKA, AND SISTER BRONISLAWA SZEWCZYK

The bill (H. R. 4157) for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrsko, Sister Anna Gluchowska, and Sister Branislawa Szewczyk was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH DENEKAR AND MRS. MARY A. DENEKAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the name "Denekar," to strike out "In the settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer or disbursing officer of the United States full credit shall be given for the same payment of $2,800 to Mrs. Mary A. Denekar."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RUBEN GEORGE VARGA AND MRS. ILONA VARGA

The bill (H. R. 4250) for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOSHIKO NAKAMUTA TAKIMOTO AND HER MINOR SON

The bill (H. R. 4326) for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAHEL ZAKAR PETERS

The bill (H. R. 4466) for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUZANNE MARIE SCHARTZ

The bill (H. R. 4503) for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARK YEN HUI

The bill (H. R. 4588) for the relief of Mark Len Hui was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LINDA LEE CONVERSE

The bill (H. R. 4632) for the relief of Linda Lee Converse was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BARON FRED ALEXANDER D'OSTEN-SACKEN

The bill (H. R. 4709) for the relief of Baron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEBORAH ANITA HUDSON

The bill (H. R. 4762) for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMMA GAZZANIGA AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4866) for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF EMIL A. PESHEK

The bill (H. R. 4891) for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOONG MOY LAM

The bill (H. R. 5087) for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARITE MARY FUJITA

The bill (H. R. 5107) for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT O. HOLLAND AND BERGTOR HAALAND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 8, after the word "state", to insert "while employed in Venezuela under contract with the Venezuelan Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

F. ARCHIE MEATYARD

The bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN H. VOGEL

The bill (H. R. 5515) for the relief of John H. Vogel was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. KATHARINA LUISE TRENYE

The bill (H. R. 5517) for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER ANGELANTONIA DIANA

The bill (H. R. 5591) for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SACHIKO KANEMOCHI

The bill (H. R. 5864) for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELMA L. MAUZEY

The bill (H. R. 5955) for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID DARYL DALKO

The bill (H. R. 6025) for the relief of David Daryl Dalko was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AYAKO SUKIURA

The bill (H. R. 6381) for the relief of Ayako Sukiura was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEANNE MARIE MIURA

The bill (H. R. 6446) for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KAREN ANN CROWLEY

The bill (H. R. 6505) for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA BRIDGES

The bill (H. R. 6850) for the relief of Martha Bridges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIE BON KONG

The bill (H. R. 6870) for the relief of Louie Bon Kong was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KATHARINA HOFFMANN

The bill (H. R. 6945) for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUTH ANN HOLECEK

The bill (H. R. 7095) for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AI-LING TUNG TSOU AND HER SON, MOODY TSOU

The bill (H. R. 8052) for the relief of Ai-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CODIFICATION OF PATENT LAWS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7794) to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents", which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments in chapter 10, section 102, on page 9, line 9, after the word "country", strike out "or" and insert "on"; in chapter 28, section 282, in the 5th line of the section, after the word "Noninfringement" to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "infringement", to strike out the comma and insert "or unenforceability,", and in the

same chapter, section 284, beginning in line 1 of the section, to strike out "Upon adjudging a patent valid and infringed," and insert "Upon finding for the claimant."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, let me ask what action was taken in the case of House bill 7794, Calendar 1908?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill was passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed is reconsidered, and the bill as amended is before the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill is passed over.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from New Jersey will withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have objected on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

Mr. WILEY. I wonder whether the Senator will withhold objection, for I think probably we can agree to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar. The bill provides for a codification of the patent laws, and the House of Representatives has worked on this subject for 3 or 4 years. The bill simply constitutes a restatement of the patent laws of the United States.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am quite familiar with the bill; it is a very meritorious measure, and I am in favor of it.

On the other hand, I have been requested to object. If the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar, so that in the meantime he can discuss the matter with the Senator from North Dakota, I shall be very happy to have that done.

Mr. WILEY. I so request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS OF SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO INDIAN TRIBES OF WIND RIVER RESERVATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3333) to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the word "a" to insert "reasonable;" in line 4, after the word "consideration," to strike out "of" and insert "not to exceed," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, for a reasonable consideration not to exceed $458,000, to be paid from funds appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project, to convey and relinquish to the United States of America the property and rights of the Shoshone and of the Arapaho Indian Tribes needed by the United States for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Boysen Unit of the Missouri River Basin project. Action heretofore taken by the Secretary of the Interior in granting rights-of-way over Indian lands for the establishment or the relocation of roads, highways, and railroads, and telegraph, telephone, power transmission, and pipelines in connection with the construction of the Boysen Unit of the Missouri River Basin project is hereby confirmed.

SEC. 2. The conveyances and relinquishments shall be, in all things, in accord with the memorandum of understanding between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs as approved by the Secretary of the Interior on December 29, 1951, and as amended with his approval on May 1, 1952.

SEC. 3. The moneys to be paid to the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes hereunder shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States of America to the credit and for the use of the respective tribes in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), as amended by the act of August 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 208).

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS—RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 169) creating a Select Committee on Consumer Interests, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the word "Senate" to insert "of whom not more than seven shall be of the same political party"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "the" to insert "ultimate"; in line 13, after "Eighty-second", to strike out "Congress" and insert "and succeeding Congresses", and on page 3, line 7, after the word "exceed" to insert "$158,800", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Consumer Interests and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate of whom not more than seven shall be of the same political party as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution.

It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems affecting consumer interests in the present national emergency and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys, together with its recommendations. No proposed legislation shall be referred to such committee and such committee shall not have power to report by bill or otherwise have legislative jurisdiction.

In carrying out its duties the committee shall give special attention to prices charged the ultimate consumer for food, fuel, and clothing and the costs and methods of producing, processing, and distributing these and other consumer goods.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the Eighty-second and succeeding Congresses at such times and places, whether or not the Senate is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned; to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies and special assistants, and to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government; to hold such hearings; to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $158,800 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL subsequently said: Mr. President, was Senate Resolution 169, Calendar 1912, agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; it was agreed to, as amended.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to, be reconsidered, for I wish to object to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the resolution, as amended, was agreed to, is reconsidered.

The resolution, as amended, is now before the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 3413) authorizing the Secretary of State to make grants or loans to needy widows of Foreign Service officers who died prior to the effective date of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

NOGALES SANITATION PROJECT, ARIZONA

The bill (S. 960) to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly. I believe that only a brief explanation will be required.

Mr. President, in the Arizona border city of Nogales, 70 percent of the population resides in Mexico, and the remainder of the population resides in the United States. For years the city has faced the problem of developing jointly a sanitation project, in a situation in which the natural drainage of the land runs from Mexico towards the United States.

Several years ago the International Boundary Commission authorized the construction of the sanitation project. That project is now complete, and the problem arises as to its maintenance and operation.

This bill authorizes an agreement between the United States and Mexico, by means of which the International Boundary Commission would be authorized to operate the sanitation system. The city of Nogales will bear its equitable share of the cost.

However, in view of the unbalance as between the population on each side of the border, it is anticipated that the United States will need to carry about $4,500 of the annual cost. There is precedent for the proposed action, and I hope this measure will be passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Did the Senator from Wisconsin say that the United States must bear $4,500 or $45,000 of the cost?

Mr. WILEY. Four thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Is that approximately 50 percent of the total?

Mr. WILEY. It is less than 50 percent. The city of Nogales will pay most of it.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Very well, Mr. President; I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 960) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to the conditions provided in this act, to enter into an agreement with the appropriate official or officials of the United Mexican States for the operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, located at Nogales, Ariz., and Nogales, Sonora, Mexico, heretofore constructed by the said Commission, which agreement shall contain such provisions relating to a division between the two Governments of the costs of such operation and maintenance, or of the work involved therein, as may be recommended by said Commission and approved by the Government of Mexico and by the Secretary of State on behalf of the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be entered into until the governing body of the city of Nogales, Ariz., has given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of State that it will, so long as such agreement remains in force, contribute an equitable proportion, as determined by the United States section of said Commission, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State, of the costs of such operation and maintenance allocated to the United States.

SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, such sums as may be necessary to defray such costs as may accrue to the United States arising out of any such agreement for the operation and maintenance of such project: *Provided*, That funds heretofore appropriated to the Department of State under the heading "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this act: *Provided further*, That any moneys received from the United Mexican States under the terms of any such agreement shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriations which may be available or which may be made for the purposes of this act: *And provided further*, That moneys received from the city of Nogales, Ariz., pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be available for expenditure in connection with any appropriations which may be available or which may be made available for the purposes of this act.

INSURANCE OF DEPOSITS IN BANKS IN PUERTO RICO

The bill (H. R. 5120) to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

SUITS ON PATENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill, please?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is House bill 3975, Calendar No. 1917.

Under present law, whenever an invention covered by a patent of the United States is used or manufactured by or for the United States, without a license of the owner thereof, the owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the court of claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation. This law does not, however, apply to any patentee who, when he makes such a claim, is in the employment or service of the United States.

This amendment will permit a Government employee to bring suit against the United States, except in cases where he was in a position to order, influence, or induce the use of an invention by the Government. Also, such patentee may not sue where the invention is related to the official functions of the employee or in the making of which Government time, materials, or facilities were used.

The net effect of this proposed legislation would be to allow persons to sue the Government of the United States for the use of patents where their employment by the Government did not influence the granting of the patent.

The committee recommends the passage of this bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3975), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 3, after the word "the", to strike out "first two sentences of the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HAJNA SEPSI

The bill (S. 624) for the relief of Hajna Sepsi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hajna Sepsi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available appropriate quota.

GEORGE PROKOFIEFF DE SEVERSKY AND ISABELLE PROKOFIEFF DE SEVERSKY

The bill (S. 1358) for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act,

upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHARLES MICHELL

The bill (S. 2212) for the relief of Charles Michell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Charles Michell may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

LUCIANO PELLEGRINI

The bill (S. 2473) for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Luciano Pellegrini, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Mose G. Quilici, citizens of the United States.

MARY BOUESSA DEEB

The bill (S. 2479) for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mary Bouessa Deeb shall be deemed to have been born in Canada.

MIKIO ABE

The bill (S. 2577) for the relief of Mikio Abe was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mikio Abe, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Coy Elmer Barton.

CARLOTTA OLIMPIA FORGNONE

The bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YURIKO NISHIMOTO

The bill (S. 2869) for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yuriko Nishimoto, the Japanese fiancée of Pfc Homer W. Holloway, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Yuriko Nishimoto shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yuriko Nishimoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Pfc Homer W. Holloway, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Nishimoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Nishimoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Nishimoto as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

COMMANDER JOHN J. O'DONNELL, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

The bill (S. 2989) for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $252.67 to Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for pay and allowances for active training duty actually performed by him for the period of June 19 to 29, 1950, inclusive, in compliance with paragraph 1 of appropriate duty orders issued June 7, 1950, by the Commandant, Thirteenth Naval District, Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HOMER C. BOOZER, AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 3356) for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $62.60, $34.12, $15.78, $18.78, and $35.68, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, Wilmington, Del., during the period beginning December 16, 1951, and ending December 31, 1951, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

DAMAGES THROUGH NONCOMBAT ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMY

The bill (S. 3050) to authorize the payment of certain claims for damage to private property, loss of wages, personal injuries, and death, arising out of noncombat activities of the Army was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Felix Garcia, of Barrio Naranjito, Hatillo, P. R., the sum of $204.65; to Henriette Bauilion, of 26 Rue Lucien Vallee, Petit-Quevilly, Seine Inferieure, France, the sum of $2,421; and to Stanley James Carpenter, of 46 Linnegatan, Goteborg, Sweden, the sum of $256. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States, arising out of damage to private property, loss of wages, personal injuries, and death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable under any existing statute available for the settlement of claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

HARRY RAY SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2763) for the relief of Harry Ray Smith, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "period" to insert "less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the claim of Harry Ray Smith against the United States for compensation which he would have received as an immigrant inspector, United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, during the period from July 11, 1938, to September 27, 1939, had he not been suspended from the Service during such period, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period. Suit on such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MERCEDES HERNANDEZ SAGUAR

The bill (H. R. 1092) for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMIKO YAMAMOTO

The bill (H. R. 1151) for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. THOMAS H. CAMPBELL

The bill (H. R. 2073) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this measure? I understand the military authorities oppose it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to award $5,000 to Maj. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell of Heflin, Ala., in full settlement of their claim against the Government arising out of the death of their minor son, which occurred at Esslingen, Germany, on November 21, 1949.

In this case the death of claimants' 20-month-old son occurred when he was run over by an Army bus transporting the children of Army personnel from school to their homes in Esslingen, Germany. The law requires that the driver of a motor vehicle exercise reasonable care to avoid danger to children whom he may see, or reasonably should see, on or near the street. Here the evidence offered by the only eye witness to this tragic accident is conflicting, and the committee determined after long deliberation that the very close question presented here should be resolved in favor of the claimants.

In these circumstances the committee recommends that the bill be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SISTER ANITA (VINCENZINA DI FRANCO)

The bill (H. R. 2166) for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD S. LAWSON AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2789) for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INEZ PRYER (SISTER MARY CARMEL)

The bill (H. R. 2860) for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALMA COOPERATIVE EQUITY EXCHANGE, ALMA, NEBR., AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3211) for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? It involves approximately $60,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I do not think there should be any objection to passage of this bill because it follows exactly several precedents already approved by the Senate and by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

This bill will grant relief to several business firms having properties in the area to be flooded by construction of Harlan County Dam and Reservoir. In the normal case where property is to be flooded by federally constructed dams, the property owners receive compensation directly from the Army engineers for the value of their property.

In these cases, however, the Army engineers have discovered that they are not authorized by law to pay these claimants for taking their property because of the rather unusual legal status of their holdings. The property of the claimants is located on land leased from the Burlington Railroad under contracts which give the railroad the right to terminate the lease on very short notice—generally 30 days. As a result, it has been found that congressional action is necessary to do justice to these claimants.

It should be noted that no one denies that these claimants have suffered damages in exactly the same way as persons holding property in the reservoir area under some other type of legal set-up. Congress has previously recognized the equity of claims of persons with this type of holding.

For example, last year's civil functions appropriations bill specifically appropriated a sum of money for Garrison Dam "to pay to lawful occupants of properties for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy."

Furthermore, the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate a few weeks ago passed a bill similar to this one, granting retroactive relief to a business firm in exactly the same status as those affected by this bill. That was done in the bill H. R. 3616, granting relief to the Pacific Fruit Express Co., whose property is being flooded in connection with the construction of the McNary Dam.

This bill is carefully drafted so as to provide that the Government will pay either the fair value of the property or the cost of moving the improvements whichever is less. The Army engineers have already worked out a proper figure with the claimants which will amount to $56,500 for the three properties in question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator for the explanation. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF HELEN J. LUMLEY AND KIRSTEN-JESSEN SCHMIDT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the last meeting of the Judiciary Committee, certain bills were ordered reported. I have in my hand one of those bills which we did not get around to reporting to the Senate. I invite the attention of the Senators from Kansas and New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that this bill, which is a private immigration bill, be considered at this time, as having been reported from the committee. It was ordered reported, but had not actually been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2774) for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a mother and daughter who are natives and citizens of Denmark. They last entered the United States as visitors on May 8, 1950. The adult beneficiary was married to a United States citizen on May 28, 1950, and they are presently parties to a divorce suit. In view of this situation the beneficiaries of the bill are not eligible for administrative relief.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VITO AIUTO

The bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Vito Aiuto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF WILLIAM MOONEY

The bill (H. R. 3705) for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIAS PAPADOPOULOS

The bill (H. R. 4396) for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSE LUIS SEGIMONT DE PLANDOLIT AND FUENCISLA SEGIMONT

The bill (H. R. 4590) for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Plandolit and Fuencisla Segimont was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILAS B. MORRIS

The bill (H. R. 4921) for the relief of Silas B. Morris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TERMINAL WAREHOUSE CO.

The bill (H. R. 5004) for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GALLAGHER'S WAREHOUSE, INC.

The bill (H. R. 5006) for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouse, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF EDWARD B. FORMANEK, INC.

The bill (H. R. 5095) for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, Inc., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to pay the estate of Edward B. Formanek the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of said Edward B. Formanek, which occurred May 14, 1943, when the civilian airplane which he was piloting was struck by an Army bomber on the runway at the Birmingham Municipal Airport, Birmingham, Ala.

The traffic-control tower at the Birmingham Airport was operated by a civilian employee of the Department of Commerce. After the decedent's plane had landed several visual signals were transmitted to the pilot of the civilian plane, directing that he clear the runway. The civilian plane had no radio transmitter or receiver but had been cleared in regular course by the proper authorities for the flight which had just been completed. Notwithstanding the fact that the visual signals were disregarded, and that the civilian plane remained motionless on the runway in the direct path of landing traffic, the traffic-control operator gave clearance to the Army bomber for a landing, with the result that the Army bomber crashed into the civilian plane, killing Edward B. Formanek.

Although the Department of the Army attributes decedent's negligence as the cause of this accident, evidence submitted by eye witnesses and others familiar with the facts and circumstances forms the basis for the committee's conclusion that the accident was caused instead by the faulty judgment of the traffic-control operator in allowing the Army plane to land when it should have been evident that he did not have the requisite control over the civilian plane standing on the runway. The evidence before the committee indicated that the accident could have been avoided if the Army plane had not been given clearance to land, and therefore the committee was of the opinion that the doctrine of last clear chance was applicable in the consideration of this case.

The committee recommends that this bill be considered favorably.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOYCE OERLEMANS HAUG

The bill (H. R. 5458) for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NORMAN E. DOLE, JR., ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 5481) for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROLLINS F. BAKER ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 5578) for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID BRAITHWAITE AND ORVIN E. WILDE

The bill (H. R. 5911) for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAUL GUST WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 6070) for the relief of Paul Gust Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMALIA ARCHITETTO

The bill (H. R. 6083) for the relief of Amalia Architetto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 6356) for the relief of William J. Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GAETANA GIAMBRUNO TOMASINO

The bill (H. R. 6637) for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HITOMI MATSUSHITA

The bill (H. R. 6640) for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ILONA LINDELOF

The bill (H. R. 6732) for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ERIKA O. EDER AND JAMES ROBERT EDER

The bill (H. R. 7366) for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son James Robert Eder, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMERCE TRUST CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3060) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co. which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "Code", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government or any other defendant named in such suit."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOSEPHINE F. GARRETT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$140.95" and insert "$390."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANGELINA MARSIGLIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $11,288.50 to the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States as damages for the death of said Michael R. Marsiglia, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1944, when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while said motor vehicle was proceeding on and over the public highway at the corner of West Houston and Varick Streets, Manhattan, New York City, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia."

FRANCIS C. DENNIS AND MARVIN SPIRES

The bill (H. R. 4163) for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires of Eastover, S. C., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the proposed legislation, as amended, will permit the claimants, Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C., to file suit in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina and have that court hear, adjudicate, and render judgment, if any, on their claim for damages which resulted from an accident between an automobile owned and operated by Mr. Dennis and in which Mr. Spires was riding as a passenger and a United States Army vehicle. Inasmuch as the accident happened within the purview of the Federal Tort Claims Act, the committee is of the opinion that this was a claim for the determination of the court. The reason that suit was not filed in accordance with the terms of the Tort Claims Act, according to information received from the House and the sponsor, is that these claimants had or gained no knowledge of any rights they may have had to sue the Government.

As the bill originally came from the House it was to pay money damages for the accident but the committee again felt that the claimants should be put in no better position than they were at the time of the accident, and therefore submits that the bill, as amended, should be considered favorably.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4163), which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C., for alleged personal injuries and expenses incident thereto sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on August 9, 1946, in Columbia, S. C.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, if any, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of a liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C."

JOSEPH MANCHION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4842) which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 2, line 3, to strike out "Court" and insert "Tort"; and in the same line after "Act", to insert:

No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD J. VOLTIN AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 4932) for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill awards the total sum of $53,797.40 to 13 claimants to reimburse them for damage to their property which they sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Air Force airplane in San Antonio, Tex., on July 10, 1948. The airplane had been taken by an aviation cadet without authority at approximately midnight on that date. After taking the plane, the aviation cadet piloted the plane at a low altitude over San Antonio and ultimately crashed into a two-story frame house. The aviation cadet and a tenant in the house next door were killed in the accident and property nearby was either destroyed or damaged.

The evidence before the committee established that the accident was not caused by any fault or negligence on the part of the claimants. Primary responsibility for the accident rests with the aviation cadet, but the committee felt that the person responsible for the security of these planes must have been derelict in his duty. In any event the committee did not believe that the hardship caused by this accident should rest with these claimants.

The committee recommends this legislation as amended. Most of the amendments eliminate the payment to the named claimants of sums which they have already received through insurance.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, is it not true that the payment of this money would be only a gratuity?

Mr. McCARRAN. It will be a gratuity in the sense that the claimants have no legal right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "of" to strike out "$4,784.14" and insert "$2,284.14"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "$842.46" and insert "$94.66"; in line 9, after the word "of", to strike out "$22,605.94" and insert "$15,805.94"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "$14,208.76" and insert "$5,515.73"; on page 2, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "$18,810.28" and insert "$13,798.68"; in line 4, after the figures "$665.22" to strike out "to pay Mrs. Emma Geneva Burke the sum of $549.24;"; in line 9, after the name "San Antonio" to strike out "Texas. Such sums represent property damage sustained by these claimants as a result of the crash of a United States Air Force airplane on Quincy Street, San Antonio, Tex., on July 11, 1948, such plane operated by a member of the United States Air Force" and insert "Texas, and to pay Mrs. W. E. Deal, Jr., of Los Alamos, N. Mex., the sum of $1,209.30. Payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by these claimants as a result of the crash of the United States Air Force airplane on Quincy Street, San Antonio, Tex., on July 11, 1948, such plane being operated by a member of the United States Air Force." and in line 32, after the numerals "1946" to insert the follow-

ing proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount provided for in this act shall be subject to any claim for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund which may have paid any amount to the claimants herein by reason of the property damage incurred:".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ANDRIANNE LUIZ AND JOHN LUIZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7331) for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,250" and insert "$3,000", and in line 8, after the words "of", to strike out "$250, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Andrianne Luiz, and for medical and hospital expenses paid for, and for loss of services to John Luiz," and insert "$25, in full settlement of all the claims of John Luiz against the United States and in full settlement of all claims of Andrianne Luiz against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of wages,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF LANDS AT MILL ROCK ISLAND, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 6129) to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, N. Y., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over by request.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas withhold the objection temporarily, so that I may make a statement?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to withhold it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Briefly, Mr. President, the bill authorizes and directs the General Services Administrator to convey to the city of New York for park purposes all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to Mill Rock Island. A further provision in the bill specifies that this conveyance of title shall be made and is effective only so long as the property is used for park purposes.

Mill Rock Island was acquired by the United States Government in 1911, by the United States Army engineers. The Engineers obtained this property in order to establish a base for their marine operations in the port of New York. The island is no longer used by the United States Army engineers and has been declared surplus. I am informed that no other Government agency has indicated any interest in this property. Consequently, the property was turned over to the General Services Administration. The city of New York has now made application to the General Services Administration and has been advised that the island can be released to the city of New York only through enactment of specific legislation. H. R. 6129 is designed to accomplish this transfer.

Mill Rock Island is located in the center of the confluence of the Harlem and East Rivers. Its size is about 8.6 acres, of which 2.5 acres are above water and 6.1 acres submerged. There is no public commercial water frontage from which any industrial or utilitarian use of this island could be serviced economically. The tidal currents make ferry service hazardous. The only conceivable private use of this property, according to the commissioner of parks, would be as a support for a gigantic advertising structure which would be in violation of zoning and building laws. In spite of the negligible commercial value, the General Services Administration has appraised the island at approximately $85,000. The estimated market value is nil.

It is the expressed intention of the Department of Parks of the City of New York to keep Mill Rock Island in public ownership for scenic, park, and protective purposes. In connection with this purpose, it is pointed out that the city is now carrying through a plan to convert Wards Island, which is adjacent to Mill Rock Island, into an important addition to the city park system. As Governor of New York in 1933, I approved the law to make this park system possible. Under this legislation enacted in 1933, the State of New York has turned over State hospital property in the area to the city.

The city has removed certain State buildings and is developing the land for park purposes. The city has spent and will continue to spend large sums in developing this park system. Mill Rock Island is in the approximate center of the area being developed.

The commissioner of parks, Mr. Robert Moses, has corresponded at some length with Senator MORSE and has acquainted him with the fact that New York has provided the Federal Government with facilities and services of value far in excess of the estimated worth of Mill Rock Island. These facilities and services are namely nine sites in various parks in the city which were turned over to the Army engineers for the placement of antiaircraft batteries. The total fair rental value of these sites amounts to approximately $140,000 per year. The city released the desired antiaircraft battery sites to the Army engineers at no charge and in addition included free water, sewage, and garbage-collection services.

The annual value of these sites and the services provided far exceeds the total value of Mill Rock Island. I would like to stress that Mill Rock Island has no apparent value in and of itself. It is, however, imperative that the island not be used for commercial purposes which would destroy the general effect the department of parks is attempting to create in that area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas ask that the bill go over?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator for his courtesy in allowing me to make the statement.

SANDRA E. DENNETT

The bill (H. R. 4002) for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3303) to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments: On page 5, line 24, after the word "a", to strike out "treasurer." and insert "treasurer, to be selected from the officers and members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference"; on page 6, line 23, after the word "prescribe." to insert "The Board of Directors shall be selected from the officers or members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference", and on page 8, line 5, after the word "persons", to insert "agency, or organization", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following persons: Robert N. Anderson, Arlington, Va.; Emma Mae Brotze, Marshall, Tex.; Leo M. Cadison, Washington, D. C.; Thomas F. Clear, Stamford, Conn.; Earle T. Hawkins, Towson, Md.; Carl B. Hyatt, Rockville, Md.; Richard B. Kennan, Chevy Chase, Md.; and Justin Miller, Washington, D. C., are created a body corporate by the name of the National Conference on Citizenship (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession and the powers and limitations contained in this act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of regulations and bylaws and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to hold annually a national conference on citizenship on or about "Citizenship Day," September 17;

(2) to assist in the development of more dynamic procedures for making citizenship more effective, including the promotion and encouragement of local, State, and regional citizenship conferences; and

(3) to indicate the ways and means by which various organizations may contribute concretely to the development of a more active, alert, enlightened, conscientious, and progressive citizenry in our country.

DIGITIZED BY MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(3) to choose such officers, managers, agents, and employees as the business of the corporation may require;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State in which such corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs, including the establishment and maintenance of local and State conferences on citizenship;

(5) to contract and be contracted with;

(6) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and accomplishing the purposes of the corporation, subject to applicable provisions of law of any State (a) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (b) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by a corporation operating in such State;

(7) to transfer and convey real or personal property;

(8) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, subject to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law;

(9) to use the corporate funds to give prizes, or awards, to citizens for outstanding contributions toward the achievement of the purposes of the corporation;

(10) to publish a magazine or other publication consistent with its corporate purposes;

(11) to use and display such emblems and badges as it may adopt; and

(12) to do any and all acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

HEADQUARTERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICES; STATES AND TERRITORIAL SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 5. (a) The headquarters and principal offices of the corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, or in the States of Maryland or Virginia, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to these places but may be conducted throughout the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, such designation to be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed sufficient notice or service upon the corporation.

MEMBERSHIP; VOTING RIGHTS

SEC. 6. Membership in the corporation shall be confined to agencies and organizations and the rights and privileges of membership shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, be prescribed by the bylaws of the corporation. In the conduct of the business of the annual national conference on citizenship each agency or organization sending delegates to, and participating in such conference shall have one vote.

NATIONAL OFFICERS; ELECTION OF OFFICERS

SEC. 7. (a) The national officers shall be a president, who shall serve as chairman of the board of directors and of the executive committee, a first vice president, a second vice president, a third vice president, a secretary, and a treasurer, to be selected from the officers and members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) For the purposes of initiating the corporation, the national officers shall be elected within 10 days of the date of enactment of this act by the persons named in the first section of this act, to serve until the final session of the next following annual conference. Thereafter, the national officers of the corporation shall be elected biennially by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS; COMPOSITION; MEETINGS, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES; EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

SEC. 8. (a) From the date of enactment of this act until the final session of the next following annual conference, the governing body of the corporation, which shall exercise the powers herein granted to the corporation, shall be the persons named in the first section of this act and such additional persons as shall be named by them. Thereafter, the governing body of the corporation shall be a board of directors consisting of such number (not less than 10 including ex officio members) as the bylaws may prescribe. The Board of Directors shall be selected from the officers or members of the member agencies or organizations participating in the conference.

(b) The members of the board of directors shall be elected for such term as the bylaws shall prescribe by a majority vote of the agencies and organizations sending delegates to, and participating in the annual conference, one vote to each such agency and to each such organization.

(c) The board shall meet at least once each year at such time and place as may be prescribed by the bylaws. The annual report of the board shall be presented at such meeting. Special meetings of the board may be called as prescribed by the bylaws.

(d) The board shall designate three of its own members, who together with the president and the three vice presidents shall constitute the executive committee which, when the board is not in session, shall have and exercise the powers of the board subject to its direction and have the power to authorize the seal of the corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it.

(e) An executive director for the corporation shall be selected by the executive committee in keeping with qualifications and terms of employment adopted by such committee. Other professional staff members shall be nominated by the executive director and approved by the executive committee.

USE OF INCOME OR ASSETS; LOANS TO OFFICERS, DIRECTORS, OR EMPLOYEES

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, or director, or be distributable to any such person, agency, or organization except upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation as provided in section 15 of this act. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the executive committee from adopting terms of employment of the executive director as prescribed by section 8 (e) of this act.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its officers, directors, or employees. Any director who votes for or assents to the making of a loan to an officer, director, or employee of the corporation, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 10. The corporation, and its members, officers, and directors, as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office, nor advocate, sponsor, or promote legislation in the Congress of the United States or in the legislatures of the several States.

LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 11. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents when acting within the scope of their authority.

PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, nor to declare or pay any dividends, its objects and purposes being solely patriotic and educational.

BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of the annual conference, the board of directors, and committees having any authority under the board of directors; and it shall also keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member entitled to vote or his agent or attorney at any reasonable time.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS; REPORT TO COMPTROLLER GENERAL

SEC. 14. (a) The financial transactions shall be audited annually for the fiscal year ending June 30 of each year by an independent certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be filed annually with the Comptroller General in accordance with such regulations and upon such form as he shall prescribe verified by the certified public accountant by whom the audit is made.

USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon final dissolution or liquidation of the corporation, and after the discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation shall be transferred by the board of directors to some recognized agency or agencies engaged in the furtherance and advancement of citizenship.

EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the name, the National Conference on Citizenship, and such emblems, seals, and badges as the corporation may lawfully adopt.

RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I understand, the bill conforms to all standards and precedents which have heretofore been established in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

DR. ALEXANDER D. MORUZI

The bill (S. 1780) for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MICHAEL COSMO ZULLO

The bill (S. 1966) for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Michael Cosmo Zullo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HELGA EVELINE MATZ

The bill (H. R. 6109) for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEU WAI UNG (WONG WAI UNG) AND LEU WAI CHIU (WONG WAI CHIU)

The bill (H. R. 6641) for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WONG YANG YEE AND WONG SUE CHEE

The bill (H. R. 6863) for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB GITLIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 525) for the relief of Jacob Gitlin, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Jacob Gitlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GRANT OF FRANCHISE TO PERSONS OVER 18 YEARS OF AGE

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 127) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age 18 the right to vote was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, over by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

BENEFITS UNDER VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3200) to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that a companion bill which has passed the House be substituted for the Senate bill. The House bill, H. R. 7721, has just come over. It is not yet on the calendar, but it has come over from the House. I ask that the House bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7721) to extend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina that House bill 7721 be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7721) to extend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 4 minutes to explain my amendment, which I offer to the House bill. May my amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. (a) The rate of compensation of any employee who was changed from a position, the rate of pay of which was fixed in accordance with prevailing local wages upon recommendation of wage boards or other similar authority, to a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and placed in the appropriate step of the grade during the period between the effective date and the date of enactment of Public Law 201, approved October 24, 1951, shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the new rate provided by section 1 (a) of Public Law 201, Eighty-second Congress, for the step in which he was placed at the time of such assignment.

(b) This section shall become effective as of the first day of the pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

(c) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this section only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement, or the person or persons specified in section 1 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), in the case of a deceased officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of said officer's or employee's death.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], is willing to take the amendment to conference. In fact, the Senator has informed me that had I not offered the amendment, he himself would have submitted a similar one.

The inequity sought to be cured by the amendment has only recently come to the attention of the Senate, and the language which I propose as an amendment has been carefully worked out by my staff and the staff of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, working in conjunction with representatives of the Civil Service Commission.

The amendment would apply to persons who were transferred from so-called wage board positions to Classification Act positions subsequent to July 1, 1951, but prior to the effective date of Public Law 201, October 24, 1951. Due to a ruling of the Comptroller General as to the method of making the retroactive pay adjustment certain persons who transferred from wage board positions to Classification Act positions instead of being benefited by the pay increase actually lost money.

In some instances the persons transferred from the wage board positions

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

not only did not get the pay increase intended in Public Law 201 but were reduced in salary after the Comptroller General's increase. This amendment would cure that inequity and would authorize the application of the pay increase to the salary fixed for the grade and step of the position to which he was transferred in the Classification Act scale.

A great number of individuals have been paid on the basis that the law passed last year intended the action which this amendment would provide. They are now being required or have been required to refund the money. This has created great hardships in some cases, as employees have relied on being entitled to the pay increase. They would be entitled to it except for pure technicality of law.

Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of the statement which I have prepared, more fully explaining the situation, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM

Several thousand employees transferred from ungraded to Classification Act positions during the retroactive period provided in Public Law 201 and received increases which they have had to refund. In some instances they would have received more money benefit if the old rates had not been changed.

In moving an employee from an ungraded position to one under the Classification Act, an agency has discretionary authority to pay the employee any rate within his grade which does not exceed his highest previous rate. If such rate falls between two standard rates for the grade, he may be given the next higher rate.

Here is a specific case:

Employee in a wage-board position received $1.32 per hour; on a per annum basis	$2,745.60
On Aug. 8, 1951, he was moved to GS–2, step (e) at $2,770 since $2,745.60 falls between the two step rates of $2,690 and $2,770	2,770.00
On Sept. 16, 1951, he was promoted to GS–3, step (d). Since $2,770 to $2,810 was not a full salary step he was given	2,890.00
Subsequent to Oct. 24, 1951, the agency increased the rate of $2,890 to the corresponding new rate	3,190.00

Later the agency reconstructed the action in accordance with the Comptroller General's decision:

The salary of $2,745.60 was less than the new minimum rate of GS–2 so he was given	$2,750
The promotion from the new minimum rate of GS–2 ($2,750) to the new minimum rate of GS–3 ($2,950) met the requirement of the $80 step increase	2,950

Thus, the employee was changed from the fourth rate of GS–3 to the first rate of the grade and has to refund the difference between $3,190 and $2,950 per annum.

In this particular case, Public Law 201 benefited the employee by $60 per annum. This actual example is somewhat more complicated than most cases in this category because it also involved promotion from one grade to another. However, if the employee had not been promoted from GS–2 to GS–3 he would have been reduced in pay. The enactment of Public Law 201, rather than benefiting this employee would actually have cost him $20 per annum and resulted in placing him at the minimum rate of GS–2 rather than at the fifth rate.

In some instances, wage-board rates were increased during the interim but these transferees lost out on this also because they were then in Classification Act positions.

In the Department of the Air Force, things were even worse because the Department correctly interpreted the original Comptroller's ruling and withheld adjustments until they could get a decision on the precise point. The decision of the Comptroller, B–107070 of January 22, 1952, stated that they could make the adjustments as was originally done in the above case. This they proceeded to do with a lump-sum payment. Sometime later the Civil Service Commission learned of the decision and thinking it to be in conflict with the earlier ruling to the Commission, informally inquired about it. The GAO immediately discovered that there had been a slip-up and corrected the decision to the Air Force with the result that the employees had to pay back the money they had received in the meantime.

The effect of section 3 (a) of the amendment would be to nullify the correction to the Comptroller decision (B–107070 of January 22, 1952) so as to restore to the wage-board employees transferred to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, during the retroaction period provided in Public Law 201, the pay increase provided in said Public Law and to refund to them the full amount that the corrected decision of the Comptroller General has caused them to refund.

Section 3 (b) provides that the amendment shall be retroactive to the effective date of Public Law 201 of the 1st session of the Eighty-first Congress.

This subsection is merely a restatement of section 6 (a) of Public Law 201 as proposed to be amended by S. 2457, Senate Calendar No. 1735, reported June 23, 1952.

Section 3 (c) Public Law 201 provided that the retroactive increase shall be paid to employees still on the rolls as of October 24, 1951, with certain specific exemptions.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be accepted by the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina accept the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this amendment is acceptable to me as chairman of the committee. I have discussed it with certain members of the committee. As the Senator from Utah has stated, his staff worked on this amendment. It is nothing but equity. First the Comptroller General ordered that the increases be paid from July 1 to October 1 of last year. Then he made another ruling, that the increases could not be paid. Now an effort is being made to have the amounts repaid. As I see it, this amendment is nothing but justice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr BENNETT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3200 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

It is the purpose of this legislation to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after April 28, 1952 (the date of the signing of the treaty terminating the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan) and prior to July 2, 1955, the date on which inductions under the Universal Military Training and Service Act are terminated.

Under the present Veterans' Preference Act, veterans' preference for civil-service purposes has been granted, among others, to those ex-servicemen and women who have served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces of the United States during any war or during any campaign or expedition, for which a campaign badge has been authorized.

While hostilities during World War II ceased with VJ-day, a technical state of war existed until April 28, 1952. As a result, persons who entered the Armed Forces during actual hostilities and until April 28, 1952, were entitled to the benefits accorded to veterans under the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. However, with the signing of the peace Treaty with the Government of Japan, only those servicemen actually in Korea, for which military operation a campaign badge is authorized, have veterans' preference for civil-service purposes.

The men presently being inducted into the armed services are, of course, faced with many of the same situations as those who were inducted prior to April 28, 1952. They must involuntarily submit to a disruption in their professional careers or occupations, manner, and place of living and undergo rigorous training.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR KNOWLAND

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am always pleased when one of my distinguished colleagues receives an appropriate tribute for honorable and distinguished service to his country.

But today, I am particularly pleased to bring to the attention of the Senate, an editorial which appeared in the Tuesday, July 1, 1952, issue of the Binghamton (N. Y.) Sun.

Every Member of this Senate, and indeed every American, should read this editorial with deep pride and then proceed to ponder upon the suggestions which it enunciates because it reflects high credit upon a great American—the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

From the moment I entered upon my duties of a Member of this august body, I saw in BILL KNOWLAND, a capacity for tireless, unselfish, energetic, efficient, and courageous service.

Since that day, he has established a record of performance which marks him not only as one of the outstanding Members of the Senate of the United States,

but also one of the great statesmen of our country.

The editorial to which reference has been made, portrays the fine qualities of the man and his accomplishments more eloquently than anything that I could say.

Not wishing to take the time of the Senate in which to read the entire editorial, I shall read only a few excerpts therefrom:

When Senator BILL KNOWLAND recently accomplished the phenomenal feat of winning by a record-breaking vote both the Republican and the Democrat nominations for United States Senator in California's primaries, it could hardly be said that a new star was born in the political firmament. KNOWLAND already was a star. His smashing primary victory simply called national attention to his stardom. * * * In Washington his brilliant mind, engaging personality, energetic character, and rugged honesty, quickly established an enviable reputation as United States Senator. * * * Senator KNOWLAND has always shown himself to be a solid rock of common sense and courageous sincereness. * * * To know Senator KNOWLAND is to respect and trust him thoroughly. * * * He has tremendous opportunities for public service as a powerful and influential Senator. He has become a real national asset for America, for the Republican Party, and for all the citizens of the Nation. We hope he will serve where he can do the most public good, and we are sure that will also be his own personal desire. We are very proud that there is a Senator BILL KNOWLAND. We are proud that in these difficult times when it often seems that democracy itself is on trial, we can point to BILL KNOWLAND and say, "There is a United States Senator who is young, able, honest, courageous, intelligent, with the courage to stand up every time and fight openly for what he thinks is right and best for America."

Mr. President, because we who serve with BILL KNOWLAND hold him in deep affection and high regard; and because we admire all of his fine qualities, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "New Star in the West" be inserted in its entirety in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STAR IN THE WEST

When Senator BILL KNOWLAND recently accomplished the phenomenal feat of winning by a record-breaking vote both the Republican and the Democratic nominations for United States Senator in California's primaries, it could hardly be said that a new star was born in the political firmament. KNOWLAND already was a star. His smashing primary victory simply called national attention to his stardom. As a member of the California State assembly, and later the State senate, and as Republican national committeeman from California, he distinguished himself as a serious, hard-working, friendly, public official. He saw overseas duty as an enlisted man and officer in World War II, and was still overseas when appointed in 1945 as United States Senator to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Hiram Johnson.

In Washington his brilliant mind, engaging personality, energetic character, and rugged honesty, quickly established an enviable reputation as United States Senator. In Congress, where too often certain characters gain and seek to hold public office by demagoguery, hot air, and clap-trap, Senator KNOWLAND has always shown himself to be a solid rock of common sense and courageous sincereness. As a Senator he has been dignified without being stuffy; he has been effective and colorful without any cheap gaudiness or headline hunting. To know Senator KNOWLAND is to respect and trust him thoroughly. And from the vote given him by the California people they certainly feel they know him well. His campaign attracted a great deal of national attention and here in central New York many people having friends and relatives in California got busy by mail in behalf of Senator KNOWLAND. One of the smears the opposition attempted was to deride his interest in protecting Formosa—and California's coast—and term KNOWLAND "the Senator from Formosa." By trying to make this an issue the opposition must now be greatly more distressed by the appearance of California voters overwhelmingly voting that Formosa should have a seat in the United States Senate. Seriously though, the people of New York State certainly congratulate California voters on their fine discernment and good judgment in returning BILL KNOWLAND to the United States Senate—also for that matter on their selection of his brilliant and able colleague, Senator RICHARD NIXON.

Politically speaking, any Republican candidate for President should be proud and eager to have as a running mate, Senator KNOWLAND for Vice President, but historically the Vice Presidency more often leads to oblivion than elsewhere. We are not sure we would like to see the great talents of Senator KNOWLAND filed away in the oft-time mustiness of the Vice Presidency. He has tremendous opportunities for public service as a powerful and influential Senator. He has become a real national asset for America, for the Republican Party, and for all the citizens of the Nation. We hope he will serve where he can do the most public good, and we are sure that will also be his own personal desire. We are very proud that there is a Senator BILL KNOWLAND. We are proud that in these difficult times when it often seems that democracy itself is on trial, we can point to BILL KNOWLAND and say, "There is a United States Senator who is young, able, honest, courageous, intelligent, with the courage to stand up every time and fight openly for what he thinks is right and best for America. He has just proved that a man can be all these things in public office and still be reelected. And our political system produced BILL KNOWLAND even though there have been Pendergasts and Tammany Halls." And that, friends, ought to be encouragement enough for every right-thinking man and woman to get busy in their communities, take part in political affairs, and try to get more public officials like BILL KNOWLAND in office.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, such a tribute should make us all proud to be Members of the Senate of the United States for the good and sufficient reason that we have the privilege of serving with a man of such distinction.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE OF LAWS

The bill (H. R. 1758) to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I feel that the remainder of the bills on the calendar from Calendar 1974 through 2001 should be carefully explained. I do not like unnecessarily to prolong the call of the calendar, but these bills were reported only yesterday and we have not been able to get copies of the bills or the reports. I think under the circumstances it would not be wise to pass any of the remainder of the bills on the calendar without a thorough explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 1758?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to say that the Senate passed a similar bill and it was sent to the House. The House passed its own bill. The only change in the House bill is in the penalty provided, from $50 to $100. That is the only change which the House made.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is some confusion in the Chamber with respect to what is pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 1758?

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, that is not the bill to which the Senator from South Carolina has addressed himself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is the bill to which I am referring. The bill came to the Senate from the House. I am talking about the House bill. I should like to see the House bill passed, instead of having the Senate bill enacted. The Senate passed a similar bill and it was sent to the House. The House did not act on the Senate bill. Instead, the House passed its own bill. They are identical bills, with the exception of the penalty provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 1758 to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM IRRIGATION WORKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2320) to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, a few minutes ago the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] objected to Calendar No. 1777, H. R. 2470, granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes. I am compelled to object to the pending bill because it is a parallel bill to the bill to which the senior Senator from Washington objected.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The pending bill applies to Chief Joseph Dam on the Columbia River, and it would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with a study of the use of the water stored in Chief Joseph Dam for reclamation purposes. The bill (H. R. 2470) which was objected to a few minutes ago seeks to do the same thing on a five-State basis. I believe that the five States which are involved in H. R. 2470, which seek to enter into a compact for the maximum use of the water resources in the Columbia River Basin, might object to any local dam such as is proposed in the pending bill, because it could interfere with the over-all basin pattern of development.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator object to the bill, or does he object to me?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am objecting on principle. The principle involved in the pending bill is comparable to the principle involved in the bill to which the Senator objected. The bill to which the Senator objected applies to the five States in the Columbia River Basin.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the Senator from Idaho yield further?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator knows that I stated very frankly to the Senate why I thought H. R. 4197 should go over. I had the courtesy to talk to the Senator from Idaho about it, and I told him the reason for my objection. I said I would be glad to have the bill go over while we were trying to make telephone calls to the people who thought they should be heard, because there were no hearings on the bill. It is an entirely different matter than the pending bill. If the Senator from Idaho wishes to retaliate by objecting to this little bill, he can do so.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is not retaliating. He is presenting the facts. The five States involved are entitled to the same consideration to which a local project in the Columbia River Basin is entitled. Upon that basis, Mr. President, I do object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this matter may not be of concern to some of our colleagues. Certainly both measures to which the Senator from Idaho has made reference are imperatively important to the States within the Pacific Northwest, particularly to the State of Washington. The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], is a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which reported H. R. 2470, the compact bill. He was one of the three Senators on the subcommittee which reported the bill which has been discussed by the Senator from Idaho. If the Senator from Oregon were to agree, I would deeply appreciate his stating his attitude and making his observations concerning the problem presented before us. Would the senior Senator from Oregon indicate whether both bills are deserving of being passed at this time, whether there is a preference between the bills, or whether one should be passed and the other postponed?

Mr. CORDON. I have none of the attributes of Solomon, but inasmuch as my opinion has been requested, I shall give it for what it is worth.

The same principle runs through both bills. The purpose of the compact is to give equitable division to the affected States of the use of the water in the State through which the water flows from the point of origin to the time it meets the sea. The bill with respect to Chief Joseph Dam provides for a special use of the water; that is, it has its origin in Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho, and its use would be in the State of Washington. It seems to me that the same principle applies in both bills, and both should be passed or both should fail of passage, as I see it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho withhold his objection so that I may make a statement?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I reserve my objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Oregon is quite right in stating that the general aspects of both bills are the same. One bill gives the consent of Congress for the States to negotiate and enter into a compact for the allocation of the waters of the Columbia River Basin. I stated very clearly, in connection with H. R. 2470, that I wanted the bill to go over by request. I made that statement.

I think the RECORD will also show that I went to the senior Senator from Idaho and to my colleague, the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. The Senator from Oregon did not happen to be on the floor at that time. I told those Senators exactly what organizations think a hearing should be had on this very important matter, which involves the waters of five States. They said that no hearings had been held in either the House or the Senate committees.

I said that personally I think the bill is all right, and that we are trying to find out whether we can reach an agreement. I said I shall be glad to have the bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

I suggested to both those Senators, personally, a minor amendment to the bill.

Now along comes another little bill; and I suppose the fact that it bears my name and involves the same matter, is the explanation of the objection. The objection probably is as valid to the one bill as to the other.

I was hoping that because I was trying to work out an agreement, the bill would be placed at the foot of the calendar so that an agreement could be reached.

I am perfectly willing to say that the Senator from Oregon is quite correct.

I wish to place in the RECORD, not necessarily the technical objection to the compact, but at least the views of some persons in regard to whether we should enter into this matter without hearings.

I suggested a very innocuous amendment which I thought would satisfy everyone, and I also went to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CAIN. May we not have a better opportunity to resolve this admittedly important question if we have both of the bills in question go to the foot of the calendar, to be considered later in the afternoon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I was going to suggest that both bills be placed at the foot of the calendar, and then perhaps we can work out the matter.

My staff is trying to get in contact, by long-distance telephone, with these very important organizations in my State, which feel that they should consider the compact.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, directing my remarks to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], let me say to him that I just came to the floor. I know nothing about the bill he has been discussing.

However, knowing the senior Senator from Washington as I do, I am quite convinced that he and I can go to the cloakroom and discuss this matter with the other Senators involved.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that both these bills be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN OTTAWA NATIONAL FOREST, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 5055) to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRUCK CROP AND CITRUS INSECT LABORATORIES

The bill (H. R. 7952) to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BURLEY TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 8170) relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Tennessee and the two Senators from Kentucky have been in conference in regard to House bill

8170. Those conferences will be continued.

I now ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice, subject to an early call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Kentucky referring to House bill 8170, Calendar 1978?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky wish to have this bill placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish it to be in such a position that it will be subject to early consideration, as of the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill be passed over, without prejudice.

CONSTRUCTION RESERVE FUNDS UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT

The resolution (S. J. Res. 166) to extend the time for the use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? There is an identical House joint resolution, which could be substituted in lieu of the Senate resolution.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the joint resolution would merely extend the time for the use of funds which have been deposited in the construction reserve fund. It extends the time for 1 year. Several shipping lines, that have sums in the United States Treasury deposited in the construction reserve fund, have been unable to use those funds for construction, for various reasons, such as the shortage of steel, and, sometimes, the inability to contract for the construction of a ship. They want to use these funds for construction, rather than to withdraw them. This joint resolution would merely extend the time for 1 year, so that, within the period through 1952, to March 31, 1953, they could still use the funds for ship construction.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Will the Senator indicate to the Senate whether there is any objection on the part of any Government agencies and if the action of the committee was unanimous?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The action of the committee was unanimous. I have the report of the agency which is particularly interested. Both reports are here. Neither the Department of Commerce nor the Bureau of the Budget opposed the resolution.

I may say further for the RECORD that we have had to take this kind of action twice for the simple reason that conditions following the war have been such that some of the shipping companies which have this money lying in the Treasury, for purposes of construction, have been unable, on account of material shortage, or for other reasons, to proceed with their original plans. I hope that it will be unnecessary to extend the time again. No harm is done. The money is there. We would rather that it be used for ship construction; though, if it is withdrawn it is taxable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 480) to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the House joint resolution being substituted for the Senate joint resolution and being now considered?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 480) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE SHIPMENT OF GAME FISH

The bill (S. 3438) to further regulate interstate shipment of game fish was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have a brief explanation of this?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should be glad to explain that bill. In 1926 we passed what was known as the Black Bass Act, which prohibited the transportation in interstate commerce of game fish, illegally taken. It applied solely to game fish. This eliminates the word "game" and leaves it "all fish illegally taken" within meaning of the laws of the States, wherever the fish may be taken, to be transported in interstate commerce.

I may say, as a matter of interest possibly to the Senator from Kansas, that a good defense lawyer, who might catch someone illegally transporting from State to State fish illegally caught could stand in front of a jury, composed in part of fishermen, and make an effective argument as to whether or not the fish caught were game fish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the senior Senator from Colorado. I know that Colorado mountain trout is a game fish.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is it not a fact that this bill merely gives force and effect to all State laws prohibiting the shipment of fish illegally caught? Is not that the purpose of it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the purpose of it. The fish may be either undersized or illegally taken within the State, either commercially or otherwise.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5803) to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the House bill being substituted for the Senate bill and being presently considered?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 5803) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 3438 is indefinitely postponed.

CAROL R. GRAY

The bill (H. R. 7477) for the relief of Carol R. Gray was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have a brief explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has just been informed that the companion bill, an identical Senate bill, was passed earlier today.

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 2657) to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414) was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is desired. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to make certain administrative changes in the Department of Commerce which were inadvertently omitted from Reorganization Plan No. 5. It is simply to correct a mistake that was made in the reorganization plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, S. 2657, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 2, line 1, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. The language preceding the semicolon in the third sentence of section 2 of the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825, 826), is amended to read: "There shall also be such clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by the Congress".

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), is amended by striking out the following words: "including the Chief Clerk and Superintendent, who shall be chief executive officer of the Department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department."

SEC. 2. The language preceding the semicolon in the third sentence of section 2 of the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825, 826), is amended to read: "There shall also be such clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by the Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825)."

YOUNG WAI KIT

The bill (H. R. 5618) for the relief of Young Wai Kit, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have a brief explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants to the minor Chinese child of a United States citizen the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROF. WERNER RICHTER AND MAX HORKHEIMER

The bill (H. R. 7833) for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Max Horkheimer was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill preserves for two naturalized citizens of the United States their United States citizenship notwithstanding their residence abroad. The beneficiaries of the bill returned to Germany in 1948 and are rectors of two German universities. It is stated that their presence there is in the interest of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEVORK ZOHRAB BANDARIAN

The bill (H. R. 6983) for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, for the sake of saving time, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Nevada would give us explanations on all the bills, from Calendar 1985 through 1990, without a repetition of my request each time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. President, this is Calendar 1985, House bill 6983. This bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 22-year-old native of Iran who last entered the United States as a seaman on December 25, 1949. In 1950 he fraudulently obtained a false certificate of birth and succeeded in joining the United States Air Force and served for 14 months before being discharged because of alienage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERALD A. AND LYNN W. ROEHM

The bill (H. R. 6978) for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants to the minor adopted children of United States citizens the status of nonquota immigrants which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of United States citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEOPOLD LANFER AND ELFRIEDE LANFER

The bill (H. R. 7850) for the relief of Leopold Lanfer and Elfriede Lanfer was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants to the minor children to be adopted by United States citizens the status of nonquota immigrants, which is the status normally enjoyed by alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY IZUMI

The bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of Mary Izumi was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill waives the racial barrier to admission into the United States in behalf of the minor half-Japanese child to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The child would be considered to be a nonquota immigrant, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of United States citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GIUSEPPE BIOLZI

The bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 19-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who last entered the United States as a visitor on May 28, 1949. He resides with his uncle in Rockland County, N. Y., and was legally adopted by his uncle on December 3, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUELE ROSSI

The bill (H. R. 6278) for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi) was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill grants to the minor adopted child of United States citizens the status of a nonquota immigrant which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 6544) to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if the senior Senator from Pennsylvania will give us a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who is in conference asked me to make an explanation of the bill when it was called on the calendar.

This bill amends the act of June 28, 1948, involving the acquisition of land around Independence Hall in Philadelphia, so that that very historic and inspiring building may be seen better by the people of the United States. The bill also gives the American Philosophical Society, the oldest scientific society in America, the privilege of erecting on this ground a replica of the old library building at a cost of approximately $2,000,000. They will erect the building themselves.

It also adds to the authorization of $4,435,000 because of the increased value of real estate.

It also provides for the elimination of $2,000,000 which was originally intended to be used to purchase the land where Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. That is now occupied by a fine office building, and it does not seem advisable to disturb it.

The State of Pennsylvania has already contributed $3,500,000 to this project and it is obligated for a further sum of $2,600,000. The city of Philadelphia has contributed quite a large sum of money.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN VIRGIN ISLANDS

The bill (H. R. 5198) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, Virgin Islands, to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I have no intention of objecting to the consideration of the bill, but I should like to have an explanation of it.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, this bill is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of Defense.

It involves transferring from the custody of the Secretary of the Army to the custody of the Secretary of the Interior two parcels of land located in the Virgin Islands.

No expense to the Government is involved in this transaction. The property is currently surplus to the needs of the three military departments, and in line with the mission of the Department of the Interior with respect to maintaining as sound an economy as possible in the Virgin Islands, the transaction seems to be a highly meritorious one.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to know what the two parcels of land are.

Mr. HUNT. One is a small island, off the mainland, which the Secretary of Defense at one time had in mind fortifying, but finds no longer any need for it. The Department of the Interior feels that they can make out of it a tourist center which would be attractive and would add to the economy of the islands.

The other piece of land is on the highest point. It was previously considered as a good outlook point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPECIAL STAMPS AND DIES TO ENCOURAGE VOTING

The bill (S. 3435), to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to speak a few moments in order to explain this measure and to indicate that I have an amendment which I shall send to the desk in a moment for consideration.

This bill is a companion bill to one on the same subject which was introduced in the House by Representative EDWARD H. REES, of Kansas. It provides for the use by first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps in order to encourage voting in general elections.

Senators who are members of the American Legion should pick up the latest edition of the magazine, which urges people to register so as to be able to vote.

The front page of the American Federalist also urges people to register, and other great publications advocate the same thing, forcefully to impress upon the people of the country the importance of registering and voting.

The junior chambers of commerce have been advocating the same idea. The Junior Chamber of Commerce of Wichita, Kans., my home town, is pushing it. Some of the members conferred with Representative REES, and then they came to me. So we introduced similar bills on this subject. So that there may be no question about what it meant, I send to the desk an amendment which I should like to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the word "election", it is proposed to insert "held in November of an even numbered year."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator give us an approximate idea of what the cost will be? My recollection is that it would cost more than $175,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to read from the House report:

> Hearings were held on this legislation at which representatives of veterans' organizations testified in favor of the legislation and a representative of the Post Office Department discussed the methods which would be used by the Department to put the legislation into effect. The Postmaster General has estimated that the cost of this legislation will be $175,650.80.

Mr. LANGER. Is that cost justified?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that any amount of money, within reason, which would impress upon the American people the importance of registering and voting is well spent. I consider $175,000 a mere pittance, when we think about the millions of dollars we appropriate, which I think are probably, in many instances, less productive of good, constitutional government and activities on the part of the citizens of this great Republic.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator tell me how the die will be used?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. It will be used for the cancellation of stamps, and such words as are determined to be proper to be used will appear on the cancellations.

Mr. LANGER. Would that be on first-class mail?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have been informed that it would be used on first- and third-class mail.

Mr. LANGER. The report says here "first and second class."

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That refers to first- and second-class post offices. The bill provides for use of the cancellation on first- and third-class mail.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DAMAGES TO PUBLIC AIRPORTS FROM MILITARY OPERATIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2815) to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) By deleting the last sentence of subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Appropriations made pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended."

(b) By amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON FILING OF REQUESTS

"(d) No request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport submitted pursuant to this section shall be considered by the Secretary unless such request was submitted to him within 6 months after the occurrence of the damage upon which the request is based, except that in the case of a request relating to damage occurring while the airport was under the control and management of the United States, such request may be submitted to the Secretary within 6 months after the transfer of such control and management of the airport to the public agency involved."

(c) By adding thereto a new subsection (e) as follows:

"TIME LIMITATIONS ON MAKING OF CERTIFICATIONS

"(e) No certification pursuant to this section with respect to a request submitted to the Secretary after the date of enactment of this subsection (except a supplemental certification of the amount by which the actual cost of accomplished rehabilitation or repair exceeds the amount of a prior certification which was based on the estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair) shall be made to the Congress after a date 1 year from the expiration of the period prescribed by law for the submittal of such request."

SEC. 2. There is hereby repealed the proviso contained in the appropriation to the Department of Commerce Civil Aeronautics Administration, headed "Claims, Federal Airport Act," in chapter III of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), reading as follows: "*Provided*, That no request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport filed under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act shall be considered by the Secretary unless filed prior to July 1, 1951, and the Secretary shall make no certification to Congress after July 1, 1952, of the actual or estimated cost of such rehabilitation or repair."

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding the proviso of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, cited in section 2 and the provisions of subsection (d) of section 17 of the Federal

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Airport Act, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to consider, pursuant to the said section 17, any request for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation or repair of a public airport, which is submitted to him within 6 months following the effective date of this act, if such request would have met the time requirements of the said subsection (d) had it been filed on some date subsequent to June 30, 1951, and prior to the effective date of this act.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I would appreciate an explanation of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to extend to the conflict in Korea, or whatever it may be called, whether a police action, or otherwise, the provision contained in the law during World War II, to this extent, that the bill provides for reimbursement for the repair and restoration of civilian airports when they are taken over by the military.

The Department of Commerce has requested that the bill be passed and the armed services have no objection to it. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced the bill, and is sponsoring it.

Municipal organizations, which have built most of the airports involved in the bill, are heartily in accord with its provisions. It seems to me that the bill is one that should not be objected to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in justice to the municipalities all across the country which own and operate municipal airports, this bill should be enacted.

In the Federal Airport Act, provision was made for repaying municipalities for damage caused to municipal airports by the use of such airports on the part of the armed services of the United States. Through a rider on an appropriation bill, the authority for such reimbursements has been terminated. The effect of this bill would be to restore that authority, subject to audit and approval by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. In other words, this bill would make it possible for municipalities whose airports are damaged through Federal use, to be reimbursed for the amount of such damage.

I have in my files letters from scores of city officials in cities all over the country urging that this legislation be enacted; and I earnestly hope the Senate will approve this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, so as to extend and broaden the program for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of public airports damaged by Federal agencies, and for other purposes."

DEVELOPMENT OF DRAMA AND MUSIC PROGRAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2300) to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational drama and music programs in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "educational" to strike out "drama and music" and insert "fine arts"; in line 6, after the word "universities" to insert "and profit organizations"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "States", to insert "where the Federal Government has suitable space under its jurisdiction and control"; in line 3, after the word "presentation" to strike out "drama and music productions" and insert "(including performance of services incidental thereto), fine arts productions"; in line 5, after the word "universities" to insert "and nonprofit organizations"; in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "The Commissioner of Education shall submit to each department and agency of the Federal Government, and to the government of the District of Columbia, a list of the institutions having such programs and desiring to present such productions.", and insert "The Commissioner of Education shall submit to each department and agency of the Federal Government, and to the government of the District of Columbia, a list of the institutions having such programs and desiring to present such productions."; in line 15, after the word "any" to insert "college, university, or nonprofit"; in line 16, after the word "purpose" to insert "of this act"; in line 17, after the word "Education" to strike out "any department or agency of the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia" and insert "the General Services Administration or the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be"; in line 21, after the words "charge to", to strike out "accredited nonprofit educational institutions" and insert "any such college, university, or organization", and in line 23, after the word "of" to strike out "drama and music" and insert "fine arts", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and profit organizations, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make provision for bringing to Washington, District of Columbia, and to other communities in the United States where the Federal Government has suitable space under its jurisdiction and control, for public presentation (including performance of services incidental thereto), fine arts productions of such colleges and universities and nonprofit organizations. The Commissioner of Education shall submit to each department and agency of the Federal Government, and to the government of the District of Columbia, a list of the institutions having such programs and desiring to present such productions.

SEC. 2. Upon the request of any college, university, or nonprofit organization approved for the purpose of this act by the Commissioner of Education, the General Services Administration or the government of the District of Columbia, as the case may be, is authorized to make available without charge to any such college, university, or organization, for the presentation of fine arts productions under this act, any auditorium subject to its jurisdiction and control; but in providing auditoriums for the presentation of such productions neither the Federal Government nor the government of the District of Columbia shall incur any expenses except those incidental to the furnishing of heat, light, and necessary custodial services.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make arrangements with the American National Theater and Academy, a corporation organized under the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 457), and with other accredited nonprofit educational institutions and local and national organizations in the fields of education, drama, and music, to handle the business management, sale of tickets, local financing, housing, transportation, and other arrangements for such productions, and to promote the development of the program authorized by this act.

SEC. 4. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to receive contributions of money, materials, and other property from any source to aid in developing the programs authorized by this act. Any contributions of money so received shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of a special revolving fund, which shall be available to the Commissioner of Education for developing and carrying out the program authorized by this act.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. The major purpose of the bill is to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts in the State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes.

The bill has the support of the entire Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It will not cost the Government anything, except for some incidental expenses.

The committee has amended the bill in order to insure that the Federal Government will not be called upon to underwrite the productions covered by the bill or to make up any deficit, or keep any profit which may accrue. The committee does not recommend such financial assistance or participation by the Federal Government.

The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the absorption by the Federal Government of minor costs of the proposed program under the bill. All the Federal Government would be required to do would be to furnish the buildings with light, heat, and extra guard and custodial services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Montana to tell us a little more explicitly what is included in the language, "other accredited nonprofit colleges."

Mr. MURRAY. It simply means any colleges which are nonprofit institutions. It applies only to nonprofit colleges. I do not know which ones they would be. The language was supplied to us by the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. McKELLAR. How much will the bill cost?

Mr. MURRAY. The bill will not require the Government to spend any money except for incidental services, such as heat and light, and some incidental expenses in connection with exhibitions of art or presentations which may be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator from Montana that members of the Appropriations Committee have found that generally when a bill such as this is passed at the close of a session, it is passed without proper consideration. We then find that enormous organizations are set up to appear before the Committee on Appropriations to get money, and they cite a bill like this as an authorization. I hope the Senator will let this bill go over until the next session. I ask him to let the bill go over, if he will, because I think a measure of this importance ought to be properly considered. I know what it means when people come before the Appropriations Committee for money. They ask for a very much larger amount than was ever dreamed of when the original bill was passed.

Mr. MURRAY. The bill was very fully considered by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and has the unanimous support of the committee. It would require no appropriation whatever. The only expenses that would be connected with the bill would be those which might be submitted by the Commissioner of Education, and would amount to scarcely anything. The Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the absorption of the minor costs by the Federal Government under the proposed program contained in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, would it include what are usually termed the denominational colleges?

Mr. MURRAY. It would not.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Then it would apply only to State institutions?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; nonprofit institutions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study the bill properly, and I ask that it go over.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

MARIE LUIS ELFRIEDE STEINIGER

The bill (H. R. 7667) for the relief of Marie Luis Elfriede Steiniger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETTLEMENT OF LABOR DISPUTES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2999) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, so as to provide a more effective method of dealing with labor disputes in vital industries which affect the public interest, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I did not hear the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO JAPAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8222) to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, the bill would authorize the loan of certain patrol-type vessels to the Japanese Government for a period of 5 years, subject to a 5-year renewal if agreed to by the two Governments.

Obviously the coastal waters in the vicinity of Japan will require patrolling. At this time the Japanese Government does not have suitable vessels. Hence, it is to our own national interest to loan the Japanese Government adequate patrol-type craft for the mission involved.

The Department of Defense assures us that excess craft are available, and that this arrangement will contribute materially to our own national security, with a saving of our manpower. No cost whatsoever to the United States Government is involved.

I may say that these vessels are practically "sitting ducks" at the present time. They are deteriorating, because they are not suitable for moth balling.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that there will be no cost to our Government, and that the vessels will be rehabilitated before they are returned?

Mr. HUNT. The arrangement is to the effect that they will be returned in as good condition as they are received by the Japanese Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS HENDRICKSON AND SCHOEPPEL

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, as an individual Senator I wish at this time to pay my compliments and tender my thanks to the minority calendar committee, consisting of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. They have handled this type of work through both sessions of the Eighty-second Congress. I think their work has been notable. They have been studious in carrying on the work of the calendar committee. Personally, I wish to thank them and compliment them and their staff.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). On behalf of the other 93 Senators, the present occupant of the chair joins in the compliment.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who is now occupying the Chair for the very fine compliment paid the minority calendar committee.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5350) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Government Operations was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "laws," to insert "because such lands are not substantially changed in character by improvements)".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after "(2)" to insert "to the extent that payment is not made or credit allowed therefor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 2, to strike out "(d) By deleting the third sentence of section 109 (a)." and insert "(d) By deleting the figure '$75,000,000' in the third sentence of section 109 (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$150,000,000'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 23, after the words "shall be" to insert "prepared and submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress and a copy".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 14, after "Administration" to insert "Accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual method and financial reports shall be prepared on the basis of such accounting."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 18, after the word "required" to insert "but not to exceed the amount of $10,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 20, after the word "for" to strike out "buildings," and insert "buildings".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 29 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 615; 38 U. S. C. 455), as amended by section 3 of the act of October 31, 1951 (Public Law 247, Eighty-second Congress), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The proceeds from such leases, less expenses for maintenance, operation, and repair of buildings leased for living quarters, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is desired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. The amendments are based upon the experiences under the act. The General Services Administration was directed to make a continuous study and report back to Congress the changes which were needed.

These amendments are principally to clarify certain provisions of the act, and also to provide a little greater flexibility in the administration of the act.

The bill would do four things. First, it would increase the capital of the general supply fund, the revolving fund, from the present statutory ceiling of $75,000,000 to $150,000,000. The need for such an increase arises because of the fact that the General Services Administration now is beginning to take over the supply of common-use articles and commodities which are purchased by the military. They are now working on a program which will enable the Defense Department to obtain most of its common-use supplies through the General Services Administration, as the civil agencies of the Government do. It is necessary to increase the amount of the revolving fund so as to make it possible for them to have the proper supplies on hand necessary to service the military, or the Defense Department, along with the civil agencies.

The second reason is to allow greater flexibility in determining the amount of reimbursement for transfer of excess property among executive agencies. The General Services Administration takes into custody all surplus property of the Federal Government. When it is once declared surplus by a Government agency it is taken into custody by the General Services Administration. Before it can sell such property to the public as surplus property, or sell it to private purchasers, it must submit to all the other agencies of Government a list of the property, to determine whether or not they are interested. Much of the personal property which is taken in as surplus is property which other agencies of Government can use, but presently the other agencies of Government must reimburse the General Services Administration for the price of the property.

As an illustration, if an agency has 100 or 1,000 desks and some other agency of the Government wishes to buy 50 desks, it is not going to pay the full price of such desks if it can obtain new ones for a little higher price. The result is that the property is left there as surplus, to be sold to the public at 10 cents on the dollar. The bill would allow some flexibility in negotiating with other agencies of Government as to the extent to which the other agencies will reimburse the General Services Administration for the property. In my opinion, considerable money can be saved, because when the property is put on the market through private enterprise, it is practically dumped on the market.

The third thing accomplished by the bill is to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority to dispose of surplus property by negotiation.

The fourth thing accomplished by the bill is to authorize the establishment of a buildings-management working capital fund.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3841 OF THE REVISED STATUTES—MOTION TO RECONSIDER—BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, while I was answering a telephone call earlier today Calendar No. 1720, H. R. 7205, was passed by the Senate. I move the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7205) to amend section 3814 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

REGULATION OF THE PRACTICE OF PHARMACY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REQUEST TO RECONSIDER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, while the Senator from North Dakota was engaged on another matter the Senate passed Calendar No. 1397, S. 2291, to amend the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons, and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (D. C. Code of 1929, title 20, sec. 2–601, and the following). I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, should not the Senate first consider bills which were placed at the foot of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from North Dakota states that the bill was passed. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the bill is not a calendar bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we are ready to bring up that bill, but first the Senate should dispose of the bills which were passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, approximately eight bills were placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to request that, when there is objection to a bill, Senators do not make another speech. It is very important that we proceed with the work of the Senate as rapidly as we can if we are to adjourn by Saturday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has made a very timely observation.

RELIEF OF S. A. HEALY CO.—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the first bill placed at the foot of the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1590) for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, the bill goes over.

IMMUNITY PROVISIONS WITH REFERENCE TO WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE CONGRESS—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill passed to the foot of the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provisions relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, much as I hate to do so, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN STATUTORY PROVISIONS FOR THE DURATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next measure passed to the foot of the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the state of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] wishes to offer an amendment which would strike out all after the enacting clause and insert some new language which relates solely and only to the Public Health Service. The bill as reported deals with the extension of certain war powers, which were discussed at length a short time ago.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter which I received from the Comptroller General under date of June 17, 1952, together with a memorandum which I received from him.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, June 17, 1952.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your telephone inquiry to me of June 13, 1952, concerning section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 139 appearing at page 7112 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 12, 1952, and commented upon by you during the debate, which resulted in the adoption by the Senate of a 15-day extension of certain emergency powers of the President in passing House Joint Resolution 477.

I am glad to send you the attached memorandum prepared in the General Accounting Office analyzing and commenting upon the similar section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 165 reported from the Committee on the Judiciary June 12, 1952.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

MEMORANDUM ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 165

Section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 165 would amend the War Contractors Relief Act, approved August 7, 1946, known as the Lucas Act, by adding three additional sections thereto. The first section proposed to be added (sec. 7) is practically identical with a previous bill, S. 3906, Eighty-first Congress, which was vetoed by the President August 21, 1950. A somewhat similar bill (H. R. 3436, 81st Cong.) had theretofore been vetoed by the President.

Subsection (2) of the proposed new section 7 would greatly enlarge section 3 of the existing law which limits claims to "losses with respect to which a written request for relief was filed" on or before August 14, 1945. In the case of *Fogarty* v. *United States* (340 U. S. 8) the Supreme Court held that while no particular form of notice was required to constitute a request for relief within the meaning of the act, such notice must be sufficient to apprise the agency involved that it was being asked to grant extra-legal relief under the First War Powers Act for losses sustained in the performance of war contracts, and a request which sought payment as a matter of right, not relief as a matter of grace, was not sufficient. Under the language now proposed any writing submitted by a claimant (or by any subcontractor under subsection (3)) before August 15, 1945, either requesting relief for, demanding payment of, or merely giving notice of a sustained or impending loss would be sufficient to constitute a request for relief. The broad definition of a "request for relief" embodied in subsection (2) would thus permit consideration of claims predicated upon the mere filing of forms supplying statistical information requested by the contracting agency, as was the case in *Pennington* v. *United States* (95 F. S. 817), provided the information furnished disclosed, inter alia, that a loss was sustained or impending.

Subsection (4) would permit reasonable compensation for working partners and sole proprietors to be included as cost in computing losses, and subsection (7) would permit computation of losses in the case of partnerships, joint ventures, and business associations without regard to profits or losses of the individual members comprising such business combinations.

Section 7 as a whole would permit the reopening of an indeterminate number of cases that have been finally settled under the First War Powers Act, and the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, as well as many cases heretofore dismissed by the courts. It would, as stated by the President in his veto message, write into law the principle of Government insurance against all wartime net losses incurred by contractors providing goods and services to the Government.

Far reaching as would be the effects of the proposed section 7, they are insignificant when compared to the possible results of the two following sections.

Section 8 would make the enlarged provisions of section 7 applicable to the period from August 15, 1945, to December 15, 1950, and section 9 would make the act applicable to contracts of the period from December 16, 1950, to the termination of the existing national emergency.

In other words, the net effect of these sections would be to require the Government to pay for all net losses sustained by Government contractors from the time hostilities ended in World War II up to the present and far into the foreseeable future.

If this pattern of legislative insurance in favor of Government contractors be adopted, the existing system of competitive bidding for Government work, which is based on the concept of free enterprise in business, would be virtually destroyed.

No estimate is possible as to the cost of a legislative program of this nature, but it well might have an appreciable impact upon the national economy. The General Accounting Office is therefore against favorable consideration of the proposed amendment to the Lucas Act, and is unalterably opposed to the proposed sections 8 and 9 of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the consideration of the bill at this time, I should like to have assurance from the Senator from Montana that if the bill is considered he will offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert limited language relating to the Public Health Service, in accordance with our discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana does not strike out all after the enacting clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 6, to strike out all down to and including page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The following statutory provisions, and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby, in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war or otherwise where their terms so provide, shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proclamation 2914, 3 C. F. R. 1950 Supp., p. 71), or until such earlier date or dates as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution either generally or for a particular statutory provision or by the President either generally by proclamation or for a particular statutory provision, but in no event beyond March 31, 1953, notwithstanding any other terminal date or provision of law with respect to such statutory provisions and notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency, of the time during or for which authorization or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed; and acts or events of the kind giving rise to legal consequences under any of these provisions when performed or occurring during the state of war which terminated on April 28, 1952, shall give rise to the same legal consequences when they are performed or occur during the period above provided for. Act of July 1, '944 (ch. 373, secs. 212, 213, and 216, 58 Stat. 689–691; 42 U. S. C. 213, 214, and 217).

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 165 was reported favorably on June 12, but it was set aside by the action of the Senate in amending a similar House resolution, House Joint Resolution 477. Subsequently, however, the Senate conferees on this measure yielded on all of their amendments. Among these amendments was one which would authorize temporary continuation of the military status and benefits for the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service. This same authorization is included in Senate Joint Resolution 165 as item 9, lines 18–19, on page 3. The sole purpose of the proposed amendment is to extend this authority relating to the Public Health Service in the same manner and for the same period of time as provided for the other emergency powers covered by the conference report on House Joint Resolution 477.

For many years commissioned officers of the Public Health Service have been appointed, paid, promoted, and retired under the laws identical or similar to those applicable to officers of the medical departments of the Army and Navy. Since World War II Public Health Service officers have also been extended military status and military benefits on a par with members of the other armed services.

It is essential that these physicians, dentists, research scientists, sanitary engineers, and public health administrators

continue to be so treated. They are subject to discipline; they can and are ordered to undesirable posts of duty on a moment's notice; are key men in the defense against bacteriological warfare; and they could, almost without exception, earn far more in private life than they are now getting. They have been successfully recruited largely because as commissioned officers of the Public Health Service they would be treated on the same basis as their opposite numbers in the Army and Navy.

The principal individual benefits which are derived from military status are widow's benefits, Government life insurance, the death gratuity, and the uniform allowance for junior officers. Loss of military status for the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service would mean the loss of all these benefits for its 2,500 officers. In effect, the Public Health Service would then be only one of the uniformed services without some type of death benefit.

Inasmuch as these authorities are currently in effect, there would be no additional appropriations required to support the comparatively minor expenditures authorized by the provisions of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the Senator from Montana to say that the only statutory provisions which are extended are related to the Public Health Service?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. There is no general extension of authority for the President to make whole losses or claims for losses sustained by Government contractors.

Mr. MURRAY. Absolutely none.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next bill passed to the foot of the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3177 (to amend title IV of the National Housing Act as amended.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I asked that the bill go over, by request.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold my objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this morning we asked that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar, because the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was not on the floor. He is present now. I know that an effort has been made to draft language to do what the Senator from California wants to have done. I wonder whether the Senator from California has studied the proposed language which is sought to be added to the bill, and whether it is satisfactory to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I regret very much that the language which the Senator has in mind is not satisfactory. At least I have not had a chance to get an answer from the Pacific coast with reference to it. We are trying to reach them.

I do not believe the provision, in the form in which the Senator from Alabama now has it, will be satisfactory unless some change has occurred within the last half hour.

If the Senator could see his way clear to have the Senate adopt the amendment which my colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and I offered on the floor of the Senate the other day, but which was ruled out because of the parliamentary situation, we might then be able to work out such a provision in conference.

But under the circumstances I feel that the language of the alternative provision, as the Senator has prepared it, would not be satisfactory, and I would have to object to consideration of the bill at the present time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from California will answer a further question: It is my understanding that a provision on this subject has been added in the House to the supplemental appropriation bill, which soon will be before the Senate, and it is my understanding that the Senate committee has worked out a provision somewhat similar to it, and that it is proposed to be offered in the Senate to that appropriation bill, when that bill is under consideration here. Is the Senator from California satisfied with that provision?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, because I understand it will apply only to the funds covered by that particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the time has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have reserved the right to object, and I do not think I have used all the time available to me.

Let me say that under the terms of the provision contained in the appropriation bill which the Senate has passed, certain limitations are imposed; but they apply only to the funds carried in that bill. Therefore, that provision in itself will not meet the problem.

If the Senator from Alabama could accept the so-called Knowland-Nixon amendment, it might be that within the next day the matter could be worked out to the satisfaction of the Senator from Alabama and to our satisfaction, because I think all of us are trying to find a solution to that very real problem.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield to me——

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that of course I tried to make clear the other day that the only difference between our viewpoint and that of the Senator from California is that the provision he offered was not sufficient to protect the Federal Government in the breaking of a contract between an agency of the State of California and the city of Los Angeles. We have tried to draft a provision which will protect the Federal Government in connection with a contract which has been made between two State agencies. The Federal Government has a $12,000,000 investment in the development at Los Angeles.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me, with the understanding that the time I shall use at this point will not be charged to the time available to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield, with that understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me suggest that I realize that it may be possible to work out the objections which have been made in the case of some of the bills on the calendar. On the other hand, such objections are not worked out by means of debate on the floor.

Provided such an objection is worked out, I shall be inclined to move to have the bill brought up, and to try to have it passed before adjournment.

I wish to give that notice, because if some Senator has an objection to a bill, even though he did not make the objection on the floor, if he will register his objection to the bill with either the minority leader or with myself, in order that the objection may be worked out, and if it is worked out, we shall try to have the bill brought up. Of course, such a bill could not be brought up except by unanimous consent.

On the other hand, I do not see that we shall gain anything by debating these bills any longer, after objections have been lodged.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am inclined to agree with the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Therefore, temporarily I object to this bill. If we can work out the objection, I hope the majority leader will provide an opportunity for the Senator from Alabama to have the bill brought up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, are there further bills to be called in connection with the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are several others.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have yet to act on a $8,000,000,000 appropriation bill. Unless action is taken on it today, I am in doubt as to whether it will be possible to have final action taken on the bill by Saturday night. We should give ample attention to these important measures.

I shall request the floor immediately after the last bill on the calendar is called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee will be recognized at that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair.

CODIFICATION OF PATENT LAWS—BILL PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill placed at the foot of the calendar will be called.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7794) to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have objected to the present consideration of that bill. Perhaps the objection can be worked out, but at the present time I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

STATE COMPACT RELATING TO WATERS OF COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill previously placed at the foot of the calendar will be called.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2470) granting the consent of Congress the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming, to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 1, line 4, after the name "Montana", to strike out "Nevada"; in the same line, after the name "Oregon", to strike out "Utah"; and on page 2, line 7, after the word "States", to strike out the comma and "including the four States having major interest, namely: Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes."

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM IRRIGATION WORKS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next bill previously placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2320) to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act to make a study and report to Congress on means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of applicable laws.

SEC. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may reasonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

SEC. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam."

AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that Senate bill 1084, Calendar 1387, was previously ordered placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, and that bill will be called at this time. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1084) to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that since this bill has been placed on the agenda of bills which will be called up by the majority leader, and notice served by him, I feel that the bill is of sufficient importance not to be passed during the call of the Consent Calendar.

So I request that the bill be passed over at this time.

I shall not oppose having the bill called up in order, upon request of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill is passed over.

PRESS CONFERENCE TO BE HELD BY DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATOR IN REGARD TO ALLOCATIONS OF STEEL, COPPER, AND ALUMINUM

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Henry H. Fowler, Defense Production Administrator. His letter is addressed to me, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, and is in regard to a press conference which he will hold at 3 o'clock, in connection with the allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 2, 1952.

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Defense Production, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAYBANK: The Defense Production Administration is announcing tomorrow, Thursday, July 3, the fourth quarter 1952 allocations for copper and aluminum under the Controlled Materials Plan to permit industrial users to comply with lead-time requirements on material orders for copper and aluminum. Final levels of steel allocation for the fourth quarter cannot be established or announced by the DPA until after the work stoppage ends, and it is possible to measure the production loss and develop the best means of coping with the situation.

Already the steel strike has caused the loss as of June 30 of approximately 11,400,000 ingot tons of steel. Even if the strike ended tomorrow, the additional production losses involved in starting up operations are estimated to be approximately 2,000,000 tons. Even if the strike ended tomorrow, the Nation will have lost a total of 13,400,000 ingot tons of steel, about one-half of a quarter's production, and the defense program, together with the civilian economy, must operate in the year 1952 on approximately 98,830,000 tons of steel which is over 6,000,000 tons less than were produced in the year 1951.

In other words, the work stoppage has canceled out for the year 1952 the benefits to the economy of the vast steel expansion program which, barring the stoppage, would have made available approximately 113,000,000 tons this year. The dire consequences of this fact cannot be washed away by a resumption of full-scale production this year. Despite all of the advantages of allocation and the devices the Controlled Materials Plan permits for distributing the impact in an equitable and orderly manner, CMP will

not produce the steel that has been lost. Large sectors of the economy, many industries, thousands of companies, and the defense program will suffer the after effects of the lost production long after full-scale production is resumed.

Our supply programs for copper and aluminum represent an improved situation as a result of increased facilities for the production of aluminum and increased availability of foreign copper which the recent price adjustments have made possible. However, if the defense agencies concerned with the operation of the allocation machinery defer any longer the fourth quarter determinations that make possible the subsequent issuance of allotments to industrial users of these materials, the advantages of this increased supply may be lost because of the normal lead-time factors that operate in our supply system. Your committee will be interested in knowing that the allocations of copper provide the opportunity for United States users to acquire the full quantity of foreign copper to which United States is entitled under the International Materials Conference recommendations, which we have not been able to do before because of the price block.

By taking this action now we enable the consumers of copper and aluminum to take maximum advantage of the opportunities presented by increased aluminum production and hoped-for increased importations of foreign copper. Nevertheless those industrial users who, in addition require steel, will be handicapped in their production planning and operations until steel operations are resumed and thereafter in varying degrees as a result of the losses. However, by making these program determinations now and keeping the CMP machinery moving on copper and aluminum, these concerns at least will have an opportunity to restore a degree of inventory balance.

I will not go into an analysis of the changes in the allocations for the fourth quarter for various types of users of aluminum and copper except to say that the increases in supply permit the full support of the military and atomic energy programs on their increasing scale, the renewal of defense stockpiling operations, and increased benefits for large areas of the civilian economy, particularly small business that requires relatively small quantities of these materials.

I shall continue to report to your committee informally concerning the impact of the steel strike and the various alternatives from which we must choose in trying to restore industrial operations in the metal-working industries on the necessarily curtailed basis when steel production is resumed.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER,
Administrator.

EXCERPTS FROM ANALYSIS OF RECORD OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION IN REGULATION OF THE UNITED CORP.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] stated that "There has developed in Washington the purchase and sale of influence as a commodity," and he mentioned in that connection "the famous United Corp. case." Former SEC employees are now the president, vice-president, assistant to the president, senior counsel, and director of the United Corp. A study of this case has been made by staff counsel for the House Judiciary Committee, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD pertinent excerpts from counsel's memorandum.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAFF MEMORANDUM IN RE ANALYSIS OF THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION IN THE REGULATION OF THE UNITED CORP., A REGISTERED PUBLIC UTILITY HOLDING COMPANY CONTROLLED BY FORMER SEC OFFICIALS

The United Corp. is the head of a multitiered holding company system in the electric and gas utility field that was organized in 1929 by an eastern financial group headed by J. P. Morgan & Co. * * * At the peak of its power it controlled through its subsidiaries 27 percent of the entire electric output of the United States. It was, said the Public Utilities Division of the Securities and Exchange Commission in 1942, a bankers' tool and had no economic usefulness. The record indicates it was a means for pouring some $43,000,000 in profits into the hands of its promoters. * * *

Upon the advent of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, with its "death sentence" provision, United vigorously fought registration under it, but finally capitulated. The SEC through its Public Utilities Division was strong in its denunciation of United and in ' ' insistence in 1942 upon its dissoluton.

In 1943 a curous and sudden shift occurred in the attitude of the SEC toward dissolution. This shift coincided with the resignation of the long-time president and director of United, George H. Howard, in April 1943 and his replacement in those offices by William M. Hickey, who had been until June 1936 the Assistant Chief of SEC Public Utilities Finance Section, predecessor of the Public Utilities Division. * * * Despite the fact that some interval had elapsed between Hickey's SEC employment and his direct employment by United as president, within 4 months after his employment as president of United, Hickey had accomplished what the previous management had been unable to accomplish for many years, namely, a concession from SEC that instead of being dissolved, United could comply with the act simply by ceasing to be a holding company and by eliminating its preference stock. Thereafter, it would be permitted to transform into an investment company under the Investment Company Act of 1940. Hickey has publicly claimed credit for this achievement by testifying that his series of private conferences with SEC members and officials led to the SEC's order of August 14, 1943, which reversed the recommendation of the Public Utilities Division that United be dissolved. The courts have not as yet passed upon the propriety of these particular conversations.

* * * * *

At the present time the president and vice president of United, the senior counsel and director, and the assistant to the president are all former SEC employees. In addition, the assistant general counsel of United's chief subsidiary was until December 1950 the chief counsel of the SEC's Division of Public Utilities and counsel of record in the United case. * * *

The annual report of the United Corp. for the year 1950 shows there are only four officers of the corporation. Former SEC officials hold the top two of these positions. Two of the seven directors are also former SEC officials. The former SEC employees, therefore, hold 4 out of this total of 11 positions for officers and directors. * * * It is fair to conclude from these facts that former SEC officials are now and have been for some time in control of the United Corp.

* * * * *

UNIQUE SURVIVAL OF UNITED

The SEC has not established the fact that continued existence of United is in the public interest. Sanctioning its continued existence in the form of a transformation into an investment company has not heretofore been allowed by SEC for a condemned holding company whose dissolution it had previously found "appropriate," as it did with respect to United. This escape from complete dissolution has not been allowed 73 other holding companies during the period under survey, January 1938 to June 15, 1951. (See list on p. 373 of Senate hearings on independent offices appropriations bills, 1952.) * * *

On December 31, 1942, United had 33 investments on which there were net losses exceeding $500,000,000 and 2 on which there were net profits of about $10,000. Nevertheless, despite this incredibly bad investment record, the SEC decided on August 14, 1943 (13 SEC 845), that, although dissolution of United was appropriate, it would withhold entry of such an order and allow it opportunity to transform from a public utility holding company into an investment trust. This occurred shortly after Hickey had been elected president of United in April 1943.

There has been a partial recovery in values since 1942 due to the war and postwar inflations, and the subsequent general rise in the market for utility stocks. Despite this recovery, the common stockholders of United have lost as of today roughly $360,000,000, or about 80 percent of their original capital contribution to the corporation. United's uninspiring past record of investments as disclosed by the public record is no assurance that the investment wisdom of the management or its banking sponsors will improve in the future. * * *

TAX-AVOIDANCE DEVICE

The underlying reason for the continued life of United, and one which cannot be legally recognized by SEC as official justification for granting its application to convert into an investment company, is that it provides an exceptional device for tax avoidance to United stockholders, particularly the larger ones. Generally speaking, dividends paid by United are not taxable as ordinary income to the recipient. The tax advantage exists because there is a reservoir of over $100,000,000 of unrealized but realizable losses in United's portfolio, representing the difference between present market value of United's investments and their original cost basis for tax purposes. Thus for many years to come United will be able to realize sufficient losses on the selective sale of its investments to offset exactly its earnings in a particular year, so that any dividends paid to United stockholders for years to come will not be taxable as ordinary income.

Instead they will be applied to adjust the original cost basis of the United stock until that basis reaches zero. With the virtual disappearance of tax-free investments, the bonanza which the wealthier stockholders of United will have in these and succeeding years of high tax rates can readily be seen. Naturally such a situation confers greater benefits on wealthier stockholders in the high surtax brackets than it does on smaller stockholders to whom the saving would be only nominal. The inference is strong that the tax-saving feature is the controlling consideration in keeping United alive.

PRIVATE DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN UNITED MANAGEMENT AND SEC OFFICIALS

At various stages of the proceedings before SEC the representative of minority stockholders, Randolph Phillips, was prevented from full examination of witnesses who might have disclosed the details of private behind-the-scene discussions between United's management personnel and SEC officials. The Commission justifies these pri-

vate discussions by maintaining that a certain degree of informality is requisite to the conduct of proceedings by an administrative agency. Even though such a conclusion may be administratively persuasive, where a "former colleague" relationship exists between the Commission officials and the officials of the applicant company, and where a substantial group of dissident stockholders are opposed to the general aims of the company management, the Commission should not, at least in adversary proceedings, hold private audiences in the absence of representatives of all parties. Having committed themselves to such private conferences, the SEC compounded the breach by prohibiting later inquiry into the nature of the discussions. * * * With more and more of our important legal controversies being subjected to the administrative process, greater instead of less care should be exercised to prevent private deals or even the suspicion of prejudicial conduct.

* * * * *

FIDUCIARY INTEGRITY OF UNITED'S EXECUTIVES

The fiduciary integrity of the president and counsel of United is open to serious doubt. As officials of a registered holding company they occupy a position similar to that of trustees to protect the public interest and the interest of all stockholders, including minority stockholders. At the 1947 annual meeting of stockholders the president knowingly made statements to the stockholders which were contrary to the truth, and deliberately ordered an illegal recess of the meeting so as to save the management the embarrassment of losing an advisory vote on a plan which had been submitted for approval. He later supported these false statements with his oath before the SEC. Regardless of whether the particular vote was or was not of controlling importance (as the SEC now holds), it was deemed at the time by United's management to have been of crucial importance and the action of the president in league with his corporate legal advisers and over the protests of the minority stockholders was thoroughly unconscionable. The court found the recess to have been illegal but, at the SEC's request, took no action pending the final decision of the SEC. In rendering its decision on the subject in June 1951, the SEC glossed over the offense of the president and inferentially condoned it. The question is still open for judicial review and remedy. The subcommittee could well hold that the action of the president and counsel was reprehensible, inimical to the suffrage rights of minority stockholders, and highly nonfiduciary in character. The fact that it occurred on one occasion gives reason to believe that it could recur given similar or suitable opportunity. That the SEC should tolerate continuance in office of persons who have committed such acts indicates a departure from its statutory duties to maintain high fiduciary standards for officers and counsel of registered public utility holding companies.

* * * * *

REIMBURSEMENT FOR MINORITY STOCKHOLDERS' EXPENSES

Phillips has presented evidence to the SEC that he spent $42,000 out of pocket in organizing and representing minority stockholders during the United proceedings, and is seeking reimbursement from the corporation through SEC approval. The SEC Division of Public Utilities has recommended that he be paid a fee of $2,000 for 2,300 hours' work and be reimbursed expenses of $208. Phillips has taken exception to the recommendations of the Division, and the matter is now pending decision. The subcommittee should not undertake to determine the merits of this controversy but should request to be advised of its outcome. It is noteworthy that the much larger expenses incurred by the management of United through the various proceedings have been amply approved, even though in many instances questions as to propriety could be raised as to excessive expenditures for proxy solicitations, and duplication in legal effort, etc. Assuming that proof is made of actual expenditures by Phillips in the amount claimed, and assuming (as seems clear from the record) that these expenses were incurred as a direct consequence of his organization and representation of minority stockholders over an 8-year period, it would be paradoxical if SEC were to deny him relief commensurate with that afforded United's management. Moreover, were relief denied him it would serve as a most discouraging example to minority stockholders who, in other instances, might wish to invest their own money in a bona fide challenge of corporate management. * * *

MINORITY REPRESENTATION ON BOARD OF DIRECTORS

In its June 15, 1951, decision the SEC has declined to accept the recommendation of the minority stockholders that they be assured of a definite representation on the board of directors of the reorganized corporation for purposes of future operations. The basis of the SEC's rejection of the proposal seems to have been their belief that the cumulative voting features of the approved plan would provide adequate assurance of future minority representation. Judging from dispositions made of similar problems in other cases of record, it is a normal precaution that such assurance of future minority representation in corporate elections be guaranteed by the terms of the order of approval by means of a direction that the board of directors include a certain number of minority nominees, or alternatively by provision being made for additional safeguards in the election machinery so as to elect a new board of directors. This further seems to be consonant with the intention of Congress that management cliques should not be allowed to perpetuate themselves in office by control of the proxy machinery. It is difficult to see how, with the proxy machinery of United in permanent control of management, and with the failure of the Investment Company Act of 1940 to reimburse minority stockholders for proxy solicitation expenses, the minority group of United will be afforded a fair and equal opportunity in corporate elections with that of management. The SEC decision on this point coincided with that of the United management, and could be hostile to the future freedom and voice of minority stockholders.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1041) to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88) to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2938, to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. REES of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. RAINS, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. TALLE, and Mr. COLE of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8499) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances of telephone and telegraph accounts on Members of the House of Representatives, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7151. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7216. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county; and

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8370, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with this supplemental appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

How does this Nation stand on civil defense? Do we really need it, or don't we need it? Do we really want it, or don't we want it? Must we have it, or can we get along without it?

I defy anyone to tell me the answers to those questions on the basis of our handling of civil defense to date. With one breath our leaders tell us that we do need civil defense, and need it badly. With the next, we cut the budget request made by the Civil Defense Administrator by 93 percent. At one moment we set up an agency which, by law, is charged with the task of educating the American people in the facts of survival. At another moment we propose to cut the money the agency needs for educational and training purposes to one-third the amount required. While in one frame of mind we order civil defense to stockpile the medical supplies and fire-fighting equipment that would be so desperately needed in time of emergency. In another moment of whimsy we eliminate the budget request for these purposes from the appropriation.

Meanwhile the Pentagon brass and the security officers keep from the American people, and from the Congress, the facts that would give civil defense top priority in every home in the land if they were known to us. Has any Member of the Senate ever seen printed in his home-town paper the names of our target cities that were secretly listed by the military, even before there was such a thing as a Civil Defense Administration? No Senator has seen that list because it has never been released. Why not? We can be sure it is no secret from the Russians. It is a secret only to the Americans who live in those cities. Would any Member of the Senate hesitate one moment to vote the necessary civil-defense money if his constituents knew they lay in the direct path of Russia's global bombers?

I think not. I think civil defense funds would be the first order of business in this Chamber if the facts were known to the folks back home. I think that if the American people knew how many Russians were in the Soviet Civil Defense Corps right now—today—they would jump to the job of signing up to protect their own communities. I don't know how big the Soviet Civil Defense Corps is. It must be sizable if, as I understand, they had 22,000,000 trained workers way back in 1947. I don't know how many deep shelters the Russians have built, but I know how many we have built. None. And I know how many civil-defense volunteers we have in readiness right this minute. Less than 2,000,000.

I am not an authority on civil defense, mind you, but I know there are not enough burn dressings or penicillin shots in the whole country to take care of the victims of a mass attack on this Nation, or on just a very few big cities in this Nation. I know that even our biggest cities would have about enough equipment and supplies on hand after an A-bomb attack to last 4 hours. Four hours of medical treatment is all the victims would get, gentlemen. After that the suffering wounded would be left to drag on for days and days in their misery, for lack of the basic medicines that would be so badly needed.

Where are the gas masks that would save countless lives if the Russians chose to use nerve gas on our big cities? We haven't any, because the research money is lacking. We don't have home-shelter plans, because there are no funds with which to build and test them. We don't have a gas warning system, because the money to set one up is not available. We don't even know the extent of the gas threat, because our leaders will not trust us with information that is common knowledge to everyone but the American people.

For that matter, we don't know the number and power of the A-bombs available to the Russian high command, though there is every reason to believe that our intelligence service could tell us, if it would. We don't know the capabilities of the Russians in germ warfare, that same germ warfare which they accuse us so freely and falsely of using in Korea. Our intelligence people know; our military leaders know; the Russians know. Only the American people are barred from knowing the true extent of the danger that hangs over our heads.

Because they are being kept in a fool's paradise of ignorance, and because not even the Congress has been given the full facts, the neglect of civil defense is becoming a national scandal.

I say it is time to air this whole stupid mess. I do not blame Governor Caldwell for his failure to sell civil defense to the House and the Senate; because I suspect that he has been forbidden to reveal the very truths that would serve him as selling points. I do not even blame the White House for giving lip service rather than real significance to the request for more civil-defense funds. I blame those mysterious master minds in the Pentagon and the security officers who feel, for some ridiculous reason, that the American people cannot face facts or—worse still—cannot be trusted with them.

We cannot fight what we do not know exists. We cannot prepare for things we have never seen or heard about. As a Nation we cannot rally our forces against hints and whispers. We must know and understand that we are in danger, terrible danger. We must be given some inkling of the nature of that danger, and of the directions from which it may come. We must have facts, brutal though they may be, and we must have them at once. That is what we pay these intelligence people to find out for us. But, under the cloak of self-defined secrecy, they hide the things they learn and betray us into indifference, or unreasoning fear.

We only fear the unknown. Once the dangers are known to us, we can face them with confidence. Let's take the wraps off of civil defense and get some real perspective on this problem. Children shouldn't be asked to hide under their desks at school unless their parents know what they are hiding from. Private citizens should not be petitioned to volunteer for some half-understood purpose, giving of their time and energy on the mere say-so of some official in the Government. I demand that we be told the truth, and that every word of the truth shall be spelled out.

The first truth is that, as of now, and so far as civil-defense protection is concerned, we Americans stand naked in the streets of our target cities.

The appropriations bill reported by the House committee will not provide essential protection for the American people. The committee recommends just enough money to keep civil defense in a lingering state of ineffectiveness.

The Senate and House conferees should kill civil defense, or support it. They should make possible a worth-while program to save lives and industry, or they should stop wasting money and effort.

The people must know what the facts are. Is an informed, organized, and protected public absolutely essential to the winning of the next war, as FCDA insists. Or can the military win without such public support, as indicated by the House Appropriations Committee? There is no need to quibble over words. No one would think of sending an army into the field without weapons—we cannot expect civil-defense volunteers to work without tools and equipment.

The unadorned truth is that the House Appropriations Committee failed to recognize the scope of civil-defense responsibilities and their necessary co-equal part in the defense program. We do not have the time for a leisurely development of a home-front defense plan. The Nation is confronted with a great and present danger.

The Congress in its supplemental bill approved last May failed to make any provision for the essential functions of civil defense. The bill as now recommended by the House Appropriations Committee carries a token pittance for certain of those functions, nothing for other functions. In no case was enough allowed to accmplish any major civil defense objective.

I note that the House Appropriations Committee does not think the civil-defense program is realistic or well coordinated. The contrary is true. Civil Defense has, and submitted to the committee, a sound plan. It needs the money with which to implement that plan. Forty-eight States, three Territories, and more than 1,000,000 volunteers believe the plan is a good one.

We will not persuade 150,000,000 people to learn the facts—nor persuade 15,000,000 needed volunteers to sacrifice time and effort to organize and train themselves, without some congressional encouragement.

The States have appropriated more than $200,000,000 for civil-defense purposes, $72,000,000 of which is for matching Federal funds in the purchase of needed organizational equipment.

The bill as reported by the House committee permits FCDA to match less than one-fifteenth of State matching funds. One State alone has appropriated nearly 10 times as much for matching purposes as this bill provides for the entire country. We cannot expect the States and the cities to strain their resources and their credulity further if the Congress declines to support sufficiently and adequately the civil defense effort.

In a recent action, the Senate voted billions for Air Force appropriations. That action was taken because most Members of Congress are convinced that there is a realistic threat of war with Communist Russia. By this appropriation action for the military, we are doing our best to bolster our air defenses, and to stave off that war by building strength of arms. Those funds will be used in the active military defense of this Nation if the Kremlin does decide to go to war on a global scale.

By this and other actions, Members of Congress have consistently recognized the fact that there is a possibility of war, if not a strong probability of war—and that when

and if war comes, we must be prepared as best we can throughout our total security program.

Yet, if I read my figures correctly, the House committee recommended a slash of better than 93 percent in the funds requested for the civil-defense portion of our national-security effort.

May I remind you again that only recently we voted a total of some $45,000,000,000 for our active military efforts. Yet, civil defense which started far behind the military in building up its mobilization base and capabilities, and which is less than 2 years old, is today faced with a cut of 93 percent of its requested funds. This comes on top of a severe cut last year of 85 percent.

I hope the Senators recognize that this House committee action virtually puts civil defense out of business as a part of our security effort.

Here is what Gen. Omar Bradley, the respected Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, had to say to the Congress on the need for civil defense from a military standpoint, and I quote:

"A competent civil-defense organization must be prepared to save lives as well as to restore factories to maximum production and resume communications in the shortest possible time. The military will be unable to direct this effort.

"We must have, then, an organization in being, planned and staffed beforehand to take over in the event of such an emergency. If civil defense does not function effectively, our military-defense efforts will be very adversely affected."

It must be apparent to the Senators that the civil-defense program which was set up by this Congress in Public Law 920, can hardly be an effective organization in any sense of the word with two severe slashes in its funds.

The report of Mr. CANNON'S committee, which is generally commendatory to the FCDA in its language, makes this statement:

"The funds recommended represent continued implementation of the concept of civil defense envisaged by the committee and the Congress in making appropriations for this agency in the past two fiscal years. The continued development of this program together with the proper coordination of the civil-defense programs of the various States should provide a realistic civil-defense plan without the expenditure of large sums of money."

Realizing how many billions we have invested in military defense, and the fact that there is a constant Russian threat to our shores, the least we can do for this agency is to give it the same amount of funds voted last year—$75,000,000—plus enough to cover its increased responsibilities.

Despite the tremendous responsibilities placed on the FCDA by this Congress in Public Law 920, FCDA has been and will continue to be one of the smallest agencies in Government. Even with the $75,000,000 which this Congress voted for civil defense last year, it was able to make substantial progress against remarkable odds. It must do more this year. Take medical supplies as an example: Last year this Congress recognized the urgent need for stockpiling of medical supplies when it voted $50,000,000 to the FCDA for that purpose. Those funds were not voted to FCDA until November of 1951. It was impossible for the agency to proceed before that on procurement of the stockpile items.

Immediately upon receipt of those funds, the agency began working with the Department of Defense to work out a joint procurement program which would be noncompetitive within the Government. Despite these handicaps, FCDA was able to obligate all of the $50,000,000 which this Congress voted for medical supplies plus some $3,000,000 which reverted from the medical matching program with the States. FCDA was able to obligate every cent of the money which this Congress voted to get started on this continuing program of building up adequate medical stockpiles in case of attack.

These facts are not evident in the House committee report. Instead, it seems that they have emphasized only the amount which had actually been expended during the fiscal year, which gives a distorted picture of what was actually accomplished. This is fiscal nonsense—and dangerous nonsense at that.

We cannot complain in one breath that civil defense has not done something we wanted done, and in the next breath deny the Administrator the money he needs to do it with. That is not even good politics in a budget-slashing year. I would remind the Senators of a small mistake along that line some years ago when some of us voted against fortifying Guam.

Nothing that happened then could equal the storm that would descend upon us if civil defense was tried in the balance and found wanting for lack of funds denied this agency. For every widow who turned reproachful eyes upon us then, there would be thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of the bereft to call down curses on our heads. The wave of grief that would result might well wreck not only those of us who hold office today, but the very Government itself.

Save money, yes. Cut the budget where it needs cutting. But let us not fool ourselves that we are reducing expenditures by letting our insurance policies lapse. Worse still, let us not shoot the insurance agent, wreck his office, and throw his employees out of work. That is not the road to protection—that is an open invitation to disaster.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sorrow particularly that the point 4 appropriation for the Asian-Indian program, as carried in this bill, as it is reported to the Senate, is reduced to the size of the appropriation as voted by the House of Representatives.

I do not propose to offer any motion at this time; I prefer, instead, to remember that the authorization still holds, and that at the next session of Congress we can come forward with something better.

At this time I wish to submit, as a part of my remarks, a statement on this particular situation; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FLANDERS

POINT 4 APPROPRIATION FOR INDIA

I am much disturbed about the point 4 appropriation for the Asian-Indian program as it seems to be reduced by the conference report now before us.

I am not alone in thinking that the present conditions in India are such that, if neglected, that great country will slowly drift into Communist control. It is true that the Government is not Communist and that it has in general supported us with its votes in the United Nations. In the recent Assembly, for instance, India voted as the United States did on 38 occasions and differed from the American stand only twice. It seems to me that this is a remarkably good record.

The present danger in that part of the world occupied by India and Pakistan does not come from the existing governments. It comes from the infiltration of Communist ideas in two groups of the population. This infiltration is taking place in the colleges and other institutions of learning. Until lately we have been grossly negligent in supplying material explaining the purposes and conditions of the Western World to these Indian students. I referred to this matter some years ago on the Senate floor. Fortunately conditions have somewhat improved, but the young intelligentsia are still attracted far too strongly by Communist propaganda.

But the real danger here, as it was in China, lies in the villages throughout the countryside. It will be remembered that administration observers and advisers for a long time referred to the Chinese Communist movement for agrarian reform. The villages were the weak spot in China. They are the weak spot in India today, and the recent elections have shown a disturbing growth of communism.

It is significant that the success of the Communists in the recent Indian elections came from the Provinces of Madras and Hyderabad where famine conditions have been the most serious. Any fight against communism must take this location and this situation into account. The danger spot is in these villages.

It may be necessary for the next 2 or 3 years to provide a supply of food. But this is only a palliative. The real remedy must be more fundamental. The major part of our effort must go to something corresponding to the county agent system in the United States. Such a program of agricultural and village improvement is sponsored already by the Indian Government. The purpose is to improve living conditions through combined attack on problems of production, health and illiteracy. American farm experts are already taking an important part. We need to expand that program very greatly.

In particular we should assist in building up the agricultural colleges in the various States of India so as to train native leaders to carry on the spreading of information about improved methods. These colleges will provide a steady flow of trained personnel to man the extension service now being established.

Think what this means to the long-time futures of India. Let me say that throughout, I am referring to the Indian sub-continent, which includes Pakistan. First of all, efficient production of food will help to expand India's food supply. This should prevent famine, reduce hunger, and lessen disease. With the improved practices and inexpensive improvement in equipment, the workers released in the farms can be used in city factories to increase the production of manufactured goods. All this will tend to raise living standards throughout India.

We missed the opportunity to save China. We must not miss that opportunity in India where we can see the same development of communism coming along strongly and rapidly under the guise of agrarian reform. The danger lies in these famine-stricken villages. The remedy lies in making them self-supporting and in encouraging the present move in India itself toward the redistribution of the land.

We must not wait until it is too late. We must not find ourselves having long congressional investigations in the House and Senate to find out who was to blame when India went Communist. It is far better to decide now that we will do what is necessary to keep it from going Communist and then all these investigations will be unnecessary. It is better that the patient should live on in health than that we should hold an inquest over its contaminated remains.

This Congress, this Senate, and my own Republican Party have delighted in digging over the past to find out who was to blame. May I say here with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that if we do not stand

back of this point 4 program for India, it will be we ourselves, who are to blame; and in the years to come the investigators will point an accusing finger at those who sit here today.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep regret that the Appropriations Committee found it necessary to recommend for mutual security, in the supplemental appropriations bill, 1953, appropriations smaller than the authorizaton voted this year in the Mutual Security Act of 1953, as passed by the House and the Senate.

The matter was compromised between the House and the Senate in conference, when the differences between the House and the Senate were adjusted. In the conference, we felt that the authorized amount was about the lowest to which we could safely go in dealing with this matter. The over-all authorized figure was $6,400,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, first, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill. The question is debatable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on that motion. But, first, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CORDON. That motion is subject to a point of order at this time, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be, if any Senator raised the point.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, at the moment I intend to raise the point. I first desire to discuss it for a moment.

Mr. President, that bill is composed of estimates of the Bureau of the Budget totaling roughly $13,000,000,000. The hearings on the bill having consumed less than 2 days, no member of the committee in that period of time, had he alone handled the interrogation, could have become even faintly advised as to the merits of the several appropriation requests. It is a situation that should never exist in any legislative body. It is a situation that need not have existed in the United States Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator does not wish to represent to the Senate that the House passed this bill a day or two ago, does he? It has just come to the Senate. We have been expecting it for some time, but it has just come to the Senate. The situation is that we must either pass it or not pass it at this session. Unless we pass it today we are not going to pass it at all during this session.

Mr. CORDON. The factual statement made is correct. I am not raising any question with respect to the action of the Senate committee as such, except this: The Senate committee has been working with a gun at its head, and the gun was placed there by virtue of a leaderless majority that brought this thing into being. I, for one, am getting rather tired of operating in the United States Senate on that basis.

Mr. President, we sat here, substantially on our hands, week after week and month after month, during this session, when these matters could have been attended to, but were not. There is not a Member of this body, there is not a Member of the House of Representatives, who did not know when the session opened, that the purpose would be to adjourn the Congress by midyear. Four years ago, Mr. President, the present minority in the Senate handled a similar situation, and the work was done and we closed up on the 20th day of June. These necessities could have been met. Mr. President, they have not been met, and the RECORD should show clearly why we are in the position in which we find ourselves today. So far as I am concerned, I desire to assist in making that record at this time.

Mr. President, there are however, some practical reasons, of which I believe the Senate must take notice at this time, before that bill comes to the floor. Little as the information the membership of the committee has on the subject, it is all the information that the Senate has. If the membership of the Appropriations Committee cannot be on the floor of the Senate to pay attention to the presentation of this bill, then the bill should not be debated today. I understand that at this time there is a conference in process on the defense bill. That conference will take a good segment of the membership of the Appropriations Committee off the floor. There may be other conferences with respect to which I am not advised. I feel, Mr. President, that the least we could do at this time, in view of the position in which we find ourselves, is to take whatever time may be necessary before bringing up this bill, so that those who have what little information is available may be present on the floor.

I feel, Mr. President, that if any other measure can be presented at this time to the Senate, of sufficient importance to require consideration by this body, it should be taken up now, and that the conferees on the defense appropriation bill should be given an opportunity to finish their work, so they may be on the floor of the Senate when this $13,000,000,000 appropriation is presented. I want to ask the majority leader, who is in charge of the presentation of the legislative program, whether he has on his calendar other measures which he expects to present to the Senate in addition to the appropriation bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the Senator, if I may preface a question by so doing, that, of course, from now until the hour of adjournment sine die, so far as members of the Appropriations Committee are concerned, they are going to be faced with much the same problem as that described by the Senator. I fully agree with his statement that it is very bad legislative practice for a bill which came from the committee last night—and we did not finish with this bill until about midnight last night, as the distinguished Senator knows—to be called up and to be acted upon at this time. But the conference on the military appropriations bill—and I am one of the conferees on that bill, as are the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire, and we are now on the floor—and then conference on the civil functions bill, on which the able Senator from Oregon is a conferee, I think the problem to which he refers is going to face us continuously. I think there are more members of the Appropriations Committee on the floor now—and I see the Senator from Massachusetts is present—than we shall probably have at any other time during this session. If I thought we would gain anything by adopting the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon, I would fully support him; but I am afraid that with the time limit we have upon us, it would be just as well to proceed now with the appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CORDON. I have asked a question of the majority leader. I should like to have the questioned answered now.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I first want to reply to the chastisement and serious accusation made against me about there being a leaderless majority. I have done the best I could to work with both sides in the Senate. I have been in the Senate a little bit longer than has the Senator from Oregon. I have seen at least one more Congress adjourn than has the Senator. I have never yet seen a time when, during the last 2 or 3 days of a session, there was not a rush. It can be said, perhaps, that it is a leaderless majority. There have been times when I have lost control because the majority was so small. I have appreciated greatly the cooperation which has been given me by Members on the other side of the aisle. I have done the best I could. I could talk about the Eightieth Congress to which the Senator referred, and how we stayed all night long, two different nights, to push for a vote in order to have a recess. But all I can say is that the then leader did the best he could, just as I have tried to do.

I do not care to indulge in personalities or to criticize anyone. I do not think that will get us anywhere. I have never been one who has tried to make political speeches on the floor and to chastise Members of the Senate on either side of the aisle. The only times I have had anything to say, usually, were when I was attacked, as I have just been attacked, and, I think, unjustifiably so. I feel hurt that my good friend from Oregon would make such a charge against me. But that has nothing to do with the affairs of the Senate. It does not make any difference what someone thinks

about the junior Senator from Arizona and about the way he conducts business.

It was well pointed out by the distinguished Senator from California that there are more Senators on the floor at this moment than are usually present. I hope the Senator from Oregon will not object, because an objection might very well mean that Congress could not get away on Saturday. I think it is very important that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill. We could consider another bill; but the reason for suggesting the consideration of this bill at this time is the desire to expedite the work of the Senate. I have seen many bills called up with no more notice than in this instance. Before the reorganization law, all we had to do was to move to take up an appropriation bill the next day.

I was hoping, Mr. President, that no objection would be made. I think we should make progress. We are not trying to rush anyone. We want to expedite the work of the Senate in order to get through.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I will say to the majority leader that my remarks were not directed at him, personally. He happens to be the head of the majority party in the Senate which controls the legislative program of the Senate. The same party has a majority in the House of Representatives, and that majority controls the legislative program in the House. The two certainly have dismally failed if they have not been in conference throughout the past 6 months in working out a legislative program which could be completed on time.

I do not arrogate to myself any great wisdom, but I suggested to the Appropriations Committee at the beginning of this year that the hearings on appropriation bills on this side go forward coincidentally with the hearings on the House side. That suggestion was not accepted, except to a very slight degree.

I desire to say that while this bill only recently, within the past few days, came to the Senate, it could have come to the Senate weeks and weeks ago. The basic legislation which was necessary could have been brought up and passed. It was not brought up and passed.

So far as the majority leader himself is concerned, he has to work with his policy committee. There is a policy committee on the minority side. What cooperation that could have been extended by the minority I believe has been extended. I do not know of any instance in which it has not been extended. The failure, Mr. President, has been a failure in the creation of a program that could be presented in an orderly way and pushed to a conclusion in the days when the Congress did substantially nothing.

As a result, Mr. President, if we are to adjourn on Saturday night—and there is no obligation to adjourn on Saturday night—we are here compelled, in my opinion, to do a thing that substantially is a fraud on the American people. We are compelled to pass upon appropriations the request for which is over $13,000,000,000, and the amount recommended is somewhere around $9,000,000,000. We are asked to consider the bill without knowing anything about the items involved.

That situation should not exist. We have an obligation to the people of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. One of the items is $8,234,000,000. The amount of $6,001,000,000 is for foreign aid.

Mr. CORDON. I am familiar with that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We all know about it. It has been debated time and again. Amendment after amendment was agreed to——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may yield only for a question.

Mr. CORDON. I am aware that approximately $6,000,000,000 is for the mututal-aid program. It is made up of certain activities, and we are entitled to know what they are, and whether they justify an appropriation of the billions of dollars here requested. We do not know, and the members of the committee, I undertake to say, do not know.

There is included a complete building program for the armed services. The recommendation now is that the program be stricken from this bill. That is because this Congress did not, weeks ago, pass the necessary authorization bill. It should have been done, but it was not done. For that reason the program is stricken. We do not even have a legal authorization for the requests that were made. That is the sort of thing I am on my feet complaining about.

Mr. President, it is seldom indeed that I have risen on the floor to criticize anything. I recognize the fact that we are human and that we have our frailties, and it is a difficult situation with which we are dealing. But when I see the sorry situation in which we are today, I can no longer remain silent about it.

We are mighty close today to acting not as a parliamentary body, but like members of a group engaged in riot. The difference is the difference between order and disorder. I want intelligent action, not action on impulse, and that is what we must use today in this matter.

Mr. President, at least I want the RECORD to show the position I take in the matter. I express the hope now that when another Congress comes in at the beginning of next year, whether it be led by the Democratic Party, or led by the Republican Party, it will at least attempt to do something to correct the very obvious and terribly tragic weaknesses that have been exhibited in this session of Congress—and, Mr. President, not alone in this session, but in others, as well.

This is a job that calls for all the statesmanship, all the ability, and all the patriotism that all of us collectively have or can have. It is time for us to do something to justify the titles that we hold.

Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I desire to commend the senior Senator from Oregon for his frankness and courage in presenting the matter to the Senate at this time. So far as I am concerned, I have been making similar criticisms, not directed to the majority leader, because I think, as a general rule, he has sought constantly to expedite and accelerate the consideration of the business of the Senate. But for weeks and months we coasted along on 3-day or 4-day sessions, letting a log jam of important legislation accumulate for the 2 or 3 end weeks of the entire session.

At this point I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon why the Senate could not recess until September, if necessary, and then reconvene to discharge its constitutional duties. Have we, as representatives in the legislative branch, any right to contend that we should be in session only one-half of the year; that we can adjourn, and permit the executive department, under the Commander in Chief, the President, to carry on without any consultation or without any check by the legislative branch? I can see no reason why we are entitled to have a recess of 6 months. I am human; I do not like to spend my time here during the warm days; but I think it is our primary obligation and duty to see to it that the American taxpayers' dollars are expended wisely, and without fraud and inefficient administration.

I ask the Senator why it is necessary for us to rush through important bills in the closing days of the session, when we may be back in August or September at the call of the President, if we ourselves do not have the statesmanship to arrange and plan for such sessions.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator for his words. I agree with them.

Mr. President, I have another inquiry to address to the majority leader at this time. I wish to ask him what his plans are with respect to adjournment sine die or a recess, and if a recess, on what basis.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I see no reason why the Senate should not adjourn sine die.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona speak louder?

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason why the Senate should not adjourn sine die.

Mr. CORDON. Does the majority leader plan to introduce a resolution for a sine die adjournment?

Mr. McFARLAND. Such resolutions usually originate in the House. When they are sent to the Senate, the Senate acts upon them.

Mr. CORDON. Has the majority leader been in consultation with the leadership of the House on this matter?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have talked with the leadership of the House many times.

Mr. CORDON. On this matter?

Mr. McFARLAND. On the matter of adjournment sine die. It has always been the opinion, as expressed by the

leadership of the House, that when Congress adjourns, it should adjourn sine die.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desired to obtain the floor in my own right.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. It is seldom that I have the floor.

If there is to be an adjournment sine die, it means that Congress will not come back into session for the remainder of the year, except on call of the President. It means that whatever legislation is before the committee or on the calendar dies, so far as control by Congress is concerned, unless there be a call back into session. That is the reason why I inquired whether there were other matters which the majority leader has in mind bringing up for debate and passage.

If the majority leader intends to limit generally the legislative program to the finishing of appropriation bills, and then to close the session, I shall reluctantly not present the point of order. I have asked the question. Do I have an answer?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is hoped to call up small bills, including one farm bill, which desire it is to dispose of if it can be done. Senators on both sides of the aisle have spoken to me about small bills. I do not have arrangements made for them at this time. I do not have their order worked out at this time, because I had expected that we would proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

I have said that most of the other bills would not necessarily have to be passed. I am rather of the opinion that Congress should be measured by the quality of the legislation, rather than the quantity of legislation.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. As the Senator from Oregon has said, we could return and meet in August. But what would we do?

This is a political year. A lot of political speeches would be made. There would be a lot of bickering. I do not think anything would be gained for the welfare of the Nation.

Congress may not agree with me, when it comes time to adjourn. If it does not agree with me, it does not have to. But I certainly do not see what good we could accomplish by coming back during a political campaign. I believe in campaigns. I think they are good things for the country. We have our party system. We put our respective cases before the people, and the people decide. I am willing to work all the time. I usually work when I go home. I think that is true of Senators generally.

If I may be indulged for a few moments, I wish to say that I have never seen the Senate work harder or in a more orderly fashion than it has worked during this session. We have had no all-night sessions. We have tried to respect the strength of Senators, and not work hardship on them. Every Senator works when he goes home. I work just as hard at home as I do when I am on the floor of the Senate. So it would make no difference to me.

I believe that if the distinguished Senator from Oregon would allow us to proceed, we could accomplish more than by going on to something else. We shall not be able to dispose of this bill in a few minutes. If the Senator has different ideas about adjournment or recess, he will have the opportunity to present them at the proper time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I made the inquiry with reference to the order of business because there is very little time left. The majority leader suggests that in his view there should be an adjournment sine die. I am not quarreling with that view at all. I am simply calling attention to the fact that if that is done certain results will necessarily follow. One of them will be that legislation now pending will die. I call that fact to his attention and to the attention of other Senators. Many Senators are interested in certain legislation which they would like to see passed. If that legislation is not passed at this session, they must start anew at another session.

That brings about a very pressing problem. It emphasizes again the fact that there is not time enough left, if we are to adjourn at the end of this week, for that consideration which is necessary if we are to have the quality of legislation which the majority leader has just stated he favors. I favor it, too, Mr. President. I am making this statement because we are now about to have before us for consideration a motion to go forward with an appropriation bill involving some $10,000,000,000. We shall not know when we are through, whether it is quality legislation or quantity legislation, because we have not had the opportunity to obtain the information necessary to determine that question.

There will be one call after another on the majority leader for the consideration of other bills. He will be called upon to bring up this bill and that bill and the other bill. At the end he will be swamped with such requests. There is a danger involved in such procedure, that we shall pass, in our hurry, legislation which we may regret for a long time, and which may be prejudicial to the best interests of the people of the United States.

That is another problem which we face. That is the reason why I ask whether we are going through with the same kind of program this year. So far as the requests are concerned, no one knows how many there will be. They will be made, and it will require a strong majority leader to deny them. Most of them should be denied. Whether they will be or not, time alone can tell.

I regret that I felt it necessary to make this statement, but I feel very deeply on the subject. I am chagrined. I feel that I am a part of a vast failure of public duty, and I make that statement frankly on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not make a point of order. I shall hold on to a thin hope that perhaps the work we did up until midnight last night, which work is now to come before the Senate, will have most serious consideration. It was the best we could do within the time we had to do it. That time was tragically insufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

ACTIVITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OFFICIALS IN CONNECTION WITH 1948 ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on June 9 I inserted in the RECORD a statement which I had prepared for delivery on the floor of the Senate, but which I was precluded from making because of the time limitation on debate which existed at that time.

In that statement I pointed out how, after the Congress had adjourned on June 20, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Under Secretary, the President, and other speakers went around the country telling the farmers that there was not adequate storage for their grain that fall, and that they could not obtain loans on their grain unless it was properly stored, thereby forcing thousands of them to dump their grain upon the market for whatever they could get, which proved to be greatly depressed prices.

I pointed out how this resulted in putting the prices of all grains, as well as the prices of other farm commodities, on the skids, so that by the last of October farm prices were pretty well down in the slough of despond.

The same speakers who erroneously told the farmers that there was no storage for their grain when, in fact, there was storage in abundance, also told them that Congress was to blame for the situation in which they found themselves.

I pointed out in my statement of June 9 how the probable loss to the farmers was about $1,000,000,000 that year, because certain persons made false statements around the country for political purposes.

As I expected, the Secretary of Agriculture was not very happy over my statement. Under date of June 25, 1952, he wrote me a 5-page letter undertaking to defend himself against the charges which I had made. He also sent me a copy of a 28-page memorandum which I understand has been mimeographed and distributed in great quantities around the country. This 28-page memorandum also undertakes to defend the Secretary and his political clique against the charges which I made, that they deliberately forced down the prices of farm commodities in the fall of 1948.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator believe that the Secretary of Agriculture would need not 28 pages, but 128 pages in order to defend the miserable record which he has made?

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. AIKEN. There are not pages enough in any book adequately to defend the record which the Secretary of Agriculture has made in the past 4 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not also a fact that its own records show that the Department of Agriculture was actually selling grain bins during the 1948 campaign, when it was alleged that there was a shortage of storage space?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. I will come to that subject later. The Secretary has been convicted by the records out of his own office, time and time again.

The 5-page letter to me from the Secretary and the 28-page memorandum are, like other statements emanating from the office of the Secretary of Agriculture, replete with misleading inferences and misstatements. I have analyzed the defense of the Secretary of Agriculture against the charge that he has deliberately used his high office for political purposes.

This morning I sent a letter to the Secretary, which undoubtedly he has received by now. I shall read a copy of the letter:

JULY 3, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received your letter of June 25 and also the 28-page document purporting to explain your operations during the fall of 1948.

May I call your attention to the fact that the first line of the document is incorrect. There are no charges that "the Department of Agriculture deliberately drove down prices of farm commodities prior to the 1948 presidential election in order to influence that election."

The charges are that you, President Truman and your political associates used the powers of the Department of Agriculture and your positions to depress farm prices in the fall of 1948 for political purposes.

The Department of Agriculture is one of the most respected agencies of Government. I am sure that not only most of the 70,000 regular employees of the Department, but most of the 95,000 county and community committeemen of the PMA as well deplore the political manipulations which tend to bring discredit upon the Department itself.

Mr. President, it will be seen that the Secretary of Agriculture would make it appear that the charges are directed against the Department of Agriculture. Nothing could be further from the truth. The charges are directed against his attempts to use the Department of Agriculture to satisfy his insatiable political ambitions. Quoting further from my letter:

Referring specifically to your letter, you have failed completely to disprove the charge that you depressed farm prices in the fall of 1948.

You state that my failure to refer to the charges until 4 years later characterizes them as "obviously political."

Mr. Secretary, I do not have the means to circularize the country at the taxpayers' expense. I did what I could in the fall of 1948 to tell the farmers that the new Commodity Credit Corporation Act gave you full authority to assist in a farm storage program.

On November 17, 1948, in addressing the annual meeting of the Iowa State Farm Bureau at Des Moines, I said:

"The Commodity Credit charter bill, giving permanent status to this agency, was approved by the Eightieth Congress on the last night of the session last June.

"The charter was not exactly as I would have had it, but in my opinion there is no justification for denying support to a single bushel of grain because of any provision of the new charter.

"Under the new charter, the Commodity Credit Corporation is not permitted to own or lease elevators for the storage of grain. I am advised, however, that the CCC never has owned an elevator but has used the facilities of the commercial interests.

* * * * * *

"Under the new charter the CCC may purchase as many bins as it needs for sale or lease to farmers lacking storage capacity.

* * * * * *

"In other words, the storage of grain in temporary bins rests with the farmer rather than the Government, although the Government may furnish the bins."

This statement, Mr. Secretary, was made in accordance with a complete understanding which I had with your office.

Mr. President, I worked in close cooperation with the Solicitor's office of the Department of Agriculture in working out the interpretation and analysis of the bill which I introduced in the Senate.

The statement—

Referring to the one which I had made at Des Moines—

was repeated the following day before the annual meeting of the Illinois Farm Bureau. I only wish I had had the opportunity to make it earlier and more frequently.

I did not expose your hoax about grain-storage facilities at that time because I did not know you were not telling the farmers the truth when you stated there was an acute shortage of commercial storage space. It was only after Mr. George Bradley, Director of the Chicago office of the PMA, told the Senate Agriculture Committee on April 28 of this year that storage space was less than 60 percent occupied in the fall of 1948, that the full enormity of your hoax became known. Recent investigations, however, show conclusively that you knew there was a surplus of storage space at that time.

You submit as evidence of a storage shortage in 1948 the fact that railroads entering Kansas City had declared an embargo on the shipment of grain. Today, Mr. Secretary, the railroads entering Kansas City have again embargoed shipments of grain. Does this mean that 4 years later, and with a law since modeled to your liking, you have failed to provide storage space for this year's wheat crop? You know and I know that the use of modern combines makes it impossible for the railroads and the warehouses to handle the wheat crop within the short period of time it takes to harvest it. That is the reason for the railroad embargo today, Mr. Secretary, and that was the reason for the embargo in 1948. It was not shortage of storage space as you well know.

You make particular reference to the drop in the price of corn during 1948. You correctly state that the price fell from $2.02 a bushel in July to $1.21 in November. I agree with you that the very heavy corn crop of that year would have lowered prices under any circumstances. What you fail to state, Mr. Secretary, is that after President Truman made his "pitchfork-in-the-back" speech at Dexter, Iowa, on September 18, you failed to purchase a single bushel of corn during the 6 weeks following.

You statement that "CCC price-support commitments (loans, inventories, and purchase agreements) from August through November 1948 totaled $2,000,000,000—chiefly for placing new crops under loan" is evidently intended to give the impression that you supported crops to that amount between August and November 1948.

You know this just isn't so, Mr. Secretary. The $2,000,000,000 referred to undoubtedly does include the relatively small amount of purchases and loans on wheat and other grains between August and November, but the greater part of it was committed for loans, inventories, and purchase agreements to be consummated after election day. In fact, on October 31, 1948, the CCC had a net balance of commitments outstanding amounting to $1,866,299,230. Had you actually used the full powers of your office between August and November, the price would not have declined as rapidly as it did.

You state also, "Any farmer who could find storage was given price support—a significant fact which the charges completely ignore." Yet President Truman, yourself, and other politicians were repeatedly telling the farmers that there was an acute shortage of storage at that time, statements which have since been proven flagrantly false.

The statement that "CCC could not acquire grain bins for resale to farmers for the storage of agricultural commodities under the loan program and could not, for the purpose of financing the construction of grain bins, make loans to farmers upon the security of bins which became attached to and a part of the realty" is utterly misleading.

It was the understanding of the Senate Agricultural Committee, the House Banking and Currency Committee, which handled the bill in the House, and your solicitor's office that under the act of 1948 the CCC was not restricted in any way from purchasing grain bins to rent or sell to the farmers.

As I said at Des Moines on November 17, 1948: "Under the new charter the CCC may purchase as many bins as it needs for sale or lease to farmers lacking storage capacity."

During the summer and fall of 1948, you actually were selling good grain bins at the very time you were criticizing the Congress for not giving you authority to buy more.

Mr. President, that was a false and unjustified criticism; nevertheless it was being made at that time by the Secretary of Agriculture.

I continue to read the letter:

Either you were violating the law, Mr. Secretary, or you were not telling farmers the truth.

You cannot excuse your own failure to assist in a farm-storage program during the fall of 1948 by a misinterpretation of the law, the meaning of which you well understood at the time.

You further state "none of the storage programs beginning in 1949, soon after the ban was eliminated—

He refers to the ban on the acquisition of elevators and facilities of like nature.

I read further from the letter—

could have been carried out in 1948 when the ban was in effect."

This statement is completely incorrect for, as you admitted before the Senate Agriculture Committee on June 19 of this year, the entire program which you inaugurated in 1949 could have been utilized in the summer and fall of 1948 except for the construction of the hangar-type grain bins which were not required in the fall of 1948 anyway.

You did not even survey the grain-storage facilities of the Nation during 1948. In cooperation with the Kansas State Department of Agriculture, you did survey the available storage facilities of the State of Kansas. You found there was adequate storage for

the crop and did not bother to conduct this survey in any other State. A Department memorandum dated July 12, 1948, will substantiate this statement.

As your references to personalities are not pertinent to my charges against you—

In his letter the Secretary of Agriculture attempted to divert attention from the charges against him, by referring occasionally to Tom Dewey, Harold Stassen, and other persons who had nothing whatsoever to do with carrying out the grain-storage program. That was a little diversionary tactic on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I read further from the letter—

I pass on to your statement that "As a matter of fact, the only way the Department could have 'rigged' or depressed prices in the summer of 1948 would have been to dump large quantities of CCC stocks on the market—but the Department had no such stocks to dump."

I agree that the CCC had no stocks to dump on the market at that time, for most of the elevators throughout the country were empty or nearly so, but I take vigorous exception to your statement that the dumping of stocks is the only way you could "rig the market."

There are many ways in which the machinery of the Department of Agriculture or the Office of the Chief Executive can be used to depress farm prices. With billions of dollars at your command, with which to support prices, a simple announcement of an intent to purchase can strengthen farm prices tremendously. Official statements by the Secretary of Agriculture or the President of the United States, whether true or false, can greatly influence the market, as is well known. As I have pointed out repeatedly, prices were depressed during the fall of 1948 by the repeated assertions of the President and yourself that storage space was lacking. By this expedient, you forced farmers to dump grain at less than support levels, thereby depressing the market to all producers.

Prices can be depressed by permitting the heavy importation of foreign commodities until the price to the American farmer is forced below the support level. This has happened just recently in the case of oats and other small grains. The President has not seen fit to invoke the provisions of section 22 in order to hold prices to the American grower above the support level.

The price of soybeans was seriously depressed by your connivance with the Office of Price Stabilization to place an unrealistic ceiling of 16½ cents a pound on soybean oil, whereas the top market price was only 9½ cents a pound and then putting the ceiling on soymeal at the uneconomic figure of $81 a ton. This conspiracy, Mr. Secretary, as you well know, forced the closing of the largest soybean processing plant in the country and fixed the price of beans at 67 cents a bushel less than the minimum ceiling authorized by the Congress and well below the support price level.

Lastly, Mr. Secretary, you can depress grain prices as you have done in the case of wheat this year by calling for a production of several million acres more than is required to meet all normal demands. By this expediency, you made sure that the farmer would overproduce and have to come to you for Government support. The adverse effect that this will have on the free market is obvious. If the farmer did not comply with your request to overplant, he would be charged with lack of patriotism and you know as I know that farmers make every effort to comply with the needs of their country.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that, as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am very much interested in the very illuminating and informative discussion in which the Senator from Vermont is engaged.

Will the Senator from Vermont agree that if through the activities of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, under the able leadership of the Senator from Vermont who now is speaking, we can prevent the happening in 1952 of what, as is now so clearly evident, occurred deliberately in 1948, we shall have given the farmers of the United States a service and a benefit which probably will be as great as that rendered in the past by any single piece of legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. I am doing what I am because I hope it will give the farmers of the United States a new hope, as well as an adequate price for the commodities they produce.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that in the city of Watertown, S. Dak., in the last political campaign in 1948, to my own knowledge the Under Secretary of Agriculture engaged in precisely the efforts to depress prices which have been discussed today by the Senator from Vermont.

Certainly it occurs to me—and I inquire whether the Senator from Vermont shares that conviction—that it is just as easy to depress farm prices by forcing the farmers themselves to dump their stocks on the market, as it would be to follow the process which the Secretary of Agriculture admits would be an effective procedure, namely, for the Commodity Credit Corporation to dump its surplus stocks on the market.

Mr. AIKEN. That is entirely true.

In that case, instead of having the Commodity Credit Corporation dump its stocks on the market, in 1948—and, of course, at that time the Commodity Credit Corporation did not have surplus stocks to dump—the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture repeatedly stated that storage space was lacking. Those statements forced the farmers themselves to dump their wheat and other commodities—particularly the wheat—on the market at any price they could obtain; and, of course, the result was to depress the prices very greatly.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say that the statement the Senator from Vermont is making is just as sound as is the granite of his native State of Vermont, for I know of farmers in my own State who dumped their products on the market because of the carefully calculated "scare" activities of the Department of Agriculture at that time, which made those farmers believe that if they did not sell their grain at the first opportunity, the absence of storage facilities would cause the grain to spoil and would cause a complete loss.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, everything the Senator from South Dakota has said is true, except for his references to me.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure, also, of the correctness and soundness of my references to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me add that during the following summer, after the act had been amended so as to permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire elevators and other property, if necessary, the Secretary of Agriculture authorized loans to be made on wheat piled on the ground. The Secretary of Agriculture had no more authority to do that at that time, in the summer of 1949, than he had authority to do it in the summer and fall of 1948. Yet the Secretary of Agriculture and other officials of the Department refused to make such loans on wheat in temporary storage or when stored on the ground in 1948. In 1948 they forced the farmers to sell their grain for whatever price they could obtain when the grain was sold to the speculators. Enough of the farmers sold their grain under those conditions to bring down the price paid to all farmers.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, let me say that just today I received word from a South Dakota farmer, who says, "I hope you Members of the United States Senate will see to it that in 1952 the Democrats do not compel the American farmers to finance their campaign, as was done in 1948."

So, Mr. President, the American farmer is being advised, through the efforts of our committee, and also through the sterling leadership of the Senator from Vermont, of what occurred in 1948.

I think all Members of the Senate of the United States, regardless of the party to which they belong, should call to the attention of the farmers everywhere the irrefutable evidence now being placed in the RECORD by the Senator from Vermont, because certainly it is neither fair nor right nor decent nor just to compel the American farmer to finance the campaigns of political parties, through shenanigans which have the result of deliberately forcing down the prices paid to the farmers for their commodities and taking advantage of them.

Mr. AIKEN. The habit of the Secretary of Agriculture and his brand of political adherents has been to scare the farmer with low prices, and even to force the farmers into such a disadvantageous position that they would become scared, would turn to the Government for help, and would vote the Democratic ticket, because they did not dare do otherwise. It also has been a habit to scare the consumer with constant releases emanating from Federal agencies, threatening higher prices to the consumer, in order to force the consumer to turn to those who promise to control prices, so that they will not go higher.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. So there may be no mistake, I may point out that these boo-boo efforts to scare the farmer failed utterly, as far as South Dakota was concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. MUNDT. Those tactics were tried in South Dakota, they were tried in

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA LIBRARIES

North Dakota, and they were tried in Iowa. Unhappily they worked in Iowa. But the farmers of South Dakota and North Dakota are made of sturdier stuff, and they refused to be frightened into voting against their best interests because of the activities of selfish politicians in Washington, who were trying to force the prices down so that they could get an increase in the number of votes received.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think it will be as easy to scare the farmer this year as it was 4 years ago. We do not intend to let them get away with it. My principal purpose in exposing these nefarious practices which were so much in evidence in the summer and fall of 1948 is, if possible, to prevent the administration from doing the same thing over again.

Mr. MUNDT. It occurs to me that probably the farmers of South Dakota, Vermont, and elsewhere in America, when they were young, read the copybook fable of the man who cried "wolf wolf" too often, and that, if Mr. Brannan again tries that formula, it will boomerang against him this time, instead of helping him.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it has already boomeranged to a considerable extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not also a fact that in the manipulation of the market during 1948, the Department of Agriculture withheld purchases of foreign-aid products, and that they could have purchased more grain, had they desired to do so?

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly, as already pointed out in this letter to the Secretary. After President Truman made his "pitchfork-in-the-back" speech in Iowa in September, the Department officials did not buy one bushel of corn during the ensuing 6 weeks. It was only 3 or 4 days before the election that they bought a few thousand bushels of grain. They at that time withheld those purchases for the simple purpose of forcing down the price faster than could have been done otherwise. Of course, corn could not have continued at $2 a bushel, with the enormous surplus that existed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not also true that the famous provision of the Commodity Credit Corporation's charter about which such a hullabaloo was made by the Secretary of Agriculture was placed in it in 1948. The bill was signed by the President without any exception being taken. As I remember, it was not until September that the Secretary of Agriculture found that there was such a section as 408 in the bill, when he was so desperate for a political issue that he manufactured that section.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary will now undoubtedly say that he referred to a shortage of farm storage. I am sure of that. But, at the time he was making his speech around the country, he said there was no commercial storage for the farmers. For example, on September 10, Secretary Brannan spoke at Osceola, Iowa, in which he referred to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, saying:

> This prevents the corporation • • • from aiding farmers without storage space for grain crops. Farmers will lose millions of dollars because they will be forced to put their corn on the market instead of selling it under Government loans.

If that was not intended to force down the price of grain, I do not know of any statement that ever was so intended.

President Truman made similar statements in his pitchfork-in-the-back speech—and that was the day that the pitchfork went into the back of the farmer. It was not sent into the back of the farmer by the Eightieth Congress. The President said:

> They have already done their best to keep prices from working. Many growers have sold wheat this summer at less than the support price, because they could not find proper storage.

He now says on the same subject:

> When farmers have to sell their wheat below the support price because they have no place to store it, they can thank this same Republican Congress—the Congress that gave the speculative grain trade a rake-off at your expense.

He was constantly telling them that there was no place in which to store their wheat, when it was simply a false statement. On Monday, following the President's speech on Saturday, September 18, the price of corn dropped 4 cents a bushel, and it kept on declining, as had been anticipated.

At Tipton, Ind., on October 15, President Truman made this statement:

> In 1948, the Republican Eightieth Congress refused to grant funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, to provide storage space for grains. This means that farmers will have to sell their grain at dump prices or let it rot in improper storage.

If that statement was not intended to break the market and to force it below what it otherwise would have been, then I do not know what its purpose was.

At Springfield, Ill., the President said, "If the farmers can't find storage facilities, they cannot get the support prices." Yet he was going all over the country with the Secretary of Agriculture, telling them that they could not get storage, therefore, they could not get loans, thus forcing them to dump their crops of that year at any price they could get for them.

At Danville, Ill., on October 12, the President said:

> Farmers all over the country are being forced to dump their grain as "distress grain," or let it rot on the ground • • •.

What was that intended to accomplish?

Mr. MUNDT. Had the President added that they were already being forced by the Secretary of Agriculture to let their grain rot on the ground, he would have been accurate.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes—if they had been forced to do that, by the Department, of which the Secretary of Agriculture was the commanding general, in this particular field. And so it went on and on. He went all over the country doing that.

Now, let me conclude my reading of the letter I have written to Secretary Brannan:

> I am sorry to read in your letter that you intend to "be supporting farm prices as vigorously this year as I did in 1948." God help the American farmer if you don't do any better than this.
>
> You finally fall back on the excuse that whatever ill fortune may befall the American farmer in the future must be due to what you call "the sliding scale" in the Agricultural Act of 1949. "Sliding scale" is evidently your political term for the flexible support formula authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1948 and continued in the Act of 1949.
>
> If this provision of the law, which reposes confidence in the Secretary of Agriculture by granting him broad authority, is bad, why did you not point out this fact during the campaign of 1948? Why did you wait until the following year to make your attack upon it? Is it because you authorized Mr. Carl Farrington as your spokesman to give it the full support of the Department of Agriculture when it was before the Congress in 1948? Is it because President Truman vigorously urged the Congress to approve what you now call a "sliding scale" of price supports?
>
> Your statement that "I have repeatedly opposed the sliding scale" may be correct, but why don't you tell the country that you vigorously supported it at the time it was enacted into law?
>
> The sound features of the law which you are operating under now, including flexible supports, were put on the statute books by bipartisan supporters of agriculture.

Mr. President, we never thought of involving the Department of Agriculture in party politics until approximately May or June 1948. Secretary Brannan went along for a while without involving his office in politics; I think it was for 2 or 3 months. But up to that time it was considered almost heresy to consider agricultural legislation on party lines, and it still is, I am very thankful to say. While the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is here I am sure he will agree that we will not get in a position where we are willing to consider agricultural legislation on party lines.

I read further from the letter:

> In view of the manner in which agricultural legislation has been administered during the last 4 years, you may be right, Mr. Secretary, when you say that we should not "rely upon the discretionary power of one official to hold prices at a fair support level," but when the Congress placed wide discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, we anticipated that it would be administered as intended by the Congress, not misinterpreted and contorted or used for political purposes as the case has been.
>
> The Department of Agriculture since its inception has been one of the most respected agencies of the Federal Government. Its estimates and predictions have been relied upon. Its service to the American farmer has been unquestioned. It has until recently been kept out of politics to an admirable degree. It is too bad, Mr. Secretary, that these traditions mean so little to you.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> GEORGE AIKEN.

Mr. President, I do not like to speak as I have just done, but if there is any way under heaven that I can prevent the

Secretary of Agriculture and his power-seeking political clique from using that Department for their own ambitious purposes, I am going to do it. If what I am saying helps in that respect, I have no apology for it, although, as I say, it is contrary to what I would prefer to do.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont, the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, if it is true that surplus storage space, such as hangars, and storage facilities which the Army has used, as well as other surplus facilities, were available in 1947 and 1948 and could have been used by the Secretary of Agriculture, or by the Government, because they were Government property? General Services had the property, and it could have been placed at the disposal of the Secretary to store grain in 1949 and 1950.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. The buildings were available in the fall of 1948. They could have been used then by the Commodity Credit Corporation just as well as in 1949, except that there was no need for them. The Senator may recall that in an investigation conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry recently it was testified that only approximately 790 storage facilities were licensed in the fall of 1948. The next year there were 3,875 of these facilities licensed. They needed only 790 in 1948 in order to store grain. The Department sent out releases all over the country and got thousands and thousands of good, honest, sincere persons repeating the false stories which were given.

I recall about the 15th of September, 1948, the Farmers Union Herald carried a statement referring to a shortage of storage space for a billion bushels in the fall. They undoubtedly received that information, false as it may have been, from the Department of Agriculture.

On the 21st of September, I received a letter from Mr. Julius Barnes, one of the most respected citizens of the State of Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I know him very well.

Mr. AIKEN. In his letter he said that he had tried in vain to get someone to use a million bushels of storage capacity which he had. He said he had written to the Department and they had told him they could not take over his building outright. That was correct. The law would not permit it. They told him he would have to deal with a private party.

He talked with representatives of the Farmers Union and was told that they already had much more space than they could possibly use.

Mr. THYE. About 6 weeks ago in a hearing I asked the Secretary of Agriculture if it was not true that grain bins were being sold by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the very time he was charging the Eightieth Congress with having restricted the Department of Agriculture in obtaining grain bins. His only reply at that time was that it made no difference whether the grain bins were in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation or in the possession or ownership of a farmer. If the farmers had not been able to buy grain bins from the Commodity Credit Corporation, they would have bought on the open market their materials and built their own storage bins. So if the Commodity Credit Corporation retained the property they had acquired instead of selling it, there would have been millions of bushels of storage capacity.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Minnesota knows what he is talking about, because he was a member of the conference committee on the part of the Senate that handled the Commodity Credit Corporation legislation. We know, the members of the House committee know, and the Secretary of Agriculture and the people of his Solicitor's office know, that there was not one word in that legislation intended to prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from buying all the bins it needed and selling or leasing them to the farmers.

Mr. THYE. The conference to which the Senator alluded was held in the Capitol on the floor beneath the Senate Chamber.

Mr. AIKEN. It was in the room which is now occupied by the Official Reporters of Debates.

Mr. THYE. In that room the representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture sat with the conferees. When the conferees referred to the language in the Commodity Credit Corporation charter and asked them, "Does this meet with your approval?" the gentlemen all expressed to the conferees that it met with their approval.

Yet but a few months later the President of the United States, speaking to a group of business people, farmers, and other citizens of Iowa, referred to the sticking of a pitchfork into the backs of farmers by denying them the loan.

Mr. AIKEN. The Secretary of Agriculture was then Secretary Brannan.

Mr. THYE. Secretary Brannan was likewise speaking throughout the great Corn Belt, from Kansas to North Dakota, about the action of the Eightieth Congress in denying the right to the Commodity Credit Corporation to possess grain storage bins.

I have been very much interested in what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has stated in relation to the entire question, because it was the producer who lost when the cash grain market went down each and every day while the producer was harvesting his crop because of the spoken words of the President of the United States and the spoken words of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Each day the price of wheat or corn went down, and each day the producer sold on the market and took the reduced price, it meant a good deal less to the producer in the way of return. The consumers did not benefit, because when the shortage became known to them after the election, the price of grain went up again, and the retailers' and consumers' costs remained as they were, as if that grain had gone into normal storage, as it should have done at harvest time.

Mr. AIKEN. After the election, the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Secretary of Agriculture permitted the price of grain to rise again, and all kinds of grain did rise in price, except corn. Corn was held down for some time, due to the wheat crop. I think it went up 2 cents a bushel, from $1.21 to $1.23, in the month following the election. But that was the time, as the Senator may recall, when farmers were disposing of their soft corn, and had to take whatever price they could get.

Mr. THYE. The harvest of corn is usually in October and November.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The harvest of wheat commences in June and continues from the extreme South, in Texas, up into the Canadian area. The harvest commences in the extreme Southwest in June, and ends in the northern area in late September or October. That is why the price of wheat was so much influenced by the remarks of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, because they were made at the time of the heaviest harvesting.

Mr. AIKEN. Getting back to the Senator's question as to whether the Commodity Credit Corporation was selling its bins at this period, I can state that from July 1, 1947, to May 31, 1948, the Production and Marketing Administration sold 5,150 bins with a total capacity of 10,925,700 bushels.

From May 31, 1948, to July 31, 1948, it sold 1,224 bins, having a capacity of a little more than 2,581,000 bushels.

From July 31, 1948, to September 30, 1948, it sold 932 bins, having a capacity of 1,957,200 bushels.

From September 30, 1948, to November 30, 1948, it sold 283 more bins, having a capacity of 594,300 bushels.

I do not criticize the selling of bins. The Department had every right to sell or lease the bins—to sell them for cash or to sell them for credit, or on whatever satisfactory collateral the farmer might have had. What I criticize—and I cannot criticize it too severely—is that while they were selling bins, they were going all over the country telling the farmers that Congress had denied them the right to buy and sell grain bins, which was an absolute falsehood. For that, the Department cannot be condemned too severely, particularly in view of the results as they are known now.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has taken cognizance of the charges made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as well as by the Governor of New York, Thomas Dewey, and by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. A few days ago I received a summary of the factors, according to the Secretary's views, affecting farm prices in 1948. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I certainly shall

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA LIBRARIES

not object—I think the taxpayers ought to see this memorandum in the RECORD. I was inclined to offer it myself. Then I realized that it consisted of 28 pages. It must have cost the taxpayers $10,000 or $15,000 already for 100,000 copies to be sent over the country without postage. So I thought I would not impose further on the taxpayers by asking them to pay for printing the statement in the RECORD. However, I am glad the Senator from Louisiana has offered it. I hope it may be printed in the RECORD near the remarks which I have made.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent that it follow those remarks.

Mr. AIKEN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. However, I will say that the document has many erroneous inferences in it, besides some statements which could be referred to in harsher terms than "erroneous inferences."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Vermont if he is familiar with the document which the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has just asked to have printed in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I am familiar with it. It is a sort of "white paper" intended to defend the Secretary's actions during the fall of 1948. I do not think the public ought to be asked to accept it at its face value. It is full of erroneous inferences and some phrases which might be designated by a harsher description, but I have no objection to having it printed after my statement.

Mr. THYE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, June 26, 1952.

In view of recent charges that the Department of Agriculture deliberately drove down prices of farm commodities prior to the 1948 presidential election to influence the election, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan today issued the following statement to document facts that such a development did not occur and that large crops and other factors were responsible for certain farm price declines in 1948:

SUMMARY

First, there was a downward trend in farm prices in the summer and fall months of 1948 in conformity with the general postwar decline in farm and other commodity prices which began more than a year before the November elections of 1948 and continued for more than a year thereafter. These downward price trends were recognized and anticipated by the private grain trade in the futures market months in advance of the harvest season.

The price of corn, the major commodity involved, fell from $2.02 a bushel in July to $1.21 in November of 1948 under pressure of an oncoming crop which was the largest on record, and about 53 percent larger than the previous year's crop.

Second, the Department did a vigorous job, within its limited authority, of supporting farm prices to cushion the postwar price declines during the fall of 1948.

For example, the beginning date for price support on corn was moved up from December 1 to October 1 for the first time in order to help bolster corn prices.

CCC price support commitments (loans, inventories, and purchase agreements) from August through November 1948 totaled nearly $2,000,000,000—chiefly for placing new crops under loan.

Any farmer who could find storage was given price support—a significant fact which the charges completely ignore.

The Department was active throughout the country in helping farmers to acquire adequate storage facilities, even though the CCC itself was prohibited from acquiring such facilities.

The administration warned before and at the time the CCC charter was amended that the ban on acquiring storage facilities would cripple the price-support program.

Third, the severe storage restrictions imposed in 1948 on CCC were the major influences operating with the supply and demand situation to depress the market. CCC could not acquire or lease sites for grain bins, including new sites for bins already owned by the Corporation, and could not acquire or lease any facility, including grain bins, for the storage of commodities delivered to it under its price-support programs. Furthermore, CCC could not acquire grain bins for resale to farmers for the storage of agricultural commodities under the loan program and could not, for the purpose of financing the construction of grain bins, make loans to farmers upon the security of bins which became attached to and a part of the realty.

In fact, none of the storage programs beginning in 1949, soon after the ban was eliminated, could have been carried out in 1948 when the ban was in effect.

The House committee which corrected the charter in 1949 had this to say about the effect of the storage ban: "Restrictions contained in section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act approved in June 1948 prohibited the Commodity Credit Corporation from taking any effective action toward alleviating the storage deficiencies, and would prevent it from doing so in the future." The Senate committee made a similar declaration.

Fourth, the market experts in the private grain trade and their trade journals attributed grain price movements in 1948 to the very optimistic crop prospects as the major factor affecting the market. They also called attention to the price-depressing influence of statements by Republican leaders attacking the Government's programs for stabilizing farm prices.

To the best of our knowledge, no one in the private trade ever made reference during 1948 to any Government attempts to depress the market, yet they would have been the first to detect such an attempt and bring it to public notice. In fact, their market comments are all to the contrary.

I. REVIEW OF FACTORS AFFECTING FARM PRICES DURING 1948

The downward movement of farm prices during the summer and fall of 1948 was a part of the general postwar decline in farm prices which began almost a year before the November elections of 1948 and continued for more than a year thereafter. Altogether, average prices received by farmers dropped 24 percent during this 2-year period, beginning in January 1948 and extending through December 1949.

Three major price breaks

There were three major breaks in prices received by farmers during this period. The first came in late January and February of 1948 when grain and livestock prices broke sharply. The second occurred in October and November, which is when fall-harvested crops come piling into the market each year. The third occurred in January and early February of 1949.

The same general factors were responsible for the general trend in farm prices all through this period. Farm production—stimulated by the high price levels of the early postwar period—had reached a record-high peak at a time when the world food crisis was easing and when business pressures in the United States itself were easing. United States producers on both the farm and industrial fronts had begun to catch up with the shortages which had been left over from World War II.

Large supplies burdened market

Wheat production in 1948 was 1,295,000,000 bushels, the second largest wheat crop on record, exceeded only by the 1,359,000,000-bushel crop of 1947.

Corn production was up to an all-time record of 3,605,000,000 bushels—an increase of over 50 percent above the very short crop of 2,355,000,000 bushels harvested in 1947.

Cotton output totaled 14,877,000 bales, which meant a substantial increase not only in available supplies of cotton but also of cottonseed, compared with the 11,857,000 bales harvested in 1947.

Oat production was extremely large—1,450,000,000 bushels compared with 1,176,000,000 bushels in 1947.

Barley production was 316,000,000 bushels in 1948 compared with 282,000,000 bushels in 1947.

Sorghums for grain totaled 131,000,000 bushels in 1948 as compared with 93,000,000 bushels in 1947.

Soybean production also established what was at that time a new record of 227,000,000 bushels as compared with a harvest of 186,000,000 bushels for 1947.

In short, agricultural production in 1948 was greater than could be absorbed at prevailing price levels.

Private trade predicted price drops

Prospects of oversupply were so apparent in 1948 that members of the private grain trade—who were willing to bet money on their judgment—predicted months in advance that grain prices would drop substantially during the fall months. Their opinions were reflected not only in trade news items (see sec. III), but also in the corn futures market at Chicago, which registered a sharp decline in July and August in anticipation of a later drop in cash prices. (See chart at end.)

Government influences

Actually, the only way the Department could have "rigged" prices in the summer of 1948 would have been to dump large quantities of commodities on the market. But the Commodity Credit Corporation had no sizable supplies of commodities to dump, even if it had been inclined to contravene its assigned duties.

Because of the war demand and the food shortages throughout the world following the war, CCC price loans and inventories in 1948 had been reduced to a postwar low of $274,000,000 as of July 31. Nearly two-thirds of this amount was tied up in wool and tobacco.

Far from dumping commodities on the market to depress prices, the CCC in the period under discussion was engaged in increasing its inventories in the process of supporting prices. By December of 1948, the placing of new crops under loan, chiefly cotton, wheat, corn and other grains, had increased the total of CCC price support commitments (loans, inventories, and purchase agreements) to $2,163,000,000. During the 19 months from July 31, 1948, to February 28, 1950, CCC-owned stocks of agricultural commodities and price support commitments increased to $4,231,000,000.

Following is a partial list of press releases concerning price support activity which were issued in the months prior to the 1948 election:

March 31, 1948: Hog price supports announced through September.

May 21, 1948: Price support announced for 1948 grain crops (wheat, oats, barley, rye, gain sorghums) (USDA 1075–48).

July 15, 1948: Grain purchase agreements offered to farmers (USDA 1479–48).

July 20, 1948: 1948 crop corn price-support program announced. (Note: provided farm-stored loans only.) (USDA 1507–48.)

August 6, 1948: Farmers urged to increase farm storage and use price-protection program (USDA 1665–48).

August 30, 1948: Soybean prices to be supported at $2.18 a bushel (USDA 1821–48).

September 8, 1948: Soybean purchase-agreement program announced (USDA 1895–48).

September 21, 1948: Farmers to get loans on farm-stored and warehouse-stored soybeans. (Initial warehouse storage loan program.) (USDA 1994–48.)

September 30, 1948: Corn loan and purchase agreement rates announced for 1948 crop (new feature—loans available from harvest instead of having to wait until December 1, as in previous years) (USDA 2063–48).

October 1, 1948: Hog price supports announced through March 1949 (USDA 2078–48).

One of the most significant price-support actions of the period was the one announced September 30, which moved up the availability date for corn loans from December 1 to October 1, 1948—the first year loans were made available so early. As a result of this action, farmers were able to place more than four and a half million bushels of corn under price support just before the 1948 elections.

Price support checked price declines

All these facts add up to one conclusion. During the period when the Department was allegedly depressing market prices, it actually was busily engaged in supporting farm prices.

CCC price-support and related activities during 1948 and 1949 were strong factors in cushioning the postwar decline in farm prices. This can be illustrated by a comparison of the behavior of farm prices in a similar situation following World War I. In that case, farm prices dropped following the end of world food shortages by over 50 percent within the 12-month period from May 1920 into May 1921. But following World War II, prices dropped only half as much over twice as long a period—a fact which illustrates the effectiveness of the price support programs.

Price factors for specific crops

Following is a discussion of the important factors in the price situation for 1948 crops of corn, wheat, and soybeans. This discussion is based chiefly on statements released at the time and includes accounts of the Department's activities with respect to the varied crops.

Corn

Corn is the Nation's key crop and principal feed grain. As such, it is one of the most important factors affecting the behavior of the grain market as a whole. This was especially true in 1948.

Changes in corn prices during 1948 were typical of changes that occur in a year when corn production increases sharply from the preceding year. The 1948 corn crop was 53 percent larger than the small 1947 crop, and the largest on record. Total feed concentrate supplies increased 26 percent and supplies per animal unit increased 21 percent.

This marked increase in feed supplies caused prices of corn to drop about 40 percent from July to November 1948. This drop, however, was about in line with declines in previous years when corn production increased rapidly. For example, under similar circumstances, corn prices dropped 35 percent from July to November 1946, 59 percent from July to November 1937, and 32 percent from July to November 1935.

The Department predicted the drop in corn prices as early as May 1948. The May issue of The Demand and Price Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, contained the following statement: "Prospects for feed grains so far this season are much better than in the early months of 1947. Favorable weather this summer and fall probably would result in at least the usual decline in prices of oats and barley this summer and more than the usual drop in corn prices next fall."

For the month of August, the average closing price for December corn futures at Chicago was $1.43 per bushel, even though the average price received by farmers was $1.91 as of August 15. By October 15, the average price received by farmers had declined to $1.38 per bushel.

This decline carried corn prices under the price-support level at which farmers could obtain loans or enter into purchase-agreement contracts. The price-support level for the 1948 corn crop, United States average basis, was $1.44 per bushel. The fact that a record volume of 551,000,000 bushels of corn was placed under price support would indicate that corn prices were given significant support by the corn-loan and purchase-agreement program.

In years of comparatively large production, or low demand, corn prices generally have fallen below the price-support level at harvest time. For example, corn prices were under the support level during the early fall months, not only in 1948 but also in 1949 and 1950. This is to be expected in years when corn supplies are relatively plentiful, since corn placed under loans must be stored by farmers until the following summer or fall before being delivered to CCC. Carrying the corn involves some risk to farmers as well as costs of storage. Corn at harvest-time is also of higher moisture content and sells at a discount under the price of corn that is dried out to the grade No. 3 or better standard on which CCC loans are based. As in the 1938–39 season, corn prices remained under the support level throughout the 1948–49 season. The fact that prices continued below the loan during the latter half of the season reflected general weakness in commodity markets, especially in February 1949, and the prospects for another large corn crop coming on in the fall of 1949.

The big supplies of corn and other feed grains in 1948 came at a time when livestock numbers were at a postwar low, following the short feed supply in 1947–48. Livestock numbers began increasing in the 1948–49 season and increased to 1951–52. Corn prices, however, remained at a low level until 1950, when prospects for smaller feed-grain production and increasing livestock numbers indicated a less-favorable feed balance for livestock producers. Corn prices had advanced above the support level by the close of the 1949–50 season and averaged above the support in 1950–51.

The problem of storing the record corn crop of 1948 fell heaviest on farmers. Corn placed under price support had to be stored in farm cribs until the summer or fall of the following year. The CCC began taking delivery of 1948 corn in the summer of 1949, and delivery continued into the early part of 1950. A total of 378,000,000 bushels was delivered to CCC in that period, and 115,000,000 bushels were resealed on farms under the reseal program. The increase in storage capacity provided by CCC and the increase in farm storage capacity during 1949 and 1950 was an additional factor in easing the burden of large corn stocks.

Wheat

Despite a record large crop of wheat in 1947, prices of wheat in that marketing season, stimulated by world food shortages and extremely short supplies of corn, reached the record high level of $2.81 per bushel in January 1948. The season average price received by farmers was $2.29 per bushel. This was 46 cents per bushel above the national average price-support level for the 1947 crop.

Prospects for the 1948 crop of winter wheat were good and improved almost continuously from December 1947 through July 1948.

The world food situation had begun to ease somewhat in the spring of 1948. The new crops of feed grains were expected to ease the tight feed situation. When the 1948 crop started to market in volume, prices declined to around the $2 level and remained there during most of the marketing season. The season average price received by farmers was $1.99 per bushel, 1 cent below the national average loan rate of $2.

Prices for wheat would have been somewhat lower had it not been for the price-support program and heavy movement into export which helped to relieve the tight storage situation.

Wheat producers placed 254,000,000 bushels of wheat under loan and made out purchase agreements covering 113,000,000 bushels. Of these amounts, 215,000,000 bushels of the loan wheat and 68,000,000 bushels of purchase-agreement wheat were delivered to the CCC.

Soybeans

Prices for the 1947 crop of soybeans were at record high levels. Prices received by farmers for this crop at $3.34 per bushel were $1.30 above the 1947 price-support level and 78 cents higher than the price received for the 1946 crop. These high prices were largely the result of the fact that supplies of fats and oils were extremely tight in relation to world requirements. Strong demand for oilseed meals was also a strengthening factor in prices of soybeans.

Prices of soybeans fell sharply in February 1948, but recovered a major part of the drop in the spring and early summer.

Production of soybeans in October 1948 was estimated at 13 percent above the previous year and a record. Production of cottonseed was estimated at 31 percent greater than in 1947 and larger than any year since 1937. Mainly as a result of these production increases, prices of soybeans fell sharply and prices received by producers for 1948 crop beans averaged $2.27 per bushel. This was more than $1 less than for the 1947 crop, but still 9 cents higher than the 1948 price-support level of $2.18.

Exports of soybeans, including the bean equivalent of oil exported, amounted to 54,000,000 bushels, 39,000,000 bushels more than in any previous year.

Producers of soybeans placed nearly 7,000,000 bushels of 1948 crop soybeans under loan and made out purchase agreements for about 4,000,000 bushels. Of this total, about 10,500,000 bushels were delivered to CCC.

II. WHAT THE TRADE AND TRADE PUBLICATIONS WERE SAYING IN 1948

Even before the crops were harvested, futures markets were forecasting lower prices for the new grain crops to be harvested in the summer and fall of 1948. Prices of futures representing the new crop were below the prices of old-crop futures and cash prices for old-crop grain. The chart of corn prices shows that the December future, the first new-crop future, was far below cash prices in the spring and declined further with promising new crop prospects from July on.

Favorable new crop prospects

Corn futures prices began to fall on Saturday, July 3, and Tuesday, July 6, 1948. News ticker items, press accounts, and brokerage firm letters from July on were filled with favorable crop news, of which the following excerpts, arranged chronologically, are typical.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA LIBRARIES

Lamson Bros. & Co., July 1: "Optimistic reports continue to come through regarding the new corn crop and the Corn Industries Research Foundation in a report covering the principal growing areas of the Middle West said that one of the country's largest corn crops is in the making and that the crop might be a record one since acreage planted to corn is substantially larger in many areas than earlier anticipated, notably in Iowa."

Dow-Jones ticker, July 1, also cited this report, and included the following: "Increased corn acreage and progress of the crop to date point to a decided easing of the tight corn situation, resulting from last year's subnormal yield."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, July 6: "General liquidation by longs centering in corn futures and brought on by glowing crop reports resulted in sharply lower grain markets Saturday."

Dow-Jones ticker, July 6: "Prospective corn crop of 3,137,000,000 bushels or within about 112,000,000 bushels of the record crop raised in 1946 was estimated last Saturday by C. M. Galvin with James E. Bennett & Co. Last year's production amounted to 2,400,952,000 bushels. The statistician raised his winter-wheat estimate from 826,708,000 bushels on June 1, to present outlook of 907,463,000 bushels."

Uhlmann Grain Co., July 8: "In corn the crop outlook is about perfect and the Iowa State report claimed that cornfields were showing a uniform deep green color and that there were practically no drowned-out spots."

Lamson Bros. & Co., July 8: "Secretary of the Iowa Department of Agriculture said that considering all crops in all areas of that State, it is doubtful whether the outlook has ever been better at this time of the year."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., July 8: "Corn was the major target of bearish forces during the past week. The brilliant new crop prospect weighed heavily against the price level and broke the slim supports upon which it had been resting. September corn still appears to be, despite the sharp break, the most overpriced contract on the board. It cannot help but be influenced by the new crop."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, July 10: "Continued fine growing weather and expected bearish official crop forecast prompted general long liquidation of corn futures and prices broke sharply to lowest levels in several months."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, July 14, citing report of the Baldwin Elevator Co., of Decatur, on the corn prospect: "It is making phenomenal growth—excellent, booming, glowing. Everything favorable can be said without too much exaggeration."

Uhlman Grain Co., July 14: "The Iowa weekly crop bulletin points out that the hot weather in the past week continued to force crop development and that corn and soybeans made excellent progress although there was probably some shrinkage in oats. The Wabash Railroad released a crop report as of July 9, in which they stated that along their road corn in Iowa showed good growth and development and is knee-high or better. For Illinois, they report growing conditions ideal; plant has made splendid growth. Indiana, while weather conditions have been favorable, some fields had become weedy due to rains and inability to cultivate."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., July 22: "Erratic movements in the volatile July corn contract tended to give false impression of strength to a fundamentally weak corn market. But the contortions in the July should not hide the very real fact that the largest corn crop in history is in the making. The true size of this year's crop has as yet to be really appreciated."

Dow-Jones ticker, July 26: "All deliveries of corn, most deliveries of oats and wheat sold off to new lows for the day. Dealings were moderately active. Selling reflected private advices of favorable crop prospects. Weakness in corn touched off selling in the balance of the list."

Uhlman Grain Co., July 29: "The heaviest rains occurred in portions of Nebraska and Iowa, and the forecast is for a rather showery condition for tonight and Friday, which should benefit corn further. Under the circumstances, there seems to be some bearish sentiment even in the new-crop corn deliveries."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 5: "Heavy selling of wheat and corn futures followed release of a bearish private crop report."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., August 5: "Unrelieved congestion of small grains and an ever-brighter promise of a fabulous corn crop joined hands to promote sharply lower prices for all grains during the past fortnight. Latest private crop estimates suggest over 1,200,000,000 bushels of wheat, 3,500,000,000 bushels of corn, and approximately 1,500,000,000 bushels of oats. Total crop of these three major grains will tend to run about 6,200,000,000 bushels, as compared to 1947 total for same grains of about 5,000,000,000 bushels. In this comparison lies the major explanation of recent price behaviors.

"Tremendous premiums for cash corn could not dispel the threat of the largest corn crop in history and as a result, all futures trended lower. This potentially largest crop will face a much smaller than normal demand. Animal population has shrunk to a low for recent years. A large supply of oats and other feeds will compete with corn for this minimum demand. Action in the futures markets suggest that all feed grains are attempting to find a natural price level. Efforts of the Government to thwart such a trend may prove futile.

"Price position of old-crop corn is untenable in face of new crop prospects and the presence of competing grains. Rapid readjustments of cash markets to new conditions is liable to occur. September corn offers great appeal for sales on any rally from this level."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 11: "All deliveries of corn broke to new low prices for the season. General selling by longs was prompted by continued favorable conditions for the crop and materially increased country offerings of cash corn."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 17: "In a survey of the corn crop J. E. Bennett & Co. had a number of reports from Illinois points indicating that the corn could hardly be any better, and reports from Iowa were in similar vein."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., September 2: "We believe that the full problem facing the grain-price structure will be realized when the new corn crop starts moving to market in volume. Present price structure has as yet to absorb the shock, and we believe the only response can be a lower market structure."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, September 8: (Citing Fort Dodge, Iowa, report to J. E. Bennett & Co.) "Corn making fine progress. Half of it is dented and will be out of frost danger by September 15. Decatur and Streator, Ill., report corn is looking fine and big yields are in prospect."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., September 9: "Contrary trends evidenced themselves in the corn market. Cash corn and the nearby September contract engaged themselves on a rapid roller-coaster during the week, with every sign of acute tightness. New corn deliveries on the other hand consistently sagged. The overwhelming size of the new crop was the major depressing influence on the latter while the paucity of shipments kept the cash and September corn in a fever."

Lamson Brothers and Co., September 24: "This year practically no damage is anticipated from below freezing weather because the crop is so far ahead of normal."

Government loan and export programs—a supporting market factor

Dow-Jones ticker, July 7: "Demand for wheat was also credited to commercial dealers and brokers with flour mill connections along with short covering by traders who sold earlier. The buying reflected heavy purchases of cash wheat by the CCC over the holiday week-end and expectations of moderate sized flour purchases scheduled to be made by the PMA overnight."

Dow-Jones ticker, July 20: "Wheat again resisted pressure reflecting buying by houses with flour mill connections along with some covering by local traders. Demand for wheat reflected expectations of large export flour sales to the PMA and for export, following announcement made yesterday of September export grain allocations."

Dow-Jones ticker, August 10: "Support in wheat at the lower level was credited to mills against sales of flour to the PMA overnight."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 11: "Despite Government programs to keep prices up, there is an absence of confidence among buyers, both commercial buyers and investors, because of the big crops promised this year, in the opinion of Mitchell Hutchins & Co."

Lamson Brothers & Co., August 17: "With the practically assured bumper wheat and oat crops and prospective record corn crop, opinion tends more to the belief that commodity prices may drag for a time, and even with the Government support programs actively in force, lack of storage space in both terminals and on farms may cause for a time at least, lower price levels than were anticipated earlier in the season."

Uhlmann Grain Co., August 23: "There is no doubt in our minds that having raised bumper crops of wheat, corn and oats, not to speak of the splendid agricultural conditions prevailing elsewhere, we would have quite a sharp break in the whole price structure except for two factors: one the heavy shipments that are being made to Europe and Asia: secondly, the impoundings which are bound to take a good deal of grain from commercial supplies."

Dow-Jones ticker, August 25: "The buying which was attracted by recent share declines was also attributed to light marketings, indications that large volume of wheat would be placed under the loan along with evidence of the need for larger quantities of wheat than the CCC is currently buying. This latter situation seems to be confirmed by recently advanced premiums the agency was paying for wheat. The CCC is also seeking larger quantities of wheat in the Chicago market for shipment to the east to meet expanded export goals. Traders also were expecting the next export allocation will show a large increase over September. The strength in wheat disturbed shorts in corn."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., August 26: "Futures markets reflect potential inability of the loan to sustain corn prices in the face of the largest crop in history. Actual run of new corn could force prices down further from present levels. Eventually, government support or not, the price must reflect the balance between supply and demand."

Dow-Jones ticker, September 1: "There was absorption of the bread cereal by flour millers against sales of flour to the PMA."

Uhlmann Grain Co., September 1: "'Meanwhile, our country continues to export very heavily, and daily the allocations for the October-December quarter are expected. But as we view it, these are not final because supplemental quotas have been issued right along, so that port facilities are taxed to the maximum in order that grains may be exported to relieve the interior storage congestion. Some authorities are of the opinion that later about 1,000,000 tons of corn

will be allocated for export during the quarter mostly to clear during the month of December."

Dow-Jones ticker, September 16: "Wheat was steady and mostly higher. There was some buying credited to flour mills, also some lifting of hedges against cash wheat sales to the CCC."

Dow-Jones ticker, September 28: "Strength in corn stemmed from a higher cash market, the fact that producers are not offering supplies in large quantities, and trade expectation of early announcement of export corn allocations."

Uhlmann Grain Co., September 30: "There was some buying of corn by brokers with export connections—this may have been in anticipation of business to be done under the allocation."

Dow-Jones ticker, October 20: "There was also buying by elevator dealers against cash wheat sales to the CCC."

Dow-Jones ticker, October 27: "Corn rallied 1¼ to 1¾ cents from early lows on buying credited to commercial dealers against reported sales of cash corn to CCC today both at the Atlantic and Gulf ports."

Market support in September from earlier corn loan date

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 13: "Thomson & McKinnon note that because corn loans are only available after December 1, there is a big gap through late October and November when new crop corn will be moving to market looking for storage room. They say that export plans suggest that the pattern is to rush the best part of the season's wheat exports out by the end of the year, reserving shipping facilities thereafter for large corn export which they say could reach the 200,000,000 bushel total mentioned from time to time as a possibility."

James E. Bennett & Co., September 14: "Professional traders as well as commission houses were active on the buying side of the new crop deliveries. This was due to an announcement that the corn loan would become available to producers at the time of harvest rather than the date previously set as December 1. There have been quite a little short selling on the theory that producers would market their corn as soon as harvested rather than await December 1 when loans were available."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, September 15: "Early buying of December corn was prompted by news that Government corn loans would be available at time of harvest instead of on December 1 as originally announced."

Daniel F. Rice and Co., September 16: "An oversold new corn market perked up on receipt of the anticipated news that the Government will enter into loan or purchase agreements at harvest time rather than on the first of December."

Effect of lack of storage space

Despite Government efforts to provide crop supports, discounts under loan levels developed because of temporary shipping and storage congestion.

Dow-Jones ticker, July 12: "A record number of wheatladen boxcars clogged the Kansas City Terminal area this morning as the force of a rail embargo began to take full effect. An official of the Association of American Railroads says over 11,000 cars will be in and around that point this morning and afternoon. He said 10,100 cars piled up in the region Saturday. AAR imposed a ban on wheat shipments into Kansas City effective Friday midnight, but it was explained that the embargo would not be fully effective until 48 hours after that deadline."

Dow-Jones ticker, July 16: "The Association of American Railroads will ban shipment of wheat to any storage point in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Missouri, Oklahoma, or Texas effective at midnight tonight, it was learned. An AAR official disclosed the move as intended to prevent the accumulation of wheat on account of a severe lack of storage facilities in terminals and country elevators. The new embargo, he said, will include in addition to the other States named, storage points in Council Bluffs, Iowa, and East St. Louis, Ill."

Uhlmann Grain Co., July 30: "We understand that the Department of Agriculture has adopted a policy of pre-shipment of wheat for export owing to the fact that accumulations have been heavy, and in some places a critical storage shortage has developed."

Uhlmann Grain Co., August 6: "The Government apparently realizes that congestion at terminals has been somewhat responsible for depressing markets. Undoubtedly, the September allocations, which were increased a few weeks ago, will again be stepped up in an effort to relieve congestion in some of the Southwestern markets. Illustrative of this situation, one of our friends in the Southwest remarked: 'At worst phase of storage jam, No. 1 ordinary hard wheat sold in Kansas City at extreme discount of 19 cents a bushel below 1948 loan, near a record margin under support point.'"

Lamson Bros. & Co., August 16: "The Government is urging farmers to build more crib room to take care of the sizeable supply of corn from this season's anticipated bumper crop."

Lamson Bros. & Co., September 21: "Farmers are being urged continuously to provide crib space on the farms for their corn as present storage is inadequate and it is believed that perhaps 500,000,000 bushels of corn will go under loan this year."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, September 29, citing comment by Thomson & McKinnon: "Feel that December corn will lose ground on May and work toward a full carrying charge, which will be a reflection of bidding for storage room, in our opinion bound to become a problem equally if not greater than experienced in the Southwest on wheat. Expect corn users will hold back until there has been a complete adjustment of cash corn to a new crop basis."

Daniel F. Rice & Co., October 21: "Corn supplies have shown a persistent increase during the week and the price of cash corn has weakened as a result. Major source of buying in the nearby contracts has come from exporters, as an initiation and expansion of export business was in evidence through the week. The Government evidently is determined to keep the market clear of burdensome supplies through the first run of new crop corn."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, October 30: "Producers are selling corn freely, that is producers who have more space than they have storage for. Farmers who have crib space for the corn they raised are waiting to see what the market does and this corn will go into the loan program unless prices advance sharply from current level. Yesterday, No. 2 yellow corn in the spot market sold at prices at least 15 cents a bushel below the loan rate. The huge surpluses at the moment are outweighing the potential demand."

What caused wheat prices to fall in August 1948?

The only time in the summer and fall of 1948 wheat prices fell sharply was August 19–23. The July 1949 future dropped from 206¼ to 187¾ cents.

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 23: "Wheat futures showed greatest weakness as there was much long liquidation because of the further decline in corn and a report that leaders in Congress are discussing the advisability of making the flexible farm-support program applicable to 1949 crops instead of the present mandatory 90 percent of parity support measure.

"Saturday's break in wheat undoubtedly has disturbed the trade and the suggestion that the 90 percent mandatory support might be withdrawn in favor of one more in line with keeping down the cost of food naturally is of major interest."

Dow-Jones ticker, August 23: "Heavy selling swept the grain markets Saturday forcing all deliveries of corn, lard, and deferred contracts of wheat to new lows for the season. Liquidation came into all pits at the outset and continued throughout the session with buyers backing away from the market. News from Washington that some Congressmen were considering cutting supports under farm products in 1949 instead of waiting until 1950 started the selling movement."

James E. Bennett & Co., August 23: "Market continued under the pressure of liquidation, with an apparent lack of confidence on the part of all holders in the ability of prices to hold at current levels for the immediate future, despite Government support. The Government is about the only real support in the market and while the CCC continues to buy heavily and much wheat is going into the loan, there is little to encourage investment buying, so long as prices continue to decline."

Lamson Bros. & Co., August 24: "The present law regarding support prices is in effect until January 1, 1950, but there has been talk from Washington that when Congress meets in January there might be a change in the support prices for the 1949 crop."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, August 25: "Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, the Kansas wheat belt chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, forced congressional acceptance in the last days of the regular session of the 1950 deadline for change in price supports. His influence is still sufficient to make the Congress stick to that decision to guarantee grain producers at least a market of 90 percent of parity for one more year, and he is determined to see that the guaranty stands.

"Representative HOPE won out over Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, the powerful GOP Senate leader, who had nerve enough to call for lower support prices in a Nebraska grain area speech last spring, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, whose long-range farm bill contained the sliding-scale support that was originally slated to begin this coming January.

"On the possibility of GOP congressional abrogation of the preelection commodity price support pledge, it seems most likely that should a real movement begin in the Senate (sponsored by someone else) to move forward the date of death of the flat 90 percent of parity support, Senator AIKEN would go along."

Wall Street Journal, September 3:

"ALBANY.—A three-point Republican cure for high food prices was outlined here yesterday by Harold E. Stassen, who has been picked to open the presidential campaign of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey with a speech in Detroit next Tuesday.

"'With bumper crops here and improved crops all over the world food prices should be coming down,' Mr. Stassen said. The reason they're not, the Republican leader maintained, is largely due to the Government's food purchasing policies.

"In a sharp criticism of the administration's food buying practices, Mr. Stassen accused Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan of a deliberate effort to keep food prices from dropping. He cited a recent statement by Secretary Brannan which, Mr. Stassen said, 'indicated that food purchases would be increased.' This statement, Mr. Stassen charged, was 'a deliberate attempt to stop the downward trend of food prices' which followed reports of large crops."

Chicago Journal of Commerce, September 3: "Grain futures developed considerable weakness yesterday.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"Comments by Harold E. Stassen after meeting with Governor Dewey on food prices, in which he accused the administration of deliberately trying to stop food prices from going down, prompted some selling. Houses with eastern connections were conspicuous in this."

The day after the election, its significance to the grain market was illustrated by the following excerpt from a weekly grain letter issued by Daniel F. Rice & Co. November 4, 1948:

"Reelection of the Democratic administration provided the dominant and totally unexpected new factor in the grain markets. Initial market response to the election news was a surge of bullishness. A more general agreement now exists that the support program will be effective and that the export program will be more aggressively pursued.

"Prices of corn now at the farm level are obviously unsatisfactory to the farmer, but he has had to sell corn through sheer lack of storage space."

III. REVIEW OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION STORAGE AUTHORITY AND THE EFFECT OF RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON IT IN 1948

The Commodity Credit Corporation, pursuant to act of Congress,[1] operated until June 30, 1948, under a Delaware charter which contained adequate authority for the Corporation to provide storage facilities necessary to the conduct of its price-support program.[2] In order to continue as an agency of the United States after June 30, 1948, the Corporation was required by act of the Congress to obtain a Federal charter.[3] Like the Delaware charter, the Federal charter bill, as submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture and as originally passed by the Senate, contained adequate authority for the Corporation to provide storage facilities necessary to the conduct of its price-support program.[4] Section 4 (h) of the bill then provided that the Corporation "may in any manner acquire, hold, and dispose of such real and personal property or any interest therein as it deems necessary or desirable in the conduct of its business."

This authority was stricken from the bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee and as passed by the House of Representatives[5] and enacted by the Congress. Section 4 (h) of the new Charter Act as enacted on June 29, 1948,[6] provided: "may contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of plants and facilities for the physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subect to its control. Except as provided in section 16, the Corporation shall not have power to acquire or lease any such plant or facility or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein, except that it may rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business and it may continue to lease (by renewing or extending existing leases or entering into new leases) property leased by it on the date of the enactment of this act."

Thus, in lieu of authority to acquire, hold and dispose of real and personal property, the Corporation was authorized only to contract for the use, in accordance with the usual customs of trade and commerce, of facilities for storing agricultural commodities subject to its control, and was expressly forbidden to acquire or lease any facility for the storage of agricultural commodities subject to its control, or any real property or interest therein with limited exceptions relating only to office space and property already owned or leased by the Corporation.[7]

It is to be noted particularly that section 16 of the Charter Act—which provided for the transfer to the Federal Corporation of all the property owned by the Delaware corporation—was the only section excepted from the operation of the prohibitions of section 4 (h). Consequently, section 5 (b) of the Charter Act—which authorizes the Corporation to make available materials and facilities required in connection with the production and marketing of agricultural commodities—or the authority conferred upon the Corporation by any other section of the Charter Act, could be utilized only subject to the limitations imposed by section 4 (h) on the right of the Corporation to acquire or lease storage facilities or real property or any interest therein.

A statement to the same effect was filed by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, excerpts from which follow:[8]

"The contention has been made by Mr. Walter R. Scott, of the Kansas City Board of Trade, in hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry concerned with proposed amendments to the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, that section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act applies only to real property and does not impose any restriction upon the acquisition of any other type of storage facilities, and a secondary argument that, irrespective of the meaning of section 4 (h), another provision in the charter, section 5 (b), was clearly recognized as giving express authority for Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire grain bins and similar portable storage facilities.

"The contention that section 4 (h) is restricted to real property is dispelled by a reading of the section. Section 4 (h) forbids Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire or lease 'any such plant or facility [for the storage, handling, transportation, etc., of commodities subject to the Corporation's control] or to acquire or lease real property or any interest therein.' The language, 'any such plant or facility,' would be clearly surplusage and unnecessary if it were intended to mean only those plants and facilities which were real property. 'Such facilities' relates to transportation facilities as well as to storage facilities, and these facilities are largely personalty. In fact, Mr. H. E. Sanford, appearing before the House Banking and Currency Committee for the National Grain Trade Council, stated that he desired the limitation to include, among others, barges and boats, which must be classified as personal property.

"Even assuming that the restriction is applicable only to real property, its hampering effect upon the Corporation's operations is obvious. For example, the Corporation is not only prohibited from acquiring or leasing any storage facility which is considered to be real property, but it could not even lease bin sites upon which to erect grain bins."

As a result of the express prohibitions in the Charter Act as enacted on June 29, 1948, the Corporation's authority to provide adequate storage facilities was practically eliminated. Major effects of these restrictions were:

The Corporation could not acquire or lease sites for grain bins, including new sites for bins already owned by the Corporation, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring or leasing real property.

The Corporation could not acquire or lease any facility, including grain bins, for the storage of commodities delivered to it under its price support programs, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring or leasing any facility for storage of agricultural commodities subject to the Corporation's control.

The Corporation could not acquire grain bins for resale to farmers for the storage of agricultural commodities to be subjected to the control of the Corporation by being placed under the loan program, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring any facility for the storage of agricultural commodities subject to the Corporation's control.

The Corporation could not, for the purpose of financing the construction of grain bins, make loans to farmers upon the security of bins which became attached to and a part of the realty, since to do so would violate the prohibition against acquiring an interest in real property. Even though the grain bins did not become a part of the realty, the Corporation could not take chattel mortgages on bins constructed for the storage of commodities to be placed under its loan programs in States where chattel mortgages pass title to the mortgagee, since the Corporation, by doing so, would be acquiring title to a facility for the storage of an agricultural commodity subject to its control.

At the time the charter bill was under consideration by the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Agriculture wrote to Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, directing his attention to the adverse effect of these and other restrictions.[9]

On June 16, 1948, the Secretary referred specifically to section 4 (h) and stated that "this prohibition would have the following harmful effects, among others:

"The Corporation could not, therefore, lease sites for the approximately 20,000 grain bins which it now maintains for stand-by storage, principally in the Corn Belt.

"The Corporation could not acquire by lease or otherwise emergency facilities necessary to preserve agricultural commodities.

"The Corporation could not acquire an interest in real property for the purpose of securing or discharging debts owing to it or protecting its interests in foreclosure proceedings.

"The Corporation could not utilize excess storage space owned and made available by other Government agencies despite that economy in Government operations would demand that such space be utilized."

Two days later Congressman HOPE explained to the membership of the House of Representatives the seriousness of these restrictions.[9] After expressing a regret that the bill was brought up under suspension of rules which did not permit amendment, Congressman HOPE stated:

"This is a very important measure. The Commodity Credit Corporation furnishes the machinery through which the price-support programs on agricultural commodities are carried out. Without the Commodity Credit Corporation, it would be impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the mandate of Congress that prices on certain agricultural commodities be supported.

"There are two very serious defects in the bill as it now stands. One of them is that the bill prohibits the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for warehousing, transporting, processing, or handling of agricultural commodities, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein except the rental of office space."

Congressman HOPE explained that this provision, together with another one not here

[1] Act of Jan. 31, 1935, as amended, 15 U. S. C. supp. IV, sec. 713.

[2] Art. 3, par. (d) and (k).

[3] Government Corporation Control Act, 31 U. S. C., sec. 869.

[4] Sec. 4 (h), S. 1322, 80th Cong.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 4, page 4755.

[5] Sec. 4 (h), S. 1322, 80th Cong.; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 7, page 8867.

[6] Public Law 806, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 1070.

[7] Secs. 4 (h), and 16, Public Law 806, 80th Cong., 62 Stat. 1071, 1075.

[8] Feb. 23, 1949, at p. 81 of hearings on S. 900.

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 7, page 8870.

pertinent, "severely restricts the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation" and would "make it very difficult for the agency to carry out the duties imposed on it by law."

President Truman, upon signing the new Charter Act, commented on the restriction, as follows:

"S. 1322 also prohibits the Commodity Credit Corporation from continuing its long-standing policy of leasing or acquiring land where necessary for storing commodities as close to the farm as possible. This restriction will mean that the Corporation will have to ship grain for livestock feeding, for example, from farms to distant points for storage, and then later to ship it back again to farm areas. This will obviously increase costs for carrying grain reserves. Only those special interests who will make money by unnecessary handling of grain will profit from this provision—which will in the end be paid for by farmers and consumers."

In an analysis of the Charter Act made by Senator AIKEN and inserted in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD [10] several weeks after the Conference Report [11] on the bill had been adopted and after approval of the act, it was stated that the powers conferred by section 4 (m) of the Charter Act—this section confers upon the Corporation such incidental powers as are customary in corporations generally—include the power, in any manner, to hold, acquire, and dispose of personal property or any interest therein, as the Corporation deems necessary in the conduct of its business. In view of the deletion from the Charter bill, as introduced, of the authority for the Corporation to acquire, hold and dispose of personal property, it is obvious that it was necessary to derive this authority from the incidental powers of the Corporation. Otherwise the Corporation could not even have conducted its price support loan and purchase programs which involve the acquisition and disposal of agricultural commodities (which are personal property). It is equally obvious, however, that the incidental or implied powers of the Corporation, or any other power conferred upon the Corporation by the Charter Act, could not under any circumstances override the express and unequivocal prohibition in the act against acquiring storage facilities. Indeed, as has been pointed out above, the only provision of the Charter Act which was excepted from the prohibition against acquiring storage facilities or real property or any interest therein was the provision in section 16 for the transfer to the Federal corporation of all property owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a Delaware corporation.

The Congress fully recognized the restrictive effect of section 4 (h) as originally enacted when in 1949 it took action to remove the restrictions.[12] It was stated by the House committee in its report on the bill to amend the Charter Act that—

"Restrictions contained in section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act approved in June 1948 prohibited the Commodity Credit Corporation from taking any effective action toward alleviating the storage deficiencies, and would prevent it from doing so in the future. * * *

"This section (sec. 2 of H. R. 2682) would amend section 4 (h) of the Charter Act to restore to the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to acquire items of personal property used in connection with the care and preservation of agricultural commodities controlled by it. In addition, it will permit the Corporation to acquire such real property and such plants and facilities which are part of the realty as are necessary to provide adequate storage. The statute now in effect prevents the Corporation from acquiring or leasing any plant or facility for physical handling, storage, processing, servicing, and transportation of the agricultural commodities subject to its control, or from acquiring or leasing real property or any interest therein, except office space and real property owned by or leased by the Delaware corporation on the date of enactment of the Charter Act.

"The change proposed in the bill will permit the Corporation to utilize fully other authority contained in the charter in such a manner as to develop a well-rounded program under which it could acquire grain bins and other storage facilities, make available such facilities to producers through the purchase and resale of bins and materials, make loans to construct or otherwise acquire such facilities, and assist in the solution of storage problems through other means.

"As previously indicated in this report, this amendment is necessary in order to make the benefits of the price-support program fully available to farmers." [13]

Statements to the same effect were contained in the report of the Senate committee.[14]

Thus, the ban on providing storage facilities essential to carrying out the price support program was removed, and in 1949 the Commodity Credit Corporation launched a grain storage program under the new authority.

Alleviating action taken in 1948 in the absence of authority to provide storage facilities

Meanwhile, however, the Department had started all steps within its very restricted authority to do everything it could to alleviate the situation. It began a study of available storage facilities as soon as it became apparent that 1948 crop production would be unusually large. This study revealed five points of justification for a storage program:

1. Farm storage facilities had deteriorated during the war.

2. Storage problems were expected in 1948–49 due to large crops coupled with reduced export demand and feeding.

3. Additional farm storage facilities of about 900,000,000 bushels were needed in main producing areas.

4. Present and anticipated prices pointed to prospects of large farmer participation in price support.

5. Information which would enable farmers to build better farm storage facilities would be of direct benefit to CCC since it would enable CCC loan grain to be kept in better condition.

On July 26, 1948, the Department issued a press release (USDA 1549–48) in which Secretary Brannan urged farmers to arrange to store a substantial portion of 1948 crops on their farms. This was urged to permit orderly marketing in view of the expected large crops and the fact that commercial facilities were unable to accommodate the anticipated large volume. The Secretary indicated that all agencies of the Department had been asked to help farmers make maximum use of their storage and help construct new facilities.

On July 30, 1948, the CCC Board of Directors authorized $225,000 to carry out projects to develop the most efficient methods of storing and conditioning grain owned or controlled by CCC under price support. Projects were to consist of (1) tests and experiments to improve the quality of grain held on farms as collateral against CCC price support loans, and (2) demonstration of results to acquaint interested persons with latest designs in storage structures and conditioning equipment for the proper care of grain both prior to and during the storage period. Projects were to be conducted at Beltsville, Md., and selected points in important grain producing areas during the year ending June 30, 1949.

On August 6, 1948, the Department issued another press release (USDA 1665–48) in which Secretary Brannan repeated his appeal of July 26 that farmers take steps to put farm storage facilities in shape and increase facilities so that more grain could be stored on farms. He pointed out that loans could not be granted unless proper storage was assured and that purchase agreements would lose much of their effectiveness as price protection if unsatisfactory storage should cause grain to deteriorate.

On August 28, 1948, Under Secretary Loveland warned (USDA 1804–48) that on the basis of increased production shown in the August crop report, several hundred million bushels of grain would be unprotected from the weather unless additional farm storage facilities were built. He pointed out that storage problems would be most acute for the later produced crops—corn, grain, sorghums, and spring wheat. He urged farmers to construct temporary facilities if they could not construct permanent facilities and to store as much corn as possible on the farm where it is fed. The Under Secretary indicated that plans for temporary and permanent cribs were available at county agricultural conservation offices and from county agents.

Storage demonstration projects were carried out in 1948 for the benefit of thousands of farmers in 13 States. Meetings were held to give instructions on the building of farm storage facilities and to demonstrate different types of farm storage bins and cribs, as well as portable drying equipment. States in which projects were carried out included Maryland, Virginia, Georgia, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

Research projects in 1948–49 included (1) a grain sorghums project in cooperation with the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station at Beeville, Tex., (2) a rice project in cooperation with the Louisiana State University Agricultural Experiment Station at Crowley, La., and (3) an ear corn project with the Virginia State Agricultural Experiment Station at Holland, Va.

County storage remained critical

The critical problem during this harvest period was to find storage space on or near the farm for corn and other late-harvested crops. Storage space at large terminals would be a problem later, but it was the lack of country storage that depressed prices then.

For example, it has been said that at times in the fall of 1948 only about 60 percent of the terminal elevator space in the Chicago area was occupied, but this fact would have little or no direct relationship to the storage problems confronting farm producers.

Terminal space of the type in question would be of no use to the Iowa farmer who needed storage space on or near his farm, so that he could put his crop under the protection of the Government price support program. Incidentally, only a very small part of the corn crop moves out of the area in which it is grown.

Commercial elevator space is frequently not available for farmers on a rental basis, because the elevators may prefer to hold space for their own use in speculative buying and selling. Storage space must be of the right kind, in the right locations, and available to farmers when they need it, if it is to meet their storage problems.

The 1949 storage program

As soon as the restrictions on storage facilities were lifted, the Department imme-

[10] Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 94, part 12, page A4409.

[11] H. Rept. No. 2444 (June 19, 1948).

[12] Public Law 85, 81st Cong., 63 Stat. 154.

[13] H. Rept. No. 418 on H. R. 2682, pp. 5, 6.

[14] S. Rept. No. 125 on S. 900, pp. 2, 3.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

diately initiated a broad national program of storage to meet those problems.

It bought supplemental storage bins and cribs with a capacity of more than 500,000,000 bushels.

It extended loans to farmers to assist them in buying or building their own on-farm facilities. An increase of 85,000,000 bushels capacity of farm storage was aided directly by this measure.

Commercial storage facilities were also increased by 93,000,000 bushels as the result of use guaranties extended by the Department in shortage areas.

The total increase in storage facilities under this coordinated program, during the 1949–50 period, was more than 700,000,000 bushels. As a result, and in spite of the big 1949 crops which were added to substantial carry-overs from 1948 production, most farmers were able to find suitable storage after 1949 harvests. The price support programs were fully operative and effective again.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill, 1953.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to ask that the bill be read for action on the committee amendments, but before doing that, I wish to take about 2 minutes in making a reply to what has been said regarding the bill.

The total estimates for the bill were $13,867,000,000. The amount carried in the bill as passed by the House was $10,127,000,000. The amount of decrease by the Senate committee is the enormous sum of $1,893,000,000, a cut of almost $2,000,000,000 under the House figure. That shows that the committee has carefully considered the items in the bill.

We started with estimates from the Department of $13,867,000,000—nearly $14,000,000,000. The House cut the figure down to roughly $10,000,000,000, and the Senate has cut it nearly $2,000,000,000 more.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue in effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9003–9005 of House proceedings of July 2, 1952.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Nevada explain what the conference report does with respect to the provisions to which objection was raised in connection with the amendments proposed to be offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] some days ago?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Eastland amendment and the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nevada were both dropped in conference. The only change from the House language is that, instead of the act terminating on June 30, 1953, it terminates on April 1, 1953.

On April 28, 1952, the treaty of peace between Japan and the United States and the other signatory powers went into effect. On the same date the President issued proclamation No. 2974, which brought to an end the national emergencies previously proclaimed on September 8, 1939, and May 27, 1941. These actions had the effect of either instantly terminating or beginning the termination period of approximately 155 laws, whose effectiveness depended upon the existence of a state of war or the emergencies referred to above, except that Congress had enacted temporary extensions of some of these powers until action could be had on the resolution presently being considered.

In the meantime, on February 19, the President had requested Congress to extend for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, plus 6 months, 60 of the 155 laws which would ordinarily have expired. The proposals were considered by the Judiciary Committees of the respective Houses, and after extensive hearings covering 614 printed pages at which all interested parties were heard and after careful and intensive study it was decided to extend 40 of the requested 60 powers for a period which would terminate on April 1, 1953. It is believed that this will provide an opportunity to the interested agencies to come before the proper committee which has jurisdiction over the substantive law relating to their agency and request permanent legislation to obtain the objectives sought by this temporary extension.

The powers eliminated by this joint resolution are as follows:

1 (a) (5) Authorization for detailing Armed Forces personnel to the Veterans' Administration.

1 (a) (6) Liability of inductees to serve in Reserve components and be ordered to active duty in time of war.

1 (a) (9) Military status of commissioned corps of the Public Health Service and uniform allowances in time of war.

1 (a) (34) Recall to wartime duty of retired Public Health Service officers.

1 (a) (16) Provision permitting voting by mail of persons serving in the land or naval forces.

1 (a) (23) Payment for use of wharves and landings under control of the Territory of Hawaii.

1 (a) (24) Rights under public lands laws of persons serving in the Armed Forces of allies of the United States.

2 (b) (7) Veterans' preference under the homestead and other land laws.

2 (b) (8) Veterans' preference with respect to lands within the Boulder Canyon project.

2 (c) Homestead preference for veterans.

1 (a) (27) Power of the President to assume control of transportation systems in time of war.

2 (b) (4) Gold Star lapel buttons.

The powers which have been extended have been extended after reaching the studied conclusion that in this critical period they are extremely necessary to the national defense and security of this country, and I wish to emphasize again that in no event are any of the powers to be continued beyond April 1, 1953, unless so recommended by committees of the Congress having jurisdiction over the substantive law involved.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I appeal to Senators to see if we can not do some work on the bill. It is a very important bill. With respect to that part of it dealing with Europe, I do not favor it, but the committee has agreed upon it. It was reported almost unanimously. I hope we may make some progress with the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator read the totals on the first page of the report, which indicate that the bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee is $1,893,254,494 below the House bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. However, it is a fact, is it not, that the Senate committee recommended a reduction in one item of defense construction of $2,046,499,840 below the House, solely because there was no statutory authority for the appropriation? If that is excepted, then the action recommended by the Senate committee would be $153,245,346 above the House figure. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct; but he says "if." The authorizing legislation has not yet been passed.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator agrees, does he not, that if the legislation does pass, before final consummation of this appropriation there will be included defense construction money?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is true. By the same token, if we were to quit giving our money away in Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia, South America, Malaya, Burma, India, Hindustan, and other parts of the world, we would have a smaller bill by $6,000,000,000, because $6,100,000,000 goes for those purposes.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator entirely. Will the Senator yield for a further inquiry before he takes his seat? It relates to his over-all statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to yield. I should like to proceed with the consideration of the amendments, and see if we cannot dispose of them. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I prefer to tie these figures in with the Senator's statement. Otherwise I could reiterate the whole thing, which would be useless.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the Senator go ahead.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate that.

There is also included in the recommendation of the Senate committee to the Senate a contract authority for the Atomic Energy Commission, in round numbers, of $2,100,000,000 more than the House bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The figures shown on the first page of the report, as is usual, indicate the dollar situation as it exists, without an explanation as to additional contract authority or as to the figures for construction, which went out on a technical basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am simply talking about this bill.

Mr. CORDON. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill reduces the amount proposed to be appropriated by the House by $1,893,254,494. In other words, we are not spending the money in this bill, whatever we may spend in bills to come.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As the distinguished Senator knows, I have been opposed to the give-away policy—loans, and all that sort of thing—ever since I have been in the Senate. In connection with the $6,100,000,000 about which the distinguished Senator is speaking, my views were pretty well expressed by Associate Justice William O. Douglas in an address delivered before the National Conference on International Economic and Social Developments, on April 7, last.

Instead of my taking the time to go into the subject as fully and as completely as I should like to do, which would probably take an hour, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the address of Associate Justice Douglas.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to be included in this conference. As I have seen the type of organizations that are affiliated in this session my hopes have risen. This is a diverse group, a group of different points of view, groups that have sterling character and idealism, and that represent the various segments of American life. I think groups of this character can forge a program for us in the very difficult days ahead. It is out of the community of action where there is a freedom of thought and freedom of discussion and a wide range of inquiry into all phases of a problem that we can hope to get the kind of unanimity that will carry us through the dark days that face us. I haven't had an opportunity to participate in very many of the sessions to hear what is going on. I had some spies sitting in the audiences reporting to me, and what they brought back was very encouraging. I was disappointed, however, that most of your discussions to date have been factual and statistical, and that you had left, apparently, at least, the controversial subjects to me.

I was sorry, for example, to hear that there were too many people in certain professions. Immediately I thought of the lawyers. Is there anyone here who doesn't think that there are too many lawyers—except the lawyers? Are there any lawyers here, by the way? Would any lawyer dare raise his hand? Well, I counted a few; and if any of you lawyers should feel depressed, let me tell you this: One of the byproducts of my wanderings around the earth has been a message of hope to the lawyers. I was in Israel visiting a cooperative farm and we were drinking Coca-Cola, I think it was, and we got into a very depressing subject—of lawyers—and finally one of the farmers changed the subject and he said, "You know that the poorest farmers in Israel are the people who before they were farmers in Israel were farmers in Europe, and the next best farmers in Israel were the people who, before they were farmers in Israel, were dentists and doctors in Europe." Then he said, "But the very best farmers in Israel were those who once were lawyers." So to my own little union I say, "Cheer up, for there may be a very bright future ahead of us."

I have no prepared manuscript. I have no speech. I come to you with no qualifications, except I have had the privilege of visiting in the Middle East and Asia for three summers. I have seen most of the country from the Mediterranean to the Pacific, and I have came back filled with prejudices. I have traveled it with my eyes and my ears looking and listening for things that I thought were important to Americans. But each time I came back with my heart very heavy and my mind filled with fear for the future of America, because I realized that America did not understand the world in which it was living.

I do not pretend to be an expert. All I can hope to provide is a point of view, but I do think that we need a different point of view, and a new point of view, else this great civilization that we call the civilization of the west may disappear. If it does, it will carry with it not only the things that we hold dear but the hopes and the aspirations of little people all around the world—the little people of the rice fields of southeast Asia, the aspirations of the goatherders of Persia. That is because we are more important, we Americans, we of the west, are more important than we have pretended to be. We have, in large part, been assuming, in my opinion, a false role that is not true to our character, not true to our ideals, not true to our civilization. If I can ask your indulgence, I will explain what I mean.

We in America have been engrossed in the luxuries of our own civilization—our golf clubs, our hot dogs, our soft drinks—the rich, material civilization that our productive capacity has given us. We have imagined that other people should be like us. We are industrialized and have these things; therefore, other people should be industrialized, and they can have these same things. But as one of your reporters indicated tonight, this industrialization business is a very difficult, a very involved problem. This summer I was where few Americans have been. I was on the Sinkiang border—up in the Karakorams in an area called Gilgit, Hunza, and Nagir. The habitable portion of the region is about a half mile wide and a hundred to two hundred miles long. The valleys are around 5,000 feet and the canyon walls go up as high as 28,000 feet. It is a bleak, desolate, terrifying country. Those people, in February and March, have nothing left to eat. It is one of those food-deficit areas. They have enough for 10 months, and the problem in March and April is to find enough outcroppings of new weeds or flowers that will carry them through. That is what those good people of the Gilgit area are doing now. They are tightening their belts.

They can't grow anything more than they are growing no matter how much point 4 technical assistance you bring them. But there is something that can be done from the industrial point of view that can help them. There is an American by the name of John Clark from St. Charles, Ill., a geologist, a graduate of Princeton, about 40 years old, who is now in a hospital with amoebic dysentery that he got in this area. John Clark went in there 2 years ago. He had a "vest pocket" point 4, developed by John Clark. He taught these people simple industrial skills: how to make a pipe, how to turn a lathe. By the way, up to last summer, no wheel had ever been seen in parts of this area. John Clark brought them a few of the rudiments of industrial civilization. The reason he did it was that they needed exports—something they could trade: a pipe, a piece of cloth—and send over the high passes of the Karakorams and the Himalayas, down to the Punjab in exchange for food. When John Clark, a self-financed American, left that region in November 1951 he couldn't get on his horse until he had walked 6 miles. The reason he couldn't get on his horse until he had walked 6 miles was because the people were lined up to shake hands with him, and kiss him, and thank him for coming in. There is no other experience of mine abroad that has been as moving, from the American point of view, except one. And that was when a Negro lawyer from Chicago, Edith Sampson—God bless her—stood up in New Delhi, India, and defended America on the race issue before a hostile audience.

Industrialization is a big problem. In the Gilgit area it means doing the kind of a thing that John Clark did, teaching the people simple things, teaching them how to utilize a few of their resources, not opening up great power projects, not opening up great mines that some absentee group of stockholders will exploit, but teaching them simple skills. I suppose that those of you who have seen Bombay, Calcutta, Delhi, and the other big population centers of India and Asia, will appreciate as I appreciate the great dangers of quick industrialization. If private capital were turned loose and if the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

physical potentialities of that part of the world were exploited in the full sense, there would easily develop in a few years the greatest sweatshops in the world. Those who criticize Nehru for being a Socialist don't understand the background of India and the environment out of which he came. That's what Nehru is against—exploitation. That's why Nehru stands for his brand of socialism. That's why Nehru stands for his type of controlled and managed capitalism. Nehru does not want sweatshops in India. You can appreciate how great a sweatshop it would be when you realize that a skilled laborer in India gets $1 a day in American money, and the unskilled labor gets around 25 cents a day. Industrialization, as we know it, presupposes a lot of other things. It presupposes labor unions. It presupposes the organization of labor so that labor will get its fair share of the production, so that it will not become the victim, so that it will become the slave.

Industrialization even on the farms presupposes a lot in the Middle East and Asia. In 1950 I was near Kermanshah in Iran. That's up in the northwest—a big, broad valley that looks very much like the valley that stretches south from San Francisco to Los Angeles, a beautiful valley, rich in bottom land. There is a wonderful man up there. He's a big landlord, but not the vicious type of absentee landlord that has placed a curse upon the Middle East and Asia. His name is Tavakoli. If he were here tonight, I would introduce him with great pride to this American audience. Tavakoli is a man who has seen the same vision that many of our industrialists have seen in America—the vision of a broad base of participation of the wealth of the country—opportunities for everyone—dignity and justice and freedom for all classes. Tavakoli has some model villages near Kermanshah. When I asked him about his American farm machinery that he had imported, there was sadness in his eyes because he had $500,000 worth of it and it was all broken down; and there was not a mechanic in Persia that could fix it. There were no mechanics and there were no spare parts. We often imagine that conditions in one country are similar to conditions in another. But even in Persia, the country that is a first or second cousin to us, there are no mechanics who can fix this farm machinery. There are no factories to produce spare parts. And in 1950 there was no foreign exchange to import it. As a result Tavakoli had $500,000 of American farm machinery idle. I went down to see his beet sugar fields out of Kermanshah. He had artesian wells and there were pumps to bring the water at various levels to the fields. But the pumps weren't working. I asked him why and he said because the valves broke and there are no valves in Persia and there was no factory to produce them.

This problem of industrialization is very complicated. It includes many aspects. We have oversimplified it in our thinking. It can be done; but it will take many years and must have slow beginnings. When you see the Middle East and Asia, you begin to understand how wise a man Ghandi was and why he started talking about industrialization at the level of the home and the level of the village.

Point 4 is a great conception. I have been very critical of point 4 and tonight I will at times be very critical in some things that I will say about point 4. I do not intend to condemn it. I think that point 4 is fine, particularly if we get point 5 to go along with it.

Point 4 in Persia has done a very good job, by and large. Isfahan is one of the most beautiful eastern cities that I have ever seen, as remote from anything that we in America have as you can imagine. Isfahan is in the center of a region where there has been a wide distribution of land. Our point 4 people have done a very fine job in Isfahan. The reason they have done a good job is because they start their base of operations at a level which will benefit the people of the country. They have also done throughout Persia and Iran a very fine public health job in malaria control. Point 4, as an isolated venture, is a very difficult thing to justify in many countries. But that is not true in Isfahan. It is not true in areas like Utter Praedesh in India, where there has been considerable progress in the break-up of the landed estates, or Himachal Praedesh in northwest Indian, or in parts of Kashmir. In some of those places point 4 at the agricultural level could have a very profound effect. In other places, it might be almost a monstrosity. Let me illustrate what I mean.

In this part of the world of which I speak, 8 out of 10 of the babies die before they reach the age of 1. We could take the simple public health measures that we know in this country, send out a half dozen experts from country to country, and stop those babies from dying. We could do there what we did in Puerto Rico. It would be easy. Control the water supply, learn how to vaccinate for dysentery, and so on, and all would be well. But if we stopped there without more, we would be doing nothing but increasing the number of people among whom you would have to ration the poverty. We could send out our agricultural experts and we could increase the production of the land 10 percent, 20 percent, perhaps 50 percent. In large portions of this part of the world of which I speak, the net return to the man who works the land is between 5 percent and 10 percent of the crop; the rest of it goes to the landlord, many of whom are absentee landlords. Most of them live in Paris, Rome, or Beirut. Those people who get the 5 percent to 10 percent of the crop have barely enough to live on. They don't have enough to send their children to school. They don't have enough to have medical care or hospitals. They don't have enough to provide what we call material civilization, such as bathrooms, water taps, electric fans, radios, rugs on the floor. These people live in dirt and misery. Increase the production of that land 10 percent, 25 percent, 50 percent, and most of it will go to the man who owns the land. Some of those countries are owned by 200 men for whom 3,500,000 people work. Increase the productivity of that land and you make 200 men wealthier. Why should American taxpayers undertake that kind of a project?

This business of point 4 becomes complicated. It is easy to figure out a way whereby with the same amount of food you can increase the weight of a hog from 85 pounds to 100 pounds; how cross-breeding can push the number of eggs per hen up; how as a result of this or that or of the other thing you can increase the yield of millet, or barley, or wheat 10 percent. But point 4 cannot be judged merely from a technical viewpoint. The Middle East and Asia have a feudal economy, a feudal political, social, and economic system. That system was long supported by the British and made very romantic by the British. But those who want to stabilize that situation are the most dangerous people in the world. They are the ones most apt to accelerate the trend of that part of the world to communism. You cannot stabilize feudalism in the world today and expect to survive.

What begat communism in Russia? Feudalism. What is the great political strength of Russia in any part of the world? Feudalism. As long as there is an opportunity for people to work and to meet the ordinary requirements of life, none of these desperate creeds will have any appeal to our people; nor will they appeal to other people.

One who is down at the bottom—as you would be if you were a peasant in the Middle East—would have to take desperate measures to escape. The desperate measures are the measures to get rid of the feudalism. I have heard American officials talk about underwriting the status quo in the Middle East and Asia. That means in plain language underwriting the 200 men in charge of a country—stabilizing the political control of a government of the landlords, by the landlords, and for the landlords. Ladies and gentlemen, it cannot be done. With all the wealth of America, it cannot be done. With all the atomic bombs of America, it cannot be done. This is a revolution that is going on—a revolution against the control by a few men of the destinies of the great masses of the people. I have been among them, I have eaten with them, I have walked with them, I have slept with them. They are wonderful people—as fine as the people in our communities here. I say that when we go with the point 4 program, let us be prepared to make up our minds whom we are for. Are we for the people or are we for the landlords? Don't think we can avoid the issue. We won't be there—our point 4 people won't be there a week—before we will have to take sides. It cannot be avoided. The peasants will ask, "For whose benefit is this increased production going to accrue? Is it going to accrue to us or is it going to accrue to the man who lives in Paris?"

I'm very happy that many of our people have stood up in the villages and said, "We're for you." It made me feel good, because I knew that that's what a town meeting in America would vote. But I've also seen other Americans in other projects who have been alined on the side of the landlords. We can't take that position if we want to be in a position of leadership. Whatever you may desire, whatever you may wish, point 4 is a political instrument. Point 4, like ECA, is going to weld an economy either one way or the other. As long as it's American influence and American ideas and American dollars, I say let's do it the American way.

Sometimes there's almost an impossible choice. Sometimes point 4 will be brought to a country where it's difficult, terribly difficult, for a representative of the American Government or a person carrying an American passport to promote the kind of project that the great bulk of Americans would believe in. It is difficult because it would bring revolutions and the local governments would be opposed to it. But there are many places where you can do it. And I say, by and large, it would be a good idea to keep out of the places where you can't do it.

Let me tell you about Mossadegh in Persia. I should say parenthetically that he's a personal friend of mine, and I have a great admiration for him. When he left this country in November, empty-handed, I was sad with him because of the tragedy of the situation. The British said, "He won't last 3 months as prime minister. We have a prime minister we'll put in when Mossadegh falls."

You know what has happened in Persia? Since December when Mossadegh returned, 80 seats have stood for election in the parliament—80 seats out of 136. How many do you think Mossadegh got? Seventy-five. You know the province up on the Russian border called Azerbaijan—the troublesome province that was under a Soviet-controlled government about 1945? How many seats do you think Mossadegh got from Aberbaijan? He got all of them. He was opposed on all sides by two groups: The British and landlord groups and the Communist group. The Communist group out of 2,000,000 votes got 25,000 votes; but out of the first 80 candidates, the Communists in Persia didn't get a single candidate into the parliament. I say a man who can control a country at the

polls like that is a strong man. I say he's a man who should be respected and supported.

Do you know what Mossadegh's program is? His domestic program? Mossadegh, by the way, is a wealthy man; he's an aristocrat. He's not a Communist—needless to say. Mossadegh has a land program that calls for the break-up of the feudal estates of Persia, for a sale of that land to the peasants, so that Persia will have the kind of land program that we, thank God, have had in this country, even before the Civil War, when all the land of the West was opened to our people and nobody got too much. Mossadegh would limit the holdings in Persia. The land problem, as your panel has said, is the heart of the problem of Iran as well as it is in other parts of the Near East. Mossadegh is out to solve it. Mossadegh in Persia presents an opportunity—an opportunity that is rare because there aren't many political leaders that you can back in the Middle East because they're largely the status quo group, the feudal group, the landlord group. And why spend American taxpayers' money financing them?

Let me tell you about the composition of the new Persian Parliament today. This is a grass-roots parliament; it represents a revolution come to the Middle East. That is something that has never happened in the history of the Middle East—a grass-roots parliament, as a result of a free election. Why? Because every goat herder in Persia loves Mossadegh and believes in him, just like the people in this country—most of them—loved F. D. R. Among the 75 new members of the Majlis are three professional politicians, 25 small landlords, 35 intellectuals. I suppose that would include most of us. There are six clerymen; there are two trade-unionists, and there are three small-business men. There are still 56 seats to stand for election, and I predict that Mossadegh will bring in 110 of the 136. Even though he doesn't, he already has 75 out of 136, which is pretty good by American political standards, and even with that Mossadegh may get through his land reforms. And so I think we should be supporting Mossadegh, because those opportunities don't come very often in the Middle East.

We in America have great technical skills. We can produce machinery; we can produce a material civilization. But I imagine that Russia could do about as well as we could do at that level. I don't underestimate the tremendous power of our technical capacity and the importance of the material civilization that we have and its significance in terms of employment and the comforts of life and our standard of living. But I hate to think that America will go down in history as the Nation that made the first atomic bomb or had the finest bathrooms or the greatest television sets or the fastest motor cars. Surely, America should be remembered and measured by things more important than that. What is this thing, America—what is this thing in your hearts and souls—what is it? Is it this microphone—is it the thing we can put up and see and look at? I don't believe so. I think that this thing of America is the thing that we put into the Declaration of Independence. It wasn't written just for ourselves. Abraham Lincoln didn't think so. Abraham Lincoln when he was running for some office in Illinois about 1856 made a wonderful speech in which he said the Declaration of Independence was designed not for Americans alone but was a document that would inspire other people to shake the weight and burdens from their shoulders the world around—the people of all races and all tongues. That's the idea of America we should spread abroad. That is the idea of America that I think is real and vibrant. America stands for freedom. America stands for independence. America stands for justice. Not justice in the landlords' sense; not justice in the French or the British or the Dutch or the Russian colonial sense—but justice in the American sense.

Why did we refuse to put Tunisia on the agenda of the Security Council? Why do we refuse to give these little people of the world a hearing? What is this thing that we have created? Do we believe in the righteousness of power? I thought we believed in the power of righteousness.

Well, that's point V. How are you going to go to the world with point VI? If we can go to a region in India where there is an equitable distribution of the land, where there is opportunity for the common man, and tie into that program—then we are promoting the American ideal—then we are identifying ourselves with the peoples of the world in their aspirations—then we're making impossible this crude, this crass, this dismal thing known as communism.

If we go to a region to make a group of landlords richer, then we are promoting the thing that at home we hate.

If we go to Persia and back Mossadegh with point 4, giving him wholehearted support, then we're promoting the cause of the civilization that we believe in—then we're promoting freedom, justice, and opportunity, and dignity for the common man. Those who oppose him, who aline themselves with the forces that would destroy him, are conspirators to turn the Middle East into a Russian concentration camp.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you and I tonight were in Persia, we'd be for Mossadegh 100 percent. If we were in India, we might not be for Nehru 100 percent, because Nehru has been compromised by reason of his position in the Congress Party—though we'd be for him about 90 percent. If the conditions existed in America that exist in the Middle East and Asia, we tonight would be forming under the auspices of your chairman an American revolutionary committee—a committee to promote a revolution—to lead a revolution—to destroy the octopus that was overpowering us. The proudest thing in our history is the American Revolution. The ideas that it espoused are ideas that spinned throughout the world. Point 5 is the American Revolution. Let's make it a good revolution. Let's put our ideas behind it and a few of our dollars. The funny thing about it is that if you've got some good ideas, you don't need much financing. It is the lousy ideas that require a lot of money.

Ideas are very dangerous; ideas have no boundaries—no state lines, no national lines, no oceans. They're powerful—the most powerful things in the world today. A few simple, good, old-fashioned ideas from the Declaration of Independence coupled with a fair portion of point 4 can stem the political tide of communism. Take all the American money that you can collect and all the guns and all the atomic bombs and keep your program sterile of these ideas of freedom and justice and opportunity—and the Red tide of communism will roll on and on and on. And that's what it's doing today. You can't stop it by talking about democracy and peace. You have to talk about it in terms that are understandable at the village level. We can't do that unless we are prepared to go into the villages of Asia and the Middle East with a program of political action. If you can't go in that way, stay out. When you go in, go in wholeheartedly in the American way. With a few dollars and a few great ideas, you can save the world from this horrible specter of Soviet imperialism.

You know, the Persians have a legendary character they call Mullah Nasr-ed-Din. He dates back to about the 12th Century; he's legendary. He's a character that Irvin S. Cobb and Will Rogers and some of our other American humorists would have enjoyed knowing. When you go into the villages of Persia, you pick up a lot of his stories. Some of them you have to clean up a bit and others are all right as they are. They nearly always start out with Mullar and a donkey. One day he was going down the road with donkey; and this donkey was the slowest donkey in the Middle East. The day was hot, and Mullah got very discouraged about his donkey. Mullah, being a very ingenious person, always had something along to help him out. This time it was a bottle of turpentine. So he pulled out this bottle of turpentine and he applied it to the donkey, and the donkey immediately burst into a terrific spurt. It went so fast Mullah couldn't keep up with the animal. Mullah ran as fast as he could and still could not catch the donkey. So he pulled out the bottle of turpentine and put some on himself. Pretty soon Mullah passed the donkey. About that time they came to a village. The villagers rushed out and stopped the donkey and Mullah said, "For heaven's sake, don't stop him—stop me!"

Well, I think we've been stopping the wrong thing. I think that if we get behind Point V and put it together with Point IV, we can really start to see things happening to the Middle East and Asia.

IRRIGATION WORK IN CONNECTION WITH CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Earlier today the Senate passed Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320, to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance there to from power revenues, and for other purposes. The House passed an identical bill, H. R. 6163.

Is there objection to the Senate reconsidering the vote by which it passed Senate bill 2320 and proceeding to the consideration of the House bill?

The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the Senate passed S. 1975, to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes, is reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 6163) to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6163) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320 is indefinitely postponed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make a short statement with reference to the summary of the committee's recommendations to the Senate. The figures which I am about to give are not found on the first page of the report. The reason for it is that from a technical standpoint the figures on the first page represent the dollar situation. From the practical standpoint, that is not at all the situation.

Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to the third figure which is found on the first page of the report, $8,234,586,286. That is the amount of cash actually recommended for immediate appropriation by the Senate. The committee found that there was no statutory authority for any action in connection with the defense-construction program, it being a program to be authorized by substantive legislation which is now in process of being enacted by Congress. As of a late hour last night it had not yet been enacted. Therefore the committee was compelled to eliminate from the bill $2,046,499,840, which was in the House bill as it came to the Senate. The House had passed the necessary authorization and could properly handle the matter. The figure was eliminated from the Senate bill, although it is recognized that some action must be taken in that field, either on the floor, if the necessary substantive legislation can be cleared, or if not, in conference, when the matter will be at issue up to the amount of the House figure.

Mr. President, there is also authorized for later appropriation contract authority to the Atomic Energy Commission in the amount of $2,068,800,000. Consequently the amount in issue before the Senate is $8,000,000,000 plus, to which must be added $2,000,000,000 plus of defense contracts, to which again must be added $2,000,000,000 plus, being the amount of the contract authority to the Atomic Energy Commission, the total being $12,349,886,126.

I felt that the figures ought to be before the Senate because there will be references made to both items, and they would not be understood from the report as it stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator whether, instead of the amount stated on the first page, under "Amount of decrease recommended by Senate committee and Budget estimate," being minus $5,633,342,403, it is really only $1,200,000,000?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. That is the amount of the basic decrease recommended by the Senate committee from the request of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is also correct to say that when the two billion plus in military construction was taken from the bill it was because there was no statutory authority for it.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the bill is passed, the matter will be in conference and can come back to the Senate in the conference report as a legitimate item in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 21, to insert:

CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay, Sewer Division," to remain available until June 30, 1954, $1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of storm-water and relief sewers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Legislative branch," on page 4, after line 18, to insert:

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, $156,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 3, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of $300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, $29,100, to remain available for obligation until January 2, 1953.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, referring to page 17 of the bill, line 13 "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," I note that the bill provides:

Appropriations available to the "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," for fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until September 30, 1952.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee how much our Government has spent on the White House since the renovation began.

Mr. McKELLAR. Approximately $5,500,000.

Mr. LANGER. Is work still in progress on it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh no; the work is finished. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will look at the White House. I know he will feel very proud of it. It is the most beautiful palace in all the world. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will visit it and go through it. I believe he will find that the work that has been done on it has been done honestly and has been done faithfully, and I know he will be just as proud of it as I am.

Mr. LANGER. What is the reason for allowing the fund to remain open until September 30 of this year?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is for the use of the new President. Of course, there will be a new President.

Mr. LANGER. Not by September 30 of this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not believe he will come into office before that time. The Senator is right about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 5, line 3.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, between lines 8 and 9, it is proposed to insert the following:

SENATE

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

For an additional amount for "committee employees", $1,500; and effective on and after July 1, 1952, the compensation of the chief of staff, Foreign Relations Committee, shall be at the rate of $13,146 a year so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the amendment would appropriate $1,500, for an increase in the salary of the chief of staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I suggest that this man is very unusually able and efficient. Last year he was offered a position in the State Department as Assistant Secretary of State at a salary of $15,000. I indicated to him that he was free to go, but I hoped he would not go, because of his efficiency and his ability. Mr. President, he turned down that position as Assistant Secretary of State, with an increase in salary, to remain with the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he is still with the committee.

He now draws the same salary that two of his subordinates, who are member of the staff, draw as salary. He is the chief of staff, and he ought to be paid more than his subordinates are paid.

I very much hope that most of the Members of the Senate know Dr. Wilcox and know how able, how loyal, how efficient, and how patriotic he is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 8.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all of us who know Dr. Wilcox agree that he is an able and a splendid man. There is no doubt in the world about that.

On the other hand, there are 9 or 10 others who are in similar positions. It would not be fair to increase the salary received by Dr. Wilcox, without increasing the salaries received by the 9 or 10 others who occupy similar or corresponding positions.

So the committee felt that we could not agree to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the past, others have been paid higher salaries than that. The special committee to investigate crime paid one of its staff members a salary of $17,500.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was a different sort of committee, and I had nothing in the world to do with that arrangement. I did not know about it until after it was done, and I did not approve it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator's committee reported the bill appropriating those funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, we had nothing to do with that salary. The item we reported was one for a lump-sum appropriation, as I recall.

Mr. CONNALLY. Nevertheless, the committee had to consider the lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As the disinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has stated to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Appropriations Committee considered this matter. However, it should be realized that there are 13 regular committees of the Senate, and each of those committees is important. The clerks of those committee all have long experience, extending over many years.

For instance, the clerk of the Appropriations Committe, Mr. Everard Smith, has served the committee for many, many years. He is an outstandingly efficient official. On many occasions the Appropriations Committee has wondered how it could pay him a larger salary, so as to reward him properly for his outstanding work. However, that never has been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. In fact, Mr. Smith worked until 4 o'clock this morning on this very bill. Not only has Mr. Smith served the committee for more than 30 years, but when the Republicans gained control of the Congress several years ago, at which time the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he retained Mr. Smith. Why? Because of Mr. Smith's outstanding ability and outstanding knowledge of the affairs of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I know that the chief of staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Texas is chairman, is a fine and an able man in every way; but he is not superior to Mr. Smith.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are not proposing an appropriation either for or against Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith has nothing to do with this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, by means of the amendment, a request is made that the salary paid Dr. Wilcox be increased. If that were done, it would have the effect of taking Dr. Wilcox out of the class to which both he and Mr. Smith belong.

Mr. CONNALLY. Again the Senator from Tennessee is referring to a group of 13 persons.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that I have a very high opinion of Dr. Wilcox.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do, too.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think Dr. Wilcox is an outstanding, able man, and the Senator from Texas, of course, is justified in praising him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly, he is.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the other hand, we cannot break the precedent. If we did, this matter would be opened up to every Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, in that event each committee would feel that it was free to pay whatever salaries it regarded proper to its staff members. Certainly that is not the right way for the Senate to proceed.

If the Senator from Texas wishes to have the Senate increase the salary of each of the men in that group of 13, so as to give each of them a fair increase in salary, that would be a different proposition, although even then I would not vote for it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas would not vote for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. However, if we are to be fair, we must treat each one of those persons alike.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yet the Senator from Tennessee just suggested to me that I do something for which he would not vote, and which he would oppose. That is a great position for a leader to take, Mr. President! [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have submitted this amendment to the committee amendment in all good faith and all good humor. But immediately I find that I have to fight Mr. Smith.

I think well of Mr. Smith. He works hard and diligently. On the other hand, this amendment does not relate to him.

If the Senator from Tennessee thinks as much of Mr. Smith as he says he does, why does he not vote to raise Mr. Smith's salary, and why does not the Senator from New Hampshire aid the Senator from Tennessee in raising Mr. Smith's salary?

Dr. Wilcox is in a category by himself. He was offered a position in the State Department—the position of Assistant Secretary of State, with a salary of $15,000. But he turned that down, because of his loyalty to the committee and his desire to continue with the committee.

Dr. Wilcox lectures all over the country. He lectures at Harvard University and other great universities, by invitation, because they know of his outstanding ability.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator from Texas think that Dr. Wilcox holds as eminent a position today, as director of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, as he would hold as Assistant Secretary of State? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, that is another matter.

In any event, Dr. Wilcox did not accept the position he was offered in the State Department.

I should hate to think that anyone from New Hampshire would turn down a $15,000 salary, when he was being paid only $11,000. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that when I came to Congress I left a very much larger income than the one paid to me either as a Member of the House as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, I know that. On the other hand, what the Senator from Tennessee left when he came to Congress was not a salary. In Tennessee he was being remunerated for his loud voice before juries in Tennessee. So what he was receiving in Tennessee was not a salary. In Tennessee he was being paid separate fees for separate legal services.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Senator from Texas please not to talk about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee himself brought it up. He injected himself into this discussion. He said, in effect, "The Senator from Tennessee was making a great deal more money in Tennessee than he was paid as a Member of Congress when he came to Congress." He said, in effect, "I am a patriot, and I surrendered a large income when I came to Congress to serve my country."

That is true, and I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee. He was a great lawyer and a great citizen before he came to Congress to serve first in the House of Representatives and subsequently in the Senate.

However, all that has nothing whatever to do with Dr. Wilcox and his salary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator from Texas will admit that the Nation has benefited very much by the services of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly the Nation has benefited very much by his services. I think the Senator from Tennessee has rendered to the Nation outstanding services.

I simply said that the Senator from Tennessee was a great patriot and a great lawyer and a great Senator and a great friend—and a great apologizer. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not recall that I said very much about apologizing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, the Senator from Tennessee apologized for his committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I will always do that—and I apologize to the Senator from Texas.

But the Senator from Texas has asked us to do something that the entire committee refused to agree to do.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not one member of the committee agreed to do it.

I am sorry we could not agree to do it; I apologize for not being able to do it. But we could not do it, and we cannot do it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry, of course. I regret being steamrollered. I thought that was confined to Chicago. [Laughter.]

But I do not mind being steamrollered. The Senator from Tennessee has great influence; he goes around among his fellows and lines them up and issues an edict and a ukase, and they fall into line.

But I shall not press the matter any further. The Senate can do as it wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 8. [Putting the question.]

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The amendment to the committee amendment is rejected.

The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 5, after line 9, to insert:

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution No. 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, $500,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment. I regret to find it necessary to oppose an amendment in this appropriation bill which has been passed on by the full Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, I am surprised to find this particular amendment in the bill. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, yesterday, all day and until 11:20 last night, I sat in the committee, helping to mark up the bill which n w is before the Senate. After the bill had been completed—that is, all of the provisions of the bill, as it came to us from the House of Representatives—at that late hour I stepped just outside the committee chamber to answer the telephone. I was not gone 5 minutes. When I returned, after completing the call, the committee had adjourned. I did not know this provision was in the bill until this morning.

Mr. President, this is a most unusual provision. It emanates, under the circumstances, from a most unusual source. This is an amendment placed in the bill by the Senate committee, to give to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives $500,000 in order to increase their staff. I am sure that intrigues Senators. It begets an interest to know why such a thing should happen. I will tell you, Mr. President, why. It is because this is part of the scheme to defeat a bill which is now being considered on the floor of the House, under a rule to take it up, at this moment, as I am speaking. It is a companion bill to the bill the Senate passed some months ago, Senate bill 913, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget, and to have a joint staff assisting in the work. That is the truth about it. Here we have the situation of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, who has probably been the chairman for 20 years, deciding at the last minute, after this bill had passed the House, and after every appropriation bill, including the regular appropriation bill, had passed the House, at the eleventh hour, and sending a letter to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee at 5 o'clock yesterday afternoon, asking the Senate to provide for them $500,000. For what purpose?

I have the resolution, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with the House proceedings of yesterday. At the eleventh hour, hoping to stave off favorable action on the bill that is now on the floor of the House, or regarding which there is a motion pending to take it up, he calls the committee together, and the committee adopts a resolution, which will be found on page 8975 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, reading as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the following sum—

Then follows a copy of this amendment to this appropriation bill.

Mr. President, let us consider the purpose of it. I shall refer to a statement by Representative MAHON, who sought to call up the resolution for consideration yesterday afternoon, in response to a question by Representative TABER. The Speaker asked, "Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?" Mr. TABER then asked:

Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this resolution provides the Committee on Appropriations with funds, which in its opinion, are absolutely necessary to make the proper study and examination of the budget so that we can be prepared, when the next session begins, to hold the hearings in a satisfactory manner; is that not correct?

To which Mr. MAHON replied:

The gentleman is correct; it is for the purpose of implementing the staff on the Committee on Appropriations, and enable the Congress to do a better job in scrutinizing the budgets and investigating expenses of the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say to the Senate that last night, a few moments before we finished with the bill, a letter came from Representative CANNON, which was handed to me. The letter is addressed to me, and in it he said:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations of the House has approved an item of $500,000 for additional investigation work by its staff, but there will be no further appropriation bills considered by the House prior to adjournment. Therefore, it will be appreciated if the Senate will include in the supplemental appropriation bill now pending in your committee, the following provision—

He then states that provision. I submitted it to the committee. I was told that it had long been a rule in the Senate not to object to appropriations requested by the other House for the work of their committees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Also, that the House, on the other hand, does not object to such appropriations for the Senate. That was the rule, as I remember it.

The committee, I believe without much discussion, listened to a brief statement by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. He referred to an unwritten rule to the effect that each House of the Congress shall determine what moneys it requires.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I say most respectfully, I agree with that rule, as a general principle; but when it is used as a device in an attempt to defeat proposed legislation which is now before the House, and at a time—it was the eleventh hour——

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, it was.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After they had had 20 years to figure out whether they needed more money, and had not included it in an appropriation, at the eleventh hour they ask the Senate to take up the cudgels for them, under those circumstances, I do not believe the rule applies.

Mr. McKELLAR. I recall that it was about 11:30 when the letter was received, and the provision was included in the bill, as I have related.

As the Senator from Arkansas knows, I am thoroughly in accord with the amendments to this bill which he has offered, and I expect to continue to support them. I do not know whether there is any method of preventing the Senator's amendment from being adopted. If there is I shall not be a party to it. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. When this matter came before the Appropriations Committee, late last evening, the Senator from Michigan, I think, sensed what had happened in the House.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I suggest that the Senator from Michigan did not know until the last moment that any such request was pending. Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I sensed what was happening in the House, and I felt that this was a means of accomplishing a purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During the time the bill has been pending in the House of Representatives, they have taken the position that they did not need additional help for the Appropriations Committee, that they were doing a job. Yet, at the last moment, do Senators know how much they want? I did not finish what I was reading. The minimum would be 20 additional staff members, $500,000. If it has to be done that way in order to have the Appropriations Committee adequately staffed, I would not object. But I want to say that if we include $500,000 for the House Appropriations Committee, then I am going to propose an amendment, at this point in the bill, to add $500,000 for the Senate Appropriations Committee, so that both the committees may function properly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I urged that last night. I suggested that if we were going to include $500,000 for the House, we should include $500,000 for the Senate. So that, if provision is not made for the joint committee—which I favor—as the bill of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas proposes, then we ought to provide in this bill such a sum as we may require.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true; and that is no reflection in any manner or form upon the present committees, or upon the staffs. It is simply indicative of the fact that this Government has grown, and that its expenditures are so heavy that we cannot possibly do all the things that should be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is necessary that we either have a joint staff or have several staffs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the point. We are always telling the executive agencies that they are duplicating functions and hiring too many people. We get after them about it, and now we are preparing to set an example ourselves of hiring two people and spending two dollars where one would do.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we cannot have joint staffs, then we must have several staffs.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have an amendment prepared.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to join the Senator in it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should first like to compliment the committee of which the Senator from Arkansas is chairman. I think the bill to which he has referred is without question the most important move toward Government economy that Congress has taken at this session.

I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that his bill passed the Senate by a large majority?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and a motion is now being debated in the House to take up the companion bill.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true that this appears to be an attempt to sidetrack the bill and give the Appropriations Committee of the House enough money to do the job without passing the McClellan bill?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think there is any doubt about it. It is too obvious.

Mr. MOODY. I am wondering if it would not be a wise thing to wait and see what happens to the McClellan bill in the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas whether the matter we have at hand came to the committee—I will say, in the first place, that I was not in the committee when the matter came up——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think the chairman knew the request had been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was less than 5 minutes before we adjourned that the letter came.

Mr. CORDON. If the request comes to the Senate committee as the result of the passage of a resolution by the House——

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; not by the House.

Mr. CORDON. That is the information I desired to get and up to which I was leading.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects.

Mr. CORDON. The action taken on the House floor, as indicated on page 8976 of the RECORD, where Representative SMITH of Virginia objected to further consideration of the resolution, represents the last action of the House on this question, does it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. An objection was interposed on the House by Representative SMITH of Virginia because he desired the House to consider the companion bill to that of the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct. A rule has already been obtained for the consideration of that bill, and it was scheduled to come up yesterday in the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from Arkansas recall that shortly before 11 o'clock last night the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Virginia left the meeting of the Appropriations Committee on the assumption that we had finished all the money items?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If this amendment remains in the bill, the McClellan bill will be offered as an amendment to the pending bill. We shall try to pass it and take it to conference, so it will be a part of this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand the matter which is now under debate on the floor of the House at this moment, the House will either vote to adopt the McClellan bill or it will not. My suggestion would be that we pass over, for the moment, consideration of this amendment, to see what the House does. If the House adopts by a yea-or-nay vote or any other method the bill, then, clearly, the situation will be different from what it was when we adopted the amendment in the committee. If the House refuses to pass the McClellan bill, we will be faced with another situation. My suggestion would be to pass over this amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear and fair to the chairman of the committee, I should like to make a brief statement, because I attended the meeting from its start until the final adjournment. It is true that Senators were in and out of the room during the course of the evening. It is quite possible that several of them may have left, and it may have been their impression that there was to be no other amendment.

I am quite sure, and can testify, that no statement was made by the chairman of the committee which would have led anyone to believe that no further amendments would be offered. When the matter did come to the attention of the committee, the chairman had the letter from Mr. CANNON read in full. It was discussed. The ranking Republican member of the committee was present and joined in the discussion, and raised some questions. Some of the other members joined in the discussion, and had some doubts. But finally I think the weight was given to the general theory that there is comity between the two Houses, and that normally, when one House has asked that something be included in a bill affecting that particular House, it is not questioned by the other House.

I quite agree with the point raised by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and some other Senators, that this is a slightly different situation, because instead of the provision having been put in the bill by action of the House, it came to us by way of a letter from the committee, rather than by action of the House.

However, I feel, in fairness to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], that I should personally testify that he certainly gave no impression that no further amendments would be offered. The matter was handled entirely in the above-board manner. It was subject to discussion in the committee. I desired to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I join in every statement the distinguished Senator from California has uttered. No reflection on earth can be cast on our esteemed chairman. Everyone was tired. Some of us left under the impression that the meeting was concluded. I know that when I left I thought the meeting was adjourned. But as the chairman has said, the matter was called to his attention 5 minutes before adjournment. He himself did not know the letter was there. I did not know it was there. No other member knew it was there.

I take the position that the circumstances are most unusual. It is doubtful, in my mind, that the rule of comity should apply, as a matter of equity and right.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to take exception to what the Senator from California has said. The Senator from Virginia never has said that the chairman of the committee said there were no further amendments to be offered. I never intended to imply that the chairman had even intimated that to us. All the Senator from Virginia wished to say, without any reflection whatever upon our distinguished chairman, was that three of us left under the impression that we had finished all the money amendments, because there were no more written out in the bill. That is what the Senator from Virginia said.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I have been conferring with my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, and I should like to join with him in favoring the McClellan bill as a rider to the pending bill, unless we follow the suggestion made by the junior Senator from Michigan, made a few minutes ago, and made also by the senior Senator from Arizona, namely, that we hold the matter up until we learn what the House does about it, because it seems to me there is clearly an effort to bypass the McClellan bill. There was an overwhelming vote in the Senate in favor

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of the McClellan bill. I do not believe the Senate should permit this sort of thing to occur. It seems to me that the Senator from Arizona has made a very constructive suggestion, that we lay the matter aside until the House has had an opportunity to act.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be temporarily passed over until such time as we know definitely whether the House will vote for or against the McClellan bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the request that the amendment be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 21, to insert:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY POLICY

For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, including the objects specified in title IV of Public Law 414, Eighty-second Congress, $75,000, of which one-half shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half shall be available for payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of such committee or by any member of such committee duly authorized by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Department of Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration—Claims, Federal Airport Act," on page 7, after line 3, to insert:

For an additional amount for "Claims, Federal Airport Act," $1,235,887, to remain available until June 30, 1953, as follows: Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Okla., $111,106; Orange County Airport, Orange County, Calif., $53,604; Bakersfield-Kern County Airport No. 1, Kern County (Bakersfield), Calif., $45,719; Municipal Airport, Bainbridge, Ga., $54,196; Municipal Airport, Cleveland, Ohio, $347,605; Municipal Airport, Beverly, Mass., $40,258; Municipal Airport, Orlando, Fla., $246,618; Municipal Airport, Fort Wayne, Ind., $198,896; Municipal Airport, New Bedford, Mass., $30,580; Lambert-St. Louis Municipal Airport, St. Louis, Mo., $25,409; Municipal Airport, Grand Island, Nebr., $71,617; Cape May County Airport, Cape May County, N. J., $10,279.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Treasury Department—Coast Guard—Operating expenses," on page 8, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$4,500,000" and insert "$5,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Retired pay," on page 8, line 12, after the word "pay", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$625,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government corporation—Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Administrative expenses," on page 8, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$16,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Department of Labor," on page 9, after line 18, to strike out:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from "$3,000" to "$5,000."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to a grave injustice, and I ask Senators to listen to me momentarily. A great injustice was done by the Committee on Appropriations last night, I am sure inadvertently, in the consideration of this particular item. The item is in the Department of Labor appropriation, in the Office of the Secretary. The House bill contained the following language:

Salaries and expenses: The limitation on the amount which may be expended for one passenger motor vehicle (for replacement only) carried under this head in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from "$3,000" to "$5,000."

That is the point. That automobile is intended for the head of the Department. He is a Cabinet officer of the United States. The Senate has approved other appropriation bills during this session. Only last night we approved the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The same kind of language, with reference to a Cabinet officer, was in that bill, and it was approved by the Senate. Last night the Senate also approved the appropriation bill for the Post Office Department.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The regular appropriation bill covering the Department of Labor was presented this year, and it was passed; was it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The opportunity to have this situation taken care of was in the consideration of the regular bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly it was through the neglect of the chairman of the subcommittee that that was not done. Nevertheless, merely because the regular bill did not provide for this item, I appeal to my good friends not to base their action on that failure. I know they are ambitious, and I know that they feel, down in their hearts, that there might be a possibility that there will be Cabinet officers from the other side of the aisle. That is all right; but I know they are going to be mistaken about it. Nevertheless, ambition is always eternal, and the hope is there.

This is my idea. Do the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] feel that if that accident should happen, and a Cabinet officer should be named from the party on the other side of the aisle, the Postmaster General should ride in a $5,000 car, while the Secretary of Labor, in whom I know they are deeply interested, should ride in a $3,000 car? I ask for fair play.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that what has happened can be explained, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary of Labor, or someone in his Department, saw in one of the appropriation bills that another Cabinet officer was getting a $5,000 automobile, so they came before the committee when the committee was considering a deficiency or a supplemental appropriation bill and wanted to be certain that they got in on the kill. So they want to have a $5,000 automobile. It is a matter of keeping up with the Joneses.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not adjust myself to such a violent idea.

Mr. FERGUSON. How does the Senator think the item was included in the pending bill? Why did not the Department think of it when the regular appropriation bill was being considered, which was passed a few weeks ago?

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the same reason that those in the Department of Agriculture and those in the Post Office Department did not think of it.

I ask the Senator from Michigan in all sincerity, Are we so small in the Senate, is our country the kind of country——

Mr. FERGUSON. But this kind of item has no place in a deficiency bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No? Last night I almost had apoplexy——

Mr. FERGUSON. So did I.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan actually voted for an increase. It was all right. It was necessary. It was reasonable. We all agreed with him. What was the name of that fish—lamprey?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was not an increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, no; it was just a little extra.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was an item in the bill as to which legislation had been passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, believe it or not, the Senator from Michigan was for it. It affected the Great Lakes. I do not think he did it for that reason, but because it was a reasonable item, and a necessary item, we agreed with the Senator from Michigan that the item should go into the bill. I hope that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], to whom I am extremely devoted, will agree that the committee amendment should be defeated. I ask for a sense of fair play on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator know whether or not at this time the Secretary of Labor has a limousine?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether he has a limousine or a Ford. He has not talked with me. I have not seen him or discussed the subject with him. However, it seems to me that the amendment is unfair.

Mr. CORDON. The passenger vehicle is set out as one for replacement, so quite evidently there is no serious question involved. The item is small. I agree with the Senator that if there are to be $5,000 automobiles for other Cabinet officers, we should not discriminate against the Secretary of Labor. There is no question about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may recall that I voted against the amendment to strike out the language.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the committee out-voted me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us be fair. The greatest characteristic of the American is fair play, and that is what I am asking for. I have not talked with the Secretary of Labor. I have not discussed the subject with him or with anyone else from that particular department. I learned during the day that in the bill for the Department of Agriculture and the bill for the Post Office Department, this allowance was increased to $5,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does this item involve a Cadillac automobile which is being eliminated because the Secretary of Labor cannot ride in that kind of limousine?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did not get the question.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am asking the question plainly and bluntly. Does this mean that we are eliminating an opportunity for the Secretary of Labor to ride in a Cadillac, while the heads of other departments and other Cabinet officers ride in Cadillacs? Perhaps we have too many Cadillacs. I am inclined to believe that we have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason I am trying to defeat this amendment is that I want to be fair. It so happens that at the present time the Secretary of Labor is a member of the party represented by this side of the aisle. That is only incidental.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that Members on the other side of the aisle are ambitious. I want to give them a break when they appoint someone who they think is friendly to labor. I would not like to see the day come when the Postmaster General, even if he came from the other side of the aisle—and I know that some pretty good men are going to be disappointed because they will not have an opportunity to be Postmaster General—is to be subjected to a change in this item. If an accident like that should happen, if the American people, in their bad judgment, should decide that a change should be made, I want every Cabinet officer treated in the same way.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot understand why the Senator takes up all this time looking at us and pointing his finger in this direction. The Senator has the votes on the other side of the aisle to defeat this amendment. He had the votes last night. There is a majority on the Senator's side of the aisle. His party has a majority on the committee. Let the Senator point his finger in the other direction. He has the votes over there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only trouble with my friend from Indiana is that he does not realize that my finger is not one of scorn. My finger is one of friendship. I want to inform my friends on the other side just exactly what this amendment means. I ask for fair play.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to pour oil on the flames, is it not true that while nominal control of this body seems to be on this side of the aisle, the real control is in a bipartisan alliance between certain Democrats and the majority of Republicans?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In this instance I want a bipartisan alliance. [Laughter.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9 after line 18.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I move, on page 10, line 6, to strike out the figure "$6,800,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$6,500,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. That amendment is not in order. The Senate is considering committee amendments first. That is an amendment to the text.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. What I wish to do is to add some language to this paragraph. Would not that be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No amendments to the text of the bill are in order until the committee amendments are first disposed of.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 11, after line 4, to strike out:

PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "Payments to school districts," $11,570,000.

Mr. CAPEHART and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the able chairman of the committee just why lines 5, 6, and 7 are stricken out. They carry an appropriation of $11,570,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The majority of the committee voted against me. That is why.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am wondering why the committee eliminated the entire amount rather than to make a possible reduction.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to have something to say about this amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am very happy to yield to the able Senator from Alabama. After he has concluded, I should like to say something.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think the committee amendment in lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 11, should be rejected. The committee worked hard. In my long years in both House and Senate I have never known any committee to work more diligently and persistently or harder than the committee worked on this bill. But it was not possible to have hearings on this particular item. We reached the item rather late last night. We remained in session until practically midnight, under the leadership of our very fine, hard-working chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. At that time we did not have full information on this item.

Since the committee acted upon the item last evening I have endeavored to investigate the subject. As I say, I think the committee amendment ought to be rejected.

This is a typical deficiency item, a typical item for this kind of bill. Senators will recall that some 2 years ago, after the conflict started in Korea, Congress passed an act, Public Law 874, of the Eighty-first Congress, authorizing appropriations to help school districts in federally impacted areas—in other words, where the Federal Government, because of our defense situation, has been forced to go into a school district and there take over a great amount of land, which means that such land is no longer subject to taxation, or bring in a great many people, which means also bringing in a large number of children who must go to school and be educated. The Federal Government has created a situation in which the local school districts cannot provide teachers and the schools for the new children who come into the local school districts. The Congress, under Public Law 874, provided for Federal aid. In order to carry out the entitlements under Public Law 874 it is necessary that this deficiency appropriation of $11,570,000 be made at this time. If Senators will look at the amendment they will notice that it states:

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1952, for "payments to school districts", $11,570,000.

The school districts have hired teachers and made other expenditures. They have made commitments of various kinds, feeling that they had their entitlements under Public Law 874, which the Congress had passed, and that they had a right to expect Congress to carry out that law and grant them the entitlements provided under that law, because as I say, the situation has been brought about by action of the Federal Government.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from Alabama has stated that the appropriation was to provide payment for expenses in the present fiscal year. I am sure he meant for the fiscal year which expired on June 30, with reference to expenses which had been incurred during that fiscal year.

Mr. HILL. That is what I emphasized. I emphasized fiscal year 1952, which expired on June 30. That means that the school districts, as I said, have made these obligations, these contracts, and these commitments, by virtue of Public Law 874, which granted them these entitlements. We would simply carry out what the Federal Government had promised to do.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that if the money is not provided, the school districts will be left short with reference to the commitments which they have made

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for the fiscal year and will find themselves unable to meet those commitments?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. Having acted under the law and under the entitlements, they will be left short.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to argue the question, because it is a clear issue. It would be palpably unfair to the school districts if we did not grant the money. I merely wish to ask one question. Is it not a fact that when the issue was presented to the House on the floor, the provision with reference to $11,000,000-plus, for the maintenance of the schools in these critical defense areas, was adopted by a vote of 6 to 1?

Mr. HILL. As I recall, the vote was overwhelming. In the subcommittee, of which I am a member, the vote was overwhelming.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. We have in the State of Maryland at least four cases in which school districts that have obligated themselves with reference to maintenance and operation of schools would find that they had no money if the provision were stricken from the bill. It would be very embarrassing to them. I understand the provision was put in the bill by the subcommittee, and at the last minute stricken out by the full committee.

Mr. HILL. The money was put in by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was put in on the floor of the House.

Mr. HILL. Yes; it was added on the floor of the House, on the basis of facts which the Senate Committee on Appropriations did not have before it last night. We must keep faith with those entitlements.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I certainly agree with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very brief. The Senator from Alabama is very familiar with the operation of the entire program. Is it not correct to say that the additional burdens imposed on virtually all the school districts by virtue of the Government activities are far in excess of the amount of money Congress provides to the districts?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. Congress does not undertake to meet the whole cost. It merely helps. If anyone doubts that fact he should read Public Law 874, of the Eighty-first Congress. Congress only helps with a part of it.

Mr. STENNIS. In many cases where the burden has increased from 35 to 40 percent the Federal contribution does not run to more than 7, 8, or 10 percent.

Mr. HILL. As a general proposition the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I am very glad he has raised the question. Some of the questions and the replies to them which have been made during the colloquy have answered most of my questions. I do wish to suggest, however, that the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Oklahoma have pointed to a very important situation. The fiscal year has closed. Many of the schools in the defense areas have suffered the impact of the situation which has come about in defense areas, and they have relied upon representations heretofore made. Action which would deny help to meet to some extent the impact would be tragic, in my opinion.

In the city of Wichita, Kans., approximately from 35,000 to 40,000 persons have moved into town in the last year and a half, by reason of defense industries, with the result that the school facilities have become completely overtaxed. Some of these schools are located on property owned in fee by the Federal Government. To cut the funds will absolutely cripple not only the situation in Wichita, but many other situations all over the country. I certainly think that in all equity and good conscience we should remedy that kind of situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The ground on which the items were stricken out—not only the one with reference to the school districts, but the other items on the succeeding page as well—was because there was no evidence before the committee concerning the subject. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. We did not have any evidence before us.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Alabama is supplying the evidence, so far as I am concerned. As the Senator knows, I voted against striking it out.

Mr. HILL. The Senator certainly did.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. I bear witness to the fact that the Senator from Tennessee opposed the committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The committee voted to strike it out last night—although I voted against striking it out—merely because no evidence was presented before the committee. We had to act hurriedly, as we have had to act hurriedly on many other bills, but it was agreed that if we struck it out it would go to conference and that would give us time to act intelligently.

In line with what the distinguished Senator from Kansas has just stated, many of these districts have made their plans and let contracts for the next fiscal year on the basis of the law. Therefore they must have some help from the Federal Government in order to carry out their school program.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is certainly true with reference to the two contiguous counties of Montgomery and Prince Georges in Maryland. They have obligated themselves upon the faith of Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe that the amount on line 7, $11,570,000, is possibly the proper amount. I hope the Senate will retain that amount. The $80,000,000 in line 10 could well be cut to $50,000,000.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that that is not the amendment we are discussing.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am in favor of restoring the $11,570,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend until the Senate is in order. The Senate must be in order. It is impossible to hear what is going on in the Chamber.

Mr. HILL. Although I have the floor, I shall ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Security Agency and Labor Appropriations, who normally handles these appropriations, to make a statement at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before I do, I believe the Senator from Washington wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I have not had an opportunity to hear all of the colloquy, and therefore I have but a single question. Is it the intention of the committee that the money in question will be used by American municipalities and States to help them solve unexpected and unavoidable problems which have been imposed upon these local levels of government because of the defense effort and emergency in which we find ourselves?

Mr. HILL. I will say to my good friend that that is exactly what the money is for, namely, to help local school districts. The money goes to the local school district to help that local school district meet an emergency situation which comes out of the fact that the Federal Government has come into the local district and taken a great deal of land from the tax rolls and has brought in a great number of additional children who must be educated in the local schools.

Mr. CAIN. It is not a Federal contribution to be of assistance to any normal school situation?

Mr. HILL. Oh, no; it is only to be applied where there is a federally impacted local school district.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With reference to what the Senator from Washington has stated, let me say that in my State we have a situation in which more than 3,000 school children have been brought in by the Army and Air Force in an area which is not near a school, and the local school district must take care of those children.

Under this bill they would receive approximately $34,000 with which to take care of thousands of school children of Army and Air Force personnel. We have assured them that we would provide these funds, and they have proceeded on the basis of the public law authorizing this program. They have done their part. They have finished the job for the fiscal year which already has ended.

So, Mr. President, unless this money is appropriated now, we shall be breaking faith.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me say that there is a similar situation in the State of Washington. I wish to make certain that the money proposed to be appropriated will be used for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Washington is absolutely correct about it. This money will go to the local school districts in which there exists such a situation, growing out of these developments.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it is true that many of the areas which will be affected by this amendment are sparsely settled areas, areas with a small population—areas such as at least two on the coast of North Carolina, one of them being Camp Lejeune, where 50,000 marines were brought into a county which had a population less than half that number to begin with. Those marines, together with their wives and children, are located there. Unless this provision is made, the children of those marines will lack the necessary school facilities, and will have to go without them.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Carolina for the statement he has made. He has clearly stated the situation underlying the authorization which heretofore has been made, and he has clearly stated the need today for the appropriation we request.

Into certain areas more children have been brought as a result of orders of the Federal Government than the number of children who normally live there, whose homes are located there. In such cases the local school districts simply cannot make provision to educate all the children who have been brought into their areas.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is true in at least several areas in North Carolina, which had such a sparse population to begin with that the number of persons brought in, as a result of the activities of the Federal Government, far exceeds the native population. The result of such a development is to create an educational vacuum, one which is proposed to be filled by means of this amendment.

Mr. HILL. That is exactly the situation, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The purpose of the amendment is to make certain that a serviceman who goes into such an area does not have to sacrifice the opportunity of his children to receive an education.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina is entirely correct. A marine who goes to Camp Lejeune and takes his wife and children there should have an opportunity to have his children receive a proper education while they are living there.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Is the proposed appropriation of $11,570,000 in accordance with the needs as set forth and the plan as provided for in the original bill?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to commend the Senator from Alabama for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

In my State, most of these districts—possibly there are as many as a dozen of them—are either in suburban areas, where the taxes are limited, and where the school districts are further restricted by the carrying out of the program of the Federal Government and the building of Federal institutions, or in the quasi-rural areas, where the local school districts could not possibly meet the expanded need for schools which has developed as a result of the activities on the part of the Federal Government.

As I understand, the appropriation now requested is to be used to make payments to teachers and for maintenance of the schools for the fiscal year which has just ended.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely correct.

Mr. BRICKER. So this appropriation, in effect, amounts practically to a moral obligation, on the part of the Federal Government to the local communities, to carry out the provisions of the original bill.

Mr. HILL. It certainly amounts to a small obligation, in view of the basic act which we passed some 2 years ago, in which we said to the local school districts, "Go ahead and make your plans to educate these children; we are passing this law, granting you these entitlements."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I feel that it is necessary that this item be included in the bill, or else those schools will have to close or provide a very inferior quality of education.

Mr. HILL. That is entirely true, and I thank the Senator from Ohio very much.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS — AUTHORITY FOR REPORTING AND CONSIDERATION OF BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me at this time, to permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that in so doing I shall not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may yield for that purpose without losing the floor.

Mr. HILL. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, upon motion, House bill 8120 may be called up. It is the bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations. It is the so-called military installation authorization bill, to authorize construction for which appropriation items in the 1953 supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 8370, will be necessary.

In order that House bill 8120 may be called up tomorrow, even though the Senate does not take an adjournment today—because under the rule the bill would normally have to lie over for one day—I ask unanimous consent that that bill may be taken up on tomorrow, upon motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. Reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that, as I understand, copies of House bill 8120 and copies of the report on it will be available tomorrow before the Senator from Louisiana makes a motion to have the Senate take up the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I expect to have both the bill and the report on it available either today or tomorrow, before the bill is taken up.

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Senator would not want to have the Senate take up the bill before copies of the bill and copies of the report on it were available; is that not correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. They will be available at that time.

I make this request now, because it is necessary that House bill 8120 be considered and acted on promptly, for there will have to be a conference on that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the request of the Senator from Louisiana to be that he may be permitted to report House bill 8120 and to submit a report on it during the recess of the Senate, following the session today, and also that the Senator from Louisiana requests unanimous consent that the bill may be taken up tomorrow, upon motion. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that I think there will be no objection to the procedure proposed by the Senator from Louisiana. In the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, we have this $2,000,000,000 construction item. Until we knew what action the committee took on the substantive authorization measure, we were compelled to eliminate, or at least we felt that we should eliminate, that item from the bill. We have done so.

If the agreement requested by the Senator from Louisiana can be obtained, it will be of value not only to the Senate,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

but also to the conferees, in case we cannot reach this feature of the bill when the measure reaches conference, and so enable Congress, before it adjourns, to provide funds with which to start this great construction program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Subsequently,

Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 2078) thereon.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 11, striking out lines 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to you, sir, and to my colleagues, that the appropriation here requested is intended, not to carry all the burden, but to supplement the expense to which these school districts are being put and have been put because of the conditions created by the Federal Government in sending into these areas military personnel and their wives and children.

The amount requested to be appropriated will be spent under the supervision of the Office of Education; and the amount received by each school district will be in proportion to the number of children in that category who will be attending school there.

In my own State, there are 183 school districts that are educating children who live on or near such military installations. I shall not mention the camps by name; but these children are the children of fathers and mothers who went to those areas because the Federal Government wanted them to be there. They went there because the Federal Government put them there.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that most of these children are the children of laborers who are at such places because they are engaged in construction work there or defense work there. The parents of these children went there to do that work, and left their homes. The children involved in this matter are principally the children of such laborers who are constructing those plants or are operating those defense establishments.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is entirely correct.

Some of these children are the children of officers who are assigned to duty at these military posts. Those children have been uprooted from their homes and have been taken to those areas. They must have educational opportunities.

It is not just to impose on the local taxpayers in those districts the heavy burden of paying out of their own pockets for the education of those children—not their own children, not children who normally live in those districts, not the children of the normal population of those districts, but children who were "drafted," so to speak, and were put into those areas.

So I hope very much that the committee amendment will be rejected, and that we shall return to the provision voted by the House of Representatives.

The House overwhelmingly adopted that provision.

The Senate committee took the position that it had held no hearings on this matter and had no information about it. Of course, Mr. President, that is not the fault of the Senate. If our committee did not hold hearings, of course it could not obtain evidence or information simply by sticking its head out the window. If information is to be obtained, hearings must be held. However, the committee did not hold hearings. If the committee had held hearings, it would have obtained testimony from witnesses who would have reflected the views which are being reflected here in the Senate at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with reference to the hearings, it is correct to say that we had no hearings whatever, though today we received the information which is being so well announced to the Senate by the Senator from Texas. The conditions which exist in Texas are similar to conditions which exist in every State of the Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is some question about the fiscal year—the technical fiscal year. Today, was it 11: 20 or 11:30 when the fiscal year expired? It makes no difference as to the fiscal year in which the situation arises. If the Federal Government is responsible for this condition, it is responsible for correcting it. That is sound, is it not? Of course, it is. Money has been borrowed and contractual obligations have been incurred in reliance upon a law passed by the Congress which made it clear that it was our purpose to furnish these funds in a proportional manner. What difference does it make whether it is one fiscal year or another? If I owe a note at the bank, I want to pay it, whether it is due or overdue. Usually, it is probably overdue. [Laughter.] I want it paid with interest. I do not want the Federal Government to put its iron hand upon the poor struggling people who live in the school districts, to make them pay money out of their own pockets for the education of children from all of the 48 States of the Union. The districts were not selected by the Congress. This is not a post-office patronage proposition. The Congress does not specify where the camps shall be located. The Government says, "We want to put some troops in your school district." The people are not asked for their consent; the troops are simply stationed there. But the troops are not stationed there with any receipted bills, representing payment for their education. The school districts are expected to educate them—not with Federal money, but with money out of their own pockets. It is not just; it is not fair.

I thank the Senator from Alabama, for having yielded. I hope the Senate will reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would have been on my feet, except that I assumed the Senator from Texas was going forward with his argument. I desire to say a few words before we dispose of the committee amendment. I have no illusion about what is going to happen to it, but I have heard the statement made that the committee had no knowledge of the situation. I am not certain how much knowledge it had. I know how much it could have had. Information was available, part of it within the memories of members of the committee; and it should be within the memories of all Members of the Senate. I have no objection to deleting the suggested amendment of the committee, but I think we perhaps ought to clear the atmosphere a little bit, here. First, let us remember that this is a supplemental bill. A supplemental bill is at least presented on the philosophy that it represents appropriations, the necessity for which could not be foreseen when the regular bill was presented.

Mr. President, the regular bill for this item was presented in the 1952 Appropriation Act. It was argued at length upon the floor of the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, I recall, made a most impassioned presentation on this subject, one which was well documented, as did also the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and numerous other Senators. In other words, the Senate acted advisedly when it made an appropriation of $40,000,000 for this purpose. That $40,000,000 represented 76 percent of the total authorized amount in the pending legislation. That was known last year. It was discussed on the floor of the Senate. In the preceding year, 1951—and that was shortly after the law had gone into effect, and when no local district had had any opportunity to do anything to meet this terrific added load—the amount provided was 96 percent. The House reported on the matter, I think, rather fully. The House indicated the percentage both in 1951 and in 1952. That is their position.

This provision represents their philosophy for what it is worth. Their philosophy was that over some period of time the local government ought to commence to make some preparation to take over a greater share of the cost of education within a given area. So far as I am concerned, I think that is fairly sound philosophy.

It was felt that this $11,570,000, incidentally, would bring the appropriation for 1952—that is, for the year which closed on June 30—up to about 95½ percent of the total, the maximum amount authorized in the basic legislation. It was felt that there should be less appropriation this year than was made in

the first year. I assume it was figured to make it less as the years went by.

It may well be that the $11,500,000 is too heavy a cut for this year. I can understand how people feel who are in this situation. A similar one prevailed in World War II, in my own State, in two or three places, and it was desperate. We had no basic legislation. We had to operate under the Lanham Act. We did that. We still have such a condition in two or three places in Oregon, though not so bad as it is perhaps in other States. Over the years, of course, the local government accommodates itself to the situation. There is far more money released in the particular areas. There is more money with which to pay for education and so on.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I merely want to call his attention to Oak Ridge, Tenn., which was not even a village, or at least nothing more than a village, when the Government took it over entirely. It has grown to be the fifth largest city in Tennessee. It comes next to Knoxville, I believe, or Chattanooga. It would take 95 percent. The people who have come in there are more than 95 percent of the whole population.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I know the situation there, and of course, Oak Ridge is owned entirely by the Federal Government. There is no tax base there, but there is a very definite inequity. The people who live there are paid full salaries. They pay less rent than is paid anywhere else, and they do not contribute a thin dime toward the cost of educating their children, while all the other people of the United States do. That is wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. Unfortunately, they have no rights as citizens. They have no local government at all. They have no mayor. They are governed by a company which is located in New York.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to the fact that the report of the House committee was available to the Senate, and that the record of last year's $40,000,000 appropriation and all the facts were available. But I certainly can excuse the members of my committee for not informing themselves of the situation, because we were up against it. We did not have time enough to do much more than read the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows that if it were not for the emergency of the situation we would have had witnesses come before us and testify.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. But we were in a situation, as the Senator says, where we could not do so.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. President, if the committee amendment be not agreed to, the amount of money provided under the act will be within one-half of 1 percent of the amount provided in 1951. It will be for last fiscal year, the year which closed on the 30th of June, for school charges already incurred, and it will be for charges incurred by districts which had notice before the beginning of this year and shortly after the beginning of the school of the amount of money to be furnished for 1952.

THE SCHOOLS AND CRITICAL AREAS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to say in support of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that if this appropriation were not made it would be a breach of faith with the schools of this Nation. These towns and areas, many of relatively small population, are supporting the children of the workers who have been sent into the national defense areas. This program has been established by Congress and if we cut down this appropriation at this time it would be a clear breach of faith on the part of Congress.

It is one of the most important items contained in this bill. We are committed to keep up the work so that the children of the servicemen and the children of construction workers in areas such as Henderson, Nev., where the population tripled during the Second World War, may be included in the program.

Congress has already set the precedent by its action and it is so obviously necessary and in the public interest that it hardly admits of argument.

With the national defense pressure continuing and with the industrial areas and airports becoming more important—it would be a clear breach of faith with the schools of such areas to discontinue such assistance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 7, to strike out:

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "School construction", $80,000,000 to remain available until expended.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on page 11, line 10, I offer an amendment to strike out "$80,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana offers an amendment——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wonder if we could debate it before we vote on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator wishes to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to clarify the parliamentary situation. The Senator from Indiana suggests a reduction from $80,000,000 to $60,000,000. If his amendment is accepted by the Senator from Tennessee, does that of itself kill the amendment of the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it does not. The committee amendment would have to be rejected in order to make the $60,000,000 available.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I assume it will be useless, but I desire to rise in opposition both to the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Indiana and to any action against the committee amendment. This is a different picture altogether than was the amendment relating to $11,500,000 for operating or assisting in paying the cost of operating schools. In this connection I want to read into the RECORD a statement from the report of the House of Representatives. I hope my colleagues will pay attention, because it is interesting, at least. This is what the House of Representatives had to say about an item of school construction:

> The committee has disallowed all of the $80,000,000 requested. The committee reduced the original request for 1953 by only 10 percent, from $150,000,000 to $135,000,000——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I cannot yield until I have concluded the reading from the House report. I read further—

> and included language to make this amount available immediately upon passage of the act. The bill was passed by both the House and the Senate in exactly the form in which it was reported by the committee. The committee stated in its report on this bill "The committee wants it to be understood that this action does not in any way indicate that it will look favorably on a request for an additional amount in fiscal year 1953. The agency is expected to plan a program for the entire period from the enactment of this bill to June 30, 1953, within the funds provided." In the face of the action of both Houses of Congress and the very clear expression of the committee to the contrary, the Bureau of the Budget submitted a supplemental request for $80,000,000 even before the beginning of the 1953 fiscal year. The justifications and verbal testimony were completely devoid of any new information which would justify this action.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will pay attention to this:

> Neither the Federal Security Agency nor the Office of Education was consulted or given forewarning that this action was contemplated. The Federal Security Agency's budget officer said, somewhat in apology for the physical form of the justifications, "This came so suddenly we didn't get the regularly prepared justification * * *." The principal witness who was forced into the position of attempting to defend the estimate said, "The first thing I knew about that, Mr. Chairman, was a telephone call last night that this might be up today." The committee is unaware of and does not seek to determine the motives behind this eleventh-hour proceeding, but certainly such hastily conceived action and flaunting of the obvious intent of Congress ill befits the office that is supposed to lead and set the example for the entire executive branch in the field of budgeting the public funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has been reading from the House report?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that notwithstanding that committee report, the House itself, in its judgment, inserted $80,000,000 as recommended by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Its judgment was brought about as a result of the fact that the authority for the item is Public

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Law 815. According to the requirements under that law, the total estimate of need is $559,642,044. Last year we appropriated $146,000,000. In the regular bill this year we appropriated $135,000,000, making a total amount already appropriated of $281,000,000, with the $80,000,000 recommended by the House in this bill, that will make a total of of $361,000,000, when the need is $560,000,000.

Even if we were now to appropriate $80,000,000, we would still be $240,000,000 short of the estimated needs. Could not the House have acted upon those figures?

Mr. CORDON. Undoubtedly the House acted as it did because it felt that there was need for that amount of money. I do not question that fact. I think there is need for more than that amount of money. There is need for millions of dollars in thousands of other situations in the United States. It is not pleasant to rise and oppose this sort of appropriation. But the brutal fact is that if we do not find some way of working down to where we can live within our means, we are going to need not only that $500,000,000, we are going to need all the money that we can take from the taxpayer, and there will be no taxpayer to pay it.

In some way or other we shall have to do something to try to get down within our means. We cannot forever keep extending the debt structure. It means to me that it should be apparent to everybody that when the President of the United States last year sent his carefully prepared budget to Congress, and we voted 90 percent of it, $135,000,000 out of $150,000,000, we could at least hope, even though it be an election year, that if he had to ask for a little more, he would not have asked for any more than the $15,000,000 he did not get in his original budget.

But here is a request that was not asked for by either of the interested agencies. It came full-blown from the Bureau of the Budget to the House, and the benefiting administering agencies did not know the Bureau of the Budget was even considering the matter.

The Senate can put its approval on that sort of sharp practice if it wants to. The Senator from Oregon is not going to join them. He will vote against the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KERR. If the committee amendment is agreed to, would the amount all be stricken?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be if it were agreed to, including the $60,000,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the committee amendment?

Mr. HILL. I shall take but 1 minute. I think the Senate ought to have the information I seek. I am referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Friday, June 27. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a statement by Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the committee which has given a great deal of time, study, and thought to the matter, the committee which has handled the legislation and has authorized appropriations to the Federal impacted areas. I shall not read Mr. BARDEN's entire remarks. I merely wish to call attention to these words which he spoke last Friday, just before the House acted to put $80,000,000 in the bill:

> Let us think a little, too, of the emergencies that exist and of the school construction that is absolutely necessary. There would have been considerably more money for use in other sections of this country had it not been for the construction of the Savannah River project.

We know what the Savannah River project is. It is the great atomic energy project on the Savannah River.

I continue to quote Mr. BARDEN:

> There would have been considerably more money for use in other sections of this country had it not been for the construction of the Savannah River project which took a great amount of the money for needed school buildings that could have been used in this program for other areas. This amount of money, $80,000,000, will close up the program. That is the general concession made by all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama, and I also pay my respects to the Representative whom he was quoting, that that money was not spent in the Savannah Valley. We had to get money from other sources. We passed a sales tax to operate the schools, and it was necessary to go even further than that, and to borrow funds, in spite of what the Representative said.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I desire to have it understood that the Savannah River project had nothing to do with any money not being available for any other area.

Mr. KERR. If it is a fact, as my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina, has stated—and I know it is, because he has said it—that there were not Federal funds with which to meet the requirements in the area to which he has referred, it could only be because Congress has not appropriated enough money to meet the problem throughout the country in accordance with the spirit of the law which authorized the amount as set forth by the Senator from New Mexico a few minutes ago. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I am asking the question of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that there was no one in South Carolina who got the money. When we asked for money, Congress did not appropriate it. The State itself had to raise funds. I want the Senator to understand that I am not opposing this program. I am simply disillusioned and disappointed that South Carolina has fared so badly under this program. I certainly hope that in the future, and in consideration of the sacrifices and the contributions made by the people of South Carolina to their country, that they will be able to share in the benefits of this Federal aid which they so badly need and richly deserve because of the Government's decision to build the atomic energy plant which has taken away more than 250,000 acres of our farm land and many of our historic landmarks.

The State levied a sales tax to provide for education. We do not desire Federal interference with our educational program. The Federal Government refused to help us when we needed money. I want no misunderstanding. This money certainly was not spent in the Savannah Valley.

Mr. HILL. Of course, we all share the view of the Senator from South Carolina. We want no Federal interference. But that does not mean that we have not put these enormous burdens on certain local school districts, and we have an obligation to go in and help the school districts carry the load which the Federal Government has imposed upon them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is not this an appropriation that is intended merely to carry out the authorization which was made in view of the need for construction of schools in the local districts, without interference with the local districts, but yet in a situation where the local districts had gone as far as they could in the matter of appropriating their own funds?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the question goes far beyond the needs of the Savannah Valley?

Mr. HILL. I would not want the Senate to think for one moment that it is a question of only the Savannah Valley. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I shall read another statement, which shows that there are many such school districts.

Mr. MAYBANK. Would the Senator be kind enough to state to the Senate how much the Savannah Valley will receive under this program?

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator that I do not have the figures.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the light of past experience, I would expect that the Savannah Valley will get very little, if any.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the amount in the bill, $80,000,000, is calculated to take care of school districts in every State of the Union, among which are 250 within the State of Oklahoma, which are no more worthy than those of any other State, but they are themselves quite worthy and entirely unable to meet their requirements without this provision of the bill.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. What the Senator from Oklahoma has said is exactly what Representative BARDEN, of North Carolina, said, and exactly what Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, said.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to be impish——

Mr. HILL. It is impossible to conceive of so brilliant a statesman as the Senator from Illinois as an imp.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Without wishing to be impish, could the slogan of some Senators be "No Federal interference, but lots of Federal money?"

Mr. HILL. No, I would say that all Senators stand for no Federal interference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But for lots of Federal money?

Mr. HILL. No; I would not say that. When the Federal Government has imposed a burden on a particular local school district, right and justice require that the Federal Government help carry the burden. That is what is here involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 11, beginning in line 8.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If a Senator wishes to vote for the $80,000,000, he should vote "No," should he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The result of the vote has been announced.

Mr. DWORSHAK. How can we transact business when a quorum is not present?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is always presumed to be present unless the point of no quorum is made. Furthermore, the Chair has already announced the result, and a quorum call would have no effect on the result. Does the Senator still wish to call for a quorum?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I may do so later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 10, to strike out:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For additional amounts for increased costs of pay and allowances authorized by Public Law 346, approved May 19, 1952, as follows:

"Venereal diseases," $16,500;

"Tuberculosis," $23,250;

"Assistance to States, general," $37,500;

"Communicable diseases," $69,750;

"Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene," $61,500;

"Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska," $7,500;

"Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services," $9,000;

"Hospitals and medical care," $388,000;

"Foreign quarantine service," $15,000;

"National Institutes of Health, operating expenses," $48,750;

"National Cancer Institute," $25,500;

"Mental health activities," $16,500;

"National Heart Institute," $22,500;

"Dental health activities," $20,250;

"Retired pay of commissioned officers," $36,000;

"Salaries and expenses," $20,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hospitals and medical care," on page 12, line 15, after the word "care", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, after line 3, to insert:

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Soil conservation service

Water Conservation and Utilization Projects

For an additional amount for "Water conservation and utilization projects," $100,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 13, line 11, to change the chapter number from "VI" to "VII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior," on page 13, after line 12, to strike out:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction," $525,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That restrictions contained within the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended from appropriations to the National Park Service for personal services, are hereby waived to the extent necessary to meet the costs of fire suppression and of emergency reconstruction or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 14, to insert:

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Investigations of resources," fiscal year 1953, $240,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 5, to change the chapter number from "VII" to "VIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices," on page 14, after line 6, to strike out:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

EXTRAORDINARY ALTERATIONS AND REPAIRS, EXECUTIVE MANSION

Not to exceed $50,000 of funds made available to the President under the heading "Emergency fund for the President, national defense," contained in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953," shall be available until June 30, 1954, for extraordinary alterations, repairs, furniture, and furnishings of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Atomic Energy Commission," on page 15, line 15, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$35,000,000, of which $30,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program" and insert "$141,188,000"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,064,275" and insert "$30,755,526"; and in line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,709,350" and insert "$3,657,647."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 21, to strike out:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "Plant and equipment", including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "plant and equipment", $1,450,000,000, of which $1,355,398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as recommended by the National Security Council, approved by the President of the United States, and submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in the contracts, and any

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared as to the effect on the point 4 program in South and Southeast Asia of the amendment further reducing the MSA appropriation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE EFFECT ON THE POINT 4 PROGRAM IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA OF THE AMENDMENT FURTHER REDUCING THE MSA APPROPRIATION

One of the most serious cuts made by the House of Representatives in the Mutual Security Program is in the provision for aid to South and Southeast Asia. The President originally requested $176,000,000 for economic and technical assistance for India, Pakistan, Nepal, Ceylon, Afghanistan, Burma, and Indonesia. This was cut by a third in the authorizing legislation to only $118,000,000. The House Appropriations Committee favorably reported this full figure but it was arbitrarily cut on the floor by $50,000,000 to only $68,000,000.

In South Asia, the greatest effects of the reduction will be in the India and Pakistan programs, both of which have been considered as minimum programs in the presentation to the Congress.

Our aid programs have been established within the framework of development programs which the governments of India and Pakistan have carefully worked up in order to increase the economic well-being of their people. The people of India and Pakistan have long waited for some perceptible betterment of their pitifully low standard of living. Now that they are enjoying the experience of political independence, they are anxious and determined to enjoy the economic fruits of that independence in more food, more clothing, better health, and better housing.

The economic goals desired by the Indians and Pakistanis will be attained by them with or without external aid, but the time of their attainment would be much slower without external aid and the political framework within which they would be attained might well be different if aid is not available. United States assistance can serve to speed up the economic development programs of these countries and thus help to convince their millions of people that the path of democracy and not of communism is the true road to economic salvation without loss of personal liberty.

It must be clearly understood that the United States has a great stake in the political path which the subcontinent selects to reach its economic aims. The Communist colossus to the north is bearing down with constant and increasing pressure of propaganda upon these new democracies. Its radios, its newspapers, its agents repeat the well-known Communist phrases of utopian promises and suggest that the economic ills of India and Pakistan can be solved only if these countries follow the methods which Soviet Russia and Communist China have used to attain their self-styled wondrous economies.

Time is of essence. The impatient and hungry millions of the subcontinent will not wait generations to reap the benefits of modern economic development. They want a higher standard of living and they want it soon. The present governments are committed to achieving perceptible results within the next 4½ years. But if the large Communist vote in south India during the recent election is any indication of a desire on the part of the people to achieve quick results, the achievements in the economic field in the next 4½ years by the incumbent democratic government in India may spell victory or defeat for the democratic forms in that great country. And if India falls, others will follow in her wake.

It is this urgency of time that has spurred the Governments of India and Pakistan to great efforts to achieve substantial results in the next 4½ years. It is this need for quick results which has guided United States planners in their program presentation to the Congress.

Let us consider these facts:

1. Every United States dollar contributed to India and Pakistan for economic development will be used for specific projects mutually agreed upon between the United States and the receiving country, and will be matched by the country concerned with local currency and in some instances with four to five times the dollar equivalent of the United States contribution.

The United States contribution is but a small fraction of what the countries themselves are spending for economic development. India, for example, intends to spend close to $5 billions during a 6-year period while Pakistan plans to expend about $800 millions over a similar period. Specifically, India intends to spend about $700 millions in 1952 fiscal year and plans to spend over $800 millions in 1952–53. Pakistan will have spent over $300 millions for development during its fiscal year ending in March 1952 and plans to expend about $330 millions during its 1952–53 fiscal year.

2. The standard of living in these countries is low by any standard; per capita real income in Pakistan is about $50 per year and $60 in India. Compare this with the average income in the more developed areas of the world of $690 per person per year.

3. The most outstanding differences in the standard of living between India and Pakistan and other more developed countries is in food consumption. India affords its people on the average of 1,650 calories per person per day while the Pakistan figure is 2,030 calories. The more developed regions on the other hand, supply their people with an average of 2,750 calories. It might be noted that the Food and Agriculture Organization estimates the minimum daily caloric requirement in tropical South Asia as 2,200 calories per person.

4. One of the reasons for the low supply of food is the very low crop yields in these countries. Indian farmers, for example, produce on the average 10 bushels of wheat per acre and 22 bushels of rice per acre. In Pakistan these yields are a little higher, being 14 and 23, respectively. Compare these yields with the average in the more developed countries: 26 bushels of wheat per acre and 69 bushels of rice—a difference of 2 to 1 in wheat and 3 to 1 in rice.

5. Pakistan and India are well aware of the urgent need for increased food production and have built up their development plans to achieve such increases. India, for example, expects to achieve an annual increase in cereals of over 7,000,000 tons within a period of 6 years. But this is a minimum goal and will only satisfy the increase in the population over the period without any increase in the presently abnormally low food intake.

6. The United States aid program is aimed at increasing food production in India and Pakistan above that planned by the countries and within the framework of their present programs but it must be realized that even the United States program is a minimum. Additional expenditures can produce greater quantites of food and permit a very small but very necessary increase in per capita food intake.

7. The United States program is designed to achieve increases in food production through a joint effort of the United States and the governments concerned. In India, for example, this will be done through the Indo-American technical cooperation fund, into which the United States and India deposit the dollars and the rupees which will be needed to go ahead with development projects mutually agreed upon. In the fiscal year ending June 1952, the United States will have deposited $50,000,000 in the Indo-American fund while India will have contributed local currency equivalent to about $88,000,000.

The United States program is based primarily on the organization and operation of community-development areas. In India, each of these projects will encompass about 300 villages each with a total area of about 500 square miles, cultivated area of about 150,000 acres and a population of about 200,000. Fifty-five of these projects are scheduled to be organized this fiscal year and will benefit directly about 11,000,000 people in India. The program for fiscal year 1953 includes an additional number of similar projects. It is hoped that over a 4-year period, 600 of these areas could be established all over India and thus benefit a third of the total population.

The community-development program is an integrated program bringing irrigation, fertilizer, modern agricultural extension techniques, public-health measures, production and distribution of better farm implements, and some basic education facilities into the project area. Working directly with the people, Indian and American technicians will have a unique opportunity to show the people convincingly that the democratic form of government is the best system for helping them solve their age-old problems. These projects will be based on the experience already gained in the Etawah region of India during the last 3 years. The Etawah project has conclusively demonstrated the effectiveness of the integrated approach in village development and has shown that with proper organization, adequate supplies and equipment, and normal cooperation from the villagers, a 46–50-percent increase in food production may be expected over a period of 4 years. No increase in agricultural production is expected in the first year of a village-development project, although the effects of the production drive would begin to make themselves felt before the end of the first year and, of course, the psychological and spiritual effect would be enormous. In the second year of operation, a 10-percent rise in agricultural production can be expected; in the third year a 20-percent rise; and in the fourth year, when green manuring and extension techniques really take effect, a 50-percent rise can be anticipated.

8. India produces on the average about 46,000,000 tons of food grains per year. The needs of the Indian people are greater than domestic production, however, and India has to import over 3,000,000 tons of food grains annually in order to insure even the very low availability of 13.67 ounces per day per adult. This represents a drain on her foreign-exchange availabilities of about $520,000,000 per year. India's 6-year plan calls for a continued import of 3,000,000 tons of food grains per year, plus an increase in domestic food production of 7,200,000 tons annually. This 1956 total food-grain availability of over 56,000,000 tons will permit an increase of food grains per adult—allowing for the increase in population—from 13.67 to 14.8 ounces per day, bringing it close to but still below the prewar figure of about 16 ounces per adult per day. The successful operation of 600 community development projects under Indo-American technical cooperation should add to the food-grain availabilities another four to five million tons per year, making it possible to attain prewar levels of adult consumption. It is pointed

out that even the prewar average was one-third below the average consumption in the more developed areas of the world.

9. The cut in the India program resulting from the passage of the amendment would mean a disastrous reduction in the community development effort, and would greatly reduce the effectiveness of this program, important to both India and the rest of the free world.

The Congress has already drastically reduced the point 4 program for south and southeast Asia from the $176,000,000 originally requested as a minimum by the administration to $118,000,000. This reduction will in itself cripple the program; but to cut the program still further, as is done in this appropriation bill, threatens its complete emasculation. If our aims of peace and security in this vital area of the world are to be achieved, this sum must be restored by a further appropriation as early as possible.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 17, at the end of line 12, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, may be used, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to start new construction projects directly and primarily related to thermonuclear matter."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, in the regular independent offices appropriation bill there is a rider which states that the Atomic Energy Commission cannot start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year. By a long-standing precedent, this same rider applies to the supplemental appropriations bill. Therefore, the Commission cannot start any new project not set forth in the budget justification.

In general, and for the most part, I approve this provision. We have been in the atomic business long enough so that the Commission can plan ahead in its budget and in general principle I like the rider.

However, there is one new field where the technology is still new, still changing rapidly. In some respects it is unpredictable. I am referring to matters connected with the hydrogen bomb. I feel, and I suggest to the Senate that as regards these matters, and these matters only, that the rider be made inapplicable.

I have an amendment to the bill before us which would accomplish this purpose. I have in mind specific steps that might be taken under my amendment. These steps, I think, are of highest importance. They would not involve large sums of money relative to the appropriation as a whole. I am not at liberty to say anything more, but I do suggest that in this one area—in the area of the hydrogen program—for the sake of national defense, we should permit the Commission to start new construction projects which might not have been mentioned in the budget.

Members of the Appropriations Committee will remember that this subject was discussed at the time of the hearing with respect to the Atomic Energy Commission. It was my impression that it was the opinion of members of the Commission that this amendment was desirable. It was not in the bill as reported. It should be in the bill, for the sake of this program, which is a highly technical program. Much of the information which might be available is highly classified. I am confident that this amendment meets with the entire approval of the joint committee. There are one or two other members of the committee present. I believe they feel that this amendment is necessary. I think the Commission has been doing a grand job. The program is moving along; but in this one field, which has not yet developed entirely, a very technical and a very important field in our national defense, I suggest that the Senate ought to incorporate the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have no objection to taking the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], to the committee amendment on page 17, line 12.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 17, to insert:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Federal Trade Commission," $125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator—Defense housing," on page 19, line 3, after the word "project.", to strike out:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has recognized local liability to reimburse the Federal Government for funds, if any, advanced on such project prior to such cancellations.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, after line 8, to insert:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art," $187,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 21, line 16, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$85,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 17, after the word "expended", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the limitation on travel expenses in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, is hereby increased from $1,546,650 to $1,750,000,"

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "War Claims Commission—Administrative expenses," on page 22, line 4, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the heading, on page 22, line 15, to change the chapter number from "VIII" to "IX."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Defense—Title I—Military public works," on page 22, after line 17, to insert:

OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the act of ——— —, ——, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 23, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Army, as authorized by the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong., and the act of ———, 1952 (Public Law H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $5,000,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; $600,000,000; to remain available until expended. Of total amount appropriated in this paragraph, $1,980,000 shall be allocated for Camp Crowder, Mo.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, after line 16, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PUBLIC WORKS

For construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of June 16, 1948 (62 Stat. 459), the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.),

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

and the act of ———, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), seal coating for airfield pavements at Naval Station, Adak, Alaska; including not to exceed $2,500,000 for advance planning as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; $210,000 for the acquisition of facilities as authorized by said act of September 11, 1950; furniture for public quarters; personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; and engineering and architectural services as authorized by section 3 of the act of April 25, 1939 (34 U. S. C. 556); $386,409,840, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, after line 15, to strike out:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force, as authorized by the act of March 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 17), the act of October 27, 1949 (63 Stat. 936), as amended, the act of June 17, 1950 (Public Law 564, 81st Cong.), the act of January 6, 1951 (Public Law 910, 81st Cong.), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155, 82d Cong.), and the act of ———, 1952 (Public Law —, H. R. 8120, 82d Cong.), without regard to sections 1106 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction may be prosecuted thereon prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; not to exceed $52,620,000 for planning (including advance planning, master planning, and investigational engineering) as authorized by section 504 of said act of September 28, 1951; and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $1,200,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be expended for actual construction of facilities or structures at Grandview Air Terminal, Mo., until the city of Kansas City, Mo., has conveyed to the United States Government the fee simple title to all lands required for the base or has given the United States Government at least a 25-year lease to such land on a nominal rental basis.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 802. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 3, to strike out:

SEC. 803. None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Defense, or his designee for the purpose, shall establish a reasonable completion date for each project, taking into consideration the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 11, to strike out:

SEC. 804. No part of the funds made available by this or any other act of the present Congress shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 19, to strike out:

SEC. 805. No part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to expand the facilities of the Department of the Air Force to establish or maintain a separate system for providing such supplies and services as were furnished to the Department of the Air Force by the Department of the Army prior to August 1, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 1, to change the section number from "806" to "802."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to recur to the committee amendment on page 23, after line 16, relating to the Department of the Navy. Certain language was stricken out. I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment which, of course, would be stricken out along with the remainder of the section, but it would have the effect of putting this particular item in conference. Otherwise it would not be in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment beginning on page 23, after line 16, was agreed to, is reconsidered.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 24, line 15, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike the period at the end of the line, insert a semicolon, and add the following language:

Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga., rehabilitation of existing facilities and new construction, $2,030,000.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say that the amendment is in line with the option to purchase from the University of Georgia. The property has been approved by the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses, and an authorization to purchase under the lease and purchase agreement has today been inserted in the bill. The exact number of the bill I do not recall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Georgia that to add the suggested language to the language stricken out and then to strike it all out would not take the matter to conference. The suggestion is that the Senator offer the amendment as a separate paragraph to be inserted.

Mr. GEORGE. I offer the amendment as a separate subparagraph, following line 15 on page 24 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of the Army—Alaska Communication System—Construction," on page 27, line 21, after the word "contingencies", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the funds herein made available shall be available for painting the exterior of the Jesse Lee Children's Home at Seward, Alaska."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 28, to insert:

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Army—Civil functions

Corps of Engineers

Rivers and harbors

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for "Rivers and harbors", including the objects specified under this head in the "Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953", $5,000, to remain available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 9, to insert:

FLOOD CONTROL

Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than $450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District No. 1, Mountrail County, N. Dak., wherein such new combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 3, to change the chapter number from "IX" to "XI."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Mutual Security—Title I—Department of Defense—Government and relief in occupied areas," on page 29, line 20, after the word "individuals", to insert "not to exceed 10 in number."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General provisions," on page 44, line 9, after the word "herein", to insert "including not to exceed $186,900 for salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 22, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation made by this chapter for any purpose shall be used for the payment of personal services in excess of an amount equal to 85 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for

the payment of personal services for any purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 15 percent of the amount requested in such budget estimates for personal services for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

(b) This section shall not apply to—

(1) not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

(2) positions filled from within the Mutual Security Agency and related Government functions provided for in this act;

(3) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate:

Provided further, That subsection (1) of paragraph (b) shall operate to accomplish the provisions of paragraph (a), and the said 85 percent shall not be exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953: *And provided further,* That each agency shall impound and deposit in the general fund of the Treasury as soon as practicable, but not less frequently than quarterly, an amount equivalent to the savings resulting from the vacant positions which are prohibited from being filled by this section, based on the salaries of the prior incumbents of the positions.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said:

Mr. President, I have a statement in reference to some aspects of the supplemental appropriation bill which we have passed this evening. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD, at the point where the appropriations for the Mutual Security portion of the supplemental appropriation bill were being discussed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

CERTAIN FACTS RELATING TO THE REDUCTIONS IN THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE POINT 4 PROGRAM FOR FISCAL YEAR 1953 IN SOUTH AND SOUTHEASTERN ASIA

Certain hard facts regarding the situation and United States interests in South and Southeast Asia must be given great weight in considering whether the drastic House cut in appropriations available for our point 4 program in the area should be allowed to stand. Most of these countries are newly independent. The people of all these countries look to their present governments for economic progress. India serves as a prime example of the issues that face us and is a particularly appropriate example because the bulk of the proposed point 4 program in the area is planned for India. In terms of appropriations, the House cut would strike at the heart of the Indian and Pakistan programs for fiscal year 1953. We must consider the following facts:

1. Political situation in India: India has a free and democratic government. Its constitution is modeled on our own. The people demand economic improvement from their present government. In the elections held the early part of this year, the Communist Party of India won 27 of 496 seats in the Central Parliament while getting 5 percent of the total vote. The Congress Party, now in power, still retains control of the parliament and received 44 percent of the popular vote in the recent elections. The Communists were most successful in elections for the state assemblies of Madras, Travencore-Cochin, West Bengal and Hyderabad. In the Travencore Cochin State Assembly, the Communists got 32 seats to 44 for the Congress Party. The present Government of India and the entire free world was put on notice by the successes of the Communists in India who have greatly improved their position for propagandizing their program and for exploiting the people's hunger and poverty. Under the Indian constitution, elections must take place within the next 4½ years. There must be perceptible improvement in India before the next election if the democratic government is to remain in power.

2. Need for economic progress: The great problem throughout the area is food and food production. The people of India average about 1,700 calories per person per day, and the people of Pakistan but slightly more. In both countries the average daily caloric intake is well below the estimated daily caloric requirement of 2,200 calories in tropical South Asia, and greatly in contrast with the average of 2,750 calories in the more developed regions of the world. A further index of low economic levels is the present per capita national income of about $55 in India and Pakistan as compared with $690 per person in more developed areas of the world and $2,000 per person in the United States.

3. The country's own effort: The countries of South Asia have plans for the minimum essential economic development in their countries. The programs of both India and Pakistan represent a tremendous effort on the part of those countries and their peoples. India plans to spend on economic development nearly $5,000,000,000 over a 6-year period and Pakistan plans to spend about $800,000,000 in the same period. Plans of both countries are directed toward benefiting the people and put great emphasis on the problem of increased agricultural productivity. India plans to increase grain production by 7,200,000 tons by 1956–57. This would permit an increased availability of food grains per adult from 13.7 to 14.8 ounces per day, a figure still below the prewar figure of about 16 ounces per adult per day.

4. The point 4 program: The bulk of the point 4 program in India goes directly to the food problem through community development. Each community would contain about 300 villages, with a population of about 200,000. Fifty-five of these community projects are being organized now in India. This type of community program not only gets to the heart of the food problem but, as explained in the presentation of the fiscal year 1953 program to the Congress, demonstrates the real interrelationship of material benefits and democracy through democratic organization. The curtailment of this very real and practical approach with United States aid in India would directly counter our aims in helping the free people of India and would run directly counter to our oft-expressed views on the importance of Asia.

5. Cut in the program: The program originally presented for point 4 in these areas was $176,000,000. The authorising legislation reduced this amount drastically to the level of $118,000,000. A further cut as proposed would undercut and invalidate completely all previous expressions of intent in Asia. This is not in the interest of the United States. If a further cut is permitted, the program for India in fiscal year 1953 would be even less than that put forth in fiscal 1952.

6. Importance to the United States: The population of south Asia is approximately one-sixth of the world's population; 365,000,000 of these people live in India. South Asia is a key area in Asia and in the lands on the periphery of the area dominated by the Communists. Its importance to us in the struggle against Communist aggression is immeasurable. Its vital moral contribution to the free world is supplemented by its material contribution. Thirty-two percent of the United States manganese imports in 1951 came from India; 80 percent of our mica came from India, and 53 percent of our kyanite—to cite a few examples of United States material interest in south Asia.

The Communist Party in India is making great use of its newly achieved position in certain areas. It alleges lack of progress in the government of India's economic development program and ineffectiveness in the United States program of economic assistance. The Government of India is friendly to the United States and it is in our interests to aid them in their struggle for economic betterment. It is also in our interests to show real benefits to counter the claims of the Communist Party in India which is so firmly opposed by a government friendly to us. Our program for India in fiscal year 1953 cannot be cut further without harm to the interests of the United States now and in the near future before the next elections in India.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE V, SEC. 10 (A), MUTUAL SECURITY ACT)

If I have ever seen a case of a man stooping to pick up a penny while his billfold of real money falls from his pocket unnoticed—it is this proposed cut of over 40 percent in the amount requested for our contribution to the United Nations technical assistance program and a similar program of the Organization of American States. The reduction from $15,708,750 to $9,171,333 is indefensible.

Here we are pouring out billions of dollars not only for our own necessary defense program and that of the free world, but billions of dollars to give that free world the economic strength it will need to carry its share of the defense program—all of this with the United States standing 100 percent of the cost—and we cut to the bone a small multilateral-assistance program where we get other countries to relieve us of all but 60 percent of the cost. If that is economy I do not know the meaning of the word.

To date, this Government has strongly supported the technical-assistance program of the United Nations. We contributed approximately $12,000,000 to its first program year of 18 months ending December 31, 1951, and other governments went on the line for approximately $8,000,000 in order that there could be a total program of a little over $20,000,000. This calendar year, we are putting up $11,400,000 and other countries are putting up approximately $7,600,000 in order that there can be a total program, for the 12 months, of about $19,000,000. For the calendar-year 1953 program, which will be supported by the voluntary pledges of governments during this next General Assembly, we have authorized a contribution of $14,708,750. If that amount of money is available for our contribution to the United Nations program (reserving $1,000,000 for the Organization of American States program) then other governments should be willing to put up approximately $9,800,000, making it possible to have a total program of about $24,500,000.

Now it makes sense to me for the United States to put up $14,708,750 in order that there can be a total United Nations program of about $24,000,000. This United Nations program is bringing the same sort of benefits to the underdeveloped countries which our own bilateral program is bringing to them. As a matter of fact, the United Nations program is able to operate more effectively under the political circumstances prevailing in certain countries than our own bilateral program. The two programs work hand in glove, in fact so much so that the Communists try to propagandize the underdeveloped countries against the United Nations program on the grounds that it is just a concealed United States program.

I hope the Senate will stop a minute and think about the significance of our having been able to get other countries, who usually only receive aid, to bear 40 percent of the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

cost of this program. Instead of trying to get them to take part of the 60 percent cost we are now bearing, our objective, if we are really economy-minded, should be to get them to join us in supporting an increasingly large United Nations program. If the amount of only $9,171,333 is appropriated, and if $1,000,000 is again contributed to the program of the Organization of American States—and that is certainly not much for this program—only $8,171,333 would remain for our contribution to the United Nations program, instead of the $14,708,750. The result will not be that other countries make up the difference, so that there would still be a United Nations program of about $24,000,000. The result would be that other countries would reduce their contributions in line with our reduction, so that their contributions would only total about $5,000,000 and the total program would fall from its present level of about $19,000,000 to about $813,000,000. This would not only cut the heart out of the United Nations program, but it would mean that the pressures would be increased on our own bilateral program so that at some time and in some manner we would find ourselves putting up this difference through our own program of direct country assistance in which we would pay 100 percent of the cost.

I hope the Senate will vote the amount of $15,708,750 out of urgent considerations of sensibility and economy.

MULTILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (TITLE V, SEC. 10 (A), MUTUAL SECURITY ACT)

It is essential that the full amount authorized, $15,708,750, be appropriated for contribution to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance and the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States.

Legislative history

Authorization:	
Requested	$17,000,000
Senate allowed	14,417,000
House allowed	17,000,000
Authorized	15,708,750
Appropriation:	
Requested	15,708,750
House committee recommended	15,708,750
Cut on House floor to	9,171,333

Situation

Of the $15,708,750 authorized and requested for appropriation, it is planned that $1,000,000 would be used as a contribution to the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States, which would permit the United States to pledge the same amount to the calendar 1953 program as it has pledged to the calendar 1951 and 1952 programs. (As the United States maintains its contribution at not more than 70 percent of total pledges, its actual contribution for 1951 is $895,000 and for 1952 will be between this amount and $1,000,000.)

The remaining $14,708,750 is requested for the United States contribution to the United Nations Expanded Program of Technical Assistance. From our fiscal year 1951 funds, we have contributed $12,007,500 to a total United Nations program of $20,070,260 for the 18-month period beginning July 1, 1950 and ending December 31, 1951 (a United States contribution of 59.83 percent). From fiscal year 1952 funds, we are contributing $11,400,000 (of $12,000,000 appropriated) to a United Nations calendar year 1952 program of $18,956,499 (a United States contribution of 60.14 percent as of the present date). Since the United Nations second program year is 12 months as compared with 18 months, the 1952 program of approximately $19,000,000 represents a program increase of almost 50 percent.

A contribution of $14,708,750, with the United States at approximately 60 percent, would support a total United Nations program of approximately $24,514,000. This would represent a reasonable rate of increase for the United Nations program, although not as great as represented by the $27,000,000 program which would have been possible if the amount requested to be authorized had been granted. Although modest in terms of our own bilateral program of technical assistance cooperation, the program of the United Nations and its specialized agencies is achieving concrete results in bringing technical aid to 55 countries with funds contributed by 63 countries. In addition the receiving countries themselves contribute locally to individual projects on the average an amount equal in value to the assistance received through the program.

For the United States, the United Nations program is an economical program. We are achieving the same things we attempt to achieve through our bilateral program with the other countries bearing 40 percent of the cost. The United Nations program represents an encouraging and significant step forward in inducing the governments of the free world, as a whole, to join together in rendering to each other the sort of assistance which otherwise would fall almost exclusively on United States resources. Further, it is possible through the United Nations program to achieve results which cannot always be achieved through our bilateral program due to the greater receptiveness of countries that must be strengthened to multilateral assistance under certain political circumstances.

The United Nations program is economical to the United States not only in terms of dollars, but in terms of personnel. Of the 1,024 experts recruited by the United Nations program by the end of March 1952, only about 27 percent have come from the United States. We are thereby able to conserve expert manpower frequently in very short supply, as in the case of medical personnel and sanitary engineers. Under the United Nations program, it is possible for the under-developed countries themselves to make a very special contribution, in the way of staff, to other under-developed countries.

If the amount of $15,708,750 is appropriated, the United States representatives to the United Nations General Assembly this fall will be able to demonstrate continued strong United States support for this multilateral program. If the amount of $9,171,333 allowed by the House is appropriated, the offering of this amount, following upon much more substantial contributions for the 2 preceding years, will be understood to mean a withholding of full United States support and will be capitalized on by the Soviets, who are not participating in the program, as a demonstration that the United States is only interested in extending assistance where it can exercise direct control through the bilateral relationship.

House action

It is understood that the cut to $9,171,333 on the floor was offered on the following fallacious thesis:

(a) It is United States policy to pay no more than one-third to United Nations programs.

(b) In calculating the total to which one-third applies, no account should be taken of the local contributions of countries receiving aid.

(c) One million dollars should be reserved for the OAS program. Since the Department contemplated a total United Nations program of $24,514,000 (exclusive of local contributions), the amount of $8,171,333 should be appropriated as representing one-third of that total.

Comment

The United States goal of one-third is relevant only to the United States contribution to the regular budgets of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Support for these budgets is compulsory on all members and the member contribution is a reflection of its status as a sovereign and equal member. It is to be assumed that all countries have a basic interest in the success of the regular program of the United Nations, and, therefore, the proportion of support should be leveled out. The special voluntary programs, like that of assistance to Palestine refugees (UNRWA) and technical assistance, are quite different and have been so recognized from the outset. Senator Vandenberg, in launching the United States drive toward a goal of one-third of the regular budget, made this quite clear as the United States delegation spokesman in the United Nations. The voluntary programs are supported by various countries in accordance with their own estimate of their interest and the ability to participate. The United Nations Technical Assistance Program is not supported by certain United Nations members, most significantly those of the Soviet bloc, and is supported by others who are not members, such as Switzerland and Cambodia. It has been very much to the credit of the United States that it has been prepared to support the United Nations program while being one of the few countries capable of carrying on such a program by itself alone. At the same time, it is recognized by all that 60-percent support on our part is most comparable to 100-percent support for technical assistance through bilateral channels, and is not to be compared with our contribution to the regular budget of the United Nations which now stands at 36.90 percent and is in the process of reduction to 33⅓ percent.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 6, to change the chapter number from "X" to "XII."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I inquire as to the last committee amendment that has been stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The last committee amendment stated was on page 46, line 6.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will an opportunity be given to offer amendments to the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not to the text of the bill at this time. Such amendments will be in order after the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have an amendment which I should like to offer on page 44, beginning in line 14.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order at this time. It will be in order when the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Emergency agencies—Executive Office of the President—Office of Defense Mobilization," on page 46, line 21, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent offices—Defense Production Administration," on page 47, line 9, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Small Defense Plants Administration—Salaries and expenses," on

page 48, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Revolving funds," on page 48, line 15, after the word "amended", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 49, line 18, after the word "services", to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$32,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 50, line 4, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and expenses, defense production activities," on page 50, line 22, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Economic Stabilization Agency—Salaries and expenses," on page 51, line 12, after the numerals "1953", to strike out "$57,130,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the committee amendment. We have just passed the Defense Production Act in which we have limited the authority of the price-stabilization agency. We have directed the Office of Price Stabilization to decontrol as rapidly as possible. We have provided that reports shall not be made by those who are selling under ceiling prices, and that includes the great majority of the business houses of the country at the present time.

By the committee amendment we would be increasing the amount allowed by the House, $57,130,000, to $75,000,000. There is more Government time wasted by the employees of OPS than by any other department or agency of the Government. Not only do they waste their own time but they waste the time of businessmen by interfering with the regular conduct of their business in prowling around their books and requiring them to file unneeded reports, which are never looked at but merely filed for future reference and possible future political advantage. There is no need to increase the amount of money, when the Congress has ordered them to decontrol in certain fields and has almost completely nullified requirements for the making of reports and returns.

They have a payroll now of $2,500,000 in my State of Ohio. I say very frankly that I believe if every one of the employees of OPS were to go into some honest and constructive type of work their contribution to the economy of the country would be far greater than what is gained from the many orders, releases, decrees, and manifestos which they issue. Many of them come out so fast that it is impossible to read all of them. Certainly it is impossible to catalog all of them. No one can understand them. They have been written by men who were clearly educated beyond their intelligence. They have had no experience in business. Their work is an interference with and an encumbrance upon the legitimate business of the country. I can see no excuse for giving them $57,000,000, much less for increasing the amount to $75,000,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Ohio in seriously questioning the advisability of increasing the appropriation. By that I do not mean to infer that the members of the Committee on Appropriations have not had all of the facts and circumstances presented to them. I recall well the session last night, and I see on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas, for whom I have great affection, that the amount recommended is a reduction from $112,000,000, which was requested. Last night in the meeting of the Appropriations Committee it was decided by a very substantial majority vote to recommend $75,000,000. We all know that it is a compromise. I know the law as well as my distinguished friend from Kansas and my distinguished friend from Ohio, whose amendment with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission I just supported. This is liquidation language, and the amount must be provided if we are to carry out the law we have passed.

Last night during the long session of the committee meeting, it was felt that we should recommend $75,000,000 and let the matter go to conference. I know that the law does not require the filing of reports by businessmen who sell below ceiling prices.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the committee well recalls that during the months when we held hearings, we repeatedly heard representatives of the agency involved say that they could make cuts here and make cuts there. Perhaps this figure represents a cut. If it is, I fail to see it. In all sense of propriety and fairness, we cannot permit such a large increase, particularly when the agency is leveling off and when many reports are dispensed with. Certainly that situation should be reflected in the amount of money we appropriate to the agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say that I am sorry the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana is not in the Chamber, because he voted against the control law. Nevertheless, in committee those who had voted against the control law thought that, since the law had been passed, in justice to the agency, whose appropriation had been reduced from $112,000,000, the committee should recommend the amount stated in the amendment.

I come from a State, as does the Senator from Kansas, where we are not concerned with controls. I was thinking about the large communities for which the law was passed primarily.

The Defense Production Act was passed, and the House appropriated money to carry out the law that was passed, and the House report will show that the Representatives who voted against the amendment made the motion.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true, also, that at the time when the House passed this bill and voted for $57,130,000 for this item, the House had just passed a bill which practically emasculated the controls?

In other words, the action the House took in connection with this item of this bill was in keeping with the action taken by the House in passing the other bill; and after this amount was voted by the House of Representatives, the other bill went to conference, and the conferees worked out a measure which eliminated much of the emasculation provided for by that bill as it had been passed by the House. Is not that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

Mr. HILL. In other words, today the situation, insofar as the House, the Senate, and the country as a whole are concerned, is entirely different from the situation which existed at the time when the House voted for the amount of $57,130,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding. The Senator from Tennessee will recall—if I am in error, I hope I may be corrected—that those who voted against this item, as adopted by the House, suggested that since the other bill had been passed, the amount of $75,000,000 should be provided in this item, as opposed to the amount of $57,000,000, which had been voted by the House of Representatives. The larger amount was suggested in this case. After the larger amount is voted, this matter will go to conference.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield further to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is not now on the floor, but at any rate I believe I am correct when I state that he said he voted against the controls, but that since Congress had taken action in favor of such controls, the bill should provide sufficient appropriations for them.

Mr. MAYBANK. After all, there are 155,000,000 people in the United States, and there is much to be done for them. That is all I have to say.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that a study of the figures involved in this matter will show that the President's budget estimate was $53,200,000. The House figure was $57,130,000.

The employment as of June 30, 1952, was 17,049.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The amount of employment as estimated under the President's budget was 15,762.

The number supportable under the provisions voted by the House of Representatives was 7,753.

The agency's request of the Senate Appropriations Committee was for $93,069,000, which would furnish employment for 15,137 persons, or somewhat more than 600 less than the number who would be provided employment under the President's original budget estimate.

I felt this was a larger increase than should be granted.

However, as has been said here on the floor, the matter is going to conference.

I quite agree with the Senator from Ohio that the agency itself should be prepared to reduce its force far more rapidly than apparently it was planning to do.

But I believe that when this matter goes to conference and when a compromise is reached between the amount voted by the Senate and the amount voted by the House of Representatives, this agency will of necessity have to reduce its force a little more rapidly than it is doing now.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from California.

Mr. President, a moment ago I said the figure was $112,000,000. At that time I did not have the figures before me. The correct figure is $102,000,000.

I voted for this amount only for the reason that this item is to go to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, in line 12. (Putting the question.)

The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. BRICKER and other Senators asked for a division.

On a division, the committee amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 51, in line 18, after the word "requires", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and"

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken,".

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee the meaning of this provision. It is legislation in an appropriation bill, and it is an amendment to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be only too glad to give an explanation.

I shall charge the fault to the Banking and Currency Committee, because the distinguished Senator from Ohio was in the conference; and when we wrote the rent act and when we agreed in conference to the September 30 date, it was understood by me, as chairman, that in towns which were unincorporated, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn., about which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had asked me, and in towns about which both the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] had asked me, we should provide the same opportunity for those towns to decontrol themselves by public vote as we provided in the case of incorporated towns.

Mr. BRICKER. I understand that there is to be no change in the law itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is to be no change at all in the law itself. This committee amendment is submitted simply in order to include provision for the unincorporated towns, such as Oak Ridge, Tenn.

Mr. BRICKER. Very well, Mr. President; I am satisfied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, beginning in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Services Administration," on page 52, line 17, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations," on page 53, line 15, after the word "conclusive", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000, of which $4,000,000 is for warehousing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal contributions," on page 53, line 21, after the word "funds", to strike out "$29,500,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, after line 21, to insert:

EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

For procurement of reserve stocks of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, $50,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 6, to change the chapter number from "XI" to "XIII."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Claims, audited claims, and judgments," on page 54, line 14, after the word "Senate", to strike out "Document Numbered 144" and insert "Documents Numbered 154 and 157"; and in line 16, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$6,489,954" and insert "$1,121,563."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 5, to change the chapter number from "XII" to "XIV."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions—Departments, agencies, and corporations," on page 55, line 7, to change the section number from "1201" to "1401"; in line 12, after the word "at", to strike out "1,400" and insert "$1,600", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "notwithstanding the provisions of section 405 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment, was on page 55, line 15, to change the section number from "1202" to "1402."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 18, to change the section number from "1203" to "1403."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 8, to change the section number from "1204" to "1404."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, from what page of the bill is the clerk reading the committee amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. From page 57, in line 8, where the committee amendment calls for the change of a section number.

Mr. THYE. Have we passed beyond the committee amendment on page 54?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. COOPER was talking to me about a letter which came from the Comptroller General, a letter relating to the amendment on page 54. I am very sorry that I was not aware that that amendment had been reached.

Therefore, Mr. President, I must ask that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16, was agreed to, be reconsidered. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not believe the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16, should be agreed to, for it is my understanding that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], has received a letter from the Office of the Comptroller General, and has also received a letter from the Department of Justice—has he not—relating to the question that is involved in this amendment.

I have before me a copy of the letter from the Office of the Comptroller General.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand the statement the Senator from Minnesota made.

Mr. THYE. I have said that I have before me a copy of a letter from the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States. The letter is addressed to the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. The letter relates to the item which is involved in the committee amendment on page 54, in line 16.

As I understand, the communications which have been received on this question would completely clarify the question, and I understand that the committee amendment should be rejected, and that the full amount of the item voted by the House of Representatives, namely, $6,489,954, is the amount which should be appropriated in order completely to settle these claims.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have the letter before me; it has just been handed to me at this time. It is dated July 3.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. The letter is from Mr. Yates, the acting Comptroller General.

Very frankly, I have not read the letter. If the Senator from Minnesota will read the letter, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, may the letter be read at the desk by the clerk?

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read by the clerk.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me, let me say that I think the Senator who last night raised some question in the committee about this matter, is now in the restaurant getting dinner. I have asked that he be sent for. In the event the letter is to be read before he returns to the Chamber, I would ask that this amendment be temporarily passed over, until he can return to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment on page 54, line 16, will be temporarily passed over.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 57, in line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 13, to change the selection number from "1205" to "1405."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 22, to change the section number from "1206" to "1406."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, in line 13, to change the section number from "1207" to "1407."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 20, to change the section number from "1208" to "1408."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 3, to change the section number from "1209" to "1409."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 14, to change the section number from "1210" to "1410."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 1211. During the current fiscal year, personnel and appropriations or funds available for salaries and expenses to any department, agency, or corporation in the executive branch of the Government, shall be transferred to any defense activity under the jurisdiction of such department or agency in such numbers or amounts as may be necessary for the discharge of responsibilities relating to the national defense assigned to such department, agency, or corporation by or pursuant to law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 6, to change the section number from "1212" to "1411."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 11, to change the section number from "1213" to "1412."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 4, to change the section number from "1214" to "1413."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 16, to change the section number from "1215" to "1414."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 1, to change the section number from "1216" to "1415."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments, except for those which have been passed over, the first of which is on page 5. That amendment will be stated at this time.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, after line 9, it is proposed to insert:

For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, $500,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to recur now to that committee amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, Mr. President. I am opposed to the amendment, for reasons which I have heretofore stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, after line 9, which was discussed at some length earlier in the evening.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, can the Senator from Arkansas advise the Senate whether there has been a vote in the House of Representatives on the question involved in this committee amendment?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I could not be accurate about it, but so far as I know there has not been.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the matter still under discussion in the House?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The matter is still under discussion. I may say to the Senator that I was advised that a filibuster was actually in process in the House to try to prevent the bill from coming up, until we took this action awhile ago, and that, when they received word of that, they took up the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why would it not be satisfactory to the Senator to attach his bill, S. 913, to an amendment to the committee amendment and put them both in the bill, leaving it to the conference to work out the matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That would be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be perfectly willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then, Mr. President, I offer for myself, and on behalf of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], as an amendment, Senate bill 913, which was passed by the Senate on April 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would not be in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I submit it would be in order unless objected to, or unless a point of order were made against it. In the absence of a point of order, I ask that the amendment be accepted. The chairman says he is willing to accept it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be perfectly willing to take it to conference. I think it should be taken to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would amend the appropriation item; would it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it would amend this particular provision for a particular purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator desire to have the entire amendment read?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, Senators are familiar with it. I suggest that it be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, offered by Mr. McCLELLAN for himself and on behalf of Mr. MOODY and Mr. FERGUSON, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"'SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the "joint committee") and to be composed of fourteen members as follows:

"'(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"'(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"'(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Ap-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

propriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than two weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"'(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"'(d) A majority of the Members of each House who are members of the joint committee shall together constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, but a lesser number, as determined by the joint committee, may constitute a subcommittee and be authorized to conduct hearings and make investigations. Any member of a subcommittee so designated shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of any hearing or investigation, but the concurrence of a majority of the members of such subcommittee shall be necessary before any report or findings may be submitted to the joint committee.

"'(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"'(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"'(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"'(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cut-backs in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"'(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"'(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"'(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"'(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"'(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"'(j) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"'(k) When used in this section, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"'(l) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

"SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the first regular session of the Eighty-third Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first five-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than five years.

"'(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"'(3) The Appropriations Committees of both Houses shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

"SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof.'"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a committee amendment which has not yet been disposed of, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 54, line 16, it is proposed to strike out "$6,489,954" and insert "$1,121,563."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not believe that that amendment should prevail. There is at the clerk's desk a letter which was received from the Comptroller General relative to the question of why the committee proposed this particular amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the letter may be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter has already been ordered read, but the reading of it was withheld on account of the absence of the Senator from Oregon. The clerk will read the letter.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 3, 1952.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate greatly the time and attention given our representatives to explain yesterday before your committee the background of the item in the current Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, to pay awards of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission as detailed in the Comptroller General's letter of June 30 to you.

Today we have had opportunity to review a copy of a letter of the Honorable Holmes Baldridge, Assistant Attorney General, addressed to you, which is very helpful in setting forth the steps taken by the Department in the settlement of the litigation before the Commission. The letter refers to the test case among this group of motor carriers, R-B Freight Lines, Inc., which was settled by the Commission on an extremely high rental rate figure for the trucks and other equipment. You will recall it was mentioned in our letter that on one of the cases court review had been sought. The Assistant Attorney General's letter explains that after the Supreme Court refused to grant a hearing on that case, the Department of Justice succeeded in negotiating a settlement in the remaining cases which obviously is considerably beneficial to the Government when compared with the Commission's award in the R-B case.

If, as I understand, the Attorney General in his experience was fully satisfied that none of the other cases would have succeeded in reaching the Supreme Court, I do not wish to leave the impression that the subsequent steps taken by the Department were necessarily criticizable. Confronted with a situation of a precedent award which became final on the Supreme Court's refusal to consider it, the Department may have felt itself required to reach the best bargain it could on the remaining group of about 100 carriers.

The fact remains that the Commission awarded damages upon the rental theory and even that, not upon the basis of the rental of a going business concern, but upon the separate rental of each item of equipment. I do not understand the Department's letter to agree that this theory is correct in law, nor have I yet been advised of a prior court decision supporting that theory in the special class of "taking" cases represented by these labor dispute seizures.

In summary, I believe the General Accounting Office was fully justified in the recommendation made to you yesterday at the hearing to the effect that the present payment of these claims be deferred until there is opportunity for further consideration of the merits of the rule of damages allowed, either by your committee, the Judiciary Committee, or by other appropriate tribunal, but it must not be overlooked, as explained to the committee yesterday, that interest continues to accrue on the claims until finally paid.

However, if the committee are of the opinion that the Congress, having established the Commission to decide these cases and having provided for the payment of their awards after the manner of Court of Claims judgments is legally required to recognize the settlements made after the Supreme Court refused certiorari in the test case, there would seem to be appropriate the inclusion of a notation in the committee's report to the effect that the payments are being made upon the basis of an award which is now res adjudicata, and are not to be regarded as evidence of concurrence by the Congress in the measure of damages followed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK L. YATES,
Acting Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not reject the committee amendment and accept $6,489,954 provided by the House.

On a number of claims in the Motor Carrier Seizure case, there was evidence before the committee yesterday indicating that the Comptroller General had reason to believe that the amount of damages awarded to the various carriers was excessive.

Mr. President, in regard to certain cases it was shown that, within a period of 15 months, while the seizure continued, possession was not taken, but there was merely a token seizure. The amount of payment decided to be made to the carrier within the period of 15 months was greater than the entire amount of the assets of the company. I talked with one of those who had charge of this investigation at the Comptroller General's Office.

I am of the opinion that we should not at this time decide to pay these claims, that the time for appeal under the statute creating this commission has not expired, and will not expire for a period of 30 days; that, if we pay these claims, that will end all the litigation, it will take away the right of appeal. I am of the opinion that we should have an investigation by the Judiciary Committee as to what took place in the allowance of these claims, and in connection with the measure of damages.

I hope, Mr. President, the Senate will sustain the committee in this matter and not take it out of the hands of the Congress or of the Attorney General by paying the claims and appropriating money for the purpose of paying these claims. Therefore, I ask the Senate to vote favorably on the committee amendment striking out the House figure and including, instead, the figure proposed by the Senate. Then we will have, at least, an opportunity to discuss it with the House. If we do not adopt the committee amendment, we shall have no discussion with the House. We will have to take their figures and the matter will not be in the conference.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the reason why I called to the attention of the Senate this committee amendment is because, from all the information and evidence which I have been privileged to study, this is a just and proper claim. The Government owes the money and it will pay interest on it if the claim is not allowed.

I invited attention to it for the sole purpose of having this discussion on the Senate floor, in order to support the conferees when they give further study to the question.

The letters received from the Department of Justice and the Comptroller General, while, in my opinion they have been of assistance, have not furnished all the information we should have. We have found that the Comptroller General's investigators did not know any facts about this case and that they contradicted themselves in the statement they made in their letter to us.

Mr. President, I do not expect to be a member of the conference committee myself, because I am a junior member of the Appropriations Committee, but I do say to the Members of the Senate who will serve as conferees that this is a legitimate claim, in my opinion. I know the companies which are involved. They are truck companies in Minnesota. I was Governor of Minnesota when their property was confiscated by the Government, and put under Government supervision. The Government will have to pay a large amount of interest if the claim is not settled.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in agreement with the position taken by the Senator from Minnesota on this question. I hope the Senate will concur in the recommendation of the committee to strike out the disputed figures and permit the matter to go to conference, so that the Senate conferees will have advantage of the information contained in a letter from the Assistant Attorney General which none of us, as I understand, has yet seen.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it came to my office, I have not been able to find it.

Mr. CORDON. No member of the committee has had an opportunity to look at the information contained in that letter, nor have we had an opportunity to study either the law or the record of the case, all of which must be gone into when it reaches the conference.

I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota, as one member of the conference, that I am certain the conference will go into the matter thoroughly and attempt to do justice.

Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the evening, when I was detained from the Senate, action was taken upon an amendment on page 54, in lines 14 and 15. In other words, the committee amendment was adopted rejecting a recommended appropriation of several million dollars for

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

claims which had been adjudicated by the Motor Carriers Claims Commission in favor of certain motor carriers whose lines had been taken over by the Government during the war.

Because of my absence there was not read into the RECORD at that time a letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Holmes Baldridge. I have no desire to reopen the matter, but I feel that the conferees ought to have before them the complete report.

I should say that when the Comptroller General appeared, through his representatives, before the committee with respect to this item for which there was a budget estimate, I called the Bureau of the Budget to find how the estimate had been reached, and learned that it had been regarded as based on adjudicated claims.

I then talked with the Department of Justice and received from that Department a letter which, in brief, shows that the Department had opposed the original law setting up the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, and that it had recommended a veto of the law. It had opposed the claims, and when one of the judgments was reached, the Department of Justice took an appeal to the Supreme Court, which declined to issue a writ. That became the final judgment, and thereafter the Department of Justice negotiated settlements with the claimants which were one-third below the amount for which the original decisions had been reached.

The RECORD seems to indicate that this is a res adjudicata matter, and the important fact is that interest is accumulating at the rate of 4 percent a year on these claims, amounting to approximately $300,000.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of Justice, together with the remarks I have just made, may be printed in the body of the RECORD in the proper place in connection with the discussion of the amendment on page 54, lines 14 and 15, so that the RECORD in connection with the subject may be in one spot.

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, this matter was called to my attention today and I was advised of the facts which are substantially as the Senator has stated them. The interest amounts to $700 a day.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the fact.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 3, 1952.

HON. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This letter is written in response to a request from Senator O'MAHONEY's office in reference to the disposition of certain claims pending before the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. I am advised that the Senate is presently considering a request to pay awards made by the Commission on some of these claims. The following is a brief history of these claims.

On August 11, 1944, the President issued Executive Order No. 9462, authorizing the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation to seize and operate 103 Midwest motor carrier transportation systems in order to avoid the crippling effects of a strike. The carriers had refused to grant certain wage increases recommended by the War Labor Board. The seizure was statutory. The Executive Order recited that the action was taken under the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645), the First War Powers Act, and section 9 of the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 859), as amended by the War Labor Disputes Act (57 Stat. 163).

These carriers were federally operated from August 1, 1944 to November 1, 1945.

By act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222), the Congress created the Motor Carrier Claims Commission to hear and determine the carriers' claims for just compensation arising from Government seizure and operation. The act restricted review of the Commission's determinations to certiorari to the Supreme Court.

The Department of Justice recommended against passage of this bill and testified against it. After passage the Department recommended veto of the bill.

The carriers filed claims with the Commission, which, with interest, totaled approximately $50,000,000.

The first case decided by the Commission involved the R–B Freight Lines, Inc. This case was selected as the test case since it involved a period when there was a technical taking only as well as a period when the Government took over the exclusive management and operation of the line. It was the unanimous decision of the Commission that there had been a taking under the fifth amendment for the entire period of the seizure for which the carrier was entitled to just compensation. The Commission fixed the amount of just compensation upon a rental theory which provided for payment of 7 cents per mile for over-the-road equipment, $1.11 per hour for pick-up trucks, and 10 percent per month of the value of office property and equipment.

Based upon the award in this case the total recovery of all the carriers, including interest, would have approximated $25,000,000. At this point petitioners for 91 of the carriers approached the Department of Justice for a settlement. The Department refused, first, because we hoped to defeat liability on Supreme Court review and second, failing that we hoped such review would result in a formula which would reduce substantially the amount of recovery. Accordingly, the Department filed a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court. The R–B Freight Lines, Inc., joined in this petition. The petition was denied on February 4, 1952 (342 U. S. 933).

Subsequently, 15 additional cases were decided by the Commission. A majority of the Commission awarded damages in these cases on a reduced rental formula which would result in recovery by the 91 carriers, with interest, of approximately $14,500,000. One Commissioner dissented. A majority of the Commission informed the Government that it saw no reason why it should depart from the rental formula adopted in these 15 cases, in deciding the remaining cases.

The 91 claimants, including the 15 whose claims had been decided, again approached the Government for a settlement, if they could secure prompt disposition.

After a series of negotiations the 91 claimants agreed to settle for 33⅓ percent less than the formula adopted by the Commission in the 15 cases mentioned above. Under this formula the ceiling on compensation, including interest, was not to exceed $8,800,000.

After completion of the audits this figure including interest, was reduced to approximately $7,500,000. Since this was $7,000,000 less than the over-all cost would have been had all the claims been formally processed through the Commission, the settlement was in the best interests of the Government and hence the Department agreed to such disposition of the claims.

Under its enabling act the Commission is required to certify to Congress each claim adjudicated or disposed of.

In summary, the Commission was established by the Congress to hear and adjudicate these claims. The Department of Justice opposed the passage of such legislation and recommended its veto after passage. The Supreme Court refused to review the test case on which the Department took an appeal. The offer in compromise saved the Government $7,000,000 that it would otherwise have had to pay under the formula consistently followed by the Commission, a formula which the Commission stated it saw no reason to depart from in disposing of the remaining claims on its docket.

Interest is accumulating at the rate of 4 percent per year on these claims. On the basis of settlement for $7,500,000, this amounts to $300,000 per year.

It is requested that this letter be made a part of the record in the Senate's consideration of Senate Document No. 144.

I will be glad to supply any additional details if you need them.

Sincerely yours,

HOLMES BALDRIDGE,
Assistant Attorney General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 44, before the period in line 22, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "but nothing in this proviso shall be construed to prevent the operation of export payment programs pursuant to section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (Public Law 320, 74th Cong.), as amended, or to prevent the sale at less than the support price, including handling and storage costs, of any commodity from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks which has substantially deteriorated in quality or as to which there is danger of loss or waste through deterioration or spoilage."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida explain what he thinks this amendment will accomplish?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to do so.

The bill contains a very worthy amendment placed in the House bill by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi. The purpose of his amendment was to prevent the use of section 32 funds in such a way as to allow the friendly governments operating under the Mutual Security Program to buy agricultural products from the Commodity Credit Corporation at less than the support price and then have the difference made up with section 32 funds.

I am thoroughly in accord with the purpose and the objective of the amendment. Unfortunately, the Whitten amendment goes further than that, and would operate to ban entirely the use of section 32 funds in the very field where they are most needed and for which they are preferred, under existing law, in the giving of help to agricultural products that do not have support prices, in the field of perishables,

particularly fruit, raisins, prunes, and products of that kind.

There are under way several export programs in which this is the theory: Private businesses are allowed to sell to foreign purchasers at what they can get in order to try to recreate foreign markets that were wiped out during World War II. Up to a certain point, out of section 32 funds, the Department of Agriculture will supplement the total price so as to bring it to the prevailing price here.

This year, up to the end of May, there had been a total of $13,400,000 so used: For citrus fruit, about $4,000,000; apples and pears, $2,500,000; prunes and raisins, $5 000,000; honey, $1,000,000.

The prices of none of those items are supported, except honey. The honey did not go through the Commodity Credit Corporation. In fact, none of these items have gone through the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Department of Agriculture under legislation which we passed is trying to get rid of the surplus production so it will not break down domestic prices.

Mr. CORDON. This language would carry out the main purpose desired in section 32?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct. Likewise, the purposes which I believe are the principal purposes of Representative WHITTEN are preserved, and it is particularly provided that the use of section 32 funds in connection with fruits and dried prunes and raisins, and the like, shall not be disturbed.

There is one other factor. When I took up the matter with the Department of Agriculture, my attention was called to the fact that they have been active in the disposal of damaged goods which had been acquired in the support-price program, which now they are handling, under existing law, by selling at a discount, in large measure to foreign nations, as they have recently sold out the large supply of powdered eggs. They have recently sold the last of them. So, my amendment provides that the Whitten amendment will be further amended, so as to make it continue to allow of the disposition of deteriorated goods acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the regular support-price program.

So my amendment covers those proposed two changes only, in the amendment of the able Representative from Mississippi.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the amendment of the Senator from Florida is necessary and desirable. As the Senator from Oregon has pointed out, it is basically in line with the section 32 funds, and is for the purpose of helping recreate the historic markets in those perishable crops which American agriculture has produced.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I, too, have that belief, or I would not have offered the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may return to the amendment on page 5, lines 10 through 14, so that I may ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, and that it may be rejected and go out of the bill, so that it will not be in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I move that the committee amendment on which I have asked for reconsideration be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has previously been agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for reconsideration of the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 5, lines 10 to 14, was agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no intention of objecting, but I should like to know the basis upon which the reconsideration of the amendment has been asked.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say, as the Senator probably knows, that I objected to the amendment earlier today, and it was passed over. Then I moved to include an amendment in the bill, and the motion was agreed to. Immediately the committee amendment was agreed to, but I did not hear the action by which it was agreed to.

I can show the Senate the device employed in the House, actually, to prevent the so-called McClellan bill from coming up, by a vote of 173 to 155. I can show the Senate how that happened. I wish to indicate to the Senate the purpose of the House resolution proposing an appropriation of $500,000. What they proposed to do, among other things, was to allow the ranking minority member of each subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, with the approval of the chairman of the committee, to appoint an employee at a basic salary of $2,400 a year.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has sufficiently explained the matter to me. I certainly have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the way the House is going to operate, I want to remove the Senate amendment out of the bill, and I ask that it be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is only one thing that disturbs me in connection with deleting the amendment from the bill. We received a letter from the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations asking that the provision be included in the bill. So far as the Senate is concerned, it has been customary, as a matter of comity in dealings between the two Houses, that when the House makes a request relating to its own business, it is granted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Last night I was quite swayed by the discussion of comity. When an item has been placed in a bill by the action of the House, I certainly would be very loath, with respect to an amendment dealing with the business of the House, to strike it out or not to accept it in the Senate. I believe the House would take the same attitude in connection with an item included in the bill by a vote of the Senate.

However, I think it is on a little different basis when, instead of coming by action of the other body, the proposal comes in the form of a letter from a committee, albeit we have the highest regard and respect for the committee. I would not want to see established a precedent whereby a letter from a committee asking for something to be done was considered on exactly the same plane as action taken by the other body as a coequal branch of Congress. I think there is a distinction between the two from the aspect of comity.

Mr. HAYDEN. As far back as I can remember, whenever the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations has asked the Senate to place in a bill an item that related solely to the House, we have never hesitated to do it. For that reason I am hesitant about voting to strike this amendment. I want it to stay in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If this amendment is not rejected, I shall offer an amendment to provide $500,000 for the Senate. We shall have to protect ourselves one way or another.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, lines 10 through 14.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], I send to the desk an amendment and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of H. R. 6758 (as amended and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives) authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, $125,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, recently, at the time of the last regular call of the calendar, the Senate passed unanimously a bill authorizing a program of research in the utilization of saline waters. The bill had come over from the House. The Senate eliminated from the bill the portion which would have allowed the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a demonstration plant himself. The amendment of the Senate was agreed to by the House, and the bill is now at the White House awaiting the signature of the President.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Secretary of the Interior considered the matter important enough to send to the Senate a special communication on July 1, asking for $400,000 with which to initiate the program. In the hurry of

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

its work last night, the committee did not see fit to include the item in the bill.

I have been conferring with representatives of the Department of the Interior, and they agree that they could initiate the program for $125,000. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in sending the estimate for $400,000, spoke of the need as being urgent, because of the acute shortage of water in many areas of the Nation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I consider this a very important item. Many cities along the coast are becoming short of water. If a cheap method can be devised to take salt out of water, a great deal of development can be brought about throughout the United States.

Mr. CASE. And it will save a great deal of money.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not apply to the State of Arizona, but it will apply to other States. At the rate at which our population is increasing, certainly we should not hesitate to appropriate a mere $125,000, which may mean so much to the people of future generations.

I certainly hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be agreed to. I believe it may mean a great deal if a cheap enough method can be found. I understand that those seeking such a method have success almost within their grasp, so we should not hesitate to try to give science this assistance.

Mr. CASE. I appreciate the contribution that has been made in behalf of the amendment by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the bill in question been enacted?

Mr. CASE. It has passed both the House and Senate. It is now at the White House. It has not yet been signed. So I made the language of the amendment correspond to the bill as amended and passed by the Senate and House. I am advised that, as of yesterday afternoon, a favorable report had been prepared for the President. Whether or not the bill was signed today, I do not know.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. I think it will be in opposition to the Senator's position, but it will not take long.

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CORDON. I feel that we must ultimately implement this legislation. I was one of those who considered the question in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe this is a chore which ought to be handled. It is a very grave question in my mind, however, whether or not the Government can make arrangements for the work to be done by private enterprise without setting up a completely new operation of its own. The Government does not know whether it can do so or not. It has not yet set up a program. It seems to me that rather than put the money in this bill, we ought to put it in a regular bill after both the Interior Department and the Congress have had an opportunity to consider just how to approach the problem.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator—and what I wish to say is directly on the point he raises—that when the bill came before the Senate we struck out the section which would have permitted the Government to set up a demonstration plant; and there was colloquy between the Senator from Illinois and myself on that particular point. I pointed out that the amendment which I offered struck out that authority.

In addition, when the bill went over to the House for concurrence in the Senate amendment, Representative ENGLE, of California, had a letter from the Secretary of the Interior. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of a day or two ago. If it is important I will look it up, but I am sure that the Senator will take my word for it.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. CASE. In that letter the Secretary of the Interior stated positively and directly that not only did he not contemplate the establishment of a Government plant, but that he thought he was forbidden to do so by the history of the legislation. This amendment provides only for making arrangements with private concerns or universities to conduct the research under research contracts.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator any information as to what the Interior Department has done in the way of investigating the present situation with reference to exploration in this field, to determine whether there are in progress any exploratory operations either in universities or laboratories, or in private enterprise or elsewhere, so that we may be in a position intelligently to spend $125,000?

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator that the budget estimate, which the Secretary asked for, and which the budget approved, called for $400,000.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that. On the face of it, that indicates to me that they do not know what they are doing.

Mr. CASE. That is only a part of the answer. The second answer—and I can say this as a positive fact—is that there is a nonprofit foundation known as Ionics Research, Inc., set up at Boston, which one of the men from my staff visited. It is a foundation which eminent scientists and inventors helped to establish. Among them was our own colleague, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Because of his interest in the matter and what he told me could be accomplished, I had one of the men from my office go to Boston several weeks ago and personally visit the establishment to see what work is now being done in this field.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon appreciates the statement just made by the Senator from South Dakota, and says that the Senator, as usual, is thorough and sincere in the job which he is doing.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I note that of the $400,000 requested, $63,685 is for personal services; $15,000 is for travel; $5,000 is for printing and reproduction; $306,315 is for other contractual services; $10,000 is for services performed by other agencies.

As I understand, the facts before us indicate that there is great development all along the line. I am all for the development to try to make fresh water from the sea, so that it can be used along the seacoasts wherever it is possible to use it.

Mr. CASE. Let me say at that point that the program goes further than that. The reason I happened to develop a personal interest in the program is that desalination of water would also make it possible to use what we call alkali water.

Mr. FERGUSON. From wells and streams.

Mr. CASE. Yes. There are a great many towns and small cities which have hard water or alkali water.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. CASE. This program would help them, as well as cities like San Diego, where there has been a great increase in population. I think this program would save some of the money we are called upon to spend to build big dams.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that; but I am also of the opinion that when we pass a law and it goes to the President's desk, and has not yet been signed, we should not appropriate, because it is almost certain that the Department has not been able to set up a proper program for coordination. The Department would require one dollar out of every four for coordination of a program.

In the opinion of the Senator from Michigan the Interior Department and the Bureau of Standards have sufficient appropriations to enable them to look over this program between now and the first of the year, when the next emergency appropriation comes along, so that they will know what they are going to do with the program. As I read the apportionment of funds, $15,000 would be spent in travel.

Mr. CASE. That is, if they had $400,000. With $125,000, of course, they would not.

Mr. FERGUSON. How much would they use for personal services? They ask for $63,000 for personal services. They are going to make contracts with someone. It does not appear what for.

Mr. CASE. The contracts would be for the research itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why should they enter into contracts for research before they have ascertained all the facts as to what work has already been done? Why should we start engineers and colleges into the research field until we know what has been done? If the Department should get this money, it would immediately start to do its own work.

Mr. CASE. It cannot do so under the terms of the bill. It cannot do its own research under the authorizing act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am afraid I shall have to disappoint the Senator from South Dakota.

This bill came from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. CASE. It was originally the Senator's bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I introduced the bill to provide authority for the Department of the Interior to study ways and means of removing salinity from sea water. This was done because during World War II the Navy Department, in order to provide fresh water for submarines, conducted a successful program of taking the salt out of sea water. But it was done at a very high cost, justified only by the fact that it was necessary to keep submarines in operation.

As I say, the bill came from the Committee on Interior and insular Affairs. A bill dealing with the same subject was passed by the House. When the House bill came over here the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] were both on the floor. There was some discussion of the bill, but there were amendments.

There has been no conference. There has been no opportunity for a conference, and no one can tell as yet precisely what will be in that bill unless we accept one or the other of the two bills.

Mr. CASE. Let me say to the Senator that the House concurred in the Senate amendments. The bill, as it passed the Senate, has gone to the White House. So we do know what is in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was all done without the knowledge of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CASE. The bill as it passed the Senate has gone to the White House. It did not go to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill has not been signed by the President. It is not a law. Congress has no basis upon which to judge whether or not it will be signed. In any event, it seems to me to be utterly bad practice to appropriate for legislation which has not yet been enacted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I should like to say that it has been 2 years since I introduced the original bill. Perhaps it is 3 years, or perhaps it was in the last session of Congress that we first began this drive. If the bill becomes law, then the next Congress, in January, will be able to go into the whole matter, the Department of the Interior will be able to present to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Senate and to the House a considered program. There certainly was not the time available, in the short hours we had yesterday in considering the supplemental appropriation bill, to act on it in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wonder if it might not be a reasonable solution of the problem and a reasonable disposition of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, if the chairman of the Appropriations Committee would agree to take the amendment to conference. The bill may be signed or not signed by the time the conferees met. If it is not signed by the time the conferees meet, then the point which has been raised may be very valid. However, the appropriation should not be made without authority of law. On the strength of the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, that the bill has been passed by the House and by the Senate, and is now at the White House, it seems to me that if the President should sign it before the conferees meet we would be very well justified in adopting the Senator's amendment. On the other hand, if the President should not sign the bill, then the item could be stricken.

Mr. CASE. I would be very happy to handle it in that way if the chairman of the committee would take the amendment to conference. If the bill is not signed by the time the conferees have completed their action, they could drop it. The Bureau of the Budget has gotten busy and has sent up an estimate for $400,000, which would indicate a very good attitude on the part of the Executive Office.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While I know how important it is to find new sources of fresh water all through the arid West—through California and the whole Rocky Mountain area———

Mr. CASE. And in the Pacific Islands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And in the Pacific Islands. While that is true, it would seem to me that not a great deal more time would be lost by postponing consideration of the matter until next year. What impresses me, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, is the fact that proposals to expend money are being rushed in. We must make some authorizations and appropriations for national defense. We must authorize other expenditures. But it was my feeling that postponeable items could go over.

But the Senator from California is always reasonable. It may be that the conferees could decide the issue. I should like to have some other members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs state their opinions. What does the Senator from Oregon feel about it?

Mr. CORDON. I have always felt that amendments should not be added to the bill. I am not at all certain that we know enough about the matter. I do not know enough about it. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has made a special investigation, is the only one who is informed on the subject.

Mr. CASE. Others know more about it than I.

Mr. CORDON. If the matter should be pursued reasonably soon, there would be adequate time in the new session. There will be a deficiency bill before us almost before we get into our seats and the new Members are sworn in. When we take up the new program, it will be after study. I believe we should have some study of it. I believe we should know more about what we are doing.

Mr. CASE. If the Senate votes to adopt the amendment, and if the bill has not been signed by the time the conferees complete action, there will be no protest from me if it is dropped by the committee. But I hope that the amendment will be taken to conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not understand why it should not be taken to conference. It means a great deal to the United States. Why should it not be taken to conference?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota for himself and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. [Putting the question.]

The Chair is in doubt, and will request a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, after line 4, to insert:

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For an additional amount for "Construction and rehabilitation" to be used for construction of Minnesota transmission lines, Missouri River Basin project, $2,913,600.

Mr. THYE. The reason I offer the amendment for the junior Senator from Minnesota and myself is that as soon as this bill is disposed of the Senate will have before it a conference report on H. R. 7176. In that measure there was an item of $2,913,600 for a 230-kilowatt line in western Minnesota.

The conference committee did not agree to the item. I know when the question comes up as to whether the conference report should be agreed to, the chances of rejecting the conference report will not be very good. For that reason we are offering the amendment, which proposes an appropriation in the amount of $2,913,600 for the transmission line in western Minnesota.

The reason why legislation was proposed to construct the transmission line was that when the construction of the dam at Garrison, N. Dak., is completed and the hydroelectric generating units are installed there will be hydroelectric current available to be wheeled into Minnesota, for use by the consumers in that State.

An installation is being constructed at Randall Dam in South Dakota, as well as at Gavins Point. Those are all flood-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

control installations on the Missouri River.

As soon as the dams are constructed and the hydroelectric current is generated it will not be many months before the question arises of a steam plant for the purpose of firming up the hydroelectric power.

It is for that reason that those of us who are supporting this project in Minnesota feel so strongly about this question, because, Mr. President, in Minnesota there are excellent steam plants which are generating electricity—not only steam plants owned by private corporations or utilities, but also excellent steam plants owned and operated by the REA. The steam plants now in existence—those owned by the private corporations, as well as those owned by the REA—can be used to firm up power for the hydroelectric installations which are being installed in the flood-control projects on the Missouri River.

This is the first time in all our history that we have found the private utilities, the REA's, and the municipalities standing with the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation in full support of a project.

Why are they in full support of it, Mr. President? Why do the private investors and the private corporation executives support this project, along with the REA's and the Department of the Interior? It is because after making a full and complete study of this project for a year, they have reached the conclusion that if a transmission line is constructed across North Dakota to Fargo, and from Fargo through Granite Falls, Minn., and thence to Mankato, Minn., and thence southwesterly toward Sioux Falls, there will be a complete circuit tying in the Garrison Dam, in North Dakota, and the Fort Randall Dam, in South Dakota, and the Gavins Point Dam at the corner of Nebraska and Iowa.

If there is high water at Garrison Dam, the maximum amount of current will be generated at that point. If there is high water down below, at Fort Randall and at Gavins Point, the maximum amount of current will be generated there. When those three installations are tied together by means of one transmission line, the current can be fed either to the northern end of the project or from the northern end down to the southern end of the project, and at the same time the steam plants which will be able to firm up the hydroelectric power will be tied in.

I think this is the first project on which all the interested parties, including the private investors, the utilities, the municipalities, and the REA's are standing together.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. THYE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand this matter, this very amendment has already been rejected by the House this year. I understand that the Senate adopted the amendment, and it went to conference, but the conferees on the part of the House would not agree to it, and the result was that the amendment lost in both places. Is that correct?

Mr. THYE. The Senator from Tennessee is correct about the conference committee.

The Senate adopted this amendment, and the amendment went to conference. In the conference, the conferees on the part of the House rejected the appropriation item as voted by the Senate. The conference report is ready to be submitted as soon as action on the pending appropriation bill is completed.

I know that our opportunity and chances to have that conference report rejected, and to request a further conference with instructions to the conferees, are just about zero. For that reason, we have offered this amendment to the pending supplemental appropriation bill, in order that the House may have another opportunity to consider this project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Would it not be better for the Senator from Minnesota to let this matter go over until January?

Mr. THYE. The construction is under way at Garrison Dam, and also at Fort Randall Dam and at Gavins Point Dam. Unless these transmission lines are commenced, so that they will be completed and available at the time when the electrical current will be ready to wheel. I do not know what facilities will be available for wheeling the current, once those installations commence to generate electrical current.

Mr. McKELLAR. It does not take as long to construct a transmission line as it does to build a dam.

Mr. THYE. That is a problem, Mr. President.

Let me also call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the fact that the National Grange, the farmers' organization, has recommended this project, and is in full support of it.

The Farm Bureau has recommended this project.

I have before me a telegram from John C. Lynn, legislative director of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The telegram reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C. *July 3, 1952.*

Hon. EDWARD THYE,
Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation recommends appropriation for construction electric transmission lines to serve 20 Rural Electric Cooperatives in Minnesota. We respectfully request that $2,913,600 be provided to implement this project before adjournment.

JOHN C. LYNN,
Legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

I also have before me a letter from the National Grange addressed to me. The letter reads as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1952.

Senator EDWARD J. THYE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THYE: The National Grange trusts that you will put forth every possible effort to reinstate the appropriation for the power distribution line connecting the Garrison and Gavins Point Dams on the Missouri River and looping through southwest Minnesota.

This is a splendid example of where both public and private power have joined sensibly in a sound and serviceable program for the benefit of the users of electricity, and it would be a grievous error to kill this item and thus discourage future similar sensible cooperation.

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel,
The National Grange.

Mr. President, those two farm organizations and also the Farmers' Union have been on record all during the past year in full support of this project.

Now we have an opportunity to bring about cooperation between the private investors, the REA's, and the Department of the Interior, by means of a project which will assure the consumers and users of electricity the lowest possible rate for electric current. In this project we have an opportunity to set a pattern which might well be looked to and copied by other areas of the United States where such transmission lines need to be constructed.

Mr. President, many and many a time I have heard criticism voiced on this floor against the monopolistic trends of the utilities as one charge, and the next charge was that the bureaucratic Department of the Interior was trying to control all the power in the United States.

In this instance we see the Department of the Interior, the utilities, and the REA's standing together and asking for a project, and having the full support of the three major farm organizations in the United States.

Mr. President, one year ago I opposed an amendment which my colleague offered in regard to this same project or item. At that time I said we had not studied the question sufficiently to be able to know what we should do regarding this matter. I said that all the interested parties should return to Minnesota and should give consideration and thought to the project, and then should come forward with their recommendation.

The Northern States Power Co., the largest utility in the West, together with the Western Power & Light Co., in western Minnesota, the REA's, and representatives of the Department of the Interior met last December 4 and made a complete study of the project, and came forward with the recommendation which we have submitted to this body.

Mr. President, the Senate has been asked to vote for many a transmission line to firm up power from a hydroelectric unit, and the Senate has been asked many a time to vote for Federal power. I have voted for projects which were not nearly as worthy as this one is.

Mr. President, it seems strange to me that we should not have had any cooperation on this particular project. When the time comes that this current needs to be wheeled, will it be wheeled by private corporations, or will the movement of the current simply come to a dead end, with the result that no one will be served, because of a failure on the part of the Government or a

failure on the part of those of us who sit in the Congress to make provision for a transmission line by which to wheel the current to the users, and by which to provide an opportunity to wheel the steam-generated current back into the system when the hydroelectric current is at a low level because of low water on the Missouri River?

All these matters are involved in this amendment, Mr. President.

It is a disappointment to me to find that the House did not give any consideration to the project and did not approve it.

It is for that reason that the two Senators from Minnesota have joined in sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to say in behalf of my colleague that he has presented the argument for these lines persuasively, sincerely, and convincingly. I desire further to document the fact that, unless these lines are constructed, the REA's of our State and similar types of utilities are going to have to do some self-financing. We cannot wait for that.

The senior Senator from Minnesota, in his years of service in the Senate, has supported the Missouri Valley program. He has supported every one of these transmission-line developments. The junior Senator from Minnesota, in his 4 years in this body, has supported every one of these developments. I have voted for developments in the Northwest, the Southeast, the Southwest, and the Mid-West, wherever they might be, because I felt that they were good for America. The Senate, time after time, after conference with the House, has been able to retain transmission lines and power developments. Our State of Minnesota has not had one dollar of Federal funds for hydroelectric power. We have not had one project; and we have 3,000,000 people there, in one of the richest and finest farming areas in America.

As the senior Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, every major farm organization is in support of his amendment. Every single power group in our State, including the REA's, is in support of it. I dare say there are very few States of the Union in which the municipalities, the REA's, the legislatures, the county commissioners, and the farm organizations—and even labor organizations—are all in support of one project.

The senior Senator from Minnesota in the Appropriations Committee has given his support to many other projects, and I, for one, have tried to support them on the floor.

I simply cannot believe that the Senate would refuse to make provision for these transmission lines, which are so essential. I want to know whether the REA's are supposed to bond themselves, and the Northern States Power Co., and the other private utilities to do likewise in order to extend their own private lines, and then find that they are confronted with a fight with the Bureau of Reclamation. Are the REA's supposed to come here to the National REA office to seek more loans, more power lines, and more generation capacity? We must have the power. We have got to know where we are going, and whether we are going to develop our great State with new production, and new farm land.

We are being told to wait a little bit longer. It is true, we have waited a long time. North Dakota has its power lines, South Dakota has its. We are in the Missouri Valley. This is a logical extension, and it was in the original plan of the Missouri Valley transmission system, but we are being left out.

There is a gap. As the senior Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, this completes the circle. This is a modified plan. It is not the one that was brought in a year ago. It is a very limited plan. It is limited to the basic essentials. I submit that to reject this line now is false economy, because, as the senior Senator has pointed out, if we can tie in the new steam plants, such as the new steam plant at Sioux Falls, N. Dak., and the six plants of the REA generating facilities, we shall be able to firm up hundreds of thousands of kilowatts of electrical power over the Missouri River area. There is not one economic argument against this program. There is no argument I can think of at all against it, except to say that the House of Representatives, or the conferees of the House, will not have it.

Mr. President, let me say we have heard that before; but the Senate has been able to get them to agree. Time after time the House has resisted many such projects, but the Senate conferees have been able to hold out and finally get the projects. I think we are right in seeking the adoption of this amendment; I think we are right in seeking fair treatment. So I believe that this amendment ought to go onto this supplemental bill; that we should try once more. After all, there is no reason at all why it should not be accomplished.

Mr. YOUNG rose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator from North Dakota want me to yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. The subcommittee on Interior appropriations has had to deal with transmission-line problems in almost every State of the Union. There is usually a conflict between the Bureau of Reclamation and the private power companies as to who should build the lines. In the case of Minnesota, the power companies and the REA co-ops have all agreed. I know of no project in the entire United States that is more justified than this one in Minnesota. I supported it wholeheartedly in the committee and in the conference with the House. I see no reason why this item should not be taken to conference and one more attempt made to get the House to approve it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I surely want to thank the Senator from North Dakota. I am very much appreciative of his understanding of our problem. I appeal to my colleagues as the senior Senator from Minnesota has done. I appeal to Senators to give us a chance for fair play and equal treatment. After all, the Senate has adopted this before, and why the House of Representatives should continually turn it down is more than I can possibly understand. I have heard as one reason that we should wait a little longer. There is no logical argument for waiting. The project is not going to cost less, in fact, it will cost more; and, worse than that, it will cause the REA's and the private utilities to proceed on their own, thereby creating a duplicate system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator I should be willing to take the amendment to conference, to see what could be done about it.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We certainly appreciate that, and I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his generosity.

Mr. THYE. I wish to thank the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] for his very splendid remarks in support of this project.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the issue apparently is settled, now, with the distinguished chairman saying he will take this to conference. But, in spite of the very fluent and able arguments made by the two Senators from Minnesota [Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY], as a matter of fact, this proposal has been rejected by one conference committee. We have traveled up the hill, and now propose to travel it again. I appreciate the interest of the Senator from Minnesota and his very logical argument.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. The one hope I have is that there will be different conferees on the House side. Perhaps, with a little new blood there will not be quite so many barbs as heretofore, when the committee was giving consideration to this question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, is this issue settled?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair was about to put the question.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] for himself and his colleague. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide, and asks for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority appears at page 21 of the bill. The bill raises the House figure.

I have spoken a number of times on the fact that instead of firming up hydroelectric power in the Tennessee Valley, we have reached the point where there are more steam plants than hydroelectric plants.

When I came to the Senate and heard the debate it was never the intention to do anything else with steam plants than to firm up. That was the whole purpose and the whole idea.

There was an oportunity at Paducah for a number of private-enterprise companies to provide steam power, but the Commission decided against it, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

would allow them to furnish only a certain amount. I protest that this is the wrong thing to do in a free-enterprise system.

It now becomes the business of the Government to furnish electric power, and we find that not only the electric business but other businesses are taken over by the Government.

The total number of kilowatts is 1,710,000 for the additional units at Shawnee and other places, and the Authority wants $150,000,000.

That is just a start, Mr. President. The cost will be $287,000,000 on completion.

The matter should be called to the attention of the Senate, and I expect, Mr. President, in conference, if I happen to be a conferee, to have it known that I am opposed to this requested increase for the Tennessee Valley by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this evening I received a telegram calling attention to a portion of the House report on the bill. For the purpose of clarification of the legislative intent I think it is proper to bring it to the attention of the Senate. The telegram reads:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., *July 3, 1952.*

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building:

Adoption of House Report No. 2316 on H. R. 8370 restricting allocation of funds by Department of Labor too restrictive on State legislatures. Could prevent changes in State laws to reduce tax burden or extend benefits if such changes resulted in additional administrative costs even though additional costs were small in comparison over-all benefits. Adoption of report could permit Department of Labor to dictate additional standards for State operation and legislation. Just another method of attempting to federalize State programs. Request you oppose adoption of report.

That is with reference to unemployment insurance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In our report we have this to say about the matter:

The committee does not agree with the House report directive not to increase any State's allotment pending the study by January 1, 1953, on determination of costs resulting on revision of State laws and regulations during the last 5 years and the benefits resulting from these changes.

So that the Senator can be sure that the Senate does not agree.

Mr. CASE. I am happy to have that statement by the chairman of the committee made a part of the report record.

The statement which was disturbing was this:

Pending its completion the Bureau is directed not to increase any State's allotment because of a change in the State's laws or regulations relating to this program.

Congress has passed a law effecting an extension of social security.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator is wise in bringing the matter up, and I was glad to hear the answer of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, July 3, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2214) to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2922) to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTIONS OF LODGE NO. 257, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point two resolutions unanimously adopted at the last regular meeting of Lodge No. 257 of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks located in St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILWAY AND STEAMSHIP CLERKS, FREIGHT HANDLERS, EXPRESS AND STATION EMPLOYEES,
St. Paul, Minn., June 27, 1952.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our last regular meeting, held June 3, the members unanimously adopted two resolutions to be submitted to our division boards for further processing. The membership requested that a copy of the resolutions be sent you in order to give some idea to you of the sentiments of this local in reference toward tax relief.

"Resolution 1

"*Be it resolved*, That Local Lodge No. 257 favors the immediate action toward striving to attain the raising of personal income-tax exemption under the present Federal income-tax law from the present $600 to $1,200 exemption. Reason for requesting such: The membership feel that big business is given relief in numerous instances and labor is continuing to carry the full load and also should be given some consideration.

"Resolution 2

"*Be it resolved*, That Local Lodge No. 257 favors including any increase in taxes on incomes in figuring the escalator clause in the cost-of-living index. Reason for requesting: Any increase in taxes on income has the effect of lowering our standards of living when not figured in the cost-of-living index."

Trusting that some thought and consideration on your part be given the above, I remain,

Sincerely and fraternally,
WARREN J. KOPPY,
Recording Secretary, Local Lodge No. 257, B. of R. C.

RESOLUTIONS OF DELEGATES OF GROUP HEALTH ASSOCIATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my hand two resolutions adopted by the delegates and members at the 1952 annual meeting of the Group Health Association affecting Federal health legislation. These delegates were the authorized spokesmen for more than 100,000 members of the association in Minnesota and Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION III, REGARDING THE HUMPHREY HEALTH BILL, SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Whereas the purpose of the Humphrey bill is to assist cooperatives and nonprofit associations to initiate and carry out voluntary prepaid medical-care plans for their members by grants and loans for the acquisition, construction, and equipping of the necessary facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in the annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring this legislation and urge each delegate to so inform their congressional representative.

The supervisory committee moves concurrence and recommends adoption.

RESOLUTION IV, REGARDING FEDERAL AND STATE HEALTH LEGISLATION, SUBMITTED BY THE SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Be it resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring the following legislation: (1) Federal aid to medical education, (2) Federal credit and technical assistance to cooperative health plans, (3) enabling legislation in the various States to allow health cooperatives to incorporate, (4) Federal aid for medical research.

The supervisory committee moves concurrence and recommends adoption.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two other resolutions which were adopted by the annual meeting of the Group Health Association attended by delegates from

Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Washington, at the St. Paul Hotel on April 26, 1952.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the body of the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE HUMPHREY HEALTH BILL

Whereas the purpose of the Humphrey bill is to assist cooperatives and nonprofit associations to initiate and carry out voluntary prepaid medical care plans for their members by grants and loans for the acquisition, construction, and equipping of the necessary facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in the annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring this legislation and urge each delegate to so inform their congressional representative.

RESOLUTION REGARDING FEDERAL AND STATE HEALTH LEGISLATION

Be it resolved, That the members and delegates of Group Health Association in annual meeting assembled go on record as favoring the following legislation: (1) Federal aid to medical education, (2) Federal credit and technical assistance to cooperative health plans, (3) enabling legislation in the various States to allow health cooperatives to incorporate, (4) Federal aid for medical research.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2079).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 2572. A bill to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries; without amendment (Rept. No. 2081);

H. R. 3209. A bill amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2082);

H. R. 6856. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2092);

H. R. 7241. A bill to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co., for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2083);

H. R. 7855. A bill for the improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2084);

H. R. 8127. A bill to amend the Act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2085);

H. R. 8190. A bill to amend the Act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Co., to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; without amendment (Rept. No. 2086);

H. R. 8194. A bill to amend an Act approved May 26,1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 2087);

H. R. 8234. A bill to amend section 5 of the Act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor; without amendment (Rept. No. 2088);

H. R. 8315. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2089);

H. R. 8316. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2090); and

S. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to grant the consent of the Congress to the entry of certain States into compacts and agreements for the improvement of navigation on the boundary waters of States within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2091).

FEDERAL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—PERMISSION TO SUBMIT MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3368) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, and I submit a report (No. 2080) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] be permitted to submit his minority views at a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the minority views may be submitted at a later date.

Mr. HILL. I understand that the Senator from Alabama will have the right to submit his minority views at a later date?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That request has been granted.

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HUMPHREY, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 3471) for the relief of Otto Aleksander Jarvenpaa (otherwise known as Otto Jarvi), which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain reports and documents from the Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor Management Relations, of which I am chairman, dealing with the National Labor Relations Board, Migratory Labor, the operations of the Taft-Hartley Act, fair employment legislation, Communist Domination of Trade Unions, and Conflict Between Federal and State Jurisdiction in the Field of Labor Relations be printed as Senate documents and permitted to be submitted after the adjournment of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON MONETARY POLICY AND THE MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT (S. DOC. NO. 163)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has received a report from the Patman subcommittee on monetary policy and the management of the public debt.

The various materials previously prepared by this subcommittee have been of great interest to the Congress and the public. I am requesting, therefore, that the present report, which represents a culmination of the subcommittee's work on this important aspect of public policy, be printed as a Senate document in order that it may be available to individual members of the Congress and, through the depository libraries, to as wide an audience as possible.

The subcommittee, consisting of Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman, Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and RALPH E. FLANDERS, and Representatives RICHARD BOLLING and JESSE P. WOLCOTT, began its inquiry one year ago by preparing questionnaires for distribution to the heads of the principal Government agencies concerned and to many persons in the private economy. The answers to these questions were first published as a committee print in February, 1952, and later as Senate Document No. 123, under the title of Monetary Policy and the Management of the Public Debt. Nearly 1,200 copies of this two-volume document, which sells for $4.25, have already been sold by the Superintendent of Documents. The subcommittee then held extensive hearings which were also made available through the Superintendent of Documents and which sold in similar quantity.

It is expected that there will be an equally wide market for this final report of the subcommittee, which I am also asking to be put on sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C. The price will be 25 cents a copy.

It should be understood that this document represents only the findings of the subcommittee. Time has not permitted review and action by the full committee.

Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT, as is expressed in his statement in the report, has been prevented by the pressure of his work in the House from completing his final statement on the problem of monetary policy and debt management. I should like to request, therefore, in submitting this report for publication as a Senate document at this time that it be understood that a supplementary comment by Mr. WOLCOTT will be printed as an additional part of the document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ADDITIONAL MATTERS PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional matters were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

Address on the subject of free enterprise and price controls, delivered by Arthur Shoemaker, former acting district director of the Office of Price Stabilization, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., before the Sturgis, S. Dak., Rotary Club, on May 14, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Statement prepared by him in explanation of his opposition to the substitute for S. 2668.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HOUSING LAWS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2.

B. R. MAYBANK,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
HENRY O. TALLE,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] supported the legislation which is the subject of the conference report. The only thing that was changed is what the Senator from New Mexico desired to include. He was unable to participate because he was busily engaged in promoting good public-roads legislation and other worth-while legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report see p. 9215 of House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement explanatory of the situation prepared by me may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I wish to pay high compliment to the Senator from Washington who, through 4 years, has supervised and brought to a successful conclusion this very important matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR O'CONOR

It is a source of deep satisfaction to all those who appreciate the imperative need of an adequate merchant marine to serve this country both in peace and war that the agreement reached by the conferees on S. 241, the so-called long-range shipping bill, is such as to offer a real stimulus for the participation of private capital in the upbuilding and maintenance of the United States merchant marine.

The extraordinary achievements of our shipbuilding industry during World Wars I and II, in providing for the vast sea transport needs of those two great conflicts tend to becloud the views of both our people and many Members of Congress toward the real situation and the basic needs of the American shipping industry. In one war we were able to turn out some 2,000 ships. In this past war approximately 5,000 vessels and these achievements, which would have been impossible in any other country of the world, might give our people a false sense of security as to the Nation's ability to take care of shipping needs no matter when they might arise.

Overlooked in such a point of view are several facts which are of real significance. First, the huge costs of such hurried and necessarily wasteful construction have placed an unnecessary burden on the taxpayers. I say unnecessary, because there would have been no necessity for the huge outpouring of funds for round-the-clock and overtime construction, had our Nation exercised some little foresight in advance of these extreme emergencies.

Secondly, the great waste occasioned by rushing pell mell a program of emergency construction, which leaves us at the end of the war with a vast number of ships for which there is no longer need, is further emphasized by the fact that all these ships grow old at one time. For experience has made it an accepted fact in shipping circles that the life of a vessel is approximately 20 years.

Thus, when we build 2,000 to 5,000 ships in a period of a few years, we later have 2,000 or 5,000 ships that become obsolete within a very short period. And this is decidedly uneconomic.

When S. 241 was introduced 2 years ago, as a successor to a previous long-range bill which I sponsored in the Eighty-first Congress, I had definitely in mind the need of a well-considered program that would make it inviting for private capital to participate in ship construction and operation, to the point where such capital might be protected against the recurrent peaks and valleys, so to speak, that have always made operation of the American shipping such a gamble.

Our object was to make it possible, by legislative provisions and through some Government assistance, for American shipowners to compete with foreign ships, despite the greatly lower wages and preferential treatment given to foreign shipping by their respective governments. How stiff this competition is can be best demonstrated by testimony before our hearings to the effect that an oil tanker, operated under American registry, would cost its owners about $600 a day more than the same ship operated under foreign registry. That is well over $200,000 a year—quite an item, particularly if the company in question is operating a fleet of tankers.

What we want to do, and what we have attempted to do through the long-range shipping bill, is to keep the merchant marine at a level adequate to serve the country's needs in wartime as well as in peacetime. We do not have by any means enough passenger vessels, capable of conversion to troop transports, if needed, nor do we have enough tankers, although that deficiency is not nearly as marked as in the case of the passenger vessels.

The active merchant-marine fleet today, including ships of 1,000 gross tons or over, is just short of 2,000 vessels. It is some 50 percent larger than it was in 1939. With respect to commercial-passenger vessels, however, there are only 52 in service, against 127 at the outbreak of World War II with a passenger capacity of little more than 40 percent of the 1939 total.

To give some idea of how much we have lagged behind our needs in this particular respect, let me recall that in 1947 the report of the President's Merchant Marine Advisory Board urgently recommended a 4-year construction program of combined passenger and freight vessels to the number of 46 vessels, at least 2 of which would be of the *Queen Mary–Queen Elizabeth* type.

In the 4-year period in question we have actually had constructed, not 46 vessels of the type suggested but 3 vessels. These 3 are very splendid modern liners which will be of the utmost service should they ever be needed for troop-transport purposes. But the great disparity between the Advisory Board's recommendations and the actual number of ships built dramatically presents the lack of incentive which present merchant-marine legislation holds out for potential investors in the shipping industry.

S. 241 as agreed upon in conference presents some very decided benefits for the shipping industry, and I am sure will furnish the needed stimulus for construction.

It is, to our mind, very unfortunate that the Senate provisions of the bill regarding tax benefits had to be deleted because there was such sharp conflict with the House over this section of the bill. Because of the House position, it seemed preferable to us to allow these sections of the law to remain as they are until a thorough study can be

made by the Treasury and Commerce Departments, keeping in mind the President's declared conviction that benefits of this nature, if found to be necessary, should be administered in more direct fashion than as tax deferments.

All in all, the bill as agreed upon represents the most positive, progressive action taken in behalf of the American shipping and ship-construction industries since the passage of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. I am convinced that much good will come of the present bill, to the point where we can look forward to a continuing program of ship construction that will support our basic ship-construction facilities and will keep the United States shipping industry in step with changing conditions and needs in the merchant-marine field.

There was considerable disagreement between the managers of the House and Senate in the conference on S. 241, the long-range shipping bill. However, the conferees were able to agree on a report which has been presented to the Senate.

One of the major points of disagreement centered around certain tax deferments granted in the Senate bill with respect to deposits on earnings by unsubsidized operators in construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, for the purpose of replacement of vessels. In view of the Treasury Department's opposition to this provision of the Senate bill, the Senate managers at the conference agreed to strike this provision.

The conferees agreed to an amendment which would have the effect of providing for an extension of time to commit construction reserve funds for new vessels to September 30, 1953, which gives subsidized carriers who have deposits in reserve funds another year to plan on new ship construction.

The bill as passed by the Senate provided that interest shall not accrue in favor of the Government on any deficiencies of Federal tax resulting from proposed voluntary deposits in statutory reserve funds which are subsequently disapproved by the Maritime Board until the Board actually disapproves such deposits. The Senate managers agreed to the House amendment which would delete this provision.

With respect to subsidized operators holding an operating subsidy, the Senate provisions granted full tax deferment as to required deposits, and provided for the deferment of the normal tax and the surtax with respect to other deposits in the reserve funds. The House amendment would strike the Senate provisions and substitute therefor new language which, while granting to operators receiving an operating subsidy the same deferment provisions as provided in the Senate bill with respect to required deposits, would defer only the normal tax with respect to other deposits in the reserve funds.

The committee of conference has eliminated from the bill both the Senate and the House provisions relating to this matter. The committee agreed, however, that the Department of Commerce and the Treasury Department should immediately begin to gather all information relative to the extent and effect of tax-deferment and tax-exemption benefits to the maritime industry, and make a report on same as early as possible in the next Congress.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senate for a few minutes. Then I shall yield to other Senators.

The distinguished minority leader has suggested that we should dispose of H. R. 8120, the military and naval construction bill, this evening. I think he is correct. We had intended to take it up tomorrow morning, but I believe we should proceed to dispose of it now. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McKELLAR BY HIS COLLEAGUES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for the wonderful work he has done in expediting the passage of the appropriation bills. It has been his experience with and his knowledge of the handling of such measures that has enabled the Senate to make the progress which has been accomplished. I know of no Senator who is better qualified to handle appropriation bills than is the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Or any other bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I was just about to say "or any other bill." While he has worked diligently and faithfully for the United States Senate and for the Nation as a whole, I call attention to the fact that there has not been a single occasion when he has neglected the State of Tennessee. By his diligence and tireless efforts he has succeeded in securing the enactment of legislation making possible the building in Tennessee of steam plants for the generation of power, as well as much other legislation for the benefit of his State. His colleagues have such confidence in his integrity and thorough acquaintance with governmental affairs that whenever a proposal is made affecting Tennessee, even though some of us may have some doubts, we yield to the Senator from Tennessee and vote for it, because of our love and affection for him and confidence in him, and because as I have indicated, we know of his great knowledge of conditions in his State.

He has served his State well and faithfully, and I feel that this is an appropriate time to commend him, because the Senate has just passed the last appropriation bill of the session. All that remains is to act on conference reports.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am overcome by the words of the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate. He is very gracious indeed. He gives me credit probably where I do not deserve it, but I appreciate his remarks very, very much. I thank him with all my heart.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been said by the majority leader about the eminent chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The senior Senator from Tennessee has set an example that all Senators can well afford to emulate. His diligence, thoroughness, fairness, and, at times, his persistence, have endeared him to all Members of the Senate. He is inspiring to the younger Members, and is always on the job. I am thankful that we have in the Senate a man like the senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have been associated with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee since before 1941. I only wish to add to what has been said by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Texas that the agility, youth, and untiring efforts of the Senator from Tennessee, I might say were sufficient to exhaust me during the long sessions the Senate has held, but he brought the appropriation bills to the floor in the exceptionally short time we had available, and has acquitted himself in wonderful fashion in guiding them through.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I met the Senator from Tennessee immediately after I became a Member of the Senate. Naturally, I love him, because he hails from Memphis, Tenn., the city whence my father came when he went to South Carolina. I frequently speak with the Senator from Tennessee about some of my people in Tennessee, because he knows a great many of them, and that has made me feel much closer to him.

So far as his record as a Senator is concerned, I do not have to dwell on that in addressing his colleagues. He has done what others could not have accomplished. We are all happy that Congress will be able to adjourn on Saturday, and grateful to the Senator from Tennessee, for I can truthfully say that if it had not been for him that probably would not be possible. Without his skillful handling of the appropriation bills, I doubt whether the Republican Convention could have met on next Monday, because the Senate probably could not have passed the bills in time.

All of us know of the ability of Senator McKELLAR, not only in passing upon matters before the Committee on Appropriations, but in managing bills on the floor of the Senate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to join in commending the senior Senator from Tennessee for the excellent service he has rendered his State and the Nation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, as a Kentuckian, and therefore a neighbor of the Senator from Tennessee, I am happy to join in the tributes that are being paid to him by his colleagues.

I am glad to say that in the appropriation bills he has not taken everything for Tennessee, because, although I am a junior Member of the Senate, I have been digging up a little business myself.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

We all appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee has done for us.

Mr. President, I like the United States Senate. My admiration for its grows every day I serve as a Member. There is only one feature about it I do not like, and that is the work. This is the hardest working place I have ever seen in my life. But the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has set us an example for industry. It is a great inspiration to new Members of the Senate to see him work as he has worked, especially during night sessions,

Asking no quarter, giving no odds,
Long may he live in the smile of the gods.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is now almost 10 minutes after 9 p. m. All Members of the Senate have witnessed the manner in which the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has been handling the pending appropriation bill since it was taken up late this afternoon. I wish Senators assembled here who are not Members of the Committee on Appropriations had been able to observe the Senator from Tennessee during the session of the committee yesterday afternoon and last night. We labored in the committee until 11:30 p. m. I want the Senate to know that the Senator from Tennessee was wielding the gavel with as much vigor and with as much poise at 11:30 last night as he was when he started at noon presiding over the committee in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Tennessee was wielding the gavel with greater efficiency, much more authority, and a lot more noise. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And he was getting results.

I am very happy indeed to associate myself with the tributes which have been paid to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has taught members of the committee many lessons in vigor, in attention to duty, in diligence, and in ability to get things accomplished.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, last night the Senate adopted a conference report on the Reserve bill, but time did not permit an explanation by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly defer his comments on that subject until I take up another matter?

Mr. CAIN. I wish to make a very brief statement, but I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that the majority leader is going to have a short call of the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope we can do that. We could take up bills that are not objected to. We may be able to dispose of a few House bills that were not called today.

With that suggestion, I may say that I announced that when objection was withdrawn to a bill, we might take it up by unanimous consent.

Now, Mr. President, there is another matter to which I should like to allude.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee objected to Calendar No. 1676, Senate Joint Resolution 165, but he has now withdrawn his objection. I understand from the distinguished minority leader and other Senators who were talking about the measure that there is no objection. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 165) to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the state of war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment was offered earlier in the day by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

The following statutory provisions, and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby, in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war or otherwise where their terms so provide, shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), or until such earlier date or dates as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution either generally or for a particular statutory provision or by the President either generally by proclamation or for a particular statutory provision, but in no event beyond March 31, 1953, notwithstanding any other terminal date or provision of law with respect to such statutory provisions and notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency, of the time during or for which authorizations or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed; and acts or events of the kind giving rise to legal consequences under any of these provisions when performed or occurring during the state of war which terminated on April 28, 1952, shall give rise to the same legal consequences when they are performed or occur during the period above provided for:

Act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, secs. 212, 213, and 216, 58 Stat. 689–691; 42 U. S. C. 213, 214, and 217).

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That, notwithstanding the termination of the war with Japan declared December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939 (Proc. 2352, 54 Stat. 2643), and on May 27, 1941 (Proc. 2487, 55 Stat. 1647), and notwithstanding any proclamation of peace with respect to such war—

The following statutory provisions, and the authorizations conferred and liabilities imposed thereby, in addition to coming into full force and effect in time of war, or otherwise where their terms so provide, shall remain in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950 (Proc. 2914, 3 C. F. R., 1950 Supp., p. 71), or until such earlier date or dates as may be provided by the Congress by concurrent resolution either generally or for a particular statutory provision or by the President either generally by proclamation or for a particular statutory provision, but in no event beyond March 31, 1953, notwithstanding any other terminal date or provision of law with respect to such statutory provisions and notwithstanding any limitation, by reference to war or national emergency, of the time during or for which authorizations or liabilities thereunder may be exercised or imposed; and acts or events of the kind giving rise to legal consequences under any of these provisions when performed or occurring during the state of war which terminated on April 28, 1952, shall give rise to the same legal consequences when they are performed or occur during the period above provided for:

Act of July 1, 1944 (ch. 373, secs. 212, 213, and 216, 58 Stat. 689–691; 42 U. S. C. 213, 214, and 217).

The preamble was agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before action is taken on the conference report, let me say that this is the conference report to which I referred earlier. It is the conference report which rejected the transmission line with respect to which it was found necessary to amend House bill 8370 by including an appropriation in the supplemental bill.

There is one further item to which I wish to invite the attention of Senators, and that is an item of $200,000 requested for financial support of the foster-home

program for orphan children in Minnesota. The welfare department of Minnesota sent representatives here to appear before the committee. They made a complete case and established a full justification for the appropriation. Why this item was rejected in conference I cannot understand. It certainly is a disappointment to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is a disappointment to me. What happened was that the complete justification was made before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, but the House committee members insisted that they did not have such justification, that the evidence had not been properly presented to them, and therefore they would not agree. We came to a place where we had to yield. However, in doing so we did obtain the money required for the maintenance of the existing school, which the House had failed to provide. That was the way we had to adjust matters. But from the way the House conferees talked they were not familiar with the facts as we were.

My suggestion is that on another occasion representatives from the State agency should devote as much attention to educating the House subcommittee handling this question as it does in the case of the Senate committee. We were completely sold, but we could not convince the House conferees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question.

My question deals with the power lines in the Southwest and those in the Southeast. I understand that last year and 2 years before that the Senate Appropriations Committee directed that the wheeling type contract be negotiated in the Southwest. I assume that there has been no change in the thinking of the committee, and that the committee continues to believe in the desirability of negotiating satisfactory contracts instead of providing for Government construction of transmission lines, wherever the contract method is feasible and desirable. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct, and to emphasize that, it is stated in the report of the conferees that the managers on the part of both Houses hope that the contract now under negotiation with the 12 private power companies in the Southwest power area will be consummated at an early date, and in a manner which will make unnecessary any further litigation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator any information as to whether or not the Secretary of the Interior has signed a contract with the 12 electric companies?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; he has not. A meeting was in progress today in Tulsa, Okla., I understand, with respect to this very matter. So the problem is under active consideration.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Secretary certainly knows how the committee and the Congress feel about these wheeling contracts.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is so stated in the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7176, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 3, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 14, 22, 23, 30, 49, and 51 to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this paragraph or any part of the unobligated balance appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952 shall be available for the construction of transmission lines and related facilities in the Southeastern power area until (1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas for system-wide transmission of electric power and energy from Government-owned projects to preferred customers has been executed, or the said companies have refused to execute such contracts, and (2) the Secretary of the Interior has so informed the Congress."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

" 'The Bonneville Power Administrator', is hereby added after 'the Commissioner of Reclamation', in subsection (a) of section 6 of the act of October 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.), as amended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed for construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be available for the initiation of construction under the terms of reclamation law of any dam or reservoir or water supply, or any tunnel, canal, or conduit for water, or water distribution system related to such dam or reservoir until the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "including (notwithstanding the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, relating thereto) operation and maintenance of Palo Verde Weir."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the mendment of the Senate numbered 27 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"Of the sum appropriated in the preceding paragraph $5,493,750 shall be for expenses necessary for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress, including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 34): *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, character, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress: *Provided further*, That the reserve for Navy subsidies in the amount of $1,801,934 carried in the accounts of the Island Trading Company of Micronesia on December 31, 1951, as "Paid in Surplus" shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That after June 30, 1953, no funds appropriated by this or any other act and no funds which are available or which may become available from any source whatever shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except as may be specifically authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Island Trading Company of Micronesia shall not have succession after December 31, 1953, and any funds available to said company on said date shall, unless otherwise specifically provided by law, be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the reference herein to the Island Trading Company of Micronesia shall be deemed to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

include any other officer, agency, or instrumentality performing the same or similar functions: *Provided further*, That no new activity requiring expenditures of Federal funds shall be initiated without specific prior approval of Congress."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 21, 24, 25, 27, and 44.

The motion was agreed to.

TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE ACCOUNTS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate House bill 8499, relating solely to the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 8499) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances of telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives was read twice by its title.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. It applies only to a change in the law affecting Members of the House and their telegraph and telephone allowances. The bill makes a change from the basis of the fiscal year to the calendar year. It is a House matter only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report Senate Resolution 347, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I have conferred with the majority leader. The resolution was originally reported from the Committee on Armed Services on July 2, 1952. It provides for an increase in the limit of expenditures for hearings before the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution which had been originally reported by Mr. RUSSELL from the Committee on Armed Services on July 2, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Armed Services is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS AT UNVEILING OF BRONZE REPLICA OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE IN CAPITOL ROTUNDA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report an original concurrent resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the proceedings, held in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol at the presentation and unveiling of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence, be printed, with illustrations, in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, as a Senate document; and that 5,000 copies be printed, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. The cost will be $350. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I took the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] from his feet. He was kind enough to yield to me. I apologize to him. I did not know that he would be taken off his feet for so long a time.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the majority leader for moving in the direction of helping me to be recognized again.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, during the call of the calendar the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] objected to calendar 1070, House bill 5248, to suspend certain import duties on tungsten. He now tells me that he has withdrawn his objection. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "by", to strike out "subparagraphs (c), (g), and (h) of paragraph 302 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and the duties on articles containing more than 50 percent of tungsten or tungsten carbide imposed by subparagraph (b) of paragraph 316 of such act" and insert "subparagraph (c) of paragraph 302 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended"; on page 2, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "tungsten (high grade tungsten concentrate, f. o. b. mine)" and insert "standard grade (or better) tungsten concentrates, domestic or foreign, f. o. b. mine or c. i. f. United States ports",; in line 16, after the word "imposed", to insert "under"; in the same line, after the amendment just above referred to, to strike out "subparagraphs (c), (g), and (h) of paragraph 302 and subparagraph (b) of paragraph 316" and insert "subparagraph (c) of paragraph 302"; after line 21, to strike out:

In determining the average market price of tungsten for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is hereby authorized to base its findings upon the average monthly price of tungsten (high-grade tungsten concentrate, f. o. b. mine) reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal's "Metal and Mineral Markets" (or where two or more such average monthly prices are so reported, upon the average of such prices).

And in lieu thereof to insert:

In determining the average market price of standard grade (or better) tungsten concentrates, domestic or foreign, f. o. b. mine or c. i. f. United States ports, for each calendar month, the Tariff Commission is authorized to consider the prices of tungsten concentrates reported by the Engineering and Mining Journal in its weekly Metal and Mineral Markets.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVITATION TO INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION TO MEET IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1953

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a matter which concerns the Congress of the United States.

The Interparliamentary Union will meet in Berne, Switzerland, in the last part of August or the first of September. The United States Congress is a member of the Interparliamentary Union. Our distinguished Vice President is president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. It has been 26 years since the Interparliamentary Union met in the United States.

I believe that the group as a whole would appreciate an invitation to meet in Washington. I hope the Senate will agree that we should extend an invitation to the Interparliamentary Union to meet in Washington next year, at its forty-second annual meeting.

Having that thought in mind, I submit the following Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration:

Whereas the Interparliamentary Union has not met in Washington, D. C., since 1926; and

Whereas United States delegates have attended 22 meetings of the Interparliamentary Union in other capitals of the world since the meeting in Washington, D. C.: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union be requested to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual meeting for the year 1953 in Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution has been read by its author. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Senators have asked me about the legislative program of the Senate, particularly with regard to convening tomorrow. If we pass the pending bill we shall convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow; otherwise it will be necessary to convene at 10 o'clock. I hope we can dispose of the bill and several small matters and recess by 10 o'clock tonight.

THE ARMED FORCES RESERVE ACT OF 1952

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, last night the Senate adopted the conference report on the Armed Services Reserve Act of 1952, but time did not permit the chairman of the conferees, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to make a statement covering the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill.

However, the chairman did issue a statement at the conclusion of the final meeting of the conferees on July 1. The statement is clear and brief and answers conclusively the several important and legitimate questions which not only Members of the Senate have asked but which the Reserves throughout the country as well have asked.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Louisiana be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, the chairman of the Senate conferees on the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, announced that the committee of conference had reached agreement on the differing provisions of the Senate and House bills.

Among the major points of difference between the two bills, Senator LONG stressed the following:

An amendment offered on the floor of the Senate to insure that women officers of the Reserve components should not be declared ineligible for continued service in the Reserve solely because of the birth or assumption of care or custody of minor children was rejected by the committee of conference after lengthy discussion. The conferees felt that this subject should receive the benefit of further consideration during the next Congress.

Similarly, an amendment offered on the floor of the Senate by Senator TAFT, Republican, to authorize the crediting by Reserve officers of cadet and midshipmen service rendered prior to 1916 was rejected by the conferees.

A provision which appeared in the House bill authorizing constructive service for certain legal specialists of the Navy was also rejected by the conferees.

With respect to the appointment of officers in the Reserve components, the House bill provided that all appointments should be for an indefinite period of time rather for a certain number of years. The Senate bill contained a similar proviso. However, with respect to the transition from present commissions to the new type of indefinite commission, there was considerable difference between the bills. The House bill provided that the individual officer would automatically be deemed to hold a permanent commission unless he expressly declined within a certain specified time. The Senate version provided that in making this transition the individual officer concerned would be required to actually accept in writing the new commission, thereby leaving no room for misunderstanding as to the individual's status. The conferees accepted the Senate version.

The House bill contained a proviso providing that all enlistments and obligated periods of service in the Reserve components could be extended by the President in time of an emergency declared by the President, such extension to run for the duration of such emergency plus 6 months. The Senate bill required that such extension of enlistment or obligated period of service could be effected only by the specific consent of the Congress. The conferees accepted the Senate version.

Senator LONG pointed out that perhaps the most controversial differences were the provisions of the House bill establishing a Ready Reserve and a Standby Reserve and formulating the relative degree of liability between these two major categories.

In the compromise agreement was reached by the conferees regarding these provisions. The significant points are: (1) the size of the Ready Reserve is limited to an aggregate of 1,500,000; (2) the Ready Reserve can be ordered to active duty during an emergency declared by the President, but only in such numbers as specifically authorized by the Congress; (3) the Standby Reserve can be ordered to active duty only in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress; and (4) except in time of war or when specifically authorized by the Congress, units and members of the Standby Reserve cannot be ordered to active duty unless the Secretary of Defense determined that qualified units or individuals of the Ready Reserve were not available.

The provision of the Senate bill relating to Korean veterans was modified as a result of the general changes necessitated by adopting the concept of a Ready Reserve and Standby Reserve. Essentially, however, the compromise agreement retains a clear expression of congressional intent that the Korean veteran should not be called so long as there are available in appropriate numbers sufficient reservists who have lesser sacrifices and suffered less hardship.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, should the President of the United States sign the Reserve bill, as I am certain he will sign it enthusiastically and gladly, it will mark the first time in the long history of America's military establishment that a reservist can determine within reason his degree of vulnerability and the general circumstances under which he, as a reservist, will be called to the colors in the future. I speak not personally but as a reservist when I state my own conviction that the adoption of the Reserve bill provides a degree of justice and equity and satisfaction to the literally millions of reservists, both officers and enlisted personnel, which have been conspicuously absent in years gone by.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Washington for what he has said, because I believe, as does the Senator from Washington, who has ably participated in the formulation of the bill, that it will do as much as any other bill in preparing this country for the future, and in keeping up the enthusiastic interest of civilian leadership, which must be created into military leadership in time of emergency.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services has made unnecessary for me to offer several other comments which I had intended to make. His experience is greater than mine. I am grateful for the comment he has made.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Louisiana is gratified by the compliment of the Senator from Washington concerning the Reserve bill. However, it should be known that had it not been for the determination of the Senator from Washington that the bill should be acted upon it would not have received action in this Congress. It was on his motion that the committee agreed to undertake action on the bill and to get it before Congress in the dying days of this session. Even though the Senator from Washington was ill during a part of the time, he attended many meetings, and he was of invaluable help in working out the differences in conference.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I would return the compliment of the Senator from Louisiana, for which I am grateful, by stating my own appreciation for the opportunity which made it possible for me to serve, not only with the Senator from Louisiana, but with his colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and, most importantly, with every other member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

In all sincerity, the House of Representatives and the Senate are to be congratulated for having found it possible in these turbulent and overcrowded times to give consideration, which is long overdue, to the problems of the reservists. I know that wherever they may be serving now, they will be grateful in considerate fashion to their Congress.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I favorably report nominations for the promotion of several hundred officers in the armed services. None of these nominations is above the grade of colonel. They have all been before the Armed Services Committee in excess of 7 days. The Committee has received no objections concerning these nominations.

Since the names of all of the nominees have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time they were received by

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the Senate and in order to save the cost of printing these names on the Senate Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate as in executive session confirm these nominations and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A large number of committee amendments, most of them representing reductions, have been reported by the committee.

Is there objection to the consideration of the amendments en bloc, with the understanding that if a Senator wishes to reopen any of the amendments, he may do so?

The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, after the word "Massachusetts", to strike out "Troop housing, covered storage and"; in line 5, after the word "facilities", strike out "$2,356,000" and insert "$324,000"; in line 6, after the name "New Jersey", to strike out "Troop housing and"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$5,007,000" and insert "$116,000"; after line 7, to strike out:

"Fort Tilden, N. Y.: Community facility, $77,000."

After line 9, to strike out "Fort Wadsworth, N. Y.: Maintenance and closed storage facilities, $352,000."

In line 16, after the name "Kentucky", to strike out "Troop housing, operational, maintenance and"; in line 17, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$5,125,000" and insert "$822,000"; in line 18, after the word "Kentucky", to strike out "Troop housing"; in line 20, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$16,794,000" and insert "$11,411,000"; in line 21, after the word "Maryland", to strike out "Administrative, operational, maintenance and"; in line 23, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$1,454,000" and insert "$335,000."

On page 3, line 3, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "cold"; in line 4, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$5,753,000" and insert "$5,193,000"; in line 5, after the word "Carolina", to strike out "Troop housing"; in line 7, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$15,325,000" and insert "$9,507,000"; after line 7, to strike out:

"Camp Gordon, Ga.: Administrative facility, $125,000.

"Fort Jackson, S. C.: Administrative facility, training buildings, and utilities, $182,000."

In line 14, after the word "Alabama," to strike out "Administrative"; in line 15, after the word "facilities," to strike out "covered storage"; in line 16, after the word "acquisition," to strike out "$893,000" and insert "$361,000"; in line 19, after the word "utilities," to strike out "$1,024,000" and insert "$512,000"; in line 21, after the word "buildings," to strike out "administration"; in line 22, after the word "facilities," to strike out "$5,036,000" and insert "$4,856,000"; in line 24, to strike out "$461,000" and insert "$432,000."

On page 4, line 2, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$10,516,000" and insert "$10,090,000"; after line 2 to strike out:

"Camp Polk, La.: Administrative and maintenance facilities, open and covered storage, $608,000."

In line 5, after the word "Oklahoma," to strike out "Troop housing"; in line 6, after the word "facilities", to strike out "training buildings, open storage,"; in line 7, to strike out "$4,374,000" and insert "$893,040"; after line 8, to strike out:

"Camp Atterbury, Ind.: Maintenance facility and open storage, $315,000."

In line 13, after the name "Missouri", to strike out "Permanent troop and troop support facilities" and insert "Rehabilitation of troop housing and support facilities"; after line 14, to strike out:

"Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Administrative facility and training building, $7,600,000."

In line 18, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$370,000" and insert "$132,500."

On page 5, line 1, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "Operational facility"; in line 2, after the word "storage", to strike out "$582,000" and insert "$504,000"; in line 4, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$924,000" and insert "$272,000"; after line 4, to strike out:

"Fort Ord, Calif.: Troop housing and utilities, $7,888,000."

"Camp Stoneman, Calif.: Troop housing, $1,476,000."

"United States Disciplinary Barracks, Camp Cooke, Calif.: Troop housing, $293,000."

In line 15, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$2,520,000" and insert $2,488,000"; in line 21, after the word "Maryland", to strike out "Troop housing, training buildings and facilities,"; in line 24, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$6,850,000" and insert "$5,419,999."

On page 6, line 4, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$2,398,000" and insert "$2,370,000."

On page 7, line 13, after the name "New Jersey", to strike out "Troop housing and"; in line 14, after the word "facility", to strike out "$8,600,000" and insert "$7,500,000"; after line 20, to strike out:

"Army Map Service, District of Columbia: Operational facility, $846,000."

On page 8, line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$461,000" and insert "$315,000"; in line 12, to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$42,300."

On page 10, line 16, to strike out "$143,010,000" and insert "$135,010,000."

On page 11, line 5, after the word "expansion", to strike out "$3,996,000" and insert "$3,499,000"; in line 13, after the word "laboratory", to strike out "$7,329,000" and insert "$6,006,000"; in line 18, after the word "capacity", to strike out "$380,000" and insert "$319,000"; in line 20, after the word "Island" to insert "Planning for"; in line 21, after the word "facility", to strike out "$5,140,000" and insert "$140,000."

On page 12, line 3, after the word "pier", to strike out "extension of three existing piers"; in line 5, to strike out "$5,043,000" and insert "$3,083,000"; in line 9, after the word "easements", to strike out "$3,792,000" and insert "$2,522,000"; in line 16, after the word "roads", to strike out "$3,734,000" and insert "$2,600,000"; in line 19, after the word "facilities" to strike out "$4,760,000" and insert "$4,337,000"; in line 22, after the word "Station", to strike out "Omaha" and insert "Lincoln"; in line 25, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,372,000."

On page 13, line 11, after the word "land", to strike out "$11,072,000" and insert "$9,102,000"; in line 14, after the word "preparation", to strike out "$3,281,000" and insert "$2,481,000"; in line 18, after the word "housing", to strike out "$652,000" and insert "$564,000"; in line 21, to strike out "$3,625,000" and insert "$2,600,000."

On page 14, line 2, after the word "services", to strike out "$3,933,000" and insert "$2,793,000"; in line 15, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$14,463,000" and insert "$13,687,000"; after line 15, to strike out "Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Communications Officers School $163,000."

On page 15, line 11, after the word "building", to strike out "$428,000" and insert "$379,000"; in line 13, to strike out "$630,000" and insert "$500,000"; in line 18, after the word "cities", to strike out "$21,248,000" and insert "$14,443,000"; in line 23, after the word "messhall", to strike out "$2,100,000" and insert "$1,555,000"; in line 25, after the word "land", to strike out "$3,279,000" and insert "$2,325,000."

On page 16, line 10, after the word "buildings", to strike out "$2,250,000" and insert "$2,030,000"; in line 24, after the word "housing", to strike out "$1,520,000" and insert "$1,450,000."

On page 17, line 9, after the word "plant", to strike out "$2,670,000" and insert "$2,424,000"; after line 16, to strike out:

"HYDROGRAPHIC FACILITIES

"Hydrographic Office, Suitland, Md.: Addition to existing Hydrographic Office, $687,000."

On page 18, line 13, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,482,000" and insert "$1,171,000"; in line 15, after the word "quarters", to strike out "$2,084,000" and insert "$1,322,000"; in line 19, after the word "pavement", to strike out "$1,135,000" and insert "$795,000"; after line 21, to strike out:

"Naval Air Station, Kwajalein, Marshall Islands: Family quarters, $1,131,000."

On page 20, line 24, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$3,356,000" and insert "$1,832,000."

On page 21, line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$15,844,000" and insert "$13,889,000"; in line 17, after the word "shops", to strike out "$13,556,000" and insert "$9,932,000"; in line 19, after the word "storage" to strike out the comma and "and dispensing facilities,"; in line 20, after the word "facilities", to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "utilities" to insert a comma and strike out "and medical facilities"; in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$5,339,000" and insert "$5,067,000."

On page 22, line 2, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$8,890,000" and insert "$8,014,000"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$9,471,000" and insert "$9,421,000"; in line 12, after the word "shops", to strike out "$15,737,000" and insert "$15,520,000"; in line 19, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$31,516,000" and insert "$24,805,000"; in line 22, after the word "utilities", to strike out "land acquisition,"; in line 23, after the word "shops", to strike out "$6,027,000" and insert "$5,185,000"; in line 25, after the word "storage" to insert a comma and strike out "and dispensing facilities."

On page 23, line 2, to strike out "$12,098,000" and insert $"6,566,000."

On page 23, line 4, after the word "storage" to strike out "and dispensing facilities,"; in line 9, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$19,167,000" and insert "$13,966,000"; in line 14, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$23,971,000" and insert "$22,892,000"; in line 25, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$31,165,000" and insert "$23,749,000."

On page 24, line 5, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$13,645,000" and insert "$9,906,000"; in line 9, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$8,669,000" and insert

"$7,168,000"; in line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "troop housing facilities"; in line 13, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$3,798,000" and insert "$1,776,000"; in line 18, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$15,265,000" and insert "$12,568,000"; in line 20, after the word "facilities", to strike out "troop housing facilities,"; in line 21, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$881,000" and insert "$281,000."

On page 25, line 2, after the word "facilities" to insert "and"; in line 3, after the word "facilities", to strike out the comma and "and shops, $36,261,000" and insert "$28,426,000"; in line 12, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$23,755,000" and insert "$18,285,000"; in line 18, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$29,041,000" and insert "$19,820,000"; in line 22, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$6,120,000" and insert "$5,962,000."

On page 26, line 2, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$2,240,000" and insert "$1,583,000"; in line 8, after the word "shops", to strike out "$32,273,000" and insert "$23,472,000"; in line 13, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$3,271,000" and insert "$3,091,000"; in line 15, after the word "pavements" to strike out "navigational aids" and insert "communications"; in line 18, to strike out "$24,334,000" and insert "$23,239,000"; in line 22, to strike out "$634,000" and insert "$579,000."

On page 27, line 2, to strike out "$843,000" and insert "$704,000"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "administrative and community facilities,"; in line 9, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,270,000" and insert "$976,000"; in line 21, after the word "facilities", to strike out "administrative and community facilities,"; in line 23, to strike out "$879,000" and insert "$740,000."

On page 28, line 3, after the word "facilities", to strike out "troop housing facilities,"; in line 4, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$12,518,000" and insert "$10,866,000"; in line 10, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$6,730,000" and insert "$5,885,000"; in line 14, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,355,000" and insert "$1,179,000"; in line 21, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$2,611,000" and insert "$1,776,000."

On page 29, line 1, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "medical facilities" and insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and shops $2,006,000" and insert "$1,394,000"; in line 6, after the word "utilities", to insert "and"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and shops, $4,146,000" and insert "$3,801,000"; in line 10, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$660,000" and insert "$612,000"; in line 13 after the word "utilities", to strike out "medical facilities"; in line 14, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$2,576,000" and insert "$2,402,000"; in line 16, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$782,000" and insert "$746,000"; in line 18, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,299,000" and insert "$1,251,000."

On page 30, line 6, after the word "pavements", to strike out "troop housing facilities, utilities"; in line 7, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,297,000" and insert "$185,000"; in line 16, after the word "facilities", to strike out "administrative and community facilities"; in line 17, after the word "utilities", to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and shops, $2,805,000" and insert "$2,335,000"; in line 21, after the word "utilities", to insert "and"; in line 22, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and shops, $1,554,000" and insert "$1,518,000."

On page 31, line 3, after the word "facilities", where it occurs the second time, to insert "and"; in line 4, after the word "facilities", to strike out "and shops, $3,000,000" and insert "$2,731,000"; in line 9, after the word "shops", to strike out "$2,141,000" and insert "$1,965,000"; in line 15, after the word "utilities", to strike out "land acquisition," and in line 16 to strike out "$4,324,000" and insert "$2,852,000"; in line 21, to strike out "$4,237,000" and insert "$4,045,000."

On page 32, line 3, after the word "facilities", where it occurs the first time, to insert "and"; after the word "facilities" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "and shops $16,203,000" and insert "$11,602,000"; in line 8, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$24,777,000" and insert "$18,663,000"; in line 10, after the word "facilities", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "troop housing facilities,"; in line 12, after the word "facilities" to strike out "$1,152,000" and insert "$906,000"; in line 19, after the word "shops", to strike out "$6,269,000" and insert "$5,746,000."

On page 33, line 2, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$9,243,000" and insert "$8,457,000"; in line 9, after the word "acquisition" to strike out "medical facilities,"; in the same line, after the word "shops", to strike out "$18,895,000" and insert "$14,838,000"; in line 17, after the word "acquisition" to insert "and"; in the same line, after the word "facilities" to strike out "and shops, $9,726,000" and insert "$7,092,000."

On page 34, line 5, after the word "shops", to strike out "$3,791,000" and insert "$3,440,000"; in line 10, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$2,402,000" and insert "$2,339,000"; in line 14, after the word "facilities" where it occurs the second time, to insert "and"; in line 15, after the word "utilities", to strike out "and storage facilities, $4,787,000" and insert "$4,563,000"; in line 20, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$5,129,000" and insert "$4,383,000"; in line 25, to strike out "$3,741,000" and insert "$3,820,000."

On page 35, line 3, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$11,488,000" and insert "$5,796,000"; in line 8, after the word "shops", to strike out "$7,829,000" and insert "$6,333,000"; in line 14, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,943,000" and insert "$4,266,000"; in line 19, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,958,000" and insert "$4,601,000"; in line 24, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$5,174,000" and insert "$5,167,000."

On page 36, line 3, after the word "acquisition", to strike out $8,372,000" and insert "$5,839,000"; in line 7, after the word "shops", to strike out "$2,112,000" and insert "$1,846,000"; in line 13, after the word "shops", to strike out $10,858,000" and insert "$10,309,000"; in line 20, after the word "shops", to strike out $5,560,000" and insert "$5,306,000"; in line 25, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,976,000" and insert "$4,810,000."

On page 37, line 2, after the word "storage", to strike out "and dispensing facilities,"; in line 5, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$11,044,000" and insert "$10,341,000"; in line 13, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$8,239,000" and insert "$7,356,000"; in line 17, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,718,000" and insert "$1,691,000."

On page 38, line 2, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$7,621,000" and insert "$7,275,000"; in line 6, after the word "utilities", to strike out "land acquisition"; in line 7, after the word "shops", to strike out "$9,871,000" and insert "$9,703,000"; in line 17, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,603,000" and insert "$1,507,000"; in line 23, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,620,000."

On page 39, line 3, after the word "facilities", to insert "and"; in line 3, after the word "utilities", to strike out "and medical facilities, $8,000,000" and insert "$7,964,000"; in line 8, after the word "acquisition", to strike out "$4,800,000" and insert "$4,790,000"; in line 11, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$2,642,000" and insert "$564,000"; after line 17, to strike out:

"Dobbins Air Force Base, Marietta, Ga.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft-maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $1,083,000."

In line 23, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,145,000" and insert "$995,000."

On page 40, after line 17, to strike out:

"Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, Baltimore, Md.: Communications facilities, troop-housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and medical facilities, $1,646,000."

In line 25, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,399,000" and insert "$990,000."

On page 41, line 8, after the word "facilities", to strike out $40,770,000" and insert "$39,838,000"; in line 14, to strike out "$10,189,000" and insert "$8,543,000"; in line 21, to strike out "$707,000" and insert "$560,000"; in line 24, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$1,871,000" and insert "$1,290,000."

On page 42, line 2, to strike out "$12,114,000" and insert "$6,060,000"; in line 14, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$17,179,000" and insert "$14,479,000"; in line 18, after the word "utilities", to strike out "$37,155,000" and insert $31,325,000."

On page 43, line 2, after the word "facilities" to strike out "$18,055,000" and insert "$14,856,000"; in line 6, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$4,756,000" and insert "$3,914,000"; in line 9, to strike out "$1,069,000" and insert "$800,000"; in line 17, to strike out "$32,752,000" and insert "$27,014,000."

On page 44, line 5, after the word "of" to strike out "$1,133,938,000" and insert "$1,012,398,000."

On page 45, line 9, after the word "utilities" to strike out "land acquisition"; in line 11, after the word "shops" to strike out "$74,745,000" and insert "$62,500,000."

On page 46, line 12, after the word "shops" to strike out "$36,362,000" and insert "$28,432,000."

On page 48, after line 5, to strike out:

"Hammonton Air Force Base, Hammonton, New Jersey: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilites, storage facilties, and shops, $73,523,000."

In line 14, after the word "amounts", to strike out "$1,989,964,800" and insert "$1,896,271,800"; in the same line, after the word "and" to strike out "$3,477,022,800" and insert "$3,383,329,800."

On page 51, line 3, after the word "act", to strike out "Any reimbursement made by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force, or their designees, under the authority of this subsection or subsection 501 (b) of the act of September 28, 1951, 65 Stat. 365), shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to the contrary."

In line 14, after the word "States" to strike out "$171,664" and insert "$116,865,800"; in line 16, after the word "facilities"; to strike out "$143,010,000" and insert "$135,010,000"; in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out "$383,291,000" and insert "$320,492,800"; in line 18, after the word "States", to strike out "$164,514,000" and insert "$137,043,000"; in line 19, after the word "States", to strike out "$34,839,000" and insert "$32,295,000"; in line 20, after the word "of" to strike out "$285,750,-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

000" and insert "$255,735,000"; in line 22, after the word "States", to strike out "$844,-240,000" and insert "$708,352,000"; in line 23, after the word "States", to strike out "$111,-099,000" and insert "$92,610,000"; in line 24, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,-133,938,000" and insert "$1,012,398,000"; in the same line, after the word "of", to strike out "$2,089,277,000" and insert "$1,813,360,-000."

On page 52, line 2, after the word "centum" to strike out the comma and "and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations"; in line 22, after "SEC. 407" to strike out "The limitation on total aggregate net expenditures set forth in section 638 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1953, is hereby increased by the amount of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, pursuant to this or any other act authorizing the establishment or development of installations and facilities."

At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

"SEC. 407. In the case of any public work authorized to be established or developed under the authority of section 102, 202, or 302 of this act, the Secretary of the military department authorized to establish or develop such public work shall inform the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate or his designee and the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives or his designee whenever the military department concerned proposes to commence the acquisition of land or rights pertaining thereto, or to commence construction in connection with any such public work. If within 30 days after being so informed, either of such chairmen (or his designee) advises the Secretary of the military department concerned that he disapproves the contemplated acquisition or commencement of construction, then there shall be no such acquisition or commencement of construction unless the Secretary of Defense specifically authorizes it or the chairman (or his designee) who disapproved withdraws his approval.

"SEC. 48. The Secretary of Defense shall maintain direct surveillance over the planning and construction by the military departments of all public works projects. Such surveillance shall be maintained through a civilian official of the Department of Defense to be known as the Director of Installations, who shall be appointed by and directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,800 a year. The Director of Installations shall, from time to time, make such reports directly to the Secretary of Defense with respect to public works projects under construction by the military departments as he may deem necessary to keep the Secretary of Defense currently and fully informed with respect to the status, progress, and cost of, and all other pertinent matters concerning, such public works projects. No person shall be appointed as Director of Installations unless the Secretary of Defense is satisfied that he has had a substantial amount of experience in the construction of public works of the types constructed by the military departments. The Secretary of Defense shall provide for furnishing the Director of Installations with such engineering, clerical, stenographic, and other personnel as he may require in order adequately to perform his functions.

"SEC. 409. Whenever—

"(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act, and

"(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts,

the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. MORSE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the speed and ease with which the military construction bill has just been passed by the Senate may obscure the hard and conscientious work which was done by the committee, particularly by its chairman, the very able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. It was not my privilege to be a member of the committee, but I followed its work from the outside.

I believe the country should know that the junior Senator from Louisiana and his associates by very careful work have saved $450,000,000 for the country. The Senator from Louisiana should be congratulated for getting experts attached to the committee who were able to meet the Air Force on their own terms and beat them.

The whole country owes a debt of gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana. His record is much better than my own in obtaining economies, and I shall try to learn from him what the recipe is.

I wish to congratulate him. I think the country has been very deeply served.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared in regard to House bill 8120, which has just been passed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG

The Armed Services Committee presents this public works bill fully aware that it is not a perfect bill; despite long hearings and intensive investigative work, the committee could not accomplish what might eventually have resulted except for the extreme pressure of time. The departmental requests were not sent down until May, which means that the committee has had to consider some $3,000,000,000 of requests involving thousands of items scattered over much of the globe within a few weeks.

Despite this handicap, the committee believes it is on sound ground in the reductions it recommends in this bill and which I will detail a little further along in this presentation.

The total request, including all three services, was $3,027,752,000. The total amount authorized by the House action was $2,758,-318,000. Your committee recommends a bill in the total of $2,382,250,800. This is a reduction of $645,501,200 under the departmental requests and $376,067,200 under the amount as it passed the House.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks tables showing the requests by departments, the House allowance and your committee recommendation.

I think the Senate should know that the reductions in this bill will not keep a gun from firing, a plane from flying, or a ship from sailing; the reductions have been made with a view of eliminating the frills, trimming, the fat, and postponing the luxuries. For myself, Mr. President, I was shocked to find, particularly within the Air Force, a callous disregard in the military for the necessity for economy. Construction standards are far too high in comparison with those generally followed in industry and commerce. Requirements are poorly estimated and, almost invariably, on the liberal side. There seems to be no coordination of construction practices between the services. Comparable items reflect different unit costs as between Army, Air Force, and Navy.

In time of crisis, the public generally would prefer to see its substance spent in fire power, rather than in frills; the American people do not resent necessary expenditures for guns and planes, but it justly complains against tiled bathrooms, empty garages, and high-priced wash racks.

The committee, in marking up the bill, set up rather broad ground rules which it followed strictly in making the reductions. Additional barracks were not allowed where there is now an excess or a sufficient number to meet requirements. Barracks unit costs were reduced to $1,700 per man for permanent structures and $1,400 per men for 10-year-life construction. By comparison, the Air Force was asking $2,000 and $1,960 per man respectively. Warehousing, which was requested at prices ranging from $7.50 to $10 per square foot, was reduced to $6 per square foot after investigation revealed that in some instances the services are obtaining it for less than that figure and commercial and other governmental warehousing is being obtained at even lesser amounts. In this item, it was evident that the services are specifying on too high standards. If presently prescribed warehousing cannot be obtained at the $6 figure, the standards will be lowered accordingly.

Where varied unit costs were submitted on comparable items as between the services, the authorization is on the basis of the lowest unit cost requested. Bachelor officer quarters have been reduced to $5,000 per man. Vehicle maintenance shops were trimmed where there are existing facilities now serving.

Requests for medical and dental facilities have been reduced where either other facilities are available or where the requests appeared excessive to the need. Dental chairs are allowed on the basis of 1 to 1,000 rather than 1 to 500 as requested.

Where structures were requested for replacement purposes, they were in general denied, since the committee did not believe that improvements as against necessities are justified at this time.

I believe that in general those are the ground rules set. They were applied across

the board. In some cases their application resulted in substantial reductions; some items were not affected at all.

I wish to point out that there are substantial differences between this bill and the bill as it passed the House. A protracted conference will be necessary. If there are errors or miscalculations, they can be corrected in the conference and I will, in the meantime be glad to discuss any item with any interested Senator. Under the circumstances, however, I ask Senators to allow us to pass this bill in the shortest possible time so that the conference can begin immediately. Every item in the bill will be in conference, if reductions were made, and as a practical matter the final version of the bill must be arrived at between the Houses.

Department request

	Within United States	Outside United States	Classified facilities	Total
Army	$178,809,000	$68,617,000	$26,310,000	$273,736,000
Navy	174,044,000	34,839,000	28,972,000	237,855,000
Air Force	859,991,000	139,099,000	517,071,000	1,516,161,000
Providing in whole or in part for installations in foreign countries for all services				1,000,000,000
Total				3,027,752,000

House action

	United States	Outside	Classified	Total
Army	$171,664,000	$68,617,000	$143,010,000	$383,291,000
Navy	164,514,000	34,839,000	86,397,000	285,750,000
Air	844,420,000	111,099,000	1,133,938,000	2,089,277,000
Total				2,758,318,000

Senate action

	Within United States	Outside United States	Classified facilities including those in foreign countries	Total
Army	$116,652,800	$68,617,000	$135,010,000	$320,279,800
Navy	136,167,000	32,265,000	86,397,000	254,859,000
Air Force	702,104,000	92,610,000	1,012,398,000	1,807,112,000
Total				2,382,250,800

Mr. LONG. Also, Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which worked on this bill, I should like to convey the thanks of the subcommittee to the professional engineers who worked with us in helping pare down the cost of the bill. In many cases we have made reductions of unit prices which I believe will cause savings of perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars to the country at this time, by finding ways to obtain warehousing and troop housing and to obtain other items at much reduced cost. I believe these savings will make possible great additional savings in the future.

In this instance, Mr. President, we did not need to hire a professional staff. The armed services were so kind as to make available to us, on a loan basis, certain professional engineers who have been working with the armed services of this Nation.

One of them was Mr. C. C. Phillips, of the Corps of Engineers.

Another was Mr. Louis E. Dowling, presently with the Navy Bureau of Yards and Docks.

Another was Mr. George W. Vinzant, presently with the Corps of Army Engineers.

I do not believe we could have effected such extensive economies as will be possible in this instance if we had not had the services of those competent, able, and highly cooperative engineers, whose services were made available to us through the cooperation of the armed services of the Nation.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8122, Calendar 1916, relating to the computation of parity prices for basic agricultural commodities.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

COST ALLOCATIONS, REPAYMENTS, AND APPLICATION OF RECLAMATION LAW ON KINGS RIVER PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief introductory statement of mine and exchanges of correspondence with the Secretary of the Army and Assistant Chief of Engineers, and with the Secretary of the Interior, concerning cost allocations, repayments and the application of reclamation law on the Kings River project, in California.

There being no objection, the statement and correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I. COMMENTS ON CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECRETARY OF THE ARMY AND ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

I am moved to share with Members of Congress an exchange of correspondence I have had with Secretary of the Army, Frank Pace, Jr., and Brig. Gen. C. H. Chorpening, Assistant Chief of Engineers, concerning cost allocations on the Kings River irrigation and flood-control project in California because I find their present position on this matter seriously disturbing to what Congress, the Federal budget situation, and our reclamation laws require. I hope that the opening up of this controversy for the information of Congress, and the various interested parties will help to secure a revision of the position which the Army engineers are taking.

In brief, the Engineers are refusing to make a reallocation of irrigation costs on the Kings River project which are properly repayable to the Government, although total project costs have mounted 40 percent since the last allocation in 1947. This threatens not only to override the congressional direction in 1944 to make continuing cost studies, but also to deprive the Federal Treasury of some $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 of additional repayments which ought properly to be made by the irrigation beneficiaries.

The further danger is that owners of present large farm acreages may try to take advantage of the low irrigation cost figure and an ambiguity in the Department of the Interior's interpretation of reclamation law, in such a way as to buy their way at cut rates out of the acreage limitation and nonspeculation features of reclamation law. This would be a heavy blow to the veterans and others who, in accordance with the definite policy of reclamation law, are hoping to secure the benefits of Federal irrigation in the Kings River and Central Valley. I believe it would be a serious threat to the effectiveness of that reclamation policy across the Western States if such evasion of its provisions should succeed.

While the engineers cite the proviso inserted in the 1947 Appropriations Act as a bar to a new cost allocation now, I have set forth in my reply of June 19 my grounds for believing that the 1947 proviso not only does not preclude such an allocation, but on the contrary was inserted in an effort to make doubly sure that Federal reclamation policy, including repayment and wide distribution of benefits, would apply to that project.

The matter is one of some urgency inasmuch as the construction work on the project is being pushed and may be concluded and confer many of the benefits of the project on owners in the valley before these issues are fully decided.

II. COMMENTS ON CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

In a second section I am also attaching a related exchange of correspondence with the Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary's letter of June 23 establishes the point referred to above, that repayment contracts by irrigation beneficiaries will probably not be executed prior to completion of construction on either the Kings River or Kern River projects.

He also reports lump-sum settlement proposals which are most inadequate to reimburse the Government for its irrigation costs. I learn from other sources that the Kings River Water Association's offer is only $10,000,000. The Secretary mentions an earlier proposal to permit the water users to settle for $8,265,000, or less than one-third

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of 52 percent of present construction costs ($51,121,000), which percentage of 52 percent is the engineers' own estimate of the ratio of irrigation benefits to the total.

Secretary Chapman also makes the logical suggestion that if so much of the Kings River costs are allocated to flood control as now planned by the engineers, it may be advisable to review and reduce the flood-control allocations on the other three projects which empty into Tulare Lake. The justice and wisdom of this suggestion are hard to deny. It will be interesting to see how the engineers will handle it.

I am still disturbed, however, by the apparent willingness of the Department of the Interior to allow the ambiguity to remain in its interpretation of reclamation law in respect to lump-sum settlements. As urged in my letters of April 29 and June 26, the future of our national land policy is at stake. Congress has not passed any law that landowners must be permitted to buy their way out of acreage limitation by lump-sum payments. The sooner the Department clarifies the situation and withdraws any such hope of evasion from the excess landholders of Kings and Kern Valleys, or any other area, the sooner it may expect to make reasonable repayment contracts with owners and operators of family-size farms and effectuate the basic policies of reclamation law.

While the groups which would run roughshod over reclamation policy are powerful, I hope the Bureau of Reclamation with the cooperation of the Army Engineers will show the intestinal fortitude to stand up to them, as urged by veteran leaders like my friend M. C. Herman, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California.

I. CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECRETARY OF THE ARMY AND ASSISTANT CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

FEBRUARY 8, 1952.

Hon. FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army,
The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Would you be good enough to send me the information requested below, relating to the Kings and Kern River projects in California, which will soon be before us again in the Senate? I have been following developments there for several years and am concerned about certain matters which seem to me to threaten the integrity of our reclamation laws.

Construction of these projects is nearing completion. Yet according to my information no contracts for repayment under reclamation law have been executed between the United States and water users for either project. This seems to place financial repayment to the United States in jeopardy and to endanger settlement of farm families according to the purposes of the reclamation law under which they are being built.

At the same time that no contracts are executed, Congress is being asked to appropriate more Federal money for the benefit of local water users on these projects. Besides, I understand that the construction costs are rising far above original estimates, and far above the original cost allocation on the Kings River and Tulare Lake projects.

I would now be grateful if you would send me:

(1) Your opinion as to when an allocation of costs on Kern River project will be made, and whether it will be made in time to complete negotiations for a repayment contract prior to completion of Isabella Dam.

(2) Your opinion whether a reallocation of costs should and will be made on Kings River and Tulare Lake projects in view of the greatly increased cost of constructing Pine Flat Dam.

(3) Your opinion whether it would be advisable to consider and to determine at the same time, the flood control allocations to projects on all the streams whose flood waters enter Tulare Lake.

(4) Your estimate as to whether recent negotiations indicate any probability that repayment contracts will be executed in the near future in the absence of some affirmative legal requirement, such as was proposed to the Senate in 1950. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 9, pp. 11482–11485; 11816–11817).

I shall appreciate your making these facts and judgments available to me.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1952.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This is in reply to your recent letter in which you inquired regarding several matters pertaining to the Kings and Kern River projects in California and other projects on streams flowing into Tulare Lake.

The last part of paragraph 2 of your letter indicates an understanding that these projects are being built under authority of reclamation law. It is pertinent to consideration of these matters to point out that the projects were authorized as flood-control projects in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944. The reports of this Department on which the authorizations are based recognize the important benefits which the projects will also furnish for irrigation and other purposes, and provision therefor is contained in the legislation in the 1944 Food Control Act.

It is the established policy of this Department that official cost allocations for multiple-purpose river-development projects are made when the projects are approaching completion and actual costs are known with a high degree of certainty. Cost allocations made earlier must of necessity be based on estimates which are much less certain, particularly in times of rising costs, such as the recent postwar years. By making allocations at the end of project construction, it is possible to distribute equitably to all project functions their proper share of actual costs; a distribution which is not possible if allocations to certain functions are made firm at an earlier stage.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 adopted the report on the Kern River contained in House Document No. 513, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which contains in the report of the Chief of Engineers the following provision with regard to cost allocation for the Kern River project:

"14. * * * Continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, this Department, and the local organizations will establish the best plan of operation and appropriate cost allocations. Under these conditions it is considered appropriate that provision be made for the construction of the reservoir with Federal funds, and that after completion and when use thereof is made conservation interests be required to pay the United States for the beneficial use of the conservation capacity either in lump-sum or annual installments."

"15. Authority to construct should be understood to include authority to * * * make arrangements for payment by the State or other responsible agency to the United States for the conservation storage when used."

The cost-allocation studies pertaining to the Kern River project were intiated some time ago and are now in progress. It is expected that these studies will be completed and the allocation made in ample time to complete negotiations for repayment contracts prior to completion of the Isabella Dam.

The item authorizing the Kings River project, contained in section 10 of the 1944 Flood Control Act, provides that "The division of costs between flood control, and irrigation, and other water uses shall be determined by the Secretary of War on the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Department, and the local organizations." This language would have permitted the cost allocation to be made in the usual manner as discussed above. However, an item in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act of 1947 required that the appropriation contained therein for the Kings River and Tulare Lake project could not be used for construction until a determination was made by the Secretary of War with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior as to what the cost allocation shall be. Consequently, the allocation studies were undertaken immediately and the report thereon was transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the President on February 17, 1947. It is printed in House Document No. 136, Eightieth Congress, first session. In this document, the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, determined "that the division of cost to irrigation should be set at an amount not to exceed $14,250,000, the exact amount to be as agreed upon between the Bureau of Reclamation and the local agencies concerned." In view of the item in the 1947 Appropriation Act and the submission of House Document No. 136, there is no authority now available for a reallocation of costs on the project.

With regard to the other projects on streams entering Tulare Lake (Terminus and Success Reservoirs), those projects have not yet been placed under construction, and in fact they are not included, even for planning, in the 1953 budget. It will be several years before construction approaches completion. For the reasons discussed above, it would be unwise to make allocations on the basis of the estimates which are now available so far in advance of project completion.

Since the negotiations for repayment contracts for the Kings River project are being handled by the Bureau of Reclamation under Presidential directives as discussed in House Document No. 136, I cannot express an opinion as to the probability of repayment contracts being executed in the near future.

Thank you for bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.

MARCH 27, 1952.

Mr. FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I appreciate your response of March 21 to my inquiry of February 8 concerning the Kings and Kern River projects in California. Your reply, however, raises serious questions which it seems to me require further answer.

In the first place, while you properly refer to the act of 1944 as the authorizing law for the construction of the Kings and Kern River projects, I trust that you did not intend in the second paragraph of your letter to deny the applicability of reclamation law to the irrigation phases of these projects, as provided in section 8 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

It was my understanding that despite some wavering, the Department of the Army now recognizes the clear legislative intent and executive purpose that the operation of the irrigation features of these works shall be

subject to reclamation law. If this issue is to be raised again by the Army, I shall be greatly disappointed. I would like to be informed of your position, however, so that I may be fully advised if your letter was intended to indicate that there has been some change of position.

On the basic question in my letter, however, I am at a loss to understand why you interpret the allocation studies and report on the Kings River project made pursuant to the Appropriation Act of 1947 to be a bar to a reallocation of costs on this project.

Your letter concedes that it is the established policy of your Department to make such final allocations on the basis of actual costs. You also mention the provision in the 1944 Flood Control Act which imposed a positive duty upon you to make such an allocation "on the basis of continuing studies."

Nothing in the 1947 act either repeals your general policy or sets aside the specific direction of the 1944 act. It merely required that an allocation be made before construction was started.

It added to your duties, but did not relieve you of any. In the words of the President on signing the measure, it "afforded an opportunity for assuring that the Federal reclamation policy, including repayment and the wide distribution of benefits, will apply to that project."

Your letter suggests, however, that because in his initial allocation report the Secretary of the Army determined "that the division of cost of irrigation should be set at an amount not to exceed $14,250,000," the Department now has no authority to make a reallocation of costs. While this quirk of phraseology in the Secretary's report seems to set a ceiling on the amount to be repaid by water users, the Secretary had no authority to fix any such binding ceiling and it is inconceivable to me that this should now be cited as a bar to your planning an up-to-date final allocation of costs at the appropriate time. Surely the positive duty imposed in the 1944 act cannot be so simply set aside.

The foregoing analysis of the legislative background is, of course, fortified by the obvious practical effects of any contrary interpretation. If irrigation costs are limited to the 1947 figure of $14,250,000, this would amount to only 28 percent of the estimated project costs in 1952 ($51,121,000), although the engineers estimated in the House hearings this year that irrigation users would receive 52 percent of the prospective annual benefits from the project. This is certainly not a fair share of the project costs for the water users to meet, and in the face of Federal budget conditions, it is hardly consistent with the national interest to limit repayments to such a low figure. I would appreciate it, therefore, if you would review the considerations I have set forth above and give me your further views. These questions are important not only in their relation to our fiscal policy, but also in their possible effect upon the integrity of our reclamation law.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 15, 1952.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: This is in further reply to your letter of March 27 to the Secretary of the Army pertaining to the Kings and Kern River projects in California which were the subjects of your letter of February 8 and the Secretary's dated March 21.

The citation to the 1944 Flood Control Act in the Department's letter of March 21 was simply to clarify the point that these projects are being built pursuant to that act. You will recall your letter had referred to them as being built under reclamation law. I wish to point out that Secretary Pace's letter does not indicate a change of position of the Department regarding the applicability of reclamation law to these projects.

Regarding the matter of cost allocation for the Kings River project, it is believed that there is no authority now available for a reallocation. The 1947 act, being subsequent to the 1944 act, appears to be the controlling legislation. Moreover, the 1947 Civil Functions Appropriations Act specifically provided that the cost allocation was to be made before the construction could begin. There is no mention of the allocation being tentative or preliminary or of any later reallocations being made. It appears that the 1947 act precludes any further studies or allocations pursuant to the 1944 act.

Your interest in this matter is sincerely appreciated and I trust the above further clarifies the position of the Department.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. CHORPENING,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works.

JUNE 19, 1952.

Mr. FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Secretary of the Army.
Brig. Gen. C. H. CHORPENING,
Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, Department of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY, AND GENERAL CHORPENING: This will acknowledge General Chorpening's reply dated May 15, and received May 27, to my letter of March 27 to you, Mr. Secretary, relating to the Kings and Kern River projects in California.

I am writing again to advise you that I cannot see any justification for the conclusion repeated in General Chorpening's letter, that in the case of the Pine Flat Reservoir on the Kings River the 1947 Civil Functions Appropriation Act "precludes any further studies or allocations pursuant to the 1944 act."

I had hoped that my letter of March 27 would clarify the legal duty to make a reallocation of these costs, and the obvious unfairness both to the Federal budget and the reclamation policy of permitting water users to secure for $14,250,000 the irrigation benefits which the engineers themselves estimate to be 52 percent of the prospective benefits of this project now costing $51,121,000. Since General Chorpening's letter rejects these conclusions, I wish to set them forth somewhat more fully for your joint review.

The Flood Control Act of 1944, which authorizes the Kings River project, directed:

"That the division of costs between flood control, and irrigation and other water uses shall be determined by the Secretary of War on the basis of continuing studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, the War Department, and the local organizations."

Section 8 of the act also placed this project, and all others including irrigation features, under the Federal reclamation laws. The obligation to make allocations and secure repayment of the appropriate portion of the cost of the project used for irrigation was thus clearly set forth in the basic authorization legislation.

Your earlier letter of March 21 also concedes it is the general policy of the Department of the Army to make official cost allocations for such multiple-purpose projects as they near completion and actual costs become known with more certainty.

The 1947 appropriations act (Public Law 374, 79th Cong.), which you cite as precluding a reallocation of costs now, provided that the funds for the project could not be used for construction until the Secretary of War, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, made a determination as to what the allocation should be. And on the basis of this direction, the first allocation of $14,250,000 to irrigation costs was made and reported by the Secretary (H. Doc. 136, 80th Cong.). The total estimated cost of the entire project at that time was $36,429,000.

While the Secretary used the words "not to exceed" $14,250,000 in his report, I am sure you must agree that he had no authority to legislate in this matter and could not thus by administrative action set aside the policy or the law by fixing a ceiling beyond which irrigation repayment could not go.

While the 1947 act is, as General Chorpening points out, a later enactment and does not mention that the allocation to be made thereunder is tentative, it is also important to note that: (a) The 1947 act does not repeal the provisions of the 1944 Flood Control Act; (b) the 1947 act does not state that the allocation thereunder shall be final and permanently binding; (c) the 1947 act did not authorize the Secretary to set any top limit on irrigation costs, regardless of cost changes; and (d) it was generally understood that the purpose of this proviso in the 1947 act was to make doubly sure of compliance with the repayment provisions of reclamation law and not to open up an escape hatch for water users to evade the full measure of its provisions. On this last point you will recall that when signing the 1947 act the President stated:

"I am also glad to note that the Congress, by the addition of certain provisos to the item for the Kings River project, California, has afforded an opportunity for assuring that the Federal reclamation policy, including repayment and the wide distribution of benets, will apply to that project. This is in accordance with the view that I have heretofore expressed and the position repeatedly taken by the late President Roosevelt. It is consistent with the policies laid down by the Congress in the Flood Control Act of 1944."

If the purpose of the proviso requiring a cost allocation in the 1947 act was as I understand it, and as the President then interpreted it, to secure repayment to the Government of the right amount for irrigation costs in accord with reclamation law and the 1944 Flood Control Act was designed to accomplish the same end, then your present interpretation of the 1947 act, as barring a reallocation, has the effect of doing just the opposite. It fixes the wrong amount, on the basis of today's costs, and will enable water users to evade the full operation of the reclamation law.

Had construction costs remained constant, it is possible that your interpretation would not injure anyone. But as your own figures now reveal, since the 1947 allocation the estimated costs of the project have risen from $36,429,000 to $51,121,000. The irrigation benefits now amount to 52 percent of the total. Land values are up. Prices of farm products are up. And the ability of water users to repay the fair costs of the irrigation works is up.

I can see no justification in these circumstances for an interpretation of the 1947 act which will leave the Government holding the bag and defeat the expressed will of Congress in both the 1944 Flood Control Act and the 1947 act as I have, I believe correctly, interpreted it.

I press this matter upon you not only because it seems to involve an unwarranted, administrative misinterpretation of the laws, but also because $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 of additional repayments to the Federal Government are involved, and I believe we must guard against undermining our reclamation laws.

For all of these reasons I hope my analysis may have your most careful study and that you will appreciate the necessity of making a reallocation of the Kings River project costs shortly before completion, in line with your

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

general policy and in line with a correct reading of the 1944 and 1947 acts referred to above.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

II. CORRESPONDENCE WITH SECRETARY OF INTERIOR

FEBRUARY, 8, 1952.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Would you be good enough to send me the information requested below, relating to the Kings and Kern River projects in California, which will soon be before us again in the Senate? I have been following developments there for several years and am concerned about certain matters which seem to me to threaten the integrity of our reclamation laws.

Construction of these projects is nearing completion. Yet, according to my information, no contracts for repayment under reclamation law have been executed between the United States and water users for either project. This seems to place financial repayment to the United States in jeopardy, and to endanger settlement of farm families according to the purposes of the reclamation law under which they are being built.

At the same time that no contracts are executed, Congress is being asked to appropriate more Federal money for the benefit of local water users on these projects. Besides. I understand that the construction costs are rising far above original estimates, and far above the original cost allocation on the Kings River and Tulare Lake projects.

I would now be grateful if you would send me:

(1) Your opinion as to when an allocation of costs on Kern River project will be made, and whether it will be made in time to complete negotiations for a repayment contract prior to completion of Isabella Dam.

(2) Your opinion whether a reallocation of costs should and will be made on Kings River and Tulare Lake projects, in view of the greatly increased cost of constructing Pine Flat Dam.

(3) Your opinion whether it would be advisable to considor and to determine at the same time the flood-control allocations to projects on all the streams whose floodwaters enter Tulare Lake.

(4) Your estimate as to whether recent negotiations indicate any probability that repayment contracts will be executed in the near future in the absence of some affirmative legal requirement, such as was proposed to the Senate in 1950. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 9, pages 11482–11485; 11816–11817.)

I shall appreciate your making these facts and judgments available to me.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: We wish to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 8, 1952, concerning the Kings River and Kern River projects in California. The Bureau of Reclamation is sending a copy of your letter to the Regional Director in Sacramento with the request for a report on these two projects, prior to making a full reply to the questions raised in your letter.

Meanwhile, we are advised that the Regional Director of the Bureau of Reclamation in Sacramento has been conferring recently with field staffs of the Corps of Engineers concerning cost allocations for the Kings River and Kern River projects. Frankly, to date no agreement has been reached between Reclamation officials and certain water users' groups along the Kings and Kern Rivers for repayment for irrigation water. This absence of any agreement that could qualify under Reclamation laws exists after years of negotiations. It is therefore a fair assumption that at least some groups in the valley are hoping to receive water, on completion of the dams, without compliance with the Reclamation law. Nevertheless, it is the earnest hope of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior that repayment contracts involving these two projects can be completed at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

APRIL 29, 1952.

Hon. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know, I have seriously attempted to assist your efforts, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to obtain repayment contracts in line with reclamation law from water users on the Kings and Kern Rivers in California. On August 1 and 4, 1950, I took the matter to the floor of the Senate, where I was blocked in my immediate attempt.

My purposes in doing this were not only to protect the United States from financial loss of a particularly indefensible variety, but also to insure that the Kings River and Tulare Lake area distinguished for its huge land holdings, shall be settled with family farms instead of great corporate farms. That, I take it, is one of the great purposes of reclamation law.

As a veteran I also have a special interest in promoting opportunities for veterans to farm, and I believe the 160-acre limitation that your Department administers offers the first step toward veteran settlement. Indeed, veterans' leaders have communicated with me insistently about the necessity for enforcing acreage limitation strictly on Kings and Kern Rivers.

Now it is reported to me by veterans' leaders that your Department is conducting negotiations for a repayment contract on Kings River that seems to offer water users an opportunity to repay irrigation costs in a lump sum and receive in return the special privilege of ignoring acreage limitation. In my opinion this is directly opposed to the policy of promoting family farms that was written into reclamation law in 1902, and so far as I can find, was never removed by Congress.

I am aware of certain departmental instructions of 1914, and have seen the text of the opinion by the Department's Assistant Solicitor, Mr. Felix S. Cohen, in 1947. Whatever the reasons for these administrative opinions, I find nothing in the laws enacted by Congress (including the act of August 9, 1912) that justifies a ruling that landowners may buy their way out of acreage limitation.

I therefore urge that if the present policy of the Department is to surrender acreage limitation in return for dollars, that you take appropriate steps to review and alter it forthwith so that Central Valley in California cannot become the burial ground for reclamation policy.

The great landowners of the Kings River and Tulare Lake area apparently have not hesitated to seek public appropriations for their own benefit while deferring and possibly defying compliance with a law they should be proud to support. The President, on the other hand, has wisely declared maintenance of the family farm to be our national policy at home and abroad. Land reform has become one of our main instruments for stopping the spread of international communism and maintaining our national security. At home the studies by the Hoover Commission has highlighted Kings River as a notorious example of water users' defiance of national policy and interest for their own advantage. Whatever we do on Kings River, therefore, will be subjected to the most searching examination of all who realize that our policy must now meet the test in our own country, as well as in foreign lands.

I am confident you realize the importance of the acreage limitation feature of reclamation law and do not desire to maintain what may be a fatal breach in this policy previously adopted by Congress and the President. Won't you review the prior Departmental opinions inconsistent with this policy and take any steps that prove necessary to remedy them?

I would appreciate having your comments and report on this important issue.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1952.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: We are pleased to respond further to your letter of February 8 and your letter of April 29 concerning the Kings and Kern River projects in California. Reclamation's regional director in California has supplied a report dealing with the four questions raised in your letter. Each of the following four paragraphs deals with one of those questions:

(1) An allocation of costs on the Kern River project is primarily the responsibility of the Secretary of the Army, although naturally Interior is deeply concerned and, pursuant to instructions from the Congress, has been making continuing studies of the subject for many months. The regional director reports that the district office of the Corps of Engineers plans to initiate formal cost allocation discussions immediately, in consultation with the Bureau of Reclamation, the State of California, and local interests on the Kern River. Meanwhile, construction of Isabella Dam is progressing, and it is understood that the contractor's construction schedule calls for its completion no later than May 1953 and probably as early as December 1952. After completion of the cost allocation report, contract negotiations for repayment of the irrigation benefits may require a minimum of 12 to 18 months, judging by our past experiences. It is probable, therefore, that construction will be completed before a repayment contract can be negotiated.

(2) This Department has been advised, by letter of February 26, 1952, from the district engineer of the Corps of Engineers to the regional director of Reclamation in Sacramento, that the Department of the Army does not contemplate making a new cost allocation on the Pine Flat project either now or in the future. In the light of such advice by the district engineer, the subject of cost allocations for the Pine Flat project would appear to be in the nature of finished business.

(3) With a decision of the Department of the Army that there is to be no reallocation of costs on Kings River, it would seem advisable that flood control allocations to projects on the other three streams whose flood waters enter Tulare Lake should be consistent with the flood control allocation fixed for Kings River. A major share of the flood control benefits accruable in Tulare Lake already has been credited by the Corps of Engineers to Pine Flat Dam on Kings River; in fact, most of the flood control benefits creditable to Pine Flat come from the protection provided Tulare Lake. It is my opinion, therefore, that only those Tulare Lake flood control benefits not credited to

Pine Flat should be allocated to the other three streams whose waters enter Tulare Lake.

(4) As you know, Reclamation has been engaged for several years in negotiations with representatives of the Kings River water users for repayment of the cost allocated on account of irrigation benefits soon to be provided by the Pine Flat Dam. While some differences have been resolved, so far no agreement has been reached as to the amount of money to be repaid to the United States for those benefits. Based on the Army's original cost estimate for Pine Flat of approximately $36,000,000, an original-cost allocation report was agreed upon by the Departments of the Army and Interior setting up an amount of $14,250,000 for repayment of interest-free irigation cost. The Army's current cost estimate for the dam is close to $50,000,000. The Kings River representatives have heretofore proposed a lump-sum settlement based on the interest-free irrigation allocation with discount for cash. In the second session of the Eighty-first Congress a bill (H. R. 7915) was introduced by Congressman WERDEL for a settlement of $8,265,000 as a cash-discount payment. This Department has no present authority to allow a discount for prepayment of interest-free irrigation obligations. Furthermore, the Department would oppose any such arrangement since the investment of interest-free money provided by reclamation affords no basis for additional discount. In the light of all the circumstances, we are not optimistic that repayment contracts under either of these projects will be executed in the near future, unless other developments of a compelling nature occur.

You may be sure that this Department and the Bureau of Reclamation will be happy to provide you with further information on these matters at any time.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

JUNE 26, 1952.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

DEAR OSCAR: Have you had an opportunity to review the important question in my letter of April 29 to you, relating to the preservation of the acreage limitation features of the reclamation law?

I am hoping that I shall receive assurances that the loophole which the assistant solicitor's opinion in 1947 seemed to be designed to create, does not in fact exist under your present and proper interpretation of the law.

While I recognize that you are hard pressed by many obligations, I trust that this important policy question is not being forgotten.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

"THE FAITH AND HOPE OF AN AMERICAN"—STATEMENT BY FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a moving statement on "The Faith and Hope of an American," by our former colleague, the highly respected and greatly beloved Frank P. Graham. Brought out as a public service by The Spiral Press, of New York City, to express the spirit and temper of our times, this eloquent declaration of faith deserves a wide reading.

Frank Graham's sense of the importance of human freedom and justice, and his confidence in the integrity and strength of the democratic way, should encourage us all to be more effective coworkers with him in his continuing service to the cause of human brotherhood.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH AND HOPE OF AN AMERICAN

(By Frank P. Graham)

In the fulfillment of her heritage of freedom and hope of brotherhood may America more and more be a land in which free people become brothers in the sight of God and in the human heart. Here the autonomy of the human spirit, the freedom of the mind, the liberty of inquiry, speech, publication, association, enterprise, work and worship, together with a personal sense of moral and social responsibility, are essential to the dignity of the free individual in whom are the security of the state, the welfare of the people, and the progress of civilization. Here the best answer to the totalitarianism of the police state is not scrapping the Bill of Rights but keeping the faith of our historic Americanism. In this land the equal freedom of people to organize for self-development, cooperation, and creative participation in the agricultural, industrial, commercial, political, professional, cultural, and religious life is now the moving frontier of our dynamic democracy. In the general life the daily toil of millions of men and women is above privilege and power, and the integrity of simple people is beyond price.

May this America be a land where the home, as the sanctuary of love, nurture and faith, is the source and measure of civilization, and the schools, libraries and playgrounds of the people are the chief hope of the equal opportunity of all the children in all the States to develop to the highest their individual capacities for a unified and useful life. In the cities, the towns and the country may the multiplication and acceleration of the mechanical contacts of civilization increasingly mean the enjoyment of leisure and recreation, the widening of information and sympathies, and the deepening of the cultural and spiritual content of the lives of the people. The commonwealth not only means the common responsibilities for the conservation and development of the natural resources and cultural heritage for this generation and the generations to come, but also more and more means the common opportunities of the people for free information, sound knowledge, equal suffrage, fair employment, decent standards of life and labor, social security against the hazards of modern society, good health and medical care within reach of the people, and lawful agitation to broaden the base of the general welfare and lift the level of human liberty in the pursuit of happiness in America and the world.

In this land of liberty, for which our fathers died, and for which we would live, work, and give our all, may America become a country in which the highest and the lowest and all the people equally together have the freedom to struggle for the higher freedom of truth, goodness and beauty; where democracy is without vulgarity, excellence is without arrogance, the answer to error is not terror and the response to a difference in color, race, religion, ideas, economic condition, or social status is not discrimination, exploitation, or intimidation. Here is humility of repentance for our own wrongs, freedom of indignation against injustice and evil in places high or low, and courage in action for human decency and fair play. Our democracy is made fairer and stronger by the robust struggles of freedom, and life is made richer by the vigor and variety of the differences of the people. Where and when men are free, the way of progress is not subversion, the respect for the past is not reaction, and the hope of the future is not revolution; where the majority is without tyranny, the minority without fear, and all people have hope of building together a nobler America in a freer and fairer world.

These toiling and hopeful people, as pioneers along the free frontiers of the vast wilderness of our yet unmastered international society, seek to prevent both the destruction of human freedom and the self-destruction of civilization and to share their generous strength for peace on earth and good will among men. In a dynamic world, in which a depression or a war anywhere involves human beings everywhere, the people of the American dream, against the lags of the conceptions of the absolute state, the superior race and the master class, patiently struggle in the atomic age through the United Nations, through regional reenforcements of collective security, through economic cooperation and technical assistance programs, to end all wars and all depressions and to provide the basis for the self-determination and equal opportunity of all people. On the fresh continents of abundant resources, fronting east and west on the two great oceans between the Old World and the New, the people of America are the grateful heirs of all the ages, races, regions, cultures, and hopes of mankind. With all their faults, frustrations, and aspirations these people of this youthful Nation would rise to the responsibility of their power and the opportunity for their greatness to help give fresh hopes to stricken peoples for food and freedom and to help organize justice under law and peace among nations. In creative cooperation with all peoples, east and west, the American people would share their heritage, their toil, their strength, and their dream in the unresting adventure of the human spirit in the long pilgrimage toward one world neighborhood of human brotherhood in answer to the prayers of the people for peace, freedom and justice on God's good earth.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN TREATIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate of the United States:

It is desirable from time to time to remove from the Calendar of Treaties of the Senate treaties which have become obsolete because of their replacement by new instruments or because of other circumstances rendering their provisions unsuitable to current conditions, or at least subject to reappraisal.

With that objective in mind, and desiring to place the Calendar of Treaties on a more current basis, I desire to withdraw from the Senate the following treaties:

An agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London September 24, 1945 (Executive H, 79th Cong., 1st sess.).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

A protocol dated at Montreal May 27, 1947, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation (Executive GG, 80th Cong., 1st sess.).

Notes exchanged at Washington December 23, 1948, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, providing for temporary emergency diversions of water for power purposes from the Niagara River (Executive J, 81st Cong., 1st sess.).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 3, 1952.*

THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no executive reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of these confirmations of nominations.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, July 4, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 3, legislative day of June 27), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy (retired), of California, presently Director of the Munitions Board Supply Management Agencies, to be Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency in the Department of Defense.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Paul Moss, of Texas, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice J. H. Allen, deceased.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ronald Barrie Jamieson, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the First Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Willson C. Moore, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

James Augustine Walsh, of Arizona, to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona, vice Howard C. Speakman, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada, vice Miles N. Pike, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

William B. Savchuck
Biagio J. Cosentino
Oliver D. Harvey

To be assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

William O. Engler
Jack D. Robertson
Herbert Swerdlow
Edgar K. Anderson

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, United States Army.

Capt. Robert McClellan Mummey, O26610, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be colonels

Archibald Baird Barrett, O28880.
Elmer Gwynne Brown, O39521.
Lester James Burbidge, O50938.
Thomas Francis Donahue, O41435.
Roy Eugene Hattan, O17563.
Walter Charles Heinel, O50947.
Harold Edgar Liebe, O29334.
James Blythe Macdougall, O29335.
Kenneth Frease March, O16481.
Hugh Delvin McGaw, O39537.
Clarence Avery Moore, O50919.
William Paris Moore, O51052.
Joseph Pou Persons, Jr., O56776.
Edward Cassel Reber, O17201.
Donald Henry Scott, O29018.
Wade Levan Shankle, O28984.
Joseph Matthew Shanks, O29061.
Claude Newman Shaver, O29333.
Paul William Shumate, O17547.
John Edward Soule, O50960.
Robert Olney Stone, O28975.
George Patrick Welch, O41422.
Jack Henry Weske, O51054.
Vachel Davis Whatley, Jr., O16886.
Stewart Yeo, O16664.

To be colonels, Judge Advocate General's Corps

John Anthony Carrigan, Sr., O28874.
Claudius Oscar Wolfe, O39536.

To be colonel, Chaplains

John Allen DeVeaux, O21470.

To be colonels, Medical Corps

John Mars Caldwell, O19313.
Richard Howard Eckhardt, O19312.
Elmer Arthur Lodmell, O19315.
Charles Parmalee Ward, O19314.

To be colonels, Dental Corps

Elmer Osman Hinman, O38633.
Hamilton Robert Young, O56786.

To be colonels, Veterinary Corps

Laurence Robert Bower, O16019.
Elmer William Young, O16298.

To be colonels, Medical Service Corps

Claude Carrol Britell, O29183.
Ralph Rankin Cleland, O29178.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels

Norman Parker Barnett, O38784.
Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780.
Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931.
Harry William Berry, O42480.
Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569.
Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297.
Arthur John Cornelson, O51567.
John Louis Davids, O38783.
George Archibald Douglass, O30296.
Armel Dyer, O42674.
Perry Edwards, O30309.
Louis M. Etherton, O39940.
James Lee Ferguson, O30046.
William Foley, O42474.
Charles William Henry, O30299.
Holman Don Hoover, O30305.
Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464.
Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304.
Samuel Tilden McDowell, O30321.
Timothy Howard McKenzie, O39797.
Eward McMaken, O30318.
George Patrick Miller, O42475.
Howard Arthur Miner, O39933.
George Kreigh Moody, O38778.
Edgar Allen Noel, O51570.
William Delio Perez, O30324.
James Donald Peterson, O30311.
George Faries Pindar, O42463.
Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301.
Max James Roadruck, O42479.
Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307.
Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454.
Robert Orville Rupp, O42103.
Benjamin William Saurel, O42482.
Henry Robert Sievers, O30298.
John Anthony Stahl, O39934.
Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785.
Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566.
Ralph Henry Watson, O42459.
Donald H. Woodyard, O51564.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Raymond Bender Croissant, O21734.
Wilbur Dwight Dice, O23671.
William Nelson Donovan, O21042.
Ralph Everett Reiner, O22284.
Louis Franklin Saylor, O21733.
Joseph Robert Vivas, O22704.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Earl Reid Nichols, O30857.
Clarence Ellwyn Sheets, Jr., O21692.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Curtis William Betzold, O19641.
William Francis Collins, O19698.
James Bernhard Nichols, O19693.
Daniel Stevens Stevenson, O19696.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Trygve Obert Berge, O30980.
David Cornelius Burke, O39667.
Walter Parmelee Mead, O30972.
Leslie Earl Starks, O52029.
Arthur Dennis Sullivan, O30974.

To be lieutenant colonel, Women's Army Corps

Bernice Gaines Hughes, L208.

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Ann Cummings, L322.
Irene Bertha Groff, L316.
Ida Katherine Madden, L252.
Lillian Singer, L340.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Frances Ann Pesmenski, L193.
Clara May Zunker, L197.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by section 3, Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 16, 1950. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Eleanor Roberta Aaleson, N56.
Ruby Grace Bradley, N87.
Mary Frances Prucha, N72.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be first lieutenants

×Alfred Matthew Adams, O65721.
Warren Melvin Clark, O65294.
×Robert Forgie Litle, Jr., O66039.
×Albert Sidney Pugh 3d, O66074.
×Marcus Carl Scheumann, Jr., O66094.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade), subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Donald D. Butler	Armido E. Marcini
Francis E. Carnicon	Robert L. Moore
Peter Della Rocco	Harry B. Pitcher
Otis E. Engelman	Irvin W. Reed
Homer A. Giddens	Albert G. Sentman
Donnie W. Huckaby	Elroy J. Shafer
William L. Hutton	Jack D. Smith
Jack R. Ingram	John C. Valek

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

FLORIDA

Franklin P. Rhode, Arcadia, Fla., in place of C. D. Boring, retired.

George P. Brantley, Jr., Lakeland, Fla., in place of L. W. Bloom, retired.

GEORGIA

Thomas R. Wood, La Grange, Ga., in place of H. C. Fincher, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 3 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Michael J. Bradley, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for permanent appointment to the grade indicated subject to qualifications provided by law:

To be ensigns

Robert B. Noble, effective September 3, 1952.

Kenneth A. MacDonald, effective September 10, 1952.

Kurt W. Bauer, effective October 1, 1952.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations of Franklin B. Cooper et al. for appointment or promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 26, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Franklin B. Cooper, which is shown on page 8171, and ending with the name of Lee P. Moore, which is shown on page 8172.

The nominations of Ford Elliott Allcorn et al. for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 11, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ford Elliott Allcorn, which is shown on page 7051, and ending with the name of Georgia Dawnell Hill, which is shown on page 7052.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

MEDICAL

To be captain

Woodward, George Spangler, 23587A.

AIR FORCE

To be first lieutenants

Morgan, John Dean, 23766A.
Ford, John Robert, 23767A.
Carlomagno, Armand Michael, 23769A.
Allen, Joseph William, 23772A.
Hudson, Eugene Lawrence, 23770A.

The nominations of Jack F. Burnett et al. for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 19, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Jack F. Burnett, which is shown on page 7618, and ending with the name of Albert H. Wuerz, Jr., which is on the same page.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Paul Allison et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 3, 1952, and appear in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Paul Allison, which is shown on page 6481, and ending with the name of Francis Roche, which appears on the same page.

The nominations of John A Davis et al., for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on July 1, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of John A. Davis, which is shown on page 8749, and ending with the name of Herron Oldham, which is on the same page.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to lieutenant (junior grade) in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Roy E. Clymer, Jr.	John L. Murphy
Chester E. Elliott	John F. Pierce
George Hamilton	Walter A. Walden
Helmuth A. Ludwig	Richard O. Wetmore
Raymond K. Marker	

SUPPLY CORPS

Robert L. Breeden

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Donald O. Taber
Romeo E. Wilcox

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Bernard E. Bassing	Andrew J. Owens
Donald J. Loudon	James G. Tapp

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Theodore J. Larson

Ensign John R. Parker, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for permanent appointment as ensign in the line of the Navy.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Raymond B. Hurst et al., for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 19, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Raymond B. Hurst, which is shown on page 7619, and ending with the name of Betty J. Preston, which is shown on page 7620.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 3, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this new day with the glorious revelation of Thy grace and beneficent care and its many opportunities for service in behalf of our needy world.

Grant that our minds and hearts may turn instinctively to obedience to what Thou dost will and command.

We pray that the strifes and divisions which exist among the nations of the earth may soon come to an end and they shall be united in the bonds of a strong and abiding fellowship.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 27, 1952:

H. R. 1114. An act for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverley;

H. R. 4182. An act for the relief of Clarence Sudbeck;

H. R. 4543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla Crowley; and

H. R. 6264. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne.

On June 28, 1952:

H. R. 812. An act for the relief of Karel Vaclav Malinovsky;

H. R. 1097. An act for the relief of Ethel White, Frank Ezell, and Ralph James;

H. R. 1261. An act for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski;

H. R. 2413. An act for the relief of the Kloman Instrument Co., Inc.;

H. R. 2595. An act for the relief of Clarice D'Amico and Chiara Antonucci;

H. R. 2629. An act for the relief of Dr. Leonides M. Peppas;

H. R. 2718. An act for the relief of Enrique M. Orpilla;

H. R. 2719. An act for the relief of Philip Fugh, Sarah Liu Fugh, and John Fugh;

H. R. 3832. An act for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz;

H. R. 3155. An act for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall'Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Takae Nomura;

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

H. R. 3534. An act for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy;

H. R. 4067. An act for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong;

H. R. 4465. An act for the relief of Angela Moniz McCracken;

H. R. 5208. An act for the relief of Sor Eufrasia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza;

H. R. 5301. An act for the relief of Leonard Jesse Richards (Michio Inoue);

H. R. 5479. An act for the relief of the estate of Floyd L. Greenwood;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre;

H. R. 5755. An act for the relief of Chong So Yong;

H. R. 5759. An act for the relief of Chizuko Nakagami;

H. R. 5957. An act for the relief of Veronica Merita Ritson;

H. R. 6010. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lennie G. Clarkson and William E. Clarkson;

H. R. 6023. An act for the relief of Fred Augustus Snead, Jr.;

H. R. 6117. An act for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp;

H. R. 6152. An act for the relief of Lucille Hujima;

H. R. 6231. An act for the relief of Gordon Uglow;

H. R. 6259. An act to authorize the admission of Wong Ng Chin Chun to the United States;

H. R. 6291. An act to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with the States before January 1, 1954;

H. R. 6635. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7030. An act to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of documents to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7253. An act to authorize the conveyance to the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum of certain parcels of land in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7496. An act to amend the act of August 7, 1946, providing for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia, as amended, so as to extend to June 30, 1955, the period for authorization for appropriations for carrying out the purposes of the act as amended.

On June 30, 1952:

H. R. 2296. An act for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo;

H. R. 2810, An act for the relief of James Nels Ekberg;

H. R. 4344. An act for the relief of Clyde R. Sharp;

H. R. 6854. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7397. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951;

H. R. 7783. An act to increase certain rates of veterans' compensation provided for specific service-incurred disabilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7860. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 490. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 3, 1952.

On July 1, 1952:

H. R. 160. An act to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks;

H. R. 3220. An act for the relief of Joseph Wynn Steel and William Peter Kruse;

H. R. 5185. An act for the relief of Epifania Giacone;

H. R. 6500. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 6943. An act to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department; and

H. R. 7405. An act to provide for an economical, efficient, and effective supply management organization within the Department of Defense through the establishment of a single supply cataloging system, the standardization of supplies and the more efficient use of supply testing, inspection, packaging, and acceptance facilities and services.

On July 3, 1952:

H. R. 856. An act for the relief of Dr. James F. Spindler;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan; and

H. R. 5349. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith P. Powell.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county;

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author; and

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution providing that the briefs for the Government and others, and the record filed in the Supreme Court of the United States in the steel seizure case, be printed as a House document; and that additional copies be printed.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7216) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 57 and 66 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1310. An act amending the act of May 7, 1941 (55 Stat. 177; 30 U. S. C., 1946 edition, secs. 4f–4o), providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; and

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7314) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 20, 21, 28, and 39 of the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5426) entitled "An act relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7151) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to Senate amendment No. 28 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7072) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 1, 17, 19, 46, 48, and 130 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 658) entitled "An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendment, as follows:

On page 14, strike out line 18.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment to the House amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN AIR CARGO CARRIERS

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, a vital factor in the Korean struggle has been the operation of United States commercial aircraft in the Korean airlift. There has been too little public recognition of the important part being played by our commercial aviation in carrying essential cargo across the Pacific. Although emphasis just now is understandably on Korea and the Pacific, it is noteworthy that our commercial aviation is also maintaining essential cargo-carrying operations across the Atlantic to Europe, North Africa, and as far east as India.

This vital carrying of cargo by air could not be carried on adequately without the use of some 38 C–54 aircraft under lease by the Air Force to private operators. These leases were entered into several years ago and run until the fall of 1954.

The Air Force policy of making available aircraft to commercial operators has established the United States prestige in the field of commercial aviation through the accomplishment of offsetting the short supply of commercial aircraft immediately following the end of World War II, at the same time strengthening the national defense in having immediately available aircraft in top flight condition in the event of emergency. The logistical value of this reserve was strikingly demonstrated in the inauguration of the Pacific airlift 2 years ago when certain carriers were able to move into action several days after hostilities began in Korea.

All or almost all of the leased aircraft are being used by commercial airlines in the Korean airlift or other military activities.

It is readily realized, then, that in addition to substantial contribution in the public interest, the American taxpayer has been saved untold millions of dollars:

First. By having immediately available the military reserve fleet of C–54's; and

Second. Realization of income in the amount of millions of dollars from aircraft that in the ordinary process of expendability would either deteriorate in storage or have been reduced to scrap.

The continued use of these leased planes in the intervening years has required the lessors to keep their equipment in top flying condition at all times. Added savings to the public have been accomplished, too, in the fact that improvements and overhaul have made the same planes the most modern versions of C–54 transports, without cost to the United States Air Force and the taxpayer.

Much credit is due the Military Establishment in its long-range program of making available to legitimate commercial enterprises at a cost permitting fair return for the investment the aircraft presently leased.

The thinking in this undertaking has made it possible for private corporations to contribute to national well-being on both civilian and commercial levels—enabling American enterprise to compete successfully in both domestic and foreign commerce, at the same time keeping our military reserve at the best available strength.

ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to extend at this point in the RECORD an address made yesterday by President Truman at Bull Shoals, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

(The text of the address referred to follows:)

I am glad to be here among so many friends. I am sure you are all as impressed as I am by this huge dam here at Bull Shoals. And the one I saw over at Norfork this morning is almost as big as this one.

These dams belong to the people. We are here to dedicate them to the service of the people.

Bull Shoals and Norfork Dams will hold back millions of gallons of floodwater—water that otherwise would go on a rampage down the river, tearing up good farm land, carrying away homes, filling towns with mud and trash.

The electric generators at these dams will have a capacity of more than 230,000 kilowatts. These dams will have capacity enough to supply four cities the size of Little Rock, Ark., or seven cities the size of Springfield, Mo.

The reservoirs behind these dams are creating wonderful opportunities for fishing, camping, and recreation. I am told that more than 700,000 people visited Norfork Lake last year.

These are marvelous projects, indeed. They are examples of how men have learned to put the resources of nature to work for human good. But they are examples of something else, too. They are examples of how people have to fight to overcome not only the forces of nature, but also the forces of reaction and selfishness.

You people in Arkansas and Missouri know how hard you had to fight to get these dams built. But Shoals and Norfork were opposed, bitterly opposed. And why? Because in addition to stopping floods they were to produce hydroelectric power.

PRIVATE INTERESTS ASSAILED

And right there the public interest ran head-on into private selfishness. For there were some private power companies in this area who thought that nobody should be allowed to produce power but themselves. These private power companies had been given State charters to produce and sell power, and they seemed to think that gave them some sort of divine right to prevent anyone else from producing electricity.

They fought against these dams for years. They made speeches, and they put ads in the papers, and they appeared before congressional committees, trying by every means—fair and foul alike—to prevent these dams from being started.

You may remember that the Arkansas Power & Light Co. built an expensive working model of a dam. This model was supposed to prove that you could not have flood control and power in the same project. The company carted that thing all over the State of Arkansas, trying to fool people. They didn't fool anybody but themselves.

I hope the gentlemen who built that model will come up here and look at Bull Shoals and Norfork in operation. They will see how foolish they were. These great dams are stopping floods and they are producing power—all at the same time, and in the same projects. It's pretty hard to argue with a fact.

But it isn't enough simply to produce power at dams like these. That power is no good unless it gets to the people who need it, at a cost they can afford to pay. Power can make a tremendous difference in people's lives, as many of you here know from your own experience.

Electricity can replace the kerosene lamp and the hand-operated pump It can replace hand milking and the old-fashioned washboard. Farm families and town families need electricity for refrigerators, and freezers, and hay dryers, and feed grinders, and a hundred other uses.

That's where this power ought to go, to lighten the burdens of farmers and workers and housewives. And as long as I have anything to do with it, that's where the power will go.

SOCIALISM IDEA DERIDED

But the private power companies have a contrary idea. Right now they are trying to stop the farmers of this area from getting the benefit of low-cost hydroelectric power through their electric cooperatives. The power companies have been bringing law suits, and running advertisements, and appearing before the Congress.

And why are they doing that? I'll tell you why. It is to try to make the farmers pay more for their electricity. It's as simple—and as shocking—as that.

The private power companies around here made a great hullabaloo about these dams being what they called socialism. The president of the Southwestern Gas & Electric Co. went up to Washington and told a congressional committee that these dams would be a "method toward socialization of the electric industry."

That's what they say about a lot of things the Government is doing these days. The American Medical Association uses this same slogan in its fight against better health and hospital services for the common man. The real estate lobby uses the same lying slogan in its fight against housing programs. In other words, every time we try to do something for the people, some special interest pops up and yells "socialism." That's what happened here.

Now, I should like to give the private power companies a little warning. You can't fool the people of this country. No matter how much of the consumers' money you spend on false and misleading advertising, you can't beat the common sense of the American people.

I call your attention to something that Mr. Doyle Pope, a farmer from Norman, Okla., told the Senate Appropriations Committee in May of this year. Mr. Pope was speaking on behalf of his neighbors in the rural electric cooperatives of this area. Mr. Pope said, and I quote:

"We are getting more than a little bit fed up with utility companies who talk out of both sides of their face, who smear us farmers as Socialists and who have the gall to come before Congress and say that they

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

are actually here to protect us against a Communist-inspired plot to take over the entire utility industry * * *.

"For 17 years we have been the objects of an unparalleled campaign of smear and vilification on the part of certain power companies. They come before this committee each year to attack us. When we want protection, we know by this time that we are not going to get it from the power companies. The only kind of protection they have to offer is the kind Stalin gave Poland."

That is what Mr. Pope told the Senate committee.

HE WARNS POWER INTERESTS

I say to the private power companies, "take note." Mr. Pope is not a Government employee, he is a farmer. He is not speaking for a Government agency, he is speaking for himself and his neighbors.

Sooner or later the private power companies are going to find out that they cannot stand in the way of what the people need in this country. And the sooner they find that out, the better it will be for everybody concerned.

But no matter what the private power companies do or say, if I have my way about it, we are going right ahead to develop our water resources all over this country.

Right here in this area, we need at least half a dozen more dams like Bull Shoals and Norfork before we will begin to have the rivers harnessed for the welfare of the people. I have just asked the Congress to appropriate money for Table Rock Dam, on this same river up in Missouri. I hope they will approve those funds, because Table Rock should be started this year.

But we need something more than big dams on the rivers. We have to go on up the tributaries, and up the small creeks, and do something about floodwaters up there, where the rain hits the ground.

We need to plant trees and sow grass to hold water that now runs off bare land. We need more contour plowing, more terracing, more cover crops. We need a lot of small dams up on the little creeks—many of them the sort of dams you can build with a couple of drag lines and a bulldozer.

There have been some wonderful experiments made in this sort of work. Over on the Washita River, where it crosses from Texas into Oklahoma, the farmers and the Government have taken one little watershed, the Sandstone Creek watershed, and have shown in practice what ought to be done everywhere. As a result, the flood damage in that little watershed has been reduced an estimated 98 percent.

I suppose the special-interest fellows would call that "socialism at the grass roots."

NATIONAL PROGRAM URGED

As a matter of fact, it is just one example of what can be done all over our great country. We need to treat the lands on which the rain falls, to build small dams on the little creeks, and to build big dams and levees on the main rivers. In this way we can do more than stop floods. We can get more farm production, more electric power, more reclamation, navigation, recreation, and other benefits.

The money put into these projects will prove bread cast upon the waters. It will return the cost many times over in benefits to the people of this region. We have been doing the same sort of thing for people all over the country, and we must keep right on doing it.

I'd like to see the day when every major river in our country is under control from its source to its mouth; when they are all wealth givers instead of wealth destroyers; when every one is running clean and pure and doing the work it ought to for the people of this country—and that wouldn't take too long. It could be done in my lifetime.

I had a fine commission look into this matter to help us find the best way to do the job. Mr. Lewis Jones, who was then president of the University of Arkansas, was a member of it. I have been studying the report of that commission. It is probably the best and most comprehensive report ever made on the development of water resources. Before I leave office, I expect to have some important recommendations stemming from that report to be presented to the Congress.

We can develop our country the way we would all like to see it. We can provide more jobs and more homes and more food for our growing population. We can provide a rising standard of living for our people.

But if we are to do that, we must use all our natural resources to the best possible advantage. By 1975 we are going to need two and a half times as much electric power as we produce today. That means we must develop hydroelectric power at every site where it is feasible. We cannot let our development programs be stopped by the private-power lobby or any other selfish interest.

You know all these special-interest lobbies are ganged up together to work against the public interest.

The special interests that have fought against flood control and power development are teamed up with the special interests that have fought against price supports for farm products. These same special-interest lobbies have fought against minimum wages for working people. They have fought against advances in housing and health and education.

They keep yapping about socialism and a lot of other silly slogans to try to stop every measure for the good of the people.

HE LOOKS AT 20 YEARS

Well, we have been fighting—and licking—that kind of opposition for 20 years. And I don't think we're going to stop now. Because the progressive policies we have been following have brought more prosperity and more happiness and more real freedom to the people of the United States than any other people ever had, anywhere on earth.

My friends, I say to you that the progressive policies of the last 20 years have been the salvation of this country. They have brought us out of the depression. They have enabled us to fight and win the Second World War. And they are making us able now to be strong leaders of the fight for freedom against communism in the world.

You people here in Arkansas, here in the South, can see better than almost anyone else in our country what amazing changes have been brought about in 20 years. Look around you. Look at your own farms and businesses, look at your homes and your children.

You know what it was like in the South in the 1930's. You saw the backward farms, and the struggling businesses, and the bank failures. You saw the raw materials from your farms and forests going to other regions.

What a difference today!

The New Deal and the Fair Deal have done a lot for the whole country, but I believe they have done more for the South than any other part of it. I know the New Deal and the Fair Deal have done more for the South than any other national administration in this country's history.

New businesses and industries have sprung up all over the South. Arkansas, together with her neighbors in Louisiana and Texas, will soon be turning out more aluminum than the whole Nation did in 1940. Chemicals, and paper, and fertilizers, and textiles and hundreds of other things are being turned out in new factories built in the South.

Look at the farms. They are producing more and better crops. Livestock and dairy products are coming up fast alongside the old staples of cotton and tobacco. Farm income in the South is four or five times what it was 20 years ago. Machines and electricity have done away with back-breaking labor in the fields and drudgery in the home.

Here in Arkansas, in the early 1930's, only 1 farm in every 100 was connected for electricity. Just 1 out of 100. Today, nearly 80 out of 100—or 140,000 Arkansas farms—are connected to the highlines. This has come about mainly through the good work of the REA co-ops.

There are about a million people in Arkansas and Missouri getting power from the REA co-ops.

NEW WAY OF LIFE

The changes that have come about in the South are not just matters of new businesses and more productive farms. The whole way of living has become better. You live in better homes. You travel more. Your children are healthier, and better educated. Your whole economic and social pattern has changed—rapidly and permanently—for the better.

These things did not come about by accident, my friends. They came about because you and your Government fought and overcame the selfish interests, the standpatters, the reactionary lobbies. Progress in the South has come about because of TVA (Tennessee Valley Authority) and other public works programs. It has come about because you had a Government that was interested in good roads and good schools and good health.

Progress in the South has come about because the national policies of these 20 years have been directed to meet human needs, and not just to meet private greed.

The progressive programs of these 20 years were not programs on paper; they were action programs. Things were done. We took action to lift wages and put a floor under farm prices, and create new businesses.

We took action to bring about fair incomes and equality of opportunity for everyone. We took action to put natural resources to work for the good of all the people.

It is good to remember these things and think about them: These two great dams that we are dedicating today are symbols of the progress that has come to the South. And they are symbols of the struggle and the effort that has to take place to achieve that progress.

Remember these things this year when you see and hear the storm of political propaganda that will be put out to try and turn back the clock.

We don't want to turn back the clock. We want to keep moving forward. That means we have to keep on fighting the pull-backs and the reactionaries.

The progressive growth of the South—and of the whole Nation—is what we want to continue.

That is the way for our Nation to gain in strength and prosperity in the years ahead.

That is the way toward peace and happiness for all the people of this great land.

THE LATE HONORABLE CLARE GERALD FENERTY

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce at this time the death of a former Member of this body, Judge Clare Gerald Fenerty, judge of the court of common pleas of Philadelphia County,

and a Member of the Seventy-fourth Congress, who passed away on July 1, 1952. Judge Fenerty's death shocked all of the people and his friends in Philadelphia. He was a fine lawyer and in his administration of justice in the common pleas court he was looked upon as fair, able, and just. Judge Fenerty's passing is a distinct and special loss to the bench and bar as well as to the people whom he long and faithfully served.

Judge Fenerty was a World War I veteran, serving with the Navy in 1917 and 1918, and in 1933 he reentered the Naval Reserve as a lieutenant, senior grade.

The jurist also served on the law faculty of the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania for 5 years and for 10 years was a member of the Philadelphia Board of Law Examiners.

He held the following degrees: Doctor of laws, Loyola College, Baltimore; doctor of jurisprudence, St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia; doctor of humane letters, St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa.; doctor of laws, Canisius College, Buffalo; doctor of philosophy, Philadelphia College of Law; doctor of civil and canon law, Hahnemann Medical College; certificate in international law, Naval War College, Newport, R. I.

He was a member of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, past national advocate general, Irish War Veterans of the United States; honorary life member of the Jewish War Veterans; member of the Three Hundred and Fifteenth Infantry Association; past commander, Catholic War Veterans of America; member of Old Guard, city of Philadelphia; Municipal War Veterans; Knights of Columbus; district deputy, Knights of Columbus, Philadelphia, 1924 to 1930; and former president, Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Philadelphia.

He has contributed to various periodicals and magazines in both prose and verse.

As a Member of Congress, he was the leader in the fight to stop religious persecution in Mexico, and, as early as 1935, introduced bills, first, to withdraw recognition of Soviet Russia; second, to have European powers to cede possessions in the Western Hemisphere to the United States in payment of World War I debts; and, third, to prevent reciprocal trade agreements with any nation indulging in racial or religious persecution.

I want to offer my sincerest sympathy to his wife and daughter.

RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I submit herewith my resignation from the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully yours,
JACK ANDERSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Veterans' Affairs Committee effective July 3, 1952.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,
JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 734), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THIRTY-THIRD REPORT OF LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 465)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the Thirty-third Report to Congress on Lend-Lease Operations, for the period from April 1, 1951, through December 31, 1951.

Since the previous report a lend-lease settlement arrangement has been concluded with Nicaragua; Colombia completed the payments scheduled under the settlement arrangement of April 13, 1950; and Cuba liquidated a residual amount due under the terms of the original lend-lease agreement of November 7, 1941.

Across-the-board negotiations with U. S. S. R. continued during part of the report period. The course of these discussions is described at some length in the body of the report.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 3, 1952.*

UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. 449)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following mesage from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, pursuant to the United Nations Participation Act, a report on the work of the United States in the United Nations during 1951.

This will be my last report, as President, to the Congress on our participation in the United Nations.

I have dedicated my 7 years as President of the United States to working for world peace. That has been my paramount aim since becoming President. The first order I issued after being sworn into office on April 12, 1945, was that the United States should carry out its plan to participate in the United Nations Conference, which met on April 25 in San Francisco. Since that time the United Nations has been the mainstay of our work to build a peaceful and decent world.

During these years the United Nations has faced many trials and difficulties. In 1945 there were high hopes that this partnership of nations would quickly lead to permanent peace and the advancement of the general welfare of the nations. But these hopes have been dimmed by the conflicts of the succeeding years and by the hostile attitude of the Soviet Union. As a result, voices have been raised, questioning the value for us of the United Nations and the need for maintaining it.

Nevertheless, in spite of all these difficulties and discouragements, the United Nations remains the best means available to our generation for achieving peace for the community of nations. The United Nations, in this respect, is vital to our future as a free people. In this message I want to explain why this is true and to sum up a few of the reasons why we should continue to support the United Nations in this dangerous period in the history of mankind.

The need for a world organization of nations should have been made clear to us by the First World War. But President Wilson's pioneering efforts to organize world peace through the League of Nations were thwarted by some Americans who still thought we could turn back the clock of history. We had to pay a terrible price for that kind of narrow thinking in the Second World War.

Our victory over the Axis gave us another chance to work with the other nations in a united effort to prevent war. This time we assumed our responsibilities and took part in launching a far stronger world organization for peace.

In the United Nations we have pledged our support to the basic principles of sovereign equality, mutual respect among nations, and justice and morality in international affairs. By the Charter all United Nations members are bound to settle their disputes peacefully rather than by the use of force. They pledge themselves to take common action against root causes of unrest and war, and to promote the common interests of the nations in peace, security, and general well-being.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

These principles are not new in the world, but they are the only sure foundation for lasting peace. Centuries of history have made it clear that peace cannot be maintained for long unless there is an international organization to embody these principles and put them into effect.

The United Nations provides a worldwide forum in which those principles can be applied to international affairs. In the General Assembly all member nations have to stand up and be counted on issues which directly involve the peace of the world. In the United Nations no country can escape the judgment of mankind. This is the first and greatest weapon against aggression and international immorality. It is the greatest strength of the United Nations. And because we, as a nation, sincerely desire to establish the rule of international justice, this is a precious instrument, a great asset, that we should constantly seek to reinforce, that we should never ignore or cast away.

The great morale value of the United Nations has been clearly demonstrated with respect to the conduct of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet leaders have been dominated by their doctrines of communism, by the concept of the use of force, unchecked by ethical considerations. This concept has led the Kremlin into a course of international conduct which threatens the peace of the world. By stirring up class warfare, subverting free governments, and employing lies, intimidation, and conquest, the Soviet Union has pursued a policy of extending its control without regard to the sovereignty of other nations or respect for their rights.

This policy might have been irresistible if it had not been clearly and decisively brought to the bar of world opinion in the United Nations.

The proceedings of the United Nations, time and time again, have proclaimed to the world that the Soviets have not lived up to the principles of liberty, morality, justice, and peace to which they profess to subscribe. Through the United Nations the international conscience has relentlessly exposed and sternly resisted the attempts of the Kremlin to impose a rule of force upon the peace-loving nations of the world.

This process has strengthened freedom. It has given courage to the fainthearted, who might otherwise have yielded to the forces of communism. It has presented the truth to those who might have been deceived by Communist propaganda. And, as a result, the principles of international justice, of freedom and mutual respect, still exercise a far greater sway over the minds of men than the false beliefs of communism.

By itself, of course, this moral function of the United Nations would not be enough. The collective conscience of the world is not enough to repel aggression and establish order. We have learned that moral judgments must be supported by force to be effective. This is why we went into Korea. We were right in what we did in Korea in June 1950; we are right in holding firm against aggression there now.

Korea might have been the end of the United Nations. When the aggression began, the free nations might have yielded their principles and followed the dreary road of appeasement that, in the past, had led from Manchuria to Munich and then to World War II. But Korea had the opposite effect. When the Communist aggressors brutally violated the Republic of Korea, the United Nations acted with unprecedented speed and rallied to the international conscience to meet the challenge. And, with our country proudly in the lead, the free nations went into the conflict against aggression.

It is profoundly heartening to remember that far-off Ethiopia, which had been one of the first victims of the fatal policy of the 1930's, sent troops to fight in Korea. The free nations now understand that nobody can be safe anywhere unless all free nations band together to resist aggression the first time it occurs.

In Korea the United Nations forces have repelled Communist aggression, they have forced the aggressors to abandon their objectives and negotiate for an armistice, and they have demonstrated that the course of conquest is mortally dangerous. The success of the United Nations in repelling the attack in Korea has given the free world time to build its defensive strength against Communist aggression.

We are working to strengthen the United Nations by building up a security system in accordance with the purposes of the Charter that will protect the community of nations against aggression from any source. We are working, in important regions of the world, to build the pillars of this collective strength through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Rio treaty, and the security treaties in the Pacific. All this is being done under the Charter as a means of fulfilling the United Nations purpose of maintaining world peace. The progress we have made since the Korean aggression started has now begun to tip the scales toward real security for ourselves and all other peace-loving peoples.

Such measures are necessary to meet the present threat of aggression. But we cannot admit that mankind must suffer forever under the burden of armaments and the tensions of greatly enlarged defense programs. We must try in every way not only to settle differences peaceably but also to lighten the load of defense preparations. In this task the United Nations is the most important if not the only avenue of progress.

On October 24, 1950, in an address to the General Assembly of the United Nations, I outlined the principles which must guide disarmament. This was followed up by concrete proposals, which were presented at the 1951 session of the General Assembly in Paris. These proposals involved a world census of armaments, a reduction of armaments and armed forces, and the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, all under a foolproof system of inspection. The Disarmament Commission of the United Nations is now discussing these proposals, and if they are adopted they will not only enhance world security but also free vast energies and resources of the world for constructive ends. This program of disarmament offers a way out of the conflict of our times. If the Soviet Union will accept it in good faith, it will be possible to go forward at the same time to reconcile other conflicting national interests under the principles of international morality.

These disarmament proposals emphasize anew that our objective is world peace. We hope that the day will come when the Soviet Union, seeing that it cannot make aggression and subversion work, will modify its policies so that all nations can live together peacefully in the same world. Therefore we must continue to test Soviet willingness to take tangible steps toward easing international tensions. We must continue to keep the door open in the United Nations for the Soviet Union to join the great majority of countries on the road to peace.

Among the nations of the free world, the United Nations performs the valuable function of settling disputes and terminating conflict. It has been notably successful in localizing and diminishing dangerous situations which might otherwise have torn the free world apart and paved the way for Communist expansion. In Indonesia, Palestine, and Kashmir the United Nations stopped serious fighting and persuaded the combatants to take steps toward a peaceful settlement of their differences. In many other cases the United Nations has prevented disputes from erupting into violence.

We must remember that the challenge of international lawlessness is not only military but also political and economic. The United Nations is helping dependent peoples to move toward greater freedom. The United Nations is taking measures to promote extensive international progress in such fields as agriculture, communication and transportation, education, health, and living standards. Its technical assistance programs and our own point 4 activities are providing dramatic examples of tangible accomplishments at relatively little cost. The United Nations in this way is helping to build healthier societies, which in the long run are the best defense against communism and the best guaranty of peace.

During the past 7 years our work in the United Nations has been carried out on a strictly nonpartisan basis. Able men and women from both political parties and both Houses of Congress have represented this country in the General Assembly. Nevertheless partisan attacks have been made on the United Nations. Some of these attacks are made in a spirit of impatience that can only lead to the holocaust of world-wide war. Most of those who urge us to go it alone are blind to the fact that such a course would destroy the solid progress

toward world peace which the United Nations has made in the past 7 years. I am confident that the American people will reject these voices of despair. We can win peace, but we cannot win it alone. And, above all, we cannot win it by force alone. We can win the peace only by continuing to work for international justice and morality through the United Nations.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 3, 1952.*

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 122]

Abernethy	Hall,	Potter
Adair	Leonard W.	Poulson
Albert	Harden	Powell
Allen, La.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bakewell	Herter	Regan
Bates, Ky.	Heselton	Richards
Beckworth	Hillings	Robeson
Bender	Hope	Roosevelt
Bentsen	Johnson	Sabath
Brehm	Kearney	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Kennedy	Scott,
Buckley	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Burdick	Kilday	Sheehan
Butler	King, Calif.	Sikes
Carlyle	King, Pa.	Stigler
Celler	Lanham	Sutton
Cole, N. Y.	Lyle	Tackett
Combs	McKinnon	Thompson, Tex.
Cooper	Mitchell	Watts
Cox	Morris	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Wickersham
Donovan	Morton	Willis
Elston	Moulder	Wolcott
Evins	Nelson	Wood, Ga.
Fenton	O'Hara	Woodruff
Fisher	O'Neill	
Hall,	Patman	
Edwin Arthur	Poage	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 351 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. KIRWAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2451)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 15, 28, 33, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 47, and 48.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 8, 13, 16, 17, 29, 32, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50, 52, and 53, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$51,801,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,253,760"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$3,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$177,797,991"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,770,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 402. (a) No part of the money appropriated by this Act to any department, agency, or corporation or made available for expenditure by any department, agency, or corporation which is in excess of 90 per centum of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1953 contemplated would be employed by such department, agency, or corporation during such fiscal year in the performance of—

"(1) function performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, photographer, radio expert, television expert, motion picture expert, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title, or

"(2) functions performed by persons who assist persons performing the functions described in (1) in drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating or disseminating public information, publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, photographs, motion picture and similar material, shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing the functions described in (1) or (2).

"(b) This section shall not apply to the preparation for publication of reports and maps resulting from authorized scientific and engineering investigations and surveys, to photography incident to the compilation and reproduction of maps and reports, or publications of the National Park Service, or to photocopying of permanent records for preservation.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 403. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply to—

"(a) not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) positions filled from within the department;

"(c) offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) positions the personnel of which are engaged in health and safety, law enforcement, soil and moisture, and activities in the field, exclusive of administrative personnel not directly connected with such activities;

"(e) seasonal and casual workers;

"(f) employees of the Bureau of Mines;

"(g) employees of the Geological Survey;

"(h) employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(i) salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary;

"(j) employees paid wholly from trust funds, or funds derived by transfer from trust accounts, or to employees paid from appropriation of, or measured by, receipts:

Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates, such limitation may cease to apply and said 90 per centum shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this provision shall again become operative."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 404. (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be available to pay—

"(1) for travel of personnel,

"(2) for personal services of personnel above basic rates, or

"(3) for transportation of things (other than mail), more than 90 per centum of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with such appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for any such purpose, is hereby

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purposes, less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for personal services in budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such services.

"(b) This section shall not apply to appropriations for—

"(b) This section shall not apply to appropriations for—

"(1) activities for health and safety, law enforcement, soil and moisture, and activities in the field, exclusive of administrative employees not directly connected with such activities;

"(2) seasonal and casual workers;

"(3) the Bureau of Mines;

"(4) the Geological Survey;

"(5) employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(6) salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary; and

"(7) activities paid wholly from trust funds, or funds derived by transfer from trust accounts, or to activities paid from appropriations of, or measured by, receipts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 3, 5, 7, 9, 14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 30, 44, 49, and 51.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
BEN F. JAMES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
GUY CORDON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Enforcement of Connally Hot Oil Act

Amendment No. 1—Expenses: Appropriates $187,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $170,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction, Southeastern Power Administration

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $959,500 as proposed by the House instead of $115,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the figure agreed upon by the conference $844,500 is for the Clark Hill-Greenwood 115-kilovolt transmission line, $25,000 is for planning of the Jim Woodruff-Wiregrass 115-kilovolt transmission line, and $90,000 is for plans and specifications for future programs.

Amendment No. 3: Reported in disagreement.

Continuing fund, Southwestern Power Administration

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $231,000 as proposed by the House. The managers, while approving the Senate amendment, desire to reiterate the statements made in the report of the Committee on Appropriations at the time the bill was reported to the House (H. Rept. 1628) as to pending litigation. At that time it was thought that no funds would be required until the Congress will again be in session but later developments indicate that the amount provided in the Senate amendment will be required regardless of the outcome of lawsuits referred to in the report above referred to. The action here is intended only to provide such funds as appear to be necessary to meet the responsibilities of the Government until such time as the rights of all parties have been determined by the courts. Nothing herein or in the accompanying conference report should be construed as indicating any attitude on the part of the conference or any of the managers as to the issues involved in the pending litigation.

Managers on the part of both Houses hope that the contract now under negotiation with 12 private power companies in the Southwestern Power area can be consummated at an early date and in a manner that may make unnecessary any further litigation.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Management of lands and resources

Amendment No. 6: Appropriate $11,000,000 instead of $9,722,605 as proposed by the House and $11,172,605 as proposed by the Senate. Included in the amount allowed is $700,000 for the timber-salvage program as requested in Senate Document No. 121.

Construction

Amendment No. 7: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 8: Authorizes the purchase of 45 automobiles as proposed by the Senate instead of 36 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Reported in disagreement.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Health, education, and welfare services

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $51,801,000 instead of $51,266,019 as proposed by the House and $51,916,019 as proposed by the Senate. The increase above the House figure provides $300,000 for public assistance payments to Indians in Arizona other than the Navajo and Hopi, and $234,981 for operation of the Pipestone Indian School in Minnesota.

Resources management

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $13,253,760 instead of $12,949,760 as proposed by the House and $13,900,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the increase above the House figure $154,000 is to provide sanitary water facilities for the pueblo villages in New Mexico and $150,000 is for improving range water sources on the Papago Reservation.

Construction

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $17,500,000 instead of $5,310,000 as proposed by the House and $31,312,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13: Inserts a provision as proposed by the Senate to prohibit the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming. The proviso also prohibits the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations.

Amendment No. 14: Reported in disagreement.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 15: Provides for the purchase of 260 automobiles as proposed by the House instead of 300 automobiles as proposed by the Senate.

Tribal funds

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $2,920,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,335,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Inserts a provision as proposed by the Senate to prohibit the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

General investigations

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $4,000,000 instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19: Provides that of the foregoing figure of $4,000,000, $3,200,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund instead of $2,200,000 as proposed by the House and $4,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $177,797,991 instead of $153,355,400 as proposed by the House and $183,406,531 as proposed by the Senate. In arriving at the conference figure the managers of both Houses have approved the construction program as set forth in the House report and modified in the Senate report with the exception that the $2,913,600 proposed by the Senate for the Jamestown - Fargo - Fergus Falls - Benson - Granite Falls-Mankato-Blue Earth-Jackson-Fort Randall 230-kilovolt lines and substations is specifically disallowed, and a further reduction of $2,694,940 to offset 1952 unobligated balances available in 1943 has been made.

While the managers have agreed to the inclusion of funds amounting to $15,950,000 for 10 "new starts" as proposed by the Senate, it is pointed out that 89 percent of the total cost of these projects is repayable.

Funds for the Salano County project in California have been allowed with the understanding that they will not be used to initiate construction of the project until there is a determination as to whether or not the project is to be constructed as a unit of the Central Valley project. It is further understood that this determination is not to be made until all local interests have had an opportunity to be heard by the proper legislative committee with respect to the question of reauthorization of the project.

The managers on the part of both the Senate and the House re-affirm the language concerning the CVP-BPA interconnection and Camp Stoneman items which is included in both the House and Senate reports. It is further directed that expenditures for construction at Tracy and Folsom switchyards and the Folsom interconnecting transmission line and necessary connecting switches be confined to 230 kilovolts only as required in the Senate report. Also, as required by the Senate report, at the Tracy switchyard the 115- and 69-kilovolt equipment should be removed as recently ordered by the Secretary of the Interior.

Amendment No. 21: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in disagreement for technical reasons. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with this amendment inserted in the bill by the Senate. The amendment provides that $1,419,000 of the appropriation for "Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation," shall be expended for completion of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal system. These funds as

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

well as other funds appropriated in the 1952 bill are over and above the $13,500,000 cost originally set on the project and fixed in the repayment contract. Suit has been entered by the Justice Department in the United States District Court of Southern California to determine the liability of the water district for repayment of the funds appropriated in addition to the $13,500,000 stipulated in the repayment contract. Conferees of both Houses have agreed on the additional appropriation in this bill with the expectation that the law suit will be tried on the merits of the case without introduction of technicalities, in accordance with assurances given the House managers in written statements by the counsel for the water district and district attorney of California. Should the case be decided in favor of the Government, it is expected that the water district will immediately enter into a supplemental repayment contract for the full amount appropriated above the original $13,500,000.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Reported in disagreement.

Operation and maintenance

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates $5,250,000 instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $5,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 27: Reported in disagreement.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment 28: Appropriates $25,362,685 as proposed by the House instead of $25,301,000 as proposed by the Senate. The appropriation of $25,362,685 is to be distributed among the activities of the Survey as set out in the Senate report with the exception that the amount allowed for topographic surveys and mapping is to be reduced by $138,415 and the amount allowed for water resources investigations is to be increased by $200,000.

BUREAU OF MINES

Conservation and development of mineral resources

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $18,657,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House. Of the amount allowed, $75,000 is to be used for the testing and gasification research on coals of the Pacific Northwest. Also, in addition to the amount budgeted for mine flood prevention studies, $84,800 is to be used for this purpose. In making the necessary budgetary adjustments to handle these two items, no reduction is to be made in the funds budgeted for the synthetic liquid fuels program.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Construction

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $14,770,000 instead of $11,770,000 as proposed by the House and $19,670,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have allowed $500,000 for the Blue Ridge Parkway. The remaining part of the increase above the House figure is to be used for roads, trails, and parkways, except the Suitland Parkway.

General administrative expenses

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates $1,342,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,262,000 as proposed by the House.

Administrative provisions

Amendment No. 33: Provides for the purchase of 19 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 24 as proposed by the Senate.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Management of resources

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $7,325,375 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,292,000 as proposed by the House. The program is to be adjusted in accordance with the list of increases and decreases set forth in the Senate report.

Investigations of resources

Amendment No. 35: Appropriates $4,062,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,056,000 as proposed by the House.

Construction

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates $673,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of $450,000 as proposed by the House. The increase above the House figure is to be distributed to various projects in the amounts and in the manner set out in the Senate report.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

Administration of Territories

Amendments Nos. 37, 38, and 39: These amendments delete language with reference to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands proposed to be inserted by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates $9,320,287 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,703,037 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 41 and 42: Language proposed by the Senate with reference to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in these two amendments has been deleted.

Amendment No. 43: Strikes out the language proposed by the House for making an appropriation to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Alaska public works

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $13,208,200 as proposed by the Senate instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the House. In the House proposal of $7,000,000 allowance had been made for all projects for which elections had been held approving the assumption of local indebtedness to the extent required by law, and for which plans had been completed or were in the final stages of development. Since passage of the House bill additional projects have been advanced to meet this criteria and the amount agreed upon in conference is for these projects as set forth in the table in the Senate report.

Amendment No. 46: Provides that not to exceed $654,000 shall be available for administrative expenses as proprosed by the Senate, instead of $486,000 as proposed by the House.

Alaska Railroad revolving fund

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48: Strike out the proposal of the Senate to increase statutory limits on salary rates to be paid certain personnel of the Alaska Railroad.

ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

General provisions

Amendment No. 49: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Revolving fund

Amendment No. 50: Appropriates $1,515,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $975,000 as proposed by the House. The amount allowed includes $690,000 for the acquisition of power facilities now operated by the St. Thomas Power Authority. A total of $150,000 included in the budget estimates for agricultural diversification and marketing is specifically disallowed.

TITLE III—EMERGENCY FLOOD AND STORM REPAIRS

Amendment No. 51: Reported in disagreement.

General provisions

Amendment No. 52: Changes a title number.

Amendment No. 53: Changes a section number.

Amendment No. 54: Strikes out the proposal of the House for limiting the use of funds for publicity purposes, and adopts the proposal of the Senate to impose limitations upon expenditures for such purposes but modifies the Senate proposal by limiting the amount of funds allowed for such purposes to 90 percent of the estimates therefor instead of 75 percent.

Amendment No. 55: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to limit the amount available for personnel services to 90 percent of the amount requested in the budget estimates for such services, reinserts the Jensen amendment as proposed by the House with the provision that two additional categories of personnel be exempted from provisions of the amendment and sets as a maximum for reductions required 10 percent of the total number of employees provided for in the budget estimates rather than 10 percent of the total provided for in the act.

Amendment No. 56: Inserts a section as proposed by the Senate limiting the use of funds for payment of civilian personnel above basic rates, transportation of things and travel of civilian personnel to not more than 90 percent of the amount programed in the budget estimates therefor. The Senate proposal has been altered to provide for the exception of the same categories of personnel as are exempted from operation of the Jensen amendment.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
HENRY M. JACKSON,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
BEN F. JENSEN,
BEN F. JAMES.
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me 10 minutes to discuss the conference report?

Mr. KIRWAN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of vital importance to the State of Minnesota. We Minnesotans have been anticipating for a good many years some of the benefits from the low-cost power to be produced by the Missouri River dams. The Senate has agreed with us; they have agreed because of the statements right here in Washington by about 200 farmers connected with various REA associations, and by officials of three large private

utilities of my State. These two groups have reached an agreement on this issue, and that agreement can well be a forerunner of other similar agreements throughout the United States. Surely when all parties concerned can agree, they should be entitled to respectful consideration by the Congress.

For the first time, I believe, in the history of this Congress the large private utilities have joined with 20 electric cooperatives to ask for this loan. Every dime will be repaid, plus 3 percent interest. The Senate has agreed to the insertion of this $2,913,600 for the purpose of building these lines, from Garrison Dam on the north, bending over into Minnesota, going down through central and western Minnesota and then connecting up with Fort Randall on the south. Only through the complete loop can we obtain the best results.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you wish to do something constructive for 500,000 good American citizens, if you wish to bring the benefits of this low-cost power into an area of the United States where today electrical energy costs more than in almost any other area because of our distance from fuel sources, help me to recommit this bill with instructions to accept the Senate language. Such acceptance would mean the commencement of this great enterprise. I am not asking for any appropriation, Mr. Speaker. If this were an outright appropriation I would not be here beseeching you to give it to us. It is a loan, repayable in full, with 3 percent interest. Is this asking much of the Congress?

I am firmly convinced that the subcommittee headed by my good friend from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] on our side of the aisle are not really aware of how much this means to the great State of Minnesota. If they did, they surely would remove their objections.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman agree that this is an important thing, not only for the State of Minnesota but for the pattern it establishes with respect to the use of power that is being generated anywhere by facilities constructed at public expense? Heretofore some people have denounced the rural electric cooperatives as socialism; some on the other side have denounced the power companies and private utilities as being Wall Street capitalism. Now here is a case where after years of conflict the private utilities and the farmers' electric cooperatives get together, work out a plan that is satisfactory to everybody, come down here and ask not for concessions or grants but just for a loan so that they can do the thing that for years we have been asking them to do.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I do not think that there is any Member of Congress who has done more than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] to prevent duplication of transmission lines by private and public power. They are against such waste. This proposal prevents any duplication. The private utilities agree with the REA's through this agreement that once this line is permitted to be built into Minnesota, they will fight against the bringing into the State of any other belt lines of this nature. After 2 years of hard work these conflicting interests have now presented this point plan to the Congress.

Mr. JUDD. How in the world can we ask or expect these two groups to get together to do the job that needs to be done in our State and other States in making power available to consumers unless the Congress will help them in this sound way without cost to the taxpayer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say this to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. The gentleman from Iowa did offer a compromise. He was willing to give us half of this line from Garrison down to Benson, Minn. I appreciate that, but upon consultation with the people involved in the State of Minnesota they told me that it was impossible to accept that because they had to have the entire loop from the one big dam to the other to make it effective. The gentleman from Iowa was willing to give us the northern half of the line but I have been unable to accept his compromise, even though he has always been willing to help in REA and all kindred matters.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the transmission line building policy of Congress has not been in the past 3 years to run lines a long ways out into the hinterland. We have been willing to tie the dams together, as the Speaker of the House will testify. I have gone overboard in tying hydroelectric, Government-owned dams together so that we get the full benefit of all the power.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is consuming all my time. Will he get me additional time?

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] will give the gentleman some more time. Now I have been willing to let Minnesota have a line that squares with the line-building policy of Congress, and that is why I was willing to compromise and go for a line from the northern dams down as far as Benson.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes, I appreciate that concession.

Mr. JENSEN. Now that line is twice as long as they gave to the State of Iowa, and we gave Nebraska a line to O'Neill, Nebr.; that is what we did, and let the folks come and get it from there.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The various parties interested, the three large private utility companies and the 20 REA cooperatives, declare that this proposal of mine is entirely feasible; that it is within the 250-mile radius of these two dams. We are in the natural consumption area, and I do not think the gentleman's argument on that score is very strong.

Furthermore, this project has been stopped more or less because of the refusal of the Congress to go along with what is called new starts. Well, you cannot call the Missouri Dam construction a new start. What is the use of building those great big tractors of energy unless you put out these transmission lines to give the people who happen to live in the area the benefit of the low-cost electrical energy? The two go hand in hand.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions Mr. KIRWAN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior, has indicated to the House that he was glad to support an appropriation for some particular project because he knew the money would be spent in America and that it would help American progress. I have always been able to see his point of view since, as the membership well knows, I believe that too many American dollars have been appropriated for the benefit of other countries to the great disadvantage of our own. Because of Mr. KIRWAN's attitude in the past, it is very difficult for me to understand his strong opposition to the Senate's approval of the loan I propose to 20 Minnesota cooperatives for the survey and planning costs of the proposed construction of a transmission line which would insure the needed cheap power to consumers in our area of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been working with the members of these cooperatives since March 6, 1951, when 100 managers and members of REA Boards in my district came here to testify before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior at a hearing I arranged for them. Electrical energy will be available when the great dams on the Missouri River are completed, starting in 1954, and my people are certainly entitled to the cheap power that they have been led to believe they would be able to purchase. It takes time to survey and plan the project we need in Minnesota. There is no good reason on earth why we should not be permitted to enjoy the savings Minnesotans are entitled to expect. Our people have helped pay for the dams. We have done our share, as always. We are only asking for the low-cost power we are entitled to. We are only asking for a loan, not a grant.

Mr. Speaker, this transmission line would benefit not only the people in farm homes but those living in our municipalities as well. As the REA has expanded more farm chores are done by electricity. In our villages the power needed is steadily increasing. We must secure additional energy and unless we can utilize the electrical current which will be available from the Missouri River dams we will have to install additional steam generating plants from time to time to meet the demands at a cost of many millions of dollars. Certainly it is only reasonable to use the low-cost power the dams will furnish. Otherwise, why build these dams? Certainly it is only reasonable to consider that it is only through the utmost possible use of this energy that the huge expenditure for the dams would be justified. Certainly our people have

a right to expect to realize on their investment in these dams. Mr. Speaker, it is almost ridiculous to have to stand here in the well of this House and ask for the benefits my people should receive automatically. However, the paramount consideration—aside from the fact that we have a legitimate right to this power—is that we must be assured of ample power to meet the ever-increasing demand. Our situation in that regard is critical. Are we to be expected to sit back and agree to wait for these benefits, Mr. Speaker, while the rest of the country progresses? Are the people in my district to be discriminated against in that fashion? Every Member of this House knows of my efforts in connection with the REA and I am working for the day when every farm home in America will be electrified and the producers of the food the rest of the Nation must have to survive will be able to enjoy the benefits of American progress. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if some of the members on this subcommittee understood what this electrical energy meant to a farmer and to his wife in her household chores, they would be the first in line to vote for the funds to give them the help they should have. On April 9, 1951, the original request to the budget for these lines was initiated by me personally.

On June 12, 1951, I arranged a further hearing before this subcommittee, Mr. Speaker, and appeared with a group from our REA associations requesting consideration of an allocation of $29,000,000 for the construction of transmission lines in southern and central Minnesota, which would have made it possible for these deserving people to enjoy the low-cost power benefits from the Missouri River dams immediately. It was proposed that these lines be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation which would have resulted in almost 100 percent of the cost reverting to the United States Treasury. Prior to the completion of the dams this grid work of transmission lines proposed would have given our cooperatives and municipalities an opportunity to utilize surplus power which any cooperative or municipality might have available and which might be badly needed by others. In my judgment it is infinitely wiser to construct these transmission lines than to construct additional generating plants which would be obsolete when the dams were completed. This original request was turned down because of the war emergency but there were good indications that it would be possible to secure funds for a main outlet for Missouri River power and I proposed the construction of a high-voltage line from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., through Luverne, Minn., to Worthington. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better for us to secure this much consideration than to wind up with nothing and I appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations requesting $1,000,000 for this purpose. I told the members of the committee that later on this line could be extended in a northerly or easterly direction as needed to make certain that the cheap electrical energy produced by the Missouri would be available to our Minnesota people and they would enjoy savings of millions of dollars annually. I had hoped that if we could secure this extension of the Bureau of Reclamation lines to Worthington, Minn., that the REA could then loan sufficient money to rush the grid work so badly needed throughout western and central Minnesota to completion and thus prevent a power shortage prior to the time the dams can be completed.

Later, I learned of the opposition of the REA's and private utilities to my proposal for this stub line and finally made the suggestion that the REA cooperatives interested reach an agreement with the private utilities involved and then come to us with their proposal.

Early last February I received word that these two groups had reached an agreement and on February 4, I headed the group representing the cooperatives and the private utilities at a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Interior requesting an allocation of $3,000,000 to commence construction of 230,000-kilovolt transmission lines by the Bureau of Reclamation in southwestern Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford not to build these lines. The American taxpayers will ultimately pay approximately $600,000,000 for harnessing the tremendous potentialities of the Missouri River. It is just good business—just good horse sense—to secure some return on an investment of that magnitude, and it is only by insuring large savings in bills for electrical energy that we could justify such an expenditure in the first place. However, Mr. KIRWAN and his subcommittee did not approve the allocation I requested. But the Senate has now placed an allocation of $2,913,600 in the bill and I plead with the House conferees to use good, common sense and vote to retain this item.

As the RECORD will show, Mr. Speaker, we Minnesotans have rarely asked for consideration of items such as this. The Minnesota delegation has supported allocations of tens of millions of dollars for projects in other States. We have supported allocations of millions of dollars in flood-control items throughout the country. The fact that we are representatives of a particular area in the country does not indicate that we should fail to support allocations needed in other parts of it. Certainly my record in Congress discloses no disposition to overlook the needs of any other locality.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress 14 years and this is the first major project that Minnesota has ever requested. We come to you as a united delegation asking for the first $2,913,600 of a $54,000,000 loan, repayable at 3 percent interest. The entire State wants it. Minnesota needs it and we earnestly hope that the conferees will be instructed to agree to the Senate language.

This motion will not delay passage of this conference report by 2 hours. The action in the Senate was unanimous. You who are interested in other items in this Interior appropriation bill need not be apprehensive that this endangers those items.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, Minnesota is entitled to this consideration when we consider the huge sums voted for foreign countries. Let us in this instance, put first things first—let us improve the situation of some of our own people for a change.

All I ask is that our House conferees agree to the Senate language. I do not think that is an unreasonable request. Minnesota needs this help and should have it. Our taxpayers have contributed their share of the cost of these dams—they were constructed to afford our people cheap power as well as flood control. Why deny my people a chance to enjoy the savings they have a right to make.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter I received which will point up conclusively the need for this transmission line. This letter is from members of the cooperative group and the utilities group who have joined together in this request. They make clear their objection to considering the compromise proposed by the gentleman from Iowa, and I ask your undivided attention as I read it.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: During these last few days of the Eighty-second Congress, when time is limited and any particular legislation is bound to receive less consideration than at any other time during the legislative session, we hesitate in again calling your attention to our Minnesota transmission-line problem. We do feel, however, that we must keep faith with those REA cooperative members we have back home and who have asked us to represent them, in again calling your attention to our united program for bringing hydroelectric power from the Missouri River to the people of Minnesota.

This program was arrived at after extensive engineering studies had been made by the 20 cooperatives, the three private power companies, and the Bureau of Reclamation. These studies were based on the following factors:

1. The requirements of the area.

2. The use of the existing transmission facilities.

3. The minimum requirements of expenditure on the part of the Federal Government.

4. On a program that would bring power to all the cooperatives in the marketing area.

5. On a program that would have united support, leaving none of the cooperatives involved out of the plan.

We again wish to call your attention to what we think is a unique agreement, one we are told that may well establish a precedent for harmony in the electric-power distribution field.

This united plan, as approved by the Senate on Thursday, and now before the Senate and House conference committee, may well be sabotaged. We have been informed that a member of the House conferees will take a firm stand against the proposed line, as approved in the Senate, and will make every attempt to substitute therefor a short stub line from the north to either Fergus Falls or Benson, contending that he would support the remaining portion of the project next year.

If a compromise, as proposed, were accepted in conference, it would leave most of the cooperatives at the mercy of the gentlemen offering the same. Such a compromise is in no way consistent with either sound engineering practices or good financial judgment. We recognize that while a curtailment in funds could handicap the progress of the project to a degree, we could still accept such a compromise, but we also recognize that any compromise in the project

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

itself would completely wreck the program we have all worked so hard on.

We, therefore, sincerely request that you lend your every effort toward convincing members of the Senate and House conference committee that we must have approval of the complete project as proposed and that anything else could very likely cause a rupture among the group who now feel they have a plan that has long been advocated by the majority of both Senate and House over the years.

This united plan has been so well accepted that it has the support of the Farmers Union, the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the Minnesota, North and South Dakota State REA associations, the National Milk Producers Federation, and the two large national labor organizations.

We again wish to thank you for your efforts made in our behalf and particularly with your patient acceptance of our pleadings.

Yours very truly,

LEROY C. SABIE.
VICTOR HANSON.
W. E. OLSON.
J. A. BUSCH.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, may I say that all we ask is that these good conferees, these splendid gentlemen, spend half an hour with the Senate conferees, agree to what the Senate wants, and put this language back in the bill, thus making 500,000 people in western and central Minnesota happy knowing that they will get the benefit of this cheap electric energy which, I believe, will start flowing from the Fort Randall Dam the end of next week. Is that unreasonable? We are going to repay every dime of it. All of the Minnesota delegation in both the Senate and the House want this. Is that not a fact, Mr. BLATNIK and Mr. MARSHALL? They nod in affirmation. Is that not a fact, Mr. ANDRESEN?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my good colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This is a business proposition. The Government is not giving anything to those people out there. It is advancing or loaning the money to construct these lines, and the loan will be fully repaid. We hesitate about a little proposition like this when we have voted $40,000,000,000 to send out of this country, and a good deal of it has been used for projects of this kind.

I say to my colleagues here, recognizing that there is a Democratic majority, that you have a majority on the committee of conference, and they could put this through if they are interested in approving this project so that these lines can be built. The money will be repaid. I ask the gentlemen of the majority to support this project.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me say in conclusion that this subcommittee have been more than kind. They have helped Minnesota keep the Pipestone Indian School open for the orphan Indian children. I want to acknowledge that debt to them. But I do not think they understand the great need for this line in Minnesota today. We are trying to help the consumers, the cooperatives, the municipalities, and the private utilities.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. HAGEN. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota on his fine efforts to get this money reinstated. I will support it. What is the reason for building these dams if we are not going to utilize the power they produce?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I cannot see any good reason for spending that money unless we give the people the benefits of that low-cost power.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota is a fine fellow, but I will bet you that if the rafters of this Chamber could only talk they would echo the stirring speech he made this year to cut out the Burke Airport. How he was for economy. The RECORD will show that he voted 12 times last year against transmission lines.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the correct roll-call figure should be seven out of eight. The gentleman will recall that years ago I supported the steam plants for the TVA, when such a movement was not popular. I also voted against the Keating amendment last year, which amendment was very restrictive as to public power lines.

Mr. KIRWAN. I did not say a word about the TVA. I was telling you about the 12 roll calls we had last year. It is just the same out in the other States of this great country as it is in Minnesota. Most of the transmission lines required last year were ready. There was power to deliver over them. Let me tell the Congress this, and I say this with sincerity: There cannot be any power go over those transmission lines in Minnesota about which they are talking for 5 years. Why build transmission lines that you cannot use for 5 years?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly that is not the testimony of the Reclamation Bureau.

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That does not jibe with the testimony. They say it will be December 1953.

Mr. KIRWAN. The record shows that the first unit of the Randall Dam will not come in until 1953. Garrison Dam will not come in until 1955, and the people who are nearer to these projects are going to get the electricity produced there first. So Minnesota probably will not get any electricity over these lines for perhaps 7 years, not to mention 5 years. Here we want to make the Government of the United States, your Government and mine, put an investment into something that will not be used for 5 years. By that time the transmission lines may be built in all probability at half the price. The costs then will be down. They are bound to go down after this war in Korea. Why build the transmission lines now? I am for the transmission lines for Minnesota, but I am not for them at this stage—5 years in advance of the time when they will be needed. When the Members of the Minnesota delegation make this statement that the Government is going to get this money back with 3 percent interest, certainly the Government is going to get the money back. I have been shouting and advocating that for years and years, in every State west of the Mississippi. So it is nothing new that Minnesota, of course, will pay back this loan at 3 percent interest, but there are more places in the United States where that money is more needed today than dumping it in Minnesota. Minnesota is a great State and has a great people, but I again say they do not need this money in Minnesota for 5 years or more and certainly not under 4 years at the least. When that day comes, if I am still alive and here, I will be one of the first to vote for this money, but not now. I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that the papers and magazines of this county are printing and publishing a picture out in Iowa where the Government built a bridge that does not have any water under it. Let us not start out building transmission lines out in Minnesota, which are not going to be used for 5 years.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair. The gentleman realizes that the money in this bill is for nothing but planning and survey, and certainly you cannot expect the projects to be completed in less than 3 years?

Mr. KIRWAN. There will be plenty of time in the future to go into planning and surveying. Prices will very likely come down and the cost of materials will be cut considerably. When that happens, then we will appropriate this money for use in Minnesota, but not now.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The people served by the Southwestern Power Administration are greatly interested in two questions, which I think the gentleman can answer as a result of this conference report. The first is in regard to a continuing fund. Is it our understanding that the continuing fund is in this conference report?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; it is in the report.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The second question, if the gentleman will be so kind, concerns the possibility of getting a 12 company contract agreed to. Can the gentleman tell us if there is anything in this report which would give us hope that the contract would be signed and go into operation soon?

Mr. KIRWAN. The conferees of the House and Senate, before they went into conference, asked the Department of the Interior to sign up with the utilities as fast as they could and to establish a friendly relationship between them in the best interests of the country just as fast as they possibly could.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman. I am glad for that report.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact, however, that the $1,000,000 that the conferees included in this bill for the continuing fund of the southwest power is to have no effect on the court trials now going on as to whether or not the deal that has been made between the southwest power and the REA in the Southwest is legal?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is strictly up to the courts.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, that is right, and the million dollars is to have no effect on that court action?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. None whatsoever.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman made the statement a moment ago about a bridge in Iowa which had no water under it. I believe that came about because the forces of nature changed the channel of the stream. That was the reason, and not because of any mistake made by the engineers in the development of that bridge project.

Mr. KIRWAN. When I made that statement, I was not criticising the engineers in any way. What I am saying is this. Are we going to do the same thing now in Minnesota, and start to build transmission lines today which would cost $54,000,000, when 5 years from now they might only cost $25,000,000?

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. YORTY. The other day here in Washington the Governor of California, Earl Warren, made the statement that anything you get for yourself from the Government is social progress, and anything somebody else gets is socialism. Can the gentleman tell us under which category these transmission lines would come?

Mr. KIRWAN. I would not want to be the judge of that.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that it takes 2 or 3 years to build these transmission lines in Minnesota. Am I right in assuming that if he is reelected, and I presume he will be, he will be fighting in our corner next year and the year after for the money for this loan to build these lines?

Mr. KIRWAN. My record since I came to Congress is that I have been for public power. I am for it in Minnesota, but I do not see why we want to waste money, putting this money into Minnesota today, when the prices 2 years from today perhaps will be cut in half. It will be 1953 before the first unit comes in, the end of 1953. It will be 1955 before the power comes in on the Garrison Dam, and the places nearest to it will get the power first. So it will probably be 6 or 7 years before Minnesota is ready to receive the power.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to give you the total and final figures in this bill. As the bill passed the House there were $486,248,253 in the bill. As it passed the Senate, the Senate increased it by $80,080,911, making a total Senate approval of $567,328,164. The amount of money provided for in the conference report is $541,729,854, which is $25,598,319 below the Senate figure. The conference report allows $90,421,955 below the budget request. So I feel both the House and Senate have done a pretty good job.

There are things in the bill that did not have unanimous approval of the members of the conference. As a whole, I am satisfied with the bill, and I hope this conference report will be approved by the House today in the same amount as it came to the floor today.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] a few moments ago said that in a couple of years from now prices could be half what they are today. I would like to know from the gentleman whether that is a threat or a promise.

Mr. JENSEN. That is a hope.

Mr. KIRWAN. There never was any time in the history of this country when in an emergency like we are in today prices were not up. That is not new. It does not make any difference whether it was in the War of 1776, or down through the 150 years since. Certainly they will come down. They always do.

Mr. JUDD. Is the gentleman counting on a Republican or a Democratic depression to bring prices down one-half?

Mr. KIRWAN. I do not know as we ever had a Democratic depression.

Mr. JUDD. We just have Democratic wars which lead inevitably to depression.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to call attention to certain things in connection with this bill. The gentleman from Iowa has given you the figures on the bill as it passed the House, as it passed the Senate, and as it passed the Congress. It is, of course, still below the budget; on the other hand, there were put into it over my protests 10 items for which the allowance was something over $20,000,000 with which to start new projects which were not recommended by the budget or the President, which will cost ultimately $332,000,000.

Frankly, I wonder why we should be starting large projects at this time when we are so pressed not only for cash but also for the manpower to supply the military forces and other needs.

The House yielded two-thirds of the Senate increases and a little better, and for that reason I could not sign the conference report; for that reason I think I should call the attention of the House to this situation, because I believe we must get to a point some time where we refuse to go into unbudgeted items starting large new projects which are going to cost so much money.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I shall take but a couple of minutes to reply to the gentleman from New York.

Eighty-nine percent of the cost of the 10 new starts is going to be paid back into the Treasury of the United States. This leaves only 11 percent to be paid by the Federal Government. Surely and truly 11 percent is not much to contribute to the upbuilding of the Nation when you think of how it has been robbed and looted by the exploitation of its natural resources for so many years. Only 11 percent is not going to come back.

If we run out of projects after this emergency in Korea is over and have nothing to start what will that mean to employment in this country? I am asking the House to keep that in mind, with all due respect to the gentleman from New York, and I have the highest regard for him. I mean that sincerely.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it should be said in fairness to the committee on both sides that the members of the Committee on the Interior, both of the House and the Senate, and of both political parties, are quite liberal when it comes to appropriating money for irrigation and reclamation projects. We know that. I know I have heard the gentleman from Ohio say many times, and Members of the Senate likewise, that we cannot expect the good Lord to furnish the sunshine and water necessary to give us bumper crops very many more years because He already has done so for 9. One of these days when the drought comes the American people are going to be very glad this committee saw fit to put a few thousand acres under irrigation which will produce from three to five times more vegetables than an acre will produce in dry-land farming.

Mr. KIRWAN. Especially is this necessary from the long-range viewpoint. They claim that a hundred years from now the population of this country will be 250,000,000. If you do not take care of them now it will be too late to take care of them a hundred years from now.

Mr. JENSEN. One cannot serve on this committee and travel through every State in the Union, especially the Western States, without seeing the great need for and the great value of irrigation and reclamation.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. There is one project in this bill that is very much in dispute out in my congressional district. I refer to the Solano project and providing for an expenditure of $3,000,000. Several representatives of the affected area made a trip to Washington to contact members of the committee endeavoring to have them permitted to construct a project at their own expense which would better serve the area, rather than the Federal Government involve itself contrary to their desires. I have talked with members of the committee and I understand from the report that is sub-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

mitted that the following agreement, in effect, has been reached:

Funds for the Solano project in California have been allowed with the understanding that they will not be used to initiate construction of the project until there is a determination as to whether or not the project is to be constructed as a unit of the Central Valley project.

It is further understood that this determination is not to be made until all local interests have had an opportunity to be heard by the proper legislative committee with respect to the question of reauthorization of the project.

I would like to ask the chairman, Mr. KIRWAN, a question. This would mean, would it not, that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee would have to reauthorize this project before the money could be expended?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; before they spent a dollar on that project, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee would have to reauthorize it. Senator KNOWLAND, of California, who is on the committee, and members of the conference committee, inserted that in the report.

Mr. SCUDDER. I am glad to hear that because our people want to appear and be heard.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I would like to compliment the conferees for putting in the 10 new starts. I do think the rule should have been broken against new starts. We are spending $300,000,000 in the Rhone Valley in France. We want to bring the Central Valley project of California to a completed state. It is no more than fair that the people of this country should at least share 50–50 with these foreign expenditures involving projects which have the same purpose in view.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say for the RECORD that the gentleman is an indefatigable worker so far as the natural resources of this country are concerned and their development. I want to commend the gentleman for the splendid fight he has put up on behalf of the resources development in this great land of ours.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Members to the beautiful plaque above the main door in the press gallery which reads as follows:

Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Those words were uttered by Daniel Webster.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised to hear the enemies of public power turn back and read the statement that Daniel Webster made a hundred years ago, 30 years before the electric light was invented. That just shows how far behind they are.

If Webster were here now, I am sure that he would not oppose the building of these power lines to take to the people the power generated at dams built at public expense on navigable streams—power that the Supreme Court has decided more than once is public power and belongs to the American people, and supply it to the surrounding areas where it is so badly needed.

I call your attention to the fact that you need not wait for prices to go down as long as the volume of the currency continues to expand. From the 30th of April to the 31st of May the increase in our circulating medium amounted to more than $300,000,000. You are not going to have any deflation of the currency any time soon. If you do it will probably plunge this country into one of the greatest panics the world has ever known.

It is time for the Committee on Banking and Currency to wake up and bring in a bill to stabilize the currency; place a ceiling beyond which it cannot go and place a floor beneath which it cannot be deflated. Then whenever it goes below that floor by the retirement of Federal Reserve notes it can be replaced with United States notes with a gold reserve behind them—just as Lincoln did during the War Between the States. That would stabilize the currency and keep us from undergoing uncontrolled inflation or disastrous deflation.

It is going to take some time to build these power lines. I saw six votes here one day where funds were denied to build power lines to supply public power to the people in the surrounding areas from dams built by the Federal Government. Now there is a drive on by the Power Trust to take over the Tennessee Valley Authority, to take over the Columbia River development, and take over rural electrification. If that should happen, you would see rates spiral as they have never done before. The American people are overcharged now more than $2,300,000,000 a year, and if it were not for the yardsticks provided on the Columbia River, the Tennessee Valley Authority and Boulder Dam, if they used the same amount of power they are consuming now, their overcharges would probably amount to $10,000,000,000 a year.

The water that flows through the State of Minnesota, in the Red River of the North, goes up to Winnipeg, Canada, and they use it to generate electricity which is distributed to the people in the Winnipeg area. They not only have about the lowest rates to be found on the American Continent, but they have the highest per capita consumption to be found, not only in Canada, but anywhere on this continent, including the United States.

Now let us see what this means. The people of Minnesota are miserably overcharged for their electricity. In Minnesota last year they used 4,057,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity for which they paid $102,000,000, or $53,000,000 more than it would have cost them just across the line in Canada, and $53,000,000 more than it would have cost along the Columbia River or in the Tennessee Valley area.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman mentioned the cost of electricity, In western Minnesota we do not have enough electric power. We need this power. We cannot get it at any price, and that is why we are so anxious to get this started.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman. I have fought this battle, not only with reference to my own area, but I fought the battle for the development of the Columbia River, making the Grand Coulee Dam a high dam instead of a low dam, which would have allowed a vast wealth of power to go to waste for centuries to come. I have supported the St. Lawrence project where 12,000,000,000 kilowatts of electricity are going to waste every year, where the people of the State of New York are overcharged $302,000,000 a year for their hydroelectric lights and power. I am for the Missouri Valley Authority, and unless we do provide such an authority the power on that great stream will probably be running to waste a hundred years from now, and the people throughout that area will be suffering as a consequence.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support the motion offered by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I think that the funds for these transmission lines into Minnesota ought to be approved in this session of the Congress. I have never seen people in any community so enthusiastically interested in an item as they are in this particular item of $2,913,600 to provide for construction of transmission lines and substations to distribute Missouri River power into Minnesota.

Now the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has mentioned the fact that it may be several years before this particular project is put into effect. There is a lot more that goes into one of these projects than just going out today and building a line. There is a lot of planning to be done, there is a lot of preliminary work that has to be done and because of the unity of feeling and because the people in that area know that they must do something to protect themselves against high cost power, it is time that this project is begun.

A number of things have been talked about here today. I am sorry my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] attempted to inject a little political note into the debate because the people in our State have looked upon this as benefit to the people regardless of party. I must say that the people of our State will look at the record of the two parties, and they themselves can

judge as to the benefits received when the resources of this country have been developed for and by the people.

As far as I have been concerned, in appearing before this Interior Subcommittee I have been treated with the finest courtesy. The people who have appeared before this committee in support of this item have informed me that they were given an excellent hearing. They are deeply appreciative of that fact, and they are deeply appreciative of the fact that sometime or other the transmission lines will be built. I think they have a feeling that in having appeared before this committee they have assurance that this necessary line will be built in the future.

Because we know that the Congress will realize the necessity of distributing Missouri River power in Minnesota, I am supporting the motion to recommit the bill in order that this action can be taken now, in this session of the Congress.

Twenty electric cooperatives and three Minnesota power companies have joined together in a mutual effort in order to bring the benefits of the hydroelectric developments along the Missouri River to the greatest number of Minnesota customers possible.

This fine spirit of cooperation is in the highest traditions of our country, and it is the spirit which has helped to build this most powerful Nation in the world. Public and private cooperation to bring the benefits of the development of a natural resource to as many people as possible is real democracy at work.

Together the cooperatives and power companies have agreed upon a single 230,000-volt transmission system in Minnesota to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation from Fargo, N. Dak., to Fergus Falls, Benson, Granite Falls, Mankato, Jackson, and then westward to South Dakota.

This is the project for which we are asking funds. Electric companies will link this line with the distribution systems of the rural electric cooperatives and will deliver Missouri River power to them.

Together with the representatives of these cooperatives, I have appeared before the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations and have carefully discussed the entire project with members of the Committee on Appropriations. I sincerely appreciate the hearing I have been given and because I know first-hand the work that has already gone into this matter, I ask now that we recommit the bill in order that the funds can be included this year.

I am sure that all of you will agree with me that when American citizens get together, as the representatives of the cooperatives and the power companies have, to work for their common good they deserve the honest consideration of this House.

Furthermore, I want to make clear that we are asking for a loan to be repaid at 3 percent interest. The taxpayers will pay only a very small administrative cost for supervision of the project. And the farmers who work the 80,000 farms served by the 20 REA cooperatives in western, central, and southern Minnesota are taxpayers, I can assure you of that.

More and more Minnesota farms need more and more electricity to meet the production they are called upon to maintain in the present situation. Our State is one of the highest fuel cost areas in the United States and only by full use of the Missouri River development can we hope to achieve an effective and long-range solution to our problem.

The estimated cost of the project is $54,000,000, every cent including local administration to be repaid within 50 years at 3 percent interest. The supervision cost of the Bureau of Reclamation office in Washington is the only cost to be borne by us as taxpayers and this investment will be returned many times by the increased revenue paid into the Treasury as a result of this development.

Because of the high fuel cost in Minnesota and the rapidly increasing need for power in rural and urban areas, what we fail to do in this House today will be back to plague us in future years. Because I am sure that the Members here realize this, I am sure that this project will be built and I therefore ask that we begin now and save the money and food production that will be lost otherwise.

The power companies are prepared to interconnect their systems to relieve the shortages in those areas where it now exists to solve these shortages until Missouri River power is available. This cooperative effort of the power companies demonstrates their interest in meeting the problem.

The companies will then enter into wheeling contracts with the Bureau of Reclamation to wheel the power from the substations to the load centers. By virtue of this arrangement, the preferred customers among the cooperatives would become direct customers of the Bureau without additional expenditures. And in the over-all plan, the cooperatives, the power companies, and the municipalities will integrate their facilities to give the maximum benefit to all customers.

This is certainly a remarkable example of the kind of cooperation we need to solve our common problems. I submit this as a sound, effective, and desirable plan to serve 180,000 families in Minnesota with the power they need at a fair price.

The 20 cooperatives who have worked for this project purchased about 200,000,000 kilowatt-hours last year and will need about 480,000,000 kilowatt-hours by 1960. By making Missouri River power available to them, it will mean an eventual annual saving of $3,600,000 to their patrons—and all of this without cost to the Government.

The efficiency and economy represented in this plan are its best recommendation. I hope the House will evidence the same spirit of cooperation that has been shown by the people of Minnesota who now urge us to approve the beginning of this line.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I had not thought I would say anything at this time, but two or three matters have come up on which I would like to comment. First of all, may I say to the gentleman from California that had I had my way the project he mentioned would have been deleted from the bill. That is true of certain others of the conferees on the House side. Had I had my way, and others, we would have written this report differently from what it is. Had I had my individual way, it would have been still more different. But all in all, this is an outgrowth of a long, hard session, and we have done the best we could do.

I want to say now regarding the Minnesota matter that I know they want cheaper power. I think the conference committee is sympathetic to their cause. But let us not shed too many tears over their inability to get this money.

If the REA's in Minnesota desire to build these transmission lines sooner than this committee desires to allow the money, they have nothing to do but go down to the REA Administrator and borrow the money and then construct the lines. If they do not want to do that and are willing to go along with this subcommittee, we are going to be sympathetic to Minnesota just as quickly as we can get to it. We do not think now is the time to do it, because power is not available. But if they need it sooner, they can get the money by borrowing it from the REA.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this report will be approved. It is the best we can do. It does not suit us entirely. It does not suit you entirely. But, it is a good report all in all, and it is the best we could work out.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I represent a great State, the State of Pennsylvania, a great industrial and agricultural State with some 10 millions of people dependent upon it. I am sorry that I cannot have more than a minute, but I do want to say it is really very interesting to listen to the discussion here this morning. It reminds me very much of the fellow who is always crying the blues with a ham under each arm. I have been in the Congress of the United States for 10 years, and I have watched carefully the passing of hydroelectric projects, navigation projects, irrigation projects, and land-reclamation projects, and projects of all kinds all over the United States. Now my State of Pennsylvania pays approximately 10 percent of the taxes into the Treasury so it can be recognized we are paying our share for the cost of these projects and we are interested. I would like to see an occasional project for the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, or for some of the New England States. All we do in these States is furnish the money to sharpen the razor to cut our economic and industrial life. In the TVA, for example, which has been referred to here this morning, an $850 million job, the State of Pennsylvania pays approximately 10 percent. So we pay $85,000,000 toward the completion of the TVA. So what happens. When industry wants to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

locate, they don't locate in Pennsylvania, Ohio, or one of the New England States. They go down into the TVA area where they have cheap hydroelectric power, which has been referred to, and for which we have paid our share of the cost. I just want to say that as far as I am concerned I would rather see the miners of Pennsylvania at work producing coal from Pennsylvania's mines than see the water going over the TVA dams. We are making in Pennsylvania the fight of our lives for our industrial existence in this highly competitive situation all over the United States and it is about time some consideration is given to the northeastern area of the country for the protection and rehabilitation of our industrial and agricultural life. Certainly I am pleased to see these great programs for the development of our Nation; however, in view of the fact that we contribute through taxes to pay the costs of these various projects, we are entitled also to some consideration for the development of our natural resources, agricultural, and industrial life for the thousands of people who are dependent upon these areas for their livelihood.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RESOURCES FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the future of America depends in the last analysis upon two major factors—our human resources and the rational use of our natural resources. The reason that the United States is the greatest Nation in the world today is because we have an energetic and industrious people, and a territory which is richly endowed with fertile farm and forest land, great rivers for producing electric power, and vast deposits of minerals. It also goes without saying that the key to America's future welfare requires the fullest use of these human and material resources. The continued application of the energies and initiative of a great people to the God-given natural wealth of this country, is an unbeatable combination.

We can point with pride to some very real progress in the resources field during the last 20 years. We have, under the leadership of the Federal Government, gone forward in the development of electric power, soil conservation, better forest practices and mineral exploration. I will cite just a few facts and figures for purposes of illustration.

In 1933 Federal hydro-power installations were generating less than half a billion kilowatt-hours—today Federal projects are producing 45,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of cheap electric power for use of farm and factory. Beginning with the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, we have been able to develop a soil conservation program to conserve soil fertility, and which has reclaimed some 25,000,000 acres of land by means of terracing, irrigation, and tree planting. The Federal Government is today playing an important role in research and exploration to broaden our mineral mining base, and has initiated the selective cutting-sustained yield concept in forestry.

However, it is my contention that we have only made a beginning in the development of our resources—we have made a start but what has been done is only the first step in what must be done. We must intensify the Government's efforts to develop more cheap electricity by harnessing our rivers. Congress should provide the funds for an expansion and extension of the soil conservation program so to insure an ever-increasing rise in food production. Congress should enact additional legislation to encourage scientific forest practices, and to develop new fuel and mineral resources. What we need is a comprehensive program of resources utilization in the interests of all the people.

RESOURCES: USE NECESSARY TO MINNESOTA

When I discuss the question of resources development, I speak on a subject which is of special significance to the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. For this district—the Eighth District of Minnesota—is one whose whole economy rests upon the exploitation of natural resources. It is in this district that we find the Mesabi iron range, which has produced nearly three-fourths of America's total iron ore needs for the last 50 years, and which today is supplying the bulk of the iron ore required in the defense effort. It is in this area that we find millions of acres of forest land from which comes pulpwood and timber for pulp and saw mills. These two industries—iron mining and lumbering—are basic to the economy of northeast Minnesota. The mining of iron ore and its shipment by rail and water, and the logging of the timber and its processing in local mills, are the two most important sources of employment and income in this area.

It can also be said that the future prosperity and economic position of northeast Minnesota requires further progress in the development and use of natural resources. It cannot be repeated too often that the high-grade ore of Mesabi is fast being depleted, and that based on present estimates of existing reserves, another 20 years may see the end of our best ore supplies. Likewise, the forests of northern Minnesota have been exploited and wasted, and the forest industry is not the source of jobs and profits that it once was. For these reasons, the welfare of my region requires that Government action be taken to develop substitute resources to exploit, and to establish new industries to maintain the economy. We cannot afford to wait until our iron ores are gone and the Mesabi Range becomes one great ghost town.

Fortunately, northern Minnesota is rich in untapped resources awaiting development. Unlimited amounts of taconite, which is a new source of iron ore, is found on the Mesabi Range—better methods of extracting and refining our low grade ores can further expand the mineral base. My area has rich deposits of peat—a possible source of cheap fuel and power. By proper conservation and reforestation programming, Minnesota forests can become increasingly productive. In other words, Mr. Speaker, northern Minnesota has the raw materials to support an expanding economy—we have the resources which, if developed, will give rich rewards to the people and to the national welfare.

However, resources will not develop themselves—their utilization requires human initiative and effort and a social policy of encouraging resources-use. In short, we need a Government program to develop these basic natural resources, and it is with respect to such a program that I now direct my remarks.

TACONITE INDUSTRY MUST BE EXPANDED

I have already mentioned that the high grade iron ore of Mesabi is being depleted, and that we must find substitute sources of iron and steel. It is indeed fortunate that scientific research has found a substitute in the form of a black rock called taconite.

There are billions of tons of taconite in northern Minnesota, which, when processed, yield about 28 percent iron ore. The commercial exploitation of this taconite is a matter of top priority in view of our future steel needs, and in view of the eventual exhaustion of high grade Mesabi ore. I am pleased to report to the Congress that real progress is being made in this direction. Already taconite plants have been established in Beaver Bay and Babbitt, and present plans contemplate a total taconite ore production of ten to fifteen million tons by 1960.

The growth of the Minnesota taconite industry is a source of personal satisfaction to myself. When I was a member of the Minnesota Senate back in 1940, I authored the Minnesota taconite law which gave preferential tax treatment to taconite producers. Two years ago I sponsored legislation here in Congress to give RFC loans to taconite companies, and was successful in incorporating its substance into the Defense Production Act. Because of the now established Federal policy of encouraging taconite production by tax deferments and loans, we now have the beginnings of a vast taconite industry in Minnesota. The growth of this industry must receive continued encouragement by the Federal Government. Taconite must be developed to the fullest in the interests of more jobs, more income, and an increased supply of iron and steel.

PEAT: USE FOR FUEL AND POWER

Another important Minnesota resource is peat—there are some 7,000,000,000 tons of peat, half of the Nation's supply—located right in my congressional district. The potentialities of this peat for fuel and power is enormous. Research shows that one ton of peat possesses a heat content equal to half a ton of good coal. The successful use of peat as fuel in Finland, Sweden, France, Ireland, and Russia shows what can be done with this resource.

My State needs a cheaper supply of fuel and more electric power for REA, and I believe that a commercial peat industry will help meet our needs. Studies show that peat fuel can be produced for $2.40 per ton, which makes it much cheaper than coal shipped in from Kentucky and Pennsylvania. I maintain that Congress should encourage peat production in the same way it has done with taconite. We need this for the fuel and power it will give us, and it is social folly to delay action any longer.

OUR FORESTS ARE RENEWABLE

There are 20,000,000 acres of forest land in Minnesota, and forestry is a $100,000,000 industry in my State. However, our forest industries do not produce the income that they did 50 years ago because of the waste and systematic destruction of our forests. Due to the criminal practices of the lumber barons and raging fires, 3 out of every 10 acres of Minnesota forest lands are today unproductive, and another 6,000,000 acres is covered with scrub timber useful only for pulp.

Yet the forests of Minnesota are renewable, and a sound program of conservation, reforestation, and forest management would increase the annual income from forestry many times the present income we now receive. It is my contention that Congress should appropriate more money for forest management, forest roads, timber surveys, and fire protection. Federal technical service to insure better forest practices should be expended with emphasis on wood-lot forestry among farmers. We should step up production of tree seedlings to a point necessary to reforest the 7,500,000 acres of denuded and unproductive forest lands. Sound forest management, reforestation, and conservation are the key to increased pay rolls and greater income in Minnesota's forest industry.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

One other national resource deserves comment, and that is the use of that natural waterway transportation system made up of the Great Lakes chain, and which can be extended by the construction of the St. Lawrence seaways. Increased resources use requires additional and economical transportation, and this is why Great Lakes shipping and the seaway are so important to Minnesota.

Two years ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and I secured passage of the Blatnik-Potter Great Lakes shipping law to add 10 war surplus vessels to the Lakes fleet, and I am pleased to note that the pending long-range shipping bill gives tax deferment for the construction and restoration of Lakes vessels. However, we need additional legislation to develop an adequate United States flag fleet on the Great Lakes for handling the growing lake commerce and to decrease our dependence upon Canadian ships for ore transportation.

As my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know, I have championed the St. Lawrence seaway ever since coming to Congress, and that I am the author of the Blatnik seaway bill which is buried in the Public Works Committee. The recent defeat of seaway legislation was a source of great personal disappointment, since no one knows better than I how important the seaway is to the entire Great Lakes-Midwest region. It means lower transportation costs, increased commerce and trade, and an outlet to the channels of foreign trade. I deplore the shortsightedness of Congress in failing to approve the seaway. Now that Congress has defaulted, Canada intends to start construction of the seaway by herself. Yet I still have hopes that this country will see the error of its ways, and join Canada in constructing the seaway as a joint project. I refuse to give up the fight until American partnership in this great undertaking is assured.

HUMAN RESOURCES ALSO IMPORTANT

Mr. Speaker, I have devoted the bulk of my time to the advancement of a program for developing our natural resources. However, we should never lose sight of the fact that the whole purpose of resources use is to promote human welfare. Resources without people is meaningless—it is the application of man's labor and intelligence to the exploitation of resources that is significant. The purpose of the program which I have outlined is to use our natural wealth to insure a rising standard of living and the good life for the American people.

The farmers, the laborers, and the small-business men constitute America, and hand in hand with any program of resources development must also go an economic program for the benefit of each of these three groups. If we are to exploit our natural resources for the many instead of the few, we must have full production, full employment, high incomes, and good wages to translate increased resources use into rising standards of living.

The farmer needs price supports at full parity, liberal farm credit so he can own his own farm, soil-conservation legislation to maintain its fertility, and more REA for labor-saving power and greater home comfort. The worker needs guaranteed annual employment at good wages, the right to bargain collectively through his union free from the shackles of Taft-Hartley. The small-business man requires freedom from chain-store competition, and an environment in which his business can thrive and prosper. All the people need old-age security, better schools for their children, better health and hospital facilities. These legislative goals reflect the hopes and aspirations of the American people, and deserve the active consideration of the Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker, as long as this language is not in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H. R. 7176 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to reinsert the funds inserted by the Senate for the construction of the western Minnesota transmission line in the amount of $2,913,600.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 22, noes 132.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant At Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 49, nays 299, not voting 82, as follows:

[Roll No. 133]

YEAS—49

Aandahl	Harrison, Nebr.	McVey
Andersen, H. Carl	Harvey	Mansfield
	Hays, Ark.	Marshall
Andresen, August H.	Hinshaw	Martin, Iowa
	Hoeven	Mason
Angell	Horan	Miller, Nebr.
Baker	Hull	O'Konski
Bennett, Mich.	Irving	Rankin
Berry	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.
Blatnik	Javits	Smith, Miss.
Bray	Jenkins	Talle
Canfield	Judd	Trimble
Cunningham	Lovre	Whitten
Frazier	McCarthy	Wier
Golden	McDonough	Williams, Miss.
Gross	McGregor	Winstead
Hagen	McIntire	Withrow

NAYS—299

Abbitt	Bosone	Clemente
Addonizio	Bow	Clevenger
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Cole, Kans.
Allen, Ill.	Bramblett	Colmer
Anderson, Calif.	Brooks	Cooley
Andrews	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Arends	Brownson	Cotton
Armstrong	Bryson	Coudert
Aspinall	Buchanan	Cox
Auchincloss	Budge	Crawford
Ayres	Buffett	Crosser
Barden	Burleson	Crumpacker
Baring	Burnside	Curtis, Mo.
Barrett	Burton	Curtis, Nebr.
Bates, Mass.	Busbey	Dague
Battle	Bush	Davis, Ga.
Beall	Byrnes	Davis, Wis.
Beamer	Camp	Dawson
Belcher	Cannon	Deane
Bennett, Fla.	Carnahan	DeGraffenried
Betts	Carrigg	Delaney
Bishop	Case	Dempsey
Blackney	Celler	Denny
Boggs, Del.	Chatham	Denton
Boggs, La.	Chelf	Devereux
Bolling	Chenoweth	D'Ewart
Bolton	Chudoff	Dingell
Bonner	Church	Dollinger

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Dolliver	Jones, Mo.	Rains
Dondero	Jones,	Ramsay
Donohue	Hamilton C.	Reams
Dorn	Jones,	Redden
Doughton	Woodrow W.	Reed, Ill.
Doyle	Karsten, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
Durham	Kean	Rees, Kans.
Eaton	Kearns	Rhodes
Eberharter	Keating	Ribicoff
Elliott	Kelley, Pa.	Riehlman
Ellsworth	Kelly, N. Y.	Riley
Engle	Kerr	Rivers
Fallon	King, Calif.	Roberts
Feighan	Kirwan	Rodino
Fernandez	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Fine	Kluczynski	Rogers, Mass.
Flood	Lane	Rogers, Tex.
Fogarty	Lanham	Rooney
Forand	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Ford	Latham	Ross
Forrester	Lesinski	Sasscer
Fugate	Lind	Saylor
Fulton	Lucas	Schenck
Furcolo	McConnell	Scott, Hardie
Gamble	McCormack	Scrivner
Garmatz	McCulloch	Scudder
Gary	McGrath	Secrest
Gathings	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Gavin	McKinnon	Shafer
George	McMullen	Shelley
Goodwin	Machrowicz	Short
Gordon	Mack, Ill.	Sieminski
Gore	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Ill.
Graham	Madden	Simpson, Pa.
Granahan	Magee	Sittler
Granger	Mahon	Smith, Kans.
Grant	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Green	Meader	Smith, Wis.
Greenwood	Merrow	Spence
Gregory	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Gwinn	Miller, Md.	Staggers
Hale	Miller, N. Y.	Stanley
Hall,	Mills	Steed
Leonard W.	Morano	Stockman
Halleck	Morgan	Taber
Hand	Multer	Taylor
Hardy	Mumma	Teague
Harris	Murdock	Thomas
Harrison, Va.	Murphy	Thompson,
Harrison, Wyo.	Murray	Mich.
Hart	Nicholson	Thornberry
Havenner	Norblad	Tollefson
Hays, Ohio	Norrell	Vail
Hedrick	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Pelt
Heffernan	O'Brien, Mich.	Van Zandt
Heller	O'Brien, N. Y.	Velde
Herlong	O'Neill	Vinson
Hess	Osmers	Vorys
Hill	Ostertag	Walter
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Toole	Weichel
Hoffman, Mich.	Passman	Werdel
Holifield	Patten	Wharton
Holmes	Patterson	Wheeler
Howell	Perkins	Widnall
Hunter	Philbin	Wigglesworth
Ikard	Polk	Williams, N. Y.
Jackson, Wash.	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
James	Preston	Wilson, Tex.
Jarman	Price	Wolverton
Jenison	Priest	Wood, Idaho
Jensen	Prouty	Yates
Jonas	Rabaut	Yorty
Jones, Ala.	Radwan	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—62

Abernethy	Harden	Potter
Adair	Hébert	Powell
Albert	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Heselton	Regan
Anfuso	Hillings	Richards
Bailey	Hope	Robeson
Bakewell	Johnson	Sabath
Bates, Ky.	Kearney	Sadlak
Beckworth	Kee	St. George
Bender	Kennedy	Scott,
Bentsen	Keogh	Hugh D., Jr.
Brehm	Kersten, Wis.	Sheehan
Brown, Ohio	Kilburn	Sheppard
Buckley	Kilday	Sikes
Burdick	King, Pa.	Stigler
Butler	Larcade	Sutton
Carlyle	LeCompte	Tackett
Chiperfield	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Cole, N. Y.	McMillan	Vursell
Combs	Mitchell	Watts
Cooper	Morris	Welch
Davis, Tenn.	Morrison	Wickersham
Donovan	Morton	Willis
Elston	Moulder	Wolcott
Evins	Nelson	Wood, Ga.
Fenton	O'Hara	Woodruff
Fisher	Patman	
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Phillips	
	Poage	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Reese of Tennessee.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Welch with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Evins with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Bakewell.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Cooper with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Patman with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Adair.

Mr. HALE and Mr. PROUTY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. McVEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION OF FIREWORKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the 20th day of June 1951, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] introduced a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks to any State or political subdivision. There were hearings by the Judiciary Committee on March 3, 1952, and the committee reported this bill, H. R. 4528. On June 17, 1952, the Rules Committee unanimously reported a rule providing for the consideration of this bill. Seven legislative days have elapsed since this bill was reported.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am not going to insist on this, but I just want to say this for the purpose of asking the majority leader a question. I would like to find out from the majority leader if he will program this bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority leader has not put it on the program, and in all frankness I want to state that I had not intended to put it on the program. The gentleman's statement of the facts is correct. A rule from the Committee on Rules has been out seven legislative days. The gentleman from Illinois has conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts, and it is the understanding of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Illinois, acting under the rule, would like to have this bill programmed; is that correct?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, there is no other alternative for me than to cooperate with the gentleman and to program the bill. I will announce to the House, of course, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] has forced this situation. I am programing H. R. 4528 after the judgeship bill. H. R. 4528 is the bill which the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has introduced. Then I am reprograming H. R. 5012, which is the oleomargarine bill for the Navy. I had taken that off the list a few weeks ago, but, of course, it is in order to be programed so I shall program the bill to follow the Church bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When are we going to take up this oleomargarine bill—next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am putting it on the program following the Church bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is just being put on the program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am just putting both of them on the program. The word "just" is very important. I accept the gentleman's observation, and I think that is very important.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. For the information of the House, what about the so-called Colmer bill, when is that going to come up?

Mr. McCORMACK. That bill will come up after some conference reports are out of the way.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Then we have the judges bill, and H. R. 4528 comes up after that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, conference reports can come up in between, or any other matter that has priority.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the bill that was introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], and which has been reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary, and on which a rule has been granted by the Committee on Rules, might not be subject to passage by unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think there would be a burglar's chance of that.

Mr. HALLECK. That is a pretty conclusive answer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to give a frank answer. There are several Members who are very much interested in the bill. All I can say is, on the basis of what information I learn from others, I am not expressing any state of mind of my own, but as a leader—and our

friend knows that we find out information in this and that way because he also has been majority floor leader for his party—we govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the majority leader that that also is my information, that there would be objection to bringing it up under unanimous consent; but in order that no possibility might be overlooked as a practical matter, I thought it might be well to disclose the situation at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; there would be objection.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to say to the majority leader and to the gentleman from Illinois, regarding the margarine bill, I do not know what can be gained by bringing it up now. Everybody, everywhere, knows that it cannot go through now, so I do not see why it should be programed.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very nice of my friend from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] to make his contribution.

Mr. RIVERS. There was no point of getting the bill out of our committee. Nobody is being fooled. I just say the time is too late now. Everybody knows that it cannot pass at this late date. The sponsors have been fully informed who is responsible for this.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we had the time, I think it is a very, very important bill, and we ought to try to get it through.

Mr. RIVERS. I think it is a very, very important bill, too, and it took me a long time to get that over to certain people, and I do not think any favor is being done for anybody right now. To be sure, you are doing nothing for me.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 10, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this paragraph or any part of the unobligated balance appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952 shall be available for the construction of transmission lines and related facilities in the Southeastern power area until (1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas for transmission of electric power and energy from Government owned projects to preferred customers has been executed, or the said companies have refused to execute such contracts, and (2) the Secretary of the Interior has so informed the Congress."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated by this paragraph or any part of the unobligated balance appropriated under this heading in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1952 shall be available for the construction of transmission lines and related facilities in the Southeastern power area until (1) a contract with the affected power companies in the area of substantially the type which has heretofore been executed in other power areas for system-wide transmission of electric power and energy from Government owned projects to preferred customers has been executed, or the said companies have refused to execute such contracts, and (2) the Secretary of the Interior has so informed the Congress."

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senate amendments which are reported in disagreement be considered en bloc: Nos. 7, 9, 14, 22, 23, 30, 49 and 51.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Amendment No. 7: Page 7, line 3, insert:

"CONSTRUCTION

"For construction of access roads on the revested Oregon & California Railroad grant lands; acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands; to remain available until expended, $2,750,000: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*, That said sum of $2,750,000 is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II, of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875)."

Amendment No. 9: page 8, line 3, insert "(other than expenditures for construction of access roads and for acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads adjacent to such lands."

Amendment No. 14: Page 10, line 17, insert ": *Provided further*, That the amount of $24,000 heretofore appropriated and now available under this heading for school facilities at Squaw Point Unorganized Territory, Minn., may be expended for school facilities for the Prairie Island Indian Community or for cooperation with Burnside Consolidated School District No. 3, Goodhue County, Minn., in the construction, extension, equipment, or improvement of public-school facilities as may be agreed upon by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the State Department of Education of Minnesota, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe."

Amendment No. 22: Page 16, line 9, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,419,000 of the appropriation herein made for 'Construction and rehabilitation, Bureau of Reclamation' shall be expended for completion of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal System, Boulder Canyon project in accordance with the terms and conditions of the appropriation for the same purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1952."

Amendment No. 23: page 16, line 16, insert ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $700,000 shall be available toward emergency rehabilitation of the Savage Rapids Dam to be repaid in full under conditions satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior."

Amendment No. 30: Page 26, line 24, insert "and said sums, together with."

Amendment No. 49: Page 40, line 5, insert:

"SEC. 110. The Secretary hereafter is authorized without regard to section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949 to place the position of Director, Division of the Budget and Finance, in grade GS-17 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Amendment No. 51: Page 41, line 11, insert:

"TITLE III—EMERGENCY FLOOD AND STORM REPAIRS

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Emergency flood and storm repairs

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse applicable appropriations for the cost of personnel, supplies, and facilities, diverted for the repair, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of structures, buildings, or other facilities, including equipment, damaged or destroyed by flood or storm, $1,350,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 9, 14, 22, 23, 30, 49, and 51 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 10, insert: " 'The Bonneville Power Administrator,' is hereby added after 'the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration,' in subsection (a) of section 5 of the act of October 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.)."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

" 'The Bonneville Power Administration,' is hereby added after 'the Commissioner of Reclamation,' in subsection (a) of section 6 of the act of October 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.), as amended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 14, line 22, strike out the proviso and insert ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation procedures: *Provided further*."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for other than the completion of field engineering, survey work, and preliminary designs of the Southwest Contra Costa County Water District System and no repayment contract shall be executed or construction begun until plans have been submitted to and approved by the Congress through its legislative and appropriation

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

procedures, after submission of a report to the Congress by the Secretary of the Interior (1) on the cost and feasibility of said project, including the necessary distribution system, and (2) on the rates required to be charged to the ultimate consumers."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 24: Page 16, line 20, insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the initiation of construction under the terms of reclamation law of any dam or reservoir or water supply, or any tunnel, canal or conduit for water, or water-distribution system related to such dam or reservoir until the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be available for the initiation of construction under the terms of reclamation law of any dam or reservoir or water supply, or any tunnel, canal or conduit for water, or water-distribution system related to such dam or reservoir until the Secretary shall certify to the Congress that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made and that the lands to be irrigated are susceptible to the production of agricultural crops by means of irrigation."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 25: Page 17, line 17, insert "including operation and maintenance of Palo Verde Weir."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", including (notwithstanding the provisions of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, relating thereto) operation and maintenance of Palo Verde Weir."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 21, line 3, strike out:

"Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be reimbursable or returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 34, line 4, insert:

"Until Congress shall further provide, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums not to exceed $5,500,000, to supplement local revenues as may be required to enable civilian authorities to continue to carry out the civilian activities which have heretofore been carried out by the Navy: *Provided, however*, That no new activity requiring expenditures of Federal funds shall be initiated without specific prior approval of Congress."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NORRELL moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

"Of the sum appropriated in the preceding paragraph $5,493,750 shall be for expenses necessary for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress, including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Acounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 34): *Provided further*, That the Government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the Administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship agreement approved by Public Law 204, Eightieth Congress: *Provided further*, That the reserve for Navy subsidies in the amount of $1,801,934 carried in the accounts of the Island Trading Company of Micronesia on December 31, 1951, as "Paid in Surplus" shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That after June 30, 1953, no funds appropriated by this or any other act and no funds which are available or which may become available from any source whatever shall be used for administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, except as may be specifically authorized by law: *Provided further*, That the Island Trading Company of Micronesia shall not have succession after December 31, 1953, and any funds available to said company on said date shall, unless otherwise specifically provided by law, be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the references herein to the Island Trading Company of Micronesia shall be deemed to include any other officer, agency, or instrumentality performing the same or similar functions: *Provided further*, That no new activity requiring expenditures of Federal funds shall be initiated without specific prior approval of Congress."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting], One hundred and seventy-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, may the amendment be again reported by the Clerk?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the motion made by the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 345, nays 2, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 134]

YEAS—345

Abbitt	Boggs, La.	Clemente
Addonizio	Boiling	Clevenger
Allen, Calif.	Bolton	Cole, Kans.
Allen, Ill.	Bonner	Colmer
Andersen, H. Carl	Bosone	Cooley
Anderson, Calif.	Bow	Corbett
Andresen, August H.	Boykin	Cotton
Andrews	Bramblett	Cox
Anfuso	Bray	Crawford
Angell	Brooks	Crosser
Arends	Brown, Ga.	Crumpacker
Armstrong	Brownson	Cunningham
Aspinall	Bryson	Curtis, Mo.
Auchincloss	Buchanan	Curtis, Nebr.
Ayres	Budge	Dague
Baker	Burleson	Davis, Ga.
Barden	Burton	Davis, Wis.
Baring	Busbey	Dawson
Barrett	Bush	Deane
Bates, Mass.	Byrnes	DeGraffenried
Battle	Camp	Delaney
Beall	Canfield	Dempsey
Beamer	Cannon	Denny
Belcher	Carnahan	Denton
Bennett, Fla.	Carrigg	Devereux
Bennett, Mich.	Case	D'Ewart
Berry	Celler	Dingell
Betts	Chatham	Dollinger
Bishop	Chelf	Dolliver
Blackney	Chenoweth	Dondero
Blatnik	Chiperfield	Donohue
Boggs, Del.	Chudoff	Dorn
	Church	Doyle
		Durham

Eaton	Judd	Reams
Elliott	Karsten, Mo.	Redden
Ellsworth	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Engle	Kearns	Reed, N. Y.
Fallon	Keating	Rees, Kans.
Feighan	Kee	Rhodes
Fernandez	Kelley, Pa.	Ribicoff
Fine	Kelly, N. Y.	Richlman
Flood	Keogh	Riley
Fogarty	Kerr	Rivers
Forand	Kersten, Wis.	Roberts
Ford	King, Calif.	Rodino
Frazier	Kirwan	Rogers, Colo.
Fugate	Klein	Rogers, Fla.
Fulton	Kluczynski	Rogers, Mass.
Furcolo	Lane	Rogers, Tex.
Gamble	Lanham	Rooney
Garmatz	Lantaff	Roosevelt
Gary	Latham	Ross
Gathings	Lesinski	Sasscer
Gavin	Lind	Saylor
George	Lovre	Schenck
Golden	McConnell	Scott, Hardie
Goodwin	McCulloch	Scrivner
Gordon	McDonough	Scudder
Gore	McGrath	Secrest
Graham	McGuire	Seely-Brown
Granahan	McIntire	Shafer
Granger	McKinnon	Shelley
Grant	McMullen	Sheppard
Green	McVey	Short
Greenwood	Machrowicz	Sieminski
Gregory	Mack, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Gross	Mack, Wash.	Simpson, Pa.
Gwinn	Madden	Sittler
Hagen	Magee	Smith, Kans.
Hale	Mahon	Smith, Miss.
Hall, Leonard W.	Mansfield	Smith, Va.
	Marshall	Smith, Wis.
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Spence
Hand	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Hardy	Mason	Staggers
Harris	Meader	Stanley
Harrison, Nebr.	Merrow	Steed
Harrison, Va.	Miller, Calif.	Stockman
Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, Md.	Taber
Hart	Miller, Nebr.	Talle
Harvey	Miller, N. Y.	Taylor
Havenner	Mills	Teague
Hays, Ark.	Morano	Thomas
Hays, Ohio	Morgan	Thompson, Mich.
Hedrick	Multer	
Heffernan	Mumma	Thornberry
Heller	Murdock	Tollefson
Herlong	Murphy	Trimble
Hess	Murray	Vail
Hill	Nicholson	Van Pelt
Hinshaw	Norblad	Van Zandt
Hoeven	Norrell	Velde
Hoffman, Ill.	O'Brien, Ill.	Vinson
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Brien, Mich.	Vorys
Holifield	O'Brien, N. Y.	Vursell
Holmes	O'Konski	Weichel
Horan	O'Neill	Werdel
Howell	Osmers	Wharton
Hull	Ostertag	Wheeler
Hunter	O'Toole	Whitten
Ikard	Passman	Widnall
Irving	Patten	Wier
Jackson, Calif.	Patterson	Wigglesworth
Jackson, Wash.	Perkins	Williams, Miss.
James	Philbin	Williams, N. Y.
Jarman	Phillips	Wilson, Tex.
Javits	Polk	Winstead
Jenison	Poulson	Withrow
Jenkins	Preston	Wolverton
Jensen	Price	Wood, Ga.
Jonas	Priest	Wood, Idaho
Jones, Ala.	Prouty	Yates
Jones, Mo.	Rabaut	Yorty
Jones, Hamilton C.	Radwan	Zablocki
	Rains	
Jones, Woodrow W.	Ramsay	
	Rankin	

NAYS—2

Bailey	Lucas

NOT VOTING—83

Aandahl	Carlyle	Harden
Abernethy	Cole, N. Y.	Hébert
Adair	Combs	Herter
Albert	Cooper	Heselton
Allen, La.	Coudert	Hillings
Bakewell	Davis, Tenn.	Hope
Bates, Ky.	Donovan	Johnson
Beckworth	Doughton	Kearney
Bender	Eberharter	Kennedy
Bentsen	Elston	Kilburn
Brehm	Evins	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	King, Pa.
Buckley	Fisher	Larcade
Buffett	Forrester	LeCompte
Burdick	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lyle
Butler		McCarthy
McCormack	Powell	Sutton
McGregor	Reece, Tenn.	Tackett
McMillan	Regan	Thompson, Tex.
Mitchell	Richards	Walter
Morris	Robeson	Watts
Morrison	Sabath	Welch
Morton	Sadlak	Wickersham
Moulder	St. George	Willis
Nelson	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Ind.
O'Hara	Sheehan	Wolcott
Patman	Sikes	Woodruff
Posge	Stigler	
Potter		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Evins with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Bakewell.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Larcade with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Cooper with Mr. Hillings
Mr. Albert with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. McGregor.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 88):

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2938) to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutues, as amended, and for other purposes, to make the following change, namely: On page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed bill, in lieu of the language "(b) Subsection (c) or section" insert "(b) Subsection (c) of section."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) entitled "An Act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ROONEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 2454)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) "making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 10, 11, 14, 18, 20, 31, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 22, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 44 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$87,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,877,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$264,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,810,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

ment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,390,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$120,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,997,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after July 1, 1952, through the fiscal year 1953: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the departments

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to the Department of Justice;

"(e) to the Judiciary Branch;

"(f) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(g) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, National Bureau of Standards, the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads;

"(h) to the Patent Office;

"(i) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"(j) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;

"(k) to construction personnel, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(l) to employees in grades CPC–1 and 2: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1953, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 605. (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be available to pay—

"(1) for personal services of personnel above basic rates;

"(2) for transportation of things (other than mail) or

(3) for travel of employees,

more than 90 per centum of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose.

"(b) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

"(2) the Foreign Service, Department of State.

"(3) the Department of Justice.

"(4) the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

"(5) the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(6) the operational personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau.

"(7) the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

"(8) the Patent Office.

"(9) Bureau of the Census.

"(10) the Judiciary Branch."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment strike out "75" and insert in lieu thereof "87½"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 13, 21, 23, 24, 43, and 52.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
HOMER FERGUSON (except as to amendment No. 18),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $76,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $72,936,907 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Appropriates $6,500,000 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Contributions to international organizations: Appropriates $30,484,749 as proposed by the Senate instead of $27,923,163 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Contributions to international organizations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Missions to international organizations: Appropriates $1,321,112 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6—International contingencies: Appropriates $1,500,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Provide that the Anzalduas Diversion Dam shall not be operated for irrigation or water supply purposes in the United States unless suitable arrangements have been made with the prospective water users for repayment to the Government of such portions of the costs of said dam as shall have been allocated to such purposes by the Secretary of State, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—American sections, international commissions: Appropriates $505,344 as proposed by the Senate instead of $525,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—American sections, international commissions: Strikes out the provision of the Senate to make $45,000 available for American section, International Joint Commission.

Amendment No. 11—International information and educational activities: Strikes out language of Senate to include television.

Amendment No. 12—International information and educational activities: Appropriates $87,325,000 instead of $86,575,000 as proposed by the House and $88,556,516 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—International information and educational activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the provision of the Senate stating that $7,967,958 shall be available for the exchange of persons.

Amendment No. 15—General provisions—Department of State: Strikes out House language (sec. 111) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—General provisions—Department of State, section 111: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—General provisions—Department of State, section 112: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—General provisions—Department of State, section 113: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No. 19—Salaries and expenses, general legal activities: Appropriates $9,900,000 instead of $9,750,000 as proposed by the House and $10,030,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals: Appropriates $13,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $13,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Amendment No. 21—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Federal prison system

Amendment No. 22—Building and facilities: Appropriates $624,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23—Buildings and facilities: Reported in disagreement.

General provisions—Department of Justice

Amendment No. 24—section 208; Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 25—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,877,000 instead of $1,850,000 as proposed by the House and $1,904,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Technical and scientific services: Appropriates $264,500 instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House and $259,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: Appropriates $6,810,935 instead of $6,975,000 as proposed by the House and $6,410,935 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Seventeenth decennial census: Appropriates $1,700,000 instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,005 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and mineral industries: Appropriates $1,390,300 instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,330,617 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Census of agriculture: Appropriates $120,700 instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House and $116,382 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Census of governments: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $806,841 for census of governments.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $105,594,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $106,470,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33—Establishment of airnavigation facilities: Appropriates $11,091,499 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,091,499 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34—Technical development and evaluation: Appropriates $1,162,972 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Appropriates $19,821,154 as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Acts: Provide that $2,571,154 shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Appropriates $433,594 as proposed by the Senate instead of $435,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39—Transport aircraft development: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,383,074.

BUREAU OF FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC COMMERCE

Amendment No. 40—Departmental salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,792,932 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41—Field office service: Appropriates $1,965,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—Export control: Appropriates $5,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $5,504,300 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 43—Operation and administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44—Operation and administration: Appropriates $1,351,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,140,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45—Research and testing: Appropriates $4,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $4,156,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46—Radio propagation and standards: Appropriates $2,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,910,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and Expenses: Appropriates $27,250,000 instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House and $27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Other courts and services

Amendment No. 48—Salaries of clerks of courts: Appropriates $4,991,850 instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the House and $5,042,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—Probation system: Appropriates $2,420,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,445,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Miscellaneous salaries: Appropriates $2,900,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,955,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $837,200 as proposed by the House instead of $855,200 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—the judiciary

Amendment No. 52—Section 404: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54—Section 604: Restore the provision of the House with certain amendments and strike out substitute provision proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Section 605: Inserts provision of the Senate with certain amendments.

Amendment No. 56—Section 606: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate with an amendment proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like first to point out that as the result of the conference between the House and Senate conferees, the total of this appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and for the Judiciary as agreed upon by the conferees is now $1,015,981,710. This is $942,021 below the amount of the bill as it passed the House last April 4. The amount contained in the bill is $227,155,099 below the amount of the budget estimates, an over-all reduction of over 18 percent.

I should also point out that the reductions in appropriations finally arrived at by the conferees with regard to the Department of State amount to over 31 percent of the amount of the budget estimates and that insofar as the Department of Commerce is concerned the amount finally agreed upon is a 17-percent reduction in the amount of that Department's budget estimates. I think we have a good conference report, all in all, and I feel it should be adopted.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-one Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 135]

Abernethy	Gregory	Potter
Adair	Hall,	Powell
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Harden	Regan
Anfuso	Hébert	Richards
Bakewell	Herter	Robeson
Bates, Ky.	Heselton	Rogers, Mass.
Beckworth	Hillings	Sabath
Bender	Hope	Sadlak
Bentsen	Horan	St. George
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Sasscer
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Scott,
Brownson	Kearney	Hugh D., Jr.
Buckley	Kennedy	Sheehan
Buffett	Kilburn	Sheppard
Burdick	Kilday	Sikes
Butler	King, Pa.	Stigler
Carlyle	Larcade	Sutton
Cole, N. Y.	LeCompte	Tackett
Combs	Lyle	Teague
Cooper	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Dawson	Mitchell	Watts
Donovan	Morano	Welch
Dorn	Morris	Wickersham
Eaton	Morrison	Wier
Elston	Morton	Willis
Evins	Moulder	Wolcott
Fenton	Nelson	Wood, Ga.
Fisher	O'Hara	Woodruff
Forrester	Patman	
Gore	Poage	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). On this roll call 334 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had been recognized for 5 minutes. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

TO AMEND SECTION 9 OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT AND SECTION 5155 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 88.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2938) to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes, to make the following change, namely: On page 2, line 19, of the Senate engrossed bill, in lieu of the language "(b) Subsection (c) or section" insert "(b) Subsection (c) of section."

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE DEFENSE HOUSING LAWS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3066) to amend the defense housing laws, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I had the misfortune of serving on this conference. One of the items is amendment No. 18:

SEC. 113. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference.

I intend to offer a motion to recommit this bill with instructions to the House conferees to insist upon agreement to that Senate amendment.

The conference report wipes out the amendment which would protect the people of the United States, the stockpile fund, and all of the business interests and people of the United States from being broken down.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. If I remember correctly, this House kicked out of the defense production bill that very item on the International Materials Conference.

Mr. TABER. In the Sadlak amendment which was adopted, it was fixed in such way that they could not do any damage. The United States is paying almost 60 percent of the expense of this performance to have its throat cut, and I want to see that stopped.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] in the House on the 19th of June supported the Sadlak amendment which was adopted and demonstrated absolutely how our stockpile interests and our material that we needed to operate our war economy and civilian economy was being stripped out by the operations of that outfit. Why we should try to monkey along with that kind of business and why we should do everything to upset and destroy our own economy and our capacity to carry on the military efforts in which we are now engaged I cannot understand; so when the time comes for this thing to be brought to a head I intend to move to recommit the bill with instructions to agree to that Senate amendment so we can get rid of that performance. I hope the House will adopt that amendment and that we will be able to make progress toward a constructive effort by continuing our national defense and building up the stockpile which is so necessary to preserve us, so necessary to get hold of those rare minerals of which we are in short supply, such as copper, cobalt, tungsten, and that sort of thing on which we have been completely upset. I hope that when I make that motion it will be adopted.

The conference report on the War Production Board proposition on Saturday that was presented here did not contain sufficient language or the necessary language out of the original Sadlak amendment so that it would protect the United States. The only recourse we have and the only safety we have is to get rid of it.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent in his position.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for this time. I realize the difficulty under which he is laboring. I am sure that the House has put in a lot of effort and a lot of time on these conference reports, therefore I hate to take the time of the House at this time; but I do want to call attention to what we are doing.

Since we had the defense production bill up last week I have continued in my effort to try to study the International Materials Conference.

Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the House adopted the conference report on S. 2594 to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950. Under our rules of procedure we were required to vote the conference report up or down. The Senate had already passed the bill and discharged its conferees. The conferees adopted language which was not contained in either the House or Senate bill with reference to the International Materials Conference. The conference report contained this provision:

No agreement shall be entered into by the United States limiting total United States consumption of any material unless such agreement authorizes domestic users in the United States to purchase the quantity of such material allocated to other countries participating in the International Materials Conference and not used by any such participating country.

My immediate concern with this language was whether we were being asked to legalize the International Materials Conference, because the IMC has such an adverse effect on our national security. I made an inquiry of the parliamentarian and received his expert advice that such was not the case. I voted for this bill because I had this assurance that we were not in any way legalizing United States' participation in this illegal cartel by adopting this language.

I do not believe the Members of this House fully realize the implications of the International Materials Conference on our standard of living and on our security through its impact on our military stockpile, as well as on the level of civilian production. The IMC is a group of internationalists which undertakes to allocate the world's raw materials among the various nations and establishes for each nation its "entitlement for consumption." This country, when it passed the Sherman Act in 1890, voiced its belief in free markets. We have never accepted the principle of world planning as embodied in these agreements; in fact, our Government has broken up the German and Japanese cartels because we believed they were engaged in the evil practices which the International Materials Conference condones.

I want to again remind the House that the power to allocate materials among nations is the power to determine the living standards of the nations of the world, their national income, the employment opportunities of their people and their military potential. I could not have voted for a bill which would have legalized our participation in such an arrangement.

One of the implicit problems in an arrangement such as this is that a small group of individuals who may be well-meaning have an enormous power to affect the lives of all the people in this country.

For many years the halls of Congress have resounded to the recurring debate regarding the alleged increase in the concentration of economic power by big business groups in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that no business group has a fraction of the power which we have vested in unknown bureaucrats who are attempting to plan the economy of the entire world through devices such as this International Materials Conference. If we are really concerned about the concentration of economic power, let us strike down these bureaucratic monstrosities. Whatever power may be exercised by private business groups is a power responsible to the laws of our country. In their Report on Operations the IMC say:

The committees were created as autonomous bodies in the interest of expediting action and allowing the countries which were principally concerned with the commodities in question to deal with the problems involved without being subject to review by any other body.

Such irresponsible power is intolerable to the American people who believe in a free enterprise economy.

I am sure that very few members of this House could name our representative to the International Materials Conference. He has the power to accept or reject recommendations made by governmental representatives of other nations which as I have already said determine our living standards and military potential. He is Mr. James F. King, a Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration. I have had

occasion to inquire as to his background and his competence. I find that Mr. King has had no background in industry. His record shows no qualifications for the intricate task he is attempting to perform. He was a newspaperman until 1938 when he left the press to enter Government service. His career may best be described as one involving frequent transfers from one agency to another. None of the positions he has held would give one experience to qualify for his present post. He first became an assistant to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. In 1941 he appeared as executive officer of the Office of Censorship. In 1942 he was assistant to the Administrator of the National Housing Agency. He then served as special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, and later became Deputy Administrator of the Office of Price Administration until he entered the service as a lieutenant in the Navy. Following his military service he joined the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission of the State Department from where he transferred to the Department of the Army. Next he appears as Deputy Administrator for Resources Expansion in the Defense Production Administration, as well as our representative on the International Materials Conference.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to controlling the allocations of our raw materials through the International Materials Conference, Mr. King is responsible for the expenditure of millions of dollars of Government money to expand our mineral resources through procurement contracts, Government loans, and the granting of tax-amortization certificates. As deputy administrator for resources expansion in the Defense Production Administration, he is also charged with furnishing exploration assistance, priorities for scarce materials, and highly technical advice to those interested in expanding the natural resources upon which our defense depends. Mr. Speaker, I do not impugn Mr. King's sincerity, his motives, or patriotism, but I am appalled at the selection of a man with such qualifications to undertake these responsibilities.

I want to use this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to review in detail the way the IMC has jeopardized our stockpiling objectives. I shall first discuss copper.

Mr. Fowler in a press release on June 17, 1952, said:

> The copper situation was aggravated by several factors, among which were the impact of increasing military demand, the necessity for stepping up certain defense-supporting activities, such as the power program and communications program which are large users of copper, and the fact there was a substantial demand for large sizes of wire and items such as bus-bars in the plant-expansion program.
>
> To accomplish these vital needs, civilian items had to be held to a low level. This level was considerably below 50 percent of pre-Korea basis in many cases.
>
> To help maintain even this low level, it became necessary in the third quarter of 1951 to suspend stockpiling. In fact, because of strikes which developed in the United States and Chile and other interruptions to production, it became necessary to withdraw substantial quantities of copper from the stockpile.

Mr. Speaker in reviewing the last public Munitions Board report to Congress I find that as of December 31, 1951, copper which was under contract for the military stockpile totaling 163,500 short tons was diverted to industry. In addition to these contract diversions of copper, metal was actually withdrawn from the stockpile. As of the date of this report, 55,000 short tons of copper, already in stockpile, were withdrawn for use by American industry. Only last month Mr. Fowler announced the withdrawal of an additional 22,000 tons of copper from the stockpile. Mr. Speaker, this means that the stockpile is now short 240,500 tons of copper.

In this same press release of June 17, Mr. Fowler said:

> American industry has not been able to purchase the full amount of foreign copper to which we are entitled because of the sharp disparity between the fixed domestic price and the cost of foreign copper. * * *
>
> The simple fact is that United States producers did not buy all the copper to which the United States was entitled.

Mr. Speaker, if as Mr. Fowler says, United States producers would not buy all the copper to which the United States was entitled, why did not the Munitions Board take advantage of this situation to acquire this copper so that our stockpiling objectives could be met and our security increased? The reason for this action is obvious: we did not want to take copper from the other countries of the world so we have deliberately prevented the attainment of our stockpile objectives in order to ease the pressure for other consuming countries.

The hearings before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on the Defense Production Act extension includes a statement by Mr. Ticoulat, Mr. King's predecessor, with reference to the stockpiling of copper. He said:

> In the first quarter of 1952, owing to the acute shortage, no specific provision was made for stockpiling.

The International Materials Conference in their report on operations said, and I quote:

> In the case of commodities where the shortage was more acute, nickel, tungsten, and molybdenum, the committees were unable to recommend any special allowances for stockpiling. In the allocation plans for the first quarter of 1952, the copper-zinc-lead and manganese-nickel-cobalt committees found it inadvisable to provide any special allowance for stockpile purposes.

Mr. Speaker, should any further proof be required to show that the administration has decided to flaunt the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 520, our stockpiling act, it may be found on page 82, volume I, of the report to the President by the President's Materials Policy Commission. The following statement is taken from the report:

> Soon after the outbreak of the Korean war, materials were at a premium. World-wide demand soared, and raw-material prices became a major inflationary threat. The acute shortages of some materials aggravated international tensions. The inability of Western Europe to obtain enough American products like cotton and sulfur held back essential industries and caused resentment. The United States stockpile program was severely criticized abroad for shorting the rest of the world. The United States, in turn, resisted paying prices deemed excessive for materials produced in sterling areas and elsewhere. It is clear that materials distribution in emergencies is an international problem, calling for international machinery.

Apparently we are to suspend our stockpiling program if it severely criticized abroad for shorting the rest of the world. Mr. Speaker, do other nations honestly believe that in the event of war they are not dependent on our industrial might for the weapons for their defense? If we fail in carrying out Public Law 520 because of fear of resentment, we will never have the strength to defend ourselves or those abroad who may now criticize us.

Again I do not wish to impugn the patriotism or integrity of the members of the President's Materials Policy Commission. It is quite apparent that this report was primarily prepared by the staff and furnishes a vehicle for selling the people of this country some of the same programs which the Congress has consistently rejected. I refer particularly to the references to intergovernmental commodity agreements, chapter VI of the Habana Charter and buffer stocks all of which are favorably presented by the Commission in volume I of their report.

Time does not permit a complete discussion of this 5-volume work. It is most unfortunate that the press of the country has been willing to take the publicity hand-outs prepared by the Commission and use them for editorial purposes without ever having read the full report. I can assure the Members of this House that I intend to read this entire report and will make my views known to the House when I have had an opportunity to do so.

Under the present organizational setup there is nothing that would prevent the central group of the International Materials Conference from creating new committees at any time to deal with commodities which the world planners feel should be under their control and supervision. Naturally I am interested in fissionable materials such as uranium and thorium and my review of the IMC publications gives me no assurance that they could not make agreements affecting these materials if these world planners thought such action desirable.

Mr. Speaker, we have confined our discussion primarily to copper. The International Materials Conference has also made allocations of nickel, cobalt, molybdenum, tungsten, sulfur and zinc. The nickel allocations cause me great concern. I have already shown that no provision is currently being made by the IMC Committee to stockpile nickel in the United States. We have diverted nickel from the stockpile to operate our industries. During 1950, before our military program assumed serious proportions, this country consumed 68.1 percent of the total world supply of nickel. This nickel was largely used for civilian purposes. At the beginning of 1951,

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

drastic limitation orders were imposed which prohibited the use of nickel in countless civilian applications. The United States consumption of nickel for 1951 has largely been for defense uses. The International Materials Conference in its allocation of nickel to the United States for the first quarter of 1952 only allocated 68.3 percent of the free world supply. This is an increase of only two-tenths of 1 percent since 1950. Other countries who have continued to use nickel in their civilian industries have received approximately the same share of the world's nickel as they did prior to Korea. For example, Sweden manufactures stainless steel tableware containing 8 percent nickel. American producers are prohibited from using nickel for the manufacture of such a product. Swedish tableware enters American markets and destroys the business which our producers have taken years to build. The International Materials Conference in its nickel allocations has clearly not given the United States the nickel warranted by our defense effort. I could say as much about each of the other materials under IMC allocations but time does not permit. The operations of the IMC have discriminated against United States producers, and have prevented us from building our defenses.

Mr. Speaker, under Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, we laid down the principles which were to govern the acquisition and maintenance of the United States stockpile of strategic and critical materials. This law does not permit Mr. King to enter into agreements with any foreign powers in which we defer our stockpiling objectives to the needs of their civilian economies.

I shall insist that any allocations which are accepted by this Government in the future must provide the necessary material for the proper attainment of our stockpile objectives as well as the maintenance of our defense production and a healthy civilian economy in this country so that we may have a level of national income to support the defense contribution which this Nation is making for the entire free world. I shall make it my business through our Armed Services Committee to audit these allocations from now on.

Mr. Speaker, last November a committee of experts appointed by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations filed their report entitled "Measures for International Economic Stability," with the Secretary-General of the U. N. The conclusions to their report contained the following:

> We suggest that governments should reconsider the case for a series of commodity arrangements of various types as a means of keeping short-run movements of primary product prices, both upward and downward, within reasonable bounds, and of helping to stabilize the international flow of currencies. To this end, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development might indicate that it is willing in principle to consider participating in the financing of commodity arrangements that involve buffer stocks. Progress in these directions would make an important contribution to the stability of industrial as well as primary producing economies.

> We do not believe that any new international agency to administer a comprehensive scheme for a range of different commodities is necessary or practicable. The arrangements needed differ from commodity to commodity, and must be worked out and put into effect by the countries mainly concerned in each case. Coordination of general structure and policy amongst the various schemes is important, but international bodies—such as the Interim Coordinating Committee for International Commodity Arrangements and the International Materials Conference—already exist and can be used.

Mr. Speaker, here is the plan of the internationalists to permanently control the agricultural and mineral economies of the world. You will note it includes a permanent International Materials Conference. Now let me quote further from their conclusions:

> The present shortage of many commodities does not reduce the urgency of the problem. We have already emphasized that detailed agreements take a long time to negotiate and that assurances to producers are required now, both to encourage production necessary to prevent continuing shortage and as a quid pro quo for the import allocations now being made. The possibility should be considered of converting these emergency schemes into permanent stabilization arrangements. It might also be possible at some future date to use for stabilization purposes the stockpile acquired for strategic reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that the experts propose using the stockpiles acquired for strategic reasons for stabilization purposes. This is contrary to Public Law 520. The experts also speak of a quid pro quo for the allocations now being made. Mr. Speaker, I have now found the quid pro quo. Apparently, some of the metal producing countries now realize that IMC allocations deprived them of a portion of their potential income during the past period of intense shortages. Now that prices have receded, they look to us to stabilize the market by using the taxpayers' dollars to build a civilian stockpile along the lines outlined by the U. N. experts. This development has serious implications—not only for our security—but also for the future of our entire free enterprise economy. My attention was drawn to this development by an article in the Wall Street Journal of June 12, wherein it was stated that the defense agencies propose to create a civilian or auxiliary stockpile of metals beginning with the purchase of 30,000 tons of lead. This civilian stockpile is designed apparently as a "put and take" proposition for the civilian economy, not the military, on the assumption that sooner or later there would be a shortage of lead which only the Government could cure. It is stated that any lead remaining at the end of the year would be transferred to the military stockpile.

In the first place, who decides when there is a shortage of civilian lead? Have we a shortage today? What criteria are used? Only recently the price of lead declined sharply from a ceiling of 19 cents to 15 cents per pound. Last week it moved up in two jumps to 16 cents, where I am informed it is today. I have just learned that the Defense Production Administration are now actually starting to buy this lead. If they come into the market now with an order for 30,000 tons, the price will move upward momentarily and the consumers will be compelled to pay a higher price.

I am inserting a letter from Jess Larson, Administrator, Defense Materials Procurement Agency:

> DEFENSE MATERIALS PROCUREMENT AGENCY,
> *Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.*
>
> Hon. CARL T. DURHAM,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee No. 3,*
> *House Armed Service Committee,*
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. DURHAM: It has been brought to my attention that some time ago there appeared in the Wall Street Journal an article to the effect that the Defense Materials Procurement Agency had recommended the institution of a program which would establish a civilian stockpile of minerals and metals. I have also been informed that such article was disturbing to you and members of your committee.
>
> I wish to assure you that at no time has this Agency recommended the institution of such a program. Some time ago this Agency recommended that there be established a purchase and resale program for lead. In view of the considerable easing which developed in the supply and demand balance of lead metal it was proposed that the metal be purchased under spot contracts and held for a period not beyond December 31, 1952. This proposal was based on information that the defense requirements for lead would in all probability increase during the third and fourth quarters of this calendar year and the further fact that such program would do away with the necessity of any withdrawals from the stockpile such as occurred in the fourth quarter of 1951. Any metal acquired which had not been resold to industry prior to December 31, 1952, would be placed in the stockpile. It was determined that a quantity of 30,000 tons appeared to be a practical inventory for purposes of this program.
>
> Consequently this Agency recommended to the Defense Production Administration the certification of a purchase and resale program for lead metal which contemplated that the program would terminate by December 31, 1952; that any of the metal bought under this program and remaining unallocated would be transferred to the national stockpile; and that any purchase made would be within the uncontracted for portion of the stockpile objective for lead.
>
> I hope the foregoing information is satisfactory.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JESS LARSON,
> *Administrator.*

In its next issue dated June 21, Business Week carried an editorial which commented on the news article quoted above. It read:

> DANGER LOOMS IN STOCKPILING
>
> Will the stockpiling program—intended only to meet the needs of war—be converted into a device to stabilize markets and prices?
>
> There's more and more pressure to do just that.
>
> W. Averell Harriman, presidential candidate and administrator of the Mutual Security Program, has said that we should use the stockpiling program to stabilize the economies of friendly countries.
>
> And the General Services Administration, which buys for the strategic stockpile, is ready (Business Week, June 14, 1952, p. 32) to buy 30,000 tons of lead, not for the stockpile, but to support prices and so maintain domestic production.
>
> This, for the advocates of a controlled or stabilized economy, is the opening for a

touchdown run. For this would give them a broad degree of control over a field of business that they've never been able to penetrate before. It can lead to the same control over metals that they now have over farm products. It's the foot in the door that could bring an important section of manufacturing under regulation—along with agriculture, the transportation industries, and utilities.

WHAT MAY HAPPEN

This stockpiling-into-stabilization move is sure to be fought along many lines.

It involves a sweeping extension of the powers of the Federal Government, which many will oppose on that basic ground alone.

It may hurt one wide section of industry, that which buys lead or other stabilized materials, while benefiting the producers of raw materials. High prices for lead, for example, mean high prices for batteries, paint, and a host of other products—and that means opposition.

We have other doubts. Is there a Government agency that's really competent to run such a program? And would it really benefit industry? Or the whole economy?

Take the case of the potato. For years the Department of Agriculture supported the price of potatoes. And it brought up a battery of other controls, like acreage allotments, to hold down production. But the farmers rolled out potatoes until the Department couldn't give them away or burn them fast enough.

Agriculture finally gave up on its program, and potatoes became short. This might have been met with only a minor rise in prices, but the Office of Price Stabilization was in business and determined to hold the price down. The result was to turn the industry upside down, put the black market back in business, and drive potatoes out of the supermarkets.

OPS gave up in its turn. Potatoes are flooding back into the markets. But meanwhile, some customers found they could get along without them very well. Wives and hostesses have a suspicion that potatoes are fattening anyway. And apparently, they weren't too unhappy to shift to other foods.

The potato's isn't the only sad story. No one has yet totted up the score on governmental mismanagement of economic affairs in the last, say, 10 years. But the field is littered with casualties, both here and abroad. Governments everywhere haven't been able to pass up the temptation to regulate free markets. Where they have, as often as not, intervention has been a mistake. And when it is, everyone in the country feels it. It's not a case of a few companies missing their market or taking losses on inventories. Everyone in the country goes without potatoes, or meat, or steel.

As yet, the General Services Administration is working only on a scheme for an intermediate stockpile. Officials hope that by fall they'll be releasing lead from their stockpile to industry, rather than going on adding to the stockpile. And this program might work well.

But this will be no easy business to choke off. Chile with her copper, Bolivia with tin, and many other countries producing raw materials are geared to our market. Any drop in demand or prices here brings them up against the specter of bankruptcy. So there will be tremendous pressure from abroad, as well as from domestic producers, to keep a stabilizing program going.

With so much at stake, the stockpilers might do well to concentrate on defense needs, and hold out against the pressure to convert themselves into an ever-normal granary.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1 the Wall Street Journal published a letter which they had received from Mr. J. F. King, the Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, commenting on their editorial. I wish to insert his letter in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, June 19, 1952.

MR. WILLIAM N. GRIMES,
Editor, the Wall Street Journal,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. GRIMES: I believe the article entitled "The Hidden Lever" by Henry Simmons in your June 12 issue, and the editorial A New Sort of Stockpiling, which appeared on June 3, were written without full consideration of the background of the Government's materials expansion program.

This program is intended to insure the development of sufficient raw materials productive capacity so that all controls on use can be removed as quickly as possible, thus permitting unrestricted civilian consumption, accelerated additions to the national stockpile, and at the same time provide sufficient materials to meet the defense program.

In order to secure the expansion of production of raw materials, the Congress included section 303 in the original Defense Production Act. This section authorized the making of purchases or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other raw materials for Government use, or for resale extending to June 30, 1962, and provided that metals and minerals should not be sold at less than the established ceiling price or the current domestic market price, whichever is lower.

In order to secure necessary increases in raw-materials production, in many instances the Government has had to guarantee markets and prices for new production running for several years into the future. Indeed, in many instances in the field of strategic materials, the Government has given not only procurement contracts, but also loans, accelerated tax amortization, exploration assistance, priorities for scarce materials and supplies, and technical advice to expedite expansion of such materials as cobalt, columbium, nickel, tantalum, and a score of other materials basic to the military program.

Our supplies of strategic materials under the Stockpile Act are only approximately 40 percent complete. Consequently, if the Government is required to purchase material under Defense Production Act commitments, the material, if not needed for defense production, will in most cases be sold to the national stockpile. There is no intention on the part of the Government to create a so-called civilian stockpile. The Government does intend to provide adequate supplies of materials for defense production, and while critics of the defense program may fear that commitments made under the Defense Production Act are a civilian stockpile intended to manipulate markets, such is not the intention of those commitments.

In most commodities the quantities of material under Government contracts to insure expansion are so small in proportion to the total production that the effect on the free market is very slight. Specific DMPA projects already certified by DPA are expected to add approximately 15,000 short tons of lead in 1952. Thus, assuming that the Government purchased the entire 30,000 tons referred to in your article, the Government would be directly concerned with purchasing under the Defense Production Act only about 4 percent of the total 1952 supply.

With specific reference to the lead purchase program mentioned in your article, in the spring of 1952, the National Production Authority estimated that, although lead was in easy supply at the time, increased defense needs in the third and fourth quarters might require additional supplies. Thus it was not considered wise to put all lead then available into the national stockpile, from which it could not be removed for defense use without considerable difficulty. At the same time the DMPA stated that the maintenance of domestic production required some purchases by the United States Government since industry was not buying in the rapidly falling market. The DMPA recommended the purchase of 30,000 tons of lead which was approved by the DPA on May 28, 1952. The material is to be purchased at the current market price and, if not required to meet defense production needs by December 31, 1952, will be sold to the national stockpile.

Sincerely yours,

J. F. KING,
Deputy Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. King shows little understanding of Public Law 520, our stockpiling act. Section 6-A of the act provides that transfers to the stockpile may be made only "so long as the amount of the stockpile for that material does not exceed the quantities determined therefor pursuant to section 2 hereof."

What does Mr. King propose to do when the stockpile objectives have been met? Are we to raise them and increase the stockpile of materials in easy supply with declining prices, while we abstain from securing those materials which we really need for the stockpile which are in short supply? Mr. King's letter and the IMC declarations of policy lead me to the conclusion that this is the purpose of the Defense Production Administration. The use of the military stockpile as a dumping ground for a civilian stockpile is absurd. It can only lead to waste and confusion. I shall demand that we concentrate on achieving the stockpiling objectives for the military stockpile and that we then withdraw from the metal markets.

When we debated the Sadlak amendment on the floor of this House, many Members indicated that they believed the International Materials Conference was part of a broad scheme to foist a planned economy on the world, based on the Habana charter for an International Trade Organization which this Congress refused to accept. The recent report of the President's Materials Policy Commission confirms our worst fears. It recommends international controls; it commends the International Materials Conference; it suggests international buffer stocks, and it endorses chapter VI of the Habana charter. Mr. Speaker, although the Congress has refused to accept this charter, page 87 of the report contains this remarkable statement:

> The United States has not ratified the treaty, but under a resolution of the United Nations Economic and Social Council is bound with other nations to recognize chapter VI as a general guide.

This is the final proof that our fears were well grounded. We were told that the International Materials Conference was a temporary organization and that it had no relation to the plans for the International Trade Organization. Some of us knew better.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this House have been told that we must maintain the International Materials Conference because our friends overseas desire it. I have just secured an analysis of the contributions by each participating country for the maintenance of the IMC since its establishment on February 26, 1951, through June 25, 1952. The

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

following table shows the contributions by countries during this period:

JUNE 25, 1952.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA REGARDING THE COST OF INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

The following additional information is submitted relative to the International Materials Conference:

1. Breakdown of costs by object class

	Fiscal year 1951	Fiscal year 1952	Total
Object class:			
01	$31,701	$399,820	$431,521
02		200	200
04	300	5,100	5,600
05		49,000	49,000
06	1,400	18,000	19,400
07	14,935	37,490	52,425
08	1,000	12,200	13,200
09	40,415	9,000	49,415
Undistributed		12,907	12,907
Total	89,951	543,717	633,668

2. Method of assessment

Organizationally the International Materials Conference consists of the central group and seven standing commodity committees. The United States, United Kingdom, France, Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, and Italy are represented on the central group. Membership in each commodity committee consists of those countries which have a substantial producing or consumer interest in the commodity concerned.

Membership in a committee, including the central group, constitutes the basic unit of assessment, which has a current monetary value of $1,437.50. Thus, if a country is a member of the central group plus all seven committees, its assessment would be 8×$1,437.50 or $11,500.

Contributions made to the International Materials Conference under this plan are used to pay for expenses in object classes 02 through 06. All personal service costs (including contract personnel) other than personnel contributed by other member governments and all equipment costs are paid by the United States from funds outside the assessed contribution of $11,500.

COST OF INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

The following information regarding the International Materials Conference was furnished by IC:

1. Total cost since establishment Feb. 26, 1951, to present)

Fiscal year 1951	$89,951
Fiscal year 1952	543,717
Total	633,668

2. Contributions by countries

Country	Amount	Percent
United States	$359,108	56.67
France	[1] 75,375	11.89
United Kingdom	[1] 57,018	8.99
OEEC	[2] 26,800	4.23
Italy	[1] 20,625	3.25
Canada	12,130	1.91
Australia	8,600	1.36
Belgium	8,600	1.36
Brazil	8,600	1.36
India	5,000	.78
Norway	5,000	.78
Others	[3] 46,812	7.42
Total	633,668	100.00

[1] Includes cash contribution plus contributed personnel.
[2] Contributed personnel only.
[3] The following countries have made cash contributions which are less than $5,000: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia Chile, Cuba, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Uruguay.

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the United States is making the major contribution. Obviously the United States is forcing the other nations through its position and prestige to join with it in maintaining this socialistic cartel. This is the same scheme which the United States first devised when it issued the invitation to other nations to join us in creating the International Trade Organization.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for us to take any further legislative action at this session to terminate our participation in the International Materials Conference. The House, by a teller vote of 169 to 102, voted that we withdraw from the International Materials Conference. Unfortunately, this issue was commingled with so many others in the Defense Production Act extension that the will of the House was lost in compromising the many provisions of this bill in conference. I feel confident that my colleagues on both side of the aisle will support my effort to establish the will of this House. Our security and well-being demand that we withdraw from the International Materials Conference.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this matter with which your conferees found themselves confronted is one that was decided upon not only this House but by the other body within the past week when the so-called Sadlak amendment to the extension of the defense production bill was under discussion and consideration. At that time the conferees from the Committees on Banking and Currency who sat on this matter in your behalf resolved the question by adopting the language which is known as section 102 of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952. That section was not only agreed to and ratified by this body and by the other body but has since been signed into law by the President of the United States.

That, simply, is the situation. Are you going to revive the same debate that you had at great length just a week ago?

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has very clearly stated what the situation is. We all went through the long and extensive debate on the controls bill here just this past week. The Sadlak amendment was debated at great length, everybody understood exactly what was being done.

Mr. Speaker, the House went to conference with the Senate. You all realize the importance of the controls bill. Nobody got what they wanted, everybody debated the proposition. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] came down here and he talked to us eloquently and well, in great detail and with great earnestness. He explained the situation to us.

Mr. Speaker, this House and this Congress then adopted the conference report, and the President signed the bill. It is law. Now you are trying to do indirectly and most improperly and irregularly something that you did not do directly. I hold no brief one way or the other at this moment for the merits of that legislation. But this is an appropriation bill. How many times have many of you objected to the Committee on Appropriations doing what you now, under this amendment, propose be done? Whether or not this should or should not prevail as meritorious legislation, you have acted upon it; you have made an agreement. This is a conference report. We met with the Senate and had a very long, hard conference, like all of the rest of these conferences. That being the case, gentlemen, you should not, with all reason, and you should not in conformity with the rules of the House, and you should not in all decency and propriety and common sense now double-cross in effect your own conferees who just last week produced the bill that is now law. The language of the compromise Sadlak amendment is in the bill. You know as much about that as I do. I am not going to presume to debate that with you. But I appeal to you as a conferee, as a spokesman for the House. We went to bat for you and we came back here, under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]—as a matter of fact, both gentlemen from New York—with the best possible conference report.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman might point out to the House that there were 56 substantial items in disagreement between this body and the other body. A conference is a matter of give and take. This conference was certainly not one where we sat down and hastily agreed to the Senate version on 56 items. The conferees met on more than one occasion, and at great length.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes. There have been nearly 60 amendments. We cut this thing some 30 percent from the budget request and the President's request. I think the leadership has done an extraordinarily fine job for you Members, and at your direction. They performed your instructions well. Now, do not do this. It certainly would be a reflection on your own advice and your own instructions.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I might point out further that this conference report which it is proposed to recommit, contains many, many important items which should be promptly adopted.

Mr. FLOOD. I cannot believe that any fair-minded man would at this time support a motion to recommit, in view of these facts.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 136]

Abbitt	Allen, La.	Bakewell
Abernethy	Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Ky.
Adair	Anfuso	Battle

Beckworth	Harden	Patman
Bender	Harris	Poage
Bentsen	Harrison, Va.	Potter
Brehm	Hébert	Powell
Brown, Ohio	Heriong	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Herter	Regan
Burdick	Heselton	Richards
Butler	Hillings	Robeson
Camp	Holifield	Sabath
Cannon	Hope	Sadlak
Carlyle	Jensen	St. George
Celler	Johnson	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, N. Y.	Kennedy	Steed
Cooper	Kilburn	Stigler
Cox	Kilday	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Sutton
Doyle	Larcade	Tackett
Durham	LeCompte	Thomas
Elston	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	McCarthy	Vinson
Fenton	Mitchell	Watts
Fisher	Morano	Welch
Flood	Morris	Wickersham
Forrester	Morrison	Willis
Furcolo	Morton	Wolcott
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Moulder	Wood, Ga.
Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson	Woodruff
	O'Brien, N. Y.	
	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 337 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2190. An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill (H. R. 2190) requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2968) entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. DUFF to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to amendment No. 18 in the conference report which has to do with the language that was inserted by the Senate in the appropriation bill in which the House conferees refused to concur. They have brought the conference report back to us with that language stricken out.

In a word, the Senate amendment in respect to appropriations for the State Department provides that none of the money appropriated for that Department shall be used to implement the International Materials Conference or its operations. The objective sought by that amendment was met here in the House when we had the proposal for the extension of DPA before us. You will recall that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] offered an amendment to that measure providing that the orders of the International Materials Conference, the IMC, allocating or undertaking to allocate certain critical materials among the 28 nations participating should not henceforth be binding as far as the United States is concerned.

That amendment was thoroughly debated in the Committee of the House. It was adopted, as I remember it, by the very decisive vote of 169 to 102. In other words, the membership of the House spoke very definitely, conclusively, and overwhelmingly that they did not want this country to longer be subject to the allocation of these materials by the IMC.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] who has so kindly yielded me this time, referred to the action of the conferees on the part of the House in connection with this amendment. It does seem to me that since the House and its membership had spoken so conclusively on this very matter within the last few days our conferees carrying out the express will and desire of the House and its membership should have agreed with the Senate on that language and that prohibition should be in this conference report and in the legislation as it is finally adopted.

You may inquire as to why the Sadlak amendment did not go on to adoption and into the law, hence eliminate the necessity for this language in the appropriation bill. As you know, the conferees on that DPA measure met until 3 o'clock in the morning. I think that some of those conferees thought that the effect of the Sadlak amendment had been retained in the conference action; but when we got to examining it we found that was not true. The effect of the language had been eliminated and we were left about where we were before except if any materials allocated by the IMC to a given country were not used by that country then the domestic users in this country might ask for those materials and obtain them.

But that was a far cry from the clear intent of the Sadlak amendment. Therefore, if the House of Representatives is to work its will on this very important matter, the motion to recommit, about which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has spoken, must be adopted by us and I hope it will be adopted.

To refresh your recollection about this whole matter and going back to the debate on the Sadlak amendment and to the arguments there made that were not disputed by anyone, the views of the proponents of the ITO—the International Trade Organization—that would have included these very provisions of the IMC were presented before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. There no action was taken on ITO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman from New York.

The same matter of the ITO was presented to our Committee on Foreign Affairs. Hearings were held. Reference was made to those hearings by certain members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of undisputed standing here in the House and of undisputed knowledge of matters of this sort in the debate on the Sadlak amendment. That committee never saw fit to even report the bill, so no action was taken approving any such proposal.

Then what happened? The State Department took it upon itself to create the IMC. It stated in a letter from Mr. McFall, Assistant Secretary, that there was no statutory authority for the IMC; that its creation flowed from the nebulous philosophy that it would help carry on the foreign policy of the country.

There was an argument originally made when this matter was debated in the Senate—and I might say, parenthetically that there was an amendment adopted over there looking to this very situation and in doing something about it, but the argument was made that the language there presented would interfere with the control materials plan that is in operation domestically with reference to the allocation of critical materials. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], so fixed his amendment that no such objection could be made, and by the retention of the Senate language no such objection could be made; in other words, whatever materials we get here at home or have here will continue to be allocated under such program as is in effect in this country now.

Now just one further thing about this whole operation of the IMC. It has no termination date. For a long time some people in this country have sought to tie us into some international operation that would allocate to us, not only in wartime but in peacetime, the share we are to get of certain of the resources of the world. I am not willing to grant to any international organization, and certainly not to one never sanctioned, never authorized by the Congress of the United States, the power of life and death over our economy; the power to determine our capacity in war and, yes, our economy and its strength in peace. That is the sort of power that could well be exercised by the IMC. As a matter of fact, I think it has definitely operated against the stockpiling to which the gentleman from North Carolina referred, and certainly has interfered with much of our domestic production, particularly as that production involves the operation of small business.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, following just what has been pointed out and bringing the matter up to date, the Senate, in section 113 (21) provided that no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with the International Materials Conference.

That settles the matter. That is the way to end this controversy.

Instead of accepting the Senate language, which removes our materials from the jurisdiction of the International Conference, our own conferees asked the Senate that it recede from the very language that cures this difficulty.

What we should do is to recommit the report, as the gentleman from New York proposes to do, and ask our conferees to adopt the language of the Senate, which is that no funds shall be used for this purpose. This International Materials Conference has used without any authority up to now $359,108 to function as an extra legal organization, over which we have had no jurisdiction up to now.

To show you that the other nations who produce copper do not want this, Chile, that produces 20 percent of the copper, contributes $5,000, just a little token, while this organization that seems to be fathered and financed by our own Government spends $359,108 to limit our domestic use of copper after we have made arrangements for the rest of the world to have what they want.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the gentleman from New York what amounts to a parliamentary question. He will shortly move the previous question.

Mr. ROONEY. I will say to the gentleman I should have moved it a long time ago.

Mr. PHILLIPS. At that time, if any motion to recommit is to be made, it is then in order, and a vote will be taken on that. Then there will be certain amendments in disagreement, one of which is No. 24. At that time, on behalf of the California delegation, I shall make a motion on item 24. Time will be given us at that time to discuss it, to make the matter clear to the other Members, and then a vote may be taken on that.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the gentleman from California can very ably describe that situation in the course of a few minutes. We will be glad to give him that time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. I am saying this simply so the members of our delegation will understand it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. In connection with the so-called Sadlak controversy, may I say that the Senate language was put in their bill before the conference report on the controls bill was passed. As soon as we pointed out to the Senate conferees that they acted before the bill became law and that the language they were worrying about was in the bill, they immediately withdrew their language and did not insist on it. The senior Senator from Michigan was not in agreement.

Mr. TABER. That is not the situation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON].

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to observe the new confidence the House Members have found in the ability of the other body to frame language. Ordinarily we do not give them credit for being able to frame laws that suit us very well, but today the minority party has proclaimed a new and profound confidence in the leadership on the other side of the Capitol.

This question the gentlemen on my left are undertaking to use as a postmortem on the Defense Production Act does not really involve whether you like the International Materials Conference or not. That is certainly a debatable question. The House debated it at length. But I personally do not feel that we have any need to be too alarmed about how much materials we are going to get in this country, because the thing that is talking the loudest in the world today is the American dollar. Wherever we take that dollar we usually get what we want with it throughout the world.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How can we get what we go after with the dollar when we go into an International Materials Conference where they want to take it away from us?

Mr. PRESTON. That is a matter of opinion, of course.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I just wanted to say that yesterday's paper said the Canadian dollar was worth $1.03 in United States currency.

Mr. PRESTON. I am glad to have that new fiscal report on the financial affairs of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing here today, and let us make no mistake about it, and let us be perfectly frank about it, is this. A battle has been lost in the House on this question, and the losers are not satisfied to stay lost. They are trying to revive this question of the International Materials Conference, and we are taking this method of retrying the case. You gentlemen on my left used every means in your hands to kill this defense production bill. It was the broad policy on your side to kill all controls—you failed. The majority party policy prevailed in the conference, and that is now the majority party policy—not to take the funds from the State Department to finance this conference since the Congress voted on both sides of the Capitol to have this conference. That is our policy. That is the Democratic policy. Now the objection is coming from the minority party. It is an effort to retry the case on the part of the unhappy losers on the extension of controls.

I say that when the Congress has acted in both bodies, and proper legislative procedures have been followed, then it is our responsibility to provide the funds. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] mentioned a very significant thing a moment ago. When the Senate wrote this language, there was not any extension of the Defense Production Act at all, and when we went into conference, the majority party conferees from the other body, without any hesitation, said, "We recognize that this language should be taken out." So it was not a one-sided proposition. The majority party from the other body, and this body, agreed that the language should be taken from the bill. I hope the House will vote against this motion to recommit, and provide the funds for such conference as may be found to be necessary under the protective language as written by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK] in the House of Representatives.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, in closing debate on this matter and prior to moving the previous question on the conference report, I should like to point out that I believe we have leaned over backward in being fair in yielding time to those who are on the other side with regard to this particular controversy. We have given the amount of time requested to everyone who wished to speak against us.

I am not going to debate the merits of the so-called Sadlak amendment. That is not the question before us. This is a Senate-House conference report on an important appropriation bill containing over a billion dollars. This particular item was written into this bill by the other body long before the extension of the Defense Production Act legislation was crystallized a week ago. The agreed upon action with regard to the Sadlak amendment was adopted by both the House and Senate and, having been signed by the President, is now the law of the land.

The majority of the conferees on behalf of the other body took this out of the bill themselves. There was only one dissenting vote among the conferees on the part of the other body. That was the vote of the only one from the other body who refused to sign the conference report carte blanche and he took exception to the conference report only as to this particular matter.

In proposing a motion to recommit, the proponents are seeking to do exactly—and want the conference committee to do exactly—what everyone always complains of so far as appropriations committees are concerned. They want to legislate on an appropriation bill, when at the same time they have section 102 of the bill known as the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, which became a law less than a week ago. Why, to listen to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]—he gave us his usual splendid speech this

afternoon with regard to this proposition, but permit me to say it was ill-timed because it was 5 days out of date. As I heard my fine friend talking I thought we were back again to last Saturday debating the Sadlak amendment to the extension of the Defense Production Act. This is merely a bill making regular annual appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, and if we are going to get out of here this week—and I will say to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, it might be a good idea that they do get out of here as soon as possible and get to the convention because the able brains of those on the other side of the aisle are needed right now in Chicago, if as I listen to the radio and television I properly interpret what I see and hear—you better adopt these conference reports. I would like to see all of us get out of here—you folks go to Chicago, and we shall go to the seashore, listen to your fiasco on the radio, and get ready to go to Chicago 2 weeks later. But, if we are going to do what is proposed to be done here this afternoon on this conference report—and incidentally, this conference report straightens out 56 items in disagreement—we may have to remain here next week.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). The Chair will count.

Mr. McGUIRE (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-six Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the committee of conference with instructions to agree to Senate amendment No. 18 prohibiting the expenditure of any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference on page 21.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 157, not voting 89, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

YEAS—184

Aandahl	Gamble	Mumma
Abbitt	Gathings	Murray
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Nicholson
Andersen, H. Carl	George	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Golden	O'Konski
Angell	Goodwin	Osmers
Arends	Graham	Ostertag
Armstrong	Grant	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gross	Phillips
Ayres	Gwinn	Poulson
Baker	Hagen	Prouty
Barden	Hale	Radwan
Baring	Hall, Leonard W.	Rankin
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.	Harvey	Rogers, Mass.
Berry	Hess	Ross
Betts	Hill	Saylor
Bishop	Hinshaw	Schenck
Boggs, Del.	Hoeven	Scott, Hardie
Bolton	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Scudder
Bow	Holmes	Seely-Brown
Bramblett	Horan	Shafer
Bray	Hull	Simpson, Pa.
Brownson	Hunter	Sittler
Budge	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	James	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Jarman	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	Jenison	Springer
Bush	Jenkins	Stanley
Byrnes	Jensen	Taber
Carrigg	Jonas	Talle
Chenoweth	Jones, Hamilton C.	Taylor
Chiperfield	Jones, Woodrow W.	Teague
Church	Judd	Thompson, Mich.
Clevenger	Kean	Tollefson
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Vail
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Van Pelt
Corbett	Latham	Van Zandt
Cotton	LeCompte	Velde
Cox	Lovre	Vorys
Crawford	Lucas	Vursell
Crumpacker	McConnell	Weichel
Curtis, Mo.	McCulloch	Werdel
Curtis, Nebr.	McDonough	Wharton
Dague	McGregor	Wheeler
Davis, Ga.	McIntire	Whitten
Davis, Wis.	McMillan	Widnall
Denny	McVey	Wigglesworth
Devereux	Mack, Wash.	Williams, Miss.
D'Ewart	Martin, Iowa	Williams, N. Y.
Dondero	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn	Mason	Wilson, Tex.
Doughton	Meader	Winstead
Durham	Merrow	Withrow
Eaton	Miller, Md.	Wolverton
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Ga.
Engle	Miller, N. Y.	Wood, Idaho
Ford		

NAYS—157

Addonizio	DeGraffenried	Harris
Albert	Delaney	Harrison, Va.
Andrews	Dempsey	Hart
Aspinall	Denton	Havenner
Bailey	Dingell	Hays, Ark.
Barrett	Dollinger	Hays, Ohio
Battle	Donohue	Hedrick
Bennett, Fla.	Donovan	Heffernan
Boggs, La.	Doyle	Heller
Bolling	Eberharter	Herlong
Bosone	Elliott	Holifield
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Howell
Bryson	Feighan	Ikard
Buchanan	Fernandes	Irving
Burnside	Fine	Jackson, Wash.
Burton	Flood	Javits
Camp	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Canfield	Forand	Jones, Mo.
Cannon	Frazier	Karsten, Mo.
Carnahan	Fugate	Keating
Case	Fulton	Kee
Celler	Garmatz	Kelley, Pa.
Chatham	Gary	Kelly, N. Y.
Chelf	Gordon	Kerr
Chudoff	Gore	King, Calif.
Clemente	Granahan	Kirwan
Cooley	Granger	Kluczynski
Coudert	Green	Lane
Crosser	Greenwood	Lanham
Dawson	Gregory	Lantaff
Deane	Hardy	Lesinski
Lind	O'Toole	Roosevelt
McCormack	Passman	Sasscer
McGrath	Perkins	Secrest
McGuire	Philbin	Shelley
McKinnon	Polk	Sheppard
McMullen	Preston	Sieminski
Machrowicz	Price	Smith, Miss.
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Spence
Magee	Rabaut	Staggers
Mahon	Rains	Steed
Mansfield	Ramsay	Stockman
Marshall	Reams	Thomas
Miller, Calif.	Redden	Thornberry
Mills	Rhodes	Trimble
Morgan	Ribicoff	Vinson
Multer	Richlman	Walter
Murdock	Riley	Wier
Murphy	Roberts	Yates
Norrell	Rodino	Yorty
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.	Zablocki
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.	
O'Neill	Rooney	

NOT VOTING—89

Abernethy	Forrester	Patman
Adair	Furcolo	Patten
Allen, Ill.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poage
Allen, La.	Harden	Potter
Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Powell
Anfuso	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bakewell	Heselton	Regan
Bates, Ky.	Hillings	Richards
Beckworth	Hope	Rivers
Bender	Johnson	Robeson
Bentsen	Kearney	Sabath
Blackney	Kennedy	Sadlak
Blatnik	Keogh	St. George
Boykin	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Brehm	Kilday	Sheehan
Brooks	King, Pa.	Short
Brown, Ohio	Klein	Sikes
Buckley	Larcade	Simpson, Ill.
Burdick	Lyle	Stigler
Butler	McCarthy	Sutton
Carlyle	Madden	Tackett
Cole, N. Y.	Mitchell	Thompson, Tex.
Combs	Morano	Watts
Cooper	Morris	Welch
Cunningham	Morrison	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	Morton	Willis
Dolliver	Moulder	Wolcott
Elston	Nelson	Woodruff
Evins	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Fenton	O'Hara	
Fisher		

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Bentsen against.

Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Sadlak for, with Mr. Moulder against.

Mr. Anderson of California for, with Mr. Patten against.

Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Sheehan for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Bakewell for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. McCarthy against.

Mr. Heselton for, with Mr. Cooper against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Hébert against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Furcolo against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Sabath against.

Mr. King of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mrs. Harden for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Morano for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Welch against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Brehm for, with Mr. Kilday against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Morris against.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. Simpson of Illinois for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Brooks with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Nelson.

Mr. O'TOOLE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic.

LONG-RANGE SHIPPING BILL

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2450)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, and 34, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 13. (a) Section 511 (h) of such Act is amended by striking out the proviso thereto and substituting the following: 'Provided, That until March 31, 1953, in addition to the extensions hereinbefore permitted, further extensions may be granted ending not later than September 30, 1953.'

"(b) Section 511 (i) of such Act is amended by inserting after the words 'portion thereof' in the second sentence the following: 'with respect to a deposit made in any taxable year ending on or before June 30, 1945.'"

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the House amendment and omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "20"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "21"; and the House agree to the same.

EDWARD J. HART,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
T. MILLET HAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
OWEN BREWSTER,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment clarifies the idea that the determining voice in the establishment of the use rate for the obsolete vessel, between the time of the agreement to trade in and the receipt of the new vessel, shall be in the Government. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19: The Senate bill granted certain tax deferments with respect to deposits of earnings by unsubsidized operators in construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, for purpose of replacement of vessels. These amendments would strike out all provisions for such deferments. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 20: This amendment provides in part for deletion of a provision for extension of time to commit construction reserve funds for new vessels. The remainder of this amendment deletes provisions of the bill relative to the tax deferments mentioned with respect to amendments Nos. 2 through 19 above, and inserts provisions which would clarify existing law in recognition of the fact that the capital-stock tax and the declared value excess-profits tax have been repealed as with respect to taxable years ending after June 30, 1945. The Senate recedes with an amendment which would have the effect of providing for an extension of time to commit construction reserve funds for new vessels to September 30, 1953, and which would insert the clarifying provisions mentioned above.

Amendment No. 21: This is a clerical amendment, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 22: The Senate provision would require an affirmative vote of not less than three members of the Federal Maritime Board in granting approval to the modernization of a vessel for exclusive use on the Great Lakes. This amendment would delete the requirement for an affirmative vote of three members and thus bring the section into line with Reorganization Plan No. 21, of 1950. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 23 and 26: These amendments clarify the Senate provisions relating to the recomputation of the life expectancy of reconstructed vessels but make no substantive change in them. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 24, 25, 27, and 28: These are clerical amendments, and the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 29: The Senate bill would provide that interest shall not accrue in favor of the Government on any deficiencies of Federal tax, resulting from proposed voluntary deposits in statutory reserve funds which are subsequently disapproved by the Maritime Board until the Board actually disapproves such deposits. This amendment would delete this provision. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 30: With respect to subsidized operators holding an operating subsidy, the Senate provisions granted full tax deferment as to required deposits and provided for the deferment of the normal tax and the surtax with respect to other deposits in the reserve funds. The House amendment would strike the Senate provisions and substitute therefor, new language which, while granting to operators receiving an operating subsidy the same deferment provisions as provided in the Senate bill with respect to required deposits, would defer only the normal tax with respect to other deposits in the reserve funds. The committee of conference has eliminated from the bill both the Senate and the House provisions relating to this matter. The committee agreed, however, that the Department of Commerce and the Treasury Department should immediately begin to gather all information relative to the extent and effect of tax deferment and tax exemption benefits to the maritime industry, and make a report on same as early as possible in the next Congress.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 33: These are clerical amendments which must be changed because of changes made in conference. The Senate recedes from its disagreement and agrees to the same with the necessary amendments.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 34: These are clerical amendments, and the Senate recedes.

EDWARD J. HART,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
DONALD L. O'TOOLE,
ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
T. MILLET HAND,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, when the bill S. 241 came from the Senate it contained a provision authorizing tax deferments with respect to certain deposit of earnings by unsubsidized operators in construction reserve funds. That was stricken out by the House. The Senate bill also provided that in addition to the deferment granted subsidized operators on required deposits, they be granted tax deferment on normal and surtaxes on

voluntary deposits. The House extended that privilege only to normal taxes.

Those were the main differences between the Senate and the House. Being unable to agree on tax deferments to subsidized operators the conference unanimously decided on dropping all reference to tax deferments from the bill, the Senate having first agreed to the elimination of tax deferments to the unsubsidized operators.

The bill as agreed on carries no other amendment of consequence, and the report of the conferees on the part of both the Senate and the House is unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this report, and I move the previous question thereon.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 138]

Abernethy	Forrester	O'Hara
Adair	Furcolo	Patman
Allen, La.	Hall,	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Edwin Arthur	Potter
Anfuso	Harden	Powell
Armstrong	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Bakewell	Heller	Reed, N. Y.
Barden	Herter	Regan
Bates, Ky.	Heselton	Richards
Beckworth	Hillings	Robeson
Bender	Hoffman, Ill.	Ross
Bentsen	Hope	Sabath
Brehm	Jenkins	Sadlak
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	St. George
Buckley	Kearney	Sasscer
Burdick	Kennedy	Scott,
Butler	Keogh	Hugh D., Jr.
Carlyle	Kilburn	Sheehan
Celler	Kilday	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	King, Pa.	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Sutton
Combs	Larcade	Tackett
Cooper	Lyle	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Teague
Davis, Wis.	Mack, Wash.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Mitchell	Watts
Dolliver	Morano	Welch
Doughton	Morris	Wickersham
Elston	Morrison	Wier
Evins	Morton	Willis
Fenton	Moulder	Wolcott
Fisher	Nelson	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LONG-RANGE SHIPPING BILL

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE—DEFENSE HOUSING

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3066) entitled "An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes," and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendments to the bill S. 3066, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this motion provides for the essential legislative process, the only way by which the differences can be ironed out.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE.]

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, GAMBLE, TALLE, and COLE of Kansas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE—AMENDING CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a message from the Senate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2968) entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended," and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. DUFF be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
Secretary.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the bill S. 2968, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY, MILLER of California, and REES of Kansas.

AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 695 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7888) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I inserted in the Appendix an address by Dr. Harold Moulton, which I am advised exceeds the regular amount allowed and will cost $231. I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made, notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have two or three matters that will take only a minute or two, and I wonder if it would be in order for the Speaker to recognize me to take them up at this time.

The SPEAKER. It would.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 728, the sole purpose of which is to permit the Committee on Ways and Means to file their reports during the recess of the House.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 78, as amended, is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 729 with respect to reports from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolution 436 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any study or investigation conducted under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SERVE ON OTHER COMMITTEES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Resolution 647.

This resolution was considered yesterday, having for its purpose to permit minority members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to serve on other committees. There was a question about it yesterday because we really did not include the same privileges to the members of the Committee on House Administration.

There is an amendment here which I shall offer if permitted which will extend the same privilege to the Committee on House Administration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That clause (a) 8 of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

Clause (b) (3) of rule X is amended to read as follows:

"All vacancies in standing committees in the House shall be filled by election by the House. Each Member shall be elected to serve on one standing committee and no more; except that Members who are elected to serve on the Committee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Government Operations, or on the Committee on Un-American Activities may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more, and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on the Committee on House Administration may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more."

Clause (1) (h) (1) of rule XI is amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this amendment gives to the Committee on House Administration the same privileges that the Committee on Expenditures has.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have no objection to their riding along on the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman from Virginia referred to the possibility of offering such an amendment; what is the parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. If consent for consideration of this resolution is granted the gentleman from Virginia said he would offer the amendment.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

Page 1, line 12, after the word "operations", strike out the words "or on."

And on page 2, line 1, after the word "activities", strike out the words "may be elected to serve on two standing committees and no more and Members of the majority party who are elected to serve on" and insert the word "or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Does the gentleman from Illinois have any requests for time?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes; does not the gentleman have requests for time?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, I do not.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use of my 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution attempts to do something logical. I think, however, the membership should know that when the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TABER] as well as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], came before the Committee on Rules I asked both whether they needed this extra staff.

As you know, this bill provides for a joint committee of the Senate and House for the purpose of having expert economists and financiers for the Committee on Appropriations. When they came before the Committee on Rules I naturally wanted to know the attitude of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the ranking minority member of the committee because, after all, they are the two most important members who will be on this joint committee; so I asked both if they felt it was necessary to have this additional staff, whether they could accomplish any useful or necessary purpose or any necessary function which would give the Congress of the United States or the Committee on Appropriations a better knowledge of the working departments of the Government.

The gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who would have much to say in the appointment of the staff and who would naturally be more important in regard to the supervision of that staff said: "Definitely not"; or substantially those words. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] felt the same way.

It appears to me that were I one of the managing officers of a corporation or a company running a plant and the board of directors came to me and asked if I wanted to have another staff in addition to the experts I had already and I said I did not need any more, that it would simply result in duplication of effort, it would serve no useful purpose for the board of directors to force such a staff on the management. I mention this merely to call the situation to the attention of the membership and remind them of the fact that they would be attempting to force onto the Appropriations Committee another staff, and economists, and so forth, when the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking Republican and others on the committee say they do not need them and do not want them. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the membership.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is a fact that there were members of the Appropriations Committee who appeared before the gentleman's committee in favor of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is true.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Undoubtedly there will be an opportunity on the floor here to discuss both sides of the issue.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The rule provides for 2 hours' general debate. But when you have the chairman and the ranking minority members of the Appropriations Committee of the House opposed to this, and they are the two keymen in the setup should this committee be created, that fact should receive the attention of the membership of the House. While most of us want committees and staffs that will help, we are not unmindful of the fact that we have a sufficient staff now around the city of Washington, and, as far as I am

concerned, I am not in favor of creating another one when those who will be in charge of this setup say it is unnecessary and can bring about no important additional function to the Joint Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN OF HOPE, N. MEX.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill is?

Mr. COOLEY. I will be glad to do so. It merely provides for the transfer of certain lands in the town of Hope, N. Mex., from the Federal Government to the town of Hope, N. Mex. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee with an amendment that provides that the city of Hope, N. Mex., shall reimburse the Government to the extent of $1,950, the amount that the Government paid for the land. The Government has no further use for the land, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Hope, N. Mex., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following real estate situate within the corporate limits of said town in Eddy County, N. Mex.:

The south half of the northwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter, twenty-nine acres in the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, thirty-three and nine-tenths acres in the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 19, township 17 south, range 23 east; and the east half of the southeast quarter of section 24, township 17 south, range 21 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing two hundred and sixty-three acres, more or less.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the first comma insert "upon payment by said town of $1,950."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERADICATION AND CONTROL OF HALOGETON GLOMERATUS ON LANDS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1041) to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would explain the provisions of the bill. Certain members of the committee seem to think it is all right. First of all, can the gentleman tell us what they propose to do and how much money it will cost?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand it will not cost any additional money. It would give to the Department certain authority to cooperate in the eradication of this weed on privately owned land and on State-owned land whereas at the present time the work can only be carried on on Government-owned land.

There were two House bills introduced, one by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] and one by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] and apparently the authority herein provided is necessary in the eradication program. This matter was unanimously approved by our committee. It is a poisonous weed that is killing the cattle and endangering the herds in certain areas of the country.

Mr. HALLECK. I might say to the gentleman that I just glanced at the bill. Section 6 (a), page 4, reads:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

It would seem to me, unless there is some reasonable explanation to the contrary, that that would contemplate the appropriation of money. Possibly it is something that needs to be done, but I think we ought to know something of the extent to which it might go and how much it might reasonably be expected to cost.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. This bill is very necessary. The Halogeton plant is a very poisonous weed which is killing cattle and sheep and horses on the western ranges. We can eradicate this weed on public land, but we have to have authority to eradicate it on private land. We have already appropriated around $3,000,000 for the eradication of this poisonous weed, the Halogeton weed, and I hope the bill will go through without objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Halogeton Glomeratus Control Act."

SEC. 2. In order to protect the livestock industry from losses caused by the poisonous weed Halogeton glomeratus now or hereafter existing on lands in the several States, to provide for the maintenance and development of valuable forage plants on range and pasture lands, and to prevent destruction or impairment of range and pasture lands and other lands by the growth, spread, and development of the poisonous weed known as Halogeton glomeratus, it shall be the policy of the Federal Government, acting independently or in cooperation with the several States and political subdivisions thereof, private associations and organizations, and individuals, to control, suppress, and eradicate this weed, poisonous to livestock, on lands in the several States irrespective of ownership.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior with respect to lands under his jurisdiction, including trust or restricted Indian lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any other lands, either independently or in cooperation with any State or political subdivision thereof, private association or organization, or individual, are severally authorized, upon such conditions as they respectively deem necessary—

(1) to conduct surveys to detect the presence and effect of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in such State;

(2) to determine those measures and operations which are necessary to control, suppress, and eradicate such weed; and

(3) to plan, organize, direct, and carry out such measures and operations as either of them may deem neecssary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Measures and operations to control, suppress, or eradicate Halogeton glomeratus on lands under the jurisdiction of any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation of the Federal Government shall not be conducted without the consent of the department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation concerned.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion may allocate, out of any sums appropriated to him under authority of this act, to any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation of the Federal Government having jurisdiction over any land on which there exists Halogeton glomeratus, such amounts as he deems necessary for the control, suppression, and eradication of such weed by such department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation, as the case may be. Sums appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior under authority of this act shall be expended for work on, or of benefit to, lands under his jurisdiction, including trust or restricted Indian lands. Either Secretary may also accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services of Federal, State, and local officers and employees as are available.

SEC. 5. In the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, no expenditures shall be made from funds appropriated under this act to control, suppress, or eradicate Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the several States until there have been made or agreed upon such contributions, in the form of funds, materials, services, or otherwise, by the States and political subdivisions thereof, private associations, and organizations, and individuals, toward the work of controlling, suppressing, or eradicating such weed, as the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, may require.

SEC. 6. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Any sums so appropriated shall be available for expenditure for the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the purchase, hire, maintenance, operation, and exchange of aircraft and passenger-carrying vehicles, and for such other expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(c) Such sums shall not be used to pay the cost or value of any property injured or destroyed in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The authority contained in this act shall be in addition to, and shall not limit or supersede, authority contained in existing law with respect to the control, suppression, and eradication of pests, plants, and plant diseases.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL REPORTER TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 732) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of an additional official reporter to committees of the House of Representatives, to be appointed in the same manner, and to receive the same rate of compensation, as the other official reporters to House committees.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAM ACCOUNTS OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8499) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give a brief statement in explanation of this bill?

Mr. DEANE. Under the present arrangements telephone and telegraphic allowances are placed on a fiscal-year basis. This places it on the basis of term membership.

Mr. McCORMACK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act relating to telephone and telegraph service and clerk hire for Members of the House of Representatives," approved June 23, 1949, as amended, are each amended by striking out the words "fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "term of office of such Member in which such month occurs."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this act shall take effect as of July 1, 1951.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 237) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1952.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefore and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1950) to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That, upon the application of the Secretary of State, the Federal Security Administrator is authorized to admit to St. Elizabeths Hospital, in the District of Columbia, for treatment, any citizen of the United States legally adjudged insane in a foreign country whose legal residence in a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, it has been impossible to establish. Upon the ascertainment of the legal residence of any person so transferred to the hospital, the Superintendent of the hospital shall thereupon transfer such person to such place of residence, and the expenses attendant thereon shall be paid from the appropriation for the support of the hospital.

SEC. 2. Upon the request of any person admitted to St. Elizabeths Hospital under the first section of this act, or upon the request of any relative or friend, he shall have a hearing in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia upon his mental condition and the right of the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital to hold him for treatment.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide for the repatriation of certain insane American citizens," approved March 2, 1929, and the act entitled "An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belonging to the Foreign Service of the United States," approved October 29, 1951, are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after the comma insert "or certified by appropriate authorities (as determined by the Administrator) to be in need of care and treatment in a mental hospital."

Page 2, line 14, after "entitled", strike out the remainder of the line and lines 15 and 16, ending with the word "entitled."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "are" and insert "is."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL REPORTER TO HOUSE COMMITTEES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor for a minute, and during that time the resolution (H. Res. 732) to provide for an additional official reporter to House committees was considered by unanimous consent and passed. I ask for a reconsideration of House Resolution 732.

The SPEAKER. It takes unanimous consent to do that, and the Chair doubts that the gentleman could get unanimous consent for it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Speaker.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 139]

Abernethy	Gregory	Patman
Adair	Hall,	Patten
Allen, La.	Edwin Arthur	Poage
Anderson, Calif.	Harden	Potter
Anfuso	Hébert	Poulsen
Bakewell	Heller	Powell
Barden	Herter	Ramsay
Bates, Ky.	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Beckworth	Hillings	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Bentsen	Hope	Richards
Blackney	Irving	Robeson
Brehm	Jenkins	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Sadlak
Buckley	Jonas	St. George
Buffett	Kearney	Scott,
Burdick	Kennedy	Hugh D., Jr.
Butler	Keogh	Sheehan
Carlyle	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Celler	Kilburn	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Stockman
Combs	King, Pa.	Sutton
Cooper	Klein	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	Larcade	Taylor
Dingell	Lyle	Teague
Dolliver	McCarthy	Thompson, Tex.
Doughton	McKinnon	Vinson
Eaton	Mitchell	Watts
Elston	Morano	Welch
Engle	Morris	Wickersham
Evins	Morrison	Willis
Fenton	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Fisher	Moulder	Wolcott
Forrester	Murphy	Wood, Ga.
Frazier	Nelson	Woodruff
Furcolo	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 324 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order that I have for today go over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING TO POTTER COUNTY, TEX., CERTAIN SURPLUS LANDS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5567) to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to donate and convey to the County Commissioners Court of Potter County, Tex., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands constituting the westerly portion of the tract of land on which is located the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo, Tex. Such tract of land was originally conveyed to the Veterans' Administration by Potter County for the nominal consideration of $3, and the westerly portion thereof has been declared to be surplus to the requirements of the United States. The lands to be conveyed under the authority of this Act contain approximately 275 acres in Potter County, Tex., and are more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of survey numbered 26, block 9, B. S. & F.; thence south no degrees 20 minutes east with the west line of said survey numbered 26, 1,814 and five-tenths varas to a one-and-one-quarter-inch iron pipe in the north line of the right-of-way of Highway Numbered 66 on a curve, whence the center of said curve bears north 16 degrees 37 minutes 20 seconds west 3,719 and eight-tenths feet; thence northeasterly on curve to the right with a radius of 3,719 and eight-tenths feet for a distance of 700 varas to a concrete post marker; thence north 43 degrees 15 minutes 20 seconds east with the northwest boundary of said Highway Numbered 66, 768 and two-tenths varas to a one-and-one-quarter-inch iron pipe for the southeast corner of this tract; thence north 24 degrees 31 minutes 10 seconds west with a fence 178 and two-tenths varas to a one-and-one-quarter-inch iron pipe, a reentrant corner of this tract; thence north one degree 12 minutes 10 seconds east with a fence at 715 varas pass a one-and-one-quarter-inch iron pipe, at 725 and eight-tenths varas, a point in the north line of survey numbered 26 in block 9, B. S. & F., the northeast corner of this tract; thence north 89 degrees 47 minutes west with the north line of said survey numbered 26, 1,067 and eight-tenths varas to the beginning corner of this tract.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following: "which land the Veterans' Administration reported to the General Services Administration as excess under date of August 14, 1950 (holding agency No. VA-116) comprising 297 acres, more or less, located in Potter County, Tex.

Page 2, line 3, after the words "United States", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COPYRIGHTS

Mr. BRYSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code:

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2470)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same.

J. R. BRYSON,
S. J. CRUMPACKER, Jr.,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIS SMITH,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "copyrights with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill (H. R. 3589) as it passed the House, limited the coverage of performing and recording rights in nondramatic literary works to those made "for profit." The purpose of this limitation was to avoid a holding of infringement by "a teacher reading excerpts from a copyrighted schoolbook in a schoolroom, a minister reading from text in a church or a speaker at a civic meeting." Amendment No. 1 of the bill (H. R. 3589) as it passed the Senate inserted the word "pecuniary" after the word "for" and before the word "profit" to ensure that the quotation of a portion of a copyrighted poem or literary work or a speech for which no monetary compensation was received would not be deemed an infringement. This result appeared desirable to the House and was intended to be included in the bill passed by the House by means of the words "for profit."

The conferees believe that the objective of the first Senate amendment is obtained without the addition of the word "pecuniary" and that the addition of such word may create uncertainties in the law. The concept of "public performance for profit" has been in the copyright law since 1909 and the courts have construed the phrase to mean a material, tangible, commercial profit. The inclusion of the word "pecuniary" might cast doubt upon the phrase "public performance for profit" appearing elsewhere in the law. The use of different language to achieve the same result in the same law appears to be undesirable.

Accordingly, the conferees have agreed to strike out the Senate amendment number 1 with the understanding that the word "profit" as used in the bill refers only to a pecuniary remuneration.

Senate amendment No. 2 was passed to permit a record company to dispose of certain inventory that would otherwise be covered by the bill. Although a record company would not have had to pay a royalty on records manufactured or sold prior to the effective date of the bill, a royalty would have been payable for records manufactured or sold after the date of enactment. As record companies have large investments in original or master recordings, they might find themselves in the position of having made a large investment and, if they could not obtain a license at a reasonable rate, be unable to make and sell records after the enactment of the bill. To reduce the possibility of loss from such a contingency, the conferees have agreed to accept the Senate amendment No. 2, which moves the effective date of the bill up to January 1, 1953 and, accordingly, will exclude from coverage of the bill works manufactured or sold prior to January 1, 1953.

The managers on the part of the House believe that the legislation herewith presented to the House should be approved and accordingly they recommend the approval of the instant conference report.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 85, noes 107.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 138, nays 189, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

YEAS—138

Aandahl	Flood	Mason
Allen, Calif.	Fogarty	Meader
Allen, Ill.	Ford	Merrow
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulton	Miller, Md.
	Gamble	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Gary	Miller, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Gavin	Mumma
	Golden	Murray
Angell	Goodwin	Norblad
Armstrong	Graham	Osmers
Auchincloss	Gross	Ostertag
Baker	Gwinn	Passman
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Patterson
Beamer	Hale	Preston
Belcher	Hall, Leonard W.	Rabaut
Bennett, Mich.		Rees, Kans.
Berry	Halleck	Riehlman
Betts	Harrison, Nebr.	Riley
Bishop	Harrison, Wyo.	Rivers
Bow	Harvey	Rooney
Bramblett	Hays, Ohio	Ross
Bray	Hedrick	Saylor
Brownson	Hess	Scott, Hardie
Budge	Hill	Scrivner
Bush	Hinshaw	Scudder
Byrnes	Hoeven	Seely-Brown
Cannon	Hoffman, Mich.	Sheppard
Carrigg	Hunter	Short
Chenoweth	Jackson, Calif.	Simpson, Ill.
Chiperfield	James	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Jenison	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Smith, Wis.
Corbett	Jensen	Stockman
Coudert	Kearns	Taber
Crawford	Kerr	Talle
Crumpacker	Latham	Thomas
Curtis, Mo.	LeCompte	Van Pelt
Curtis, Nebr.	Lovre	Velde
Dague	McConnell	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Werdel
Denny	McDonough	Wharton
Devereux	McIntire	Whitten
D'Ewart	McMillan	Wigglesworth
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Marshall	Withrow
Engle	Martin, Mass.	Wood, Idaho

NAYS—189

Abbitt	Buchanan	DeGraffenried
Addonizio	Burleson	Delaney
Albert	Burnside	Dempsey
Andrews	Burton	Denton
Aspinall	Canfield	Dingell
Ayres	Carnahan	Dollinger
Bailey	Case	Donohue
Baring	Celler	Donovan
Barrett	Chatham	Doughton
Battle	Chelf	Doyle
Bennett, Fla.	Chudoff	Eberharter
Blatnik	Church	Elliott
Boggs, Del.	Clemente	Fallon
Boggs, La.	Colmer	Feighan
Bolling	Cooley	Fine
Bolton	Cotton	Forand
Bonner	Cox	Frazier
Bosone	Crosser	Fugate
Brooks	Cunningham	Garmatz
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ga.	Gathings
Bryson	Dawson	Gordon
Gore	Lind	Rhodes
Granahan	Lucas	Ribicoff
Granger	McCormack	Roberts
Grant	McGregor	Rodino
Green	McGuire	Rogers, Colo.
Greenwood	McKinnon	Rogers, Fla.
Gregory	McMullen	Rogers, Mass.
Hand	McVey	Rogers, Tex.
Hardy	Machrowicz	Roosevelt
Harris	Mack, Ill.	Sasscer
Harrison, Va.	Madden	Schenck
Hart	Magee	Secrest
Havenner	Mansfield	Shafer
Hays, Ark.	Martin, Iowa	Shelley
Heffernan	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Herlong	Mills	Sittler
Holifield	Morgan	Smith, Miss.
Holmes	Multer	Smith, Va.
Howell	Murdock	Spence
Hull	Murphy	Springer
Ikard	Nicholson	Staggers
Jackson, Wash.	Norrell	Stanley
Jarman	O'Brien, Ill.	Steed
Javits	O'Brien, Mich.	Teague
Jones, Ala.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Thompson, Mich.
Jones, Mo.	O'Konski	
Jones, Hamilton C.	O'Neill	Thornberry
	O'Toole	Tollefson
Jones, Woodrow W.	Patten	Trimble
	Perkins	Van Zandt
Judd	Philbin	Vorys
Karsten, Mo.	Phillips	Walter
Kean	Polk	Weichel
Keating	Poulson	Wheeler
Kee	Price	Widnall
Kelley, Pa.	Priest	Wier
Kelly, N. Y.	Prouty	Williams, Miss.
King, Calif.	Radwan	Wilson, Tex.
Kluczynski	Rains	Winstead
Lane	Rankin	Wolverton
Lanham	Reams	Yates
Lantaff	Redden	Yorty
Lesinski	Reed, N. Y.	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—103

Abernethy	Fisher	Morton
Adair	Forrester	Moulder
Allen, La.	Furcolo	Nelson
Anfuso	George	O'Hara
Arends	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Patman
Bakewell		Poage
Barden	Harden	Potter
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Powell
Beall	Heller	Ramsay
Beckworth	Herter	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Bentsen	Hillings	Regan
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Boykin	Hope	Robeson
Brehm	Horan	Sabath
Brown, Ohio	Irving	Sadlak
Buckley	Johnson	St. George
Buffett	Jonas	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burdick	Kearney	
Busbey	Kennedy	Sheehan
Butler	Keogh	Sikes
Camp	Kersten, Wis.	Stigler
Carlyle	Kilburn	Sutton
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Tackett
Combs	King, Pa.	Taylor
Cooper	Kirwan	Thompson, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Klein	Vail
Deane	Larcade	Vinson
Dolliver	Lyle	Watts
Durham	McCarthy	Welch
Eaton	McGrath	Wickersham
Elston	Mitchell	Willis
Evins	Morano	Wolcott
Fenton	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Fernandez	Morrison	Woodruff

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. MCGUIRE, SIEMINSKI, KELLEY of Pennsylvania, and SECREST changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) entitled "Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953."

AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the Members of the House, since there has been so much confusion in between the debate on this matter, that this is an open 2-hour rule which was adopted by the Rules Committee after 6 days of hearings. I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with a number of my good friends on both sides of the aisle in reference to this matter. I believe that the bill now under consideration is a reasonable one. I believe it is forward looking. I believe it is a necessary bill and a most important bill; in fact, I think it is one of the most important bills which we have considered in this session of the Congress.

I would like to say first what I think this bill will not do. In my estimation this bill will not destroy in any respect the power of the House of Representatives to initiate appropriation measures. Nor will it whittle away any of the time-tested rules or privileges of the House of Representatives. But, what will this bill do? I believe that this bill will give to the hardworking Committee on Appropriations and to the other Members of the House a complete set of legislative tools to perform better the increasingly difficult task of making the huge appropriations which we must make. I believe that this bill is one short step toward returning the purse strings of the United States to the Congress. I believe that this bill will parallel the work of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue which has been working successfully for the last 25 years. This bill, if adopted, will parallel the action of the other body, which voted a companion measure which is in some respects different from this bill by a vote of 55 to 8. The measure in that body had wide, bipartisan cosponsorship.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a fact that what this bill really does is set up for the Congress the equivalent of what the Bureau of the Budget is to the White House?

Mr. LATHAM. That is true.

Mr. JUDD. The President has a professional staff which gets all this material, organizes, digests it, and analyzes it for him. We need the same sort of agency working for us, and the resolution is a real forward step.

Mr. LATHAM. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. I approve of it wholeheartedly and I hope it will be enacted.

Mr. LATHAM. I would like to call to the attention of the House that the

following Members of the other body cosponsored this measure: HOEY, O'CONOR, HUMPHREY, MONRONEY, UNDERWOOD, MOODY, MCCARTHY, MUNDT, SCHOEPPEL, DWORSHAK, and NIXON. They were all cosponsors. The bill passed the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8.

I believe that this bill is a crystallization of the bipartisan concern over tremendously increased Government expenditures.

This bill will create a joint committee of the budget, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] said, and will give it the manpower and the talent somewhat equivalent to that which the executive branch of the Government has today.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I wanted to ask whether the membership would be limited to the House Committee on Appropriations and to the Finance Committee of the Senate, and if it is limited, can we have outside people serving on this committee other than from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. LATHAM. Yes.

Mr. FULTON. One other question. Will this act be in derogation of the historic powers of the House that have arisen through custom, of our handling the original appropriation bills?

Mr. LATHAM. I have already stated that in my opinion it will in no way whittle away the powers of the House to initiate appropriation measures. I feel that this is a worthy program to spend a very little and save a very great deal.

I would like to point out that this is directly in line with the recommendations of the Hoover report. I have here two booklets on the Hoover report. One has to do with the National Security Organization, and it says in the Hoover report:

> The appropriations committees do not seem to have made much progress toward providing themselves with the more adequate technical staffs envisaged by the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946. It is only by continuous follow-up of operations of the Military Establishment throughout the year by permanent, well-qualified examiners that the seasoned judgment necessary to production of reliable information for the committees can be obtained. The investigations of such a permanent staff would establish for the committees either verification or lack of justification of the details of many items of the budgets, thus simplifying the hearings of the subcommittees and leaving the latter free for more thorough consideration of policy aspects of the budget programs.

That is the Hoover Commission speaking.

Then again, in the fiscal, budgeting, and accounting report of the Hoover Commission, this is said:

> Congress is confronted with a stupendous task when it comes to reviewing the budget materials which are annually presented to it or to its appropriate committees. There is a huge budget document submitted early in January which contains the President's budget recommendations—the 1948-49 document ran to 1,534 quarto pages.

And so on. I will not bother to read it all.

Those are the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. This bill follows those recommendations.

I do not think there is a Member of this House who, as we voted on these tremendous appropriation bills, has not had a feeling of frustration. Frustration because we did not know what we were voting on. We could not possibly tell what was in the bills we were voting on. We did not know whether we were appropriating money which would be wasted. We read every single day in the newspapers another illustration of waste in the executive branch of the Government. It bothers us. Some of the Members of this House are almost sickened over the waste in Government. Yet we go along and vote on these tremendous appropriation bills, not knowing really what is in them. I think we become hardened to these tremendous appropriation bills. We get a sort of impersonal feeling about the whole thing. I think that should not be, because there is not one of us who does not have back in his district thousands upon thousands of small wage earners who have perhaps four or five children. Every time we appropriate another million or another billion dollars we are reaching down into the pocket of each one of those wage earners and taking from him a few more dollars that he needs to feed and clothe his children. It is not very impersonal to that small taxpayer. I think the time has come when we must dig down to get the facts and make sure of the things on which we vote in these tremendous appropriation bills. We owe a duty to that little taxpayer.

You say, "We have to rely on the Appropriations Committee," and, of course, that is completely true. I believe the Appropriations Committee of the House is the hardest working committee in the Congress. I understand it has a very able staff, but it is a very small staff. But you know and I know deep down in our hearts it is a physical impossibility for the few members of the Appropriations Committee and for the small staff to know every item that is in these tremendous appropriation bills.

Look what they are up against. They sit as a sort of legislative judge. It is like a law suit. The plaintiff comes before this legislative judge suing for $80,000,000,000 or $90,000,000,000 each year. In this case the plaintiff is the executive branch of the Government. They call hundreds and hundreds of expert witnesses. The plaintiffs witness are the bureaucrats in the executive branch of the Government. They are the ones who are asking for the money and they are the ones who are going to spend the money. They are pleading their own case. They are making self-serving declarations.

Who is there to appear and testify for the defendants, and in this case the defendants are the people, the taxpayers of America. We do not have any similar expert staff to testify for the defendants before the Appropriations Committee, or at best a very few.

That is the vacuum which this bill seeks to fill, to give to the Appropriations Committee an expert, trained, technical staff that will work year in and year out. It will check on the executive branch of the Government and on its fiscal affairs, so that we will know where the fat is and where to cut out the waste. They would be able to cut out the fat without cutting the sinew and the muscle.

Many of the Members of this House are economy-minded. I say to those of you who are economy-minded, here is a weapon and a tool by which you can produce real economy in your appropriations in the House. There are others of us who accuse the Committee on Appropriations of the House, of using a meat axe. Well, if you are against the use of a meat axe, then I say to you, you should vote for this bill and this rule because this will replace the meat axe with a scalpel. Then the Committee on Appropriations like a surgeon will be able to cut around and get rid of the fat, without doing damage to the sinews and the muscle.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would give these expert witnesses who would testify on behalf of the House and on behalf of the taxpayers of the country, an adequate and highly trained, nonpolitical, career staff to dig into the facts and dig into the truth. I do not think there is a single Member of the House who does not have a great concern at times as to the future of this country. I do not think the Members of the House fear this country will ever be defeated on the field of battle. I do not think Members of the House are concerned because they fear that the people of this country will ever be converted to communism. I do believe, however, that most of the Members of the House are deeply concerned that we shall, ourselves, spend this country into bankruptcy.

We do not claim this bill will cure everything. But we have this enormous, serious problem with us, and what have we done about it? Up until today, we have not done a single thing.

The gentleman from Mississippi, and I think he is to be highly complimented, has done something about it. He has produced a plan and brought it before the Congress. It appears to be a workable plan.

I believe we had compelling testimony in favor of the Colmer bill on yesterday when the Committee on Appropriations sprung out a resolution which was to forestall this bill.

I think every member of the Committee on Appropriations who voted out that resolution on yesterday, indicated the compelling necessity for the passage of the Colmer resolution. I look upon this bill as an opportunity—an opportunity for the House not to scrap the old system but to streamline just a little bit the legislative machinery of the House. It is a nopportunity to make appropriations a little bit more scientifically. It is an opportunity to give a more sensitive control to the Committee on Appropriations so that it will be able to guide a little bit better this enormous appropriations' steam roller.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

It is an opportunity to put into the hands of the Committee on Appropriations, a weapon with which they will be able to fight the giant spending octopus, which seems to be smothering all of us.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATHAM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I have been waiting all this time trying to find out if any of the proponents of these bills have read the bills, and if they know what is in them. Frankly, in my opinion, it is one of the most reactionary and destructive bills I have ever seen, and it would prevent the Committee on Appropriations from seeking and getting information because we would have to go to a joint committee who would not have the approach that the House Committee on Appropriations might have. We would be handicapped and our job would be almost impossible.

Mr. LATHAM. There has been a slight difference of opinion on this bill, as I stated earlier.

I look upon this bill as an opportunity for the House to spend a little and save a very great deal.

I believe it is one step forward, toward a solution of this tremendous problem, and I hope the rule and the bill will be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from New York, JOHN TABER, a great American yielding me this time, may I say also, there is no finer man in Congress than my friend and colleague from Mississippi, BILL COLMER. He is seriously disturbed at the financial affairs of this Nation and so am I. If there were anything in the present bill which in my judgment would bring about more economy I would be for it. However, to my mind this bill has helped already but will not contribute anything we do not have now except a joint committee which would cost us money. First, let me say that I have served on the Appropriations Committee for 10 years, as have others. I will compare my record for economy with any man in the Congress. I have been chairman of a subcommittee for 4 years. We have always had a staff, investigators, and investigations. I have had investigations made of the Department of Agriculture each year, because we did have authority for such investigations. Entomology and Plant Quarantine, PMA Commodity Credit Corporation, and many others. Up until recently we had to get the approval of the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority Member, but in so far as I they have never refused such permission. The trouble has been that too few asked for such investigations. We have had the right to investigate, and I personally have used it. I have constantly, for the last 4 years, insisted on the floor of this House that the trouble was not that the committee did not have authority; the Committee on Appropriations has the authority but they have not used it to the extent that I have or to the extent that they should. I have made speeches to that effect for a number of years. The appropriations for the department I handle are about 32 percent below that for the same Department in 1940. I am proud of that record when the average Department has gone up 385 percent for the same time.

On May 15 I offered a resolution in the committee, without any knowledge that my friend and colleague from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] had in mind introducing any bill. My resolution adopted by the Committee on Appropriations is as follows:

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION NO. 10

Resolved, That it shall be the policy of the Appropriations Committee that the programs and budget estimates of each department or agency shall be inspected and checked by investigations of the Appropriations Committee each year and the appropriate subcommittee may direct the particular phases to which special attention shall be given.

This represented a signal victory for me. Then yesterday—after the present bill was coming up, I got through the Committee on Appropriations the other action which I have advocated so long. This resolution embodying some provisions advocated by others, is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in order to carry out the policy established by Committee Resolution No. 10, by Mr. WHITTEN, adopted on May 15, 1952, the following procedure is hereby adopted:

"The chairman shall appoint (in addition to such number of clerical assistants as may be required) not less than 20, and such additional numbers as may be from time to time required, persons with such qualifications as investigators, analysts, etc., as he may deem appropriate to conduct studies, investigations, and surveys in accordance with the provisions of this resolution.

"The chairman shall assign such employees to make investigations, studies, and surveys for each subcommittee as may be necessary to meet the wishes of such subcommittee.

"Written reports of all such investigations, studies, and surveys conducted during each year shall be made to the appropriate subcommittee by the 3d day of January each year, but special written reports may be made from time to time as may be necessary to advise the subcommitte as to matters requiring early attention. Such subcommittee shall publish such factual information contained in such reports as may be made public compatibly with the national interest and security as soon as may be practicable for use of the membership of the House.

"The ranking minority members of each subcommittee, with the approval of the chairman of the committee, is authorized to appoint a clerk-stenographer at a basic salary of $2,400 per annum.

"The chairman is authorized and directed to introduce, and seek immediate enactment thereof, a joint resolution appropriating the sum of $500,000 for the fiscal year 1953 for the purposes of this resolution."

A Director of Studies and Investigations has already been appointed and will proceed immediately to recruit the necessary personnel. He will consult with the various subcommittees, find out what their desires are, and make every effort to furnish such information and assistance as they may wish.

This was done, in my judgment, because of a change of heart on the part of some members of the committee, under pressure, and I frankly say it was because this bill, the Colmer bill, was up for consideration. My friend and colleague from Mississippi, BILL COLMER, can take full credit. But it was in line with what I have been trying to do all the time. As a result of the pressure to use more and more of these investigators, in the last year we have had 144 investigators working for that committee. We have had 31 investigations. Yesterday we directed the employment of at least 20 more investigators, so do not vote to bring up this bill, believing you will get additional investigators. This bill itself leaves the number up to the Appropriations Committee. You already have them. We have the authority in the committee. What I have advocated is increased use of that authority. This bill would give once again the same authority the committee has and there is nothing in it that makes the committee use it, but yesterday the committee committed itself to use the authority.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing the bill before this committee provides that the information to be gathered by the investigators of the committee shall be made available to the membership of the Congress.

That should be done, but my resolution, adopted by the committee yesterday, provides for that.

The bill before us provides for a joint committee of Members of the Senate and House. Listen, I have been on conferences with the Senate for 10 years. They have upped every bill that ever went to them that I know about. I have just finished a conference on the appropriation for the District of Columbia.

The Senators on the Appropriations Committee in the Senate upped every item and would have enlarged the title if they had time.

I had a conference with the Senate on the agriculture appropriation a few days ago. The Senators on that committee upped practically every item except one which was in my area. It was reduced. That was done, apparently, to make me agree to the other increases which I did not do.

So it is. We had a joint committee similar to that provided in the Colmer bill a few years ago. You could not get anything done with Members of the other body issuing press releases through the door.

Members of the other body are fine but do not try to fool me by claiming that to put them on a House committee would save money. Check the records through the years. The record shows that to add members of the Senate to a House committee is to add to appropriations.

No, my friend from Mississipi is right, we need to do everything we can honorably do to save money. However, under the threat of his bill the Appropriations Committee, thanks to his efforts, are now doing everything he advocates, and which I have advocated for several years, except to take members of the other body on House committee which would save nothing.

I may say that a few years ago, when we had such a joint committee, I offered a resolution to such joint committee providing that 5 percent of all money collected should go toward payment of the

principal of the public debt. When the Democrats were in the majority I got the votes of all the Republicans but of course that was too few. When the Republicans were in the majority I got the votes of all the Democrats but of course they were too few. So it goes.

If our friends on the Rules Committee wish to save money, and I know they do, they will report out House Resolution 110 which I introduced January 31, 1951, which would provide for investigation of the facilities and manpower used by the defense agencies and the Government. I saved millions on Navy appropriations and on Government corporations yet my resolution has been pigeonholed within their committee notwithstanding the fact that I have asked that they bring it out. I fully believe had that resolution been reported out we could have saved billions.

I wish I could go more into detail but I believe we can expect great results from the pending bill when we defeat it. It has brought about all the good things it could and we are not saddled with the expensive joint committee.

I regret that the members of the Appropriations Committee, with years of experience, have not had a chance to discuss this bill reorganizing the procedures of their committee except for the two minutes granted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and which he has so graciously given to me.

I have tried to at least point out why this bill has helped lots already but cannot do more.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 141]

Abernethy	Elliott	Kilday
Adair	Elston	King, Pa.
Allen, La.	Engle	Klein
Anderson, Calif.	Evins	Larcade
Anfuso	Fenton	Lyle
Bakewell	Fisher	McCarthy
Bates, Ky.	Flood	Mason
Beckworth	Forrester	Mitchell
Bender	Furcolo	Morano
Bentsen	Granger	Morris
Blackney	Gregory	Morrison
Brehm	Hall, Edwin, Arthur	Morton
Brown, Ohio	Harden	Moulder
Buckley	Hébert	Murdock
Burdick	Heller	Nelson
Butler	Herter	Norblad
Byrnes	Heselton	O'Brien, N. Y.
Camp	Hillings	O'Hara
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Carlyle	Holifield	Poage
Cole, Kans.	Hope	Potter
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Poulson
Combs	Johnson	Powell
Cooper	Jonas	Ramsay
Cox	Kearney	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy	Reed, Ill.
Dawson	Kersten, Wis.	Regan
Dolliver	Kilburn	Richards
Eaton	Kirwan	Rivers
Robeson	Stockman	Watts
Sabath	Sutton	Welch
Sadlak	Tackett	Willis
St. George	Taylor	Wolcott
Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Teague	Wood, Ga.
Sheehan	Thompson, Tex.	Woodruff
Stigler	Vail	
	Vursell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 317 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDING THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I have been a member of that committee now for 12 or 13 years, I want to say that I believe deeply and sincerely that if you want economy, we should pass the pending bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM], on the minority side, made a great talk. I endorse what the gentleman has said.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ought to be the law. We do not give away any of our powers. We reserve our authority. The Colmer bill does nothing more than to create a fact-finding staff to secure information for the subcommittees, so they can function more intelligently.

Mr. Speaker, all the bureaus, departments, and commissions of the executive department have budget departments. Then the President has a central budget department, known as the Bureau of the Budget, with in excess of 500 employees. These departmental budgets are doing a fine job for the executive agencies. However, the legislative department has no budget department of any kind. About all my committee can do is to accept, rely and act on what the executive employees say—we are doing our best. Your Appropriations Committee is composed of very able gentlemen. We have a small but splendid staff of clerks. They are as efficient as could possibly be found. We cannot, however, do what I think is an adequate job. We need additional experts, so that we may more intelligently reduce budget requests, without continuing what sometimes is referred to as the meat-ax approach."

Mr. Speaker, I hope the rule is adopted and the bill is passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I realize we are all weary at this hour of the day, and I also realize what is going on, and what has been going on. I am sure you could not expect me in the brief time of 10 minutes to give you the full benefit of my convictions on the bill and to fully analyze it. In fact, to be perfectly candid with you, as I always try to be, I had not expected to speak on this rule at all. I had expected to explain the bill under general debate after the adoption of the rule. But when it came to me that those who are so busy trying to kill this bill were going to try to kill the rule, I thought I ought to take a little time and say something about it.

I want to say in the first place that it might seem a bit presumptuous to some members of the Appropriations Committee on my part, Mr. Speaker, since I am not a member of the powerful Committee on Appropriations to introduce a bill here which affects that powerful committee. But, Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now I have been vitally concerned about the future of my and your country. I am vitally concerned about whether we are going to be able to survive under this unbridled spending spree that we have been on. For a number of years now, not as a member of the Committee on Appropriations but upon my responsibility as a Member of the House of Representatives, I have attempted to do something about it in cutting these appropriations. Therefore, I do not feel that I have to apologize to anyone in my efforts, however humble, to prevent national bankruptcy.

When the other body passed this bill with only eight dissenting votes, setting up a joint committee of the two Houses on appropriations with an adequate staff, I thought that this offered an opportunity to give the House the tools with which to work, and to give us as Representatives of the overburdened taxpayers the necessary information with which to intelligently combat these constant gargantuan demands that are made upon the purse of this country. I make this statement to you this evening upon my responsibility as a Member of the Congress of the United States: That if you do not do something about these expenditures you are going to become the victim of Soviet aggression—not by arms, not by force, but by the destruction of the soundness of your dollar and the resultant breakdown of your economy. I have been telling you this for more than 5 years. I am more concerned about that than I am about any Soviet aggression by force of arms.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what happened. I do not want to step on anybody's toes. I do not have anything against anybody. I love every Member of the House whether he is on the Committee on Appropriations or not—but what happened when this bill was introduced by me, after being passed by the other body, and nothing had been done about it over here by any member of the Appropriations Committee. According to the record the following chronological things happened:

My original bill, H. R. 7624, similar to the Senate bill, S. 913, was introduced.

On April 30 the distinguished majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, sought and obtained consent to refer both S. 913, the McClellan bill, and my bill, H. R. 7624, to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This was obviously an attempt to bury the bill.

On May 1, after I had complained about this, the distinguished majority leader asked unanimous consent to have the bill referred back to the Rules Committee. This was done.

Thereafter and to wit on May 15, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations, secured the adoption of a resolution in the Committee on Appropriations providing for additional clerical and investigatory staff. But nothing was done about providing this staff. Now bear you in mind this was May 15.

Then on May 16, in order to meet the objections of some members of the Appropriations Committee to a joint committee with the Senate giving the Senate equal power with the House, I introduced a new bill, the bill before you, H. R. 7888, giving the House 9 Members as to 7 for the Senate with the chairmanship in the House.

On May 22, the Committee on Rules having recaptured the subject matter began hearings on my bill, H. R. 7888, which consumed some 6 days.

Then the powerful chairman of the powerful Committee on Appropriations came before the Committee on Rules, where this bill was pending, and said, and I shall quote the gentleman:

I quote the gentleman. I do not have time to quote it all, but I will quote part of it. It is on several pages. Whatever I do quote will be complete as to that statement; there will be nothing out of context. Said Mr. CANNON:

We investigated. We have an unlimited staff of investigators whom we send out to departments when we receive the budget, to see whether or not they need the money. Then we have a staff which goes down to see how they spend it.

You are talking about the investigations staff? We have all that the FBI has. We call upon them for an unlimited number. If we have 10 committees ordering an investigation, we go to the FBI and bring up enough to make 10 investigations. If we only have two, we dismiss the rest and they go back.

If we had a permanent staff of a permanent number, when all of the committees were investigating we would not have enough, and when only one or two were investigating we would have too many. We are not limited to the FBI. We can also call upon the General Accounting Office. We can call upon the Secret Service of the Treasury Department. We can call upon the investigating officials of the Health Department. We can call, and do call, upon every branch of Government which uses operatives.

We are in a position to mobilize within 24 hours the best qualified investigators which can be found, and we do it. We have an unlimited number at our command. We meet the situation effectively.

What next? When the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee saw that this bill was coming up for consideration, what did he do? He called the Appropriations Committee into session. What did they do? On yesterday morning, July 3, they passed out a resolution, a resolution offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. I am not criticizing him about it. That would set up a staff of not less than 20. Then what happened?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I will have to yield to my colleague, but I hope the gentleman will be brief. My time is so limited.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have for 3 or 4 years advocated the very thing that I did.

Mr. COLMER. I give the gentleman credit for it all. I am perfectly willing to agree for the gentleman to have credit. I am interested only in results.

Then yesterday, after that, what happened? The Appropriations Committee came in here and attempted to get unanimous consent to get that resolution through authorizing $500,000 for an additional staff for the Appropriations Committee. Why did they do that? When the chairman of the committee said they had all the staff they needed; they did not need any more? Now, what happened? They did not need any staff, but what happened? The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee, went over to the Senate last night, after being refused in the House—now let us be fair about that—let us put it this way—after he could not get the resolution up for consideration in the House he went before the Senate, went before the Senate Appropriations Committee and had $500,000 written into the Senate bill for a staff—for whom? For the Senate? Oh, no. For the House of Representatives. That is being debated upon the floor of the Senate now. Why, if the committee does not need any staff, if we do not need something to assist in cutting the burden of taxation, why was all this resorted to at the last moment? You can call it what you want to call it. I want to be charitable. The most charitable thing I can say about it is, with love to all and enmity to none, that it was a death-bed repentance. Now what is going to happen if the patient gets well? I do not know. We will have to wait and see.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Would the gentleman pardon me? I have such a limited time. I have not been able to go into so many of the things I wanted to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. COLMER. I just want to take this time to show you what has been going on here, not that I would rather not have discussed the bill, but I know of the movement on foot to kill this rule, and then we would not have a chance to explain the bill.

Mr. Speaker, what is the present situation? The Congress gave the President a budget organization with over 500 employees—that is the number in the President's Budget Bureau now—every department, every bureau, every agency in this far-flung Government of ours has literally hundreds and thousands of experts, but we in the Congress with the responsibility in the House and the Senate for appropriating the taxpayers' money have a mere handful of people, most of whom are of clerical capacity.

Oh, yes; in the staff thing that was reported out yesterday I am informed that there was a little sop offered to you gentlemen on the minority. They are going to give you a staff also, you ranking members of the subcommittee—a $2,400 expert. Why, we pay our page boys more than that. You know as well as I—and I still hope I have not said anything that reflected on any member of the Appropriations Committee—I talked to the members of the Appropriations Committee; you talked to them. I say to you that they are not satisfied with the set-up, these men on the Appropriations Commmittee. I want to say this if I do not say anything else, that they have done a wonderful job with the tools they have to work with; they have done an admirable job; but when these experts from these other departments come in there, you know and I know it, that they hear only one side of it, the bureau's side. The committee does not have trained experts to sit there and present the other side of the picture. They are completely at the mercy of the bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, the crying need of the hour is to stop this unbridled spending spree upon which we have been engaged for the past two decades. We are now approaching a $270,000,000,000 national debt. The Congress has surrendered the purse strings to the executive department in spite of the constitutional mandate of the Congress to control taxes and expenditures. It cost the taxpayers of America over $6,000,000,000 a year to pay the interest on the indebtedness alone, a sum greater than it cost to operate the entire Federal Governmnent during the 1935 period. Somewhere along the line there is going to be a day of reckoning. The Government cannot go on in this wild spree of spending. It can only result in further inflation and ultimate bankruptcy. Wh , Mr. Speaker, if instead of deficit spending we were to now start retiring the national debt at the rate of $1,000,000,000 a year it would require 270 years to liquidate the present national indebtedness. I ask you if that is not a horrifying thought.

Having surrendered the purse strings to the executive department with its ever and ever expanding bureaus, I repeat again what I have pointed out many times here on the floor that if the Republic is to survive, it is necessary for the Congress to recapture the surrendered purse strings. The governmental bureaus have become so large in their ever-expanding trend that there is only one way to meet the situation and that is for the Congress to equip itself with the machinery; namely, an adequate staff of experts who can make the necessary studies and give the Congress the necessary information to intelligently act in curbing these unnecessary expenditures, extravagance, and waste. I say to you deliberately, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress in this atomic age is equipped with oxcart machinery. It was adequate 100 years ago. It is completely inadequate now.

This joint committee, similar to the Committee on Taxation and Revenue, which is now doing such a splendid job, may not be the complete answer but will someone please tell me how in the name of the lovers of the Republic that the membership of this House, even in their desire to go home to their loved ones and to campaign for reelection, can turn it down?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am cognizant of what those of us who are interested in

stopping this extravagance and waste are up against. I know what is going on. I have not been around here for 20 years for nothing. I know that the leadership of the House is against the bill. I know that even the Republican leadership, which started out for the bill, has now, in its haste to get out to Chicago for their political convention, has joined the Democratic leadership. I am fully cognizant of the cracking of the whip by the powerful chairman of the Appropriations Committee and of the jealousy and zealousness of members of that committee of their prerogatives. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I realize and appreciate most fully the task of opposing the combined leadership of the House on both the majority and minority side coupled with the influence of the powerful Appropriations Committee of some 45 members, all of whom are jealous of their prerogatives and powers. It all adds up to a pretty difficult obstacle to overcome in this House. Yes, the prerogative of the Appropriations Committee, the machinery of the House, even though it is of the oxcart variety in the atomic age, must be respected. But, Mr. Speaker, I am thinking about the prerogatives of the taxpayers and the future of the Republic, which I love better than life itself. Even under the lash of all of this power it is difficult for me to understand how the ordinary, plain American variety of a Congressman in this House, with the interest of the country and the taxpayer, can vote against even considering a bill that would give him the necessary information that he so sorely needs to protect his country and his taxpayers from impending disaster.

Mr. Speaker, with apologies to none, with a deep and sincere love of country and with a keen sense of desire to avert the impending disaster, I urge my colleagues to resist the powerful pressures and at least give the House an opportunity to consider this bill.

Under this bill you would have an adequate staff; every Member of Congress would have that available information, and there would be no necessity in the future for the so-called meat-tax approach. I just hope that even in these dying hours of the Congress you will not by your vote say to your taxpayers at home that you were not willing even to consider this legislation.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Colmer bill. Obviously in 3 minutes it is impossible to lay before you what is actually in the bill, its merits and perhaps some of its weaknesses which may be cleared up after experience has shown how it works out. At the moment we are discussing only the rule. My appeal to you is not to vote down the rule; my appeal to you is to let this matter go to discussion so you may hear both sides of the argument. It is desirable that you do. If you are opposed to the bill, and are going to vote against it, you should know the arguments against it when you go home, because the tax-conscious agencies of the United States are very much in favor of this. It was a recommendation of the Hoover Commission. If you are going to vote for it you should be able to explain the desirability of such a bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. In a minute I will try to yield; I have only 2 minutes.

Today when I entered this Chamber I placed on the Speaker's desk a petition with 17,108 names asking for reductions in the spending of the Federal Government. The signers know what they are doing and what they wanted. They came from all parts of California. I think other members may have received similar petitions. I know duplicates, or additional petitions, were sent to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

This bill we are now discussing is one recognized step toward the reduction of the costs of Government on the Federal level. This bill, as I will try to show if opportunity presents itself, is along the lines pointed out in many recommendations for procedural improvement in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. I would like to concur in what the gentleman from California has said and speaking not as a Member of Congress but as a small-business man, if I ran my business like the Federal Government is run today I could not stay in business 30 days.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if it was because they wanted full discussion that they gave 2 minutes time to the opposition and took all of the rest of the hour?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The House will certainly want to hear the opposition and will, accordingly, vote for the rule.

It would be unfortunate if the rule were to be denied and the word went out that we had refused even to discuss the proposed Colmer bill. If that should happen, I can only say that I, for one, have great patience. This is not the first time I have personally heard the arguments, and met the opposition to procedural improvements, which this bill would provide. It took us years to get a similar system established in the California Legislature. The arguments against it were the same. Now that we have had it for 10 years, and it has proved its worth, beyond any question, many people want to take credit for its adoption.

The proposals in the Colmer bill do not take away any authority the Committee on Appropriations now has. It does not affect the closely guarded right of the House to originate money bills, for which right we have insisted since the Constitution was written. The Colmer bill does not interfere with the right of the House or the Senate to have investigators or investigations. It provides an orderly method of furnishing statistical information, constantly up to date, for the use of both committees and eventually all members.

The members of the House Committee on Appropriations have been loudest in complaining of the present lack of analytical help. I know the Members of Congress are not going to be misled by what the gentleman from Mississippi called a "death-bed conversation" the hastily contrived resolution rushed through the Committee on Appropriations yesterday. Its only object was to stop the passage by any means, of the Colmer bill, which I now urge you to understand, and then pass.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time on this side.

Mr. Speaker, there will not be time to go into the merits of the bill, but I want to talk about the rule. We garden-variety Members of Congress who are distrubed about the fiscal affairs of this Nation are not able to know or to find out what is going on with reference to these appropriations.

I do not say this bill is right, I do not say this bill is exactly what you want, but ever since the bill has been introduced the Rules Committee and members of the Rules Committee who favored some approach to the question of furnishing Members of the House with necessary information have been trying to get those who oppose the bill in its present form to offer something. They have told them: "If this does not suit you, come in with something that will do the trick."

I am primarily interested in getting some kind of a bill. I do not care what it is. You can amend the bill in any way you want, but fix it so that every Member of this House who is not a member of the Appropriations Committee can know what he is doing when he votes for an appropriation bill, and I challenge anybody to say that he can know now what is going on when an appropriation bill is being considered.

The Appropriations Committee is the only committee of Congress I ever heard of that holds star-chamber meetings. You cannot go to a hearing there. You Members who represent a whole congressional district cannot attend a public hearing or what ought to be a public hearing on an appropriation bill to spend the money of your taxpayers.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I cannot yield. The gentleman will have plenty of time.

Mr. Speaker, I have been around here 2 or 3 years myself and I have tried to attend some of these hearings and I could not attend them. I have been told by members of the Appropriations Committee that the public is not permitted to attend, that Members of Congress are not permitted to attend, and I was told no later than today by a member of the Appropriations Committee that a member of the Appropriations

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Committee himself is not permitted to attend a hearing before a subcommittee of which he is not a member.

Mr. Speaker, all I am asking you to do is to give yourself the opportunity to consider this great project when you are appropriating $86,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money a year. My plea is for the taxpayer, give him a chance, give yourselves a chance to get a bill that will give the Members of Congress an opportunity to know what they are doing when they are appropriating money. That is all I am asking you to do. If you do not like this bill, offer another one.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the purpose of this bill is to provide Congress with the necessary and vital tools to work out a sound national fiscal policy. The report emphasises the fact that the importance of the soundness of the dollar is not even exceeded by the threat of Soviet aggression. I subscribe to that emphasis 100 percent. There is no question in my mind but that the Soviet Government hopes to destroy us by desroying our economy.

The American people have for some time been very critical of the Congress because it is of the justifiable opinion that the Congress has lost its control of the Nation's purse strings. This bill is designed to return to Congress this necessary control in accordance with the Constitution of the United States.

I had been a Member of this Congress less than 4 months before I came to the realization of the enormous task faced by the Committees on Appropriations. This legislation seeks to equip the respective Committees on Appropriations with the necessary staff to cope with this problem. Such equipment comes in the form of the specific proposal in this legislation that a joint committee on the Budget be formed, comprised of seven Members of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, together with nine members of the Committee on Appropriations of this House, five from the majority party and four from the minority party. However, such committee, in and of itself will do nothing to meet the present problem. But, it is proposed in this legislation that this joint committee will be so staffed with experts and investigators, to enable the marshaling of detail and technical information for the benefit of both Appropriations Committees of this Congress. The amendment before us is certainly a step in the right direction. However, whether it will solve the problem and return to Congress its Constitutional control of the purse strings depends very much upon the staff and its ability to serve, not only the two Committees on Appropriations, but all Members of Congress as well.

This is progressive legislation—it is economy-minded legislation. It is a healthy step in the right direction and should have the approval of this House. The least that the proponents of this measure deserve is adoption of this rule so that this worthy legislation can be deliberated.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 83, noes 93.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 174, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—154

Abbitt	Doughton	McVey
Addonizio	Durham	Mack, Wash.
Albert	Elliott	Martin, Iowa
Allen, Calif.	Ellsworth	Merrow
Andrews	Frazier	Miller, N. Y.
Armstrong	Fugate	Mills
Ayres	Gamble	Murray
Baker	Gathings	Norblad
Barden	Goodwin	Norrell
Battle	Gore	O'Brien, Mich.
Beamer	Grant	Ostertag
Belcher	Gregory	Philbin
Bennett, Fla.	Gross	Phillips
Bennett, Mich.	Gwinn	Prouty
Berry	Hagen	Radwan
Boggs, Del.	Hale	Reams
Boggs, La.	Hardy	Redden
Bolton	Harris	Ribicoff
Bonner	Harrison, Va.	Richlman
Boykin	Harrison, Wyo.	Roberts
Bramblett	Harvey	Rodino
Brooks	Hays, Ark.	Rogers, Colo.
Brown, Ga.	Herlong	Rogers, Fla.
Bryson	Hinshaw	Rogers, Tex.
Buffett	Hoeven	Ross
Burleson	Holmes	Schenck
Burton	Howell	Scudder
Busbey	Hunter	Seely-Brown
Byrnes	Ikard	Sittler
Canfield	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Miss.
Case	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Chatham	Javits	Springer
Cheif	Jenison	Stanley
Chiperfield	Jensen	Steed
Church	Jones, Ala.	Talle
Colmer	Jones, Hamilton C.	Teague
Cooley	Jones, Woodrow W.	Thornberry
Corbett	Judd	Tollefson
Cotton	Kean	Trimble
Coudert	Keating	Van Pelt
Cox	Lane	Velde
Crumpacker	Lanham	Vursell
Cunningham	Lantaff	Walter
Dague	Latham	Weichel
Davis, Ga.	LeCompte	Wheeler
Deane	Lucas	Widnall
DeGraffenried	McCulloch	Williams, Miss.
Devereux	McGregor	Wilson, Tex.
D'Ewart	McIntire	Winstead
Donohue	McMullen	Wood, Idaho
Donovan	Morton	Yates
Dorn	Mumma	Yorty

NAYS—174

Allen, Ill.	Bosone	Curtis, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Bow	Davis, Wis.
Anderson, Calif.	Bray	Delaney
Andresen, August H.	Brownson	Dempsey
Angell	Buchanan	Denny
Arends	Budge	Denton
Aspinall	Burnside	Dingell
Auchincloss	Bush	Dollinger
Bailey	Cannon	Dondero
Barrett	Carnahan	Doyle
Bates, Mass.	Carrigg	Eberharter
Beall	Celler	Engle
Betts	Chenoweth	Fallon
Bishop	Chudoff	Feighan
Blatnik	Clevenger	Fernandez
Bolling	Crawford	Fine
	Crosser	Flood
	Curtis, Mo.	Fogarty
Forand	Lind	Rees, Kans.
Ford	Lovre	Rhodes
Fulton	McConnell	Riley
Garmatz	McCormack	Rivers
Gary	McDonough	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	McGrath	Rooney
Golden	McGuire	Roosevelt
Gordon	McKinnon	Sasscer
Graham	Machrowicz	Saylor
Grannahan	Mack, Ill.	Scott, Hardie
Green	Madden	Scrivner
Greenwood	Magee	Secrest
Hall, Leonard W.	Mahon	Shafer
Halleck	Mansfield	Shelley
Hand	Marshall	Sheppard
Harrison, Nebr.	Meader	Short
Hart	Miller, Calif.	Sieminski
Havenner	Miller, Md.	Simpson, Ill.
Hays, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.	Simpson, Pa.
Hedrick	Morgan	Smith, Kans.
Heffernan	Multer	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Murdock	Staggers
Hill	Murphy	Stockman
Hoffman, Mich.	Nicholson	Taber
Horan	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas
Hull	O'Konski	Thompson, Mich.
Irving	O'Neill	Van Zandt
Jackson, Wash.	Osmers	Vinson
James	O'Toole	Vorys
Jenkins	Passman	Werdel
Jones, Mo.	Patten	Wharton
Karsten, Mo.	Patterson	Whitten
Kearns	Perkins	Wier
Kee	Polk	Wigglesworth
Kelley, Pa.	Poulson	Williams, N. Y.
Kelly, N. Y.	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Kerr	Price	Withrow
King, Calif.	Rabaut	Wolverton
Kirwan	Rankin	Zablocki
Kluczynski	Reed, Ill.	
Lesinski	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—102

Aandahl	Granger	O'Brien, N. Y.
Abernethy	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Adair	Harden	Patman
Allen, La.	Hébert	Poage
Anfuso	Heller	Potter
Bakewell	Herter	Powell
Baring	Heselton	Priest
Bates, Ky.	Hillings	Rains
Beckworth	Hoffman, Ill.	Ramsay
Bender	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Bentsen	Hope	Regan
Blackney	Johnson	Richards
Brehm	Jonas	Robeson
Brown, Ohio	Kearney	Sabath
Buckley	Kennedy	Sadlak
Burdick	Keogh	St. George
Butler	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Camp	Kilburn	Sheehan
Carlyle	Kilday	Sikes
Clemente	King, Pa.	Spence
Cole, Kans.	Klein	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Larcade	Sutton
Combs	Lyle	Tackett
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Vail
Dolliver	Mason	Watts
Elston	Mitchell	Welch
Evins	Morano	Wickersham
Fenton	Morris	Willis
Fisher	Morrison	Wolcott
Forrester	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Furcolo	Moulder	Woodruff
George	Nelson	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Mitchell against.

Mr. Robeson for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Forrester for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. O'Brien of New York against.

Mr. Wood for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Bakewell.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Cooper with Mr. Morano.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Powell with Cole of New York.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. George.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Elston.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Vail.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reece of Tennesse.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Priest with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Larcade with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Sheehan.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. MANSFIELD and PATTERSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Colmer bill looks fine superficially, and if it would do the things its proponents claim for it, I would be for it, but sad experience with similar proposals convinces me it will not work. It would replace a similar budget provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act which looks good on its surface but which has never worked as planned. I helped create a watchdog committee in the ECA law, a joint House-Senate committee with a staff to do exactly the same thing for foreign-aid spending that is proposed for our entire budget. I served on that watchdog committee as long as it functioned. While it did some constructive work at the outset, I regret to say that its net value during its existence was not much.

What is needed is to expand the Appropriations Committee staff with the right kind of qualified personnel in sufficient numbers. This was done in the Eightieth Congress. This excellent staff was dismantled in the Eighty-first Congress, and has never been restored.

One thing is clear: We will never secure real economy in Government under a spending administration, no matter what Congress does. On the other hand, if we elect a Republican President and a Republican Congress, I feel sure that proper machinery for screening and reducing expenditures will be provided, both in the executive departments and here in Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I regret I am forced to oppose this rule and the bill offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], for whom I hold deep respect.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently and vigorously urged that the Congress staff itself. It is only by providing itself with fact-finding instruments that the Congress can penetrate beneath the surface of complex national problems and huge lump-sum Federal expenditures. Only then will the Congress be able to familiarize itself with a subject, to found its policy on fact and logic rather than on emotional, superficial generalities and to express its will in clear, specific, and unambiguous terms. Only then will the Congress begin to recall to itself the legislative power it has permitted the executive branch of the Government to usurp in the past two decades.

Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my views on the need for strengthening the Congress. I am just as convinced as ever that the only way Congress can be strengthened is through providing itself with adequate fact-finding staffs. But what is needed is more investigators for existing committees, not more committees.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is illusory. Its objective is laudable, but it will not accomplish that objective. On the other hand, it will throw a monkey wrench into the machinery of Congress by establishing a new joint committee with powers which parallel existing committees without in any way diminishing the authority of those existing committees. Therefore, we will have duplication, conflict, friction, and dissension. It will not streamline but confuse the structure of the Congress.

The reason I say that H. R. 7888, the Colmer bill, will not accomplish the announced objective is that it is impossible by legislation to compel the staffing of the Congress. There will remain the personal equation. The committee, its members, and particularly its chairman, must possess an awareness of the need for a sizable and competent staff and the will to acquire one.

The Colmer bill provides for a joint committee of nine Representatives and six Senators, the chairman to be elected from among the Representatives. How would that work out if the Colmer bill were law today?

Obviously the present Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON of Missouri, would be one of the nine Representatives. Seniority being what it is, I cannot conceive that Mr. CANNON would permit some other Representative to be elected chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget. It is a very safe guess that the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON would be the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget created by H. R. 7888.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of protestations to the contrary, the record is clear that Representative CANNON has resisted the creation of an adequate staff for the House Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees. I myself have called attention to this deficiency repeatedly as have other Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. Do you suppose that the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, as chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, will establish a competent staff for that joint committee when he has neglected and refused to do so for the House Appropriations Committee in spite of the persistent urgings of his colleagues?

No legislation is needed for Mr. CANNON to accumulate able investigators for the House Appropriations Committee right now, if he really wants to do so. I believe I can say without fear of contradiction that the House of Representatives would provide adequate funds for such a staff. All Mr. CANNON needs to do is to ask for money. It is a curious commentary on his assertions that he has enough investigators that it took the Colmer bill to force Mr. CANNON to ask for an additional $500,000 for staff for the Appropriations Committee. Whatever the fate of the rule and the bill, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is entitled to the thanks of the House of Representatives and the people of the United States for having forced Mr. CANNON to do what he ought to have done, in the public interest, on his own account long ago.

While I may not have convinced the press or the public, I believe my colleagues in their experience in the House of Representatives have ample proof that what I say is right, namely, that setting up a Joint Committee on the Budget under existing leadership will not guarantee the acquisition of a competent staff.

But the real flaw in this measure is the creation of a committee which overlaps the jurisdiction of existing committees.

Mr. Speaker, committee jurisdiction is always a touchy subject. Even the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which probably was an improvement over the situation existing before that, did not, and perhaps could not, clearly describe in words the areas of jurisdiction of the standing committees. Some of the most violent controversies in legislative history have arisen over the reference of bills and conflicts in jurisdiction between committees.

This new "superduper" Joint Committee on the Budget, which might almost be called "a little Congress" would overlap the jurisdiction of practically every standing committee of both Houses of the Congress. Specifically it would invade the fields of jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees, the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and the committees on Government Operations of both Houses.

It is true that the Joint Committee on the Budget could not report legislative or appropriation bills, but by section 138 (e) (2) and (3) the joint committee is given the duty to recommend to standing committees changes in existing laws to effect greater efficiency and economy in Government and to combat

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

deviations from basic legislative authorization or appropriations inconsistent with authorizations. The standing committees are still left with the power and duty to decide on legislation and appropriations, but the new joint committee would develop the factual background and instruct the standing committees what decisions they should make. This cannot help but develop resentment and perhaps retaliation by standing committees, jealous of their prerogatives.

Mr. Speaker, the point which escapes the philosophy of the Colmer bill is that the decisions should be controlled by the facts. The facts should be found by and immediately available to those who are to make the decisions. The Colmer bill will result in a splitting of the responsibility for deciding and the responsibility for fact finding which cannot be sound as a matter of basic principle. The place where the facts should be is in the mind of the man who has to make the decision, not in the mind of the man who has no responsibility for the decision. However impartial a human being may desire to be, the development of facts cannot be separated from the philosophy of the individual developing them nor from the principles by which he is guided. Fact and judgment must go hand in hand if wise decisions are to result. The Colmer bill would compel an artificial and unnatural separation of fact finding from decisions.

Because of this basic defect and the Pandora's box of dissension and the confusion and friction in the machinery and the processes of the Congress which would result from it, I could not support the Colmer bill even if the rule is granted. If the bill had been brought before the House earlier in the session when there was ample time to discuss it, even though I could not vote for the bill either in its present form or in any form that it might conceivably be amended and maintain its basic character, I would have been inclined to vote for the rule. However, we are pressing for adjournment. Appropriation conference reports must be acted upon before we adjourn, as must other important legislative matters. We have no time for discussing a measure simply for the purpose of airing views. For that reason I shall vote against the rule on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close without paying tribute again to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for having pressed this matter so successfully as to induce the chairman of the Appropriations Committee finally to take the step many of us have been urging him to take for many months, namely, to ask for funds for an enlarged staff. This is a step in the right direction, the credit for which must go to the gentleman from Mississippi. I commend him for it.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for his intelligent and energetic approach to the solution of the most urgent problem before the Congress—a more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies. I want to associate myself with him in the remarks that he has made on this bill. This bill, if enacted into law, would create a joint committee of the House and Senate on the budget. In my judgment, it will do vastly more than that. The joint committee is not and should not be the most important part of this measure. It is the staff which is authorized by this proposed legislation that is most important.

In the conduct of the financial affairs of an individual, a family, a business, or the Government of the United States there is required the answer to three important questions before any money can be properly spent. The first is: How much income will there be during this fiscal period? Second, What will this measure cost? Third, How much of the available funds remain after expenditure has been authorized?

Each time a bill authorizing the appropriation of money is before the House, I am startled at how difficult it is or rather impossible it is to get an answer to these three basic questions. For instance, on Tuesday, May 20, 1952, in the Committee of the Whole House considering H. R. 7860—page 5588, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] illustrated the inability of the Members of Congress to get accurate facts upon which to base an intelligent vote on any appropriation being considered in the House of Representatives. He said:

> It is no wonder the House is confused about these figures, it is no wonder the President is confused about them, it is no wonder the Defense Department is confused about them, and I hope my friend from Texas [Mr. MAHON], is not confused about them, because he is the one man around here who seems to know about them.
>
> • • • • •
>
> The gentleman said $52,000,000,000. Now, here are the actual figures as I get them from the Record. The President in his budget estimated $50,000,000,000 plus for expenditures during the next fiscal year. It was not 2 weeks before the Defense Department comes out with an entirely separate and independent estimate that they were going to spend $51,000,000,000. But of the $50,000,000,000, $1,500,000,000 had not been authorized. So that what they expect to expend under the provision of the bill was $48,500,000,000.

That is the position that the constitutionally authorized body of the Congress for originating money bills finds itself in each time an appropriation measure is before it.

Outside the door of the House Chamber there is a weather map of the United States which is kept up to date for the entire country. Most Members look at it each day to learn what the weather is in their districts and to keep advised of the weather prospects throughout the country. What this Congress needs is an organization to keep Congress posted on the financial climate of the Nation. Congress should have a staff just as efficient in keeping before us each day the amount of income which can be expected during the fiscal period, the amount appropriated to date and the balance left to meet the remaining appropriation bills.

In an effort to keep myself advised on the fiscal climate of our Government I had a chart made in the form of a thermometer. This showed at the bottom of the tube the amount of income which the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue had predicted would be the income of the Government. As each appropriation was made from it, the temperature indicator would show how this amount was pushing up the line of disbursements toward the red line which marked deficit spending. While this is a very elementary device, I felt it would be helpful to me personally and perhaps such an idea would be helpful to the Congress. If this chart could be kept accurate, we would all be reminded daily of the true financial and fiscal status of the Nation. We would have no excuse then for moving blindly into the danger zone of deficit spending. However, I found it impossible to get figures to keep this chart posted. I am sure that with such a staff which this bill provides for this information would be available. I enthusiastically support the principle in this bill because such a joint committee, properly staffed, will, in the language of the bill:

> (A) Inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States.
>
> (B) Will provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House and the Senate with information on items contained in the budget and justification thereof.
>
> (C) Will have the answer to messages from the executive department of Government and economic reports including the estimates of revenue.
>
> (D) Will make reports available to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate, and make such reports available to any standing committees of either House of Congress on matters within the jurisdiction of that committee.
>
> (E) Give to the Congress at the beginning of each session the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs during the fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year and subsequent fiscal years.

These are the important features of the bill. An analysis of the provisions show that it provides a staff which will be trained and organized for the purpose of finding the facts and charged with the duty of transmitting them to the Congress. It takes away no constitutional right or even rights acquired by squatter sovereignty.

Such a staff furnishing information to the Congress will make it unnecessary for our committees to depend upon the ex parte testimony from the divisions of the executive department and the Bureau of the Budget. The responsibility belongs to the Congress. There can be no proper decision made unless there is a complete justification by a congressional staff for the requests and allocations made in the budget and supported by representatives of the executive branch.

Most Members, I believe, dislike flat percentage cuts in the budget. It is an admission of lack of information on the subject to make vertical or horizontal cuts. This legislation can give us a staff that will furnish information to permit economy through the skillful use of the scalpel method to excise the unnecessary parts instead of the meat-ax method which is the style today.

This staff will give information that is the answer to those who feel that a one-package appropriations bill is best for the country. The one-package appropriation bill certainly is the easiest

way to save money blindly. But, how much better if Congress carries out its responsibility by knowing where to cut the budget and by cutting it there.

The Federal budget has grown so tremendously in the last two decades that it has reached the point where it totals 25 percent of our national income. It is too immense for any one Member or any small group to know and understand and legislate on it intelligently. The able Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees are greatly to be commended on the presentations that they make before the House. They, however, fall back for justification for most of the expenditures upon information which is given to them by the most interested parties, that is, those who are going to spend the money. It is no charge of cupidity or dishonesty but just a perfectly understandable trait of human nature that the people who are spending the money want as much as possible. It is the duty of Congress to be able to know from its own sources of information how much and exactly what budget items are justified. A post audit and a discovery of fraud, waste, extravagance, and inefficiency are no longer adequate.

The element of combat should be present in the consideration of every bill before Congress. The proponent in appropriation bills is the executive department of the Government. The expert witnesses are the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget. The House of Congress sit in a judicial attitude to hear the testimony and decide whether the request for appropriation is proper and if so how much money is necessary.

Under our present system it is an ex parte presentation. Except for a few sturdy, economy-minded Members, we are too prone to listen to the superficial presentation of those who want to spend the money, supported by their experts from the Bureau of the Budget and then because of, or to cover our lack of knowledge, make a percentage cut and pass the appropriation.

The staff provided for in this bill would give us a combat team to give the correct answer to the testimony of the Bureau of the Budget. The Congress having heard both sides of the case could then decide for itself, on an informed basis, whether or not the appropriation is proper—and if so, how much is required to do the job called for.

At the present time the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is doing a good job. Through it we are able much better to predict what the future income will be than we are to tell what the expenditures will be at any time in the fiscal period. We have been able to know what the taxes and other sources of revenue would produce for the next fiscal period but we have not been able to keep our expenditures within the income. This has been largely because of lack of information.

If we can match the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation with this joint committee on expenditures, we can and should do a better job, a more efficient job and a more economical job. We can have the answers to the three important questions which we face with each and every appropriation bill: First, What will the bill under consideration cost? second, what is the probable income of the Government for this year? third, how much of the probable income is available for this appropriation?

It is of utmost importance to the Congress that they have new and better instruments to work with to meet these new and expanded problems. In my judgment the provisions of the bills before us will do just that. I do hope that this House will grant this rule and pass this much-needed legislation.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDING DEFENSE HOUSING LAWS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2879 (b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7651) to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

WITHHOLDING SUMS FROM COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this would enable the Federal Government to collect withholding taxes from the officials of States. It applies particularly to the State of Vermont but the Government may enter into an agreement with other States if they wish to do the same thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has spoken to me about this.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That since the internal revenue laws of the United States impose upon States, Territories, possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions thereof the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to promote harmonious relations and reciprocity by consenting, under certain conditions, to the application to the United States of any statute of any State, Territory, possession, or any political subdivision thereof which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

SEC. 2. Where any statute or provision of law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State, Territory, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That since the internal revenue laws of the United States impose upon States, Territories, possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions thereof, the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to promote harmonious relations and reciprocity by consenting, under certain conditions, to

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

the application to the United States of any statute of any State, Territory, possession, or any political subdivision thereof which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

"SEC. 2. Where any statute or provision of law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State, Territory, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the present time Federal agencies lack any authority to cooperate with the States by withholding State income taxes from salaries of their employees. The basic purpose of H. R. 5157 is therefore to make it possible for Federal agencies to withhold State income taxes. As reported with amendments H. R. 5157 provides, under certain conditions, that where any statute or provision of law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax upon employers the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns thereof to the proper authorities, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, shall enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request of an agreement from the proper official of any such governmental unit, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of the law with respect to the employees, with certain exceptions, of such department or agency subject to such tax.

The authorization for withholding contained in the bill as reported is limited so as not to apply with respect to the taxes of any State or Territory which requires withholding only with respect to nonresidents.

Secondly, the bill, as reported, will apply only to those Federal employees whose regular place of Federal employment is within the particular State or Territory with which the agreement is entered into. Thus, to be withheld upon pursuant to the authorization contained in the bill, the Federal employee concerned must not only be employed within the taxing State or Territory but must not be there only temporarily while absent from his regular post of duty outside of that State or Territory. H. R. 5157, as reported, does not authorize withholding with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States. Your committee believes that to extend the authorization contained in the bill into this area would create serious administrative problems in view of the fact that service in the Armed Forces may frequently be of a temporary nature or may be transient in character.

The bill further provides that nothing in the act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability.

Every practicable step should be taken to cooperate in the area of withholding with the State and Territorial governments in view of their cooperation with the Federal Government in fiscal matters generally, and particularly in withholding the Federal income tax from their employees.

The purpose of this bill is similar with that of S. 1999 which has already passed the other body. H. R. 5157 is favored by the Treasury Department.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS TO INVESTIGATE AND STUDY THE SEAWARD BOUNDARIES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, and on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], I call up House Resolution 676 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the seaward boundaries of the States and the continental United States and the Territory of Alaska in order to determine the proper criteria for fixing the seaward limits of the inland or internal waters of the United States, and the seaward boundaries of the United States and Alaska.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SUBSECTION (D) OF SECTION 12 OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2922) to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. WALTER. This bill is identical with a bill reported unanimously by the Committee on Un-American Activities in order to bring the salaries paid to the members of the Subversive Activities Control Board in line with the salaries paid in similar agencies.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it a matter originating from the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, and it is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 831, 81st Cong.) is amended by striking the figure "12,500" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "15,000."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONROE M. REDDEN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a brief tribute to a beloved colleague who is leaving Congress.

MONROE REDDEN could have remained here until he had grown gray and wrinkled with age in the service of his great country, but he has elected to return to his home in the green hills of North Carolina and to live again the life of a private citizen and to carry on the practice of his profession.

He has been here for only a short time but long enough to know something about the great burdens of the office and certainly he has a right to share the glory of service in this, the Congress of the greatest nation on earth. No man can say that he squandered his time or wasted his talents. He has applied himself

faithfully and diligently to the performance of all the duties of his high position, and with courage and competency he has rendered a great public service.

By his devotion to duty, fidelity to truth, the friendliness of his spirit and the warmth and cordiality of his manner, he has endeared himself to his colleagues.

I have enjoyed his friendship, and I know that I shall long cherish our associations.

He has served in Congress in momentous days, and he has acquitted himself ably and well and with distinction.

He is going home, but not to rest. The public will make a pathway to his door and demands upon his time and talents, and he will continue to serve the people of his State and Nation. He is going home, back to the people he has known and loved since childhood, and back to the law which is a jealous master.

It is with profound regret that I bid him farewell and extend to him my cordial good wishes for his personal welfare and happiness and for all the good things of life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of loss that I learn of MONROE REDDEN'S decision to retire from Congress. I have had the pleasure of occupying an office next to Mr. REDDEN'S during our service here, and because of such close association I had come to have a genuine affection for him. I have observed his actions here in the House and I have been impressed with his diligent attention to duty, his unfailing courtesy, and the fact that, while he seldom speaks on this floor, when he does he is always a stanch advocate for the best causes of good government.

I should add, Mr. Speaker, that MONROE REDDEN has taught me a number of lessons, too numerous to set out here. But what I have admired the most in him is the administrative ability he has demonstrated in the performance of his duties here in the House.

He has operated the most efficient office in the smoothest manner, caring for the needs of his constituents with apparently small effort, but I have been amazed at the amount of work actually performed by him and his splendid staff.

So, Mr. Speaker, I must say these words of regret that MONROE REDDEN is leaving us. I know of the beauties of his section of North Carolina and of the attractions of his family, having observed them myself with great pleasure, and so I cannot say that I blame our friend Monroe for going home to stay. He carries with him my best wishes always, and I am certain the best wishes of all other of his colleagues who have learned to regard him so highly.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point in regard to our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that MONROE REDDEN is retiring from the Congress. He has been a good and an able Member.

He and I have been close friends during his service here. His personality is of a generous type. He is a man of high character and splendid ability. For the years allotted to him I wish for him and his the best life possible.

Mr. WOODROW W. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying a tribute to the outstanding service rendered by the gentleman from North Carolina [MONROE REDDEN] during the past 6 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. I have known MONROE personally for a long time—long before he came to Congress. He was an eminent and successful lawyer before entering public office. During his tenure of office here in the House of Representatives, he has exhibited outstanding ability, devotion to duty and qualities of leadership. He has combined a keen intellect with sound judgment and good common sense. These qualities tend to make a great Congressman.

Congressman REDDEN has deemed it wise to voluntarily retire from Congress to return to the practice of the law. I deeply regret to see him leave, but as he goes, he can have a strong feeling of satisfaction that he has served well his district, his State, and his Nation. As he goes, I wish for him continued prosperity, good health, and happiness.

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel very sad over the loss of MONROE REDDEN. He has been an able representative of our State and Nation, and we will all miss him. He has worked hard and intelligently, and his district can be proud of the fact that his influence has been very large in the Congress.

I congratulate his home folks upon his return to his own community, and I am sure the State of North Carolina will receive many useful years of wise counsel and advice from our colleague. I wish him Godspeed, good luck, and happiness upon his return to North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues from North Carolina and the Members of the House I join in expressing my best wishes to our beloved friend and colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] on his leaving the Congress at the end of this, his third term in the Congress.

Monroe and I came to Congress together. We were classmates at Wake Forest College. He is a devoted father, an outstanding Christian gentleman, and will be missed by all of us.

He, together with Mrs. Redden, carry with them the best wishes of Mrs. Deane and myself.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, we on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee who have been colleagues of MONROE REDDEN for the past 6 years will, indeed, miss him. It takes an association and working together on a committee to really know a man in Congress, and to appreciate his ability.

Monroe is an able attorney who illustrates his point by homespun philisophy. I have had particular opportunity to become well acquainted with him because I have visited his home community near Asheville, N. C., on three different occasions and have noted the high respect with which he is held in that area, and as a result of my contact with him I have seen that it is well justified. I might add that one could never find a more gracious host than MONROE REDDEN.

I have faith in his ability and integrity and hate to see him leave Congress.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in the session of the Eightieth Congress, a Representative of outstanding ability began his service as Congressman from the Twelfth District of North Carolina. He was MONROE MINOR REDDEN, outstanding and able lawyer from Hendersonville, N. C., having graduated from Wake Forest College in law and being one of the leading lawyers in western North Carolina at the time of his election to the Eightieth Congress.

Before being elected to Congress he had served his State in a number of important positions including chairman of the State Democratic executive committee for North Carolina from February 1942 to August 1944. Since his first election to Congress he had been re-elected to the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses with large majorities.

I feel especially close to Congressman REDDEN because of the fact that he and I entered the Congress at the same time and have been very close friends ever since. It has also been my privilege to know his most attractive family, consisting of his wife, Mary Redden, and his two sons, Monroe, Jr. and Robert M. Redden. I cannot express in a short statement of this sort just how much I will miss Monroe. He is a very able Representative, a legislator of fine, common sense and has the happy faculty of weighing both sides of questions before casting his vote. Many times we have conferred together and reached conclusions about difficult legislation which had been puzzling before our conferences. He possesses a very keen sense of humor and his many friends always enjoy his wisecracking and humorous attitude toward many questions which made him an attractive colleague and associate. He served in the Congress with fine ability on the Public Lands Committee to which affairs he gave diligent and most intelligent consideration and service. In the retirement of MONROE REDDEN from Congress to enter again into the active and successful practice of law, the State and Nation has lost a most capable, diligent, and intelligent Representative whose place is very hard to fill.

Mr. MCMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, my association with MONROE MINOR REDDEN has been a fine experience. I have found him to be a man of moral soundness, honesty and uprightness. Serving on the same Committee as I, Interior and Insular Affairs, I have noticed that he approaches his duties with wisdom, attentiveness and resourcefulness. He has promoted the welfare of his district, State and Nation with pride, alacrity and effectiveness.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Monroe and I have much in common. During the summer season of the year he represents many of my constitutents. Thousands of my friends from the First District of Florida own summer homes in the area in Hendersonville, N. C., the home of MONROE REDDEN. For many summers my own family has enjoyed the refreshing climate, the picturesque countryside, the delightful food, the friendly people, and the wonderful golf courses of the Twelfth District of North Carolina.

Even though we are both returning to the private practice of law in our respective districts, may our friendship be continued in his State during the summer, and in my State during the winter. It has been a pleasure to know Monroe and to serve with him as a Member of Congress.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, we are very fortunate in this life and especially here in this body in which we serve for the friends we make and the influences that play upon us because of those men. MONROE REDDEN comes from the section of our State which is known as the Great Smoky Mountains. These mountains instill into those people from that section a steadiness of character and independence. Wherever you find mountains, you usually find men of this type, and MONROE REDDEN has given this body that type of character. Moderate in his views, unbending in his principles, charitable in his judgment, he is well versed in the teachings of Washington, Jefferson and other great statesmen. In his retirement, I wish him happiness in the quietness I am sure he will find in that lovely mountain country from which he hails. I will miss him personally and will cherish my association and friendship with him the rest of my life.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my associates on this occasion and pay a most sincere and deserved tribute to our colleague, MONROE REDDEN, as he voluntarily departs from the Halls of Congress. It was my good fortune to be given membership on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—then Public Lands—when I came to Congress in 1948. Congressman REDDEN had been a member of such committee for some time and chairmaned one of the subcommittees with the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. In our relations on the committee, I have found him to be able, cooperative, and most fair. He is possessed of a keen insight into the problems of legislative work, which attribute—together with his inherent courtesy—has brought to him much more than the usual success of a legislator.

Soon after becoming a member of Congressman REDDEN's committee, it was my pleasure to serve on an investigating committee holding hearings in his home community, at which time I came to realize the esteem and admiration held for him by his constituents. It has always been my thinking that a public servant's success could be largely measured by the frank and sincere regard in which he is held by his neighbors. By such measuring stick I am sure that Congressman REDDEN has been one of the most successful members that Congress could possibly have. He will be sorely missed in the succeeding sessions of Congress. However, knowing him as I believe that I do, I am sure he will be willing to give of his time, counsel, and advice—not only to his successor from his own district but to those Members of Congress who call upon him for such purpose.

I have enjoyed immensely my associations with Monroe. I sincerely trust that I may be favored with a continuance of such pleasurable associations as often as humanly possible for a long time to come.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, shortly after I came to Congress it was my privilege to come to know MONROE REDDEN. I am happy to associate myself with those who honor him on this occasion.

The people of western North Carolina and of the United States will miss the services of such a fine and outstanding Representative as MONROE REDDEN. Aside from being an exceptionally able legislator, he is a splendid gentleman, friend, and neighbor. I have had occasions when members of my family were in difficulty. As soon as Monroe learned about it, he went out of his way to be more than a friend; and there will ever be in my heart a tender and warm spot for the splendid things he has done for my family.

With the ability that he has, I know he will be successful in private life. It is my hope and prayer that kind providence will sustain him in good health to enjoy the much deserved fruits of his labors.

MONROE REDDEN'S family and friends can be justly proud of the splendid contribution that he has made as a Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, news of MONROE REDDEN'S retirement comes as a great personal disappointment to me. He and I came to Congress together in 1947, and it has been my pleasure to be closely associated with him during our service here.

MONROE REDDEN is a man of outstanding ability. I have never known him to cast a political vote on any issue; rather, he has voted according to his earnest and conscientious desire to serve the best interests of his Nation and his constituency. MONROE REDDEN will be missed in Congress, and the Nation suffers a loss by his decision to leave this body.

As he returns to his home in North Carolina, I join his host of friends in wishing him the very best of happiness and good fortune.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of personal loss and the knowledge that an able and experienced legislator is leaving us that I contemplate the decision of my friend and colleague, MONROE REDDEN, to retire from the House of of Representatives.

It has been my privilege to observe his achievements over the past 6 years since he came to us at the outset of the Eightieth Congress. His service in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and his contributions in debate have firmly established his position here in Congress and among his constituents at home, whom he has so well served.

MONROE REDDEN is in the prime of his strength and ability.

He has given much to us during his three terms as a Member of the House of Representatives. It is my sincere hope that we have given him as much, so that he may continue to serve his country and his people in any capacity he may choose in the future.

We shall miss him. Our good wishes and our heartfelt respect are with him wherever he goes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. I, too, want to express my regrets that our friend, MONROE REDDEN, has decided to leave the House, but you can hardly blame him if you know where he lives. He lives among the most beautiful mountains on earth. When he gets there, he does not have to operate under the 5-minute rule, and debate in the corner grocery store is not limited to 2 hours. I wish for him a happy, prosperous, and long life.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join in this tribute to MONROE REDDEN. I feel that his leaving the House is a personal loss to me. I say that for the reason that we have been closely associated since I have been a Member of the Congress.

MONROE REDDEN has made a great contribution to public life. He has always been loyal to democratic principles. You might be interested to know that Monroe has taken a great interest in State affairs as well as in Federal affairs. He was chairman of the State Democratic committee during the administration of Governor Broughton, and he is at the present time chairman of the State Democratic executive committee of North Carolina. I know that when he leaves here he is going to continue to take an interest in public affairs.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the dean of our delegation, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that a young man of as fine character, as able, as conscientious, as diligent and faithful in the discharge of his duties, who has just established himself in the Congress in the confidence of his colleagues, and who is in a position now to render most useful and outstanding service, should be retiring from the Congress. I am sure that his voluntary retirement will be regretted by his constituents as well as his colleagues. Since I have been here I have not served with any man who has more faithfully, diligently, conscientiously, and courageously discharged his duties than my beloved colleague, MONROE REDDEN.

Mr. REDDEN'S retirement as a Member of Congress will be a distinct loss to the State of North Carolina and the Nation as well as his district. I have enjoyed his friendship very much and along with my colleagues I wish him many years of happiness in his chosen profession. I shall be surprised if the people of North

Carolina at some not far distant date do not call him again into some position of high public honor and responsibility. There is not any office in North Carolina which he cannot fill efficiently, capably, and satisfactorily.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE].

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I am very, very sorry that we are going to lose MONROE REDDEN. I think he has been here altogether too short a time for a person of his capabilities and his patriotism. As a Member of the western delegation, I can say that MONROE REDDEN has done a whale of a good job for the West. He is a reclamation enthusiast. He has been interested in all of the projects that have been introduced to develop the West.

MONROE REDDEN has given of himself so generously in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He has been an able chairman of the subcommittee on Insular Affairs and each Member has loved working with him. He has never hesitated to answer the call to go to any part of this country, or to go to any part of the world for the benefit of the committee and this Congress.

He has been exceedingly fair on the committee. He has been fair to both sides of the committee—both Republicans and Democrats. He has always had a kind and understanding ear for all of the intricate and important problems that have come to our committee. We need Monroe Reddens. We need them in every legislative body, and we are going to miss a person of his ability and his fairmindedness and patriotism. I want to say I have been exceedingly fond of the great State of North Carolina that was introduced to me by Monroe. Believe me I have advertised the State of North Carolina in my home State of Utah, and I think MONROE REDDEN has had something to do with that because I am one of his many colleagues who is very fond of him. I wish great happiness to MONROE REDDEN, his lovely wife and his children.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentlewoman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that a man with the talent and possibilities and capacity for service here in the Congress is retiring. Those of us who will remain will miss him greatly. His service and his interest, however, will be always available to the Nation, and will be used even though he is returning home as a private citizen in behalf of the State of North Carolina, and the people he loves.

It seems just yesterday when Mr. REDDEN was sworn in as a Member of this House. Yet in such a short time his ability has been recognized. His influence on legislation has been shown and his attention to duty has been appreciated here and in the Twelfth Congressional District of North Carolina. Personally I have benefited from association with MONROE REDDEN and I shall remember this fine character as long as I live. I predict his retirement from public service is only temporary. There are those, and I number myself among them, who are most anxious that he offer for Governor of North Carolina 4 years hence. He leaves this Congress with the best wishes of our entire delegation from North Carolina, as well as the entire membership of the House. I wish him good health and happiness, for I am confident he will have success. I will miss his wise counsel and good company.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my comments to the tribute being paid to MONROE REDDEN. I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Territories. He has been most fair to all of us.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I join in expressing great regret on the retirement of MONROE REDDEN. I have served with him on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs over the years and have enjoyed his helpful work on that committee. I have visited with him in his home, and visited with his family, and enjoyed his hospitality down there. I certainly appreciate his fine service rendered in the Congress. We will regret his retirement. I hope he will enjoy every prosperity in his new work in his home territory.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have been on the Committee on Public Lands, which is now known as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, ever since I have been in the Congress. I have been associated with MONROE REDDEN on that committee most of that time. I can vouch for everything that the gentlewoman from Utah has said, as well as with our other colleagues on the committee concerning Congressman REDDEN'S usefulness. Monroe has been very, very faithful and competent in helping us in all of our committee work. Nothing has been too difficult for him to undertake. I want fully to confirm what they have said of him.

I have never had any disagreement with MONROE REDDEN except in one respect: He and I have differed a little about the relative scenic beauty of the eastern mountains, especially the Great Smoky Mountains, as compared with the Rockies. We exchanged views and continue to disagree. He could never convince me much until he asked me down to North Carolina. Now I understand why he wants to retire to the beautiful mountains of North Carolina.

I wish him well in his retirement, and we know that he will lead an active life and continue to be active in public service as he has been with us.

Earlier this week Congressman REDDEN'S committee formally adopted the following resolution:

Whereas one of the leading members of our committee, Congressman MONROE M. REDDEN, of North Carolina, has announced his voluntary retirement from Congress at the close of the present session; and

Whereas Congressman REDDEN has served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Possessions and has greatly furthered the work of the committee by his efforts: And now therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the committee that we regret his leaving our committee and Congress and we extend our good wishes to him in his future endeavors and hope for him a long and useful career in his new activities.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I am in accord with the encomiums that have been paid our distinguished friend from North Carolina. I regret to see a man of his type, particularly this stalwart defender of the Constitution and of the free enterprise system, depart from this Congress. We are losing too many men of his caliber.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I met MONROE REDDEN and I formed a great attachment for him during the years that we have been associated together, both in the House and socially. It has been my privilege to visit his home twice and to spend pleasant hours with him and his family.

While I was in his home town I was tremendously impressed by the great esteem in which MONROE REDDEN is held in his district. He is without doubt the outstanding lawyer in his district. He left a very lucrative practice to come to Congress and has served here since with great dignity. I regret very much that Monroe has not seen fit to remain with us. We all know he could have come back term after term. He has made a fine mark in the House of Representatives. He has offended no one. He has endeared himself to every single Member of the House. He is truly a gentleman in every respect and his absence will be felt here as he departs.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I asked to be recognized in order that I might bear witness to the very fine qualities of this very fine man. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] is one of the ablest Members with whom I have served in my long term in this House. He is disciplined in spirit; he is disciplined in thought; he is disciplined in conduct. He is a very substantial, strong, patriotic American citizen. I regret very much to see him leave this body to which he has contributed so much in a solution of the questions that have arisen. He is a very sound and a very patriotic man.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

HON. THOMAS B. FUGATE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to say to the House that my distinguished colleague from the Ninth Virginia District, Mr. TOM B. FUGATE, is voluntarily retiring at the close of the present term.

I realize the hour is late and the Members are impatient. I shall not trespass upon the time of the House to express my very high regard for Mr. FUGATE. I have become very devoted to him as one of his colleagues in the time he has been here. He has endeared himself to the membership of the House, particularly to the members of the Virginia delegation. We are going to miss him very sorely. We will miss his cheerful disposition and his wise counsel.

Mr. Speaker, the Virginia delegation has concluded that in usual procedure we have written and passed in the delegation a resolution expressing our sentiments with respect to our colleague, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Honorable THOMAS B. FUGATE is not a candidate for reelection and will voluntarily retire from the House of Representatives of the United States at the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress; and

Whereas he has served his district, State, and Nation with great ability, fidelity, and zeal during the tenure of his office as a Member of the Congress; and

Whereas as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and subsequently the Banking and Currency Committee he has made an outstanding contribution to the framing of important legislation affecting the welfare of the Nation and has rendered particularly notable service as a member of the Panama Canal Subcommittee of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee in revising, and codifying the laws relating to the Canal and reorganizing the administrative procedures, which have greatly improved the efficiency of operations and strengthened the defenses of the Canal; and

Whereas during his stay in the Congress the said THOMAS B. FUGATE has earned the admiration and respect of all of his fellow Members and has greatly endeared himself to his colleagues from Virginia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Virginia delegation in the House of Representatives hereby express their profound regret over his departure and deplore the fact that in their future deliberations they will lose the benefit of the keen judgment, sound advice and helpful cooperation of the said THOMAS B. FUGATE and that in their personal relations they will miss his kindly manner, genial personality, and genuine spirit of friendliness; and that they hereby extend to him their very best wishes for a long, useful, and happy life in his retirement.

HOWARD W. SMITH, J. VAUGHAN GARY, THOMAS B. STANLEY, BURR P. HARRISON, CLARENCE G. BURTON, PORTER HARDY, JR., W. M. ABBITT, EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks, and I further ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we will all miss TOM FUGATE. He is a gentleman of the very best and highest type. His ability is of a high order. His personality is most pleasing and has made him a host of friends here that will be enduring.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this privilege to pay tribute to the fine public service rendered by our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS B. FUGATE, of Virginia, during his service in the House of Representatives.

TOM FUGATE and I came to Congress at the same time in January 1949. We became acquainted early. I admired him very much, and we became fast friends. I shall miss him very much.

TOM FUGATE has a fine mind. He is an independent thinker. He has the courage of his convictions. All these qualities made him an outstanding legislator and early earned for him the respect of all Members of the House. His background, his experience, his consideration for the views and problems of others gave him strength in the public service, and I regret that he has determined not to offer himself for reelection. Reports from his district indicate that he could have been returned here for service in many future Congresses. It is said that he could have been reelected this year without opposition. These are fine tributes to his service here.

As he leaves the House the gentleman from Virginia carries with him the good wishes and the admiration of all here who were privileged to know him well. He carries the respect, the confidence, and the trust of his people. I know he considers these as the great rewards of his service here.

It is my wish that he may enjoy a long and happy life, surrounded by his family and friends, and without the many pressures growing out of the pressing problems facing our Nation today.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives, and certainly Virginia and its delegation especially, will miss the wonderful services rendered by TOM FUGATE upon his voluntary retirement from Congress.

There are many others besides myself who will miss the affable manner and pleasant personality which he brings to every gathering into which he enters. He has a unique way of adding a spark to any group and of making the work of others pleasanter with easier and quicker results.

During his two terms in Congress, TOM FUGATE served in an exemplary way and immediately established himself as a distinguished personality and able statesman. He is a very hard and effective worker, and takes the welfare of his constituents and his committee work very seriously.

Last fall I had the privilege and pleasure of becoming well acquainted with TOM FUGATE'S many attributes when members of the House Banking and Currency Committee made an inspection of World Bank activities in Europe. He amazed me and our colleagues with his profound knowledge of world history—recent, medieval, and ancient. He is also an outstanding theologian, as was exhibited by his knowledge of Biblical places we visited in Jerusalem.

TOM FUGATE'S shining countenance will be missed by everybody in Washington who had the pleasure of knowing him. We have every right to envy Virginia's gain when he returns to his farm and enjoys the beauty of the peace and quiet of its renowned countryside.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to hear yesterday, that Hon. TOM FUGATE, of Virginia, is going to retire at the end of the Eighty-second Congress.

During the time that we have served together, I have become more and more impressed with his ability.

We not only will miss his good advice and his devotion to the work that his constituents sent him here to do, but his district will lose an excellent representative.

We consider each other as friends and I want to wish him well in his retirement. This country can ill afford to lose the services of men like TOM FUGATE.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is a lesson of life that when peoples are brought together in any endeavors, that some are just naturally attracted to each other. Today, in paying my most sincere respects to TOM FUGATE, who voluntarily departs from Congress with the close of this session. I am glad to acknowledge a personal friendship which now for almost 4 years has been one of the most appreciated experiences of my membership in Congress.

With the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, Tom and Mrs. Fugate and Mrs. Aspinall and I found ourselves living in the same hotel. The close proximity of our living quarters made it possible for us to become good friends from the very beginning of our acquaintance. This personal and family friendship has continued to grow dearer with the passing of each week. During all of our times together, whether at the table, seated together in the House Chamber, playing cards, or what have you, I have come to know the many values of Tom's friendship. In his work in Congress this colleague of ours has been most able and sincere in the discharge of his responsibilities to his district, State, and Nation. Although I have not been privileged to sit on the same committee with him, nevertheless I can testify to the high admiration and esteem in which he is held by his committee colleagues. In his varied services to his own district he has

represented the people in a most effective and able manner. In my opinion, his voting record in behalf of his own constituency, as well as in the best interests of the rest of the Nation, has been most outstanding and speaks more effectively than any words of mine.

Although our colleague retires voluntarily from Congress, I know that he does so with a high regard for the legislative procedures which govern and protect our way of life. He will be of great value in advising and helping his successor, whoever he may be.

I sincerely hope that the personal friendship which exists between TOM and me may be allowed to continue to grow, as I know of no one for whom I hold greater admiration and personal affection than I do for this southern gentleman whom I am privileged to call friend.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to revise and extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of Mr. SMITH of Virginia on Thursday, July 3, I have the honor to express the following sentiments with respect to our colleague, Mr. FUGATE.

It was with profound regret that I learned early this year that he had decided to retire from the Congress at the end of his present term. He has represented the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia throughout the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses and his decision to retire was a source of keen disappointment to his constituents.

Mr. FUGATE is a gentleman of sterling habits and character. Through his honesty, integrity and geniality, he won the friendship of the membership of this House. He is a deep and sound thinker of independent mind, always weighing the evidence presented from every angle on all issues before him. He represents a large and very fine constituency of widely diversified interests, yet, with fairness, sound judgment and careful thought and deliberation, he has represented his district, his State and Nation with credit and distinction.

As one of Mr. FUGATE'S colleagues from Virginia, I shall greatly miss him and the wise counsel he has always afforded me in discussing legislation of mutual interest. I extend to him and his lovely wife every good wish for health and happiness.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that there is any occasion for me to rise at this time to express my regret that TOM FUGATE of the Ninth Virginia District is not seeking reelection to the Eighty-third Congress. I feel certain that those of his colleagues who have known him share with me this regret at his departure.

Those of us of the Virginia delegation have had the privilege and the pleasure of close association with TOM FUGATE since he entered the Eighty-first Congress. It has been a thoroughly enjoyable association, and has developed into a warm friendship built on both respect and admiration.

The resolution signed by me and the seven other members of the Virginia delegation indicates clearly the high esteem in which TOM FUGATE'S colleagues hold him. Tom's accomplishments in serving his District, his State and the Nation are many, but I shall not review his stewardship in the House since he was elected to the Eighty-first Congress. With that you are familiar. However, I cannot help saying how sorry I am that Tom has decided to return to private life. We wish him godspeed in any future endeavor which he may undertake. We shall miss him and we hope he will miss us and find an occasional opportunity to return to these Halls if only for a visit with his friends.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, it is with very genuine regret that I contemplate the retirement of our esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS B. FUGATE. It is a great pity that a man of his ability, broad understanding, and accomplishments feels constrained to relinquish the duties of his office, after such a relatively short service. During the 4 years that Mr. FUGATE has been a member of the Congress he has established an enviable record. In his quiet, unassuming manner, he has worked diligently and has contributed to the enactment of much important legislation in a critical period of the Nation's history. His work on the legislation pertaining to the Panama Canal was notable, and this highly strategic installation is being more efficiently operated and is better protected today because of his efforts. The Nation can ill afford to lose a man of his stature at this time.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I personally mourn the loss of his companionship. He is a friendly soul, and he has made many friends in the Halls of Congress. He will be sorely missed by the Members of the Virginia delegation, who regard him with admiration and affection.

I join with his many friends at this hour in expressing sorrow over his departure, and extending best wishes for a well-deserved rest and a happy future to him and his good wife, who has stood so closely by his side and been a source of inspiration to him during his labors.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed over the fact that TOM FUGATE has decided to retire from the House of Representatives at the end of his term this year. I have known TOM FUGATE for many, many years, having served in the 1945 Virginia Constitutional Convention with him.

Tom has been diligent to the extreme in looking after the interests of his district, the welfare of the State and Nation and has rendered outstanding service during his entire tenure in the Congress. He has endeared himself to the entire membership of this House. He is respected and beloved by all. We will miss his wise counsel, his good nature, and able leadership when we assemble here in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, I fully realize and readily understand why TOM FUGATE would want to return home to the great southwestern part of Virginia, and I wish for him and his family much happiness, peace, and quiet. By no means is he retiring from public service. He will continue to render valuable service to his community, his section, and the great Commonwealth of Virginia.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that every member of the Banking and Currency Committee has heard with regret of the voluntary retirement of our friend and fellow Member, TOM FUGATE, of the Ninth District of Virginia. He has only been a Member of Congress for a few years, but I am sure he has made a profound impression upon all who have come in contact with him that he is a man of true worth. He is modest and unassuming, yet he has a serene intellect whose processes are free from emotionalism and a sound judgment that can be relied upon.

TOM FUGATE is a genial, clever, and friendly man who makes friends easily and holds them. He has had wide experience as a banker, and he brought to our committee the fine knowledge he gained in that capacity. I have no doubt that he could have remained in Congress for many years had he so desired for I am sure the people he represented know his many fine qualities. He was a faithful public servant who gave to his people all he had. We will miss him not only as an able legislator upon whom we could rely but as a friend and companion whose association gave us constant pleasure. In his retirement we wish him many years of health and happiness.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, when THOMAS B. FUGATE decided not to offer for reelection, the House of Representatives lost one of its most valuable Members. He has served the Ninth District of Virginia well and his advice and counsel will be sorely missed by his colleagues in the House of Representatives.

His long experience as a banker and his keen knowledge of economic values especially equipped him for service on the Banking and Currency Committee and his associates on the committee gave great weight to his knowledge and sound judgment.

His friendly nature, ready wit, and thoughtfulness for others made for him a host of friends who will miss him sadly. I extend him my warmest wishes for continued health and happiness in the years that lie ahead and know he will continue to be a great force for progress and Christian leadership in Virginia, as he has been in the past.

I personally will greatly miss him as no one stands higher in my esteem for ability, courage, and consecration to the service of our country.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, of my many esteemed colleagues who are retiring from Congress this year, probably my good friends TOM B. FUGATE and CHESTER MCMULLEN have been more closely associated with me than any of the others. Therefore, it is with extreme personal pleasure that I speak these few words of praise in behalf of my very, very good friend, TOM FUGATE. Tom's personal success as a farmer and prosperous businessman is known to all. Likewise his able performance on that important Committee of Banking and Currency is a matter of record, but I would like to mention what a fine fellow he is personally. During the past 3 or 4 years WAYNE ASPINALL, FRED MARSHALL, TOM FUGATE, and I have set aside a couple of evenings a month for dinner and a sociable game

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of cards. We have learned to know and respect each other, and I think I can state we have all developed a lasting friendship. Because of the great affection we have for Tom we sincerely regret his decision to retire from Congress. The great State of Virginia and the United States are the losers. However, we all extend him our best wishes for health and continued prosperity.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure, but also with real regret, that I joined my colleagues in the Virginia delegation in subscribing to the testimonial resolution honoring TOM FUGATE.

I could associate myself heartily with the expressions of respect and regard in this resolution. There was a tinge of sadness in doing so, however, because the resolution recognized that our friend was electing to end his service in this House.

It goes without saying that we shall miss TOM FUGATE. As a fine example of earnest, conscientious servant of the people he has worked diligently in our often-disordered vineyard. Ever ready to seek the counsel of his colleagues, and to offer them his, our Virginia friend and associate has striven throughout his congressional service to study carefully all facets of an issue. His legislative course, once determined, has been pursued resolutely and courageously.

The citizens of the Ninth Virginia District have enjoyed alert representation. As he returns now, to his beloved home section, TOM FUGATE carries with him the sincerest wishes for his health, happiness, and prosperity from his colleagues in this House, who have been proud and glad to call him friend.

WE MUST HELP THE AGED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachussetts [Mr. FURCOLO] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to again talk to the Members about the pressing and immediate need for consideration for our aged. I have discussed this subject on many occasions with many Members. I speak now so that between now and the time the Congress meets again, the Ways and Means Committee may consider and present an over-all plan that will really help the aged of this Nation.

The legislative situation, as far as the aged of the Nation are concerned, is not at all satisfactory. We all seem to talk a great deal about trying to help the aged, but nothing too concrete seems to have been accomplished. It is true that the social-security law has recently been amended to give a little more help to them. It is true that that was at least a step in the right direction, even though it was just a small step. It is for that reason, and that reason only, that we had to vote in favor of recent amendments to the social-security law.

MUST BEGIN IN WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

However, the amendments we recently passed are simply a token. They are not a real reform, and they are not an appreciable advance in the status of our aged. It is regrettable that this Congress does not make plans immediately to bring forth a workable and suitable plan that will resolve all of the difficulties and give our aged fair and considerate treatment. Of course, I realize that such a plan must originate in and get favorable attention from the Ways and Means Committee if it is to get any place at all. I know that most members of that committee are sympathetic toward the aged and I am hopeful they will take immediate action.

OUR POLICY IS INCONSISTENT

Our entire attitude toward the aged is inconsistent. Our policy in trying to help the aged is a conflicting one. On the one hand, Congress says it wants our old people to help themselves as much as possible. Congress then in effect contradicts itself by setting a limit on the amount of money an old person can earn and, if he exceeds that amount, he then loses any benefits that have been voted to him by the Congress. At one time the ceiling was $50 per month. Many old people had part-time jobs or other work that would bring in a little more money than that, and they then had to choose between earning the additional money or giving up the benefits they had. We tell them to try to help themselves, and when they do try to help themselves, we then penalize them by taking away their pensions.

Now the ceiling on earnings has been raised somewhat but it is still ridiculously low in view of today's high prices. It is time that Congress realistically appraise the situation and, if we want our aged to help themselves, let us not penalize them when they do so.

A DEBT, NOT CHARITY

I also want to talk about another impression that many people have because I believe the impression is false and erroneous. Many people seem to think that assistance to the aged is a matter of charity. Nothing could be further from the truth in my opinion. I believe our old people should be given assistance as a matter of right and not as a matter of charity. It is a right that they have earned and they are entitled to the assistance. It should be given in such a way that they can receive it with dignity and hold their heads high in the knowledge that it is not a dole, it is not charity, and it is not something that is being given to them for nothing. The assistance they are given is something they have earned by their toil and contribution over the years. It is something to which they are entitled. It is their just due and, far from being a charity, it is rather an obligation overdue them by the Nation.

AGED HELPED TODAY'S WORKERS

Our working people today have far better wages and conditions than our aged had when they were working, but today's wage earners must not forget that those who are no longer able to earn a living paved the way for them. If it had not been for the earlier advancements of those we today call the aged, the workers of today would not have as high wages and as good working conditions. Today's workers often have adequate pensions or retirement allowances to look forward to. They also have certain sickness and welfare benefits. Such advantages were beyond the reach of the average person during the working life of those we today call the aged. Consequently, they do not have the benefit of those advantages. The working people of today would not have those benefits either if it had not been for the necessary preliminary steps in that direction that were taken by our aged when they were working and fighting to improve the lot of the wage earner. It is not their fault that they themselves are without such protection.

AGED BUILT THE NATION

We must not forget the contributions that have been made to this Nation by the aged. Their toil and their productive effort have contributed greatly to the wealth and progress this Nation has made in the past century. Would America have made the progress it has made in the past 50 years if those we now call the aged had not been working here, tilling the soil, putting in long hours in shops and factories, conducting the affairs of business, and performing all the other tasks without which a Nation cannot live?

WE MUST MEET OUR DUTY

We forget the parents who toiled long hours in order to provide food, clothing and shelter for their children. Many of those children fought in world wars to have this Nation survive. So did many of the parents. Those we now call the aged made great sacrifices in every way in order to raise families and in order to help this Nation. There would be no Nation today, in fact, if it had not been for the lasting contribution of those who are now the aged of this Nation. In the face of that truth, can anyone say that assistance to the aged is simply charity?

The fact of the matter is that this Nation has never given the aged the help to which they are entitled. Our treatment of the aged has not only been inconsistent and miserly but, in many instances, it has been downright shameful.

The Nation must face up to that and face up to its duty to properly take care of the aged. I urge the Ways and Means Committee, and the Congress, to abandon its piecemeal attack on the problem. Continual change by amendments that make slight changes is not the answer. That may solve tiny phases of the problem or may make minute improvements but it does not get to the root of the matter. The entire problem must be met once and for all.

Once we face that realization and decide we want to adopt a final solution, that can be done quickly and easily. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will prepare such a bill. It should be done between now and the time Congress next meets. Then Congress will vote on it once and for all. The Nation and the aged will know once and for all whether

anything is or is not to be done. It will put an end to the piecemeal approach we have made. If that be done, it may solve the problem of the aged.

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE OF POLISH OFFICERS

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Katyn Forest Committee investigating the massacre of thousands of Polish officers, I wish to report to the Congress and to all the people of the Nation. I hope all will read this report, which tells the story of Katyn.

Katyn is the name of a forest in Russia near the ancient city of Smolensk. Katyn Forest has existed for centuries, but its significance in world history begins in September of 1939.

POLAND IS ATTACKED

On September 1, in that year, Hitler had attacked Poland and the mechanized might of the Nazis swept into Poland across the western borders. Great as were the odds against them, the Polish troops fought magnificently. They were the first to resist Nazi aggression.

After 17 days of heroic resistance, an ominous rumble came from the east and troops of Soviet Russia swept across the undefended eastern border of Poland. They came, they said, to aid Poland and to defend the Polish Nation against the Nazi onslaught. They asked the leaders of Poland's gallant army to cooperate with Russia against the common enemy. They promised to respect the territorial integrity of Poland and they made many other promises, none of which were kept.

There was a brief period of great confusion during which the defenders of Poland were uncertain whether to attack the Russian troops as enemies or to welcome them as allies against the Nazi invaders. The result was that thousands of Poles were taken and held in custody by the Russians. By the latter part of September 1939, an estimated 100,000 to 200,000 men of the Polish Army were held by the Russians. That number included at least 12 generals, 250 colonels, 500 majors, 2,000 captains, 5,000 lieutenants, and 7,000 selected technicians. After their capture, both the Russian military and the security police, the NKVD, interrogated the Polish prisoners time after time. Detailed files were kept on the Polish officers.

"WHERE ARE OUR OFFICERS?"

Gradually the Russians began to separate the Polish enlisted men from the officers. Finally, approximately 15,000 officers were quartered in three prison camps in Russia—the camps of Starobielsk, Ostashkov, and Kozielsk. About 4,500 of the higher ranking officers were sent to Kozielsk, near the city of Smolensk. There they were allowed to write home to their families and, by correspondence, they kept in touch with their loved ones. That was the situation from fall of 1939 until spring of 1940—then silence, and nothing more. It was as though the earth had suddenly opened and swallowed up thousands of Polish prisoners.

During all this time world events were happening in rapid sequence. In September of 1939 the Nazis and the Russians had joined forces. That alliance continued until June of 1941. That month the Nazis attacked Russia. Immediately after that Russia joined the Allied Powers and, in that capacity, became the ally of Poland, too. On August 12, 1941, there was a formal reconciliation between Russia and Poland, with a clause stipulating that Russia would release all Polish citizens. Poland agreed to form a Polish Army to help in the fight against the Nazis. Russia accordingly issued a decree releasing all Polish prisoners and the gates of prisons and camps were opened. Polish soldiers began reporting to places where the Polish Army was forming under General Wladislaw Anders. They came by the thousands but very few officers reported. Of course, it was a puzzling circumstance and the Polish leaders renewed their inquiries of Soviet authorities.

"About 15,000 of our Polish officers are missing," they said, "officers who were taken in custody by Soviet Russia in September of 1939. Since early 1940 no one has seen or heard from them, or of them, directly or indirectly. Where are our missing officers?" was the question Polish officials asked of Russian officials. The inquiries went as high as Stalin himself, and the question was asked time after time, month after month, year after year. The answer? There was no one answer—in fact, often there was not even any reply at all. But when there were replies they ranged from evasions to outright denials.

"They have all been returned home," the Russians said. But the Polish families knew better. "They have gone to join the Polish Army," the Russians said. The Polish Army knew that was not true. "They escaped into Manchuria. We do not have records. We have released all prisoners," were other answers. But—and this is significant in the light of later developments—never once did the Russians so much as hint that the Polish officers might have been sent to the Smolensk area.

END OF THE SEARCH

The search for the missing Polish officers continued until April of 1943. In the meantime, the war raged on all fronts. In June of 1941 the Nazis surged into Russia. In August of 1941 they took control over Russian territory in the Smolensk area, including Katyn Forest, that secluded woods near Smolensk. On April 13, 1943, the world first learned of the fate of the missing Polish officers when the following bulletin was issued by the Berlin radio:

> From Smolensk comes news that the native population has revealed to German authorities the spot where in secret mass executions the Bolsheviks murdered 10,000 Polish officers. * * * German authorities made a horrible discovery. * * * They found a pit 28 meters long and 16 meters wide in which, 12 deep, lay the bodies of 3,000 Polish officers. In full uniform, in some cases shackled, all had wounds from pistol bullets in the back of the neck. * * * Search and discovery of other pits continue.

Polish authorities had been notified of the discovery a few days before the radio announcement. They had immediately begun an extremely careful investigation because they believed it a propaganda move by Germany to drive a wedge between Russia and Poland, who were now allied against Germany.

THE GERMAN INVESTIGATION

After the Berlin radio bulletin, events moved rapidly. Russia said the prisoners had been in camps in that area, that they fell into German hands and, if murdered, the Germans had done it. The Polish asked the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva, Switzerland, to investigate. The International Red Cross was a neutral organ. Germany also made the same request but Russia did not. As a result of Russia's refusal, the International Red Cross Committee did not conduct an investigation. Russia not only refused to ask for an investigation—and there could be none without Russia joining in the request for it—but Russia also broke off diplomatic relations with Poland.

The next step was taken by Germany. An international commission was appointed composed of medical authorities from many nations. There were doctors and university professors from Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Croatia, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Rumania, Switzerland, Slovakia, Hungary, and Moravia. This so-called German investigation was made from April 28 through the 30th, in 1943. The conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Russians approximately 3 years before. While some of those nations might have been under German domination in 1943, of course none is today. The committee heard testimony from several members of the international commission reaffirming their findings of Russian guilt.

THE RUSSIAN INVESTIGATION

The war continued and in August of 1943 Russia recaptured Smolensk and the Katyn Forest area. In January of 1944 the so-called Russian investigation was conducted by Russian doctors. The Russian conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Germans in the summer of 1941.

From the date of the discovery of the Katyn Forest massacre until 1952 there has never been an impartial investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre by any official body of any nation. In September 1951, the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States passed House Resolution 390, the so-called Madden resolution—after Representative RAY MADDEN, of Indiana, its author—to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in a mass grave in the Katyn Forest.

WHY A KATYN FOREST COMMITTEE?

The Katyn Forest Massacre Committee was formed for several reasons. Without listing them all, a few are:

First. The nation guilty of committing the murders must be identified after an investigation that will be considered to be unbiased, impartial, and

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

fair. It is imperative that the verdict be recorded for history. Certainly posterity is not going to accept the investigation report of either Germany or Russia when those two nations each stand accused of the crime.

Second. America is the world's major neutral country. We have told all the nations of the world that we will seek truth and justice for any people who have been victims of totalitarian atrocities. Do not we in America—the leader of the free world—owe a duty to investigate the Katyn massacre?

Third. Eventually, of course, the United Nations should take action. America should assume leadership in making such a recommendation to the United Nations. An investigation by the committee of the Congress of the United States should result in a carefully documented presentation of facts to the President of the United States on which he would be completely justified in asking the United Nations for action. America of course must first have taken the time and trouble to study the case, prepare the evidence, and present a factual indictment. That is the purpose, the function, and the responsibility of the congressional committee.

Fourth. There have been stories for years that one or more departments or agencies of the United States Government have covered up some phases of the Katyn massacre. Reports filed by United States investigators have been missing or misplaced or concealed. It is the duty of Congress to investigate that phase of the case.

Fifth. American boys and the boys of other nations are being captured in Korea. They will be prisoners of some nation just as the Polish officers had been prisoners. If any nation is disposed to ill-treat prisoners, knowledge that the United States will take action—and the Katyn investigation is the proof—may cause such nation to think twice. The Katyn investigation may save prisoners in the Korean war or in other wars.

A FULL INVESTIGATION

The Katyn Forest Massacre Committee has held hearings in the United States, England, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland. The committee also offered to sit in countries behind the iron curtain but such countries refused to grant the necessary permission. Every possible effort has been made to hear all sides of the case. The committee conducted an exhaustive investigation and left no stone unturned in seeking to locate witnesses and evidence. Invitations to submit evidence were extended to the Soviet Government, the Polish Government in Warsaw, the Polish Government-in-exile in London, and the German Republic at Bonn. Both the Soviet Government and the Polish Communist Government rejected the committee's invitation and, in addition, attacked the committee in the Communist press.

The committee has examined every bit of evidence that it has been able to find bearing on the guilt or innocence of Germany and Russia, the two nations that have accused each other of committing the crime. The hearings contain testimony in great detail by 84 witnesses. Those witnesses included Polish officers who had been in the prison camps; Polish diplomats and civilians who conducted the search for the missing Polish officers; Americans who had been present at the separate Russian and German investigations; German civilians and officers; Russian Army officers; and many other witnesses. Over 190 exhibits were introduced in evidence. The committee also viewed the official motion pictures of both Russia and Germany, showing the investigations made by those two nations. The official reports of both Germany and Russia were also introduced in evidence.

As concerns the Polish prisoners in Kozielsk, the evidence is clear that in early 1940 the Russians began to evacuate the prison camp. Some 300 or so were sent to another prison camp, Pavlischev Bor, near Smolensk. Some of those men testified before the committee. The remaining Polish prisoners, approximately 4,200 in number, were removed from Kozielsk in small groups during the months of March and April. They were taken from the camp in railway prison cars, then transferred into motor vans, and finally removed in Katyn Forest. Every one taken to Katyn was executed by one shot fired into the base of the skull. The bodies of about 4,200 Polish officers were found in seven mass graves in Katyn Forest. The ground had been levelled and pine trees planted to conceal the graves.

Germany accused Russia of having committed the Katyn massacre in March and April of 1940. Russia claimed the Nazis had murdered those men in August of 1941 when Germany was in control of the Smolensk area. What does the evidence show?

SOVIET RUSSIA GUILTY

On all the evidence the conclusion is inescapable that the Katyn Forest murders were committed by the Soviet Communists in 1940. The Russian guilt is established by the direct testimony of witnesses, by the physical condition of the bodies themselves, by clothing and articles found on the bodies, and by many bits of circumstantial evidence. It is also indicated by the very actions of the two nations involved, Germany and Russia. The testimony may be found in extensive detail in the hearings but it is herein summarized briefly.

The direct testimony of witnesses established beyond the shadow of a doubt that the Soviets evacuated Kozielsk in March and April of 1940. The Polish prisoners who were removed were never again heard from until their bodies were discovered in Katyn. Clues that were left in the prison railway cars in which Polish prisoners were taken from Kozielsk established that they were removed from those cars near Katyn Forest. Those clues were left by prearrangement between the Polish prisoners. Former prisoners at Kozielsk testified to these facts.

The physical evidence of the bodies themselves is of great weight in determining whether the Polish officers were killed in the hot summer weather, as Russia claimed, or in the cold weather of winter or early spring, as Germany claimed. The evidence indicates the executions had taken place in cold weather. There was a complete absence of insects and maggots in the bodies, explainable only on the premise that the executions had taken place in cold weather and the graves had been covered before the weather became warm enough to permit the parasites to develop. If the killings had occurred in warm weather, as the Russians claimed, it is almost certain that such insects and maggots would have been in the mass graves.

The clothing on the bodies is important. They were in winter uniform, including overcoats. All the testimony proves that, including the official motion pictures taken by Russia. The clothing and the boots were in excellent condition, supporting the German claim that the executions occurred in 1940. If the massacre had occurred over a year later—in 1941, as the Russians claimed—the boots and clothing would not have been in as good condition because of the additional wear and tear on the apparel.

Articles found on the bodies, including diaries, newspapers, letters, records, and various documents, all bore dates before May of 1940. One diary reads as follows: "April 8, 1940, 3:30 a. m., departure from Kozielsk station, moving west, 9:30 a. m., at Yelmia station. April 8, since 12 noon we have been standing in a railway siding at Smolensk. April 9, in the morning some minutes before 5, reveille; in the prison trucks and preparations to leave. We are to go somewhere by car, and what next? April 9, it has been a strange day so far. Departure in prison coach in cells, terrible; taken somewhere into a wood, something like a country house. Here a special search. I was relieved of my watch pointing to 8:30 a. m. Asked about a wedding ring. Rubles, belts, and pocket knife taken away."

There the diary breaks off. The last item is dated April 9, 1940. The writer of the diary was identified as a fellow prisoner at Kozielsk by a witness who testified before the committee.

Circumstantial evidence, without exception, points to Russian guilt. For example, what reasonable explanation other than death is there for the fact that the families of the Polish officers heard from them regularly up to April of 1940, and then not a word thereafter? The Polish had established a Special Family Bureau to locate the missing officers. That Bureau received thousands of letters from families of the officers saying they had never heard from them after April of 1940.

The actions of the two Nations accused point to Russian guilt and German innocence. Germany had an investigation by an International Commission of scientists from a dozen or more nations whereas the Russian investigation was conducted by Russians only. Germany sought Red Cross intervention whereas Russia avoided it. The fact that Germany wanted an investigation by the International Red Cross, a neutral organ of unimpeachable integrity, becomes doubly significant in the light of Russia's blocking

such action by refusing to join in the request.

Before the atrocities were discovered, there is the pattern of evasion and falsification on the part of Russia in answering inquiries about the missing Polish officers. For 2 years Russia had been telling the Polish authorities that the Russians had no knowledge of the whereabouts of the missing Polish officers. Then, after Germany announced the finding of the Katyn graves in the Smolensk area, Russia claimed the Polish prisoners had been in camps in that area when it was overrun by the Germans.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Upon all the facts outlined above and detailed in the hearings, the evidence is overwhelming that the Katyn Forest massacre of Polish prisoners was committed by Soviet Russia.

That conclusion is reached even without taking into account other evidence pointing to Russian guilt. For example, the testimony of a Pole who testified as an eyewitness to some of the murders; the independent conclusion reached by the Polish underground; and the opinion of those who were at Katyn Forest during the Russian and German investigations.

In this latter category are Lt. Col. Donald B. Stewart and Col. John Van Vliet, the only two Americans who were present when the Germans were exhuming the bodies at Katyn in April of 1943. Both went to Katyn Forest with the preconceived idea that the Germans had committed the crimes. Both were prejudiced against Germany because of their war-time experiences. Both came to the conclusion that the crimes had not been committed by Germany—our enemy at that time—but by Russia—our ally at that time. On the other hand, witnesses who attended the Russian investigation were of the opinion that it was a staged presentation and not productive of any real evidence.

For whatever weight it may have, there is also the refusal of the Soviets to present any evidence at all or to cooperate in even the slightest way with a committee established by the Congress of the United States to determine who perpetrated the Katyn atrocities. Why should any innocent nation not want to help solve those crimes?

The history of both the Nazis and the Communists in World War II indicates very clearly that both were capable of committing atrocities such as the Katyn Forest massacre. In finding that the Nazis were not responsible for the Katyn murders, the committee is not unmindful of Dachau, Buchenwald, Lidice, and other wholesale killings committed by the Nazis. The Nazi record is one of inhuman cruelty and murders but the blood of Katyn Forest is not in that record.

The killings at Katyn were committed by the Communists of Soviet Russia, and the committee has so found. The committee so found unanimously, and beyond even the shadow of a doubt.

GENOCIDE

The committee also finds that the evidence is overwhelming that the Katyn Forest massacre of Polish prisoners was committed by the Communists of Soviet Russia as a carefully calculated and cold-blooded act of genocide.

The dictionary defines "genocide" as "the deliberate and systematic extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group." What did the 15,000 murdered Polish officers mean to Poland? The committee assumes all 15,000 are dead even though less than 5,000 bodies have been found. The other 10,000 are still missing but there is no real doubt of their fate and undoubtedly their bodies will be found eventually.

What did the 15,000 mean to Poland? One answer is found in the words of former Ambassador Tadeus Romer, who testified:

> Among them were top and high ranking Polish Army officers; also well-known scientists, politicians, lawyers, editors, physicians, economists, and clergymen. These men were, of course, badly needed, not only for our war effort but also in connection with future plans for multilated Poland.

It was put another way by another witness, Colonel Grobicki, who had been in the prison camp at Kozielsk. He said:

> In Kozielsk there was concentrated the brain of the Polish nation. It is much easier to handle the people when the intelligentsia, the brain of the nation, is put away.

Or, as it was put by a former Russian soldier who testified:

> The massacre at Katyn destroyed the creative force of Poland.

SELECTIVE MURDER

The massacre at Katyn Forest was genocide—a cold-blooded, deliberate, calculated attempt to destroy the leadership of Poland. There have been many mass extermination and wholesale killings that far exceeded the number murdered at Katyn. But there has never been such a wholesale case of selective murder. There have been exterminations of millions—ruthlessly, indiscriminately—without regard to which were leaders and which were rank and file. But Katyn marks the first time in recent history, at least, of genocide in the sense of selective, discriminate, and carefully planned murder intended to eliminate solely the leadership of a nation, yet keep the masses, the rank and file, alive—for exploitation, for slavery, or for whatever purpose was in the minds of the murderers.

The aim was to eliminate the leadership that might lead those masses in resistance; to destroy the intelligentsia that might teach the less educated the truth; and to kill the creative force that might rebuild a nation. It was genocide—to keep a gallant nation from its true destiny. The perpetrators of the Katyn massacre well know how easy it is to lead the flock of sheep once the shepherd has been removed.

There have been greater mass murders and exterminations than at Katyn. That is not its significance. Its significance lies rather in the attempt to enslave an entire nation by destroying its leadership. The purpose was to cut off the head but keep the body to work.

A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

The Katyn Forest massacre is not a crime against only the Polish people; it is a crime against humanity. It should not be a matter solely of concern to the Polish people. It concerns everyone. Every generation born in every country in the world must hear of it, learn the truth about it, know what it means, and understand its significance in the history of mankind. Until we all know the terrible truth about it, the ghosts of Katyn will haunt the world—not merely crying out for vengeance, far more than that—pleading for truth and knowledge and justice, so that never again will there be another Katyn.

It is in that light that the committee has conducted its investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre. This report covers the first phase of the investigation, namely, who committed the murders? The second phase will be covered in a second report to the Congress at a later date. That phase will deal with the investigation into whether or not the guilt of Russia was concealed in any way either at the war crimes trials in Nuremberg or in departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

The committee intends to pursue that inquiry relentlessly, and if the truth about Katyn has been concealed or hushed up by anyone, to expose such persons. The committee cannot possibly complete its investigation into that second phase before July 5 of this year. Since that phase of the case has nothing to do with the question of "Who committed the Katyn Forest massacre?" the committee has decided to submit its first report before Congress adjourns or recesses as planned on July 5 of this year. The committee has made that decision in the hope that Congress may act immediately on at least this phase of the report.

The evidence is overwhelmingly that—

First. The Katyn Forest massacre was committed by the Communists of Soviet Russia.

Second. The Katyn Forest massacre was a deliberate act of genocide by the Communists of Soviet Russia against Poland.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is strongly recommended that—

First. Congress ask the President of the United States to take every appropriate action, including specifically the following:

(a) The United Nations be asked to conduct an inquiry based upon the documented accusation against Soviet Russia prepared by the Committee. Soviet Russia should be compelled to take the responsibility of voting against, or vetoing, such a resolution in the United Nations.

(b) If the United Nations cannot act, then the President of the United States should seek the assistance of an International Commission of nations other than Germany and Russia to sit as a jury, hear the facts of the Katyn Forest massacre, weigh the evidence, record its findings, and make such recommendations as it determines are required by justice.

Second. An investigation be made by Congress and, if possible, by the United

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Nations, to determine whether the Katyn Forest massacre is simply one part of the pattern of a Communist campaign of genocide against all the free nations of the world.

Several months ago I asked President Truman to be prepared to take such steps. I recommended at that time that America should assume leadership in this matter. I hope President Truman will do so. I again urge him to take immediate action. I hope Americans in every corner of this Nation will learn the facts about Katyn and join in our movement to bring the truth about Katyn to the world and to insist on justice.

We in America must assume leadership in this matter. We owe it to the Katyn victims. We owe it to gallant Poland. We owe it to humanity.

LIMITATION EXPENDITURES UNDER DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that action should immediately be taken to impress on the responsible authorities the fact that we have laws to protect the public that are not being used.

The Defense Department appropriation bill has the following provisions:

SEC. 629. No part of any money appropriated in titles II, III, IV, or V of this act shall be expended under any contract (other than a contract for personal services) entered into after the enactment of this act unless such contract provides—

(1) that the Government may, by written notice to the contractor, terminate the right of such contractor to proceed under such contract if it is found, after notice and hearing, by the Secretary of the military department with which the contract is made, or his designee, that gratuities (in the form of entertainment, gifts, or otherwise) were offered or given by such contractor, or any agent or representative of such contractor, to any officer or employee of the Government with a view toward securing a contract or securing favorable treatment with respect to the awarding or amending, or the making of any determinations with respect to the performing, of such contract: *Provided*, That the existence of the facts upon which such Secretary makes such findings shall be in issue and may be reviewed in any competent court,

(2) that in the event any such contract is so terminated the Government shall be entitled, (A) to pursue the same remedies against the contractor as it could pursue in the event of a breach of the contract by the contractor, and (B) as a penalty in addition to any other damages to which it may be entitled by law, to exemplary damages in an amount not less than 3 nor more than 10 times (as determined by the Secretary or his designee) the costs incurred by any such contractor in providing any such gratuities to any such officer or employee.

It seems to me that that provision can do a great deal to protect the public. In checking into the situation, I am advised by the Department of Justice that they have searched the records of the Department and they cannot find that any cases have been to the Department for appropriate action under the abovementioned act.

I also have been advised that the Department of Defense has not terminated any contracts and no damages have been collected by them pursuant to this provision.

I want to bring this to the attention of the Congress and of the responsible authorities because it seems to me that some attention should be paid to it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, several days ago there appeared a streamer headline in the Washington Daily News entitled "Representative DEANE Confesses His Sins From the Pulpit" and there was a short article giving the gist of this confession at the Baptist Church. Under leave to extend my remarks I ask permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this very fine address which Mr. DEANE made at the Baptist Church in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CLERGYMEN SEIZED BY EAST BERLIN POLICE

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the newspapers carried the word of the seizure at gun point of three Catholic clergymen from my home town, Chicago—the Reverend B. Sokolowski, Rev. George Gorski, and Rev. Martin Borowski.

They were seized by the East Berlin police on the instructions of the Russian soldiers for taking sightseeing pictures a few yards inside of the Russian zone.

This is just another evidence of the ruthlessness of communism. It apparently does not recognize any laws—not even ordinary customs of civilized people. This unlawful action must be immediately and vigorously protested by our Government, and I am confident everything within its power will be done to bring the immediate release of these priests.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FOR KOREAN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include an article by Constantine Brown etntitled "Sweat, Toil While Facing Death."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the GI bill of rights this afternoon agreed among other things to an amendment today to the Korean war veterans bill, giving them unemployment insurance. I am extremely glad of that, Mr. Speaker, because I do not see how any human being who voted to give unemployment insurance to people who work in factories and other places at good pay could refuse to give unemployment insurance to the men who, as Constantine Brown says in his article, toil and sweat while facing death in Korea.

(The article referred to follows:)

SWEAT, TOIL WHILE FACING DEATH—GI'S IN KOREA FRONT LINES BELIEVE THEY ARE BEING SACRIFICED TO THE SELFISH INTERESTS OF UNION LEADERS AND POLITICIANS

(By Constantine Brown)

The feeling among the men who are fighting in Korea is mounting that except for some bonuses politicians are throwing at them in order to win the favor—and the votes—of their families in the United States they are being sacrificed to the selfish interests of labor leaders and politicians.

This feeling was put adequately on paper by a 24-year-old "shavetail" who for the last 4 weeks, soon after he arrived from the United States, has been on the front line continuously.

The boys out there apparently receive some information about the political contests back home. But all this is obviously of little importance to them. "The political picture means little to us over here," writes the youngster, "in comparison to the news we read in the Stars and Stripes about 47 percent of jet engine production being halted because of the strikes; no more 3.5 rockets because of the strikes; no more trucks or tanks because of the strikes. If ever there were men who would volunteer as strike breakers it is these men here who sweat through the day in their toil in making bunkers or digging trenches and then sweat throughout the night from the mental strain of watching and waiting."

In modern armies of democratic nations there is little difference between the enlisted man and the officer. They are all comrades in arms sharing the same food and the same risks. The only difference is that of responsibility.

Hence officers and men feel alike in the face of common dangers and risks. What a junior or senior officer writes usually represents the sentiments of all the fighting men. The shavetail who describes succinctly the feelings of his associates continues: "To us men here, there are no fringe benefits; no time and a half; no opportunity to work in defense plants and reap high wages; no holiday; no Sunday drive with wife and kids—nothing but the chance of being torn asunder by screaming shells as we are quietly doing our job. It takes no ranting union leader or the talk of union shop to make the men here do their jobs. It is the respect they have in one another, the thrill of belonging to a good unit, the close comradeship with your buddy who wouldn't let you down. It is these facts that make the GI and his unit the close and hard-working team that does not quit until the job is done.

"What a lesson could be learned by many who pretend to call themselves Americans if they could see the voluntary sacrifices a soldier will make in doing his part. No man in industry has to worry about his life. But here, where that thought rings through your mind 24 hours a day, men will volunteer for almost certain death in trying to save a buddy, accomplish a mission, or in working their everyday job."

The writer of the above, who less than 3 months ago was just an American youngster concerned with baseball, his girl friend, and the routine of military life, has acquired in the relatively short time he has been at the front a philosophy which many high-paid leaders may be unable to understand.

"It is the very small things that mean so much to us," he continued. "Think of it: A shower, a soothing opportunity to wash away the accumulation of sweat and dirt; a hot meal to break the routine of canned

rations; a lift in a jeep instead of the long walk down the dusty road. We look at these war-scarred mountains, breathe fresh air, and these thoughts go through our minds: 'Wonder whether tomorrow we shall be alive. Lots of incoming (enemy's shells), maybe China boy is getting ready. Wonder whether we can make some hot water and shave. Well, hell, let's eat before we start on that trench.'

"I am proud to serve and command these men who are so unselfish with themselves and who will work with their loquacious griping until their fatigues are soaked; then sit down and laugh and drink a can of beer in the dim interior of an earthen bunker. I am, according to the views of Francis, the mule, 'the lowest thing on earth'—a second lieutenant. But there is no greater praise for a man in this world than the quiet comment of men under your orders: 'The lieutenant is O. K., we'll follow him anywhere.' We fellows up here will live up to the trust placed in us. But will we be deprived of the tools which alone can make our job possible, by the play of selfish labor leaders and the play of even more selfish politicians?"

These are not the sentiments of just an individual youngster but of tens of thousands who are on the front line and wonder what is happening back home. They cannot understand why selfish interests and politics should interfere with the only thing that may save their lives: The arms and ammunition which have enabled them so far to withstand the onslaught of a numerically superior enemy.

BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in my first remarks I would like to make it clear to this Congress and to the people I represent that I do not believe in Federal control of education and shall insist always that the States retain complete autonomy over our educational system.

For many years the Congress has been urged by educational leaders, the Chief Executives of our country, Members of Congress, civic and professional organizations, and by countless thousands of our most earnest and best informed citizens to provide needed grants to the States for the operation and maintenance of local schools. These grants were to be used by the States in improving their elementary and secondary schools by raising teachers' salaries, providing textbooks, and other essential materials and services.

The conditions existing among our States which justify Federal aid to education are familiar to millions of our people. The elementary school population, up nearly 4 million since 1947, will continue to increase for the next 6 years by 1,200,000 pupils each year. In 1954–55 this growth will reach the high schools. It is reported that 160,000 qualified elementary teachers will be needed in September of this year. Qualified teachers, satisfactory classrooms, books, and other essential materials and services will not be available for hundreds of thousands of boys and girls.

Unless this Congress, at long last, rises above the influence of those governed by fear, selfishness, and sectionalism, these same hundreds of thousands and many, many more each year will continue to be denied the essential implements of democracy. Is it not possible for this body to lay aside some of those items of business, important though they may be but which do not assume such a vital part in the continued security of our country as does the education of all our youth, to meet the challenge presented by the necessity of providing each boy and girl an opportunity to secure an education in keeping with his or her abilities and needs.

In his budget message for 1953, the President of the United States requested $300,000,000 for Federal aid to schools and emphasized the loss the country is sustaining by not making adequate schools available to all people:

> In some States more than one-third of the young men called by the selective service system failed their educational tests for entrance into military service during the fiscal year of 1951. The States with the highest rejection rates are those low-income States which, despite heavier taxes in relation to income, are unable to provide satisfactory education for their young people. Many of those rejected for military service because of educational deficiencies are also unable to meet our needs for skilled workers in industry.

How much longer can we continue to waste our human resources by failing to provide the opportunity for all our youth to secure an education that will enable them to contribute their proper share of the common effort?

To provide the aid for current needs, I most heartily urge support of the proposal to provide $300,000,000 to be distributed among the States in proportion to need. In order to assure lasting and continued support for education, I propose that those moneys realized from the development of the tidelands oil fields be used exclusively for the support of the public schools for both current operation expenses and the construction and equipping of school plants.

I am in full agreement with the ruling of the Supreme Court; that is, the tidelands oil belongs to all the States of this Nation. This is my view as a private citizen because: First, Thomas Jefferson took $15,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to make the Louisiana Purchase; second, many American boys from all over the Nation lost their lives in the Mexican War, out of which came the independence of Texas, and subsequently that of California; and third, our navies defend the shores of all the Nation, and international law recognizes United States control over all our coastal waters out to the 12-mile limit.

For these reasons, I believe the royalties and revenues derived from these tidelands oil fields belong to all the people of the United States and not to three States of the Union and to the big oil companies, as some would have you believe.

A bill has been introduced in Congress to utilize the money realized from these tidelands oil fields solely for school purposes, to be prorated among the States. I am supporting this bill 100 percent.

I believe the House and the Senate will accept the amendment unanimously.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

WRIGHT PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE, DAYTON, OHIO

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, on May 13 I brought to your attention facts concerning the 1,000-unit rental housing project now under construction at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. Those facts, in my opinion, justified an investigation of that project by an appropriate committee, and I asked for such an investigation. I want now to report what has transpired.

In response to that request our distinguished colleague from Alabama, ALBERT RAINS, chairman of the Banking and Currency Subcommittee on Housing, assured me that his committee would be very glad to investigate the project. W. Kenneth Watkins, architect-investigator for the committee, spent several days at the site of the housing, and submitted a very thorough and detailed report of his inspection. On June 17, the subcommittee held an extended hearing at which time representatives of the Federal Housing Administration, the Air Force, the project sponsors and builders, the Montgomery County Builders Association, and I were permitted to testify. As a result of Mr. Watkins' inspection, the hearing, and submitted materials, the subcommittee has much evidence before it, and I am informed by Congressman RAINS that the investigation is continuing.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and the members are aware of the excellent work of the Rains subcommittee, and I want to express to you the highest praise for the way they are handling this investigation. The scope of their assignment is very broad, and literally hundreds of specific housing situations are subject to their inquiry, yet they found time for an extensive hearing on this Wright-Patterson Air Force Base project. The investigation has been vigorous, but entirely fair and impartial. This example of the manner in which they are carrying out their duties causes me to look forward with great interest to their final report and recommendations on FHA and VA housing. I know these will be

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

a magnificent credit to the Congress and an esteemed service to our country.

While the investigation is still not completed, there is much already brought to light in which the membership of the House will be interested. I charged previously that the location chosen for this project was inordinately dangerous. These units, and 1,000 additional ones to be built adjoining these, abut the field, and are less than 1,500 feet from one of the runways. An estimated 8,000 people, probably half of them children, will live in these dwellings. Two elementary schools will be erected in the same area. The Air Force says the location meets all their criteria for safety. Wright Field is a base for experimental flights, and aircraft crashes have occurred, one in or very near this housing location. Because of the danger, some responsible field officials were against this site, and the opinion of the personnel who are eligible for these quarters may be indicated by an officer who stated that under no circumstances would he take his children and his wife to live in one of these units for fear of a crash. The safety criteria approach may be proper when applied with good judgment, but the voluntary assumption of such a frightful risk to the lives of so many people, when open country extends for miles on three sides of Wright Field, and certainly affords many safe locations, is the exercise of very bad judgment.

On May 13 I also charged that there were indications of influence and favoritism in the history of this transaction. Let me review the record on that issue. The certificate of necessity for this project was issued to the Cowen Construction Co. in June 1950. Col. E. V. Schuyler, Air Force, testified there were five firms originally seeking to build the project. He had no records or knowledge with which to reply to allegations that the Cowan firm was rated low by Wright Field officials, but stated that the final decision was made by a secret board in the Pentagon. He said the firm was chosen because it was best qualified for the job. Bear that in mind. Month after month went by, and this "best-qualified" firm failed to perform. Sometime late in March 1951 it showed how able it was to do the job by calling in two other construction firms to do its work. These were David Muss and N. K. Winston & Co. David Muss testified, "We came in and traded our know-how for Cowen's possession of the land." David Muss further said he looked over Cowen's plans and found them wholly unfeasible. He threw them all out and started over with new plans and specifications. Can a plainer commentary on the Air Force's rating of the Cowen firm as "best qualified" be spelled out?

The FHA permitted continuing delays for many more months, and construction was not begun until November 1951. About the only excuse I could gather from the testimony of the FHA representative was weather. Consider, in addition, these circumstances which were brought on record. Link Cowen, et al., purchased an option on the land on which this project is being built in June 1949 when the Wherry Act, the legislation making such projects possible, was being debated by Congress and not even enacted into law. There was testimony that Cowen's representative, at the time when negotiations were under way, told of past campaign contributions, political affiliations, and ability to influence decisions of Government departments. Land manipulations permitted a possible profit of over $50,000 before the project even got under way. Link Cowen failed to testify before the committee, even though present.

The Air Force, as I mentioned, was represented at the hearing by Colonel Schuyler. At the time of this transaction, Brig. Gen. J. T. Morris, and Col. John Griggs were base commander and director of installations for AMC. Though reported to be against this location for the project, and certainly able to shed considerable light on the matter, neither man was offered as a witness by the Air Force. Neither was Col. J. C. Elliott, then head of Air Force housing, though he was in Washington at the time of the hearing. Through Colonel Schuyler, the Air Force admitted it had made major mistakes in the procedure used in selecting the sponsor and issuing a certificate of necessity for this project. These mistakes were attributed to "greenness" in handling such procedures. New techniques are now employed. This admission and the effort to correct their procedures I certainly commend. There was not the slightest indication, however, of any effort to correct the original mistake of issuing the commitment to the Cowen firm. Even worse, just within the past few weeks, the Air Force compounded its admitted mistake by permitting the same group to go ahead with an additional 1,000 units to be erected adjoining those now under construction.

I also charged that the construction work on this project was very shoddy. Mr. Kenneth Watkins, architect-investigator for the subcommittee, submitted a very detailed report on this question. That report was based on a thorough inspection of the job site. It cites defect after defect in construction, and numerous examples of careless workmanship and short-cutting. One of the most important concerns the fire hazard being built into these units. Units contain six separate apartments. As protection against a gutting fire, partitions separating apartments are provided with vapor barrier insulating material. Whether this conforms to State and local fire regulations, which I have always understood to require masonry firewalls at frequent intervals, is a question not yet clarified, and now being pursued. However, the Watkins report shows that even the plans and specifications for the project were not being followed, and that intermittent omission of fire stops occurred in several buildings. The stucco over chicken wire exterior surfaces, in my opinion, which is confirmed by building experts familiar with the locality, will not stand up in the Dayton area, even if constructed in optimum fashion. But the report shows unworkmanlike construction even here, with poor bracing, open joints, careless nailing, improper application of the wire mesh, variation in thickness of the stucco from one-half to 1⅛ inches, and similar defects. Mr. Jack Stein, a heating expert and holder of several patents in the field, testified categorically that the heating systems being installed in these units were inadequate for proper heating, and that winter weather would make the quarters almost untenantable.

The FHA has stated that the plans and specifications conform to their minimum requirements. Through the years, the Federal Housing Administration has performed a service to the people of America which has gained for it an enviable reputation. It has inspired confidence in home owners and lending institutions, and raised the standards of home construction. That confidence and reputation have given rise to a duty to maintain good service and high standards. Lax inspection and low requirements evident in this housing project bring no credit to FHA.

Most sharply focused by the investigation is the question of the amount of the commitment made by FHA on this construction. Originally set at $7,598 per unit, the commitment was subsequently raised and reraised until it is now $8,743 per unit. Changes in plans with both cost-increasing and cost-decreasing items were made. Testimony on the amount of the commitment increase and on the total cost and commitment figures was sharply conflicting. The contractor's cost figures were subscribed to, of course, by FHA. Opposing these figures were the building permit figure, set by Montgomery County Building Inspector Robert Gray, at $5,742 per unit, and testimony and statements by members of the Montgomery County Home Builders Association, all of whom are local builders of wide experience, that the cost figures submitted by the project contractors, and agreed to by FHA, are highly inflated.

Let me state here that the local builders who appeared and who submitted statements in this controversy did so at my request. I needed their opinions as experts on the many technical phases of the investigation, and because some of them were very familiar with the facts involved. With no personal interest, they very willingly offered to help me and to render any service possible to the subcommittee. Several came to Washington at their own expense to testify. Mr. Speaker, this is a recognition and discharge of civic duty deserving to be acknowledged before this body, and I publicly thank these men for their display of good citizenship.

Actual-cost figures submitted by these builders on units of comparable or superior quality and size, together with such statements as that of Joseph B. Haverstick, vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, that the units could be built for 12 to 15 percent lower than the amount for which the commitment was issued are not to be summarily discounted. This phase of the investigation is of utmost

importance. If these cost figures are as exaggerated as they appear to be, the way is paved for a quick profit by these contractors of as much as $2,000,000. In addition, it could mean that these FHA insured mortgages would be protected by only a negligible or paper equity in the project operators. The likelihood of the FHA having to stand good on the mortgages is plain and probable, and once again the American taxpayer would ultimately have to foot the bill.

In this connection, leases of Government property as a site for the second 1,000 units are worthy of note. These leases are for a term of 75 years with a nominal rental. Although the lessees agree to comply with all laws, ordinances, and regulations applicable to the leased area, they are already seeking waivers of issuance of building, heating, electrical, and plumbing permits. The property is not subject to Ohio real-estate taxes. Default clauses are numerous. Security behind the mortgages is certainly very weak. In the event of foreclosure, FHA would have only a leasehold interest in property owned by another Government department. The market for such an interest would be very restricted. In all probability a sale of the leasehold, in case a buyer could be found, would be only at a great loss. The other alternative, operation of the project by FHA, promises a similar result.

I doubt that any responsible lending institution, in the absence of FHA guaranties, would lend money on these leases. If the operators have no equity in the project, voluntary default or abandonment would leave FHA with a white elephant of tremendous proportions, and wholly without recourse. Four separate corporations have been formed or will be formed to operate these projects. What assets will they have other than this property and leases? What can the FHA look to except a paper judgment? In the absence of a substantial investment in these properties by the operators, the Air Force or the FHA has absolutely no protection or assurance of performance. For that reason, an audit, both searching and exhaustive, of all cost figures and expenditures in the construction of these projects should be made, by impartial investigators. Such an audit, if it disclosed inflated cost figures through waste or an unreasonable profit, could provide a basis for corrective action to assure the soundness of these mortgages, and thus protect the public investment and the guaranties under the FHA insurance commitments. There is a second equally important goal to be effected by such an audit. The rents to be charged of the military and defense personnel who will occupy these units is based on the cost of the units. At present they range from $66.25 to $96.75 per month, not exactly in my opinion low rents. The Air Force, in testimony at the hearing, stated it had no interest in seeing that the rents paid by its airmen and officers were low, but only that they were within the various allowances for quarters under military pay scales. This is an unsound policy, in my opinion, since the Air Force, in following it, makes no effort to see that personnel get their money's worth in housing. Their attitude seems to be this: We pay a man $96 for quarters allowance. Let him spend all of it, and so long as we keep his rent within that figure, our obligation is discharged. If accurate cost figures on these projects are lower than those submitted, and the mortgages are lowered to conform to the proper figures, a consequent reduction in rent to be charged these airmen and officers could be made. Testimony has indicated a possible discrepancy of up to $2,000,000 or almost 25 percent. If these excesses are stricken out, a real service will have been performed for these men and their families, and for the investors in these mortgages and the taxpayer as well.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reviewing briefly some things I think the subcommittee's investigation of this WPAFB housing project has already disclosed.

First. Culpably poor judgment by the Air Force in locating this project where it gravely endangers the lives of thousands of people.

Second. Questionable procedures by the Air Force in selecting the sponsor for the project and plain evidence that the Air Force rating of the sponsor's ability to perform the work proved to be erroneous.

Third. Defective construction, one result of which is a very pronounced fire hazard.

Fourth. The authorization by FHA of construction standards which are too low, and which undermine the reputation of FHA and the confidence reposed in it, coupled with a failure of FHA to make adequate inspection and to enforce compliance with even the low standards permitted. The negligence of FHA in failing to properly inspect the buildings as they were erected allowed instance after instance of faulty construction to get by. Funds were expended on the basis of FHA inspection reports which must have, contrary to fact, indicated proper compliance with approved plans and specifications. Belatedly, after this investigation was begun, and the defects pointed out by Mr. Watkins, FHA assigned another inspector to the project and made some effort toward proper inspection. All in all, they have shown a tender concern for the builders of this project. Far different treatment by FHA is the experience of less favored contractors.

Fifth. An FHA commitment, based on inflated costs, equal to or greater than the true cost, and making possible an unconscionable profit.

Sixth. Rents based on those inflated costs, and therefore substantially higher than is fair to the personnel who will live in these units.

These and similar matters already brought to light by the subcommittee's inquiry show the need for a continuance of the investigation. Remedial steps, if we act promptly, can be taken. The commitment for the second 1,000 units has been issued, but I have hope and urge that this commitment be withdrawn. An accurate cost audit will show, I am confident, a basis for reduction of the prior commitment. Fair rent for these tenants, protection of the funds of the many people who will ultimately be the investors in these mortgages, and assurance that the taxpayer, who must stand behind the FHA guaranties, will be safeguarded against loss are all results for which we must earnestly strive. I know the House will feel, as I do, that this probe should be continued until all the facts are brought into open view.

STATE DEPARTMENT (H. DOC. NO. 529)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

JULY 3, 1952.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the President, I am making available the following information requested in paragraph (2) of House Resolution 664, adopted by the House of Representatives on June 10, 1952, and transmitted to the Department of State by the Clerk of the House on June 18. The information requested in paragraph (1) of the resolution is considered as being of a military nature and thus not within the province of the Secretary of State to furnish.

In regard to paragraph (2) of the resolution, it may in general be noted that following the departure of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur from Japan in April 1951 and prior to the convening of the Peace Conference in San Francisco in September 1951 there were no Communist-inspired riots and disturbances of the peace of any consequence in Tokyo and other places in Japan.

However, the signing of the Treaty of Peace and the Security Treaty with Japan on September 8, 1951, and the United States security arrangements with Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines, confronted the Soviet Union and Communist China with a situation in Japan which differed in important respects from that which had obtained since Japan's surrender. Not only did the San Francisco conference assure Japan's return to a position of sovereign independence, but, more importantly, it underscored Japan's alinement with the United States and western democracies. Communist policy in response to these circumstances has been characterized by two lines of approach to the primary objective of weakening Japan's effective alinement with the non-Communist world, and especially with the United States, by pressures directed against both the Japanese Government and the general public.

On the one hand, beginning in the fall of 1951, the Communist bloc has instituted a series of ostensibly friendly overtures, chiefly in the form of trade tenders, calculated in particular to appeal to Japanese desires for increased trade with the Chinese mainland and, more generally, to advance the Communist thesis that United States control of Japan through the traitorous Yoshida Government prevents Japan from reaching an amicable accord with its Communist neighbors. Simultaneously, however, Communist-bloc policy toward Japan since the San Francisco Conference has maintained the hard and hostile line set forth in the Sino-Soviet pact of 1950 and contained in the new program of the Japanese Communist Party (JCP), made public by the Cominform Journal in November 1951. This program, while approving nonviolent methods, gave explicit sanction to programs of violence

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

designed to achieve Communist objectives in Japan.

This latter policy of threat and intimidation has been implemented through the JCP and has been characterized by an increasing emphasis on violent activities. On only four occasions, however, has there been concerted action of any significance.

On February 21, 1952, observed by Communists as Anticolonization Day, an estimated total of 3,000 demonstrators engaged in Tokyo in rallies accompanied by clashes with the police, in which at least 20 policemen were reported injured and 30 demonstrators arrested. Some 21 other rallies, embracing an additional estimated 3,000 participants, took place in other parts of the country, although these were considerably less violent. Americans and other foreign nationals and their property were not injured or damaged on this occasion.

On May 1, Japanese Communists spearheaded by North Koreans, members of the Communist-dominated National Federation of Students' Self-Government Associations, and day-laborers' unions, broke up the May Day rally and captured the parade in Tokyo sponsored by the non-Communist General Council of Trade-Unions and turned the occasion into the most serious outbreak of violence in postwar Japan. The major display of violence occurred in Tokyo when a column of some 7,000 Communist agitators forced entry into the Imperial Palace Plaza. Mass rioting instigated by recognized Communist tactical teams broke out as demonstrators armed with clubs and stones attacked Japanese police and damaged, overturned, and burned 13 official and private American cars and some 60 Japanese vehicles. Before the Japanese police effectively reorganized to bring this situation under control, 1 person had been killed, 491 Japanese police and over 500 Japanese civilians were injured, and 12 United States military and 6 civilian personnel were injured. Capable police action in bringing the riot under early control received due recognition. The Japanese Government expressed the shock of the great majority of the Japanese people over the riots, and is undertaking to indemnify those Americans who suffered injuries and property losses. By contrast, however, JCP agitators elsewhere, except for relatively minor disturbances in Kyoto and Osaka, were unsuccessful in similarly exploiting May Day rallies which were extensively held throughout Japan without incident.

The circumstances surrounding the May 1 action suggested that the Communists were comparatively well prepared and organized and were determined to provoke the Japanese police, and if possible to involve members of the United States garrison forces in forcible action against the demonstrators.

Possibly in an effort to test further this organization and encouraged by the relative success of their May 1 efforts in Tokyo, the JCP attempted on May 30 to stage a repetition of the previous display of mass violence. Designating it as an anniversary celebration of the death of Japan's labor martyrs, JCP directives reportedly called for a "nation-wide armed struggle" and ordered "action unit corps" to execute raids against police stations and tax offices. The most serious incidents again took place in Tokyo where three Japanese were killed and some 20 injured. On this occasion, however, party agitators avoided a major clash with the police, confining their activities to suburban areas, and no concerted attack was made on United States personnel or property. No attempt was made to force entry into the Palace grounds, which the police closed to all traffic.

In general, the May 30 efforts of the JCP fell far short of the party's professed goal of a "nation-wide armed struggle." In some cases, scheduled demonstrations in the Tokyo area were canceled because of inability to attract participants or because of the failure of principal speakers to appear. Although demonstrations were staged throughout Japan and those in the Osaka-Kobe area appeared to be carefully planned, the fact remained that the May 30 action was unable to capitalize on concurrent non-Communist activities, while adequate police precautionary measures prevented a repetition of the serious violence on May 1. Communist propaganda portrayed these efforts as popular Japanese "uprisings" against Japanese Government "fascism" and American "imperialism" rather than in their true colors.

The fourth occasion occurred on June 25, the second anniversary of the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, and was marked by further outbreaks of violence sponsored by the JCP and participated in by some 21,000 Communist sympathizers including large numbers of North Koreans in Japan. Meetings, demonstrations, and attacks on Japanese police as well as on United States security force vehicles and installations occurred in some 114 localities throughout various parts of Japan, but large-scale demonstrations and violence were limited to the Osaka, Kobe, Nagoya, and Tokyo areas. Those injured included 43 police, 21 demonstrators, 4 correspondents, and 7 bystanders. The Japanese police were in general relieved that the demonstrations were not of the scope which they had feared on the basis of preliminary intelligence. In contrast to the incidents of May 30, the June 25 demonstrations were particularly directed at United States installations and property, notably the Itami air base, Hirakata arsenal compound and the Suita railroad marshaling yards near Osaka. A sulfuric-acid bomb was thrown into the vehicle of Brig. Gen. Carter Clarke, who is reported to have sustained minor burns about the face.

Although the JCP may well attempt to stage further disruptive incidents, there is already evidence that their effort is likely to boomerang. These incidents have increased popular support for the government's program to strengthen internal-security measures and agencies, and have provided a perspective against which Communist peace propaganda may be placed. While the JCP has been afforded some exercise in the execution of mass violence, the civil police has also gained experience in handling such disorders and has proven more than adequate to deal with them. It is, therefore, anticipated that the Japanese authorities will continue to prove able to cope with such activities of the JCP, although further outbreaks of violence may be expected to occur in line with the announced Communist policy of using violent methods to attempt to achieve objectives in Japan.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID BRUCE,
Acting Secretary.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 707. An act for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of John George Papailias;

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyck;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1448. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1477. An act for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Milhollin;

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1814. An act to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan;

H. R. 1843. An act for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of the alien Maike Kresel Mohrer;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2447. An act for the relief of George M. Sanger;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beidle;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2856. An act for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel);

H. R. 2906. An act for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Vito Aiuto;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Anny Scher;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3382. An act for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi;

H. R. 3438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80);

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3705. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Dr David M. Ju;

H. R. 3778. An act for the relief of Wong See Sun;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Aldo Vallesa;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of Franco Berardi;

H. R. 4001. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4021. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo;

H. R. 4157. An act for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska, and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the board of water supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian home lands;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4326. An act for the relief of Toshiko Nokamuta Takimoto and her minor son;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4407. An act to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Scharts;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Piandolit and Fuencisla Segimont;

H. R. 4632. An act for the relief of Linda Lee Converse;

H. R. 4709. An act for the relief of Baron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken;

H. R. 4762. An act for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson;

H. R. 4797. An act to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of Act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of Act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, county of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935;

H. R. 799. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4800. An act to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Emma, Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Silas B. Morris;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5055. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5087. An act for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5120. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 5193. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 5327. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug;

H. R. 5461. An act for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana;

H. R. 5788. An act to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 5911. An act for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde;

H. R. 5917. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Delma L. Mausey;

H. R. 6025. An act for the relief of David Daryl Dalko;

H. R. 6070. An act for the relief of Paul Gust Williams;

H. R. 6083. An act for the relief of Amalia Architetto;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6356. An act for the relief of William J. Martin;

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Ayako Sukiura;

H. R. 6446. An act for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6544. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 6556. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 6637. An act for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino;

H. R. 6640. An act for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Eeu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu);

H. R. 6681. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6869. An act for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 7009. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott;

H. R. 7255. An act to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans);

H. R. 7301. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7303. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7366. An act for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son, James Robert Eder;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray;

H. R. 7502. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; and

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox, a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GRAHAM and to include a short poem.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include the Chaplain's prayer to be given on tomorrow on the Voice of America.

Mr. DOLLINGER notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will be $294.

Mr. PRICE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a speech prepared by him to be read at the Ukrainian Congress in New York which he could not attend because of the session of Congress;

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement by him in support of a joint resolution calling for an independent Slovakia.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. TEAGUE in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RIBICOFF and to include a petition.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. HOWELL (at the request of Mr. RIBICOFF) and to include an article.

Mr. MCCARTHY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a speech he made as temporary chairman of the Indiana Democratic Convention on June 24.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a number of telegrams from colleges and institutions regarding the GI bill of rights now in conference.

Mr. MORANO and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANDERSON of California and to include extraneous material.

Mr. GAVIN and to include a statement on Col. Frank S. Gabreski.

Mr. RIEHLMAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. WILNALL and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. MADDEN and to include a radiogram.

Mr. FOGARTY and to include a speech delivered by the Ambassador of Ireland.

Mr. DEMPSEY.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. JENSEN) and include a speech which he delivered to the postal employees at Hagerstown, Md.

Mr. LUCAS and to include an article written by W. L. Redus.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'TOOLE.

Mr. BRAY (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an editorial.

Mr. OSTERTAG (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. COLMER.

Mr. IRVING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

Mr. SECREST and include an article written by O. R. Strackbine.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two separate instances.

Mr. HELLER (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) and to include an article notwithstanding it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $280.

Mr. MILLER of California and include a summary of a preliminary report to the President of the United States by the National Historical Publications Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Mississsippi in four separate instances.

Mr. LANE in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK to extend the remarks he made eulogizing the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] and include a resolution adopted formally by his committee.

Mr. RADWAN and to include a letter.

Mr. WEICHEL in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include an article entitled "Second Anniversary in Korea" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper editorial.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of titles 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7151. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7216. An act making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county;

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveneses of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953; and

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion;

H. R. 3707. An act for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick;

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for research into and development of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953;

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; and

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the pay rolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, July 4, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1630. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1631. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a note from the Minister of Switzerland to the United States, in which is extended an invitation to the Congress of the United States to be represented at Forty-first Conference of the Interparliamentary Union which will be convened at Bern, Switzerland, on August 28, 1952; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1632. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a certified copy of the acts of the Fourth Regular Session of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, pursuant to section 23 of the organic

act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1633. A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, transmitting the Motor Carrier Claims Commission report on the claim of the Cassell Transfer & Storage Co., a corporation, against the United States, pursuant to section 10 of the Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act of July 2, 1948 (62 Stat. 1222; 49 U. S. C. 305) (note), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1634. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a report pursuant to House Resolution 664, Eighty-second Congress (H. Doc. No. 529); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and order to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee of conference. H. R. 7176. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2451). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 7289. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2454). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam; without amendment (Rept. No. 2457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1951. A bill to provide that lands reserved to the Territory of Alaska for educational purposes may be leased for periods not in excess of 99 years; without amendment (Rept. No. 2460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3363. A bill to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds; with amendment (Rept. No. 2461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6891. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial; with amendment (Rept. No. 2462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7262. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7506. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land and dwelling houses on the project known as Shadehill Unit, Missouri River Basin project, Lemmon, S. Dak., without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; without amendment (Rept. No. 2464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7555. A bill relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8293. A bill to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of the Lower Brule and the Crow Creek Reservations in South Dakota for Indian lands and rights; acquired by the United States for the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development; and to authorize an appropriation for the removal from the taking area of the Fort Randall Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Development, and the reestablishment of the Indians of the Yankton Indian Reservation, S. Dak.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 8144. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, Lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 732: Resolution to provide for an additional official reporter to House committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 8499. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee of Conference. H. R. 3589. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works; without amendment (Rept. No. 2470). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2471. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2472. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5042. A bill to extend to the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5157. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees; with amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5283. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to allow containers for petroleum products to be temporarily imported, under certain circumstances, without payment of duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4145. A bill to amend section 309 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1309), and section 446 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C. 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1446); with amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5567. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; with amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. EBERHARTER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7651. A bill to amend section 2879 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 2478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 457. Joint resolution to amend sections 1606 and 1607 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee of conference. S. 3066. An act to amend defense-housing laws, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2480). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee of conference. H. R. 7656. A bill to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2481.) Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under Clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 981. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama; with amendment (Rept. No. 2452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6638. A bill to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site; with amendment (Rept. No. 2453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McMULLEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 7304. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Jennings; with amendment (Rept. No. 2455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease; without amendment

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(Rept. No. 2456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 8494. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in South Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8495. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 8496. A bill to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8497. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces who suffer disability or death while performing travel to and from specified types of active duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 8498. A bill to provide that a woman taxpayer who must work to support her dependents may deduct moneys paid for the care of her dependents while she works; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STANLEY:

H. R. 8499. A bill to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 8500. A bill to credit the Oglala Sioux Tribe with the proceeds of Oglala Sioux tribal lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 8501. A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 8502. A bill to amend section 34 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to prevent allowance or payment of certain debt claims based upon bonds of Germany, Japan, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, or Italy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8503. A bill to amend section 39 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, so as to permit the return of property to nationals of Germany or Japan, or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8504. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading with the Enemy Act, so as to permit the return under such section of certain property owned by an alien individual; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8505. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of a demonstration plant at Hazleton, Pa., to produce synthetic liquid fuel from anthracite; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. J. Res. 494. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a sculptural piece known as The Pony Express in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. J. Res. 495. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a sculptural piece known as The Pony Express in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution reaffirming our historic friendship with the Slovak peoples, and expressing our hopes for the early liberation of the Slovak peoples from their present enslavement and for the early restoration of their basic human rights and freedoms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature urging Congress to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Senate of Massachusetts urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8506. A bill for the relief of Felice Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 8507. A bill for the relief of Catherine V. Sindy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8508. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rachel Soloff Vertman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8509. A bill for the relief of Arthur Weingarten; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 8510. A bill for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Herrmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 8511. A bill for the relief of John Jacob Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 8512. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8513. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Krogsoe Carver; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 8514. A bill for the relief of Arthur Neustadt and Mrs. Emma Neustadt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8515. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 8516. A bill for the relief of Carlo Giovanni Recchia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8517. A bill for the relief of Saliba Douaihy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 8518. A bill for the relief of Jose Gomes Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of Juanita Kloeden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8520. A bill for the relief of Ehstathios A. Spathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 8521. A bill for the relief of Kim Ki Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 8522. A bill for the relief of Marlene D. Knight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

787. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 969 citizens of Port Arthur, Tex., in support of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2188), a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce and ban its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

788. By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of Mrs. Joseph J. Pausner, president of the California Chapter of Pro-America, containing 17,108 signatures, from all congressional districts of California, petitioning for tax reduction, the elimination of unnecessary spending, and a limitation on the Federal debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, the strength of our years and the light of all our days, we turn again from the clash and clamor of our times, from the confusion of voices and the pressure of daily duties to hear again the "still, small voice." We lay before Thee our little lives—our weary bodies, our tired minds, our taut spirits—beseeching the refreshment which alone comes from Thee, the fountain of life and health.

We thank Thee for this new day of duty and service. Grant to Thy servants here clean hands, pure hearts, wisdom in every decision, and fidelity in every dedication. Make known Thy ways to them and grant this body courage to follow therein.

On this day of sacred memory we thank Thee for this good land which Thou hast given us for an heritage and for the freedom vouchsafed to us as sons of Thy creation. We remember before Thee those whom Thou hast raised up for our Nation, to defend our liberty, preserve our union, maintain law and order within our borders, and

to represent us in the far corners of the earth. Regard with special favor the youth of this land who in distant places now strive to uphold the liberties of mankind. Give them strength in temptation and courage in every peril that they and we may ever be an honor to Thee.

O Lord, in whose sovereign will is the destiny of men and nations, wilt Thou in these demanding days make us strong enough and good enough and great enough to be the servants of Thy righteousness.

Through Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 3, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense-housing laws, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DURHAM, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. SCRIVNER, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1950. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; and

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 237) authorizing the disposal of certain obsolete Government publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Congress, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug; and

H. R. 8409. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FULBRIGHT and Mr. SPARKMAN were excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 4:30 p. m. today, and tomorrow.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KNOWLAND was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate beginning at 4:30 o'clock p. m. today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to state for the RECORD the high estimate of the capabilities of our majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], which is held by me and, I feel certain, by Members of the United States Senate generally.

The State of Arizona is particularly fortunate in being represented in the United States Senate by such a capable and conscientious Senator. His outstanding worth to the country at large, as well as to his State, is recognized by all who have observed his sincere efforts.

He is experienced, thoroughly devoted to his constituency, unusually well informed on national and world matters, and a symbol of industry and integrity to all who know him.

As majority leader of the Senate he bears a well-deserved reputation for fairness in dealing with Senators of both parties. In this exacting position, likewise, he has demonstrated a very valuable ability to work out satisfactory agreements on controversial matters. The further fact that he is continually at his post of duty makes him really an ideal majority leader.

The State of Arizona is to be complimented on having such exemplary leadership, and it can be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that the United States Senate and the country at large have been the beneficiaries of the splendid work of Senator McFARLAND.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably two bills, H. R. 3268 and H. R. 6558, and I submit reports thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be placed on the calendar in order that they can be taken up when the calendar is called today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none.

The bills reported by Mr. Kilgore were ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

H. R. 3268. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2095); and

H. R. 6558. A bill for the relief of George Blech and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 2094).

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES — REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, or enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 2093) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks on this proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to meet the threat of totalitarian aggression the American people have agreed to mobilize the national resources and energies for the common defense and to maintain standing forces far in excess of the normal peacetime level.

This mobilization has resulted in serious dislocations in the normal pattern of the lives of many of our citizens. It is clear that some of these dislocations create social problems for which the Federal Government can and must assume the responsibility. One of these areas is the health needs of the families of men who are called to serve in the Armed Forces, and the most urgent aspect of this problem is that of making sure that the children of these men and their pregnant wives will have adequate hospital and medical care.

Under peacetime conditions, military hospitals and medical personnel have been adequate to care for the health needs of the dependents of all members of the Armed Forces. Today, however, with the Armed Forces at several times their peacetime strength, this is no longer true. More than 200,000 babies are expected to be born to the wives of enlisted men in the next year, but it is estimated that only about 75,000 of these births can be cared for in military hospitals. It is essential that each man serving in the Armed Forces be assured that his pregnant wife and his preschool children will be able to get the medical care they need. But tens of thousands of servicemen do not have this assurance now, and that number is expected to increase. If the Armed Forces should be required to go into larger-scale mobilization than at present, the size of this problem would be enormous.

This program is needed now to meet the immediate problem of those dependents for whom military facilities are unavailable. Legislation is needed now to enable the appropriate Federal and State agencies to set up in an orderly way the necessary machinery to deal with the much larger problem which might arise overnight if the world crisis should suddenly become critical.

Mr. President, I urge early Senate consideration and action on this bill which would make it possible for a GI wife to be delivered in a civilian hospital by the civilian doctor of her choice, and which would provide similar arrangements for needed medical care for the children of GI's through the fifth year. This program is based upon the well-tried principles emerging from the experience gained with respect to the so-called EMIC program which was in effect during World War II. Its passage is urged by maternal and child health experts, by the numerous civic and voluntary organizations serving GI families, and by veteran and labor groups throughout the country.

Delay in enactment of this legislation would cause serious hardship to GI wives for whom childbirth care cannot be provided by doctors in military hospitals.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3472. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Fishbird; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 3473. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service-testing of jet transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3474. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Grace Chun (nee Si Chin Wu); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 3475. A bill for the relief of Jessie Connelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 3476. A bill for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3477. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. HENNINGS):

S. 3478. A bill to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 3479. A bill for the relief of Arsenios Peter Gligorievitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 3480. A bill for the relief of Erato Aronopoulou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 3481. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LEHMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3482. A bill to establish a legislative bureau for the audit, analysis and review of Federal Government programs and projects for the purpose of making recommendations to the Congress with respect to the elimination of unnecessary, wasteful and extravagant activities and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, public or private, those government activities which they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3483. A bill to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 3484. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3485. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended.

PROTECTION AGAINST VIOLENCE TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3481) to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "man of the Coast Guard" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "uniformed members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

The statement presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I am aware that it is on the eve of the adjournment of the session but I am, nevertheless, introducing a bill whose purpose is to prevent unprovoked violence and assault against uniformed members of the Armed Forces. I think it important that a record be made of this bill and that it be available for consideration by the public and by the Congress should it be recalled into special session.

I have been working on this legislation for almost 2 years. I introduced a similar measure, as an amendment to the universal military training bill, in the spring of 1951. Since that time I have been in contact with various departments of the Federal Government, and especially with the Defense Department, with a view to working out some of the difficulties involved in this legislation and to answering some of the questions and doubts raised when this proposal was originally considered a year and a half ago.

The effect of this bill would be to penalize physical assault against uniformed military personnel if committed while such personnel are engaged in performance of duty or on account of the performance of duty. Such assault would be defined as Federal offense and could be tried in a Federal Court.

Our proposal is nothing startling. The protection of Federal law is already extended—and has been for many years—to a long list of categories of Federal officers ranging all the way from marshals and deputy marshals to game wardens and meat inspectors.

Interestingly enough, this protection is also accorded, under present law, to members of the Coast Guard. Our bill merely grants the same protection as is now extended to members of Coast Guard to other members of armed services—to Army, Navy, and Air Force. A bill such as this was originally considered in 1944. It was recommended by the War Department, by the then Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson. It was then favorably reported to the Senate. Today the Defense Department is still in favor of this measure. Many public interest groups are likewise in favor of this measure.

Its purpose is clear—to prevent unprovoked assault upon uniformed members of the Armed Forces in areas where local police protection is either inadequate, unavailable, or unwilling to assure the men in the uniform of our country of their personal physical safety.

The question has been raised as to how far this protection would and should go. We have determined that this protection should be extended only while the military personnel are in uniform and only while they are engaged in actual performance of duty or when the assault occurs because of their performance of duty. I have a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Charles A. Coolidge, in which "on duty" is defined to mean "periods when they are performing official duties." The letter from the Defense Department is as follows:

"ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
"Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.

"Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
"United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Reference is made to your letter requesting the views of the Department of Defense as to the extent which legislation should go in protecting members of the Armed Forces against physical violence, and requesting the Department's definition of the term "on duty."

"It is the view of the Department of Defense that the protection afforded officers and employees of the Government by sections 1114 and 111 of title 18, United States Code, should be extended to members of the Armed Forces for periods when they are engaged in the performance of official duties. Such periods may be more precisely defined as being during the execution of duties imposed by statutes, and regulations and directives of the Armed Forces concerned, and during the execution of specific duties imposed by order of competent authority. It would seem that it would be unrealistic to attempt to extend such protection to members of the Armed Forces for periods not involving the performance of official duties, such as periods of leave, liberty, or authorized absence. It is our understanding that the provisions of sections 1114 and 111 have been so construed in the case of the Coast Guard. The draft of bill furnished you by the Department of Defense on July 5, 1951, would accomplish this purpose.

"Your letter specifically requested an interpretation of the term "on duty." While that term is generally construed by the Department to mean any time during which a member of the Armed Forces is in receipt of basic pay, it should not be used in this sense in legislation extending protection against physical violence to members of the Armed Forces. Any extension of such protection to members of the Armed Forces should be limited, as in the case of the Coast Guard, to periods when they are performing official duties.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this letter.

"Sincerely yours,
"CHARLES A. COOLIDGE."

The question has been raised as to whether there is a need for legislation of this kind. Indeed there is a need. Last year I asked the Army Department to prepare a report of instances of physical violence against Army personnel, committed by civilians, as reflected in the files of the Army Department. I asked that only such data as has been already assembled should be analyzed, being aware that many cases of violence of this kind are never reported to the central files of the Army Department. I also asked that the Army specify the instances in which these offenses have been punished by State law and the instances in which such offenses had gone unpunished. I now attach a summary of the material submitted to me by the Army Department, broken down by Army corps areas in the United States:

"INFORMATION REGARDING SPECIFIC CASES OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE AGAINST MEMBERS OF ARMY BY CIVILIANS

"First Army area (New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Maine), January 1 to August 31, 1951:

"1. Thirty-three cases of simple assault, 4 of which are punished by State laws, 2 are being held for court action, and 27 cases under investigation.

"2. Thirty-one cases of assault and battery, 7 of which have been punished by State laws, 10 are being investigated, 7 are held for court action, and 7 were unpunished.

"3. One case of homicide punished by State law.

"4. Two cases of involuntary manslaughter under investigation.

"Second Army area (Kentucky, Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Delaware), November 1950 to September 1951:

"1. Camp Breckinridge reports incidents of alleged mistreatment of military personnel by civil authorities during or after arrest which have not yet been disposed of.

"2. Pennsylvania Military District reports two murders of military personnel by civilians who have been punished by State law.

"3. West Virginia Military District reports two cases of assault of military personnel by civilians who have been fined by civilian courts.

"4. Maryland Military District reports 46 cases of physical violence by civilians against military personnel. Disposition of these cases is not known as no records are kept by the military district. Such information can be procured only by extensive research.

"5. Fort Monroe reports one instance of a soldier being shot and wounded by a female civilian who received a suspended sentence of 1 year in prison.

"6. Camp Pickett reports one case of a soldier receiving knife wounds from a civilian who was sentenced to 5 years' probation and 1 year suspended sentence. In another case of a soldier assaulted with a knife by a civilian, the civilian is presently in jail awaiting trial.

"7. Fort Eustis reports six cases of physical violence against military personnel by civilians. In five of these cases, either no punishment has been adjudged or the culprit has not been found. One case is still pending.

"8. Fort Story reports one case of an officer killed during an armed robbery by a civilian who has been sentenced to death. In another case, a female civilian was acquitted on grounds of justifiable homicide of killing an enlisted man who was attempting to enter her apartment.

"9. Army Chemical Center reports one case of physical violence against Army personnel by a civilian which has gone unpunished.

"Third Army area (Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, Florida), January to September 1951:

"1. Fifty-eight cases of violence.

"2. Thirteen punished by State laws.

"3. Twenty-six cases of action incomplete.

"4. Nineteen cases were unpunished.

"Fourth Army area (New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma), September 1, 1950, to August 1, 1951:

"1. Thirty-five cases of physical violence.

"2. Ten cases were punished by State laws.

"3. Six cases by persons unknown.

"4. Nineteen cases were unpunished.

"Fifth Army area (Missouri, Kansas, Colorada, Nebraska, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland), no date given:

"1. Specific information required not available in the military installations without exhaustive search.

"Sixth Army area (Utah, Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Washington), January 1 to September 1951:

"1. Seventy-two cases of violence by civilians against the military.

"2. Thirty-eight of the cases were punished by State laws.

"3. Thirty-four cases were not punished.

"Military district of Washington, January to August 1951:

"1. Eleven incidents of violence by civilians against the military.

"2. Ten were committed by unknown persons.

"3. One was referred to civil authorities and is still pending."

This is a shocking summary. In a period of slightly less than 1 year and on the basis of such reports as were available, we find 111 cases in which assaults were committed against uniformed members of the armed services and no punishment was meted out to those who committed the acts in question.

There probably are extenuating circumstances in some of the cases. In some instances, local law-enforcement offices do not have enough staff to apprehend the guilty parties. In some instances the local police officers are unwilling to apprehend the perpetrators of these acts.

We are calling our young men into the service of our country. We are sending them to camps all over the country far from home. We have an obligation to see that these young men and women are adequately protected. Obviously, when new posts are established in small communities, the communities' facilities become suddenly overtaxed.

If adequate police protection is not available, the Federal Government must provide a means whereby Federal law-enforcement officers can prevent these acts of violence and can apprehend the guilty ones when such acts are committed.

This proposal is, of course, a bipartisan one. It should be considered by the appropriate Senate committee and adopted at the earliest possible time. I hope it will be acted upon in the near future. Certainly our young men and women in the Armed Forces are entitled to as much protection as employees of the grazing division or of the Indian Bureau.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

REQUEST OF GOVERNORS OF STATES TO TAKE ACTION TO AFFORD MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. JENNER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. IVES, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARTHY, and Mr. BUTLER of Maryland) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 349), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Whereas there are millions of men and women in uniform within the United States and in foreign countries engaged in protecting the security of the United States; and

Whereas these men and women have the inherent right to vote and are entitled to be provided with the means by which they may exercise such right: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should cooperate with the governors of the States in seeing that members of the armed services wherever assigned may exercise their voting franchise in the 1952 National and State elections.

The Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to cooperate with the several States in carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the governor of each State.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1950. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia, of certain citizens of the United States adjudged insane in foreign countries; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HISTORY OF THE SENATE SEAL (S. DOC. NO. 164)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for not more than 30 seconds, and then to present a unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, several months ago I was sent an early Senate seal. I wondered about its authenticity, because Mrs. Saltonstall was using it in connection with some art work, so I brought the seal to Mr. Emery L. Frazier, Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. Frazier and I became interested in the subject of the history of the Senate seal. To my amazement, I learned that there have been at least three official seals, perhaps four. Furthermore, at different times in the early part of the nineteenth century, various Members of the Senate made their own seals for use in sealing letters.

As a result of these disclosures, Mr. Frazier and I commenced a study of the subject, and mostly with his help, considerable data was assembled. I submitted the data to the Library of Congress. The Library has now published a small history of the Senate seal from 1800 to the present time.

I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and he has agreed that the manuscript may be printed as a Senate document. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, a manuscript entitled "History of the Senate Seal."

Credit for the manuscript should be given to the Chief Clerk of the Senate, Mr. Frazier, who under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Biffle, keeps in his custody the Senate seal, and has much interest and pride in the authenticity of the seal and its history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (S. DOC. No. 165)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD after the adjournment a summary of the legislative record of the Eighty-second Congress, and that the summary be also printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO MAKE INSERTIONS IN APPENDIX FOLLOWING ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Appendix of the RECORD following the adjournment of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I inquire how long after the adjournment of Congress Senators are permitted to insert matters in the Appendix of the RECORD?

Mr. McFARLAND. As long as the RECORD is kept open. I can find out tomorrow and make an announcement with regard to it.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (S. DOC. NO. 166)

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD after final adjournment of the Congress a statement prepared jointly by the Senate minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] and Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., House minority leader, together with an accompanying review of the legislative record of the Eighty-second Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent that this statement and the legislative review be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement and review will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, or the full committee, be authorized to submit interim reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress, and that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by Senator HUMPHREY at the annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held at Oklahoma City, Okla., June 29, 1952.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Address delivered by Millard Cass, special assistant to the Secretary of Labor, before the twenty-fifth annual Florida State convention of Disabled American Veterans, on June 7, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Congress and the Farmers of Wisconsin."

By Mr. MURRAY:

Editorial entitled "ILO Looks Ahead," published in the New York Times of June 14, 1952.

Article entitled "The Great Gamble," published in summer 1952 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, dealing with the German problem.

Article entitled "The Trickery of the 'Trust Busters'," published in the summer 1952 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, dealing with German cartels.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Article entitled "Amortization of Defense Facilities," published in Capital Goods Review of the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, for May 1952.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "Dr. Abraham Rosenbach," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Morning News of July 4, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article in regard to the late Albert D. Lasker.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "The Apology to Lattimore," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman, of Boise, Idaho, on June 30, 1952.

By Mr. MALONE:

Address delivered by him before the State Republican Convention, at Tonopah, Nev., May 9, 1952.

Article written by him, entitled "Is Useful Atomic Power Only a Year Away?", published in the American Engineer, in the May 1952 issue.

Address delivered by him at commencement exercises of a high school in Nevada.

By Mr. HILL:
Statement prepared by him on health progress during the past 20 years.

By Mr. LEHMAN:
Statement prepared by him in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 169, proposing a study and review of immigration and naturalization policies.

By Mr. FREAR:
Pamphlet entitled "Molecules on the Delaware."

By Mr. MORSE:
Statement entitled "Civil Rights Platform Plank, 1952," issued to the delegates to the 1952 Republican National Convention by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights.

By Mr. CAIN:
Letter dated June 28, 1952, addressed to the Wage Stabilization Board by Carl H. Berglund, CPA.

By Mr. MUNDT:
Article regarding the present steel situation, entitled "Steel Output Drops to 12½ Percent in Strike—Total Loss in Postwar Years Above 34,500,000 Tons," published in Steel Facts, June 1952.

ANALYSIS OF LEGAL PROBLEMS ARISING FROM SEIZURE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, while the current Steel case put the spotlight on the constitutional issues involved in Government seizure, there are various other aspects of seizure of a company or an industry which must be evaluated before consideration can be given to work-stoppage legislation in periods of national emergency.

I have, therefore, requested the Department of Justice to provide information dealing with the Government's experience with seizures ordered under the Smith-Connally Act between 1943 and 1947.

Because of the vital importance of these data for the proper assessment of Government seizure, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, my letter to the Attorney General, the factual memorandum prepared by the Justice Department under the direction of Mr. Baldridge, the Assistant Attorney General, and an article from the Buffalo Evening News analyzing the many legal problems arising from seizure.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 27, 1952.

The Honorable JAMES P. MCGRANERY,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCGRANERY: Apart from the constitutional issue raised in the current Steel case, Government seizure of a company or an industry for the purpose of maintaining operations has lost its novelty by reason of the Government's frequent resort to this device in recent years.

In exploring the subject I find, however, that factual information regarding the various aspects of Government seizure is very scanty.

As your Department has been extensively involved in seizure cases, I assume that comprehensive information is readily at hand in its records. It is on that assumption that I am addressing this request to you. First of all, let me say that I would be wholly satisfied with a reply that is confined to seizures ordered under the War Labor Disputes (Smith-Connally) Act during the period of its effectiveness, 1943–47.

As a means of assessing Government seizure, in its practical effects, answers to the following questions would be greatly appreciated for whatever bearing they may have on legislation that is now before the Congress.

How many seizures took place under the Smith-Connally Act?

What industries, trades, or services were affected?

Was the taking made in any case for a purpose other than averting or ending a strike? If so, what was the purpose?

On what terms was termination of seizure effected in most cases?

On what other terms have seizures been terminated?

In what seizure cases did the Government introduce changes in wages or working conditions during the period of seizure?

In what, if any, seizure cases was acceptance by the private owners of such changes in wages or working conditions made a condition for terminating seizure?

How much have seizures cost the Federal Government in moneys paid to the private owners on the basis of (1) terms offered or negotiated by the Government; and (2) damages awarded to the private owners by the courts?

What seizure actions were challenged in the courts and by whom?

What were the issues raised in such cases? How were these issues adjudicated?

How many seizure cases under the Smith-Connally Act are still in litigation, and what are the issues in dispute?

If the questions above fail to bring out any facts which you regard as pertinent, please consider that this request also includes them.

A reply at your early convenience will be greatly appreciated in the interest of assuring mature consideration of proposed legislation intended to avert work stoppages in periods of national emergency.

Sincerely yours,

IRVING M. IVES.

MEMORANDUM RE INQUIRY OF SENATOR IRVING M. IVES REGARDING SEIZURES PURSUANT TO THE WAR LABOR DISPUTES ACT

Senator IVES' recent letter to the Attorney General requests that he be furnish with answers to certain specific questions. It was further requested that the answers be sufficient to permit a mature assessment of Government seizure. Each of the questions will be taken up separately in an effort to answer these questions directly and as forthrightly as possible, except where the Department of Justice does not have the information needed to provide the answers, in which instances the Government department or agency which should have available the necessary information is indicated in the list attached as Appendix A. In view of the Senator's request that we provide him with any further information which may be pertinent and significant, and yet not within the range of his questions, a short discussion of some of the problems encountered by the Department in connection with seizures is included.

I

How many seizures took place under the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act?

During the period the Smith-Connally Act or War Labor Disputes Act (act of June 25, 1943, c. 144, 57 Stat. 163; 50 U. S. C. A., App. 1501–1511) was in effect (June 25, 1943 through Dec. 31, 1946), 64 seizures took place. These seizures affected mines, plants, or facilities in a great variety of industries. In some instances, such as the seizures of railroads, other statutes, such as the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645; 10 U. S. C. 1361) (seizure of transportation systems), authorized the seizure; but, in view of the fact that most executive orders indicate that the action was taken pursuant to the Constitution and laws of the United States, it cannot be stated flatly that seizures authorized by other statutes were not also authorized by the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act, the terms of which are quite comprehensive.

II

What industries, trades, or services were affected?

Because of the great variety of different industries, trades, or services affected by the seizures between June 25, 1943, and December 31, 1946, inclusive, there is attached hereto as Appendix A, a list of the appropriate executive orders, the dates the executive orders were issued, the plant, mine, or other facility seized, and the Government official in charge of the administration of the respective seized property.

III

Was the taking made in any case for a purpose other than averting or ending a strike?

The Government always takes the position that the seizure was not made for the purpose of ending or averting a strike. We always assert that the seizure occurred in order to prevent interruption of necessary production or service, whatever may have been the reason for the interruption, or threatened interruption, of the needed production or service. We feel that this position has not only been necessary but that it also accurately reflects the true state of affairs, for, generally speaking, the Government performs its administrative and mediatory services through separate agencies whose functions are quite disparate. However, the great majority of the seizures occurred because continuous production or service was interrupted, or threatened with interruption, by a labor dispute. Accordingly, the seizures, listed in Appendix A, which were made for some reason other than because of labor dispute had threatened interruption of production, or service, are marked with an asterisk. Seizures, during World War II, were effected where production of needed war materials was interrupted, or threatened with interruption, by reason of the following, apart from labor disputes: (1) refusal to deliver at "fair and reasonable prices"; (2) unacceptable quality of product; (3) inefficient management; and (4) failure to maintain production schedules.

IV

1. On what terms was termination of seizure effected in most cases?

2. On what other terms have seizures been terminated?

3. In what seizure cases did the Government introduce changes in wages or working conditions during the period of seizure?

4. In what, if any, seizure case was acceptance by the private owners of such changes in wages or working conditions made a condition for terminating seizure?

This group of questions can be answered only by the respective administering agencies. Since this Department has concerned itself with seizures only where seizures have led to litigation and we have not been concerned with termination of seizure other than indirectly, the Department of Justice does not have available the information required to answer these questions.

V

How much have seizures cost the Federal Government in moneys paid to the private owners on the basis of (1) terms offered or negotiated by the Government; and (2) damages awarded to the private owners by the courts.

1. Unless the return of seized properties gives rise to litigation, we have no contact with, or information pertaining to, terms offered or negotiated by the Government in connection with the termination of Government seizure; and, consequently, we are neither in a position to answer this question nor the appropriate agency to do so. Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that sufficient answers to this question be ob-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

tained from the respective agencies listed in appendix A, sources which have the information and experience we do not possess.

2. However, we have had some experience with respect to damages awarded, by the courts, to private owners of seized properties. There follows a brief summary of the salient points involved in our relatively recent experience in these matters. In *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* ((1951) 341 U. S. 114, 116),[1] the Court of Claims (115 Ct. Cl. 626) had awarded Pewee $2,241.26 as the amount of the increased wages paid pursuant to an order issued by the War Labor Board during Government seizure under Executive Order No. 9340, May 1, 1943 (8 F. R. 5695). The Government petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims in an effort to defeat this claim, which it felt to be wholly unjustified. Pewee did not file a cross petition for certiorari; and, as a consequence, the affirmation by the Supreme Court of the award by the Court of Claims was restricted to the original judgment in the amount of $2,241.26. This fact is significant because the majority opinion by Mr. Justice Black indicates that, in his opinion, and in that of the three other justices, Pewee may have been entitled to a "fair rental" award in addition to the award for the increased wages. It should be noted, however, that four justices felt that Pewee was entitled to no compensation whatever and that Mr. Justice Reed, in his concurring opinion, disagreed with Mr. Justice Black and stated that Pewee was entitled only to compensation for the wage increases and would not have been entitled to fair rental in any event. Thus, the question of fair rental is an open one and a present problem for the Department of Justice in connection with other cases now pending in the Court of Claims which arose out of subsequent seizures under the War Labor Disputes Act.

The situation with respect to the Motor Carrier Claims Commission is considerably more complex. In the first place, it should perhaps be pointed out that the Motor Carrier Claims Commission was established by an act of Congress (Motor Carrier Claims Commission Act (62 Stat. 1222 (1948)), as amended (62 Stat. 1289, 1290 (1948), 63 Stat. 80 (1949)), in order to process claims of various motor carriers arising out of seizure of their properties, pursuant to Executive Order No. 9462, August 11, 1944 (9 F. R. 10071), during the Second World War when a labor dispute threatened substantial interruption of motor transportation in the Middle West.[2]

A total of 103 cases were filed with the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. These 103 claims sought recovery in a total amount approximating $50,000,000. The claim of R. B. Freight Lines, Inc., was the first case determined by the Motor Carrier Claims Commission. R. B. was awarded a rental value computed with respect to each of the component parts of the seized system: for example, (1) "over-the-road" trucks were compensated for at a rate of 7 cents per mile, computed on a basis of 5,000 miles per month; (2) pick-up and delivery trucks were compensated for at a slightly lower rate of approximately 5 cents per mile; (3) office equipment was compensated for at a basis of 10 percent per month of the original cost of such equipment, or 140 percent approximately; (4) $2,500 was allowed for the cancellation of a contract and an additional $13,000 was allowed for excessive wear and tear. Thus, the award to R. B. Freight Lines, Inc., amounted to $121,860.34, plus interest at 4 percent from November 1, 1945, to date of payment. The Government petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari in the R. B. case, but this petition was denied (342 U. S. 933).[3]

In subsequent cases, determined by the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, the Government succeeded in reducing the rental figure for line-haul trucks from 7 cents per mile to 5 cents per mile and in achieving certain other reduction in the compensation determined by the Commission. The Supreme Court having denied certiorari in the R. B. case, there was no point in petitioning for certiorari in the other cases determined by the Commission. However, in each case finally determined by the Commission, the Government petitioned for a rehearing, and then undertook settlement negotiations. Reductions to two-thirds of the amounts determined by the Commission were obtained through these efforts in those cases in which final determination had been made, and to corresponding amounts in the other pending cases. In 91 cases settlement has been agreed upon under the formula described above and 64 of these have been fully processed through the Commission. At the present time, 13 more of these settled cases are ready for processing by the Commission. All but 6 of the 103 claims filed with the Motor Carrier Claims Commission, in a total amount of nearly $50,000,000, have been determined or settled in a principal amount of about $6,000,000, although the award of interest at 4 percent per year for a period of 7 years has increased this amount to approximately $7,700,000. In view of the fact that the Supreme Court denied the Government's petition for a writ of certiorari in the R. B. case, and in view of the subsequent final determinations by the Commission, it is felt that the one-third reduction of the claims accomplished by the settlements was most fortunate with respect to the Government's interest in connection with these seizures.

VI

What seizure actions were challenged in the courts and by whom?

What were the issues raised in such cases?

How were these issues adjudicated?

The principal challenge to Government seizure was raised in *United States* v. *United Mine Workers of America* ((1947) 330 U. S. 258). This case involved Executive Order No. 9728 (11 F. R. 5593) issued on May 21, 1946, which authorized the Secretary of the Interior to assume the possession and operation of certain bituminous coal mines. The United Mine Workers, before the Supreme Court, asserted that the seizure was a "sham and a fiction" because the day-to-day operation of the various seized properties remained under the immediate supervision of the private managerial forces. This contention was advanced in order to defeat the Government's argument that the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C. 101 et seq.) did not apply where the Government had seized the facility concerned and had assumed role of employer.

In this case, the Government relied upon the traditional equity jurisdiction of the Federal courts to grant injunctive relief (see: *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 599–600)). Consequently, in these circumstances it was found that the provisions of the Norris-LaGuardia Act which divested district courts of jurisdiction to issue injunctions in cases arising out of labor disputes did not apply. In the Mine Workers case the Supreme Court held that the Government retained ultimate control of the seized properties and that, therefore, the seizure could not be said to be a mere sham and fiction. This holding was further explained in Mr. Justice Black's opinion of the Court in *United States* v. *Pewee Coal Co.* ((1951) 341 U. S. 114, 116), where it was said:

"It should not and will not be assumed that the seizure of the mines was a mere sham or pretense to accomplish some unexpressed governmental purpose instead of being the proclaimed actual taking of possession and control. In *United States* v. *United Mine Workers* (330 U. S. 258), there had been a Government seizure of the mines under Presidential and Secretarial orders, which, insofar as here material, were substantially the same as those issued in the present case. We rejected the contention of the mineworkers that 'the Government's role in administering the bituminous-coal mines [was] for the most part fictional and for the remainder nominal only.' We treated that seizure as making the mines governmental facilities 'in as complete a sense as if the Government held full title and ownership' (id., at 284–285)."

Challenges of seizure action have been carried further in cases involving railroad seizures which have arisen since expiration of the War Labor Disputes Act. The various railway labor organizations, which have been the defendants in these actions for injunctive relief, have somewhat amplified the arguments first advanced by the United Mine Workers. Today, in this type of litigation, we usually meet arguments that the seizure is a mere sham and fiction because (1) profits have not been seized, (2) private managerial forces remain in control of day-to-day operations, (3) the governmental agency administering the seized property has not entered into collective-bargaining agreements or negotiations with the labor organization, and (4) various other arguments pertaining to an outward demonstration of governmental control, such as flying the flag, establishing offices for Government representatives apart from those belonging to the seized property.

It should be pointed out that these additional arguments have arisen in connection with the recently terminated railroad seizure, which lasted for approximately 21 months. The railroad-injunction litigation which arose in March in the northern district of Ohio (Civil No. 28926) reached a decisive stage approximately 20 months following the seizure, so that there was available, for judicial examination, evidence pertaining to the administration of seized properties by the Department of the Army. In this sense, the case is most unusual, if not unique. Ordinarily, litigation occurs almost immediately after the seizure action, so that there is no period of administraton of a seized property which can be presented to the court as an indication either of the genuineness of the seizure or the fictitious nature of the seizure. As a consequence, we normally must rely upon the bare terms of the Executive order directing the seizure in order to establish the employer-employee relationship between the Government and

[1] Although the seizure of the Pewee Coal Co. occurred prior to enactment of the War Labor Disputes Act, and, therefore, is not within the purview of the inquiry, still it is felt that this case presented the Department with many of the more important questions involved in connection with compensation for seizures under the War Labor Disputes Act. Certainly, the Pewee case is a pilot in this field of litigation, and it is within the spirit, if not the precise terms, of the inquiry.

[2] The Supreme Court has held, in *United States* v. *Wheelock Bros., Inc.* ((1951), 341 U. S. 319, 320), that the act of Congress, which established the Commission, conferred exclusive jurisdiction on the Motor Carrier Claims Commission with respect to the compensation claims arising out of these seizures. As a consequence of this holding, these cases cannot be heard in the Court of Claims.

[3] Thus, the Government was unable to argue before the Supreme Court that "rental" awards should not be allowed in these cases, and that question remains unanswered by the Supreme Court although, as pointed out above, the Pewee decision indicated that the Supreme Court may consider such awards proper.

the workers, which is necessary to avoid the prohibitive effects of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. In *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* ((D. Ct. for D. C., 1948), 79 F. Supp. 485); *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, et al.* ((N. D. Ill., 1951), 96 F. Supp. 428; (D. Ct. for D. C., 1951) 95 F. Supp. 1019; and (N. D. Ohio, 1951), Civil No. 27911); and *United States* v. *Switchmen's Union of North America* ((W. D. N. Y., 1950), 97 F. Supp. 97), the Department of Justice was successful in contending that the question as to whether or not seizure was appropriate was one vested exclusively in the President, and, secondly, that the conduct of the Government in administering the seized property apart from questions of just compensation was a matter with respect to which the executive branch of the Government was responsible only to the electorate, in the absence of congressional limitations. In advancing these arguments, we relied, in part, upon the following cases: *United States* v. *Switchmen's Union of North America* ((W. D. N. Y., 1950), 97 F. Supp. 97); *Martin* v. *Mott* ((1827) 25 U. S. 12, 18); *Dakota Central Telephone Co., et al.* v. *State of South Dakota, et rel. Payne, Attorney General, et al.* (250 U. S. 163, 184); *Ainsworth, Commandant Fifth Naval District* v. *Barn Ballroom Co.* ((4 Cir. 1946), 157 F. (2d) 97, 100); *Ludecke* v. *Watkins* ((335 U. S. 160, 163–164); *United States* v. *Carmack* (329 U. S. 230, 242–243); *United States* v. *Chemical Foundation* (272 U. S. 1, 14–15); and *Marbury* v. *Madison* ((1803), 5 U. S. 137, 164–165).

However, in *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, et al.* ((N. D. Ohio—1952), Civil No. 28926), the three labor organizations, which were the defendants, challenged the constitutionality of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645), which authorized the President, in time of war, to seize transportation systems, on the ground that the action was an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power because it did not establish sufficient standards for the exercise of the powers concerned. Cf. *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Company* v. *Sawyer* ((1952), 72 S. Ct. 863). The point that the unions stressed in this connection was that the seizure statute permitted the executive branch of the Government to disturb normal collective bargaining balances by refusing to enter into a collective bargaining agreement, and thereby purportedly relieving the various railroad managements from any real incentive to settle the underlying labor dispute. It is the apparent contention of the unions that a seizure statute must establish standards to govern the executive branch with respect to collective bargaining rights, and that, unless a seizure statute sufficiently prescribes administrative standards in this respect, it would be an unconstitutional delegation of legislative power. In *United States* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, et al.* ((N. D. Ohio—1952), Civil No. 28926), Judge Freed, after a trial lasting more than a week, issued the preliminary injunction on the ground that he was compelled to protect the national interests from irreparable harm pending final determination of the grave and substantial questions inherent in the case. The unions appealed from this order, and, after a denial of a stay from the court of appeals for the sixth circuit and Mr. Justice Reed, filed a petition for certiorari in the Supreme Court. The defendants also filed a counterclaim and a cross claim, seeking to impound the profits of the railroads and to obtain fair compensation for the services of their respective members. They also sought to join as parties to the action each owner of the seized carriers.

However, the case was rendered moot by settlement of the dispute and return of the carriers to their private owners.

VII

How many seizure cases under the Smith-Connally or War Labor Disputes Act are still in litigation, and what are the issues in dispute?

At present there are three just compensation cases pending in the Court of Claims:

1. *Pewee Coal Co.* v. *United States* (No. 49351). Amount of claim: $36,000. This case allegedly arose under Executive Order No. 9393 (8 F. R. 14877) (coal mine seizure).

2. *Pewee Coal Co.* v. *United States* (No. 50140). Amount of claim: $113,900. This case allegedly arose under Executive Order No. 9536 (10 F. R. 3939) (coal mine seizure).

3. *Ralph A. Fox and Jack G. Wells* v. *United States* (No. 49725). Amount of claim: $140,-223. No Executive order alleged. (Coal mine seizure.)

None of these cases has reached a stage at which issues, other than those discussed above in connection with the first Pewee case, can be anticipated.

VIII

Other problems which have arisen in connection with litigation involving seizures.

In addition to the problems outlined above, at least two other problems have arisen in connection with railroad seizure cases which should be considered in any study of problems incident to Government seizure. The first problem is that which arises because the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 645) is restricted to "time of war." In view of the fact that the state of war, in connection with World War II, has now been terminated, the President would no longer be authorized to seize the railroad to prevent a disastrous interruption of essential transportation services, or at least his authority to seize would be highly questionable had Congress not enacted the Emergency Powers Interim Continuation Act (66 Stat. 54).

The second problem involves Government liability under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the actions or negligence of persons performing services on or with respect to seized properties. This problem has been made both real and immediate in connection with the recently terminated railroad seizure. An action was instituted in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (*Gover* v. *United States* (Civil No. 11613)) under the Federal Tort Claims Act, to recover damages from the United States for a wrongful death which resulted from an accident on the Long Island Railroad on November 22, 1950, when the railroad was in the possession, operation and control of the United States.

This memorandum should not be taken as exhaustive in any sense, for each injunction action presents new and different problems, and sometimes old problems present themselves with a new vigor.

APPENDIX A

EXECUTIVE ORDERS ISSUED BETWEEN JUNE 25, 1943, AND DECEMBER 31, 1946, INCLUSIVE, DIRECTING GOVERNMENT SEIZURE AND OPERATION OF MINES, PLANTS, OR FACILITIES

No. 9375, September 3, 1943 (8 F. R. 12253), Atlantic Basin Iron Works, Inc.; Administrator of War Shipping Administration.

No. 9393, November 1, 1943 (8 F. R. 14877), coal mines; Secretary of the Interior. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9395B,[1] November 20, 1943 (8 F. R. 16957), 13 leather manufacturing plants near Salem and Peabody, Mass.; Secretary of War.

No. 9399,[1] November 25, 1943 (8 F. R. 16269), Remington Rand; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9400,[1] December 3, 1943 (8 F. R. 16641), Los Angeles Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.; Secretary of the Navy (amended by E. O. 9592A).

No. 9408, December 19, 1943 (8 F. R. 16958), Western Electric Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9412, December 27, 1943 (8 F. R. 17395), railroad systems; Secretary of War.

No. 9416,[1] January 21, 1944 (9 F. R. 939), York Safe & Lock Co.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9420, February 7, 1944 (9 F. R. 1503), 10 textile plants near Fall River, Mass.; Secretary of War.

No. 9426, February 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 2113), Department of Water Power, city of Los Angeles, Calif.; Secretary of War.

No. 9435, April 13, 1944 (9 F. R. 4063), Jenkins Bros., Inc.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9436, April 13, 1944 (9 F. R. 4063), Ken-Rad Tube & Lamp Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9438, April 25, 1944 (9 F. R. 4439), Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of Commerce.

No. 9443, May 20, 1944 (9 F. R. 5305), Hummer Manufacturing Division, Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9459, August 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 9073), Philadelphia Transportation Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9462, August 11, 1944 (9 F. R. 10071), 103 motor carrier transportation systems, Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9463, August 12, 1944 (9 F. R. 9879), certain foundries and machine shops in San Francisco, Calif.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9466, August 18, 1944 (9 F. R. 10139), certain additional foundries and machine shops in San Francisco, Calif.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9469, August 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 10343), Philadelphia and Reading Coal & Iron Co., (coal mines); Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9473, August 29, 1944 (9 F. R. 10613), International Nickel Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9474, August 31, 1944 (9 F. R. 10815), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9475A, September 2, 1944 (9 F. R. 10817), Hughes Tool Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9476, September 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 10917), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9477, September 5, 1944 (9 F. R. 10941), Cleveland Graphite Bronze Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9478, September 6, 1944 (9 F. R. 11045), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9480, September 9, 1944 (9 F. R. 11143), Twentieth Century Brass Works; Secretary of War.

No. 9481, September 12, 1944 (9 F. R. 11387), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9482, September 14, 1944 (9 F. R. 11459), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9483, September 19, 1944, (9 F. R. 11601, certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9484, September 23, 1944 (9 F. R. 11731), Farrell Cheek Steel Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9493,[1] October 24, 1944 (9 F. R. 12360), Lord Manufacturing Co.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9496, November 3, 1944 (9 F. R. 11987), certain companies in or near Toledo, Ohio (machine tools); Secretary of War.

No. 9505, December 6, 1944 (9 F. R. 14473), Cudahy Bros. Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9508, December 27, 1944 (9 F. R. 15079), Montgomery Ward & Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9511, January 12, 1945 (10 F. R. 549), Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9516, January 24, 1945 (10 F. R. 1313), Bingham & Garfield Railway Co.; Secretary of War.

---

[1] The interrupted or threatened interruption of production of service which gave rise to the seizure was not caused by a labor dispute.

[1] The interrupted or threatened interruption of production of service which gave rise to the seizure was not caused by a labor dispute.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

No. 9523, February 18, 1945 (10 F. R. 2133), American Enka Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9536, April 10, 1945 (10 F. R. 3939), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9540, April 17, 1945 (10 F. R. 4193), Cities Service Refining Corp.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9542, April 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 4591), United Engineering Co., Ltd.; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9548, May 3, 1945 (10 F. R. 5025), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior. (No copy in executive adjudications file.)

No. 9552, May 19, 1945 (10 F. R. 5757), Cocker Machine & Foundry; Secretary of War.

No. 9554, May 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 5981), motor carriers in Chicago, Ill.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9559, May 28, 1945 (10 F. R. 6287), Gaffney Manufacturing Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9560, June 1, 1945 (10 F. R. 6547), Mary-Leila Cotton Mills, Inc.; Secretary of War.

No. 9564, June 5, 1945 (10 F. R. 6791), Humble Oil & Refining Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9565, June 5, 1945 (10 F. R. 6792), Pure Oil Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9570, June 14, 1945 (10 F. R. 7235), Scranton Transit Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9574, June 18, 1945 (10 F. R. 7435), Diamod Alkali Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9577A, July 1, 1945 (10 F. R. 8090), Texas Co.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9585, July 4, 1945 (10 F. R. 8335), Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Inc.; Secretary of the Navy. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9589A, July 19, 1945 (10 F. R. 8949), Sinclair Rubber, Inc.; Petroleum Administrator.

No. 9593, July 25, 1945 (10 F. R. 9379), Springfield Plywood Corp.; Secretary of War.

No. 9595, July 30, 1945 (10 F. R. 9571), United States Rubber Co.; Secretary of War.

No. 9602, August 23, 1945 (10 F. R. 10957), Illinois Central Railroad Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9639, October 4, 1945 (10 F. R. 12592), certain petroleum transportation, refining, and processing plants and facilities; Secretary of the Navy.

No. 9658, November 21, 1945 (10 F. R. 14351), Capital Transit Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9661, November 29, 1945 (10 F. R. 14591), Great Lakes Towing Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9685, January 24, 1946 (11 F. R. 989), certain meat production, processing, etc., plants and facilities; Secretary of Agriculture. (No copy in Executive Adjudications Division file.)

No. 9693, February 5, 1946 (11 F. R. 1421), certain towing transportation companies in New York Harbor; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9727, May 17, 1946 (11 F. R. 5461), railroad systems; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9728, May 21, 1946 (11 F. R. 5593), certain coal mines; Secretary of the Interior.

No. 9736, June 14, 1946 (11 F. R. 6661), Monongahela Connecting Railroad Co.; Director of Office of Defense Transportation.

No. 9758, July 19, 1946 (11 F. R. 7927), Carter Coal Mines; Secretary of the Interior.

[From the Buffalo Evening News]

BALDRIDGE TELLS IVES OF SOME UNITED STATES PROBLEMS IN PLANT SEIZURES

(By Irvin D. Foos)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—Even when Government seizure of privately owned industrial facilities was legal under wartime law, many legal problems, still undecided, arose in connection with the Government's administration of seized properties.

Some of these problems were outlined today by Holmes Baldridge, Assistant Attorney General, in response to a request by Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York.

Senator IVES felt that before again delegating seizure power to the President, as it did in the Smith-Connally Act of 1943, Congress should have a report on the Government's experience with wartime seizures.

RESPONSIBLE TO ELECTORATE

Because the Smith-Connally Act and the Selective Service Act of 1916 did not impose specific limitations, the Government generally was successful in contending that it was free to conduct the administration of seized property as it saw fit. To quote Mr. Baldridge, "the executive branch of the Government was responsible only to the electorate, in the absence of congressional limitations."

Litigation challenging congressional delegation of seizure power to the President demonstrates that Congress, in framing a new seizure law, should cover such questions as seizure of profits, fair rental for seized property, day-to-day managerial supervision, collective bargaining by the Government with employees and the Government's liability for the actions or negligence of persons working on seized property.

The Justice Department official reported that 64 seizures took place during the period that the Smith-Connolly Act was in effect from June 25, 1943, through December 31, 1946.

All but five of the seizure actions were the result of labor disputes.

DAMAGES TOTAL $8,000,000

For legal reasons, the Government "always takes the position that the seizure was not made for the purpose of ending or averting a strike," Mr. Baldridge said.

"We always assert that the seizure occurred in order to prevent interruption of necessary production or service."

In five seizure cases the Government moved in because of refusal of the company to deliver war material at fair and reasonable prices, unacceptable quality of product, inefficient management or failure to maintain production schedules for reasons other than a labor dispute.

Damages awarded by the courts to private owners of seized facilities have run up to a total of nearly $8,000,000, including interest. Most of this total represents awards to 93 motor carriers on claims that originally totaled $50,000,000. Six motor-carrier claims still are pending.

Three coal-mine seizure cases, involving claims of $290,000, still are pending in the Court of Claims.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF IMPRISONMENT OF WILLIAM N. OATIS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, exactly 1 year has elapsed since William N. Oatis, Associated Press correspondent, was sentenced by Communist rulers in Czechoslovakia.

Before the Eighty-second Congress passes into history it would seem pertinent to remind Members of the Senate that while today will bring to an end this second session of the present Congress it will mark only the beginning of a second year of imprisonment for a loyal American citizen and newsman who now is unjustly confined in a Czechoslovakian prison. Mr. Oatis was sentenced, as I am sure many here will recall, by a Czechoslovakian court on this day of last year. Charges of espionage which the whole world knows were entirely without foundation were the pretext on which he was sentenced to 10 years imprisonment.

As we prepare to disperse to homes throughout the country, let us give thought to the plight of Mr. Oatis and to his chances of emerging sound and healthy, or even alive, from his place of confinement. Every day he spends in his prison cell is but another insult added to the many which our Communist foes delight in heaping upon anyone or anything representative of the United States of America.

It seems proper, particularly, for us to consider what steps have been taken or are in process, to effect his release. One thing we do know is that whatever steps have been taken have been completely unsuccessful and that, to all intents and purposes, there would seem as little hope for speedy release of Mr. Oatis today as when he was so flagrant a victim of Communist tyranny a year ago today.

We talk of the United Nations as the one medium through which world peace can be achieved. Our experience, and our lack of success, in freeing Mr. Oatis from the effects of the injustices visited upon him gives little cause for hope as to the eventual achievement of world peace. Such incidents as the Oatis trial and sentence offer dramatic testimony of the large-scale injustices visited upon millions of unfortunate residents of the countries now under Soviet rule. If the concerted weight of free world opinion cannot effect the release of one man whose imprisonment is so palpably unjustified, what basis would there seem to be for hope that we could ever arrive at any understanding based on justice with nations and leaders who make injustice rather than justice their basic policy, and, in addition, seek out ways and means to impress their enslaved peoples with the impotence of the United States to protect its nationals against Communist violence?

As I have pointed out time and again, this country permits known subversives from enemy countries to enter and roam the Nation at will, while our people in Communist-dominated countries, if not subjected to indignities or injustices as was Oatis, are harassed and restricted in innumerable ways. I am convinced that the longer we submit to these indignities without drastic retaliatory measures, the less chance we ever will have to arrive at just and decent agreements with such lawless countries.

We have been told that we cannot take too drastic action, but that does not help at all to resolve the situation. Maybe the time has come to start doing some of the things which we are told must not be done. Perhaps we can find a way to impress upon Communist leaders that there will be redress for violence against our people. It may be possible that procedures which our State Department has not seen fit to use would be effective, where accepted diplomatic approaches have failed.

We cannot leave this session with the feeling that we have really disposed of

all the problems facing us, when we realize that our Government has failed to do anything to help Bill Oatis. His pride in his American citizenship must be at a low ebb, indeed. In a previous discussion of this important matter in the Senate on July 17, 1951, I advocated the adoption by the Senate of a resolution that would urge upon the State Department and upon other Government agencies to prevent representatives of the free Communist press from dispatching, forwarding, or gathering news and information in the United States for the governments or news agencies of the Communist countries; make suitable representation to the United Nations for consideration of the Oatis case by that body; prohibit trade between citizens of the United States and Czechoslovakia until the release of Mr. Oatis.

I am strongly of the belief that summary action should be taken so that Mr. Oatis and all freedom-loving peolle thoughout the world may know that American principles and American rights will be upheld.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 237, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall prepare a statement showing the noncurrent and obsolete congressional publications now stored in the folding rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to submit an itemized list thereof, in duplicate, to the Joint Committee on Printing, which is hereby authorized and directed to dispose of the publications enumerated on such lists as follows:

First. A printed statement of such publications shall be submitted to each Senator, Representative, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, and officer of the Senate and House of Representatives, and any Member or officer of either House having any of such publications to his credit may dispose of the same in the usual manner at any time before September 1, 1952.

Second. Upon the expiration of the aforesaid time the Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, as promptly as practicable, a list of the publications herein referred to then remaining in the folding rooms, and thereupon such publications shall be subject to the order of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, in the order in which they are applied for, for a period of 30 days after the day when such list shall be furnished by the Joint Committee on Printing, but no application for the transfer of these publications may be honored.

Third. The Joint Committee on Printing shall furnish a list of all such publications remaining in the folding rooms at the expiration of the last-named period to the various departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government at Washington, including the Superintendent of Documents, Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, National Archives Establishment, Bureau of American Republics, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and such publications shall be turned over to any department, independent office, or establishment making written request therefor and shall be allocated in the order in which their application is made, and all such publications which shall remain in the folding rooms for a period of 10 days after such list shall have been furnished to the departments, independent offices, or establishments aforesaid shall be delivered to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, for such disposition as he may deem to be in the best interests of the Government, and submit a report to the Joint Committee on Printing showing the tonnage so disposed of, together with the amount of money derived from such sale which shall be deposited to the credit of miscellaneous receipts in the Treasury of the United States in accordance with existing law.

Fourth. No publication which is described in the list aforesaid shall thereafter be returned to the folding rooms from any source.

Mr. HAYDEN. The suggested procedure would be very advantageous in that it would save a great deal of paper and documentation.

I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

WITHHOLDING OF STATE INCOME TAXES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That where—

(1) the law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State or Territory, and

(2) such duty to withhold is imposed generally with respect to the compensation of employees who are residents of such State or Territory,

then the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State or Territory. Such agreement shall provide that the head of such department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax and whose regular place of Federal employment is within the State or Territory with which such agreement is entered into. No such agreement shall apply with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application of any provision of law which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability by reason of the provisions of this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with the recommendation of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	McKellar
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Stennis
Ellender	Long	Taft
Ferguson	Magnuson	Thye
Flanders	Malone	Underwood
Frear	Martin	Watkins
George	Maybank	Welker
Gillette	McCarran	Wiley
Green	McCarthy	Williams
Hayden	McClellan	Young
Hendrickson	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent because of official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, last night after I had left the Senate Chamber the majority leader, after conferring with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who had previously objected to calendar No. 1070, House bill 5248, to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, asked for the immediate consideration of the bill, and the bill was passed.

There had been a previous conversation between the chairman of the Finance Committee and the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who wished to continue to insist upon his objection to the bill.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would advise the Senator that the bill has been sent to the House, and the House will have to be asked to return the papers. Then a motion to reconsider will be in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I make the appropriate motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia moves that the House be asked to return the papers to the Senate. The Senator may follow the return of the papers with a motion to reconsider.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to state my reason for my objection yesterday. Mr. Howard Robertson of the Defense Department called me and stated that we are producing in this country only 20 percent of the tungsten needed for defense purposes, and we are importing 80 percent. Certainly it seems to me that the bill should be passed. The duty on tungsten raises the cost of it to $63 a ton.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has not made a unanimous-consent request. He has made a motion.

Mr. LANGER. I understand. I want to explain why I changed my mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is not debatable. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota wish to be recognized?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that when the tungsten matter came up my mind flashed to the wool situation. At the present time all over the country the warehouses are filled with domestic wool. In my State there are nearly 5,000,000 pounds in one warehouse. At the same time the Army is buying from Argentina and other South American countries, and also from Australia. Our domestic producers are not raising sheep and not producing wool because of the foreign competition.

When the tungsten matter came up I objected because it gave me an opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the desperate situation which confronts the wool grower in the United States.

When I was informed by the Defense Department what the situation was with respect to tungsten, I promptly withdrew my objection. I believe the bill should be passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that I did not know of the later objection. At first, objection was made by the Senator from North Dakota. He withdrew the objection. I spoke with the minority leader, but evidently he did not know about the second objection either. If I had known of the objection, I would not have asked unanimous consent to consider the bill. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] certainly would have beeen entitled to notice. Therefore, under the circumstances, I think it is no more than fair that the bill should be brought back from the House and disposed of in some other way, if it can be disposed of. Certainly it cannot be disposed of under a unanimous-consent agreement. I hope the papers will be returned from the House.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to debate the question for a minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Very well.

NECESSITY FOR ORDER IN THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the last days of the session there is a natural tendency for confusion to exist in the Chamber. In order that legislation which must be acted upon may be considered and consummated in an orderly manner, the Chair will ask all Senators to cooperate in preserving order. It is difficult to transact the business of the Senate when every Senator is talking and transacting business in his own personal capacity.

The Chair asks the occupants of the gallery to cooperate in preserving order. The Senate appreciates their interest in the proceedings, but the Chair asks their cooperation by not talking.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the early part of this year the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on three bills. The purpose of the first bill S. 450, was to encourage expanded production of needed nonbasic agricultural commodities. It was patterned after the so-called Steagall amendment which was adopted during World War II.

The second bill, S. 2115, sought to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic commodities by using both the old formula and the new formulas.

The third bill, S. 2996, introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], provided 100 percent of parity price supports on all major commodities, basic and nonbasic.

After holding hearings for four days the committee decided to take no action on S. 450 and S. 2996, and reported unanimously S. 2115 with an amendment.

The sole purpose of S. 2115 as amended, is to continue the present law with regard to the use of the dual parity formula in fixing parity prices for the basic commodities for a period of 2 years following December 31, 1953. While the Department of Agriculture objected to a permanent entension of the dual parity system for the basic commodities, the Department later submitted a report to the committee stating that it would be unwise to permit a sharp drop in the price support levels for the basic commodities at this time and that one way to avoid this was to continue the dual parity system through 1955.

The purpose of the pending bill, H. R. 8122 in one of its provisions, is the same as that of S. 2115, indeed, the language is identical. In addition the House bill adds another section, section 2.

The purpose of section 2 is to make the level of support prices to cooperators 90 percent of parity for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955 in the case of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.

The committee refused to approve the second portion of the bill, with reference to making mandatory 90 percent support prices for 3 years, because of opposition in committee. Several Senators from both sides of the aisle objected to the proposal. A further reason was that the Secretary of Agriculture, under the law as it is now written, has the right and power to fix support prices at 90 percent of parity.

I now offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of the pending House bill and to insert in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2115. The amendment will be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause of House bill 8122, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity as of any date during the 6-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, to the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] an amendment with reference to long staple cotton, which I hope the Senate will accept. Long-staple cotton is a strategic material, and for it there is needed a better program than the one provided by the Munitions Board, and one on which the producers can rely. I hope the Senator will take the amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to will be reconsidered, in order that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute may be considered.

The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I can state in substance what the amendment to the amendment provides.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reading of the amendment to the amendment will be dispensed with.

The amendment submitted by Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) to Mr. ELLENDER's amendment in the nature of a substitute, is as follows:

At the end of the bill to insert:

"SEC. —. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such act, as follows:

"'(f) The provisions of this act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton, and (2) extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra-long staple cotton if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the cost of production of extra-long staple cotton in relation to the cost of production of American upland cotton in the areas where both of these types of cotton are produced. Disapproved by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra-long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra-long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402.'

"2. Add a new section 420 to such act, reading as follows:

"'SEC. 420. Any price-support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall likewise be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'

"SEC. —. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'LONG STAPLE COTTON

"'SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"'(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 percent, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 percent of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) All provisions of this act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, that the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be 50 percent of the parity price for American-Egyptian cotton as of the date specified therein.

"'(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is 1½ inches or more in length.

"'(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse conditions.'"

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I understand its purpose, the amendment submitted to my amendment is intended to give to long staple cotton producers price support similar to that given to upland cotton producers.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct, up to 30,000 bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. The amendment would establish a minimum marketing quota equal to the larger of 30,000 bales or 30 percent of estimated domestic consumption and exports; is that right?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that the committee considered the amendment, but took no action on it because it was to be attached to a very controversial cotton bill, known as the Abernethy bill. Inasmuch as we took no action on the Abernethy bill, no action was taken on the amendment. In discussing the amendment, the committee agreed that its provisions should conform to the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. We understand that the pending amendment is practically in line with what the Department recommends and in those instances where the Department objects to the provisions of the amendment, I hope to adjust them in conference with the House.

I shall be glad to take this amendment to my amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], for himself and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana.

Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

If there is no further amendment to be submitted, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the able chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Mr. ELLENDER, explained the provisions of the bill very well. I should like, however, to make a few comments.

Commencing with the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1948, there was adopted a new parity formula known as the modernized parity formula. Until the Agricultural Act of 1948, the formula which was used to determine parity prices was the old 1909–14 base period formula.

The major basis of determining parity under the old parity formula was how many bushels of wheat would be required to buy a plow, how many pounds of cotton would be required to purchase a cotton picker, or how many bushels of corn would be required to purchase a corn planter, and so on.

The modernized parity formula used as a major basis of determining parity the average price received for farm commodities during the previous 10-year period. When first adopted the level of parity under the modernized parity formula was much lower for basics than under the old formula.

The contention of the supporters of the modernized parity formula was that as the years passed, the level of parity prices under the modernized formula would be about equal to those under the old formula for basic commodities.

There would have been considerable justification for that contention, had times been normal. However, because of the international situation and the resultant security program here in the United States, the Department of Agriculture is purposely carrying over large surpluses of the major agricultural commodities.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

No three commodities are more important to the existence of man than are wheat, corn, and cotton. Because the United States Department of Agriculture is calling for increased production at a time when we are carrying over large surpluses, the surpluses we are creating by the increased production are a burden on the market, and hold down the prices to support levels or below.

Presently, the average cash price for wheat in the United States is only 84 percent of parity, while the support price is 90 percent of parity. By depressing prices in that manner, we can easily understand how the average price, as we move ahead under the modernized parity formula is lower than it would normally be.

For that reason, the spread has been widened between the old parity formula level and the level established under the modernized parity formula rather than narrowed.

Actually, we should not be carrying these wheat and other surpluses for war-emergency needs under the Commodity Credit Corporation at all. Under a different program we are stockpiling scarce war materials, such as tin, rubber, zinc, and perhaps 50 or 75 others; and they do not come into competition with prices of industrial products.

But in the case of agricultural commodities we are operating both a Commodity Credit Corporation program to support farm commodity prices and a separate program to produce increased surpluses and carry them purposely for war needs. As a result, prices have been depressed, and the modernized parity formula has not had a chance to operate as it might have otherwise.

It is for that reason that we are asking for an extension for 2 years of the use of the two parity formulas, whichever is the higher, for the basic commodities.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has agreed to study the whole parity formula system, in the hope of bringing out next year a parity formula which will be more equitable to all segments of agriculture.

Mr. President, during the period since World War II, we have appropriated approximately $30,000,000,000 for foreign assistance. The countries that are receiving this money are buying our farm commodities, in most cases at far below the cost of production.

With respect to dairy products, we have been selling our surplus at 10, 15, or probably not higher than 50 percent of parity.

Under the International Wheat Agreement, we are providing these countries with wheat at $1.80 a bushel, which probably would come within the range of 70 to 75 percent of parity.

As a result, the cost of the International Wheat Agreement has been approximately $600,000,000, as estimated by Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. As he has pointed out in his telegram to all Senators, Mr. Kline, rather than defend this worth-while program, tends to condemn it in his telegram to the Members of the Senate in his opposition to the House bill we are now considering. Actually the International Wheat Agreement program ought to have been a part of the foreign-assistance program and its losses changed where it rightfully belongs—the foreign assistance program for which we are spending billions.

Mr. President, I may point out that in the foreign assistance appropriation bill which was passed just yesterday, providing economic assistance to foreign countries, there is an item of $1,282,000,000 to give foreign countries money with which to purchase industrial equipment in the United States. Some of these items are very interesting.

For instance, in the bill there is an item of $10,000,000 for the purchase of farm equipment. What price will those countries have to pay for that equipment? Not 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably 100 percent or more.

The bill contains an item of $11,000,000 for the purchase of fertilizer—again, not at 80 percent or 90 percent of a fair price, as in the case of agricultural commodities.

The bill contains an item of $93,000,000 for the purchase of industrial machinery and equipment; $100,000,000 for iron and steel; $69,000,000 for aluminum; $68,000,000 for copper; $34,000,000 for zinc; $66,000,000 for industrial chemicals; $63,000,000 for solid fuels; $8,000,000 for lead; $13,000,000 for lumber; $14,000,000 for paper and pulp; and $23,000,000 for nonferrous ores. Foreign countries will have United States appropriations to pay full price for these huge amounts of industrial goods at the full price.

Another item is for $4,200,000,000 for military assistance. That money will be used to purchase military equipment, most of which will be purchased in the United States, not at 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent of a fair price, but probably at 100 percent or better. Why do we have to sell our agricultural commodities at reduced prices and charge the loss to the farm program?

I am attempting to point out the difference between the farmers' end of this entire assistance program and that with respect to industry.

Those who charge that the International Wheat Agreement or other agricultural programs have been a great loss to the Department of Agriculture, ought to consider the part the farmers are playing in this international plan of security.

Actually, Mr. President, during the 18 years of operation of the farm price-support program, so far as basic farm commodities are concerned—namely, wheat, corn, cotton, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—until June 30, 1951, there was a net profit to the Government of the United States of $40,000,000. The latest figure as of June 30, this year, is not available, and, I understand, will not be available for a few days.

There has been a net cost to the Government, so far as perishables and other than basic commodities, to Commodity Credit Corporation, of approximately $1,000,000,000. That is understandable, because almost half of it was due to the potato support-price program.

Again, I may point out that we have been selling our surpluses, particularly surpluses of dairy products, eggs, and other farm commodities, to meet the needs of the people of Europe, if they were to survive, at 10, 15, and 20 cents on the dollar, while we are providing billions and billions of dollars worth of industrial equipment at the price demanded for it by industry in this country.

I may say to those who condemn the program of helping the people of Europe by giving them the most essential thing in their life—which is food—and who condemn the cost of that program, ought to consider what we are doing on the industrial side.

Mr. President, I should have preferred to support the House bill known as the Cooley bill, which embodies what is in the Young-Russell bill, namely, the continuing of the use of the dual parity program for an additional 2 years. That bill contains the provisions of a bill which I introduced almost a year ago, Senate bill 450, which would extend 90 percent supports for an additional period of years. I understand—and I think it is fair to say—that there are not sufficient votes in the Senate to secure what I believe to be these desirable provisions of the Cooley bill, so our only alternative is to support the substitute offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I should first like to congratulate the Senator from North Dakota upon his excellent presentation. As a colleague of his on the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I know how hard he works on farm problems, and how carefully he has studied this situation. While I associate myself completely with him in feeling that it would be much better to have the Cooley bill approved today, I, along with him, also realize that in the closing day, or next to the last day of this session, there is no possibility of overcoming the opposition which exists in this body to the Cooley bill. I simply want to emphasize the fact that while the Young-Russell bill will constitute a firm step forward, we have the further protection that in the Defense Production Act there is a guaranty of 90-percent parity for another year.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the Senator from North Dakota feel that, during that year, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the able, distinguished, and completely nonpartisan leadership of our friend and chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senate and the House can work out a support-price program to serve as a foundation and as a continuing aid to American prosperity?

Mr. YOUNG. That is my understanding of the agreement reached in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that he and I, as well as many other members of the committee, see eye to eye as to what we should do for agriculture. The

question is, What can be enacted? I should like to say that the Cooley bill is, I think, an excellent bill. Though opposed by the Farm Bureau and the Grange, it was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Agriculture, and it received a vote of more than 2 to 1 by the Members of the House; which indicates that the Members of that body, representing the large consuming areas, and the farm areas, recognized the need of the bill, and what it could accomplish, both for the consumers and farmers of the Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. So, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, were it not for the fact that we have in the Defense Production Act precisely the same protection for a year that the Cooley bill would give us for 3 years——

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. But for that, I would now join the Senator from North Dakota and many other friends of the farmer, I am sure, in remaining here, through July and August, and even September, if necessary, in order to give my support to a suitable price support program for the farmers. However, I am certain that the position of the two Committees on Agriculture is such that during the coming session of the Congress they will arrive at a formula for continuing the price-support program.

Mr. YOUNG. I desire to point out what the emergency war program is doing to the farmers. The Agriculture Department has been asking farmers to increase their wheat production at a time when we had a surplus of wheat; it was asking the cotton farmers to go all out in production of cotton, thereby creating a tremendous surplus. Is there anyone who doubts that the creation of a surplus has the effect of beating down prices, if the surplus is sufficiently large? Certainly the farmers who are doing their part in the emergency war program are entitled to protection. Now, certainly, with the surplus which is being created by compliance on the part of the farmers with the request of the Department of Agriculture to increase production, the increased production will cause prices to drop drastically.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The application of the 90 percent of parity support program is precisely the wartime philosophy which is being applied to other segments of the American economy. We meet the labor situation by giving labor a minimum wage law. We meet the manufacturers' and industrialists' position by giving them amortization contracts, for purposes of tax relief, and by giving them cost-plus-fee contracts. Were it not for the amendment incorporated in the Defense Production Act continuing the 90 percent of parity-support prices, it would mean that the farmer alone, in the whole economy, would be expected to produce for the war situation and the emergency and to take the entire risk upon his own shoulders with respect to the income he receives instead of simply applying to the farmer the same kind of formula which is being applied to other types of economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the Senator is wrong in saying that the Defense Production Act guarantees net profits. I think that all it says is that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling below 90 percent. I do not think there is any guaranty up to 90 percent, whatever. I have the bill before me now, for the first time, but if I remember correctly, it only says that the OPS Director shall not set a ceiling price below 90 percent, and has nothing to do with guaranteeing the profits.

Mr. YOUNG. My recollection is that it extends 90 percent support under the present Agricultural Act of 1949 for one additional year.

Mr. CAPEHART. I will check on that.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 4 o'clock today, there be a call of the calendar of unobjected to bills placed on the calendar since the last call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum in the time of another Senator, unless that Senator yields for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the absence of such yielding, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot do that at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand I do not have a right to withhold it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator has a right to withdraw his objection. Mr. President, I discussed this matter with the Senators from New Jersey and Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point letters from the Oregon Wheat Growers' League and the National Association of Wheat Growers, supporting Senate bill 2115, the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, and which is exactly the same as the provisions of the House bill that we are now considering.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OREGON WHEAT GROWERS LEAGUE,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 3, 1952.

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: The Oregon Wheat Growers League has requested the support of the Oregon congressional delegation for the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL introduced to extend the present method of using both the old and new parity formulas for 2 years to figure the parity price for basic crops. The enclosed brief was also brought to their attention.

We appreciate your interest in the welfare of agriculture, and will do what we can to support this bill.

Sincerely yours,

FLOYD ROOT, *President.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF WHEAT GROWERS,
Pendleton, Oreg., June 4, 1952.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: We wish to inform you that the National Association of Wheat Growers has gone on record supporting the bill which you and Senator RUSSELL recently introduced into Congress to extend the present method of figuring parity for basic crops for two more years.

The enclosed letter is a copy of letters we have written to the following Senators and Representatives requesting their support for your bill: WAYNE L. MORSE, GUY CORDON, TOM CONNALLY, HUGH BUTLER, EDWARD J. THYE, FRANK CARLSON, LOWELL STOCKMAN, WILLIAM R. POAGE, WALTER E. ROGERS, CLIFFORD HOPE, HAROLD COOLEY, WALTER HORAN.

We hope that our efforts will help secure enactment of this legislation necessary to the welfare of producers of basic agriculture products, especially wheat. If you have any suggestions as to what further action we can take, please let us know.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JENS TERJESON,
President, National Association of Wheat Growers.

Mr. YOUNG. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a telegram received by me from Allan B. Kline, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops.

High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers' ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international-wheat

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

agreement, will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say that I think it would come with better grace on the part of Mr. Kline, as president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, had he given the true facts about the international-wheat agreement and the part it plays in the international program of security against communism, rather than to discredit the agreement by not stating all of the facts.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator consider that it is hopeless to get for the farmer 100-percent parity such as industry and labor are getting?

Mr. YOUNG. I would say to my distinguished colleague, that I think it is hopeless at the present time. There are not sufficient votes to bring it about, although I agree with the Senator's program.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that when Congress convenes again, whenever that may be, a fight will be inaugurated on the part of certain Senators to get 100-percent parity?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes; that is the plan.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the farmer is receiving the same miserable deal at the end of World War II that he received at the end of World War I? At the end of World War I the price of everything the farmer bought was kept up to 100 percent, while everything he sold went down almost to rock bottom.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, in the case of farm machinery the index, as my distinguished colleague knows, was 101 when World War I ended, and it never receded, whereas the price of everything the farmer produced dropped steadily.

Mr. YOUNG. I may say that the price of everything the farmer has to buy has risen steadily in the period since the last war, and the price of products the farmers has to sell has declined steadily.

I may say to my distinguished colleague, who has just won a decisive victory, that received the biggest vote in areas supposed to be for sliding scale and lower supports. I think that is a tribute to him, and an expression on the part of these farmers in favor of high-level supports.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, since my distinguished friend from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] discussed the provisions of the Production Act, let me say that after the agricultural provision was adopted, I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture and received this information with reference to section 106 (a):

Section 106 (a) of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952 (S. 2594) would amend the fifth sentence of section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to read as follows (the new material in brackets):

"Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or affect the provisions of either (1) the Agricultural Act of 1949 [except that under any price support program announced while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent of the parity price, or such higher level as may be established under section 402 of that act for any crop of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas], or (2) the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, or to invalidate any marketing agreement, license, or order, or any provision thereof or amendment thereto, heretofore or hereafter made or issued under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended."

That is an exact quotation from the provision of the act.

I read further:

The Department advises that this provision will require the 1953 crops of the basic commodities to be supported at 90 percent of parity, assuming that title 4 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 remains in effect until April 30, 1953, as is now provided; since 1953 price support programs would normally be announced prior to April 30, 1953, Section 406 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 requires the Secretary to announce the level of price support in advance of the planting season insofar as is practicable.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was wrong in the statement I made, because the discussion we had with the conferees did not follow that line; but I am certain that all three of the able Senators are correct. It simply means that we do not really need to pass the bill, because we already have in the law the provision which is needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have it mandatory for 1953. If there is any necessity for having 90 percent of parity price supports mandatory in 1954 and 1955, we can attend to it next year.

Mr. CAPEHART. We do not need it until after the Defense Production Act expires.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, to pass this bill or to refuse to pass it means nothing.

Mr. YOUNG. But it does contain a provision which extends the use of the parity system for another 2 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I stated in my opening remarks, there were two provisions in the pending bill, one of which dealt with the dual-parity program——

Mr. CAPEHART. Outside of that, the Defense Production Act does for 1953 exactly what section 2 does.

Mr. ELLENDER. For 1 year. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, there is nothing to be gained either by passing or turning down this bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the reason why I asked that the Senate bill, which deals merely with the dual-parity program which was introduced by my distinguished friend from North Dakota, be substituted for the House bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Indiana that it would be highly desirable to pass the House bill, which would give the farmers some assurance of what is going to happen to their prices in 1954 and 1955. The provision in the Defense Production Act takes care of them for only one more year, which is a very short period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I warmly compliment the junior Senator from North Dakota and his associate the junior Senator from Georgia. They have been the introducers and the very aggressive sponsors of this measure which is designed further to protect the farmers during this period of confusion.

In my opinion, there is real value in the immediate passage of the bill which we are now considering and of which the two Senators I mentioned are the sponsors, for the reason that in the Defense Production Act there is machinery of two or three kinds which might result in the early termination of that act. The passage of the bill now under consideration would give complete assurance that throughout the next production year the dual system would prevail. But, further than that, it would give assurance looking to the future through 1955—and there is no farmer who is not looking a little further than the immediate crop year and hoping that he will have reasonable protection during the period which covers not only that 1 year but which will last beyond that time.

This is protection of the same kind that was given under the Steagall amendment during the troublous days of World War II, by which the farmers who produced the crops covered by that amendment were assured that not only through the duration of the war, but beyond that time, they might still depend on price support at a fixed figure, which gave them some protection as against the added cost of preparing new land for increased production, and in other ways gave them the assurance which they needed.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that the measure now under consideration is like the Steagall Act in that regard, for it gives protection over more than 1 year, indeed, for three additional years to those large groups of farmers which it covers, and it will be worth a great deal generally to the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Florida for his comments. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and has always done an excellent job for the farmers of America.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to point out that while the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] originally raised

a question of doubt as to whether the Defense Production Act actually provided 90-percent support prices, we have his subsequent statement that from reading the legislation he is convinced that it does. Someone reading the debate might be confused.

Paragraph (a) of section 106 was read to us by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There is no doubt in the world about it, because it provides that while this title is in effect the level of support to cooperators shall be 90 percent. We want to be sure that some subsequent reader of the RECORD or some interpreter downtown does not get an erroneous impression.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. After reading the act itself, there is no question in my mind that the act covers 90 percent of parity.

Mr. MUNDT. I merely want to have that made clear in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I should like to pay my tribute to the Senator from North Dakota for advancing the proposal and for his active support of higher parity and higher price supports. I believe there are two basic reasons why we need this extension for 1 year.

The Government is calling upon the farmer to increase production. That involves a risk, and a very heavy risk. That risk is involved with a type of commodity as to which the price structure might run up and down in the open market as compared with fixed prices for nonfarmers.

Second, there are large numbers of new farmers—the younger farmer, the veteran farmer, and the nonveteran farmer who have turned to the soil, and have been called upon to buy expensive machinery, rent equipment, or buy fertilizer. Those men simply cannot have a price-support program for only next year. It is not merely next year that they will have to pay on the equipment they purchase, if they are going to be sound producers. So the extension of several additional years, up to 1955, gives them something by which they can plan. It gives them an opportunity to operate on a systematic, planned basis for the utilization of their soil and production facilities.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has put it, this is a sort of Steagall amendment all over again. It worked well during the last period of emergency. I would remind the Senate that our defense program has been stretched out to 1955. That is the way we are thinking in terms of aircraft production and military preparedness. This measure would stretch out the program of 90 percent of parity supports to 1955. It fits right into the same kind of program which the mobilization officials of our country have asked us to adopt. We need agricultural mobilization as much as we need military mobilization.

I join with the Senator from North Dakota in support of this proposal and commend him for the work he has done in connection with the 90 percent of parity program, which, to my mind, is of basic importance. I do not see how farmers can get along on even 90 percent, in light of statistics which are revealing in terms of farm indebtedness and a reduction in real farm cash—not farm income, but real income.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed the references by the Senator from Florida and the junior Senator from Minnesota to the similarity of this bill with the Steagall bill. I cannot see to close a resemblance between the two, because this bill—if it is the version I have in mind—covers basic commodities, whereas in the Steagall bill the basic commodities were already covered. The Steagall bill covered 12 additional commodities.

I might point out to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] that this bill with support at 90 percent of parity does not cover a great deal besides wheat, so far as his State is concerned. It leaves the poultry raisers, the dairymen, and the hog raisers out of the program. The Steagall amendment was designed to cover, not the basic commodities, but the other commodities which were designated by Secretary Anderson, and there happened to be about 12 of them, including flax for oil, turkeys, of which the State of Minnesota produces a tremendous quantity——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it does.

Mr. AIKEN. Around Buckingham, and other parts of the State.

Mr. THYE. And around Worthington.

Mr. AIKEN. It includes hogs, poultry of certain kinds, and dairy products. None of them is covered by this bill, but they were all covered by the Steagall amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. The bill pending before the Senate, as I understand, covers only the provisions of the Young-Russell bill, which provides for a continuation of dual parity. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Do I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain type of long-staple cotton? I made inquiry of the parliamentarian, and I understand that the bill has been amended to include a certain long-staple cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. What we struck out was section 2.

Mr. AIKEN. Was that stricken out on the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. What I did was simply to strike from the pending measure all after the enacting clause and to substitute the Senate bill. This is the Russell-Young bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. YOUNG. I prefer to make a statement of my own, first.

The implication was left that the only thing affecting Minnesota was with respect to wheat produced there. I should like to point out that this bill would prevent a drop in parity of more than 15 cents a bushel on corn. Minnesota also produces considerable corn.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not think that so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, he intended to involve Minnesota as being opposed to this bill in commenting on its probable effect. I do not wish the RECORD to show that Minnesota might be in any way involved in an argument which suggests that we are criticizing the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We are not.

Mr. THYE. Minnesota is not criticizing the bill. I am only attempting to clarify the question, because I was not here when this measure was taken up for discussion.

I asked the Parliamentarian, "What is the legislative question we are considering?" I was informed that for House bill 8122, Senate bill 2115 had been substituted, and that a certain amendment relating to long-staple cotton had been attached to the substitute and had become a part of it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is not my fault.

Mr. THYE. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that he left the inference for anyone who reads the RECORD that the Senators representing Minnesota were finding fault with a legislative measure that was before Congress. It was for that reason that I asked to be recognized.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I wish to answer a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, who did not know that the bill had been amended earlier.

Mr. THYE. May I first call one matter to the attention of the Senator from North Dakota, because I wish the situation to be entirely clear. The Senator from North Dakota left the impression, in his statement referring to Minnesota, that the contention was being made here that the only thing from which we would benefit would be in wheat. That was the reason why I rose, because I know that the farmer will read this RECORD, and he rightfully should read it.

If the Senator from North Dakota will permit me to do so, I will first state that I join with him in support of this measure. If he will permit me further to state, I may say that at no time has the actual tiller of the soil, the producer, the man who operates the farm, been squeezed any more tightly economically than he is squeezed today. Taxes are up on personal property and real estate. The cost of repairs to machinery is up. The cost of new machines is double what it was 4 years ago. The price of pork has gone down steadily in the past 3 years. The price of dairy products is not commensurate with the cost that he must invest in his dairy unit and the cost of the hired help he is compelled to employ in order to take care of his dairy production.

There is today a greater distress in the diversified agricultural area of the United States than I have seen in the past 10 years. Economically, the farmer is

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

squeezed today. He is squeezed more than he was at any time during World War II, both with respect to help on the farm, and with respect to other costs of operation.

Many persons believe that the farmer is exceedingly well off, because of the cost of food to the consumer. Let us examine the price of pork. Four years ago the producers received from 26 to 28 cents a pound for their pork. I will ask the consumers if they are paying more for pork at retail markets today than they did 4 years ago. They are. And yet the producer, as of today, is receiving from 18 to 19 cents a pound for his pork, whereas 4 or 5 years ago he received 28 cents. The difference between 28 cents a pound live weight for pork and a price of 18 or 19 cents is 9 or 10 cents a pound. The producer receives 9 or 10 cents a pound less today than he received for his pork 4 or 5 years ago.

That is what we are faced with. That is why I say, Mr. President, to my distinguished friend from North Dakota that I will join and support him in this legislative measure, even though I know that some of the outstanding farm organizations in the United States do not approve of this type of legislative measure as of today.

Today the producer is economically depressed. In the event that the producer's purchasing power is diminished, destroyed, or dried up, it will not be long before the factories feel the effect of the lack of purchasing power on the part of the producer.

I believe that we who serve in Congress have just as much justification for taking a look at the problems of the farmer as we have for examining the businessman's problems, or the problems of citizens of foreign countries. We endeavor to assist the citizens of foreign countries in our European recovery program and in the mutual security expenditures which we are now making abroad to build up the defenses of those countries.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am sorry if I left the wrong impression concerning the good Senators from Minnesota. Certainly the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has made his position abundantly clear. I should like to add that no Member of the Senate has been a better friend of agriculture than has the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There is only one statement that I wish to make in connection with this legislation. We do not sufficiently safeguard the interests of the man engaged in diversified farming, the man who produces poultry, eggs, pork, and dairy products. We are not today safeguarding that kind of producer by the type of support program which would make certain that he is safeguarded against ruinously low prices, whether it be prices of eggs, pork, or other perishable products besides dairy products and eggs. I refer to such products as the citrus crop and other perishable crops.

Mr. YOUNG. I join the Senator from Minnesota in his comments. I shall be glad to join him at any time in working out a better program for other types of farming.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which has been prepared by Dr. Wilcox of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This statement relates to the pork price question.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOG SUPPLIES AND PRICES, OCTOBER 1951–SEPTEMBER 1952

An analysis of the application of alternative price-support methods.

The hog-corn feeding ratio turned unfavorable for hog producers in November 1951 and remained unfavorable until May 1952. Hog prices declined almost steadily from a United States average of $20.50 per 100 pounds in July 1951 to $16.40 in April 1952. The first part of the decline was a normal occurrence for the fall season, but prices continued to sag in midwinter when they usually rise. The hog-corn ratio, which averaged 12.6 from 1931–50, fell from 12.6 in July to 9.8 in April.

Although the Secretary of Agriculture had discretionary legislative authority to support hog prices at any level up to 90 percent of parity, no price supports were announced. Some Members of Congress and leaders of farm groups urged the Secretary to support hog prices. Others urged the Secretary to take no action, fearing that heavy losses and serious product disposal problems would be encountered, similar to those resulting from the egg and potato price support programs. After considerable urging from the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the use of section 32 funds was authorized in April to purchase pork products for distribution through the school-lunch program and to public institutions.

A review of the supply and price behavior from October to date now makes possible estimates of the size of purchase or storage operations or the amount of direct payments which would have been required if price supports had been announced and either of these two methods used to carry them out.

The change in supplies, prices and other market data as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for the first 7 months of the 1951–52 marketing year as compared with the first 7 months of 1950–51 are shown below:

Change from first 7 months, 1950–51, to first 7 months, 1951–52

	Percent
Pork produced (pounds slaughtered commercially)	+ 8.1
Pork consumption per capita	+ 4.9
Increase in cold storage stocks	+20.3
Increase in marketing margin	+ 6.8
Decrease in retail price (pork products excluding lard)	− 3.7
Decrease in farm price of hogs	−10.8

The above data indicate there was nothing unusual about the price declines at the retail and farm levels in view of the 8 percent increase in pork slaughtered. The increase in storage stocks was to be expected and it is reported that available cold storage facilities were quite fully utilized.

Marketing margins usually widen under the impact of above-average supplies. When farmers offer more hogs for market without a compensating increase in consumer demand, processors offer lower prices at the farm which more than compensate for the mark-down in retail prices required to move the increased supplies into consumption or storage.

The United States average farm price of hogs during the period October 1951 to May 1952 compares with 90 percent of seasonally-adjusted October 1951 parity as follows:

Month	United States average farm price	90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity	Difference
1951—October	$20.20	$19.90	+$0.30
November	18.10	18.24	−.14
December	17.60	17.22	+.38
1952—January	17.40	18.14	−.74
February	17.20	18.89	−1.69
March	16.70	19.68	−2.98
April	16.40	19.26	−2.86
May	20.00	18.93	+1.07

Hog prices are expected to average above 90 percent of parity for the remainder of the marketing year. On the basis of estimates made at this time, hog prices for May through September will average high enough to pull the seasonal average up to 89 percent of parity.

In view of this it appears that, had price supports been announced at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity with direct payments used to make up the difference between the announced support price and the seasonal average market price, payments would have been extremely small. With approximately 18,000,000,000 pounds live weight of hogs marketed, direct payments would have been from zero to around $50,000,000, depending on the level of prices the remainder of the marketing year.

If the Government had maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity by purchase and storage operations the marketing mechanism would have been affected in a number of places. It is doubtful if the marketing margin would have widened as it did. This widening of marketing margins amounted to $68,000,000 in the November-April period.

The volume of hog marketings also would have been smaller if prices had been supported at 90 percent of parity. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that breeding herds were reduced by 1,000,000 head of gilts sent to market because of the unfavorable hog-corn ratio. With prices supported, producers would have been more confident and less reduction would have occurred in spring farrowing, hence smaller marketings of gilts in the winter months.

Utilizing the Bureau of Agricultural Economics established relationships between supplies and prices, the removal of 278,000,000 pounds of pork, carcass weight, would have maintained hog prices at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity during the months from November 1951 through April 1952, assuming no change in other marketing activities.

This estimate is reduced sharply, however, by taking into account the effect of price support operations on the number of hogs marketed and on marketing margins. If half of the extra breeding gilts sent to market had been retained for spring farrowing and marketing margins had remained the same as a year earlier, hog prices might have been maintained at 90 percent of seasonally adjusted parity October 1951 to April 1952 by purchase and storage operations which removed 120,000,000 pounds from marketing channels in addition to the amount which did go into commercial storage.

Had the Government undertaken a price support operation, it probably would have been forced to make price supporting loans or purchase agreements covering almost all pork which went into commercial storage or a total in excess of 500,000,000 pounds.

Cold storage facilities might have been taxed to capacity, and special programs might have been needed to free sufficient space to care for the additional pork placed in storage.

Prices in the May to September period would be somewhat lower than otherwise if the Government had acquired additional storage stocks. Total storage stocks would not have exceeded 15 percent of the current marketings May to September, however. Although a part of the price improvement November through April would be offset by the removal of storage stocks later in the year, farmers would gain by preventing the $68,000,000 widening of the margin between farm and retail prices. Both farmers and consumers would benefit from the stabilizing effect on hog breeding plans of a price support program. At the present time it appears that spring farrowings in 1952 were reduced excessively as a result of the low hog prices in the winter months.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not rising to delay proceedings at all. I simply wish to make some explanatory statements.

As I came into the Chamber the discussion seemed to be revolving around the proposal to make mandatory a minimum of 90 percent support of the six basic commodities, for 3 years more. The Senate bill which I have on my desk has been substituted for the so-called Cooley bill from the House which I found on my desk as I entered the Chamber.

The question of continuing a minimum of 90 percent support prices for the six basic commodities does not enter into this bill at all at this time. As a matter of fact, under existing legislation the Secretary of Agriculture has very broad authority in supporting the prices of farm commodities. I sometimes think he has almost too broad authority.

With relation to the amendment offered by the Senators from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. HAYDEN] relating to long-staple cotton, I point out that I have had no opportunity to study this amendment. I did not know that it was coming up. I should like to point out that the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture is so broad that he has full authority to take care of the situation which is brought to our attention by the amendment of the two Senators from Arizona. At the present time the Secretary of Agriculture is actually supporting the price of long-staple cotton at 153 percent of parity. He is authorized to do so by the Agricultural Acts of 1948 and 1949. I do not know that this amendment does any harm. It may do a great deal of good for the Senators from Arizona. However, I am not opposing it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is very necessary to maintain a program upon which the farmers can depend. The only program which the long-staple cotton producers have is the program providing for the purchase of cotton by the Munitions Board. That is uncertain.

The amount of cotton involved is very small. Thirty thousand bales is a small amount of cotton. During World War II the Government called upon farmers to produce long-staple cotton. There was a time when we produced hardly enough from seed to keep the production of long-staple cotton going. If we are to maintain a minimum amount, we need this amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona and their cotton-growing constituents for wanting to know where they stand. As I say, the Secretary of Agriculture is now supporting the price of native long-staple cotton at $1.07, or 153 percent of parity. Nevertheless, not long ago the Government was actually buying cotton of this grade from Egypt for more than $1.40 a pound, or nearly 50 percent more than the price at which the price of our own native long-staple cotton was being supported. I do not blame the Senators from Arizona for wanting to have that situation definitely corrected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator has just stated, it is true that the Secretary is supporting the price of long-staple cotton, but the fear is that with so much cotton being stored, the Secretary may not do so in the future. The amendment of the distinguished Senator from Arizona makes it mandatory that long-staple cotton shall be supported the same as upland cotton.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible that the Commodity Credit Corporation has bought so much long-staple cotton from abroad for the Munitions Board that the very weight of the stockpile may seriously depress the price to our western long-staple cotton producers.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the growers of that product fear.

Mr. AIKEN. For that reason it may be just as well to have the program spelled out in the law.

As to the other part of the bill or the main part of it that is now left, which permits the dual parity formula to continue for another 2 years. It is already authorized for at least one more year. It is true that the operations of the price controllers have upset the workings of the new parity formula. Under the old parity formula the base used was the years 1909 to 1914. Under the new parity formula the base consists of the immediately preceding 10 years, which would be much better in the long run.

Changing the parity formula would not give agriculture as a whole any more money. All agricultural commodities added together amount to 100 percent of parity. The formula is devised for the purpose of keeping each agricultural commodity in the proper price relationship with all the other commodities. However, if it is changed that does not give agriculture as a whole any more money or any less money, figuratively speaking, in comparison to the other factors of our economy.

It naturally follows that if one agricultural commodity gets more than it is entitled to it takes away from some other commodity.

However, I do not have any objection to continuing the parity formula for another 2 years beyond next year. I believe we must review the entire parity situation. Producers of certain commodities feel that it is not treating them fairly. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized by law to correct such conditions when it is found, after an open hearing, that any particular commodity is discriminated against, or out of line with other commodities.

I know that if the new parity formula went into effect this year there would be a substantial drop in the price of wheat, and that situation probably would hold true for the next 3 or 4 years, or until the heavy surpluses which we have on hand at the present time were taken care of and the price went up in a free market, which we may not have for some time.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. It has been impossible for me to be on the floor during this debate because it was necessary for me to attend conferences on other bills.

Therefore, I may ask a question which has already been answered. I believe it is a fact that the leaders of some of the principal farm organizations have had rather strenuous objections to certain provisions of H. R. 8122. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont if the objectionable provisions have been taken care of in the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the objections which the Senator from Nebraska refers to were particularly directed at section 2 of the Cooley bill, which would guarantee a minimum of 90-percent support for basic farm commodities through 1955. I do not believe that the farm organizations would approve entirely of what we have before us, but I doubt that they are as strenuously opposed to it as they were to the Cooley provisions, which were stricken out.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. They have been stricken out?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. As a matter of fact, the right to choose the higher of two parity formulas will continue for another year in any event. During 1953 we must review carefully the whole agricultural situation. We may find that parity is not a fair method of arriving at what farm prices should be in relation to other commodities. It may be, if we are to have price controls pop up here and there, and have other factors come into the picture, that we will have to abandon the parity concept and find some other criterion of determining fair farm prices. The amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will continue dual parity for another 2 years beyond next year. In the meantime the next Congress will very likely consider the whole proposition. I do not see how any great harm can some from it at the present time. I would not agree to continue it indefinitely. But if it does not work, it will be changed anyway.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I believe the Senator from Vermont has been very fair. He recognizes the fact that when the Government is asking for increased production, the increased production depresses prices, as do ceiling prices, and a modernized parity formula does not have an opportunity to work, as it otherwise would.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Wheat is particularly affected by developments of the last 2 or 3 years. Normally our country uses a little more than 700,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is estimated that we will export approximately 375,000,000 bushels this year. I feel that the estimate by the Department of Agriculture may be a little high. I hope it is not. Under the law the legal carry-over is 163,000,000 bushels. The fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for such huge production of wheat, by next July we may have a carry-over of well over 500,000,000 bushels, instead of 163,000,000 bushels which normally would be expected to be adequate. I understand that the Secretary of Agriculture considers the program to be part of the preparedness program. He may be right in asking for the tremendous production of wheat. Under his emergency powers he has announced that there will be no quotas set on wheat next year. We may have another surplus of 100,000,000 bushels, and then we will have a real problem on our hands.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Would not the Senator from Vermont agree that if we carried over 163,000,000 bushels, which is deemed to be the normal carry-over under the Agricultural Act of 1948, we could expect normal prices?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. With a carry-over of 500,000,000 bushels there is not any chance of wheat prices going above the support level.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from North Dakota is correct. If we carry over only 163,000,000 bushels the price of wheat would probably be 100 percent of parity. The fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture has asked for a huge production, and undoubtedly the price would collapse if it were not for price supports. The wheat grower is in a peculiar situation. For that reason I have sympathy with him. I would rather have the Secretary of Agriculture exercise the power which he possesses under the existing law to maintain the price of wheat at a reasonably good level, in view of the fact that he has himself asked for an overproduction. But if he does not choose to do so under the law he can be required to do it. Apparently the growers feel they would rather have it required directly by law.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not also true that on account of the switchover to the modernized parity formula, as of now there will be a drop in parity of about 17 cents a bushel for corn and 1 cent or 1½ cents a pound for cotton?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that would be true, but the effect on the farmers in the case of corn would not be so great, because more corn would be used, and that would increase the value of practically all protein and animal products.

When the 1948 formula was developed, it was felt that it would be wise to encourage as much use of corn as possible, by having the farmers feed corn to livestock, thus putting the corn into meat and poultry products, because in that way from 4 to 6 bushels of grain will be disposed of, as compared to 1 bushel of grain disposed of when used for cereal diet. We deliberately set out to encourage an increased use of grain in the form of animal products.

So with that addition, I see no objection to enactment of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think it is most unfortunate that each 4 years, on the eve of the presidential election, we get on the floor of the Senate an agricultural bill in connection with which the decisions are made from a political standpoint, rather than from a constructive standpoint for the American farmer. This bill proposes further extension of the artificial-high supports on certain basic commodities.

I remember that in 1948 we passed an agricultural bill providing for a flexible support program. If that program had been allowed to go into effect as scheduled, I believe the American farmer would be much better off than he is today.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] pointed out how today the American farmers are in worse shape than they were during the depression years, on the basis of the prices they are receiving for the things they produce, as compared with the prices they are paying for the implements they have to buy. That just shows how a false sense of prosperity has been created by the program under the Democratic Party. I do not believe anyone will dispute that assertion.

Likewise, I have pointed out that the agricultural program, as it is being administered today, which takes care of just a few producers of a few basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, peanuts, tobacco—at an artificially high level, is gradually bankrupting the poultry industry and the livestock industry in the United States as well as the consumers. There is very little that the present program can do to the poultry industry that it has not done in the last 2 years, because today that industry is practically on the rocks, from the standpoint of making a profit.

If this program is continued as proposed under this bill for another 6-year period, it wil mean that in that 6-year period the parity program can be computed either under the old average or under the new average, and the result will be to continue an artificially supported high price.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to make a correction: the bill extends it for 2 years, not 4 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator said it would apply for the next 6-year period, beginning January 1, 1950. That would take it to January 1, 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right; but we have already used up 3 years of that time, and it has one more year to go under present law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Perhaps so, but by 1956 the 10-year cycle following the war will have been completed; and then, when we go back to computing prices on the last 10-year average, from 1956—computing them backward—the effect will be to compute them under the prices established under the 90-percent formula. Is not that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. The dual-parity formula was begun in January 1950; and under the law as it now exists, it was to run for 4 years from January 1, 1950.

The amendment now proposed simply extends it 2 years more, or 6 years from 1950.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct; but you go back to 4 years beyond 1950, and the 90-percent provision was in effect during those 4 years. When the 6 years are added to that 4-year period, you arrive at 10 years, when computed to January 1, 1956.

I thought we might as well recognize that if this bill is enacted, and if this contract with the farmers is lived up to, the high formula will be projected for the basic commodities until 1956, while the producers of other agricultural commodities remain unprotected.

If we do not change this agricultural program, whereby the Department of Agriculture will recognize that one farmer in one section of the country, even though he is a diversified farmer or a producer of livestock, is just as important to the economy of the Nation as is a farmer who is producing wheat and other grains, the ultimate result will be to break down the entire agricultural program. The program today is splitting the farmers into two sections, one composed of the diversified farmers and livestock producers and one composed of those who favor this program because they reap substantial benefits from it.

The diversified farmers will not continue to take the blame of the high cost of living under an agricultural program which, in reality, not only gives them no benefit but actually penalizes them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In the case of cotton, if the price continues for another year at about the present price, by 1954 the parity price of cotton under the new formula will show an increase of ½ cent or possibly 1 cent a pound above the price under the old formula.

Mr. ELLENDER. At least it will equalize it.

Mr. AIKEN. It will run about ½ cent over, if it stays where it is.

However, in the case of wheat the Secretary has asked for such tremendous production that I think he is actually depressing the price, because with that production the wheat farmer cannot hope to get more than the support price.

That happened in the case of potatoes. When the potato farmers had 60 percent support on potatoes, 60 percent of parity was all those farmers could get. Yet when the support price was removed, thus stopping a considerable amount of the growing of potatoes, those who did produce potatoes last year received from 90 percent to 100 percent.

So I think the new formula will raise the price of cotton in several years' time, and will increase by over 25 percent the parity value of cottonseed.

But in the case of wheat, I am inclined to think the tremendous production which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested will depress the price a little.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would assume that the Secretary would foresee the tremendous production and accumulation and would cut down on the requested production, because if that is not done, we do not have in the Nation sufficient storage facilities to take care of all the wheat that will be produced with 2 or 3 bumper crops. The amount of storage cannot be cut down by increased purchases, because the farmers who are feeding the wheat to livestock cannot afford to buy it.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1948 Congress anticipated that the Secretary of Agriculture would comply with the act, as directed by Congress. However, he showed signs of not doing so; and in 1949 Congress took steps to require him to carry out the congressional intent, by putting in the bill certain definitions and other provisions.

However, the best bill in the world cannot do the job any better than the one who administers it will do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Vermont is correct; there is no question of that.

As the Senator from Vermont says, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, had failed to carry out the intent of Congress. I am reminded of a bulletin which the Secretary of Agriculture issued, and which I called attention to on this floor, several years ago, where he instructed his top, key officials, that in the course of their official duties, they should give more attention to getting his pet farm program enacted rather than to making the existing program work.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will yield, let me point out a case in which the law has not been used as quickly as was intended by Congress. The Senator from Delaware will recall that last winter and spring the price of hogs started going down, and dropped and dropped, until it fell below a fair price. When the price of pork started to go down, the Secretary of Agriculture did not move to support it, as he was authorized by the law to do. He could have supported it up to 90 percent of parity. However, the price went way below parity.

Before the announcement of any program to support the price of hogs, thousands and thousands of hog raisers had sold their brood sows because they felt they could not afford to keep them any longer.

Now we are faced with a probable shortage of pork, next fall as a result.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. And then the same man will then be pitying the consumers in the cities and will be advocating price controls.

Someday, Mr. President, the American people will wake up and will find that price controls or price tags emanating from a bureaucratic office in Washington do not taste very good when cooked in the pot. In order to have food, it is necessary to have something more than a bulletin from Washington. Washington does not produce food.

Mr. AIKEN. It is almost conclusive that after the price was forced so low, last spring, as to force the farmers to sell their brood sows, we can predict higher pork prices to the consumers this fall.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and the same is true in the case of potatoes. When the price support was removed from potatoes, the Department of Agriculture tried to scare the farmers to death by telling them how poorly they would fare in a free market, with the result that they cut back the acreage more than they would have done had the Government stayed out. At the same time, the threat was held over them of a price ceiling. Had the farmers been let alone, they would have gone on to produce the potatoes necessary to feed the people today. I think the Secretary of Agriculture has done more to confuse the farmers than any other organization, group, or individual in this country.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks because I recognize that today we are against a losing proposition. Nevertheless, I think it is important, if we want to get a good, sound agricultural program and keep it in effect, that we someday wake up to the fact that recognize that a farmer producing diversified crops in the East and the producer of livestock are entitled to some recognition. During the past few months we have been asked by many farmers in our area why it is that dairy feed and poultry feed are so much higher than they were even during the late war. The answer to that is that we are today supporting the prices of the basic commodities which go to make up the cost of feed to the dairyman and poultryman at levels which are about 40 percent higher than the ceiling prices on those same commodities during the war. At the same time, the producers of livestock are having to sell their products at prices which are lower than the prices were during the late war. As I have said, the poultry industry has already been seriously damaged, the pork industry is following closely behind, and before many months we are likely to see the beef industry in the same situation.

Mr. President, there is not enough money in the Federal Treasury to support all perishable commodities. I think the need in this country is for a sound agricultural program, one which will not be an incentive to production, because if we continue as we are doing today, under an artificially high support price, we are inevitably going to build up a huge surplus, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, and those surpluses are going to act as ceiling prices instead of support prices. The prices on wheat and corn will not rise above the support price when there are huge backlogs waiting to be dumped on the market. The same thing is true in the case of cotton. Whether the farmers want it or not, under this administration we are inevitably moving toward a controlled agricultural economy, with ceiling prices and support prices operating at the same time, under some governmental agency in Washington. If we are to have artificially high support prices, we must give to some governmental agency the control of acreage; and the farmers are going to be told how much they can plant, when they can plant, and what they can do with the crop. That is against everything we stand for in America. Furthermore, under this procedure, the small farmers will bear the heaviest burden on acreage cut-backs.

Mr. President, I do not think the American farmers want that. The two major farm organizations of this country have gone on record unanimously as being against the provisions of the pending bill and against artificially high support prices. They recognize the danger. I shall conclude my remarks by reading a telegram which I received yesterday from the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I think speaks louder as to what should be done in the matter of the agricultural program than anything else that could be said. The telegram, dated July 1, 1952, is from Mr. Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and reads as follows:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good in-

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

comes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc., signed by Ralph R. Peters, executive secretary, Dover, Del.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., July 2, 1952.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I know that you have been giving a lot of thought to agricultural programs and that when the time comes to vote you will support measures that you believe best for the Nation.

H. R. 8122, providing for extension of dual parity for 3 years and mandatory price supports at 90 percent of parity for basic crops, certainly is not in the best interests of farmers from this section of the country. I get the National Farmers Union official publication and they are the chief supporters of high mandatory price supports.

High supports to farmers will certainly cause consumers to demand ceilings at support levels and soon farmers would have a completely controlled economy.

Price ceilings and high supports have been discussed at a great many meetings in Delaware and opposition was unanimous to both unless in an extreme emergency.

However, the majority are in favor of a flexible support program that will give farmers an opportunity to stay in business while they make the necessary adjustments.

I understand the high-support legislation being pushed by Farmers Union will soon be before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH R. PETERS,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I conclude in the hope that this Congress will reject the pending bill and will return next year, 1953, to work out an agricultural program which will recognize every farmer in America as being equally as important to our economy. Let us never forget the small farmer is the backbone of American agriculture just as small business is the backbone of our free enterprise system.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel it my responsibility as representing, in part, the State of New Jersey to insert in the RECORD in connection with the pending bill two messages which have come to me on the subject involved in the bill. The first one is from Mr. H. W. Vorhees, president of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

Farmers of our State are opposed to H. R. 8122, which will place rigid controls on agriculture until 1956. Your help in defeating this bill is requested. This is really important.

The other message which I received, and I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] read it into the RECORD, is from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Chicago, Ill. It is addressed to me, and I read the first paragraph:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122.

Then follows the telegram which the Senator from Delaware read in full.

SENATOR MOODY'S REPORT ON FARM POLICY

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, during this busy session of Congress I have spent considerable time and thought on agricultural problems. In order to get directly the views of farmers in my State, I have studied the positions of the farm organizations on various aspects of farm policy. And I have also mailed a large number of questionnaires to Michigan farmers to obtain their views first-hand on specific points relating to our efforts to promote a stable and prosperous farm economy. Our purpose, of course, is to prevent any recurrence of farm depression which would bring disaster to the entire country as well as to farmers.

I should like, therefore, to take a few moments of the Senate's time this afternoon to report on some of the findings and thinking which I believe may be of interest to the Senate and also to my constituents.

A nation must eat. New cars, refrigerators, and television sets are mighty nice to have. But unless there is food in the pantry, nothing else matters.

This is the main reason why agriculture will always be our most important industry.

But agriculture's importance lies in more than this. If the farmer and his land prosper, the Nation is likely to prosper. When the farmer can buy, the manufacturer can sell; when the manufacturer can sell, there are jobs for city workers.

America has always known the value of the farmer's place in the scheme of things. But not everyone has recognized that the Nation's dependence on the farm is matched by the farmer's dependence on the rest of the Nation. What we do about inflation, military strength, unemployment, monopoly, taxation and foreign policy can make or break the farmer.

We know what can happen when these decisions are mishandled by men whose thinking has lagged behind reality.

Mr. President, I agree with some of the things which my friend from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] said a few moments ago. I differ, however, with his remarks regarding false prosperity. I wonder if he believes the farmers were prosperous before the Government put into effect its program.

Farmers will long remember the collapse of farm prices in 1921, and the lengthening shadows of the later twenties, warning of the gathering storm ahead. They will never forget the brief, tragic period when 233,000 farmers lost their homes and their land to the men holding the mortgages. They have vivid memories of milk holidays, bank failures, two-bit wheat, 15-cent corn, 2½-cent beef, and food rotting in the fields while city children lacked bread.

Farmers can recall when the parity ratio stood at 55 percent and the farmer cleared $290 per year—$290 per year on which to raise a family. That kind of poverty does not build character. It builds only despair and a burning sense of injustice.

In the last couple of decades, however, the American farmer has come up from the black pit of desperation, foreclosures, crashing farm prices, and staggering piles of unwanted crops. He has had behind him the assurance that the bottom would not be allowed to drop out of farm prices—as it does not drop out of the manufacturers' prices. He has had an opportunity to electrify his farm at a reasonable cost, bringing greater efficiency.

A realistic system of farm credit has helped him expand production and survive the lean years. An ever-normal granary has stabilized his supply of livestock feed, as well as safeguarded the Nation against food shortages. The Government has promoted the growth of farm cooperatives, brought about tremendous progress in soil conservation, and stimulated modern farming practices.

Given a fair break, the farmer has forged ahead as never before.

It is important now, as we ponder what Government policies will be most helpful to farmers and the Nation, to compare agricultural conditions today with those of 20 years ago.

Seventy-five percent of our farmers own their own farms, compared to 58 percent in 1932.

Farm mortgage debt is down from more than $9,000,000,000 to less than $6,000,000,000.

Net farm income is up from $1,900,000,000 to $14,600,000,000 a year.

In 1932, only 9 percent of the Nation's farms had electricity. REA, plus enlightened policy of private utilities in some States, have raised this to 92 percent.

The State of Michigan leads the Nation in this field. Over 97 percent of Michigan farms are electrified today, compared with 14 percent in 1930.

Eighty percent of the Nation's farms are included in the 2,450 soil-conservation districts created since 1937.

But this is not all. Equally remarkable is the farmer's record of increasing man-hour output 70 percent in the last 20

years. Backed up by outstanding research in the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, he has increased his efficiency in the past 10 years three times faster than the rate for industry. This is an astounding performance.

In Michigan, for example, the potato farmer is producing three times as many potatoes as in 1930, and on half the acreage. Bean growers harvest 50 percent more beans on only three-fifths the 1930 acreage. Total sugar beet production has doubled on only a third larger acreage.

The farmer has a right to be proud of this achievement. The Nation can also take pride and satisfaction in what has been done. Everyone in our country has profited, directly or indirectly, by the progress which the farmers have shown they can make if fair opportunities are given to them.

We have made a lot of progress—but we have not come to the end of the road. The world changes, and agriculture changes with it. Policies which are sound at one time are out of date at another. The farm program must be continually reexamined in the light of the changing picture of today and the prospects of tomorrow. If we are satisfied to pat ourselves on the back, if we forget to profit by the mistakes of the past, if we fail to look and plan ahead, we may lose what has been won.

What are the main questions farmers are asking themselves these days? It is important to face them squarely.

First, what Government policies will help the farmer meet the Nation's food requirements in the years ahead?

This is a crucial problem. We have already brought into production about all the farm land the Nation has. In some areas, in fact, we have plowed up land which better would have been left in sod. Yet, in 1975, it is estimated there will be five plates to fill, where now there are four. Every 24 hours 7,000 more persons look to the farmer for bread.

This presents a major challenge to the farmer, and a problem of utmost concern to the Nation. It is imperative that we follow the most modern practices, conserve our soil prudently, and insure that Government policy is geared to stimulate, rather than to stifle, production.

Of this we may be sure: The farmer likes to produce. Nothing suits him better than an opportunity to turn out bumper crops—at prices which net him a reasonable profit.

What governmental policies will help the farmer do the job?

Farmers do not ask for prices that make it tough on the low-income consumer. They do want and are entitled to a fair return on their labor and their investment. They do not want the taxpayer to carry them on his back. They do not want their freedom eroded. They are willing, however, to accept such intelligent rules as are necessary to their welfare and the welfare of the Nation.

To those sincerely seekingly a farm program of maximum usefulness, a number of other questions press forward.

Is it fair to give price protection to some farmers and deny it to others? Since the question answers itself, how do we go about correcting the unequal situation that exists today?

What can and should be done to help the 1,200,000 farmers who produce less than $2,000 worth of commodities every year? We have thousands of them in Michigan.

These farmers, many of whom got off to a bad start through no real fault of their own, are not enjoying the living standards America can offer. Whatever can be done to help them work out a satisfactory, self-sustaining income should be done.

These farmers do not want charity—and should not get it. But if we can help them get a new start, under conditions which bring out the best that is in them because they see the prospects of better things ahead, they can make important contributions to their communities which will be of advantage to all of us.

What amount and what kind of food reserves should the Nation have?

This is an exceptionally important question, because of the current threat to peace inherent in the ominous international conspiracy known as communism. Some hard thinking needs to be done in this area—now.

Finally, what should be our policy on the exporting and importing of farm products?

Farmers and farm organizations have already done a lot of spadework on most of these problems. So have Members of Congress. It is important that we get the right answers.

Here are a few suggestions. They are not put forward in any sense as final conclusions, or as the only answers. They are simply recommendations—recommendations which others will undoubtedly be able to improve upon. But I hope they will provoke thought and discussion, and help contribute something toward the development of sound agricultural policies for our time.

Basic to the problem of protecting agriculture against depression and stimulating abundant and confident production, is the system of price supports. Price supports are essential to protect the Nation from a collapse of farm income which, in 1930 and at other times, has touched off major national depressions. Only war would be a greater disaster than another depression on the scale of the early thirties.

Our policy should be directed toward creating the economic climate in which farmers will produce to the maximum the foods we need, and receive for their products prices as close to parity as possible. This provides the best guaranty of adequate supply and therefore the best break for the consumer as well. After all, is not parity, by definition, the price at which the farmer can receive in the market place a return which will enable him to buy the things he needs on a fair basis? Farmers should not be forced to sell cheap and buy dear.

Of course, if price guaranties should bring about persistent surpluses of certain crops, or excessive costs to the taxpayer, or if to avoid these evils the Government should be tempted to impose too many controls, supports should be adjusted accordingly. The farmer must never be penalized for producing abundantly the things we need; on the contrary, he must be encouraged to do so. But if production of a particular commodity goes beyond abundance and into waste, he would want sensible adjustments to protect both the farmer and the national economy. Some flexibility in the price-support system strengthens our capacity to deal with special situations.

A serious weakness in the present farm program is its failure to protect specialty crops adequately. Producers of fruits and vegetables have little price protection compared to other producers. Obviously, there can be no real justification for helping one group of farmers far more than others.

The regular price-support system does not seem to provide the answer for most perishable commodities. In order to maintain price-support guaranties in this area, the Government undoubtedly would have to resort to mass purchases from time to time. This frequently would be followed by the rotting or destruction of food, something none of us wants to see happen.

One alternative to price supports I have been studying, Mr. President, is a system of mutual price insurance. This idea should be thoroughly explored, for it may be the answer we are looking for.

In the field of fruits and vegetables, prices fluctuate sharply from year to year. Good prices one year may be followed by unprofitable prices the next. It may be possible to work out a voluntary, self-financing insurance plan to level out the losses suffered during bad years. If farmers were to contribute to the insurance fund during favorable years, and receive payments from the insurance pool during poor years—in proportion to their marketings—we might go a long way toward solving the problem.

The Government's part should be limited if possible, to administering the plan, and paying the administrative costs. It would be hoped that no direct Government contribution would be necessary to persuade farmers to join the system in sufficient numbers to make it workable.

A plan of this nature would of course present difficulties. But if farmers put their best efforts into working out a sound insurance plan, these would not be insuperable.

Only in a major depression should it be necessary to supplement the insurance fund in order to give these producers the protection they unquestionably deserve.

The dilemma of low-income farmers, of course, presents a special problem requiring special treatment.

The Farmers Home Administration, if its activities were expanded, could do a

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

lot more towards putting many low-income farmers on their feet. Wherever individual farmers want and need to enlarge their acreage, modernize their farms, or convert from a low-cost type of farming to a more costly type—such as livestock farming—the FHA should help them do the job if loans from private sources are not available. At the present time 96 percent of FHA loans are being paid on or before schedule. By carefully selecting enterprising farmers in unfortunate circumstances, thousands of farmers can be helped to get a new lease on life.

Another problem of national as well as individual importance is that of adequate food reserves.

Our present ever-normal granary program builds up reserves of a few storables to take care of normal ups and downs of national yields. But this does not provide a reserve for great national emergencies. We know from our experiences in World War II and in the Korean conflict, how indispensable our food reserves can be.

When we are spending scores of billions on military defense and stockpiling critical metals for an hour of emergency, it is a tragic mistake not to stockpile food reserves for war. We need to store several hundred million bushels more of both corn and wheat, substantial amounts of fats and oils, dried beans and peas, canned milk, dried fruits, and such other items as are storable and necessary to a sound diet. In the event of an atomic world war, these reserves could mean the difference between our survival and the loss of all our liberties. Certainly we should not overlook the compelling need for a national food policy which recognizes the tremendous dangers involved in a world in which freedom and communism are locked in a gigantic struggle for the future of the human race.

In dealing with certain controversial aspects of agricultural policy, it is essential to be guided by the facts, and not be deceived by misconceptions of our national position, even if widely held.

There is a good deal of discussion about the advisability of allowing foreign farm produce to compete, to some extent, with our own. Many fail to realize that, if we adopted a policy of isolation and exclusion, we would be damaging not only the Nation but also our farmers.

Our total farm exports in 1951 were valued at over $4,000,000,000. This represented about one-ninth of the total value of farm produce sold during the year.

We imported only about $2,300,000,000 of farm products which competed with our own. The balance of our imports consisted of noncompetitive items such as bananas, cocoa, coffee, and so forth.

During the first 4 months of 1952, to take a specific example, we exported far more dairy products than we imported.

After excluding the small amount of dairy exports which were subsidized by our Government, our dairy exports were almost three times as great as our imports.

Our overseas sales can drain off surpluses which would otherwise depress the domestic price, or increase the cost of maintaining the support level. And here is the point to remember: Foreign nations have repeatedly threatened to raise barriers against American agricultural exports if we deny them the right to sell to us. We must make sure this does not happen. The loss of our foreign trade would be a major blow to the American farmer.

This, all too briefly, capsules part of the farm picture and points out some of the jobs that lie ahead. It is my earnest hope that the ideas touched on here will stimulate farmers to renewed efforts to strengthen the farm program to meet their needs and the needs of our people.

A prosperous agriculture goes far toward building the character of the Nation. It contributes stability. It nourishes the solid virtues of diligence, frugality, and self-reliance. It replenishes the Nation's human stock with those who have lived close to nature and to God.

The welfare of agriculture lies at the core of a sound economy. None of us can afford to permit the farmer once again to become America's forgotten man.

COMPUTATION OF PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with reference to the farm bill.

I am also fully aware of the position taken by the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as well as the position taken by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I realize, of course, that in the closing days of this session—and it may well be in the closing hours of the session—the Senate is unable to consider all angles of farm parity legislation. The Senator from Vermont has pointed out most vividly and clearly the position in which we find ourselves and the protection which the farmers of the country should have.

I realize that there is some objection to the Cooley bill. Many persons in my State and some of the great farm organizations have emphasized to me the objections they have to that measure, but I sincerely feel that because of the shortness of time it would be wise for the Senate to take into consideration and pass the amended form of House bill 8122 which, of course, is incorporated in Senate bill 2115.

I fully agree with some of my colleagues who feel that during the next year we shall be in a position thoroughly to investigate and consider all avenues of legislative approach to this most important problem. Farmers are a vital segment of the economy of this Nation. I feel that the action the Senate is taking today with reference to the amended section of this measure is most important and is a practical way to handle the situation.

Mr. MARTIN subsequently said: Mr. President, I have received a telegram from Allan B. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, relating to House bill 8122. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator EDWARD MARTIN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price-support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid, high-level price-support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high-level price-support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed price-support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason international wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term, is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed-level price-support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long-run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. CAPEHART subsequently said: Mr. President, first, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks, and then I shall request that a chart which I shall present be placed before the vote taken on the parity bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a

chart showing the exact dollars spent for food in the United States from 1929 through 1951, and the exact amount of national income each year from 1929 through 1951, together with the percentage of the national income spent for food by all the people of the United States.

An interesting fact shown by the statistics in the chart is, for example, that in 1929 the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people was 22½ percent and that the percentage of the national income spent for food by all our people in 1951 was about 21⅓ percent.

Another interesting fact shown by the chart is that the highest percentage of national income spent by our people for food was in 1932, when there was a depression. At that time our people spent 27½ percent of the national income for food. That was at a time when farm prices in the United States were very, very low. They were certainly terribly depressed. Yet the consumer in the United States spent for food in 1932, when the farmer was getting the lowest prices for his products, 27½ percent of the national income, whereas in 1951 the consumers of America spent for food only 21⅓ percent of the national income.

Those figures certainly prove that the consumer does not necessarily spend for food less percentagewise because farm products are low. If prosperity is maintained on the farms, there will be prosperity in the cities. There can be no question at all in my mind about that.

The chart is very enlightening, and it ought to put a stop to much of the uncalled for propaganda and unwarranted attacks which are made upon the American farmer to the effect that he is getting more than his share of income today because of high food prices. The American public are paying less today, based upon national income, than they paid in 1932, in the midst of the so-called depression.

Mr. President, I ask that the chart be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of national income spent for food in the United States

Year	Food expenditures (millions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income for food
1929	$19,674	$87.4	22.5
1930	18,065	75.0	24.0
1931	14,779	58.9	25.0
1932	11,394	41.7	27.3
1933	10,876	39.6	27.4
1934	12,256	48.6	25.2
1935	13,690	56.8	24.1
1936	15,295	64.7	23.6
1937	16,465	73.6	22.3
1938	15,669	67.4	23.2
1939	15,849	72.5	21.8
1940	17,085	81.3	20.9
1941	20,148	103.8	19.4
1942	25,254	137.1	18.4
1943	29,324	169.7	17.2
1944	31,879	183.8	17.4
1945	35,229	182.7	19.2
1946	41,615	180.3	23.1
1947	47,239	198.7	24.0
1948	51,587	223.5	23.0

Percentage of national income spent for food in the United States—Continued

Year	Food expenditures (millions)	National income (billions)	Percent of national income for food
1949	$50,674	$216.7	23.0
1950	52,838	239.0	22.1
1951	58,880	276.0	21.3

Note that the percentage of national income for food remains quite constant. This proves that the real cost of living cannot be reduced on a national basis through the medium of lower farm prices. The real cost of living can be reduced only through an increase in per man output. This is also true of the over-all standard of living.

1942-45 period of food subsidies under OPA.

PARITY FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that 90 percent of parity for agricultural products is included in the National Defense Act for the period for which the act was recently extended, most of the debate on the agricultural bill, H. R. 8122, appears to be more or less academic.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point telegrams received from the Nevada State Farm Bureau, the National Farm Bureau, and others, in the order of their date.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELLS, NEV., *June 23, 1952.*

Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I would urge your opposition to amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid high-price supports. Ranchers believe all forms of support confusing and unnecessary at this time. Best regards.

RUSSEL WEEKS.

RENO, NEV., *June 23, 1952.*

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Resolutions of 1,406 Farm Bureau families in Nevada oppose amendment to Agriculture Act of 1949 calling for high-priced support. We are convinced this not in the long range interest of farmers. Looking to you to call a halt to these unsound proposals.

BILL HOWARD,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

ELKO, NEV., *June 24, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge you to oppose amendment to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid high-price support. This looks like a trap for the ranchers and farmers.

NORMAN D. GLASER.

HALLECK, NEV.

RENO, NEV., *June 24, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members of the Washoe County Farm Bureau urge your effort to defeat proposal to amend Agricultural Act of 1949 for high-price support. This is not the way to the hearts of Nevada farmers and ranchers.

ANGELO ROSSI,
President.
PIT MELINDY,
CAESAR GASPERI,
ANDY HANSON,
Board of Directors.

FALLON, NEV., *June 25, 1952.*

Hon. GEO. W. MALONE,
United States Senator from Nevada,
Washington, D. C.:

Nevada State Farm Bureau, representing over 60 percent of Nevada farmers and ranchers, is on record as opposed to urgent price support system. Price supports encourage overproduction at the expense of overloaded taxpayers to the chagrin of participating taxpaying farmers. Production of agricultural commodities should be discouraged as production goes over 100 percent of normal. Flexible system needed. Have you forgotten Government meddling in the potato deal? We oppose amendments to Agricultural Act of 1949 for rigid price supports. Government-manipulated guaranteed profits not analogous to free enterprise. We urge your support.

GEORGE FREY,
Legislative Director and Second Vice President, Nevada State Farm Bureau.

MINDEN, NEV., *June 25, 1952.*

Hon. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We rigidly oppose the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1949 for high price supports. We feel that it has caused shortages and overproduction.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WHITE,
President, Douglas County Farm Bureau.

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 1, 1952.*

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

American Farm Bureau Federation Board of Directors in session here today strongly urges your opposition to both provisions of H. R. 8122. We are for a price support policy providing protection of farm prices against drastic and unreasonable price declines as provided in the Agricultural Act of 1949.

We are opposed to price fixing by Government, including Government price fixing of farm prices by rigid high-level price support programs. It is not the responsibility of Federal Government to guarantee profitable prices or returns to any economic group. Rigid high level price support programs are part of a trend toward centralizing more and more power and authority in Federal Government. They are a trap because if Federal Government guarantees profitable farm prices, the next logical step is for Government to impose rigid price ceilings with result that farm income is held down in years of short crops. High, fixed prices support programs lead to an accumulation of excessive stocks in the hands of CCC, the expansion of Government controls and restrictions on farmers' ability to earn good incomes by high production. Mandatory, high-level price supports can mean heavy costs to Treasury. For example, major reason internation wheat agreement will cost over $600,000,000 in its 4-year term is level of price support that has been maintained. High, fixed level price support programs prevent normal adjustments in production, unwisely stimulate production of some commodities in excess of needs, and depress production of others below needs. On behalf of 1,500,000 farm families, we recommend your opposition to H. R. 8122 as being harmful to long run and real interests of farm people.

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

RENO, NEV., *July 2, 1952.*

Senator MALONE,
Senate Office Building:

Again we urge your effort to vote down H. R. 8122 with which short-sighted Congressmen are mistakenly trying to buy votes. This bill is for the wartime support levels. This is not wartime. Such support levels will create surpluses for which Congress will take the blame. We observe this as another wedge for the Brannan plan. Will some of these Congressmen never see the light?

BILL HOWARD,
Nevada State Farm Bureau.

Mr. MALONE. Ninety percent of parity is included in the National Defense Act. Therefore, this bill, H. R. 8122, simply affirms something that has already become law.

The junior Senator from Nevada suggests that the entire system be reviewed by Congress in 1953, the Eighty-third Congress, and a feasible, workable method be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2115 is indefinitely postponed.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM IRRIGATION WORKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, yesterday during the call of the calendar the Senate passed Calendar No. 1975, Senate bill 2320. I wish my colleague would listen to what I am saying, because it involves a matter in which we are both interested.

This bill deals with the irrigation works in connection with the Chief Joseph Dam. Later in the proceedings the Chair noted that there was on the desk a measure passed by the House, House bill 6163, dealing with the same subject. From a casual reading of the two bills it appeared they were identical, hence the Chair, in an effort to expedite matters, obtained unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate bill was originally passed be reconsidered, and the House bill substituted for the Senate bill, and that Senate bill 2320 be indefinitely postponed.

Unfortunately, the two bills are not identical. Section 1 of the House bill contains ambiguities which were clarified by the Senate committee. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] suggested the changes. The text of the Senate bill therefore should be enacted.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed be reconsidered, and I further ask unanimous consent that the House bill be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and substituting the language of Senate bill 2320. That would mean that the Senate would send to the House the bill the Senate first passed yesterday, and I understand the House is in complete agreement with the changes. The Chair was endeavoring to be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which House bill 6163 was passed yesterday? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

The Senator from Washington now moves that all after the enacting clause of House bill 6163 be stricken out, and that there be inserted in lieu thereof the text of Senate bill 2320. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act to make a study and report to Congress on means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of applicable laws.

SEC. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may reasonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

SEC. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6163) was read the third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT OF JUDGE WILLIAM P. COLE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the appointment of Judge William P. Cole to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals gives untold gratification to me, as I have consistently urged his elevation, based upon his proven capabilities and sound judgment.

Judge Cole's record has reflected distinct credit upon our State of Maryland, and his promotion gives assurance that the important duties entrusted to him will be discharged conscientiously and efficiently.

As I personally stated to the President of the United States, in a call at the White House in urging this appointment, Judge Cole's lengthy experience in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government, combined with his professional skill and mental qualities, constitute him as an ideal appointee to this important tribunal.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, it was with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I learned that my friend and fellow Marylander, Hon. for which he has now been nominated, by the President of the United States to be associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. Judge Cole is an outstanding lawyer and jurist. He is at present a member of the court of customs sitting in the city of New York. His elevation to the appellate court is but a well-merited recognition of his integrity, learning, and judicial qualifications.

When I first learned that Judge Cole was being considered by the President of the United States for the position for which he has now been nominated, though I am of the opposite political faith I immediately transmitted to the President my endorsement and wholehearted support of this truly great son of my native State. Maryland is and can well be proud of this recognition of one of its learned sons. I hope the nomination of Judge Cole will be speedily confirmed.

THE COST OF AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, aid to foreign countries by the United States from July 1, 1945, to date amounts to the staggering total of $61,461,000,000. This includes $6,400,000,000 recently authorized by the Congress. The figures are official. They come from the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress.

This sum of $64,461,000,000 is $408 for every man, woman, and child in the United States on the basis of the last official census. It is $1,428 for the average American family.

Let us look at the cost of foreign aid to the average man. I have here a table showing, with reference to each county and many towns and cities in Missouri, the per capita cost of foreign aid since July 1, 1945, to the residents of these

counties, towns, and cities. I ask unanimous consent to have this table incorporated as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts [1]
Adair	19,689	$8,033,112	466,820
Kirksville	11,110	4,532,880	
Novinger	734	299,472	
Andrew	11,727	4,784,616	434,934
Savannah	2,332	951,456	
Atchison	11,127	4,539,816	560,438
Fairfax	806	328,848	
Rockport	1,511	616,488	
Tarkio	2,221	906,168	
Watson	199	81,192	
Audrain	23,829	9,722,232	703,176
Laddonia	599	244,392	
Martinsburg	296	120,768	
Mexico	11,623	4,742,184	
Vandalia	2,624	1,070,592	
Barry	21,755	8,876,040	374,289
Cassville	1,441	587,928	
Monett	4,031	1,644,648	
Wheaton	394	160,752	
Barton	12,678	5,172,624	309,588
Golden City	839	342,312	
Lamar	3,233	1,319,064	
Liberal	739	301,512	
Bates	17,534	7,153,872	477,479
Adrian	804	328,032	
Amsterdam	160	65,280	
Butler	3,333	1,359,864	
Hume	474	193,392	
Rich Hill	1,820	742,560	
Rockville	372	151,776	
Benton	9,080	3,704,640	214,540
Warsaw	936	381,888	
Bollinger	11,019	4,495,752	142,392
Marble Hill	454	185,232	
Boone	48,432	19,760,256	820,461
Centralia	2,460	1,003,680	
Columbia	31,969	13,043,352	
Hartsburg	171	69,768	
Sturgeon	544	221,952	
Buchanan	96,826	39,505,008	2,209,928
Rushville	319	130,152	
St. Joseph	78,588	32,063,904	
Butler	37,707	15,384,456	669,343
Poplar Bluff	15,064	6,146,112	
Caldwell	9,929	4,051,032	358,113
Breckenridge	617	251,736	
Braymer	955	389,640	(1)
Hamilton	1,728	705,024	
Kidder	726	296,208	
Kingston	338	137,904	
Polo	549	223,992	
Callaway	23,316	9,512,928	433,512
Auxvasse	993	405,144	
Fulton	10,052	4,101,216	
Mokane	477	194,616	
*New Bloomfield	500	204,000	
Camden	7,861	3,207,288	199,215
Camdenton	1,142	465,936	
Cape Girardeau	38,397	15,665,976	692,125
Cape Girardeau	21,578	8,803,824	
Jackson	3,707	1,512,456	
Carroll	15,589	6,360,312	663,836
Bosworth	503	205,224	
Carrollton	705	287,640	
Hale	452	184,416	
Norborne	1,114	454,512	
De Witt	254	103,632	
Carter	4,777	1,949,016	78,676
Van Buren	708	288,864	
Cass	19,325	7,884,600	604,504
Belton	1,253	503,064	
Creighton	269	109,752	
Drexel	456	186,048	
Garden City	149	60,792	
Harrisonville	2,530	1,032,240	
Pleasant Hill	2,300	897,600	
Cedar	10,663	4,350,504	204,753
El Dorado Springs	2,618	1,068,144	
Stockton	811	330,888	
Chariton	14,944	6,097,152	624,540
Brunswick	1,653	674,424	
Keytesville	733	299,064	
Mendon	349	142,392	
Salisbury	1,676	683,808	
Christian	12,412	$5,064,096	$255,029
Billings	597	243,576	
Ozark	1,087	443,496	
Clark	9,003	3,673,224	295,943
Kahoka	1,847	753,576	
Clay	45,221	18,450,168	1,249,354
Excelsior Springs	5,805	2,368,440	
Kearney	570	232,560	
Liberty	4,709	1,921,272	
North Kansas City	3,886	1,585,488	
Smithville	947	386,376	
Clinton	11,726	4,784,208	490,924
Cameron	3,446	1,405,968	
Lathrop	888	362,304	
Plattsburg	1,655	675,240	
Cole	35,464	14,469,312	700,655
Jefferson City	25,099	10,240,392	
Cooper	16,608	6,776,064	459,561
Boonville	6,686	2,727,888	
Pilot Grove	635	259,080	
Crawford	11,615	4,738,920	$198,765
Bourbon	543	221,544	
Cuba	1,301	530,808	
Steelville	1,157	472,056	
Dade	9,324	3,804,192	215,004
Everton	306	124,848	
Greenfield	1,213	494,904	
Lockwood	791	322,728	
Dallas	10,392	4,239,936	187,919
Buffalo	904	368,832	
Daviess	11,180	4,561,440	335,897
Altamont	178	72,624	
Gallatin	1,634	666,672	
Jamesport	720	293,760	
Pattonsburg	883	360,264	
De Kalb	8,047	3,283,176	314,195
Maysville	973	396,984	
Osborn	237	96,696	
Stewartsville	414	168,912	
Union Star	373	152,184	
Dent	10,936	4,461,888	148,453
Salem	3,611	1,473,288	
Douglas	12,638	5,156,304	121,617
Ava	1,611	657,288	
Dunklin	45,329	18,494,232	945,355
Campbell	1,931	787,848	
Kennett	8,685	3,543,480	
Malden	3,396	1,385,568	
Franklin	36,046	14,706,768	709,713
Gerald	429	175,032	
New Haven	1,009	411,672	
Pacific	1,964	801,312	
St. Clair	1,779	725,832	
Sullivan	2,638	1,076,304	
Union	2,917	1,190,136	
Washington	6,850	2,794,800	
Gasconade	12,342	5,035,536	240,162
Bland	596	243,168	
Hermann	2,323	1,029,384	
Owensville	1,946	793,968	
Gentry	11,036	4,502,688	325,510
Albany	1,850	754,800	
King City	1,031	420,648	
Stanberry	1,651	673,608	
Greene	104,823	42,767,784	2,273,812
Ash Grove	970	395,760	
Republic	965	393,720	
Springfield	36,046	14,694,528	
Grundy	13,220	5,393,760	332,778
Trenton	6,157	2,512,056	
Harrison	14,107	5,755,656	477,336
Bethany	2,714	1,107,312	
Cainsville	618	252,144	
Gilman City	450	183,600	
Henry	20,043	8,177,544	497,475
Clinton	6,052	2,469,216	
Urich	490	199,920	
Windsor	2,429	991,032	
Hickory	5,387	2,197,896	110,313
Hermitage	204	83,232	
Holt	9,833	4,011,864	428,578
Forest City	484	197,472	
Maitland	456	186,048	
Mound City	1,412	576,096	
Oregon	870	354,960	
Howard	11,857	4,837,656	328,973
Armstrong	424	172,992	
Fayette	3,144	1,282,752	
Glasgow	1,440	587,520	
New Franklin	1,060	432,480	
Howell	22,725	9,271,800	332,629
Mountain View	892	363,936	
West Plains	4,918	2,006,544	
Willow Springs	1,914	780,912	
Iron	9,458	3,858,864	145,342
Ironton	1,148	468,384	
Jackson	841,033	220,742,280	15,708,160
Blue Springs	1,008	435,744	
Buckner	639	260,712	
*Fairmount	4,200	1,713,600	
Grandview	1,556	634,848	
Independence	36,963	$15,080,904	
Lee's Summit	2,554	1,042,032	
Oak Grove	761	310,488	
*Raytown	880	359,040	
Sugar Creek	1,858	758,064	
Kansas City	442,825	180,672,600	
Jasper	79,106	32,275,248	$1,818,913
Carl Junction	1,006	410,448	
Carthage	11,034	4,501,872	
Jasper	776	316,608	
Joplin	35,498	14,483,184	
Sarcoxie	1,042	425,136	
Webb City	6,919	2,822,952	
Jefferson	38,007	15,506,856	1,025,822
Crystal City	3,499	1,427,592	
De Soto	5,357	2,185,656	
Festus	5,199	2,121,192	
Herculaneum	1,603	654,024	
Hillsboro	390	159,120	
Johnson	20,716	8,452,128	636,603
Holden	1,765	720,120	
Knob Noster	585	238,680	
Warrensburg	6,857	2,797,656	
Knox	7,617	3,107,736	262,182
Edina	1,607	655,656	
Hurdland	268	109,344	
Knox City	362	147,696	
Laclede	19,010	7,759,080	297,734
Conway	514	209,712	
Lebanon	6,808	2,777,664	
Lafayette	25,272	10,310,976	807,647
Concordia	1,218	496,944	
Corder	541	209,712	
Higginsville	3,428	1,398,624	
Lexington	5,074	2,070,192	
Odessa	1,969	803,352	
Waverly	809	330,072	
Lawrence	23,420	9,555,360	523,295
Aurora	4,153	1,694,424	
Marionville	1,167	476,136	
Miller	615	250,920	
Mount Vernon	2,057	839,256	
Pierce City	1,156	471,648	
Lewis	10,733	4,379,064	294,294
Canton	2,490	1,015,920	
La Belle	840	342,720	
La Grange	1,106	451,248	
Lewistown	415	169,320	
Lincoln	13,478	5,499,024	355,360
Elsberry	1,565	638,520	
Troy	1,738	709,104	
Linn	18,865	7,696,920	559,473
Brookfield	5,810	2,370,480	
Browning	373	152,184	
Bucklin	783	319,464	
Linneus	513	209,304	
Marceline	3,172	1,294,176	
Meadville	446	181,968	
Livingston	16,532	6,745,056	337,709
Chillicothe	8,694	3,547,152	
McDonald	14,144	5,770,752	222,659
Anderson	1,073	437,784	
Noel	685	279,480	
Pineville	464	189,312	
South West City	595	242,760	
Macon	18,332	7,479,456	525,237
Atlanta	436	178,704	
La Plata	1,331	543,048	
Macon	4,152	1,694,016	
New Cambria	296	120,360	
Madison	10,380	4,235,040	182,391
Fredericktown	3,696	1,507,968	
Maries	7,423	3,028,584	130,226
Belle	906	369,648	
Vienna	471	192,168	
Marion	29,765	12,144,120	661,634
Hannibal	20,386	8,317,488	
Palmyra	2,295	936,360	
Mercer	7,235	2,951,880	230,754
Princeton	1,506	614,448	
Miller	13,734	5,603,472	332,323
Eldon	2,709	1,128,528	
Iberia	595	242,760	
Tuscumbia	221	90,168	
Mississippi	22,551	9,200,808	305,967
Charleston	5,501	2,244,408	
East Prairie	3,033	1,237,464	
Moniteau	10,340	4,422,720	253,517
California	2,627	1,071,816	
Tipton	1,234	503,472	
Monroe	11,314	4,616,112	291,881
Madison	571	232,968	
Monroe City	1,896	773,568	
Paris	1,407	574,056	
Montgomery	11,555	4,714,440	297,286
Middletown	240	97,920	
Montgomery City	1,679	685,032	
New Florence	522	212,976	
Rhineland	198	80,784	
Wellsville	1,519	619,752	

[1] State of Missouri, Annual Report of the Director of the Department of Revenue for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950, Jefferson City, Mo., Mid-State Printing Co., 1950. Tax figures are for 1949 calendar year, latest figures available.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952—Continued

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts
Morgan	10,207	$4,164,456	$256,912
Stover	693	282,744	
Versailles	1,929	787,032	
New Madrid	39,444	16,093,152	720,054
Gideon	1,754	715,632	
Lilbourn	1,361	555,288	
New Madrid	2,726	1,112,208	
Parma	1,163	474,504	
Portageville	2,662	1,086,096	
Risco	495	201,960	
Newton	28,240	11,521,920	535,014
Diamond	405	165,240	
Granby	1,670	681,360	
Neosho	5,790	2,362,320	
Seneca	1,195	487,560	
Nodaway	24,033	9,805,464	1,645,707
Clearmont	283	115,464	
Elmo	258	105,264	
Hopkins	825	336,600	
Maryville	6,834	2,788,272	
Ravenwood	319	130,152	
Skidmore	485	197,880	
Oregon	11,978	4,887,024	154,080
Alton	571	232,968	
Koshkonong	333	153,864	
Thayer	1,639	668,712	
Osage	11,301	4,610,808	211,304
Chamois	621	253,368	
Linn	758	309,264	
Meta	353	144,024	
Ozark	8,856	3,613,248	97,277
*Bakersfield	177	72,216	
Gainsville	309	126,072	
Pemiscot	45,624	18,614,592	893,357
Caruthersville	8,614	3,514,512	
Hayti	3,302	1,347,216	
Steele	2,360	962,880	
Perry	14,890	6,075,120	255,161
Perryville	4,391	1,873,128	
Pettis	31,577	12,883,416	845,180
Green Ridge	335	136,680	
La Monte	502	204,816	
Sedalia	20,354	8,304,432	
Smithton	339	138,312	
Phelps	21,504	8,773,632	379,523
Newburg	949	387,192	
Rolla	9,354	3,816,432	
St. James	1,811	738,888	
Pike	16,844	6,872,352	365,046
Bowling Green	2,396	977,568	
Clarksville	702	286,416	
Louisiana	4,389	1,790,712	
Platte	14,973	6,108,984	553,584
Dearborn	391	159,528	
Parkville	1,186	483,888	
Platte City	742	302,736	
Weston	1,067	435,336	
Polk	16,062	6,553,296	343,152
Bolivar	3,482	1,420,656	
Humansville	803	327,624	
Pulaski	10,392	4,239,936	145,532
Crocker	712	290,496	
Dixon	988	403,104	
Richland	1,133	462,264	
Waynesville	1,010	412,080	
Putnam	9,166	3,739,728	223,467
Unionville	2,050	836,400	
Ralls	8,686	3,543,888	291,526
Center	415	169,320	
Perry	813	331,704	
Randolph	22,918	9,350,544	613,726
Clifton Hill	262	106,896	
Higbee	674	274,992	
Huntsville	1,520	620,160	
Moberly	13,115	5,350,920	
Ray	15,932	6,500,256	557,698
Hardin	747	304,776	
Lawson	486	198,288	
Orrick	675	275,400	
Richmond	4,299	1,753,992	
Reynolds	6,918	2,822,544	174,451
*Centerville	250	102,000	
Ellington	777	317,016	
Ripley	11,414	4,656,912	151,167
Doniphan	1,611	657,288	
St. Charles	29,834	12,172,272	610,269
Wentzville	1,227	500,616	
St. Charles	14,314	5,840,112	
St. Clair	10,482	4,276,656	213,052
Appleton City	1,150	469,200	
Osceola	1,082	441,456	
St. Francois	35,276	14,392,608	1,130,738
Bismarck	1,244	507,552	
Bonne Terre	3,533	1,441,464	
Farmington	4,490	1,831,920	
Flat River	5,308	2,165,664	
Ste. Genevieve	11,237	4,548,696	196,734
Ste. Genevieve	3,992	1,628,736	
St. Louis	406,349	165,790,392	14,527,298
*Ballwin	450	183,600	
Clayton	16,035	6,542,280	
Ferguson	11,573	4,721,784	
Kirkwood	18,640	7,650,120	

Foreign-aid costs to the people of Missouri by individual, city, and county for the period July 1, 1945–June 30, 1952—Continued

County and city	Population	Cost of foreign aid to the counties and cities of Missouri	Annual tax receipts
St. Louis—Con.			
Maplewood	13,416	$5,473,728	
Lemay	47,773	19,475,064	
Overland	11,566	4,718,928	
Normandy	2,306	940,848	
Pinelawn	6,425	2,621,400	
University City	39,892	16,275,936	
Webster Groves	23,390	9,543,120	
Wellston	9,396	3,833,568	
St. Louis City	856,796	349,572,768	$36,535,403
Saline	26,694	10,891,152	792,625
Marshall	8,850	3,610,800	
Slater	2,836	1,157,088	
Sweet Springs	1,439	587,112	
Schuyler	5,760	2,350,080	143,583
Downing	453	184,824	
Greentop	281	114,648	
Lancaster	856	349,248	
Queen City	554	226,032	
Scotland	7,332	2,991,456	290,508
Gorin	2,035	830,280	
Memphis	303	123,624	
Scott	32,842	13,399,536	500,619
Benton	546	222,768	
Chaffee	3,134	1,278,672	
Illmo	1,247	508,776	
Sikeston	11,640	4,749,120	
Shannon	8,377	3,417,816	132,245
Birch Tree	409	166,872	
Eminence	527	215,016	
Winona	473	192,984	
Shelby	9,730	3,969,840	283,610
Clarence	1,123	458,184	
Hunnewell	293	119,544	
Shelbina	2,113	862,104	
Shelbyville	635	259,080	
Stoddard	33,463	13,652,904	539,788
Bloomfield	1,382	563,856	
Bernie	1,308	533,664	
Dexter	4,624	1,886,592	
Puxico	749	305,592	
Stone	9,748	3,977,184	169,210
Crane	939	383,112	
Galena	439	179,112	
Sullivan	11,299	4,609,992	293,511
Green City	673	274,584	
Milan	1,972	804,576	
Taney	9,863	4,024,104	159,214
Branson	1,314	536,112	
Forsyth	354	144,432	
Texas	18,992	7,748,736	364,226
Cabool	1,245	507,960	
Houston	1,277	521,016	
Licking	733	299,064	
Vernon	22,985	9,255,480	554,602
Bronaugh	214	87,312	
Nevada	8,009	3,267,672	
Sheldon	427	174,216	
Warren	7,666	3,127,728	185,904
Marthasville	347	141,576	
Warrenton	1,884	646,272	
Washington	14,689	5,993,112	226,893
Potosi	2,359	962,472	
Wayne	10,514	4,289,712	142,320
Greenville	270	110,160	
Piedmont	1,548	631,584	
Webster	15,072	6,149,376	261,197
Marshfield	1,925	785,400	
Seymour	1,015	414,120	
Worth	5,120	2,008,960	195,203
Grant City	1,184	483,072	
Wright	15,834	6,460,272	214,823
Hartville	526	214,608	
Mansfield	963	392,904	
Mountain Grove	3,106	1,267,248	
Norwood	345	140,760	
State total	3,954,653	1,613,498,424	116,881,857

*Unincorporated towns with estimated population figures for 1952, Rand McNally Commercial Atlas and Marketing Guide, 83d ed., 1952. (All cities and towns in Missouri are not included in this tabulation.)

NOTE.—Where population was given in part for some cities, the parts were totaled to get the full population of the city. In cases where the city was not specified the population of a whole township was taken.

Sources: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1950 United States Census of Population, Missouri. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 16, 1948, A Synopsis of Foreign Aid, 1940-52. H. Ficker, Legislative Reference Service, May 1, 1952.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, it will be observed from this table that the residents of my native county of Macon, a typical northeast Missouri county, have, since July 1, 1945, paid on a per capita basis, a total of $7,479,456 for foreign aid. This is more than 10 times the annual tax bill of the people of Macon County, for county, including school, purposes. The sum could be used to pretty good advantage in Macon County, Mo.

Foreign aid has cost the people of St. Louis $349,572,768. We may well contemplate the slums this would clear, the hospitals, homes, schools, and streets this would build, the playgrounds, parks, airports, and other improvements it would provide.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this is only the first cost of foreign aid. An additional cost is found on the price tag of every essential product. The high cost of giving is a major cause of the high cost of living in this country today.

Mr. President, I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but the record will show that I have been more successful in prophecy than in persuasion.

In 1948, when the Marshall plan first came before the Senate, I said:

> Every dollar sent to Europe weakens by that much our own national economy. We are distributing our wealth and resources around the world without the benefit that comes from ordinary foreign trade. Every such expenditure not only retards retirement of our national debt and the burden of taxation, but causes shortages of scarce goods in our own country. This process raises prices, promotes inflation, and intensifies our own difficulties. The ultimate result will be inevitably to reduce our own national economy to the level of the countries we want to help and to make us as vulnerable as they are to communism. Instead of setting an example to lead Europe out of her economic and political chaos we may be forced to adopt the same economic planning and controls that we find plaguing Europe today, with such tragic results.

The American housewife is striving to stretch her husband's pay checks to cover the present inflated cost of groceries and clothing. She feels the effect every day of the hardships brought about in large part by over-generous handouts.

Too little attention has been devoted to needs of our own people—old people for example, trying to eke out a living on a meager pension. I am interested in the welfare of the natives of Africa, Asia, and the South Sea islands, but I am a lot more interested in the welfare of needy folks right here at home. We have plenty of them requiring our attention now.

State Department planners have learned from long experience in doling out the money of the American people to governments abroad that at frequent intervals it is necessary and desirable to change the label on the hand-out program.

Since the end of World War II, we have had a continuous flow of dollars abroad. Each year our Uncle Sam has doled out dollars in increasingly large amounts. We have had a whole series of programs—UNRRA, Bretton Woods, the British loan, the Marshall plan, point 4, and now the so-called Mutual Security program.

They all have sounded fine; they have taken a lot of money; but none of them has accomplished the job that we were told it would do.

Great Britain, who has profited more than any other country from our gifts, is again in dire need of further assistance.

Every time an effort is made in Congress to reduce the hand-out program, European countries raise their familiar cry: "If you cut your aid we will go communistic." It is a familiar cry of "Wolf! Wolf!"

Hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign-aid funds have been used to reduce the debts of European governments.

Yet in terms of national debt, the average debt upon every man, woman, and child in the United States is six times as heavy as the per capita debt upon the individual European.

Our lavish gifts abroad have led one on-the-spot observer to state that "the American taxpayer in the guise of Santa Claus strides through Europe dispensing presents in a fashion never achieved by the old gentleman from the North Pole."

From the English Channel to the Danube there are new buildings with inset placques stating that they were built with ECA funds. There are privately owned hotels in Nuremburg, old headquarters of the Nazi movement. Gigantic plants have been built to create electricity. Massive hydroelectric dams, docks, and factories have been raised with American tax dollars.

Paris is swarming with United States Government employees, some press agents turning out endless copy telling of more money to be spent.

The Greeks demand more. The Iranians have high hopes. Politicians from Asia, Europe, and Africa swarm over Washington, D. C., with proposals to help rich Uncle Sam divest himself of his uncomfortable wealth so that he may retire at his ease in some convenient poorhouse.

There is a definite relationship between the vast expenditures for foreign aid during the last 6 years and increasingly heavy domestic spending.

The scooping of the assets of the United States abroad has been accompanied by a visible letting down of efforts on the part of both Congress and the executive branch of the Government to economize at home.

As I said in 1948 during Senate debate on the Marshall plan:

> We cannot have at one and the same time economy and frugality at home and profligacy and extravagance abroad. If we open the sluice gates of public spending abroad, who among us will undertake to keep them closed at home?

Every Member of Congress must have received letters from people at home saying in effect: If we can afford to spend billions abroad for flood-control projects and a million other purposes, why cannot we have funds for projects of the same kind right here at home? I have had my share of such letters from my fellow Missourians.

Leading economists have warned that our own economy has about reached the breaking point—that our commitments at home and abroad far exceed our capacity to deliver. This plagues us now and will plague us in the future more than we like to think.

Production in the United States is currently high. There are a lot of dollars in circulation, but our economy is sick. The disappointing thing about the present kind of prosperity is that it is based upon extravagant Government spending, ill-considered hand-outs to foreign nations, and war, and threats of war.

This type of prosperity is as deceiving as the rosy cheeks on a patient with a fatal fever.

Our national debt has long since exceeded wise limits.

The value of the dollar is now 53 cents. This fact alone has profoundly altered our economy for the worse. No bureaucratic argument for a cheap dollar will relieve the difficulties of the hard-pressed housewife, the young married couple longing to buy a home, parents striving to educate their children, or the teacher compelled to live on a fixed income.

Somehow, we must reverse the present trend. Instead of more spending there must be less spending. Instead of bigger Government deficits, we must reduce the national debt. And instead of doling out bigger and bigger handouts to foreign nations, we must encourage those countries to make their way on their own. The hour is late—it is later than many of us realize.

In March 1948, when the Marshall plan first came before the Senate, I urged the Congress to adopt a three-point program. Here is the program I presented at that time:

First. Let us stop meddling in the internal governmental affairs of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

Second. Let us drive the Communists and fellow travelers from all employment under the Government of the United States.

Third. While we still have strong resources, let us spend as much as needed to build a national defense so strong that neither Russia nor any other aggressor nation will dare attack us.

I do not hesitate to say that if these proposals had been put into effect when they were made in 1948, the United States would be in far better position than now to meet the threat of communism.

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not know that the Senate of the United States has ever met on the Fourth of July to transact a full day's business. So far as I know, the Senate last met on the 4th of July 17 years ago to perform some perfunctory business before recessing.

Without further comment, but, I think, to the satisfaction, certainly, of the junior Senator from Washington, and of a great many other Americans as well, I want to consume a few minutes of the precious time of the Senate in reading that declaration of faith known as the Declaration of Independence, which was made available to the citizens of this Nation on July 4, 1776.

Mr. President, in the opinion of all of us, the words in the Declaration of Independence are completely timeless. They have been worth while since 1776, and will continue to be so in perpetuity.

The Senator from Washington is privileged to speak these words about the greatest Republic the world has ever known. Our collective hope and effort is to maintain its strength and fidelity.

I shall now read the Declaration of Independence.

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE—IN CONGRESS JULY 4, 1776

THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION OF THE THIRTEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his governors to pass laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of representation in the legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places, unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the legislative powers, incapable of annihilation, have returned to the people at large for their exercise; the state remaining in the meantime exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation.

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us.

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States.

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world.

For imposing taxes on us without our consent.

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury.

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses.

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies.

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments.

For suspending our own legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

He has constrained our fellow citizens taken captive on the high seas to bear arms against their country, to become the executioners of their friends and brethren, or to fall themselves by their hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages, whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions.

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have we been wanting in attentions to our British brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind. Enemies in war, in peace friends.

We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America, in General Congress, assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, that these united Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; and they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

(The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members:)

JOHN HANCOCK.

New Hampshire: Josiah Bartlett, Wm. Whipple, Matthew Thornton.

Massachusetts Bay: Saml. Adams, John Adams, Robt. Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry.

Rhode Island, etc.: Step. Hopkins, William Ellery.

Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Sam'el Huntington, Wm. Williams, Oliver Wolcott.

New York: Wm. Floyd, Phil. Livingston, Frans. Lewis, Lewis Morris.

New Jersey: Richd. Stockton, Jno. Witherspoon, Fras. Hopkinson, John Hart, Abra Clark.

Pennsylvania: Robt. Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benja. Franklin, John Morton, Geo. Clymer, Jas. Smith, Geo. Taylor, James Wilson, Geo. Ross.

Delaware: Caesar Rodney, Geo. Read, Tho M'Kean.

Maryland: Samuel Chase, Wm. Paca, Thos. Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton.

Virginia: George Wythe, Richard Henry Lee, Th Jefferson, Benja. Harrison, Thos. Nelson, jr., Francis Lightfoot Lee, Carter Braxton.

North Carolina: Wm. Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn.

South Carolina: Edward Rutledge, Thos. Heyward, junr., Thomas Lynch, junr., Arthur Middleton.

Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, Geo. Walton.

Resolved, That copies of the Declaration be sent to the several assemblies, conventions, and committees or councils of safety, and to the several commanding officers of the continental troops; that it be proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the Army.—(Jour. Cong., vol. 1, p. 396.)

AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield to me for about 2 minutes, so that I may ask the Senate to act on a bill which was discussed here yesterday?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I yield for that purpose, provided it is understood that I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may yield for that purpose, without losing any right he has to the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly, Mr. President.

I now ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 8271, calendar 1765, on page 12 of the calendar, a bill to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask what the calendar number is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is calendar No. 1765.

Mr. McCARRAN. Has the bill been amended?

Mr. McKELLAR. Several amendments to it were agreed to yesterday.

Mr. President, my information is that the Senator who objected yesterday no longer objects. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered and passed, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Finance Committee with two amendments. One offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the other by myself. Objection was made to them at that time, but those objections have been withdrawn.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Does the Senator recall who objected to consideration of the bill on the call of the calendar yesterday?

Mr. McKELLAR. The objection was made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I inquire whether the bill was reported unanimously by the Finance Committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The chairman, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is present, and I shall refer the question to him.

Mr. GEORGE. It was unanimously reported, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has indicated he will not insist upon his objection today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments were agreed to yesterday.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it may be necessary to amend the title to this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended to conform to the text that has been approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 457 and section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given to the Senator from South Dakota to yield for the purpose of having this bill considered, without his losing the right to the floor. Does the Senator from South Dakota now yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MUNDT. For what purpose?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation. We are trying to expedite the consideration of several important treaties now on the calendar. I have been requested by the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Wisconsin to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, in order that, following the remarks of the Senator from South Dakota, the Senate may proceed expeditiously to the consideration of the treaties.

Mr. MUNDT. My remarks will be brief.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

A NEW ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, at this time in this country a number of exchange-of-persons programs are being advanced by our Government. We are going to put several millions of dollars into these programs. One of the main objectives of the programs is to develop better understanding among men and nations, and particularly to develop better understanding of our America in foreign lands. I have supported such programs, because I believe the best way to impart to the nations now being wooed by the Communists an adequate idea of what America really is would be by having the people in other countries learn to know our America and our democratic way of life first hand.

When the Senate was considering the appropriation bill, I joined with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in securing a slight increase of funds for the exchange-of-persons program which is operating under the so-called Fulbright Act and the Smith-Mundt Act. This exchange-of-persons program is also operating as a part of the mutual security aid program.

It seems to me that this particular type of public-information program is uniquely American, because it is one strategy, it is one device, and it is one tactic which the Communists dare not employ. We are proud to invite foreigners to come to our country, so that they may understand, know, and see the real America. The Communists are afraid to have people from outside the iron curtain visit their sequestered areas, because of the impact made by communism upon people who are antagonistic toward seeing and visiting and living in a police state. So, under the mutual security program and similar projects, thousands of foreigners are being brought to America from month to month and from year to year. They are taken usually in large groups from big city to big city on a tour of America, with most of the concentration being made upon the coastal areas of America, especially the areas in the East.

My concern lies in the fact that many of the foreigners who are brought here so that they may know America never really get to know the heart of America. The heart of America is in the American family and the American home, and on the American farm; in the pioneer spirit which braved the wilderness and the desert and developed this country; in the America we see typified in communities of less than 250,000 people, and in what we are happy to call rural America. That spirit which built America still dominates great areas of this country. I am sure it dominates the wide-open spaces of the West.

It is for this reason that I am eager to have our get-to-know-America guests brought to the West, and into the heart of America. I shall continue to confer with the officials of the Mutual Security Administration and in the State Department, concerning the arrangement of these programs. I have done so in the past, and I shall do so in the future, because many Members of the Senate have told me they share with me the desire to see a more concentrated effort made to take the foreign guests who come here under these programs into the interior portions of the United States.

Mr. President, I have in mind a plan for orientation and reception of these guests from afar, which will change their status here from sightseers to personal guests of Americans living in typical American centers.

I mention this proposal today on the Senate floor because I am sure there are other Senators who, like me, want to help these people know our America as it is outside the large metropolitan areas, to help these foregin visitors know the people, the families, the aims of this country, and in the small towns, on large farms, in the factories, in typically small cities, which are all a part of America, to gain an insight into the true America of which we are so proud, the America which was originated and born out of the Declaration of Independence which was recently read to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

It is my theory that we should get these foreign visitors "oriented" in our western colleges and universities and in our wide-open spaces, as well as in crammed places of metropolitan centers, for it takes all of this to make our America.

It seems to me that we should have several orientation centers established for visitors outside the large metropolitan centers. I think at least some of these should be in the West and in the Midwest. I have conferred with a number of educators and farm leaders and labor leaders in this connection, and I know that they are desirous of cooperating in the establishment of orientation centers of this type. I know, Mr. President, that the University of South Dakota, at Vermillion, and the State college, at Brookings, as well as other colleges in the West, would afford visitors from afar this opportunity to see America, which is entirely different from anything in Europe, the wide-open spaces and the type of free men and women that America has produced, the tremendous natural resources of our country in many fields, both those being worked and those still undeveloped and untouched.

Under such programs of orientation, these foreign visitors could study American farming methods on large and small farms in the vicinity of our smaller American urban communities; they could study mining and metallurgy in their many aspects as they are being developed throughout this country. Under a program of this kind, cattle raising and marketing, forestry, and other activities such as are developed in the United States could be studied, and knowledge of the progress we have made carried back to the foreign countries from which these visitors come.

Mr. President, after such orientation courses, when these visitors first reached this country, they could then be sent out in small groups to visit not only in the large cities of America, but with the peoples of these cities, and with the people of the smaller communities of the South and in the Middle West.

At present, relatively large groups—sometimes as many as 25—are taken from one city to another, on conducted tours, without having the opportunity to come to know the real American by having a chance to meet him in his home, in his church, in his place of business, and in his place of recreation. Usually there has been altogether too little preparation from the standpoint of the reception and education of these guests, and usually little preparation has been made for their education before they arrive. They have not been oriented. They have not been briefed. They have not been given a preview of what to expect as they come to visit America. I think we are failing to take advantage of vast potentialities of development through our failure to provide the proper kind of

orientation centers and the proper kind of reception treatment for these visitors who come here yearning to know what it is that actually makes America tick.

So, Mr. President, I suggest a program through which hospitality and continuing education could be provided under the Know Your America Program and the program to encourage the exchange of persons. These visitors should have private contacts with the little people and big people of America, the urban and the rural people of this country.

State and local receptionists can be employed at a nominal fee, perhaps $5 to $10 a day, on an average of 3 days a week. The receptionist would fully plan the programs of those who are to come before they arrive.

A well-trained, alert housewife in any city who wishes to work at home—and that is the type of work which appeals to many women—would be told not less than 2 or 3 weeks before the arrival of the visitors that they are coming. She would be given a thumbnail sketch by the chairman of the reception group. The local chairman would then arrange for study visits where the visiting students would want to go and arrange to have them called for if necessary. Arrangements could be made for visits in the simple, good American homes that we want our guests to know. Arrangements could be made for a dinner here or a cup of coffee there or for a trip to the country. Hostess teams could be set up in many communities composed of volunteer local representatives of member organizations joining with many others like Rotary Clubs, Lions Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, or other service clubs which are eager to help on such projects.

Talks could be arranged to put our visitors before many such groups under this hostess plan. They can tell us the type of country in which they live and, at the same time, learn from us more about the country which it is their privilege to visit.

I am proud of South Dakota, and I want to let the world know what we have in our State. I am sure other Senators from other States are equally interested in helping foreign visitors to our shores learn to know the real forces and virtues which make America great and they are equally proud of the vast potentialities and the vast possibilities of their areas.

I am sure it is the intention of the Senate that in this exchange-of-persons program, whether it be under the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act, or any other act, foreign visitors should have an opportunity to see the soul and heart of this country of ours.

By following some such program as has been suggested, I am confident that what the Senate and the Congress have in mind could be better implemented and better satisfied than by the somewhat careless and cursory manner in which visitors now come to this country and spend the major portion of their time in a few of the great metropolitan cities of this country.

I am interested in effecting a part of this exchange program through the Mutual Security Administration. I like the word "mutual" in this program. I think that any program must be mutually cooperative to make it work.

A program which helps effect functional cooperation, and I repeat, functional cooperation, between the people of other democracies and our own, is the kind of activity I believe in and the kind which we Americans want. If, at the same time, such a program will help bring the people of other lands closer to the people of our country, then I am sure that this is the kind of project we need and want. I feel confident the Mutual Security Administration aims to have such a program, and I sincerely believe the suggestions I have made this afternoon move in the direction of developing a program of this type.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO RECORDING AND PERFORMING RIGHTS IN LITERARY WORKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same.

ALEXANDER WILEY,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
WILLIS SMITH,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement on the conference report which has just been agreed to.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 3589 is a copyright bill which passed the Senate on June 21, 1952, with three amendments. The amendments consisted of inserting the word "pecuniary" in two places and the third amendment consisted of making the effective date of the act January 1, 1953.

The conferees agreed that the word "pecuniary" was not necessary in the bill and the conferees agreed to recede from those two amendments. The more important amendment, making the effective date of this act January 1, 1953, was discussed and the conferees agreed that the House should recede from its disagreement to that amendment.

I ask the adoption of the conference report on H. R. 3589.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals vice Joseph R. Jackson, retired; and

James Augustine Walsh, of Arizona, to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona, vice Howard C. Speakman, deceased.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

William B. Savchuck and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Paul Moss, of Texas, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department, vice J. H. Allen, deceased; and

Thirty-six postmasters.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike to proceed out of order, but I have to attend a committee in a very few minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive K, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield so that

we may take up nominations on the Executive Calendar of judges, district attorneys, and others?

Mr. GEORGE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Ross Paty, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring May 18, 1960.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the name of James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the name of James T. Hill, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

IN THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Air Force will be confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps will be confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, two nominations were filed this afternoon by the Judiciary Committee, a judge for the district of Arizona, and a judge of the Tax Court of Appeals in Maryland. They were both approved by the Senators from their respective States, by the bar associations of their respective districts, and by the Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that those nominations may be considered out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nominations?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I may ask the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee to let those two nominations go to the calendar so that they may be passed on tomorrow. I have heard rumors that someone would like to read the reports and find out more about the nominees. I am asking that of my friend in all sincerity, not because I have any wish to delay the proceedings.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will go to the Executive Calendar to be considered tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the Senate in confirming nominations passed upon today be reported immediately to the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

Mr. GEORGE. Last year the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of 14 conventions and protocols designed to afford tax relief to individuals and corporations subject to taxation by two or more jurisdictions because of their place of residence or the nature of their operations.

The pending conventions, one with Switzerland on estate taxes and two with Finland on estate and income taxes, carry forward this program to prevent double taxation. The conventions have been examined by the Committee on Foreign Relations and by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They have been found consistent with other conventions we have approved.

The committee has received no evidence of opposition to these conventions. On the contrary, it has received a number of requests that they be approved.

The committee therefore recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of these conventions.

Mr. President, in conclusion, all the questionable provisions which have heretofore given rise to some controversy in connection with the tax conventions have been omitted in the treaties under consideration and they are wholly unobjectionable.

Executive L and Executive P are separate conventions, but they are precisely as I have described them. They both relate to the double taxation of individuals and corporations having a dual residence, or whose business in its nature leads to double taxation by differing jurisdictions.

CONVENTION WITH FINLAND RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive K (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Finland, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are the following taxes asserted upon death:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal estate tax, and

(b) In the case of the Republic of Finland: The inheritance tax, the communal tax on inheritances, bequests, or devices, and the "poors percentage."

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Finland" means the Republic of Finland.

(c) The term "tax" means the Federal estate tax imposed in the United States, or the inheritance tax, the communal tax on inheritances, bequests or devises, or the "poors percentage," imposed in Finland, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in the case of Finland, the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States, any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the tax laws of that State.

ARTICLE III

(1) For the purposes of the present Convention, the question whether a decedent was at the time of his death domiciled in or a citizen of the United States, or whether the decedent or the beneficiary of a deceased person's estate was a resident in Finland at the time of the decedent's death, shall be

determined in accordance with the laws in force in the United States or Finland, respectively.

(2) In the case of a decedent who at the time of death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, or in the case of a decedent who at the time of death was a resident of Finland, or in the case of a beneficiary of a deceased person's estate who at the time of the death of such person was a resident of Finland, the situs of any of the following property or property rights shall, for the purposes of the imposition of the tax where the tax is imposed on the basis of the situs of property, and for the purposes of credit, be determined exclusively in accordance with the following rules:

(a) Immovable property shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the land involved is located. The question whether any property or right in property constitutes immovable property shall be determined in accordance with the law of the place where the land involved is located.

(b) Tangible movable property (other than such property for which specific provision is hereinafter made) and bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue, shall be deemed to be situated at the place where such property or currency are located at the time of death, or, if in transitu, at the place of destination.

(c) Debts (including bonds, promissory notes, bills of exchange, and insurance) shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the debtor resides, or if the debtor is a corporation, at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(d) Shares or stock in a corporation (including shares or stock held by a nominee where the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) shall be deemed to be situated at the place in or under the laws of which such corporation was created or organized.

(e) Ships and aircraft and shares thereof shall be deemed to be situated at the place of registration or documentation of the ship or aircraft.

(f) Goodwill as a trade, business, or professional asset shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the trade, business, or profession to which it pertains is carried on.

(g) Patents, trade-marks, and designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where they are registered or used.

(h) Copyrights, franchises, rights to artistic and scientific works, and rights or licenses to use any copyrighted material, artistic and scientific works, patents, trade-marks, or designs shall be deemed to be situated at the place where the rights arising therefrom are exercisable.

(i) All property other than hereinbefore mentioned shall be deemed to be situated in accordance with the laws of the contracting State imposing the tax on the basis of situs of property within such State, but if neither of the contracting States impose the tax on the basis of situs of property therein, then all such other property shall be deemed to be situated where the decreased person was domiciled at the time of his death.

ARTICLE IV

(1) In the case of a decedent (other than a citizen or domiciliary of the United States) who at the time of his death was a resident of Finland, the United States, in imposing the tax:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption, which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if such decedent had been domiciled in the United States; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside the United States in determining the amount or rate of tax.

(2) In the case of a decedent (other than a resident of Finland) who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, or in the case of a beneficiary of a deceased person's estate (other than a beneficiary who at the time of the decedent's death was a resident of Finland), and such deceased person was at time of death a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, the taxation authority in Finland, in imposing the tax:

(a) shall allow a specific exemption, which would be allowable under its law if the decedent or beneficiary, as the case may be, had been resident in Finland, in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the property subjected to its tax bears to the value of the property which would have been subjected to its tax if such decedent or beneficiary had been resident in Finland; and

(b) shall (except for the purpose of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph and for the purpose of any other proportionate allowance otherwise provided) take no account of property situated according to Article III outside Finland in determining the amount or rate of tax.

ARTICLE V

(1) If the decedent was at the time of his death domciled in or a citizen of the United States, the United States shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the amount of the tax imposed in Finland with respect to property situated in Finland and included for tax purposes in both contracting States, but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed by the United States which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3) of this Article.

(2) If the decedent was at the time of his death a resident of Finland, or if the beneficiary of the deceased person's estate was at the time of the death of such person a resident of Finland, the taxation authority in Finland shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the amount of the tax imposed by the United States with respect to property situated in the United States and included for tax purposes in both contracting States, but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed in Finland which is attributable to such property. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3) of this Article.

(3) If in a particular case taxes are imposed in one of the contracting States by reason of the decedent's domicile or citizenship thereof and in the other contracting State by reason of the decedent's or beneficiary's residence therein, the taxation authorities in each contracting State shall allow against their taxes (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the part of the taxes imposed in the other contracting State with respect to property included for tax in both States and situated or deemed to be situated—

(a) in both contracting States, or

(b) outside of both States.

The total of the credits authorized by this paragraph shall be equal to the amount of the taxes imposed with respect to such property in the contracting State imposing the smaller amount of taxes, and shall be divided between the two States in proportion to the amount of taxes imposed in each of the two States with respect to such property.

(4) For the purpose of this Article, the amount of the tax in each contracting State attributable to any designated property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit otherwise provided, except any credit authorized by this Article.

ARTICLE VI

(1) Any claim for credit or for a refund of tax founded on the provisions of the present Convention shall be made within six years from the date of death of the decedent.

(2) Any refund shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

ARTICLE VII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE VIII

Each of the contracting States may collect taxes, which are the subject of this Convention, imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were a tax imposed by the former State) as will ensure that the credit or any other benefit granted under the present Convention shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE IX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE X

Where the representative of the estate of a decedent or beneficiary of such estate shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of one of the contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, such representative or beneficiary shall be entitled to present the facts to the contracting State of which the decedent was a citizen at the time of death or of which the beneficiary is a citizen, or if the decedent was not a citizen of either of the contracting States at the time of death or if the beneficiary is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, such facts may be presented to the contracting State in which the decedent was domiciled or resident at time of death or in which the beneficiary is domiciled or resident. The competent authority of the State to which the facts are so presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of this Convention shall in no case increase the tax liability in either contracting State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to carry into effect the present Convention within the respective States. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, costs of collection, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Helsinki as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date. It shall continue effective for a period of five years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of that five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

DONE at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Finnish languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this third day of March, 1952.

For the President of the United States of America:

DEAN ACHESON [SEAL]

For the President of the Republic of Finland:

JOHAN A. NYKOPP [SEAL]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have but a very brief statement to make on this treaty or convention, and it is equally applicable to Executive L which appears on page 2 of the Executive Calendar, and Executive P; Executive L being a convention between the United States and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation, and Executive P being a convention between the United States and Switzerland for the avoidance of double taxation. What I shall say relates to all three of the conventions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive K, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION WITH FINLAND FOR AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive L (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, which read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION AND THE PREVENTION OF FISCAL EVASION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON INCOME

The President of the United States of America and the President of the Republic of Finland, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The President of the Republic of Finland:

Johan A. Nykopp, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Finland to the United States of America,

who, having communicated to one another their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal income tax, including surtaxes and excess profits taxes.

(b) In the case of Finland: The State (National) income tax.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by either contracting State subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Finland" means the Republic of Finland.

(c) The term "permanent establishment" means a branch office, factory, warehouse or other fixed place of business, but does not include the casual and temporary use of merely storage facilities, nor does it include an agency unless the agent has and exercises a general authority to negotiate and conclude contracts on behalf of an enterprise or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders on its behalf. An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the other State merely because it carries on business dealings in such other State through a bona fide commission agent, broker or custodian acting in the ordinary course of his business as such. The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States maintains in the other State a fixed place of business exclusively for the purchase of goods or merchandise shall not of itself constitute such fixed place of business a permanent establishment of such enterprise. The fact that a corporation of one contracting State has a subsidiary corporation which is a corporation of the other State or which is engaged in trade or business in the other State shall not of itself constitute that subsidiary corporation a permanent establishment of its parent corporation.

(d) The term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity.

(e) The term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, United States enterprise" or "Finnish enterprise".

(f) The term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States by a resident or partnership of the United States or by a United States corporation or other entity; the term "United States corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other entity created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory of the United States.

(g) The term "Finnish enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in Finland by a resident or partnership of Finland or by a Finnish corporation or other entity; the term "Finnish corporation or other entity" means a corporation or other entity created or organized in Finland or under Finnish law.

(h) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and in the case of Finland, the Taxation Department of the Ministry of Finance.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under the tax laws of that State.

ARTICLE III

(1) An enterprise of one of the contracting States shall not be subject to taxation in the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits unless it is engaged in trade or business in such other State through a permanent establishment situated therein. If it is so engaged such other State may impose its tax upon the entire income of such enterprise from sources within such other State.

(2) In determining the industrial or commercial profits from sources within the territory of one of the contracting States of an enterprise of the other contracting State, no profits shall be deemed to arise from the mere purchase of goods or merchandise within the territory of the former contracting State by such enterprise. In the determination of the net industrial and commercial

profits of the permanent establishment there shall be allowed as deductions all expenses, wherever incurred, reasonably allocable to the permanent establishment, including executive and general administrative expenses so allocable.

(3) Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States is engaged in trade or business in the territory of the other contracting States through a permanent establishment situated therein, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the industrial or commercial profits which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions and dealing at arm's length with the enterprise of which it is a permanent establishment and the profits so attributed shall, subject to the law of such other contracting State, be deemed to be income from sources within the territory of such other contracting State.

(4) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may lay down rules by agreement for the apportionment of industrial and commercial profits.

ARTICLE IV

Where an enterprise of one of the contracting States, by reason of its participation in the management or the financial structure of an enterprise of the other contracting State, makes with or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which would normally have accrued to one of the enterprises but by reason of those conditions have not so accrued, may be included in the profits of that enterprise and taxed accordingly.

ARTICLE V

(1) Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other contracting State.

(2) The present Convention shall be deemed to have superseded, as of the effective date of this Convention, the arrangements between the United States and Finland providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits, effected by exchange of notes dated June 6, 1946 and January 7, 1947.

ARTICLE VI

(1) The rate of United States tax on dividends derived from a United States corporation by a resident or corporation or other entity of Finland, not engaged in trade or business in the United States through a permanent establishment therein, shall not exceed 15 percent: provided that such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such Finnish corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate.

(2) The rate of Finnish tax on dividends derived from a Finnish corporation by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States, not engaged in trade or business in Finland through a permanent establishment therein, shall not exceed 15 percent; provided that such rate of tax shall not exceed 5 percent if such United States corporation controls, directly or indirectly, at least 95 percent of the entire voting power in the corporation paying the dividend, and not more than 25 percent of the gross income of such paying corporation is derived from interest and dividends, other than interest and dividends from its own subsidiary corporation. Such reduction of the rate to 5 percent shall not apply if the relationship of the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of securing such reduced rate. For the purposes of this paragraph the combined Finnish tax on such dividends and the Finnish property tax on the capital stock of a Finnish corporation owned by such resident or corporation of other entity shall not exceed an amount computed at such rates as applied to dividends, if any, so derived.

ARTICLE VII

(1) Interest on bonds, securities, notes, debentures, or on any other form of indebtedness derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State, not having a permanent establishment in the former State, shall be exempt from tax by such former State.

(2) Bonds, bank deposits and trade balances beneficially owned by a resident or corporation or other entity of the United States shall be exempt from the Finnish property tax.

ARTICLE VIII

Royalties for the right to use copyrights or in respect of the right to produce or reproduce any literary, dramatic, musical, or artistic work (but not inclusive of rents or royalties in respect of motion picture films) derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a resident or corporation or other entity of the other contracting State, not engaged in trade or business in the former State through a permanent establishment therein, shall be exempt from tax imposed by such former State.

ARTICLE IX

(1) Income from real property (not including interest derived from mortgages and bonds secured by real property) and royalties in respect of the operation of mines, quarries, or other natural resources, shall be taxable only in the contracting State in which such property, mines, quarries, or other natural resources are situated.

(2) A resident or corporation or other entity of one of the contracting States deriving any such income from sources within the other contracting State may, for any taxable year, elect to be subject to the tax of such other contracting State as if such resident or corporation or other entity were engaged in trade or business within such other contracting State through a permanent establishment therein during such taxable year.

ARTICLE X

(1) (a) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions, paid by the United States or by the political subdivisions or territories thereof to an individual (other than a Finnish citizen who is not also a citizen of the United States) shall be exempt from Finnish tax.

(b) Wages, salaries and similar compensation and pensions, paid either directly, or from funds or institutions created, by Finland or by the political subdivisions or communities thereof, to an individual (other than a United States citizen who is not also a citizen of Finland) shall be exempt from United States tax. The term "funds or institutions" shall not be deemed to include a corporation even if such corporation is owned, in whole or in part, by the Government of Finland.

(2) Private pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

(3) The term "pensions", as used in this Article, means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

(4) The term "life annuities" as used in this Article means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in return for adequate and full consideration in money or money's worth.

ARTICLE XI

(1) A resident of Finland shall be exempt from United States tax upon compensation for labor or personal services (including the practice of the liberal and artistic professions) if he is temporarily present in the United States for a period or periods not exceeding a total of 183 days during the taxable year and either of the following conditions is met:

(a) his compensation is received for labor or personal services performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident, or corporation or other entity of Finland, or

(b) his compensation received for labor or personal services does not exceed $10,000.

(2) The provisions of paragraph (1) of this Article shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to a resident of the United States with respect to compensation for such labor or personal services performed in Finland.

(3) The provisions of this Article shall have no application to the income to which Article X (1) relates.

ARTICLE XII

(1) Dividends and interest paid by a Finnish corporation shall be exempt from United States tax except where the recipient is a citizen, resident or corporation or other entity of the United States.

(2) Dividends and interest paid by a United States corporation shall be exempt from Finnish tax except where the recipient is a resident or corporation or other entity of Finland.

ARTICLE XIII

A professor or teacher, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the territory of the other contracting States for the purpose of teaching for a period not exceeding two years at a university, college, school or other educational institution in the other contracting State, shall be exempted in such other contracting State from tax on his remuneration for such teaching for such period.

ARTICLE XIV

A student or apprentice, a resident of one of the contracting States, who temporarily visits the other contracting State exclusively for the purposes of study or for acquiring business or technical experience shall not be taxable in the latter State in respect or remittances received by him from abroad for the purpose of his maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE XV

(1) It is agreed that double taxation shall be avoided in the following manner:

(a) The United States in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention in the case of its citizens, residents or corporations may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States as if this Convention had not come into effect. The United States shall, however, subject to the provisions of section 131, Internal Revenue Code, as in effect on the date of the entry into force of this Convention, deduct from its taxes the amount of Finnish taxes specified in Article I of this Convention.

(b) Finland in determining its taxes specified in Article I of this Convention in the case of its residents or corporations or other

entities may, regardless of any other provision of this Convention, include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of Finland as if this Convention has not come into effect. Finland shall, however, deduct from the taxes so calculated that portion of such tax liability which the taxpayer's income from sources in the United States (not exempt from United States tax under this Convention) bears to the taxpayer's entire income but not in excess of the income tax paid to the United States and to the political subdivisions thereof on or with respect to the income so taxable in the United States.

(2) The provisions of this Article shall not be construed to deny the exemptions from United States tax or Finnish tax, as the case may be, granted by Article X (1) of this Convention.

ARTICLE XVI

The citizens of one of the contracting States shall not, while resident in the other contracting State, be subjected therein to other or more burdensome taxes than are the citizens of such other contracting State residing in its territory. As used in this paragrapn,

(a) the term "citizens" includes all legal persons, partnerships, and associations created or organized under the laws in the respective contracting States, and

(b) the term "taxes" means taxes of every kind or description whether national, Federal, State, communal or municipal.

ARTICLE XVII

The competent authorities of the contracting States shall exchange such information (being information available under the respective taxation laws of the contracting States) as is necessary for carrying out the provisions of the present Convention or for the prevention of fraud or the administration of statutory provisions against tax avoidance in relation to the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. Any information so exchanged shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any person other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention. No information shall be exchanged which would disclose any trade secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XVIII

Each of the contracting States may collect taxes, which are the subject of this Convention, imposed by the other contracting State (as though such tax were a tax imposed by the former State) as will ensure that the exemption or reduced rate of tax granted under the present Convention by such other State shall not be enjoyed by persons not entitled to such benefits.

ARTICLE XIX

The State to which application is made for information or assistance shall comply as soon as possible with the request addressed to it except that such State may refuse to comply with the request for reasons of public policy or if compliance would involve violation of a trade, business, industrial, or professional secret or trade process.

ARTICLE XX

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect to any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen, or if he is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, with the State of which he is a resident, or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it is created or organized. Should the claim be upheld, the competent authority of such State may come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE XXI

(1) The provisions of this Convention shall not be construed to deny or affect in any manner the right of diplomatic and consular officers to other or additional exemptions now enjoyed or which may hereafter be granted to such officers.

(2) The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention, or its relationship to Conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations necessary to interpret and carry out the provisions of this Convention. With respect to the provisions of this Convention relating to exchange of information and mutual assistance in the collection of taxes, such authorities may, by common agreement, prescribe rules concerning matters of procedure, forms of application and replies thereto, conversion of currency, disposition of amounts collected, minimum amounts subject to collection and related matters.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XXIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Helsinki as soon as possible. It shall have effect for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January of the year in which such exchange takes place.

(2) The present Convention shall continue effective for a period of five years and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the five-year period, or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, and, in such event, the present Convention shall cease to be effective for the taxable years beginning on or after the first day of January next following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Finnish languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this third day of March, 1952.

For the President of the United States of America:

DEAN ACHESON [SEAL]

For the President of the Republic of Finland:

JOHAN A. NYKOPP [SEAL]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION WITH SWITZERLAND REGARDING THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention Executive P (82d Cong., 1st sess), a convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington on July 9, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, which was read as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE SWISS CONFEDERATION FOR THE AVOIDANCE OF DOUBLE TAXATION WITH RESPECT TO TAXES ON ESTATES AND INHERITANCES

The President of the United States of America and the Swiss Federal Council, desiring to conclude a Convention for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, have appointed for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

The Swiss Federal Council:

Charles Bruggmann, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the Swiss Confederation in Washington, who, having communicated to one another their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The taxes referred to in this Convention are the following taxes asserted upon death:

(a) In the case of the United States of America: The Federal estate tax, and

(b) In the case of The Swiss Confederation: Estate and inheritance taxes imposed by the cantons and any political subdivision thereof.

(2) The present Convention shall also apply to any other estate or inheritance taxes of a substantially similar character imposed by the United States or the Swiss cantons or any political subdivision thereof subsequently to the date of signature of the present Convention.

ARTICLE II

(1) As used in this Convention:

(a) The term "United States" means the United States of America, and when used in a geographical sense means the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Switzerland" means The Swiss Confederation.

(c) The term "tax" means the Federal estate tax imposed by the United States, or the inheritance or estate taxes imposed in Switzerland, as the context requires.

(d) The term "competent authorities" means, in the case of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury; and in the case of Switzerland, the Director of the Federal Tax Administration as authorized by the Federal Department of Finances and Customs.

(2) In the application of the provisions of the present Convention by one of the contracting States any term not otherwise defined shall, unless the context otherwise requires, have the meaning which such term has under its own laws.

(3) For the purposes of the present Convention, each contracting State may determine whether the decedent was at the time of death domiciled therein or a citizen thereof.

ARTICLE III

In imposing the tax in the case of a decedent who at the time of death was not a citizen of the United States and was not domiciled therein, but who was at the time of his death a citizen of or domiciled in Switzerland, the United States shall allow a specific exemption which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) subjected to its tax bears to the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been domiciled in the United States. If a tax is imposed in Switzerland by reason of movable property being situated within the territorial jurisdiction of the tax authority (and not by reason of the decedent's domicile therein or by reason of the decedent's Swiss citizenship) in the case of an estate of a decedent who at the time of his death was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States, the tax authority in Switzerland shall allow a specific exemption which would be allowable under its law if the decedent had been domiciled within its territorial jurisdiction in an amount not less than the proportion thereof which the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) subjected to its tax bears to the value of the total property (both movable and immovable) which would have been subjected to its tax if the decedent had been domiciled within its territorial jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IV

(1) If the tax authority in the United States determines that the decedent was a citizen of or domiciled in the United States at the time of his death, and the tax authority in Switzerland determines that the decedent was a citizen of or domiciled in Switzerland at the time of his death, the tax authority in each contracting State shall allow against its tax (computed without application of this Article) a credit for the tax imposed in the other contracting State with respect to the following property included for tax by both States (but the amount of the credit shall not exceed the portion of the tax imposed in the crediting State which is attributable to such property):

(a) Shares or stock in a corporation (including shares or stock held by a nominee where the beneficial ownership is evidenced by scrip certificates or otherwise) created or organized under the laws of such other contracting State or a political subdivision thereof.

(b) Debts (including bonds, promissory notes, bills of exchange, and insurance) if the debtor resides in such other State, or if the debtor is a corporation created or organized under the laws of such other State or a political subdivision thereof.

(c) Corporal movable property (including bank or currency notes and other forms of currency recognized as legal tender in the place of issue) physically located in such other State at the time of death of the decedent, and

(d) Any other property which the competent authorities of both contracting States agree upon as constituting property situated in such other State.

(2) For the purpose of this Article, the amount of the tax of each contracting State attributable to any particular property shall be ascertained after taking into account any applicable diminution or credit as provided by its law other than any credit authorized by this Article.

(3) The credit provided by this Article shall be allowed only upon condition that the tax for which credit may be authorized has been fully paid; and the competent authority of the contracting State in which such tax is imposed shall certify to the competent authority of the contracting State in which credit may be allowed such information pertaining thereto as is necessary to carry out the provisions of this Article.

ARTICLE V

(1) Any claim for a credit or refund of tax founded on the provisions of the present Convention shall be made within five years from the date of death of the decedent.

(2) Any refund or credit shall be made without payment of interest on the amount so refunded.

ARTICLE VI

Where the representative of the estate of a decedent or a beneficiary of such estate can show proof that the action of the tax authorities of one of the contracting States has resulted or will result in double taxation contrary to the provisions of the present Convention, such representative or beneficiary shall be entitled to present the facts to the contracting State of which the decedent was a citizen at a time of death or of which the beneficiary is a citizen, or if the decedent was not a citizen of either of the contracting States at the time of death or if the beneficiary is not a citizen of either of the contracting States, such facts may be presented to the contracting State in which the decedent was domiciled at time of death or in which the beneficiary is domiciled. The competent authority of the State to which the facts are presented shall undertake to come to an agreement with the competent authority of the other contracting State with a view to equitable avoidance of the double taxation in question.

ARTICLE VII

(1) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the present Convention within the respective States.

(2) The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of this Convention. Any information so received shall be treated as secret and shall not be disclosed to any persons other than those concerned with the assessment and collection of the taxes which are the subject of the present Convention.

(3) Should any difficulty or doubt arise as to the interpretation or application of the present Convention or its relationship to conventions between one of the contracting States and any other State, the competent authorities of the contracting States may settle the question by mutual agreement.

ARTICLE VIII

(1) The present Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Berne as soon as possible.

(2) The present Convention shall become effective on the day of the exchange of instruments of ratification and shall be applicable to estates or inheritances in the case of persons who die on or after that date. It shall continue effective for a period of five years beginning with that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of that five-year period or at any time thereafter, provided that at least six months' prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective with respect to estates or inheritances in the cases of persons who die on or after the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and German languages, the two texts having equal authenticity, this 9th day of July, 1951.

For the President of the United States of America:

[SEAL] DEAN ACHESON

For the Swiss Federal Council:

[SEAL] CHARLES BRUGGMANN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive P, Eighty-second Congress, first session, the convention between the United States of America and Switzerland, signed at Washington, on July 9, 1951, for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

PROTOCOLS REGARDING REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to have taken up now Executive I and Executive O.

These protocols extend the international sugar agreement of 1937 until August 31, 1952, as follows: Executive I for 1 year after August 31, 1950, and Executive O for 1 year after August 31, 1951. Their only purpose is to continue alive the administrative framework provided for in the agreement until a revision of the agreement can be negotiated and to make possible a further study of the world sugar situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the protocol Executive I.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive I (82d Cong., 1st sess.), a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement, regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR SIGNED IN LONDON ON 6TH MAY, 1937

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after 31st August 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on 31st August, 1944, 31st August, 1945, 30th August, 1946, 29th August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, and 31st August, 1949, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on 31st August, 1945, 31st August, 1946, 31st August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949, and 31st August, 1950, respectively:

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after 31st August, 1950.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV and V of the Agreement and those provisions of Article 31 thereof which limit the number of members of each delegation and the number of advisers accompanying each delegation shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting-point.

2. In the event of an agreement based on such revision coming into force before 31st August, 1951, the present Protocol shall thereupon terminate.

3. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date 31st August, 1950, and shall remain open for signature until 30th September, 1950, provided, however, that any signatures appended after 31st August, 1950, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

It witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 31st day of August, 1950, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:
A. L. GEYER.
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:
E. J. HARRISON.
For the Government of Belgium:
OBERT DE THIEUSIES.
For the Government of Brazil:
MONTZ DE ARAGÃO.
For the Government of Cuba:
Subject to a reservation that the Republic of Cuba will have the right to withdraw from the Agreement at any time, giving notice to the Government of the United Kingdom, as depository of the Protocol, of the intention to withdraw ninety days in advance.
ROBERTO G. DE MENDOZA.
For the Government of Czechoslovakia:
Dr. RUDOLF BYSTRICKY.
For the Government of the Dominican Republic:
J. G. BATLLE.
For the Government of the French Republic:
P. ANDRÉ-HESSE.
For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
ERNEST BEVIN.
For the Government of Hayti:
HUGUES BOURJOLLY.
For the Government of the Republic of Indonesia:
SUBANDRIO.
For the Government of the Netherlands:
W. J. G. GEVERS.
For the Government of Peru:
RICARD RIVERA SCHREIBER.
For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:
J. E. ROMERO.
For the Government of Poland:
JÚRKIEWICZ.
For the Government of Portugal:
MIGUEL DE ALMEIDA PILE.
For the Government of the United States of America:
J. C. HOLMES
(subject to ratification).
For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:
ZLATARIC.

Certified a true copy.

FOREIGN OFFICE
LONDON
6 Nov 1950

S. H. GELLATLY
Deputy Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a protocol dated in London August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement, regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the protocol.

PROTOCOL PROLONGING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the protocol, Executive O (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol dated in London August 31, 1951, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR SIGNED IN LONDON ON 6TH MAY, 1937

Whereas an International Agreement regarding the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (hereinafter referred to as "the Agreement") was signed in London on 6th May, 1937;

And whereas by a Protocol signed in London on 22nd July, 1942, the Agreement was regarded as having come into force on 1st September, 1937, in respect of the Governments signatory of the Protocol;

And whereas it was provided in the said Protocol that the Agreement should continue in force between the said Governments for a period of two years after 31st August, 1942;

And whereas by further Protocols signed in London on 31st August, 1944, 31st August, 1945, 30th August, 1946, 29th August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949 and 31st August, 1950, it was agreed that, subject to the provisions of Article 2 of the said Protocols, the Agreement should continue in force between the Governments signatory thereof for periods of one year terminating on 31st August, 1945, 31st August, 1946, 31st August, 1947, 31st August, 1948, 31st August, 1949, 31st August, 1950 and 31st August, 1951, respectively:

Now, therefore, the Governments signatory of the present Protocol, considering that it is expedient that the Agreement should be prolonged for a further term as between themselves, subject, in view of the present situation, to the conditions stated below, have agreed as follows:—

ARTICLE 1

Subject to the provisions of Article 2 hereof, the Agreement shall continue in force

between the Governments signatory of this Protocol for a period of one year after 31st August, 1951.

ARTICLE 2

During the period specified in Article 1 above the provisions of Chapters III, IV, and V of the Agreement and those provisions of Article 31 thereof which limit the number of members of each delegation and the number of advisers accompanying each delegation shall be inoperative.

ARTICLE 3

1. The Governments signatory of the present Protocol recognise that revision of the Agreement is necessary and should be undertaken as soon as the time appears opportune. Discussion of any such revision should take the existing Agreement as the starting-point.

2. In the event of an agreement based on such revision coming into force before 31st August, 1952, the present Protocol shall thereupon terminate.

3. For the purposes of such revision due account shall be taken of any general principles of commodity policy embodied in any agreements which may be concluded under the auspices of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 4

Before the conclusion of the period of one year specified in Article 1, the contracting Governments, if the steps contemplated in Article 3 have not been taken, will discuss the question of a further renewal of the Agreement.

ARTICLE 5

The present Protocol shall bear the date 31st August, 1951, and shall remain open for signature until 30th September, 1951, provided, however, that any signatures appended after 31st August, 1951, shall be deemed to have effect as from that date.

In witness whereof the undersigned, being duly authorised thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Protocol.

Done in London on the 31st day of August, 1951, in a single copy which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of which certified copies shall be furnished to the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:
A. L. GEYER.
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:
T. W. WHITE.
For the Government of Belgium:
OBERT DE THIEUSIES.
For the Government of Brazil:
MONIZ DE ARAGÃO.
For the Government of Cuba:
Subject to a reservation that the Republic of Cuba will have the right to withdraw from the Agreement at any time, giving notice to the Government of the United Kingdom, as the Depository of the Protocol, of the intention to withdraw ninety days in advance.
ROBERTO G. DE MENDOZA.
For the Government of Czechoslovakia:
J. ULLRICH.
For the Government of the Dominican Republic:
J. V. BATLLE.
For the Government of the French Republic:
R. MASSIGLI.
For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
WILLIAM STRANG.
For the Government of Hayti:
LOVE O. LEGER.
For the Government of the Republic of the United States of Indonesia:
SUBANDRIO.
For the Government of Mexico:
F. JIMÉNEZ O'F.
For the Government of the Netherlands:
W. J. G. GEVERS.
For the Government of Peru:
RICARDO RIVERA SCHREIBER.
For the Government of the Republic of the Philippines:
J. E. ROMERO.
For the Government of Poland:
JERZY MICHALOWSKI.
For the Government of Portugal:
LUIZ LEOTTE DO REGO.
For the Government of the United States of America:
WALTER S. GIFFORD.
Subject to ratification.
For the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia:
ZLATARIC.

Certified a true copy.

FOREIGN OFFICE
LONDON
25 Oct 1951

E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers for the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive O, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a protocol dated in London August 31, 1951, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. (Putting the question.) Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the protocol.

HIGHWAY CONVENTION WITH THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to call up next Executive W, the highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays the convention before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the Convention, Executive W (81st Cong., 2d sess.), a highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950, which was read the second time, as follows:

HIGHWAY CONVENTION

The United States of America and the Republic of Panamá,

Having in mind their interest in the maintenance of highways essential to the security and defense of the Panama Canal, have decided to conclude a Highway Convention, and to this end have designated as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

The Honorable Monnett B. Davis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Panamá; and

The President of the Republic of Panamá:

His Excellency Dr. Carlos N. Brin, Minister of Foreign Relations of the Republic of Panama;

Who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, which have been found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:

ARTICLE I

In consideration of the obligations assumed by the Republic of Panamá in the present Convention, the United States of America assumes the responsibility for maintenance, at its expense, of that portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway which begins at the southeast pavement edge of Randolph Road, near Coco Solito, Latitude N 9°20′ +2715.5 feet, Longitude W 79°52′+5991.72 feet, and which ends at the intersection of the highway with the Tumba Muerto Road, Latitude N 8°59′+2383.0 feet, Longitude W 79°32′+784.0 feet. The above limits and the course of the highway are shown on the map which accompanies this Convention and is marked Exhibit A.

ARTICLE II

The Republic of Panama agrees to prevent any encroachments which might interfere in any way with the safe use or proper maintenance of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway within the limits prescribed in Article I of the present Convention.

ARTICLE III

The Republic of Panama agrees to assume any and all liability which may accrue on account of damage to or loss of property, or on account of personal injury or death arising out of or in connection with or resulting from maintenance, within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panama of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway referred to in Article I of the present Convention; but this Article shall not apply to any liability accruing on account of damage to or loss of property utilized by the United States of America in the maintenance of such portion of the highway, or on account of the personal injury or death of any employee of the United States of America engaged in the maintenance of such portion of the highway.

ARTICLE IV

The Republic of Panama agrees to furnish free of charge in natural deposits, all stone, gravel, sand, earth or other natural products desired by the United States of America for the performance of the maintenance responsibility assumed in Article I of the present Convention, where such deposits occur on the public domain, so long as such materials cannot be easily obtained in the Canal Zone, and also to arrange for any easements that may be necessary to gain access to such deposits so long as the arrangements for these easements do not entail unreasonable expenses to the Republic of Panamá.

ARTICLE V

The Republic of Panama agrees that there shall not be imposed any import duties or taxes of any kind upon any property, equipment or materials utilized by the United States of America in the maintenance, within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panamá, of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway referred to in Article I of the present Convention; and that there shall not be imposed contributions or charges of a personal character of any kind upon employees of the United States of America engaged in

the maintenance of such portion of the highway.

ARTICLE VI

The Republic of Panamá agrees to provide without cost to the United States of America throughout the life of this Convention a right-of-way which shall be 100 feet in width from each side of the center line of the portion of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway described in Article I of the present Convention: Provided, however, that in areas where it is unnecessary or impracticable in the opinion of either government to provide a right-of-way of the full width hereinbefore prescribed, and in areas where it is necessary and practicable in the opinion of either Government to provide a right-of-way of greater width than that hereinbefore prescribed, the width of the right-of-way shall be as agreed upon between representatives to be designated by the two Governments: And provided further that this paragraph shall not apply to the corridors referred to in Articles III and IV of the Convention regarding the Colón Corridor signed May 24, 1950.

ARTICLE VII

In consideration of the obligations assumed by the United States of America in the present Convention, the Republic of Panamá accords to the United States of America the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the jurisdiction of the Republic of Panamá, and of the Ancón Cove Dock, Taboga Island, and the roads leading therefrom, including the road to El Vigia Reservation, subject to the laws and regulations relating to vehicular traffic in force in the Republic of Panamá.

ARTICLE VIII

The Governments of the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá shall maintain in a suitable condition at all times those surfaced roads which are essential for the protection and security of the Republic of Panamá and the Panama Canal and for the maintenance of which they are respectively responsible. Whenever either Government is unable to perform its maintenance obligations, as undertaken in this Article, the other Government will cooperate in the making of such repairs as are determined by the Board constituted by Article IX of the present Convention to be essential to the road or roads involved. The cost of such repairs shall be borne by the Government originally responsible for maintenance under the terms of the present Convention.

ARTICLE IX

There is hereby constituted a Board, to be known as the Joint Highway Board, consisting of two qualified representatives appointed by each of the High Contracting Parties. It shall be the responsibility of the Board to advise the two Governments relative to matters and problems arising in connection with the execution of the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE X

The provisions of the present Convention shall not affect the rights and obligations of either of the two High Contracting Parties under the treaties or other international agreements now in force between the two countries, nor be considered as a limitation, definition, restriction or restrictive interpretation of such rights and obligations, but without prejudice to the full force and effect of any provisions of the present Convention which constitute addition to, modification or abrogation of, or substitution for the provisions of previous treaties or other international agreements.

ARTICLE XI

1. The present Convention shall be ratified in accordance with the constitutional methods of the High Contracting Parties and shall enter into force immediately on the exchange of instruments of ratification which shall take place in Panamá.

2. The present Convention shall remain in force for twenty years and thereafter unless terminated in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of this Article.

3. Either High Contracting Party may, by giving one year's written notice to the other High Contracting Party, terminate the present Convention at the end of the initial twenty-year period or at any time thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being authentic, and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE at the city of Panamá the 14th day of September 1950.

For the United States of America:
[SEAL] MONNETT B. DAVIS
For the Republic of Panamá:
[SEAL] CARLOS N. BRIN

No. 408.

PANAMÁ, September 14, 1950

His Excellency Dr. CARLOS N. BRIN,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Highway Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá which has been signed today at Panamá by the Plenipotentiaries of the two countries.

In accordance with the understanding reached by the Governments of the two countries in the course of the negotiation of the Highway Convention that, upon the signing of the Convention, the provisions of Point V of the General Relations Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of Panamá, effected by exchange of notes dated May 18, 1942, should cease to be effective, the Government of the United States of America proposes that it be mutually agreed that Point V of that Agreement is terminated as of this date.

In order to safeguard the common interest of the two countries in the proper maintenance of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway, the Government of the United States of America further proposes that, by way of modus vivendi, pending the entry into force of the Highway Convention above-mentioned, it be mutually agreed by and between the Governments of the two countries as follows:

(a) The United States of America assumes the responsibility for maintenance, at its expense, of the Boyd-Roosevelt Highway as defined in article I of the convention, it being understood that the Republic of Panamá, in order to make possible such maintenance, will cooperate in the manner specified in articles II to VI, inclusive, of the convention.

(b) The Republic of Panamá grants to the United States of America the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the Republic of Panamá and of the Ancón Cove Dock, Taboga Island, and the roads leading therefrom, including the road to El Vigia Reservation, subject to the laws and regulations relating to vehicular traffic in force in the Republic of Panamá.

In the event that, at the expiration of 3 years from the date o. this exchange of notes, the exchange of ratifications of the Highway Convention above-mentioned shall not have been accomplished, the provisions of this exchange of notes will be automatically terminated and will be the subject of further discussions between the two Governments.

The Government of the United States of America will consider this note and your reply note indicating the concurrence of your Government in the proposals set forth above as constituting an agreement between the two Governments with respect thereto, effective as of this date.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

MONNETT B. DAVIS.

[Translation]

[SEAL] D. P. No. 1443

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Panama, September 14, 1950.

His Excellency MONNETT B. DAVIS,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, City.

Mr. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to refer to Your Excellency's courteous note No. 408, of this date, which reads as follows:

[Here follows a Spanish translation of the complete text of the American Ambassador's note, except the complimentary closing paragraph.]

In reply, I have the honor to state that the Government of the Republic of Panama considers the proposals set forth in Your Excellency's note to be acceptable, and that these two communications constitute an Agreement between the two Governments with respect thereto, effective as of this date.

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

CARLOS N. BRIN,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the highway convention with Panama provides that the United States shall assume responsibility for the maintenance of the strategic Boyd-Roosevelt Trans-Isthmian Highway in the Republic of Panama. In return the United States is granted the free and unimpeded use without cost of all public roads within the jurisdiction of Panama and of the Ancon Cove Dock, Taboga Island and connecting roads.

The present convention was signed on September 14, 1950. At the same time a modus vivendi was entered into which embodies the main principles of the convention, terminates the highway provisions of the 1942 agreement on general relations between the United States and Panama, and will expire after 3 years unless the convention is ratified in the meantime.

The Trans-Isthmian Highway was built by the United States in Panamanian territory parallel to the Canal by agreement with Panama. After the completion of the highway, it was maintained by the United States until 1949 under another agreement discussed below. The total cost to the United States for construction and maintenance over these years was $9,000,000. The obligations and rights of both countries with relation to the public roads in Panama were set forth in two agreements between United States and Panama signed May 18, 1942, the first dealing with general relations and the second with defense sites.

The terms covering public roads in Panama in both agreements were identical. They provided that the United States should complete the Trans-Isthmian Highway and maintain it until the highway was stabilized. They also provided that the United States should pay one-third of the maintenance cost of all Panamanian roads used "periodically and frequently" by the United

States Armed Forces. In return for this commitment, the United States was granted the right of transit for the routine movement of its Armed Forces and other personnel and equipment engaged in the defense of the Panama Canal.

The new convention is very much needed. The highway provisions in the 1942 agreement served a wartime need, but they are no longer satisfactory. Accordingly they are terminated. The words "periodically or frequently," which proved contentious in that they were capable of many meanings, are omitted from the new convention. Differences also developed under this commitment over the amount properly chargeable by Panama to the United States. The Trans-Isthmian Highway during the period in which Panama was responsible for maintenance deteriorated, making a new agreement desirable. Finally, the critical world situation, which has caused the United States to strengthen its defenses generally, makes it urgently necessary for our Armed Forces to have the right to use the Panamanian roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive W, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the highway convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama, signed at Panama on September 14, 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA FOR PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the agreement, Executive M (82d Cong., 2d sess.), an agreement between the United States of America and Canada signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio, which was read the second time, as follows:

AGREEMENT FOR THE PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, being desirous of promoting safety of life and property on the Great Lakes of North America by means of radio, and believing that this purpose will be served by making provision in common agreement for radiotelephone communication for safety purposes, including radiotelephone communication as an aid to and instrument of navigation, and considering that this objective may best be achieved and maintained by the conclusion of an Agreement between the two Governments, have designated for that purpose as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Stanley Woodward,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America at Ottawa;
E. M. Webster,
Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission.

The Government of Canada:

Lionel Chevrier,
Minister of Transport.

who, having communicated to each other their respective Full Powers, found to be in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. The Contracting Governments undertake, by their respective constitutional procedures, to give effect to the provisions of this Agreement, for the purpose of promoting safety of life and property on the Great Lakes, and to take all steps which may be necessary to give this Agreement full and complete effect.

2. This Agreement shall apply to vessels of all countries, as provided in Article 3 of this Agreement.

3. The Regulations annexed to this Agreement are an integral part thereof, and every reference to this Agreement implies at the same time a reference to the Regulations unless the language or context of the reference clearly excludes the Regulations. The Regulations may be amended, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Agreement, by agreement between the two Governments.

4. Each Contracting Government agrees that any vessel which is not subject to this Agreement, and which is permitted by such Government to use any frequency designated by this Agreement, shall be required, while on the Great Lakes, to use such frequency in the same manner as a vessel subject to this Agreement.

5. No provision of this Agreement shall prevent the use by a vessel or survival craft in distress of any means at its disposal to attract attention, make known its position, and obtain help.

ARTICLE 2—DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Agreement, unless expressly provided otherwise:

1. "Approved" or "Approval" means, in relation to compliance with the terms of this Agreement by vessels of Canada and of the United States, approval by Canada and the United States, respectively, and in relation to vessels of other countries, approval by either Canada or the United States.

2. "Vessel" includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance, except aircraft, used or capable of being used as a means of transportation on water, whether or not it is actually afloat.

3. "Passenger carrying vessel" means any vessel transporting persons for hire.

4. "Port" means any place to which vessels may resort for shelter or to load or unload passengers or goods or to obtain fuel, water, or supplies. This term shall apply to such places whether proclaimed public or not and whether natural or artificial.

5. "Great Lakes" means all of the Great Lakes, their connecting and tributary waters, and the River St. Lawrence as far east as the lower exist of the Lachine Canal and the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, but shall not include tributary rivers which are not also connecting rivers, and shall not include the Niagara River (including the Black Rock Canal).

6. "Mile" means a statute mile of 5,280 feet or 1,609 meters.

7. "Safety Convention" means the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (1929) and the Regulations annexed thereto, and the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (1948) and the Regulations annexed thereto as from the date the latter Convention and its annexed Regulations are brought into force in supersession of the former, and any other safety of life at sea convention and the regulations annexed thereto which may be brought into force between the Contracting Governments in supercession of the 1948 Convention and its annexed Regulations.

8. "Safety Radiotelephony Certificate", "Safety Radiotelegraphy Certificate", and "Safety Certificate" as referred to in paragraph 3 or Article 3 of this Agreement, mean certificates bearing those titles provided for by the Safety Convention.

9. "International Radio Regulations" means the Radio Regulations in force (General Radio Regulations, Cairo, 1938, and Radio Regulations, Atlantic City, 1947) annexed to the International Telecommunication Convention in force (Madrid, 1932, and Atlantic City, 1947) or any regulations which have been, or which from time to time in the future may be, substituted for such regulations.

10. "Regulations" means the regulations in force referred to in paragraph 3 of Article 1 of this Agreement.

11. "Radiotelephone installation" means a radio station (including the source of power necessary to energize the apparatus) capable of being used for the effective transmission and reception of speech for the purpose of quickly establishing and effectively carrying on radiotelephone communication in time of emergency or distress.

12. "Distress frequency" means the distress frequency designated for radiotelephony in the maritime mobile service by the International Radio Regulations or any frequency applicable to all stations of the maritime mobile service on the Great Lakes substituted therefor in the Regulations.

13. "Alarm signal" means the automatic alarm signal, if any, prescribed by the International Radio Regulations for radiotelephony, or any such signal substituted therefor in the Regulations.

14. "Auto Alarm" means a warning device which is capable of being actuated automatically by the alarm signal, and which complies with the Regulations.

ARTICLE 3

1. Except as provided in paragraph 2 of this Article, a vessel to which this Agreement applies generally, as stated in paragraph 2 of Article 1 of this Agreement, and which falls in any of the following specific categories, shall be subject to the requirements of this Agreement while being navigated on the Great Lakes outside of a port, or while being navigated on the St. Mary's River, the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, the Detroit River, the Welland Ship Canal, the River St. Lawrence as far east as the lower exit of the Lachine Canal and the Victoria Bridge at Montreal, and other restricted waters of the Great Lakes as may be specified in the Regulations

(a) Every vessel of 500 gross tons or over.

(b) Every passenger carrying vessel over 65 feet in length (measured from end to end over the deck exclusive of sheer).

(c) Every vessel under 500 gross tons engaged in towing another vessel of 500 gross tons or over or engaged in towing any other floating object having a dimension in any direction of 150 feet or more, unless the vessel so towed complies with the requirements of this Agreement.

2. A vessel which would otherwise be subject to the requirements of this Agreement as provided in paragraph 1 of this Article, shall nevertheless not be subject thereto if such vessel falls in any of the following specific categories:

(a) Ships of war and troop ships.

(b) Vessels in tow.

(c) Vessels not self-propelled by mechanical means.

(d) Vessels owned and operated by any Government and not engaged in trade.

(e) Any vessel engaged in towing another vessel in or out of a single port when such towage is not in excess of 30 miles outside such port.

(f) Any vessel towing another vessel engaged in the movement of material between a port and a dumping ground authorized by either Contracting Government when the dumping ground is not more than 30 miles outside such port.

(g) Any vessel navigated in connection with river or harbor improvement work or any marine construction when such navigation is within an area whose radius from the site of such river or harbor improvement work or marine construction is not greater than 30 miles.

3. In order to provide a means whereby a country, whether or not a party to this Agreement, may facilitate compliance with this Agreement on behalf of vessels belonging to it, for not more than two voyages on the Great Lakes in any calendar year, any such vessel which enters the Great Lakes from Montreal or below and proceeds above the lower exit of the Lachine Canal or the Victoria Bridge at Montreal for the sole purpose of engaging in a voyage between (a) one or more ports outside the Great Lakes and (b) one or more ports on the Great Lakes, shall be deemed to be in compliance with the technical radiotelephone requirements of this Agreement if such vessel has on board a radiotelephone installation which—

(i) meets the radio frequency requirements of this Agreement and the technical requirements of either this Agreement or the Safety Convention for radiotelephony, and

(ii) is carrying a Safety Radiotelephony Certificate issued to the vessel by the country to which it belongs, or a certificate issued by either of the countries party to this Agreement endorsed for operation on the Great Lakes.

The Safety Radiotelephony Certificate or the endorsed certificate tendered under these terms will be satisfactory for the purpose of this paragraph, even though the same vessel also carries a valid Safety Certificate or a valid Safety Radiotelegraphy Certificate.

ARTICLE 4—CASES OF FORCE MAJEURE

A vessel which is not subject to the provisions of this Agreement shall not become subject thereto due to stress of weather or any other cause of *force majeure*.

ARTICLE 5—COAST STATION LISTENING WATCH

Each Contracting Government undertakes to ensure that necessary arrangements are made for a listening watch by coast stations on the distress frequency.

ARTICLE 6—EXEMPTIONS

1. Each Contracting Government, if it considers that the conditions of the voyage or voyages affecting safety, including but not necessarily limited to the regularity or frequency of the voyages, the route or routes, the maximum distance of the vessel from shore, the length of voyage or voyages, and the absence of general navigation hazards, or other circumstances, are such as to render the full application of Articles 7, 8, and 9, or any of them, of this Agreement unreasonable or unnecessary, may exempt partially, conditionally, or completely from the provisions of Articles 7, 8, and 9, or any of them, any individual vessel for one or more voyages or for any period of time not exceeding one year from the date of exemption. Each Contracting Government shall promptly notify the other of each exemption that is granted and of the significant terms thereof.

2. Since the waters to which this Agreement applies are under the jurisdiction of Canada or the United States, the exemptions referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article may be granted only by the Contracting Governments, each for vessels of its own country and either for the vessels of other countries.

ARTICLE 7—OPERATORS AND LISTENING

1. While a vessel is subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3 of this Agreement:

(a) There shall be on board, as an officer or member of the crew of vessel, at least one person whose qualifications for radiotelephone operation for safety purposes on the Great Lakes have been certified by the Contracting Governments, each for citizens of its own country for employment on vessels of that country, and either for persons for employment on vessels of other countries, as meeting the qualifications set forth in the Regulations.

(b) From among those certified persons, the master shall designate one or more who shall operate the radiotelephone installation. The duties of the persons so designated need not be restricted to duties in connection with the radiotelephone installation but may include any and all duties assigned them by the master.

(c) Except when the radiotelephone installation is being used to transmit or receive on frequencies authorized for the Maritime Mobile Service, there shall be continuous effective listening on the distress frequency by aural means by at least one officer or member of the crew of the vessel who has been designated by the master to perform such listening. The person so designated by the master may simultaneously perform other duties relating to the operation or navigation of the vessel, provided that such other duties do not interfere with the effectiveness of the listening.

(d) If the vessel is deprived of the services of the certified persons referred to in subparagraph (a) of this Article without fault or collusion of the master, the vessel may, as a matter of temporary expediency, proceed on her voyage, provided:

(i) The master shall exercise due diligence in an effort to obtain a qualified replacement before sailing and failing that shall exercise due diligence to obtain a qualified replacement as soon as practicable,

(ii) The qualified replacement is made at the destination of the vessel before proceeding on another voyage, and

(iii) In addition to the foregoing, the master shall within 12 hours after the time of arrival of the vessel at her destination, explain, in writing, the full particulars in the matter to the Contracting Government of the country to which such vessel belongs. If the vessel does not belong to the country of either Contracting Government, the master's written explanation shall be made to the Contracting Government of the country where the vessel's destination is located or to the Contracting Government in which the vessel's last port of call on the Great Lakes is located.

2. If and when a system, consisting of an alarm signal and an auto alarm apparatus actuated by such signal transmitted on the distress frequency, is adopted by both Canada and the United States for use on the Great Lakes, an approved auto alarm in operation may be substituted for the continuous, aural listening prescribed in paragraph 1 of this Article. Adoption of such system by both Canada and the United States for use on the Great Lakes, as well as the conditions under which it may be used, shall be accomplished by appropriate amendment of the Regulations.

ARTICLE 8—RADIOTELEPHONE INSTALLATION

1. Each vessel, while subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3, shall, except as it may be exempted under Article 6, or except as may be otherwise provided by paragraph 3 of Article 3, be fitted with a radiotelephone installation in effective operating condition and approved as meeting the requirements set forth in the Regulations.

2. If while a vessel is subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3, the vessel's radiotelephone installation ceases to be in effective operating condition, the master shall forthwith exercise due diligence to restore the radiotelephone installation to effective operating condition at the earliest practicable moment and, in any event, the effective operating condition of the radiotelephone installation shall be restored at the destination of the vessel before the vessel proceeds on another voyage. In addition to the foregoing, the master shall within 12 hours after the time of arrival of the vessel at her destination, explain, in writing, the full particulars in the matter to the Contracting Government of the country to which such vessel belongs. If the vessel does not belong to the country of either Contracting Government, the master's written explanation shall be made to the Contracting Government of the country where the vessel's destination is located or to the Contracting Government in which the vessel's last port of call on the Great Lakes is located.

ARTICLE 9—VESSEL RECORD

Each vessel, while subject to the requirements of this Agreement, as stated in Article 3 of the Agreement, shall, except as it may be exempted under Article 6, maintain such records of the use of the radiotelephone installation for safety purposes as may be required by the Regulations.

ARTICLE 10—AUTHORITY OF THE MASTER

The radiotelephone installation, its operation and all persons connected therewith, and the performance of the act of listening shall be under the supreme control of the master. The person holding this authority must comply with applicable law and international agreements and with rules and regulations made pursuant thereto.

ARTICLE 11—INSPECTIONS AND SURVEYS

1. So far as concerns the enforcement of this Agreement, the radiotelephone installations of all vessels subject to the provisions of this Agreement shall be subject to inspection from time to time. In addition, vessels subject to the provisions of this Agreement belonging to the countries of the Contracting Governments shall be subjected to a periodical survey of the radiotelephone installation not less than once every twelve months. This survey shall be made while the vessel is in active service or within not more than one month before the date on which it is placed in such service.

2. The inspection and survey of radiotelephone installations shall be carried out by officers of the Contracting Governments for their respective vessels. With respect to any vessel which belongs to any other country, such inspection shall be carried out by officers of the Contracting Government within whose jurisdiction such vessel first enters and thereafter by the Contracting Government having jurisdiction as determined by the location of the vessel at the time of any inspection deemed necessary by such Government.

3. Each Contracting Government may entrust the inspection and survey of the radio-

telephone installations either to surveyors nominated for this purpose or to organizations recognized by it. In every case the Contracting Government concerned fully guarantees the completeness and efficiency of the inspection and survey.

ARTICLE 12—CERTIFICATION AND PRIVILEGES

1. If, after appropriate inspection or survey made in accordance with Article 11, the Contracting Government responsible for the inspection or survey is satisfied that all relevant provisions of this Agreement have been complied with, including any exemption or conditions of exemption approved in accordance with Article 6, that fact shall be certified immediately after each such inspection or survey either on the vessel's radiotelephone station license or by means of another document as determined by the Contracting Government.

2. The certification prescribed by paragraph 1 of this Article shall be kept on board the vessel while the vessel is subject to the provisions of this Agreement and shall be available for inspection by the officers authorized by the Contracting Governments to make such inspections. Certifications issued under the authority of a Contracting Government shall be accepted by the other Contracting Government for all purposes covered by this Agreement.

ARTICLE 13—ISSUE OF CERTIFICATE ON REQUEST OF RESPONSIBLE ADMINISTRATION

Each of the Contracting Governments may, at the request of the other, cause a vessel for the survey of which the requesting Government is primarily responsible to be surveyed, and, if satisfied that the requirements of this Agreement are complied with, issue certificates to the vessel in accordance with the terms of this Agreement. Any certificate so issued must contain a statement to the effect that it has been issued at the request of the Government which made the request, and it shall have the same force and receive the same recognition as a certificate issued under Article 12 of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 14—CONTROL

1. Over and above the application of this Agreement as set forth in the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 3 of this Agreement every vessel required by this Agreement to have a certificate issued by one Contracting Government in accordance with Article 12 or Article 13 is subject in the ports of the other Contracting Government to control by officers duly authorized by such Government insofar as this control is directed towards verifying that (a) there is on board a valid certification, (b) that the conditions of the radiotelephone apparatus correspond substantially with the particulars of that certification, and (c) that there are on board the necessary certificated personnel required by Article 7 of this Agreement.

2. In the event of this control giving rise to intervention of any kind, the authorities carrying out the control shall forthwith inform the appropriate authorities of the country to which the vessel belongs of all the circumstances in which intervention is deemed to be necessary.

ARTICLE 15—VESSELS OF COUNTRIES OTHER THAN CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

To the extent permitted by their respective constitutional procedures, the Governments of Canada and the United States will undertake to assist the vessels of countries other than Canada and the United States in meeting the requirements of this Agreement.

ARTICLE 16—LAWS, REGULATIONS, REPORTS

The Contracting Governments undertake to communicate to each other:

(a) a sufficient number of specimens of their certifications under Article 12 and Article 13 for the information of their officers;

(b) the texts of laws, decrees, and regulations which shall have been promulgated on the various matters within the scope of this Agreement; and

(c) all available official reports or official summaries of reports insofar as they show the results of the provisions of this Agreement, provided always that such reports or summaries are not of a confidential nature.

ARTICLE 17—ENTRY INTO FORCE

This Agreement shall be ratified and instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington, D. C., as soon as possible. This Agreement shall come into force two years after the data on which the instruments of ratification are exchanged.

ARTICLE 18—DURATION AND TERMINATION

1. This Agreement may be terminated by either Contracting Government at any time after the expiration of five years from the date on which the Agreement comes into force. Termination shall be effected by a notification in writing from either Contracting Government to the other Contracting Government.

2. Termination of this Agreement shall take effect twelve months after the date on which notification thereof is received by the Contracting Government to which such notification is addressed.

In witness whereof, the above-named Plenipotentiaries have signed this Agreement and affixed thereto their respective seals.

Done in duplicate at Ottawa this 21st day of February, 1952.

For the Government of the United States of America:

STANLEY WOODWARD
E M WEBSTER

[SEAL]

For the Government of Canada:

LIONEL CHEVRIER

[SEAL]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the purpose of the agreement, and its attached technical regulations, is to promote safety on the Great Lakes by requiring that authorized radio telephone equipment be installed on all Great Lakes shipping of 500 gross tons and over and on all passenger-carrying vessels over 65 feet in length in those waters; and to require that all such vessels and shore stations maintain constant listening watch on the distress-calling frequency—2,182 kilocycles. The agreement is effective on the Great Lakes and their navigable connecting tributary waters as far east as Montreal.

The committee recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of the agreement. Only the intervention of World War II prevented an agreement for that purpose from being drawn up and entered into long before this. As noted above, in 1937 the congressional committees expressed the hope and expectation that the United States in agreement with Canada would soon prescribe the use of radio equipment for safety purposes for ships on the Great Lakes. And now that such an agreement is submitted for Senate advice and consent to ratification, the committee knows of no opposition to favorable Senate action.

The convention prescribes safety provisions for the Great Lakes comparable to those now applicable to the high seas. In effect the convention here under consideration complements the provisions of the recent agreements governing the safety of life at sea to which the Senate has agreed that the United States should become a party. This agreement is in the interests of the United States and the safety of its people and therefore the committee recommends favorable action by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the agreement will be reported to the Senate.

The agreement was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an agreement between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the agreement.

CONVENTIONS RELATING TO WORKING CONDITIONS ON SEAGOING VESSELS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to call up four conventions, Calendar Nos. 16, 17, 18, and 19, being Executive R, Executive S, Executive Y, and Executive Z.

These conventions all relates to working standards on seagoing vessels. They were recommended by the International Labor Convention, of which this country has been a member since 1938. Some of them have already been adopted by as many as eight foreign nations. We should not hesitate to join, inasmuch as they do not affect the working conditions on our ships, because our standards are higher than those elsewhere. Our interest is in raising the standards on foreign competing vessels. The conventions serve to bring about that result in the different categories.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, let me say that we do not recommend any amendments or any reservations; but we do recommend certain understandings, so that it may be clear that the conventions do not relate either to inland waters such as the Great Lakes or to coastwise vessels. We consider it sufficient to state the understandings in the form in which they are stated. The understandings have been drafted and attached to certain of the four covenants where they belong.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION (NO. 68) CONCERNING FOOD AND CATERING FOR CREWS ON BOARD SHIP

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive R (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning food and catering for crews on board ship, adopted on June 27, 1946,

which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE R. (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 68) CONCERNING FOOD AND CATERING FOR CREWS ON BOARD SHIP

The General Conference of the International Labor Organization—

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labor Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on June 6, 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to food and catering for crews on board ship, which is the fourth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-seventh day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Food and Catering (Ships' Crews) Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. Every Member of the International Labor Organization for which this Convention is in force is responsible for the promotion of a proper standard of food supply and catering service for the crews of its sea-going vessels, whether publicly or privately owned, which are engaged in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers, shall determine the vessels or classes of vessels which are to be regarded as sea-going vessels for the purpose of this Convention.

Article 2

The following functions shall be discharged by the competent authority, except insofar as these function are adequately discharged in virtue of collective agreements:

(*a*) the framing and enforcement of regulations concerning food and water supplies, catering, and the construction, location, ventilation, heating, lighting, water system and equipment of galleys and other catering department spaces on board ship, including store rooms and refrigerated chambers;

(*b*) the inspection of food and water supplies and of the accommodation, arrangements and equipment on board ship for the storage, handling and preparation of food;

(*c*) the certification of such members of the catering department staff as are required to possess prescribed qualifications;

(*d*) research into, and educational and propaganda work concerning, methods of ensuring proper food supply and catering service.

Article 3

1. The competent authority shall work in close co-operation with the organisations of shipowners and seafarers and with national or local authorities concerned with questions of food and health, and may where necessary utilise the services of such authorities.

2. The activities of the various authorities shall be duly coordinated so as to avoid overlapping or uncertainty of jurisdiction.

Article 4

The competent authority shall have a permanent staff of qualified persons, including inspectors.

Article 5

1. Each Member shall maintain in force laws or regulations concerning food supply and catering arrangements designed to secure the health and well-being of the crews of the vessels mentioned in Article 1.

2. These laws or regulations shall require—

(*a*) the provision of food and water supplies which, having regard to the size of the crew and the duration and nature of the voyage, are suitable in respect of quantity, nutritive value, quality and variety;

(*b*) the arrangement and equipment of the catering department in every vessel in such a manner as to permit of the service of proper meals to the members of the crew.

Article 6

National laws or regulations shall provide for a system of inspection by the competent authority of—

(*a*) supplies of food and water;

(*b*) all spaces and equipment used for the storage and handling of food and water;

(*c*) galley and other equipment for the preparation and service of meals; and

(*d*) the qualification of such members of the catering department of the crew as are required by such laws or regulations to possess prescribed qualifications.

Article 7

1. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers shall provide for inspection at sea at prescribed intervals by the master, or an officer specially deputed for the purpose by him, together with a responsible member of the catering department of—

(*a*) supplies of food and water;

(*b*) all spaces and equipment used for the storage and handling of food and water, and galley and other equipment for the preparation and service of meals.

2. The results of each inspection shall be recorded.

Article 8

A special inspection shall be made by the representatives of the competent authority of the territory of registration on written complaint made by a number or proportion of the crew prescribed by national laws or regulations or on behalf of a recognised organisation of shipowners or seafarers. In order to avoid delay in sailing, such complaints should be submitted as soon as possible and at least twenty-four hours before the scheduled time of departure from port.

Article 9

1. Inspectors shall have authority to make recommendations to the owner of a ship, or to the master or other person responsible, with a view to the improvement of the standard of catering.

2. National laws or regulations shall prescribe penalties for—

(*a*) failure by an owner, master, member of the crew, or other person responsible to comply with the requirements of the national laws or regulations in force; and

(*b*) any attempt to obstruct an inspector in the discharge of his duties.

3. Inspectors shall submit regularly to the competent authority reports framed on uniform lines dealing with their work and its results.

Article 10

1. The component authority shall prepare an annual report.

2. The annual report shall be issued as soon as practicable after the end of the year to which it relates and shall be made readily available to all bodies and persons concerned.

3. Copies of the annual report shall be transmitted to the International Labour Office.

Article 11

1. Courses of training for employment in the catering department of sea-going ships shall be organised either in approved schools or by means of other arrangements acceptable to both shipowners' and seafarers organisations.

2. Facilities shall be provided for refresher courses to enable persons already trained to bring their knowledge and skill up to date.

Article 12

1. The competent authority shall collect up-to-date information on nutrition and on methods of purchasing, storing, preserving, cooking and serving food, with special reference to the requirements of catering on board ship.

2. This information shall be made available, free of charge or at reasonable cost, to manufacturers of and traders in ships' food supplies and equipment, ships' masters, stewards and cooks, and shipowners and seafarers and their organisations generally; appropriate forms of publicity, such as manuals, brochures, posters, charts or advertisements in trade journals shall be used for this purpose.

3. The competent authority shall issue recommendations to avoid wastage of food, facilitate the maintenance of a proper standard of cleanliness, and ensure the maximum practicable convenience in working.

Article 13

Any of the functions of the competent authority in respect of the certification of catering department staff and the collection and distribution of information may be discharged by delegating the work, or part of it, to a central organisation or authority exercising similar functions in respect of seafarers generally.

Article 14

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 15

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by nine of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least five countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 16

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 17

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labor Organisation of the

registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 18

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding Articles.

Article 19

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 20

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 16 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 21

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

In faith whereof we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive R, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 68) concerning food and catering for crews on board ship, with the following understanding:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words "seagoing vessel" appearing in this Convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the Act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION (NO. 69) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF SHIPS' COOKS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive S (80th Cong., 1st sess.) an international convention concerning the certification of ships' cooks, adopted on June 27, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE S (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 69) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF SHIPS' COOKS

The General Conference of the International Labour Organization,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the certification of ships' cooks, which is included in the fourth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-seventh day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Certification of Ships' Cooks Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. This Convention applies to sea-going vessels, whether publicly or privately owned, which are engaged, in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations or, in the absence of such laws or regulations, collective agreements between employers and workers shall determine the vessels or classes of vessels which are to be regarded as seagoing vessels for the purpose of this Convention.

Article 2

For the purpose of this Convention the term "ship's cook" means the person directly responsible for the preparation of meals for the crew of the ship.

Article 3

1. No person shall be engaged as ship's cook on board any vessel to which this Convention applies unless he holds a certificate of qualification as ship's cook granted in accordance with the provisions of the following articles.

2. Provided that the competent authority may grant exemptions from the provisions of this Article if in its opinion there is an inadequate supply of certificated ship's cooks.

Article 4

1. The competent authority shall make arrangements for the holding of examinations and for the granting of certificates of qualification.

2. No person shall be granted a certificate of qualification unless—

(*a*) he has reached a minimum age to be prescribed by the competent authority;

(*b*) he has served at sea for a minimum period to be prescribed by the competent authority; and

(*c*) he has passed an examination to be prescribed by the competent authority.

3. The prescribed examination shall provide a practical test of the candidate's ability to prepare meals; it shall also include a test of his knowledge of food values, the drawing up of varied and properly balanced menus, and the handling and storage of food on board ship.

4. The prescribed examination may be conducted and certificates granted either directly by the competent authority or, subject to its control, by an approved school for the training of cooks or other approved body.

Article 5

Article 3 of this Convention shall apply after the expiration of a period not exceeding three years from the date of entry into force of the Convention for the territory where the vessel is registered: Provided that, in the case of a seaman who has had a satisfactory record of two years' service as cook before the expiration of the aforesaid period, national laws or regulations may provide for the acceptance of a certificate of such service as equivalent to a certificate of qualification.

Article 6

The competent authority may provide for the recognition of certificates of qualification issued in other territories.

Article 7

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 8

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by nine of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Demark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least five countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 9

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this article.

Article 10

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 11

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 12

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 13

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 9 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 14

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive S, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 69) Concerning the Certification of Ships' Cooks, with the following understanding:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words "seagoing vessel" appearing in this convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

CONVENTION (NO. 73) CONCERNING THE MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SEAFARERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Y (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning the medical examination of seafarers, adopted on June 29, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE Y (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 73) CONCERNING THE MEDICAL EXAMINATION OF SEAFARERS

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the medical examination of seafarers, which is included in the fifth item on the agenda of the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-ninth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention, which may be cited as the Medical Examination (Seafarers) Convention, 1946:

Article 1

1. This Convention applies to every seagoing vessel, whether publicly or privately owned, which is engaged in the transport of cargo or passengers for the purpose of trade and is registered in a territory for which this Convention is in force.

2. National laws or regulations shall determine when vessels are to be regarded as sea-going.

3. This Convention does not apply to—

(*a*) vessels of less than 200 tons gross register tonnage;

(*b*) wooden vessels of primitive build such as dhows and junks;

(*c*) fishing vessels;

(*d*) estuarial craft.

Article 2

Without prejudice to the steps which should be taken to ensure that the persons mentioned below are in good health and not likely to endanger the health of other persons on board, this Convention applies to every person who is engaged in any capacity on board a vessel except—

(*a*) a pilot (not a member of the crew);

(*b*) persons employed on board by an employer other than the shipowner, except radio officers or operators, in the service of a wireless telegraphy company;

(*c*) traveling dockers (longshoremen) not members of the crew;

(*d*) persons employed in ports who are not ordinarily employed at sea.

Article 3

1. No person to whom this Convention applies shall be engaged for employment in a vessel to which this Convention applies unless he produces a certificate attesting to his fitness for the work for which he is to be employed at sea signed by a medical practitioner or, in the case of a certificate solely concerning his sight, by a person authorized by the competent authority to issue such a certificate.

2. Provided that, for a period of two years from the date of the entry into force of this Convention for the territory concerned, a person may be so engaged if he produces evidence that he has been employed in a sea-going vessel to which this Convention applies for a substantial period during the previous two years.

Article 4

1. The competent authority shall, after consultation with the shipowners' and seafarers' organisations concerned, prescribe the nature of the medical examination to be made and the particulars to be included in the medical certificate.

2. When prescribing the nature of the examination, due regard shall be had to the age of the person to be examined and the nature of the duties to be performed.

3. In particular, the medical certificate shall attest—

(*a*) that the hearing and sight of the person and, in the case of a person to be employed in the deck department (except for certain specialist personnel, whose fitness for the work which they are to perform is not liable to be affected by defective colour vision), his colour vision, are all satisfactory; and

(*b*) that he is not suffering from any disease likely to be aggravated by, or to render him unfit for, service at sea or likely to endanger the health of other persons on board.

Article 5

1. The medical certificate shall remain in force for a period not exceeding two years from the date on which it was granted.

2. In so far as a medical certificate relates to colour vision it shall remain in force for a period not exceeding six years from the date on which it was granted.

3. If the period of validity of a certificate expires in the course of a voyage the certificate shall continue in force until the end of that voyage.

Article 6

1. In urgent cases the competent authority may allow a person to be employed for a single voyage without having satisfied the requirements of the preceding articles.

2. In such cases the terms and conditions of employment shall be the same as those of seafarers in the same category holding a medical certificate.

3. Employment in virtue of this Article shall not be deemed on any subsequent occasion to be previous employment for the purpose of Article 3.

Article 7

The competent authority may provide for the acceptance in substitution for a medical certificate of evidence in a prescribed form that the required certificate has been given.

Article 8

Arrangements shall be made to enable a person who, after examination, has been refused a certificate to apply for a further examination by a medical referee or referees who shall be independent of any shipowner or of any organisation of shipowners or seafarers.

Article 9

Any of the functions of the competent authority under this Convention may, after consultation with the organisations of shipowners and seafarers, be discharged by delegating the work, or part of it, to an organisation or authority exercising similar functions in respect of seafarers generally.

Article 10

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 11

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force six months after the date on which there have been registered ratifications by seven of the following countries: United States of America, Argentine Republic, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Denmark, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey and Yugoslavia, including at least four countries each of which has at least one million gross register tons of shipping. This provision is included for the purpose of facilitating and encouraging early ratification of the Convention by Member States.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member six months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 12

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 13

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the last of the ratifications required to bring the Convention into force, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 14

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 15

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 16

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides,

(*a*) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention, notwithstanding the provisions of Article 12 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(*b*) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 17

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON
The Acting Director of the Internal Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution of ratification with the understanding will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Y, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 73) Concerning the Medical Examination of Seafarers, with the following understanding:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that the words 'seagoing vessel' appearing in this convention, shall mean a merchant vessel which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895 (28 Stat. 672), as amended (U. S. C., title 33, sec. 151)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification with the understanding. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification, with the understanding, is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

CONVENTION (NO. 74) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF ABLE SEAMEN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive Z (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an international convention concerning the certification of able seamen, adopted on June 29, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXECUTIVE Z (EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION)

CONVENTION (NO. 74) CONCERNING THE CERTIFICATION OF ABLE SEAMEN

The General Conference of the International Labour Organisation,

Having been convened at Seattle by the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, and having met in its Twenty-eighth Session on 6 June 1946, and

Having decided upon the adoption of certain proposals with regard to the certification of able seamen, which is included in the fifth item on the agenda on the Session, and

Having determined that these proposals shall take the form of an International Convention,

adopts this twenty-ninth day of June of the year one thousand nine hundred and forty-six the following Convention which may be cited as the Certification of Able Seamen Convention, 1946:

Article 1

No person shall be engaged on any vessel as an able seaman unless he is a person who by national laws or regulations is deemed to be competent to perform any duty which may be required of a member of the crew serving in the deck department (other than an officer or leading or specialist rating) and unless he holds a certificate of qualification as an able seaman granted in accordance with the provisions of the following articles.

Article 2

1. The competent authority shall make arrangements for the holding of examinations and for the granting of certificates of qualification.

2. No person shall be granted a certificate of qualification unless—

(*a*) he has reached a minimum age to be prescribed by the competent authority;

(*b*) he has served at sea in the deck department for a minimum period to be prescribed by the competent authority; and

(*c*) he has passed an examination of proficiency to be prescribed by the competent authority.

3. The prescribed minimum age shall not be less than eighteen years.

4. The prescribed minimum period of service at sea shall not be less than thirty-six months. Provided that the competent authority may—

(a) permit persons with a period of actual service at sea of not less than twenty-four months who have successfully passed through a course of training in an approved training school to reckon the time spent in such training, or part thereof, as sea service; and

(b) permit persons trained in approved sea-going training ships who have served eighteen months in such ships to be certificated as able seamen upon leaving in good standing.

5. The prescribed examination shall provide a practical test of the candidate's knowledge of seamanship and of his ability to carry out effectively all the duties that may be required of an able seaman, including those of a lifeboatman; it shall be such as to qualify a successful candidate to hold the special lifeboatman's certificate provided for in Article 22 of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1929, or in the corresponding provision of any subsequent Convention revising or replacing that Convention for the time being in force for the territory concerned.

Article 3

A certificate of qualification may be granted to any person who, at the time of the entry into force of this Convention for the territory concerned, is performing the full duties of an able seaman or leading deck rating or has performed such duties.

Article 4

The competent authority may provide for the recognition of certificates of qualification issued in other territories.

Article 5

The formal ratifications of this Convention shall be communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration.

Article 6

1. This Convention shall be binding only upon those Members of the International Labour Organisation whose ratifications have been registered with the Director.

2. It shall come into force twelve months after the date on which the ratifications of two Members have been registered with the Director.

3. Thereafter, this Convention shall come into force for any Member twelve months after the date on which its ratification has been registered.

Article 7

1. A Member which has ratified this Convention may denounce it after the expiration of ten years from the date on which the Convention comes into force, by an act communicated to the Director of the International Labour Office for registration. Such denunciation shall not take effect until one year after the date on which it is registered.

2. Each Member which has ratified this Convention and which does not, within the year following the expiration of the period of ten years mentioned in the preceding paragraph, exercise the right of denunciation provided for in this Article, will be bound for another period of ten years and, thereafter, may denounce this Convention at the expiration of each period of ten years under the terms provided for in this Article.

Article 8

1. The Director of the International Labour Office shall notify all the Members of the International Labour Organisation of the registration of all ratifications and denunciations communicated to him by the Members of the Organisation.

2. When notifying the Members of the Organisation of the registration of the second ratification communicated to him, the Director shall draw the attention of the Members of the Organisation to the date upon which the Convention will come into force.

Article 9

The Director of the International Labour Office shall communicate to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations full particulars of all ratifications and acts of denunciation registered by him in accordance with the provisions of the preceding articles.

Article 10

At the expiration of each period of ten years after the coming into force of this Convention, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office shall present to the General Conference a report on the working of this Convention and shall consider the desirability of placing on the agenda of the Conference the question of its revision in whole or in part.

Article 11

1. Should the Conference adopt a new Convention revising this Convention in whole or in part, then, unless the new Convention otherwise provides—

(a) the ratification by a Member of the new revising Convention shall *ipso jure* involve the immediate denunciation of this Convention notwithstanding the provisions of Article 7 above, if and when the new revising Convention shall have come into force;

(b) as from the date when the new revising Convention comes into force this Convention shall cease to be open to ratification by the Members.

2. This Convention shall in any case remain in force in its actual form and content for those Members which have ratified it but have not ratified the revising Convention.

Article 12

The English and French versions of the text of this Convention are equally authoritative.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the International Labour Organisation during its Twenty-eighth Session which was held at Seattle and declared closed the twenty-ninth day of June 1946.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this thirtieth day of August 1946.

The President of the Conference,
HENRY M. JACKSON

The Acting Director of the International Labour Office,
EDWARD J. PHELAN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification with the understandings will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive Z, Eightieth Congress, first session, Convention (No. 74) Concerning the Certification of Able Seamen, with the following understandings:

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that nothing in this convention will interfere with the practice in the United States of America of issuing limited certificates as able seamen to persons of less service or training than prescribed in the convention and of the signing on such persons, who are considered as holding an intermediate rating which is outside the terms of the convention; and

It is the understanding of the Government of the United States of America that this convention shall apply to seagoing vessels only, and that for this purpose the words "seagoing vessel" shall mean a merchant vessel of more than 100 gross tons, which in the usual course of her employment proceeds outside the line dividing the inland waters from the high seas as defined under section 2 of the act of February 19, 1895, 28 Stat. 672, as amended (U. S. C. title 33, sec. 151).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the understanding to the resolution of ratification.

The understanding was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution with the understandings. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution, with the understandings, is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN WITH A PROTOCOL RELATING THERETO

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive S (82d Cong., 2d sess.), an international convention for the high seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada, and Japan, whose respective duly accredited representatives have subscribed hereto.

Acting as sovereign nations in the light of their rights under the principles of international law and custom to exploit the fishery resources of the high seas, and

Believing that it will best serve the common interest of mankind, as well as the interests of the Contracting Parties, to ensure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean, and that each of the Parties should assume an obligation, on a free and equal footing, to encourage the conservation of such resources, and

Recognizing that in view of these considerations it is highly desirable (1) to establish an International Commission, representing the three Parties hereto, to promote and coordinate the scientific studies necessary to ascertain the conservation measures required to secure the maximum sustained productivity of fisheries of joint interest to the Contracting Parties and to recommend such measures to such Parties and (2) that each Party carry out such conservation recommendations, and provide for necessary restraints on its own nationals and fishing vessels,

Therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. The area to which this Convention applies, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention area", shall be all waters, other than territorial waters, of the North Pacific Ocean which for the purposes hereof shall include the adjacent seas.

2. Nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to affect adversely (prejudice) the claims of any Contracting Party in regard to the limits of territorial waters or to the jurisdiction of a coastal state over fisheries.

3. For the purposes of this Convention the term "fishing vessel" shall mean any vessel engaged in catching fish or processing or transporting fish loaded on the high seas, or any vessel outfitted for such activities.

ARTICLE II

1. In order to realize the objectives of this Convention, the Contracting Parties shall establish and maintain the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission."

2. The Commission shall be composed of three national sections, each consisting of not more than four members appointed by the governments of the respective Contracting Parties.

3. Each national section shall have one vote. All resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Commission shall be made only by a unanimous vote of the three national sections except when under the provisions of Article III, Section 1 (c) (ii) only two participate.

4. The Commission may decide upon and amend, as occasion may require, by-laws or rules for the conduct of its meetings.

5. The Commission shall meet at least once each year and at such other times as may be requested by a majority of the national sections. The date and place of the first meeting shall be determined by agreement between the Contracting Parties.

6. At its first meeting the Commission shall select a Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary from different national sections. The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Secretary shall hold office for a period of one year. During succeeding years selection of a Chairmany, Vice-Chairman and Secretary from the national sections shall be made in such a manner as will provide each Contracting Party in turn with representation in those offices.

7. The Commission shall decide on a convenient place for the establishment of the Commission's headquarters.

8. Each Contracting Party may establish an Advisory Committee for its national section, to be composed of persons who shall be well informed concerning North Pacific fishery problem of common concern. Each such Advisory Committee shall be involved to attend all sessions of the Commission except those which the Commission decides to be in camera.

9. The Commission may hold public hearings. Each national section may also hold public hearings within its own country.

10. The official languages of the Commission shall be Japanese and English. Proposals and data may be submitted to the Commission in either language.

11. Each contracting Party shall determine and pay the expenses incurred by its national section. Joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall be paid by the Commission through contributions made by the Contracting Parties in the form and proportion recommended by the Commission and approved by the Contracting Parties.

12. An annual budget of joint expenses shall be recommended by the Commission and submitted to the Contracting Parties for approval.

13. The Commission shall authorize the disbursement of funds for the joint expenses of the Commission and may employ personnel and acquire facilities necessary for the performance of its functions.

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall perform the following functions:

(a) In regard to any stock of fish specified in the Annex, study for the purpose of determining annually whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention under the provisions of Article IV. If the Commission determines that such stock no longer meets the conditions of Article IV, the Commission shall recommend that it be removed from the Annex. Provided, however, that with respect to the stocks of fish originally specified in the Annex, no determination or recommendation as to whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention shall be made for five years after the entry into force of this Convention.

(b) To permit later additions to the Annex, study, on request of a Contracting Party, any stock of fish of the Convention area, the greater part of which is harvested by one or more of the Contracting Parties, for the purpose of determining whether such stock qualifies for abstention under the provisions of Article IV. If the Commission decides that the particular stock fulfills the conditions of Article IV it shall recommend, (1) that such stock be added to the Annex, (2) that the appropriate Party or Parties abstain from fishing such stock, and (3) that the Party or Parties participating in the fishing of such stock continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

(c) In regard to any stock of fish in the Convention area;

(i) Study, on request of any Contracting Party, concerned, any stock of fish which is under substantial exploitation by two or more of the Contracting Parties, and which is not covered by a conservation agreement between such Parties existing at the time of the conclusion of this Convention, for the purpose of determining need for joint conservation measures;

(ii) Decide and recommend necessary joint conservation measures including any relaxation thereof to be taken as a result of such study. Provided, however, that only the national sections of the Contracting Parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock of fish may participate in such decision and recommendation. The decisions and recommendations shall be reported regularly to all the Contracting Parties, but shall apply only to the Contracting Parties the national sections of which participated in the decisions and recommendations.

(iii) Request the Contracting Party or Parties concerned to report regularly the conservation measures adopted from time to time with regard to the stocks of fish specified in the Annex, whether or not covered by conservation agreements between the Contracting Parties, and transmit such information to other Contracting Party or Parties.

(d) Consider and make recommendations to the Contracting Parties concerning the enactment of schedules of equivalent penalties for violations of this Convention.

(e) Compile and study the records provided by the Contracting Parties pursuant to Article VIII.

(f) Submit annually to each Contracting Party a report on the Commission's operations, investigations and findings, with appropriate recommendations, and inform each Contracting Party, whenever it is deemed advisable, on any matter relating to the objectives of this Convention.

2. The Commission may take such steps, in agreement with the Parties concerned, as will enable it to determine the extent to which the undertakings agreed to by the Parties under the provisions of Article V, section 2 and the measures recommended by the Commission under the provisions of this Article and accepted by the Parties concerned have been effective.

3. In the performance of its functions, the Commission shall, insofar as feasible, utilize the technical and scientific services of, and information from, official agencies of the Contracting Parties and their political subdivisions and may, when desirable and if available, utilize the services of, and information from, any public or private institution or organization or any private individual.

ARTICLE IV

1. In making its recommendations the Commission shall be guided by the spirit and intent of this Convention and by the considerations below mentioned.

(a) Any conservation measures for any stock of fish decided upon under the provisions of this Convention shall be recommended for equal application to all Parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock.

(b) With regard to any stock of fish which the Commission determines reasonably satisfies all the following conditions, a recommendation shall be made as provided for in Article III, Section 1, (b).

(i) Evidence based upon scientific research indicates that more intensive exploitation of the stock will not provide a substantial increase in yield which can be sustained year after year,

(ii) The exploitation of the stock is limited or otherwise regulated through legal measures by each Party which is substantially engaged in its exploitation, for the purpose of maintaining or increasing its maximum sustained productivity; such limitations and regulations being in accordance with conservation programs based upon scientific research, and

(iii) The stock is the subject of extensive scientific study designed to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions necessary for maintaining its maximum sustained productivity.

Provided, however, that no recommendation shall be made for abstention by a Contracting Party concerned with regard to: (1) any stock of fish which at any time during the twenty-five years next preceding the entry into force of this Convention has been under substantial exploitation by that Party having regard to the conditions referred to in Section 2 of this Article; (2) any stock of fish which is harvested in greater part by a country or countries not party to this Convention; (3) waters in which there is historic intermingling of fishing operations of the Parties concerned, intermingling of the stocks of fish exploited by these operations, and a long-established history of joint conservation and regulation among the Parties concerned so that there is consequent impracticability of segregating the operations and administering control. It is recognized that the conditions specified in subdivision (3) of this proviso apply to Canada and the United States of America in the waters off the Pacific Coasts of the United States of America and Canada from and including the waters of the Gulf of Alaska southward and, therefore, no recommendation shall be made for abstention by either the United States of America or Canada in such waters.

2. In any decision or recommendation allowances shall be made for the effect of strikes, wars, or exceptional economic or biological conditions which may have introduced temporary declines in or suspension of productivity, exploitation, or management of the stock of fish concerned.

ARTICLE V

1. The Annex attached hereto forms an integral part of this Convention. All references to "Convention" shall be understood as including the said Annex either in its present terms or as amended in accordance with the provisions of Article VII.

2. The Contracting Parties recognize that any stock of fish originally specified in the Annex to this Convention fulfills the conditions prescribed in Article IV and accordingly agree that the appropriate Party or Parties shall abstain from fishing such stock and the Party or Parties participating in the fishing of such stock shall continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

ARTICLE VI

In the event that it shall come to the attention of any of the Contracting Parties that the nationals or fishing vessels of any country which is not a Party to this Convention appear to affect adversely the operations of the Commission or the carrying out of the objectives of this Convention, such Party shall call the matter to the attention of other Contracting Parties. All the Contracting Parties agree upon the request of such Party to confer upon the steps to be taken towards obviating such adverse effects or relieving any Contracting Party from such adverse effects.

ACTICLE VII

1. The Annex to this Convention shall be considered amended from the date upon which the Commission receives notification from all the Contracting Parties of acceptance of a recommendation to amend the Annex made by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of Article III, Section 1 or of the Protocol to this Convention.

2. The Commission shall notify all the Contracting Parties of the date of receipt of each notification of acceptance of an amendment to the Annex.

ARTICLE VIII

The Contracting Parties agree to keep as far as practicable all records requested by the Commission and to furnish compilations of such records and other information upon request of the Commission. No Contracting Party shall be required hereunder to provide the records of individual operations.

ARTICLE IX

1. The Contracting Parties agree as follows:

(a) With regard to a stock of fish from the exploitation of which any Contracting Party has agreed to abstain, the nationals and fishing vessels of such Contracting Party are prohibited from engaging in the exploitation of such stock of fish in waters specified in the Annex, and from loading, processing, possessing, or transporting such fish in such waters.

(b) With regard to a stock of fish for which a Contracting Party has agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures, the nationals and fishing vessels of such Party are prohibited from engaging in fishing activities in waters specified in the Annex in violation of regulations established under such conservation measures.

2. Each Contracting Party agrees, for the purpose of rendering effective the provisions of this Convention, to enact and enforce necessary laws and regulations, with regard to its nationals and fishing vessels, with appropriate penalties against violations thereof and to transmit to the Commission a report on any action taken by it with regard thereto.

ARTICLE X

1. The Contracting Parties agree, in order to carry out faithfully the provisions of this Convention, to cooperate with each other in taking appropriate and effective measures and accordingly agree as follows:

(a) When a fishing vessel of a Contracting Party has been found in waters in which that Party has agreed to abstain from exploitation in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, the duly authorized officials of any Contracting Party may board such vessel to inspect its equipment, books, documents, and other articles and question the persons on board.

Such officials shall present credentials issued by their respective Governments if requested by the master of the vessel.

(b) When any such person or fishing vessel is actually engaged in operations in violation of the provisions of this Convention, or there is reasonable ground to believe was obviously so engaged immediately prior to boarding of such vessel by any such official, the latter may arrest or seize such person or vessel. In that case, the Contracting Party to which the official belongs shall notify the Contracting Party to which such person or vessel belongs of such arrest or seizure, and shall deliver such vessel or persons as promptly as practicable to the authorized officials of the Contracting Party to which such vessel or person belongs at a place to be agreed upon by both Parties. Provided, however, that when the Contracting Party which receives such notification cannot immediately accept delivery and makes request, the Contracting Party which gives such notification may keep such person or vessel under surveillance within its own territory, under the conditions agreed upon by both of the Contracting Parties.

(c) Only the authorities of the Party to which the above-mentioned person or fishing vessel belongs may try the offense and impose penalties therefor. The witnesses and evidence necessary for establishing the offense, so far as they are under the control of any of the Parties to this Convention, shall be furnished as promptly as possible to the Contracting Party having jurisdiction to try the offense.

2. With regard to the nationals or fishing vessels of one or more Contracting Parties in waters with respect to which they have agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures for certain stocks of fish in accordance with the provisions of this Convention, the Contracting Parties concerned shall carry out enforcement severally or jointly. In that case, the Contracting Parties concerned agree to report periodically through the Commission to the Contracting Party which has agreed to abstain from the exploitation of such stocks of fish on the enforcement conditions, and also, if requested, to provide opportunity for observation of the conduct of enforcement.

3. The Contracting Parties agree to meet, during the sixth year of the operation of this Convention, to review the effectiveness of the enforcement provisions of this Article and, if desirable, to consider means by which they may more effectively be carried out.

ARTICLE XI

1. This Convention shall be ratified by the Contracting Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible at Tokyo.

2. This Convention shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall continue in force for a period of ten years and thereafter until one year from the day on which a Contracting Party shall give notice to the other Contracting Parties of an intention of terminating the Convention, whereupon it shall terminate as to all Contracting Parties.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the respective Plenipotentiaries, duly authorized, have signed the present Convention.

DONE in triplicate, in the English and Japanese languages, both equally authentic, at Tokyo this ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred fifty-two.

United States of America:
ROBERT MURPHY
Canada:
A. R. MENZIES
Japan:
K. OKAZAKI
K. HIROKAWA
[seal]
[seal]
[seal]

ANNEX

1. With regard to the stocks of fish in the respective waters named below, Japan agrees to abstain from fishing, and Canada and the United States of America agree to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2 of this Convention:

(a) Halibut (*Hippoglossus stenolepis*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America in which commercial fishing for halibut is being or can be prosecuted. Halibut referred to herein shall be those originating along the coast of North America.

(b) Herring (*Clupea pallasii*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of the meridian passing through the extremity of the Alaskan Peninsula, in which commercial fishing for herring of North America origin is being or can be prosecuted.

(c) Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha, Oncorhynchus keta, Oncorhynchus kisutch, Oncorhynchus nerka, Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*)

The Convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of a provisional line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island; in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of Canada and the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

2. With regard to the stocks of fish in the waters named below, Canada and Japan agree to abstain from fishing, and the United States of America agrees to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2 of this Convention:

Salmon (*Oncorhynchus gorbuscha, Oncorhynchus keta, Oncorhynchus kisutch, Oncorhynchus nerka and Oncorhynchus tschawytscha*)

The Convention area of the Bering Sea east of the line starting from Cape Prince of Wales on the west coast of Alaska, running westward to 168°58'22.59" West Longitude; thence due south to a point 65°15'00" North Latitude; thence along the great circle course which passes through 51° North Latitude and 167° East Longitude, to its intersection with meridian 175° West Longitude; thence south along a provisional line which follows this meridian to the territorial waters limit of Atka Island; in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan, through their respective Plenipotentiaries, agree upon the following stipulation in regard to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo on this ninth day of May, nineteen hundred fifty-two.

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan agree that the line of meridian 175° West Longitude and the line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island, which have been adopted for determining the areas in which the exploitation of salmon is abstained or the conservation measures for salmon continue to be enforced in accordance with the provisions of the Annex to this Convention, shall be considered as provisional lines which shall continue in effect subject to confirmation or readjustment in accordance with the procedure mentioned below.

The Commission to be established under the Convention shall, as expeditiously as practicable, investigate the waters of the Convention area to determine if there are areas in which salmon originating in the

rivers of Canada and of the United States of America intermingle with salmon originating in the rivers of Asia. If such areas are found the Commission shall conduct suitable studies to determine a line or lines which best divide salmon of Asiatic origin and salmon of Canadian and United States of America origin, from which certain Contracting Parties have agreed to abstain in accordance with the provisions of Article V, Section 2, and whether it can be shown beyond a reasonable doubt that this line or lines more equitably divide such salmon than the provisional lines specified in sections 1 (c) and 2 of the Annex. In accordance with these determinations the Commission shall recommend that such provisional lines be confirmed or that they be changed in accordance with these results, giving due consideration to adjustments required to simplify administration.

In the event, however, the Commission fails within a reasonable period of time to recommend unanimously such line or lines, it is agreed that the matter shall be referred to a special committee of scientists consisting of three competent and disinterested persons, no one of whom shall be a national of a Contracting Party, selected by mutual agreement of all Parties for the determination of this matter.

It is further agreed that when a determination has been made by a majority of such special committee, the Commission shall make a recommendation in accordance therewith.

The Governments of the United States of America, Canada and Japan, in signing this Protocol, desire to make it clear that the procedure set forth herein is designed to cover a special situation. It is not, therefore, to be considered a precedent for the final resolution of any matters which may, in the future, come before the Commission.

This Protocol shall become effective from the date of entry into force of the said Convention.

In witness whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol.

Done in tripulicate at Tokyo this ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred fifty-two.

United States of America:
ROBERT MURPHY
Canada:
A. R. MENZIES
Japan:
K. OKAZAKI
K. HIROKAWA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this convention is designed to provide protection for the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean. By its terms Japanese fishermen will abstain from fishing for salmon, herring, and halibut in areas where United States and Canadian fishermen now fully exploit existing stocks and where adequate conservation measures are under way.

The convention provides for the creation of an International North Pacific Fisheries Commission to which the United States and Canada and Japan are parties. This commission will engage in research and recommend to the parties to the convention such measures as will conserve the vast fishery sources of the North Pacific.

The convention also makes provision for patrol of the fisheries covered by the convention.

The Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on the pending convention. No one asked to be heard in opposition to the convention. The committee did receive, however, a number of letters and statements indicating widespread support for the treaty. The committee believes that it will be in the interests of the United States to ratify this convention.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the convention before the Senate is, of course, of most vital importance to those of us who come from the Pacific coast, and particularly from the Pacific Northwest.

A great deal could be said about this convention matter; but, inasmuch as we are in the closing hours of the session, I shall not take time to make a long statement, but shall ask to have my full statement printed in the RECORD.

A great deal of work has gone into the making of this treaty between Japan, the United States, and Canada. The background of the treaty goes back to 1884, when the first salmon cannery was established in Alaska, although, of course, the Japanese had been fishing in the North Pacific for many hundreds of years, no doubt.

Since that time, relations between Japan, Canada, and the United States, particularly in the early days, in respect to conflicts over the fisheries of the North Pacific, were of a friendly nature, because, generally speaking, fishermen did not venture very far from their own shores.

However, with the coming of more modern means of fishing, and with the development of the world demand for salmon, herring, halibut, and the huge Japanese crab, conflicts at times flared up between these three countries, particularly prior to World War II.

There have been many negotiations and conferences. All in all, our relationships in the North Pacific have, with rare exceptions, been of a friendly nature.

Except for agreements between the United States and Canada in connection with halibut fishing and in connection with part of the Fraser River salmon run, there never existed a treaty to establish what might be called the ground rules in this area—for instance, an arrangement similar to the ground rules applying to the fisheries on the Newfoundland Banks.

So, realizing that there might be possible conflicts following the war with Japan, many of us who had a deep interest in this matter suggested that, since we were entering upon a new era of relationship with Japan, we might well settle this fisheries problem by means of a treaty. To that end, approximately a year ago, the Senator from Washington, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and because of my geographical interest and experience in the matter, was asked by John Foster Dulles and by members of the State Department to go to Japan, if possible, to participate in the preliminary negotiations which led to the signing of the general treaty. I did so. On my way to Tokyo, at that time, which was a year ago last April, I had many conferences, not only with my own people on the Pacific coast, but with Canadians who were interested in fisheries, and, upon my arrival in Japan, with the Japanese who were interested in the matter. We found in all instances a great willingness on the part of the Japanese to enter into negotiations for the treaty, and the treaty is today before the Senate.

The purpose of the treaty is to establish so-called ground rules to govern in the future fishing in the North Pacific. At first there was great agitation on the part of certain people on the Pacific coast to have included within the general Japanese treaty provisions covering our future relations with Japan the matter of fisheries, and to have an agreement spelled out for that purpose. We dissuaded them as best we could, holding to the view that the general treaty should deal, not with commercial or conservation matters, but with present and future political relations between Japan and the United States. So, in order to forestall the possibility that, if such provisions were included, opposition might arise to the general treaty, which, because of the existing situation in Asia at the time, we felt should be made and signed as soon as possible. We prevailed upon Mr. Dulles and the Japanese, including the Premier, and we also prevailed upon the State Department and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who took great interest in this matter, particularly the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama, not to include in the general treaty matters pertaining to the subject of fishing, since it dealt with the prime industry of Japan. The interest of the Japanese people in that matter is of course very great, as is also the interest of our people on the Pacific coast.

It was, however, felt desirable to place in the general treaty an obligation on the part of Japan, that, following ratification of the general treaty and Japan's becoming technically a nation, she would enter into a fishing agreement with other nations bordering on the North Pacific. That was done. The Foreign Relations Committee on many occasions stressed the importance of our making some progress in the fishing negotiations, in order that it might be unnecessary to include reservations in the general treaty.

The State Department acted promptly. It did an excellent job. I compliment the Department upon having done, in the course of the negotiations for the treaty, the one thing that was particularly needful. I think criticism of the State Department would not have been less had the matter been attended to sooner, that is, had it been attended to between the time of the writing of the text of the general treaty and the signing of the treaty at San Francisco. The State Department established a sort of task force, very ably headed by Mr. Harrington, and, instead of confining their activities solely to the political level and the writing of the general treaty, attention was also given to the matter of the fishing agreement, in which, as I say, the people of Japan, as well as our own people, were vitally interested.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I rise, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as a member of the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, simply to express to the Senator from Washington my appreciation of the very effective work he did in developing the background for this treaty, and in having the vision to realize that it was wise to deal with these negotiations in the way in which they were handled. Having been one of the participants in the preparation of the Japanese Peace Treaty, I was very much interested in this separate agreement, lest, as the Senator said, it might interfere with the general treaty negotiations. The way in which it was handled, separately, is a matter of congratulation.

Later, while I was in Japan in connection with the signing of the treaty, I talked with Japanese leaders. That was at the time the treaty was actually concluded with the Japanese people.

I should like merely to say for the record that I think this is a good example of the way international negotiations of this kind can be handled, and handled to the best interest of all parties. Obviously, there were conflicting interests. The parties were brought together around the conference table, and questions were resolved by an across-the-table discussion, not merely by one side telling the other side to "take it or leave it." It is an example of a splendidly negotiated treaty, and the Senator from Washington is entitled to tribute for his part in it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

This was not done at the political level. As has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, this treaty meets with widespread approval in the Pacific Northwest. Our reason for expediting it is that we are advised by the Japanese that they would like to have this treaty as soon as possible, since, without the treaty, they have no control over certain people within their country who might be inclined to create incidents similar to those which occurred prior to the beginning of World War II. So they are very anxious that we ratify this treaty. Some of them are a little dubious about it, but I think the RECORD ought to show that this treaty represents one of the three steps taken in the general arrangements between the United States and Japan; first, the general treaty on the political level, in which Japan became obligated to sign a fishing treaty; second, the treaty which is now before the Senate, and third, the consummation of a reciprocal trade agreement between this country and Japan, which it is our hope the State Department will expedite.

Questions are asked about the processing of tuna and other canned fish. I have tried to explain that to the Foreign Relations Committee. This treaty relates only to the taking of fish. The matter of processing would be the subject of a trade agreement, which I believe, will follow. I think there are certain preliminary negotiations now under way in regard to a reciprocal trade agreement; and that is vitally necessary, too. I think we could promise the people of the Pacific coast in particular that such a treaty will now be worked out between this country and Japan.

With the general treaty, the fishing treaty, and a reciprocal trade agreement, there will be a two-way street, so to speak. The two countries will be able to work economically, hand in hand. Lacking such an agreement, we could anticipate other unfortunate instances, such as the raising of questions about the amount of canned fish that should come from Japan, or about frozen tuna, salmon, or Japanese crab. Those matters must be dealt with expeditiously through a reciprocal trade agreement. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that the ratification of the treaty with Japan has resulted in a sincere willingness on the part of the Japanese people to work out these problems now, so that in the future we shall have a relationship free from the possibility of occurrences such as those which took place prior to World War II; which occurrences, I may add, most of the Japanese people, I think, now realize to have been among the worst mistakes of their entire history.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the point just made by the Senator is most important. As the Senator knows, I have long advocated, as I did during the debate regarding the tariff on tuna, that the way to deal with this matter is to sit around the conference table, to try to arrive at a reciprocal understanding as to the relative rights of the parties, and to proceed from there. What offends our friends, especially in the Far East, is the matter of one country's acting singly and then expecting another country to follow its judgment. I think the way to deal with these problems is through reciprocal agreements, arrived at after free conferences.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think they should be handled in that way, and I believe that will be done. As soon as the fishing agreement is ratified, we shall then have established the ground rules, not only to govern future relationships between this country and Japan but also ground rules in the matter of this great economic potential, the fisheries, as well as the ground rules governing our future trading in general. I am sure that this attitude will culminate in a lasting friendship.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have about 2 or 3 minutes remaining, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina. This is an important matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can appreciate its importance to the people of the Pacific coast, as well as to other parts of the country.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The treaty reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations is not only a very simple but it is also a very sensible approach to the question of north Pacific fisheries.

I merely want to add, Mr. President, that the importance of this treaty will be much greater in the future, because the fish potential in the great Bering Shelf, in the North Pacific, has hardly been scratched. The treaty should result in good relations between Japan and the United States.

I should like to place in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement by John Laurence Kask, Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which sets forth the views of the Fish and Wildlife Service in this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

(Statement of John Laurence Kask, Assistant Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, June 27, 1952)

The Department of the Interior recommends approval of the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, considering it to be a significant step toward the goal of protection and sound management of the great fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. The employment in this treaty of a formula providing for abstention from a fully exploited, regulated fishery to a large degree removes a threat which has in the past cast its shadow over the North Pacific fisheries which are of great importance to the United States. The Department of the Interior has long felt the need for such a convention.

It will be recalled that as early as 1906, the Congress recognized the importance of the fisheries of Alaska, and the need for protection thereof. In that year an Act for the Protection and Regulation of the Fisheries of Alaska was voted, establishing certain protective regulations. Since that year a number of additional statutes have been enacted, all designed to further the protection of the fisheries of Alaska. In each case the law has placed severe restrictions upon fishermen. For example, since 1924, fishermen have been permitted to take no more than 50 percent of the runs of salmon in Alaska. The law has required that at least half of the salmon be permitted to escape to the spawning grounds in order that the populations might reproduce themselves. These restrictions were formulated after intensive and costly study of the fishery had made clear the need for protection. These restrictions have required the fishermen to make sacrifices—sacrifices which they have been generally unwilling to make until convinced that the exercise of restraint is in reality an investment in the future. It is axiomatic in fishery management that the effective enforcement of fishery regulations is virtually impossible without the understanding and cooperation of the great majority of the fishermen affected. The laws protecting the fisheries of Alaska would be ineffective, in fact probably would not have been enacted, had not much time, effort, and money been devoted to a study of the fisheries and to bringing fishermen to the realization that sacrifices in the form of reduced catches today mean profits tomorrow, that permitting an escapement of spawning fish is like putting money in the bank.

The United States has spent in the neighborhood of $20,000,000—more than twice the

original cost of Alaska—since the beginning of this century for the protection and management of the fisheries of the North Pacific; American fishermen have made sacrifices totaling many more millions of dollars, believing such sacrifices to be in their best interest. As a result these fisheries today yield products worth approximately $200,000,000 annually.

In spite of the past efforts of the United States toward conservation, in spite of the sacrifices of United States fishermen, these fisheries and others like them are threatened by foreign fishermen operating off our coasts beyond the limits of the United States jurisdiction and without regard for the restraints placed upon American fishermen. The committee will recall that in 1936 such a threat arose when plans were made for a factory ship of British registry to operate on the halibut banks off the Pacific coast of North America. The halibut fishery had been since 1923 the subject of an international agreement between the United States and Canada, both of which Governments had devoted much time, energy, and money to a study of the fishery in order to maintain it at a level of productivity. As a result of these studies American and Canadian halibut fishermen were subjected to stringent regulations, were required to make sacrifices in the interest of long-term yields. Now, in 1936 a foreign vessel proposed to operate in this fishery which was already being exploited to the maximum by United States and Canadian fishermen. If the vessel disregarded the treaty regulations, the fishery would be quickly destroyed. If she complied with the regulations, it simply meant that the Canadian and American fishermen would get less fish, a smaller return on their investment. The reaction from the fishermen, of course, was violent, and the United States Government lodged a protest with the British Government. Fortunately, the factory-ship operation was never undertaken and there was a minimum of friction.

However, in the following year a similar threat was posed by Japanese salmon vessels operating in Bristol Bay, just beyond the limit of United States jurisdiction. In this case the reaction was even more violent. The United States brought strong diplomatic pressure to bear upon the Japanese Government, and that Government, possibly not desiring to force the issue, required its salmon vessels to withdraw.

These incidents, fortunately, amounted to little. However, the threat may well arise again, and at a time when, for one reason or another, the United States Government might not find it desirable or possible to resort to such action. The result in that case would be disastrous. It would require no more than a few years of unrestricted exploitation by foreign fishermen to deplete the salmon or halibut fisheries. American fishermen, helpless to prevent destruction of stocks which they had labored to maintain, faced with the loss of long years investments, would abandon conservation principles in favor of a quick killing before the stocks were completely destroyed.

The Department of the Interior has lived close to this problem for many years. While it is true that during much of that time Japan, the country which has caused our fishermen the greatest concern, has been strictly limited in its fishing operations, the Department has, nevertheless, with the Department of State, worked steadily toward a solution to the problem which might be applied when Japan regained sovereignty.

It has been the traditional position of this Department that sound conservation in high seas fisheries would best be served by an agreement among the nations concerned which would permit the joint and equal application of such conservation measures as careful study of the fisheries might dictate. This position has been reflected in the halibut and salmon conventions between the United States and Canada. However, in negotiating the present agreement, it was necessary to consider an additional fact. Be they right or wrong, be they sanctioned by international law or no, the Americans who have developed the salmon fishery in Bristol Bay consider it to be an exclusively American fishery and they will tolerate no foreign fishermen; the Americans and Canadians, who have developed the halibut fishery, the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River and the North Pacific herring fishery, consider those to be exclusively American-Canadian fisheries and they will tolerate no foreign fishermen. It is the opinion of the Department of the Interior that, before they would accept the presence of Japanese fishermen in the Alaska salmon fisheries, regardless of the type of regulations imposed upon the Japanese, American fishermen themselves might well cast conservation measures aside and enter upon a ruthless exploitation of the stocks. The halibut and sockeye salmon fisheries would probably meet the same fate. It is certain that a treaty which did not, in one way or another, exclude Japanese fishermen from the more important of these fisheries would not receive the endorsement of the industry and fishermen's organizations on the west coast of this country and in Alaska. Any approach to a solution of the problem which is to have a reasonable chance of meeting with approval at this time must take into consideration this proprietory feeling on the part of American and Canadian fishermen.

The Department of the Interior considers that the abstention provisions contained in the North Pacific Fisheries Convention go a long way toward solving this problem. Specifically, the three countries, party to this treaty, have agreed that when a fishery resource exploited by one of them is producing at a level at which intensified fishing will not increase the total yield; when exploitation of that resource is limited or otherwise regulated by the party engaged in its exploitation for the purpose of maintaining or increasing its maximum sustained productivity; and when the resource is a subject of extensive scientific study designed to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions necessary for maintaining its maximum sustained productivity—when these conditions are met, it is agreed that the countries not previously exploiting this resource shall abstain from it. Canada, Japan, and the United States have agreed that at present three fishery resources in the Pacific Ocean off the coast of North America meet these conditions. Japan and Canada have agreed to abstain from the Alaska salmon fishery in the Bering Sea, while Japan has agreed to abstain from halibut, herring, and salmon fisheries in waters off the west coast of this continent, exclusive of the Bering Sea. With respect to the Alaska salmon fishery, the United States has agreed to continue necessary conservation measures, and with respect to halibut, herring, and salmon fisheries exclusive of the Bering Sea, the United States and Canada have agreed to do likewise.

It will be noted that at present only three of the many fisheries in the waters off the Pacific Coast of the United States and Canada qualify for abstention under the provisions of this treaty. This, of course, does not mean that the other stocks of fish in these waters will be deprived of protection. The drafters of this convention, in addition to dealing with immediate problems, looked into the future. They realized that Canadian, Japanese, and United States interests in fisheries would follow increasingly converging courses in the future and that opportunities for conflict would increase rather than decrease. They have provided in the convention a means whereby such conflicts may be anticipated and equitable solutions to problems be found before they become issues. Article II of the convention establishes the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission which shall promote and coordinate the scientific studies necessary to ascertain what conservation measures may be required to secure the maximum sustained productivity of fisheries of joint interest to the contracting parties. That Commission which will consist of not more than four members from each of the contracting governments, will, upon the request of one or more of the three governments, study any stock of fish exploited by one or more of them to determine the need for protective measures. Thus the Commission might, at the request of Canada, undertake a study of the albacore stocks off the Alaskan and British Columbia coasts to determine whether or not this fishery was in need of further protection. As the Department of the Interior understands it, the Commission's investigation would be directed at establishing certain broad facts, i. e. (a) is the fishery producing at a level of maximum supervised yield? (b) is the exploitation of the fishery limited or regulated by the Government of the United States or Canada for the purpose of maintaining maximum productivity? (c) is the fishery the subject of extensive scientific study to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions for maintaining it maximum productivity? (d) has the United States or Canada alone developed this fishery over the last two decades? Should the Commission, upon conclusion of its study, find that the answer to each of these questions was "yes" it would recommend to Japan that that government require its fishermen to abstain from exploiting the stock, and would recommend that the Government of the United States or Canada continue that conservation measures in effect. If, on the other hand, the Commission found that the answers were negative, it might recommend that no further protection was needed and Japan might engage in exploitation of the resource. Thus, any fishery developed exclusively by Americans or by Americans and Canadians may receive the same protection which the Convention would now afford the Alaska salmon fishery and the North Pacific halibut fishery.

It is not contemplated that the Commission will employ a large staff of its own to conduct investigations. Instead the Commission, insofar as feasible, will utilize the technical and scientific services of official agencies of the contracting parties and their political subdivision and may, when desirable and if available, utilize the services of public or private institutions or organizations, or any private individual. In conducting its investigations the Commission might thus call upon the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the United States, the Fisheries Agency of the Japanese Government, or possibly private organizations such as the Fisheries Institute of the University of Washington to obtain information for it. In performing this function, the Commission will, in effect, encourage a broader approach to research than can be made by any single agency attacking the problems alone. The Department of the Interior believes that, by promoting cooperative operations involving the research agencies of several governments, many problems can be avoided or solved unless they become serious and relations in the field of fisheries between the United States and Canada and Japan may be expected to become increasingly more friendly.

In short, the Department of the Interior believes that this treaty, with its provision

for abstention and for the establishment of a joint commission, provides the best solution possible at this time to the problems stemming from the converging interest of the United States, Canada, and Japan in the fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean. I may say, however, that the Department does not consider the abstention provisions to constitute a principle necessarily suitable to universal application in the solution of fishery problems. Rather it considers the provisions to be a device which is mutually accepted by the three nations directly interested and which provides a solution to the problems peculiar to the North Pacific. The Department of the Interior recommends that the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean receive the favorable consideration of this committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a very excellent article by Edward W. Allen, entitled "The North Pacific Fisheries Treaty—Friendly Settlement of a 20-Year Dispute."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES TREATY—FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT OF A 20-YEAR DISPUTE

(By Edward W. Allen)

Meeting at Tokyo, delegations from Japan, Canada, and the United States, on December 14, 1951, recommended to their three Governments the ratification of a North Pacific Fisheries Treaty which they had drafted during 5 weeks of almost continuous session.

The basic objective of the proposed treaty is to stimulate production from the sea by making it profitable to the fishermen of each nation to support sound fishery conservation practices. This is to be accomplished by granting protection as to the fruits of conservation so long, but only so long, as it is practiced.

An immediate objective is to eliminate one of the most potent causes for dispute and ill will between the peoples on opposite sides of the North Pacific, and instead, to promote a spirit of friendliness and cooperation. To this end the Japanese propose to abstain from fishing salmon, halibut, and herring (as to herring only, the abstention agreement excludes Bering Sea) off the northwest coast of America for a period of 5 years and thereafter as long as the treaty is in effect unless otherwise recommended to the three countries pursuant to provisions of the treaty, and agreed to by them.

This draft treaty is the culmination of many years of work and study. Under it, each of the three nations will have equal opportunity to avail itself of the provisions for the protection of its own coastal fisheries which comply with the formula that is set forth. No party gives up any claim of legal rights, nor does the treaty attempt to define or change any rule of international law. It is an agreement which should benefit all three of the nations. It is being entered into voluntarily, but once in effect, it becomes binding and carries its own enforcement provisions. Its ratification should go far toward popularizing that sound principle of fishery management referred to in the draft as "maximum sustained productivity," and should also constitute a real contribution toward the preservation of peace on the Pacific.

Some of the background may be of historical interest, and a brief analysis of the proposed treaty may be useful in connection with future negotiations between other nations.

From 1884, when the first salmon cannery to operate in the Bristol Bay area of Alaska was built at Nushagak, this area and the Puget Sound-Gulf of Georgia area became the great rivals in the production of canned red, or sockeye, salmon. When disastrous slides occurred at Hells Gate Canyon on the Fraser River in 1913 and 1914, the sockeye were largely blocked from ascending to their spawning grounds, and Bristol Bay was left in undisputed predominance. For decades, it was the source of one of the most dependable and profitable fisheries in the world. The annual production ran from 1,000,000 to 1,500,000 cases of 48 pounds each.

Because of its rich color, oil content, flakiness, and firmness, red, or sockeye, salmon has had a special appeal to the housewife and has generally found a ready market. The British were particularly fond of Alaska reds. The old sailing fleets which took their loads of cans, grub, gill-net fishermen, and Chinese cannery workers north in the early summer through the passes of the Aleutian Islands, on into the Nushagak or Kvichak as soon as the ice gave way and, when the short, intensive season was over, brought back loads of canned salmon along with the workers, were picturesque sights to denizens of Pacific coast ports. Stories like the Silver Hoard, by Rex Beach, cast a romance about the region.

Yet it was serious business, this operating thousands of miles from home ports, forced to bring everything that was needed for an entire season into a forbidding region of long tidal runoffs, storms, and mosquitoes. In time, too, overfishing began to tell on the supply. At last the Bureau of Fisheries stepped in and, when it received authority under the White Act of 1924, research and regulation superseded the previous unrestricted exploitation.

Both under the Bureau of Fisheries and its successor, the Fish and Wildlife Service, scientific investigation had become intensified and restrictions tightened. In spite of this, the average catch has been falling off so that in the last 10 years it is lower than during the previous decade. In fact, the salmon canners who operate in the Territory became so concerned that for several years they have themselves been contributing several hundred thousand dollars to the University of Washington to conduct scientific research as to Alaska salmon.

Biologists have injected certain phrases into the field of fisheries. One of the most popular is "maximum sustained yield" as the sound objective of fishery conservation. This means to allow as many fish to be taken in any year as will permit of the highest average annual catch which can be maintained on a continuous basis. In other words, the objective is to avoid catching an excessive amount in any one year or period of years and then having this followed by a period of scarcity. When a fishery has been depleted below what is believed to be the largest sound annual average, it may be necessary to reduce the legal catch severely in order to restore the fishery to a maximum condition.

It was in this Bristol Bay area of Alaska, where, in spite of regulation, the fishing was probably still excessive, the Japanese fishing vessels appeared in 1930. The reaction by the American fishermen was exactly what one would expect. Vigorous protests were sent to Washington. One fish-boat captain demanded guns.

These Japanese vessels were said only to be fishing for and canning king crabs. Now our own fishery people had been having trouble over processing crabs. Only the winter before, the organization by Seattle and San Francisco promoters of a company to can crabs in Bering Sea had fallen through for the sole reason that the proposed financial backers were not convinced that the canning process would be successful.

So a curious thing is said to have happened. An informal and unpublished understanding is supposed to have been negotiated between our Government and the Japanese that the Japanese would stay out of the Bristol Bay salmon fishery but would not be interfered with in their crab operations north of the Alaska Peninsula.

It is probable that, at first, the Japanese lived up to this understanding, but as the early 1930's rolled along, increasing complaints were heard among American fishermen that the Japanese were also fishing salmon. * * *

Coastal irritation increased when it became known, late in 1935, that Japanese fishery interests had requested their Government to issue licenses to operate floating canneries off Alaska. This rose to still higher pitch when in 1936 the Japanese Diet appropriated a sum equivalent to about $75,000 for investigating the fishery resources in the waters off Alaska and, with the apparent approval of our own Government, sent a vessel into Bristol Bay said to be manned with fishery students but which our fishermen were convinced was staffed by officers who were surveying more than fisheries.

In the spring of 1937, a delegation of Japanese businessmen sought to make a deal with Alaska cannery men for joint operation of Japanese floating salmon canneries on the American side of the ocean. This was, of course, rejected, but it tended to arouse even greater suspicion that the Japanese were also fishing salmon. In spite of denials from our own Government, it is highly probable that the suspicion had considerable foundation. Since the Japanese occupation, information has come to light indicating that during the 1930's the Japanese had conducted thorough systematic fishery (and probably other) surveys covering Bering Sea right up to the Alaskan coast. There is also indication of Japanese industry participation in these surveys, and it is unlikely that the salmon which were caught were dumped.

In 1936, an Assistant Secretary of State had brushed off Pacific Coast representatives with the charge that they were prejudiced by their failure to appreciate that "the Japanese were the best friends this country had in the world." But some of the fishery people who were less confident of this friendship chartered a plane in July, 1937, flew out over Bristol Bay, caught and photographed a Japanese floating cannery with salmon on her deck and fishing boats about her. Only last year, one of these American fishermen who was in the plane met and compared notes with the Japanese fishery official who was aboard the floater.

In this same year (1937), Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach and the writer finally secured an interview with Secretary Cordell Hull and found that he had not been made conversant with the situation but was heartily responsive to taking action when it was brought home to him. In fact, from then on, as long as he was active, Mr. Hull was most cooperative with the American fishing industry in seeking to protect the coastal fisheries of this country.

The matter was assigned first to a committee of assistant secretaries, then to Judge R. Walton Moore, counselor of the Department. Leo Sturgeon, who had been a consul at Tokyo for many years, was recalled from Birmingham, England, made a special adviser on fisheries to Judge Moore, and went diligently to work.

On November 22, 1937, a strong representation was made to Japan asserting that—

"But for consistent adherence to a policy of conservation, the Alaska salmon fisheries unquestionably would not have reached anything like their present state of development."

It was also stated:

"The cost of the extensive efforts made by the Government to regulate salmon fishing and to perpetuate the supply of salmon has been borne by the American people, and not infrequently American fishermen have suffered loss of employment and income as a result of the various restrictions imposed. Because of such sacrifices, and the part that American citizens have played in bearing the cost of conserving and perpetuating the salmon resources, it is the strong conviction and thus far unchallenged view on the part of millions of American citizens on the Pacific Coast interested in the salmon industry and on the part of the American public generally that there has been established a superior interest and claim in the salmon resources of Alaska.

"It must be taken as a sound principle of justice that an industry such as described which has been built up by the nationals of one country cannot in fairness be left to be destroyed by the nationals of other countries."

An announcement the next spring indicated that the Japanese Government agreed temporarily to issue no licenses for salmon fishing in this area, but clearly asserted a right to have its fishing vessels reenter this fishery if it chose to do so. It now appears clear that this concession was probably due to the fact that the militarists who, unfortunately, were then dominating Japan were not yet ready to precipitate trouble.

The fishing industry appreciated this progress but was not satisfied with this temporary solution. It demanded something more permanent. War came on and later Mr. Stettinius made his notorious reorganization of the Department of State in which among other dislocations, he shifted fisheries to a subordinate position in the Commodity Division of the Economics Branch, not realizing that fishing is an activity, not a commodity.

In spite of handicaps, Mr. Sturgeon, in cooperation with industry representatives, worked out a proclamation which was issued September 28, 1945, and became known as the Truman proclamation. In harmony with Mr. Hull's communication to Japan above referred to, this proclamation asserted the special interest of this country in its coastal fisheries and authorized the creation of ocean fishery zones. According to the official announcement which accompanied the proclamation, protection would now be provided for the Bristol Bay salmon. The Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior were directed to implement the proclamation, but have never done so.

Persistent efforts of the industry, made more effective by the organization of Pacific Fisheries Conference, a federation of all branches of the fishing industry—employees, employers, vessel owners, and fishery biologists, from Alaska to the Mexican border—finally (with congressional assistance) persuaded Mr. Robert A. Lovett, as Under Secretary of State, to rescue the Fishery Division from its low status in the Department by creating the position of Special Adviser on Fisheries and Wildlife to the Under Secretary of State. Dr. W. M. Chapman, then director of the School of Fisheries of the University of Washington, was the first appointee. Dr. Chapman resigned and in June 1951, was succeeded by Mr. W. C. Herrington who had the excellent background of 4 years spent in Japan as Chief of the Fisheries Division of the Natural Resources Section of SCAP.

Mr. Herrington secured industry backing of a form of treaty which resulted from many conferences with the industry and presumably within the Department, which sought to effect a compromise between the theoretical concepts of the Department and the practical views of the fishing industry. In the meantime, Mr. John Foster Dulles had entered into correspondence with Mr. Shigeru Yoshida, Japanese Prime Minister, to the effect that until Japan became independent she would respect the restrictions imposed by SCAP to stay off the American coast and would then enter into negotiations for a fishery treaty.

This noncommittal correspondence only whetted the industry's insistence for immediate negotiations for a treaty, and the Department finally agreed to institute such negotiations immediately following the peace treaty meeting at San Francisco. The Department furthermore gave assurance that this Nation's delegation would include industry advisers. This agreement was carried out and as a result of such negotiations Japan invited delegations from this country and Canada to come to Tokyo to meet with a Japanese delegation. The present treaty draft is the result of this meeting.

The preamble recognizes that Japan, as a sovereign nation (which she will be when the peace treaty becomes effective), has equal rights with other sovereign nations, but does not attempt to define such rights. The desirability of fishery conservation is also set forth with emphasis.

An International North Pacific Fisheries Commission is provided for to carry out the administrative features of the treaty and to encourage ocean fishery conservation. This Commission is authorized to conduct investigations, among other things, for the purpose of recommending to the three Governments that certain fisheries should be classified as entitled to the protection provided for in the treaty against the intrusion of one or two of the three nations into a coastal fishery not off its own shores, in which it has not theretofore substantially participated, and which has been subjected to scientific research and governmental regulation by the party or parties to the treaty who have been exploiting this particular fishery, and which is being utilized approximately upon a maximum sustained yield basis.

The draft furthermore provides that Canada and the United States now qualify under the provisions referred to as to their salmon, halibut, and herring fisheries (herring, however, limited with a northerly boundary) as far seaward as they are being or can be fished commercially; hence that Japan will abstain from participating in these particular fisheries while these conditions continue and the treaty is in effect. Canada also agrees to abstain from Bristol Bay salmon fishery participation.

Although Japan probably has fisheries which would qualify under the proposed treaty formula, she did not consider it expedient in view of existing Asiatic conditions to press for their protection.

The treaty is to run for 10 years and thereafter until terminated by 1 year's notice from any of the three countries.

One feature which has aroused undue apprehension on the Pacific coast is that as to Bering Sea salmon it was necessary to designate some specific boundary line. This line was fixed at 175° W. longitude but was left subject to adjustment according to the appropriate actual division line between Asiatic and Alaskan salmon. Our biologists and officials all appear to be confident that the line indicated gives complete protection to the salmon of Bristol Bay.

* * * * *

It must be admitted that our Government declined to ask for the simple reciprocal solution demanded by the fishing industry—that the Japanese stay out of our coastal fisheries and we stay out of theirs. Neither is the present proposal in complete conformity with Secretary Hull's communication to Japan, with the Presidential Proclamation of September 28, 1945, or with some modern trends in the interpretation of international law. Nevertheless, nothing is stated which negatives our legal right to reassert these various claims, the proposed treaty does contain a formula which may prove of general encouragement to ocean fishery conservation and, if adopted, this treaty should provide sound protection to the salmon, halibut, and herring fisheries which are so important to the Pacific coast of both Canada and the United States.

It is to be hoped that the treaty will be ratified by the three nations directly concerned and that it may be profitably emulated by others.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I close with the statement that here is another step forward in our relations with Japan. We still have one more step to go, and that is the expeditious handling of a reciprocal trade agreement with Japan in connection with the economic side of the question, including not only fish but other trade that will come between the two countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive S, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an international convention for the high-seas fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, together with a protocol realting thereto, signed at Tokyo, May 9, 1952, on behalf of the United States, Canada, and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution is agreed to, and the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the convention.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE BUREAU OF AUDIT AND REVIEW

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of that committee has been able to view the growth of Government and the increasing cost of the growing Government during the past several years.

I think it is appropriate today, on the 4th of July, 1952, which the American people celebrate as the anniversary of the day on which the Declaration of Independence was signed and our Nation came into being, that I speak on the question of big government.

Mr. President, there is clearly today something about the evolution of the Federal Government which is fundamentally wrong.

Has it not grown too large and complex for the Congress to control?

Has it not grown beyond the power of the Executive to control?

Has not the phenomenal growth of the Federal Government upset the fundamental basis on which government in the United States was designed to rest?

Is there not now a dangerous lack of balance between the Federal Government and the States and local governments?

Has not the division of powers between the three branches of the Federal Government—which is the real safeguard of our freedom—broken down?

Congress has all but completely lost control of the purse and can no longer keep track of the activities of the far-flung departments, agencies, and bureaus. Even the Chief Executive has lost most of the essential control over the complex ramifications of the executive branch. Today, we have a government without a true rudder, running amuck in the tempestuous sea of political, social, and economic storms of our times. I am seriously concerned about our ability to weather those storms with our present ship of state.

Today the Federal Government is a big, sprawling, inefficient, wasteful, costly, and purposeless collection of departments, bureaus, boards, offices, agencies, administrations, commissions, services, authorities, sections, and units. These multitudinous units of administration are like thousands of ratholes down which are drained millions of dollars of taxpayers' money away from the real purpose for which they were originally collected from the people.

Amid this vast array of Federal Government units, the people themselves are lost. They cannot possibly know where they stand.

The great multitude of Americans have not been able to locate their tax dollars in terms of productive return—return in the form of a positive foreign policy—return in the way of more tanks and planes for Korea—return to individuals in the form of full employment and the general betterment of their living standards.

Where is all our money going when we see only these few results? One answer is that we have had no evaluation of our Government in terms of what it should be able to achieve to meet our needs in a free society. We have not explored the reasonable limits of Federal activities in the matters of returnable tax dollars, national strength, and security.

Clearly it is time to take stock. It is time to determine what powers and duties can best be carried by the States and communities and what others belong to the Federal Government. We must carefully study the conditions which make it all but impossible for the representatives of the people in Congress to govern. Only through that evaluation will the people know the answer to the riddle of where they stand, and where Government stands.

It is difficult for the Congress, without an approach such as I am going to suggest, to make any headway against the ever-expanding Federal Government. Under the present system, the direction which this vast Federal Government will take in its twistings and turnings into new highways and byways is largely determined by the executive branch. The Congress, with the limited facilities currently at its disposal, is only occasionally able to determine the speed of the movement and almost never to determine the direction or the course which this unwieldy and overgrown ship of state will take.

From time to time Congress seeks to increase its staffs on its various committees. Steps like that are certainly in the right direction. But a bold new approach such as I suggest must be taken before the country is entirely overwhelmed by its own government.

There was nothing haphazard about the way the founding fathers designed the American form of government.

They had come to our shores from Old World countries, where kings and dictators tyrannized the people. They were thoroughly acquainted with the work of great philosophers and of political writers of all ages. They knew the dangers of strong government and of weak government, of kings and demagogs. They had a profound knowledge of the right principles upon which government had to be founded if it was to be good government, self-government by the people, and if it was to safeguard the freedom and liberties of the people.

Out of this deep understanding of human nature and the principles of good government the founding fathers established a representative republic with certain unique features.

One of these features was the division of government into proper spheres of activities based upon Federal, State, and local concerns. This was absolutely essential for three reasons:

First, to enable a new form of government to succeed in a nation of continental proportions; second, to provide governmental bodies appropriate to different levels—Federal, State, and local; and, third, to place the exercise of government as close to the people as possible. That was one of the secrets that our forefathers unlocked in order that we might have this Republic, Mr. President.

A second feature closely related to the first is the distribution of power geographically among Federal, State, and local bodies, and structurally among the three branches of the Federal Government.

The wisdom of the political theories upon which the founding fathers built this Nation has been amply demonstrated over the years of the country's growth and development into the richest and most productive in the world.

Our form of government, which has released the energies of the American people, has made America great. When lapses occur now and then, they occur, not in the form of government, but in the administration of government. As Abraham Lincoln said, we must always distinguish between administrators and the form of government.

But recent years have seen the evolution of a widespread drift away from the original American principles of a Federal Republic. The power of the Federal Government has been expanded to an extent that would have been unbelievable a few years ago.

Through this increase of Federal power, many forms of free competition and productive private capital are being destroyed. By price fixing and profit control, the Government is eliminating possibly our greatest claim to progress—free competition. By taxation and subsidization of industry, the Government can corrupt the public with the public's own money.

Two or three political axioms spell out the basis for still greater inroads by the Federal Government into the lives of every citizen, every business, every individual liberty or freedom.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. The right to subsidize is the right to control.

Mr. President, our form of government also can be destroyed either by private monopoly or by Government monopoly. Monopoly can destroy what we have here in America.

These truths, in and of themselves, are sufficient, if applied by an unchecked and uncontrolled Federal Government, to write an obituary to the American way of life as we have known it.

And so Mr. President, realizing this danger and the need for an evaluation of our Government, I am introducing this bill to create a Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review, which would find ways to cut the Federal Government down to size and would report its findings to Congress, together with specific recommendations.

The agency which I seek to create would be an independent arm of the legislative branch of Government, and would be charged with a continuing audit, analysis and review of the programs and projects and I emphasize the words "programs and projects" of the Federal Government with respect to the elimination of unnecessary activities, and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, private or public, such activities as they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than can the Federal Government.

I believe this to be one answer to the growing riddle of how to maintain individual liberty and at the same time a strong Nation.

The need for one, over-all sweeping evaluation of Federal activities on a continuous basis is increasingly becoming apparent.

Therefore, I contend that we cannot achieve any degree of success by investigating the Government piecemeal. Congress must be provided with the right tools to do the job.

Let me say that in introducing this bill I hope it will be given the most thoughtful consideration by the taxpayers and citizens. It is a bill to protect their interests, and to permit those of us who serve in the Congress to give them the "breaks" they deserve—in other words, to control the Government, the size of the Government, and the policies of the Government of the United States.

Between now and next January, when the new Congress will convene, I hope to

receive the constructive views of those interested in assisting, so that we may perfect this plan through adoption of ideas which may have escaped my attention.

Mr. President, I hope each Senator and Representative will study this subject, so I may have the benefit of his views on what may be done along this line. I sincerely believe that it is most urgent that we establish some procedure of this sort, and that we do so at a very early date.

A great deal is involved and much is at stake in this bill to reverse the trend toward socialism.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference the bill, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3482) to establish a legislative bureau for the audit, analysis, and review of Federal Government programs and projects for the purpose of making recommendations to the Congress with respect to the elimination of unnecessary, wasteful, and extravagant activities and for returning to State and local governments or other agencies, public or private, those Government activities which they can perform with greater economy and efficiency than the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to curtail unnecessary and duplicating projects and programs of the Federal Government, to reduce the cost of maintaining and operating the Federal Government, to restore to State and local governments the powers which were reserved to them under the Constitution but which have been gradually assumed by the Federal Government, and to leave to the States sufficient sources of revenue to enable them to carry out their responsibilities, by eliminating those activities now being performed by the Federal Government: (a) which are no longer essential, desirable, useful, or productive; (b) the benefits from which are not commensurate with the costs involved; (c) which can be performed more efficiently or economically by State and local governments or other agencies, public or private; and (d) the performance of which by State or other governmental units is closer to and more responsive to the people as they determine their local needs and which would be more consistent with American principles.

DUTIES OF LEGISLATIVE BUREAU OF AUDIT AND REVIEW

SEC. 2. There is created an establishment of the Government to be known as the Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review, and which shall be independent of the executive department, and under the control and direction of a legislative commissioner. This Bureau shall make a continuing and comprehensive audit, analysis, and review of existing activities of the Federal Government, and of relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments, and upon the basis thereof to make recommendations with respect to the enactment of such legislation, the proposal of such constitutional amendments, and the taking of such other action as may be necessary to carry out the policies expressed in section 1.

APPOINTMENT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER AND DEPUTY LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 3. (a) There shall be in the Legislative Bureau of Audit and Review a legislative commissioner and a deputy legislative commissioner who shall be appointed jointly by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House with the advice and consent of the Senate, and they shall receive such compensation as may be determined from time to time by the Congress. The deputy legislative commissioner shall not be of the same political party as the legislative commissioner and he shall perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the legislative commissioner, and during the absence or incapacity of the legislative commissioner, or during a vacancy in that office, shall act as legislative commissioner.

(b) Except as hereinafter provided in this section, the legislative commissioner and the deputy legislative commissioner shall hold office for — years. The legislative commissioner or the deputy legislative commissioner may be removed at any time by joint resolution of Congress after notice and hearing, when, in the judgment of Congress the legislative commissioner or deputy legislative commissioner has become permanently incapacitated or has been inefficient, or guilty of neglect of duty, or of malfeasance in office, or of any felony or conduct involving moral turpitude, and for no other cause and in no other manner except by impeachment. When a legislative commissioner or deputy legislative commissioner attains the age of 70 years, he shall be retired from his office.

STAFF OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUREAU

SEC. 4. The legislative commissioner shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the classification act of 1949. The legislative commissioner also may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government services, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C., sec. 22a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUREAU

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

POWERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER

SEC. 6. (a) The legislative commissioner, or any member of the bureau authorized by the legislative commissioner, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the legislative commissioner or such bureau member may deem advisable. Any bureau member may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the legislative commissioner or before such member.

(b) The legislative commissioner is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the commissioner upon request made by the legislative commissioner or the deputy legislative commissioner.

REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 7. The legislative commissioner shall transmit to the Congress from time to time reports of his activities under this act.

WORKLOAD OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I have to go to a conference committee, and I would like to have some matters inserted in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point a statement of the workload performed by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate during this session.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE WORK AND WORKLOAD, AS OF JULY 1, 1952, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-second Congress, as of July 1, 1952, comprised 47.3 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 59.6 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; 50.4 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 2,047 written reports filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 1,199, which represents 58.5 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 7,145 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, and 2,216 cases involving adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

Through July 1, 1952, during the Eighty-second Congress, the Judiciary Committee received 1,918 Senate bills and resolutions, and 787 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 2,705 bills and resolutions.

As of July 1, 1952, the committee had disposed of 1,195 Senate bills and resolutions, and 719 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,914 bills and resolutions.

Of the bills thus disposed of 172 were general bills other than claims or immigration; 448 were private relief bills, 1,243 were private immigration bills, 18 were general claims bills, and 33 were general immigration bills.

Committee approval was granted to 593 Senate bills and resolutions, and 608 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 1,201 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

(It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 2 of the 1,201 bills and resolutions approved.)

Of the bills and resolutions acted upon favorably 106 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 277 were private relief bills, 796 were private immigration bills, 11 were general claims bills, and 11 were general immigration bills.

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 602 Senate bills and resolutions, 111 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 713 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of the bills thus acted upon unfavorably 66 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 171 were private relief bills, 447 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 22 were general immigration bills.

Measures pending before the committee as of July 1, 1952, included 723 Senate bills and

resolutions, and 68 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 791 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Of these bills 143 are general bills other than immigration and claims, 112 are private relief bills, 516 are private immigration bills, 15 are general claims bills, and 5 are general immigration bills.

Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. As of July 1, 1952, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports have been requested, but not received, was 601, of which 56 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 51 were private relief bills, 485 were private immigration bills, 8 were general claims bills, and 1 was a general immigration bill.

Thus, it will be seen that out of the 2,705 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled 190, of which 87 were general bills other than claims or immigration, 61 were private relief bills, 31 were private immigration bills, 7 were general claims bills, and 4 were general immigration bills.

It will be noted the committee has disposed of 719 House bills and resolutions, out of 787 such measures referred to it, leaving only 68 House bills and resolutions pending at the close of the session.

This means the committee took action on 91.3 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,918 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 1,195, leaving 723 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to "start from scratch" in all such cases, action was taken on 62.2 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, and adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, are, under authority delegated by the Congress, reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending in the committee 2,761 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 10,529 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 13,290 cases, of which 7,145 were approved, 2,568 were held for further consideration, 81 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving 3,496 cases "in process" as of July 1, 1952.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending 845 cases of adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, to which were added 2,448 additional cases submitted during this Congress, making a total of 3,293 cases, of which 2,216 were approved, and 28 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, 514 were held for further consideration, leaving 535 cases in process, as of July 1, 1952.

Through July 1, 1952, Eighty-second Congress, the committee received 146 executive nominations, of which 38 were Federal judges, 51 were United States district attorneys, 40 were United States marshals, 1 was Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, 1 was Assistant Commissioner of Patents, 1 was Attorney General of the United States, 1 was Deputy Attorney General, 2 were Assistant Attorneys General, 2 were Examiners in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office, and 9 were members of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

As of July 1, 1952, nominations pending totaled 6.

JULY 4, 1952.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. Sourwine:

As of July 1, 1952, during the Eighty-second Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary had reported 53 of the 437 bills and resolutions which were enacted into public laws. The 53 measures reported by the committee are as follows:

Public Law	Bill No.	Title
5	H. R. 335	Sedgwick, Kans., commissioners.
6	H. R. 1000	Alien spouses.
14	H. R. 2339	Federal regulations re subversive aliens.
31	H. R. 3291	Bankruptcy.
32	H. R. 3292	Do.
56	H. R. 389	For relief of State of Maryland.
60	H. R. 3576	To amend DP Act.
61	S. J. Res. 51	Commemorating Independence Day.
62	H. R. 2924	Parole of prisoners.
65	H. R. 2396	Passport frauds.
71	H. R. 1746	Bankruptcy.
75	S. 1042	Motor Carrier Claims Commission.
79	H. R. 2305	Secret Service, basic authority.
93	H. R. 1899	Amending charter, Daughters of American Revolution.
98	H. R. 3455	Parole of prisoners.
114	H. R. 400	Expeditious naturalization of former citizens.
116	H. R. 3142	Japanese evacuation claims.
117	H. R. 3442	To protect emblems, etc., of Girl Scouts.
126	S. 248	Audubon Centennial Year.
128	S. J. Res. 42	Interstate oil and gas compact.
129	H. R. 4106	Permitting photographic reproductions of business records as evidence.
141	S. 13	Employment agency fees.
154	S. 24	Customs Bureau land and building facilities.
194	H. R. 4693	Bankruptcy (Long Island R. R.).
220	H. R. 1181	Payment of claims re correction military or naval records.
223	H. R. 4945	Refunding of forefeited bail.
225	H. J. Res. 308	Stephen Foster Memorial Day.
232	S. 1482	Relief of town of Mount Desert, Maine.
248	H. R. 3899	To amend certain titles of U. S. Code.
250	H. R. 2176	Relief of Fort Pierce Port District.
256	H. R. 4687	Withholding patents for security purposes.
261	H. J. Res. 314	Citizenship Day.
281	S. 1345	Court fees for the District of Columbia, United States district court.
283	S. 1851	Preventing illegal entry of aliens (wet-backs).
300	S. 1184	Youth Correction Act for District of Columbia.
301	S. 1212	Federal savings and loan association.
303	S. 1415	War Claims Act (increased compensation, etc.).
304	S. 1609	War Claims Act (persons under legal disability).
306	S. 2206	Pay increases of certain Navy Department employees.
307	S. 2549	Relief of sheepherding industry.
313	H. J. Res. 423	Temporary extension of emergency statutes.
324	H. J. Res. 382	National Prayer Day.
333	S. 2100	Admission of State prisoners to Federal prisons.
342	S. 1305	Rehabilitation of Federal prisoners.
344	H. J. Res. 445	Proclaiming Olympic Week.
359	S. 2322	Protecting the name of "Smokey Bear."
366	S. J. Res. 156	Extension of emergency statutes to June 15, 1952.
378	S. 302	Amending the Trading With Enemy Act.
395	S. 1932	Establishment of facilities for detention of aliens.
414	H. R. 5678	Revision and codification of immigration laws.
432	S. 2198	Relating to theft or receipt of stolen mail.
435	S. 968	Interstate compact relating to mutual military aid.
437	S. 1537	Extension of patents of World War II veterans.

Fifteen bills and resolutions bypassed Senate committees, among which were Senate Joint Resolution 40, amending War Claims Act; House Joint Resolution 284, one hundredth anniversary of John Howard Payne; Senate Joint Resolution 147, Bataan Day; House Joint Resolution 481 and House Joint Resolution 490, temporary extension of emergency powers; which normally would have come to this committee.

Public laws resulting from bills reported by other Senate committees are:

Agriculture	21
Appropriations	28
Armed Services	51
Atomic Energy	1
Banking and Currency	19
District of Columbia	50
Finance	55
Foreign Relations	10
Government Operations	14
Interior and Insular Affairs	43
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	22
Labor and Public Welfare	10
Post Office and Civil Service	21
Public Works	20
Rules and Administration	4
Total	369

GLOSSARY OF LEFTIST LANGUAGE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Mr. Robert Donner, of Colorado Springs, Colo., has sent me a two-page "Glossary of Leftist Language," the author of which is Mr. Wanden M. Kane, of Fountain, Colo. This list contains, according to its entitlement, "words, phrases, and proper names, as used by Communists, comrades, fellow travelers, Socialists, Socialist fronters, anti-anti-Communists and others of their color." Because I think there is real humor, as well as a great deal of useful information in this little document, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the glossary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GLOSSARY OF LEFTIST LANGUAGE

(By Wanden M. Kane, Fountain, Colo.)

Containing words, phrases and proper names, as used by Communists, comrades, fellow travelers, Socialists, Socialist fronters, anti-anti-Communists, and others of their color, shading from shell pink to bloody red.

Academic freedom: The right to go left.

America: A land of milk and honey. Hurry, honey, and let's milk it for Moscow.

Anti-Defamation League: Our cloak and suit boys—out to get your pants.

Artists: Do we have to say?

Authors: Who said "Take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines; for our vines have tender grapes"?

Bible: The most dangerous book in the world. Must be destroyed.

Bourgeoisie: A bunch of old fuddy-duddies who own their homes, go to church, and plan for their children's future. They must go.

Brotherhood: Sucker-bait for the warm-hearted and soft-minded—who never catch on anyway.

Capitalist: A man who bought a bicycle for his kid and wants to hang on to it.

Christianity: A lot of superstitious notions that are standing in our way.

Constitution: The second most dangerous document in existence. Must be destroyed or bypassed.

C. I. O.: See point 7 of Karl Marx Communist manifesto; then see Brannan farm plan.

Civil rights: Speaking for a lot of people who didn't mention it in the first place.

Democracy: Mob rule, and we rule the mob.

Education: Seeing that the kids learn the right lessons—or nothing at all.

Fascist: That's a good one; they're just like us, but the dopes don't know it.

Foundation: A million-dollar touch. Old man Rockefeller only gave out dimes.

Freedom: Freedom from want—anybody want a Cadillac?

Hatemonger: A good thing to call those who didn't take the bait.

Human rights: They give up everything they've got for this one; lucky they don't understand it.

Isolationist: Someone who doesn't want to help us conquer the world.

Junk pusher: A good man to have around. He'll always peddle the heroin, so the dollars can go back to "good old Joe."

Korea: Bleeding ground.

Left-wing laborites: Highly recommended. Can furnish several bosses trained in school of sabotage at Moscow.

Liberal: Leftist—but they haven't figured that out either.

McCarthyism: People who are breathing down our necks and must be stopped.

Mink: Well, what does it rhyme with?

Mossback: Won't play.

Movie actors: Stout fellers, most of them our boys.

Movie directors: Ditto.

Newspapers: Very good—got most of 'em.

Peace: It's wonderful. Good sucker bait; the Kremlin loves it.

Progressive: Everything going our way—it won't be long now, boys.

Property rights: These guys are tough; try reactionary, hatemonger, mossback, and Fascist on them.

Proletariat: All the underprivileged people we're supposed to be working for; don't tell a soul—they all have cars and washing machines—but keep it quiet.

Psychoanalysis: If the right doctor does it to a millionaire, he can relieve him of his money and his guilt complex (because he's rich) in no time flat. A lot of our boys work this racket.

Reactionary: A man who doesn't want to give up what he's got for what he ain't.

Sex: If they're too dumb to understand the new social order, we call out the bed brigade.

Smear: Our perfected technique. Ye'll like hell if anyone is on to you—scream they've called you dirty names and hurt your civil liberties.

United Nations: A wolf in Bear's clothing.

U. N. flag: Will you come into my parlor, said the spider to the fly?

Women's organizations: Very receptive to packaged birdbrain frozen thinking.

Workingman: Sucker.

Universities: Several have turned out some dillies for us. We recommend Harvard, Columbia, Chicago, Vassar, and Sarah Lawrence.

Youth organizations: Hotbeds of interracial amity.

THE DISPUTES CLAUSE OF THE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT—ITS MISCONSTRUCTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in connection with the discussion on S. 2487, relating to the finality clauses in Government contracts, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks today an extremely able article on this subject prepared for the Law Review of Notre Dame University by the Honorable William Hughes Mulligan, a professor at Fordham University and a member of the bar of the city of New York.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISPUTES CLAUSE OF THE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT—ITS MISCONSTRUCTION

The Government of the United States has been and will continue to be the largest, most extensive, and prolific client of the construction industry in this country. The tremendous military expansion required for World War II saw the erection of Army, Navy, and Air Force installations of unprecedented scope and geographic distribution. The postwar era continued apace with the construction of mammoth hospitals for veterans in mute valedictory to the carnage of victory. The present period, which may well be a prewar era, brings further extension of national defense facilities, construction of atomic energy installations, and rehabilitation of the sprawling posts, camps, and stations of the past war. This recent history of concentrated building on behalf of the United States has brought with it a corresponding flood of litigation which accentuates the importance of a document undramatically entitled "United States Standard Form of Contract No. 23," the legal instrument creating, defining, and describing the mutual rights and obligations of the contractor and his Government in all of the varied construction operations described.[1] Much of the litigation arising from the performance of this gigantic program of construction involves the interpretation of the various standard clauses found in United States Standard Contract No. 23. With the tightening of credit controls and the conservation and allocation of scarce building materials, the contractor, small as well as large, is more and more occupied with Federal building programs. The subcontractor (the plumber, the painter, the electrician, the ironworker, the plasterer and lather, the mason, and the excavator) does not escape the requirements of the standard Government construction contract, since it is usual to incorporate in the private subcontract a provision subjecting the subcontractor to all of the terms, agreements, and provisions of the contract subsisting between the prime contractor and the United States. It therefore behooves an ever-widening segment of the bar to be familiar with the standard contract.[2] This article will be limited to a discussion of the legal aspects of one of the clauses, article 15, the disputes provision, found in this contract.

Perhaps most of the litigation involving the standard Government contract has been created by the very provision which was designed to avoid it. The disputes clause usually provides: [3]

"ART. 15. Disputes: Except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract, all disputes concerning questions of fact arising under this contract shall be decided by the contracting officer subject to written appeal by the contractor within 30 days to the head of the department concerned or his duly authorized representative, whose decision shall be final and conclusive upon the parties thereto. In the meantime the contractor shall diligently proceed with the work as directed."

The object of the quoted article has been stated by the Supreme Court of the United States as follows:[4]

"It creates a mechanism whereby adjustments may be made and errors corrected on an administrative level, thereby permitting the Government to mitigate or avoid large damage claims that might otherwise be created. * * * This mechanism, moreover, is exclusive in nature. Solely through its operation may claims be made and adjudicated as to matters arising under the contract."

However laudable and refreshing the thought of saving Government funds may be, a study of the cases will reveal that the failure of the Supreme Court to supply the mechanism with the necessary lubrication of reasonable construction and interpretation has resulted in a Frankenstein creation. Retooling and replacement of parts appear to be in order.

At the outset it should be noted that this procedure set up by article 15 provides an exclusive avenue of relief. An aggrieved contractor must exhaust the administrative procedure before he can litigate in the Court of Claims.[5] He must first protest to the contracting officer; [6] if redress is not forthcoming, he must then appeal in writing within

[1] The United States Standard Form of Construction Contract No. 23 was adopted and approved by the President in 1926 and revised in 1940. On the back of the last page it is noted: "1. This form shall be used for every formal contract for the construction of or repair of public buildings or works, but its use will not be required in foreign countries. 2. There shall be no deviation from this standard contract form, except as provided for in these directions, and except as authorized by the Director of Procurement." See *Pfotzer* v. *United States* (77 Supp. 390 (Ct. Cl. 1948)).

[2] Thus in *United States ex rel. Gillioz* v. *John Kerns Const. Co.* (50 F. Supp. 692 (E. D. Ark. 1943)), the subcontractor's right to recover against the contractor for delays was denied by reason of the finality of the contracting officer's decision which was binding not only upon the contractor, but also on the relator whose subcontract was expressly made subject to the main contract.

[3] The contracting officer named in the contract is usually a professional engineer regularly employed by the department of Government requesting the construction. He might be the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army, or a corresponding official in the U. S. Air Force, Navy, or in a civilian department of the Government. The head of department is, as the name implies, the administrative official in control, subject only to the President. Thus, the head of the department might be the Secretary of the Army, Navy, Interior, etc. He may have delegated his duties under this type contract to a Board of Contract Appeals" sitting in Washington, D. C. See the discussion of these boards in *McWilliams Dredging Co.* v. *United States* (118 Ct. Cl. 1, 16, 17 (1950)).

[4] *United States* v. *Holpuch Co.* (328 U. S. 234, 239–40, 66 S. Ct. 1,000, 90 L. Ed. 1192 (1946)).

[5] Id., 328 U. S. at 240. The controlling statute, 28 U. S. C., sec. 1491 (Supp. 1951), provides: "The Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to render judgment upon any claim against the United States: (4) Founded upon any express or implied contract with the United States."

[6] Usually the contracting officer has representatives on the job site, project engineers, inspectors or superintendents. Protest to the contracting officer is usually required by the contract to be in writing. Oral protest, even though followed by a written opinion of the Judge Advocate General favorable to the contractor and approved by the Assistant Secretary of War, and unfruitful negotiation were held insufficient to waive the requirement of the contract. *Sanford & Brooks Co.* v. *United States* (267 U. S. 455, 45 S. Ct. 341, 69 L. Ed. 734 (1925)); accord, *United States* v. *Cunningham* (125 F. (2d) 28 (D. C. Cir. 1941)).

30 days to the head of the department concerned.[7] Failure to exhaust the administrative remedy is fatal to the contractor.[8] This rule has been adhered to by the Supreme Court[9] even though the conduct of the representative of the contracting officer was so abusive and flagrantly unreasonable that the contractor had concluded that protest and appeal would be a waste of time. In a dissenting opinion, Justice Frankfurter characterized the conduct of the Government engineers as "willful and oppressive" and as a "systematic practice of unjustified demands and vexations."[10] The majority of the Court argued that it was not reasonable for the contractor to assume that the same antisocial attitude of the minor officials involved would pervade the entire department to top levels.[11] The contractor had been successful in the Court of Claims, urging inter alia, that as a practical matter, appeals and protests would only further antagonize the on-the-site representative of the Government who resented any reflections upon his judgment and who would further harass operations as the job continued.[12]

AN AVENUE OF ESCAPE?

At first blush it would seem that article 15 does not completely shut the door to judicial review. As the clause in question is quoted above, it appears that the jurisdiction of the contracting officer and the department head are limited to questions of fact. The ready suggestion would be that with respect to questions of law, access to the Court of Claims could be gained without resorting first to administrative remedies. There is authority for this distinction and the contractor has been afforded a judicial review without appealing to the department head where the dispute involved a question of law rather than fact.[13] However, the contractor must be wary and his attempt to avoid the administrative toils may be thwarted.

First: In some cases article 15 is not limited on its face to questions of fact. There are cases where the article provides that "all disputes arising under the contract" are to be determined by the contracting officer subject to appeal to the department head. The Court of Claims vigorously challenged the validity of the "all disputes" clause:[14]

But the competency of the parties to so stipulate, as the courts have many times pointed out, is limited to the decision of questions of fact arising under the contract, such as the quantity and quality of materials delivered, whether the work performed meets contract requirements, causes of delay in the performance of the work, etc. These are questions of fact, the correct solution of which is usually largely dependent on professional knowledge and skill. * * * "But the disputed question here—whether the plaintiff under the terms of the contract was required to furnish the materials demanded by the contracting officer—was not one of fact. It was a disputed question of law—the proper construction of the contract—a question the decision of which was outside the jurisdiction of the contracting officer or head of the department, it being the province of the courts to declare the law of the contract."

Three years later, the Court of Claims in *John McShain, Inc.* v. *United States*,[15] reaffirmed this specific holding. The Solicitor General petitioned for a writ of certiorari, urging that the decision was the "culmination of a recent tendency in the Court of Claims to whittle away the authority of designated officers of the United States to make final decisions under contracts."[16] Certiorari was granted[17] and the judgment reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States in a per curiam opinion.[18] In a later decision the Court emphatically reaffirmed the validity of the "all disputes" clause.[19] With some reluctance[20] the Court of Claims has followed the determination of the Supreme Court.

It would seem clear, therefore, that if article 15 provides for administrative jurisdiction of "all disputes," the contractor must exhaust his remedy in the department before proceeding to the Court of Claims.[21]

Second: Even if the disputes clause is limited to disputed questions of fact, the contractor's attorney must still be cautious. Article 15 commences with the language "except as otherwise specifically provided in this contract. * * *" Normally, article 1 of the contract incorporates into the main agreement the drawings and specifications. In these voluminous documents counsel for the contractor may find some interesting language which precludes escape from administrative appeal and finality of the determination of the department head. In *Pfotzer* v. *United States*,[22] the Court of Claims was faced with a situation where the contractor and the contracting officer had differed as to whether certain work performed was included within the drawings and specifications. The contractor urged that the decision of the contracting officer and department head denying him extra compensation was based upon an interpretation of the contract and was therefore a question of law and not fact. The Government relied on paragraph 1-07 of the specifications which provided:[23]

"Unless otherwise specifically set forth, the contractor shall furnish all materials, plant, supplies, equipment, labor, etc., necessary to complete the work according to the true intent and meaning of the drawings and specifications, of which intent and meaning the contracting officer shall be the interpreter."

Despite the incorporation by reference of the specifications, the Court of Claims held that where article 15 mentions "this contract," it refers to the Standard Form 23 and not the specifications; that article 15 was paramount to the specifications and that the quoted language of the specifications was only intended to keep the work progressing under the direction of the contracting officer and was not designed to give him final authority with respect to an interpretation of the contract, which was held to be a question of law and not fact. The Supreme Court denied the Government's petition for certiorari.[24] The Court of Claims, in *Moorman* v. *United States*,[25] was presented with a similar problem. The contractor had agreed to grade the site of an aircraft assembly plant at a unit price of 24 cents per cubic yard in strict accordance with the drawings and specifications. A taxiway was shown on the drawings but was not located within the plant site as described in the specifications. A dispute arose as to whether or not the contractor was required to grade the taxiway and whether the unit price applied. Paragraph 2-16 of the specifications provided that if the contractor objected to performing any work as not within the contract, he must protest in writing to the contracting officer and, if not satisfied, may appeal to the Secretary of War whose decision would be "final and binding." There was the usual article 15 limiting administrative jurisdiction to questions of fact. Following its decision in the *Pfotzer* case, the Court of Claims held that article 15, limited to fact questions, was governing; that the specification section involved, properly interpreted, only meant that such decision was final and binding to the extent provided in article 15 of the contract; and that since under article 15, only decisions upon disputed questions of fact were final, the instant determination involving a question of contract interpretation was one of law and thus not conclusive upon the contractor. The Court of Claims therefore made its own findings and permitted the contractor to recover 59.3 cents per cubic yard for the taxiway grading instead of the 24-cent unit price provided in the specifications. The Solicitor General again petitioned for a writ of certiorari which was granted.[26] The petition urged that this decision plus pre-

---

[7] Upon appeal the contracting officer usually prepares findings of fact which are forwarded to the contractor who responds by comment and brief. Failure to serve the contractor with a copy of the findings has been held to nullify the finality of the department head's decision and to permit the contractor to proceed in the Court of Claims. *Sachs* v. *United States* (63 F. Supp. 59 (Ct. Cl. 1945)).

[8] *United States* v. *Callahan Walker Co.* (317 U. S. 56, 63 S. Ct. 113, 87 L. Ed. 49 (1942)).

[9] *United States* v. *Holpuch Co.* (328 U. S. 234, 66 S. Ct. 1000, 90 L. Ed. 1192 (1946)); *United States* v. *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[10] *United States* v. *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 740, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[11] Id., 321 U. S. at 736. The unreasonable conduct of a contracting officer, who is "repellant" of appeal, as distinguished from similarly unreasonable conduct of a contracting officer's underling, excused administrative appeal in *United States* v. *L. P. & J. A. Smith* (256 U. S. 11, 41 S. Ct. 413, 65 L. Ed. 808 (1921)).

[12] *Blair* v. *United States* (99 Ct. Cl. 71 (1924), rev'd, 321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[13] See *Western Well Drilling Co.* v. *United States*, 96 F. Supp. 377 (N. D. Calif. 1951), where a contractor was permitted to sue under the Tucker Act, 28 U. S. C., §§ 1346, 2401, 2402 (Supp. 1951), even though he did not first appeal to the department head, since the finding of the contracting officer that no "changed condition," as defined by article 4 of the contract, existed was a determination of law and not of fact. *Rust Engineering Co.* v. *United States*, 86 Ct. Cl. 461 (1938), permitted the contractor to sue in the Court of Claims on a similar distinction.

[14] *Davis* v. *United States*, 82 Ct. Cl. 334, 346-7 (1936).

[15] 88 Ct. Cl. 284, 297 (1939).

[16] The petition is noted in *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 460, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[17] *United States* v. *John McShain, Inc.*, (307 U. S. 619, 59 S. Ct. 1043, 83 L. Ed. 1499 (1939)).

[18] *United States* v. *John McShain, Inc.* (308 U. S. 512, 60 S. Ct. 134, 84 L. Ed. 437, order amended, 308 U. S. 520, 60 S. Ct. 134, 84 L. Ed. 437 (1939)).

[19] *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 460-462, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[20] *George F. Driscoll Co.* v. *United States* (63 F. Supp. 657 (Ct. Cl. 1945) (Whitaker J., and Madden, J., dissenting), cert. denied, 328 U. S. 854, 66 S. Ct. 1340, 90 L. Ed. 1626 (1946)).

[21] The vast weight of authority supports the validity of clauses in contracts appointing an impartial umpire as a final arbiter of all disputes arising under the contract. See Notes, 54 A. L. R. 1255 (1928), 110 A. L. R. 137 (1937), Indiana is contra. *McCoy* v. *Able* (131 Ind. 417, 30 N. E. 528 (1892)). There it was held that such a provision was an improper attempt to oust the courts of jurisdiction. The arbitrator's finding was entitled only to prima facie validity and was not conclusive.

[22] 77 F. Supp. 390 (Ct. Cl. 1948).

[23] Id. at 399.

[24] *United States* v. *Pfotzer*, 335 U. S. 885, 69 S. Ct. 237, 93 L. Ed. 424 (1948).

[25] 82 F. Supp. 1010 (Ct. Cl. 1949).

[26] *United States* v. *Moorman*, 338 U. S. 810, 70 S. Ct. 58, 94 L. Ed. 490 (1949).

vious holdings of the [27] Court of Claims had "weakened and narrowed the effectiveness of the well-established policy of the Government to settle, without expensive litigation disputes arising under its contracts."

The Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the Court of Claims in a unanimous opinion written by Justice Black which castigated the lower court with obvious relish.[28] The Court reaffirmed the legality of contractual provisions designed to effect speedy settlement of all disputes, factual or legal, at an administrative level. Whether the determination at issue was one of fact or law, the contracting officer was held to have jurisdiction and the determination of the department head was final under the specific language of paragraph 2–16 of the specifications, which was to be construed with article 15 and which was not nullified by it. The Court pointed out: [29]

"The oft-repeated conclusion of the Court of Claims that questions of interpretation are not questions of fact is ample reason why the parties to the contract should provide for final determination of such disputes by a method wholly separate from the fact-limited provisions of article 15."

The stanch judicial blessing of the Supreme Court to specification provisions conferring finality upon decisions of the contracting officer (if affirmed by the department head) in interpreting the requirements of the contract, makes it mandatory for counsel representing the contractor to read beyond the standard printed contract form to the bewildering engineering and architectural data of the specifications, if he is to advise his client properly as to his remedies under the contract. The avenue of escape from appeal to department head or from the finality of his decision may well be a mirage.

HOW FINAL IS FINAL

Assume that an aggrieved contractor has appealed from an adverse determination of the contracting officer whose decision has been upheld by the department head. Assume further that the dispute involves a question of fact within the contracting officer's jurisdiction under the usual article 15, or a question of law wihin his jurisdiction under the judicially sanctioned all-disputes article 15 or under a special clause of the specifications. The vexatious question arises: to what extent is his decision "final and conclusive" as the contract literally provides?

The Supreme Court in 1854,[30] in determining the conclusiveness to be accorded a commercial arbitration award provided for by contract, warned that a court of equity should not set aside an award simply for error in judgment or to substitute its judgment for that of the arbiter selected by the parties. However, the Court pointed out that "corruption" or "gross mistake" [31] on the part of the arbitrator would warrant equitable intervention. In 1878 the Court, in upholding the validity of the disputes clause, stated that the findings of a contracting officer were final "in the absence of fraud or such gross mistake as would necessarily imply bad faith. • • •" [32] The rule was restated in a later case which held that such determination was final and conclusive "unless impeached on the ground of fraud, or such gross mistake as necessarily implied bad faith." [33]

An even more complete exposition of the obligations of the contracting officer is revealed in *Ripley* v. *United States*,[34] decided by the Supreme Court in 1912. There, the contractor claimed that he was prejudiced by the arbitrary refusal of the contracting officer to permit blocks to be placed on a jetty, which delayed the progress of the job. The Court stated: [35]

"But the very extent of the power and the conclusive character of his decision raised a corresponding duty that the agent's judgment should be exercised not capriciously or fraudulently, but reasonably, and with due regard to the rights of both the contracting parties. The finding by the court that the inspector's refusal was a gross mistake and an act of bad faith necessarily, therefore, leads to the conclusion that the contractor was entitled to recover the damages caused thereby."

In 1950 the Supreme Court, in the Moorman case,[36] reiterated its position that either fraud or gross mistake would lift the curtain of conclusiveness so as to permit judicial scrutiny.[37] In Penner Installation Corp. versus United States [38] which was held in abeyance until the Supreme Court reached a decision in the Moorman case, the Court of Claims reviewed its prior holdings on the question and concluded that it was not bound by the determination of the contracting officer on a question of fact, affirmed by the department head, when the evidence disclosed that "The decisions of the contracting officer and the head of the department • • • were arbitrary and so grossly erroneous as to imply bad faith." [39] The court had in the past formulated and continued to announce the rule in substantially that language.[40] The rationale of this rule espoused by the Court of Claims had its genesis in the language of the Ripley case [41] referred to above. The Court of Claims, after reviewing its prior rulings, admitted in the Penner decision that the contracting officer was properly in a unique, unenviable position. Although the representative of the Government in the performance of the contract and charged with the responsibility of insuring that the Government receives precisely what it bargained for, he must, in the event of a dispute, assume the capacity of an impartial referee eager to do justice to the rights of both contracting parties. And if the evidence discloses his failure to act impartially, if there is no substantial basis upon which his decision can be supported ("arbitrary and capricious" seem to be the judicial epithets characterizing this situation) or when it is grossly erroneous, he has not been faithful to his duty to act impartially, he is in bad faith and his determination is not conclusive. Bad faith, therefore, does not imply that the contracting officer has been unfaithful to his employer, but unfaithful to his duty as impartial arbiter. The Court of Claims concluded that the contracting officer had betrayed that trust in the Penner case and awarded judgment to the contractor.[42] The Supreme Court granted certiorari,[43] affirmed the judgment by an equally divided Court [44] and finally denied a rehearing.[45] One might conclude that the law was rather well settled.

THE WUNDERLICH CASE

In *Wunderlich* v. *United States*,[46] the Court of Claims was again faced with the usual problems which have been discussed. The plaintiff had contracted to erect a dam in Colorado in 1938. He performed certain work which was allegedly beyond the contract requirements. A principal dispute involved the amount recoverable for the maintenance and repair of machinery and equipment. The contracting officer fixed rates on an hourly basis which did not reflect any substantial variation in amount for equipment ranging from a $207 jack hammer to a $39,000 drag line. This allowance was termed "arbitrary" and "capricious" by the court which permitted the contractor to recover some $172,000.[47] Certiorari was granted by the Supreme Court.[48] and judgment was reversed in a 6–3 decision with a startling opinion by Justice Minton.[49] The opinion is startling not because it reversed judgment for Wunderlich but because the rule it announces has "wide application and a devastating effect." [50] The Court emasculated "gross mistake" from the exception to administrative finality and announced that fraud was the only exception to the conclusiveness of the determination under article 15. The Court defined fraud as "conscious wrongdoing, an intention to cheat or be dishonest." [51] The Court further stated: "The decision of the department head, absent fraudulent conduct, must stand under the plain meaning of the contract." [52] The Court admitted that other words such as negligence, incompetence, capriciousness, and arbitrary had appeared in the opinions but stated that "this Court has consistently upheld the finality of the department head's

---

[27] The petition for certiorari is quoted in the opinion of the Supreme Court on the merits, *United States* v. *Moorman*, 338 U. S. 457, 460, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950).

[28] Id., 338 U. S. at 462–3.

[29] Id., 338 U. S. at 463.

[30] *Burchell* v. *Marsh*, 17 How. 344, 15 L. Ed. 96 (U. S. 1854).

[31] Id., 15 L. Ed. at 99.

[32] *Kihlberg* v. *United States*, 97 U. S. 398, 24 L. Ed. 1106, 1108 (1878).

[33] *Martinsburg & P. R. R.* v. *March*, 114 U. S. 549, 5 S. Ct. 1035, 1038, 29 L. Ed. 255 (1885).

[34] 223 U. S. 695, 32 S. Ct. 352, 56 L. Ed. 614 (1912).

[35] Id., 32 S. Ct. at 355.

[36] *United States* v. *Moorman* (338 U. S. 457, 70 S. Ct. 288, 94 L. Ed. 256 (1950)).

[37] The Court, id., 338 U. S. at 461, cited with approval the language of the Court in *Martinsburg & P. R. R.* v. *March* (114 U. S. 549, 5 S. Ct. 1035, 29 L. Ed. 255 (1885)). See note 33 supra.

[38] 89 F. Supp. 545 (C. Cl. 1950).

[39] Id. at 563.

[40] See, e. g., *Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.* v. *United States* (90 F. Supp. 963, 965 (Ct. Cl. 1950)); *Loftis* v. *United States* (76 F. Supp. 816, 827 (Ct. Cl. 1948)); *Needles* v. *United States* (101 Ct. Cl. 535, 601–7 (1944)); *Bein* v. *United States* (101 Ct. Cl. 144, 166 (1943)). But see *Henry Ericsson Co.* v. *United States* (62 F. Supp. 312 (Ct. Cl. 1945)), where the court found that the contracting officer had ruled adversely to the contractor because he was "unaware" of the basis of the claim. The court, id. at 327, saw "no point in applying words as 'arbitrary,' 'capricious,' or 'bad faith,' which are obviously inapplicable, in order to reach the result which justice demands. We think that unawareness of the problem on the part of the deciding officer is an equally good reason why his decision should lack finality."

[41] *Ripley* v. *United States* (223 U. S. 695, 32 S. Ct. 352, 56 L. Ed. 614 (1912)). See discussion in text at note 34 supra.

[42] *Penner Installation Corp.* v. *United States* (89 F. Supp. 545, 548–50 (Ct. Cl. 1950)).

[43] *United States* v. *Penner Installation Corp.* (340 U. S. 808, 71 S. Ct. 55, 95 L. Ed. 594 (1950)).

[44] *United States* v. *Penner Installation Corp.* (340 U. S. 898, 71 S. Ct. 278, 95 L. Ed. 651 (1950)).

[45] 340 U. S. 923, 71 S. Ct. 356, 95 L. Ed. 667 (1951).

[46] 117 Ct. Cl. 92 (1950).

[47] Id. at 217–9.

[48] *United States* v, *Wunderlich* (341 U. S. 924, 71 S. Ct. 795, 95 L. Ed. 1356 (1951)).

[49] *United States* v. *Wunderlich* (— U. S. —, 72 S. Ct. 154, 96 L. Ed. •67 (1951)). Justices Douglas and Jackson each dissented in separate opinions. Justice Reed concurred in the opinion of Justice Douglas.

[50] Id., (72 S. Ct. at 156).

[51] Id. (72 S. Ct. at 155).

[52] Ibid.

decision unless it was founded on fraud, alleged and proved."[53] The Court suggested that the respondent was not coerced, but had voluntarily entered the contract providing for the settlement of disputes in this manner. If the standard of fraud proposed was too narrow, the Court suggested that this was a matter for Congress to determine.

In his dissenting opinion Justice Douglas eloquently expressed his abhorrence at a rule which dispensed such uncontrolled discretion to a contracting officer who would be immune from judicial intervention no matter how negligent, capricious, stubborn, or incompetent he might prove to be. Justice Jackson, in a separate dissenting opinion, commented unfavorably on the excision of gross mistake from the rule to which the Court had previously subscribed. He observed that "Men are more often bribed by their loyalties and ambitions than by money."[54]

The holding of the majority opinion would seem not only to be a departure from precedent, which was both unnecessary and unfortunate, but to be based upon specious reasoning. The argument that the plain meaning of the contract requires that only fraud be excepted overlooks the fact that neither "fraud" nor "mistake" is mentioned in article 15. Both exceptions have been engrafted by the judicial interpretation of the Supreme Court in the line of decisions discussed above. The argument that the contractor voluntarily entered the contract and therefore agreed to the arbitral disposition overlooks the following points: (1) If the contractor had consulted counsel with respect to the finality of article 15, he could hardly have had the good fortune to retain a combination lawyer, prophet, seer who would have been able to predict this departure from precedent. One of the homely virtues of stare decisis is the reasonable expectation of properly advising clients; (2) the argument further overlooks the fact that the Government construction contract is about as flexible as an insurance contract insofar as its standard clauses are concerned.[55] It is in reality a contract of "adhesion." The contractor is in no position to bargain as to its terms, to select an independent arbiter, or to propose an entire elimination of the disputes clause. Even if the courts do not go to the extremes of interpretation found in the insurance cases, it should not be overlooked that the Government prepared the instrument. Moreover, the Supreme Court has held:[56]

"Although there will be exceptions, in general the United States as a contractor must be treated as other contractors under analogous situations. When problems of the interpretation of its contracts arise the law of contracts governs."

This judicial accolade upon unfettered discretion of the arbiter has little support in analogous situations in the law.[57] (3) The argument finally overlooks a fact already adverted to: the lack of availability of other civilian work of comparable size. Tightening of credit requirements and shortages of materials constantly exert economic pressure upon the contractor to undertake governmental work. Choice to sign the contract may simply be choice to remain in business.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Id., 72 S. Ct., at 157.

[55] See note 1, supra.

[56] *United States* v. *Standard Rice Co.* (323 U. S. 106, 65 S. Ct. 145, 89 L. Ed. 104 (1944)).

[57] See, e. g., the architect certificate cases, Restatement, Contracts, sec. 303 (f) (1932), excusing the condition if the architect, surveyor or engineer is guilty of gross error in regard to the facts on which the refusal is based. See also 13 McQuillin, Municipal Corporations, sec. 37.155 (3d ed. 1950).

AFTERMATH TO WUNDERLICH

More important than its questionable legal basis, the Wunderlich case presents grave practical and political difficulties which Congress should remedy. The clash between Court of Claims and Supreme Court has not been restricted to the interpretation of article 15 alone.[58] The attitude of the lower bench has been consistently responsive to the fact that the contractor did not prepare and could not vary the terms of the instrument. That court has implied constructive conditions of good faith and cooperation on the part of the Government.[59] The Supreme Court has rarely acknowledged these considerations, although in a dissenting opinion in the Blair case,[60] Justice Frankfurter observed rather elegantly that "* * * Government contracts have interstices that secrete relevant implications."[61] The unreasonable, vexatious, and oppressive conduct of the Government agents in that case prompted the dissenting Justice to agree with the Court of Claims that appeal within the department involved was excused.

The Court of Claims has also been much more familiar with and cognizant of the stresses and strains accompanying the Government construction project and the relationship between the contractor and the contracting officer. The contracting officer is properly charged with the responsibility of assuring the Government of the performance it has bargained for. His presence personally or by representative, as the job progresses, is indispensable. Left to his own devices, the contractor might attempt to disregard the stringent requirements of Government contracts. When a question of interpretation of drawings or specifications arises it must be his responsibility to make decisions and keep the work progressing. No reasonable person could suggest otherwise. The difficulty arises where a dispute occurs and he is required to temporarily forsake his role of Government representative and act as impartial arbiter. It becomes extremely difficult in practice to suddenly change character. It is roughly comparable to suggesting that the attorney for the defendant who has represented his client through the pleadings, motions, and negotiations be now the judge of the merits of the case on trial. The contracting officer, no matter how well disposed, does not and cannot operate in a vacuum. He can hardly help but be partial to the Government. Moreover, the actual performance of the work often engenders an aura of mutual suspicion and distrust. The Government representative may feel that the contractor's sole concern is to make a profit at Government expense. On the other hand, the contractor may consider him an unbending civil servant enmeshed in reams of red tape, directives, and channels of command which have deprived him of any independence or flexibility of action. Whether one or the other is accurate in his appraisal or whether both are partially correct is wholly immaterial. The undeniable fact is that the atmosphere exists in many cases.

The unfortunate Wunderlich decision takes no cognizance of this reality. Incompetence, caprice, stubborn, or unimaginative adherence to supposed duty are not proscribed; the sole criterion is a conscious design to be dishonest or to cheat. A striking example of the necessity of much broader judicial review was revealed in *Stafford* v. *United States*.[62] The contractor had agreed to plant some 10,000 trees and shrubs upon a Government project over an area 15 blocks by 3 blocks. The contract provided for liquidated damages in the event of delay beyond the specified time. There was only one Government inspector on the job and he insisted on personally supervising the planting of each tree and shrub. He even demanded the uprooting of those which were planted in his absence. The contractor's demand for more inspections was refused. The contractor, "between the rock and the whirlpool,"[63] as the Court of Claims described it, had no alternative but to work with a single crew. The court permitted a recovery for the damages caused by this action. However, the court emphasized that it had no doubt of the inspector's sincerity.[64] It is precisely this type of arbitrary action which Wunderlich has placed beyond review. Rare indeed will be the case where the contracting officer is consciously attempting to defraud or cheat the contractor. And rare will be the case where it could be proved. The Wunderlich case teaches that fraud cannot be presumed. A determination which could not be arrived at by reasonable men could be the product of incompetence or of an overdeveloped, out-of-proportion sense of duty as well as the result of fraud.

That appeal to a department head is an unsatisfactory method of curing improper action in lower echelons would seem to be attested by reviewing the cases in the Court of Claims. The reports and recommendations of subordinate officials, acquiring age, bulk, and respectability as they proceed to swim upstream to top levels through the mystifying channels of Government departments, may well find acceptance at face value. The tendency to emphasize the solution of factual and legal disputes within the limits of Government agencies to the practical exclusion of courts of record, is alarming. Traditionally a suitor is entitled to a "day in court": this should be literally true, he should not be relegated to administrative bureaus. The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims has been seriously whittled down by these decisions. It would seem entirely proper and just that Congress revise and rewrite article 15 so as to assure the contractor a day in the Court of Claims if the action taken below is "arbitrary, capricious, or so grossly erroneous as to imply bad faith." If the contracting officer and department head are to be placed in the incongruous position of impartial arbiter, then their jurisdiction should not extend to the determination of questions of contract law. Presumably the Court of Claims is a more competent forum for the settlement of legal disputes if the system of "checks and balances" is to be maintained.

WILLIAM HUGHES MULLIGAN.[65]

[58] The courts have also differed in their interpretations of articles 3, 4, and 9. See *United States* v. *Rice* (317 U. S. 61, 63 S. Ct. 120, 87 L Ed. 53 (1942) (articles 3 and 4 referring to changed conditions)); *United States* v. *Foley Co.* (329 U. S. 64, 67 S. Ct. 154, 91 L. Ed. 44 (1946) (article 9 referring to delays)). The law review comments were adverse to the rulings of the Supreme Court: Anderson, Damages for Delays in the Law of Government Contracts, 21 So. Calif. L. Rev. 125 (1948); Coblens, Liability of the Owner for Delaying Contractor's Work—The Foley Case, 21 So. Calif. L. Rev. 36 (1947); 26 Nebr. L. Bull. 457 (1947).

[59] See, e. g., *Kehm Corp.* v. *United States* (93 F. Supp. 620, 623 (Ct. Cl. 1950)).

[60] *United States* v *Blair* (321 U. S. 730, 64 S. Ct. 820, 88 L. Ed. 1039 (1944)).

[61] Id., 321 U. S. at 738.

[62] 74 F. Supp. 155 (Ct. Cl. 1947).

[63] Id. at 162.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Professor of Law, Fordham University. A. B., 1939, LL. B., 1942, Fordham University. Associated with the firm of Manning, Harnisch, Hollinger, Quinnan & Shea, New York City. Member, New York County Lawyers Association. Contributor of articles to various legal periodicals.

ALTERATION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES OVER NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, because I have to attend a committee meeting, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 2015, House bill 8127, which was unanimously passed by the Public Works Committee. I may say that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] had a similar bill in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have any knowledge of whether the bridge over the Delaware River has been included?

Mr. MAYBANK. It provides for the alteration of bridges over navigable waters so as to include highway bridges.

I can only say that the Senate of the United States passed the bill unanimously in 1950. The House passed it the other day unanimously, and it came to the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, it is a bill the Senate has passed once before——

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And it permits the building or rebuilding of bridges over navigable waters under the Federal Highway Act, which allows contributions by the Federal Government to the States. That is all it would do.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all it would do.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say to the acting minority leader that I believe the bill is perfectly fair, and is in accord with what we have already done.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is in accordance with what we have already done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, together with the accompanying papers.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, and Mr. D'EWART were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 7317. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2097).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

H. R. 5567. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2098).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 948. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; without amendment (Rept. No. 2096);

H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Milagros Aujero; without amendment (Rept. No. 2107);

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta; without amendment (Rept. No. 2099);

H. R. 2840. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck; without amendment (Rept. No. 2108);

H. R. 4634. A bill for the relief of Johann Komma; without amendment (Rept. No. 2109);

H. R. 5442. A bill for the relief of Martin A. Dekking; without amendment (Rept. No. 2110);

H. R. 5624. A bill for the relief of Iokusaburo Imamura Glasscock; without amendment (Rept. No. 2111);

H. R. 6915. A bill for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill; without amendment (Rept. No. 2112);

H. R. 6939. A bill for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson; without amendment (Rept. No. 2113);

H. R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2114);

H. R. 7665. A bill for the relief of Annalyn Earley; without amendment (Rept. No. 2115);

H. R. 7713. A bill for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy; without amendment (Rept. No. 2116); and

H. R. 8163. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier; without amendment (Rept. No. 2117).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 3186. A bill to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army ground forces or commanded an Army during World War II, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 2105).

By Mr. LEHMAN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

H. R. 7722. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 2106).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 8321. A bill to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor Minnesota and Wisconsin; without amendment (Rept. No. 2104).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

H. R. 4792. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 2103).

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9380–9396 of House Proceedings of July 3, 1952.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HILL. The conference report is unanimous, signed by all the conferees, and has just been adopted by the House of Representatives by a vote of 321 to 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NORTH DAKOTA HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD two letters which I inadvertantly omitted in connection with an insertion I made in the RECORD yesterday.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMITTEE,
Bismarck, N. Dak., June 13, 1952.

Mr. PYKE JOHNSON,
President, Automotive Safety Foundation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Our Governor's highway safety conference held at Bismarck on

May 12 and 13 adopted the attached resolution.

In order to carry forward the purpose of this resolution it is the intent of the legislative research committee to prepare an interim report that can furnish the basis for legislative action at the next general assembly.

The objectives of the resolution have been discussed with various members of your staff, as well as the director of the State and Local Officials' National Highway Safety Committee.

The purpose of this letter is to request that the Foundation make available to the committee the services of Norman Damon, vice president, in charge of safety, to assist us in the development of this interim report.

Yours very truly,

ROY A. HOLAND, *Chairman.*

AUTOMOTIVE SAFETY FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.

Mr. ROY A. HOLAND,
Chairman, Legislative Research Committee, Bismarck, N. Dak.

DEAR MR. HOLAND: In response to your request of June 13 for Norman Damon's services in the development of an interim legislative safety report, I am glad to advise that Mr. Damon is available. He now plans to be in Bismarck on Tuesday, July 15, at which time he will, no doubt, discuss with you, your staff, and others the necessary steps in the formulation of the report to which you refer.

We have always felt that the leadership for responsibility of this kind is one for people of the State through their legislature, and your committee's decision to carry this study forward is one that certainly is welcome here, and we want to do everything possible to assist.

Sincerely,

PYKE JOHNSON, *President.*

COMPENSATION OF INDIANS FOR TRAVEL EXPENSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on various occasions I have called attention of the Senate to the fact that of all the treaties ever made with Indians, not a single one has ever been kept. As a matter of fact, the Indians today are worse off than when we took them over a long time ago.

In that connection, I wish to say that I agree with a letter that was written by an Indian tribe. I ask unanimous consent that I may have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Re S. 2338, H. R. 5857.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: S. 2338, "To authorize pay to delegates representing Indians of California from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California," is important to the Indians and merits your consideration.

The fund is the result of efforts of a few of the Indians, beginning back in 1920, who insisted the Indians of California had never been compensated for their rights in land within the State. It was their united persistence that culminated in a jurisdictional act to determine the amount due that resulted in judgment of more than $5,000,000.

At the time Congress appropriated, to satisfy the judgment, Senator Elmer Thomas told his Committee on Senate Appropriations:

"I am free to say that Mr. Collett has been here for many years and has done a vast amount of work. Had it not been for Mr. Collett and his associates, I am doubtful if the Indians of California would have gotten a penny."

The work and necessary expense money were furnished by Indians, assisted by a few friends in and out of Congress. The judgment was for all of the Indians of California. The work, through many years, by delegates who have journeyed to Washington on many occasions, should not now find it necessary for a few Indians, by personal donations, to finance the official expenses of the delegates. They should be able to make occasional trips to Washington to represent their people and be paid from funds now in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California.

Authority for delegates to be paid from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California would mean that all enrolled Indians who share and share alike in benefits secured for them and should also share and share alike in necessary expenses of their delegates. The cost under these conditions would be divided equally among all enrollees and would amount to only a few cents for each such enrollee.

The report of the Secretary of the Interior on S. 2338 gives reasons why he recommended that the bill be not enacted. His prime reason is embodied in the following words:

"Any part of the funds remaining after such distribution (presently authorized per capita payments) should be considered in connection with the general plan to facilitate termination of Federal supervision over all Indians in California."

This quotation refers to S. 3005 which is entitled "A bill to facilitate the termination of Federal supervision over Indian affairs in California."

The bill S. 2338 is supported by cogent evidence as to why the delegates representing Indians of California should have congressional authority to use some of the funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California for their official expenses. We urge that the bill to facilitate the termination of Federal supervision over Indian affairs in California and other bills affecting the rights of the Indians of California be not enacted without the delegates having had the right and privilege to be heard. Delegates are here to present the views of Indians of California on that and several other bills relating to their welfare. Bills affecting the rights of Indian delegates and their people are very vital and their delegates should be heard.

It has been asserted that the provisions of S. 2338 would encourage a large number of delegates who might come to Washington in the hope of being paid. This is an exaggeration beyond all reason. However, we here offer limiting amendments to further safeguard the funds of the Indians of California.

On page 2, line 11, strike the words "any person" and insert in lieu thereof "any enrollee."

On page 2, line 15, after the words "District of Columbia", insert the following: "*Provided*, That not more than seven delegates shall be entitled to per diem, compensation, and other expenses within any one calendar year, unless otherwise authorized by a committee of Congress in charge of pending legislation that affects Indians of California. The Secretary shall recognize such delegates in the order they shall have been selected and qualified: *Provided further*, That after the date of the approval of this act, not more than three such delegates shall be representative of any tribe, band, or organization. The stay of delegates within the District of Columbia shall not exceed 60 days on any occasion."

As enrollees and delegates, we believe enrollees should be authorized to choose any person they believe best qualified to represent them. In the several years past, different organizations of the Indians of California, consisting of enrollees, have seen fit to choose one or more persons who was not an enrollee to assist them in their activities in California and here. This has been true of the Federated Indians of California, the Mission Indian Federation, and the Indians of California, Inc. On account of objections that might be offered to any person serving as a delegate of enrolled Indians, Mr. Collett has suggested that there be stricken from the bill "any person" and in place of those words there be inserted the words "any enrollee.". We believe the original wording was well justified, but in the interest of speedy enactment of this bill, we agree to the proposed change.

In these days of determined effort by the Congress, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and others to free the Indians of California from Federal supervision, we are confident Indian delegates should appear before your committee, officials of the Indian Bureau, the Department of the Interior, and Members of Congress, and that funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California should be used for the official expenses of the delegates.

For these reasons we earnestly petition your committee and Congress to enact the provisions of S. 2338, together with the amendments suggested.

With the adoption of the suggested amendments there should be no objection to this proposed legislation. Indian delegates from Oregon and over a period of many years have been paid for their official expenses from Tribal funds to come to Washington, D. C. The funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California are tantamount to tribal funds. Authority for the use of some of these funds for the purposes of the Indian Bureau to revise the roll of the Indians of California have been authorized by Congress without any specific authority from the Indians. It is, however, an estimated fact recognized by the courts that Congress has plenary authority to direct the use of tribal funds for the benefit of the Indians.

Authority for the payment of the official expenses of delegates is equally important to authority to pay the expenses of agents of the Indian Bureau. We believe the authority for expenses of the delegates is more important. The rights of every tribe, band, and individual Indian of California is in jeopardy.

In this connection it should be noted that under date of June 1949 the Acting Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Mr. Greenwood, recommended to the Senate Committee on Appropriations a proposed amendment to read as follows:

"For the payment from and after January 1, 1946, of a per diem (not exceeding $10) in lieu of subsistence, and of other expenses to Indian delegates representing Indians of California while in Washington, D. C., while enroute from their homes and return, and while away from their homes in California engaged in receiving instruction from or making reports to the Indians whom they represent, $50,000 to remain available until expended, payable from funds in the United States Treasury to the credit of the Indians of California: *Provided*, That the payment of other expenses shall include transportation based on the cost of railroad and Pullman fares, stenographic services, mimeographing,

printing, postage, telephone, and telegraph charges and stationery, except that any such payment shall be based upon the presentation of receipts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That no delegate shall be paid a per diem for more than 180 days in any one calendar year nor receive reimbursement for expenses, other than transportation, in excess of $100 in any one calendar year: *Provided further*, That payments under this authorization shall be made only to such Indians who upon a satisfactory showing to the Secretary of the Interior are determined by him to be delegates representing the Indians of California, but not more than seven persons shall be determined to be delegates for any one calendar year."

Senator Thomas concluded that the proposed amendment was in the nature of legislation and could not properly under the Senate rules be made a part of an appropriation bill. He advised that appropriate language for the purpose should be undertaken as an independent or a part of a bill that dealt exclusively with legislation.

S. 2338 embodies substantially the language suggested by the Acting Commissioner and is in conformity with the suggestion made by Senator Thomas.

The proposed legislation is justly retroactive beginning with January 1, 1946. The delegates who have appeared in Washington, D. C., heretofore have had to obtain from a few of their people contributions, in the form of loans and otherwise, to meet their expenses. It has always been with the understanding that the delegate if and when paid would reimburse his financial sponsors. Books have been kept as to the amounts furnished.

The provisions of S. 2338 apply equally to the delegates that might be sponsored by any group or organization of enrollees.

Respectfully submitted.

ELLEN NORRIS,
ROBERT CROMWELL,
LINWOOD WARD,
Delegates Representing Indians of California.

F. G. COLLETT,
Executive Representative, Indians of California, Inc.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I stated earlier today that we would try to have a call of the calendar. Before doing so, I think it will be necessary to have a quorum called, so that all Senators may have notice. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO POTTER COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am engaged in a conference committee, and I should like to make a very brief statement on House bill 5567, which, as I understand, will be on the calendar later this afternoon.

The question has been asked as to whether or not my objection to this bill will prevail. I wish to explain why my objection to the bill will not prevail.

This is a bill to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo, Tex. I wish the record to show that the facts as they have been represented to me in regard to this bill, in my judgment, place this case on all-fours with the facts in the Kentucky case of some 2 years ago, in which land was turned over to the Federal Government for a specific purpose. When it was no longer needed for that specific purpose it was sought by Kentucky to be used for 4–H Club purposes. I took the position then, as I have consistently taken the position since, that when land is given to the Federal Government for a specific purpose and it is no longer needed by the Federal Government for that purpose, the State under those circumstances is entitled to a return of the land.

In this particular case the principle is the same, although the facts vary to this extent from the Kentucky case: In this case the land was made available to the Federal Government in the first instance by the American Legion in this area, in order to have a veterans' hospital built. The land was made available to the Federal Government for $3. Entirely too much land was made available for the use for veterans' hospital purposes so the part of the land referred to in the bill is, at the request of the Veterans' Administration, being made available for use for 4–H Club purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill referred to?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to conclude my statement.

I think that because of the type of precedent which I have already applied in the Kentucky case, this case is on all fours with it, and the Morse formula does not apply.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 5567.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5567) to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I gave notice yesterday that there would be a call of the calendar today. I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called for unobjected-to bills, beginning where the last call of the calendar left off.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first bill on the calendar beginning where the call left off yesterday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are one or two bills on the calendar in which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is interested. He is engaged in a conference committee. I ask unanimous consent that the bills in which he is interested be called up out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, there are two bills in that category.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania indicate which bills they are?

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the majority leader is very kind. We are all working to facilitate the business of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 2011, House bill 8316.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8316) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPLEMENTAL COMPACT BETWEEN NEW JERSEY AND PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN. The next bill is Calendar No. 2012, House bill 8315.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8315) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I wish publicly to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his courtesy.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I had intended to address the Senate on the subject matter of these two bills, but inasmuch as they have passed without any difficulty, I now send to the desk a statement which I had prepared, and ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

I may add that what I have to say in this statement goes for my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who concurs in everything I have said in this statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

The two great States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, after extended consideration and careful studies, both by their elected representatives and by their peoples, formally and respectfully presented to the Congress for its approval, proposals to undertake at their own expense, and without requests for Federal aid, public improvements vitally needed in the lower Delaware River metropolitan area.

These measures mean a great deal to the two sovereign States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania and especially to the more than 12,000,000 people in the whole of the Delaware River valley.

I believe that the vital need for this legislation and the high public purposes which it will serve, has been amply demonstrated during the course of the public hearings recently had both before the House committee and the Senate committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico is chairman.

The testimony of the able chief executives of the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, Governor Driscoll and Governor Fine, respectively, made it patently clear that the legislation now before the Senate will be of infinite benefit to the future progress of both States as well as proving to be a vital force in our national defense.

A glance at a highway map will show how much has been done in modern times to improve interstate and intrastate communication and transportation, by the application of the toll principle to the financing, construction, and operation of adequate and properly designed modern roads and highways.

The purpose of the bill H. R. 8315 of which S. 2187 which was introduced and sponsored by both Senators from New Jersey and Pennsylvania as a companion measure, is to give congressional consent to a supplemental compact which spells out the grant of powers to the Delaware River Joint Commission which was established under a 1931 compact and 1932 consent, to develop and promote commerce on, and across, the Delaware River by rail, highway, and water between Philadelphia, Pa., and Camden, N. J., and the sea. Heretofore, the Commission has operated and maintained the Philadelphia-Camden Bridge and a rapid transit system thereover for the transportation of passengers, and investigated and reported on the need for additional bridges or tunnels, and facilities for transportation, terminals, and port improvement to develop and promote the ports of Philadelphia and of Camden, and the use by commercial vessels of their facilities.

The principal changes effected by the supplemental compact would be (1) to change the name of the Commission to the "Delaware River Port Authority"; (2) to define as a port district the area of its operations in Pennsylvania and New Jersey; (3) to extend its jurisdiction northward to the boundary line between Bucks and Philadelphia Counties as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river; (4) to authorize the establishment of a rapid-transit system for passengers, express, and mail between points within Philadelphia and points in New Jersey within the port district by extending existing facilities or constructing new facilities for such system; and (5) to authorize the port authority, subject to prior approval by the Legislatures and the Governors of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, to provide other transportation, terminal, or port improvement facilities needed for the commerce and welfare of the port district, and, subject to the written consent of the Governors of said States, to acquire the Socony-Palmyra Bridge between Philadelphia County and New Jersey.

The second of these two measures, H. R. 3816 (companion measure to S. 2188), which was likewise introduced by the junior Senator from New Jersey and cosponsored by the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. SMITH, and both Senators from Pennsylvania, Messrs. MARTIN and DUFF, would grant the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact which would authorize the Delaware River Joint Commission, established under a 1931 compact and 1932 consent, by whatever name said commission may be designated, to finance and construct an additional crossing over the Delaware River, either bridge or tunnel, between Philadelphia and Camden, to be located 2 or 3 miles south of its existing bridge, but only upon the filing with the Commission of the written consents by the Governors of the two States.

The supplemental compact would regulate the undertaking of the new construction and would clarify and modernize certain incidental powers vested in the commission. The bill would permit the commission to combine into one project, for financing and operating, the new crossing and any other of the facilities it provides for the public.

It is contemplated that these bridges or tunnels, when constructed, will become one of the facilities described in H. R. 8315 and thus eventually be under the jurisdiction of the Delaware River Port Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 2003, where the previous calendar call left off.

PREVENTION AND CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 218) to provide for intensified research into the causes, hazards, and effects of air pollution, into methods for its prevention and control and for recovery of critical matrials from atmospheric contaminants and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire first to have an explanation as to exactly what the joint resolution would do.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the joint resolution calls for a study of the causes and methods of preventing a situation which is poisoning the people in many parts of the country. Several catastrophes have resulted from poisoned air coming from plants which could be regulated and controlled.

A similar situation existed in my State at one time. Conditions caused by smoke became such as to bring about serious effects. It seems to me that some effort should be made to control this nuisance. Many of the cities of the country are very seriously affected by it. The joint resolution only calls for a study and development of methods of preventing such conditions.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Along that line, in my State during the war there was a Government plant which caused almost incalculable damage to the community in which the State University is situated. I think it is high time that some effort such as this be made.

Mr. MURRAY. Several cases have arisen in the State of Pennsylvania which were very serious. Many people died as a result of contamination of the air.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to say to the able Senator from Montana that the joint resolution provides for the recovery of critical materials from atmospheric contaminants, and for other purposes. Does the phrase "for other purposes" in the joint resolution mean that the departments listed may go into business establishments and make certain requirements, effect certain changes, and control the business operations or the engineering operations of such concerns?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it does not mean that at all. It merely calls for a study and recommendations of methods and means for eliminating pollution.

Similar work was done many years ago, as far back as 1900, when Theodore Roosevelt took an interest in the problem. The forests of the United States were being destroyed. As a result of those studies the smelters were required to build their plants in such a manner that the chemicals could be saved, preventing pollution of the air. The smelters have profited from such regulation. All the joint resolution calls for is merely a study, and the designing of programs to prevent pollution.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I heartily approve of research and attempts to determine the best possible methods of eradicating, removing, and eliminating completely the injurious fumes and poisonous refuse which must of necessity follow in the wake of some of our manufacturing techniques, and as to which we have not yet determined the best preventive measures.

However, I am certainly wondering whether, as the Senator says—and I am willing to take his word for it, because he is the chairman of the distinguished committee which has reported the bill—the purpose of the joint resolution is for research and guidance only; and it does not mean the control of certain business practices which good engineering design would indicate a business concern should follow. Along those lines I might not have serious objection. I am wondering whether it is necessary to put the following language in the joint resolution. I am reading from page 3, at the top of the page:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Public Health Service, the Department of the Interior, and to the De-

partment of Agriculture such sums for each fiscal year for the next 5 years, following enactment of this resolution, as may be necessary to intensify such activities.

Does the able Senator feel that it is necessary to have three or four departments handling the matter, and why? Does the able Senator believe it is necessary to give this open-end appropriation for 5 years?

Mr. MURRAY. Several departments are interested in the problem for different reasons. For example, the Department of the Interior is interested in protecting and preserving forests. In my State of Montana the situation was so bad at one time that policemen on the night shift had to wear sponges in their noses to keep them from being poisoned by swallowing the arsenic, sulfur, and other chemicals which were expelled into the air. It seems to me that the study should be carried on by those who are already familiar with the subject. They can make recommendations.

That is all that would be done. It would not interfere with any business concern except to the extent of advising them and encouraging them to adopt ways and means of preventing the fouling of the air.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say frankly that I have not had an opportunity to read the report. Can the Senator from Montana give any indication as to what the cost of it each year would be?

Mr. MURRAY. I do not know what the exact cost would be, but——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Would the Senator say whether the outlay would be nominal or excessive?

Mr. MURRAY. It would be nominal. Naturally a very extensive study will not be required. Already the agencies are largely familiar with the problem, and the country is very much interested. The State of Pennsylvania is very much interested in it because of the serious condition which developed about a year ago when many people died because of the pollution of the air. I am sure that it will not be an expensive program. In any event, the agencies must come to Congress for an appropriation, and it can be controlled in that way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana why a measure of this kind has been delayed for so long, if it is so important. We have had smoke and fumes in the air for several years. Now in the last days of the Eighty-second Congress we are presented with a measure which at least has been indicated to me will give more power to three governmental agencies to hire more people and spend more money. I want to know how much the program will cost before I consent to it. I will find out about its cost, or I will object to it.

Mr. MURRAY. I am sure it will not require the building up of any personnel. The departments involved are already equipped with the personnel. The Public Health Service already has the staff with which to carry on the necessary studies and investigations. I am sure the same is true with reference to the other departments. If they were to require appropriations which were regarded as excessive, the situation could be controlled when they requested the money.

Mr. WELKER. I disagree with the Senator from Montana on that point, because once we authorize an expenditure very rarely do we not appropriate the money. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects.

FEDERAL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY IN EMPLOYMENT ACT

The bill (S. 3368) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOEY. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

COMPACTS AND AGREEMENTS BETWEEN STATES FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION ON THE GREAT LAKES–ST. LAWRENCE RIVER SYSTEM

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 167) to grant the consent of the Congress to the entry of certain States into compacts and agreements for the improvement of navigation on the boundary waters of States within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage system, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the sponsor of the joint resolution whether it is a compact between States similar to other compacts which have been entered into between States, such as the New York Port Authority, which was formed by the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. MOODY. That is precisely correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the sponsor whether, instead of designating the United States Corps of Engineers, the Federal Power Commission, or other appropriate Federal agency, as provided on page 2, line 21, the Senator would accept an amendment to provide for the establishment of a commission, as set forth in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, to the St. Lawrence seaway measure, with a slight change in the language, so that an independent commission would be required to make a very thorough study of the subject with relation to the compact, and also to make a study of the seaway and power facilities, and all that goes with it?

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, whether such a study would abridge the rights of States to enter into a compact or delay the development of the seaway by the States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not. It would simply come within the clause on page 2, line 20. The commission would report to Congress as to whether the United States should become a party to the compact or agreement.

Mr. MOODY. So long as such a survey would be made by a competent and impartial commission of experts and would not delay carrying the seaway forward, I would be glad to accept it if the Senator from Massachusetts insists.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont objects.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Vermont to reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I favor the resolution but I cannot permit such an amendment to be added to it. I will reserve my objection if the Senator from New Jersey wants me to do so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall not discuss the amendment which has been suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, much as I approve of it. I wish to say, however, that I am entirely in accord with the purpose of the joint resolution, permitting the States involved to enter into compacts and agreements. I was one of the Senators who voted to recommit the St. Lawrence seaway measure because I was not satisfied with respect to several points, such as depth, for example. I am thoroughly in accord with the principle of letting the States form compacts. I hope the Senator from Vermont will withdraw his objection. I believe it is a very fine approach to the whole subject. I believe it is very proper for us at this time to approve of such compacts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont object?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague. The joint resolution embodies a principle which has done much for the economic development of the various sections of our country. We should encourage States to enter into such compacts. I cite the Port of New York Authority as one of the greatest agencies of that kind. If the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway could be realized through the passage of a measure of this kind, which would permit States on their own initiative to enter into compacts and go to work on great projects of this character, I certainly would approve procedures to obtain such worthy objectives.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WELKER. I thought objection had been made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont withheld his objection.

Mr. WELKER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the joint resolution goes over.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS, TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 3209) amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Without objection——

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, although I do not object, I should like to know the purpose of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the bill merely provides for the fees of condemnation commissioners under the Federal courts, in connection with the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority. There is a board of appraisal which has to do with the Tennesee Valley Authority, under direction of the Federal court. That board inspects and appraises land to be acquired by the Government. The commissioners who perform that work are presently allowed fees not in excess of $15 a day, as the ceiling. That is the present arrangement, under the court's order and direction.

The bill will permit the court to allow up to $30 a day for those who do that work. The total amount involved is approximately $2,000 a year.

Mr. HOEY. This bill will not change the basic procedure; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the bill does not change it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask how many employees are involved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The commissioners are already employed; there are already three employees of the United States for this purpose. This bill, when enacted, will merely increase the maximum fees they may be paid from not to exceed $15 a day to not to exceed $30 a day. Only three persons are involved, and the total amount involved will be approximately $2,000 a year.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. This matter involves condemnation cases. As the Senator knows, the court usually appoints commissioners, who represent the court and arrive at a fair value for the property.

This bill does not provide for permanent employees; it merely provides that when commissioners are temporarily appointed for a particular condemnation, the court will have authority, within its discretion, to allow up to $30 a day for the services of each commissioner who appraises the property.

This bill, when enacted, will not involve any permanent appointments or any employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The bill merely involves the commissioners who serve in condemnation cases in the Federal courts.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from Kansas, that the bill is before us really at the request of the Federal judges who serve in that area. They find it difficult to obtain persons whom they regard as qualified and competent to appraise such property; it is difficult at present to obtain such persons, by reason of the fact that the ceiling on the fees was fixed in 1933. The Federal judges feel that unless the ceiling is raised from $15 a day to $30 a day, they will be very much handicapped.

Today they are handicapped in respect to obtaining properly qualified appraisers to do the work.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama has now touched on a matter about which I am satisfied. In other words, I have always understood that the Federal courts in Federal condemnation matters, or the District courts in such matters within State jurisdictions—certainly this is true in our area, in the case of all condemnations—fix the salaries or fees of the appraisers and experts who are called upon, and there is no limitation.

If, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama has indicated, the courts themselves have requested the enactment of this bill, and if the bill is strictly limited to appraisers on such projects, I have no objection to consideration of the bill.

Mr. HILL. I assure the Senator from Kansas that he has stated the case correctly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3209) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT TO EMPIRE DISTRICT ELECTRIC POWER CO. FOR COSTS OF PROTECTING OZARK BEACH POWER PLANT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next bill on the calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 7241) to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill, particularly with respect to the amount of payment involved? My information is that this bill involves payment in the amount of approximately $750,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the committee was unable to obtain a printed report in time to submit it to the Senate.

However, we have the report on this matter by the House committee, and I now read from that report:

> The Bull Shoals Dam, authorized by the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638, 645), is a multiple-purpose project located about 86 miles downstream from the Ozark Beach Dam and hydroelectric plant of the Empire District Electric Co. Work on the dam is practically completed.
>
> Testimony of witnesses supported the claim of the utility company that backwater from the Bull Shoals Dam during the storing of floodwaters will, under certain conditions, damage the Ozark Beach Dam and hydroelectric plant unless protective works are provided. Any flooding of the plant would render it useless for an extended period of time.
>
> Army engineers informed the committee that at the time the Bull Shoals project was authorized and construction under way it was believed protective works would be necessary for the plant operated by the Empire District Electric Co. and that such protection could be provided. After construction had started a study was made of the legal technicalities involved and it was found that the Department of the Army did not have the authority to provide the necessary protective works.
>
> At the request of the Corps of Engineers an investigation and report of the works necessary to protect the Ozark Beach plant was made by the Ambursen Engineering Corp., independent consulting engineers. Protective works planned as a result of this report include a wall or similar protecting device outside of the power plant on the downstream side; raising of the transmission crossing; riprapping or other suitable protection for the earthen left bank section of the dam; and the necessary protection of other smaller parts of Empire's plant facilities. Details of the necessary protection is to be the subject of negotiation between the Empire District Electric Co. and the Corps of Engineers.
>
> While the exact cost of the protective works to be provided by this legislation has not been officially determined, the Corps of Engineers has estimated the cost at approximately $500,000. The committee was advised that the total cost might exceed this estimate, and to meet unusual cost variations, amended the bill to provide a ceiling of $700,000.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that the Empire District Electric Co. is 86 miles upstream of the new dam?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. At the time when the authorization was made for the Bull Shoals Dam, did the Army engineers or the private engineers know that when the dam was built, it would back water up to this particular piece of private property?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The information is to the effect that the Army engineers knew that. That is why we think we are justified in allowing the private enterprise to collect at least for the damages which were brought about by construction by the Government of the Bull Shoals Dam.

Mr. FREAR. They knew that, but apparently the committees which authorized the appropriation did not know it. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I assume they did not; I do not recall.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7241) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE CALUMET RIVER

The bill (H. R. 8190) to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT BETTENDORF, IOWA

The bill (H. R. 8194) to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICE OF SUPERVISOR OF NEW YORK HARBOR

The bill (H. R. 8234) to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask whether this measure will effect—as I assume it will—a saving.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; $100,000.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The bill simply transfers the supervisors from the port authority to the Army engineers.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIGHWAY AND RAILROAD BRIDGES OVER COLUMBIA RIVER OR ITS NAVIGABLE TRIBUTARIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 3, beginning in line 13, to strike out "Engineers. (b) In the event of a failure to agree upon the terms and conditions of any such contract, or upon any default in the performance of any contract entered into pursuant to this act, the bridge owner or the Secretary of the Army shall have the right to bring suit to enforce his rights or for a declaration of his rights under this act, or under any such contract, in the district court of the United States for the district in which the structure in question is located. In any such proceeding the court shall apportion the total cost of the work between the Secretary of the Army and the owner in accord with the provisions contained in this act. Any judgment, award, or decree rendered against the Secretary of the Army under this act may be satisfied out of appropriations available for construction of the McNary Lock and Dam, or out of appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for the maintenance and improvement of rivers and harbors" and insert "Engineers", and on page 4, in line 10, before the word "This", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF GOWANUS CREEK CHANNEL, N. Y.

The bill (H. R. 7855) for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am delighted to explain the bill, Mr. President.

The situation existing in the case of the report on the Arkansas matter also applies in this instance. I shall read now from the report of the House committee, which was submitted by Representative BUCKLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Public Works:

> The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7855) for improvement of Gowanus Creek channel, New York, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.
>
> The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on March 19, 1946, adopted a resolution authorizing the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review reports previously submitted on Gowanus Creek channel, New York, with a view to determining if it would be advisable to modify the existing project. That review report has been completed, was transmitted to Congress on January 8, 1952, and is designated as House Document No. 318, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
>
> Gowanus Creek is a tidal waterway on the east side of Upper New York Bay, in the Borough of Brooklyn, about 4 miles by water southeast of the Battery, New York City. It extends 1.8 miles northeasterly from the north end of Bay Ridge Channel in Gowanus Bay and includes the 1-mile upper portion known as Gowanas Canal, which local interests have improved to depths ranging from 12 feet at the lower end to 7 feet at the head. The lower part of Gowanus Creek has been improved by the United States under a project known as Gowanus Creek channel. The locally dredged Henry Street Basin enters Gowanus Creek channel from the north, 750 feet upstream from the lower end of the Federal project. This basin, about 2,000 feet long and 200 feet wide, has depths decreasing from 21 feet in a strip 100 feet wide in the lower 1,000 feet of the basin to 5 feet at the head.
>
> Local interests have expended approximately $6,000,000 in developing water-front terminals and berthing facilities in the section of Gowanus Creek under consideration.

In other words, they want a deeping of the channel. It is a dual project. The estimated cost to the Government is $287,000, and the estimated non-Federal cost is $141,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONTROL OF DURATION OF THE WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

The bill (H. R. 6856) to control the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF BILLS REPORTED TODAY

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the call of the calendar. About a dozen bills which have been reported today are not on the calendar. If there is no objection, those bills will be called, in order that Senators may object to them, if they desire to do so, or, if not, that the bills may be passed. The clerk will call the first of the bills reported today, which are not on the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the measure, particularly a statement of the cost, and whether it is retroactive?

Mr. LEHMAN. This is a bill which was introduced by me, for myself, on behalf of certain of my colleagues. I think I should say in justice to the members of the Labor Committee that this bill was reported only this morning. The report was completed only yesterday. I believe that some of the members of the Labor Committee have not had an opportunity to study the report. I gave my assurance to fellow members of the Labor Committee that I would not press for action on this bill this afternoon, in order that they might have more time in which to study the report and reach a decision. I therefore ask that the bill go over until tomorrow, to be called up

at that time, if there is to be another call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it has been my thought we would have a short call of the calendar tomorrow, so as to dispose of bills which, in the meantime, Senators would have an opportunity to study.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if it is the intention of the majority leader to have a call of the calendar tomorrow, might we not at that time be in a better position to consider some of the measures which were reported this morning, as the reports will then be available to us, unless the measures which it is intended to bring up at this time have received full concurrence on the part of members of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that as to some of the bills reported today there will be no question. The House may have to take some action, because of amendments or otherwise. I suggest that the Senate proceed with the bills reported today, and any to which there is objection can be placed on the calendar for tomorrow.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Is my understanding correct that tomorrow it will be the intention of the majority leader to call up only the House bills on the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know about that. I do not think there will be many, and I doubt if it would make much difference. Perhaps one or two of them might go over. I do not know what business might come up tomorrow. That was the principal reason for having the bills called at this time, I may say to my good friend from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think we should commit ourselves to consider only House bills, because there might be an apparently small Senate bill which, nevertheless, it might be important to send to the House immediately.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I should like to say that I gained that impression in conversation with the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator gained it correctly. However, upon reflection, I believe Senate bills should also be called up.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection so long as that is understood.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the next bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the time at which he expects to call the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. Perhaps we can determine that before we get through this afternoon. The proper time probably would be shortly after the Senate convenes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. What are the Senator's plans with respect to the hour at which we shall convene tomorrow—10 or 11 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator will let me do a little checking, I shall be glad to let him know. It would depend upon whether we could probably accomplish anything by convening early. Meeting earlier might enable us to get through sooner tomorrow. If it would, we would convene earlier; if not, we might as well convene tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next bill.

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO HOPE, N. MEX.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex., was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as I remember from having read the first part of the bill, it pertains to a matter in which the Senator from Oregon is interested, and as to which I must object on his behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to withhold it for an explanation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the purpose is to authorize the conveyance of lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex. It is land which was taken over by the Soil Conservation Service. They do not need it any more. It lies within the corporate limits of the little town of Hope, N. Mex., and the committee insists that it be paid for, if it is turned over. The Government cannot use it, but the little town of Hope can use it. I am sure the Senator from Oregon would not object, if he knew the explanation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator will yield, I may say he does not have to convince me on the proposition, but I am bound to object, since the Senator from Oregon has requested it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

GEORGE BLECH AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 6558) for the relief of George Blech and others, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have an explanation of the bill, Mr. President?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, prior to about the middle of World War II, there was a definite limitation of time within which an officer could claim credit for the expense of moving his household furniture. At that time, the minimum assignment to duty was for 2 years, but the practice was later followed of making emergency assignments. Some of the men were compelled to move their household furniture. The Congress, realizing the situation, changed the law. This bill would be unnecessary but for the fact that there were presented 11 claims, totalling $2,383.19, for moving personal effects, resulting from a permanent change of station of 11 naval officers. This is merely to reimburse them and place them on a parity with others.

I may say that when this bill first was taken up in the Judiciary Committee, I objected to it, because I thought it might be the forerunner of a great number of similar bills. At that time the Navy Department assured the committee there were no other such claims within the Department. I still objected, because I did not know about the Air Corps and the Department of the Army. I have since that time received a letter from General Reber, assuring the committee that there are no claims in the Army—which at the time in question also included the Air Corps—so that these 11 claims are the only ones that are not now taken care of by substantive law. So the total amount of $2,383.19 will take care of these three emergency war cases. It is purely a reimbursement for the out-of-pocket cost of shipping personal effects from one station to another, when the removal was made by order of the Government, not for the convenience of the men, and prior to a certain time limit, which in peace times is normally observed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, his statement has refreshed the memory of the Senator from Kansas regarding a discussion on the part of several Senators. I regret that, because of the precedent it would establish, I must object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

TERMS OF COURT TO BE HELD AT WEST PALM BEACH AND FORT MYERS, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 948) to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I think we should have an explanation of the bill for the purposes of the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, before the Committe on the Judiciary the matter was explained, as I recall, by one of the Senators from Florida. The purpose is to provide that Federal courts shall be held in two different places. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and I think the statement was that the Judicial Conference endorsed this proposal. That is why we reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 948) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH R. LA PORTA

The bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Bureau of Employees' Compensation of the United States Department of Labor, pursuant to the administration of the benefits provided for under the head "Civilian war benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947, to receive, consider, and adjudicate a claim from Joseph R. La Porta for compensation for disability sustained by him on or about August 26, 1944, as a result of a plane crash.

Mr. La Porta was a cadet in the Civil Air Patrol when he was injured, and he filed his claim with the Veterans' Administration within the statutory period. It took that agency 7 months to inform the claimant he had no rights as a veteran. As a result of this delay the statute of limitations ran against Mr. La Porta and his claim was barred.

The committee is of the opinion that the claimant has shown "good cause" for his failure to file this claim timely, and consequently this bill is favorably recommended.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was wondering if it is a referral case.

Mr. KILGORE. It is a case to be referred to the board only.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2358) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JANE P. MYERS

The bill (H. R. 3268) for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Mexico to explain the bill? He is thoroughly familiar with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, this bill pertains to a citizen of my State. The record shows that Jane P. Myers, wife of John A. Myers, was receiving Class E allotment in the sum of $50, and Class F allowance in the sum of $50. John A. Myers was killed in action in the European area on December 3 and the wife's entitlement was declared to have ceased on that date, though she was paid through December 1944.

On December 23 Mrs. Myers was sent a form letter, Adjudication Form 605, stating, in effect, that she might be entitled to a pension, and enclosing Application Form 534. She took the form to Mr. E. C. Crampton, an attorney in the law office of Crampton and Robertson. I know Mr. Crampton personally. He is a very fine man, quite advanced in age. I think he is between 80 and 90 years of age. "Senator Crampton" as we know him, assisted Mrs. Myers as a matter of charity, as he has advised me, in preparing the form which was forwarded to the Veterans' Administration. It was received there on January 8, 1945. In the form Mrs. Myers stated that she was expecting a child. Shortly thereafter she was confined and her child was born February 2, 1945.

It is one of those cases where, because of a Government agency's confusion, an effort is being made to get a little money back from the lady, and this bill will give her help.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I recall, the bill was reported by the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Jane P. Myers, of Raton, N. Mex., the sum of $953, representing the amount of compensation she would have received for the period beginning on January 1, 1945, and ending on March 27, 1946 had her claim filed within 1 year after the date fixed by the Department of the Army as the date of the death of her husband, Staff Sgt. John A. Myers, been completed by the timely filing of certified copies of her marriage certificate and of her child's birth certificate: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF PRESIDENT TO APPOINT CERTAIN OFFICERS TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 3186) to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army Ground Forces or commanded an army during World War II, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a bill introduced by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It involves no money. It was recommended by the Defense Department and was reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. It involves a few officers who served during World War II with three-star rank, although they were actually filling positions calling for higher rank.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, while serving in the grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army ground forces at any time between March 8, 1942, and August 16, 1945, or who commanded an army or armies of the United States in either the European-African-Middle Eastern Theater of Operations at any time between December 11, 1941, and May 8, 1945, or in the Asiatic-Pacific Theater of Operations at any time between December 8, 1941, and August 16, 1945, and, if retired, to advance such officers to such grade on the retired list. Any such officer who died prior to the effective date of this act, or prior to appointment hereunder, may be so appointed posthumously: *Provided*, That no increase of basic or retired pay or allowances shall result from such appointment or the passage of this act.

BESTOWAL OF RANK ON CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF THE COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 7722) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance, between the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I would like to have an explanation of the measure.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at the present time there is, of course, a Chief of the Public Health Service, with six deputies heading various branches of the medical and engineering activities carried on by the Public Health Service. The chief deputy is designated by statute as entitled to the rank of major general. The others are permitted to have the rank either of brigadier general or major general. They are designated by the head of the Public Health Service. All six of the deputies have the rank by designation of the Chief of the Public Health Service of major general. The only one who has not that rank at the present time is the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard. He is the only such officer who now holds the rank of brigadier general. All the others hold the rank of major general.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are all these medical officers now in the military service?

Mr. LEHMAN. This officer is subject to military discipline and the Coast Guard is part of the Armed Forces though assigned to the Treasury Department. I believe that he has been commissioned from civil life. The chief medical officer of the Army is an Army officer. The chief medical officer of the Navy is a naval officer, whereas the chief medical officer of the Coast Guard is a member of the commissioned corps of the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Are they uniformed officers?

Mr. LEHMAN. Public health officers of either service may be in uniform.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. How many persons are to be involved in this action? Does it mean increased emoluments, and is it necessary to give the advanced rank merely so that the persons involved may be in line with Army requirements, even though their positions pertain to medical service? Just what is the reason?

Mr. LEHMAN. I cannot say whether the rank of officers in the Public Health Service should be that of major, colonel, brigadier general, or major general. The fact remains that of the six deputies, five of them have the grade equivalent to that of major generals. Only one does not. So far as pay or other emoluments are concerned, the bill would therefore affect only one individual, namely, the Public Health Service officer assigned as chief medical officer of the Coast Guard. I believe that officer is doing just as important work as are the chief medical officer, the chief dental officer, and the other deputies in the Public Health Service.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. What was the report of the committee? I will be frank with the Senator from New York. I believe there are too many generals in the Army, too many generals all the way down the line, who have been advanced because they want to go up the line, whether they have earned their positions or not. I desire to be very careful about this one.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is my recollection that last year we passed a bill giving the Chief Dental Officer the same rank, sought by this bill, namely, the equivalent of the rank of major general. The Chief of the Bureau of Medical Services and the Chief Sanitary Engineer officer and two others have that rank. I believe such rank is justified in the Public Health Service, because those officers deal with large numbers of people. They are responsible for a very considerable personnel, and, of course, they come into contact with representatives of many other countries and also with all departments of the Government. The bill would affect only one person.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I was merely going to say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the bill affects one individual, the Chief of the Medical Service of the Coast Guard. It is the feeling of Dr. Scheele, the Surgeon General, that responsibilities of that gentleman are fully equal to those of the others who now have the higher rank. The bill would apply to one individual.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming answer a question?

Mr. HUNT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It will affect persons holding these offices in the future, will it not?

Mr. HUNT. Just the one person who may hold this particular position in the future. His successor, of course, would hold it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Would it not be mandatory in effect?

Mr. HUNT. I would not say it would be mandatory, but it would make such an appointment possible, of course, and we know that if the position is available, the person who fills it will desire the rank that goes with it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. From this time on everyone who holds one of the positions would be made a major general?

Mr. HUNT. That is now the case in five divisions. The bill would make it the case in the sixth.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand.

Mr. HUNT. It seems to be a case of equalizing the rank of men doing comparable work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to know why these officers should have military rank at all. They are not in the military service, as I understand.

Mr. HUNT. It is the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Perhaps we had better change the law. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The bill will go to the calendar.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Nevada to agree that the bill will be placed on the calendar if the calendar is to be called tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill would automatically go to the calendar, the Chair will state to the Senator from New York.

The clerk will state the next bill.

MARTIN A. DEKKING

The bill (H. R. 5442) for the relief of Martin A. Dekking was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Martin A. Dekking. The bill also provides for the payment of the required visa fee and head tax, and for the appropriate quota deduction.

Mr. Dekking is a native of the Netherlands, and is approximately 26 years old. He entered the United States on January 29, 1949.

The pertinent facts in the case are contained in a letter from the Attorney General. The bill has been reported favorably by the House committee and has been unanimously passed by the House. It was reported today by the Senate committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from Texas for his explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMMIGRATION BILLS REPORTED BY JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee of the Judiciary if, as I have been informed by my colleague, the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, there are a number of bills relating to immigration that may be reported. I have been informed generally about the bills. We have that much information. If the Senator will indicate those bills en bloc, we would be perfectly willing that they be considered in that manner, in order to save time.

Mr. McCARRAN. There were about 12 or 13 bills considered today by the committee and reported favorably to the Senate. They were bills on immigration matters. I have 10 bills here besides the one which was just considered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. They were all reported unanimously.

MILAGROS AUJERO

The bill (H. R. 1913) for the relief of Milagros Aujero was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. HEE SHEE WONG ACHUCK

The bill (H. R. 2840) for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANN KOMMA

The bill (H. R. 4634) for the relief of Johann Komma was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ILKUSABURO IMAMURA GLASSCOCK

The bill (H. R. 5624) for the relief of Ilkusaburo Imamura Glasscock was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GISELA HELEN SNOWDY

The bill (H. R. 7713) for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAYMOND SCOTT HILL

The bill (H. R. 6915) for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BOZIE LINCOLN DONALSON

The bill (H. R. 6969) for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I find that with reference to the bill just passed, I do not have a report before me. I should like to hold the bill up until I can inquire as to the number of bills that were approved by the committee today at noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 6969 was passed, is reconsidered, and the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER subsequently said: There is one bill that has been passed over. Has the Senator from Nevada had an opportunity to examine the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Chair kindly give me the number?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H. R. 6969.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HILDEGARD HOBMEIER

The bill (H. R. 8163) for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNALYN EARLEY

The bill (H. R. 7665) for the relief of Annalyn Earley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA GRAZIA MARANTO

The bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. H. R. 6558 has not been called. It has been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk advises the Chair that the bill is not at the desk at this time.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made a motion to request the House to return the papers in connection with H. R. 5248. That bill was passed yesterday. Had the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] been on the floor, he would have objected to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 4, 1952.

Ordered, That the bill of the House and the accompanying papers (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, be returned to the Senate, in compliance with the request of the Senate for the return thereof.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. What was the calendar number?

Mr. McFARLAND. We do not have the calendar number now, because the bill did not appear on today's calendar. It is the so-called tungsten bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered? The Chair hears none, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In what position does that leave the bill that would place tungsten on the free list? That is, remove the tariff.

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill will be on the calendar. Unless it is passed, nothing will happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Nevada that the bill would come up on a call of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, if the calendar were called again, the bill would be subject to being called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is subject to being called whenever there is another call of the calendar, if the calendar call proceeds from the beginning of the calander.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada wishes to register an objection now, and make it a matter of record with both the majority and minority leaders.

It is well known that when the Government purchases material for the stockpile for national defense, no tariff is paid; therefore this bill is unnecessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand from the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that he does not desire to make a motion to bring the bill up. If no motion is made to proceed to consider the bill, it would not be passed unless it were passed on a call of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. It is subject to being called up every time the calendar is called. More and more Senators are leaving the Senate and more and more bills are being passed haphazard and with little consideration of the subject matter of such legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill would come up on a call of the calendar only if the call started from the beginning of the calendar. If the call started at the point where the previous call left off, the bill would not be called.

Mr. MALONE. It came up last night, Mr. President, by request of the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that instance the call proceeded from the very beginning of the calendar.

Mr. MALONE. It came up following the call of the calendar by special request—following an understanding between the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the junior Senator from Nevada that it would not be considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think I can explain the action which was taken. I gave notice that when an objection was made to a bill, if the objector were to withdraw his objection, the bill could be taken up and passed. I also requested other Senators than the one who made the original objection to register any objection they might have with the minority leader or myself, and they would be protected. I did not know of the objection of the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada to the bill, or it would not have been called up. Inasmuch as it was called up by unanimous consent, certainly nothing will be done in connection with the bill without notice to the distinguished Senator from Nevada. He will be given an opportunity to be present on the floor and take such action as he deems necessary.

Mr. MALONE. With that understanding, I am satisfied.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are a few other bills with respect to which I wish to give notice. First, let me say that I wish to give notice that tomorrow we may move to take up Calendar No. 2003, House Joint Resolution 218, and Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint Resolution 167, or any of the bills to which objection was made today on the call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. There was some confusion in the Chamber and I did not hear what the majority leader had to say.

Mr. McFARLAND. I gave notice that we may move tomorrow to bring up two measures to which objection was made, namely, Calendar No. 2003, House Joint Resolution 218, and Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint Resolution 167.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was that announcement made today or yesterday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I was just giving the notice. I stated that we might make a motion to proceed to the consideration of either or both of those measures tomorrow, not today. I feel that I should give notice. Certain Senators wished to have them brought up today, but I replied that the policy was to give notice.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. With respect to Calendar No. 2005, Senate Joint

Resolution 167, does not the Senator realize that there have been no committee hearings? None of us knows what is in the joint resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Quite a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle are very anxious that the joint resolution should pass.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Without any consideration by a committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that, by and large, the majority of Senators understand the purpose of the joint resolution. I do not think it is necessary to have consideration by a committee. However, if the Senate wishes to do so it can vote the joint resolution down.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to make a further brief observation. I merely wish to reflect the sentiments of certain Senators who have spoken to me with reference to the calendar call today. Many Senators understood that this was to be the last calendar call. Obviously that is a matter which is in the jurisdiction of the majority leader. However, I may say that it has been indicated to me that if there is to be another call of the calendar certain. Senators wish to be advised about it today. If there is to be a call of the calendar tomorrow they will insist upon a tight quorum call being not only requested but assured on the floor. I think I should make that statement in deference to Senators who have requested me to take certain action.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly all right. I am sorry I did not consult the Senator from Kansas. I told the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] that we might have a further call of the calendar, because some small House bills might come over. The call of the calendar today has been as much to accommodate Senators on the other side of the aisle as Senators on this side. That is the reason I am giving notice. We are not trying to take advantage of anyone. I think Senators should have full opportunity to be present when there is a call of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I hope the majority leader will understand that I was merely reflecting the sentiments which had been expressed to me. The Senator from Kansas always tries to be present when there is a call of the calendar; and I feel constrained to keep faith with Senators who have spoken to me on the subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. The Senator from Kansas has been very cooperative.

MARIA GRAZIA MARANTO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Arizona that there is one more bill on the desk which has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EQUALITY OF GRADE, ETC., BETWEEN CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER OF THE COAST GUARD AND COMPARABLE OFFICERS OF THE ARMY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago I objected to a bill which would have granted increased rank, pay, and allowances to the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard. I wanted to obtain an explanation of the bill. My understanding is that all the health officers in the services have a certain rank pursuant to statute. Am I correctly advised in that regard?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. As I understand, this is the only Chief Medical Officer who has not been given an advanced rank.

Mr. HUNT. And a comparable level of responsibility.

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7722) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BURLEY TOBACCO ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1978, House bill 8170, which is one of the bills with respect to which I have previously given notice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 8170) relating to burley-tobacco farm-acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill. Does the Senator wish an explanation at this time?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. No. I apologize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, this is a measure which was on the calendar yesterday, and it was passed over without prejudice. At that time it was stated that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and the two Senators from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS and Mr. UNDERWOOD] were considering the subject.

I will say to the Senator from Kansas, as well as to other Members of this body, that this measure is approved by the Department of Agriculture. It is unanimously approved by the Committee on Agriculture of the House and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. It passed the House without objection. It affects the acreage allotments of burley tobacco only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think this is the most disorderly and improper way to enact legislation I have seen in the 20 years I have been in the Senate. We are crowding through a great many bills in the last minutes of the last session of the Eighty-second Congress. Many of the bills we know nothing about; few of them have been properly considered by committees.

The Judiciary Committee works for weeks on some of the bills which today we are passing in a few minutes. It is just not right. I do not like to object. When a Senator wishes to have a bill passed in which he is personally interested, another Senator dislikes to object. I withdrew my objection to a bill a few minutes ago. However, I will say that there was never a more disorderly way of enacting legislation. Some day we will enact legislation for which we will be sorry later, if we proceed with this kind of program.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to my good friend from Nevada that the bills which are being called up all were the subject of notice to Members. Notice was given that they would be taken up, and they are on the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not speaking about bills which the Senator from Arizona is now bringing up, notice as to which has been given. I am speaking about some bills which were passed in the last half hour. I will be frank to say that some of them came from my own committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada could have objected to the consideration of any of the bills.

AMENDMENT OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1514, S. 2592.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2592) to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit

the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the nature of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill would permit—and I will say that its provisions are not mandatory—granting by airlines of reduced rates to ministers. The same privilege is granted to ministers by the railroads. The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the majority leader for bringing up the bill. I think it is a very fine bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, am I to understand that the bill would do no more than to allow airlines, if they desired, to grant a reduced rate to ministers of religion?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. What rate could airlines give? Could they carry ministers of religion free?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may explain the bill, it would give airlines the same right which railroads have had for a hundred years. It would permit airlines to sell tickets to ministers of religion at half fare.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I want to know. It provides that ministers of religion could be carried for half fare?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are no compulsory features about it?

Mr. CAPEHART. No. If the airlines wanted to do it today they could not do it. Legislation is required to give them the right to sell half-fare tickets to ministers of religion.

Mr. FERGUSON. If one airline, flying to New York City, for example, allowed the half-fare privilege, would all the other airlines be forced to allow the same privilege?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not be considered unfair competition?

Mr. CAPEHART. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is purely a permissive provision?

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. It grants no other right than the one which railroads have been enjoying for a hundred years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS RELATING TO PATENTS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1908, H. R. 7794.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7794) to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 9, line 9, to strike out the word "or" and insert the word "on"; on page 29, in subsection 282 (1), to strike out the word "or" between the words "infringement" and "absence"; to strike out the comma at the end of the line after the word "infringement" and add the words "or unenforceability"; and on the same page, in the first line of section 284, to strike out the words "Upon adjudging a patent valid and infringed," and insert in lieu thereof the words "Upon finding for the claimant".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada tell us the purpose of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill would codify the patent laws of the United States. It is under the able guidance of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am not a patent lawyer, but I know patents are a very technical subject. Does the bill change the law in any way or only codify the present patent laws.

Mr. McCARRAN. It codifies the present patent laws. It passed the House, and it was approved by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as I recall, it was approved by the Judiciary Committee unanimously.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

This legislation is another step in codification of the United States Code and will enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents." This legislation has been in the process of study and consideration for a number of years. It has passed the House and has reached the Senate after lengthy hearings on the House side. The bill has the general approval of all parties concerned and represents a step forward in the codification of our laws, for it brings together in one package all of the laws relating to patents that were contained in the revised statutes of 1874 down to the present time. The bill is divided into three categories, the first being entitled the "Patent Office" and deals with its functions; part 2 is titled the "Patentability of Inventions and Grant of Powers," and part 3 is titled "Patents and Protection of Patent Rights." Into these three categories the existing laws relating to patents have been codified. In view of decisions of the Supreme Court and others as well as trial by practice and error there have been some changes in the law of patents as it now exists and some new terminology used. All these matters, as stated before, have been carefully gone over in hearings and the bill as it is now presented to the Senate represents, in the opinion of the committee, legislation of merit. The committee therefore recommends that this legislation be speedily passed.

The Senate amendments are primarily technical. The addition of the words "or unenforceability"—this is the subject matter of the committee amendment No. 3—will place in the code this word which has been used in numerous court decisions under the section in question.

The change in language proposed in committee amendment No. 4 is for the purpose of avoiding a possible construction that judgment must be entered by a court even in a case where a patent is found unenforceable. This will preserve the present rule of law in this regard.

The question as to whether part I of H. R. 7794 should have been properly codified in title 35 rather than title 5 dealing with executive agencies was discussed in the House Codification Committee and brought up in the study of the bill in the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate.

Inasmuch as title 5 has not been codified and the Patent Office is the proper agency for handling both patents and trade-marks, it is considered that part I is properly in H. R. 7794 at this time.

If it is desired to transfer the Patent Office to title 5 which deals with executive agencies, that matter could be properly taken care of when title 5 is offered for codification. It would seem that to leave the setting up of the Patent Office out of title 35 at this time would be to leave a portion of the patent law uncodified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

FRED P. HINES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, and the message from the President vetoing the bill.

(For the veto message see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 30, 1951).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his motion. A great many conference committees are meeting at this time. A record vote will be required on the question before the Senate, and in view of the fact that many Senators

are meeting in conferences I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withdraw his motion. I would prefer if we proceeded to the consideration of the veto message tomorrow, when many more Senators will be on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. There are more Senators on the floor today than there will be tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. But we have important conferences going on.

Mr. LANGER. There will be conferences going on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was passed by Congress, vetoed by the President, and is now reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with the recommendation that it do pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to say to my good friend from North Dakota that with so many Senators in conference I hope he will withdraw his motion, with the understanding that the bill will be the first order of business tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I withdraw my motion for the present, with the understanding that the matter will be taken up as the first order of business tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am told that the conferences are about over. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to have the veto message brought up now, I would as soon have it taken up now as tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Very well, Mr. President, I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to know what the bill relates to.

Mr. LANGER. Let me state that I have just moved that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill, which has been vetoed by the President.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that, but I should like to know what the bill provides.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me, I shall be glad to make a brief statement about the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill would provide for payment of the sum of $778.78 to Fred P. Hines, of Minot, N. Dak., which sum represents the amount necessary to pay private medical and hospital expenses incurred by him incident to an emergency operation when his physical condition was such that he could not be moved to a Veterans' Administration hospital.

An identical bill of the Eighty-first Congress, S. 2618, passed the Senate on July 26, 1950.

Mr. Hines was admitted as a patient at the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Fargo, N. Dak., from September 22, 1941, to May 14, 1942, during which time it was discovered that he was suffering from cancer. Following several extensive surgical procedures, he was discharged from that hospital on the abovementioned date. The claimant was admitted to the same hospital again on February 7, 1948, for treatment for abdominal complaints. The survey conducted revealed no recurrence of cancer but it did reveal a hernia at the site of the previous abdominal operations. He was treated with an abdominal belt and was discharged from the hospital on March 4, 1948, his symptoms having disappeared.

Mr. President, the bill was before the Judiciary Committee, and was reported favorably by that committee, and was passed by the Senate, but was vetoed by the President.

Thereafter, the bill was again referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee made a further study of the bill, in view of the President's veto message; and again the Judiciary Committee reported the bill favorably, with a recommendation that the bill be passed over the veto.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Dakota, that the Senate proceed to reconsider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this question must be decided by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to explain the reason why I shall vote to sustain the veto.

I notice from the report that Mr. Hines has a non-service-connected disability.

Personally, I feel—and I have taken this position throughout my service in the Senate—that we should do everything possible to rehabilitate the veterans of any war. On the other hand, in this case the report indicates that this man has a non-service-connected disability.

Under those circumstances, I believe it is my duty to vote to sustain the President's veto. I do not wish to discuss the case in detail, for I do not know very much about it.

On the other hand, if we set a precedent of this kind, it can be applied in many other cases. Although the sum of money involved in this case is relatively small, yet if the Senate were to override the President's veto, by taking such action the Senate would set a precedent which would have to be followed in the future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader says that Mr. Hines' disability was non-service-connected. However, the fact remains that twice Mr. Hines was taken to the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., and twice he was taken care of at that hospital. The doctors at the hospital claimed that Mr. Hines had cancer.

When Mr. Hines returned to the hospital the third time, the doctors kept him there 1 day, but then said they could do nothing for him; and they sent him—a man of 75 years of age—home to die.

When he reached Minot, N. Dak., he went to a private doctor, who proceeded to treat him. At the end of 1 month, Mr. Hines was strong enough to be able to submit to an operation.

He survived the operation. He has been in the hospital now for 5 years; he is in the hospital today. He is receiving a pension of $90 a month—not enough to keep body and soul together.

It was not his fault that the Veterans' Administration hospital would not keep him.

The bill was vetoed solely on the ground that there is some sort of regulation on the part of the Veterans' Administration that a veteran cannot go to a private hospital unles he obtains the consent of the Veterans' Administration.

I say that when the Veterans' Administration says to a man, "We can't cure you; go on home to die," and when the veteran then is treated by a private physician, at least the Government should pay his hospital expenses—which in this case amount to $778.78.

Those are the facts.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that under the law it is the duty of the Veterans' Administration to admit veterans to the veterans' hospitals if the illness is due to a service-connected disability. If the sickness is not service-connected, then the veteran may still be admitted if there is a bed available.

The fact that a veteran may receive treatment for non-service-connected disability certainly should not obligate the Government to pay his hospital bills in the future.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Mr. Hines stayed in the hospital, the first time, for several months. On the second occasion, again he stayed in the hospital for several months.

When he returned to the hospital the third time, the doctors there told him, "You are going to die anyway." They kept him at the hospital for 24 hours and then sent him home to die.

Certainly, merely because the Veterans' Administration did not do its duty, this man should not be penalized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not thoroughly familiar with this case. Did Mr. Hines die?

Mr. LANGER. No. He has been in the hospital for 5 years, now, after the Veterans' Administration said it could not do anything for him.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to observe that when this

bill was initially before the Senate, it came to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Judiciary Committee, and the bill also had the approval of the Republican calendar committee. After a searching examination into all the facts, all of us felt that this measure was a good and a meritorious one, and should be passed.

I hope the bill will be passed at this time, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in behalf of the bill. I think Mr. Hines is well deserving of the small benefit this bill would accord him.

Both the House committee and the Senate committee have thoroughly gone over his case and over this bill. If there were anything wrong with the bill, those committees would have found it.

I think the Senate should override the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, a yea-and-nay vote is required on this question, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator, from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. MCCARTHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	Saltonstall
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kem	Stennis
Dworshak	Kerr	Taft
Ecton	Kilgore	Thye
Ferguson	Langer	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
George	Martin	Williams
Hendrickson	McCarran	Young
Hennings	McClellan	

NAYS—16

Benton	Hunt	Moody
Chavez	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Long	Pastore
Ellender	Maybank	Smathers
Green	McFarland	
Holland	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—36

Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Bricker	Hayden	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Kefauver	Russell
Carlson	Knowland	Seaton
Case	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Magnuson	Sparkman
Duff	McCarthy	Tobey
Eastland	McKellar	Underwood
Flanders	McMahon	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. More than two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO LEASE QUARTERS FOR POST OFFICE PURPOSES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1795, House bill 6839, to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a bill which was called on the calendar, and an agreement has been reached whereby there is no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the objection to this bill was registered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

In reply to what the majority leader has said, I may say that in the committee we added to the words "Public Works Committee" the words "Post Office and Civil Service." We have agreed that both committees should supervise, instead of only one committee. The language is: "approved by the Committees on Public Works and Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committees on Public Works and Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate."

Mr. McFARLAND. As I understand the bill would permit a lease and an option to buy and would, in the end, save the Government a great deal of money. The only difficulty in regard to this proposed legislation in the past has been a dispute as to the jurisdiction of the two committees mentioned. I understand that the differences have been ironed out, and I personally feel that the bill is a good one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is good legislation, and the dignity of both committees is protected.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, are we considering this bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am going to object to the consideration of the bill. In fairness, I think I should say that there is some feeling around the Senate Chamber that after bills have been objected to on the calendar there has been some maneuvering to get action on them.

I have assured some of the Senators on our side that before any bill is taken up, either tonight or tomorrow, unless advance notice has been given, there will be a quorum call. I say that so that the distinguished majority leader may be aware of it, and also that we may have a statement in advance of what bills are going to be brought up, so that opportunity will be afforded to study them. There may be no necessity for objection; but, other than regular appropriation bills or the military or public works bills which are on the vital program of the Senate—if matters of a miscellaneous character are going to be brought up without advance notice, the Senator from New Hampshire, in justice to the people he represents, will demand a quorum.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho objects.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE IN CONSIDERING BILLS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the minority leader whether his statement applies to the situation which I am about to state.

Early in the afternoon objection was raised by me to a bill by which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]

sought to get some property for a New Mexico town. The Senator has now agreed to accept an amendment whereby the town will pay the full appraised fair market value for the property, because it will be used in a private sense, in that it will make home sites available to persons who want to come to the town.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the distinguished Senator that so long as we are on notice, so long as we have some advance notice, I shall not object to the consideration of such a bill tomorrow or after a quorum call at this time, but I do not want things to run wild.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator to withhold his comment.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on line 5, to be called up when the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] calls up the bill, which is H. R. 757. The amendment is as follows:

Upon payment by said town of the appraised fair market value of the property.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent is required to have the bill taken up, unless the Senator moves to take it up.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move to take it up, and I ask that the Senate vote on it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Idaho. I have tried to conform to the suggestion, though it is not always possible to do so, of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES], namely, to give notice of bills that we expect to call up. That is a courtesy which I have tried to extend. Usually I try to reach an agreement with the distinguished minority leader if I intend to depart from that practice.

I hope the distinguished Senator from Idaho will not resist taking up the bill. It is a very important bill and will save the Government a large amount of money. It is a bill on which the only controversy has been between two committees. If it had not been for that controversy, the bill would have been passed on the calendar a long time ago. The Senator from New Mexico is the only Senator who objected to it.

I hope that the Senator from Idaho will withhold his objection. If he does not, I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not insist on his motion. I shall move to take up the bill tomorrow, but I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not insist on his motion to take it up tonight, because I wish to keep faith with the practice we have established and have tried to follow.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I objected to the bill because during the past few hours there have been put through a score or more bills about which many Senators knew nothing. We had no notice about their being called after the calendar was completed. Many committees have been polled. We are considering bills which have never been considered by any committee. We have been asked to sign bills by clerks who have come to us and asked us to do so.

All Senators desire to be courteous to their colleagues, but I do not think this is the way to legislate. If committees have not considered bills, we should not consider them on the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senate distinctly understood that the only bills which were to be considered, as to which notice was not given, were bills on the calendar considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall not yield until I have made my explanation. I should like to have the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I want the Senate to know that, in my humble judgment, not a single bill has been slipped through; no bill has been passed that should not have beeen passed. The bills which have been taken up and considered have been bills not objected to. I have conformed to our practice of extending every courtesy to the minority by conferring with them about bills before making motions to take them up.

The measure now being discussed is important, but I myself would have to resist the motion of the Senator from South Carolina, if he insists on it, because I did not give the notice——

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator kindly wait? I hope the distinguished Senator from Idaho will withdraw his objection, because this bill has been on the calendar a long time. The Senate is fully informed in regard to the contents of the bill. I believe it to be an important measure, and that it can be disposed of this afternoon.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. With that explanation, I am willing to withdraw my objection, but I certainly shall object to the consideration of any bills already objected to on the Consent Calendar, because I think all Senators with bills caught in log jams in the committees are entitled to equitable treatment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator very kindly for withdrawing his objection.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I, too, thank the Senator from Idaho. I wish to say to the Senate that I meant to withdraw my motion to take up the bill tonight, and to let the bill go over until tomorrow. I desired to say that with all deference to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is agreed to, and without objection the bill——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not like to step in the way, but the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] desired to have a bill considered at the same time. If we are to endeavor to be consistent, we shall really be consistent. I think the Senator should let the bill go over until tomorrow. There will be no objection to it then. Let us treat everybody in the same way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall have to object as a matter of principle.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair had already announced that there was no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to clear the atmosphere, I think the Senator from Oregon has offered a proper amendment to the bill in which I am interested, and I am willing to accept it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to see the matter straightened out. Things ought to be either black or white. There should not be a mixture that is gray. Either it is proper for the Senator from Oregon to have his bill taken up, or it is proper for the Senator from South Carolina have his taken up, or it is not. If we are going to draw the line on one, we certainly should draw it on both. I am perfectly willing to have both bills come up tomorrow, or I am willing to allow them to be acted on now, and then apply the rule after those two have been acted upon. I have no objection to either bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why cannot we act on them now?

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, are we now acting on bills that have been reported by a mere poll of some members of committees?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. We are acting in conformity with the suggestion I made after the call of the calendar for the consideration of certain bills. I made an announcement that if objectors withdrew their objections, and there were no other objection, we would take up such bills and pass them by unanimous consent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. There may be two or three Senators who desire to object to a bill. One Senator may object, and then later withdraw his objection, but another Senator who has objection to the bill may be in conference and, therefore, would not know that the objection was being withdrawn and the bill taken up immediately.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say that I have tried to follow a rule that would obviate such a situation. I stated to the Senate that if any other Senators were opposed to a bill which had been objected to, they should register their opposition with the majority leader or the minority leader, and those bills would not be taken up. I made that announcement a few days ago, in order that the Senate might have notice of it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to have both these bills considered. I do not think there will be a better attendance of the Senate tomorrow than there is now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply wish to say that the bill in which I am interested is an old bill. The Senator from New Mex-

ico communicated with the city officials of the city in his State that is involved, and discovered that they are willing to pay the value of the property. My objection to the bill was that they were not paying full value for the property. I am perfectly willing to have the bill brought up tomorrow. However, I do not believe any other Senator has objected.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, at this point, in the interest of sound legislative procedure, I think it would be wise, except for the two bills to which reference has been made, that from here on in throughout the remainder of the session the Senate should not consider, on the call of the calendar, any bills which have been previously objected to.

In my judgment, it is in the interest of sound legislative procedure to follow such a course. I believe my distinguished colleague from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] feels the same way. So tomorrow I shall feel constrained to follow that course.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have given notice with respect to certain bills. I see no objection to taking up the two bills to which reference has been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am willing to take them up now.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF POSTMASTER GENERAL TO LEASE QUARTERS FOR POST OFFICE PURPOSES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 6839, Calendar 1795?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6839) to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments on page 5, line 13, after the word "on", to strike out "Public Works" and insert "Post Office and Civil Service"; and in line 15, after the word "on", to strike out "Public Works" and insert "Post Office and Civil Service."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] a question. Section 4 of the bill provides as follows:

SEC. 4. Each such lease-purchase agreement shall include such provisions as the Postmaster General, in his discretion, shall deem to be in the best interest of the United States and appropriate to secure the performance of the obligations imposed upon the party or parties that shall enter into such agreement with the United States.

As I understand, these are leases which ultimately become the property of the United States Government. Are the terms of the leases to be left entirely within the discretion of the Postmaster General, without any restrictions? For example, the lease might be for 6 percent, or 8 percent of the purchase price. What are the terms with respect to depreciation, and so forth?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Under the terms of the committee amendments, the lease-purchase agreements must be referred back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, for our scrutiny. We are trying to throw all the safeguards possible around such agreements.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, the Postmaster General has complete discretion with relation to the terms of the leases, which ultimately become the property of the United States, subject to supervision by the two committees mentioned, but without any terms in the law as to what he shall do.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true, subject to the restrictions contained in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what is the term in years of the leases which the Postmaster General may make under the terms of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From 8 to 25 years.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill permits leases to be made from 8 to 25 years?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Whichever the Postmaster General thinks is the best under the circumstances.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the provision of the present law? For how long may a lease be made?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Ten years, as I recall.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Ten years.

Mr. FERGUSON. So we are extending the term of the leases, so that the Postmaster General may make a lease in the name of the United States for a period of 25 years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The reason for that, if I may inform the Senator from Michigan, is this: The country and the Congress know that we have not had a public works bill or authorization for many years. The country is some 25 or 30 years behind. About the only way by which construction can be carried on is through private enterprise. This is a private enterprise system, by which private enterprise constructs a building, and leases it to the Post Office Department. At the end of a certain term of years, after it is amortized at a certain rate of interest, which is to be scrutinized by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, it then becomes Government property. In other words, instead of Congress appropriating money to construct buildings, under this legislation they can be constructed by private enterprise.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does such a lease become valid before it is sent to the committees for approval?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Section 8 reads as follows:

SEC. 8. No proposed lease-purchase agreement shall be executed under this act until it has been submitted to and approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That means, then, that a committee meeting would be held, and a vote would be taken as to whether or not the lease-purchase agreement should be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the vote were in the negative, or if there were not a majority of the committee voting in favor of the agreement, the agreement could not be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the way I interpret the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am asking these questions only for the purpose of making a legislative history. I am not objecting to the bill, but I should like to make a legislative history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations of three postmasters which were favorably reported this afternoon. I ask that they may be confirmed as in executive session. One is the nomination of Bernard F. Vandergriff, to be postmaster at Clinton, Tenn.; the second is the nomination of Van Drennen Hicks, to be postmaster at Oakridge, Tenn.; and the third is the nomination of Francis E. Durrett, to be postmaster at White House, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that prior to the time he entered the Chamber we made an agreement that nothing else would come up until tomorrow unless advance notice were given and a quorum call had. Would not the Senator be willing to let these nominations go over until tomorrow, in order that we may avoid violating that agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well, if the Senator objects.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection, but I do not like to see the agreement violated, except with respect to the consideration of the two bills which have been referred to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to put the Senate on notice that we shall report the nominations of eight or ten postmasters tomorrow. However, in each case the two Senators from the particular State will have agreed to them, and the committee will have approved them.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I renew my request for the consideration of the nominations of three Tennessee postmasters reported earlier in the day. I believe the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is now willing that they be confirmed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection to the consideration of these three postmaster nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection, as in executive session, to the present consideration of the three postmaster nominations referred to? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Bernard F. Vandergriff to be postmaster at Clinton, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Van Drennen Hicks to be postmaster at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francis E. Durrett to be postmaster at White House, Tenn.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of these three postmaster nominations.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN OF HOPE, N. MEX.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex., was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, to strike out "$1,950" and insert in lieu thereof "the appraised fair-market value of the property."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED THIS DAY—GENERAL OFFICERS IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Was the Executive Calendar called with reference to the nominations on page 2 of the Executive Calendar, and particularly with reference to the nominations in the Army and in the United States Air Force?

The VICE PRESIDENT. All new reports were called, and all nominations confirmed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understood that unanimous consent had been asked for the consideration of certain treaties. However, I did not understand that the Executive Calendar in its entirety was to be called. There are Senators who are interested in some of the nominations on the Executive Calendar. It has been customary to call the Executive Calendar toward the close of the day.

I have no serious objection to some of these nominations, but I think it ought to be made crystal clear what we are doing and what we are going to do. Here are the nominations of 17 colonels advanced to the rank of general. Certainly some of us have some questions to ask, and we ought to be entitled to answers. Whether or not we are entitled to serve on various committees is something which is decided by seniority. I grant that that is the orderly procedure. But here are 17 new generals; and many generals are advanced further in their responsibility, with higher ranks. I have no serious objection if they really merit the advancement, but Members of the Senate certainly have a right to know when the Executive Calendar is to be called, especially when objections are raised by Members of the Senate, and even by some members of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It so happened that I was not in the Chamber when the Executive Calendar was called. Let me say to my good friend from Kansas that I never have the calendar taken up without consulting with the minority leader and ascertaining if there is any objection. I was not in the Chamber. I do not know whether that was done in this instance. However, the Senator can move to reconsider the action of the Senate. I shall not complain if he so moves, because if the rule was not followed it should have been followed. I always consult with the minority leader and clear the Executive Calendar with him, and then I give notice that we are to take up nominations.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I will say to the distinguished majority leader that I shall not ask for reconsideration. I do not want any special arrangement or privilege. I do think, in view of the fact that we are advancing 17 colonels, worthy as they may be, to general officer rank, and a score of other generals—probably not that many, but almost that many—to advanced positions, certainly there should be some yardstick used, and they should not be considered for promotion at the tail end of the session. I point out that fact. I have had some Senators ask me about it. I do not know why it was done. I did make objection by way of inquiring as to some of the nominations a few weeks ago, because I wanted to have some information as to what the officers had done to merit their advancement. I think it is only fair that we should know something about these people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. With the permission of the Senator from Kansas, in view of the comments he has made, I believe what the equitable action of the Senate should be is perfectly clear. As a Member of the Armed Services Committee I do not like to see promotions in the armed services go through the Senate if any Senator has any reservations about them and has not had an opportunity to express them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the action by which the nominations were confirmed, and that they be placed on the Executive Calendar for action tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would advise Senators that the difficulty presented is that the President was ordered notified immediately. The Chair is informed that the President has been notified.

Mr. WELKER. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was requested that the nominations be considered before the treaties were considered, and unanimous consent was granted that that be done. Accordingly they were confirmed. Following their confirmation, the treaties were ratified.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I was the acting minority leader for and on behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] when the nominations were confirmed. When the Executive Calendar was called the acting majority leader—and as I recall, it was the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]—came to me, as is always done in such instances, and told me what was about to be done. I sought to ascertain on this side of the aisle whether there was any objection to the procedure.

If there was any misunderstanding it was due to the fact that we are drawing near the end of the session, and if any embarrassment has been occasioned, I accept the blame as the acting minority leader.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to say to the acting minority leader, in view of the statement he has made, that he is completely right. I was not aware that there had been the inquiry mentioned on this side of the aisle. We were clearly on notice. Under the circumstances I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WELKER. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Acting as the minority leader has been an extremely confusing job for a new Member of the Senate. We were trying to expedite matters so that we could adjourn. I regret very much that I had any part in hurrying the promotions.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished acting minority leader that perhaps some Senators on this side of the aisle and some Senators on the other side of the aisle were not in the Chamber because they were on responsible assignments as members of committees.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. I did not know that final action had been taken on the Executive Calendar as it related to the general officer nominations. I

consider the question raised by the Senator from Kansas to be both understandable and certainly very legitimate. If he will permit me to do so I think I can satisfy his very natural concern.

The Senator from Kansas, who is not a member of the Armed Services Committee, has raised a question concerning why the committee has at this late date in the session recommended the advancement of so many officers to general rank. It was a little more than a year ago, I will say to the Senator from Kansas, that the Senate Armed Services Committee placed a limitation on the number of general and flag officers to be appointed in each of the services. In each of the services the committee's limitation is far lower than the statutory authority which the services have to recommend and appoint officers to general and flag rank. The RECORD ought to show, as the Senator from Kansas will be interested in knowing, that the committee limitation for the Army of the United States is 496 general officers. The committee limitation with reference to admirals in the Navy is 280. The committee limitation with reference to the Marine Corps is 60 officers of general rank. The committee's limitation with reference to the Air Force is the numerical limitation of 333 officers of general rank. What will provide satisfaction to my friend from Kansas is to be advised, for it is a fact, that even though a number of officers have been confirmed this afternoon and the President has been advised that they are to become general officers, the total of the general officers and flag officers in each of the four respective services remains—and it will never exceed, until the committee reaches another policy decision—the number limitations which were imposed by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on the four services more than a year ago.

I would add one word further, if I may. In the last several years the armed services of our Nation have expanded rapidly, as the Senator from Kansas knows full well. The limitation on the number of general officers set by the Senate Armed Services Committee is now an over-all total of 1,169. I think the Senator would like to consider in his mind and for future consideration that we have had authority to create 1,169 flag or general officers for a total personnel strength today of something in excess of 3,500,000 men.

I trust that this brief explanation has satisfied in part what I can appreciate is a serious concern on the part of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield, I wish to say I appreciate very much the explanation given by the Senator from Washington, who is a member of the Armed Services Committee. I am sure the explanation will satisfy some of those who have lodged some questions about these advancements.

I wish to ask the able Senator from Washington whether it is true that a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee or the Armed Services Committee as a whole is still holding open, for further consideration or determination, the matter of the number of advancements in the armed services, including nominations of the sort included in the Executive Calendar today.

I have been informed that such a study is in progress, and that it probably will be a good many months—perhaps not until the next session—before something is offered by way of an equitable readjustment of this situation. Am I correctly informed?

Mr. CAIN. My best answer to the Senator from Kansas is that the Senate Armed Services Committee has a subcommittee, the chairman of which is the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. That subcommittee is charged with making a continuing study of this problem and the question of how many general and flag officers there should be for the Armed Forces of the United States.

As I have said previously, that subcommittee recommended to the full committee, and the recommendation was approved more than a year ago, that until further notice there should be established a total over-all ceiling, on all of the four services, of 1,169 general and flag officers—the ceiling to which I have previously referred.

I wish to repeat that regardless of the number of general and flag officers who have been appointed and confirmed at this session of the Congress, the total is still considerably below the ceiling imposed by the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further, let me say that I appreciate that information.

To keep the RECORD absolutely straight in regard to this situation, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that the reason why I raised this question was that certain Senators, not only Senators on this side of the aisle, but also some Senators on the other side of the aisle, whom I shall not mention by name, specifically requested me to notify them of the call of the calendar because of their interest in some of these matters.

I understand that the absence of a quorum was suggested but that, following that suggestion, the order for the call of the roll was vacated.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think it unfortunate that some of our colleagues who have a serious interest in this question were not, by force of circumstances, on the floor when the Executive Calendar was called.

I am extremely grateful to the Senator from Kansas for asking these questions, for perhaps in speaking for the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the chairman of the subcommittee which concerns itself with promotion matters, I have in part—and reasonably well, I hope—explained to the satisfaction of the Senator from Kansas and other Senators who may read the RECORD tomorrow that although we have a considerable number of flag and general officers now on active duty, yet the sum total of those general and flag officers continues to be below the ceiling on the general flag officer strength which was set more than a year ago by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the statement the Senator from Washington has made.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. WELKER. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Washington and, through him, to the Senator from Kansas, that I have made inquiry as to the so-called brief quorum call and to the so-called early rescinding of the order for the call of the roll on that occasion. I find that the order for the call of the roll was not rescinded early in the call of the roll; in fact, it was rescinded late in the call of the roll.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that my sole concern during the last few minutes has been to provide as best I could some factual information, in response to a totally logical question raised by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to the discussion which has just been had, I wish to say that if any Senator has any objection to any nomination on the Executive Calendar, I hope he will register his objection with either the majority leader or the minority leader, so that we shall know of the objection. I want to be as fair as possible and to give all possible notice.

However, on the last day of the session we shall have to move to consider the nominations then on the Executive Calendar, regardless of whether there is objection, for otherwise it will not be possible to confirm those nominations. I shall try as best I can to conform to the practice Senators observe of extending courtesies to each other.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfried Bohm;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin; and

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MILLS, Mr. REED of New York, and Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) to print proceedings at the presentation of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to "Harry Strunk Lake";

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;

S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member States on the Council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 457 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. FREAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION TO SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that my work with my good friend, the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has been very pleasant. He has been most cooperative. He has always informed me of any intention on the part of the minority, and I have tried to inform him of any intention on the part of the majority or the majority leader.

Perhaps once in a while we may slip; but we constantly do the best we can to protect individual Senators here on the floor of the Senate; and we expect to continue to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to give notice of the consideration of two more bills which the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would like to call up. They are H. R. 7126 and H. R. 5954, both dealing with the transfer of land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. One of the bills, Mr. President, pertains to the Federal Government giving to the State of Colorado a quarter of an acre of land to be used for highways, and the other bill pertains to the vacation of some Federal ground, a small tract in Camden, N. J.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is another small bill which I may wish to move to have the Senate take up tomorrow. I wish to give notice of it at this time. I do not know whether I shall move to have the Senate take up the bill; but I wish to give notice now, so that if I shall decide to make that motion, the Senate will be on notice.

This measure is Senate bill 2137, Calendar 740. The bill is similar to an-

other bill regarding public works and the leasing of property. As in the other situation, the bill involves a dispute between the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the Committee on Public Works.

I do not know whether the differences will be settled. If they are not settled, I have no intention of moving to have the Senate take up the bill. However, I simply wish to call attention to this matter.

I hope I shall not have to move to have the Senate consider any measures about which I have not given notice; but if that necessity should arise, I shall certainly consult first with the minority leader and tell him why I shall have to depart from this rule.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because if there is one thing that I want when the Senate adjourns, it is to have Senators on both sides of the aisle feel that I have tried to be fair.

APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE, COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to give notice that, tomorrow, I shall ask to take up House bill 7778, which is a bill unanimously passed by the House. It has come to the Senate. It is a most important bill in connection with a post office at Council Bluffs, Iowa, where unfortunately the public mails are being handled in a rat-infested ancient warren that should have been condemned and torn down years ago, and which was not even built for a public post office. It is very vital that the bill be passed. It has been delayed for a good many years, so I shall ask to have that bill taken up tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I hope the Senator will discuss the matter with the distinguished minority leader, and he and I will confer about it. Perhaps we will agree to take it up. Has the Senator spoken to me about it?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is why I wanted to discuss it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Has the Senator previously spoken to me about taking it up?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Not about taking it up. A day or two ago I spoke to the Senator about that and another bill. I did not emphasize the other one so much, because it was a bill of a different kind.

Mr. McFARLAND. Had the Senator come to me, we might have had his bill taken up today.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator about it a day or two ago, but I did not emphasize it, because it was before the Public Works Committee and had not been reported. It has not yet been reported, as I think it should have been. But the other bill about which I spoke to the Senator yesterday and again today—and he was very kind about it—was one that had already been reported. It was passed this afternoon, without objection. I appreciate the kindness of the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will confer with the distinguished minority leader about the bill in which the Senator from Iowa is interested, but I do not know what our attitude will be.

SOLDIER VOTING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that tomorrow, on behalf of myself and the distinguished majority leader and a large group of other Senators, every Senator here is invited to join in the submission of a resolution asking the Governors of the various States to cooperate in order to provide soldier voting. The House has failed to take action on the Senate bill to provide for soldier voting, and certainly at this time the men and women of the service, particularly the men who are fighting overseas, should have every right to vote, and an opportunity to vote. This resolution seems now to be the only thing that we can do. It would call upon the Governors of the various States to take such steps as they might find reasonable and proper to provide the right to vote to service men and women. I do not think there will be any objection, but I wanted to give notice that I intend to bring it up.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say there is a bill in which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is very much interested. He is not presently on the floor, and I therefore do not ask for immediate consideration of the bill, but I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 1084, which is Calendar No. 1387.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1084 to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL CONDUCIVE TO IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES AND PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INTERESTS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the conference report approving the Interior appropriation bill. I think the committees and the conferees have done a good job on this measure.

Particularly I consider this report and its aproval by the Senate a long step forward in providing for a harmonious working relationship between the rural electric cooperatives and the public and private power interests. This bill, by establishing a continuing fund of $1,000,000 for the Southwestern Power Administration insures the continuation of the contracts with both private power and public power sources for a cheap and dependable supply of wholesale power to serve the millions of farm customers in the southwestern area of the United States.

The passage of this measure will be a milestone in the progress of rural electrification throughout Oklahoma and the southwestern area.

Mr. President, for many years I have been an ardent and enthusiastic supporter of rural electrification. I have followed the progress of rural electrification from its inauspicious beginning 16 years ago when only 11 percent of the farms in this Nation were electrified, and I have never ceased to marvel at the astounding record of accomplishments and service of the REA to our farm families.

Sixteen years ago, 89 percent of America's farm homes were in darkness, without the advantages of labor-saving devices like washing machines, electric irons, and power tools and pumps, or the conveniences which add so greatly to the pleasures of daily living such as electric refrigerators, deep freezers, electric stoves, radios and television sets.

Sixteen years ago only 11 percent of our farms were receiving the electricity which for 40 years had been an everyday necessity in our cities and towns.

Today, Mr. President, this 11 percent has increased nationally to 84.2 percent. In my own State of Oklahoma only 72.6 percent of our farms are electrified, about 12 percent less than the national average. So there is much more work to be done if we are to expand our 51,122 miles of rural lines to approximate the achievements of the country as a whole.

America's farm families know and appreciate the value of rural electrification, for perhaps no single program of the many worth while and beneficial programs undertaken by this country has directly benefitted them more.

The farmer who now grinds his feed with electric power, waters his cattle, and irrigates his land by electrically driven pumps doesn't have to be sold on the value of rural electrification. The farmer's wife who does her family's laundry in a modern washing machine, prepares their meals on a clean, efficient electric stove, keeps their food and milk fresh and wholesome in an electric refrigerator, or fills a deep freezer with vegetables and fruits fresh from her garden does not have to be sold on the value of rural electrification.

Talk with the farmers yourself and experience the feeling of the new life that comes to them and their families when that vital line touches their farm, and share with them their joy at the realization that the years of drudgery and backbreaking labor are gone.

Yes, Mr. President, the farm families know and appreciate the value of rural electrification, but I have found that not all of our townspeople do. They have not only overlooked the many benefits REA has brought to rural areas, but are even less aware of what it has done for independent business. Some townspeople, misled perhaps by clever propaganda, have compared REA with Government dictatorship and recklessly charged it as being socialistic. I submit, Mr. President, that nothing could be further from the truth.

The local REA cooperatives are farmer-owned and farmer-operated. They are successful businesses. They are getting electricity to the farms at reasonable rates—disproving the big utility claim that it would take at least $1,000 or more prepayment per farm to assure electrical service—but are repaying with interest the money loaned by the Government to do the job.

As of December 31, 1951, the REA's owed Uncle Sam $284,420,886 on their loan accounts. On that date, however, they had repaid him $326,077,549, over $41,000,000 in advance payments. I challenge anyone to show me a single other Government lending operation where the borrowers are $41,000,000 ahead of time in their repayments. Of the amount repaid Uncle Sam, $121,608,305 represents interest. The remainder is repayment on principle. REA is a financially sound investment.

In Oklahoma, as in the other States, REA is a going business and is benefiting other businesses as well as the farm families they serve.

Let us not forget that free enterprise builds the REA lines, every mile of them. Free enterprise has built the $78,000,000 worth of lines erected in Oklahoma. And it has built them in the other States, too.

Let us see, Mr. President, what happens when the enterprising and pioneering farmers of Oklahoma invest $78,000,000 in better living. First, the work of building the power lines goes to the contractor who submits the low bid—private enterprise. Who supplies the poles, the conductor, the insulator, and the hundred other items needed to erect a power transmisison line? Private enterprise. Who pays the worker for his services? Private enterprise. And not one of these could have shared in the $78,000,000 which Oklahoma's farmers were willing to invest had it not been for REA, and as a result private enterprise in my State has benefited by that amount.

Nearly 116,000 consumers have been connected to REA lines in Oklahoma. What happens when a farm home is ready to be energized, Mr. President? Each consumer spends at least $500 for wiring, lighting, and appliances. Many spend much more, but that means about $58,000,000, or a total of more than $136,000,000 in business for Oklahoma's private enterprises. Again they have benefitted because of REA—the State is that much richer because of this investment. Does this seem unfair to private enterprise? Do not forget that this is new business—business that would not have existed without REA. It was territory that no one had sought to serve until REA filled the vital need which power monopolies were unwilling or unable to provide.

This market of more than $5,000,000 in sales of electricity per year could not be served, the private utilities said. The job was impossible.

Yet these farmer-owned cooperatives, with Government loans, did the impossible. Now each year the demand for electricity increases as farmers use more and more power in their farm work and as new consumers are connected.

The gross annual business in Oklahoma—again business which would not have existed without REA—has exceeded $5,000,000 a year and is still increasing. Most of this $5,000,000 is transformed into new payrolls for Oklahoma workers.

Can this be contrary to our system of free enterprise? Even the big utility companies that once sought to discredit the REA by hurling charges of socialism benefit to the extent of a million dollars a year through the sale of wholesale power to REA cooperatives in Oklahoma.

I am greatly concerned, however, for this ever-increasing demand makes it imperative that our REA's have dependable, independent sources of electrical energy. In my State alone $78,000,000 is invested in REA facilities, and that investment must be protected. Our REA's cannot and must not be left without a dependable source of low-cost power. They cannot and must not be left to the mercy of the utilities for whatever energy they are willing to sell after meeting the demands of their city customers.

My goal, Mr. President, is to be sure we always have adequate low-cost power to supply this vast farm market. It must be provided at a reasonable figure to encourage the greatest possible use of electricity on the farms.

These farm electrical systems must not be confined to only private utility sources for their power. Certainly when it is advantageous to them to purchase their wholesale power from private lines, properly located for supply, they should be encouraged to contract for it at the best possible rates.

But as the legally defined preferred consumers they are entitled to purchase power from the vast hydroelectric power pool generated at government built flood-control dams. This power, created with public funds, should not be turned over for the exclusive use of the private utilities and the REA's forced to buy it from them at whatever rates they cared to charge.

Under the contracts with private utilities, we in Oklahoma have established a new program of Government and business cooperation where the private utilities can now deliver this hydroelectric power over their existing lines at low rates prescribed by the Southwestern Power Administration. It is a give and take arrangement in which the private utilities buy and sell to the SPA and deliver power over their lines to the SPA account.

But often private utility lines do not and cannot serve these farm cooperatives at points on their system where the lines can be energized properly. Other lines are required as well as other sources of steam-generated power to properly service these 51,000 miles of farm electric lines.

Under the policy which has just been approved by the Congress, these necessary additional lines can be built. The Southwestern Power Administration can reach points on these farm electric systems which private lines cannot properly service.

With this policy now established by the Congress, unnecessary duplication can be avoided, an adequate supply of power for REA lines assured at low rates, and Government and private industry can work together to make the vast pool of public and private power available to the consumers of the State.

The establishment of such a policy has not been accomplished without a fight and without difficulty. I am happy to have been a part of that fight to bring to the farmers the advantages of electricity at low rates, and to insure also that these systems will not and cannot be exploited or destroyed by high costs or shortages of wholesale power.

My goal is to see every farm home in America have access to electricity at rates they can afford to pay. The goal is almost in sight, Mr. President, and I will continue to fight for the REA until it is achieved.

PURCHASE OF ST. LOUIS CARDINALS BASEBALL CLUB BY FRED M. SAIGH, JR., AND THE LATE ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, several months ago my attention was called to a certain transaction whereby Fred M. Saigh, Jr., and the late Robert E. Hannegan, of St. Louis, had, in purchasing the St. Louis Cardinals Baseball Club, made a substantial profit, the suggestion being that this profit accrued largely as a result of a failure on the part of the Treasury Department to enforce strictly certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

I have submitted this case to Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, requesting an opinion as to whether or not there was laxity on the part of the Treasury Department in this case. I quote from two paragraphs of a letter which I received from Mr. Stam, which quotation sums up this case:

> The record which has been examined indicates a lack of compliance in this case with provisions of various Treasury decisions requiring that the examining officer's report set forth in every instance specific recommendations for the application or nonapplication of section 102, that each revenue agent in charge designate a qualified employee whose responsibility it would be to pass personally upon each case in which a recommendation has been made with respect to the application or nonapplication of section 102, and that special consideration be given by the Bureau on post review to determine whether field officers have complied fully with these instructions. * * * It would appear that the question of the application of section 102 to this company has not been properly developed or explored by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, this entire report, including the letter of Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report, including the letter, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1947.

Re Cardinals.

Mr. WALTER SMITH,
President, First National Bank in St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR MR. SMITH: My associate and I desire to borrow $3,000,000 for purchasing the stock

of the Cardinal Baseball Co. from Mr. Sam Breadon, his family, and others.

Here are the details: The Cardinal club is owned by holders of 10,152 shares of stock, 7,833 of which is common and 2,319 preferred. Mr. Breadon is the principal holder of the stock with 7,666 shares, 6,514 of comman and 1,152 preferred. Mr. Mark S. Steinberg owns 336 shares of common and 643 shares of preferred. Mr. Breadon also controls 710 shares of common and 220 shares of preferred. The rest, or 577 shares, are owned by 120 stockholders holding from 1 to 10 shares.

The company has $1,000,000 in United States bonds; a minimum of $1,500,000 in cash; stadiums at Houston, Rochester, and Columbus valued at over $1,500,000; 15 acres of land in St. Louis, $300,000; National League franchise (conservative), $400,000, a total of $4,700,000. I have a commitment from the Lincoln-Rochester Trust Co. on the Rochester stadium for a loan of $400,000 and from the City National Bank of Houston for $400,000 on the Houston stadium. I have not tried to get a commitment on the Columbus club but I am told it is in better condition and produces better than either the Houston or Rochester club.

My associate and I will form a new corporation. The loan from your bank will be in the name of that corporation and the stock of the Cardinals will be held in that corporation. The stock will remain in your possession until the loan is paid. After the board of directors of the Cardinals resign (and that will be a condition), we will cause the accounts of the company to be transferred to the First National Bank. We will then have the Cardinal organization sell the United States bonds to take the profit within the Cardinal company; have the subsidiary companies make the $400,000 loan at Houston and at Rochester and transfer the funds to the parent organization, and then declare a dividend of sufficient amount to pay the $3,000,000 loan.

As you know, the new company will pay 38 percent or 15 percent of the dividend it receives from the Cardinals. That will cost $57,000 for every $1,000,000 we have to use. The 14 acres of land in the city of St. Louis will also be sold. Roughly, that will leave us approximately $600,000 in working capital with all liabilities paid except the $800,000 we shall owe on the Houston and Rochester clubs.

We would like to be in a position to direct Mr. Breadon to present his stock at your bank for payment at the agreed price; and than proceed to make similar offers to Mr. Steinberg and the other stockholders; however, on a different price level. We feel that Mr. Breadon has put in 27 years of his business life in the company and deserves somewhat more for that and for a block of stock that will deliver control.

It should not take us over 60 days to complete the whole transaction and we are agreeable to pay whatever interest rate you desire, plus any expenses that you may incur in handling the transaction. We want to act as quickly as humanly possible, so I shall appreciate it very much if you will give me a firm commitment at your very earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

FRED M. SAIGH, Jr.

REPORT

The St. Louis National Baseball Club, hereinafter called the Cardinals, was as of November 15, 1947, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Missouri, with 7,833 shares of common and 2,319 shares of preferred stock issued and outstanding. Mr. Sam Breadon was the principal holder of the stock, with 6,514 shares of common and 1,152 shares of preferred, making a total of 7,666. He also controlled 710 shares of common and 220 shares of preferred. Mr. Mark C. Steinberg owned 336 shares of common and 643 shares of preferred. The stock of 16 minor-league clubs was wholly owned by the Cardinals.

Mr. Fred M. Saigh, Jr., in a letter dated September 26, 1947, addressed to the First National Bank in St. Louis, a copy of which is enclosed, presented a plan whereby through the formation of a new corporation and a loan by the bank of $3,000,000 to the newly formed corporation the latter would acquire the stock of the Cardinals. In the letter to the bank an estimate was placed on the value of the Cardinals at $4,700,000, comprised of $1,000,000 in United States bonds, a minimum of $1,500,000 in cash, stadiums at Houston, Rochester and Columbus valued at over $1,500,000, 14 acres of land in St. Louis $300,000, and National League franchise $400,000.

On November 25, 1947, Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh borrowed $60,800 on their personal note from the Manufacturer's Bank and Trust Co. of St. Louis, Mo. With these funds they formed National Sports, Inc. Mr. Hannegan received 51 percent and Mr. Saigh 49 percent of the stock. The opening journal entry on the books of National Sports, Inc., indicates capital stock of $10,000 and paid-in surplus of $400,800; the latter was presented by stock in the Cardinals.

On November 25, 1947, National Sports, Inc., borrowed $3,000,000 from the First National Bank of St. Louis, Mo. The loan was evidenced by a demand note and the bank paid out the loan solely against delivery to it of stock in the Cardinals, which it retained as security for the loan. In addition, as consideration in part for the stock, Mr. Breadon took a short-term note for $550,000 and Mr. Steinberg took a short-term note for $100,000 from National Sports, Inc. As collateral security for payment on the notes of Messrs. Breadon and Steinberg a lien was created on all shares of stock in the Cardinals held by the bank, such lien being subordinate to the lien granted the bank. Mr. Breadon also took a long-term note from National Sports, Inc., Robert E. Hannegan and Fred Saigh, Jr., for $350,000 at the rate of $50,000 per year for 7 years.

National Sports, Inc., by means of the bank loan and loans from individuals, was enabled to acquire all of the outstanding stock of the Cardinals, with the exception of 15 shares, for the sum of $4,055,142.85. The purchase of the stock was made possible by the financing as follows: Cash $60,800, proceeds from bank loan $3,000,000, short-term notes $650,000, long-term note $350,000, total $4,060,800.

The $3,000,000 bank loan was repaid to the bank as explained hereafter. In December 1947, having acquired substantially all the capital stock of the Cardinals, National Sports, Inc., received a dividend of $60 per share or $608,220, on the Cardinals stock. The full amount of $608,220 was applied by National Sports, Inc., on the $3,000,000 bank loan. On December 23, 1947, National Sports, Inc., borrowed $800,000 from the Cardinals on an unsecured note and applied the proceeds against the remaining balance of the bank loan, leaving an unpaid balance of $1,586,180.

On January 8, 1948, a corporate merger took place. The St. Louis National Baseball Club (the Cardinals) was merged into the National Sports, Inc., by the terms of the merger agreement, the latter was the surviving corporation. The name of National Sports, Inc., was then changed to "St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc." Under the merger the assets and liabilities of the former two organizations became vested in the surviving corporation.

On January 9, 1948, the balance of the loan of $1,586,180 was paid by the surviving corporation, St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., to the First National Bank of St. Louis, Mo. On February 24, 1948, the short term notes in the amounts of $550,000 and $100,000 owing to Sam Breadon and Mark C. Steinberg, respectively, were paid by St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc. To make these large cash payments funds in the amount of $1,500,000 were made available to the parent corporation by three of the minor league clubs—Rochester, Houston, and Columbus. Each of these clubs borrowed from banks a sum of $500,000.

In connection with the merger, certificates of stock in the National Sports Inc., and the Cardinals were canceled and new certificates of stock in St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., were issued to shareholders. Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh each received the same proportionate share in the new stock as they had in National Sports, Inc.

The dividend of $608,220 received by National Sports, Inc., in December 1947 was reported as income on the tax return of the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc. (new name for National Sports, Inc.)

During the year 1948 the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., paid off the personal liability of Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh owing to the Manufacturer's National Bank & Trust Co. $60,800 plus interest of $1,202.03. The revenue agent is taking the position that the amount of $62,002.03 is taxable income in 1948 to Robert E. Hannegan to the extent of 51 percent of such amount, and to Fred Saigh, Jr., on the balance of 49 percent.

In the years 1948, 1949, and 1950 payments of $50,000, $50,000, and $250,000, respectively, plus an amount of interest each year, were made on the long-term note of $350,000 given to Sam Breadon by National Sports, Inc., Robert E. Hannegan, and Fred M. Saigh, Jr. The revenue agent is proposing deficiencies in tax for these years against Messrs. Hannegan and Saigh on the basis that such payments constitute income to them allocated 51 percent to Hannegan and 49 percent to Saigh.

On January 26, 1949, Robert E. Hannegan disposed of his entire interest in the Cardinals. He sold 1,731 shares of his stock in the St. Louis National Baseball Club, Inc., to that corporation for the sum of $700,000, and he transferred 96/100 share of stock to Fred M. Saigh, Jr., and received in return 250 shares of the Locust Ninth Realty Corp. valued at $338.21. The total sales price of $700,388.21, a cost price of $25,908 and a capital gain of $674,408.21 were reported on the income-tax return of Robert E. Hannegan (deceased) and Irma P. Hannegan for 1949."

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, D. C., July 2, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am returning the attached material which you submitted relating to the question of whether the St. Louis National Baseball Club should have been subject to the provisions of section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The material submitted is insufficient to enable the staff to pass judgment upon this question. The staff made an examination of the agent's reports and returns of this corporation covering the years 1940 to 1947, inclusive. The record which has been examined indicates a lack of compliance in this case with provisions of various Treasury decisions requiring that the examining officer's report set forth in every instance specific recommendations for the application or nonapplication of section 102, that each revenue agent in charge designate a qualified employee whose responsibility it would be to pass personally upon each case in which a recommendation has been made with respect to the application or nonapplication of section 102, and that special consideration be given by the Bureau on post

review to determine whether field officers have complied fully with these instructions.

The record discloses that there were no recommendations with respect to section 102 for some years although it indicates that the matter should have been thoroughly investigated. With respect to other years, the record shows that while there was a recommendation as to the nonapplication of section 102 by the field agent, there is no indication that such recommendation was reviewed either in the office of the internal-revenue agent in charge or in the Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The conclusion to be drawn from the brief investigation we were able to make is that while there were numerous reasons why the application of section 102 should have been thoroughly explored, neither the field nor the Commissioner's office gave the question the consideration required by Treasury regulations.

Indefinite plans for expansion which do not materialize or for which commitments have not been made have never been regarded as sufficient evidence to overcome the presumption of liability under section 102. See *Koma, Inc.*, v. *Commissioner*, decided by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit on May 16, 1951. In that case, section 102 was held applicable where there was no definite commitment for expansion plans and where there was no evidence prior to or during the taxable year in question that the board of directors formally or informally had decided to commit funds for the construction of new facilities. See also, *World Publishing Co.* v. *United States* (169 Fed. (2d) 186), where the court applied section 102, because there was no showing as to the immediate need of funds for expansion purposes. It would appear that the question of the application of section 102 to this company has not been properly developed or explored by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Sincerely yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
Chief of Staff.

BRIDGE CANYON POWER DAM, COLORADO RIVER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Bridge Canyon, on the Colorado River, is located at the head of Lake Mead, 117.5 miles upstream from Hoover Dam.

The capacity of this reservoir is 3,720,000 acre-feet. The power to be developed is estimated to be 750,000 kilowatts to 900,000 kilowatts.

The dam would be 673 feet above the stream bed. The crest length of the dam would be 1,950 feet.

The total cost of the Bridge Canyon Dam and power project would be $325,314,000, divided as follows: For the Bridge Canyon Dam and reservoir, $224,604; for the Bridge Canyon power plant, $92,219,000, and for the Coconino Dam and reservoir, on the Little Colorado River, for regulatory purposes, $8,491,000.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—BRIDGE CANYON DAM

Mr. President, I submit a bill, to be referred to the proper committee, for the construction of this dam and to be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3487) authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, introduced by Mr. MALONE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of controlling floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, and for the generation, use, and sale of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking, the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter referred to as the Secretary, subject to the terms of the Colorado River compact, is hereby authorized to construct, operate, and maintain (1) a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, which dam shall be constructed to an elevation of not more than 1,877 feet above sea level; (2) complete plants (other than steam plants for the production of electrical energy), transmission lines, and incidental structures suitable for the fullest economic development of electrical energy generated from water at the works constructed hereunder for use in the operation thereof and for sale in accordance with Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1922, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto); and (3) such appurtenant dams and incidental works necessary for desilting as may be necessary in the opinion of the Secretary for the successful operation of the undertaking herein authorized.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall have the authority to acquire, by purchase, exchange, condemnation, or otherwise, all lands, rights-of-way, and other property necessary for said purposes: *Provided*, That anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary shall not have the authority to condemn established water rights or the water to the use of which such rights are established.

SEC. 3. The estimated cost of the construction of the said works shall be determined by the Secretary. The Secretary shall also determine (a) the parts of said estimated cost that can be properly allocated to flood control, navigation, fish and wildlife conservation, respectively, and any other purposes served by the project which may hereafter be made nonreimbursable by law, the sum so allocated, together with the expenses of operation and maintenance attributed by him to such purposes, to be nonreimbursable, and (b) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to power and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues. Before any construction work is done or contracted for, the Secretary shall first determine that costs allocated to power shall be returned to the United States: *Provided*, That the repayment period for costs so allocated shall be such reasonable period of years, but in no event to exceed 75 years, as may be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 4. In the production, sale, exchange, and distribution of electric energy generated by the works herein authorized, the Secretary shall be governed by the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, and revenues derived from the sale of such energy shall be credited in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291).

SEC. 5. The works provided for by the first section of this act shall be used, first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control and, second, for power. The title to all works herein authorized shall forever remain in the United States and the United States shall until otherwise provided by law, control, manage, and operate the same.

SEC. 6. Nothing herein shall be construed as modifying or affecting any of the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States signed at Washington, D. C., February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado River and other rivers as amended and supplemented by the protocol dated November 14, 1944, and the understanding recited in the Senate resolution of April 18, 1945, advising and consenting to ratification thereof.

SEC. 7. This act shall be deemed a supplement to the reclamation law, which said reclamation law shall govern the construction, operation, and management of the works herein authorized except as otherwise herein provided.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That during the existence of the present national emergency, no construction of any part of the project authorized by this act shall be undertaken, no contract for any such construction shall be entered into, and no money shall be appropriated for the construction during such emergency of any such part of the project: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this section, the present national emergency shall be deemed to have ended when the exercise of existing Government controls over wages and prices has terminated and when the exercise of mandatory controls over the allocation for domestic use of materials necessary for the construction of such project shall have ended.

SEC. 9 (a) In aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works authorized by this act, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this section, (1) all the right, title, and interest of the Indians in and to such tribal and allotted lands, including sites of agency and school buildings and related structures, as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, or maintenance of said works and any facilities incidental thereto, or for the relocation or reconstruction of highways, railroads, and other properties affected by said works; and (2) such easements, rights-of-way, or other interest in and to tribal and allotted Indian lands as may be designated from time to time by the Secretary in order to provide for the construction, operation, maintenance, relocation, or reconstruction of said works, facilities, and properties: *Provided*, That before designating any tribal lands, or any easements, rights-of-way, or other interests in tribal lands, the Secretary shall make every reasonable effort to negotiate a contract for the purchase of such lands or interests on reasonable terms from the tribe of Indians concerned, and that the Secretary shall proceed with the designation of lands or interests under this section only if he finds that reasonable efforts to negotiate with the tribe of Indians concerned have been made, but have not resulted in, and are not apt to result in, a mutually satisfactory agreement. The Secretary is authorized to provide in any such contract for the payment of compensation in the same forms through which compensation may be made pursuant to a designation under this section, and any tribe of Indians entering into such a contract is authorized to execute the conveyances or other instruments needed for its effectuation, notwithstanding any provision of law or of any tribal constitution or charter to the contrary.

(b) As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this section, the Secretary shall determine the just and equitable compensation to be made therefor. Such compensation may be in money, property, or other assets, including rights to electric energy developed at any

of the generating plants herein authorized. In fixing such rights to electric energy, including the rates and other incidents thereof, the Secretary shall not be bound by section 4 of this act. Any Indian tribe or individual Indian owning lands or interests designated under this section who is dissatisfied with the determination of compensation made by the Secretary shall have a right of action against the United States to recover such additional sums of money, if any, as may be requisite under the Constitution or laws of the United States, or under any treaty or agreement made by the United States, to provide just and equitable compensation for the taking of the lands so designated. Such action may be instituted in the United States district court for the district where the lands or interests are situated or in the Court of Claims, at the election of the plaintiff. The amounts of money determined as compensation hereunder for tribal lands shall be transferred in the Treasury of the United States from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the credit of the appropriate tribe pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 560). The amounts due individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this act to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as shall be designated by the Secretary, for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the individuals concerned.

(c) Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or the construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the individuals whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this section. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

(d) Whenever any Indian cemetery lands are required for the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, in lieu of requiring payment therefor, to establish cemeteries on other lands that he may select and acquire for the purpose, and to remove bodies, markers, and appurtenances to the new sites. All costs incurred in connection with any such relocation shall be paid from moneys appropriated for the purposes of this act. All right, title, and interest of the Indians in the lands within any cemetery so relocated shall terminate and the grant of title under this section take effect as of the date the Secretary authorizes the relocation. Sites of the relocated cemeteries shall be held in trust by the United States for the appropriate tribe, or family, as the case may be, and shall be nontaxable.

(e) The Secretary is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this section.

(f) Nothing in this act shall be construed as, or have the effect of, subjecting Indian water rights to the laws of any State.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the construction of Bridge Canyon Power Dam has long been contemplated by the Colorado River commissions of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin—Colorado, New Mexico, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, California, and Nevada.

The power from this project is badly needed at this time by the lower basin States. The State of Nevada alone can use the major part of the power to be generated by the date it can be made available.

AMERICAN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICIES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I made before the 11 Western States Republican conference on the subject American Domestic and Foreign Policies, in Seattle, Wash., October 15, 1951.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN POLICIES

(Address by Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from Nevada, before the 11 Western States Republican Conference, Seattle, Wash., October 15, 1951)

We need a new administration with no vested rights in past mistakes—an administration which can shed from the Federal Government payroll the leeches and the hangers-on that have accumulated over the past 18 years, and can reestablish integrity in government.

It is time the American Government adopted American foreign and domestic policies, which will insure our security and continued well-being as a Nation.

PRESENT STATE OF THE UNION

What is the effect of our foreign policy? What is the effect of our domestic policy? How did we get this way? What possessed a thrifty and intelligent people to sit idly by and watch an administration filled with improvident individuals and business failures dissipate our assets and divide our markets and our wealth with the nations of the world?

Here is the present state of the Union under domestic and foreign policies, which have led us through a Second World War—and for what? For the privilege of spending untold millions, the greatest sum of money of all time, to prepare for World War III.

Wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories

For 18 long years, people have listened to wishful thinking and Alice-in-Wonderland theories: the theory that deficit financing is sound economy, that the more we owe the greater our wealth; the theory of "reciprocal trade," the principle that the more goods we can import from foreign-sweatshop labor, the more jobs we create in America; the theory that taxes must be continually raised to siphon off any increase in wages and in business capital to prevent inflation.

National debt—National assets

Our national debt is in excess of $256,000,000,000. In 38 of the 48 States the State's per capita share of the national debt is greater than the assessed value of its property.

The administration and the Congress of the United States, in a few short years, have dissipated the wealth of the Nation which was built up over a century of time.

Discarding the Constitution of the United States

The political one-worlders are now ready for a fateful step to modify the Constitution that the United States may join an Atlantic federation of nations. In this federation, each nation being equal, the foreign nations, without the formality of submitting such proposal to the Congress of the United States, could tax us for their support by the simple expedient of basing taxation on ability to pay, just as Russia is now proposing for the United Nations.

Inflation

We condemn the spendthrift inflation achieved by removal of the metal (gold) base for our money, deficit financing, the sale of almost unbelievable amounts of Government bonds, all resulting in a disastrous flow of newly printed money into the market. It is utter idiocy to say that inflation can be stopped by fixing prices on goods and services at the consumer level without determining the cost of such goods and services.

Bonuses to foreign manufacturers—foreign gift loans—taxes

Bonuses to foreign manufacturers through their cheap labor which the Democrats like to call reciprocal trade, foreign gift-loans, and other economic sleight-of-hand tricks will work just so long as the American taxpayers are able and willing to pick up the check.

We do this by paying increased taxes, by purchasing additional Government bonds with savings or from current pay checks, and by paying higher prices for the necessities of life.

One-half of savings, insurance, and wages stolen

Inflation, caused by the administration, has stolen nearly one-half of all of the savings, insurance, and wages of the American people. The administration admits that the purchasing power of the 1939 dollar is now 53 cents.

The difference between an individual and a sovereign government is that the individual is finished with his unbusinesslike practices when his bank quits him, while a government is not finished with its impractical schemes until the money is prints has no value—or the public votes them out of office.

The foreign nation "dollar shortage" hoax

The "dollar shortage" theory as an excuse for gift loans to foreign nations is the greatest hoax ever sold to a trusting public. Any nation fixing a fictitious dollar value on its own currency—demanding more dollars for its own currency than it is worth in the markets of the world—will certainly be short of dollars.

Manipulating the exchange value of their money by foreign nations is a form of piracy.

A FORWARD-LOOKING PROGRAM

An American domestic and foreign policy, which will insure this Nation's security and continued well-being, must be adopted while this country is still solvent. Only by such a program can we continue to set an example for weaker foreign nations to follow. Such a program should include:

The domestic policy

1. Establish in this country a market for the goods of foreign nations on a basis of fair and reasonable competition, protecting our workers and investors against unfair competition of foreign low-wage producers.

There is no suggestion of a high or low tariff or import fee, but a flexible import fee would represent the difference between the wage standards of living here and abroad.

2. Make the Western Hemisphere self-sufficient for emergency: Encourage production particularly of strategic and critical materials throughout the Western Hemisphere—including South America, Canada, and Alaska; thus in time of emergency the Western Hemisphere could be made self-sufficient and the transportation lines kept open.

3. Establish a sound currency. Determine the degree and extent of the current inflation and fix the price of gold to conform, establishing the gold standard. The use of silver should be emphasized, inasmuch as approximately half the people of the world have used silver for money for the past 2,000 years.

4. Congress should regain its power as one of the three independent branches of the Government set up by the Constitution

as a check on the executive and the judicial.

Congress must resume its constitutional authority to regulate foreign commerce, to regulate money, and to approve treaties and agreements with foreign nations. Many of these constitutional duties of the Congress have been taken over or modified by the executive branch during the last 18 years.

5. All rights of regulation and sovereignty not specifically given to the Federal Government by the Constitution of the United States must be returned to the States.

Many such rights have been exercised by the Federal Government through congressional inertia or actual legislative acts during the past 15 years.

The foreign policy

1. Establish the free currency exchange principle for mutual trade, and stop gift loans to foreign nations. End the ruinous administration policy of showering foreign nations with gift loans out of the pockets of the American taxpayers. Accept, up to reasonable amounts, foreign nations' currency at the current rate of exchange for the purchase of goods and services in this country, and then use their own currency in purchasing goods from such countries.

2. As a condition of such relations, require a free exchange of the currencies of foreign nations between themselves, and in terms of the dollar upon the New York and London exchanges.

3. As a further condition, require that foreign nations protect the integrity of private investments in their respective countries.

4. As a further condition, establish equal access to the markets of those nations which we are committed to defend, providing that any nation may protect its own workers and investors, through tariffs or import fees, but that no third nation may fix such conditions, including quotas, money exchanges, or other subterfuge, to preclude the United States from trading with that nation upon an equal basis.

5. Extend the 128-year-old Monroe Doctrine to include the areas in Asia and Europe that it is necessary for us to currently defend for our own security and well-being.

The foreign policy of other nations

It must be recognized that the foreign policies of the nations of Europe and Asia are based upon the principle voiced by one of England's great Prime Ministers in 1849 when we said that, "We (the English) have no eternal allies and we have no perpetual enemies. Our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow."

This foreign policy was reiterated by another great Prime Minister of that Commonwealth, Mr. Churchill, in 1945, when he answered President Roosevelt's suggestion that England relinquish her claim to Hong Kong, with a statement which was heard around the world: "I did not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire."

We also must acknowledge and protect our "permanent interests." This is a sound principle, which we have not been following.

DISCLAIMER

We oppose sweatshop labor competition (so-called reciprocal trade), inflated currency, ruinous taxation, and foreign domination of our domestic and foreign policies.

Sweatshop labor competition

We oppose the administration's bonuses to foreign manufacturers, so-called reciprocal trade, which puts the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia in direct competition with the workers and investors of this Nation, threatening the American high standard of living.

Inflated currency

We oppose the administration's inflated currency policies, which started in 1934 with the cutting loose of our money system from the metal (gold) base, and is aggravated by the sale of additional Government bonds to cover continuous deficit financing, resulting from the unnecessary sending of billions of dollars to foreign nations and the vast amount otherwise wasted by the administration.

Fifty billion dollars was supposed to have been spent on the military between VJ-day and the outbreak in Korea—and nothing to show for this huge sum.

The administration and the Congress of the United States should treat the taxpayers' money in the same manner that the cashier of a bank treats depositors' money—as a trust to be fully accounted for to the people as stockholders in the greatest organization on earth.

Ruinous taxation

We oppose the policy of the administration of raising taxes to siphon off raises in wages and investment profits, supposedly to prevent inflation, on the theory that the Government can spend the private citizen's money without causing inflation, but that if it is spent by the man who earns it for the comforts of life, it will upset the economy and cause inflation. We favor taxation for the necessary revenue only.

Foreign domination

We warn against the domination of our economy and our foreign policy by the Fabian-Marxist system into which we are falling. This one-economic-world philosophy had led to gift-loans of billions of our taxpayers' dollars to foreign nations to make up their balance of trade deficits each year, and threatens to level our standard of living with those of other nations of the world.

We have inadvertently adopted the Socialist policy between nations which Marx enunciated more than 100 years ago when he said, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his need."

CONCLUSION

This Nation desperately needs a liberal dose of common horse sense and old-time religion.

We need an administration which will reestablish the integrity of government and encourage integrity between individuals and between nations, and assure respect for American citizens at home and abroad.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the 11 Western States' Republican Conference then, on October 16, adopted the foreign trade and the gold standard resolutions.

THE GOLD STANDARD—GOLD AND SILVER PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada recommended before the Seattle conference the 11 Western States' Republican Conference, last year, on October 15, 1951, and again before the Nevada Republican State convention on May 9, in Tonopah, that "we return to the gold standard and abolish the present-day managed currency system."

DEFICIT FINANCING AND INFLATION

Since the removal of the gold base for the currency of this Nation the administration has resorted to what has been popularized as deficit financing. In reality it means printing counterfeit money, and it is directly responsible for the continuous inflation, thereby causing friction between the workingmen and the investors of this Nation—the investors as represented by management.

Gold and silver were among the first metals known to man. They have been used in the arts and industry, as monetary standards, or as mere personal adornment. These continued uses through the ages have retained in gold and silver the character of preciousness. The desire for these two metals has inspired conquest and exploration. The role of gold and silver as natural standards of value and mediums of exchange has been of prime importance in the development of civilization.

Few records are available concerning the production of the common metals before the nineteenth century. Gold and silver, however, have long been valued; comprehensive and reliable production records extend back to the opening of the New World.

In 1929 the United States Bureau of Mines, then part of the Department of Commerce, summarized the recorded production of gold and silver in two separate papers, Summarized Data of Gold Production—United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines, Economic Paper 6, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1930—and Summarized Data of Silver Production—United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines, Economic Paper 8, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1930.

One-half of the world has used gold for money, and the other half silver for more than 2,000 years of recorded history—these nations have recognized the intrinsic value of these metals, whatever the nations stamp—or none at all, therefore they are the only metals that inspire confidence in a money base or standard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the tables of production to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the tables of production were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total world production by major gold-producing countries, 1493–1950

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Colombia	Percent	U. S. S. R. (Russia)	Percent
1493 to 1600	22,968,491	100					771,618	3.36	4,115,295	17.91		
1601 to 1700	28,848,860	100					1,231,373	4.27	11,252,760	39.01		
1701 to 1800	61,205,875	100	166,250	0.19			2,932,148	4.79	15,110,849	24.69	170,399	0.28
1801 to 1900	374,266,607	100	115,275,707	30.80	6,968,582	1.86	6,847,522	1.83	12,317,544	3.27	62,448,404	16.70
1901 to 1925	477,536,621	100	93,913,934	19.67	21,170,931	4.44	18,925,887	3.96	4,703,487	.98	24,624,734	5.16
1926 to 1930	97,743,912	100	10,657,613	10.90	9,524,745	9.74	3,522,225	3.60	391,646	.40	5,686,769	5.81
1931 to 1935	129,154,880	100	13,037,628	10.09	14,977,098	11.59	3,188,960	2.46	1,413,883	1.09	15,000,264	11.61

Total world production by major gold-producing countries, 1493–1950—Continued

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Colombia	Percent	U. S. S. R. (Russia)	Percent
1936 to 1940	186,353,717	100	21,600,763	11.59	23,027,548	12.35	4,248,945	2.28	2,554,385	1.37	25,767,891	13.82
1941 to 1945	153,895,061	100	11,733,566	7.62	19,469,191	12.65	3,241,020	2.10	2,978,371	1.93	(1)	
1946 to 1950	148,700,000	100	9,863,809	6.63	18,110,399	12.17	2,066,523	1.38	1,894,349	1.27	[2]34,000,000	22.86
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	1,680,664,024	.....	276,251,270	16.43	113,257,494	6.73	46,976,221	2.79	56,732,569	3.37	167,698,461	9.97

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.

Source: Bureau of Mines, Summarized Data of Gold Production, 1929; Bureau of the Mint, annual reports.

Years	Union of South Africa	Percent	Australia	Percent	India	Percent	British West Africa (Gold Coast, Nigeria, Sierra Leone)	Percent	Rhodesia	Percent	Total, all countries	Percent
1493 to 1600	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,886,913	21.27
1601 to 1700	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,484,133	43.27
1701 to 1800	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	18,379,646	30.02
1801 to 1900	20,660,249	.....	104,859,165	28.02	3,024,488	0.81	647,894	.....	240,806	0.13	333,290,361	89.05
1901 to 1925	178,437,577	37.36	62,657,796	13.12	12,642,214	2.65	5,882,428	1.23	14,358,714	3.01	437,328,702	91.58
1926 to 1930	51,578,831	52.76	2,448,519	2.50	1,837,396	1.87	983,302	1.00	2,869,365	2.93	89,500,411	91.56
1931 to 1935	54,709,712	42.35	3,892,041	3.01	1,646,067	1.27	1,700,522	1.31	3,188,239	2.46	112,754,414	87.30
1936 to 1940	62,100,190	33.32	7,352,092	3.94	1,593,133	.82	3,611,476	1.93	4,057,667	2.17	155,914,090	83.66
1941 to 1945	65,843,138	42.78	4,715,843	3.06	1,150,254	.74	3,440,453	2.23	3,373,938	2.19	115,945,774	75.34
1946 to 1950	58,180,255	39.12	4,387,058	2.95	844,688	.56	3,210,438	2.15	2,631,499	1.76	135,189,018	90.91
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	491,509,952	29.24	190,312,514	11.32	22,738,240	.13	19,476,513	.11	30,720,228	.18	1,415,673,462	84.23

Total world silver production by major producing countries, 1493–1950

[In fine ounces]

Years	World total	Percent	United States	Percent	Canada	Percent	Mexico	Percent	Bolivia	Percent	Chile	Percent
1493 to 1600	748,932,166	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	90,410,000	12.10	355,360,000	47.58	.....	.....
1601 to 1700	1,271,922,450	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	306,650,000	24.11	456,860,000	35.92	20,000	.....
1701 to 1800	1,832,708,759	100	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,044,510,000	57.00	213,550,000	11.66	6,470,000	0.35
1801 to 1900	5,098,551,183	100	1,338,153,144	26.25	30,184,476	0.59	1,864,084,854	36.56	421,607,515	8.27	235,129,747	4.61
1901 to 1925	4,901,347,412	100	1,534,422,940	31.31	464,279,982	9.47	1,614,722,340	32.94	109,009,808	2.22	47,547,987	.97
1926 to 1930	1,272,806,550	100	295,353,652	23.04	116,500,658	9.15	525,684,685	41.30	28,782,943	2.26	8,274,511	.65
1931 to 1935	940,774,230	100	155,634,689	16.54	88,343,776	9.39	373,202,827	39.66	28,523,866	3.03	3,030,496	.32
1936 to 1940	1,334,472,289	100	328,496,857	24.61	112,717,300	8.44	401,674,239	30.09	39,431,081	2.95	7,447,594	.55
1941 to 1945	1,078,154,226	100	232,506,736	21.56	90,881,335	8.42	366,419,252	33.98	36,282,820	3.36	5,149,020	.47
1946 to 1950	842,100,000	100	176,172,099	20.92	83,249,928	9.88	258,223,025	30.66	33,093,304	3.92	3,712,831	.44
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	19,321,829,265	100	4,058,740,117	21.00	986,157,515	5.10	6,845,581,222	35.42	1,722,501,337	8.91	316,782,186	1.63

Source: Bureau of Mines, Summarized Data of Silver Production, 1929; Bureau of the Mint, annual reports.

[In fine ounces]

Years	Peru	Percent	Spain	Percent	Japan	Percent	Union of South Africa	Percent	Australia	Percent	Total all countries	Percent
1493 to 1600	94,360,000	12.63	.....	.....	25,000,000	3.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	565,130,000	75.45
1601 to 1700	332,440,000	26.14	.....	.....	75,000,000	5.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,170,970,000	92.06
1701 to 1800	360,220,000	19.65	.....	.....	1,000,000	.05	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,625,750,000	88.70
1801 to 1900	284,537,367	5.58	100,090,412	1.96	30,902,038	.61	2,258,000	0.05	157,611,709	3.09	4,464,559,262	87.56
1901 to 1925	237,099,456	4.86	94,842,898	1.94	101,697,876	2.07	20,437,432	.42	306,950,891	6.26	4,531,611,610	92.45
1926 to 1930	98,398,706	7.73	13,902,121	1.09	26,024,310	2.04	5,108,864	.40	48,935,498	3.80	1,164,965,748	91.52
1931 to 1935	51,908,302	5.51	12,052,472	1.28	33,615,092	3.54	5,853,085	.62	53,339,901	5.66	805,485,106	85.61
1936 to 1940	94,344,044	7.06	2,313,508	.17	52,668,672	3.94	5,782,775	.43	72,916,131	5.46	1,117,792,321	83.76
1941 to 1945	74,644,096	6.92	2,282,333	.21	39,937,808	3.70	6,750,979	.62	56,193,451	5.21	911,047,830	84.50
1946 to 1950	86,086,939	6.66	3,057,658	.36	11,827,229	1.40	5,804,528	.68	49,220,133	5.84	680,447,674	80.80
Accumulative total 1493 through 1950	1,686,618,710	8.72	228,541,462	1.18	397,673,625	2.05	51,975,663	.26	745,167,714	3.85	17,039,739,551	88.18

WORLD PRODUCTION—GOLD—SILVER

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, these comprehensive reports presented the details of world production of gold and silver from 1493 to 1927. The production figures presented here are taken from these two reports and the annual reports of the Director of the Mint.

Table I shows world production of gold for certain periods and the cumulative total world production since 1943 through 1950. Production of 10 of the major gold producers by certain periods and total cumulative production from 1493 through 1950 is also shown.

Table II, following, shows total world production of silver for the same period 1493 through 1950 and the production of 10 major silver producers.

The United States has played an important role in the production of gold and silver. We find from table I that the United States production of gold accounted for 16.43 percent of the total world production of gold since 1493. Referring to the attached photostat of table 58, taken from the afore-mentioned report, Summarized Data of Gold Production, we find the United States produced 44.48 percent of the world total production in the period 1851–1855. Recent domestic production of gold has never recovered its record level of production of 1940, 4,862,979 fine ounces. In 1950 domestic production accounted for only 7.24 percent of total world gold production.

The production of silver in the United States has averaged about one-fifth of total world production. From table II we find that only in the 5-year period 1931–35 has the United States failed to supply 20 percent of the total world production of silver.

PRESENT STOCKS—GOLD, SILVER

The following table shows the accumulative total world production of gold

and silver and the existing monetary stocks of these two metals. Reliable figures for industrial consumption, private holdings, or loss of gold and silver through other than monetary uses are not available.

The following table shows the accumulative total world production of gold and silver and the existing monetary stocks of these two metals.

Reliable figures for industrial consumption, private holding, or loss of gold and silver through other than monetary uses are not available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have table III printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE III.—*Comparison of gold and silver production with monetary stocks, 1950 (in fine ounces)*

	Cumulative world production since 1492	Total world monetary stocks	Percent	Balance of gold and silver lost or absorbed in other than monetary uses
Gold	1,680,664,024	1,013,063,000	60.27	649,631,024
Silver	19,321,829,265	4,563,149,000	23.61	14,758,680,265

SUMMARY—WORLD PRODUCTION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have here the General Summary of World Production of Gold, 1493 to 1927, fine ounces, from the paper Summarized Data of Gold Production; also table 45, General Summary of World Production of Silver, 1493 to 1927, fine ounces, from the paper Summarized Data of Silver Production.

Production figures for gold and silver from 1928 to 1950 for each producing country may be found in the annual reports of the Director of the Mint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table showing gold production from 1493 to 1927, and a table showing silver production for the same period.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*

Period	World total		North America		United States [1]		Canada		Mexico		Central America and West Indies		South America	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	22,968,491	100.00	771,618	3.36					771,618	3.36			8,204,871	35.72
1601–1700	28,848,860	100.00	1,231,373	4.27					1,231,373	4.27			17,811,509	61.74
1701–1800	61,205,875	100.00	3,048,398	4.98	116,250	0.19			2,932,148	4.79			48,965,579	80.00
1801–1810	5,850,759	100.00	701,818	12.00	135,000	2.31			566,818	9.69			4,385,361	74.95
1811–1820	3,814,652	100.00	749,013	12.56	135,000	3.54			344,013	9.02			2,510,572	65.82
1821–1830	4,685,182	100.00	463,791	9.90	150,000	3.20			313,791	6.70			2,353,434	50.23
1831–1840	6,567,781	100.00	595,782	9.07	318,000	4.84			277,123	4.23			2,748,887	41.85
1841–1850	17,117,313	100.00	5,811,506	33.95	5,170,420	30.21			641,086	3.74			2,572,058	15.03
1801–1850	38,035,687	100.00	8,051,910	21.17	5,908,420	15.53			2,143,490	5.64			14,570,712	38.30
1851–1855	32,089,321	100.00	14,593,740	45.49	14,270,625	44.48			323,115	1.01			1,205,652	3.76
1856–1860	32,470,734	100.00	12,822,343	39.49	12,384,000	38.14	220,039	0.68	218,304	.67			1,168,680	3.60
1851–1860	64,560,055	100.00	27,416,083	42.47	26,654,625	41.29	220,039	.34	541,419	.84			2,374,332	3.68
1861–1865	29,697,616	100.00	11,856,794	39.93	10,716,271	36.09	859,365	2.89	281,158	.95			1,237,803	4.17
1866–1870	31,401,761	100.00	13,131,953	41.82	12,225,570	38.93	618,634	1.97	287,749	.92			1,270,970	4.05
1861–1870	61,099,377	100.00	24,988,747	40.89	22,941,841	37.54	1,477,999	2.42	568,407	.93			2,508,773	4.11
1871	6,391,308		2,274,443		2,104,312		105,187		64,944				302,692	
1872	5,798,460		1,896,727		1,741,500		90,283		64,944				313,694	
1873	5,503,951		1,880,790		1,741,500		74,346		64,944				331,364	
1874	5,359,925		1,782,922		1,620,122		97,856		64,944				365,906	
1875	5,340,709		1,814,253		1,619,009		130,300		64,944				395,081	
1871–1875	28,394,353	100.00	9,649,135	33.98	8,826,443	31.09	497,972	1.75	324,720	1.14			1,708,647	6.02
1851–1875	154,053,785	100.00	62,053,965	40.28	58,422,909	37.92	2,196,010	1.43	1,435,046	.93			6,591,752	4.28
1876	5,429,572		2,077,209		1,931,575		97,729		47,905				363,422	
1877	6,001,368		2,411,192		2,268,662		94,304		48,226				444,673	
1878	5,987,207		2,599,755		2,477,109		74,420		48,226				437,176	
1879	5,415,952		2,006,174		1,881,787		76,547		47,840				443,937	
1880	5,349,158		1,852,461		1,741,500		63,121		47,840				469,305	
1876–1880	28,183,257	100.00	10,946,791	38.84	10,300,633	36.55	406,121	1.44	240,037	.85			2,158,513	7.66
1871–1880	56,577,610	100.00	20,595,926	36.40	19,127,076	33.80	904,093	1.60	564,757	1.00			3,867,160	6.83
1881	5,064,313		1,783,675		1,678,612		63,524		41,539				437,248	
1882	4,885,626		1,677,775		1,572,187		60,288		45,300				435,996	
1883	4,746,390		1,551,336		1,451,250		53,853		46,233				484,384	
1884	5,014,923		1,598,380		1,489,950		51,202		57,228				559,776	
1885	5,102,414		1,636,162		1,538,373		55,575		41,923		289		496,607	
1881–1885	24,813,666	100.00	8,247,328	33.24	7,730,372	31.15	284,442	1.15	232,225	.94	289	0	2,414,011	9.73
1886	4,944,835		1,791,489		1,686,788		70,782		29,707		4,212		440,144	
1887	5,255,917		1,707,185		1,603,049		57,003		39,897		7,266		453,773	
1888	5,508,562		1,712,633		1,604,478		53,788		47,101		7,266		435,858	
1889	6,048,359		1,698,858		1,594,775		62,662		33,855		7,266		454,452	
1890	5,814,182		1,713,815		1,588,577		60,570		37,102		7,266		479,818	
1886–1890	27,571,848	100.00	8,623,680	31.28	8,077,967	29.30	324,805	1.18	187,632	.68	33,276	.12	2,264,045	8.21
1881–1890	52,385,514	100.00	16,871,008	32.21	15,803,339	30.19	609,247	1.16	419,857	.80	33,565	.06	4,678,056	8.93
1891	6,300,223		1,706,147		1,604,840		45,011		48,387		7,909		509,075	
1892	7,060,290		1,703,537		1,597,098		43,905		54,625		7,909		562,499	
1893	7,543,737		1,855,229		1,739,323		44,853		63,144		7,909		546,840	
1894	8,657,113		2,201,672		1,910,813		80,411		217,688		22,760		548,717	
1895	9,518,192		2,660,210		2,254,760		92,440		290,250		22,760		550,584	
1891–1895	39,079,555	100.00	10,126,795	25.91	9,106,834	23.30	276,620	.71	674,094	1.72	69,247	.18	2,717,715	6.95

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	World total		North America		United States [1]		Canada		Mexico		Central America and West Indies		South America	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1896	9,716,749		3,036,851		2,568,132		136,274		314,437		18,008		503,649	
1897	11,396,952		3,454,864		2,774,935		294,582		362,812		22,535		500,007	
1898	13,920,747		4,222,672		3,118,398		669,445		411,187		23,642		539,966	
1899	15,073,419		4,906,315		3,437,210		1,031,563		411,187		28,355		547,534	
1900	12,420,942		5,638,180		3,829,897		1,348,720		435,375		24,188		550,827	
1895–1900	62,528,809	100.00	21,260,882	34.00	15,728,572	25.15	3,480,584	5.57	1,934,998	3.09	116,728	.19	2,641,983	4.23
1891–1900	101,608,364	100.00	31,387,677	30.90	24,835,406	24.45	3,757,204	3.70	2,609,092	2.57	185,975	.18	5,539,698	5.27
1876–1900	182,177,135	100.00	59,205,476	32.50	50,944,378	27.97	4,772,572	2.62	3,268,986	1.79	219,540	.12	12,196,267	6.69
1851–1900	336,230,920	100.00	121,259,441	36.06	109,367,287	32.52	6,968,582	2.07	4,704,032	1.40	219,540	.07	18,788,019	5.59
1801–1900	374,266,607	100.00	129,311,351	34.55	115,275,707	30.80	6,968,582	1.86	6,847,522	1.83	219,540	.06	33,358,731	8.91
1901	12,692,227		5,501,217		3,805,500		1,167,216		497,527		30,974		580,922	
1902	14,494,382		5,490,159		3,870,000		1,032,161		491,156		96,842		623,502	
1903	15,934,268		5,078,358		3,560,000		911,118		516,524		90,716		531,248	
1904	16,902,209		5,359,223		3,892,480		796,374		609,781		60,588		499,708	
1905	18,498,085		5,824,913		4,265,742		706,778		779,181		73,212		518,108	
1901–1905	78,511,171	100.00	27,253,870	34.71	19,393,722	24.69	4,613,647	5.88	2,894,169	3.69	352,332	.45	2,753,488	3.51
1906	19,533,892		6,136,037		4,565,333		581,657		896,615		92,432		517,122	
1907	20,039,853		5,782,878		4,371,639		405,517		903,699		102,023		571,206	
1908	21,483,983		6,264,933		4,560,548		476,112		1,082,210		146,063		570,139	
1909	22,093,602		6,544,217		4,809,694		453,865		1,153,490		127,258		561,749	
1910	22,146,716		6,573,606		4,649,496		493,707		1,205,051		225,352		566,669	
1906–1910	105,298,046	100.00	31,301,671	29.73	22,956,710	21.81	2,410,858	2.29	5,240,975	4.98	693,128	0.65	2,786,885	2.65
1901–1910	183,809,217	100.00	58,555,541	31.85	42,350,432	23.03	7,024,505	3.82	8,135,144	4.43	1,045,460	.57	5,540,373	3.01
1911	22,466,812		6,516,944		4,677,508		472,241		1,203,573		163,622		624,105	
1912	22,670,332		6,442,054		4,498,388		611,885		1,185,187		146,594		648,426	
1914	22,306,558		6,134,279		4,265,530		802,973		934,065		131,711		595,080	
1914	21,319,747		5,640,374		4,519,662		773,178		231,628		115,906		640,509	
1915	22,718,154		6,202,754		4,823,672		918,056		317,305		143,721		729,861	
1911–1915	111,481,603	100.00	30,936,405	27.75	22,784,760	20.44	3,578,333	3.21	3,871,758	3.47	701,554	.63	3,237,981	2.90
1916	22,035,302		5,878,507		4,405,779		930,495		372,040		170,193		750,228	
1917	20,297,144		5,306,719		3,981,482		738,831		435,375		151,031		673,603	
1918	18,568,278		4,936,431		3,258,375		699,681		813,895		164,480		684,000	
1919	17,667,308		4,562,265		2,877,509		766,764		758,354		159,638		643,244	
1920	16,335,420		4,064,933		2,414,410		766,913		738,485		145,125		638,584	
1916–1920	94,903,452	100.00	24,748,855	26.08	16,937,555	17.85	3,902,684	4.11	3,118,149	3.29	790,467	.83	3,389,659	3.57
1911–1920	206,385,055	100.00	55,685,260	26.98	39,722,315	19.25	7,481,017	3.62	6,989,907	3.39	1,492,021	.72	6,627,640	3.21
1921	16,003,616		4,093,201		2,361,301		926,329		684,634		120,937		660,513	
1922	15,467,223		4,421,859		2,289,235		1,263,364		748,323		120,937		719,500	
1923	17,802,109		4,528,509		2,426,490		1,223,601		781,663		96,755		734,812	
1924	19,033,459		4,856,016		2,446,328		1,525,380		797,223		87,085		568,230	
1925	19,025,942		4,941,398		2,319,833		1,735,735		788,993		96,837		500,360	
1921–1925	87,332,349	100.00	22,840,983	26.15	11,843,187	13.56	6,674,409	7.64	3,800,836	4.35	522,551	.60	3,213,415	3.68
1901–1925	477,526,621	100.00	137,081,784	28.71	93,915,934	19.67	21,179,931	4.44	18,925,887	3.96	3,060,032	.64	15,381,428	3.22
1926	19,349,118	100.00	4,852,580	25.08	2,238,616	11.57	1,754,228	9.07	772,661	3.99	87,075	.45	508,195	2.63
1927	19,397,757	100.00	4,759,535	24.54	2,117,253	10.92	1,844,544	9.51	725,175	3.74	72,563	.37	491,787	2.54

Period	Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador		British Guiana	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600			1,800,442	7.84			1,543,236	6.72	4,115,295	17.91				
1601–1700			3,343,677	11.59	482,261	1.67	1,125,276	3.90	11,252,760	39.01				
1701–1800			2,314,853	3.78	27,006,623	44.12	2,764,964	4.52	15,110,849	24.69				
1801–1810			321,507	5.49	1,205,653	20.61	999,888	17.09	1,607,537	27.47				
1811–1820			192,904	5.06	565,853	14.83	643,015	16.86	964,522	25.28				
1821–1830			128,603	2.74	707,316	15.10	385,809	8.23	1,028,824	21.96				
1831–1840			192,904	2.94	964,522	14.69	385,809	5.87	1,060,974	16.15				
1841–1850			192,904	1.13	771,618	4.51	321,507	1.88	1,093,125	6.38				
1801–1850			1,028,822	2.70	4,214,962	11.08	2,736,028	7.19	5,754,982	15.13				
1851–1855			160,754	.50	353,658	1.10	64,301	.20	562,638	1.76				
1856–1860			160,754	.50	340,798	1.05	48,226	.15	562,638	1.73				
1851–1860			321,508	.50	694,456	1.08	112,527	.17	1,125,276	1.74				
1861–1865			160,754	.54	385,809	1.30	64,301	.22	562,638	1.89				
1866–1870			160,754	.51	281,319	.90	64,301	.20	562,638	1.80				
1861–1870			321,508	.53	667,128	1.09	128,602	.21	1,125,276	1.84				
1871			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1872			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1873			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1874			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1875			64,301		55,299		12,860		112,528					
1871–1875			321,505	1.13	276,495	.97	64,300	.23	562,640	1.99				
1851–1875			964,521	.63	1,638,079	1.06	305,429	.20	2,813,192	1.82				

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador		British Guiana	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1876	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,702		128,603					
1877	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,702		193,515					
1878	3,794		21,734		49,512		8,703		193,515					
1879	3,794		21,734		48,548		6,237		193,515					
1880	3,794		21,734		43,243		6,237		193,515					
1876–1880	18,970	0.07	108,670	0.39	240,327	0.85	38,581	0.14	902,663	3.19				
1871–1880	18,970	.03	430,175	.76	516,822	.91	102,981	.18	1,465,303	2.59				
1881	3,794		3,504		35,880		6,237		193,515					
1882	3,794		3,504		35,880		7,877		186,539					
1883	3,794		3,504		30,608		7,877		186,539				(5)	*
1884	3,794		3,504		30,608		16,075		186,539				257	
1885	2,794		3,504		38,709		16,075		120,951				932	
1881–1885	18,970	0.08	17,820	0.07	171,685	0.69	54,141	0.22	874,063	3.52			1,189	0.01
1886	965		3,504		48,290		16,075		120,951				6,527	
1887	1,447		4,598		31,636		76,487		145,128				11,896	
1888	1,511		2,894		21,541		94,941		145,128				14,468	
1889	3,955		2,894		21,541		69,510		165,930				27,103	
1890	3,955		3,247		21,541		69,510		174,128				54,431	
1886–1890	11,833	.04	17,137	.06	144,549	.52	326,823	1.18	751,265	2.74			114,425	.41
1881–1890	30,803	.06	34,657	.07	316,234	.60	380,664	.73	1,625,348	3.09	(6)		115,614	.22
1891	3,955		3,247		41,507		69,510		167,955		2,540		87,064	
1892	3,967		3,241		107,368		29,209		167,958		2,515		116,047	
1893	6,782		3,241		107,368		22,466		139,939		2,515		124,198	
1894	4,596		3,241		57,566		22,466		139,939		3,309		111,751	
1895	15,238		3,241		46,498		68,092		139,939		6,429		107,059	
1891–1895	34,538	.09	16,211	.04	360,307	.92	211,743	.54	755,730	1.93	17,308	0.04	546,119	1.40
1896	15,238		12,110		48,426		29,559		106,428		6,429		107,059	
1897	6,661		16,617		58,251		16,482		107,740		6,429		100,945	
1898	6,661		16,204		76,613		43,229		104,426		1,911		99,105	
1899	6,661		7,249		103,983		62,819		89,231		2,317		98,712	
1900	2,112		5,786		134,260		78,735		54,804		5,208		98,487	
1896–1900	37,333	.06	57,986	.09	421,533	.67	230,824	.37	465,629	.75	22,294	.04	504,308	.81
1891–1900	71,871	.07	74,177	.07	781,840	.77	442,567	.44	1,221,359	1.20	39,602	.04	1,050,427	1.03
1876–1900	121,644	.07	217,504	.12	1,338,401	.73	861,812	.47	3,749,370	2.06	39,602	.02	1,166,041	.64
1851–1900	121,644	.04	1,182,025	.35	2,976,480	.89	1,167,241	.35	6,562,562	1.95	39,602	.01	1,166,041	.35
1801–1900	121,644	.03	2,210,847	.59	7,191,442	1.92	3,903,269	1.05	12,317,544	3.27	39,602	.01	1,166,041	.31
1901	1,451		5,786		134,260		51,626		135,513		5,321		85,701	
1902	1,451		48		101,584		32,262		122,031		9,675		87,491	
1903	1,451		142		110,314		30,812		131,795		13,272		77,948	
1904	445		1,039		98,854		30,812		95,513		6,430		77,828	
1905	265		912		98,906		45,886		123,001		9,117		81,789	
1901–1905	5,063	.01	7,947	.01	543,918	.70	191,398	.24	609,853	.78	43,815	.06	410,757	.52
1906	268		838		116,243		35,667		105,982		14,233		77,770	
1907	4,985		228		97,750		61,085		157,491		12,923		63,099	
1908	7,801		1,141		106,259		38,195		165,797		16,945		68,116	
1909	9,186		1,369		108,983		40,767		153,826		13,273		87,697	
1910	8,372		1,061		94,557		40,767		163,022		12,054		57,697	
1906–1910	30,612	.03	4,637	.00	523,792	.50	216,481	.21	746,118	.70	69,428	.07	324,379	.31
1901–1910	35,675	.02	12,584	.01	1,067,710	.57	407,879	.22	1,355,971	.74	113,243	.06	735,136	.40
1911	13,979		1,061		185,496		35,752		153,241		13,389		43,149	
1912	5,193		2,508		172,728		35,398		143,757		19,665		42,560	
1913	128		3,007		109,072		36,874		143,757		19,665		65,475	
1914			5,789		103,513		34,622		226,327		16,779		54,495	
1915			5,735		117,286		33,662		263,796		26,397		44,693	
1911–1915	19,300	.02	18,100	.02	688,095	.62	176,308	.16	930,878	.82	95,895	.09	250,372	.22
1916	740		198		139,804		29,852		298,662		27,090		31,962	
1917	223		242		143,093		37,041		241,875		42,947		23,107	
1918	193		242		135,450		37,007		290,250		38,700		24,546	
1919	193		242		96,750		37,007		290,251		38,700		16,216	
1920	4,837		242		125,775		43,538		280,575		36,281		9,675	
1916–1920	6,186	.01	1,166	.00	640,872	.08	184,445	.19	1,401,613	1.48	183,718	.19	107,506	.11
1911–1920	25,486	.01	19,266	.01	1,328,967	.65	360,753	.17	2,332,491	1.13	279,613	.14	357,878	.17
1921	3,628		290		134,482		45,139		290,250		36,259		12,828	
1922	3,628		407		146,668		79,828		278,737		42,456		10,877	
1923	3,870		407		144,675		64,397		275,738		42,456		8,170	
1924	2,903		964		144,675		67,725		96,750		38,700		6,337	
1925	2,661		386		108,506		61,216		76,550		43,537		9,107	
1921–1925	16,690	.02	2,454	.00	679,006	.78	318,305	.36	1,015,025	1.17	203,408	.23	47,319	.05
1901–1925	77,851	.02	34,304	.01	3,075,683	.64	1,086,937	.23	4,703,487	.98	596,264	.12	1,140,333	.24
1926	2,419	.01	332	.00	102,108	.53	59,132	.31	71,658	.37	62,486	.32	6,516	.03
1927	967	.00	241	.00	100,000	.53	60,000	.31	72,563	.37	64,242	.33	5,714	.03

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Dutch Guiana		French Guiana		Peru		Uruguay		Venezuela		Europe		Austria-Hungary [9]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493-1600					745,898	3.25					4,758,310	20.72	4,758,310	20.72
1601-1700					1,607,535	5.57					3,215,074	11.14	3,215,074	11.14
1701-1800					1,768,290	2.89					3,480,118	5.69	3,395,118	5.55
1801-1810					250,776	4.29					327,647	5.60	308,647	5.28
1811-1820					144,678	3.79					358,507	9.40	321,507	8.43
1821-1830					102,882	2.20					757,911	16.18	364,911	7.79
1831-1840					144,678	2.20					1,343,450	20.46	522,450	7.96
1841-1850					192,904	1.13					3,246,939	18.97	626,939	3.66
1801-1850					835,918	2.20					6,034,454	15.87	2,144,454	5.64
1851-1855					64,301	.20					1,724,338	5.37	285,338	.89
1856-1860					56,264	.17					1,796,776	5.53	250,776	.77
1851-1860					120,565	.19					3,521,114	5.45	536,114	.83
1861-1865					64,301	.22			[8]		1,109,860	3.74	271,674	.91
1866-1870					57,871	.18			144,087	0.46	1,316,728	4.19	265,244	.84
1861-1870			[8]		122,172	.20			144,087	.24	2,426,588	3.97	536,918	.88
1871			20,094		11,574				25,946		264,666		44,850	
1872			24,370		11,574				32,762		271,549		44,850	
1873			33,180		11,574				41,622		251,147		44,850	
1874			53,627		11,574				55,717		222,751		44,850	
1875			58,997		11,574				79,522		222,511		44,850	
1871-1875			190,268	0.67	57,870	.20			235,569	.83	1,232,624	4.34	224,250	.79
1851-1875	[8]		190,268	.12	300,607	.20			379,656	.25	7,180,326	4.67	1,297,282	.85
1876	965		54,881		8,681				86,550		258,072		61,202	
1877	5,691		52,020		8,681				101,024		292,774		57,871	
1878	7,909		55,203		8,681				88,125		337,426		58,643	
1879	13,214		70,056		8,681				78,158		399,123		51,377	
1880	21,863		60,186		8,681				110,052		366,105		52,952	
1876-1880	49,642	0.18	292,346	1.04	43,405	.15			463,909	1.65	1,653,500	5.87	282,045	1.00
1871-1880	49,642	.09	482,614	.85	101,275	.18			699,478	1.24	2,886,124	5.10	506,295	.90
1881	15,657		62,790		5,819				110,052		333,043		60,025	
1882	15,014		52,116		5,755				125,517		303,486		50,798	
1883	23,888		60,894		5,787				161,493		286,901		52,663	
1884	24,306		62,790		5,787		[8]		226,116		332,384		53,306	
1885	23,984		53,209		7,266		2,067		226,116		434,444		57,035	
1881-1885	102,849	.41	291,799	1.18	30,414	.12	2,067	0.01	849,294	3.42	1,700,258	6.85	273,827	1.10
1886	22,891		51,345		5,466		2,733		161,397		372,021		57,035	
1887	22,891		57,389		5,080		2,055		95,166		438,074		60,347	
1888	15,657		65,330		5,080		827		68,481		453,724		58,514	
1889	21,863		44,882		4,501		3,376		88,897		480,121		70,667	
1890	21,477		42,921		3,344		4,501		80,763		443,297		67,645	
1886-1890	104,779	.38	261,867	.95	23,471	.09	13,492	.05	494,704	1.79	2,187,237	7.93	314,208	1.14
1881-1890	207,628	.40	553,666	1.06	53,885	.10	15,559	.03	1,343,998	2.57	3,887,495	7.42	588,035	1.12
1891	26,235		48,290		3,537		6,848		48,387		482,783		167,709	
1892	34,530		48,288		3,531		6,850		38,995		532,987		72,659	
1893	34,240		56,715		3,531		6,850		38,995		536,161		81,047	
1894	31,482		126,026		3,599		745		43,997		492,243		87,423	
1895	25,426		90,263		3,086		1,316		43,997		541,795		96,218	
1891-1895	151,913	.39	369,582	.95	17,284	.04	22,609	.06	214,371	.55	2,585,969	6.62	405,056	1.04
1896	23,309		101,945		5,639		1,625		45,882		440,784		104,137	
1897	29,127		74,299		30,380		1,925		51,151		491,587		108,147	
1898	27,532		79,547		30,380		1,664		52,694		424,937		89,954	
1899	23,196		81,691		41,634		1,331		28,710		365,890		94,037	
1900	22,439		76,468		52,498		1,492		15,538		348,053		103,615	
1896-1900	125,603	.20	413,950	.66	160,531	.26	8,037	.01	193,975	.31	2,071,251	3.31	499,890	.80
1891-1900	277,516	.27	783,532	.77	177,815	.18	30,646	.03	408,346	.40	4,657,220	4.58	904,946	.89
1876-1900	534,786	.29	1,629,544	.89	275,105	.15	46,205	.03	2,216,253	1.22	10,198,215	5.60	1,775,026	.97
1851-1900	534,786	.16	1,819,812	.54	575,712	.17	46,205	.01	2,595,909	.77	17,378,541	5.17	3,072,308	.91
1801-1900	534,786	.14	1,819,812	.51	1,411,630	.38	46,205	.01	2,595,909	.69	23,412,995	6.26	5,216,762	1.39
1901	19,621		96,750		27,825		1,530		15,538		372,916		103,363	
1902	15,577		117,077		112,525		2,796		20,985		392,111		105,037	
1903	18,183		101,658		28,669		2,491		14,513		404,531		108,609	
1904	21,362		87,384		64,300		1,209		14,512		419,711		102,423	
1905	30,597		89,955		24,968		2,419		8,293		401,483		118,875	
1901-1905	105,340	.13	492,824	.63	258,287	.33	10,445	.01	73,841	.09	1,990,752	2.54	538,307	.69

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Dutch Guiana		French Guiana		Peru		Uruguay		Venezuela		Europe		Austria-Hungary [1]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1906	33,338		89,923		40,102		1,535		1,223		390,878		126,519	
1907	30,961		114,202		24,890		2,510		1,032		466,504		120,209	
1908	32,071		103,307		24,890		4,433		1,184		593,652		119,454	
1909	30,041		103,708		24,890		4,433		13,576		501,986		93,946	
1910	38,344		107,835		22,055		4,433		16,472		563,126		105,101	
1906–1910	164,755	0.16	518,975	0.49	136,827	0.13	17,344	0.02	33,537	0.03	2,525,146	2.40	565,229	0.54
1901–1910	270,095	.15	1,011,799	.55	395,114	.21	27,789	.02	107,378	.06	4,515,898	2.46	1,103,536	.60
1911	25,320		107,835		23,813		3,422		17,648		475,604		105,705	
1912	19,702		147,571		23,813		5,360		30,162		407,425		98,840	
1913	22,757		147,571		23,813		1,444		21,517		457,447		105,425	
1914	24,351		94,805		49,445		739		29,644		314,344		9,711	
1915	21,723		94,805		53,691		573		67,500		371,408		67,360	
1911–1915	113,853	.10	592,587	.53	174,575	.16	11,547	.01	166,471	.15	2,026,228	1.81	387,041	.35
1916	21,198		77,400		61,310		581		61,431		287,713		48,375	
1917	21,527		69,587		60,667		484		30,810		211,652		7,256	
1918	18,851		57,741		57,645		484		22,891		151,045		8,708	
1919	15,932		53,212		65,232		484		29,025		143,363			
1920	12,506		43,538		62,757		21		18,839		52,544			
1916–1920	90,014	.10	301,478	.32	307,611	.32	2,054	.00	162,996	.17	846,317	.89	64,339	.07
1911–1920	203,867	.10	894,065	.43	482,186	.23	13,601	.01	329,467	.16	2,872,545	1.39	451,380	.22
1921	11,283		48,375		77,383		339		30,253		73,010		161	
1922	11,992		48,772		81,436		338		17,361		112,796		546	
1923	12,731		44,624		120,372		11		17,361		139,877		739	
1924	10,352		63,496		118,955		12		17,361		327,251		1,961	
1925	9,902		40,220		117,733				30,542		254,695		1,865	
1921–1925	56,262	.07	245,487	.28	515,881	.59	700	.00	112,878	.13	907,629	1.04	5,272	.01
1901–1925	530,224	.11	2,151,351	.45	1,393,181	.29	42,090	.01	549,723	.12	6,296,072	1.74	1,560,188	.33
1926	7,526	.04	45,235	.23	120,241	.63			30,542	.16	244,712	1.26	1,318	.01
1927	7,684	.04	48,354	.25	92,656	.48			39,366	.20	261,570	1.35	129	.00

Period	Czechoslovakia		France		Germany		Great Britain		Greece		Italy		Norway	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600														
1601–1700														
1701–1800														
1801–1810														
1811–1820														
1821–1830														
1831–1840														
1841–1850														
1801–1850														
1851–1855														
1856–1860														
1851–1860							(3)							
1861–1865							13,186	0.05						
1866–1870							3,484	.01						
1861–1870					(3)		16,670	.03						
1871					2,646									
1872					10,529									
1873					10,127									
1874					8,346		385							
1875					8,912		579							
1871–1875					40,560	0.14	964	.00						
1851–1875					40,560	.03	17,634	.01			(3)			
1876					6,015		293				5,144			
1877					9,902		143				3,504			
1878					10,063		702				3,504			
1879					12,474		447				3,504			
1880					11,253		10				3,504			
1876–1880					49,707	.17	1,595	.01			19,160	.07		
1871–1880					90,267	.16	2,559	.01			19,160	.03		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Czechoslovakia		France		Germany		Great Britain		Greece		Italy		Norway	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881					11,253		4				3,504			
1882					12,089		226				3,504			
1883					14,693		66				9,967			
1884					17,844						6,269			
1885					44,304		3				6,269			
1881–1885					100,183	0.40	299	0.00			29,513	0.12		
1886					34,241						6,269			
1887					72,371		64				6,269			
1888			(6)		57,614		7,073				4,758			
1889			12,860		62,951		3,119				4,823			
1890			5,948		59,640		129				6,784			
1886–1890			18,808	0.07	286,817	1.04	10,385	.04			28,903	.10		
1881–1890			18,808	.04	387,000	.74	10,684	.02			58,416	.11		
1891			6,559		75,844		3,247				4,565			
1892			6,274		100,987		2,477				4,421			
1893			8,964		74,106		2,046				5,660			
1894					103,566		3,183				5,660			
1895					107,542		5,176				6,063			
1891–1895			21,797	.06	462,045	1.18	16,129	.04			26,369	.07		
1896					55,104		1,188				6,782			
1897					66,424		1,698				9,404			
1898					3,561		321				8,027		32	
1899			64		3,589		2,844				3,633		484	
1900			32		3,192		13,360				1,704		129	
1896–1900			96	.00	131,870	.21	19,411	.03			29,550	.05	645	.00
1891–1900			21,893	.02	593,915	.58	33,540	.03			55,919	.06	645	.00
1876–1900			40,701	.02	1,030,622	.57	47,819	.03			133,495	.07	645	.00
1851–1900			40,701	.01	1,071,182	.32	65,453	.02			133,495	.04	645	.00
1801–1900			40,701	.01	1,071,182	.29	65,453	.02			133,495	.04	645	.00
1901					2,893		5,626				257		129	
1902					3,023		3,737				257		97	
1903			225		3,412		4,547				1,291		129	
1904					3,130		17,405				2,128		354	
1105			7,813		3,227		5,450				2,128			
1901–1905			8,038	.01	15,685	.02	36,765	.05			6,061	.01	709	.00
1906			24,305		3,890		1,414				1,993			
1907			40,413		3,220		1,414				1,914			
1908			55,595		3,134		772				2,251			
1909			67,754		3,348		1,041				1,168			
1910			82,580		3,042		1,914				1,430		66	
1906–1910			270,557	.26	16,634	.02	6,555	.01			8,756	.01	66	.00
1901–1910			278,595	.15	32,319	.02	43,320	.02			14,817	.01	775	.00
1911			87,659		3,779		1,914				2,165			
1912			87,659		3,779		1,344				534			
1913			102,912		6,558		864				832			
1914			67,725		5,000		979				1,555			
1915			67,725		5,000		932				111			
1911–1915			413,680	.37	24,116	.02	6,033	.01			5,197	.00		
1916			48,375		5,000		276				97			
1917			33,862		4,774		242				34			
1918			24,187		6,247				316		1,103			
1919	6,076		7,298		3,890				225		739			
1920	8,761		900		4,437		32		514		725			
1916–1920	14,837	0.02	114,622	.12	24,348	.03	550	.00	1,055	0.00	2,698	.00		
1911–1920	14,837	.01	528,302	.26	48,464	.02	6,583	.00	1,055	.00	7,895	.00		
1921	11,413		96		4,180				482		77			
1922	8,294		16,075		5,433				418		720			
1923	3,344		16,943		6,430				418		1,221			
1924	9,002		19,804		6,430				386		1,543			
1925	7,587		33,950		5,851						1,929			
1921–1925	39,640	.05	86,868	.10	28,324	.03			1,704	.00	5,490	.01		
1901–1925	54,477	.01	893,765	.19	109,107	.02	49,903	.01	2,759	.00	28,202	.01	775	.00
1926	7,716	.04	42,010	.22	5,208	.03					1,704	.01		
1927	7,500	.04	45,010	.23	5,000	.03			482	.00	2,154	.01		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Portugal		Rumania		Russia (European)[1]		Serbia		Spain		Sweden		Turkey		Yugoslavia	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600																
1601–1700					(2)											
1701–1800					85,000	0.14										
1801–1810					19,000	.32										
1811–1820					37,000	.97										
1821–1830					393,000	8.39										
1831–1840					821,000	12.50										
1841–1850					2,620,000	15.31										
1801–1850					3,890,000	10.23										
1851–1855					1,439,000	4.48										
1856–1860					1,546,000	4.76										
1851–1860					2,985,000	4.62										
1861–1865					825,000	2.78										
1866–1870					1,048,000	3.34										
1861–1870					1,873,000	3.06					(2)					
1871					217,000						170					
1872					216,000						170					
1873					196,000						170					
1874					169,000						170					
1875					168,000						170					
1871–1875					966,000	3.41					850	0.00				
1851–1875					5,824,000	3.78					850	.00				
1876					185,000						193		225			
1877					221,000						129		225			
1878					264,000						289		225			
1879					331,000						96		225			
1880					298,000						161		225			
1876–1880					1,299,000	4.62					868	.00	1,125	0.00		
1871–1880					2,265,000	4.00					1,718	.00	1,125	.00		
1881					258,000						32		225			
1882					236,000						547		322			
1883					218,000						1,190		322			
1884					254,000						643		322			
1885					325,000						1,511		322			
1881–1885					1,291,000	5.20					3,923	.02	1,513	.01		
1886					272,000						2,154		322			
1887					296,000						2,701		322			
1888					323,000						2,443		322			
1889					3.3,000						2,379		322			
1890					300,000						2,829		322			
1886–1890					1,514,000	5.48					12,506	.05	1,610	.01		
1881–1890					2,805,000	5.35					16,429	.03	3,123	.01		
1891					321,000						3,537		322			
1892					343,000						2,830		339			
1893					261,000						2,999		339			
1894					289,000						3,024		387			
1895					324,000						2,540		256			
1891–1895	(2)				1,638,000	4.19	(2)				14,930	.04	1,643	.00		
1896	896				268,000		643				3,681		353			
1897	501				300,000		643				4,083		687			
1898	227				318,000		(2)		96		4,044		675			
1899	54				257,000		(2)		96		3,414		675			
1900	83				222,000		(2)		418		2,845		675			
1896–1900	1,761	0.00			1,365,000	2.18	1,286	0.00	610	0.00	18,067	.03	3,065	.01		
1891–1900	1,761	.00			3,003,000	2.97	1,286	.00	610	.00	32,997	.03	4,708	.00		
1876–1900	1,761	.00			7,107,000	3.90	1,286	.00	610	.00	50,294	.03	8,956	.01		
1851–1900	1,761	.00			12,931,000	3.85	1,286	.00	610	.00	51,144	.02	8,956	.00		
1801–1900	1,761	.00			16,821,000	4.50	1,286	.00	610	.00	51,144	.01	8,956	.00		
1901	63				256,000		965		418		2,017		1,185			
1902	63				274,000		900		494		3,023		1,480			
1903	63				283,000		354		262		1,640		909			
1904	193				288,000		2,733				1,945		1,400			
1905	129				259,000		2,797				1,775		289			
1901–1905	511	.00			1,360,000	1.73	7,749	.01	1,174	.00	10,400	.01	5,353	.01		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Portugal		Rumania		Russia (European)		Serbia		Spain		Sweden		Turkey		Yugoslavia	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1906	932	.....	.....	.....	237,000	.....	2,893	.....	.....	.....	643	.....	289	.....	.....	.....
1907	322	.....	.....	.....	295,000	.....	2,893	.....	.....	.....	903	.....	216	.....	.....	.....
1908	1,833	.....	.....	.....	407,000	.....	2,893	.....	.....	.....	702	.....	108	.....	.....	.....
1909	802	.....	.....	.....	326,000	.....	7,273	.....	140	.....	491	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1910	133	.....	.....	.....	359,000	.....	9,742	.....	.....	.....	95	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1906–1910	4,022	0.00	.....	.....	1,624,000	1.54	25,694	0.02	140	0.00	2,834	0.00	659	0.00	.....	.....
1901–1910	4,533	.00	.....	.....	2,984,000	1.63	33,443	.02	1,314	.00	13,234	.01	6,012	.00	.....	.....
1911	115	.....	.....	.....	260,000	.....	14,149	.....	.....	.....	95	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1912	113	.....	.....	.....	202,000	.....	12,149	.....	.....	.....	984	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1913	113	.....	.....	.....	224,000	.....	15,867	.....	.....	.....	853	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1914	113	.....	.....	.....	221,000	.....	5,611	.....	.....	.....	2,627	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1915	32	.....	.....	.....	229,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,225	.....	23	.....	.....	.....
1911–1915	486	.00	.....	.....	1,136,000	1.01	47,776	.04	.....	.....	5,784	.01	115	.00	.....	.....
1916	.....	.....	.....	.....	185,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1917	.....	.....	.....	.....	165,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	484	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1918	.....	.....	.....	.....	110,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	484	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1919	.....	.....	23,551	.....	101,102	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	482	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1920	.....	.....	22,730	.....	11,000	.....	.....	.....	5	.....	225	.....	.....	.....	3,215	.....
1916–1920	.....	.....	46,281	.05	572,102	.60	.....	.....	5	.00	2,265	.00	.....	.....	3,215	0.00
1911–1920	486	.00	46,281	.02	1,708,102	.84	47,776	.02	5	.00	8,049	.00	115	.00	3,215	.00
1921	.....	.....	41,409	.....	11,000	.....	.....	.....	141	.....	64	.....	.....	.....	3,987	.....
1922	.....	.....	42,984	.....	29,000	.....	.....	.....	904	.....	32	.....	1,446	.....	6,944	.....
1923	.....	.....	48,225	.....	54,000	.....	.....	.....	904	.....	67	.....	1,446	.....	6,140	.....
1924	.....	.....	42,149	.....	236,000	.....	.....	.....	967	.....	265	.....	932	.....	7,812	.....
1925	.....	.....	40,027	.....	154,000	.....	.....	.....	967	.....	.....	.....	932	.....	7,587	.....
1921–1925	.....	.....	214,794	.24	484,000	.55	.....	.....	3,883	.00	428	.00	4,756	.01	32,470	.04
1901–1925	5,019	.00	261,075	.05	5,176,102	1.09	81,219	.02	5,202	.00	21,711	.00	10,883	.00	35,685	.01
1926	.....	.....	55,652	.29	104,000	.53	.....	.....	967	.00	14,789	.08	964	.00	10,384	.05
1927	.....	.....	66,165	.34	106,000	.56	.....	.....	967	.00	14,789	.08	964	.00	12,410	.06

Period	Asia		British India		China		Chosen		British East Indies		Dutch East Indies		Indochina		Japan	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1493–1600	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1601–1700	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1701–1800	85,399	0.14	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1801–1810	34,049	.58	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1811–1820	64,275	1.68	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1821–1830	692,086	14.77	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1831–1840	1,445,627	22.01	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1841–1850	4,618,740	26.98	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1801–1850	6,854,777	18.02	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1855	2,536,439	7.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1856–1860	2,725,226	8.39	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1860	5,261,665	8.15	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1861–1865	3,046,592	10.26	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1866–1870	3,782,649	12.05	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1861–1870	6,829,241	11.18	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1871	1,046,910	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1872	999,587	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1873	870,408	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1874	899,080	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1875	883,233	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1871–1875	4,699,218	16.55	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1875	16,790,124	10.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	(6)	.....
1876	903,421	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,159	.....
1877	1,108,979	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,899	.....
1878	1,104,721	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,307	.....
1879	1,072,766	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,570	.....
1880	1,105,766	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,570	.....
1876–1880	5,295,653	18.79	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	79,466	0.28
1871–1880	9,994,871	17.67	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	79,466	.14

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Asia		British India		China		Chosen		British East Indies		Dutch East Indies		Indochina		Japan	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881	943,570		[1]												22,570	
1882	949,628		390		[1]										30,608	
1883	997,020		750		259,039										9,356	
1884	1,115,824		1,135		300,995										9,517	
1885	1,140,753		6,327		224,959										8,520	
1881–1885	5,146,795	20.74	8,802	0.04	784,993	3.16	[1]				[1]				80,571	0.32
1886	993,293		20,384		176,572		55,171				4,790				15,518	
1887	1,242,028		15,465		459,563		67,163				5,723				18,133	
1888	1,265,922		32,729		435,385		66,456				4,373				19,483	
1889	1,414,137		72,693		435,385		47,519								25,078	
1890	1,252,302		96,742		257,945		36,266				1,993				24,563	
1886–1890	6,167,682	22.37	238,013	.86	1,764,850	6.40	272,575	0.99			16,879	0.06			103,075	.37
1881–1890	11,314,477	21.60	246,815	.47	2,549,843	4.87	272,575	.52			16,879	.03			183,646	.35
1891	1,344,858		120,694		321,797		26,878				3,022				24,595	
1892	1,432,366		160,523		407,608		29,330				3,151				24,754	
1893	1,556,376		184,453		333,444		28,440		[1]		4,373				23,414	
1894	1,543,591		187,835		413,937		22,600		13,471		3,601				23,694	
1895	1,546,858		225,244		170,328		33,824		13,111		3,569				25,015	
1891–1895	7,476,049	19.13	878,779	2.25	1,647,114	4.21	141,072	.36	28,582	0.07	17,716	.05			121,472	.31
1896	1,549,565		296,565		289,836		34,915		21,217		2,311				30,927	
1897	1,593,130		350,585		296,463		49,350		33,206		8,630				33,385	
1898	1,678,814		376,431		260,571		56,511		25,625		5,689				37,336	
1899	1,648,842		418,869		209,662		70,579		20,562		5,689				45,653	
1900	1,803,227		456,444		209,662		217,687		27,643		21,043				58,127	
1896–1900	8,273,578	13.23	1,898,894	3.04	1,486,494	2.38	429,042	.69	128,253	.20	40,362	.06			205,428	.33
1891–1900	15,749,627	15.80	2,777,673	2.73	3,133,608	3.09	570,114	.56	156,835	.15	58,078	.06			326,900	.32
1876–1900	32,359,757	17.76	3,024,488	1.66	5,683,451	3.12	842,689	.47	156,835	.09	74,957	.04			590,012	.32
1851–1900	49,149,881	14.62	3,024,488	.90	5,683,451	1.68	842,689	.25	156,835	.05	74,957	.02			590,012	.18
1801–1900	56,004,658	14.96	3,024,488	.81	5,683,451	1.52	842,689	.22	156,835	.04	74,957	.02			590,012	.16
1901	2,012,782		454,527		439,801		145,125		41,685		24,042				58,127	
1902	2,055,289		463,824		422,401		145,125		49,686		22,930				95,397	
1903	2,276,233		552,873		354,334		145,125		65,055		68,189				139,861	
1904	2,166,792		567,094		217,688		145,125		71,851		68,427		[1]		142,634	
1905	2,079,511		578,089		217,688		125,436		67,299		68,426		2,122		148,625	
1901–1905	10,590,607	13.49	2,616,407	3.33	1,651,912	2.10	705,936	.90	295,576	.38	252,014	.32	2,122	0.00	584,844	.74
1906	1,936,854		594,744		217,688		110,438		70,079		60,706		1,415		132,979	
1907	2,186,165		502,307		217,688		105,013		75,525		100,614		1,540		134,146	
1908	2,443,332		512,702		418,312		147,423		67,770		125,596		3,174		160,680	
1909	2,720,430		501,097		452,406		96,440		69,510		103,832		3,174		174,966	
1910	2,739,116		518,502		176,960		212,808		69,988		163,852		2,655		188,839	
1906–1910	12,045,897	11.44	2,619,352	2.49	1,483,054	1.41	672,122	.64	352,872	.34	554,600	.53	11,958	.01	791,610	.75
1901–1910	22,636,504	12.32	5,235,749	2.85	3,134,966	1.71	1,378,058	.75	648,448	.35	806,614	.44	14,080	.01	1,376,454	.75
1911	2,630,186		534,744		160,344		139,774		64,791		163,852		3,600		199,239	
1912	2,249,101		534,822		176,999		137,993		65,402		163,852		3,600		216,092	
1913	2,495,475		589,109		176,999		173,306		79,063		163,852		3,600		174,846	
1914	2,608,042		550,432		176,999		160,115		75,020		154,761		3,213		226,364	
1915	2,467,157		557,399		135,677		180,997		60,005		106,963		2,112		260,551	
1911–1915	12,449,961	11.17	2,766,506	2.48	827,018	.74	792,085	.71	344,281	.31	753,280	.68	16,125	.01	1,077,092	.97
1916	2,352,700		542,115		149,996		199,421		56,862		125,160		3,173		250,854	
1917	2,071,303		523,099		174,155		162,724		55,988		98,622		2,419		226,380	
1918	1,768,894		485,236		174,150		159,437		53,864		88,836		2,419		246,998	
1919	1,691,916		507,260		159,637		135,450		69,419		92,592		1,835		233,405	
1920	1,219,041		499,068		125,000		76,000		58,231		90,920		160		248,181	
1916–1920	9,103,914	9.89	2,556,748	2.69	782,938	.83	733,232	.77	294,364	.31	496,130	.52	10,006	.01	1,205,818	1.27
1911–1920	21,553,875	10.44	5,323,254	2.58	1,609,956	.78	1,525,317	.74	638,645	.31	1,249,410	.61	26,131	.01	2,282,910	1.11
1921	1,171,052		432,723		100,000		130,893		54,665		94,168		160		237,106	
1922	1,267,457		438,015		100,000		127,892		45,127		104,294		4,822		233,809	
1923	1,341,088		422,307		89,500		121,433		39,225		115,547		6,205		247,276	
1924	1,857,635		396,349		107,300		134,128		40,005		124,388		349		244,500	
1925	2,071,594		393,807		107,300		146,825		39,043		132,715		349		317,231	
1921–1925	7,709,426	8.83	2,083,201	2.38	504,100	.58	661,177	.76	218,065	.25	571,112	.65	11,885	.01	1,279,922	1.47
1901–1925	51,899,805	10.87	12,642,214	2.65	5,249,022	1.10	3,564,546	.75	1,505,158	.32	2,627,136	.55	52,096	.01	4,939,286	1.03
1926	2,130,627	11.01	383,970	1.98	110,000	.57	190,620	.99	34,068	.18	115,354	.60	321	.00	307,862	1.59
1927	2,169,223	11.18	384,268	1.98	100,000	.52	190,000	.98	30,299	.16	113,071	.58	321	.00	308,000	1.59

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Philippine Islands		Asiatic Russia [3]		Taiwan		Siam		Africa		Ethiopia (Abyssinia)		Belgian Congo		British West Africa [4]	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493-1600									8,153,428	35.50						
1601-1700			[6]						6,430,148	22.29						
1701-1800			85,399	0.14					5,465,626	8.93						
1801-1810			34,049	.58					385,809	6.60						
1811-1820			64,275	1.68					385,809	10.12						
1821-1830			692,086	14.77					385,809	8.23						
1831-1840			1,445,627	22.01					385,809	5.87						
1841-1850			4,618,740	26.98					482,261	2.82						
1801-1850			6,854,777	18.02					2,025,497	5.33						
1851-1855			2,536,439	7.90					241,131	.75						
1856-1860			2,725,226	8.39					241,131	.84						
1851-1860			5,261,665	8.15					482,262	.75						
1861-1865			3,046,592	10.26					241,131	.81					[5]	
1866-1870			3,782,649	12.05					241,131	.76					141,588	0.45
1861-1870			6,829,241	11.18					[7] 482,262	.79					[7] 141,588	.23
1871			1,046,910						96,452						32,312	
1872			999,587						96,452						25,616	
1873			870,408						96,452						18,241	
1874			899,080						96,452						32,062	
1875			883,233						96,452						27,605	
1871-1875			4,699,218	16.55					482,260	1.70					135,836	.48
1851-1875			16,790,124	10.90					[7] 1,446,784	.94					[7] 277,424	.18
1876			896,262						96,452						34,238	
1877			1,096,119						96,452						28,363	
1878			1,090,414						96,452						28,823	
1879			1,050,196						96,452						27,098	
1880			1,083,196						96,452						29,642	
1876-1880			5,216,187	18.51					482,260	1.71					148,164	.53
1871-1880			9,915,405	17.53					964,520	1.70					284,000	.50
1881			921,000						96,452						22,610	
1882			918,630						96,452						26,066	
1883			727,875						103,236						14,565	
1884			804,177						40,188						18,985	
1885			900,747						66,970						24,994	
1881-1885			4,272,429	17.22					403,298	1.63					106,620	.43
1886			720,558						69,542						20,799	
1887			675,981						92,851						22,546	
1888			707,496						258,779						24,030	
1889			833,462						400,491						40,841	
1890			834,793						482,957						34,138	
1886-1890			3,772,290	13.69					1,304,620	4.73					142,354	.52
1881-1890			8,044,719	15.36					1,707,918	3.26					248,974	.48
1891			847,872						738,398						41,444	
1892			857,000						1,126,459						48,951	
1893			984,222						1,320,695						21,972	
1894			878,453						1,850,711						21,472	
1895			1,073,767						2,051,627						25,415	
1891-1895			4,641,314	11.88					7,087,890	18.14					159,254	.41
1896			773,794						2,068,227						23,940	
1897			824,511				[8]		2,809,660						23,555	
1898			913,940				2,411		3,916,714		[8]				17,733	
1899			815,417				2,411		3,765,657		31,154				14,250	
1900			752,621						525,149		31,154				12,024	
1896-1900			4,080,283	6.52			4,822	0.01	13,085,407	20.93	62,308	0.10			91,502	.15
1891-1900			8,721,597	8.59			4,822	.00	20,173,297	19.85	62,308	.06			250,756	.25
1876-1900			21,982,503	12.06			4,822	.00	22,363,475	12.28	62,308	.03			647,894	.36
1851-1900			38,772,627	11.54			4,822	.00	[7] 23,810,259	7.08	(?)				(?)	
1801-1900			45,627,404	12.19			4,822	.00	[7] 25,835,756	6.90	(?)				(?)	
1901			849,475		[9]				505,310		31,154				5,208	
1902			816,116		39,610				1,986,947		31,154				22,795	
1903			908,678		39,610		2,508		3,328,360		31,154		140		59,961	
1904			911,857		39,610		2,506		4,211,031		32,408		129		90,987	
1905			819,384		50,091		2,351		5,507,378		3,665		4,501		153,906	
1901-1905			4,305,510	5.49	168,921	0.22	7,365	.01	15,539,026	19.79	129,535	.16	4,770	0.01	332,857	.42

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Philippine Islands		Asiatic Russia		Taiwan		Siam		Africa		Ethiopia (Abyssinia)		Belgian Congo		British West Africa [2]	
	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent
1906	(1)		706,142		50,091		2,572		6,558,317		3,665		8,006		210,041	
1907	3,130		995,854		42,310		8,038		7,372,189		3,665		15,789		273,808	
1908	13,763		950,027		28,035		15,850		8,064,717		514		6,623		281,257	
1909	11,978		1,240,443		50,734		15,850		8,330,213		514		21,252		230,494	
1910	7,471		1,362,163		53,145		2,733		8,517,059		21,187		23,695		183,691	
1906–1910	36,342	0.03	5,254,629	4.99	224,315	0.21	45,043	0.04	38,842,495	36.88	29,545	0.03	74,365	0.07	1,179,381	1.12
1901–1910	36,342	.02	9,560,139	5.20	393,236	.21	52,408	.03	54,381,521	29.59	139,080	.09	79,135	.04	1,512,238	.82
1911	9,448		1,295,333		56,328		2,733		9,308,563		11,703		29,354		253,977	
1912	22,331		671,875		53,402		2,733		10,286,432		11,703		36,685		352,461	
1913	34,204		1,038,357		39,406		2,733		10,054,958		24,052		44,334		384,836	
1914	53,179		1,161,867		46,092		(3)		9,815,326		(3)		49,787		406,576	
1915	63,898		1,044,362		55,293				10,577,174		(3)		49,787		401,733	
1911–1915	183,060	.16	5,431,794	4.88	250,521	.22	8,199	.01	50,042,461	44.90	47,458	.04	199,947	.18	1,799,583	1.61
1916	73,249		903,437		48,433		(3)		10,808,137		(3)		112,012		380,232	
1917	69,953		705,750		52,303		(3)		10,369,796		(3)		102,734		368,168	
1918	62,404		470,300		24,850		(3)		9,537,354		9,675		117,733		314,869	
1919	41,119		431,013		20,186		(3)		9,824,676		17,284		108,442		225,226	
1920	61,756		46,225		13,300		(3)		9,264,540		14,104		96,804		230,948	
1916–1920	308,481	.33	2,556,925	2.09	159,272	.17			49,304,503	51.96	41,063	.04	537,725	.57	1,519,434	1.60
1911–1920	491,541	.24	7,988,719	3.86	409,793	.20	8,199	.00	99,346,964	48.14	88,521	.04	737,672	.36	3,319,017	1.61
1921	60,705		32,177		28,455		(3)		9,672,549		30,000		65,715		203,606	
1922	75,840		117,700		21,958		(3)		8,033,879		30,000		68,384		213,395	
1923	81,564		190,673		21,958		(3)		10,167,967		20,000		91,306		200,565	
1924	79,893		722,070		8,653		(3)		10,624,264		20,000		118,119		223,910	
1925	94,135		831,154		9,035		(3)		10,582,493		20,000		122,781		199,697	
1921–1925	390,137	.45	1,899,774	2.18	90,059	.10			48,481,251	55.51	110,000	.13	466,272	.53	1,051,173	1.20
1901–1925	918,020	.19	19,448,032	4.07	893,088	.19	60,607	.01	202,209,736	42.34	357,601	.08	1,283,079	.27	5,882,428	1.23
1926	91,242	.47	888,155	4.58	9,035	.05	(3)		10,960,833	56.65	20,000	.10	132,201	.68	199,666	1.03
1927	79,314	.41	954,950	4.91	9,000	.05	(4)		11,071,619	57.07	21,605	.11	128,417	.65	171,607	.88

Period	Egypt		French West Africa [2]		German East Africa		Madagascar		Portuguese East Africa		Rhodesia		Sudan		Tanganyika	
	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent	Quantity	Per cent
1493–1600																
1601–1700																
1701–1800																
1801–1810																
1811–1820																
1821–1830																
1831–1840																
1841–1850																
1801–1850																
1851–1855																
1856–1860																
1851–1860																
1861–1865																
1866–1870																
1861–1870																
1871																
1872																
1873																
1874																
1875																
1871–1875																
1851–1875																
1876																
1877																
1878																
1879																
1880																
1876–1880																
1871–1880																

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Egypt		French West Africa [3]		German East Africa		Madagascar		Portuguese East Africa		Rhodesia		Sudan		Tanganyika	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881																
1882																
1883																
1884																
1885							[5]									
1881–1885							8,391									
1886							8,391									
1887							8,391									
1888							23,341									
1889							8,391									
1890																
1886–1890							16,782	0.06								
1881–1890							16,782	.03								
1891							8,391									
1892							8,391									
1893							8,391									
1894							23,341									
1895							8,391									
1891–1895			[6]				56,905	.15								
1896			9,183				8,391				[6]					
1897			4,950				19,322				18,085					
1898			6,848				3,150				65,472					
1899			6,000				11,050		[6]		65,298					
1900			6,334				33,468		1,318		91,951					
1896–1900			33,315	0.05			75,381	.12	1,318	0.00	240,806	0.39				
1891–1900			33,315	.03			132,286	.13	1,318	.00	240,806	.24				
1876–1900			33,315	.02			149,068	.08	1,318	.00	240,806	.13				
1851–1900			[7]				[7]		[7]		[7]					
1801–1900			[7]				[7]		[7]		[7]					
1901	[8]		6,334				30,800		1,500		172,071					
1902	2,705		4,758				38,838		1,993		165,705					
1903	3,482		5,505				55,139		2,000		198,081					
1904	5,750		5,433		129		72,336		2,000		228,206					
1905	10,138		6,382		129		67,517		2,139		349,254					
1901–1905	22,075	0.03	28,412	.04	258	0.00	254,730	.34	9,632	.01	1,113,317	1.42				
1906	5,216		6,302		386		62,147		2,283		467,086					
1907	4,916		4,180		386		82,306		2,560		525,343					
1908	1,843		4,276		225		101,243		3,440		596,428		[5]			
1909	2,900		6,044		2,829		118,861		3,858		624,303		4,501			
1910	4,452		418		9,902		104,008		6,302		603,964		4,147			
1906–1910	19,327	.02	21,220	.02	13,728	.01	468,565	.45	18,443	.02	2,823,124	2.68	8,648	0.01		
1901–1910	41,402	.02	49,632	.03	13,986	.01	733,295	.40	28,075	.02	3,936,441	2.14	8,648	.00		
1911	5,068		1,768		12,057		91,630		2,990		628,521		[5]			
1912	4,958		2,540		6,237		68,160		2,411		688,226		[5]			
1913	4,602		2,979		12,249		60,769		5,699		690,541		14,868			
1914	6,136		2,100				56,553		15,263		854,481		19,156			
1915	7,010		2,100				66,823		12,922		915,029		19,167			
1911–1915	27,774	.02	11,487	.01	30,543	.03	343,935	.31	39,285	.04	3,776,798	3.30	53,191	.05		
1916	6,289		1,514				46,682		11,218		930,358		18,351			
1917	3,183		1,500				26,742		12,026		834,232					
1918	2,856		1,500				23,887		11,997		631,358		3,666			
1919	1,948		3,990				22,505		9,675		593,446		7,883			
1920	128		4,838				16,686		7,256		553,067		3,569			
1916–1920	14,404	.02	13,342	.01			136,502	.14	52,172	.06	3,542,461	3.73	33,469	.04		
1911–1920	42,178	.02	24,829	.01	30,543	.01	480,437	.23	91,457	.04	7,319,259	3.55	86,660	.04		
1921			8,584				14,660		6,015		586,908		4,157		321	
1922	225		11,188				18,582		11,734		655,296		8,126		376	
1923	482		17,489				16,686		10,513		649,082		8,318		1,326	
1924	934		13,117				10,802		5,321		628,974		8,088		7,863	
1925	354		9,774				13,503		12,292		582,754		8,466		8,898	
1921–1925	1,995	.00	60,152	.07			74,233	.08	45,875	.05	3,103,014	3.55	37,155	.04	18,784	0.02
1901–1925	85,575	.02	134,613	.03	44,529	.01	1,287,965	.27	165,407	.03	14,358,714	3.01	132,463	.03	18,784	.00
1926	643	.00	9,906	.05			9,870	.05	9,127	.05	594,208	3.07	8,714	.05	7,202	.04
1927	64	.00	6,848	.04			10,352	.05	9,521	.05	581,788	3.00	7,166	.04	8,179	.04

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	British South Africa [4]		Transvaal		Union of South Africa [5]		Other Africa		Australasia		New Zealand		Australia		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600															1,080,264	4.70
1601–1700															160,756	.56
1701–1800															160,755	.26
1801–1810															16,075	.27
1811–1820															16,076	.42
1821–1830															32,151	.69
1831–1840															48,226	.74
1841–1850															385,809	2.23
1801–1850															498,337	1.31
1851–1855									11,225,383	34.98			11,225,383	34.98	862,638	1.73
1856–1860									13,299,602	40.95	32,977	0.10	13,299,625	40.85	422,976	1.30
1851–1860									24,518,985	37.97	32,977	.05	24,486,008	37.92	985,614	1.53
1861–1865									12,205,436	41.09	2,105,041	7.09	10,100,395	34.00		
1866–1870							99,543	0.31	11,658,330	37.13	2,961,404	9.43	8,696,926	27.70		
1861–1870	(6)						[7] 99,543	.16	23,863,766	39.06	5,066,445	8.29	18,797,321	30.77		
1871	10						64,130		2,406,235		671,627		1,734,608			
1872	14						70,822		2,220,451		469,740		1,810,711			
1873	920						77,294		2,073,790		464,910		1,608,880			
1874	14,838						40,552		1,962,814		346,277		1,616,537			
1875	11,806						57,041		1,929,179		326,896		1,602,283			
1871–1875	27,588	0.10					318,836	1.12	10,622,469	37.41	2,219,450	7.82	8,403,019	29.59		
1851–1875	[7] 27,588	.02					[7] 418,379	.27	59,005,220	38.29	7,318,872	4.75	51,686,348	33.54	985,614	.64
1876	13,536						48,678		1,730,996		296,255		1,434,741			
1877	3,239						64,851		1,647,298		341,950		1,305,348			
1878	2,273						65,356		1,411,677		285,647		1,126,030			
1879	1,946						67,808		1,397,500		264,467		1,133,033			
1880	11,984						54,826		1,459,069		280,828		1,178,241			
1876–1880	32,577	.11					301,519	1.07	7,646,540	27.13	1,469,147	5.21	6,177,393	21.92		
1871–1880	60,165	.11					620,355	1.09	18,269,009	32.30	3,688,597	6.52	14,580,412	25.78		
1881	1,875						71,967		1,470,325		248,916		1,221,409			
1882	3,599						66,787		1,422,289		231,108		1,191,181			
1883	21,215		(6)				67,456		1,313,513		228,504		1,085,009			
1884	5,491		2,376				13,936		1,368,371		211,560		1,156,821			
1885	24,860		1,414				15,702		1,327,478		218,381		1,109,097			
1881–1885	57,040	.23	3,790	0.02			235,848	.95	6,901,976	27.81	1,138,459	4.59	5,763,517	23.22		
1886	24,083		8,171				16,489		1,278,346		208,913		1,069,433			
1887	15,764		39,880				14,661		1,322,006		187,559		1,134,447			
1888	7,000		227,749						1,381,646		185,121		1,196,525			
1889	350		350,909						1,600,863		186,954		1,413,639			
1890	276		440,152						1,441,993		177,738		1,264,255			
1886–1890	47,473	.17	1,066,861	3.87			31,150	.11	7,024,584	25.48	946,285	3.43	6,078,299	22.05		
1881–1890	104,513	.20	1,070,651	2.04			266,998	.51	13,926,560	26.58	2,084,744	3.98	11,841,816	22.60		
1891	124		688,439						1,518,902		251,996		1,266,906			
1892	59		1,009,098						1,652,442		238,079		1,414,363			
1893	114		1,200,216						1,726,436		235,811		1,490,625			
1894	808		1,805,000						2,030,179		199,380		1,830,799			
1895	378		2,017,443						2,167,118		264,142		1,902,976			
1891–1895	1,573	.00	6,870,158	17.58					9,085,137	23.25	1,189,408	3.02	7,904,729	20.23		
1896	1,203		2,025,510						2,117,673		237,350		1,880,323			
1897	230		2,743,518						2,547,704		230,782		2,316,922			
1898	144		3,823,367						3,137,644		254,416		2,883,228			
1899	192		3,437,713						3,837,181		356,222		3,480,959			
1900	139		348,784						3,555,506		339,395		3,216,111			
1896–1900	1,908	.00	12,378,869	20.12					15,195,708	24.30	1,418,165	2.27	13,777,543	22.03		
1891–1900	3,481	.00	19,449,027	19.14					24,280,845	23.90	2,598,573	2.56	21,682,272	21.34		
1876–1900	140,571	.08	20,519,678	11.27			568,517	.31	45,853,945	25.17	6,152,454	3.38	39,701,481	21.79		
1851–1900	(7)		(7)				(7)		104,859,165	31.19	13,471,336	4.01	91,387,829	27.18	985,614	.29
1801–1900	(7)		(7)				(7)		104,859,165	28.02	13,471,336	3.60	91,387,829	24.42	1,483,951	.40
1901					258,243				3,719,080		412,875		3,306,205			
1902					1,718,999				3,946,374		458,933		3,487,441			
1903					2,972,898				4,315,538		479,489		3,836,049			
1904					3,773,553				4,245,744		467,891		3,777,853			
1905					4,909,747				4,156,692		492,954		3,663,738			
1901–1905					13,633,440	17.36			20,383,428	25.96	2,312,142	2.94	18,071,286	23.02		

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 58.—*General summary of world production of gold, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	British South Africa [4]		Transvaal		Union of South Africa [5]		Other Africa		Australasia		New Zealand		Australia		Various	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1906					5,793,185				3,985,684		534,603		3,451,081			
1907					6,460,146				3,660,911		477,310		3,183,601			
1908					7,068,868				3,547,210		471,973		3,075,237			
1909					7,314,657				3,435,007		473,455		2,962,552			
1910					7,549,293				3,167,140		446,445		2,720,695			
1906–1910					34,186,149	32.45			17,795,952	16.90	2,402,786	2.28	15,393,166	14.62		
1901–1910					47,819,589	26.02			38,179,380	20.77	4,714,928	2.57	33,464,452	18.20		
1911					8,271,495				2,911,410		427,379		2,484,031			
1912					9,123,051				2,636,894		310,962		2,325,932			
1913					8,810,037				2,569,311		343,595		2,225,716			
1914					8,405,274				2,301,152		227,954		2,073,198			
1915					9,102,603				2,369,800		422,825		1,946,975			
1911–1915					43,712,460	39.22			12,788,567	11.47	1,732,715	1.55	11,055,852	9.92		
1916					9,301,481				1,958,017		282,317		1,675,700			
1917					9,021,211				1,664,011		199,803		1,464,208			
1918					8,419,822				1,490,554		208,654		1,281,900			
1919					8,333,698		579		1,301,844		222,063		1,079,781			
1920					8,336,561		579		1,095,778		124,375		971,403			
1916–1920					43,412,773	43.75	1,158	.00	7,510,204	7.91	1,037,212	1.09	6,472,992	6.82		
1911–1920					87,125,233	42.23	1,158	.00	20,298,771	9.84	2,769,927	1.34	17,528,844	8.50		
1921					8,133,583		19,000		903,291		135,720		767,571			
1922					7,026,542		64		911,732		144,117		767,615			
1923					9,152,200				889,256		164,408		724,848			
1924					9,577,233				799,966		122,341		677,625			
1925					9,603,197		779		675,400		111,202		564,198			
1921–1925					43,492,755	49.82	19,843	.02	4,179,645	4.79	677,788	.78	3,501,857	4.01		
1901–1925					178,437,577	37.36	21,001	.00	62,657,796	13.12	8,162,643	1.71	54,495,153	11.41		
1926					9,968,457	51.53	779	.00	652,171	3.37	125,777	.65	526,394	2.72		
1927					10,127,433	52.20	1,639	.01	644,023	3.32	129,519	.67	514,504	2.65		

[1] Does not include the Philippine Islands or Puerto Rico. Philippine Islands is shown under Asia. Puerto Rico is included in West Indies.
[2] Includes Ashanti (Gold Coast) and Nigeria.
[3] Includes Senegal, French Guinea, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, and French Sudan.
[4] Cape Colony and Natal.
[5] Includes Bechuanaland and Swaziland.
[6] Previous production data not available.
[7] Africa's total for this period contains some undistributed production.
[8] No data available.
[9] Segregation of Russian production into European and Asiatic was estimated by the author from the best sources available.
[10] Austria since 1919 only.

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*

Period	World total		North America		United States		Mexico		Canada	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	746,932,166	100.00	90,410,000	12.10			90,410,000	12.10		
1601–1700	1,271,922,450	100.00	306,650,000	24.11			306,650,000	24.11		
1701–1800	1,832,768,759	100.00	1,044,510,000	57.00			1,044,510,000	57.00		
1801–1810	286,614,899	100.00	178,050,000	62.12			178,050,000	62.12		
1811–1820	173,378,899	100.00	100,310,000	57.86			100,310,000	57.86		
1821–1830	153,553,520	100.00	85,140,000	55.44			85,140,000	55.44		
1831–1840	197,348,711	100.00	106,539,132	53.98	119,132	0.06	106,420,000	53.92		
1841–1850	253,365,466	100.00	135,436,468	53.46	306,468	.12	135,130,000	53.34		
1801–1850	1,064,261,495	100.00	605,475,600	56.89	425,600	.04	605,050,000	56.85		
1851–1855	154,988,259	100.00	75,123,500	48.47	193,500	.12	74,930,000	48.35		
1856–1860	145,582,525	100.00	72,299,400	49.66	309,400	.21	71,990,000	49.45		
1851–1860	300,570,784	100.00	147,422,900	49.05	502,900	.17	146,920,000	48.88		
1861–1865	178,863,296	100.00	104,850,600	58.62	28,810,600	16.11	76,040,000	42.51		
1866–1870	221,785,770	100.00	133,023,200	59.98	49,113,200	22.14	83,740,000	37.76	170,000	0.08
1861–1870	400,649,066	100.00	237,873,800	59.36	77,923,800	19.45	159,780,000	39.87	170,000	.04
1871–1875	334,264,202	100.00	219,813,300	65.76	121,083,300	36.22	96,740,000	28.94	1,990,000	.60
1851–1875	1,035,484,052	100.00	605,110,000	58.44	199,510,000	19.27	403,440,000	38.96	2,160,000	.21
1876	66,932,201		46,744,687		29,996,200		17,567,487		181,000	
1877	74,174,990		51,799,782		30,777,800		20,897,982		124,000	
1878	78,291,041		56,742,282		35,022,300		20,897,982		822,000	
1879	78,876,244		51,084,537		31,565,500		19,466,278		52,759	
1880	77,902,694		49,837,737		30,318,700		19,466,278		52,759	
1876–1880	376,177,170	100.00	257,209,025	68.37	157,680,500	41.91	98,296,007	26.13	1,232,518	.33
1871–1880	710,441,372	100.00	477,022,325	67.14	278,763,800	39.24	195,036,007	27.45	3,222,518	.45

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	World total		North America		United States		Mexico		Canada	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881	84,487,883		54,727,250		33,264,733		21,409,758		52,759	
1882	88,274,154		58,875,467		36,204,404		22,618,304		52,759	
1883	89,936,458		58,776,572		35,740,244		22,874,610		161,718	
1884	82,307,566		59,000,019		37,751,594		21,086,707		161,718	
1885	91,997,703		64,921,286		39,917,654		24,843,914		161,718	
1881–1885	437,023,764	100.00	296,300,594	67.81	182,878,629	41.85	112,831,293	25.82	590,672	0.14
1886	95,484,904		66,690,962		39,453,494		25,528,750		161,718	
1887	97,148,513		72,237,766		41,276,891		29,054,271		349,414	
1888	110,030,745		79,644,236		45,793,138		32,006,064		297,844	
1889	126,564,054		88,720,584		50,010,029		36,779,967		383,398	
1890	134,429,165		95,414,818		54,511,583		38,955,318		400,727	
1886–1890	563,657,381	100.00	402,708,366	71.44	231,045,135	40.99	162,334,370	28.80	1,593,101	.28
1881–1890	1,000,681,145	100.00	699,008,960	69.85	413,923,764	41.36	275,165,663	27.50	2,183,773	.22
1891	138,283,427		95,058,137		58,342,087		34,854,619		314,241	
1892	154,377,339		104,897,229		63,499,992		39,504,867		345,495	
1893	166,594,198		106,157,933		59,909,956		44,362,519		248,583	
1894	164,529,094		98,932,943		49,300,000		47,038,381		847,687	
1895	167,744,560		106,012,216		55,726,945		46,962,738		1,775,658	
1891–1895	791,828,618	100.00	511,058,458	64.54	287,068,980	36.25	212,723,124	26.86	3,531,664	.45
1896	157,321,170		108,567,801		58,834,800		45,718,982		3,205,343	
1897	160,765,331		114,133,516		53,860,000		53,903,180		5,558,446	
1898	169,537,121		116,344,745		54,438,000		56,738,000		4,452,333	
1899	168,806,306		114,700,404		54,764,500		55,612,090		3,411,644	
1900	173,688,775		120,546,848		57,647,000		57,437,808		4,448,755	
1896–1900	830,118,703	100.00	574,293,316	69.18	279,544,300	33.68	269,410,060	32.45	21,076,521	2.54
1891–1900	1,621,947,321	100.00	1,085,351,774	66.92	566,613,280	34.93	482,133,184	29.73	24,608,185	1.52
1876–1900	2,908,805,636	100.00	2,041,569,759	68.09	1,138,217,544	37.97	855,594,854	28.53	28,024,476	.93
1851–1900	4,034,289,688	100.00	2,646,679,759	65.60	1,337,727,544	33.15	1,259,034,854	31.21	30,184,476	.75
1801–1900	5,098,551,183	100.00	3,252,155,359	63.79	1,338,153,144	26.25	1,864,084,854	36.56	30,184,476	.59
1901	173,100,596		118,992,912		55,214,000		57,656,549		5,242,697	
1902	162,936,273		120,871,228		55,500,000		60,176,604		4,223,364	
1903	167,814,265		130,065,596		54,300,000		70,499,942		3,149,591	
1904	164,274,497		122,724,661		57,682,800		60,808,978		3,577,536	
1905	172,393,047		128,498,206		56,101,600		65,040,865		5,994,292	
1901–1905	840,518,663	100.00	621,152,603	73.90	278,798,400	33.17	314,182,938	37.38	22,187,410	2.64
1906	165,998,018		121,981,992		56,517,900		55,225,268		8,568,663	
1907	184,784,361		132,334,499		56,514,600		61,147,203		12,779,800	
1908	204,103,994		149,670,569		82,439,500		73,664,027		22,106,233	
1909	213,391,980		185,484,677		54,718,500		73,942,432		27,529,473	
1910	221,428,092		163,404,443		57,136,100		71,372,194		32,869,264	
1906–1910	989,706,454	100.00	725,876,180	73.35	277,326,600	28.03	335,351,124	33.89	103,853,435	10.49
1901–1910	1,830,225,117	100.00	1,347,028,783	73.60	556,125,000	30.39	649,534,062	35.48	126,040,845	6.89
1911	227,128,987		173,380,952		60,398,017		79,932,440		32,740,748	
1912	235,899,157		172,871,384		63,759,679		74,640,300		31,625,451	
1913	227,519,787		171,154,827		66,790,650		70,703,828		31,524,708	
1914	177,246,560		131,153,131		72,444,800		27,546,752		28,406,711	
1915	189,454,264		144,062,534		74,945,927		39,570,151		26,625,980	
1911–1915	1,047,248,755	100.00	792,622,828	75.68	338,337,073	32.31	291,493,471	27.83	150,923,578	14.41
1916	174,632,240		125,297,757		74,397,157		22,838,400		28,459,700	
1917	179,800,233		131,327,181		71,736,381		35,000,000		22,221,300	
1918	203,423,269		154,606,941		67,805,962		62,517,000		21,383,979	
1919	179,931,884		141,398,917		66,674,036		65,904,224		16,020,657	
1920	173,345,280		137,495,249		55,339,455		66,662,253		12,793,541	
1916–1920	911,227,906	100.00	690,126,045	75.74	325,952,991	35.77	252,921,877	27.76	97,879,177	10.74
1911–1920	1,958,476,661	100.00	1,482,748,873	75.71	664,290,064	33.92	544,415,348	27.80	248,802,755	12.70
1921	171,580,712		132,626,523		53,026,250		64,465,347		13,134,926	
1922	209,828,662		157,870,392		56,212,054		81,076,899		18,581,439	
1923	246,275,858		184,409,599		73,295,810		90,859,083		17,754,706	
1924	230,680,209		179,275,449		65,366,840		91,486,136		19,736,323	
1925	245,280,193		181,922,310		66,106,922		92,885,455		20,228,988	
1921–1925	1,112,645,634	100.00	836,104,273	75.15	314,007,876	28.22	420,772,930	37.82	89,436,382	8.04
1901–1925	4,901,347,412	100.00	3,665,881,929	74.79	1,534,422,940	31.31	1,614,722,340	32.94	464,279,982	9.47
1926	253,806,386	100.00	186,835,161	73.61	62,672,953	24.69	98,291,166	38.73	22,371,924	8.81
1927	251,396,555	100.00	190,735,273	75.87	60,394,199	24.03	104,573,919	41.60	22,613,134	8.99

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Central America		South America		Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600			453,820,000	60.76			355,360,000	47.58					4,100,000	0.55		
1601–1700			800,570,000	62.94			456,860,000	35.92	50,000	0.00	20,000	0.00	11,200,000	.88		
1701–1800			598,040,000	32.07			213,550,000	11.66	2,700,000	.15	6,470,000	.35	15,100,000	.82		
1801–1810			83,640,000	29.19			31,030,000	10.83	120,000	.04	2,220,000	.79	1,600,000	.56		
1811–1820			48,416,000	27.92			15,850,000	9.14	56,000	.03	3,220,000	1.86	1,000,000	.58		
1821–1830			39,751,000	25.89			13,600,000	8.86	71,000	.05	6,430,000	4.19	1,000,000	.65		
1831–1840			60,256,000	30.54			19,610,000	9.94	96,000	.05	10,610,000	5.38	1,000,000	.51		
1841–1850			72,617,000	28.66			21,220,000	8.38	77,000	.03	15,500,000	6.12	1,100,000	.43		
1801–1850			304,680,000	28.63			101,310,000	9.52	420,000	.04	38,010,000	3.57	5,700,000	.54		
1851–1855			48,655,000	31.39			11,770,000	7.59	35,000	.02	23,910,000	15.43	560,000	.36		
1856–1860			38,824,000	26.67			11,770,000	8.08	34,000	.02	15,850,000	10.91	560,000	.38		
1851–1860			87,479,000	29.10			23,540,000	7.83	69,000	.02	39,760,000	13.23	1,120,000	.37		
1861–1865			29,578,000	22.13			11,560,000	6.46	38,000	.02	15,360,000	8.60	560,000	.31		
1866–1870			44,138,000	19.90			14,470,000	6.52	28,000	.01	17,830,000	8.05	560,000	.25		
1861–1870			83,716,000	20.90			26,030,000	6.50	66,000	.02	33,190,000	8.28	1,120,000	.28		
1871–1875			68,657,000	20.54			35,770,000	10.69	27,000	.01	20,610,000	6.17	1,000,000	.30		
1851–1875			239,852,000	23.15			85,340,000	8.22	162,000	.02	93,560,000	9.04	3,240,000	.31		
1876			9,136,136		325,000		2,642,976		5,000		3,519,446		773,450			
1877			9,136,148		325,012		2,166,754		5,000		4,092,668		773,450			
1878			9,136,148		325,012		2,815,663		5,000		3,353,759		773,450			
1879			15,407,520		325,012		8,509,562		5,000		3,931,232		773,450			
1880			15,406,520		325,012		8,509,562		4,000		3,931,232		773,450			
1876–1880			58,222,472	15.48	1,625,048	0.43	24,651,517	6.55	24,000	.01	18,738,337	4.98	3,867,250	1.03		
1871–1880			126,879,472	17.86	1,625,048	.23	60,421,517	8.50	51,000	.01	39,348,337	5.54	4,867,250	.69		
1881			15,042,756		325,012		8,509,562		3,500		3,931,232		773,450			
1882			15,020,597		325,012		8,509,562		3,500		4,118,703		587,812			
1883			19,958,353		360,734		12,377,353		3,000		5,144,119		587,941			
1884			15,316,785		360,734		7,735,983		3,000		5,144,119		587,941			
1885			16,708,815		360,734		7,735,983		3,000		6,751,656		309,451			
1881–1885			82,047,308	18.76	1,759,226	.40	44,868,643	10.27	16,000	.00	25,089,829	5.74	2,846,585	.65		
1886	1,547,000		17,942,429		46,426		7,735,983		4,533		6,751,656		309,451			
1887	1,547,190		14,054,838		23,213		4,419,808		4,000		6,414,587		773,570			
1888	1,547,190		16,910,821		328,773		7,409,460		4,000		5,975,248		773,570			
1889	1,547,190		15,602,961		471,973		8,471,913		4,000		3,976,918		473,420			
1890	1,547,190		15,283,768		471,973		9,089,974		4,000		2,369,510		642,082			
1886–1890	7,735,760	1.37	79,794,817	14.15	1,342,358	.24	37,718,028	6.69	20,533	.00	25,487,919	4.52	2,972,111	.53		
1881–1890	7,735,760	.77	161,842,125	16.17	3,101,584	.31	82,586,671	8.26	37,433	.00	50,577,748	5.05	5,818,706	.58		
1891	1,547,190		17,122,216		479,625		11,081,488		4,100		1,083,930		1,314,033		7,716	
1892	1,546,875		17,671,835		479,571		10,714,358		10,700		3,240,007		1,313,761		7,734	
1893	1,546,875		21,079,291		708,005		13,631,449		20,700		3,128,709		1,687,950		7,734	
1894	1,546,875		30,988,678		1,200,066		21,999,966		5,700		2,850,503		1,687,950		7,734	
1895	1,546,875		32,223,300		328,170		21,999,966		4,600		5,031,907		1,687,950		7,734	
1891–1895	7,734,690	.98	119,085,320	15.04	3,195,397	.40	80,328,227	10.16	35,800	.00	15,335,056	1.94	7,691,644	.97	38,652	0.00
1896	808,676		17,205,562		328,170		6,374,240		4,800		3,236,536		3,407,004		7,734	
1897	811,892		19,519,509		383,479		8,204,368		5,800		2,591,998		5,047,328		7,734	
1898	716,412		26,938,742		383,479		10,997,705		7,700		4,754,636		5,483,718		7,734	
1899	912,170		28,475,759		383,479		10,843,977		10,400		4,162,718		3,521,563		7,734	
1900	1,013,285		24,353,150		37,898		10,970,610		13,400		4,162,718		1,964,165		7,734	
1896–1900	4,262,435	.51	113,472,722	13.67	1,516,505	.18	47,391,100	5.71	42,100	.01	18,908,606	2.28	19,323,778	2.33	38,670	.00
1891–1900	11,997,125	.74	232,558,042	14.34	4,711,902	.29	127,719,327	7.88	77,900	.00	34,243,662	2.11	27,015,422	1.67	77,322	.00
1876–1900	19,732,885	.66	452,622,639	15.09	9,438,534	.31	224,957,515	7.85	139,333	.00	103,559,747	3.45	36,701,378	1.22	77,322	.00
1851–1900	19,732,885	.49	692,474,639	17.16	9,438,534	.23	320,297,515	7.93	301,333	.01	197,119,747	4.89	39,941,378	.99	77,322	.00
1801–1900	19,732,885	.39	997,154,639	19.56	9,438,534	.19	421,607,515	8.27	721,333	.01	235,129,747	4.61	45,641,378	.90	77,322	.00
1901	879,066		27,763,442		45,166		12,992,695		13,400		9,255,130		1,881,649		7,734	
1902	971,320		16,805,226		37,720		8,999,596		10,100		1,737,300		1,776,604		7,736	
1903	2,116,063		9,971,554		92,592		6,083,333		11,000		868,067		1,128,799		39,996	
1904	655,357		8,652,937		66,153		3,752,953		9,900		868,067		946,066			
1905	1,361,449		10,490,864		150,149		3,095,998		9,900		397,853		679,245			
1901–1905	5,983,855	.71	73,685,023	8.77	391,780	.05	34,895,575	4.15	54,300	.01	13,126,417	1.56	6,412,363	.76	55,466	.01
1906	1,670,159		12,141,067		14,440		3,540,450		11,600		392,608		763,335		13,592	
1907	1,892,896		16,050,270		25,178		4,794,474		9,800		602,400		1,048,719		2,456	
1908	1,460,809		17,647,143		127,108		5,040,180		10,600		1,400,830		1,375,039		22,642	
1909	2,294,272		16,690,799		265,106		5,035,260		10,900		1,154,482		431,204		22,642	
1910	2,026,885		13,772,824		263,255		4,652,169		9,400		1,123,970		866,093		22,642	
1906–1910	9,345,021	.94	76,302,103	7.71	695,087	.07	23,062,533	2.33	52,300		4,674,290	.47	4,484,390	.45	83,974	.01
1901–1910	15,328,876	.84	149,987,126	8.20	1,086,867	.06	57,958,108	3.17	105,600	.01	17,800,707	.97	10,896,753	.60	139,440	.01

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Central America		South America		Argentina		Bolivia		Brazil		Chile		Colombia		Ecuador	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1911	1,211,747	.....	14,880,920	.....	203,111	.....	4,112,241	.....	47,222	.....	889,807	.....	817,431	.....	22,642	.....
1912	2,845,954	.....	14,887,709	.....	81,996	.....	3,986,394	.....	40,610	.....	970,283	.....	587,683	.....	22,642	.....
1913	2,135,641	.....	15,623,042	.....	35,271	.....	3,986,394	.....	28,364	.....	940,510	.....	587,683	.....	22,642	.....
1914	2,754,868	.....	12,871,284	.....	30,000	.....	2,300,000	.....	76,685	.....	882,412	.....	351,271	.....	16,726	.....
1915	2,920,496	.....	13,129,735	.....	25,000	.....	2,475,884	.....	21,523	.....	811,452	.....	351,271	.....	24,655	.....
1911–1915	11,868,706	1.13	71,392,690	6.82	375,378	0.04	16,860,913	1.61	214,404	0.02	4,494,464	0.43	2,695,339	0.26	109,307	0.01
1916	2,602,500	.....	15,580,300	.....	21,300	.....	2,495,300	.....	22,000	.....	1,906,800	.....	309,400	.....	30,000	.....
1917	2,369,500	.....	15,451,300	.....	29,000	.....	2,435,000	.....	25,000	.....	1,716,600	.....	325,000	.....	45,000	.....
1918	2,900,000	.....	14,712,065	.....	25,000	.....	2,435,000	.....	25,000	.....	1,900,000	.....	494,331	.....	40,000	.....
1919	2,880,000	.....	14,753,160	.....	25,000	.....	2,435,000	.....	25,000	.....	1,900,000	.....	494,331	.....	40,000	.....
1920	2,700,000	.....	14,587,738	.....	30,000	.....	2,200,000	.....	30,000	.....	2,604,456	.....	480,000	.....	35,000	.....
1916–1920	13,372,000	1.47	75,084,563	8.24	130.300	.01	12,000,300	1.32	127,000	.01	10,027,856	1.10	2,103,062	.23	190,000	.02
1911–1920	25,240,706	1.29	146,477,253	7.48	505.678	.03	28,861,213	1.47	341,404	.02	14,522,320	.74	4,798,401	.24	299,307	.02
1921	2,000,000	.....	15,614,200	.....	25,000	.....	2,400,000	.....	33,000	.....	2,558,947	.....	500,000	.....	75,000	.....
1922	2,000,000	.....	21,395,008	.....	25,000	.....	5,373,521	.....	25,720	.....	2,709,152	.....	3,150	.....	75,000	.....
1923	2,500,000	.....	27,353,073	.....	30,000	.....	5,212,826	.....	28,613	.....	3,337,491	.....	3,150	.....	75,000	.....
1924	2,686,150	.....	27,065,296	.....	20,000	.....	4,857,608	.....	28,613	.....	3,357,688	.....	2,900	.....	70,000	.....
1925	2,700,935	.....	27,630,101	.....	18,000	.....	4,346,532	.....	1,833	.....	3,261,682	.....	2,900	.....	70,000	.....
1921–1925	11,887,085	1.07	119,057,678	10.70	118,000	.01	22,190,487	2.00	117,779	.01	15,224,960	1.37	512,100	.05	365,000	.03
1901–1925	52,456,667	1.07	415,522,057	8.48	1,710,545	.03	109,009,808	2.22	565,783	.01	47,547,987	.97	16,207,254	.33	803,747	.02
1926	3,499,118	1.38	30,463,552	12.00	15,000	.01	5,834,003	2.30	20,672	.01	2,876,911	1.13	125,953	.05	80,000	.03
1927	3,154,021	1.25	26,863,481	10.69	15,000	.01	5,402,840	2.15	20,000	.01	2,900,000	1.15	131,417	.05	87,601	.03

Period	Peru		Guianas, Uruguay, and others		Venezuela		Europe		Austria (Austria-Hungary, 1493–1918)		Czechoslovakia		France		Germany	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent
1493–1600	94,360,000	12.63	.....	.....	.....	.....	177,702,166	23.79	87,770,000	11.75	.....	.....	.....	.....	50,300,000	6.73
1601–1700	332,440,000	26.14	.....	.....	.....	.....	89,702,450	7.05	30,220,000	2.38	.....	.....	.....	.....	26,500,000	2.09
1701–1800	360,220,000	19.65	.....	.....	.....	.....	189,218,759	10.32	62,050,000	3.39	.....	.....	.....	.....	66,620,000	3.63
1801–1810	48,640,000	16.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	24,824,899	8.66	9,480,000	3.31	.....	.....	200,000	0.08	6,720,000	2.34
1811–1820	28,290,000	16.33	.....	.....	.....	.....	24,552,899	14.16	8,040,000	4.64	.....	.....	225,000	.14	7,620,000	4.39
1821–1830	18,650,000	12.14	.....	.....	.....	.....	28,562,520	18.60	6,750,000	4.38	.....	.....	397,801	.26	9,070,000	5.91
1831–1840	28,940,000	14.66	.....	.....	.....	.....	30,453,579	15.43	6,440,000	3.26	.....	.....	585,176	.30	9,580,000	4.85
1841–1850	34,720,000	13.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	45,211,998	17.84	9,840,000	3.87	.....	.....	934,397	.37	11,570,000	4.57
1801–1850	159,240,000	14.96	.....	.....	.....	.....	153,605,895	14.43	40,550,000	3.81	.....	.....	2,342,374	.22	44,560,000	4.18
1851–1855	12,380,000	7.99	.....	.....	.....	.....	29,354,759	18.94	5,630,000	3.63	.....	.....	1,531,147	.99	7,871,000	5.08
1856–1860	10,610,000	8.29	.....	.....	.....	.....	32,579,125	22.38	5,100,000	3.50	.....	.....	6,965,040	4.79	9,888,000	6.80
1851–1860	22,990,000	7.65	.....	.....	.....	.....	61,933,884	20.61	10,730,000	3.57	.....	.....	8,496,187	2.83	17,759,000	5.90
1861–1865	12,060,000	6.74	.....	.....	.....	.....	32,774,696	18.32	5,870,000	3.28	.....	.....	5,557,995	3.11	10,983,000	6.14
1866–1870	11,250,000	5.07	.....	.....	.....	.....	43,853,411	19.77	6,425,000	2.90	.....	.....	6,455,740	2.90	14,327,174	6.45
1861–1870	23,310,000	5.82	.....	.....	.....	.....	76,628,107	19.13	12,295,000	3.07	.....	.....	12,013,735	3.00	25,310,174	6.31
1871–1875	11,250,000	3.37	.....	.....	.....	.....	44,471,190	13.30	6,197,000	1.85	.....	.....	6,239,655	1.87	16,961,703	5.07
1851–1875	57,550,000	5.56	.....	.....	.....	.....	183,033,181	17.68	29,222,000	2.82	.....	.....	26,749,577	2.58	60,030,877	5.81
1876	1,863,264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,650,282	.....	1,541,641	.....	.....	.....	905,000	.....	3,959,219	.....
1877	1,863,264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,763,730	.....	1,639,688	.....	.....	.....	1,064,000	.....	4,745,835	.....
1878	1,863,264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,974,390	.....	1,564,519	.....	.....	.....	977,000	.....	4,042,795	.....
1879	1,863,264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,861,044	.....	1,549,023	.....	.....	.....	1,177,553	.....	4,308,424	.....
1880	1,863,264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,095,060	.....	1,543,236	.....	.....	.....	1,297,958	.....	4,313,086	.....
1876–1880	9,316,320	2.48	.....	.....	.....	.....	58,344,506	15.51	7,838,107	2.08	.....	.....	5,421,511	1.44	21,369,359	5.70
1871–1880	20,566,320	2.89	.....	.....	.....	.....	102,815,696	14.48	14,035,107	1.98	.....	.....	11,661,166	1.64	38,331,062	5.40
1881	1,300,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	13,821,177	.....	1,008,215	.....	.....	.....	1,759,000	.....	6,011,867	.....
1882	1,476,008	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	13,554,805	.....	1,514,879	.....	.....	.....	459,466	.....	6,911,831	.....
1883	1,476,008	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,632,465	.....	1,565,741	.....	.....	.....	204,350	.....	4,587,911	.....
1884	1,476,008	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,040,837	.....	1,585,032	.....	.....	.....	189,850	.....	887,296	.....
1885	1,538,091	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,731,065	.....	1,695,887	.....	.....	.....	1,639,688	.....	789,847	.....
1881–1885	7,466,115	1.70	.....	.....	.....	.....	53,780,349	12.31	7,369,754	1.69	.....	.....	4,252,354	.97	19,138,751	4.40
1886	3,094,380	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,724,289	.....	1,695,887	.....	.....	.....	1,504,301	.....	824,667	.....
1887	2,419,761	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,561,099	.....	1,716,560	.....	.....	.....	1,746,235	.....	1,014,806	.....
1888	2,419,761	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	8,174,198	.....	1,675,954	.....	.....	.....	1,588,118	.....	1,030,463	.....
1889	2,204,737	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,192,197	.....	1,692,769	.....	.....	.....	2,602,378	.....	6,198,470	.....
1900	2,115,229	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	13,965,959	.....	1,627,246	.....	.....	.....	2,286,464	.....	5,854,200	.....
1886–1890	12,253,868	2.17	.....	.....	.....	.....	54,617,742	9.70	8,408,416	1.49	.....	.....	9,727,496	1.73	14,922,606	2.65
1851–1890	19,719,983	1.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	108,398,091	10.83	15,778,170	1.58	.....	.....	13,979,850	1.40	34,111,358	3.40

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Peru		Guianas, Uruguay, and others		Venezuela		Europe		Austria (Austria-Hungary, 1493–1918)		Czechoslovakia		France		Germany	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1491	2, 253, 324						14, 420, 787		1, 672, 449				2, 063, 210		6, 000, 486	
1892	1, 904, 744						16, 298, 229		1, 770, 553				2, 979, 745		6, 818, 316	
1893	1, 904, 744						16, 634, 222		2, 897, 219				3, 152, 609		5, 753, 756	
1894	3, 236, 759						14, 715, 726		2, 684, 524				841, 113		6, 203, 820	
1895	3, 102, 973						14, 336, 667		2, 184, 265				566, 346		5, 818, 106	
1891–1895	12, 402, 544	1. 57					76, 273, 631	9. 63	11, 209, 010	1. 42			9, 603, 023	1. 21	30, 594, 484	3. 86
1896	3, 847, 678						16, 760, 814		1, 863, 921				525, 628		5, 890, 500	
1897	3, 278, 602						13, 065, 089		1, 970, 332				542, 913		5, 498, 135	
1898	5, 303, 770						13, 217, 899		1, 814, 294				460, 946		5, 571, 516	
1899	6, 525, 245		643				13, 627, 516		1, 895, 253				466, 989		6, 242, 053	
1900	7, 290, 825		800				13, 412, 100		1, 988, 774				452, 151		5, 411, 441	
1896–1900	26, 250, 520	3. 16	1, 443	0. 00			70, 023, 418	8. 44	9, 532, 574	1. 15			2, 447, 727	. 29	28, 613, 645	3. 45
1891–1900	38, 711, 064	2. 39	1, 443	. 00			146, 297, 049	9. 02	20, 741, 584	1. 28			12, 050, 750	. 74	59, 208, 129	3. 66
1876–1900	67, 747, 367	2. 26	1, 443	. 00			313, 030, 646	10. 44	44, 357, 861	1. 48			31, 452, 111	1. 05	114, 688, 846	3. 83
1851–1900	125, 297, 367	3. 11	1, 443	. 00			466, 072, 827	12. 30	73, 579, 861	1. 82			58, 201, 688	1. 44	174, 719, 723	4. 34
1801–1900	284, 537, 367	5. 58	1, 443	. 00			649, 678, 722	12. 74	114, 129, 861	2. 24			60, 544, 062	1. 19	219, 279, 723	4. 31
1901	3, 566, 808		800				13, 768, 541		1, 906, 706				384, 263		5, 521, 648	
1902	4, 264, 528		755		1, 887		14, 648, 571		1, 881, 132				747, 359		5, 722, 641	
1903	1, 746, 674		1, 093				15, 152, 509		1, 624, 048				747, 359		5, 822, 452	
1904	3, 008, 705		1, 093				15, 053, 563		1, 987, 797				298, 103		5, 799, 133	
1905	6, 156, 044		675				14, 798, 804		1, 860, 169				890, 555		5, 820, 947	
1901–1905	18, 742, 819	2. 23	4, 416	. 00	1, 887	0. 00	73, 421, 988	8. 74	9, 349, 852	1. 11			3, 067, 639	. 36	28, 686, 821	3. 43
1906	7, 404, 238		804				14, 298, 559		1, 806, 322				719, 453		5, 696, 433	
1907	9, 566, 118		1, 125				13, 792, 935		1, 744, 233				794, 973		5, 088, 086	
1908	9, 566, 118				104, 626		13, 559, 330		1, 770, 457				592, 042		4, 971, 544	
1909	9, 566, 118		129		294, 958		13, 872, 455		999, 184				629, 848		5, 332, 901	
1910	6, 636, 930		322		208, 043		14, 274, 211		1, 540, 808				713, 028		5, 597, 026	
1906–1910	42, 729, 522	4. 32	2, 380	. 00	517, 627	. 05	69, 808, 490	7. 05	7, 861, 004	. 79			3, 449, 344	. 35	26, 685, 990	2. 70
1901–1910	61, 472, 341	3. 35	6, 796	. 00	519, 514	. 03	143, 230, 478	7. 83	17, 210, 856	. 94			6, 516, 983	. 36	55, 372, 811	3. 03
1911	8, 351, 563				436, 903		13, 975, 470		1, 538, 772				429, 831		4, 904, 677	
1912	8, 351, 563		724, 235		122, 303		14, 482, 949		1, 846, 297				429, 831		4, 984, 677	
1913	9, 971, 067		51, 111				14, 639, 083		2, 104, 107				320, 766		4, 984, 677	
1914	9, 214, 190						13, 605, 830		1, 572, 746				279, 711		5, 295, 227	
1915	9, 412, 950						14, 136, 136		1, 772, 699				70, 732		5, 455, 981	
1911–1915	45, 308, 333	4. 33	775, 346	. 07	559, 206	. 05	70, 239, 468	6. 71	8, 828, 621	. 84			1, 730, 871	. 17	25, 705, 239	2. 46
1916	10, 787, 000		8, 500				13, 617, 040		1, 500, 000				115, 743		5, 523, 497	
1917	10, 864, 400		8, 000		3, 300		11, 664, 333		1, 500, 000				147, 893		5, 404, 540	
1918	9, 781, 734		8, 000		3, 000		12, 203, 456		1, 750, 000		554, 780		40, 000		5, 259, 861	
1919	9, 821, 729		8, 000		4, 100		6, 971, 600		15, 432		580, 918		12, 000		3, 472, 280	
1920	9, 196, 282		8, 500		3, 500		8, 356, 309		13, 985		680, 069		221, 500		3, 305, 020	
1916–1920	50, 451, 145	5. 55	41, 000	. 00	13, 900	. 00	52, 872, 738	5. 80	4, 779, 417	. 52	1, 815, 767	0. 20	637, 136	. 07	22, 965, 198	2. 53
1911–1920	95, 759, 478	4. 89	816, 346	. 04	573, 106	. 03	123, 112, 206	6. 29	13, 608, 038	. 69	1, 815, 767	. 09	2, 368, 007	. 12	48, 670, 437	2. 50
1921	10, 008, 553		11, 000		2, 700		7, 920, 639		10, 513		703, 056		321, 500		3, 387, 420	
1922	13, 109, 765		11, 000		2, 700		8, 334, 231		8, 584		875, 157		208, 975		3, 841, 510	
1923	18, 654, 793		8, 500		2, 700		8, 776, 468		14, 178		702, 285		213, 025		3, 752, 968	
1924	18, 717, 087		8, 700		2, 700		9, 202, 455		26, 678		732, 538		147, 858		3, 772, 968	
1925	19, 917, 439		8, 500		3, 215		10, 899, 782		23, 920		707, 300		352, 010		4, 780, 383	
1921–1925	80, 467, 637	7. 23	47, 700	. 00	14, 015	. 00	45, 133, 575	4. 05	85, 873	. 01	3, 720, 366	. 33	1, 243, 368	. 11	19, 255, 309	1. 73
1901–1925	237, 699, 456	4. 86	807, 842	. 02	1, 106, 635	. 02	311, 476, 259	6. 36	30, 904, 767	. 63	5, 536, 133	. 11	10, 128, 358	. 21	123, 298, 557	2. 52
1926	21, 499, 798	8. 47	8, 000	. 00	3, 215	. 00	11, 265, 265	4. 44	14, 050	. 01	765, 491	. 30	261, 830	. 10	5, 358, 858	2. 11
1927	18, 205, 408	7. 29	8, 000	. 00	3, 215	. 00	11, 667, 958	4. 64	9, 677	. 00	730, 000	. 30	308, 640	. 12	5, 500, 000	2. 18

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600															3, 632, 166	0. 49
1601–1700					10, 970, 000	0. 86									1, 952, 450	. 15
1701–1800					14, 250, 000	. 78					31, 125, 000	1. 70			1, 173, 759	. 06
1801–1810					820, 000	. 29					6, 478, 000	2. 26	500, 000	0. 17	126, 899	. 04
1811–1820					320, 000	. 18					7, 321, 000	4. 22	200, 000	. 12	126, 899	. 07
1821–1830					286, 000	. 19					7, 478, 000	4. 87	3, 500, 000	2. 28	180, 719	. 12
1831–1840					2, 112, 143	1. 07					6, 625, 000	3. 36	3, 750, 000	1. 90	260, 260	. 13
1841–1850			50, 000	0. 02	1, 947, 953	. 77					6, 274, 000	2. 48	12, 340, 000	4. 95	355, 748	. 14
1801–1850			50, 000	. 00	5, 485, 996	. 52					34, 177, 000	3. 21	20, 490, 000	1. 93	1, 050, 525	. 10

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per-cent	Quantity	Per cent
1851-1855			120,000	0.08	531,130	0.34					2,758,000	1.78	8,040,000	5.19	203,482	0.13
1856-1860			530,000	.36	1,029,949	.71					2,794,000	1.92	3,250,000	2.23	178,372	.12
1851-1860			650,000	.22	1,561,079	.52					5,552,000	1.85	11,290,000	3.76	381,854	.13
1861-1865			702,000	.39	531,130	.30					2,770,000	1.55	2,922,535	1.63	181,491	.10
1866-1870	3,250,000	1.47	1,858,000	.84	579,999	.26					2,619,000	1.18	4,248,078	1.92	190,557	.09
1861-1870	3,250,000	.81	2,560,000	.64	1,111,129	.28					5,389,000	1.35	7,170,613	1.79	372,048	.09
1871-1875	3,600,000	1.08	2,165,000	.65	582,571	.17					1,848,000	.55	3,833,783	1.15	125,356	.04
1851-1875	6,850,000	.66	5,375,000	.52	3,254,779	.31					12,789,000	1.24	22,294,396	2.15	879,258	.08
1876	650,000		535,000		128,603						359,992		1,067,405		30,000	
1877	650,000		647,000		145,450						361,857		2,970,729		41,796	
1878	650,000		697,000		128,603						367,258		3,108,977		40,767	
1879	720,000		820,000		142,621						366,229		2,395,230		48,290	
1880	800,000		899,000		142,621						366,229		2,395,230		42,182	
1876-1880	3,460,000	.92	3,598,000	.96	687,898	.18					1,821,565	.48	11,937,571	3.17	203,035	.05
1871-1880	7,060,000	.99	5,763,000	.81	1,270,469	.18					3,669,565	.52	15,771,354	2.22	328,391	.05
1881	950,000		939,000		154,709						256,949		2,395,230		37,809	
1882	530,000		883,000		189,464						250,165		2,395,230		48,226	
1883	760,000		940,699		181,491						321,186		1,746,911		50,895	
1884	720,000		1,087,949		205,347						300,931		1,746,911		58,386	
1885	720,000		1,087,949		231,485						409,944		1,746,911		74,783	
1881-1885	3,680,000	.84	4,938,597	1.13	962,496	.22					1,629,175	.37	10,031,193	2.30	270,099	.06
1886	800,000		1,087,949		231,485						408,539		1,746,911		99,056	
1887	1,000,000		1,087,949		165,480						434,742		1,887,602		187,375	
1888	1,150,000		1,125		165,480						466,925		1,655,828		149,437	
1889	1,075,000		260,678		165,480						103,268		1,655,828		137,187	
1890	1,130,000		325,044		178,083						482,936		1,655,828		134,390	
1886-1890	5,150,000	.91	2,762,745	.49	906,008	.16					1,896,410	.34	8,601,997	1.53	707,445	.13
1881-1890	8,830,000	.88	7,701,342	.77	1,868,504	.19					3,525,585	.35	18,633,190	1.86	977,544	.10
1891	1,060,000		1,193,532		182,134						445,738		1,487,904		117,607	
1892	1,150,000		1,281,045		144,478						465,377		1,487,630		1,702	
1893	1,020,000		928,512		144,478						325,260		2,013,258		143,705	
1894	1,139,041		928,512		151,207						275,808		2,044,505		92,194	
1895	1,139,041		183,655		195,525						401,646		3,529,582		38,130	
1891-1895	5,508,082	.70	4,515,256	.57	817,822	.10					1,913,799	.24	10,562,879	1.33	393,338	.05
1896	1,028,609		875,763		162,198						336,127		5,779,357		17,822	
1897	1,203,184		737,163		207,126						284,625		2,290,453		20,728	
1898	1,348,411		801,512		173,327						293,149		2,456,730		65,345	
1899	1,178,369		819,481		146,798						143,220		2,456,730		73,619	
1900	1,011,636		751,335		172,839						151,142		3,189,106		61,983	
1896-1900	5,770,229	.70	3,988,254	.48	863,288	.10					1,208,263	.15	16,172,376	1.95	239,497	.03
1891-1900	11,278,311	.70	8,503,510	.52	1,681,110	.10					3,122,062	.19	26,735,255	1.65	632,835	.04
1876-1900	23,508,311	.79	19,802,852	.66	4,237,512	.14					8,469,212	.28	57,306,016	1.91	1,813,414	.06
1851-1900	30,418,311	.75	25,177,852	.62	7,492,291	.19					21,258,212	.53	79,600,412	1.97	2,692,672	.07
1801-1900	30,418,311	.60	25,227,852	.49	12,978,287	.25					55,435,212	1.09	100,090,412	1.96	3,743,197	.07
1901	1,154,046		964,333		165,902						164,836		3,189,106		53,986	
1902	1,062,177		964,339		206,413						167,358		3,703,962		46,226	
1903	718,148		806,335		197,923						161,452		4,878,076		34,117	
1904	727,069		757,777		260,210						172,912		4,878,076		23,702	
1905	829,025		757,777		242,805						204,960		4,000,000		24,765	
1901-1905	4,490,465	.53	4,250,561	.51	1,073,258	.13					871,519	.10	20,649,220	2.46	182,796	.02
1906	829,025		672,449		175,475						166,183		4,064,532		32,375	
1907	829,025		737,843		201,516						132,122		4,097,035		29,761	
1908	829,025		674,848		226,175						132,122		4,175,674		35,728	
1909	829,025		786,620		213,122						132,122		4,767,091		29,373	
1910	881,539		468,566		229,989						140,632		4,546,430		19,823	
1906-1910	4,197,639	.42	3,340,326	.34	1,046,277	.11					703,181	.07	21,650,762	2.19	147,060	.01
1901-1910	8,688,104	.47	7,590,887	.41	2,119,535	.12					1,574,700	.09	42,299,982	2.31	329,856	.02
1911	803,750		998,576		292,073						477,140		4,270,324		19,823	
1912	803,750		447,761		247,988						200,094		5,358,448		32,202	
1913	803,750		423,888		247,988						300,000		4,437,637		58,969	
1914	591,464		510,365		440,917						300,000		4,434,417		33,511	
1915	591,464		493,856		413,867						638,403		4,567,454		24,230	
1911-1915	3,594,178	.34	2,874,446	.27	1,642,835	.16					1,915,637	.18	23,068,280	2.20	168,735	.02
1916	350,000		486,500		439,100						550,000		4,517,803		37,900	
1917	350,000		486,500		294,900						500,000		2,850,000		35,000	
1918	175,015		500,000		270,200						400,000		3,182,464		31,500	
1919	160,000		350,000		312,820						400,000		1,548,228		31,507	
1920	220,935		297,452		323,172		84,700				50,000		2,956,546		11,574	
1916-1920	1,255,950	.13	2,120,452	.23	1,640,192	.18	84,700	0.01			1,900,000	.21	15,055,038	1.65	147,481	.02
1911-1920	4,850,128	.25	4,994,898	.25	3,283,027	.17	84,700	.00			3,815,637	.19	38,123,318	1.95	316,216	.02

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Greece		Italy		Norway		Poland		Rumania		Russia		Spain (including Portugal)		Sweden	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1921	192,900	.....	199,330	.....	196,115	.....	53,401	.....	96,450	.....	40,000	.....	2,679,349	.....	13,342	.....
1922	184,123	.....	204,699	.....	205,149	.....	20,479	.....	62,821	.....	150,000	.....	2,778,210	.....	32	.....
1923	184,123	.....	385,800	.....	297,934	.....	130,950	.....	64,300	.....	192,900	.....	2,778,210	.....	578	.....
1924	160,750	.....	496,975	.....	424,380	.....	192,900	.....	72,209	.....	250,000	.....	2,879,966	.....	800	.....
1925	254,274	.....	320,761	.....	504,755	.....	212,190	.....	76,581	.....	250,000	.....	3,303,863	.....	55,200	.....
1921–1925	976,170	0.09	1,607,565	0.14	1,628,333	0.15	609,920	0.05	372,361	0.03	882,900	0.08	14,419,598	1.30	69,952	0.01
1901–1925	14,514,402	.30	14,193,350	.29	7,030,895	.14	694,620	.01	372,361	.01	6,273,237	.13	94,842,898	1.94	716,024	.01
1926	254,274	.10	519,351	.20	308,640	.12	271,700	.11	93,685	.04	250,000	.10	3,000,656	1.18	80,375	.03
1927	241,125	.10	537,098	.21	321,821	.13	300,000	.12	140,688	.06	321,500	.13	3,056,565	1.22	80,375	.03

Period	United Kingdom		Yugoslavia (Serbia, 1876–1918)		Undistributed Europe		Asia		China		Chosen		India		Indochina	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	.....	.....	.....	.....	36,000,000	4.82	25,000,000	3.35	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1601–1700	.....	.....	.....	.....	20,000,000	1.57	75,000,000	5.90	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1701–1800	1,000,000	0.05	.....	.....	13,000,000	.71	1,000,000	.05	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1801–1810	500,000	.17	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.03	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1811–1820	700,000	.40	.....	.....	.....	.....	155,000	.06	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1821–1830	900,000	.59	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.07	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1831–1840	1,100,000	.56	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.05	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1841–1850	1,700,000	.67	.....	.....	.....	.....	100,000	.04	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1801–1850	4,900,000	.46	.....	.....	.....	.....	500,000	.05	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1855	2,670,000	1.72	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,855,000	1.20	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1856–1860	2,843,764	1.95	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,880,000	1.29	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1860	5,513,764	1.83	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,735,000	1.24	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1861–1865	3,256,545	1.82	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,650,000	.92	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1866–1870	3,899,863	1.76	.....	.....	.....	.....	700,000	.32	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1861–1870	7,156,408	1.79	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,350,000	.59	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1871–1875	2,918,122	.87	.....	.....	.....	.....	725,000	.22	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1851–1875	15,588,294	1.51	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,810,000	.66	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1876	483,422	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	330,892	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1877	497,375	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	405,126	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1878	397,471	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	368,017	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1879	333,674	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	347,439	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1880	295,518	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	387,673	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1876–1880	2,007,460	.53	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,839,147	.49	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1871–1880	4,925,582	.69	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,564,147	.36	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1881	308,398	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	764,062	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1882	372,544	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	748,630	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1883	273,281	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	458,566	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1884	259,135	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	796,791	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1885	244,571	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	784,735	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1881–1885	1,457,929	.33	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,552,784	.81	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
1886	325,494	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,090,139	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
1887	320,350	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,074,449	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,000	.....	.....	.....
1888	290,868	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,408,499	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,000	.....	.....	.....
1889	306,139	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,433,746	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,000	.....	.....	.....
1890	291,768	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,414,913	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	7,000	.....	.....	.....
1886–1890	1,534,619	.27	.....	.....	.....	.....	6,411,746	1.14	.....	.....	.....	.....	16,000	0.00	.....	.....
1881–1890	2,992,548	.30	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,964,530	1.00	.....	.....	.....	.....	16,000	.00	.....	.....
1891	197,727	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,604,191	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9,000	.....	.....	.....
1892	169,383	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,983,028	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	12,000	.....	.....	.....
1893	253,455	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,081,244	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,000	.....	.....	.....
1894	255,002	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,019,292	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14,000	.....	.....	.....
1895	280,371	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,443,042	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	17,000	.....	.....	.....
1891–1895	1,155,938	.15	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,130,797	1.28	.....	.....	.....	.....	66,000	.01	.....	.....
1896	262,567	.....	18,322	.....	.....	.....	2,315,293	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,000	.....	.....	.....
1897	232,108	.....	18,322	.....	.....	.....	1,916,766	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	26,000	.....	.....	.....
1898	211,347	.....	18,322	.....	.....	.....	2,116,789	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	28,000	.....	.....	.....
1899	186,582	.....	18,322	.....	.....	.....	1,875,898	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	31,000	.....	.....	.....
1900	221,673	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,986,403	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	34,000	.....	.....	.....
1896–1900	1,114,277	.13	73,288	0.01	.....	.....	10,211,149	1.23	.....	.....	.....	.....	141,000	.02	.....	.....
1891–1900	2,270,215	.14	73,288	.00	.....	.....	20,341,946	1.25	.....	.....	.....	.....	207,000	.01	.....	.....
1876–1900	7,270,223	.24	73,288	.00	.....	.....	32,145,623	1.07	.....	.....	.....	.....	223,000	.01	.....	.....
1851–1900	22,858,517	.57	73,288	.00	.....	.....	38,955,623	.97	.....	.....	.....	.....	223,000	.01	.....	.....
1801–1900	27,758,517	.54	73,288	.00	.....	.....	39,455,623	.77	.....	.....	.....	.....	223,000	.00	.....	.....

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	United Kingdom		Yugoslavia (Serbia, 1876–1918)		Undistributed Europe		Asia		China		Chosen		India		Indochina	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1901	173,297		418				2,304,160						34,000			
1902	146,289		675				2,457,196						35,000			
1903	162,593						2,566,978						41,000		296	
1904	147,241		1,543				2,775,767						43,000		519	
1905	167,479		322				2,929,456						43,000		851	
1901–1905	796,899	0.09	2,958	0.00			13,033,557	1.55					196,000	0.02	1,666	0.00
1906	137,216		96				2,860,978				6,000		44,000		771	
1907	137,216		1,125				3,534,478				6,000		38,000		1,000	
1908	135,255		26,460				4,508,379				6,000		38,000		1,758	
1909	141,943		11,226				6,395,824				6,000		27,500		739	
1910	136,370						6,881,960				6,000		49,680		862	
1906–1910	688,000	.07	38,907	.00			24,181,619	2.44			6,000	0.00	197,180	.02	5,130	.00
1901–1910	1,484,899	.08	41,865	.00			37,215,176	2.03			6,000	.00	393,180	.02	6,796	.00
1911	136,370		24,132				6,826,387				9,446		103,850		1,447	
1912	113,769		24,132				7,128,909				12,224		93,476			
1913	128,543		28,758				6,827,893				15,048		125,209			
1914	135,458		12,014				7,168,967		107,155		16,864		236,440		1,767	
1915	96,450		11,000				7,418,285		18,230		21,897		284,875		1,056	
1911–1915	610,590	.06	100,036	.01			35,370,441	3.38	125,385	0.01	75,479	.01	843,850	.08	4,270	.00
1916	86,500		10,000				8,084,143		30,000		25,000		1,257,100		1,000	
1917	75,500		20,000				10,114,919		63,400		26,500		2,068,700		1,000	
1918	79,636		20,000				10,654,938		70,000		26,000		2,240,500		1,000	
1919	68,415		20,000				8,342,325		65,000		20,000		2,165,606		1,000	
1920	76,356		15,000				8,984,225		50,000		1,200		2,870,595			
1916–1920	386,407	.04	85,000	.01			46,180,550	5.06	278,400	.03	98,700	.01	10,602,501	1.16	4,000	.00
1911–1920	997,997	.05	185,036	.01			81,550,991	4.16	403,785	.02	174,179	.01	11,446,351	.58	8,270	.00
1921	11,317		15,946				8,992,921		40,000		2,958		3,587,587			
1922	27,649		26,813				9,410,453		100,000		10,723		4,244,304			
1923	34,625		24,562				10,213,931		100,000		39,281		4,863,066			
1924	31,153		31,250				11,374,368		110,000		54,662		5,309,203		900	
1925	32,439		26,106				12,558,347		110,000		70,299		4,854,923		1,000	
1921–1925	137,183	.01	124,677	.01			52,550,020	4.72	460,000	.04	177,923	.02	22,859,083	2.04	1,900	.00
1901–1925	2,619,079	.05	351,578	.01			171,316,187	3.49	863,785	.02	358,102	.01	34,698,614	.71	16,966	.00
1926	41,345	.02	45,010	.02			12,736,425	5.02	135,000	.05	51,927	.02	5,124,962	2.02	1,220	.00
1927	46,714	.02	53,755	.02			13,541,172	5.39	100,000	.04	52,000	.02	6,024,806	2.40	10,159	.00

Period	Japan		Netherland East Indies		Philippine Islands		Taiwan		Turkey		Africa		Algeria		Belgian Congo	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600	25,000,000	3.35														
1601–1700	75,000,000	5.90														
1701–1800	1,000,000	.05														
1801–1810	100,000	.03														
1811–1820	100,000	.06														
1821–1830	100,000	.07														
1831–1840	100,000	.05														
1841–1850	100,000	.04														
1801–1850	500,000	.05														
1851–1855	75,000	.05							1,780,000	1.15						
1856–1860	100,000	.07							1,780,000	1.22						
1851–1860	175,000	.06							3,560,000	1.18						
1861–1865	150,000	.08							1,500,000	.84						
1866–1870	200,000	.09							500,000	.23						
1861–1870	350,000	.09							2,000,000	.50						
1871–1875	475,000	.14							250,000	.08						
1851–1875	1,000,000	.10							5,810,000	.56						
1876	280,892								50,000							
1877	355,126								50,000							
1878	318,017								50,000							
1879	292,172								55,267							
1880	332,406								55,267							
1876–1880	1,578,613	.42							260,534	.07						
1871–1880	2,053,613	.29							510,534	.07						

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	Japan		Netherland East Indies		Philippine Islands		Taiwan		Turkey		Africa		Algeria		Belgian Congo	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1881	708,795								55,267		5,000					
1882	679,056								69,574		10,000					
1883	416,031								42,535		14,436					
1884	754,256								42,535		7,652					
1885	742,200								42,535		40,960					
1881–1885	3,300,338	0.75							252,446	0.06	78,048	0.02				
1886	1,036,604								42,535		101,757					
1887	1,030,914								42,535		13,889					
1888	1,363,964								42,535		25,000					
1889	1,336,211								42,535		39,000					
1890	1,365,378								42,535		48,000					
1886–1890	6,183,071	1.10							212,675	.04	227,646	.04				
1881–1890	9,483,409	.95							465,121	.05	305,694	.03				
1891	1,391,548								203,643		76,000					
1892	1,767,459								203,569		118,000					
1893	1,863,675								203,569		142,000					
1894	1,956,565								48,727		199,000					
1895	2,165,084								260,958		222,000					
1891–1895	9,144,331	1.15							920,466	.12	757,000	.10				
1896	2,008,068								225,225		233,000		10,000			
1897	1,748,609								142,157		312,449		10,449			
1898	1,946,648								142,141		427,846		6,846			
1899	1,702,757								142,141		409,131		6,430			
1900	1,729,003		80,659						142,141		50,011		8,359			
1896–1900	9,195,685	1.10	80,659	0.01					793,805	.10	1,432,437	.17	42,084	0.01		
1891–1900	18,340,016	1.13	80,659	.00					1,714,271	.11	2,189,437	.13	42,084	.00		
1876–1900	29,402,038	.98	80,659	.00					2,439,926	.08	2,495,131	.08	42,084	.00		
1851–1900	30,402,038	.76	80,659	.00					8,249,926	.20	2,495,131	.06	42,084	.00		
1901–1900	30,902,038	.61	80,659	.00					8,249,926	.16	2,495,131	.05	42,084	.00		
1901	1,729,603		111,377						429,180		41,485		10,353			
1902	1,819,171		121,919						480,596		127,015		997			
1903	1,887,407		179,445						458,530		374,772		3,987			
1904	1,984,674		182,889						564,685		508,677		19,419			
1905	2,664,842		182,889						37,874		640,226		10,803			
1901–1905	10,086,237	1.21	778,519	.09					1,971,135	.23	1,692,175	.20	45,559	.01		
1906	2,530,043		248,240						37,874		805,051		2,926			
1907	3,073,411		285,454		100		19,162		67,351		1,123,080		35,076			
1908	3,887,397		171,953		1,300				7,971		1,533,474		36,491			
1909	4,130,972		465,980		3,000		49,737		1,717,896		1,588,950		113,074			
1910	4,581,613		465,980		1,800		58,129		1,717,896		1,548,826		100,664			
1906–1910	18,203,436	1.84	2,087,607	.21	6,200	0.00	127,028	0.01	3,548,988	.36	6,599,381	.67	288,231	.03		
1901–1910	28,289,723	1.54	2,866,126	.16	6,200	.00	127,028	.01	5,520,123	.30	8,291,556	.45	333,790	.02		
1911	4,459,087		465,980		3,383		65,208		1,717,896		1,486,837		77,162			
1912	4,932,852		465,980		7,121		108,123		1,509,133		1,790,262		146,613			
1913	4,649,910		465,980		10,850		51,763		1,509,133		1,746,365		150,000		1,454	
1914	4,836,228		400,000		10,300		51,080		1,509,133		1,447,348		150,000		4,770	
1915	5,120,293		400,000		15,148		47,653		1,509,133		1,457,574		150,000		4,770	
1911–1915	23,998,370	2.30	2,197,940	.21	46,802	.00	323,917	.03	7,754,428	.74	7,928,386	.76	673,775	.06	10,994	0.00
1916	5,805,700		400,000		17,643		47,700		500,000		1,353,000		150,000		11,000	
1917	7,111,700		400,000		4,019		39,600		400,000		1,332,500		150,000		10,300	
1918	6,000,400		1,286,000		4,138		28,900		400,000		1,256,815		170,813		10,500	
1919	4,950,468		1,006,842		8,409		25,000		100,000		1,271,694		170,813		10,000	
1920	4,892,380		1,027,932		22,118		20,000		100,000		1,231,670		150,000		10,673	
1916–1920	29,360,648	3.22	4,120,774	.45	56,327	.01	159,200	.02	1,500,000	.16	6,445,379	.71	791,626	.09	52,473	.01
1911–1920	53,359,018	2.73	6,318,714	.32	103,129	.01	483,117	.02	9,254,428	.47	14,373,765	.73	1,465,401	.07	63,467	.00
1921	4,187,666		1,021,094		26,191		28,525		100,000		1,080,745		48,899		5,819	
1922	3,886,301		1,109,657		27,994		23,437		8,037		1,333,221		13,214		6,558	
1923	3,597,334		1,578,983		3,776		23,437		8,037		1,704,086		159,853		8,745	
1924	3,542,320		2,083,256		43,113		11,008		219,906		1,902,759		183,806		10,000	
1925	4,835,497		2,385,016		68,544		13,162		219,906		1,428,619		98,450		10,000	
1921–1925	20,049,135	1.80	8,178,906	.75	169,618	.02	97,569	.01	555,886	.05	7,519,430	.68	502,192	.05	41,122	.00
1901–1925	101,697,876	2.07	17,363,746	.35	278,947	.01	707,714	.01	15,330,437	.31	30,184,751	.62	2,301,383	.05	104,589	.00
1926	4,776,110	1.88	2,363,829	.93	44,013	.02	14,314	.01	225,050	.09	1,280,623	.51	169,141	.07	10,000	.00
1927	4,800,000	1.91	2,285,801	.91	28,356	.01	15,000	.01	225,050	.09	1,274,033	.50	118,087	.05	10,609	.00

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	German Southwest Africa		Rhodesia		Union of South Africa		Other Africa		Australasia		Australia		New Zealand		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1493–1600																
1601–1700																
1701–1800																
1801–1810																
1811–1820																
1821–1830																
1831–1840																
1841–1850																
1801–1855																
1851–1855																
1856–1860																
1851–1860																
1861–1856									10,000	0.01	10,000	0.01				
1866–1870									71,159	.03	22,973	.01	48,186	0.01		
1861–1870									81,159	.02	32,973	.01	48,186	.01		
1871–1875									597,712	.18	374,538	.11	223,174	.07		
1851–1857									678,871	.07	407,511	.04	271,360	.03		
1876									70,204		57,521		12,683			
1877									70,204		36,311		33,893			
1878									70,204		47,185		23,019			
1879									175,704		155,059		20,645			
1880									175,704		155,704		20,000			
1876–1880									562,020	.15	451,780	.12	110,240	.03		
1871–1880									1,159,732	.16	826,318	.12	333,414	.04		
1881							5,000		127,638		108,753		18,885			
1882							10,000		64,655		58,961		5,694			
1883							14,436		116,064		99,238		16,826			
1884							7,652		145,482		120,568		24,914			
1885							40,960		810,842		794,218		16,624			
1881–1885							78,048	0.02	1,264,681	.29	1,181,738	.27	82,943	.02		
1886					1,000		100,757		945,328		933,220		12,108			
1887					4,000		9,889		206,472		185,663		20,809			
1888					25,000				3,867,991		3,867,588		403			
1889					39,000				6,575,566		6,551,461		24,105			
1890					48,000				8,301,707		8,269,080		32,627			
1886–1890					117,000	0.02	110,646	.02	19,897,064	3.53	19,807,012	3.51	90,052	.02		
1881–1890					117,000	.01	188,694	.02	21,161,745	2.12	20,988,750	2.10	172,995	.02		
1891					76,000				10,002,096		9,974,073		28,023			
1892					118,000				13,439,018		13,416,965		22,053			
1893					142,000				20,501,508		20,447,331		54,177			
1894					199,000				18,073,455		18,032,655		40,800			
1895					222,000				12,507,335		12,443,535		63,800			
1891–1895					757,000	.10			74,523,412	9.41	74,314,559	[1] 9.39	208,853	.02		
1896					223,000				12,238,700		12,175,800		62,900			
1897					302,000				11,878,000		11,750,900		127,100			
1898					421,000				10,491,100		10,319,900		171,200			
1899					400,000		2,701		12,737,598		12,533,631		203,967			
1900			951		38,000		2,701		13,340,263		13,062,481		277,782			
1896–1900			951	0.00	1,384,000	.16	5,402	.00	60,685,661	7.31	59,842,712	7.21	842,949	.10		
1891–1900			951	.00	2,141,000	.13	5,402	.00	135,209,073	8.34	134,157,271	8.28	1,051,802	.06		
1876–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.07	194,096	.01	156,932,838	5.23	155,597,801	5.19	1,335,037	.04		
1851–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.06	194,096	.00	157,611,709	3.91	156,005,312	3.87	1,606,397	.04		
1801–1900			951	.00	2,258,000	.05	194,096	.00	157,611,709	3.09	156,005,312	3.06	1,606,397	.03		
1901			3,132		28,000				10,230,046		9,658,912		571,134			
1902			3,455		122,573				8,026,037		7,351,841		674,196			
1903			20,715		350,070				9,682,856		8,770,942		911,914			
1904			70,146		416,262		2,850		14,558,892		13,464,431		1,094,461			
1905			89,278		540,145				15,035,486		13,855,742		1,179,744			
1901–1905			186,716	.02	1,457,050	.17	2,850	.00	57,533,317	6.84	53,101,868	6.31	4,431,449	.53		
1906	50,000		110,575		641,550				13,909,371		12,518,835		1,390,536			
1907	225,064		147,324		715,030		595		17,949,099		16,386,496		1,562,603			
1908	402,672		283,424		809,611		1,276		17,175,099		15,443,763		1,731,336			
1909	397,431		262,133		814,557		1,755		16,359,284		14,545,454		1,813,830			
1910	400,421		217,633		827,090		3,018		21,545,828		19,834,593		1,711,235			
1906–1910	1,475,588	0.15	1,021,089	.10	3,807,838	.39	6,635	.00	86,938,681	8.78	78,729,141	7.95	8,209,540	.83		
1901–1910	1,475,588	.06	1,207,805	.07	[5] 5,264,888	.28	9,485	.00	144,471,998	7.89	131,831,009	7.20	12,640,989	.69		

TABLE 46.—*General summary of world production of silver, 1493–1927 (fine ounces)*—Continued

Period	German Southwest Africa		Rhodesia		Union of South Africa		Other Africa		Australasia		Australia		New Zealand		Various	
	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent	Quantity	Percent
1911	271,909	-------	187,641	-------	896,539	-------	53,586	-------	16,578,421	-------	15,267,378	-------	1,311,043	-------	----------	-------
1912	374,989	-------	176,532	-------	1,018,842	-------	73,286	-------	14,737,944	-------	13,936,779	-------	801,165	-------	----------	-------
1913	500,000	-------	142,390	-------	952,521	-------	----------	-------	18,128,577	-------	17,152,961	-------	975,616	-------	----------	-------
1914	250,000	-------	150,765	-------	890,562	-------	1,223	-------	11,000,000	-------	10,490,838	-------	509,162	-------	----------	-------
1915	150,000	-------	185,233	-------	965,914	-------	1,657	-------	9,250,000	-------	8,292,459	-------	957,541	-------	----------	-------
1911–1915	1,546,898	0.15	842,589	0.08	4,724,378	0.46	129,752	0.01	69,694,942	6.85	65,050,415	6.21	4,644,527	0.44	----------	-------
1916	----------	-------	200,700	-------	968,900	-------	22,400	-------	10,700,000	-------	9,913,500	-------	786,500	-------	----------	-------
1917	----------	-------	212,000	-------	938,100	-------	22,100	-------	10,000,000	-------	9,212,848	-------	787,152	-------	----------	-------
1918	----------	-------	175,722	-------	877,500	-------	21,980	-------	9,934,354	-------	9,434,354	-------	500,000	-------	----------	-------
1919	----------	-------	180,591	-------	891,304	-------	18,986	-------	7,187,919	-------	6,734,358	-------	453,561	-------	6,269	-------
1920	----------	-------	164,865	-------	891,304	-------	14,828	-------	2,684,910	-------	2,231,343	-------	453,567	-------	5,179	-------
1916–1920	----------	-------	933,878	.10	4,567,108	.50	100,294	.01	40,507,183	4.45	37,526,403	4.12	2,980,780	.33	11,448	0.00
1911–1920	1,546,898	.08	1,776,467	.09	9,291,486	.48	230,046	.01	110,202,125	5.63	102,576,818	5.24	7,625,307	.39	11,448	.00
1921	----------	-------	161,856	-------	830,839	-------	13,362	-------	5,362,247	-------	4,908,680	-------	453,567	-------	3,437	-------
1922	----------	-------	184,309	-------	1,115,676	-------	13,374	-------	11,484,904	-------	11,108,734	-------	376,170	-------	453	-------
1923	----------	-------	161,492	-------	1,373,930	-------	66	-------	13,818,701	-------	13,291,210	-------	527,491	-------	----------	-------
1924	----------	-------	401,277	-------	1,397,676	-------	----------	-------	10,769,882	-------	10,269,859	-------	500,023	-------	----------	-------
1925	----------	-------	157,972	-------	1,162,937	-------	1,260	-------	10,841,084	-------	10,420,609	-------	420,425	-------	----------	-------
1921–1925	----------	-------	1,066,906	.10	5,881,058	.53	28,062	.00	52,276,768	4.70	49,999,092	4.50	2,277,676	.20	3,890	.00
1901–1925	3,022,486	.06	4,051,268	.08	20,437,432	.42	267,593	.01	306,950,891	6.25	284,406,919	5.80	22,543,972	.46	15,338	.00
1926	----------	-------	117,763	.05	982,594	.39	1,125	.00	11,225,360	4.42	10,800,073	4.25	425,287	.17	----------	-------
1927	----------	-------	131,585	.05	1,013,070	.40	682	.00	7,314,638	2.91	6,887,280	2.74	427,358	.17	----------	-------

DATA FROM THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in support of the data and statement already made, I ask unanimous consent that the material I now submit be included in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 24, 1952.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago I submitted a memorandum containing the pro and con arguments on the reestablishment of the convertible gold standard. I herewith am submitting several new sections that deal with the questions that you raised with me.

Sections I and II include a consideration of the problem from the gold miners' viewpoint. Section III presents the pro and con arguments on the question of the Government increasing the statutory price of gold. Section IV is identical with the first memorandum submitted on the pro and con arguments on the reestablishment of the convertible gold standard.

Sincerely yours,

MEYER JACOBSTEIN,
Senior Specialist in Money and Banking.

In this report gold is considered from two points of view: First, as a commodity, and secondly, but more importantly, as the basis of our monetary system.

The contents are presented in four separate sections as follows:

Section I, recent developments affecting the gold-mining industry.

Section II, selected information on assistance given to gold-mining companies by foreign governments.

Section III, a compilation of statements setting forth the effects of a reduction of the gold content of the dollar or changing the price of gold.

Section IV, the case for and against the return of the convertible gold standard.

Prepared by Meyer Jacobstein, senior specialist, assisted by Harry Lamar, research assistant, Senior Specialist Section, Legislative Reference Service, June 24, 1952.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AFFECTING THE GOLD MINING INDUSTRY

The subject of this discussion is gold. Gold may be considered from two points of view. First, gold as a monetary unit, and second, gold as a commodity. This second aspect has been overlooked in most discussions of this subject; therefore, we feel it important to deal first with gold as a commodity.

In an address, Mr. Charles E. Wilson, the president of the General Motors Corp., once stated,[1] "I would like to say * * * gold should be considered for what it really is, namely, just another commodity."

THE TREATMENT OF GOLD AS A COMMODITY

If it be true that gold should be considered as a commodity then the owners of the domestic gold mines have a right to expect the same consideration that is enjoyed by owners of any other industry or economic group that produces commodities.

This is certainly not the case. Gold is the only commodity the marketing of which has been completely, totally taken over by the Government as a monopoly. The gold producers in the United States can only sell their gold to the Government or to parties licensed by the Government. They must sell their product at a fixed price established by the Government. This price is $35 per fine ounce, and it has remained unchanged since 1934.

Contrasted with the monopolist restrictions of the United States Government on the marketing of domestically produced gold is the relative freedom of action allowed by other governments in the export, import, or domestic sale of gold at free market prices. (See section on Government assistance to gold-mining companies.)

For example, the Union of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia allow their miners to sell approximately 40 percent of their production on the world's free markets. The Philippine Government permits 75 percent of its gold industry's output to be sold on the free world markets. Gold miners in Canada and Australia may sell all their production on the free markets, with the specification that premium sales must be made against payment in United States dollars. Canadian producers also lose their right to gold mining subsidies if they take advantage of free market sales.

These governments are all members of the International Monetary Fund and subject to the same rules that apply to the United States as to sales of gold at premium prices. As we shall see later, the actions taken by some of the major gold-producing countries as regards premium sales and subsidies to gold producers are either exceptions or outright violations of the concepts set forth by the International Monetary Fund.

Domestically, the Government provides the gold producers their only market, directly through Treasury purchases, or indirectly through issue of licenses. Domestic uses aside from monetary purposes, are limited to the arts and industrial purposes.

The domestic producer of gold is denied the right to export his commodity except in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and under authority of an export license granted by the Treasury Department. In the event that a license to export gold is obtained, the exporter must make the sale at the price established by the Government of $35 per fine ounce, even though the price in some foreign countries might be substantially higher than $35.

THE TREATMENT OF GOLD IN RELATION TO OTHER COMMODITIES

By its gold policy the Government affords the gold producer a constant but narrow market for his product. In offering this constant but narrow market at a fixed price the Government does not take into consideration increases or decreases in the cost of production. Neither does it consider the availability of higher prices for this commodity in other markets.

During World War II, we found it necessary to establish a price-control program over most commodities. Inherent in this system, however, were the provisions for raising prices when costs rose to the detriment of the producers of those commodities. In the Korean war, price control has been

[1] Commercial and Financial Chronicle, November 8, 1951, Charles E. Wilson, "Gold—Just Another Commodity," pp. 8, 41.

reintroduced. These new price controls also have specific provisions for allowing prices of commodities to rise when the costs of producing those commodities have increased. The price of gold, however, has remained unchanged since 1934, even though labor and material costs to the mine owners have increased.

The unequal treatment of gold as a commodity is also evident when we consider the manner in which other commodities are handled under the Government's price-support program. In the farm-price-support program for, say, cotton, the farmer may obtain a loan in the amount of 90 percent of the parity price of his cotton. In the event that the market changes favorably the farmer can sell the cotton, gain the higher price, and repay the loan. If he is unable to obtain a higher price, he can then turn the cotton over to the Government as payment for the loan. Further, if the farmer can sell his cotton at a favorable price in France, for example, he is not prohibited by the Government from doing so.

In the case of gold, domestic producers are barred from sale of their gold in markets where the price is higher than $35 per fine ounce. In the postwar years, 1946–51, the free gold markets of the world have continually traded in gold at prices higher than $35 per fine ounce.

The inequality of barring the export of domestically mined gold for sale in the world free markets at premium prices can be shown in another way. For example, some of the principal countries of the world allow their mine owners to sell a portion of the gold production in the free markets. Since February 1949, the Union of South Africa has allowed a part of its gold production to be sold at premium prices. At present it allows up to 40 percent of its annual gold production to be sold on the free gold markets.

It is interesting to note in connection with premium gold markets, that the Bank of France acknowledged that after purchasing gold in the United States for $35 per ounce, it had in turn sold the gold to private citizens at prices ranging from $40 to $44 per fine ounce. Further, the French Government has even minted and sold gold coins which have no legal tender status and thereby making as high as a 33-percent profit on the transaction.

EFFECTS OF GOLD POLICY ON GOLD PRODUCERS

As an industry, gold mining has always tended to flourish in times of depression and suffer in periods of great economic activity. This is due to the fact that production costs are lower in deflationary periods, and, in the United States, operation costs mainly reflect labor costs. In periods of depressions, gold miners, to protect their rich reserves, usually develop less accessible deposits, where operating and production costs are higher. Likewise in periods of increased economic activity, they tend to work the richer deposits in order to compensate for loss of profits resulting from the increased costs of production. Mining profits, therefore, should be more or less stable from year to year.

In face of rising costs and a fixed price, the mining industry in the United States in recent years has not been able to shift its operation to absorb these higher costs resulting from inflation.

There are those who contend that the United States Government arbitrarily set the price of gold at $35 per fine ounce. Further, it is contended that this price, high in relation to the then existing statutory price, allowed the gold producers to reap windfall profits; therefore, it is contended that the domestic gold mining industry has no right to complain that the current gold price is too low in relation to present costs.

That the President by proclamation on January 31, 1934, set the official price of gold at $35 per fine ounce is, of course, true. It is not true, however, that the price of $35 was a purely arbitrary figure. The price of gold on world markets, during the period September 1931–January 1934, was well above the statutory price of $20.67. Gold prices quoted in the annual reports of the Director of the United States Mint belie the charge that the $35 figure was arbitrary.

Average price in London per fine ounce[1]

Year:	
1930	$20.68
1931	22.51
1932	28.73
1933	30.38
1934	34.94

[1] Conversion on basis of legal monetary parity; exchange not a factor. Source: Annual Report of the Director of the Mint, 1935, pp. 90–91.

During the depression the people in this country, as well as foreign countries, were fearful of future economic developments. There was a natural urge to hold or hoard gold as a protection against further deterioration in economic conditions. The price of gold was quite naturally bid up in the world markets and in the United States as well. For a time gold flowed out of the United States at an alarming rate. There was considerable domestic hoarding.[2]

The knowledge abroad that there was hoarding of gold in the United States and the knowledge of the anticipated action of the Roosevelt administration undoubtedly had an influence in pushing up the price of gold in the world markets.

To prevent exportation of gold, among other reasons, the Treasury Department in September 1933, and later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, started buying gold at prices substantially higher than $20.67. The following is a table of daily price quotations for newly mined domestic gold in the United States, September 8, 1933, to January 31, 1934:

	Price[1]
Sept. 8, 1933	$29.62
Sept. 30, 1933	31.46
Oct. 31, 1933	32.12
Nov. 30, 1933	33.93
Dec. 30, 1933	34.06
Jan. 15, 1934	34.06
Jan. 30, 1934	34.45

[1] Prices shown from Sept. 8 through Oct. 24, 1933, represent the price at which the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to sell newly mined domestic gold received on consignment under authority of Executive order of Aug. 29, 1933. Quotations from Oct. 25, 1933, through Jan. 15, 1934, represent the price fixed for newly mined domestic gold by the RFC in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the President. Quotations from Jan. 15 to Jan. 31, 1934, represent the price at which the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as fiscal agent purchased newly mined domestic gold consigned to the mints and assay offices.

Source: Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1934, p. 205.

Thus the price of $35 per fine ounce actually approximated market conditions prevailing during 1933 up to January 31, 1934. Some believe the price of gold might have gone even higher had not the United States set the price at $35 per fine ounce.

[2] President Hoover made two separate appeals, one on February 1, 1932, and another on March 7, 1932, exhorting the American people to refrain from hoarding currency. On February 4, 1932, President Hoover announced that $1,300,000,000 had been hoarded, and a month later, on March 7, this figure had risen to $1,500,000,000, which was about 25 percent of the currency in circulation.

Despite the increase in the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per fine ounce in 1934, the domestic gold mining industry is now and has been since the end of World War II at a disadvantage by rising costs and the inaccessibility of world markets.

The following table illustrates how the relationship between the price of gold and other commodities has changed since 1926. The year 1926 is commonly chosen because it was a normal year as far as prices and economic activity are concerned.

Selected indexes of commodity prices and the price of gold

Year	Wholesale prices, all commodities	Wholesale prices, metals and metal products	Consumers' Price Index	U. S. Government official gold price
1926	100	100	100	100
1927	95.4	96.3	98.0	100
1928	96.7	97.0	97.0	100
1929	95.3	100.5	97.0	100
1930	86.4	92.1	94.0	100
1931	73.0	84.5	86.0	100
1932	64.8	80.2	77.0	100
1933	65.9	79.8	73.0	(1)
1934	74.9	86.9	76.0	[2]169
1935	80.0	87.0	78.0	169
1936	80.0	93.7	78.0	169
1937	86.3	95.7	81.0	169
1938	78.6	94.4	80.0	169
1939	77.1	95.8	79.0	169
1940	78.6	99.4	79.0	169
1941	87.3	103.8	83.0	169
1942	98.8	103.8	92.0	169
1943	103.1	103.8	98.0	169
1944	104.0	103.8	99.0	169
1945	105.8	104.7	102.0	169
1946	121.1	115.5	110.0	169
1947	152.1	145.0	126.0	169
1948	165.1	163.6	135.0	169
1949	155.0	170.2	134.0	169
1950	161.5	173.6	136.0	169
1951	180.4	189.1	147.0	169

[1] Although the official mint price of gold remained at $20.67 per fine ounce of gold until Jan. 31, 1934, the Treasury price for newly mined domestic gold on Dec. 30, 1933, was $34.06 per fine ounce. (Annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, 1934.)

[2] This index figure of 169 is based on the statutory price of $35 an ounce set forth in the Presidential proclamation of Jan. 31, 1934.

Source: Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Labor Reviews.

From the preceding table it can be seen that the price of gold increased 69 percent in 1933–34 and has remained there. The increase in the gold price was from $20.67 to $35 per fine ounce. The wholesale price index on all commodities has risen 80 percent, in the period 1926–51. The wholesale price index for metals and metal products has risen 89 percent, fully 20 percentage points more than the increase in the price of gold.

For a period of 24 years, 1927–50, the index of the price of gold was higher than the wholesale price index of all commodities. That is, from 1926 to 1932 the price of gold remained stationary while the level of wholesale prices declined. This was, of course, the result of the depression. For the period 1933–51 the price of gold rose 69 percent and has remained there. The price of gold started rising in early 1933 and was finally fixed at $35 per fine ounce on January 31, 1934. On the other hand, the level of wholesale prices, declined from 1926 to 1932. Thereafter, wholesale prices have moved upward until, at the end of 1951 they were 80 percent above the levels of 1926. This increase is 11 percentage points greater than the rise in the price of gold. Similarly the index of wholesale prices remained below the index of the price of gold until 1949. The level of consumer prices is still below the gold price, based on price relationships prevailing in 1926.

There is no doubt that the gold mining industry enjoyed an advantageous cost-price relationship over a period of some 16 years. With the depression and resulting low pro-

duction costs in the country, the gold mining industry was doing well prior to the increase in the price of gold. From 1934 to 1942 its advantage of price over cost was even greater, since the price levels of other commodities did not rise proportionately to the rise in the price of gold paid by the Government.

With the advent of World War II, the picture changed. Other prices and therefore, costs increased somewhat. Material and labor shortages appeared. Furthermore, production was severely restricted because the gold mining industry was not classed as a vital industry in the war effort.

Action has been taken by several gold mining companies to collect damages allegedly resulting from the War Production Board's Limitation Order L. 208 (7 FR. 7992) issued October 8, 1942.

In *Idaho Maryland Mines Corp. v. the United States* before the United States Court of Claims, the Idaho Maryland Mines Corp. alleged in part the following:[2]

"Plaintiff alleges that whereas Order L-208 recited and purported on its face to be necessary and appropriate in the public interest, and to promote the national defense, for the preservation of critical materials for defense, for private account, and for export, which materials were used in the maintenance and operation of gold mines, numerous circumstances conclusively rebut the presumption that the order was reasonably calculated to accomplish such manifest purpose, and the order was in fact arbitrary and confiscatory.

"It is alleged that the particular critical materials used in gold mining were, at the time the order was issued and thereafter, subject to allocation and restriction by virtue of duly issued War Production Board priority regulations; that only a relatively small amount of critical material was actually used in gold mining; that the limitation order did not allocate, restrict, or distribute materials or equipment, but merely prohibited the removal of any ore from plaintiff's mine, above or below ground; that notwithstanding the statement in the order that gold mining was nonessential to the national defense, mining equipment valued at more than $300,000,000 was produced and manufactured in the United States during the years 1942 through 1945, and exported to foreign countries; that to the extent of such exports, both the critical materials used and the manpower employed to produce such equipment, were diverted from national defense with the approval of defendant.

"It is alleged that defendant at no time found or determined that gold mining was a public evil requiring regulation for the protection of the public peace, health, or safety; that defendant prepared and issued the order hastily, without any notice to, or opportunity to be heard by, plaintiff or the gold mining industry who were thus deprived of their right to be heard on their own behalf by the War Production Board before the mines were summarily closed; that no other industry was directly and completely closed down by defendant during the war; that despite the fact that gold and silver are analogous metals with analogous uses for industry and as the basis of the national currency, the silver mines were allowed to operate at all times.

"It is alleged that the true purpose of defendant in closing the mines was to alleviate the manpower shortage in the nonferrous metal mines, particularly the copper and zinc mines; that in issuing the order, the War Production Board did not exercise its own independent judgment, but acted under pressure from the War and Navy Departments; that as a manpower measure, the order was unenforceable and no attempt was ever made to so enforce it because no agency of the defendant, including the War Production Board, had the right or power to compel the transfer of labor from one employer to another, or from one industry to another."

After the war, inflation with increased costs made production prohibitive for many mines. Current domestic gold production is only 43 percent of production of 1941. In a survey of the gold-mining industry for 1951, Standard & Poor's described present conditions as follows: "* * * domestic gold mines have been slow to recover from recent wartime restrictions. Because of an unchanged $35 gold price and mounting costs, many mines have never reopened. Others have failed to reattain full-scale operations."[4]

All mines which were able to resume operations found that profits were lower and the profit dollar dropped progressively in terms of purchasing power. For example, in terms of consumer purchasing power, profits of $1,000,000 in 1951 would only have had two-thirds of the purchasing power the same profits had enjoyed in 1926.

A comparison of prices alone does not tell the whole story. The disadvantage in which domestic gold miners find themselves today could better be told in terms of wage costs, since in the domestic gold mining operating costs mainly reflect labor costs. Unfortunately, few published figures on labor costs are available. The final answer as to the effects of the Government's current gold policy must be illustrated in terms of profits. Here, too, we are handicapped by the nature of the domestic gold-mining industry, since a large portion (30 percent) of the gold produced at present is on a by-product basis. Profit figures for the gold-mining industry as a whole, and for most mines producing gold on a byproduct basis are therefore unavailable. An effective gage of the profit picture for illustrative purposes, can, however, be drawn from the Homestake Gold Mine in South Dakota.

Homestake Mining Co. is normally the largest gold-producing mine in the United States. The following table shows the Homestake's net profits after depletion and depreciation for the period 1926–51:

Net profits of Homestake Mining Co.

Year	Net profits [1]	Cost per milled ton [2]
1926	$2,283,996	(3)
1927	3,350,368	(3)
1928	1,473,547	(3)
1929	1,044,070	(3)
1930	1,492,871	(3)
1931	2,436,560	(3)
1932	2,495,789	$3.29
1933	5,077,743	(3)
1934	7,104,352	(3)
1935	8,144,528	(3)
1936	7,650,452	(3)
1937	7,188,854	5.53
1938	6,940,948	(3)
1939	7,103,608	4.94
1940	6,001,137	4.63
1941	5,682,999	4.50
1942	4,416,322	3.57
1943	364,437	12.18
1944	[4] −1,148,220	nil
1945	[4] −478,228	10.98
1946	2,361,657	6.93
1947	2,585,047	7.85
1948	2,445,868	8.23
1949	2,809,446	8.63
1950	3,659,065	8.40
1951	[5] 1,820,000	(3)

[1] Net profits for all years except 1951, are after depreciation and depletion; for 1951, net profits are after depreciation but before percentage depletion.
[2] Cost per ton is not available for all years.
[3] Not available.
[4] For years 1944-45 there was a net loss or deficit; very little ore was milled.

The preceding table shows that profits of the Homestake Mining Co. for the postwar years have been well below the level of profits for the period 1933–43. The trend of profits lends itself to three definite phases.

The following is the average annual profits of Homestake Mine for these three periods:

Average annual profits of Homestake

Period:	
1926–32	$2,083,749
1933–42	6,540,099
1943–51	1,606,787

The cost figures that are available also show the disadvantage that has accrued to the gold industry, as a result of inflation. Costs at the Homestake Mine per milled ton in 1932 were $3.29. The year 1932 was the depth of the depression in the United States and the costs figure is slightly lower than the costs which probably prevailed for the previous years 1926–31. From 1943 to the present, costs per milled ton have continually run from 2 to almost 3 times higher than the costs prevailing in 1932. It will be noted that costs in the postwar years are at least twice as high as those which prevailed in the period 1933–42.

Since the Homestake Mining Co. is the most profitable single gold mining operation in the United States it is evident that many mines could not have resumed operations because of the unfavorable cost-price relationship.

The following table shows gold production for the same period, 1926–51; and includes domestic, world, and Homestake's production for selected years:

World gold production, United States gold production and the production of Homestake Mining Co., 1926–51

[Gold in fine ounces]

Year	World production	United States production	Homestake Mining Corp. production	Homestake as percent of United States
1926	19,252,000	2,232,526	(1)	
1927	19,180,000	2,107,032	(1)	
1928	19,399,000	2,148,064	(1)	
1929	19,673,000	2,058,993	314,000	15
1930	20,836,000	2,138,723	(1)	
1931	22,329,000	2,224,729	(1)	
1932	24,306,000	2,209,353	479,000	21
1933	25,367,000	2,291,697	(1)	
1934	27,930,000	2,778,789	472,000	17
1935	29,999,000	3,236,951	(1)	
1936	32,590,000	3,782,667	(1)	
1937	35,723,000	4,117,078	550,000	13
1938	37,603,000	4,267,469	(1)	
1939	39,651,000	4,673,042	568,000	12
1940	40,907,000	4,869,949	542,000	11
1941	40,332,000	4,750,865	632,000	13
1942	35,982,000	3,457,000	487,000	14
1943	28,900,000	1,363,815	104,000	7
1944	26,200,000	998,394		
1945	26,100,000	954,572	53,000	6
1946	27,800,000	1,573,073	298,000	19
1947	28,000,000	2,107,188	398,000	19
1948	29,700,000	2,014,257	361,000	18
1949	30,600,000	1,991,783	447,000	22
1950	31,000,000	2,392,000	549,000	23
1951	(1)	[2] 2,000,000	(1)	

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.

Source: World production and United States from Annual Report of the Director of the Mint; Homestake production from Standard & Poor's, Industry Surveys.

The preceding table shows that world production has surpassed its level of production of 1926 and has recovered to some extent, that is, between 75 and 80 percent of its record production of 1940. On the other hand, production in the United States has continued, for the postwar years, at a level equal to that of the period 1926–32, but it has never recovered fully. Production presently is approximately only 40 percent of the record domestic production of 1940.

It is interesting to note that the Homestake production has been approximately

[2] The United States Court of Claims, *Idaho Maryland Mines Corp. v. the United States* (No. 50182, decided May 6, 1952).

[4] Standard & Poor's Industry Surveys, Metals, gold and silver, February 7, 1952, p. 2.

one-fifth of the total domestic production of the United States in the postwar years. Its share of total production is much larger than in previous years. This would tend to point up the fact that production costs have prohib'ted many of the less prosperous gold mines from reopening.

Comparing the trend of world and United States production of gold, it can be seen that other major gold-producing countries have been more successful in recovering and maintaining their production, although they too have experienced inflated costs. The high levels of world production reflect the discovery of new gold fields and use of modern technology, whereas the production in the United States has been from older, more depleted gold fields.

Among the reasons for these higher levels of gold production in other countries has been the treatment of the gold mining industries in these countries. We shall, therefore, briefly explore governmental action in some of the major gold producing countries as regards their mining industries.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO GOLD MINING COMPANIES IN THE MAJOR GOLD PRODUCING COUNTRIES

The major gold producing countries of the world have experienced their own special problems of cost-price relationship in regard to gold production. This is true on the cost side since the inflation of the postwar period has been world wide, varying, of course, in degree in the different countries.

As to the price of gold the International Monetary Fund has opposed, basically, most governmental action that might have the effect of increasing the price of gold above $35 per fine ounce. One of the primary aims of the IMF is, "to promote exchange stability" and "to maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members." Since exchange parities are expressed in terms of gold, it is laid down that no member shall buy gold at a price above, or sell gold below, par value plus or minus a small prescribed margin.

Since December 11, 1947, the fund has deprecated both the continued and increasing external purchases and sales of gold at premium prices and measures to subsidize the production of gold. The fund was forced to modify its position as to subsidies very soon after its first policy pronouncement, and on September 28, 1951, it had to drop its gold policing policy, admitting its inability to police the traffic in gold at premium prices.

It has developed then that most of the major gold-producing countries have actively sought to alleviate the disadvantageous position of their gold-mining industries. This action has taken a variety of forms. Direct subsidization, tax relief, including special depletion and depreciation allowances, special exchange-rate treatment, and permitting sales at premium prices have all been important forms of assistance.

The sterling area and some 30 other countries devalued their currencies in 1949. This devaluation increased the price of gold in terms of the devalued currencies. While the primary aim of these currencies adjustments was not a rise in the gold price, the gold miners in the devaluating countries benefited.

The two following sections describe the afore-mentioned governmental assistance to the gold-mining industry. The first covers the postwar period through 1950. The second, the action that has taken place between January 1951 and June 1952. Both of these sections were written by Mr. E. E. Billings, analyst, International, Fiscal, and Financial Affairs, of the Economic Section of the Legislative Reference Service, the Library of Congress.

WORLD GOLD PRODUCTION IN 1951

I. World gold production was smaller in 1951 than in 1950. This is the first year during the postwar period that gold production has failed to increase moderately. The greatest absolute decline was in the United States, and the largest relative declines were in Ecuador and Venezuela where gold mining has practically stopped. Among the large gold producers only some of the countries of Asia, whose production is still far below prewar, Australia, the Gold Coast, and Colombia, showed an increase in production.

Throughout the postwar period world gold production has averaged only about three-fourths of prewar production. This decline has been very general among almost all gold producing countries and areas. Again, the largest absolute decline has been in the United States. The largest relative declines were in the countries of Asia. The only important exception has been in Central America, where gold production in the postwar period has been about three times its prewar level. While the decline in gold production from prewar to postwar has been general, differences in the rates of change have produced large shifts in the relative importance of different gold producing areas. The Sterling Area's gold production has increased from about 50 percent of world production before the war to 62 percent in 1949 and to 60 percent in 1951. Central American production has increased from less than one-half of one percent to almost one and one-half per cent of world production. On the other hand, United States production has declined from about 13 percent of world production to less than 10 percent, and production in Asia has declined from 10 percent of the total to less than 4 percent.

Many of the most important gold producing countries devalued their currencies near the end of 1949. It might have been expected that gold production in the following year would increase appreciably in the devaluing countries inasmuch as gold is the only commodity for which the national currency price would be expected to increase to the full extent of the devaluation and its national currency costs of production ought not to have risen differently from those of other domestic goods. In fact, however, production in 1950 was smaller than in 1949 in almost every devaluing country and larger than in 1949 in almost every non-devaluing country.

II. The table of world gold production on the opposite page has been revised in two important particulars. More importantly, the world total that is being measured has been reduced to the world excluding all iron-curtain countries. Formerly the world total referred to production of the world excluding only the U. S. S. R. There are no reliable data on gold production in China, Hungary, Rumania, and other iron-curtain countries, and world estimates including them cannot have any appreciable degree of reliability. The significance, moreover, of gold-production data excluding the iron-curtain countries is probably greater than that of data including those countries even if production in those countries could be known reliably. Gold is an important part of the financial mechanism of the free world. The importance of gold-production data lies therefore in the knowledge that it provides for the interpretation of financial events in countries for which gold plays a role in financial events.

The data have also been regrouped by economic areas rather than by continents as was formerly done, and the economic areas have been listed in the order of their importance as gold producers. The continental totals are shown at the bottom of the table.

The 1951 estimates are based upon complete data for the year from 30 countries whose production accounts for approximately 96 percent of the total. The estimates for New Zealand, Peru, and French Africa, and for a number of the small producers for whom separate entries are not shown, are derived from data covering less than the full year. For several countries no information on 1951 is available but rough estimates are included in the area and world totals.

III. Estimates of world gold production are made by a number of governmental and private agencies. The differences between the available estimates reflect primarily the extent to which attempts have been made to include data for the U. S. S. R. and for other iron-curtain countries and from the differing amounts of these estimates. The available estimates are summarized below (in millions of United States dollars):

	1937	1948	1949	1950	1951
I. M. F.: World, excluding all iron curtain countries	1,034	785	817	844	826
Samuel Montagu & Co.: World excluding U. S. S. R.	------	792	831	854	830
U. S. Bureau of Mines: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	1,059	798	833	861	-----
U. S. Federal Reserve: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	1,042	794	826	------	-----
B. I. S.: World, excluding U. S. S. R.	------	805	840	868	-----
Samuel Montagu & Co.: World, including U. S. S. R.	------	862	901	924	900
U. S. Bureau of Mines: World, including U. S. S. R.	1,247	1,043	1,078	1,106	-----

IV. Comparing the amount of world gold production in countries outside the iron curtain for any period with the increase during the period in the official gold holdings of those countries indicates the extent to which the gold producers or the monetary authorities have made net sales of gold to industrial users, private hoarders, or the iron curtain countries. During the period 1914–21 official gold stocks increased by an amount approximately equal to new gold production. During the period 1922–30 official stocks increased by an amount equal to about 75 percent of gold production, and during the thirties they increased by an amount equal to about 20 percent more than gold production. During the entire postwar period, however, the increase in official gold stocks has been very much less than the amount of gold production. The provisional estimate for 1951 shows that the increase in official gold stocks during the year was exceptionally small and that in the first and last quarters of the year official gold stocks actually declined. The data for recent years and for the quarters of 1951 are as follows:

	Gold production	Increase in stocks	Increase in stocks as a percentage of production
1948	785	380	48
1949	817	480	59
1950	844	415	49
1951:			
I	207	−5	−7
II		120	58
III		60	29
IV		−40	−19
Total, 1951	826	125	15

World gold production in 1951

[In millions of United States dollars at 35 United States dollars per ounce]

	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1945	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	Basis of 1951 estimates
World total [1]	1,034	1,117	1,190	1,264	1,247	736	752	767	[2] 785	[2] 817	[2] 844	[2] 826	
Sterling area	546.23	576.12	607.37	655.58	636.80	508.21	502.35	483.76	498.22	503.28	500.98	*497.00*	
In Africa	467.00	486.91	515.01	563.20	573.41	470.77	460.99	433.16	450.29	455.32	453.09	*448.00*	
Union of South Africa	410.71	425.65	448.75	491.63	504.27	427.86	417.45	392.01	405.47	409.68	408.23	403.08	Complete data.
Gold Coast	19.57	23.62	27.38	31.02	31.11	18.87	20.51	19.53	23.53	23.69	24.13	24.45	Do.
Kenya	1.92	2.42	2.71	2.70	2.52	1.35	1.05	.77	.82	[3] .70	.80	[3] *.97*	10 months data.
Southern Rhodesia	28.15	28.52	27.85	28.96	27.67	19.89	19.06	18.30	18.00	18.49	17.89	17.04	Complete data.
Tanganyika	2.64	2.86	4.40	5.05	4.99	1.73	1.70	1.66	2.02	2.42	2.28	[3] 2.30	Do.
In Oceania	63.65	73.59	77.52	78.98	70.54	30.82	35.94	43.56	40.57	41.00	39.25	*40.00*	
Australia	48.49	55.72	57.60	57.54	52.38	23.00	28.86	32.82	30.99	31.12	30.14	30.66	Do.
Fiji	.87	3.23	3.77	3.90	4.15	3.32	2.88	4.72	3.26	[3] 3.64	3.62	[3] 3.28	Do.
New Guinea	7.60	8.27	8.62	10.32	7.43	----------	.02	2.07	3.03	3.26	2.80	----------	
New Zealand	5.90	5.32	6.26	6.50	6.11	4.49	4.17	3.93	3.29	2.97	2.68	[3] *2.90*	9 months data.
Papua	.79	1.04	1.26	.73	.45	----------	----------	.02	.01	.02	.01	----------	
In Asia	14.32	14.27	13.57	12.27	11.79	5.90	4.62	6.21	6.72	6.28	7.60	*8.51*	
India [4]	11.58	11.24	11.01	10.13	10.01	5.89	4.61	6.01	6.33	5.74	6.89	7.92	Complete data.
Canada [5]	143.94	166.02	178.87	186.46	187.66	94.80	99.59	107.84	123.88	144.32	155.44	152.75	Do.
United States	143.92	148.58	161.74	170.20	169.12	32.04	51.17	75.79	70.89	67.27	80.10	69.88	Do.
Latin America [6]	82.95	90.82	96.02	104.02	99.53	70.02	64.86	59.03	55.20	59.82	61.38	*58.10*	
Mexico	29.62	32.33	29.46	30.91	28.00	17.48	14.72	16.26	12.99	14.19	14.28	13.66	Do.
Central America	3.20	3.98	5.92	8.22	10.29	8.68	9.01	8.85	9.50	9.91	10.72	11.64	
El Salvador	.30	.36	.30	.33	.29	.40	.76	.38	.73	.95	1.02	.94	Do.
Honduras [3 7]	.79	.74	.82	.94	1.02	.76	.52	.51	.51	.86	1.08	1.24	Do.
Nicaragua	.98	1.72	3.75	5.91	7.72	7.40	7.40	7.64	7.89	7.80	8.27	9.06	Do.
South America [8]	51.38	55.86	61.92	66.05	62.70	44.58	41.93	34.76	33.37	36.40	36.82	*33.30*	
Brazil	7.13	7.88	8.84	9.23	8.24	7.43	6.12	6.12	5.68	5.30	5.72	5.99	Do.
Chile	9.54	10.29	11.53	11.74	9.23	6.31	8.08	5.91	5.75	6.27	6.49	6.08	Do.
Colombia	15.48	18.22	19.95	22.12	22.96	17.73	15.30	13.41	11.73	12.58	13.28	13.08	Do.
Ecuador	2.45	2.47	3.10	4.01	3.80	2.43	2.68	2.03	2.77	3.46	3.38	.34	Do.
Peru	8.54	9.11	9.36	9.84	9.98	6.04	5.54	4.06	3.89	3.98	5.18	[3] 5.53	6 months' data.
Venezuela	3.97	3.95	5.04	5.02	4.57	2.67	1.68	.74	1.74	2.15	1.20	.02	Complete data.
Other Africa	22.67	24.87	28.05	29.66	25.96	18.33	17.49	15.85	15.39	16.67	16.92	*16.00*	
Belgian Congo [9]	15.14	16.57	18.08	19.58	19.69	12.14	11.60	10.55	10.49	11.68	11.88	[3] 12.80	Do.
French Africa [10]	6.37	7.18	8.40	8.36	4.71	3.71	3.32	2.93	2.66	2.50	2.44	*2.35*	6 months' data.
Other Asia	81.48	96.02	104.49	130.77	99.18	7.68	10.40	18.63	15.13	19.00	21.75	*24.88*	
Formosa	1.47	1.90	1.42	.90	1.01	.02	.02	.29	.62	.58	.64	----------	
Japan	25.89	27.08	29.18	30.35	28.13	2.96	1.40	2.42	3.49	4.62	5.44	6.62	Complete data.
Korea	25.71	31.21	32.85	28.46	28.79	3.38	6.76	11.36	[3] 12	[3] 17	[3] 18	[3] *04*	11 months data.
Philippines	25.63	32.31	37.06	39.23	[11] 36.89	----------	.04	2.28	7.32	10.07	11.69	13.83	Complete data.
Saudi Arabia	----------	----------	.56	1.12	1.28	1.33	1.70	1.80	2.60	2.35	2.32	----------	
Europe	12.83	14.92	13.23	14.14	8.20	4.67	6.40	5.91	6.10	6.94	7.65	*7.50*	
France	2.32	3.05	2.33	2.84	2.10	1.39	1.69	1.16	1.21	1.16	2.21	----------	
Sweden	6.76	8.19	7.56	7.62	5.33	3.00	3.20	2.64	2.52	2.81	2.83	----------	
Yugoslavia	3.06	2.74	2.50	2.62	----------	----------	.72	.76	.92	1.21	1.50	1.55	Do.
Continental totals:													
Africa	489.67	511.78	543.06	592.86	599.37	489.09	478.46	449.02	465.58	472.00	470.61	*464.00*	
North America	317.49	346.93	370.06	387.87	384.78	144.31	165.48	199.90	207.75	225.78	249.83	236.28	
Central America	3.20	3.98	5.92	8.22	10.29	8.68	9.01	8.85	9.50	9.91	10.72	11.64	
South America	51.38	55.86	61.92	66.05	62.70	44.58	41.93	34.76	33.37	36.40	36.82	*33.30*	
Oceania	63.65	73.59	77.52	78.98	70.54	30.82	35.94	43.56	40.57	41.00	39.25	*40.00*	
Asia	95.80	110.29	118.06	116.04	110.97	13.58	15.03	24.84	21.84	25.28	29.36	*33.40*	
Europe	12.83	14.92	13.23	14.14	8.20	4.67	6.40	5.91	6.10	6.94	7.65	*7.50*	

[1] Estimated world total excluding U. S. S. R., China, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania.
[2] Excluding North Korea.
[3] Exports.
[4] Undivided India excluding Burma up to 1947; thereafter Indian Union only. Pakistan production estimated as negligible.
[5] Including Newfoundland.
[6] Not including British Guiana which is included under the sterling area.
[7] Fiscal year ending June.
[8] Including British Guiana.
[9] Including Ruanda Urundi.
[10] Including Cameroun, Equatorial Africa, West Africa, Madagascar, and Morocco.
[11] January to October.

NOTE.—World and continental totals include estimates for countries listed when no figures for those are given. Figures in italics represent preliminary estimates. In almost all cases continental totals include estimates for countries not listed.

ADMINISTRATION DEPRECIATES PURCHASING POWER OF WAGES, SAVINGS, AND INSURANCE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, for 20 years following the removal of the gold standard from the money of this Nation the administration, supported by a subservient Congress, has stolen one-half of the wages, savings, and insurance of the citizens of this Nation through deliberate inflation.

LORD KEYNES AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Lord Keynes, in the early 1930's, persuaded the administration that there was something about deficit financing that would make a nation wealthy.

If a government could just succeed in spending more money than it could possibly collect from the taxpayers each year, that nation would be on the way to untold riches—there would never be another depression, no hardship, and everybody would be happy and wealthy.

Perhaps it was not very hard to persuade the administration to follow that line of reasoning, because they needed money to put over the various schemes to influence the electorate of the Nation.

To accomplish their purpose they needed more money each year than they

could possibly collect from the taxpayers annually.

COUNTERFEIT MONEY

They called it deficit financing, and while the citizens of the Nation were wondering what deficit financing meant, the Government simply printed anywhere from five to fifteen or twenty billions of dollars in counterfeit money each year and poured it into the economic bloodstream of the Nation.

Of course, this counterfeit money thinned out the existing currency to that extent, so that inflation was the foreordained result.

Of course, it required a considerable time for the inflation to really take effect.

This country had built up a very sound system over the many years, and it requires a long time to wreck a really sound economic system. Naturally they kept the printed money ahead of the inflation, so that they could spend it each year and the resulting inflation was a delayed effect.

It required about 10 years for it to really start to take effect.

UNREST—WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

Then came the unrest among the workingmen of the Nation—the working people of the Nation.

PULLING THE RUG OUT FROM UNDER THE WORKINGMAN

The administration was always telling the working people of the Nation what a great friend it was to labor—that they could write their own labor legislation if they would support the remainder of the administration's program—including "free trade"—called "reciprocal trade."

While they were emphasizing their friendship for the workingman, they were pulling the rug out from under his feet by thinning out the purchasing power of his wages through deliberate inflation through making his wages purchase less.

FRICTION BETWEEN WORKINGMEN AND INVESTORS

The real unrest and friction between the workingmen and the management representing the investors started as soon as inflation began to be felt. Strikes were threatened all over the country, because investors could not understand why working people were not satisfied with the wages they had been getting.

By the same token the workingmen could not understand the reason why their wages would no longer pay the rent and the grocery bill—and send the children to school.

DEFICIT SPENDING—PAINLESS PROSPERITY

The investors did not pin the trouble on the deficit financing because everybody had money—and the old law of supply and demand was thrown out of gear.

Plenty of money was available, nevertheless, the economic system resembling the water in a stream or reservoir, finds it own level unless you can keep it dammed up some place along the line and support on the unusual condition. So it is with respect to the purchasing power of money. There must be a definite relation to the money available for purchasing goods and services in relation to the amount of such goods and services available to be purchased.

When money is printed at random and turned into the money supply of the Nation over the past 20 years, without commensurate production, of course it simply made that much more money available to purchase the same amount of goods, and the money was worth correspondingly less.

Therefore, wages had to go up to purchase the same amount of groceries and house rent.

WAGES AND PRICE RISES DO NOT CAUSE INFLATION

Raising the wages and the raising of prices of goods on the shelves was the result of inflation—and not the cause of it.

Deficit financing is the phrase used to cover up the real objective—inflation.

Deficit financing sounds very fine and uplifting. It sounds like a banker's term—which is what it is.

The phrase "deficit financing" is like the phrase "reciprocal trade"—both are misleading. The language belongs in a different strata of society; everybody is for reciprocity if he receives any reciprocity, but in both cases—deficit financing and reciprocal trade—it is a one-way street. The workingmen and investors can only lose.

Of course, inflation is a direct cause of labor unrest, the unrest of the working men, and the quarrel between investors represented by management and workingmen.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND A SUBSERVIENT CONGRESS

Unrest throughout the Nation at the present time between the workingmen in the steel industry, in the mines, the textile industry, the crockery industry, and the investors is caused by inflation, which is directly and intentionally caused by the administration supported, of course, by a subservient Congress.

They are directly and solely responsible for it, not the workingmen and investors.

IF YOU MUST MIX WATER WITH THE MILK IT REQUIRES MORE OF IT

If you insist upon putting a milk can under the pump, it may still look like milk, but it does not taste like milk.

If you are going to water the baby's milk, you have to give him more of it.

It is the same with wages. They will purchase less, and you have to pay more wages.

So it is that the administration's own program of inflation has caused the unrest and the trouble between the workingmen and the investors—management—and it is catching up with them.

FABIAN SOCIALISM

Many suspect a long-range program of Fabian socialism, which is being carried out largely by men who do not really understand, for the most part, what they are doing.

For this part of the program I refer to my address to the Senate on June 28, 1952, entitled "The Free Economic System Versus Fabian Socialism."

THE SEA BOTTOMS OR SUBMERGED LANDS—THE SUPREME COURT DECISION—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. President, public ownership of the sea bottom or submerged lands from low tide seaward to the established State line was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States on June 23, 1945, in what has long been referred to as the tidelands decision. It has also been said that States' rights have been violated.

NO TIDELANDS OR STATES RIGHTS AFFECTED

Mr. President, it is well known that no tidelands, inland waterways, or navigable rivers are included in the Supreme Court decision, and that they are affected in no way whatsoever. Nor are there any States' rights violated in any way. The States, for example, have exactly the same police power or general jurisdiction over such public domain, known as the sea bottom or submerged lands, as they have over any other public lands located within the respective States.

That is what the Supreme Court decided. The effect of the decision is that they are public lands within the State boundaries just the same as the approximately 65,000,000 acres of public lands located in my State of Nevada.

ONE BILLION ACRES OF PUBLIC LANDS

There are approximately 1,000,000,000 acres of public lands. My own State of Nevada includes approximately 65,000,000 acres. There is no question as to the authority of Congress to deed to the States wherein they are located in fee simple all or any part of such lands, but no State has ever claimed such lands as a right.

THE RECLAMATION FUND

In 1920 the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act decreed that 52½ percent of the royalties from the leases on such public domain shall go to the reclamation fund, 37½ percent to the States wherein such leases are located, and 10 percent to the Federal Government for supervision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Reno Evening Gazette of June 18 entitled "Not a States' Rights Issue." This editorial is a clear and concise statement of facts concerning this much maligned and misrepresented subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOT A STATES' RIGHTS ISSUE

Once more the miscalled tidelands bill will come before the Senate on Thursday, when it will consider President Truman's veto of the measure that would give to the States title to the marginal lands offshore.

Since 1945 three States—California, Texas, and Louisiana—have sought to establish title to the undersea lands where rich oil and gas deposits have been discovered. The Supreme Court has held that these submerged areas beyond the low water mark belong to the Federal Government, not to the contiguous States. Even while the Supreme Court decision was pending, the State of California endeavored to pass through Congress a bill that would give it title to the offshore sea bed.

Bills passed by Congress were vetoed by the President, on the ground that the coastal States were endeavoring to seize upon lands

and resources which belong to the entire Nation.

Proponents of these measures have deliberately confused the issue by referring to the disputed lands as "tidelands," and making it appear that the States' undisputed rights to the submerged lands between high- and low-tide marks, the inland waters—lakes, bays, and rivers—are threatened by the National Government. These rights have long been established by laws and court decisions, and would not be affected by the recent Supreme Court decisions on the offshore lands, or the President's veto of the bills that would give the offshore lands to the States.

The three States now pressing for the gift of lands beneath the marginal sea are not making a desperate stand in the name of State's rights. They are doing it for the very selfish reason that they want to derive all the benefits from the rich mineral deposits. Coming from public lands, these benefits go to the Federal Treasury, and under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, are distributed as follows: 37½ percent is paid to the respective States within whose boundaries the lands comprising the source of income are situated; 52½ percent goes into the reclamation fund, and 10 percent is deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

Nevada has a direct interest in this "tidelands" bill, for it is one of the great beneficiaries of the reclamation funds. Senator GEORGE MALONE voted against giving the offshore lands to the States claiming them, for the very sound reason that it would be depriving Nevada of the funds it expects to receive for reclamation.

Senator MALONE, whose experience as State engineer, and as consulting engineer on both State and Federal projects, qualifies him as an authority on such matters, has pointed out that the ownership or title of real tidelands and of inland waters is not threatened by the Supreme Court's decision on the offshore lands, nor is the Federal Government's insistence on retaining control over the disputed undersea areas going to put any cloud over State and private water rights.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, an article from the Christian Science Monitor of October 2, 1951, entitled "Tidelands Versus Marginal Sea." This is a further very clear and concise explanation of what has been made a very muddled subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIDELANDS VERSUS MARGINAL SEA

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Attorney General Daniels, of Texas, has presented the so-called tidelands controversy, the case for the States. The following is a brief statement, the case for the Nation, and we believe answers the arguments set forth by Mr. Daniels.

The fundamental arguments Mr. Daniels presented for the States are:

1. The States have always owned the tidelands from the time the Nation was formed until the Supreme Court decisions; therefore, Congress should now return these tidelands to the States.

2. The three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes, and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed.

3. The Supreme Court introduced a new doctrine in the cases of *U. S.* v. *California-Texas-Louisiana* which would give the National Government the right to take, without just compensation, any State property; and this doctrine is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the United States.

4. The Supreme Court has not yet decided that the United States owns the disputed area but only that it has paramount rights to and dominion over this property; therefore, Congress should settle the question and quitclaim the disputed area to the States.

5. The oil operators who went into the disputed area, secured State leases, and developed for oil, did so in good faith and have now spent millions of dollars to improve these leases, and these leases should not now be taken away from them.

We believe all the answers to Mr. Daniels' arguments are very simple and complete:

1. The most fundamental misrepresentation regarding this problem is the statement that the disputed area is tidelands. There is not one foot of tidelands involved—never has the National Government claimed any part of State-owned tidelands or State-owned inland waters. The three Supreme Court decisions described the area in dispute as commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. The complaints and decisions in all three cases specifically exclude tidelands from the controversy.

The use of the word, "tidelands," has been retained by the oil lobby to becloud and misrepresent the real issues to Congress and the American people. There are 54 Supreme Court decisions which hold that tidelands actually belong to the States. The oil-lobby group want to make it appear as if the Supreme Court had overruled all these prior decisions—taken the tidelands from the States and given them to the National Government under this new doctrine of necessity. Never has a Supreme Court decision been so completely misrepresented.

The only area in dispute is the offshore marginal sea, commencing where the tidelands end and extending oceanward. In regard to this area the Supreme Court said: (a) The case of *United States* v. *California* was the first time a question of ownership of this offshore belt had ever come before the Supreme Court; (b) Neither the original 13 States, nor any new State after being admitted into the Union, have ever owned or controlled this submerged offshore belt.

"California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty (332 U. S. pp. 31-34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area." (339 U. S. 704).

If the statements (a) and (b) are true (and a rereading will convince anyone that that is exactly what the Supreme Court decided) then the States have never owned the disputed area—the Supreme Court did not take this disputed area from the States and give it to the National Government—there is no new theory or doctrine of law which the Supreme Court announced that the National Government can take property from the States without just compensation contrary to fundamental constitutional law.

2. The argument that the three Supreme Court decisions have endangered State ownership of navigable inland waters, lakes, and rivers, areas which the States have owned since the Union was formed, has caused many governors, states attorneys general, and states legislatures to support the quit-claim bills before Congress.

The President and all national officials having anything to do with the problem, have repeatedly stated that the National Government makes no claim to these State-owned areas. The disclaimer bills introduced into Congress would, if passed, settle the question forever, but the lobby group won't let any one of these disclaimer bills be passed.

It just seems impossible after reading the Supreme Court decisions that anyone should now question the United States' ownership or its exclusive right to take the oil and other minerals from the marginal sea belt.

3. Have all operators in the marginal sea been fairly dealt with? At the time the oil operators actually began taking any amount of oil from the offshore oil pools they had full notice that the United States was making claim to the offshore area. The States in granting State leases were very careful not to guarantee title to these offshore leases, and the operators took their chances with full knowledge that the States might not own this offshore area and that the State leases might be void.

These operators have made millions and millions of dollars on these State leases after paying their costs of operation, and have now succeeded in convincing Congress that they should not be liable for any oil wrongfully taken by them, and Congress will pass a bill that will relieve these operators of any obligation to repay for any oil wrongfully taken.

Many are of the opinion that a bill introduced in the Senate by Senators DOUGLAS, HILL, and others is the best solution of this controversy. Under their proposal control over the marginal sea areas would remain in the Federal Government but revenues from them would be devoted to grants-in-aid for schools in all States. Thus natural resources, which under three Supreme Court decisions belong to the Nation as a whole, would be dedicated to the welfare of the youth of the land at the local level.

HAROLD MORGAN.

SALT LAKE CITY.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, there has been some discussion relative to the status of the scrip applications in connection with the sea-bottom lands.

The status of such applications seem clear from the press dispatch which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is entitled "Scrip Oil Land Bid Turned Down." It is from the Reno Evening Gazette of November 21, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCRIP OIL LAND BID TURNED DOWN

WASHINGTON, November 21.—Secretary Chapman today turned down the move by E. L. Cord and others to get oil-rich submerged coastal lands in exchange for old Government land scrip.

The Secretary of the Interior announced he had denied all applications to acquire lands off the coast of Texas, Louisiana, and California. They had been filed by Cord, former automobile manufacturer, and 10 others.

The applicants bid for the lands with scrip the Government issued many years ago. This scrip, or land certificates, allowed early settlers and Indians to choose acreages of unoccupied public lands in exchange for lands which had been taken from them.

With the Federal Government claiming title to the oil-valuable coastal lands, it presented a knotty problem when Cord and the others turned up with quantities of this old scrip and called for delivery of the lands to them.

THE NATIONAL OIL AND GAS LEASING ACT

Mr. MALONE. The Secretary of the Interior also denied that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act applied to the sea-bottom or submerged land.

This action was taken immediately following the Supreme Court's decision, obviously to prevent many applications under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act from applying to selected sea-bottom lands.

It will be understood that the sea-bottom land is located from the mean low tide seaward to the State boundary which we are discussing at this moment. It has nothing to do with tidelands or inland waterways, or navigable rivers. It in no way affects those areas.

APPLICANTS SUED THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The Secretary denied that the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act applied to the sea-bottom or submerged lands.

But, Mr. President, the applicants for such selected sea-bottom lands sued the Secretary of the Interior in the Federal district court to reverse his decision. The decision of the Federal district court is due to be handed down at any time.

THE SPECIAL MASTER

The case has been argued, and I understand that the decision is being withheld only until the special master appointed by the Supreme Court reports on the boundaries of the inland waterways.

The Supreme Court appointed a master to inspect, hold hearings, and to collect all the available information with respect to the position of the outside boundaries of the inland waterways—the inland waterways being harbors, inlets, and other indentations along the coast, already adjudged by many Supreme Court decisions as belonging to the States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by Mastin White, general counsel for the Department of the Interior, in relation to the sea-bottom or submerged lands.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. BEDS OF NAVIGABLE INLAND WATERS

Inland waters are the bodies of water, both tidal and nontidal, which lie inside the coast line of the United States. Rivers, lakes, harbors, and bays are examples of inland waters.

Navigable inland waters are those inland waters which are available for navigation in their natural condition, or which can be made available for navigation upon the basis of reasonable improvements.

Some obvious examples of navigable inland waters are Mobile Bay, San Francisco Bay, Chesapeake Bay, Delaware Bay, New York Harbor, Boston Harbor, Long Island Sound, Mississippi Sound, Puget Sound, the Columbia River, and the Mississippi River.

The initial Supreme Court case involving the question as to the ownership of the bed of a navigable inland water was *Martin et al.* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367), which was decided by the Supreme Court in 1842. It involved a controversy over the title to an oyster bed on the bottom of Raritan Bay and River in the State of New Jersey. The Supreme Court held that the title to the beds of navigable rivers and bays within the limits of the American Colonies, including New Jersey, had been vested in the Crown of England prior to independence; and that when the Thirteen Original States, as the result of the Revolutionary War, became free and independent, they severally succeeded to the rights of ownership previously held by the Crown of England in the beds of navigable rivers and bays within their respective boundaries. Accordingly, it was decided that the State of New Jersey, upon the attainment of independence, became the owner of the bed of Raritan Bay and River; and that the State had the authority to issue an exclusive license for the taking of oysters from the bed of the bay and river.

A number of subsequent Supreme Court decisions have reaffirmed the principle of constitutional law announced in 1842 and have held that the beds of navigable inland waters situated within the boundaries of a State belong to the State (or its grantees). A list of such decisions is set out below:

Smith v. *Maryland* (18 Howard 71 (1855));
Mumford v. *Wardwell* (6 Wallace 423 (1867));
Barney v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324 (1876));
McCready v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391 (1876));
Illinois Central v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892));
United States v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391 (1903));
McGilvra v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70 (1909));
Scott v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229 (1913));
Port of Seattle v. *Oregon & W. R. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56 (1921));
Oklahoma v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574 (1921));
United States v. *Holt Bank* (270 U. S. 49 (1926));
Massachusetts v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65 (1926)); and
United States v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 64 (1931)).

II. TIDELANDS

Tidelands are the lands which are situated between the line of mean high tide and the line of mean low tide.

The question as to the ownership of tidelands situated within the boundaries of a State was first presented to the Supreme Court in the case of *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan et al.* (3 Howard 212). That case was decided by the Supreme Court in 1845. It involved a controversy over a tideland area bordering on the Mobile River in Alabama. It was held by the Supreme Court that when Alabama ceased to be a Territory and was admitted into the Union as a State, the ownership of the tidelands within the boundaries of the new State was automatically transferred from the United States to Alabama.

Subsequent Supreme Court cases holding that the respective States (or their grantees) own the tidelands situated within the States' boundaries are listed below:

Goodtitle v. *Kibbe* (9 Howard 471 (1850));
Weber v. *Board of Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wallace 57 (1873); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1894); *Mobile Transportation Co.* v. *Mobile* (187 U. S. 479 (1903); and *Borax Consolidated* v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10 (1935)).

III. BED OF THE MARGINAL SEA

The marginal (or territorial) sea is that portion of the open ocean which begins at the line of mean low tide (sometimes referred to as the ordinary low watermark) on the coast of the United States, or at the mouths of rivers, bays, harbors, and other inland waters, and extends seaward to the boundary line of the United States.

The Federal Government has consistently asserted ever since 1793 that the seaward boundary line of the United States is located three nautical or geographical miles (3½ statute or land miles) from the coast line. However, the State of Texas contends that, when it entered the Union, its seaward boundary line was fixed in the Gulf of Mexico at a distance of three marine leagues (10½ statute or land miles) from the Texas coast. A similar contention is made by the State of Florida with respect to its seaward boundary line in the Gulf of Mexico. The contentions of Texas and Florida have not been passed upon by the Supreme Court.

The first Supreme Court case that ever involved the question of the respective rights of the United States and of a State in the bed of the marginal sea contiguous to the coast of the State was *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19). That case, which was instituted in 1945 and decided on June 23, 1947, involved a controversy between the United States and the State of California over the oil and gas deposits in the bed of the marginal sea off the coast of California. The Supreme Court held that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the California coast are lands of the United States rather than State-owned lands; and that the United States, rather than the State of California, has the authority to dispose of the oil and gas deposits in such lands.

The principle of constitutional law announced by the Supreme Court in the California case was subsequently reaffirmed in the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707 (1950)), which involved (among other lands) lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas.

During the interval between the announcement by the Supreme Court of its decision in the California case and the announcement of its decisions in the Louisiana and Texas cases, the Court had occasion in the case of *Hynes* v. *Grimes Packing Co.* (337 U. S. 86 (1949)), to consider the status of lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea off the coast of a territory. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, in establishing the Karluk Indian Reservation on Kodiak Island in Alaska, to include within the boundaries of the reservation coastal waters to a distance of 3,000 feet from the shore line at mean low tide.

IV. EXERCISE BY COASTAL STATES OF POLICE POWER IN THE MARGINAL SEA

That the police power of a coastal State extends over the marginal (or territorial) sea contiguous to its coast was clearly established by the Supreme Court in the case of *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69 (1941)). That case involved the power of the State of Florida to regulate the sponge fishery off its coast. The Supreme Court held, among other things, "* * * that Florida has an interest in the proper maintenance of the sponge fishery and that the [Florida] statute so far as applied to conduct within the territorial waters of Florida, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, is within the police power of the State" (p. 75).

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell* (334 U. S. 385 (1948)), again upheld the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power in the marginal sea contiguous to its coast. That case involved the authority of the State of South Carolina to regulate commercial shrimp fishing in the marginal sea.

The Toomer case was decided after the Supreme Court had rendered its decision in the case of *United States* v. *California*, holding that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal rather than State-owned lands. Thus, it is clear from the decision in the Toomer case that the fact that the lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea are Federal lands does not affect the authority of a coastal State to exercise its police power with respect to activities conducted in such lands or in the waters above them. A State's police power over activities conducted in the marginal sea is comparable to a State's police power over activities con-

ducted on public domain lands situated within the boundaries of the State.

V. DISTRIBUTION OF REVENUES DERIVED UNDER THE MINERAL LEASING ACT

The revenues derived by the United States from mineral operations on public lands under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 are distributed as follows: 37½ percent is paid to the respective States within whose boundaries the lands comprising the source of the income are situated; 52½ percent goes into the reclamation fund; and 10 percent is deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts (sec. 35, Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; 30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 191).

There are pending at the present time in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia several cases involving the question whether the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 applies to lands comprising the bed of the marginal sea. It it should be judicially determined as a result of the pending litigation that the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 is applicable to such lands, the income derived from the development of the oil and gas deposits in these lands would, of course, be distributed in the manner outlined above—i. e., the several coastal States would get 37½ percent of the money derived from operations in the portions of the marginal sea bed contiguous to their respective coasts; 52½ percent of the money would go into the reclamation fund and would be used for the reclamation of arid lands in the 17 Western States; and 10 percent would be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

VI. BED OF THE HIGH SEAS

The Continental Shelf that begins at the line of mean low tide along the coast of the United States, or at the mouths of rivers, bays, harbors, and other inland water, not only comprises the bed of the marginal sea, but it extends seaward beyond the marginal sea for varying distances beneath the high seas. In some places, the Continental Shelf extends seaward for a total distance of approximately 250 miles from the coast of the United States. In other places, it is much narrower. The average width of the Continental Shelf off our Atlantic coast is approximately 73 miles, the average width of the Gulf coast is approximately 59 miles, and the average width off the Pacific coast is approximately 18 miles.

The question of the respective rights of the United States and of coastal States in the Continental Shelf beneath the high seas adjacent to the seaward boundary line of the United States was decided by the Supreme Court for the first time in the cases of *United States* v. *Louisiana* and *United States* v. *Texas*, previously cited. These cases were instituted in 1948 and decided in 1950. The State of Louisiana had purported to extend State control and ownership over the Continental Shelf for a total distance of 27 nautical miles from the Louisiana coast line, and the State of Texas had purported to extend State control and ownership over the Continental Shelf to its outermost edge. The Supreme Court held, however, that the United States, rather than the States of Louisiana and Texas, is entitled to exercise rights in the adjacent Continental Shelf underlying the high seas; and that among the rights held by the United States in such lands is the right to dispose of the oil and gas deposits contained in them.

THE HOLLAND BILL, OR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. MALONE. The measure variously known as the Holland bill, or Senate Joint Resolution 20, seeks to transfer that part of the public domain known as the sea bottom or submerged lands between low tide and the State line, to the States wherein they are located.

The transfer would mean, of course, that all the royalties or revenues from such leases would accrue to the individual States to the exclusion of the reclamation fund, and thereby nullify the 32-year old Government policy initiated by the Congress in 1920.

ONE HUNDRED BILLION DOLLARS WORTH OF PETROLEUM

It is estimated that from $40,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 of petroleum will be produced within the sea-bottom lands area affected by the Supreme Court decisions affecting the sea-bottom lands. Twelve and one-half percent has been the customary royalty to be received from these areas. Fifty-two and one-half percent of that amount would go to the reclamation fund, amounting to between two and a half billion and six billion dollars to such reclamation fund, with which to construct reclamation projects in the 17 Western States.

Nevada is vitally concerned in the disposition of the royalty payments from oil and gas production in the public domain, since Congress stipulated in the 1920 National Oil and Gas Leasing Act that 52½ percent of such royalties should accrue to the reclamation fund, to be expended in the 17 reclamation States.

THE PUBLIC LAND STATES SHOULD BE TREATED ALIKE

I may say that this act has been amended from time to time, but as it stands now, that is the situation. If the oil and gas-bearing public lands are to be transferred to the States it should be done through a bill introduced in the Eighty-third Congress in 1953, simply stipulating that when oil or gas is discovered on the publicly owned lands, immediately such lands are to be transferred to the States.

That would then equalize the situation. Many companies are drilling for oil and gas now in my State of Nevada under the National Oil and Gas Leasing Act.

We have high hopes that they will discover oil. Under a bill then of that nature, when such oil was discovered such lands would be automatically transferred to the State of Nevada in the same manner as it is proposed to transfer to the States in this case the publicly owned lands including the submerged or sea-bottom lands seaward from low tide to the State boundaries.

NOT RETURNING LANDS TO THE STATES

I point out that the Government is not, as is often said, returning anything to the States through the legislation. The States never have had these lands. There has been only one previous decision touching the submerged or sea-bottom lands. That was an Alaskan decision, in regard to fisheries, in which it was held that the Government controlled the lands and had the right to reserve such lands for the Indian fisheries.

NO PRIOR DECISION AFFECTING SEA-BOTTOM LANDS

Mr. President, in this connection there never has been a direct decision on sea-bottom or submerged lands with reference to ownership until the 1947 Supreme Court decision.

The question was never raised before the Supreme Court until that time.

There were many decisions by the Supreme Court, however, involving inland waterways, tidelands, navigable rivers, and lakes. Mr. President, those decisions always held that the States owned and controlled such lands.

The Supreme Court decision to which I have referred did not in any way affect these lands or these decisions.

If it was not feasible to introduce a bill to transfer to the States the public lands within their borders whenever oil should be discovered, a bill could be introduced in the Eighty-third Congress transferring selected lands to the public-land States. Out of the 11 Western States which contain most of the public lands, many have for a long time wanted to own such lands within their boundaries.

We in Nevada have never desired to own such public lands. However, if oil were to be discovered upon such public lands within our State, there might be a change with respect to the desire to own and control such areas.

SELECTED LANDS—SCHOOL LANDS

Areas in any case could be selected by each public-land State with a view to the value of the lands. It should be remembered that certain of such lands including section 36 of each township was transferred to the States for school purposes. States could either lease the land, or sell it, and use the money derived from the sale for school purposes.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF SUCH LANDS

All other public lands in the same category as the area seaward from low tide to the State boundary were judged to be public lands by the Supreme Court.

The only method by which these public lands could be transferred to private ownership is under some public law—a law passed by Congress—such as the homestead law, calling for 160 acres; the additional homestead law, calling for an additional 160 acres; the grazing homestead law, calling for 640 acres; or the mining-claim law, calling for 600 feet one way and 1,500 feet the other way. When a mineral discovery is made on public land, it can be held indefinitely for $100 of such work on the claim a year, and later can be patented if $500 worth of work is done on it in a constructive manner.

Then there is the placer-claim location, which is a different method of operation than a lode claim.

The Pittman Act was passed by Congress under which certain lands can be taken up for irrigation.

Of course, all of these laws are not applicable to all of such lands. It is obvious that certain lands could not be farmed, therefore not subject to a homestead location. A homestead could not be taken up if it were impossible to find water with which to irrigate it, and naturally the sea-bottom land would not be available for that purpose.

However, I point out that a placer location on the black sands on the beaches of Oregon, for example, containing chromite sands, would be subject to a placer claim location. In the same manner a mining claim might be filed on any ledge which either showed above the surface of the water or could be worked under water in this submerged or sea-bottom area.

So, Mr. President, I merely point out that propaganda with respect to these lands has been misleading in stating that it included tidelands and violated States' rights and that neither of these items are included in the Supreme Court decision.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or De Ott-Kuan;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma;

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere; and

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia;

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C.

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz; and

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; and

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks; and

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON SUPERVISORY SELECTION IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2100)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate resolution 53, as amended by Senate resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to supervisory selection in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The report will be received and printed.

REPORT ON INCENTIVE AWARDS PROGRAM IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2101)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 53, as amended by Senate Resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to the incentive awards program in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

REDUCTION IN FORCE SYSTEM IN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (S. REPT. NO. 2102)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 53, as amended by Senate Resolutions 206 and 288, a report relating to reduction in the force system in the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION IN WYOMING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader. I have a report prepared on the REA in my own State. The report comes within the rule, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL FOR EDUCATION—RESOLUTION OF COMMUNICATIONS WORKERS OF AMERICA, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Communications Workers of America at their annual convention at Cleveland, Ohio, June 16–21, 1952. The resolution en-

dorses the oil for education amendment which I and Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, LANGER, BENTON, TOBEY, NEELY, SPARKMAN, KEFAUVER, CHAVEZ, HUMPHREY, HENNINGS, LEHMAN, MURRAY, GILLETTE, AIKEN, MOODY, FULBRIGHT, CASE, KILGORE, SEATON, GREEN and MAGNUSON are sponsoring to S. 3306.

There being no objection the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL FOR EDUCATION

The oil resources of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf are too great to be dealt with as a plaything or a political gain or the pawn of a financial group. Geologists in the oil industry and the geological survey of the United States Department of the Interior estimate the off-shore oil reserves of the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf at 15,000,000,000 barrels. It is estimated that at the present prices these 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth over $40,000,000,000.

Legislation has been proposed in this Eighty-second Congress by Senator LISTER HILL which provides for the royalties from these oil resources be given to the Federal Government and used to aid education for our children in all 48 States.

The Office of Education, in releasing its annual enrollment estimates, claims that the highest enrollment of students was recorded last year. The enrollment in elementary high schools and colleges was 33,000,000. Elementary-school enrollment jumped by nearly a million last year as the wartime baby group began to become of school age. Ten thousand new elementary school teachers are required just to meet the increased enrollment this year. Expanded school enrollments in 1951–52 calls for 25,000 new class rooms. To replace obsolete facilities an additional 18,000 class rooms should be provided. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That CWA support wholeheartedly Senator LISTER HILL's proposal that the royalties from the off-shore oil developments be put into a special fund to finance improved education in the United States.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

By unanimous consent, the following additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MALONE:

S. 3486. A bill to eliminate the requirement that certain preference be given with respect to the sublease of power privileges leased from the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3487. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. MALONE when he introduced the last above-named bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. 3488. A bill to provide for the transfer to the States of the money in the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for the establishment and operation by the States of old-age insurance systems, and for the abolition of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, July 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 4 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, vice Joseph R. Jackson, retired.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Grace M. Stewart, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, vice Ellen K. Raedy, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Col. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Barclay, O402854, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304, Armor Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285, Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Lamar Tooze, O107927, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

POSTMASTER

Van Drennen Hicks to be postmaster at Oak Ridge, Tenn., vice George E. Bowling, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 4 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Raymond Ross Paty, of Georgia, to be a member of the Board of Directors for the term expiring May 18, 1960.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

James T. Hill, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James William Johnson, Jr., of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. John Reed Hodge, O7285, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), to be Chief, Army Field Forces, with the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. John Taylor Lewis, O7000, United States Army, to be commanding general, Army Antiaircraft Command, with the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. George Price Hays, O7149, United States Army, to be commanding general, United States Forces, Austria, with the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Silas Beach Hays, O17803.
Brig. Gen. Frank Huber Partridge, O7497.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Bernard Loper, O12243.
Brig. Gen. Homer Watson Kiefer, O12701.
Brig. Gen. Edward Thomas Williams, O-12818.
Brig. Gen. Robert Leroy Dulaney, O15351.
Brig. Gen. William Nelson Gillmore, O-16196.
Brig. Gen. Joseph Pringle Cleland, O16239.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Harold Thomas Miller, O12633.
Col. Rawley Ernest Chambers, O16733.
Col. Francis Marion Day, O15614.
Col. Gordon Byrom Rogers, O15620.
Col. Aubrey Strode Newman, O16099.
Col. Thomas Morgan Watlington, O16780.
Col. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160.
Col. Legare Kilgore Tarrant, O17208.
Col. Lionel Charles McGarr, O17225.
Col. Carl Ferdinand Fritzsche, O17234.
Col. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681.
Col. Paul Lamar Freeman, Jr., O17704.
Col. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062.
Col. Robert Jefferson Wood, O18064.
Col. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, O18088.
Col. John Knight Waters, O18481.
Col. John R. Beishline, O18523.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Thomas Wade Herren, O7430.
Maj. Gen. Alonzo Patrick Fox, O8434.
Maj. Gen. William Arthur Beiderlinden, O10303.
Maj. Gen. Reuben Ellis Jenkins, O11658.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Alwin Schow, O12180.
Brig. Gen. John Harrison Stokes, Jr., O12181.
Brig. Gen. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219.
Brig. Gen. Herbert Bernard Loper, O12243.
Brig. Gen. John Bartlett Murphy, O12338.
Maj. Gen. Edmund Bower Sebree, O12376.
Maj. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428.
Lt. Gen. Henry Spiese Aurand, O3784, commanding general, United States Army, Pacific (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsec. 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, 25A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe.

Lt. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Far East Air Forces.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A, to be Director, the Joint Staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Development.

Maj. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 88A, to be commanding general, Continental Air Command.

Maj. Gen. Charles Trovilla Myers, 37A, to be commander in chief, United States Northeast Command.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Raymond P. Coffman for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

Samuel K. Bird for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

Bernard F. Vandergriff, Clinton.
Van Drennen Hicks, Oak Ridge.
Francis E. Durrett, White House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JULY 4, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this fourth day of July, commemorating that significant and sacred event and time in the annals of our American history when the founding fathers signed the Declaration of Independence in which they had stated in verbal form their inner faith and deepest convictions.

Grant that on this anniversary of the birthday of our Nation we also, as members of their succeeding generations, may be inspired with a resurgence of faith in Thee and with a more patriotic and loyal devotion to those ideals and principles of freedom and democracy for which many of our fellow citizens are now giving themselves so sacrificially.

May the blessings of Thy grace and favor, Thy wisdom and power, continue to rest upon our beloved country as she pursues her God-ordained onward and upward course in all things that make for justice and righteousness, for peace and brotherhood.

May glory and majesty, dominion and power, through Christ Jesus, our Lord, be thine for ever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Izumi;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6278. An act for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi);

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Forces with respect to the withholding of officers' pay;

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6078. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Professor Werner Richter and Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan;

H. R. 8499. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 401. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee numbered 152419, for certain land in California;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic Bishop of Northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4163. An act for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, of Eastover, S. C.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine P. Garrett;

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland;

H. R. 5248. An act to suspend certain import duties on tungsten;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; and

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill (H. R. 8120); requests a conference with the House on the

disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. MORSE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill (H. R. 8370); requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 241) entitled "An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American Merchant Marine, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) entitled "An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7176) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 3, 5, 21, 24, 25, 27, and 44 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

WITHHOLDING SUMS FROM COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYEES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings whereby on yesterday the bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, was amended, read the third time, and passed, for the purpose of offering a correcting amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That since the internal revenue laws of the United States impose upon States, Territories, possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions thereof the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to promote harmonious relations and reciprocity by consenting, under certain conditions, to the application to the United States of any statute of any State, Territory, possession, or any political subdivision thereof which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

SEC. 2. Where any statute or provision of law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State, Territory or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of New York: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1999 and insert the following: "That where—

"(1) the law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State or Territory, and

"(2) such duty to withhold is imposed generally with respect to the compensation of employees who are residents of such State or Territory,

then the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State or Territory. Such agreement shall provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax and whose regular place of Federal employment is within the State or Territory with which such agreement is entered into. No such agreement shall apply with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application of any provision of law which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability by reason of the provisions of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the statement I made with reference to this bill on yesterday, and that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] have the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the present time Federal agencies lack any authority to cooperate with the States by withholding State income taxes from salaries of their employees. The basic purpose of H. R. 5157 is therefore to make it possible for Federal agencies to withhold State income taxes. As reported with amendments, H. R. 5157 provides, under certain conditions, that where any statute or provision of law of any State or Territory provides for the collection of a tax upon employers the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns thereof to the proper authorities, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, shall enter into an agreement with such State or Territory within 120 days of the request of an agreement from the proper official of any such governmental unit, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of the law with respect to the employees, with certain exceptions, of such department or agency subject to such tax.

The authorization for withholding contained in the bill, as reported, is limited so as not to apply with respect to the taxes of any State or Territory which requires withholding only with respect to nonresidents.

Secondly, the bill, as reported, will apply only to those Federal employees whose regular place of Federal employment is within the particular State or Territory with which the agreement is entered into. Thus, to be withheld upon, pursuant to the authorization contained in the bill, the Federal employee concerned must not only be employed within the taxing State or Territory but must not be there only temporarily while absent from his regular post of duty outside of that State or Territory. H. R. 5157, as reported, does not authorize withholding with respect to compensation for service as a member of the Armed Forces of the United States. Your committee believes that to extend

the authorization contained in the bill into this area would create serious administrative problems in view of the fact that service in the Armed Forces may frequently be of a temporary nature or may be transient in character.

The bill further provides that nothing in the act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability.

Every practicable step should be taken to cooperate in the area of withholding with the State and Territorial governments in view of their cooperation with the Federal Government in fiscal matters generally, and particularly in withholding the Federal income tax from their employees.

The purpose of this bill is similar with that of S. 1999, which has already passed the other body. H. R. 5157 is favored by the Treasury Department.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, the last Vermont legislature added a provision to the State's income-tax laws requiring that all employers in the State withhold sums from the compensation of employees to facilitate the collection of income taxes.

Following the enactment of Vermont's withholding tax law, the Governor requested the United States General Accounting Office to instruct all Federal agencies in the State to cooperate to the fullest extent with State officials in making that law a success.

However, the Comptroller General of the United States expressed the opinion that Federal agencies could not enter into any agreement or understanding whereby the Vermont income tax could be held as a matter of courtesy or cooperation between the Governments, for the sovereign immunity of the United States cannot be waived administratively but only by an act of Congress.

Consequently, it appeared that legislation was required in order for the Federal Government to withhold State taxes from the salaries of its employees, and so in order to preclude any constitutional limitations with respect to the collection of such taxes I introduced H. R. 5157 and Senator FLANDERS introduced S. 1999, a companion bill, which was passed by the other body.

The National Tax Association has recognized for a long time the need for legislation of a similar nature. The association at its forty-fourth annual conference adopted a resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to permit the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government to withhold from the compensation of their employees income tax imposed by a State or Territory of the United States or any subdivision thereof to the extent that such withholding is generally required by employers within the jurisdiction of the State, Territory or political subdivision.

On August 13, 1951, the Treasury Department Information Service issued a press release relative to this matter, and I quote in part from this as follows:

It is the policy of the Federal Government to cooperate with the States in the administration of their tax laws to the fullest extent practicable. To furher this objective, legislation is required authorizing Federal agencies to withhold State income taxes. The appropriate form of such legislation is now under consideration with a view to a request for early congressional action. Federal withholding of State income taxes in those instances in which the States employ this method of collection will constitute a logical development in Federal-State fiscal cooperation. State and local governments are cooperating generously in the administration of Federal taxes and the Treasury strongly supports Federal cooperation with the States in this matter.

Again in its report of January 21, 1952, to the Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department expressed its accord with the general principles of the proposed legislation, and urged its adoption, stating that "it strongly supports Federal cooperation with States which utilize employer withholding of taxes in the administration of their income tax as a logical development in Federal-State fiscal cooperation."

In addition, the Bureau of the Budget in reviewing S. 1999 offered no objections and gave its assurance that the bill was in accord with the program of the President.

The successful operation of any Government, local, State, or national depends to a large degree upon its powers to tax, but these powers are little more than illusory if there is not concomitantly present the ability to collect the taxes levied, and it is my feeling that it would be the better part of wisdom to abrogate the present legal restrictions which hinder the collection of States taxes.

The enactment of S. 1999 would accord to the States the same cooperation in tax collections which the Federal Government demands from them under 26 United States Code, pages 1622 to 1624, and therefore increase the revenue of State governments, lessening their dependence on the Federal Government and strengthening our system of duality of sovereignty.

Anticipated administrative problems under the provisions of S. 1999 originally drafted led to a serious study of the proposed legislation by Mr. Colin F. Stam, Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and Treasury officials with a view toward the elimination of any possible problems of an administrative nature.

As a result of this study, Mr. Stam and his associates recommended certain changes in the bill and these were approved and adopted by the committee, and are perfectly agreeable to me. Mr. Stam has assured me that neither he nor the Treasury Department have any objections whatsoever to the enactment of S. 1999 as reported by the committee.

In its present form the bill is not applicable to political subdivisions of States or Territories; neither does it apply to personnel of the armed services or to Federal employees temporarily residing in States requiring employers to withhold sums from the compensation of employees for income tax purposes. Moreover, the provisions of the bill will be without force in States which collect withholding taxes for nonresidents only. In brief then, S. 1999 merely provides for the collection of State withholding taxes by Federal agencies from employees who actually live and work in States which utilize employer withholding of taxes.

Vermont officials are convinced that no court would rule that a State must collect Federal withholding taxes from its employees, and it is my understanding that Treasury officials concur in this opinion. Vermont is perfectly willing to cooperate on a voluntary basis in the collection of Federal withholding taxes from State employees, but it also feels that in return, the Federal Government should render similar assistance to the State.

The passage of this bill is of great interest and importance to the State of Vermont. It was reported only after long and serious study by the Ways and Means Committee, and it has the approval of both the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 20, inclusive.

Page 4, line 12, after "property.", insert "The Secretary of each of the military departments shall transmit to the Congress reports covering contracts for research or development entered into during each 6 months following the enactment of this act. Each such report shall contain (1) a list of each contract for research or development entered into during such period the total cost of which to the Government will exceed $50,000, and (2) specific information with respect to each such contract, except that specific information the disclosure of which he deems incompatible with the security of the United States may be excluded from such reports."

Page 6, strike out lines 8 to 16, inclusive.

Page 6, line 17, strike out "8" and insert "7."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the

purpose of asking the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to explain to the House these three changes which were made by the other body and agreed to by the conferees.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1180 is a bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, passed the House on August 2, 1951. It passed the Senate on July 3, 1952, with three amendments.

The three Senate amendments are restrictive in nature and while the Department would normally not want to agree to those amendments, the time element at present has prompted them to state that the House should agree to the amendments.

Section 1 of the House bill relieved the members of the committees of civilians, which committees were to assist each of the service Secretaries on certain statutory restrictions. For instance, the members of these committees would be permitted to serve with or without compensation and would be exempted from certain statutory prohibitions and penalties which are applicable to all other Federal employees, for example, in regard to the participation in Government contracts or claims against the Government. The net result of the Senate amendment would be that persons who comprise these advisory panels to the Secretaries will probably have to be picked from sources which are not in a contractual relationship with the Government.

The second amendment requires each of the Secretaries to report on research and development contracts involving more than $50,000 each 6 months, unless publication of the information would violate security considerations.

The third amendment deletes section 7 of the bill which authorized the Secretaries of the military departments to arrange for the publication of scientific and technical information resulting from the research and development activities of his Department.

The author of the Senate amendment, Senator SCHOEPPEL, is of the opinion that this printing can be taken care of in a different fashion.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY AND NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, DURHAM, SHORT, and ARENDS.

COPYRIGHTS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to recommit the bill (H. R. 3589) amending title 17 of the United States Code with reference to copyrights to the committee of conference, together with the committee report thereon, for the purpose of making certain corrections.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FIRST IRON WORKS IN AMERICA

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am requesting the Postmaster General to cause to be issued a special postage stamp commemorative of the establishment of the first iron works in America in the town of Saugus, Mass., in 1643. This is responsive to action taken by the Board of Selectmen of Saugus. A little later I shall present for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some informative material and data regarding this event which is one of the very earliest and most significant landmarks in the industrial history of the Republic.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, it is likely that younger people often fail to realize it, but one of the very real and pressing problems of today is the problem of our senior citizens. I use that term advisedly, because I cannot bring myself to refer to many of my friends 65, 70, 75, and older as aged. That just does not fit the physical and mental vigor enjoyed by most of them. Indeed, the problem itself arises from the modern circumstance that people are living far longer, and are much healthier, than at the turn of the century. A generation ago, the average man or woman was worn out at 55; today that age group can generally expect 15 to 20 years of useful life—and there are millions more of them.

What are we going to do with them, about them, for them—more, what are we going to do to let them help us?

Let us glance briefly at both the cause and effect of such a markedly changed society.

The cause: Medical science has virtually conquered the familiar epidemics of the past; improved sanitation and diet, generally superior living conditions, advanced surgical techniques, and now the "wonder drugs" have given the new generation a life expectancy of 20 to 30 years more than our ancestors enjoyed.

What is the result? There are millions more of the so-called aged living among us today—most living in health, but many neither in comfort nor in happiness.

Three years ago, when the Hoover Commission made its report on social security, nearly 11,000,000 men and women in this country were over 65. It is estimated 40 years hence, their number will be 21,500,000, over 13 percent of the calculated population.

This great change among us presents a variety of social problems. For the sake of their happiness, and for the practical good of our whole society, means must be improved to protect their health and comfort, provide them with opportunities to live usefully and provide them reasonable security.

Medical science dealing with the health and comfort of our elders is making rapid strides. It will continue to improve and must be encouraged. But it is not enough merely to live free of pain and disease. Man should live in the present consciousness that he is of some use to his family, his fellow men, and himself, and with confidence that his future will at least be free from real want.

Here, two major obstacles confront us; one is the traditional reluctance of employers to hire older workers; the second, inadequacies in our social-security system.

The House has recently passed a bill which increased social-security pensions by $5 per month or 12½ percent, whichever is greater. The bill also provided an increase in the so-called work clause to $70 per month. I supported this bill, inadequate as it was, because there was no better bill then before us. But the final bill has been bettered by Senate action.

An important provision is that social-security payments will stop in the event of total disability, thus bringing this Federal insurance in line with private insurance programs.

What is needed, however, is not a piecemeal amendment of this character, but a totally new concept of problems arising from a great increase in our older population—better opportunities, improved health, and real security.

It is toward this goal that my bill—directing the Ways and Means Committee to study our security system to the end that it may be completely revised—is aimed. I hope this whole subject will get thorough attention in the next Congress.

Let us have a declaration of independence for our elders.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks and include an article. I am advised it will exceed the allowed amount and will cost $189. Notwithstanding the additional cost, I ask unanimous consent to insert the article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD but they did not appear. I ask permission again today that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House sine die, I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks on several subjects in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to insert extraneous material and excerpts therefrom on various subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 735) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That those Members of the House elected to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are hereby elected to the Committee on Government Operations, and all records and papers of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are hereby transferred to the Committee on Government Operations.

That all bills, resolutions, communications, papers, documents, petitions, and memorials heretofore referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are hereby referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to call up a conference report. The Chair will dispose of conference reports, then we will take up matters of concurring in Senate amendments to House bills; and the Chair puts it in that order because these conference reports may have to go to the other body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Do we understand that we are to proceed with the matter of conference reports ahead of the private calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that would be the expeditious thing to do, because most of these bills are Senate bills on the private calendar. I understand this conference report is entirely noncontroversial.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 3066, to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to raise a point of order against this conference report.

The conference report is not in order because the conferees on the part of the House have added to this bill a provision, section 12, as now reported by the conferees, which is not in order in that it amends the Home Owners' Loan Act, which is a different act than that covered by S. 3066 as reported to and passed by the House which sought to amend the National Housing Act and not the Home Owners' Loan Act. I therefore make the point of order that the conference report is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand how the point of order would lie, because it certainly was a matter that was in conference.

Mr. MULTER. The bill as it came to the House, reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, did not contain section 12; had it contained section 12 it would have been subject to a point of order in that it attempted to amend a law other than the Housing Act which was the law sought to be amended by the bill as reported by the committee. Had it come to the floor it would have been subject to a point of order. We passed that bill without section 12, but it now comes back from conference containing section 12.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the amendment about which the gentleman complains was in the Senate bill and was struck out by an amendment to the bill when it came to the House. This amounts to language that was originally in the Senate bill being reinstated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman is in error. The Committee on Banking and Currency considered the bill as sent to us by the Senate and that committee struck out section 12. The bill came to the floor without section 12 and was passed without section 12. It appears, so far as the House itself is concerned, without section 12. It now comes back from the conference containing section 12.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule. The conference report makes this statement:

That the House recede from its amendment No. 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2.

The Chair does not see where a point of order could lie against a conference report when the matter agreed upon was in either the Senate or the House bill. Because the House struck out language of the Senate bill and the conferees reinstated the provision certainly would not amount to the conferees exceeding their authority.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2480)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
HENRY O. TALLE,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

B. R. MAYBANK,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3066) to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1 of the House struck out section 12 of the Senate bill which section would have amended section 5 (c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, to authorize Federal savings and loan associations to purchase loans secured by first liens on improved real estate which are insured under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, without regard to the fifty-mile area restriction now applicable to such purchases. In retaining this provision authorizing such purchases the committee of conference desires to make it clear that the authority so provided is permissive, and that it does not authorize any such association to originate this type of loan beyond the present statutory area limitations.

Amendment No. 2, which is retained in the conference report, pertains to certain insuring programs administered by the Federal Housing Commissioner pursuant to the National Housing Act.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
ALBERT RAINS,
HENRY O. TALLE,
ALBERT M. COLE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill as reported to the House originally had stricken from it section 12 which is now back in the bill as a result of the conferees' action. Section 12 has nothing to do with Fanny May money, it has nothing to do with FHA money and it

should not be in this bill. If it had come to the floor originally I am sure there would have been many Members opposed to it. Section 12 attempts to change the Home Owners' Loan Act by inserting a provision permitting Federal loan and savings associations to buy mortgages anywhere in the country no matter where the associations themselves may be located and to an unlimited amount. At the present time there is a 15-percent limitation on the investment of funds outside of their own communities. They may not lend more than 15 percent or buy investments to more than 15 percent of their funds outside of a 50-mile area, which has recently been extended to a 100-mile area. Under existing law even such purchases require Home Loan Board approval.

By this amendment the loan and savings associations which are community associations for community purposes, made up of local people, will be permitted to take their entire funds and invest them by purchasing mortgages all over the country. They need not operate any longer within their own community if this provision of the bill should remain in it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will offer a motion to recommit to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist upon the House amendment striking out section 12 of the Senate bill. If this matter is such that it should be passed by the House, then I say it should have a separate hearing, a separate bill, and the entire matter should be brought up when all sides can be heard.

In the 33-page statement that was sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator in support of the bill, S. 3066, the only reference you will find to this section 12 are three sentences merely telling what the provision will do—no recommendation, no approval, no word as to why it should be done.

I have in front of me a statement by the chairman of the legislative committee and the vice chairman of the legislative committee of the United States Savings and Loan League strongly urging opposition to section 12. I think the Members will agree with me that the savings and loan associations should be what they were intended to be, local community projects, run by local people. If they are to be mortgage banks with Nation-wide jurisdiction then let us rewrite the law.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

WHAT JULY THE FOURTH MEANS TO ME

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, on this great day so compelling in the life and history of our Nation, the message that I would convey to my constituents would be:

America is in the middle of a new age. Most of us are still thinking in terms of the industrial age where giant machines, giant factories, and great wealth were the deciding factors. But 25 years ago there were those who saw that the future of the world would be decided by men with the most compelling ideas—ideas that could capture and hold the loyalties of men. In 1926 a friend of mine went to Moscow. There he was shown a group of ragged young Chinese being trained in the ideas of communism at the Sun Yat Sen University. He was told: "These young men don't look like much today, but in 20 years they will be running China." The group included the men who are governing Red China today. Unless we recognize the existence of this world war of ideas, we shall fail to prepare our young men to meet the challenge of this age.

Democracy's answer to this threat is the basic moral ideology that was set forth by our founding fathers. It is the absolute moral standards which distinguish democracy from totalitarianism, and provide the inner discipline we need and the inner liberty we desire. They are the real safeguards of our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I especially direct this thought to our military planners. It seems to me that America has been relying on a three-dimension defense, namely, political, economic, and military, to meet the U. S. S. R.'s four-dimensional threat. In addition to building strength on these three fronts, the Soviets have become experts in ideological warfare, the battle to capture the hearts and minds of men. Foreign Minister Vishinsky declared at a Soviet rally in East Berlin, "We shall win the next war not with atom bombs but with our superior brains, ideas, and doctrines."

Today we must not only have a gun in our hand, but a right moral idea in our head, and an answer in our heart.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand why the able gentleman from New York assumes the position he does on this conference report. In this bill we have given to the Federal National Mortgage Association the authority to purchase $900,000,000 of defense mortgages, and it also releases at the same time $360,000,000 of conventional mortgages. This is a benevolent intrusion by the Government into private enterprise.

Here we have an amendment that will allow savings and loan associations, which are about as American as the American flag or the Declaration of Independence, to buy certain mortgages. These are splendid institutions.

They can now purchase GI insured mortgages anywhere in the United States. This gives the savings and loan associations the authority to purchase FHA mortgages beyond the 50-mile limit. It lessens the pressure on the Treasury. There is nothing mandatory in the act. It merely gives them the permission to do so. It will more evenly spread the funds available for the construction of homes where there has been a lack of funds in one section and an abundance in another. There certainly is no argument that could be made against it. I think the gentleman is afraid that it might siphon some funds from the great financial center of the Nation and of the world into the rural areas. I do not believe it will do that. I do not think he need have any apprehension. It is an entirely meritorious section, and if you attempt to strike it out you will jeopardize this bill that is so generally asked for by the construction trades in the United States.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Our distinguished chairman, who now stands in the well, I know, is sincere in what he says. I know that there are very few Members in this House who have had as much experience with savings and loan associations as he has. He has done a splendid job in fostering and sponsoring them, particularly in his home district; not only legislation involving his own district, but the Nation as a whole. I dislike very much to take a position in opposition to him, but I want to assure him that we have no fear that this will siphon off any money to the rural areas. But I say if you want these savings and loan associations to go into your area, then let them take their money and organize associations for that purpose in your area. They ought to do like the United States Savings and Loan League says they should do; they are organized in the local communities, intended to operate in the local communities, and I think that is what they ought to do.

Mr. SPENCE. In answer to the gentleman I want to say this: I would not be in favor of savings and loan associations initiating loans beyond the 50-mile limit. The Savings and Loan Association acts as quasi-guardian for those who borrow from it. They see that the money goes into the home, that the contractor is paid, and that the subcontractor is paid, that the material men and the laborers are paid, so there will be no liens upon the property. They see that the construction is done properly. I would not have them initiate a loan beyond the 50-mile limit; I do not think it would be desirable for them to go that far. But, they initiate no loan here; they are merely authorized to buy securities that are insured by the National Government. They now have the authority to buy GI loans, and this only gives them the authority to buy FHA loans which are already made beyond the 50-mile limit. If you give the authority to the National Government, and that is what we did when we authorized the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase $900,000,000 of mortgages, how could you reconcile this with your refusal to grant this small power to the savings and loan associations and contend you are in favor of private enterprise.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Abernethy	Gamble	Morton
Allen, La.	George	Moulder
Anderson, Calif.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray
Anfuso	Harden	Nelson
Bailey	Havenner	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	O'Hara
Beall	Heller	Patten
Beckworth	Herter	Ponge
Bender	Heselton	Potter
Bentsen	Hillings	Powell
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Hope	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Javits	Regan
Brehm	Johnson	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Rivers
Brownson	Judd	Robeson
Buckley	Kearney	Roosevelt
Buffett	Kennedy	Sabath
Burdick	Kersten, Wis.	St. George
Butler	Kilburn	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.
Camp	King, Pa.	Sheehan
Carlyle	Klein	Shelley
Cole, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Short
Combs	Larcade	Sikes
Coudert	Latham	Stigler
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Sutton
Curtis, Nebr.	Lyle	Tackett
Davis, Tenn.	McConnell	Taylor
Dingell	McGregor	Thompson, Tex.
Dolliver	McKinnon	Watts
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Evins	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham
Fenton	Mitchell	Willis
Fisher	Morano	Wilson, Tex.
Forrester	Morris	Wolcott
Fugate	Morrison	Woodruff
Furcolo		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its clerk, announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, with the accompanying papers.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, KIRWAN, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and SCRIVNER.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include on that list the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOUSING ACT OF 1952

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the retirement of our colleague [Mr. MCKINNON] of California, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce, as dean of the California delegation, that one of our distinguished Members, CLINTON MCKINNON, will be leaving the House at the end of this Congress.

He was first elected to the House of Representatives for the Eighty-first Congress and represented the Thirtieth Congressional District of California, composed of San Diego city and county.

Since being in the House, Mac has distinguished himself in many ways. In the first place, he comes from one of California's largest populated districts—a community that has undergone extreme impact from World War II and from the Korean build-up. Naturally, that community has many problems and I have had an opportunity to watch Mac handle the multitudinous complications that have come to him from his district. Few Members in my memory have matched the legislative record that this gentleman has performed in getting special bills through for his district and in working with the agencies downtown for the solution of administrative matters.

Water has been one of the major problems of San Diego and Mac has responded with legislation that authorized and financed the construction of a second barrel to an aqueduct that brings Colorado River several hundred miles into his district. Thanks to his good work in Washington, San Diego's water problems are now settled.

The Fallbrook case, which has received national publicity and which involves an equitable division of waters in the Santa Margarita River between the farmers of his district and the huge Marine base, Camp Pendleton, was another problem that came to his office, and he was the author of the well-known Falbrook "Independence" bill that passed the House some months ago and which the other body is now considering.

The scarcity of water in his district prompted him to coauthor another well-known bill, the sea-water bill, which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to coordinate research activity to bring about commercial development of fresh water from ocean water. This bill also received favorable action by the Congress and is now awaiting the President's signature. The effects of this bill offer untold promise, not only for the citizens of this great country, but for the people of the entire world.

Transportation has been another problem of the San Diego area, and Mr. MCKINNON's Laguna tunnel bill, which authorizes the Corps of Engineers to determine the engineering feasibility and economic practicability of a highway and railway tunnel—to be the longest tunnel anywhere in the world—is another page in the legislative record of our good friend from California.

In addition to these bills which Mac authored and pushed through the Congress, he has also been successful in securing Federal prior commitment financing for 9,500 units of privately constructed war housing to take care of the pressing needs for housing. Schools, too, have been an urgent factor, and my colleague was successful in securing allocations of steel for the construction of all needed school buildings in his district.

But while my good friend and member of the California delegation was doing exceptional service for his district, he did not neglect the national and international problems that face this body. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Select Committee on Small Business, and the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, he has been a faithful worker and a man who readily accepted the responsibilities this body imposes upon a Member. If the McKinnon amendment to the original Defense Production Act had been adopted in 1950, the cost of living would be considerably less today and our Government would have saved many billions of dollars in its defense efforts.

While our delegation deeply respects the ability and hard work our colleague has displayed as a Member of the House, the Representatives from California like him even better for his integrity and friendship. He is a man of his word, a loyal friend, and a man never too busy to help another Member.

We Californians realize all too well that we impose our many problems upon this House more frequently than our numbers would indicate, and we are deeply appreciative of your kindly toleration and cooperation. Nonetheless, we are proud of the caliber of our membership, from both the Democratic and Republican side of the aisle. We think our delegation is composed of high caliber men, and the gentleman from San Diego is a good example of what I mean. We are going to miss CLINT MCKINNON from our California delegation and we hate to lose him, and I feel that his good work will be misssed by the entire House.

As the dean of the California delegation, I want to express the appreciation we all feel for Mac and to extend our sincere good wishes for continued success in whatever fields he goes into as he leaves this body.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, California is losing an aggressive, able, and fighting Congressman in CLINTON MCKINNON. In his political campaign he was labeled the "little giant," in which I sincerely concur. As a most successful businessman before entering Congress, he has demonstrated that he can bring to the House of Representatives that

knowledge and experience and translate it into legislative action.

We shall miss Clint and his charming wife.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues from California in their expression of regret at the departure from Congress of the Honorable CLINTON D. MCKINNON. During my term here, it has been my good fortune to have Representative MCKINNON as my neighbor in the House Office Building, and I have certainly enjoyed our pleasant association with him.

I have been very much impressed with Representative MCKINNON's fair-minded and conscientious approach to all legislative problems. I hope that his retirement from the Congress does not mean that he will retire from all public activities.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee I am sure I can say with assurance that all the members of that committee feel a deep regret at the retirement of Hon. CLINTON D. MCKINNON, Member of Congress from the Twenty-third District of California.

During his service Mr. MCKINNON has demonstrated his ability and his deep interest in and knowledge of public affairs in considering the many problems that have been presented to the Congress, and which mean so much for the weal or woe of our country. It has been constantly demonstrated that Mr. MCKINNON is a man of fine capacity, honesty, and industry, and he has been constant and assiduous in the discharge of his duties.

The Congress and the Banking and Currency Committee have sustained a great loss in his departure. Because of the fine service he has rendered, his retirement we know will be but temporary. We feel confident other opportunities will be offered him to serve his people, and we wish him as he leaves us health, happiness, and prosperity.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from our State in expressing my keen regret at California's loss with Representative CLINTON MCKINNON leaving the Congress.

During the two terms he has served in the House, his abilities and keen intellect have advanced him to the position that has generally commanded the respect of every Member of the House of Representatives who has been associated with him, and his work and service on the House Banking and Currency Committee has been of inestimable value to that important committee's great contribution.

I know that I express the sentiments of many who are not present here today when I say that Representative CLINTON MCKINNON will be missed not only for his faculty in ingratiating himself with his fellow Members; not alone for his persistence and diligence in matters of his duty here in his devotion to the welfare of the people of his district embracing the very populous city and county of San Diego at the southern extremity of our State, but as well for his willingness to act beyond the call of his normal duties in behalf of the many problems of our great State and the Nation as a whole during these arduous years.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of the fact that our distinguished colleague, Representative CLINTON D. MCKINNON, is not to return to this House of Representatives January next, the State of California and the Nation also is to lose the services of a most diligent, persevering, capable, patriotic citizen from my native State of California. During these two terms he has served his congressional district, the State, and the Nation with great distinction. He has not only endeared himself to every Member of the House on account of his frank, genial, sincere disposition and approach to all of the important problems which he has had to work upon, but his native ability and integrity have stamped him as a Member of Congress whose presence here at Washington will not be forgotten. As a Member of the important bipartisan delegation in Congress, he has been faithful in attendance and uniformly watchful of all the best interests of California which he has so honorably represented these 4 years, and upon the floor of the House of Representatives itself in debate he early proved himself as mentally and temperamentally equipped to able debate any of the subjects upon which he was called as a member of the important Banking and Currency Committee with clarity, logic, and finality of conclusion which generally places his debating adversaries in inconsistent and untenable positions.

I make this necessarily brief comment about my distinguished colleague and friend, CLINTON D. MCKINNON, with pleasure so that all interested may read. But, Mr. Speaker, we will miss some other folks along with Clint that is, these persons—his wife and his two splendid sons. As he returns to private life it goes without saying that he will again reach the deserved pinnacle of business and commerce success in our system of free enterprise, and, Mr. Speaker, it is hoped that again before too long the people of the State and Nation will have cause to rejoice in his return to public service. Good luck, Clint.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the issue today with reference to the conference report raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] strikes me rather favorably. First, I agree with the gentleman from New York that more extended hearings on this particular amendment should have been had, and, secondly, if the amendment would provide and permit savings and loan associations to purchase and invest all of their assets in mortgages all over the country, and none of them locally, I would certainly disagree with the amendment.

It is true that this amendment provides savings and loan associations can purchase mortgages beyond a distance of 50 miles from home. I agree that savings and loan associations are organized and are operated as local institutions with local money to help local people build homes in a particular community but it does occur to me that occasionally these savings and loan associations find their portfolios in such condition that they are not able to lend money to build homes in the community because they are unable to obtain the money locally. This will permit them under those circumstances to go beyond the present limitation and buy mortgages at a distance greater than 50 miles. I am therefore inclined to believe that the House should accept this amendment at the present time. If, in the future, we find the authority is abused, Congress can correct that situation by such limiting legislation as may be necessary.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I believe at this late hour we are trying to get legislation through the Congress with every bit of reasonable logic we can apply we should not under the circumstances take a lot of time debating a question of this kind. This is a good conference report which has been given serious and careful consideration by the conferees. I cannot agree with the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I think in the interest of providing more very much needed housing, his amendment should be defeated.

This conference report is not going to do a bit of harm to anyone, and it is going to do a lot of good to a lot of people. The original Home Loan Act of 1933 provided that these savings and loan associations could not operate outside of the 50-mile limit. Now this does not change that, except in one instance, and that is that they may purchase FHA-insured mortgages outside of their 50-mile limit but they cannot originate loans outside of their 50-mile limit. All they may do is purchase such mortgages. In my opinion it will facilitate the mortgage market to a degree that will provide housing for many, many people that would not otherwise obtain it. It will give the FHA insured mortgage market an opportunity to operate across the Nation. The amendment makes it permissive and not mandatory. I certainly think that we ought to agree to the conference report and expeditiously dispose of this piece of legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York that a motion to recommit is not in order, the Senate having acted on the conference report.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if they did, they acted improperly, because this should have been acted on in the House first.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not aware that the Senate has acted improperly. We have received a message that they agreed to the conference report.

The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 296, nays 22, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—296

Aandahl	Denny	Jones,
Abbitt	Denton	Woodrow W.
Adair	Devereux	Karsten, Mo.
Addonizio	D'Ewart	Kean
Albert	Dondero	Kearns
Allen, Calif.	Donohue	Keating
Allen, Ill.	Dorn	Kee
Andersen, H. Carl	Doughton	Kelley, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Doyle	Kerr
Andresen, August H.	Durham	Kersten, Wis.
Andrews	Eaton	Kilday
Angell	Eberharter	King, Calif.
Arends	Elliott	Kirwan
Armstrong	Ellsworth	Lanham
Aspinall	Engle	Lantaff
Auchincloss	Fallon	LeCompte
Ayres	Feighan	Lind
Baker	Fernandez	Lovre
Bakewell	Flood	Lucas
Barden	Fogarty	McCarthy
Baring	Forand	McCormack
Barrett	Ford	McCulloch
Bates, Mass.	Frazier	McDonough
Battle	Fulton	McGuire
Beamer	Garmatz	McIntire
Belcher	Gathings	McMillan
Bennett, Fla.	Gavin	McMullen
Bennett, Mich.	Golden	McVey
Berry	Goodwin	Machrowicz
Betts	Gordon	Mack, Ill.
Blatnik	Gore	Mack, Wash.
Boggs, La.	Graham	Madden
Bolling	Granahan	Magee
Bonner	Granger	Marshall
Bosone	Grant	Martin, Iowa
Bow	Green	Meader
Brambiett	Greenwood	Merrow
Bray	Gregory	Miller, Calif.
Brooks	Gross	Miller, Md.
Brown, Ga.	Gwinn	Miller, Nebr.
Bryson	Hagen	Mills
Buchanan	Hale	Morgan
Burleson	Hall, Leonard W.	Mumma
Burnside	Halleck	Murdock
Burton	Hand	Murphy
Busbey	Hardy	Murray
Bush	Harris	Nicholson
Byrnes	Harrison, Nebr.	Norblad
Camp	Harrison, Va.	Norrell
Canfield	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Brien, Ill.
Cannon	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Carnahan	Harvey	O'Konski
Carrigg	Havenner	O'Neill
Case	Hays, Ark.	Osmers
Celler	Hays, Ohio	Ostertag
Chatham	Hedrick	Passman
Chelf	Herlong	Patten
Chenoweth	Hess	Patterson
Chiperfield	Hill	Perkins
Chudoff	Hinshaw	Philbin
Church	Hoeven	Polk
Clemente	Holmes	Poulson
Cole, Kans.	Horan	Preston
Colmer	Howell	Priest
Cooley	Hull	Prouty
Corbett	Hunter	Rabaut
Cotton	Ikard	Radwan
Cox	Irving	Rains
Crosser	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Crumpacker	Jackson, Wash.	Rankin
Cunningham	James	Reams
Dague	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Davis, Ga.	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Rhodes
Deane	Jones, Ala.	Ribicoff
DeGraffenried	Jones, Mo.	Riehlman
Delaney	Jones, Hamilton C.	Riley
Dempsey		Roberts
		Rodino
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rogers, Tex.
		Ross
		Sadlak
		Sasscer
		Schenck
		Scott, Hardie
		Scrivner
		Scudder
		Secrest
		Seely-Brown
		Shafer
		Sheppard
		Sieminski
		Simpson, Ill.
		Sittler
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Miss.
		Smith, Va.
		Spence
		Springer
		Staggers
		Stanley
		Steed
		Stockman
		Taber
		Talle
		Teague
		Thomas
		Thompson, Mich.
		Thornberry
		Tollefson
		Trimble
		Vail
		Van Pelt
		Van Zandt
		Velde
		Vinson
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Walter
		Weichel
		Wharton
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Widnall
		Wier
		Wigglesworth
		Williams, Miss.
		Williams, N. Y.
		Wilson, Ind.
		Wilson, Tex.
		Winstead
		Withrow
		Wolverton
		Wood, Ga.
		Wood, Idaho
		Yates
		Yorty
		Zablocki

NAYS—22

Bishop	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Budge	Jenison	Rooney
Clevenger	Kelly, N. Y.	Saylor
Crawford	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Dollinger	McGrath	Smith, Wis.
Donovan	Mason	Werdel
Fine	Multer	
Heffernan	O'Toole	

NOT VOTING—112

Abernethy	Gamble	Morrison
Allen, La.	George	Morton
Anfuso	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Moulder
Bailey	Harden	Nelson
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	O'Brien, N. Y.
Beall	Heller	O'Hara
Beckworth	Herter	Patman
Bender	Heselton	Phillips
Bentsen	Hillings	Poage
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Potter
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	Powell
Bolton	Hope	Price
Boykin	Javits	Redden
Brehm	Johnson	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Jonas	Regan
Brownson	Judd	Richards
Buckley	Kearney	Rivers
Buffett	Kennedy	Robeson
Burdick	Keogh	Roosevelt
Butler	Kilburn	Sabath
Carlyle	King, Pa.	St. George
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Combs	Kluczynski	Sheehan
Cooper	Larcade	Shelley
Coudert	Latham	Short
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Sikes
Curtis, Nebr.	Lyle	Stigler
Davis, Tenn.	McConnell	Sutton
Dawson	McGregor	Tackett
Dingell	McKinnon	Taylor
Dolliver	Mahon	Thompson, Tex.
Elston	Mansfield	Watts
Evins	Martin, Mass.	Welch
Fenton	Miller, N. Y.	Wickersham
Fisher	Mitchell	Willis
Forrester	Morano	Wolcott
Fugate	Morris	Woodruff
Furcolo		

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Price with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Short.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Cooper with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hilling.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Welch with Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Shelley with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Fugate with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. George.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. ARENDS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT DUTIES ON TUNGSTEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS) laid before the House the following request from the Senate, which was read:

Ordered, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5248) to suspend certain import duties on tungsten, with the accompanying papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be complied with.

There was no objection.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who serv 1 in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2481)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) to provide vocational readjustment

and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 23, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 58, 59, 60, 61, 68, 69, 82, 84, 97, 98, 108, 114, and 115.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 31, 32, 40, 41, 48, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 71, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 85, 86, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 109, 110, 111, 112, and 113, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the unemployment compensation benefits," and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 5, line 24, of the House engrossed bill strike out "1" and in lieu thereof insert "20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this title of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government." And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 10, line 3, of the House engrossed bill, after the word "veteran" insert "(except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "eighty-five per centum"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$135"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposerd to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$60"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "$110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 17, lines 22 and 23, of the House engrossed bill strike out "(1) $225 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, omit the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 17, lines 23 and 24, of the House engrossed bill strike out "per month, if he has one" and in lieu thereof insert "$310 per month"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard work-week through bona fide collective bargaining between employers and employees"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, and on page 22, line 12, of the House engrossed bill, strike out "$31" and in lieu thereof insert "$10"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and the Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this title, an allowance at the rate of $1.50 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this title to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such reports and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that in the event any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this title, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, and on page 49, line 10, of the House engrossed bill strike out "1" and in lieu thereof insert "20"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert: "; substantial deficiencies in housing"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 83: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment and in lieu thereof insert:

"(c) The Administrator shall have the right to refuse to appraise any dwelling or housing project owned, sponsored, or to be constructed by any person identified with housing previously sold to veterans under this title as to which substantial deficiencies have been discovered, or as to which there has been a failure or indicated inability to discharge contractual liabilities to veterans, or as to which it is ascertained that the type of contract of sale or the methods or practices pursued in relation to the marketing of such properties were unfair or unduly prejudicial to veteran purchasers."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "TITLE IV—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE ON OR AFTER JUNE 27, 1950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS UNDER STATE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the agency administering the unemployment compensation law of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation to veterans, in accordance with the provisions of this title, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary, and with other State agencies, in making payments of compensation under this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall, except as provided in section 408, provide that compensation at the rate of $26 per week will be paid by the State to any veteran in such State with respect to weeks of unemployment (not in excess of a total of 26 weeks) which occur after the ninetieth day after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That if a veteran is eligible to receive mustering-out payment under section 502 of this Act, he shall not be eligible to receive compensation under this title with respect to weeks of unemployment completed within thirty days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $100 in such mustering-out payment; within sixty days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $200 in such mustering-out payment; or within ninety days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $300 in such mustering-out payment.

"(c) Any such agreement shall provide that any determination by a State agency with respect to entitlement to compensation pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be made in accordance with the State unemployment compensation law, insofar as such law is applicable, and shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(d) Each agreement shall provide the terms and conditions upon which it may be amended or terminated."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 89: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 89, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS IN ABSENCE OF STATE AGREEMENTS

"SEC. 402. (a) In the case of a veteran who is in a State which has no agreement under this title with the Secretary, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such veteran of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him in the same amounts and for the same periods as provided in section 401 (b). Any determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the State unemployment compensation law of the State in which the veteran is insofar as such law is applicable.

"(b) In the case of a veteran who is in Puerto Rico or in the Virgin Islands, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such veteran of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him in the same amounts and for the same periods as provided in section 401 (b). Any determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the unemployment compensation law of the District of Columbia, insofar as such law is applicable.

"(c) Any veteran whose claim for compensation under subsection (a) or (b) of this section has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Any final determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this section shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in section 205 (g) of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to final decisions of the Administrator under such title.

"(d) The Secretary may utilize for the purposes of this section the personnel and facilities of the agencies in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended. For the purpose of payments made to such agencies under such Act, the furnishing of such personnel and facilities shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the public employment offices of such agencies."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 90: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 403. (a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the payments of compensation made by such State under and in accordance with an agreement under this title.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(c) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this title, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this title may be made.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f) of this section.

"(h) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(i) Until such time as funds are appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title any funds available to the Department of Labor for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration" are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That any such expenditures made or obligations incurred shall be adjusted and charged to any applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a law is enacted which con-

tains such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"INFORMATION

"SEC. 404. (a) All Federal departments and agencies are directed to make available to State agencies which have agreements under this title or to the Secretary, as the case may be, such information with respect to military service of any veteran as the Secretary may find practicable and necessary for the determination of such veteran's entitlement to compensation under this title.

"(b) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended."

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 405 (a) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Any person who makes, or causes to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false or knowingly fails, or causes another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and, as a result thereof, has received any amount as compensation under this title to which he was not entitled, shall be liable to repay such amount to the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, for the fund from which the amount was paid or, in the discretion of the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, to have such amount deducted from any future compensation payable to him under this title within the two-year period following the finding, if the existence of such nondisclosure or misrepresentation has been found by a court of competent jurisdiction or in connection with a reconsideration or appeal."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"REGULATIONS

"SEC. 406. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreements under this title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 407. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'veteran' means any person who has served in the active service in the Armed Forces at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who has been discharged or released from such active service under conditions other than dishonorable after continuous service of ninety days or more, or by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability.

"(b) The term 'compensation' means the money payments to individuals with respect to their unemployment.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(d) The term 'State' includes Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"NONDUPLICATION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 408. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no payment shall be made under any agreement under this title, or, in the absence of such an agreement, by the Secretary under this title, to a veteran for—

"(1) any week or any part of a week he is eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) to receive unemployment benefits at a rate equal to or in excess of $26 per week under any Federal or State unemployment compensation law,

"(2) any period with respect to which he receives an education and training allowance under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of section 232 of this Act or a subsistence allowance under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or

"(3) any period he receives additional compensation necessary for his maintenance under section 6 (b) (2) of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended.

"(b) In any case in which, for any week or any part of a week, a veteran is eligible for payment of compensation under this title and is also eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) to receive for such week or such part of a week unemployment benefits at a rate less than $26 per week under any Federal or State unemployment compensation law, such veteran may elect to receive payment of compensation under this title; but if the veteran so elects, the amount of compensation payable under this title shall be reduced by the amount of such compensation benefits for which such veteran is eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) under such Federal or State unemployment compensation law.

"(c) If the veteran elects under subsection (b) to receive payment of compensation under this title, he shall be entitled to compensation at the rate of $26 per week after the exhaustion of State unemployment benefits until the total compensation received under this title equals $676.

"(d) Under no circumstances shall any veteran receive compensation under this title from more than one State at one time or in a total amount in excess of $676."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"TERMINATION

"SEC. 409. No compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than five years after the date determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress prescribed in section 407 (a)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. E. RANKIN,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
WALTER ROGERS,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.

LISTER HILL,
PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
GEORGE AIKEN,
I. M. IVES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The conference agreement largely conforms to the bill as passed by the House.

The House version provided that courses should be initiated no later than September 1, 1954, or 2 years after discharge or release. The Senate amendment provided for August 1, 1954, and the conference agreement provides that courses must be initiated by August 20, 1954.

The House version had precluded any training outside the United States except in the Republic of the Philippines. The Senate struck out this provision. The conference agreement permits the taking of courses in institutions of higher learning above the secondary school level in foreign countries. The conferees wish to stress that this program of education should be most carefully supervised. The conference agreement provides that the Veterans' Administration may discontinue benefits to any veteran in a foreign school where his conduct is detrimental to the best interests of the United States.

The one change of program by the veteran is retained as provided in the House version with language which the conferees believe will further strengthen this safeguard in the case of veterans who fail to apply themselves.

The section relating to avocational and recreational courses has had the flight training portion removed, inasmuch as this type of training is covered by very strong safeguards in another section of the bill.

The House version required that at least 25 percent nonveterans should be enrolled in any course offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit school before a veteran could be enrolled. The Senate had reduced this requirement to 10 percent. The conference agreement provides for 15 percent. The conferees emphasized that the Veterans' Administration must be alert to

subterfuges by schools that might attempt to pay tuition of nonveterans in an effort to evade this requirement. The House bill required that certain schools to be eligible for participation in this program must have been in existence for 2 years. The Senate reduced that to 1 year immediately prior to enrollment of the veteran. The agreement retains the 2-year period.

As passed by the House, the bill provided education and training allowance of $110 a month for a veteran taking a full-time course and who has no dependents, or $150 a month for a veteran with dependents, to be paid at the end of each month upon proper certification by the veteran and the school. From this amount the veteran is required to pay all of his expenses incident to his education or training. The version reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and passed by the Senate set up an entirely new formula. It reduced the subsistence allowance for the veteran to $80 where the veteran was single and provided that he should have paid to him an additional sum not to exceed $40 a month to meet the cost of tuition. The Senate amendment provided that the Veterans' Administration would determine the fair and reasonable rates in any school with less than 15 percent nonveterans enrolled. This provision violated the basic spirit and intent of the measure as passed by the House and thus the House conferees strongly resisted the inclusion of this amendment. The conference agreement provides that the $40 a month payment of tuition is to be stricken from the bill and that the system provided in the House approved measure shall apply, with the exception that the rates shall be $110 a month for a veteran taking a full time course and who has no dependents, $135 for a veteran with one dependent, and $160 a month for a veteran with more than one dependent.

For on-the-job training the House bill set the ceiling of allowances and earnings at $225 for a veteran with no dependents; $300 if he has more than one dependent. The version as passed by the Senate provides for $225 if the veteran has no dependent, $275 if he has one dependent, and $310 if he has more than one dependent. For reasons of equity the conferees have eliminated the category involving the dependency status of the veteran, and have set the one figure of $310 per month for a ceiling as the amount a veteran may receive as allowances and earnings under this bill, regardless of his dependency status. It is believed that this will work more equitably and at the same time reduce administrative costs.

A proviso has been added that the Administrator shall not define a full-time course of apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as a standard work week through bona fide collective bargaining agreements. This provision was not in the House bill; however, the managers have agreed to accept it.

The House bill made it mandatory that the Administrator, upon a finding that an institution has charged an eligible veteran an amount in excess of the established charges for nonveterans, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of veterans. The Senate version granted this power, but on a discretionary basis. The conference agreement adopts the Senate position.

The House bill provided that in the case of tax-supported public educational institutions which do not have established charges for tuition which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge an eligible veteran an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies, but not to exceed $21 per month. The Senate bill eliminated that provision and the conference agreement restores it, but with a limitation of not to exceed $10 per month for a full-time course.

Where the State fails to establish a State-approving agency, or where the State asks the Federal Government to act in its behalf, this authority is to be exercised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as provided in the bill as passed by the Senate. The conferees have adopted this position, although the House version provided for the Commissioner of Education to act in this case.

Related to the above is authority to approve certain courses which the House had lodged in the Commissioner of Education and the Senate in the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The conference agreement provides that the authority be centered in the Administrator.

Section 244 provides that the Administrator shall utilize the service of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreement between State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education. This provision was included in the bill as passed by the House and had been eliminated by the Senate. The conference agreement provides for its restoration in its original form.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is directed to form an advisory committee to assist him in the administration of this act. The Commissioner of Education had been made an ex officio member by the House bill and the Secretary of Labor had been added by the Senate bill. The conference agreement provides that the Commissioner of Education and the Director of the Bureau of Apprenticeship shall be ex officio members but not the Secretary of Labor.

In cases where it is found that an officer and employee of the Veterans' Administration or the Office of Education has a conflict of interests between his duties as a Government official and his interest in a school, severe penalties are made applicable. As passed by the House, there was no discretionary authority contained in this application. The Senate added the provision which permitted the waiving of this requirement by the Veterans' Administration where it is shown that the interest of the employee will result in no detriment to the United States or to eligible veterans. This discretionary authority has been retained by the conference agreement.

The Senate bill authorized the Administrator to pay educational institutions which are required to submit certain reports and certifications an allowance for each full-time eligible veteran or a prorated part thereof for a part-time veteran. No such provision was in the House bill. The conference agreement provides for a payment to the educational institution of $1.50 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution, to be made in such manner and at such time as the Administrator may prescribe.

The criminal penalties section has been retained as passed by the House with the exception that the specific forfeiture provision included in the House version has been eliminated. By including the provisions of section 15 of Public Law 2 for application to this act, the same forfeiture provisions now in effect under other programs apply to the veterans violating one of the provisions of the education and training title.

The effective date had been set by the House as September 1, 1952. The Senate changed this date to August 1. The conference agreement provides that it shall be effective as of August 20.

The appropriations of the Veterans' Administration for administration of medical, hospital, and domiciliary benefits and readjustment benefits are made available for expenditure for the provisions of the education title of this act.

TITLE III—LOANS

As passed by both the House and the Senate and as provided in the conference agreement, the loan-guaranty sections of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 are made available to the veterans with service on or after June 27, 1950.

The version as passed by the House provided that the seller of a newly constructed dwelling for initial occupancy should give to the veteran purchaser a warranty. The Senate bill eliminated this provision and the conference agreement conformed to the Senate bill.

The House also granted authority for the Administrator to refuse to appraise dwellings or housing projects which were owned, sponsored or constructed by a person identified with housing previously sold to veterans as to which substantial deficiencies had been discovered. The Senate bill eliminated that provision. The conference agreement provides for its restoration.

The House bill added a new section to title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act which empowered the Administrator to refuse to guarantee or insure loans where it is found that the lender or holder has failed to maintain a loan accounting record or for other reasons specified in the act. The Senate version eliminated this section and the conference agreement provides for its retention in the form approved by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY CREDITS

Title IV of the bill as previously passed by the House provided for $160 a month credit for social-security purposes. This section was stricken by the Senate and the conference agreed to eliminate this title on the assurance that a similar provision in H. R. 7800 will be enacted during the present session of Congress.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

As passed by the House, no unemployment compensation was included in the bill and provision was made in the mustering-out section that mustering-out payments should be in lieu of unemployment compensation or readjustment benefits. The Senate, however, added a section which generally made the veteran eligible for benefits to which he would be entitled under the State laws. The conference agreement in substance provides that the veteran shall be entitled to a maximum benefit of $26 per week for a maximum period of 26 weeks. This provision will be administered by the Secretary of Labor under existing agreements and contracts with the States. The benefit cost and the cost of administration would be paid by the Federal Government.

MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENT

Under World War II law each veteran serving less than 60 days was awarded, upon discharge, a mustering-out payment of $100 for service of less than 60 days with service in this country. The payment was $200 where the serviceman served more than 60 days. For service of more than 60 days and service overseas the payment was $300. The same provisions for identical purposes are made applicable to men serving on or after June 27, 1950, with the section to be administered by the Secretary of the service in which the man served. The amendment added by the Senate providing that the

mustering-out allowance should not be paid in addition to a reenlistment bonus was eliminated by the conference agreement inasmuch as the conferees believed that these payments are for separate purposes and should be treated as such.

An amendment was added in the Senate authorizing the veterans to take courses from the United States Armed Forces Institute within a period of 2 years after their discharge or release. This had been suggested by several veterans now serving in Korea and was eliminated after discussion by the conferees.

For the convenience of Members, a comparison of the text as passed by the House and Senate follows:

Comparison of H. R. 7656 as passed House, Senate, and conference agreement

	H. R. 7656 [1] as passed House	H. R. 7656 as passed Senate	Conference agreement
Title	"Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"	Same	Same.
EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS			
Definitions:			
(1) Basic service period	Period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution.	Same	Same.
(2) Eligible veteran [2]	Active service during basic service period; discharge or release other than dishonorable; 90 days' active service or disability discharge. [3]	Same	Same.
(3) Program of education or training.	Single or plural courses or subjects leading to predetermined objective.	Same	Same.
(4) Course	Organized unit of subject matter	Same	Same.
(5) Dependent	Child, dependent parent, wife, dependent husband.	Same	Same.
(6) Educational institution	All categories of schools, colleges, universities, etc.	Same	Same.
(7) Training establishment	Business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training-on-job.	Same	Same.
(8) Armed Forces	Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.	Same	Same.
(9) State	All States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia.	Same	Same.
(10) Administrator	Administrator of Veterans' Affairs	Same	Same.
(11) Commissioner	United States Commissioner of Education	Same	Same.
Time limits	Initiation by Sept. 1, 1954, or 2 years after discharge, whichever later; completion 7 years after discharge or end of "emergency." Requires continuous pursuit of program on and after last date for initiation subject to right of suspension for periods not exceeding 12 consecutive months, or longer, if approved by Administrator.	Same, except initiation by Aug. 1, 1954	Aug. 20, 1954.
Entitlement	1½ days for each day of service up to 36 months. Entitlement ending after major part of semester or quarter is extended to termination thereof.	Same	Same.
Selection, application, and approval of program.	Veteran may select program leading toward predetermined objective at institution of choice, except no education furnished in foreign schools other than in the Philippines. Must apply to Administrator who shall approve unless he finds veteran does not meet requirements of bill or is already qualified.	Same	Same.
Change of program	1 change prior to initiation limit; 1 change after initiation limit if no prior change and subject to approval.	Same	Same.
Avocational and recreational courses.	Certain courses prohibited. Other listed courses and additional ones found to be recreational or avocational by Administrator may be pursued only on submission of justification.	Same	Same.
Minimum nonveteran enrollment.	At least 25 percent required with certain exceptions.	10 percent required	15 percent.
Period of operation for approval	Course not approvable unless in operation for 2 years or more, subject to certain exceptions.	1 year or more	2 years.
Institutions listed by Attorney General under Executive Order 9835.	Enrollment or payment of allowance for any course in such an institution is barred.	Same	Same.
Education and training allowance.	Administrator would pay veteran a "package" allowance covering his tuition, subsistence, and supplies, except that in certain cases only amount covering tuition and fees to be payable. No payments direct by the Government to institution.	2 checks as indicated below—1 for subsistence and 1 for tuition.	Same as passed by House.
Schedule of rates:			
Full-time instruction	$110 no dependents; $150, with dependents	$80, no dependents; $105, 1 dependent; $130, more than 1 dependent.	$110; $135; $160.
¾-time instruction	$80, no dependents; $110, with dependents	$60, no dependents; $80, 1 dependent; $100, more than 1 dependent.	$80; $100; $120.
½-time instruction	$50, no dependents; $70, with dependents	$40, no dependents; $50, 1 dependent; $70, more than 1 dependent.	$50; $60; $80.
Full-time instruction and supplemental on-job training.	$90, no dependents; $120, with dependents	$75, no dependents; $95, 1 dependent; $115, more than 1 dependent.	$90; $110; $130.
Apprenticeship or other on-job training.	$70, no dependents; $95, with dependents	$70, no dependents; $85, 1 dependent; $105, more than 1 dependent.	$70; $85; $105.
Institutional on-farm training.	$95, no dependents; $120, with dependents	$70, no dependents; $85, 1 dependent; $105, more than 1 dependent. In addition not to exceed $40 per month is allowed for tuition for full time course; money to be paid to veterans.	$95; $110; $130.
Correspondence courses, flight training, and courses of less than ½-time training.	Special provisions apply, gearing educational and training allowance to institutional charges only.	Same	Same.

[1] The other titles of H. R. 7656 would provide old-age and survivors insurance credits, mustering-out payments, and employment assistance.
[2] Veteran ineligible for education and training while in active service. Under SRA, veteran reentering service may receive the benefit, not including subsistence.
[3] Any period during which assigned to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which is substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or as a cadet or midshipman is excluded.

Comparison of H. R. 7656 as passed House, Senate, and conference agreement—Continued

Title	H. R. 7656 as passed House "Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"	H. R. 7656 as passed Senate Same	Conference agreement Same.
	EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS—Continued		
4 months' reduction formula	Allowances for apprentice and other on-job training and institutional on-farm training subject to reduction for each 4 months as course progresses in accordance with mathematical formula.	Same	Same.
Income ceilings	On job allowances subject to reduction when the allowances plus compensation paid to veteran for productive labor performed as part of course exceed $225 per month if no dependents, $300, with dependents.	Same, except $225, no dependents; $275, 1 dependent; and $310, more than 1 dependent.	$310 for all classes.
Full-time courses	Below college trade courses with shop practice requires 30 hours per week minimum; below college course in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates requires a minimum of 25 hours per week; undergraduate college course requires minimum of 14 semester hours or equivalent; other full-time training to be defined by Administrator.	Same	Same.
Overcharges by institution	Administrator to disapprove institution if institution charges or receives in excess of established charges for nonveterans. Authorizes up to $51 for full-time courses for certain tax-supported schools not having nonveteran resident fees.	Administrator may disapprove. No provision.	Same as Senate. Same as House, but not to exceed $10 per month.
Approval of courses	Approval by State approving agencies and in certain instances by Commissioner of Education.	Approval by State approving agencies and in certain instances by Veterans' Administration.	
Use of Federal agencies	Administrator may use services of other Federal agencies. Bill directs utilization of service of Office of Education in certain particulars.	Same.	Same.
Payment for certain State expenses.	Administrator authorized to contract for payment to State and local agencies for necessary salary and travel expenses in ascertaining qualifications of institution and supervising same and furnishing other requested services.	Same	Same.
Standards for approving courses	Provides detailed standards for on-the-job, on-farm, and all institutional courses (accreditation procedure employable in lieu of standards for certain established courses).	Same	Same.
Disapproval of course and discontinuance of allowance.	State agency to disapprove course which fails to meet requirements. Administrator authorized to discontinue allowance to veteran if he finds that course fails to meet requirements or if institution has violated any provision.	Same	Same.
Regulations and review of payments by GAO.	Administrator authorized to issue necessary regulations. Review by GAO provided.	Same	Same.
Educational and vocational guidance.	Administrator authorized to provide such service and reimburse veteran for traveling expenses incident thereto where advisement is required by Administrator.	Same	Same.
Advisory committee	Administrator directed to form advisory committee composed of educators and including Commissioner of Education, ex officio.	Similar, including representatives of education, labor, and management.	Similar to Senate version.
Control by Federal agency prohibited.	Standard provision precluding Federal supervision or control of State agencies and institutions.	Same	Same.
Conflicts of interests	Employees of VA, Office of Education or State agency having pecuniary interest in profit institutions to be dismissed, courses disapproved by State if conflicting interests develop.	Same, but with discretionary authority for waiving when no conflict found.	Similar to Senate version.
Recovery of overpayments	Provides for recovery from institution of overpayment of allowance to veteran resulting from (1) willful or negligent failure of institution to report excessive absence, etc., or (2) false certification by institution.	Same	Same.
False or misleading statements	Administrator not to make payments to any person who has willfully submitted false or misleading claims.	Same	Same.
Payment to schools for services	No provision	Payment to each school for filing reports on submitting certificates.	$1.50 payment per month per veteran.
Criminal penalties and forfeitures	Person who knowingly and willfully makes false statement or commits certain other defined acts to forfeit all rights and benefits under the program and under Public Law 2, 73d Cong., as amended, and upon conviction could be fined up to $500 or imprisoned up to 6 months, or both. Person violating such provisions who is not affected by forfeiture could be fined up to $5,000 or imprisoned up to 3 years, or both.	Person violating such provision could be fined up to $5,000, or imprisoned up to 3 years, or both.	Same as Senate version.
Waiver of overpayments	Contains standard provision for waiving recovery of overpayments of training allowance where Administrator finds that the person is not at fault and recovery would defeat purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience.	Same	Same.
Federal Trade Commission	Required to keep State agencies advised of information available to FTC which might be of assistance to State agencies in carrying out their duties.	Same	Same.
Veterans' Education Appeals Board.	No provisions, as payments to institutions not involved under the bill.	Same	Same.
Effective date of educational and training provisions.	Effective on enactment but no education and training allowances payable for period prior to Sept. 1, 1952.	Effective date Aug. 1, 1952	Aug. 20, 1952.
Participation in U. S. Armed Forces Institute courses by veterans.	No provision	Courses may be initiated within 2 years after discharge or release.	No provision.

Comparison of H. R. 7656 as passed House, Senate, and conference agreement—Continued

	H. R. 7656 as passed House	H. R. 7656 as passed Senate	Conference agreement
Title	"Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"	Same	Same.
LOAN ASSISTANCE			
Service group and nature of benefit.	Extends title III of SRA (guaranty and insurance of home, farm, and business loans, and direct home loans in certain cases) to veterans of service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	Same	Same.
Additional amendments to present law.	Makes certain other amendments to title III of SRA, including (1) specific authority to require advance approval of certain loans notwithstanding automatic guaranty provision; (2) requirements that new home construction meet minimum standards for planning and general acceptability as well as construction standards; (3) construction warranty to veteran purchaser for initial occupancy; (4) authority to refuse appraisal of housing handled by persons with poor record as to dealings with veteran purchaser; and (5) authority to exclude from future loan guaranties lenders with record of dealings detrimental to veteran or Government.	No warranty, no provision to refuse appraisal, no authority to exclude from future loans certain lenders.	Warranty eliminated; otherwise as passed House.
SOCIAL-SECURITY, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION, MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENT BENEFITS			
Old-age and survivors insurance	Gives $160 credit for each month spent in the service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	No provision	No provision.
Unemployment compensation	No provision	Gives credit for service in Armed Forces; benefits based on State laws.	Maximum $26 per week for 26 weeks under State laws.
Mustering-out payments	Grants $100 for veterans serving less than 60 days, $200 for veterans serving more than 60 days, and $300 for veterans serving more than 60 days and with service overseas. Includes up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and Air Force and lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy.	Same	Same.
JOB ASSISTANCE			
Employment benefits	Grants preference in employment based on service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to a date to be determined.	Same	Same.

Also, for the convenience of the Members, the text as agreed upon follows:

"AN ACT To provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

"TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

"Short title

"SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the 'Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952'.

"Statement of policy

"SEC. 102. The Congress of the United States hereby declares that the veterans' education and training program created by this Act is for the purpose of providing vocational readjustment and restoring lost educational opportunities to those service men and women whose educational or vocational ambitions have been interrupted or impeded by reason of active service in the Armed Forces during a period of national emergency and for the purpose of aiding such persons in attaining the educational and training status which they might normally have aspired to and obtained had they not served their country; and that the home, farm, and business-loan benefits, the unemployment compensation benefits, the mustering out payments, and the employment assistance provided for by this Act are for the purpose of assisting in the readjustment of such persons from military to civilian life.

"TITLE II—EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASSISTANCE

"Part I—Definitions

"SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

"(1) the term 'basic service period' means the period beginning on June 27, 1950, and ending on such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress;

"(2) the term 'eligible veteran' means any person who is not in the active service in the Armed Forces and who—

"(A) has served in the active service in the Armed Forces at any time during the basic service period,

"(B) has been discharged or released from such active service under conditions other than dishonorable, and

"(C) has served in the active service in the Armed Forces for 90 days or more (exclusive of any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians, or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies), or has been discharged or released from active service by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability;

"(3) the term 'program of education or training' means any single unit course or subject, any curriculum, or any combination of unit courses or subjects, which is generally accepted as necessary to fulfill requirements for the attainment of a predetermined and identified educational, professional, or vocational objective;

"(4) the term 'course' means an organized unit of subject matter in which instruction is offered within a given period of time or which covers a specific amount of related subject matter for which credit toward graduation or certification is usually given;

"(5) the term 'dependent' means—

"(A) a child (as defined in paragraph VI of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended) of an eligible veteran,

"(B) a parent (as defined in paragraph VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 10, as amended) of an eligible veteran, if the parent is in fact dependent upon the veteran, and

"(C) the wife of an eligible veteran, or, in the case of an eligible veteran who is a woman, her husband if he is in fact dependent upon the veteran;

"(6) the term 'educational institution' means any public or private elementary school, secondary school, vocational school, correspondence school, business school, junior college, teachers college, college, normal school, professional school, university, scientific or technical institution, or other institution furnishing education for adults;

"(7) the term 'training establishment' means any business or other establishment providing apprentice or other training on the job, including those under the supervision of a college or university or any State department of education, or any State apprenticeship agency, or any State board of vocational education, or any joint apprentice committee, or the Bureau of Apprenticeship established in accordance with Public Law 308, Seventy-fifth Congress, or any agency of the Federal Government authorized to supervise such training;

"(8) the term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States;

"(9) the term 'State' means the several States, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia;

"(10) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and

"(11) the term 'Commissioner' means the United States Commissioner of Education.

"Part II—Eligibility

"Entitlement to Education or Training Generally

"SEC. 211. Each eligible veteran shall, subject to the provisions of this title, be entitled to the education or training provided under this title.

"Commencement; Time Limitations

"SEC 212. (a) No eligible veteran shall be entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title after August 20, 1954, or after two years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is later.

"(b) The program of education and training of an eligible veteran under this title shall, on and after the delimiting date for the veteran to initiate his program, be pursued continuously until completion except that an eligible veteran may suspend the pursuit of his program for periods of not more than 12 consecutive months, and may suspend the pursuit of such program for longer periods if the Administrator finds that the suspension for each such period was due to conditions beyond the control of the eligible veteran.

"(c) In the event an eligible veteran returns to active service in the Armed Forces during the basic service period, his date of discharge or release shall, for the purposes of this section and section 213, be the date of his discharge or release from his last period of active service which began during the basic service period.

"Expiration of All Education and Training

"SEC. 213. No education or training shall be afforded an eligible veteran under this title beyond 7 years after either his discharge or release from active service or the end of the basic service period, whichever is earlier.

"Duration of Veteran's Education or Training

"SEC. 214. (a) Each eligible veteran shall be entitled to education or training under this title for a period equal to one and a half times the duration of his active service in the Armed Forces during the basic service period (or to the equivalent thereof in part-time training), except that—

"(1) in computing the duration of his active service in the Armed Forces, there shall be excluded a period equal to any period he was assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians or as a cadet or midshipman at one of the service academies;

"(2) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this title shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed thirty-six months; and

"(3) the period of education or training to which an eligible veteran shall be entitled under this title together with education or training received under part VII (Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, and Public Law 894, Eighty-first Congress, as amended), or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, shall not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed forty-eight months in the aggregate

"(b) Whenever the period of entitlement to education or training under this title of an eligible veteran who is enrolled in an educational institution regularly operated on the quarter or semester system ends during a quarter or semester and after a major part of such semester or quarter has expired, such period shall be extended to the termination of such unexpired quarter or semester. In all other courses offered by educational institutions, whenever the period of eligibility ends after a major portion of the course is completed such period may be extended to the end of the course or for nine weeks, whichever is the lesser period.

"(c) In the case of any eligible veteran who is pursuing any program of education or training exclusively by correspondence, one-fourth of the elapsed time in following such program of education or training shall be charged against the veteran's period of entitlement.

"Part III—Enrollment

"Selection of Program

"SEC. 221. Subject to the provisions of this title, each eligible veteran may select a program of education or training to assist him in attaining an educational, professional, or vocational objective at any educational institution or training establishment selected by him, whether or not located in the State in which he resides, which will accept and retain him as a student or trainee in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution or establishment finds him qualified to undertake or pursue. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, an eligible veteran may not pursue a program of education or training at an educational institution or training establishment which is not located in a State, unless such program is pursued at an approved educational institution of higher learning. The Administrator in his discretion may deny or discontinue the enrollment under this title of any veteran in a foreign educational institution if he finds that such enrollment is not for the best interest of the veteran or the Government.

"Applications; Approval

"SEC. 222. Any eligible veteran who desires to initiate a program of education or training under this title shall submit an application to the Administrator which shall be in such form, and contain such information, as the Administrator shall prescribe. The Administrator shall approve such application unless he finds that such veteran is not eligible for or entitled to the education or training applied for or that his program of education or training fails to meet any of the requirements of this title, or that the eligible veteran is already qualified by reason of previous education or training for the educational, professional, or vocational objective for which the courses of the program of education or training are offered. The Administrator shall notify the eligible veteran of the approval or disapproval of his application.

"Change of Program

"SEC. 223. (a) Subject to the provisions of section 222, each eligible veteran (except an eligible veteran whose program has been interrupted or discontinued due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application) may, at any time prior to the end of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title, make not more than one change of program of education or training.

"(b) Each eligible veteran, who has not made a change of program of education or training before the expiration of the period during which he is entitled to initiate a program of education or training under this title, may make not more than one change of program of education or training with the approval of the Administrator. The Administrator shall approve such a change if he finds that—

"(1) the eligible veteran is not making satisfactory progress in his present program and that the failure is not due to his own misconduct, his own neglect, or his own lack of application, and if the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change is more in keeping with his aptitude or previous education and training; or

"(2) the program to which the eligible veteran desires to change, while not a part of the program currently pursued by him, is a normal progression from such program.

"Avocational and Recreational Courses

"SEC. 224. (a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any bartending course, dancing course, or personality development course.

"(b) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran—

"(1) in any photography course or entertainment course; or

"(2) in any music course—instrumental or vocal—public-speaking course, or course in sports or athletics, such as horseback riding, swimming, fishing, skiing, golf, baseball, tennis, bowling, sports officiating, or other sport or athletic course, except courses of applied music, physical education, or public speaking which are offered by institutions of higher learning for credit as an integral part of a program leading to an educational objective; or

(3) in any other type of course which the Administrator finds to be avocational or recreational in character;

unless the eligible veteran submits justification showing that the course will be of bona fide use in the pursuit of his present or contemplated business or occupation.

"Discontinuance for Unsatisfactory Progress

"SEC. 225. The Administrator shall discontinue the education and training allowance of an eligible veteran if, at any time, he finds that, according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the educational institution or training establishment, the conduct or progress of such veteran is unsatisfactory.

"Minimum Number of Nonveteran Students Required

"SEC. 226. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of any eligible veteran, not already enrolled, in any nonaccredited course below the college level offered by a proprietary profit or proprietary nonprofit educational institu ion for any period during which the Administrator finds that more than eighty-five per centum of the students enrolled in the course are having all or any part of their tuition, fees, or other charges paid to or for them by the educational institution or the Veterans' Administration under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) or this title.

"Period of Operation for Approval

"SEC. 227. (a) The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of an eligible veteran in any course offered by an educational institution when such course has been in operation for less than two years.

"(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any course to be pursued in a public or other tax-supported educational institution;

"(2) any course which is offered by an educational institution which has been in operation for more than two years, if such course is similar in character to the instruction previously given by such institution; or

"(3) any course which has been offered by an institution for a period of more than 2 years, notwithstanding the institution has moved to another location within the same general locality.

"Institutions Listed by Attorney General

"SEC. 228. The Administrator shall not approve the enrollment of, or payment of an education and training allowance to, any

eligible veteran in any course in an educational institution or training establishment while it is listed by the Attorney General under section 3 of part III of Executive Order 9835, as amended.

"Part IV—Payments to veterans

"Education and Training Allowance

"SEC. 231. (a) The Administrator shall pay to each eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this title, and who applies therefor, an education and training allowance to meet in part the expenses of his subsistence, tuition, fees, supplies, books, and equipment.

"(b) The education and training allowance for an eligible veteran shall be paid, as provided in section 232, only for the period of the veteran's enrollment as approved by the Administrator, but no allowance shall be paid—

"(1) to any veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 253 or a course of institutional on-farm training for any period when the veteran is not pursuing his course in accordance with the regularly established policies and regulations of the institution and the requirements of this title;

"(2) to any veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 254 or in a course of apprentice or other training on the job for any day of absence in excess of thirty days in a twelve-month period, not counting as absences weekends or legal holidays established by Federal or State law during which the institution or establishment is not regularly in session or operation, or

"(3) to any veteran pursuing his program of education exclusively by correspondence for any period during which no lessons were serviced by the institution.

"(c) No education and training allowance shall be paid to an eligible veteran for any period until the Administrator shall have received—

"(1) from the eligible veteran (A) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 253 or a course of institutional on-farm training, a certification that he was actually enrolled in and pursuing the course as approved by the Administrator, or (B) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a course approved under section 254 or a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a certification as to actual attendance during such period, or (C) in the case of an eligible veteran enrolled in a program of education or training by correspondence, a certification as to the number of lessons actually completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, and

"(2) from the educational institution or training establishment, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, that such veteran was enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training during such period, and, in the case of an institution furnishing education or training to a veteran exclusively by correspondence, a certification, or an endorsement on the veteran's certificate, as to the number of lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution.

Education and training allowances shall, insofar as practicable, be paid within 20 days after receipt by the Administrator of the certifications required by this subsection.

"Computation of Education and Training Allowances

"SEC. 232. (a) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training in an educational institution and is not entitled to receive an education and training allowance under subsection (b), (c), (d), (e), or (f) shall be computed as follows:

"(1) If such program is pursued on a full-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $110 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $135 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $160 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(2) If such program is pursued on a three-quarters time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $80 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $100 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $120 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(3) If such program is pursued on a half-time basis, such allowance shall be computed at the rate of $50 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or at the rate of $60 per month, if he has one dependent, or at the rate of $80 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(b) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a full-time program of education and training which consists of institutional courses and on-the-job training, with the on-the-job training portion of the program being strictly supplemental to the institutional portion, shall be computed at the rate of (1) $90 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent.

"(c) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing apprentice or other training on the job shall be computed at the rate of (1) $70 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $85 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $105 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training alowance shall be reduced at the end of each four-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to the basic education and training allowance as four months bears to the total duration of his apprentice or other training on the job; but in no case shall the Administrator pay an education and training allowance under this subsection in an amount which, when added to the compensation to be paid to the veteran, in accordance with his approved training program, for productive labor performed as a part of his course, would exceed the rate of $310 per month. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of months of such training a multiple of four.

"(d) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has one dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than one dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of each 4-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has one dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than one dependent, as 4 months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training. For the purpose of computing allowances under this subsection, the duration of the training of an eligible veteran shall be the period specified in the approved application as the period during which he may receive an education and training allowance for such training, plus such additional period, if any, as is necessary to make the number of such months of such training a multiple of four.

"(e) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing a program of education or training exclusively by correspondence shall be computed on the basis of the established charge which the institution requires nonveterans to pay for the course or courses pursued by the eligible veteran. Such allowance shall be paid quarterly on a pro rata basis for the lessons completed by the veteran and serviced by the institution, as certified by the institution.

"(f) The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran who is pursuing a program of education or training under this title in an educational institution on a less-than-half-time basis shall be computed at the rate of (1) the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, or (2) $110 per month for a full-time course, whichever is the lesser.

"(g) Each eligible veteran who is pursuing an approved course of flight training shall be paid an education and training allowance to be computed at the rate of 75 per centum of the established charge which similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same flight course are required to pay for tuition for the course. If such veteran's program of education or training consists exclusively of flight training, he shall not be paid an education and training allowance under one of the preceding subsections of this section; if his program of education or training consists of flight training and other education or training, the allowance payable under this subsection shall be in addition to any education and training allowance payable to him under one of the preceding subsections of this section for education or training other than flight training. Such allowance shall be paid monthly upon receipt of certification from the eligible veteran and the institution as to the actual flight training received by the veteran. In each such case the eligible veteran's period of entitlement shall be charged (in addition to any charge made against his entitlement by reason of education or training other than flight training) with one day for each $1.25 which is paid to the veteran as an education and training allowance for such course.

"(h) No eligible veteran shall be paid an education and training allowance under this title for any period during which (1) he is enrolled in and pursuing a course of education or training paid for by the United States under any provision of law other than this title, where the payment of such allowance would constitute a duplication of benefits paid to the veteran from the Federal Treasury, or (2) he is pursuing a course of apprentice or other training on the job, a course of institutional on-farm training, or a course of education and training described in subsection (b), on a less than full-time basis.

"Full-time Courses

"SEC. 233. (a) For the purposes of this title, (1) an institutional trade or technical course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level involving shop practice as an integral part thereof, shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of thirty hours per week of attendance is required with not more than two and one-half hours of rest periods per week allowed, (2) an institutional course offered on a clock-hour basis below the college level in which theoretical or classroom instruction predominates shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of twenty-five hours per week net of instruction is required, and (3) an institutional undergraduate course offered by a college or university on a quarter or semester-hour basis for which credit is granted toward a standard college degree shall be considered a full-time course when a minimum of fourteen semester hours or its equivalent is required.

"(b) The Administrator shall define full-time training in the case of all types of courses of education or training other than

institutional on-farm training and the types of courses referred to in subsection (a): *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not define full-time apprentice training for a particular establishment other than that established as the standard work-week through bona-fide collective bargaining between employers and employees.

"Overcharges by Educational Institutions

"SEC. 234. The Administrator may, if he finds that an institution has charged or received from any eligible veteran any amount in excess of the established charges for tuition and fees which the institution requires similarly circumstanced nonveterans enrolled in the same course to pay, disapprove such educational institution for the enrollment of any veteran not already enrolled therein, except that, in the case of a tax supported public educational institution which does not have established charges for tuition and fees which it requires nonveteran residents to pay, such institution may charge and receive from each eligible veteran who is a resident an amount equal to the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction attributable to such veteran, but in no event to exceed the rate of $10 per month for a full time course.

"Part V—State approving agencies

"Designation

"SEC. 241. (a) Unless otherwise established by the law of the State concerned, the chief executive of each State is requested to create or designate a State department or agency as the 'State approving agency' for his State for the purposes of this title.

"(b) (1) In the event any State fails or declines to create or designate a State approving agency, the provisions of this title which refer to the State approving agency shall, with respect to such State, be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"(2) In the case of courses subject to approval by the Administrator under section 242, the provisions of this title which refer to a State approving agency shall be deemed to refer to the Administrator.

"Approval of Courses

"SEC. 242. (a) An eligible veteran shall receive the benefits of this title while enrolled in a course of education or training offered by an educational institution or training establishment only if such course is approved by the State approving agency for the State where such educational institution or training establishment is situated or by the Administrator. Approval of courses by State approving agencies shall be in accordance with the provisions of this title and such other regulations and policies as the State approving agency may adopt. Each State approving agency shall furnish the Administrator with a current list of educational institutions and training establishments, specifying courses which it has approved, and, in addition to such list, it shall furnish such other information to the Administrator as it and the Administrator may determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of the disapproval of any course previously approved and shall set forth the reasons for such disapproval.

"(b) The Administrator shall be responsible for the approval of courses of education or training offered by any agency of the Federal Government authorized under other laws to supervise such education or training. The Administrator may approve any course in any other educational institution or training establishment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"Cooperation

"SEC. 243. (a) The Administrator and each State approving agency shall take cognizance of the fact that definite duties, functions, and responsibilities are conferred upon the Administrator and each State approving agency under the veterans' educational programs. To assure that such programs are effectively and efficiently administered, the cooperation of the Administrator and the State approving agencies is essential. It is necessary to establish an exchange of information pertaining to activities of educational institutions and training establishments, and particular attention should be given to the enforcement of approval standards, enforcement of wage and income limitations, enforcement of enrollment restrictions, and fraudulent and other criminal activities on the part of persons connected with educational institutions and training establishments in which veterans are enrolled under this title.

"(b) The Administrator will furnish the State approving agencies with copies of such Veterans' Administration informational material as may aid them in carrying out this title.

"Use of Agencies

"SEC. 244. (a) In carrying out his functions under this title, the Administrator may utilize the facilities and services of any other Federal department or agency. The Administrator shall utilize the services of the Office of Education in developing cooperative agreements between the Administrator and State and local agencies relating to the approval of courses of education or training as provided for in section 245, in reviewing the plan of operations of State approving agencies under such agreements, and in rendering technical assistance to such State and local agencies in developing and improving policies, standards, and legislation in connection with their duties under this title.

"(b) Any such utilization shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall (except in the case of the Office of Education) be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement. Funds necessary to enable the Office of Education to carry out its functions under this title are authorized to be appropriated directly to such Office.

"Reimbursement of Expenses

"SEC. 245. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements with State and local agencies to pay such State and local agencies for reasonable and necessary expenses of salary and travel incurred by employees of such agencies in (1) rendering necessary services in ascertaining the qualifications of educational institutions and training establishments for furnishing courses of education or training to eligible veterans under this title, and in the supervision of such educational institutions and training establishments, and (2) furnishing, at the request of the Administrator, any other services in connection with this title. Each such contract or agreement shall be conditioned upon compliance with the standards and provisions of this title.

"Part VI—Approval of courses of education and training

"Apprentice or Other Training on the Job

"SEC. 251. (a) Apprentice or other training on the job shall consist of courses offered by training establishments whenever such courses of training are furnished in accordance with the provisions of this section. Any training establishment desiring to furnish a course of apprentice or other training on the job shall submit to the appropriate State approving agency a written application setting forth the course of training for each job for which an eligible veteran is to be trained. The written application covering the course of training shall include the following:

"(1) Title and description of the specific job objective for which the eligible veteran is to be trained;

"(2) The length of the training period;

"(3) A schedule listing various operations for major kinds of work or tasks to be learned and showing for each, job operations or work, tasks to be performed, and the approximate length of time to be spent on each operation or task;

"(4) The wage or salary to be paid at the beginning of the course of training, at each successive step in the course, and at the completion of training;

"(5) The entrance wage or salary paid by the establishment to employees already trained in the kind of work for which the veteran is to be trained; and

"(6) The number of hours of supplemental related instruction required.

"(b) The appropriate State approving agency may approve a course of apprentice or other training on the job specified in an application submitted by a training establishment in accordance with subsection (a) if such training establishment is found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The training content of the course is adequate to qualify the eligible veteran for appointment to the job for which he is to be trained.

"(2) There is reasonable certainty that the job for which the eligible veteran is to be trained will be available to him at the end of the training period.

"(3) The job is one in which progression and appointment to the next higher classification are based upon skills learned through organized training on the job and not on such factors as length of service and normal turn-over.

"(4) The wages to be paid the eligible veteran for each successive period of training are not less than those customarily paid in the training establishment and in the community to a learner in the same job who is not a veteran.

"(5) The job customarily requires a period of training of not less than 3 months and not more than 2 years of full-time training, except that this provision shall not apply to apprentice training.

"(6) The length of the training period is no longer than that customarily required by the training establishment and other training establishments in the community to provide an eligible veteran with the required skills, arrange for the acquiring of job knowledge, technical information, and other facts which the eligible veteran will need to learn in order to become competent on the job for which he is being trained.

"(7) Provision is made for related instruction for the individual eligible veteran who may need it.

"(8) There is in the training establishment adequate space, equipment, instructional material, and instructor personnel to provide satisfactory training on the job.

"(9) Adequate records are kept to show the progress made by each eligible veteran toward his job objective.

"(10) Appropriate credit is given the eligible veteran for previous training and job experience, whether in the military service or elsewhere, his beginning wage adjusted to the level to which such credit advances him and his training period shortened accordingly and provision is made for certification by the training establishment that such credit has been granted and the beginning wage adjusted accordingly. No course of training will be considered bona fide if given to an eligible veteran who is already qualified by training and experience for the job objective.

"(11) A signed copy of the training agreement for each eligible veteran, including the training program and wage scale as approved by the State approving agency, is provided to the veteran and to the Administrator and the State approving agency by the employer.

"(12) Upon completion of the course of training furnished by the training establishment the eligible veteran is given a certificate by the employer indicating the length and type of training provided and that the eligible veteran has completed the course of training on the job satisfactorily.

"(13) That the course meets such other criteria as may be established by the State approving agency.

"Institutional On-Farm Training

"SEC. 252. (a) An eligible veteran shall be entitled to the benefits of this title while enrolled in a course of full-time institutional on-farm training which has been approved by the appropriate State approving agency in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(b) The State approving agency may approve a course of institutional on-farm training when it satisfies the following requirements:

"(1) The course combines organized group instruction in agricultural and related subjects of at least two hundred hours per year (and of at least eight hours each month) at an educational institution, with supervised work experience on a farm or other agricultural establishment.

"(2) The eligible veteran will perform a part of such course on a farm or other agricultural establishment under his control.

"(3) The course is developed with due consideration to the size and character of the farm or other agricultural establishment on which the eligible veteran will receive his supervised work experience and to the need of such eligible veteran, in the type of farming for which he is training, for proficiency in planning, producing, marketing, farm mechanics, conservation of resources, food conservation, farm financing, farming management, and the keeping of farm and home accounts.

"(4) The eligible veteran will receive not less than one hundred hours of individual instruction per year, not less than fifty hours of which shall be on such farm or other agricultural establishment (with at least two visits by the instructor to such farm each month). Such individual instruction shall be given by the instructor responsible for the veteran's institutional instruction and shall include instruction and home-study assignments in the preparation of budgets, inventories, and statements showing the production, use on the farm, and sale of crops, livestock, and livestock products.

"(5) The eligible veteran will be assured of control of such farm or other agricultural establishment (whether by ownership, lease, management agreement, or other tenure arrangement) until the completion of his course.

"(6) Such farm or other agricultural establishment shall be of a size and character which (A) will, together with the group-inspection part of the course, occupy the full time of the eligible veteran, (B) will permit instruction in all aspects of the management of the farm or other agricultural establishment of the type for which the eligible veteran is being trained, and will provide the eligible veteran an opportunity to apply to the operation of his farm or other agricultural establishment the major portion of the farm practices taught in the group instruction part of the course, and (C) will assure him a satisfactory income for a reasonable living under normal conditions at least by the end of his course.

"(7) Provision shall be made for certification by the institution and the veteran that the training offered does not repeat or duplicate training previously received by the veteran.

"(8) The institutional on-farm training meets such other fair and reasonable standards as may be established by the State approving agency.

"Approval of Accredited Courses

"SEC. 253. (a) A State approving agency may approve the courses offered by an educational institution when—

"(1) such courses have been accredited and approved by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association;

"(2) credit for such course is approved by the State department of education for credit toward a high school diploma;

"(3) such courses are conducted under the Act of February 23, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 927), or the Vocational Education Act of 1946, or

"(4) such courses are accepted by the State department of education for credit for a teacher's certificate or a teacher's degree.

For the purposes of this title the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies and associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of training offered by an educational institution and the State approving agencies may, upon concurrence, utilize the accreditation of such accrediting associations or agencies for approval of the courses specifically accredited and approved by such accrediting association or agency. In making application for approval, the institution shall transmit to the State approving agency copies of its catalog or bulletin.

"(b) As a condition to approval under this section, the State approving agency must find that adequate records are kept by the educational institution to show the progress of each eligible veteran. The State approving agency must also find that the educational institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"Approval of Nonaccredited Courses

"SEC. 254. (a) No course of education or training (other than a course of institutional on-farm training) which has not been approved by a State approving agency pursuant to section 253, which is offered by a public or private, profit or nonprofit, educational institution shall be approved for the purposes of this title unless the educational institution offering such course submits to the appropriate State approving agency a written application for approval of such course in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) Such application shall be accompanied by not less than two copies of the current catalog or bulletin which is certified as true and correct in content and policy by an authorized owner or official and includes the following:

"(1) Identifying data, such as volume number and date of publication;

"(2) Names of the institution and its governing body, officials and faculty;

"(3) A calendar of the institution showing legal holidays, beginning and ending date of each quarter, term, or semester, and other important dates;

"(4) Institution policy and regulations on enrollment with respect to enrollment dates and specific entrance requirements for each course;

"(5) Institution policy and regulations relative to leave, absences, class cuts, make-up work, tardiness and interruptions for unsatisfactory attendance;

"(6) Institution policy and regulations relative to standards of progress required of the student by the institution (this policy will define the grading system of the institution, the minimum grades considered satisfactory, conditions for interruption for unsatisfactory grades or progress and a description of the probationary period, if any, allowed by the institution, and conditions of reentrance for those students dismissed for unsatisfactory progress. A statement will be made regarding progress records kept by the institution and furnished the student);

"(7) Institution policy and regulations relating to student conduct and conditions for dismissal for unsatisfactory conduct;

"(8) Detailed schedule of fees, charges for tuition, books, supplies, tools, student activities, laboratory fees, service charges, rentals, deposits, and all other charges;

"(9) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the student does not enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom;

"(10) A description of the available space, facilities, and equipment;

"(11) A course outline for each course for which approval is requested, showing subjects or units in the course, type of work or skill to be learned, and approximate time and clock hours to be spent on each subject or unit; and

"(12) Policy and regulations of the institution relative to granting credit for previous educational training.

"(c) The appropriate State approving agency may approve the application of such institution when the institution and its nonaccredited courses are found upon investigation to have met the following criteria:

"(1) The courses, curriculum, and instruction are consistent in quality, content, and length with similar courses in public schools and other private schools in the State, with recognized accepted standards.

"(2) There is in the institution adequate space, equipment, instructional materials, and instructor personnel to provide training of good quality.

"(3) Educational and experience qualifications of directors, administrators, and instructors are adequate.

"(4) The institution maintains a written record of the previous education and training of the veteran and clearly indicates that appropriate credit has been given by the institution for previous education and training, with the training period shortened proportionately and the veteran and the Administrator so notified.

"(5) A copy of the course outline, schedule of tuition, fees, and other charges, regulations pertaining to absences, grading policy, and rules of operation and conduct will be furnished the veteran upon enrollment.

"(6) Upon completion of training, the veteran is given a certificate by the institution indicating the approved course and indicating that training was satisfactorily completed.

"(7) Adequate records as prescribed by the State approving agency are kept to show attendance and progress or grades, and satisfactory standards relating to attendance, progress, and conduct are enforced.

"(8) The institution complies with all local, city, county, municipal, State, and Federal regulations, such as fire codes, building and sanitation codes. The State approving agency may require such evidence of compliance as is deemed necessary.

"(9) The institution is financially sound and capable of fulfilling its commitments for training.

"(10) The institution does not utilize advertising of any type which is erroneous or misleading, either by actual statement, omission, or intimation. The institution shall not be deemed to have met this requirement until the State approving agency (1) has ascertained from the Federal Trade Commission whether the Commission has issued an order to the institution to cease and desist from any act or practice, and (2) has, if such an order has been issued, given due weight to that fact.

"(11) The institution does not exceed its enrollment limitations as established by the State approving agency.

"(12) The institution's administrators, directors, owners, and instructors are of good reputation and character.

"(13) The institution has and maintains a policy for the refund of the unused portion of tuition, fees, and other charges in the event the veteran fails to enter the course or withdraws or is discontinued therefrom at any time prior to completion and such policy must provide that the amount charged to the veteran for tuition, fees, and other charges for a portion of the course shall not exceed the approximate pro rata portion of the total charges for tuition, fees, and other charges that the length of the completed portion of the course bears to its total length.

"(14) Such additional criteria as may be deemed necessary by the State approving agency.

'Notice of Approval of Courses

"SEC. 255. The State approving agency, upon determining that an educational institution has complied with all the requirements of this title, will issue a letter to such institution setting forth the courses which have been approved for the purposes of this title, and will furnish an official copy of such letter and any subsequent amendments to the Administrator. The letter of approval shall be accompanied by a copy of the catalog or bulletin of the institution, as approved by the State approving agency, and shall contain the following information:

"(1) date of letter and effective date of approval of courses;

"(2) proper address and name of each educational institution or training establishment;

"(3) authority for approval and conditions of approval, referring specifically to the approved catalog or bulletin published by the educational institution;

"(4) name of each course approved;

"(5) where applicable, enrollment limitations such as maximum numbers authorized and student-teacher ratio;

"(6) signature of responsible official of State approving agency; and

"(7) such other fair and reasonable provisions as are considered necessary by the appropriate State approving agency.

"Disapproval of Courses and Discontinuance of Allowances

"SEC. 256. (a) Any course approved for the purposes of this title which fails to meet any of the requirements of this title shall be immediately disapproved by the appropriate State approving agency. An educational institution or training establishment which has its courses disapproved by a State approving agency will be notified of such disapproval by a registered letter of notification and a return receipt secured.

"(b) The Administrator may discontinue the education and training allowance of any eligible veteran if he finds that the course of education or training in which such veteran is enrolled fails to meet any of the requirements of this title or if he finds that the educational institution or training establishment offering such courses has violated any provision of this title or fails to meet any of its requirements.

"(c) Each State approving agency shall notify the Administrator of each course which it has disapproved under this section. The Administrator shall notify the State approving agency of his disapproval of any educational institution or training establishment under part VII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended.

"Part VII—Miscellaneous provisions

"Authority and Duties of Administrator

"SEC. 261. (a) The Administrator is authorized to prescribe, promulgate, and publish such rules and regulations as are consistent with the provisions of this title and necessary to carry out its purposes. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 of the Act of October 17, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1193), payments under this title shall be subject to audit and review by the General Accounting Office as provided by the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950.

"(b) The Administrator is authorized to accept uncompensated services and to enter into contracts or agreements with private or public agencies, or persons, for necessary services, incident to the administration of this title, including personal services, as he may deem practicable.

"(c) The Administrator may arrange for educational and vocational guidance to persons eligible for education and training under this title and, if the Administrator requires such educational and vocational guidance, he is authorized, in his discretion, to defray, or reimburse the veteran for his traveling expenses to and from the place of advisement. At such intervals as he deems necessary, he shall make available information respecting the need for general education and for trained personnel in the various crafts, trades, and professions: *Provided*, That facilities of other Federal agencies collecting such information shall be utilized to the extent he deems practicable.

"Advisory Committee

"SEC. 262. The Administrator shall form an advisory committee which shall be composed of persons who are eminent in their respective fields of education, labor, and management, and of representatives of the various types of institutions and establishments furnishing education and training to veterans enrolled under this title. The Commissioner and the Director, Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor, shall be ex officio members of the advisory committee. The Administrator shall advise and consult with the committee from time to time with respect to the administration of this title and the committee may make such reports and recommendations as it deems desirable to the Administrator and to the Congress.

"Control by Agencies of United States

"SEC. 263. No department, agency, or officer of the United States, in carrying out this title, shall exercise any supervision or control, whatsoever, over any State approving agency, State educational agency, or State apprenticeship agency, or any educational institution or training establishment: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be deemed to prevent any department, agency, or officer of the United States from exercising any supervision or control which such department, agency, or officer is authorized, by existing provisions of law, to exercise over any Federal educational institution or training establishment, or to prevent the furnishing of education or training under this title in any institution or establishment over which supervision or control is exercised by such other department, agency, or officer under authority of existing provisions of law.

"Conflicting Interests

"SEC. 264. (a) Every officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration or of the Office of Education, who has, while such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, any educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this title shall be immediately dismissed from his office or employment.

"(b) If the Administrator finds that any person who is an officer or employee of a State approving agency has, while he was such an officer or employee, owned any interest in, or received any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, an educational institution operated for profit in which an eligible veteran was pursuing a course of education or training under this title, he shall discontinue making payments under section 245 to such State approving agency unless such agency shall, without delay, take such steps as may be necessary to terminate the employment of such person and such payments shall not be resumed while such person is an officer or employee of the State approving agency, or State Department of Veterans Affairs or State Department of Education.

"(c) A State approving agency shall not approve any course offered by an educational institution operated for profit and, if any such course has been approved, shall disapprove each such course, if it finds that any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, the Office of Education, or the State approving agency owns an interest in, or receives any wages, salary, dividends, profits, gratuities, or services from, such institution.

"(d) The Administrator may, after reasonable notice and public hearings, waive in writing the application of this section in the case of any officer or employee of the Veterans' Administration, of the Office of Education, or of a State approving agency, if he finds that no detriment will result to the United States or to eligible veterans by reason of such interest or connection of such officer or employee.

"Report by Institutions

"SEC. 265. (a) Educational institutions and training establishments shall, without delay, report to the Administrator in the form prescribed by him, the enrollment, interruption, and termination of the education or training of each eligible veteran enrolled therein under this title.

"(b) The Administrator shall pay to each educational institution which is required to submit reports and certifications to the Administrator under this title, an allowance at the rate of $1.50 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution under the provisions of this title to assist the educational institution in defraying the expense of preparing and submitting such report and certifications. Such allowances shall be paid in such manner and at such times as may be prescribed by the Administrator, except that in the event any institution fails to submit reports or certifications to the Administrator as required by this title, no allowance shall be paid to such institution for the month or months during which such reports or certifications were not submitted as required by the Administrator.

"Overpayments to Veterans

"SEC. 266. In any case where it is found by the Administrator that an overpayment has been made to a veteran as the result of (1) the willful or negligent failure of the educational institution or training establishment to report, as required by this title and applicable regulations, to the Veterans' Administration excessive absences from a course, or discontinuance or interruption of a course

by the veteran or (2) false certification by the educational institution or training establishment, the amount of such overpayment shall constitute a liability of such institution or establishment, and may be recovered in the same manner as any other debt due the United States: *Provided*, That any amount so collected shall be reimbursed if the overpayment is recovered from the veteran. This provision shall not preclude the imposition of any civil or criminal action under this or any other statute.

"Examination of Records

"SEC. 267. The records and accounts of educational institutions and training establishments pertaining to eligible veterans who received education or training under this title shall be available for examination by duly authorized representatives of the Government.

"False or Misleading Statements

"SEC. 268. The Administrator shall not make any payments under this title to any person found by him to have willfully submitted any false or misleading claims. In each case where the Administrator finds that an educational institution or training establishment has willfully submitted a false or misleading claim, or where a veteran, with the complicity of an educational institution or training establishment, has submitted such a claim, he shall make a complete report of the facts of the case to the appropriate State approving agency and where deemed advisable to the Attorney General of the United States for appropriate action.

"Criminal Penalties

"SEC. 269. Whoever knowingly and willfully—

"(1) makes or presents any false, fictitious, or fraudulent affidavit, declaration, certificate, voucher, endorsement, or paper or writing purporting to be such, concerning any claim for payment under this title, or pertaining to any matter arising under this title,

"(2) makes or presents any paper required under this title on which paper a date other than the date upon which it was actually signed or acknowledged by the claimant has been willfully inserted,

"(3) certifies falsely that the declarant, affiant, or witness named in such affidavit, declaration, voucher, endorsement, or other paper or writing personally appeared before him and was sworn thereto, or acknowledged the execution thereof, or

"(4) accepts and converts to his own use payments for any period during which he was not actually pursuing a course of education or training under this title for which period payment was made,

shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

"Application of Other Laws

"SEC. 270. The provisions of Public Law Numbered 262, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 607), as amended, the provisions of section 15 of Public Law Numbered 2, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, the provisions of section 12 of Public Law Numbered 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved July 13, 1943 (57 Stat. 557, as amended, and the provisions of titles II and III of Public Law Numbered 844, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 29, 1936, as amended, shall be for application under this title.

"Waiver of Recovery of Overpayments

"SEC. 271. There shall be no recovery of payments of education and training allowance made under this title from any person who, in the judgment of the Administrator, is without fault on his part and where, in the judgment of the Administrator, such recovery would defeat the purpose of benefits otherwise authorized or would be against equity and good conscience. No disbursing officer or certifying officer shall be held liable for any amount paid to any person where the recovery of such amount is waived under this section.

"Information Furnished by Federal Trade Commission

"SEC. 272. The Federal Trade Commission shall keep all State approving agencies advised of any information coming to its attention which would be of assistance to such agencies in carrying out their duties under this title.

"Effective Date

"SEC. 273. This title shall take effect on the date of its enactment, except that no education and training allowance shall be paid for any period prior to August 20, 1952.

"Appropriations

"SEC. 274. The appropriations for the Veterans' Administration under the headings 'Administration, medical, hospital and domiciliary services' and 'Readjustment benefits' are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this title.

"TITLE III—LOANS

"Persons eligible for loans

"SEC. 301. Subsection (a) of section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by inserting after 'war' in the first sentence the following: ', or at any time on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress,';

"(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following: 'Entitlement derived from service on or after June 27, 1950, shall (1) cancel any unused entitlement derived from service prior to June 27, 1950, and (2) be reduced by the amount entitlement from such prior service shall have been used to obtain a direct, guaranteed, or insured loan (a) on real property which the veteran owns at the time of application or (b) as to which the Administrator shall have incurred actual liability or loss, unless in the event of loss or the incurrence and payment of such liability by the Administrator, the resultant indebtedness of the veteran to the Government shall have been paid in full'; and

"(3) by inserting after 'war' in the fourth sentence of such subsection, as amended by this section, the following: ', and any loan to a veteran eligible by virtue of active service on or after June 27, 1950, if made within ten years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress,'.

"Power of Administrator to examine loans

"SEC. 302. Section 500 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Notwithstanding the provisions in this title respecting automatically guaranteed loans, the Administrator may at any time upon thirty days' notice require loans to be made by any lender or class of lenders to be submitted for prior approval, and no guaranty or insurance liability shall exist in respect to such loans unless evidence of guaranty or insurance is issued by the Administrator.'

"Additional requirement for guaranteed loans

"SEC. 303. Section 501 (a) (2) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'expenses' the following: ', and the veteran is a satisfactory credit risk'.

"Standards of planning and construction

"SEC. 304. Section 504 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(b) No loan for the purchase or construction of residential property on which construction is begun subsequent to sixty days from the date the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 becomes effective shall be financed through the assistance of the provisions of this title unless the property meets or exceeds minimum requirements for planning, construction, and general acceptability prescribed by the Administrator: *Provided*, That subsection 504 (b) as originally enacted shall continue to be applicable to construction begun prior to the end of such sixty-day period: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to a loan for the purchase of residential property the construction of which was completed more than one year prior to the making of such loan.

"'(c) The Administrator shall have the right to refuse to appraise any dwelling or housing project owned, sponsored, or to be constructed by any person identified with housing previously sold to veterans under this title as to which substantial deficiencies have been discovered, or as to which there has been a failure or indicated inability to discharge contractual liabilities to veterans, or as to which it is ascertained that the type of contract of sale or the methods or practices pursued in relation to the marketing of such properties were unfair or unduly prejudicial to veteran purchasers.'

"Eligibility for loans to refinance existing liability

"SEC. 305. Section 507 (1) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: 'or, in the case of a veteran eligible by virtue of active service on or after June 27, 1950, not later than 10 years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.'

"Expiration of authority to make direct loans

"SEC. 306. Section 512 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by striking out '(D)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(C)' and by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: ', except that if a commitment to make such a loan was issued by the Administrator prior to that date the loan may be completed subsequent to such date.'

Refusal to guarantee or insure loans in certain cases

"SEC. 307. Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 514. Whenever the Administrator finds with respect to loans guaranteed or insured under this title that any lender or holder has failed to maintain adequate loan accounting records, or to demonstrate proper ability to service loans adequately or to exercise proper credit judgment or has willfully or negligently engaged in practices otherwise detrimental to the interest of veterans or of the Government, he may refuse either temporarily or permanently to guarantee or insure any loans made by such lender or holder or bar such lender or holder from acquiring loans guaranteed or insured under this title: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not refuse to pay a guarantee on loans therefore entered into in good faith between the veteran and the lending institution.'

"TITLE IV—UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS OF SERVICE ON OR AFTER JUNE 27, 1950

"Compensation for veterans under State agreements

"SEC. 401 (a). The Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the agency administering the unemployment compensation law of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation to veterans, in accordance with the provisions of this title, and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary, and with other State agencies, in making payments of compensation under this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall, except as provided in section 408, provide that compensation at the rate of $26 per week will be paid by the State to any veteran in such State with respect to weeks of unemployment (not in excess of a total of 26 weeks) which occur after the ninetieth day after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, however,* That if a veteran is eligible to receive mustering-out payment under section 502 of this Act, he shall not be eligible to receive compensation under this title with respect to weeks of unemployment completed within thirty days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $100 in such mustering-out payment; within sixty days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $200 in such mustering-out payment; or within ninety days after his discharge or ninety days after the date of the enactment of this Act, whichever date is the later, if he receives $300 in such mustering-out payment.

"(c) Any such agreement shall provide that any determination by a State agency with respect to entitlement to compensation pursuant to an agreement under this section shall be made in accordance with the State unemployment compensation law, insofar as such law is applicable, and shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(d) Each agreement shall provide the terms and conditions upon which it may be amended or terminated.

"Compensation for veterans in absence of State agreements

"SEC. 402. (a) In the case of a veteran who is in a State which has no agreement under this title with the Secretary, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such veteran of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him in the same amounts and for the same periods as provided in section 401 (b). Any determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the State unemployment compensation law of the State in which the veteran is insofar as such law is applicable.

"(b) In the case of a veteran who is in Puerto Rico or in the Virgin Islands, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall, upon the filing by such veteran of a claim for compensation under this subsection, make payments of compensation to him in the same amounts and for the same periods as provided in section 401 (b). Any determination by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this subsection shall be made in accordance with the unemployment compensation law of the District of Columbia, insofar as such law is applicable.

"(c) Any veteran whose claim for compensation under subsection (a) or (b) of this section has been denied shall be entitled to a fair hearing in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Any final determinations by the Secretary with respect to entitlement to compensation under this section shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in section 205 (g) of title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, with respect to final decisions of the Administrator under such title.

"(d) The Secretary may utilize for the purposes of this section the personnel and facilities of the agencies in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands cooperating with the United States Employment Service under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended. For the purpose of payments made to such agencies under such Act, the furnishing of such personnel and facilities shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the public employment offices of such agencies.

"Payments to States

"SEC. 403. (a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the payments of compensation made by such State under and in accordance with an agreement under this title.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar month, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar month were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. Such estimates may be made upon the basis of such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(c) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment to the State in accordance with such certification, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned, at the time specified in the agreement under this title, to the Treasury and credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which payments to States under this title may be made.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any compensation certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f) of this section.

"(h) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III of the Social Security Act, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment compensation law.

"(i) Until such time as funds are appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title, any funds available to the Department of Labor for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration are hereby made available for expenditures necessary to carry out the provisions of this title: *Provided,* That any such expenditures made or obligations incurred shall be adjusted and charged to any applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a law is enacted which contains such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization.

"Information

"SEC. 404. (a) All Federal departments and agencies are directed to make available to State agencies which have agreements under this title or to the Secretary, as the case may be, such information with respect to military service of any veteran as the Secretary may find practicable and necessary for the determination of such veteran's entitlement to compensation under this title.

"(b) The agency administering the unemployment compensation law of any State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary or appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of paragraph (6) of subsection (a) of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended.

"Penalties

"SEC. 405. (a) Whoever makes a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false, or knowingly fails to disclose a material fact, to obtain or increase for himself or for any other individual any payment authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Any person who makes, or causes to be made by another, a false statement or representation of a material fact knowing it to be false or knowingly fails, or causes another to fail, to disclose a material fact, and, as a result thereof has received any amount as compensation under this title to which he was not entitled, shall be liable to repay such amount to the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, for the fund from which the amount was paid or, in the discretion of the State agency or the Secretary, as the case may be, to have such amount deducted from any future compensation payable to him under this title within the two-year period following the finding, if the existence of such nondisclosure or misrepresentation has been found by a court of competent jurisdiction or in connection with a reconsideration or appeal.

"Regulations

"SEC. 406. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The Secretary shall insofar as practicable consult with representatives of the State unemployment compensation agencies before prescribing any rules or regulations which may affect the performance by such agencies of functions pursuant to agreements under this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 407. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'veteran' means any person who has served in the active service in the Armed Forces at any time on or after June

27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who has been discharged or released from such active service under conditions other than dishonorable after continuous service of ninety days or more, or by reason of an actual service-incurred injury or disability.

"(b) The term 'compensation' means the money payments to individuals with respect to their unemployment.

"(c) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(d) The term 'State' includes Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

"(e) The term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States.

"Nonduplication of benefits

"SEC. 408. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no payment shall be made under any agreement under this title, or, in the absence of such an agreement, by the Secretary under this title, to a veteran for—

"(1) any week or any part of a week he is eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) to receive unemployment benefits at a rate equal to or in excess of $26 per week under any Federal or State unemployment compensation law,

"(2) any period with respect to which he receives an education and training allowance under subsection (a), (b), (c), or (d) of section 232 of this Act or a subsistence allowance under part VII or part VIII of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a), as amended, or

"(3) any period he receives additional compensation necessary for his maintenance under section 6 (b) (2) of the Federal Employees Compensation Act, as amended.

"(b) In any case in which, for any week or any part of a week, a veteran is eligible for payment of compensation under this title and is also eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) to receive for such week or such part of a week unemployment benefits at a rate less than $26 per week under any Federal or State unemployment compensation law, such veteran may elect to receive payment of compensation under this title; but if the veteran so elects, the amount of compensation payable under this title shall be reduced by the amount of such compensation benefits for which such veteran is eligible (or would be eligible except for the provisions of this title or except for any action taken by such veteran under this title) under such Federal or State unemployment compensation law.

"(c) If the veteran elects under subsection (b) to receive payment of compensation under this title, he shall be entitled to additional compensation at the rate of $26 per week after the exhaustion of State unemployment benefits until the total compensation received under this title equals $676.

"(d) Under no circumstances shall any veteran receive compensation under this title from more than one State at one time or in a total amount in excess of $676.

"Termination

"SEC. 409. No compensation shall be paid under this title for any week commencing more than five years after the date determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress prescribed in section 407 (a).

"TITLE V—MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS

"Eligibility for payments

"SEC. 501. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, each member of the Armed Forces who shall have been engaged in active service on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who is discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions, shall be eligible to receive mustering-out payment.

"(b) No mustering-out payment shall be made to—

"(1) any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of discharge or relief from active service, is in a pay grade higher than O–3;

"(2) any member of the Armed Forces who, at the time of discharge or release from active service, is entitled to severance pay or is transferred or returned to the retired list with retired pay, retirement pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, or to a status in which he receives such pay: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply upon retirement or separation pursuant to title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949;

"(3) any member of the Armed Forces for any active service performed prior to the date of his discharge or relief from active service on his own initiative to accept employment or, in the case of any member so relieved from active service, for any active service performed prior to the date of his discharge while in such inactive status, unless he has served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska;

"(4) any member of the Armed Forces whose total period of service has been as a student assigned by the Armed Forces to a civilian institution for a course of education or training which was substantially the same as established courses offered to civilians;

"(5) any member of the Armed Forces for any active service performed prior to the date of his discharge from such forces for the purpose of entering the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy;

"(6) any member of the Armed Forces whose sole service has been as a cadet at the United States Military Academy or the United States Coast Guard Academy, or as a midshipman at the United States Naval Academy, or in a preparatory school after nomination as a principal, alternate, or candidate for admission to any of said Academies;

"(7) any commissioned officer unless he is discharged or relieved from active service within 3 years after such date as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress; and

"(8) any member of the Armed Forces who is ordered to active service for the sole purpose of training duty or a physical examination, or for a period of less than sixty days.

"(c) A member of the Armed Forces who is eligible to receive mustering-out payments under this title and under the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 for the same period of active service shall elect to receive such payment either under this title or such Act, but shall not be entitled to payment under both provisions of law.

"Determination of payments

"SEC. 502. (a) Mustering-out payment for persons eligible under section 501 shall be in sums as follows:

"(1) $300 for persons who, having performed active service for sixty days or more, have served outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska,

"(2) $200 for persons who, having performed active service for sixty days or more, have served no part thereof outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

"(3) $100 for persons who have performed active service for less than sixty days.

"(b) Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (1) shall receive one-third of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service, or at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid in two equal installments—one month and two months, respectively, from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (2) shall receive one-half of the stipulated amount at the time of final discharge or ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces; and the remaining amount of such payment shall be paid one month from the date of the original payment. Each person eligible to receive mustering-out payment under subsection (a) (3) shall receive the stipulated amount at the time of such discharge or relief from active service or, at the option of the person so eligible, at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces. A person entitled to receive the first installment of the mustering-out payment at the time of discharge or release for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces shall, at his election, receive the whole of such payment in one lump sum, rather than in installments.

"Time limitations

"SEC. 503. Any member of the Armed Forces entitled to mustering-out payment who shall have been discharged or relieved from active service under honorable conditions before the effective date of this title shall, if application therefor is made within two years after the date of enactment of this title, be paid such mustering-out payment by the Department of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or the Treasury Department, as the case may be, beginning within one month after application has been received and approved by such department. No member of the Armed Forces shall receive mustering-out payment under this title more than once, and such payment shall accrue and the amount thereof shall be computed as of the time of discharge for the purposes of effecting a permanent separation from the service or of ultimate relief from active service or, at the option of such member, for the purpose of enlistment, reenlistment, or appointment in a regular component of the Armed Forces.

"Deceased members

"SEC. 504. If any member of the Armed Forces, after his discharge or relief from active service, shall die before receiving any portion of or the full amount of his mustering-out payment, the balance of the amount due him shall be payable, on appropriate application therefor, to his surviving spouse, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse, then in equal shares to his child or children, if any; and if he shall leave no surviving spouse or child or children, then in equal shares to his surviving parents, if any. No payments under this title shall be made to any other person.

"Administration of title

"SEC. 505. (a) Mustering-out payments due or to become due under this title shall not be assignable and any payments made to or on account of a veteran hereunder shall be exempt from taxation, shall be exempt from the claims of creditors, including any claim of the United States, and shall not be subject to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever either before or after receipt by the payee.

"(b) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury shall make such regulations not inconsistent with this title as may be necessary effectively to carry out the provisions thereof, and their decisions shall be final and not subject to review by any court or other Government official.

"(c) The Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Treasury, or such subordinate officers as they may designate, are authorized to make direct payment to survivors over 17 years of age, and to select a proper person or persons to whom mustering-out payments may be made for the use and benefit of former active members of the Armed Forces, or survivors thereof, as defined by section 504 hereof, without the necessity of appointment by judicial proceedings of a legal representative of any such former member or such survivors when, in the opinion of the respective Secretaries or their designees, the interests of persons under 17 years of age so justify, or where the former active member or his survivors is suffering from a mental disability sufficient to make direct payment not in the best interests of such person or persons. Payments made under the provisions of this subsection shall constitute a complete discharge of the obligation of the United States as provided in this title; and the selection of a proper person or persons, as provided herein, and the correctness of the amount due and paid to such person or persons shall have the same finality as that accorded decisions made pursuant to subsection (b). The provisions of this subsection shall not apply where a legal guardian or committee has been judicially appointed, except as to any payments made hereunder prior to the receipt of notice of appointment.

"Definitions

"SEC. 506. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'spouse' means a lawful wife or husband.

"(b) The term 'child' includes (1) a legitimate child; (2) a child legally adopted; and (3) a stepchild, if, at the time of death of the member of the Armed Forces, such stepchild was a member of the deceased's household.

"(c) The term 'parent' includes father and mother, stepfather and stepmother, and father and mother through adoption.

"(d) The term 'Armed Forces' means the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States.

"TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

"Job counseling and employment placement

"SEC. 601. Section 607 of title IV, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (38 U. S. C. 695f), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 607. The term "veteran" as used in this title shall mean a person who served in the active service of the Armed Forces during a period of war in which the United States has been, or is, engaged, or during the period on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as may be thereafter determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.'

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 603. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act."

J. E. RANKIN,
OLIN E. TEAGUE,
WALTER ROGERS,
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the principal differences between the conference report and the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. RANKIN. That will be done by the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill which we will shortly enact into law represents a tremendous amount of work on the part of the Congress, and particularly upon the part of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Weeks of hearings were held on this subject and weeks of work have gone into the final product.

In all I introduced seven bills on this subject and the bill which will be finally presented to the President closely resembles the bill, H. R. 7642, which I introduced some weeks ago.

I am particularly gratified that the entire education and training allowance is to go to these veterans whose good sense and initiative will be used in determining the type of education and training for which each one is best suited. With the enactment of this bill every benefit which was granted to World War II veterans by legislation emanating from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs will be provided the veterans of the Korean conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to express my very deep regret that the gentleman from Maryland, General DEVEREUX, is leaving the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and going to the Committee on Armed Services. He has been a very valiant fighter on the committee for veterans' rights. He knows all of the laws pertaining to the soldiers, to the servicemen; he knows all the laws now pertaining to the veterans. I would like to state that he was in constant attendance. He never missed a subcommittee hearing and he never missed a full committee hearing, and he never missed a meeting on the floor of the House. You all know that General DEVEREUX was decorated for bravery during the war. Sometimes it takes bravery to speak on the floor, I know. General DEVEREUX is a great fighter.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this report in the main is an excellent report. There was some yielding and giving in while the measure was in conference. I personally would like to have had the Nixon amendment adopted which would have provided direct payments to private schools and institutions, but that was voted out; the conferees voted against it. I was extremely glad that an unemployment insurance compensation amendment was agreed to. It provides $26 a week for 26 weeks. I believe no Member of the House will be opposed to that. Our men in Korea, our fighting men, certainly are entitled to unemployment insurance. The working people of this country, at good wages and happy conditions, are entitled to unemployment compensation. You will recall my remarks in this House yesterday when I said that I did not see how any human being who voted to give unemployment insurance to people who work in factories and other places at good pay could refuse to give unemployment insurance to men who toil and sweat while facing death in Korea.

This feature of the measure was one of the bones of contention in the conference. I am glad to say that I stood by my support of it throughout the discussions, sometimes without much aid. However, I am very happy that this title IV remains in the bill. I believe that the report will be unanimously adopted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is this the report that contains the GI educational provisions?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, as it passed the House. It provides more compensation for men with more than one dependent. The amount for the single man is the same.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentlewoman advise the House as to the provision for GIs who want to go to private colleges? Was there any differentiation on that score?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No, they will pay the tuition themselves instead of having the Federal Government pay it directly to the colleges and schools. I wanted the provision known as the Nixon amendment, which was inserted in the Senate, but the conferees did not agree to it; so the money is paid directly to the men, $110 for a single man, $135 for a man with one dependent, and $160 for a man with more than one dependent. The conferees upped the amount carried in the original House bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then it is left to the discretion of the GI as to whether he wants to go to a public school, a State university, or a private college?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct. He chooses the one he wants to go to. I thought it would be a little easier for him to go to a school of his choice if the money were paid directly to the private school or institution. I also thought it was a hedge against communism.

Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is a good one. It is long delayed. It is 2 years late. I am thankful that we have it now.

The Senate put a provision in the bill that a man could not have mustering-

out pay and also a reenlistment allowance given to him. The conferees struck out all reference to reenlistment pay because we felt it did not belong in a measure of this kind. Mustering-out pay was payment for services rendered, not enough but some money, the same amount that was given to World War II veterans, reenlistment allowance is a bonus given for reentering the service. That was left out of the bill, as it should be.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. This sounds like the Teague bill. Is this the Teague bill?

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that this bill is the result of work over the past 2 years by every educational group in this country, by the House select committee, by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, by the Senate committee, and the governmental agencies, such as the General Accounting Office and the VA. It is a bill that has had every consideration that any bill should have that passes the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] asked concerning the differences between the bill in its present form and the form in which it passed the House. One of the major differences adopted by the Senate was the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] that the classification of veterans be separated for subsistence purposes into three dependency groups, the single veteran, the veteran with one dependent, and the veteran with more than one dependent.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Maryland for the steps he took to correct the bill, and I think his amendments have improved the bill.

The Senate raised the amount of the allowance for a veteran with more than one dependent.

Another difference between the bill approved by the conferees and as it passed the House is that as it passed the House the bill required 25 percent nonveterans in courses offered by profit schools. The Senate reduced that to 10 percent and the conferees agreed on 15 percent.

Another difference is that the Senate placed in the bill a provision to pay all schools something for the administrative burden this bill imposes on them. That amount was $1.50 per veteran. The conferees agreed to this change.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman refers to colleges. Just what kind of colleges does he mean?

Mr. TEAGUE. Well, in this case I refer to all schools.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is private and public?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes, private and public.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And they will be paid $1.50 per individual for administrative expenses?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. From the study that has been made, this will probably be a little less than the actual cost to the schools for administrative cost incident to handling the veteran, but the allowance does pay for some of the administrative expense.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will not be paid directly to the GI?

Mr. TEAGUE. No, the payment will go directly to the school.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is that $1.50 per student for administrative expenses the lowest amount, or is there a rate of $1.50 up to a certain amount?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is a fixed amount. It is $1.50 per month per veteran in the school.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Per month?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, the social-security provision was taken out of the House bill because a similar provision was in H. R. 7800, which passed the House and the Senate.

Unemployment compensation was placed in the bill of $26 for 26 weeks, to be administered by the Department of Labor according to State contracts.

On housing, the warranty provision was taken out of the bill. I believe that is the only change in housing as the bill passed the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe those are the major differences in the bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The conference committee came to the conclusion that it was not advisable to make an allowance directly to the colleges and universities for tuition.

Mr. TEAGUE. The basic principle of this bill, which was first adopted, was the scholarship principle of giving a veteran a certain amount of money each month permitting him to go to the school of his choice so long as he could get good schooling, and went to a good school which met the standards for approval. In our committee, the principle of making a separate payment to the colleges was considered and defeated. In the Senate committee, it was defeated. There was later an amendment, which was called the Nixon amendment, added by the Senate, which provided that payments would be made to veterans in varying amounts, depending on the school he attends. If he attended an expensive school he would receive up to $40 per month; if he attended a school which charged $10, he would receive $10 for tuition. That was taken out in conference.

Mr. LECOMPTE. What I was getting at, of course, that privately endowed colleges, by the very nature of the case, had to charge more tuition than the tax-supported schools.

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Of course, veterans who are hard up for money might, in many cases, desire to go to the privately endowed college, but of necessity would have to go to the tax-supported school.

Mr. TEAGUE. What would happen if we did not have the GI bill?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Probably both classes of veterans would not get any education.

Mr. TEAGUE. We went into this matter very carefully because the question raised by the gentleman is very important. The United States Office of Education made a very careful study of that. They told us that 40 percent of the young men in this country going to school have sufficient money to go to private schools. There is another 40 percent who have sufficient money to go to tax-supported schools or public schools. There is another 20 percent who have insufficient funds to go to any school. They told us that under the provisions of our bill many of these young men who would normally have gone to a tax-supported school will now go to a private college because we have given them more money to finance their education. A great number of the 20 percent, or all of the 20 percent, that do not have enough money to go to any school will have sufficient money to go to some school, either private or tax-supported.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the committee has done all right, but I did hope that there would be a better opportunity for boys to select their school through some plan similar to that suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], or on the basis of the Nixon amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE. When you take a certain amount of money and turn it over to a young man and say, "Go wherever you please"; now can you give him any more freedom?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes; but the money will not go far in any school. That is the answer.

Mr. TEAGUE. Does the gentleman want to put a restriction upon this because the boy wants to go to a private school?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I want you to give him so many months or so many years of schooling. I do not want you to give him so much money, but I want you to give him so many months of tuition.

Mr. TEAGUE. Every educational group in this country who testified before our committee testified in behalf of the provision of the House bill. It is true that some few colleges within the American Council of Education broke away from their organization and came out for increased payments to high-priced schools.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. Is it not a fact that all of the colleges of the country are in the business of purveying education to the men who want a college education and and those men represent the market

for which the colleges are competing? Is it not reasonable that if you are going to benefit a number of thousands of men who are going into that market the way to do it with the least favoritism to any kind of educational institution is to give each man a scholarship, rather than giving the college the scholarship.

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. SITTLER. Does that not preserve the American proposition which is as effective in purveying education as it is in purveying goods and services?

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As a school man of 36 years' experience, I say this is a much better plan and much fairer to the GI boys than the old plan was under the old scheme.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I notice in the conference report where you have accepted the maximum benefit of $26 a week for a maximum period of 26 weeks for unemployment insurance. Have you wrapped it up with restrictions designed to eliminate the criticism that was directed to similar benefits paid to World War II veterans and which was commonly called the 52–20 club?

Mr. TEAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that it does not start until 90 days after the man gets out of the service and he must exhaust whatever benefits he may have under the State plan before he comes under this plan. He must within his own State line up with nonveterans the same as the veterans do. He will be subject to the regulations of the State. We do not believe there will be any abuses such as took place heretofore.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. Is it not also true that the gentleman who is presenting this information spent about 2 years investigating the abuses of the previous GI bill, and out of that study has come this plan which he has presented after a great deal of thought and preparation and is considered by those educators throughout the country who have watched it to be the most effective way of helping the GI?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER] is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and has worked hard on this legislation. He attended all of the hearing and has supported a program which will give both the veterans and taxpayers a break. The veterans of Pennsylvania are fortunate to have such a friend. Of course, what the gentleman from Pensylvania [Mr. SITTLER] says is true. There were abuses in colleges, the same as there were in other groups of schools. The law set up a limit of $500 for tuition and fees in school, but some schools raised their rates as close to the $500 as possible. In many schools the veteran had to buy books not required for nonveterans. Some schools increased the tuition as much as 300 percent. In this bill we turn this scholarship allowance over to the veteran. I think he has sufficient good judgment and good sense to go to the best school for him. We think it will do away with 90 percent of the red tape and bookkeeping that took place under the World War II plan, and eliminate many of the sources of abuse.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Was it possible for your committee to take up the problem which I discussed with you personally in regard to the veteran taking related courses when he so desired?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE. I know what the gentleman is speaking of. I am not sure about the conference report, but in the House report we spelled that out and made it clear what we meant by "related courses." Under the bill the veteran may arrange a program of training including related courses of his choice.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In many cases, like a radio technician in a small radio station, he has had to do not only the technical work but the announcing as well. If he wants to take a course in speech improvement, which is related to the job but not necessarily the same thing, it is your opinion that he could be allowed to take that type of course?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct. I know of the efforts by the gentleman from California to correct the situation. We think we have eliminated the possibility of its reoccurrence in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 145]

Abernethy	Brehm	Cooper
Allen, La.	Brown, Ohio	Coudert
Anderson, Calif.	Brownson	Curtis, Mo.
Anfuso	Buckley	Curtis, Nebr.
Bailey	Buffett	Davis, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Burdick	Dawson
Beall	Butler	Dingell
Beckworth	Camp	Dolliver
Bender	Carlyle	Elston
Bentsen	Carrigg	Evins
Blackney	Celler	Fenton
Boggs, Del.	Cole, N. Y.	Fisher
Boykin	Combs	Forrester
Fugate	Larcade	Reece, Tenn.
Furcolo	Latham	Regan
George	Lesinski	Richards
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lyle	Robeson
Harden	McConnell	Sabath
Hébert	McGregor	St. George
Heller	McKinnon	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Herter	Marshall	Sheehan
Heselton	Martin, Mass.	Shelley
Hillings	Miller, N. Y.	Short
Hoffman, Ill.	Mitchell	Sikes
Hope	Morano	Stigler
Horan	Morris	Sutton
Javits	Morrison	Tackett
Johnson	Morton	Taylor
Jonas	Moulder	Thornberry
Judd	Nelson	Vail
Kean	O'Brien, N. Y.	Watts
Kearney	O'Hara	Welch
Kennedy	Patman	Wickersham
Keogh	Poage	Wier
Kilburn	Potter	Wolcott
King, Pa.	Powell	Woodruff
Klein	Price	
Kluczynski	Rabaut	
	Redden	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in regard to the taxability, for Federal income tax purposes, of certain payments received by former prisoners of war:

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, July 3, 1952.

Hon. HARRY P. O'NEILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. O'NEILL: Reference is made to your verbal inquiry concerning the taxability, for Federal income tax purposes, of payments received by former prisoners of war under the authority of section 6 (d) of the War Claims Act of 1948 as added by section 6 (d) of the War Claims Act of 1948 as added by section 1 of Public Law 303 approved April 9, 1952, Eighty-second Congress.

As defined in section 6 (d) (1) of the act, the term "prisoner of war" means any regularly appointed, enrolled, enlisted, or inducted member of the military or naval forces of the United States, who was held a prisoner of war for any period of time subsequent to December 7, 1941, by any government of any nation with which the United States has been at war subsequent to such date.

Section 6 (d) (2) and (3) relates to cases where a prisoner of war was subjected by an enemy government, or by its agents, to labor in violation of such government's obligations under title III, section III, of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, or where he was subjected to inhumane treatment through the violation by such enemy government, or its agents, of one or more of the provisions of articles 2, 3, 7, 10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 54, 56 or 57 of the same Geneva Convention

concerning the proper treatment of prisoners of war.

The law provides that in such cases "compensation" shall be allowed to any prisoner of war at the rate of $1.50 per day for each day he was held as a prisoner of war on which he alleges and proves in a manner acceptable to the War Claims Commission, the violation by such enemy government of any of the provisions of the Geneva Convention referred to above.

Any claim allowed under this law must be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the War Claims Fund established by section 13 of the Act. This fund consists of all net proceeds covered into the Treasury as remaining upon the completion of administration, liquidation, and disposition of enemy assets seized or vested by the Office of Alien Property. If the prisoner of war is no longer living, payment will then be made to:

1. The widow or dependent husband if there is no child or children of the deceased;
2. The widow or dependent husband and child or children of the deceased, one-half to the widow or dependent husband and the other half to the child or children of the deceased in equal shares;
3. The child or children of the deceased (in equal shares) if there is no widow or dependent husband; and
4. The parents (in equal shares) if there is no widow, dependent husband, or child.

Claims for compensation under section 6 (d) of the act must be filed with the War Claims Commission within 1 year after April 9, 1952, the date of the enactment of the act.

In a letter dated March 24, 1952, to Mr. McCORMACK, majority floor leader of the House of Representatives, the War Claims Commission, in estimating the cost of legislation which would be designed to satisfy personal injury, death, inhumane treatment, and detention claims, referred to the Dempsey bill, which became section 1 of Public Law 303, as relating to compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of POW's.

Mr. DEMPSEY, in explaining the bill to the House, stated in part (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 31, 1952, p. 3198):

"Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the Congress finally has had an opportunity to do something to require payment to the prisoners of war held by our former enemies in World War II, of that to which they are justly entitled from the hands of those former enemies, and that payment will be made from funds of those former enemies rather than with money out of the Federal Treasury. * * *

"Our boys who went to the Pacific, especially to the Philippines, prior to World War II, went there quite untrained and had very much less material than they should have had. When they were captured, it was not because they did not fight or did not want to fight. They reached the point where they had no food to keep them alive, nor did they have the armament necessary to carry on the fight. That is why they were captured. The treatment given to them was perhaps the most inhumane ever recorded in history. I saw a great many of these boys who came back to New Mexico. Not many of them came back as they went—they came back in part only. * * *

"The action of this honorable body today is a great step toward most proper and rightful recognition of an obligation that our Nation has had for more than 5 years. It means that the 132,000 former prisoners of war from the fighting forces of our country who endured hardships and torture and were forced to labor for their enemy captors are at long last likely to receive the payment by those former enemy nations from alien property funds under terms of the Geneva Convention."

Mr. BECKWORTH, a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which had reported favorably, the bill that became Public Law 303, further explained it as follows:

"In the late hours of the session of Congress that ended in 1948, we were able to pass a bill that set up a War Claims Commission. That bill also contained a provision that paid all former prisoners of war $1 a day, because of the fact that the food that they had been fed was not in accordance with the provisions of the Geneva Convention. It was far substandard. All of the prisoners of war who will benefit under the terms of this legislation, $1.50 a day, already have benefited $1 a day."

The War Claims Act of 1948 states that its purpose is, in part, "to provide for relief for internees in certain cases." Senate Report No. 1742 (80th Cong.) on the bill discloses that the internees in question include former military personnel who were held as prisoners of war by any former enemy of the United States.

The benefit of $1 a day, which was paid under the authority of section 6 (b) of the War Claims Act of 1948, has been held by this Bureau to be exempt from income tax.

In view of the foregoing, it is the opinion of this Bureau that the benefit of $1.50 a day, arising from the violation by a sovereign enemy government of its obligations to furnish prisoners of war the treatment to which they were entitled under the terms of the Geneva Convention of July 27, 1929, does not constitute gross income for Federal lincome-tax purposes, and that it is not subject to income tax.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of June 1952, a great man died.

The Reverend Dr. James Shera Montgomery served as Chaplain of the House of Representatives during the 29 years between 1921 and 1950. His inner serenity acted as a checkrein upon us in our moments of triumph. His immovable faith buoyed us aloft in our moments of tragedy and loss.

He moved so quietly when he was among us that there were times when we were scarcely aware of his presence. When he retired from his post which he had held during nearly three decades, he chose to live within sight of those whom he had served. He was a regular visitor in the Halls of Congress even after his retirement.

Now that he is gone from us, there is a void which may not easily be filled.

One of his favorite sayings was, "I love Congress."

His love for us was genuine and real. His prayers revealed that love. His counsel demonstrated it.

Dr. Montgomery was born at Mount Carmel, Ind., the son of the Reverend William M. and Anna. He graduated from the Muncie (Ind.) Academy in 1881 and studied at DePauw, Northwestern, and Oxford, England, and the B. D. Garrett Bible Institute where he finished in 1892. He became a doctor of divinity in 1900. He was ordained in 1893 and served in pastorates at Toledo and Minneapolis before coming to the Metropolitan Methodist Episcopal Church in Washington. He was elected Chaplain of the House on March 1, 1921.

If any single trait stood out from that wonderful blend of traits which composed the character of our beloved spiritual guide, it was his absolute belief in God.

There is a passage in the seventh chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke which describes just such a man. The servant of a Roman centurion was sick unto death. The centurion appealed to the Redeemer to heal the servant. Such was the centurion's deep and abiding belief that Christ said:

> I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not even in Israel.

I cannot think of Dr. Montgomery without, also, thinking of these sacred words.

He was the epitome of goodness and of godliness. He did not thrust his thought on anyone, but he spoke in a language common to all who believe in God. No one could live near him—and with him—without becoming a better man because of that experience.

He was a powerful man because he was a meek man.

He was strong because he was gentle.

He was influential because he was a man of wisdom.

Dr. Montgomery was a man of God.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, I was the only one who voted against the GI bill when it was presented on the floor of the House. The reason I did so was to point out several things. First of all, it was the manner of considering such an important bill. Secondly, there were some provisions of the bill with which I did not agree. I felt, if I made my thoughts known, perhaps the provisions would be corrected. I am happy to say that after the explanation of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] of the changes in the bill, my objections have largely been overcome, and I wholeheartedly support the bill as it has come out of conference.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very excellent bill and has been considered very carefully. I am a member of the committee and have attended most all of the sessions. It is an eminently fair, just and good bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are entitled to a great deal of credit for bringing the bill in in this form.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill marks one more very desirable and urgently required step by the Congress in rounding out and extending governmental benefits to the gallant veterans of the Korean war.

Like much legislation, this bill represents a compromise of conflicting views concerning procedures and methods by which the benefits provided herein shall be administered. The committee has carefully considered this measure and the conferees have endeavored to iron out various differences. While I am not entirely satisfied with some provisions, on the whole I believe the bill definitely moves in the right direction. More important, the bill deals with benefits which should have been provided long ago. It is high time that Congress acted to extend this assistance to those who have so superbly served the Nation in one of the bloodiest and most barbarous wars in American history.

If there are shortcomings and imperfections in the bill we must not permit them to deter us from extending these benefits at this time. I believe that in the main the bill has merit. If necessary the Congress can correct any weaknesses in the bill at a later date. I am not willing to tolerate further delay in such a vital and pressing matter which affords such highly deserved consideration to the Korean veterans.

I am conscious of the criticism of various amendments as proposed but I would not in any circumstances be willing to vote to delay the speedy adoption of the bill. I will, therefore, vote in favor of this measure and I have no doubt of an overwhelming result.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill although it does not altogether satisfy me. I trust the House will recall some of the remarks I made with reference to the Springer amendment on two occasions when I appeared in the well of the House. I want to clarify, if I may, one or two things that have been asked me by any number of Members on both sides of the aisle, and that is whether or not this bill contains any provision of either the Nixon or the Springer amendment for direct payment to colleges and universities of tuition rather than payment to the GI's. May I say that it does not. You will recall, when this bill was considered here under the suspension of the rules, there was no chance to amend it. But when it went to the other body, I appeared there before the Senate committee and testified. The amendment was defeated in the committee. However, the Nixon amendment was a modification of my amendment, and was adopted on the floor of the other body, and put in the bill in conference. In my opinion, the heart of the bill is the question of whether you are going to make direct payments to the GI's or whether you are going to make direct payment of tuition directly to the college or university.

I think the Nixon amendment was an improvement over the Springer amendment, in this respect: that it provided for direct payment of tuition to the college or university, but it provided it should be made by the GI himself. The Nixon amendment provided that the payment of tuition should be made direct to the GI, who in turn would pay it to the university, but it provided also that the tuition should not exceed the amount that was charged a nonveteran at the same university. In other words, suppose the University of Mississippi charged a tuition of $110. They paid to the GI $110, which he in turn paid direct to the university. Under this particular bill, I think I explained to you in the committee when we considered the question of tuition and the question of subsistence, we arrived at $80 a month for subsistence and $30 a month for tuition. That makes a total of $360 a year for tuition. If he goes to the University of Mississippi, under the Nixon amendment the University of Mississippi would get $110, but under this particular bill, the Teague bill, the GI gets $360 in his own pocket. So that he actually adds to this subsistence the sum of $240. I just wanted to say to you that in the conference the Nixon amendment was removed, so that you have no protection at all, in my opinion, to the Treasury of the United States as far as payment to these GI's is concerned. Actually under this bill you are adding $240 more to the GI who goes to the University of Mississippi than you are giving to the veteran who uses up all of his $360 by going to a private school. My objection to the Teague bill in the beginning was this discrimination between GI's. I think it is sound, I think it is moral, and I think it is also good legislation.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. As I understand it, the way the bill is written at the present time, both your amendment and the Nixon amendment are out of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. VELDE. So that the result is that the average GI who wanted to go to college could choose a tax-supported school and then he would be able to pocket the extra money that he received under the GI bill. Is that true?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct. It was the purpose of my amendment, to eliminate the thing you are talking about.

Mr. VELDE. It seems to me we have been too long thwarting the attempts of the privately endowed schools to exist. I believe your amendment is a good amendment, as well as the Nixon amendment, and personally I would like to go on record as supporting both of them.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the Springer amendment would have been adopted by the House if we had not been forced to consider the bill under suspension of the rules. With the adoption of the Nixon amendment by the Senate there would not be any objection today. Personally, I think the Nixon amendment is better than the Springer amendment, because it pays directly to the GI, but only the sum which the university can charge any nonveteran.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I supported the Springer amendment and I would have supported the Nixon amendment. I would like to see that come up for a vote, but, as I understand, that is impossible. As I see the situation, it leaves it entirely to the veteran whether or not he wants to go to a private school and pay out more money in tuition, as against going to a public institution where his tuition is less.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He gets the same amount of money.

Mr. SPRINGER. In my opinion, the Nixon-Springer amendment was not a private school-public school fight, because the principle had been endorsed last summer in a poll of the American Council on Education by both public and private universities by over 9 to 1.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that the Springer-Nixon amendment is not a fight between the private-public schools. It is a question of whether or not you are going to allow the GI to profit on tuition. We are trying to eliminate the abuses from this bill. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] developed the idea of scholarship. I never heard of that until we got into this fight over the Springer amendment. I want to say this, that on the testimony that was made in the Senate committee—and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will recall this, I am sure.

When McGrath testified there, the United States Commissioner of Education, he testified that this was the forerunner of Federal scholarships. That was exactly his testimony. Senator PASTORE examined him about that and he said that this is a trial run for Federal scholarships; that that bill is going to come up. Legislation is being prepared by the United States Commissioner of Education to come before this House next January.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I, too, would like to have supported the Springer or the Nixon amendment, because I belive the private schools and colleges of the country are doing a great job for the education of the boys.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for the conference report, although there are some provisions with which I disagree and others with which I do not agree wholeheartedly. I am one of those who supported the Springer

amendment and later the Nixon amendment, both of which failed of enactment. All in all, however, I believe this bill to be a good one and deserving of passage.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] a question: I have called the attention of Members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, including the gentleman from Texas, to the unique position of the State of California with respect to payments for tuition direct to the veteran rather than to the educational institution. The California State attorney general has issued an opinion to the effect that it is not possible under our State constitution to charge a student in high school or junior college for his education; it is free. It is impossible to charge tuition or fees.

Now, because this bill will increase the attendance in our high schools and junior colleges, as well as our colleges, in California, it is going to throw an increased burden on our State for which there is no possibility of reimbursement.

The State superintendent of education suggested an amendment to correct this situation which was brought to the attention of the committee. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas why this particular amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEAGUE. I would like to tell the gentleman first that this amendment was submitted to the Office of Education and was submitted to Mr. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, and both these agencies said that it objected to the amendment.

They said further that it would cause the Veterans' Administration to go back into the school business fixing tuition rates. The bill approved by the conferees contains a provision permitting schools with no charges for tuition and fees to charge the veteran up to $10 a month. This provision was intended specifically to assist the schools in California and New York which charge no tuition.

I recognize that the California public schools charge no tuition, but the fact that we give the veterans some additional money to go to school does not make me believe we owe any school in the United States anything except the additional administrative burden which may have been placed on them in taking care of veterans. To take care of the situation in California, New York, and Louisiana where this situation also exists, we have allowed $1.50 per month because of the additional administrative burden that is placed upon them.

Mr. HUNTER. Notwithstanding my objection to this feature of the conference report, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas who is not only a member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs but is also a member of the select committee which made a very exhaustive investigation over a period of 2 years of the educational operations under the World War II GI bill. I think it was a monumental work, which this committee did, particularly the report which was issued. I wish to commend the gentleman for his splendid work as chairman of that committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman from California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and has worked very hard on this legislation. I have worked with the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] on questions pertaining to farm training, flight schools, and the public schools. He has been very persistent in his efforts to protect the veteran and at the same time to see that we have a sound program. I want to thank the gentleman from California for the help he has given in developing this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have here what I believe to be the best possible bill that could be adopted by this session of the Congress. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] and I held out in the conference between the two bodies hoping that we could bring about a more amicable adjustment on this tuition business which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] brought out. However, we feel that to send this bill back would mean there would be no GI bill in this session of Congress. So in a spirit of fair play, in a spirit of fairness, and also in the interest of the veteran, knowing full well a bill must be passed now or never as far as this session of Congress is concerned, we went along with the majority and were happy to do so because we believe we have here a good bill, everything considered.

I want to point out that this bill was drawn up on the basis of the great experiment which we had with the GI bill for the veterans of World War II. There were many abuses in that measure, there were many weaknesses in that measure. This bill we are now considering took into consideration every one of those weaknesses and every one of those abuses. We put regulations in this legislation which would stop all weaknesses and abuses that existed in the GI bill of World War II.

The main change from the bill that passed the House some time ago and the main addition to this bill, of course, is the provision involving unemployment compensation. There were many abuses in the 52–20 Club in the last bill, to such an extent we felt we did not want to continue them; however, we have a provision in reference to unemployment compensation which we think is fair and which we think will eliminate all of the abuses that took place in the old 52–20 Club by placing the administration of payments of these benefits under the laws of the various States and also setting a minimum, changing it from 52–20 to a 26–26 basis. We believe this is a good compromise, and you may rest assured that the administration of this law as provided by these provisions will be such that you will find the abuses which existed in the 52–20 Club of the old bill.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say again that we have a good bill here. We have a bill that each and every Member of this body in good conscience can vote for and know that we have done the best job that can be done.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment my colleague for his good work on this bill, as well as the other members of the conference. I shall also support this conference report. I had hoped there would be more protection to both segments of the school system of the United States, public and private, than there is, but I shall nevertheless support this conference report.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one more observation. A great deal of credit should go to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans Affairs and the members of that committee, particularly to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. This has been a sort of hobby with him, his baby, so to speak. He has made an extensive investigation through his selective committee of the abuses involved in the old GI bill. A great deal of the credit for the provisions in this bill should be given to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. I would like to compliment the gentleman for his effective explanation of the unemployment compensation feature of the bill as it has come to us from the conference committee. While I was opposed to a renewal of the wasteful procedures of the old 52–20 club, I am inclined to accept the idea of having these funds State-administered, available for 26 months and after 90 days following discharge.

Mr. Speaker, the today's veteran is entitled to the same benefits and opportunities as the veteran of World War II. This bill gives him those benefits, but because of the splendid work of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and his select committee, the American taxpayer is to be spared the waste and graft that occurred in some instances under the act of 1944. This is a good bill and I support it most heartily and vote for it gladly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. What the gentleman said in reference to unemployment compensation is that this puts the returning GI in exactly the same status as any other unemployed person in the State to which he returns, is that correct?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is no difference between a GI and any other unemployed person?

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct, with the exception we have established a minimum payment. There are some States in the Union that pay less than other States, less than $26 a week. We have struck what we call the national average, feeling that the veteran from the State of Mississippi where, I do not

know, but the employment rate may be less, is made equal to the sacrifice of the veteran from my State where we pay $30 a month. We have struck a national average of $26 a week so that they will all be treated alike.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is not a 26–26 club; it is just a matter of common justice in doing for the veterans what you are doing for the civilians.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Some States give more unemployment compensation than $26 a week.

Mr. O'KONSKI. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the statements that have been made, I desire to say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois who sat on the conference said that this Nixon amendment would be a monstrosity, and that it would penalize the veterans instead of doing them any good.

Our veterans are entitled to the benefits this measure provides. I hope it passes by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill for readjustment benefits for Korean veterans, giving them the type of assistance which was so helpful to World War II veterans. A grateful country can do no less. The state of our economy prevents our doing more. If certain payments are higher than after World War II, it is only to compensate for the inflation that has taken place while they were serving.

Someone should comment on the basic reason we need this bill. The ghastly struggle in Korea with its ever-lengthening lists of casualties and veterans, with no end in sight, the war that our military men fight well whenever and wherever they are permitted to fight, the war in which the military chance for victory has been blocked by our diplomats time and again. Here in Congress we cannot pass a law to remedy the ghastly administration mistakes that helped bring on the Korean struggle, that have helped to prolong it.

While our men fight on and on we cannot pass a law to prevent further mistakes. We can, however, pass this bill to do justice to those who have done the fighting in this struggle. We can pledge to those who fight there, and to the loved ones of those who gave their lives there, that we will do what Congress can do to so guide our policies that their struggle shall not have been in vain; that the struggle for our security against communism will be carried on to final victory for the forces of freedom.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I take a great deal of pride in the legislation before us. No legislation is perfect—yet the only objection to the legislation before us has come from some colleges that wanted the enactment of the Springer amendment. While there was merit to the position of these colleges, nevertheless, there is also considerable merit to the position taken by our committee in granting scholarships to the veterans instead of to the colleges. It is aid to the veterans and not Federal aid to education.

I want to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for his great contribution to the legislation before us. The study made by the Teague Committee enabled our Veterans' Committee to eliminate the inequities and the abuses which prevailed under the original GI bill of rights, passed by Congress in 1944. This study, together with the experience under the original GI bill, makes possible this excellent piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, no nation can ever turn its back upon those who defend it. We here have not failed. It is this motivating spirit that prevails and underscores the bill we are about to pass, and I am sure that it will have the unanimous approval of this body.

Notable also is title IV—the unemployment compensation feature of the bill. I think that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has made a very good explanation of how this particular provision corrects the abuses of the so-called 52–20 Club under the original GI bill. This legislation gives to the States, under State agreements, the authority to make these payments, as agents of the United States, to the veterans in the event of unemployment. Such compensation will be at the rate of $26 per week and is to be paid for a period of unemployment not to exceed a total of 26 weeks.

The entire bill has my wholehearted support.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, for some 3 years I have served on the Teague committee investigating the GI training program and have attended many meetings in which we received testimony regarding the training of veterans. We found many abuses, many of which we caused to be eliminated in the system which is presently in effect. The bill, H. R. 7656, was drafted from the knowledge that we gained through this lengthy investigation. It is the product of the thinking of the best authorities available and the result of much hard work on the part of the select committee and the standing committee of the House on Veterans' Affairs. It will go a long way toward assisting the veteran and also providing the maximum good for the money expended.

It is my honest belief that the bill as it was originally passed by the House was a much better bill than the one we now have before us. However, the conference committee had a difficult time in developing this report and meeting the requirements of the other body.

I believe that by and large the committee brought out the best compromise possible and considering the obligation we owe the Korean veterans to see that they are provided with benefits which other veterans have received, I am supporting this legislation and recommend its favorable consideration.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I shall vote to approve the conference report to accompany H. R. 7656 to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who have served in our Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress. Firstly, however, I desire to congratulate our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], member of the Veterans' Committee for his tireless, patient, vigorous research in an effort to correct maladministration or injustice, and likewise to ferret out and give daylight to every place with reference to the veterans' bill of rights wherever he found dishonesty, cheating, false reporting by individuals or by schools. In fact he has done a whale of a job these last 2 years; we all know it. Not only has he done so, but his subcommittee has also under his unselfish leadership. But then, Mr. Speaker, we must realize that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], is a most distinguished veteran in his own right and has the physical mark of valor and daring in behalf of our great Nation stamped indelibly the rest of his natural life. I commend all the members of the Veterans' Committee on both sides of the aisle who have manifestly done the very best that could be done. Not posing as an expert in the field myself, I am pleased to be informed that a large group of school and college educators themselves voted 9 to 1 in favor of direct scholarship payments to our GI's rather than to pay the tuition sums direct to the schools and colleges. This radical departure is an improvement in the previous procedures. For, the committee informs us that about 90 percent of the bad conditions arise from direct payment to other than the GI's will be corrected by direct payment to the GI's themselves. This is a splendid transition. Also I approve the fact that the conferees agree that the GI's should also be entitled to 26 weeks of unemployment insurance or compensation at $26 a week. Why should they not have it, Mr. Speaker? They were compelled by the needs of our beloved Nation to give up their jobs and employment and get into uniform in behalf of those of us who for one reason or another remained at home. Not only in the present conflict against aggressive communism in and about Korea have these GI's been so ordered, but our Military Establishment is built all over the world more than ever in peacetime on account of the known and realized objectives and intentions of military aggressive Soviet communism to conquer the economy, the politics, and the minds of the people of the world. Again not being an expert in this field myself I am pleased to rely upon the considered opinion and experience of the distinguished members of the Veterans' Committee when they say that this $26 and 26 weeks basis will obviate the unsavory conditions which came out of the pre-

vious bill which allowed $20 a week for 52 weeks.

And I like the conference report which gives to the schools and colleges where the GI's attend $1.50 a month toward the college administration expenses for each GI attending that particular college. That's fair and reasonable.

A perusal of the 44-page conference report as I have sat here in my seat on the floor of this great legislative body while the committee members have been discussing it for our benefit clearly shows that the tireless and fact-searching study was made by the conferees of both the Senate and the House and that this conference report embodies a basic premise of intention to be fairer than ever and more promptly to the GI's. This is as it should be.

And now may I be pardoned for a minute? It is to call to have the RECORD show of my long-time and diligent interest in such matters contained in this conference report, as will be revealed by the fact that on January 3, 1951, I filed in this Congress, and it was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, H. R. 59. The title of said bill being as follows:

To extend certain benefits now provided by law for veterans of World War II to personnel on active service with the Armed Forces of the United States of America during the military, naval, and air operations in Korea or other places while serving under the flag of the United States of America and the United Nations, or under the flag of the United States of America alone, and for other purposes.

Furthermore, I wish to state that I very much appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended me by the Veterans' Affairs Committee when I personally appeared before it during the committee hearings on the various bills then pending before it. Now concluding my third term in this House I naturally feel pleased that the visible record of my desire to at all time understand the problems of our distinguished veterans and cooperate in the reduction of these problems to understanding helpful legislation is as clear as crystal and I hardly feel that I need to urge the Members of this distinguished legislative body to vote unanimously in support and in favor of this conference report. Let us make it unanimous, and by thus voting give clear indelible proof to the parents and loved one of our GI boys, both past and present and in the future to be, that we will not willingly or knowingly see their present and future opportunities unnecessarily limited or hampered or removed or destroyed. Nothing less than such an attitude by the American people as represented in terms of legislative action by this Congress should be considered as evidencing our appreciation of the services and sacrifices which have been so freely and frequently given by these GI's, by their loved ones, by their dependents, in all brackets of immediate family, relatives and associates.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I approve, and will vote for the conference report on this bill, the Korean Servicemen's Readjustment Act. I hope the House will unanimously approve the bill. The Korean veterans have been very patient. I have felt all along that the Congress has been somewhat slow to provide benefits for our veterans of Korean service. We should unanimously approve this bill, and speed it on the way to the President for his approval.

The Korean war broke out on June 27, 1950. At that time I had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. On July 10, 1950, I introduced in the House H. R. 9052 to provide benefits for veterans of that conflict. About that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] was appointed as chairman of a select committee of the House to conduct a study and investigation of the functions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. He and his committee labored long and uncovered some violent abuses which had grown up under the provisions of the original GI bill, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. After the report of that committee came in, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs began an intensive study of the whole question of providing benefits for veterans of service since June 27, 1950. The conference report now before us represents the final fulfillment of the labors of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], as chairman, and of the members of the House select committee to conduct an investigation of abuses under the original GI bill, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. It also represents the culmination of the very intensive study given this question by the entire House Committee of Veterans' Affairs and the work of its fine staff.

I want to pay an especial compliment the the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] for the outstanding work that he has done, both in the investigation referred to and in the formulation of the bill before us.

I also want to pay a high compliment to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I know of his deep interest in this legislation, and the keen sense of responsibility which he has felt and exhibited in getting it finally approved, both by the conference committee and by the House in these closing days. The gentleman from Mississippi has been particularly interested in veterans' legislation throughout his long service in Congress, and I think he is entitled to a very large measure of credit for the fact that we have the most progressive and enlightened system of veterans' legislation of any country in the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, I believe, of making the first statement made by any Member of Congress, when hearings were held by the House committee on this most important legislation. At that time, I pointed out that veterans of service since June 27, 1950, were rapidly being demobilized from the service. This program of discharging those whose enlistments have expired has greatly accelerated since that time. Many of these veterans are anxious to take advantage of the opportunity for readjustment, which this bill provides and I am particularly happy that if we pass the bill today, it will go into effect in time to provide educational opportunities for them, beginning with the school terms which start in September of this year.

EDUCATION FOR KOREAN VETERANS

This bill grants 1½ days of education or training for each day of military service on or after June 27, 1950, regardless of where the service was performed. The cut-off date for the eligibility for this training has not yet been set and the bill wisely provides that the cut-off or closing date may be determined by the President or the Congress at some future time, when our international relations will have improved, and when the severe fighting that has been going on in Korea for the past 2 years may have ceased. The bill places a limit of 36 calendar months of education or training for each veteran and it is pointed out that this amount of time is sufficient to complete a 4-year academic college course. However, persons who have served in the military service since June 27, 1950, and who are eligible under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1949, as amended, and who will also be eligible under the conference bill now before us, may take training under both programs for a total period of 48 calendar months.

The program of education or training must be started within 2 years after discharge from the service and completed within 7 years after discharge.

The veteran may make only one change in his program from the time he begins. The reason for this provision is to eliminate one of the abuses under the World War II law, wherein veterans were sometimes encouraged to change the objective of their training several times in order to gain more training, after they had finished training for one objective.

This bill does not provide that the veteran can take recreational courses except in such cases where he submits evidence that those courses will be in good faith helpful to him in pursuit of his present or proposed business or occupation.

This bill does not encourage the formation of schools for profit for the purpose of teaching veterans, as was sometimes true under the World War II law and to prevent this the bill provides that enrollments in schools must include at least one-fourth nonveteran students in each course. It is the purpose of this bill that honorably discharged veterans take their training from, or at reputable schools, whether public or private.

The allowances for education and training as fixed by this bill are $110 per month for a single veteran enrolled in a full-time institutional course. If the veteran has one dependent, the amount of his allowances is $135. If he has more than one dependent, his allowance is $160 a month. If he is taking education or training on a three-fourths time basis, the rates for these classifications are $80, $100, and $120, respectively; and

if enrolled on a half-time basis, the payments are $50, $60, and $80 for the three classifications. It will be noted that these allowances are considerably in excess of similar allowances for subsistence under the World War II law. However, it must be pointed out that from this allowance the veteran must pay his own tuition, pay for his books, and meet all other costs connected with his education or training. These figures were arrived at by taking the average rates of similar costs for World War II education and training.

There are those who say that this bill discriminates against the privately owned or endowed college. It will be remembered that in World War II, the Federal Government paid the veteran student a smaller subsistence allowance and in addition, paid to the school the costs of his tuition, books, and other costs incident to his training.

However, the bill before us is not intended to be used as a system of Federal aid to colleges. Rather, it provides for a system of education and training, or aid to the veteran in procuring his education and training. In this respect, I think the bill is superior to the World War II bill. It provides the allowances mentioned for the veteran, and then leaves with him, in the good old free enterprise, and individual initiative tradition, the responsibility of selecting the school he wants to attend, providing for the cost of his books, his tuition, and his subsistence. He is free to exercise his own judgment and rely upon his own capabilities with regard to these matters, just as does the nonveteran student. This bill will not actually discriminate against the private school. Instead, I should think that the help provided by this bill, would encourage students who desire to do so to attend private schools and colleges, when they, without the help afforded by this bill would not otherwise be able to do so.

The Teague committee found that certain schools and colleges definitely abused the system under which educational training was provided for World War II veterans.

The training of veterans of service since June 27, 1950, or any other period of national emergency in our country's history should not be fixed upon by schools, whether public or private, for their undue enrichment, or their great advantage. Rather, the purpose should be to give the veteran the full benefit of his period of education so as to better fit him for citizenship, the professions, occupations, and trades.

ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

This bill provides that where there is a full-time program of institutional courses, supplemented by on-the-job training, the veteran without dependents receives an allowance of $90 per month. The veteran with one dependent gets $110 per month and the veteran with more than one dependent gets $130 per month.

For apprenticeship, or other on-the-job training, under this bill, the veteran without dependents gets $75 per month and with one dependent, he get $85, and with more than one dependent he gets $105. These amounts are subject to reductions as the course progresses. There is an over-all monthly ceiling on earnings and allowance of $310 per month.

ON-THE-FARM TRAINING

This bill, I think, very wisely provides for institutional on the farm training for veterans of service since June 27, 1950. For those who take on the farm training, the veteran without dependents get $95 per month, the veteran with one dependent $110, and with more than one dependent $130. These amounts are subject to reduction as the course progresses.

I have the privilege to represent the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, which can be accurately termed as a rural district, and it has the largest number of individual farms of any congressional district in the entire State of Alabama. The 1950 Census showed that the Seventh Congressional District had nearly 34,500 farms.

I have been especially interested in this provision of the law, because I have had an opportunity of seeing at first hand the wonderful accomplishments of veterans of World War II in their on the job training in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. I have seen these boys become skilled farmers through the training provided them and I have seen them master new techniques and produce a wealth from the soil of northwest Alabama, which their forebears never dreamed could be done. The effects of this program, as it pertains to World War II veterans, and as it will pertain to veterans of the Korean service, will be immediately felt for a period of at least 50 years, and its intangible and unmeasurable benefits are beyond calculation.

I represent an area that was for 75 years wedded to the production of the basic crops of cotton and corn, the corn being used primarily for the subsistence of the farmer's family and his work stock and the cotton being the primary cash crop. In the last few years, we are coming to realize that the soil of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama is suited to a diversified agriculture, and if we are to raise the level of income of our farm people, we must throw off the shackles of a one crop economy. We are making progress in the field of new beef cattle production, chicken production, milk production, the production of eggs for market, replanting our eroded hillsides in permanent pasture grasses or pine trees. The program of on the farm training provided by this law will give impetus to the new system of diversification of our agriculture and will make our lands more productive and will raise the income of our people.

We, in the Congress, must not forget that agriculture continues to be our basic industry in this country, and do whatever we will, the strength of our civilization depends primarily upon the goodness and productiveness of our land.

Recent official reports indicate that we in this country are approaching the time in which we must all be conservation minded. The richest country in the world cannot continue to be the richest country in the world, unless it conserves its resources. The heyday of waste of our land and other natural resources has passed. I like to think of the benefits that will accrue from this bill for future generations from the knowledge of conservation, which veterans of Korea will gain and demonstrate as a result of their on-the-farm training under this bill. In speaking of the conservation of natural resources, we must never forget that our human resources are the most important of all. I sometimes think that we are doing less even toward the conservation of our human resources than we are doing toward the conservation of our natural resources. Both programs go hand in hand. Conservation and development of our human resources is the bedrock upon which we achieve proper conservation of our natural resources.

We are living in an age in which the problem of earning a living, whether on the farm, in the mines, or in the factory requires greater skill and training than it has ever required before. We must maintain and increase our standard of living, and at the same time we must produce crops, goods, manufactured articles and services that the American people need and want at a price which they can afford to pay. The accomplishment of these ends requires that every skill, which the human being in any field can acquire, is needed.

HOUSING

Under this bill, veterans of service since June 27, 1950, will receive the same housing benefits, including guaranty of home loans up to 60 percent with a maximum guaranty of $7,500, business-loan guaranties and direct loans in rural areas where private financing is not available, all at interest rates not to exceed 4 percent, as are provided for veterans of World War II.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

This bill authorized payments of unemployment compensation of $26 per week for 26 weeks, under the laws of the several States, and under the administration of the Secretary of Labor.

I understand that the conferees arrived at the $26 per week by averaging the benefits now available in the several States, and payable as compensation for unemployment. Though employment is now generally high, there are many rural areas of the country, such as certain counties of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama, where unemployment is now at a rather high figure. This bill will help cushion the veteran against complete loss in earnings, while he seeks employment.

MUSTERING-OUT PAY

This bill provides for mustering-out payments for all veterans of service since June 27, 1950, at the rate of $100 for less than 60 days' service, $200 for more than 60 days' service, and $300 for service overseas. This benefit goes to all honorably discharged veterans up to and including the rank of captain in the Army and Air Force, and lieutenant, senior grade, in the Navy. These are the identical benefits provided for veterans of World War II.

This job of providing educational, vocational, and on-the-farm training for our returning Korean veterans should not be longer delayed.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly urge that we immediately accept this conference report to extend to our Korean war veterans all the benefits they so justly deserve.

As I stated on the floor of this House on June 5, 1952, when we were considering the original measure action has already been too long delayed in affording these veterans and their families the entitlements they merit on the same terms as the World War II participants.

As I also said at that time, no piece of legislation, unfortunately, can be perfect. It appears that against my own personal desires and exhortations the Congress is about to suspend legislative operations for perhaps the rest of this year so that it is imperative to pass this measure now in order that these gallant fighting men of the Korean campaign may know what benefits they are going to have and with their families make plans for return to the normal pursuits of civilian life.

There has been a real effort made in the preparation of this measure to eliminate some of the abuses that certain selfish groups and individuals imposed on the previous bill. In the zeal to close all such loopholes it well may be that inequities against those of honest purpose and design will develop and are inherent in the bill as now constituted.

If and when concrete instances of injustice are demonstrated I shall, of course, be in favor of correcting them by appropriate amendment.

The time scheduled for adjournment, unfortunately, is less than 48 hours away and so if we are going to have any legislation at all it must be accomplished in these last few minutes.

Let us, therefore, by unanimous action restore to these veterans the lost educational opportunities and extend the home, farm, and business loan guaranties, the unemployment compensation benefits, vocational readjustment assistance, mustering-out payments, and the other provisions of the bill fundamentally designed to help speed the quick return and absorption of our Korean military personnel back into American civilian life.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 322, nays 1, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—322

Aandahl	Andresen,	Bakewell
Abbitt	August H.	Barden
Adair	Andrews	Baring
Addonizio	Angell	Barrett
Albert	Arends	Bates, Mass.
Allen, Calif.	Armstrong	Battle
Allen, Ill.	Aspinall	Beamer
Andersen,	Auchincloss	Belcher
H. Carl	Ayres	Bennett, Fla.
Anderson, Calif.	Baker	Bennett, Mich.
Berry	Hagen	O'Konski
Betts	Hale	O'Neill
Bishop	Hall,	Osmers
Blatnik	Leonard W.	Ostertag
Boggs, Del.	Halleck	O'Toole
Boggs, La.	Hand	Passman
Boiling	Hardy	Patten
Bolton	Harris	Patterson
Bonner	Harrison, Nebr.	Perkins
Bosone	Harrison, Va.	Philbin
Bow	Harrison, Wyo.	Phillips
Boykin	Hart	Polk
Bramblett	Harvey	Poulson
Bray	Havenner	Preston
Brown, Ga.	Hays, Ark.	Priest
Brownson	Hays, Ohio	Prouty
Bryson	Hedrick	Rabaut
Buchanan	Heffernan	Radwan
Budge	Herlong	Rains
Burleson	Hess	Ramsay
Burnside	Hill	Rankin
Burton	Hinshaw	Reams
Busbey	Hoeven	Reed, Ill.
Bush	Holifield	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes	Holmes	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Horan	Rhodes
Canfield	Howell	Ribicoff
Cannon	Hull	Riehlman
Carnahan	Hunter	Riley
Carrigg	Ikard	Rivers
Case	Irving	Roberts
Celler	Jackson, Calif.	Rodino
Chatham	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.
Chelf	James	Rogers, Fla.
Chenoweth	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Chiperfield	Javits	Rogers, Tex.
Chudoff	Jenison	Rooney
Church	Jenkins	Roosevelt
Clemente	Jensen	Ross
Clevenger	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Mo.	Saylor
Colmer	Jones,	Schenck
Cooley	Hamilton C.	Scott, Hardie
Corbett	Jones,	Scrivner
Cotton	Woodrow W.	Scudder
Cox	Karsten, Mo.	Secrest
Crawford	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Crosser	Keating	Shafer
Crumpacker	Kee	Shelley
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Sheppard
Dague	Kelly, N. Y.	Sieminski
Davis, Ga.	Kerr	Simpson, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Deane	Kilday	Sittler
DeGraffenried	King, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Delaney	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Dempsey	Lane	Smith, Va.
Denny	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Denton	Lantaff	Spence
Devereux	LeCompte	Springer
D'Ewart	Lind	Staggers
Dingell	Lovre	Stanley
Dollinger	Lucas	Steed
Dondero	McCarthy	Stockman
Donohue	McCormack	Talle
Donovan	McCulloch	Teague
Dorn	McDonough	Thomas
Doughton	McGrath	Thompson,
Doyle	McGuire	Mich.
Eberharter	McIntire	Thornberry
Elliott	McMullen	Tollefson
Ellsworth	McVey	Trimble
Engle	Machrowicz	Vail
Fallon	Mack, Ill.	Van Pelt
Feighan	Mack, Wash.	Van Zandt
Fernandez	Madden	Velde
Flood	Magee	Vorys
Fogarty	Mahon	Walter
Forand	Mansfield	Weichel
Ford	Marshall	Werdel
Frazier	Martin, Iowa	Wharton
Fulton	Mason	Wheeler
Gamble	Meader	Whitten
Garmatz	Merrow	Widnall
Gary	Miller, Calif.	Wier
Gathings	Miller, Md.	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Williams, Miss.
Golden	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, N. Y.
Goodwin	Mills	Wilson, Ind.
Gordon	Morgan	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Multer	Winstead
Graham	Mumma	Withrow
Granahan	Murdock	Wolverton
Granger	Murphy	Wood, Ga.
Grant	Murray	Wood, Idaho
Green	Nicholson	Yates
Greenwood	Norblad	Yorty
Gregory	Norrell	Zablocki
Gross	O'Brien, Ill.	
Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.	

NAYS—1

Taber

NOT VOTING—107

Abernethy	George	Moulder
Allen, La.	Hall,	Nelson
Anfuso	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Harden	O'Hara
Bates, Ky.	Hébert	Patman
Beall	Heller	Poage
Beckworth	Herter	Potter
Bender	Heselton	Powell
Bentsen	Hillings	Price
Blackney	Hoffman, Ill.	Redden
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Brooks	Hope	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Johnson	Richards
Buckley	Jonas	Robeson
Buffett	Judd	Sabath
Burdick	Kean	St. George
Butler	Kearney	Sasscer
Carlyle	Kennedy	Scott,
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Hugh D., Jr.
Combs	Kilburn	Sheehan
Cooper	King, Pa.	Short
Coudert	Klein	Sikes
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Stigler
Curtis, Nebr.	Larcade	Sutton
Davis, Tenn.	Latham	Tackett
Dawson	Lesinski	Taylor
Dolliver	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Durham	McConnell	Vinson
Eaton	McGregor	Vursell
Elston	McKinnon	Watts
Evins	McMillan	Welch
Fenton	Martin, Mass.	Wickersham
Fine	Mitchell	Willis
Fisher	Morano	Wolcott
Forrester	Morris	Woodruff
Fugate	Morrison	
Furcolo	Morton	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Redden with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Price with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Short.
Mr. Heller with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. George.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Cooper with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Evins, with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Butler.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Curtis of Nebraska.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN HOUSE RESOLUTIONS CHANGING NAME OF COMMITTEE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 737) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That House Resolutions 124 and 623, Eighty-second Congress, be, and they are hereby, amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" where it appears in the said resolutions and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffman;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek;

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Ai-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also anounced that the Senate had passed bills, concurrent resolutions, and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 107. An act to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians and a better utilization of the resources of the Papago Tribe, and for other purposes;

S. 142. An act for the relief of Vito Rizzi;

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 624. An act for the relief of Hajna Sepsi;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 960. An act to authorize an agreement between the United States and Mexico for the joint operation and maintenance by the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, of the Nogales sanitation project, and for other purposes;

S. 1126. An act for the relief of Vera Sarah Keenan;

S. 1238. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Eileen Ida Sanders;

S. 1358. An act for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky;

S. 1393. An act to amend section 67 of the National Defense Act, as amended, to provide for an active-duty status for all United States property and fiscal officers, and for other purposes;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Malica Macesich;

S. 1588. An act to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended;

S. 1596. An act for the relief of Phed Vosniacos;

S. 1613. An act for the relief of Lian-Tong Wen and Kim Fong Chen;

S. 1716. An act for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter;

S. 1780. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander D. Moruzi;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1829. An act to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 1927. An act for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo;

S. 1966. An act for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo;

S. 2008. An act to permit payment of certain cost-of-living allowances outside the continental United States at rates in excess of 25 percent of the rate of basic compensation;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of the Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2262. An act to validate certain payments for accrued leave made to members of the Armed Forces who accepted discharges for the purpose of immediate reenlistment for an indefinite period;

S. 2291. An act to amend the laws of the District of Columbia to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poisons and for other purposes, as enacted by Congress May 7, 1906, and as amended February 27, 1907, and as amended March 4, 1927 (D. C. Code of 1929, title 20, sec. 2-601, and the following);

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2364. An act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits;

S. 2372. An act for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko;

S. 2373. An act for the relief of the Reverend A. E. Smith;

S. 2407. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to George Scott;

S. 2439. An act for the relief of the Federal Republic of Germany;

S. 2453. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Donald B. Billedeaux;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2479. An act for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb;

S. 2487. An act to permit review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged, and for other purposes;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825);

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2763. An act for the relief of Harry Ray Smith;

S. 2810. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Winona Yellowtail;

S. 2815. An act to amend section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, as amended, so as to extend and broaden the program for reimbursement of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of public airports damaged by Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 2918. An act to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes;

S. 2989. An act for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 3027. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

S. 3050. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims for damage to private property, loss of wages, personal injuries, and death, arising out of noncombat activities of the Army;

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3263. An act relating to the rate of postage on certain publications entered as second-class matter prior to June 28, 1932;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin;

S. 3303. An act to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship, and for other purposes;

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor and for other purposes;

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet;

S. 3351. An act to establish a policy with respect to the granting of special exemptions to organizations and corporations from taxes imposed by the laws of the District of Columbia;

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Praczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Davis;

S. 3435. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to provide for the use in first- and second-class post offices of special canceling stamps or postmarking dies in order to encourage voting in general elections;

S. Con. Res. 88. Concurrent resolution to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2938, to amend the Federal Reserve Act;

S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to print proceedings at the presentation of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence;

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a Special Investigator and not to exceed five deputies with power to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and to prosecute such conduct where found; and

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and six months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the state of war.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6163. An act to provide the basis for authorization of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8271. An act to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1999. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

AMENDING FEDERAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5350) to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "laws", insert "because such lands are not substantially changed in character by improvements."

Page 2, line 10, after "(2)", insert "to the extent that payment is not made or credit allowed therefor."

Page 2, strike out line 11, and insert:

"(d) By deleting the figure '$75,000,000' in the third sentence of section 109 (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '$150,000,000'."

Page 3, line 19, after "be", insert "prepared and submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress and a copy."

Page 4, line 9, after "Administration.", insert "Accounting for the fund shall be maintained on the accrual method and financial reports shall be prepared on the basis of such accounting."

Page 4, line 11, after "required", insert "but not to exceed the amount of $10,000,000."

Page 4, line 12, strike out "buildings," and insert "buildings."

Page 5, line 11, strike out "245" and insert "345."

Page 6, after line 10, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 29 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924 (43 Stat. 615; 38 U. S. C. 455), as amended by section 3 of the act of October 31, 1951 (Public Law 247, 82d Cong.), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: 'The proceeds from such leases, less expenses for maintenance, operation, and repair of buildings leased for living quarters, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS: AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 736.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any study, survey or investigation made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENCH LAKE IRRIGATION COMPANY OF HURRICANE, UTAH

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7305) to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"SEC. 3. There are hereby reserved to the United States all rights to minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1732) to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, after "Rico", insert ", Guam."

Page 2, line 6, preceding "and" insert "the apportionment for Guam."

Page 2, line 9, after "Rico", insert ", Guam."

Page 2, line 14, after "Rico", insert ", Guam."

Page 2, after line 16, insert:

"(c) Section 11 (d) (1) of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C., sec. 1760 (d) (1)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) "State" includes any of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.'"

Page 2, line 17, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930 WITH RESPECT TO IMPORTATION OF FEATHERS OF WILD BIRDS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7594) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 5, after line 18, insert:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to admit free of duty a certain carillon of 23 bells to be imported for the Citadel, Charleston, S. C."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and to admit free of duty a carillon for the Citadel, Charleston, S. C., and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTORY BIBLE CAMP GROUND, INC.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1553) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 9, after "deposits" insert ", including oil and gas."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHOLIC BISHOP OF NORTHERN ALASKA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3494) to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic Bishop of Northern Alaska for use as a mission, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 3. There are hereby reserved to the United States all rights to minerals, including oil and gas, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES A. GANN

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, and D'EWART.

CONVEYANCE TO THE TOWN OF DEDHAM, MAINE, OF A CERTAIN STRIP OF LAND

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, and D'EWART.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION TO ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT AND GROWTH OF THE EDUCATIONAL FINE ARTS PROGRAM

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7494) to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities, and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, what committee reported this bill?

Mr. HOWELL. The Committee on Education and Labor. There was a unanimous report.

Mr. HALLECK. Did the gentleman talk to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCCONNELL] about it?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Did he say it was O. K.?

Mr. HOWELL. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make provision for bringing to Washington, D. C., and to other communities in the United States where the Federal Government or the government of the District of Columbia has suitable space under its jurisdiction, for public presentation, fine-arts productions of such colleges and universities and nonprofit organizations.

SEC. 2. Upon the request of any college, university, or nonprofit organization approved for the purposes of the first section of this act by the Commissioner of Education, the General Services Administration, or the District of Columbia government, as the case may be, is authorized to make available without charge to any such college, university, or nonprofit organization for the presentation of fine-arts productions under this act and the sale of tickets of admission thereto, any suitable space subject to the jurisdiction and control of any department or agency of the Federal Government or the District of Columbia government with the concurrence of the department or agency concerned; but in providing suitable space for the presentation of such productions neither the Federal Government nor the government of the District of Columbia shall incur any expenses or assume any financial responsibility except those incidental to the furnishing of heat, light, and custodial services necessary for such productions in such space.

SEC. 3. The Commissioner of Education is authorized to receive contributions of money, materials, and other property from any source to aid in developing the programs authorized by this act. Any contributions of money so received shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of a special fund, which shall be available to the Commissioner of Education for developing and carrying out the program authorized by this act. The financial transactions of the Commissioner of Education under this act shall be audited at least once each year by the General Accounting Office in accordance with such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "fine arts" includes living drama and music, opera, literature, architecture, sculpture, painting, ballet, and dance.

(2) The term "nonprofit organization" means any public or private foundation, charitable trust, or other organization (whether or not incorporated), no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any of its stockholders or members.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, beginning with the word "to", strike out down to and including the word "organizations", page 2, line 3, and insert "to assist in making arrangements for the public presentation in Washington, D. C., of fine-arts productions of such colleges and universities and nonprofit organizations"

Page 3, strike out lines 3 to 14, inclusive.

Page 3, line 15, strike out "4" and insert "3."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT O. HOLLAND AND BERGTOR HAALAND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 8, after "state" insert "while employed in Venezuela under contract with the Venezuelan Government."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIS A. BAKKEN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 746) for the relief of Harris A. Bakken, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 6, strike out "$3,692.80" and insert "$3,692.02, plus interest which has since accrued."

Line 10, strike out "$3,692.80" and insert "$3,692.02, plus interest on such sum."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHELBY SHOE CO., OF SALEM, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1095) for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) in full settlement of the claim of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass., against the United States for losses sustained by it as a result of contract No. W 19-074qm-4267, dated May 21, 1946, with the Procurement Division of the Department of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $84,498.98 to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts who shall use such sum (1) to pay to each unsecured creditor of said Shelby Shoe Co., after giving notice and upon demand therefor, as provided in subsection (b), the unpaid balance of his claim against such company appearing in schedules heretofore filed, under chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Act, in the Shelby Shoe Co. bankruptcy case, No. 70372, and (2) to pay the balance of such sum, after making the payments authorized in (1) and deducting all incidental expenses incurred in the disbursement of such sum, to said Shelby Shoe Co.; but nothing contained herein shall authorize the payment to any such creditor of interest on the unpaid balance of his claim against such company.

"(b) Upon receipt of the sum herein authorized to be paid to the Secretary of the Treasury, said clerk shall cause notice to be published not less than once in each of three successive weeks in one or more newspapers of general circulation, and a copy thereof sent by registered mail to the last known address of each of the creditors described in subsection (a), advising such creditors of the provisions of this act. No such creditor shall be entitled to any payment under this act unless he shall file with said clerk a written claim therefor within 3 months after the date of such notice shall be last published, or the date such notice shall have been mailed to his last known address, whichever is the later.

"(c) No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. G. ALLEN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$937.75" and insert "$550."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERRING JURISDICTION ON UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3060) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after "Code", insert ": *Provided, however,* That nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States Government or any other defendant named in such suit."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS TUTNAUER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Morris Tutnauer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINA MARSIGLIA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3653) for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $11,288.50 to the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of said estate against the United States as damages for the death of said Michael R. Marsiglia, who was fatally injured on December 2, 1944, when he was struck by a United States Army vehicle while said motor vehicle was proceeding on and over the public highway at the corner of West Houston and Varick Streets, Manhattan, New York City, N. Y.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS C. DENNIS AND MARVIN SPIRES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4163) for the relief of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires of

Eastover, S. C., with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C., for alleged personal injuries and expenses incident thereto sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on August 9, 1946, in Columbia, S. C.

"SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitation. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon, if any, shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of a liability on the part of the Government of the United States."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH DENEKAR AND MRS. MARY A. DENEKAR

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4180) for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Line 10, strike out all after "Denekar." down to and including line 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE F. GARRETT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4188) for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$140.95" and insert "$390."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH MANCHION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4842) for the relief of Joseph Manchion, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "Court" and insert "Tort."

Page 2, line 3, after "act", insert "No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD J. VOLTIN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4932) for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$4,784.14" and insert "$2,284.14."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$842.46" and insert "$94.66."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$22,605.94" and insert "$15,805.94."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "$14,208.76" and insert "$5,515.73."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "$18,810.28" and insert "$13,798.68."

Page 2, lines 3 and 4, strike out "to pay Mrs. Emma Geneva Burke the sum of $549.34."

Page 2, line 7, strike out "and."

Page 2, lines 8 and 9, strike out all after "Antonio," down to and including "Force" in line 13 and insert "Tex., and to pay Mrs. W. E. Deal, Jr., of Los Alamos, N. Mex., the sum of $1,209.30. Payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by these claimants as a result of the crash of the United States Air Force airplane on Quincy Street, San Antonio, Tex., on July 11, 1948, such plane being operated by a member of the United States Air Force."

Page 2, line 15, after *"Provided,"* insert "That no part of the amount provided for in this act shall be subject to any claim for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund which may have paid any amount to the claimants herein by reason of the property damage incurred: *And provided further.*"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDRIANNE LUIZ AND JOHN LUIZ

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7331) for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike "$1,250" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "of", where it occurs the first time, down to and including "Luiz," in line 11, and insert "$25, in full settlement of all the claims of John Luiz against the United States and in full settlement of all claims of Andrianne Luiz against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of wages."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2470) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Nevada."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Utah."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "five or more of."

Page 2, line 8, strike out all after "States" down to and including "Washington", in line 10.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

PETRUS VAN KEER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3389) for the relief of Petrus Van Keer.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ALEXEI FRANK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5538) for the relief of Alexei Frank.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MRS. MARGARETTE G. COOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1967) for the relief of Mrs. Margarette G. Cook.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

MARIA GRAZIA MARANTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7645) for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, relating to illiteracy, Maria Grazia Maranto may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGNES ISHIKAWA AND SHIROI MORIYAMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7919) for the relief of Agnes Ishikawa and Shiroi Moriyama.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor children Agnes Ishikawa and Shiroi Moriyama shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Master Sergeant and Mrs. Benjamin R. Romero, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORAZIO BALASSO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 423) for the relief of Orazio Balasso.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Orazio Balasso shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 732) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ciro Careaga, Vicente Galarza, Jose Manuel Batista Perez, Jesus Llona Mencheca, Agustin Uriarte, Segundo Ybarro, Manuel Olavarria, Tomas Lanzoa, Francisco Grana, Guillermo Chacartegui, Nicasio Larrinaga Ortube, Julian Orbe Zuazua, Thomas Aransolo Abadea, George Aransolo Abadea, and Jose Erenosaga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER KOELZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1454) for the relief of Walter Koelz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the first and ninth categories of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (a) and (d)), Walter Koelz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Walter Koelz becoming a public charge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADELE FRATTINI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1479) for the relief of Adele Frattini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Adele Frattini shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TSUNEO TANIGAWA, ALSO KNOWN AS DAVID LAWRENCE ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1840) for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sgt. Ernest P. Rogers and his wife, Annie L. Rogers, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JO ANN FOSBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2166) for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Jo Ann Fosberg, a minor child, shall be considered the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Raymond O. Fosberg, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIANCAMARIA CORI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2249) for the relief of Biancamaria Cori.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Biancamaria Cori, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mary Cory, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NICHOLAS J. AND ELIZABETH MIURA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2277) for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura, minor adopted children, shall be considered the natural-born alien children of Frank A. Valentine, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHIKO OKUDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2289) for the relief of Michiko Okuda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Michiko Okuda, the Japanese fiancée of Paul S. Tani, and that the said Michiko Okuda shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Michiko Okuda is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Paul S. Tani, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Michiko Okuda, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Michiko Okuda, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Michiko Okuda as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HSIEH TA-CHUAN OR DER OTT-KUAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2313) for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of the act of December 17, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 601; 60 Stat. 975; 8 U. S. C. 212 (a)), Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan, alien minor child of William Shao-T'ang Hsieh, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States as a nonquota immigrant in accordance with sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, if such alien is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IOANNIS DIMITRIOU COHILIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2395) for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IWANNA PRYJMA AND ROMA PRYJMA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2609) for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required head taxes and visa fees.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the nonpreference category of the appropriate immigration quota for the first year such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD LEE FERGUSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2733) for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr., a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Corp. Donald Lee Ferguson, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BONNIE JEAN MacLEAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3032) for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Bonnie Jean MacLean, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. Wallace K. MacLean, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUN MIYATA

The Clerk called the bill S. 3132, for the relief of Jun Miyata.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Jun Miyata, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Loyd Greenfield, Jr., a citizen of the United States, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jun Miyata may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR DE LA BRETONIERE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3140) for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Victor de la Bretoniere, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. John W. McDonnell, a citizen of the United States, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Victor de la Bretoniere may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ICHIRO IIDA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3240) for the relief of Ichiro Iida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Ichiro Iida, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Warrant Officer Richard Leroy Tracy, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE B. HENLY CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1707) for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the George B. Henly Construction Co., Boise, Idaho, the sum of $22,929.69. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the George B. Henly Construction Co., Inc., against the United States for additional compensation under the contract dated February 16, 1948 (No. 12r-17891), between the United States and such company for the construction of earthwork and structures, Locket Gulch wasteway, according to specifications numbered 1252 of the Mitchell Butte division, Owyhee project, Oregon-Idaho. Such claims are based on additional expenses incurred by such company as a result of conditions not set forth in the specifications and plans for such construction and which could not reasonably have been anticipated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL A. WISE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1741) for the relief of Samuel A. Wise.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel A. Wise, of Dover, Del., the sum of $65.30 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of (1) the sum of $45 paid by him in satisfaction of a judgment rendered against him as a result of his damaging a privately owned vehicle while driving a Government-owned vehicle in the performance of his duties as an engineering aide, and (2) the sum of $20.30 paid by him for court costs and attorney's fees in connection with such judgment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESLIE A. CONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1988) for the relief of Leslie A. Connell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leslie A. Connell, of Tacoma, Wash., the sum of $2,622, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of (1) the sum of $2,500 paid by him in satisfaction of a judgment rendered against him as a result of his injuring a pedestrian while driving a Government-owned vehicle in the performance of his duties as a mail collector, and (2) the sum of $122 paid by him for court costs, attorney fees, and filing fees in connection with such judgment: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any persons violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR K. PRIOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2147) for the relief of Arthur K. Prior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur K. Prior, of South Orrington, Maine, the sum of $520.28, representing the amount paid by him in satisfaction of a judgment rendered against him in the Superior Court, Bangor, Maine, for damage caused by him in the course of his employment as an employee of the Post Office Department, Bangor, Maine: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE AND TOWN OF NEW BOSTON, N. H.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2393) for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of New Hampshire the sum of $2,295.96, and to the town of New Boston, N. H., the sum of $2,295.96, in full satisfaction of their respective claims for reimbursement of expenditures made by such State and such town in combating a forest fire on a United States Army bombing range located near the town of New Boston, N. H., on May 2, 1942, and for 3 days thereafter: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 1918 SENT TO COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called House Resolution 709, providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 1918) for the relief of Dewey J. Crites, Jack Mayta, and James Willette.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 1918) entitled "A bill for the relief of Dewey J. Crites, Jack Mayta, and James Willette," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EMILY WILHELM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4755) for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Emily Wilhelm, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $10,000, representing the amount which the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm would have received, as beneficiary under a policy of national service life insurance in the amount of $10,000, if Gerhart Wilhelm, corporal, United States Marine Corps (305908), deceased son of the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm had applied for and

been granted such policy under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, had paid premiums, and had designated the said Mrs. Emily Wilhelm as sole beneficiary of such policy. The death of the said Gerhart Wilhelm as a result of enemy action in the line of duty on November 2, 1942, in the British Solomon Islands and his sudden departure from the continental United States shortly prior thereto, did not permit registry of application for such policy.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the sign "$", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 8, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "5,000 as a gratuity for the death of her son, Gerhart Wilhelm, corporal, United States Marine Corps (305908), who was killed as the result of enemy action in line of duty on November 2, 1942, in the British Solomon Islands."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF RENE WEIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5376) for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Rene Weil, late of New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,927.23, together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1944. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States for refund of overpayments in Federal estate tax which were made, on July 30, 1943, and February 1, 1944, as a result of the fact that certain Federal and State income-tax payments had not been deducted from the value of the gross estate as provided by section 812 (b) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the figures, strike out ", together with interest compounded at the rate of 6 percent per annum from February 1, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD LEVANDOSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5485) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski, Dunkirk, N. Y., the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski against the United States arising out of the death of their minor daughter, Jean, which occurred on June 11, 1951, when she fell over a cliff while running along an unprotected and badly eroded path on Coast Guard property adjacent to Point Gratiot Park, a public park and playground in Dunkirk, N. Y. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. WALTER C. WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5541) for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Capt. Walter C. Wolf, United States Army, retired, is hereby relieved of all liability to pay to the United States the sum of $800. Such sum represents an amount which the Comptroller General has ruled was erroneously paid to the said Capt. Walter C. Wolf as enlistment allowance in connection with his reenlistment in the United States Army on July 25, 1949. No officer or employee of the United States shall be liable to the United States by reason of having paid any part of such enlistment allowance to the said Capt. Walter C. Wolf, and in the settlement of the account of any such officer or employee, full credit shall be given for any amount so paid.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Capt. Walter C. Wolf an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or which have been withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of such claim of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLIFFORD ROBINSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7365) for the relief of Clifford Robinson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clifford Robinson, Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of $137.71. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Clifford Robinson was held liable on January 24, 1952, in a civil action in the municipal court of Cleveland, as the result of an accident which occurred near the intersection of Chester Avenue and Thirty-sixth Street in Cleveland on March 19, 1951, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Clifford Robinson, a letter carrier in the United States post office, Cleveland, Ohio. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Clifford Robinson shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FELIX GARCIA AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7368) for the relief of Felix Garcia and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Felix Garcia, of Barrio Naranjito, Hatillo, Puerto Rico, the sum of $204.65; to Henriette Buaillon, of 26 Rue Lucien Vallee, Petit-Quevilly, Seine Inferieure, France, the sum of $2,421; and to Stanley James Carpenter, of 46 Linnegatan, Goteborg, Sweden, the sum of $256. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States, arising out of damages to private property, loss of wages, personal injuries, and death, caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable under existing statute available for the settlement of claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK CARPENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7687) for the relief of Jack Carpenter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jack Carpenter, Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $85. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Jack Carpenter against the United States for reimbursement of the amount which he paid Bruce J. Walth-

ers in settlement of a judgment which the said Bruce J. Walthers recovered against him for damages arising out of a collision which occurred on March 24, 1951, in Milwaukee, Wis., and involved a vehicle operated by the said Bruce J. Walthers, and a vehicle owned by the United States and operated by the said Jack Carpenter as an employee in the field service of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH D. CRUNK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7827) for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth D. Crunk, widow of Tim D. Crunk, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ruth D. Crunk against the United States for the death of her husband on January 22, 1944, as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (Congressional No. 17857, decided April 3, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 268, 81st Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of such fire: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. BANNING AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8001) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,236.41, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $422.35 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $428.46 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $30.70 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, deceased, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of $14.90 shall be credited in the accounts of Don Iler, regional disbursing officer, New York, N. Y., such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees or former employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeit bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell, Ben Binkley, Ottmar W. Epple, Edele Froussard, Caroline O. Gesner, Agatha M. Joy, Rosetta H. Little, James A. Metzger, Mary L. Milhollin, Edith G. Mohr, David R. Mooney, Jr., and Joseph C. Zoellner, $10 each; Bertha M. Barrett, F. H. Bowden, Jr., Joan Conrad, Mary Jane Davis, and Edward J. Jerge, $20 each; and Ashton J. Daussat, A. L. Schwemm, Joe V. Vandiver, and Mildred P. Whartenby, $30 each.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMER C. BOOZER AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8205) for the relief of Homer C. Boozer and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $62.60, $34.12, $18.78, $18.78, and $35.68, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, Wilmington, Del., during the period beginning December 16, 1951, and ending December 31, 1951, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-6196857, Ho, Kwo Mo.
A-6382891, Ho, Yu Hu.
A-6382892, Ho, Mai-Li.
A-6382893, Ho Min-We.
A-6097798, Kaneko, Kakuaki.
A-6143970, Kaneko, Otari.
A-7251808, Kapsouris, Nikolaos Giorgios.
A-5891900, Barone, Alfonso.
A-6552336, Johanson, Mary Ann or Christine Mary Johanson or Mary Ann Lander or Mary Ann Blythe or Mary Ann Levy.
A-1712752, Koumilkis, George or Georgios or George Koukis.
A-6041640, Lozano-Luna, Maximiano.
A-7145267, Ramos de Garcia, Rosa, formerly Rosa Ramos de Villalobos and Rosa Ramos.
A-4099428, Bertonasco, Delfina Virginia.
A-4572678, Casademont, Enrique or Enrique Deulonder Xasademont or Henry Casademont.
A-3430025, Dentamaro, Antonio.
A-6026525, Feng, Tsuan Hua.
A-1678372, Fredriksson, Lajha Lydia or Lajha Frederickson or Fredriksson.
A-6550914, Friedman, Pesle Babinovieicz.
A-6341322, Friedman, Vilem Kahn.
A-7476108, Godinez, Francisco Lopez.
A-6771337, Honigsfeld, Jacob (Jacub or Jakub) or Honingsfeld.
A-6771340, Honigsfeld, Sala (nee Grupsmith).
A-6851700, Jui, Oong or John Jue.
A-7197805, Jui, Shu Yi (nee Shy Yi Chang).
A-6843406, Ling, Charles Cho-Sung.
A-6848586, Ling, Ruth Jin-Heng Kao.
A-7269595, Liu, Charlotte Chih-Hwa Tsui.
A-6849835, Liu, Oscar Chun.
A-6556385, Chien, I-Nien.
A-6848064, Chien, Yen-Lin Liu.
A-4869708, Cia, Elisa Andrea.
A-7423209, Coy, Jung alias Barrie Snow.
A-6851498, Dai, Victor Shenyu.
A-5484248, Ford, Joshua N., also known as Joshua Ford and Charles Ford.
A-5447998, Gliesche, Willy.
A-5407264, Goebel, Walter Ernest August.
A-2288509, Juhar, Louis Frank.
A-7596073, Kovacs, Jeanette.
A-1991429, Lamela, Joseph Formosa or Jose Formoso Lamela, alias Manuel P. La Mela.
A-5053864, Maahs, Emil.
A-3362967, Martinez, Antonio Maria Lopez or Antonio Lopez.
A-3440298, Moy, Chang Sue.
A-4223769, Muza, Elizabeth or Elizabeth Coyle or Elibieta Muza.
A-1267361, Satas, Anthony.
A-4635329, Singh, Ram or Munsy.
A-4689213, Siwy, William Wenas or Amad Bin Hussein.
A-7132841, Ternullo, Sarina (nee Sarina Albano).
A-2868900, Tseo, Josepha Shu Hwa.
A-4674788, Venieris, Demetrios Alexandros or James Venieris.
A-1384799, Zapata de Duran, Faviana.
A-4763253, Alabacis, Antonio or Andon Alabacoff.
A-4183648, Beato, Edward or Eduardo or Eduardo Pedro Beato or Eduardo P. Bernal.
A-7967823, Beato, Esther Flora (nee Hernandez-Valdes).
A-3402784, De Silva, David Gomes or Manoel or Manuel Augusto Ferreira Malaquias.
A-4483910, Dezsofi, Sylvia Solal or Sylvia Dessy (nee Sylvia Camille Solal).
A-3117380, Fazel, Mongu or Mongu Khan or Mongu (Mongoo) Kahn and Kahn Mongu.
A-5601788, Gutaj, Wladyslaw or Walter Guttofsky or Henry Borecki or Henry Guttofsky or Henry Gutaj or Henry Walter Guttofsky or Wladyslaw Butak.
A-2460825, Hernandez-Marquez, Felipe.
A-7607791, Hikind, Frida.
A-6707432, Hikind, Majer.

A-6924608, Hoffman, Aron.
A-6017669, Hu, Ho Sheng.
A-6083911, Hu, Jui Chen (nee Hsu).
A-4180044, Jee, Wong Ding, Wong Ting Chi, Wong Kit, Wong Long Hip, Wong Gock Git, Wong Dock Mong, Gook Git, Wong Lai Hip.
A-2111328, Jelenco, Katherine or Jelenko.
A-7174612, Lee, Hoy Chen or Shue Mon Lee or Hoy Lee or Shew Mang.
A-6954786, Lightenstein, Eva (nee Lightenstein).
A-6794748, Lightenstein, Juda.
A-7539779, Ling, Julia Kuo-Fang alias Julia Agnes Ling-Ling Kuo Fang.
A-6730663, Liu, Yen Chueh or Josephine Liu Yen (nee Liu Chueh).
A-4575992, McGowan, John Joseph.
A-4206663, Moser, Daniel Edwin.
A-3780185, Ni, Ernest In-Hsin or In-Hsin Ni, alias Ying Hein Ni or Ni Ni Hsing.
A-7632240, Ni, Katherine Kao or Katherine Chun Chun Kao.
A-6635618, Oliveras, Edita or Crisologo.
A-4237553, Ozawa, Tsuneo or Tuneo Ozawa.
A-5887193, Panouskis, John Demou.
A-2634579, Ploha, Erich Ernst or Erich Ernst Ploss.
A-7064180, Reiss, Gertrude.
A-5799529, Scott, Thomas Walker.
A-4373329, Von Mathe, Johannes.
A-2694988, Badali, Clifford James Dunlop.
A-3021157, Badali, Joseph Chamberlain.
A-5177121, Bain, Peter, also known as Peter Beneaz or Panagiotis Beneaz.
A-1875416, Bauernfeind, Josefa.
A-3966816, Camponeschi, Antonina Colapaoli or Antonina Pittori or Angela Colapaoli Pittori or Angela C. Colapaoli.
A-6848475, Chang, Mei-Yum (Rose Fei).
A-6428100, Chen, Ching-Hsiang.
A-6428101, Chen, Yu-Yung Li.
A-4931450, Danzo, Sally Mello.
A-4973660, Draht, Emil.
A-1228392, Fang, Chao Ying.
A-1228389, Fang, Lien Che-Tu.
A-2100147, Gee, Myra Pui-Lan Chan or Myra Pui-Lan Chan.
A-6471817, Giocarinis, Kinon Theodore.
A-5223655, Gomes, Manuel Pereira.
A-3642362, Grinoff, Zachari.
A-4477781, Harding, Thomas Sargent.
A-7049762, Hines, Mabel Angelina Gordon.
A-7202557, Hoffman, Ruzena.
A-6497649, Langer, Zmira.
A-6667187, Langer, Moses Izaak.
A-7809301, Lee, Da-Tsien Tzu.
A-5275376, Lee, Tsung Chi.
A-2075626, Loh, Cheng Shan.
A-6306141, Nunno, Angelo.
A-5515615, Pennanen, Rose Anne (nee Carpentier) or Cecile Brown.
A-6401861, Sakellariadis, Christos Sypeos.
A-4010952, Schultz, Willy Carl.
A-3350274, Tsang, Sin.
A-3293391, Zettl, George Stefan.
A-3293409, Zettl, Marie Tresa.
A-2370115, Baharas, Maralambos or Harry Barras.
A-4183586, Burt, Morris or Moishe Berterinsky.
A-5815116, Bunger, Herman.
A-9825309, Casareo, Giuseppe.
A-7975634, Chang, Shue Wem Yeh.
A-7096061, Dengiz, Fikret.
A-7197554, Fodor, Elizabeth (nee Mitterbach).
A-7197555, Fodor, Stephen or Istvan Etienne Fodor.
A-7002683, Galisky, Albert or Albert Joseph Galisky.
A-1218184, Healy, Patrick.
A-7050467, Hernandez, Francisco.
A-4506846, Inouye, Tasaburo.
A-4813778, Levitt, Mortimer or Max Levitt or Morty Levitt.
A-7130218, Martinez, Irene.
A-7130216, Martinez, Juana.
A-7130217, Martinez, Severiano.
A-7136957, Martinez-Martinez, Arturo.
A-6964605, Ming, Fu En or En Ming Fu or Fu En Ming Cheng.
A-3800541, Sagi, Mihajlo or Mihaly Sagi or Mihailo Sagi.
A-5515787, Schwartz, Fred Hellmuth (Fritz Hellmuth Schwartz).
A-7841636, Sfikas, Panagiotis or Pfikos or Sfigas.
A-5746267, Smith, Rennie.
A-5950762, Sourvanos, Spyridos or Spyridos Sourvandos or Spryiday Sourvayos or Speros Sourvanos.
A-3124841, Spithogiannis, Elias or George Livanos or Elias Spethogiannis.
A-3199325, Tauber, Irene or Irene Rosenburg or Irene Link or Irene Chumbley.
A-5925688, Temelcovich, George Stoyan, also known as George Stevens and Joseph Anthony.
A-3552409, Tim, Joe or Tom.
A-4738293, Venier, Victor Volvero.
A-7032653, Welsch, Elizabeth (nee Dinger).
A-4386026, Welsch, Nikolaus.
A-4673268, Jager, Elizabeth (nee Welsch).
A-7512689, Yang, Yin Chang.
A-3887584, Yuen, Loy or Yuen Loy or Yen Loy.
A-2817827, Zung, Fong Yu Sun.
A-7016074, Zung, Tse Kwai Thomas.
A-6554479, Andrianopoulos, Apostolos Konstantine.
A-4535422, Barbaresos, Stefanos, Constantinos.
A-7463934, Bonilla, Rafael Gavilanes.
A-2602878, Brindle, Doreen or Dora Brindle.
A-3514333, Cadiente-Cabarloc, Gaspar or Gaspar Cabarloc Cadiente.
A-7222533, Cheng, Tom or Tom Emile Cheng.
A-5151562, Cochrane, James or Hamish.
A-6647069, Damon, Dorothy Emily, formerly Tibbetts (nee Drew).
A-6647070, Damon, Dexter Grant.
A-6647071, Damon, Ronald John.
A-7240670, Esparza-Olisaba, Ebaristo.
A-4522822, Ferguson, Sarah Hirt.
A-7240382, Georgoulopoulos, Jean Ant. or John Anthony Georgoulopoulos.
A-7375876, Hernandez, Jose.
A-6805610, Lichtig, Chawa (nee Chawa Gotlib).
A-6805614, Lichtig, Owi Majer.
A-7290163, Maris, Demetrios Konstantinos also known as James Marie.
A-7828966, Matiatos, Zacharias.
A-7576490, Matsukata, Mari.
A-6703629, Poggi, Andrew Dennis.
A-5524452, Sideris, Sideris Dimitrious.
A-2884417, Simon, Martin.
A-6704055, Ancheta, Fred Siazon.
A-7560721, Chao, Lo Hui or Nelson Hui Chao Lo.
A-6622743, Chronopoulos, Peter John.
A-7560596, Chow, Wen Mou.
A-6591973, Diamantopoulos, Socrates Athanasiou.
A-4914119, Hyndman, Richard Louis.
A-7809534, Jimenz-Ponce, Refugio.
A-9764775, Meah, Sona.
A-6880819, Papaelias, Emmanuel Louis.
A-7095000, Samonas, Evangelos.
A-7140300, Yan, Ng, Ng Tut, Ng Sam, Ng Dat Sam, Dar Sam.
A-6243822, Zwierzchowski, Alexander Antoine.
A-3135560, Beltran De Trujillo, Elena or Maneula Martinez.
A-7058995, Brooks, Eric Vincent.
A-5731311, Chang, Mildred Yuhua.
A-7423200, Clark, Ruth Viola or Ruth Viola Kiesow.
A-7583911, Fung, Fung Yuen.
A-7050419, Gasparis, Stanley or Efstratios Gasparis.
A-4760208, Marlun, Charles Hamilton or Charles Hamilton or Mar Lun or Lun Mar.
A-7483662, Pires, Eduardo or Eddie Pires.
A-9134073, Tak, Lum.
A-6501673, Bider, Fanny or Fanny Niederhoffer.
A-1437617, Bouche, Edward Adolf.
A-6388747, Calyvopoulos, Alexander Demetre.
A-9670886, Chapero, Americo or Americo Chapero y Escribano.
A-7841592, Chapman, James Austin or Chappie alias Croney.
A-7934945, Courtois, Cyril.
A-7476842, Creque, Leo Adelbert.
A-5778137, Cunning, Helena (nee McCampfield).
A-4614561, Cunningham, Mary Gladys (nee Mary Gladys Lahey).
A-4614562, Cunningham, Richard John.
A-5765012, Delangy, Joseph Philip or Alfred Parent.
A-6726830, De Organista, Baltazar Benita or Benita Baltazar de Romo.
A-4332736, De Valenzuela, Maria Felix or Maria Felix De Garcia.
A-7130699, Equihua-Gallego, Jose.
A-1369494, Escobedo-Carrillo or Jose E. Carrillo.
A-4875957, Ferenci, Rose.
A-5702749, Ferraro, Modesto Nicola.
A-6838830, Flores, Antonio Martinez.
A-6878621, Generalis, Savas.
A-5152035, Goldstein, Leib or Leb or Louis Goldstein or Benny Greenberg.
A-6686157, Gonzalez-Lopez, Ismael.
A-5418058, Gonzalez-Ybarba, Roberto.
A-2258286, Green, Lloyd or Lloyd Seburn.
A-5363172, Guerra, Ramon.
A-5881095, Gumbs, David Wilson.
A-7866943, Harrison, Mary Louise (nee Midford).
A-5470742, Hodge, Lillian Agatha or Lillian Agatha Todman.
A-7127881, Jaramillo, Manuel or Manuel Jaramillo-Alvarez.
A-7127882, Jaramillo, Carlos Manuel.
A-7127883, Jaramillo, Carlota.
A-7127884, Jaramillo, Tranquilino.
A-7130219, Lerma, Agustin.
A-7130207, Lerma, Manuel or Manuel Linna-Elias.
A-7130205, Lerma-Guerrero, Valepte.
A-7083364, Lujan, Pedro.
A-2084132, Maravilla, Jose Luis or Jose Luis Maravilla-Mendez.
A-4416088, Montelongo-Valdez, Antonio or Antonio V. Montelongo.
A-7050963, Nunez, Herlinda.
A-7050962, Nunez, Trinidad or Trinidad Nunez-Sanchez.
A-6935829, Perez, Vicente.
A-6639079, Pulido-Heredia, Manuel.
A-9777264, Quoy, Lee or Lee Quey or Quoy Lee or Quey Lee.
A-5657087, Rosales-Morones, Tomas.
A-6031803, Salazar-Balli, Fidencio.
A-7203576, Tritsarolis, Dimitrios.
A-7809285, Vourvoulas, Evangelos or Evangelos Bourboulois.
A-9125432, Anthanasidias, Nicolaos.
A-9799631, Carvounnis, John.
A-4203501, Cederholm, Axel Hugo.
A-7240213, Freire, Ildefonso Henrique, Jr.
A-9825161, Garcia, Antonio or Antonio Garcia Vasquez.
A-9825373, Glykis, Dionysios or Dennis Glykis.
A-4289793, Kutsay, Ali Umit.
A-6626121, Ling, Wen Sze-Yung alias Sze Yung Wen.
A-7144642, Lopez-Becerra, Jesus.
A-7118314, Martinez-Moreno, Jose.
A-7140261, Ortiz, Carlos or Carlos Ortiz Martinez.
A-6904342, Outor, Carolino Dos Santos.
A-7415959, Robinson, Vincent.
A-7140260, Robledo, Jesus or Jesus Robledo-Rosas.
A-5168538, Brett, Alfred George.
A-7483112, Canelopoulos, Philippe or Philip or Kanellos or Kanel Lopoulos.
A-1333078, Carreon, Miguel.
A-5691467, Daly, Catherine Mary (nee Buttress) or Catherine Mary Wirth.
A-5471818, Daly, Florence Marie.
A-5648204, Daly, Maurice D.
A-7035975, Daly, Raymond John.

A-6880219, Da Rosa, Alberto Machado.
A-6840085, Favela, Roberto.
A-7249845, Lobato, Margarita.
A-7070747, Lobato, Pablo or Pablo Lobato Holguin.
A-6079330, Rendon-Gomez, Celestino.
A-6781221, Rendon, Josefina Tejeda De.
A-1368040, Rissanen, Juho Vilho.
A-6067724, Rodrigues-Jaramillo, Juan.
A-7203062, Saenz, Raul, Jr.
A-7203064, Saenz, Raul or Raul Saenz-Reyes.
A-7203063, Saenz, Maria Elena.
A-1019172, Sanci, Francesco Antonio.
A-9765067, Scarimbolo, Antonio.
A-9825338, Statas, Stephen or Efstathios Svaliotis.
A-6961078, Tabares, Pedro.
A-6009882, Taylor, Dorothy Lenor or Dorothy Lenor Nelson.
A-6815645, Tellez-Bautista, Magdaleno or Antonio Ponce Bautista.
A-6101593, Valdez-Serla, Pedro or Pedro Serla Valdez.
A-6743352, Villa-Zaragoza, Florentino.
A-7189313, Adractas, John Spiridon or Ioannis Spiridons Adrahtas.
A-7127875, Aguilar-Miramontes, Gabriel Aguilar Gabriel.
A-7363328, Aleman-Jurado, Carlos.
A-6100780, Avila-Rodriguez, Venustiano.
A-5938356, Esquivel, Raul or Raul Esquivel Maria Valencia or Maria Valencia Raul Esquivel.
A-7188720, Fernandez, Enrique Nunez or Enrique Nunez.
A-7188721, Nunez, Ester.
A-7188722, Nunez, Rogelio.
A-7398968, Gruber, Fitz Albert, also known as Herman Woods.
A-7203609, Hernandez, Calisto.
A-7203608, Hernandez, Francisco or Francisco Hernandez-Villa.
A-6590595, Kanalos, William Z. or Vassillios Zacharias Kaneliopoulos.
A-8015825, Koutsis, Kosmas.
A-7070050, Lerma, Dario or Dario Lerma-Elias.
A-7398908, Melendez-Cano, Davis.
A-7127892, Pena-Quintero, Jose or Joe Pena.
A-7079668, Perros, Constantinos.
A-7728277, Rodriguez, Soledad (nee Murga-Yanez) or Soledad Murga De Munez.
A-7728278, Murga, Leticia Virginia.
A-6630043, Roman, Juan Haro.
A-8001110, Rubio-Soto, Marcela.
A-7390672, Sapi en-Zendejas, Jose.
A-7189636, Silva, Carlos Ramirez or Enrique Romo.
A-7367098, Stratis, Ioannis A. or John Anthony Stratis.
A-7421515, Tagonui, Sarah Vitalis (nee Vitalis).
A-7127897, Valles, Virginia, or Valles De Garica Virginia.
A-7130526, Zapien, Gabriel Morales.
A-7415450, Arvizu-Gutierrez, Cesar.
A-7050079, Balandran-Aguirre, Pablo.
A-6015255, Bertot, Antonio Eduardo y Barcelo or Antonio Bertot or Antonio Bertot E. or Antonio Edwardo y Barcelo.
A-6763048, De Bogarin, Maria Cecilia or Maria Cecilia Gomez.
A-6763049, Bogarin-Gomez, Jesus.
A-6763051, Bogarin-Gomez, Alejandrina.
A-6856292, De Joux, Solange.
A-6763050, Bogarin-Gomez, Aurora.
A-9553437, Dos Santos, Christovan Bispo.
A-5971686, George, Constantia Adina.
A-7048901, Golabek, Michel.
A-7203095, Gonzalez, Ruperto.
A-1392411, Gulabovich, Christo Naumoff or Gulabovic or Christ Nick.
A-7140080, Gurrola, Maria Elena.
A-7140081, Gurrola, Lorenzo.
A-6764906, Hernadi, Ernest or Erno Herskovits.
A-6241051, Hsiung, Chuan-Chih.
A-6403553, Hsiung Wen-Chin.
A-6027122, Hsu, Hsien Liang also known as Harry Liang Hsu.
A-4075039, Karaiskos, Evangelos Michael.
A-7140423, Krojnik, Andrej.
A-7140424, Krojnik, Nina (nee Mandel).
A-2747074, Kusalo, Ivo Pero or John Peter Kusalo.
A-6773650, Lesieutre, Leontine Edith (nee Courtin).
A-6773651, Lesieutre, Colette Regine.
A-6736262, Lesieutre, Jean Marcel.
A-6736263, Lesieutre, George Pierre.
A-6736264, Lesieutre, Gisele Edith.
A-6736261, Lesieutre, Rene Charles.
A-6982867, Liao, Hsiano Peng.
A-6555831, Liu, Daisy Da-Si.
A-6702177, Liu, Yong-Chi or Robert Chi Liu.
A-6305775, Martinez-Esquivel, Santos or Martin Carrion-Garcia.
A-7371888, Menendez, Jose Lopez.
A-7371889, Menendez, Rosalia Lopez.
A-6048010, Munoz, Manuel.
A-71401177, Munoz, Virginia.
A-6985634, Noriega, Santos or Ramon Orona or Santos Ortiz Noriega.
A-5995490, Ortiz, Baltazar.
A-5266296, Ortizian, Christos Nicholas.
A-6153182, Ozaki, Kuniaki.
A-6153184, Ozaki, Motoichi.
A-6154183, Ozaki, Tamiye.
A-6634383, Racioppi, Francesco.
A-6771408, Racioppi, Liliana (nee De Nubbis)
A-7222474, Sandoval-Pinon, Andres.
A-9732170, Sing, Tai.
A-9626742, Sotelo, Manual Mayorga or Manuel Mayorga.
A-6606306, Staley, Galina or Gala Zebero.
A-9097697, Tuominen, Anna.
A-6258445, Urdal, Jan.
A-7858040, Valadez-Villalobos, Raymundo or Raymundo Valadez-Miradores.
A-7222277, Valdez, Maria Ester, de la Vega or Ester Valdez-Munoz.
A-7222750, Valenzuela, Maria Encarnacion Aranda de.
A-7222751, Valenzuela-Aranda, Nicholas.
A-6750582, Valles-Rosales, Ysidro.
A-7491367, Varela, Jesus Tena.
A-7243059, Velona, Anna Violi Bonavolonta (nee Violi).
A-6642381, Villescaz, Severiano.
A-6642382, Villescaz, Guadalupe.
A-6903666, Wagschal, Samuel.
A-6381683, Wahab, Abdul.
A-6567004, Wan, Yee Tit.
A-6320155, Wang, Margaret Chan.
A-6321477, Wang, Paul I.
A-7703244, Woodman, Elizabeth Hide (nee Takagi).
A-7083362, Wosner, Helena (nee Helena Federweiss).
A-6855579, Wosner, Pavol or Paul Wosner.
A-6567005, Yee, Lulu Tue or Tu Lily or Tu Yee.
A-6999327, Adamson, Norman McKenzie.
A-1828498, Ascencio, Porfirio or Pete Ascencio.
A-3913095, Barraza, Apolinar.
A-7073936, Biasco, Giuseppa.
A-3722890, Bombelli, Josephine Annette Carmela Concetta (nee Corso) alias McCarthy alias Pringle.
A-5966253, Caines, Charles Ebenezer or James.
A-6723895, Godinez-Arana, Jose.
A-6865943, Gomez-Castro, Gil Alberto.
A-6614766, Govostis, Dimetrios Alexander.
A-9620383, Koutsoutos, George or George Koutsoutis or Koutsontas.
A-7457793, Medina-Ortiz, Armando.
A-7419726, Li, Chen Pien.
A-4660444, Man, Ko Kam or Ko Kam Man Goo.
A-7476455, Pesce, Francesco.
A-7427542, Polina, Amleto Claudio Armando.
A-6758243, Rotberg, Fela (nee Gutman).
A-6755582, Rotberg, Szlama or Samuel.
A-7389914, Rubino, Angelo Bruno.
A-6082661, Salgado-Bustillos, Reymundo.
A-7117728, Sawicki, Zenon Simon or Zenon Sikiewicz or Simon Sawicki.
A-7264394, Schumacher, Finn Mannu.
A-7450633, Shu-Chi, Chang.
A-6317599, Stylianides, Stephen John.
A-7383160, Sustr, Jaroslav.
A-7383161, Sustr, Vera.
A-7483311, Tang, Han Chih.
A-6027107, Teng, Chi-Yu.
A-6683186, Berg, Elise Marianne.
A-6683187, Berg, Evelyn.
A-4909120, Broniewicz, Zygmunt.
A-6484086, Buchanan, John Hilton.
A-6711108, Chan, Chit Kin.
A-6206595, Chan, Ping Hwa Shu.
A-6965276, Chavarria, Eliseo.
A-7355401, Chu, Tsun Hwei also known as Tsun Hwei Chu Li.
A-3365379, Dalty, De Louise Williams.
A-7020256, Dalty, Michelene.
A-4241272, Dalty, Tarres, Leon.
A-7241656, Dominguez-Carrillo, Julio or Ruben Rodriguez.
A-7849962, Giapapas, Theodore Antoniou or Theodore Giapapas.
A-7450204, Gomez-Galindo, Manuel.
A-7137744, Gonzales, Maria Jesus or Maria Jesus de Gonzalez or Maria Jessie Gonzalez or Marie Jesus Lopez.
A-6854477, Gruetzmann, Mary Clara.
A-6854476, Gruetzmann, Lillian Gudrun.
A-7188730, Gutierrez, Agustina Valenzuela de or Augustina Valenzuela or Augustina Valenzuela De Gutierrez.
A-7145855, Gutierrez, Felix or Felix N. Gutierrez.
A-7250765, Li, Ting Yi.
A-7379731, Lomeli, Salvador G. or Salvador Lomeli-Gonzalez or Salvador Lomeli-Gomez.
A-6142743, Ma, Ju Luan.
A-6848608, Ma, Margaret Feng-Ya Chang (nee Feng-Ya Chang).
A-7145693, Manuel-Sepulveda, Sanchez.
A-6972124, Martinez, Pedro or Pedro Martinez-Flores.
A-7809270, Panagiotidis, Fotis B.
A-4604786, Pien, Chung Ling.
A-7755811, Pien, Nung Chung (nee Lee).
A-6113969, Quiroz-Morales, Roberto.
A-6555338, Rozenberg, Motel or Rosenberg.
A-6555339, Rozenberg, Irena Rolider or Irena Rozenberg (nee Bolides).
A-7140255, Saucedo, Jose Manuel or Jose Manuel Saucedo Hidrogo.
A-7463512, Testamark, Florence Mildred (nee Hodge).
A-7130999, Acosta, Guadalupe.
A-7130892, Ortega, Maria De Jesus.
A-6698228, Alfaro-Quiroz, Enrique.
A-7359551, Alvarado, Jose or Jose Alvarado-Chevez.
A-7130810, Alvarado, Antonia.
A-6165096, Alvis, Albertha Princess formerly Collymore (nee Verbeke).
A-2570320, Armendariz, Sostenes or Sostenes Armendariz-Crozco or Alfredo Aguirre.
A-6079554, Bobadilla, Rosario Sepulcer.
A-7841596, Briseno, Vidrio, Felipe.
A-5983642, Cavazos-Gonzalez, Benito or Benito Cantu-Gonzalez.
A-7755830, Chen, Jo-Yun Tung.
A-1466909, Chin, Pao-Hsiung.
A-7560739, Chin, Ping-Sheng (nee Yen).
A-9533008, Ching, Yip.
A-7222294, De Chavez, Soledad Ledesma.
A-7222295, Chavez, Angelina.
A-7982095, De Lopez, Reynalda Lopez.
A-6562366, De Rico, Amalia Fuentes (nee Amalia Fuentes) or Amalia Fuentes Vega.
A-3479484, Ferro, Domenico Antonio or Domenic Ferro or Domenico Ferro.
A-7145856, Guerra-Gonzalez, Valintin.
A-7873620, Kiourtsis, Panagiotis or Peter Kurtis.
A-7417085, Lomeli-Ramirez, Margarito or Charley Lomeli.
A-7203752, Lopez-Lino, Enrique alias Enrique Hernandez-Lopez alias Enrique Lopez.
A-6611441, Metaxas, Emmanuel Stylianos.

A-7178309, Ortega, Eleuterio or Eleuterio Ortega-Hernandez.
A-1616469, Paul, Donald or Donald Cornelius Paul.
A-3335305, Pompeo, Guiseppe.
A-7828740, Rabsatt, Era Florene.
A-5470951, Rabsatt, Esther Cerena.
A-6561106, Rendon, Juan Rico or Juan Rico.
A-9825408, Rosende, Pedro.
A-4774079, Sandoval, Roberto or Roberto Robinson-Sandoval.
A-6843496, Shiang, Flora Wang or Flora Fusheng (Fu-Sun) Shiang.
A-6083714, Shiang, Si Ta.
A-5147027, Shusterman, Esther also known as Esther Sterman.
A-7267320, Vessenes, Dionisios Katopodis.
A-8021435, Wagschal, Frida (nee Walsh).
A-5982146, Watanabe, Habukichi.
A-6154812, Watanabe, Oyobu.
A-4651337, Weiner, Louis.
A-4712339, Weisz, Arnold.
A-6988908, Accardo, Antonio.
A-7171763, Alanis-Trevino, Bonifacio.
A-2661429, Alfheim, Asbjorn or Asbjorn Alfredsen Alfheim.
A-6340939, Baron, Alejandra Garcia alias Modesta Quiocho Cadacas.
A-6069960, Crow, Clem Raymond.
A-6069961, Crow, Carl Joseph.
A-7189494, Cruz, Maria Francisca.
A-7387467, De Del Rio, Leonor Estrada (nee Leonor Estrada-Beltran).
A-6811163, Deer, George Oswald.
A-7995831, De Vasquez, Dolores Torres.
A-6730399, Dos Vais, Manuel Vieira.
A-6591132, Franco, Pedro.
A-7092828, Franco, Socorro.
A-6849877, Gabris, Tibor.
A-6476262, Garza-Garza, Pablo.
A-7118458, Garza-Pena, Jesus.
A-6597869, Gumrukcu, Hasan Erol.
A-5024775, Hattori, Saburo.
A-6881750, Huang, Yu-Ying Tsing formerly Yu-Ying Tsing.
A-8015436, Jackson, Sydney Welesley alias Charles Scott.
A-7130505, Jergerian, Kevork (nee Pilibossian).
A-7073708, Jergerian, Siranoush (nee Bohjelian) formerly Pilibossian.
A-6590310, Kamakas, Nicholas Constantine.
A-5394176, Kosakowski, John Joseph alias John Kosky.
A-8031195, Koutchoyan, Ichran.
A-7821097, Lee, Kin Ping.
A-7366106, Lee, Tien Ho.
A-7273976, Lerman, Jakob Chaim.
A-6015840, Li, Chung Yuan.
A-6434202, Macia, Maria Laura.
A-5831796, Malone, Indiana (nee Todman).
A-6706814, Mastalos, Vasilios or Vasilios Mastalis or Vasilies Mastalos or Basile Mastalos.
A-9770922, Min, Chow Sian or Tjroe Sian Min.
A-7933190, Morejon, America Nicolasa Ferro y or America Nicolasa Kelso de Montigny.
A-5906147, Peremenis, Kyriakos or Charles K. Peremenis.
A-7682570, Peremenis, Sarah Novena (nee Sawyer).
A-7682571, Peremenis, Katerina.
A-7682572, Peremenis, Marina.
A-7682573, Peremenis, Virginia.
A-5409723, Ravasini, Guido.
A-7069284, Ray, Efthalia Kyriakicou or Efthalia Kyriakidou.
A-6732397 Redik, Heinrich.
A-6732398, Redik, Elfrida.
A-1928642, Rinaldo, Giovanni Filippo or James Philip Rinaldo.
A-7127143, Rodriguez, Juan Collazo.
A-7264804, Rubalcaba, Ines.
A-7264803, Rubalcaba, Raul.
A-7706878, Schilling, Mildred Helen (nee Pearson).
A-6006882, Sepulveda-Fimbres, Ernesto or Ernesto Fimbrys-Sepulveda or Ramon Sepulveda, Jr., or Ramon Sepulveda or Ramon Sepulveda-Valencia.
A-3541552, Smith, Charles Henry.
A-5881902, Smith, Mildred Augusta.
A-7118018, Solano-Ramirez, Miguel.
A-2967575, Stubbs, Mervin Gardiner alias Albert George Woods.
A-7863139, Tanzi, Vincenzo.
A-8021434, Wan, Chan Hing also known as Hing Wan Chan.
A-5838603, Xydis, Stephen George.
A-7463248, Alonzo-Vega, Manuel.
A-7398319, Canales, Juana Antonio.
A-7984817, Carranza-Alvarez, Jose.
A-7756418, Chang, Hsiang-Tung.
A-7457003, Chantre, Felipe Pedro.
A-6830524, Dajany, Fuad Sharif.
A-7469399, De Bejarin, Juana Saenz or Juana Saenz.
A-7196299, Kahl, June Margaret (nee Reid).
A-6203569, Moran, Carlos Lisinio.
A-6628325, Nagymajtenyi, Helen, also known as Helen Kropel or Kropyl.
A-6550701, Nagymajtenyi, Marton.
A-8001560, Penn, Amy Alma (nee Amy Alma Burrows).
A-7188175, Rodriguez, Jose.
A-7394640, Titley, Veronica Venovia.
A-6624891, Tsou, Hsieh-An Ivan.
A-7809053, Yao, Lucy Tsui-Hwa.
A-7127601, Alvarado, Jose Saldana.
A-7188869, De Lara, Narcisa Cisneros Vda.
A-6320364, Delfino, Aurora Villanueva.
A-7945412, De Ruiz, Dolores Herrera.
A-7118456, Garza-Lerma, Guadalupe.
A-9537604, Goncalves, Manuel.
A-6153066, Miyahira, Sumiko.
A-6153067, Miyahira, Kozo.
A-8039348, Monaldi, Olindo.
A-7247945, Murillo-Sanchez, Jose or Jose Abran Murillo-Sanchez or Abraham Jose Murillo-Sanchez.
A-6440824, Rubin, Abraham Samuel.
A-7945414, Ruiz, Maria Paula.
A-7945415, Ruiz, Aurelio.
A-1556398, Testolin, Antonio or Tony Testolin.
A-7203621, Uranga, Aurora.
A-7203620, Uranga, Maria de La Luz.
A-5987520, Uranga-Vaca, Mardonio or Mardonio Uranga or Mardonio Uranga Baca.
A-5950026, Vuurens, Cornelis.
A-1873529, White, Malaki.
A-6709308, Yao, Ting-Chang.
A-6144740, Acham-Chen, Peter Hugh Bernard or Peter Chen or Peter H. Chen.
A-7064135, Bretan, Patria Guion also known as Patria Siatona Guion.
A-8065655, Chavez, Teodosia Cantu.
A-8082292, Cheng, Henry (Chu-Hwa).
A-6851579, Cheng, Lydia (Lu Chin).
A-3438377, Chu, Chauncey Cheng-Shui.
A-6298259, Chu, Margaret Chen-Ying Li.
A-4342227, Clairmont, George or Solomon B. Caufman or Solomon Caufman.
A-5953151, De La O, Marcela Fernandez also known as Marcela Ibarra or Isabella Deras or Marcella Magallanes or Ibarra or Hazel Deras.
A-8065876, Daskalakis, William Michael.
A-7841695, De Arellano-Lopez, Angel Sanz.
A-7358662, De Munoz, Zenaida Solorzano.
A-5656338, De Rivera, Rita Lopez or Rita Lopez-Arce or Maria Perez.
A-6725649, Erbsland, Albertine.
A-4583397, Fritsch, Heinrich Erward or Heinrich Eduard Fritsch.
A-6701989, Garcia-Alvear, Elena.
A-6701990, Garcia-Alvear, Hortencia.
A-6678458, Garcia-Olivio, Juan.
A-8039081, Jack, Mary Veronica.
A-8039082, Jack, Ronald Clive.
A-7483341, Kardoulias, Theodosia (nee Koukouva).
A-6787394, Maynard, Christalia Augusta.
A-6961748, Rosales-Melendez, Jose also known as Francisco Jacobo-Aguelira.
A-5971693, Saddler, Joseph.
A-6006618, Tsai, Tun Hou.
A-6847919, Tsai, Ching-Hsian Wei also known as Ching Hsian Wei.
A-7140137, Urquiza, Cayetano or Cayetano Urquiza-Hernandez.
A-8031108, Villa, Joseph Paz.
A-8031691, Villa, Soledad Canales.
A-7398898, Villagomez-Bocanegra, Nicolas.
A-6921481, Viola, Eligio.
A-6190235, Wong, Frank Eugene.
A-6190236, Wong, Esther Chu.
A-8082291, Wu, Bao Cheng Lee.
A-7080337, Wu, Te-Leng.
A-6283264, Aguilar-Gomez, Eliodoro.
A-7983268, Alfonso, Agapito Alcid.
A-7358015, Arce-Thomaty, Enrique Guillermo or Enrique Arce-Tomaty or Enrique Arce.
A-7983337, Castellanos, Roberto also known as Roberto Salas-Castellanos.
A-6047918, Claxton, Elsa Eudora.
A-7983430, De Vargas, Lucia Castellanos.
A-7873892, Estrada, Teodora.
A-7957297, Evans, Edwin Ernest.
A-7957296, Evans, Vancy Irena.
A-6267939, Favela, Sijifredo.
A-7192720, Gumbs, Daisy Viola.
A-9795384, Hoff, Bastoaan Van't.
A-5475472, Koide, Kiyoichi also known as Kiyoichi Tashiro.
A-7203963, Ku, Angela or Angela Hsiao-Jao Chow.
A-6877757, Ku, William Yung-Kang or Ky Yung-Kang.
A-7730653, Lo, Hsu.
A-6142738, Lo, Kiahsuang Shen.
A-8021503, Loh, Wen-Hu.
A-8021504, Loh, Hua Jo Lee.
A-6064876, Martinez-Valencia, Rodolfo.
A-7809109, Montiel, Alfonso.
A-7363009, De Montiel, Dolores Robles.
A-7398516, Nurse, Prince Edmond or Prince Edmund Nurse or George Brown.
A-7984785, Palos, Reyes also known as Reyes Castellanos also known as Reyes Palos-Castellanos.
A-7197798, Ramirez-Torres, Genaro or Jesus Ramirez-Torres.
A-8015466, Stephens, Winifred Mary Wakeford.
A-9701380, Szalaj, Josef Tomasz.
A-1920842, Szatanek, Wladyslaw or Walter Szatanek
A-7821934, Tiberi, Duilio.
A-7476673, Wong, Veda Leonie Chen See.
A-6710565, Baras, Leja.
A-6737777, Baras, Josef.
A-7903758, De Veaux, Norma Delfina (nee Robinson).
A-7189153, Gamboa, Esteban or Esteban Gamboa-Ramirez.
A-6143090, Liu, Man-Ming Wang (nee Man-Ming Wang).
A-6545348, Liu, Tung Sheng.
A-7178886, Palazzo, Salvatore.
A-9825406, Pisani, Giacomo.
A-7755827, Sun, Jung Yi Tung.
A-7962023, Garbalosa-Bernal, Heliodoro Roberto or Robert G. Bernal.
A-6592950, Logar, Branko Francis or Logan.
A-6851277, Mateos, Tomas Alberto or Thomas Alberto Mateos.
A-6852997, Mateos, Adelia Sierra or Adelia Purification Sierra Mateos (nee Suarez).
A-6068197, Morales-Avila, Artemio.
A-3459283, Friedman, Geczel Geza or Gerczel G. Friedman.
A-6486112, Olivari, Antonio Eugenio.
A-7863659, Stark, Sarah Teura formerly Pahi Teura John Stark.
A-6731255, Montano, Severino Medina.
A-8001080, Loy, Betty (nee Cooper).
A-2053125, Villani, Frank.
A-7991491, Vitlin, John.
A-6253102, Vitlin, Mina.
A-6884672, Tang, Tsong Ming alias Anthony M. Tang.
A-6242281, Ganeshan, Ganapathi Vydianatha.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LLEWELLYN B. GRIFFITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5398) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill (S. 2046) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States, which is similar to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations, or any other limitation upon the jurisdiction of such court, to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith arising out of the failure of the War Department to certify him for retirement as an emergency officer pursuant to the provisions of the Emergency Officers Retirement Act, as amended (45 Stat. 735), or to retire him as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States, as the facts may justify. In its consideration of such claim, the court shall determine whether or not the said Llewellyn B. Griffith should have been certified for retirement as an emergency officer or retired as a disabled officer of the Regular Army. Should the court decide that the said Llewellyn B. Griffith should have been so certified or retired, judgment shall be rendered in an amount equal to the amount the said Llewellyn B. Griffith would have received had he been so certified or retired: *Provided*, That the passage and approval of this legislation shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 4 months after the date of the enactment of this act. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeal from, and payment of, any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction as now provided by law.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5398) was laid on the table.

JAKE ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 981) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to issue to Jake Alexander, Moulton, Alabama, a patent in fee to the following-described land, to wit: The east half of the northeast quarter and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 31, township 7 south, and the east half of the northwest quarter, section 6, township 8 south, range 6 west, Huntsville meridian, Alabama, consisting two hundred acres, more or less: *Provided, however*, That the issuance of such patent shall operate only as a conveyance of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described herein, but shall not affect any valid adverse rights of third parties should any such rights exist.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "to wit:" strike out the balance of the line and lines 7 to 10 inclusive and insert "The southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, section 31, township 7 south, range 6 west, Huntsville meridian; also the east half of the northwest quarter, section 6, township 8 south, range 6 west, Huntsville meridian, Lawrence County, Ala., consisting of one hundred and sixty acres, more or less: *Provided, however,*".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALVARY BAPTIST CHURCH, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6638) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, is hereby authorized for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the church, for use as a church site, the following-described land situated in Alaska: Beginning at corner No. 3, United States Survey No. 3047, A. & B., north addition No. 4 to Anchorage townsite, located at the point of intersection of the northerly side of Manor Avenue with the easterly side of North Seventh Street; thence north fifty-four degrees twenty-eight minutes thirty seconds east, one hundred ninety-nine and ninety-six one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-five degrees thirty-one minutes thirty seconds west, twenty-six and ninety-three one-hundredths feet; thence south eighty-nine degrees fifty-eight minutes west, one hundred ninety-four and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet; thence south fifty-four degrees twenty-eight minutes thirty seconds west, forty-one and thirty-seven one-hundredths feet; thence south thirty-five degrees thirty-one minutes thirty seconds east, exactly one hundred and forty feet to the point of beginning, containing four-hundred-and-thirty-seven one-thousandths acre.

SEC. 2. That the conveyance shall be made upon the payment by the said church for the land at its reasonable appraised price of not less than $1.25 per acre, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 17, strike out "$1.25" and insert "$10."

Page 2, line 21, after the word "land", strike out the balance of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM JENNINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7304) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Jennings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to William Jennings a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north half of the southeast quarter, section 36 and that part described as the northeast quarter southeast quarter and a strip three rods wide and one-quarter mile long in the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, the north half of the southwest quarter, lot 3, the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the west half of the northwest quarter, section 36; lots 1, 2, and 4, the northwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter and the south half of the southwest quarter, section 35, and the south half of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 2 south, range 34 east, Montana principal meridian; lots 3 and 4 of section 2, lots 1 and 2 and the south half of the northeast quarter of section 3, the southeast quarter of section 4, and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 3 south, range 24 east, Montana principal meridian, containing one thousand seven hundred twelve and eighty one-hundredths acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 6 down to and including the word "acres" on page 2, and insert "The west half of the northwest quarter of section 36; the northwest quarter, the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, the south half of the southwest quarter and lots 1, 2, and 4 of section 35; the south half of the southeast quarter of section 34, township 2 south, range 34 east, principal meridian, Montana; and lots 3 and 4 of section 2; lots 1 and 2 and the south half of the northeast quarter of section 3; the southeast quarter of section 4; the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 9, township 3 south, range 34 east, principal meridian, Montana, containing in all one thousand seventy-nine and two one-hundredths acres more or less.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER ANSON PEASE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2573) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Walter Anson Pease, of Billings, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands from Crow allotment numbered 3452, in the State of Montana, namely: lots 3 and 4, the south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 1; lots 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, and 9, the south half of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 2; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 11; and the north half of the north half of the northwest quarter of section 12, all in township 1 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, and amounting to nine hundred eighty-three and seventy-two one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDAHO RANCH FOR YOUTH, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1876) to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the filing of an application within 1 year from the date of this act by the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc., the Secretary of the Interior shall sell and convey as hereinafter provided to the said corporation all of sections 13, 14, 24, and 25, township 7 south, range 24 east, Boise meridian, in the county of Minidoka, State of Idaho: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public-land laws and such conveyance shall not be made until payment in full as hereinafter provided has been made to the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. The purchaser shall pay the appraised value of the land to be conveyed as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The payment shall be made on an annual basis at the rate of $1 per acre and the initial payment shall be due 5 years from the date of the filing of the said application. Failure to make any annual payment by the association when due shall constitute a forfeiture of any moneys heretofore paid under the terms of this act.

SEC. 3. The patent issued under this act shall contain a reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the land conveyed, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the deposits under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEH-JEN LEE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 697) for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please explain the bill?

Mr. WALTER. This bill is for the relief of a Chinese student at the University of Indiana, whose services are needed in one of the Government agencies.

Mr. GRAHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Teh-Jen Lee shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVAN DUROVIC ET AL.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1159) for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHIKO YAMAMORI WILDER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1423) for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand all of these bills have been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and favorably reported?

Mr. WALTER. These are matters that have been considered, but the full committee did not act on them. We entered into an agreement with the Senate Judiciary Committee under which we would report their bills if they would report all of those that passed the House. These all come within the category of bills that have never been objected to. The bill under consideration, for example, admits the wife and minor child of a service man. They are all of that nature.

Mr. HALLECK. And have the minority members of the committee been consulted?

Mr. WALTER. The minority members have been consulted and participated in putting together this list.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Michiko Yamamori Wilder, the wife of Nola Wilder, a United States citizen, and her minor child may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SACHIO KANASHIRO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1606) for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sachio Kanashiro, the Japanese fiancée of Leonard B. Fletcher, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Sachio Kanashiro may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigraton laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM TATEKI IRIYE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1740) for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Tom Tateki Iriye may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIZU HASEGAWA CROCKETT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1816) for the relief of Shuzi Hasegawa Crockett.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Shizu Hasegawa Crockett, the wife of David S. Crockett, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGHERITA GENTILE

Mr. WALTER. M. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1867) for the relief of Margherita Gentile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the first category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Margherita Gentile may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Margherita Gentile becoming a public charge.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act the said Margherita Gentile shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her father, a United States citizen.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

MRS. ANNI FRANCHINA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1896) for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eighth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Anni Franchina (nee Anni Freiburger), German wife of Anthony Franchina, of Chicago, Ill., a United States citizen and an honorably discharged World War II veteran, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

OLGA MADSEN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1916) for relief of Olga Madsen, a minor.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Olga Madsen, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Aage Boeslund, citizens of the United States and residents of Ogden, Utah.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGIT STOLZ BOHM AND KLAUS SEIGFREID BOHM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2125) for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Margit Stolz Bohm may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Klaus Seigfreid Bohm, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. (1c) Denzil Ray Bohm, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNEMARIE E. PETERSON AND WILHELM ERNST GEISEL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2185) for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Annemarie E. Peterson may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Wilhelm Ernst Geisel, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant Olaf G. Peterson, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES MICHELL

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2212) for the relief of Charles Michell.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Charles Michell may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence provided he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIKI TAKANO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2303) for the relief of Miki Takano.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child,

Miki Takano, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. Edward J. McGarvey, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE-ANTOINETTE KERSSENBROCK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2311) for the relief of Marie-Antionette Kerssenbrock.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUMIKO ITO STEWART

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2332) for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Fumiko Ito Stewart, the wife of Theodore M. Stewart, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCIANO PELLEGRINI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2473) for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Luciano Pellegrini, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Mose G. Quilici, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRENDA MARIE GRAY (AKEMI)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2498) for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. Ralph J. Gray, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEBORAH JAYNE ENGELMAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2555) for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Deborah Jayne Engelman, a minor alien child, shall be considered the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. Edward Engelman, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIKIO ABE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2577) for the relief of Mikio Abe.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mikio Abe, a minor Japanese child, shall be considered the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Coy Elmer Barton.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLOTTA OLIMPIA FORGNONE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2681) for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigraiton and naturalization laws, Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YURIKO NISHIMOTO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2869) for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yuriko Nishimoto, the Japanese financée of Pfc Homer W. Holloway, a citizen of the United States, and that the said Yuriko Nishimoto shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yuriko Nishimoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Pfc Homer W. Holloway, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Nishimoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Nishimoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Nishimoto as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREW ALEXANDER NARA AND MARY KIMBERLY NARA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3162) for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Capt. and Mrs. Edwin A. Nara, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT ROYCE FARKAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3193) for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Robert Royce Farkas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. and Mrs. William W. Farkas, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEKARU TATSUBO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3248) for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mekaru Tatsubo, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Corp. Charles T. Wright, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SADIE BADIR ELLIS NASSIF-AZAR AND GEORGE BADIR ELLIS NASSIF-AZAR

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3280) for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Mr. and Mrs. George Ellis, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIU BUT YUE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3281) for the relief of Chiu But Yue.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Chiu But Yue, the minor child of a United States citizen father, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant if otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEVERLY JANE RUFFIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3284) for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Beverly Jane Ruffin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Maj. and Mrs. James C. Ruffin, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANNAH CRUMET

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3343) for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Hannah Crumet, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Robert R. Crumet, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SADAKO ISHIGURO

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2662) for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was on objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sadako Ishiguro, the Japanese fiancée of Quentin C. Auerswald, a citizen of the United States who has been honorably discharged from the United States Navy, and that the said Sadako Ishiguro shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sadako Ishiguro is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Quentin A. Auerswald, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C. title 8, sections 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sadako Ishiguro, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sadako Ishiguro as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACOB GITLIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 525) for the relief of Jacob Gitlin.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws Jacob Gitlin shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. BANNING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3277) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,236.41, of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of $422.35 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $428.46 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; not to exceed the sum of $30.70 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, deceased, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of $14.90 shall be credited in the accounts of Don Iler, regional disbursing officer, New York, N. Y., such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees or former employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeit bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell, Ben Binkley, Ottmar W. Epple, Adele Froussard, Caroline O. Gesner, Agatha M. Joy, Rosetta H. Little, James A. Metzger, Mary L. Milhollin, Edith G. Mohr, David R. Mooney, Jr., and Joseph C. Zoellner, $10 each; Bertha M. Barrett, F. H. Bowden, Jr., Joan Conrad, Mary Jane Davis, and Edward J. Jerge, $20 each; and Ashton J. Daussat, A. L. Schwemm, Joe V. Vandiver, and Mildred F. Whartenby, $30 each.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 8001, was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOMICILIARY FACILITY AT FORT LOGAN, COLO.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2584) to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to establish, operate, and maintain on the property now in the possession of the Veterans' Administration at Fort Logan, Colo., a facility for the domiciliary care of veterans eligible for such care under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

SEC. 2. Such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act are authorized to be appropriated.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING JOINT PATENTEE TO BRING SUIT ON PATENT IN COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. PRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one of more of his copatentees is barred from doing so, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "first two sentences of the."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE ACT OF JUNE 28, 1944

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2657) to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the bill is and what contact, if any, he has made with the Members on the minority side.

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill is to strike language out of a bill that concerns the Department of Commerce. It was voted out of our committee unanimously by both sides.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think this had better be withdrawn until the gentleman has conferred with the other side.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request at this time.

UNVEILING OF BRONZE REPLICA OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 89.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the proceedings, held in the Rotunda of the United States Capitol at the presentation and unveiling of the bronze replica of the Declaration of Independence, be printed, with illustrations, in such form and style as may be directed by the Joint Committee on Printing, as a Senate document; and that 5,000 copies be printed, of which 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under authority heretofore granted, the Chair declares a recess until 4:15 p. m.

(Thereupon, at 3:28 p. m., the House stood in recess until 4:15 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, might I ask the gentleman what the other body did?

Mr. COOLEY. The other body substituted what is known as the Russell-Young bill for the House bill, with an amendment dealing with support prices for long staple cotton. It is hoped that the conferees will be able to reach an early agreement. You will recall that the first section of the House bill was identical with the Russell-Young bill, which dealt only with the old and modernized parity formula. The difference between the two bills being the 90 percent support price program on basic commodities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]? [After a

pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, GRANT, GATHINGS, AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and HILL.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2483)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 9, 20, 21, 22, 23, 23½, 24, 26, 34, 47, 48, 49, 61, and 62.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 30, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 51, 55, and 58, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$155,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,410,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation in this Act may be used for pay and allowances of military personnel assigned to recruiting duty in excess of 50 per centum of the amount expended for such purpose during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same wth an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,736,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$440,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,485,896,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$860,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$879,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$70,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,600,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,200,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$225"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "an average of five thousand pounds net, such average to be based upon the total number of shipments authorized for permanent change of station during the previous fiscal year but not exceeding nine thousand pounds net in any one shipment"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows:

Change the section number to "SEC. 634."

In line 5 of such matter strike out "personnel, during such quarter fiscal year," and insert in lieu thereof "personnel provided for in this Act during such fiscal year 1953",

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 636. None of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for training in any legal profession nor for the payment of tuition for training in such profession in excess of twenty persons per year, exclusive of students in Reserve Officers' Training Corps units: Provided, That nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit persons now attending law courses from completing same."

And the Senate agreed to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "637"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,554,851"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 639. No part of the funds appropriated in this Act for procurement which are limited for obligation during fiscal year 1953 shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year at a monthly rate more than 125 per centum of the average monthly rate of obligation during the first ten months of the year."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 26, 37, 43, 44, 45, 53, 59, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JOHN J. RILEY,
ALBERT GORE,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
HARRY F. BYRD,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal

year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title I

Independent Agencies

Amendment No. 1—National Security Council: Appropriates $155,000 instead of $150,000 as proposed by the House and $160,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3—National Security Resources Board: Appropriate $625,000 instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $750,000 as proposed by the Senate; and permit apportionment of appropriation over a 10-month period.

Amendment No. 4—National Security Training Commission: Reported in disagreement.

Title II

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Amendment No. 5—Retired pay: Deletes provision of the Senate relating to retired pay of military personnel.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out provision of the House prohibiting transfer of funds appropriated for specific purposes.

Amendment No. 7—Emergency fund: Appropriates $35,000,000 instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House and $40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Office of Public Information: Appropriates $550,000 instead of $312,500 as proposed by the House and $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Title III

Department of the Army

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, 11, and 12—Military personnel, Army: Restore language of the House limiting to enlisted personnel expenditures for education, and delete language of the Senate limiting education to personnel whose education was interrupted; appropriate $4,410,000,000 instead of $4,393,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,415,050,000 as proposed by the Senate; include language of the Senate making available $25,000,000 of the appropriation in fiscal year 1952; and restore, in modified form, language of the House restricting the use of funds for personnel assigned to recruiting duty.

Amendment No. 13—Maintenance and operation, Army: Appropriates $4,332,400,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,384,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 14, 15, 16, and 17—Maintenance and operation, Army: Include language of the Senate adding cotton and reprocessed and reused wool to the House provision governing procurement of food and clothing not produced in the United States.

Amendments Nos. 18 and 19—Procurement and production, Army: Appropriate $2,736,000,000 instead of $2,766,000,000 as proposed by the House and $2,700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete provision of the House reappropriating $50,000,000 previously appropriated for expediting production.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21—Military construction, Army civilian components: Appropriate $20,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $17,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and delete provision of the Senate continuing available until 1954 appropriations previously made.

Amendments Nos. 22, 23, 23½, and 24—Army National Guard: Restore provision of the House providing for construction of other than armory facilities, and reappropriate unexpended funds previously appropriated; appropriate $153,300,000 as proposed by the House instead of $156,300,000 as proposed by the Senate; delete provision of the Senate increasing funds by transfer from another appropriation; and restore wording of the House providing use of penalty mail privilege. The conferees are agreed that the penalty mail privilege is for the conduct of official business of the guard by the commanding officer and the adjutant and applies to units of organization and not to personnel as individual members of units.

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Research and development, Army: Appropriate $440,000,000 instead of $450,000,000 as proposed by the House and $391,500,000 as proposed by the Senate; and delete provision of the Senate which prohibited the use of funds contained in the bill for construction of a research laboratory by the Quartermaster Corps.

Amendment No. 27—National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice: Appropriates $100,000 instead of $130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Army Stock Fund: Reported in disagreement.

Title IV

Department of the Navy

Amendment No. 29—Military personnel, Navy: Appropriates $2,485,896,500 instead of $2,493,203,000 as proposed by the House and $2,478,590,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Military personnel, Marine Corps: Appropriates $616,884,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $610,605,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 31—Marine Corps troops and facilities: Appropriates $860,000,000 instead of $880,965,000 as proposed by the House and $800,562,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32—Construction of aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates $3,910,042,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,810,042,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33—Ships and facilities: Appropriates $1,200,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,224,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34—Shipbuilding and conversion: The Senate, upon insistence of the House, receded from its amendment No. 34, which included language providing for partial financing of a second carrier of the *Forrestal* class. The conferees agreed that all of the funds budgeted for said carrier under this heading are approved, the construction of said carrier to be obtained by the abandonment of other items not deemed by the Department of the Navy to be as essential as said carrier.

Amendment No. 35.—Ordnance and facilities: Appropriates $879,000,000 instead of $900,000,000 as proposed by the House and $807,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36—Research: Appropriates $70,000,000 instead of $75,700,000 as proposed by the House and $65,859,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Title V

Department of the Air Force

Amendment No. 37—Aircraft and related procurement: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 38—Major procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates $900,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39—Acquisition and construction of real property: Allows funds in the item to remain available until expended as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40—Maintenance and operation: Appropriates $3,600,000,000 instead of $3,761,790,142 as proposed by the House and $3,540,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—Military personnel requirements: Language proposed by the Senate agreed to.

Amendment No. 42—Military personnel requirements: Appropriates $3,200,000,000 instead of $3,132,261,000 as proposed by the House and $3,264,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43—Research and development: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44—Air National Guard: Reported in disagreement.

Title VI

General Provisions

Amendment No. 45: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 46: Provides for $225 per student instead of $200 as proposed by the House and $250 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 48: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Accepts language proposed by the Senate with an amendment.

Amendment No. 51: Eliminates language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Accepts language proposed by the House with an amendment.

Amendment No. 53: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 54: Accepts language proposed by the House with an amendment.

Amendment No. 55: Eliminates language proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Corrects section number.

Amendment No. 57: Restricts funds for public information and public relations to $5,554,851 instead of $5,254,851 as proposed by the House and $6,004,851 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Eliminates language as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Accepts language proposed by the Senate with an amendment.

Amendment No. 61: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 62: Eliminates language proposed by the Senate. The conferees are agreed that the Department of Defense shall request the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the Department of Defense to be relieved of payment of Federal excise taxes on all articles of procurement wherever practical to do so in the fiscal year 1953.

Amendment No. 63: Reported in disagreement.

Title VII

Combat Duty Pay

Amendments Nos. 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71: Reported in disagreement.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
JOHN J. RILEY,
ALBERT GORE,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
FOSTER FURCOLO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN PHILLIPS,
NORRIS COTTON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 7391, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the military appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1953. When the bill passed the House, it provided for something in excess of $46,000,000,000, a reduction of about $4,700,000,000 below the budget, which had been submitted to the Congress. The pending conference report provides an appropriation of $46,610,938,912. In other words, last April we reduced the bill in committee and on the floor of the House, as you may recall, by $4,700,000,000.

Generally speaking, moneywise there was little difference, relatively speaking, between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The Senate increased the amount by $200,000,000, but it had received additional budget estimates in the sum of $479,000,000. So there was not too much controversy as to the overall pattern of the bill. The rough figure on the reduction below the budget in the pending conference report is about $4,700,000,000.

There is a provision in the language of the bill but not in the conference report for combat pay, which will require something like $240,000,000 or more if the House and Senate adopt it. The language of the bill provides that if combat pay is provided, it must be absorbed in the over-all sum provided in the bill. So the bill is rather drastically reduced below the budget estimate.

Frankly, I think the cut is too deep, but in the interest of economy and taking into consideration the economic condition of the country and the necessity for approaching a nearer balance of the budget, a majority of the committee has gone along with these reductions, in some cases rather reluctantly. Frankly, I think the defense effort is moving too slowly and that some of the reductions were unwise.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Would the gentleman inform us whether there was during World War II anything similar to the provision for combat duty pay for the Korean veterans?

Mr. MAHON. As I understand it, there has never been combat duty pay provided heretofore in World Wars I or II, that is not as we ordinarily consider combat pay, but that matter can be discussed later as it is not a part of the conference report which we are now considering but will come later as a matter of disagreement between the House and Senate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is the gentleman going to tell us what was done with reference to aircraft procurement? As I understand it, the Senate had arranged contract authority providing limited appropriations year by year, but authorizing the full 143 groups. Will the gentleman tell us what the conference did on that?

Mr. MAHON. I would like to discuss that at this point. The bill as passed by the House provided a decrease below the budget for the procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and the Navy in excess of $600,000,000. The Senate restored funds for procurement of aircraft. They restored funds in excess of $500,000,000 for procurement of aircraft for the Air Force and to the extent of $100,000,000 for aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps. The other body placed in the bill contract authorizations in lieu of cash, but that was stricken out of the bill in conference. We are appropriating this year about $46,000,000,000 plus, for the Department of Defense, and for this year, the year which began July 1, it is estimated we will spend within the range of forty-six to fifty-two billion dollars. So the appropriation represents approximately what the expenditure will be, but of course much of the expenditure which will be made this year will be made from prior year funds which have been appropriated.

Mr. VORYS. Do I understand that the full amount requested is now in the bill for procurement of aircraft?

Mr. MAHON. That is right. There is a slight reduction below the Navy request, but a very slight reduction.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Do I understand correctly that the Senate made reductions over and above what the House made?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman state in round figures how much that amounted to?

Mr. MAHON. In round figures it amounted to a net of about $250,000,000. That was an almost unprecedented thing, because I would say that 90 percent of the time the other body ups the figures of the House to some extent. I believe the figures were upped on all the other appropriation bills this year by the other body. I have not carefully checked this matter.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman has anticipated me, as usual; that was what I wanted to bring up, and I wanted to compliment the other body in the reduction it made in this instance. It is rather unprecedented, I should say.

Now, if I may speak of just one other thing, the matter of the Smith amendment; the expenditures limitation was taken out.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. That is a point I was coming to.

The House placed in the bill last April by a rather top-heavy vote an expenditure limitation of $46,000,000,000 which was known as the Smith amendment, offered by the gentleman from Virginia, or the Smith-Coudert amendment, because it carried out a pattern of amendments which had previously been offered on other legislation by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COLMER. Then the gentleman said something a moment ago about the over-all expenditure; how does that compare with the limitation provided in the Smith amendment?

Mr. MAHON. The budget suggested last January that the expenditures for the Department of Defense would be in excess of $48,000,000,000, I believe. I do not have the correct figure before me. It is printed in the committee hearings. At a later date the officials of the Department of Defense when before the committee suggested that the expenditure figure would more nearly approach $52,000,000,000, because they were getting under way and getting deliveries on some of the heavy and expensive equipment. There was room for argument and doubt as to the exact amount that might be spent in fiscal 1953.

Now that the steel strike has come into the picture, it undoubtedly will reduce defense production; certainly, if it continues much longer it will no doubt reduce expenditures below the $52,500,000,000 which the Department of Defense predicted for the current fiscal year.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman explain about the second carrier?

Mr. MAHON. The House originally eliminated the second carrier of the *Forrestal* class. The House undertook to reduce the bill and to provide as many economies as possible.

The Navy went to the other body and requested the restoration of the carrier as a No. 1 procurement item of the Navy. The officials of the Navy said that if funds were provided for the carrier that they would construct the carrier within the framework of the House appropriations. They had made the suggestion earlier with respect to the matter which the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] can confirm; so in conference it was agreed that the Senate language which would handle the carrier on a contract basis, or which appeared to handle it that way, would be stricken out and the cash would be included.

Funds were included in this conference report in the sum of approximately $193,000,000, I believe, for the new carrier of the *Forrestal* class.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think it might be well to point out that the action on the second carrier was not unanimous. There are some misgivings about the advisability of its construction, and I think probably this hope should be expressed: That the Navy in the construction of this carrier will in view of some of the situations that have developed in the plans and specifications of the *Forrestal*, will not go off posthaste in their action on the second carrier but will take the time necessary to profit by some of the lessons being learned in the planning and construction of the first supercarrier.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman's remarks are well stated. I cannot speak for the conferees, but, as a matter of prudence and common sense, certainly the Department of the Navy should make sure that all possible lessons are learned from the new carrier which is now under construction and that all those lessons be applied in order that

the new carrier of the *Forrestal* type shall be the finest ship that can be produced.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand the gentleman from Texas then, in the elimination of the Coudert-Smith amendment, the military administrators, insofar as expenditures are concerned, now have no limit on their expenditures during any given period except the limitation of the amount of dollars that are available to them?

Mr. MAHON. And except the realities of life which must be taken into consideration; namely, it is not possible to get all the airplanes and guided missiles and aircraft components they want in a short period, so it is impossible for the Department of Defense to spend the $100,000,000,000-plus that will be at the disposal of the Department of Defense during the current year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the military has available if the situation is such that it could spend the dollars somewhere around $100,000,000,000 during the current fiscal year?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, in excess of $100,000,000,000. The gentleman is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am extremely thankful that the money for the second carrier of the *Forrestal* type is in the bill. The great importance of carriers has been demonstrated by the bombing of the warehouses at the Yalu River. Most of that was done by planes which took off from carriers. They are vital to our national defense.

Mr. MAHON. There is no way to precisely evaluate the carriers or other weapons and there is considerable controversy with respect to the carrier. There was no unanimity of opinion on the part of the conferees but under all the circumstances the conferees agreed to provide funds for the second carrier. I personally voted to include the additional carrier.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In the bill as it passed the other body, there was an item described as the Senator Ferguson amendment which undertook to provide that no part of the money should be used for the payment of Federal taxes. Will the gentleman comment on what disposition was made of that amendment?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the Government pays many millions of dollars in Federal taxes in connection with the procurement of various defense items. It is simply taking money out of one pocket and putting it in another.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. An exceedingly unnecessary transaction.

Mr. MAHON. And seems to be unnecessary. This is a highly difficult legislative question and the majority of the House conferees insisted that the language in the Senate version of the bill which would eliminate the payment of taxes be stricken out. So these taxes will be paid. The legislative committee, the Treasury Department and the Department of Defense will give study to this matter in connection with the next appropriation bill and if there is any proper way to handle the situation with lesser expense to the taxpayer we would be for it; but, under the circumstances, this money is already in the bill to pay the taxes and to omit the tax and not take the money out is not practical. We cannot estimate how much is in the bill for tax payments without further study.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Is there any existing law so that the Treasury Department and Government agencies may excuse the payment of taxes in certain cases?

Mr. MAHON. That matter was discussed. The Department has taken very little advantage of that provision of the law. I think it should be called to their attention. If this can properly be done, it should be resorted to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I wish attention had been called to it in the conference report, because I think it will result in very considerable savings.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. It seems to me the bombing along the Yalu in Korea demonstrates the continued usefulness of carriers, but not necessarily of supercarriers, because there were none there. I, for one, certainly hope that either in the conference report or otherwise the Navy will be made to pay attention to the remarks of the distinguished gentlemen from Texas and Iowa and the others who join in the hope that the Navy will not rush pell-mell into building these supercarriers, but will profit from what they learn of the one that is started, and by other developments in aircraft and atomic warfare.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8271) amending section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York, and SIMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, there is quite a little confusion with reference to what the Senate did. They did make reductions in certain items involving, perhaps, $400,000,000, but they added $560,000,000 for additional airplanes. So, when you come to consider the whole picture they raised it instead of lowering it. Frankly, they separated it into part contract authorizations, so it is hard for anyone to go through the bill to understand just exactly what they did do. They talk about the 143 wings. They claim that by cutting $560,000,000 it would postpone the fruition of the 143-wing program by about 3 or 4 years, when it actually figures out 2 weeks.

The thing that bothers me most sincerely about the Senate raising this figure and the House accepting it is that it encourages the Department of Defense and its representatives to tell something other than the truth to the Members of the committees that have to do with appropriations. They blasted all over the country with that kind of stuff, and the House has yielded to the Senate on that figure. Frankly, if they would use good business methods in letting their contracts and following them through, they would get more airplanes with the money that the House gave them than the number that they claim they want to get, because the trouble with their whole operation is the way they do business and the delays that are incident to their continuous and persistent changes of plans and not going through with one contract all the way, so that the costs run up probably 50 percent above what they should pay for their airplanes. That is a terrible figure when you get all through.

Frankly, every Member on the House side of the conference was in favor of eliminating these contract authorizations that the Senate had substituted for money. The net result of the bill is that it runs $400,000,000 above the figure set by the House. If you come to add in the contract authorizations, the Senate was about $150,000,000 above the House when the bill passed the Senate. The final conference report is $403,000,000 above what it was when it passed the House. I am not going to ask for any separate votes on it.

I did not believe they needed the $560,000,000 the House cut out of the airplane construction program. I do not believe so now.

I did not believe they needed the $100,000,000 which was cut out of the Navy program, but that has been put back.

I did not believe they needed the additional carrier. I believe that if the Department will properly consider it, they will not go into the large, new carrier until they have made better use of the developments that are under way in connection with guided missiles and that sort of thing which, in my opinion, are far more effective than the new, big carrier.

I appreciate that the bombers that have gone out from the smaller carriers have done a good job over in Korea. On the other hand, if we were out in front of the continent of Europe and subject to the submarine menace, we would have a different story altogether to tell.

I think that is all I care to say at this time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has raised what I think is a very powerful question here, on which I think the gentleman might throw a little more light. That is the matter of not paying the Federal tax element in the cost of military equipment. That has to do with corporation accounting in a big way. Is it proposed that in the pricing of military equipment to the Government a corporation is not to include in its selling price the element of Federal taxation?

Mr. TABER. That is the idea. Let me explain that situation a little bit, if I may.

I do not believe we are ready with a program that would be effective and fair in connection with that situation. I should like to see something done where we did not pay taxes on things that are produced for the Government. The worst trouble we have is that there are a lot of those electronic devices where there is a very considerable commingling in connection with the manufacture of those things between the products that are made for private consumption and those which are made for the military. On a lot of those things it would make a very serious problem of accounting and auditing, about which there is considerable question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 3, line 1, insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses

"For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; rental of office space in the District of Columbia; and purchase and installation of air-conditioning equipment without regard to the provisions of the act of October 26, 1942, as amended (40 U. S. C. 317); $75,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "$75,000" in the last line of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$37,500."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 28: Page 17, line 20, insert:

"ARMY STOCK FUND

"For additional working capital for the Army Stock Fund, established pursuant to section 405 of the National Security Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 172), $75,000,000: *Provided*, That stocks procured with funds appropriated for clothing and equipage during fiscal year 1952 may be transferred to said fund."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the figure "$75,000,000" named in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$70,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 37: Page 30, line 3, strike out "$12,125,044,000" and insert "$4,685,044,000 of which $1,685,044,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes, and $3,000,000,000 is for (1) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $11,000,000,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Air Force is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as submitted to the Congress by the Department of Defense for one hundred and twenty-six combat wings, seventeen transport combat groups, and other supporting elements and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount stricken and the amounts and matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$12,685,044,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 43: Page 34, line 7, strike out the colon and all thereafter including lines 8, 9, and 10.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 43, and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have offered this motion in order to correct the situation, which was raised in the House Armed Services Committee, and which was adopted by the House, to add language which would foreclose the Aro Corp, from receiving any further contracts.

If you will remember, it was at the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that this language was written in the bill. This company is an engineering company which has the engineering contract for the building of the air testing tunnels and other scientific installations for the Air Corps. The Aro Corp. had not had an opportunity to be heard before a committee of the Congress, before the previous action of the House. They had not had their day in court so to speak, and for that reason and then also because General Sverdrup; president of Aro, had been induced by the Air Force high official to accept this contract as his patriotic duty, since he is one of the outstanding engineers in this field in all America. He was General MacArthur's chief of engineers of the entire Pacific operation in World War II. My purpose was to see to it as best I could, that this great American have his day in court, and that our military defenses not be affected detrimentally by the Gore provision.

Since that time the Aro representatives have been heard before the Senate committee. Those who testified in support of Aro were Gen. Marshall S. Roth, Assistant for Development Programing, Air Force; Gen. L. J. Sverdrup, president of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., and president of Aro, Inc.; Harold C. Stuart, former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle, the General Doolittle whom we all admire, he is special consultant to the Chief of the Air Force; Lt. Gen. E. E. Partridge, commanding general, Air Research and Development Command, USAF; Col. John Martin, Air Research and Development Command; Col. C. K. Moore, commanding officer of the Arnold Engineering Development Center; Col. W. A. M. Cooper, JAG, Air Research and Development Command; James T. Hill, general counsel, Department of the Air Force; Gen. M. J. Asensio, director of the budget, Department of the Air Force; W. E. Moser, secretary, Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc.; Thurman Arnold, counselor to Aro, Inc.; Stephen Leo, director of administration, Aro, Inc.

The Senate committee struck the Gore provision, and the Senate concurred, then the conferees disagreed, so the Gore provision is now before the House today for disposition. The question is, Shall we accept the judgment of General Doolittle and other expert Air Corps officials, or the judgment of one civilian. It is just that simple.

All of these good patriotic Americans testified in defense of the Aro Co. You will find that in the hearings on pages 473 to 559 of the Senate Armed Services hearings. I would like to read General Doolittle's testimony, but time does not permit. He is in full support of the Aro Co., and he points out it is very necessary to keep Aro on the job, since they have the experts to handle this very scientific and important work for our national defense program.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman indicate where in the bill the provision is found on this subject matter?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. It is amendment No. 43 on page 35.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Speaker, those who have not studied the problem involved would need to give a little consideration to what the real issue is. This bill contains a provision that there shall not be more than 500,000 classified employees in the Department of Defense for the current fiscal year. A device has been worked out at the Arnold Engineering Development Center where we are investing $150,000,000 to try to keep ahead of the parade in aircraft development. The problem there is how to manage this $150,000,000 development. The Air Force has gone out and created an organization, a corporation known as Aro, to manage this facility. Their employees are not shown on the list of employees who work for the Government. They are paid by contract with the Air Force. It is anticipated that this kind of procedure would continue, and people who run this $150,000,000 laboratory would not be employees of the Government, strictly speaking. They would be employees of the corporation, the corporation having a lump sum contract with the Government to run this facility.

This kind of mechanism has been used in the atomic energy field by the Atomic Energy Commission, but I believe the Department of Defense has never resorted to this device of creating a corporation to employ people to manage a facility.

We sent some of our investigators to Tullahoma, Tenn., to investigate this matter and give us a report. We called on Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, to make a study of it because we wanted to determine what action should be taken. The issue was raised by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], a Representative from the State where this facility is located. I have before me this report from the General Accounting Office and I read to you a few lines in the concluding portion of the report which, more or less, briefs the problem presented. The Comptroller General says:

> It is evident that after the Arnold Engineering Development facility has been completed 3 or 4 years hence—
>
> The facility is not yet completed—
>
> and ARO becomes entrenched in its role of operator of the facilities, neither ARO or the Government will be dealing at arm's length in the annual negotiations for the operation contract.

In other words, the Government tells Aro "You run this development center; we will give you a certain amount of money to run it." The company and its officials may amass thousands of skilled employees to run this installation and when the time comes to renew the contract they can say to the Government: "Oh, but we want this and that in the contract"; and the Government says: "No; we will not do it." If Aro says, "No contract," we would, of course, be in a very serious position when it came to the matter of running this facility; whereas, if we have regular Government employees on the payroll of the United States Government running it, there would be no question of our being entrapped and enmeshed in a net of that sort.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Aro company stands high as far as their ability and efficiency is concerned and that there has been nothing found of a corrupt nature in any way that has ever been brought up against them or produced against them?

Mr. MAHON. Some charges have been made pro and con, and there has probably been considerable loose talk. I would say that Aro has by no means made a perfect record.

This demonstrates the issue: A private company is to be in control of this $150,000,000 research facility and in the position more or less to demand its pound of flesh if it desires to. It is a serious question of public policy.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. As a matter of fact the language which the gentleman from Texas has pointed out, demonstrates thoroughly that this is a matter of policy that must be gone into thoroughly, because if this could happen with Aro, it could also happen with any operating agency we might have; and then, as the GAO pointed out, the Government would be completely at their mercy.

Mr. MAHON. Yes. That is the issue that presents itself to us. Continuing to read:

> A private company with a capital investment of only $150,000 largely in liquid form, the stockholders of Aro stand to lose very little if the arrangement is terminated; whereas, from the Government's standpoint termination of the arrangement would be likely to play havoc with the orderly operation of the facilities at what may be a most critical time with respect to their need.

Mr. Speaker, we are placing ourselves perhaps at the mercy of a corporation, and setting a dangerous precedent in the Department of Defense. We have never done it insofar as I know in the Department of Defense. I wanted to call attention to this matter because we may be plagued with it for a much longer time if we embrace it in this measure.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Aro Corp. did not seek this contract?

Mr. MAHON. I am not able to say, but the gentleman may very probably be correct.

Mr. JENSEN. That is a fact, they did not seek it; and, as far as the officers of the company are concerned, they have not got rich.

Let me say that I, too, have been very much opposed to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. MAHON. That is what we have here.

Mr. JENSEN. Except in cases where it had to be sudden.

Mr. MAHON. It does not have to be.

Mr. JENSEN. The thing I am concerned about is that this company which has been investigated from top to bottom by the finest men like General Doolittle, has been very badly abused, and I do not think it should have been.

Another thing, General Sverdrup has the reputation of being one of the greatest engineers in America.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit, the issue is not the reputation of General Sverdrup. Certainly no one should be falsely accused and I am not making accusations against Aro or its officials. The question is whether or not the Government wants to permit a corporation to go down there in Tennessee and run a $150,000,000 research institution on a cost-plus contract from year to year, finally develop all of this highly technical personnel which will cost several million dollars a year, then having to negotiate with them from year to year and have them conceivably say: "I am sorry, we cannot enter into a contract with the Government for another year," and pull out. It would take us many years to recruit the type of personnel required for the operation of this facility.

The Comptroller General is warning us here in plenty of time that we should not go into this thing blindly. I warn you that a great issue is involved, a matter of principle, and personally I rather think we would do a better job of running it if we run it by Government employees rather than by a corporation over whose employees we will have no control.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, I do not believe the House or the American people will go along with the gentleman on his idea that the Government can do it better.

Mr. MAHON. Perhaps not.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly that is not the American way of thinking. If this company is to be cut off, does not the gentleman think it would have been the right thing to have hearings and write something in the report as to what you intended to do in the future and to give this company the chance that every American should have?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is from Iowa, the gentleman addressing you is from Texas, and the facility is in Tennessee. The facility is, as outlined, a Government-owned research laboratory. Others may wish to express their views on it.

Mr. JENSEN. I think there is a very great issue involved that we had better look into.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has just given us an unanswerable argument. The resort to cost-plus contracts for operation of a Government project is subject to serious question even if on a nonprofit basis.

If huge profits are involved, with little or no risk to the contractor, then it would appear most unwise and wasteful.

Now is the time to prevent such a policy at the AEDC. This is a vital project and must be pushed to completion. Its maximum usefulness will be realized only by keeping its operation sound and clean. At the request of our committee, the General Accounting Office has conducted a 3-month investigation of Aro. This report I hold in my hand. It was from that report that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] read.

You will remember when this question was debated I said that this corporation was drawing a $95,000 fee per year after reimbursement of all expenses, including salaries. I want to read to you from page 41 of the General Accounting Office report, as follows:

Allowing for the fact that $5,000 of Aro's $95,000 fee for the current contract year is to compensate Aro for the cost of borrowing operating capital, it follows that Aro will receive a net fee of $90,000, which in relation to a capital investment of $150,000 represents a 60-percent return.

That is important as you will see. I quote from page 18 of the GAO report:

General Carroll told the investigators that the three new directors had contributed nothing to the operation of AEDC to his knowledge.

This statement refers to S. D. Buchtel, J. W. McAfee, and David R. Calhoun. These gentlemen were permitted to buy a large block of Aro stock. S. D. Bechtel, of California, has never attended but one meeting of the board of directors, that being the one that approved his stock purchase. Both his son and his daughter also own large shares of Aro stock.

Yet Mr. Bechtel is quoted on page 16 as follows:

Neither I nor any of my family have visited Tullahoma.

Nevertheless, they are drawing a 60-percent return on their investment this year and the tentative contract next year calls for a 100-percent return. If that is not cost-plus profiteering I do not know where you will find an example of it. Why should the taxpayers have to pay a 60-percent or 100-percent return on investment to these people who make no contribution to the operation of the wind tunnel project?

The gentleman from Texas pointed out that this was a device to get around congressional control of personnel. That is exactly what it is doing. Let me give you an example. A man was employed by the Atomic Energy Commission on a Government salary of $17,500. This corporation, Aro, out of the same taxpayers' pockets, employed him at $30,000. Here you have Government agencies and cost-plus Government contractors bidding against each other with the taxpayer footing the bill of both.

Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has made a long report. It contains about 100 pages. By a careful examination, you will find that the facts upon which I based my charges against Aro are substantiated in this report. For instance, I charged that Aro, a subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel, actually checked the designs of Sverdrup & Parcel. It should be understood that Sverdrup & Parcel have architectural and engineering contracts for the project totaling $11,700,000, mostly without competition.

The GAO reports, page ARO–52:

The principal activity of Aro during the first contract period * * * was to review the designs of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., for functional adequacy."

Since for all practical purposes Aro, Inc., is controlled by Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., a question naturally arises as to whether Aro engineers are prejudiced in the performance of their review function by the fact that, in a sense, they owe their allegiance to Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc.

This is a bad policy. This is a particularly bad contract. This is waste and extravagance. This is cost-plus profiteering. I ask the House to again cut this pipeline to the Treasury.

The Appropriations Committee of the other body has approved this Aro contract after a star-studded dress rehearsal hearing. Let the Members of the other body take another look. If it is approved again I will fight it again.

Let not the blame for this kind of waste, this kind of chiseling, and profiteering from national defense be placed upon the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I became interested in this matter when it was last before the House. Notwithstanding my very high regard for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, and for whom I have the very greatest respect, let me say that I have read the report of the investigators of the General Accounting Office, and here is what the Chief Investigator had to say:

While the investigation discloses certain decisions in the realm of opinion or judgment made by the Department of the Air Force in the negotiation and administration of the contracts which are inevitably subject to question, no evidence has been developed which would indicate that any actions were taken or decisions made by the former Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, or by other responsible officials of the Department of the Air Force connected with the project, otherwise than under proper motives.

That was signed by W. L. Ellis, Chief of Investigations.

I think we all have the greatest admiration for General Doolittle. I know we all believe he is a good American citizen, and I believe we all know that he knows what he is talking about in regard to Air Force matters, and that he is always doing the thing that he thinks best for America. General Doolittle testified on this matter when he was before the Senate committee. Let me quote from General Doolittle's testimony found at page 542 of the hearings:

Senator O'MAHONEY. We can assume your conclusion is that this center is a highly necessary facility?

General DOOLITTLE. My conclusion is that this center is an essential facility; that without it the Air Force cannot carry out its obligations and that we will not be assuring the maximum development of our defensive and offensive equipment for the future.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you personal information with respect to the capacity of Aro to manage the job?

General DOOLITTLE. That has not been a specific chore of mine, but it has been a general chore. I have watched the work that Aro has done. I have investigated and inspected the work no later than day before yesterday on the site at Tullahoma. I have read all the correspondence and literature and reports in connection with it, and I am satisfied that Aro is doing an excellent job and should be retained and that if they are not retained that we will lose a great deal of time.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you read the testimony and the material on which the House acted?

General DOOLITTLE. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the light of that testimony you want to tell this committee that you believe Aro ought to be retained?

General DOOLITTLE. I believe that if there is any irregularity or any inefficiency in the manner in which Aro has done its job, it should be removed, despite the fact that that would seriously impede our military effort. I have seen no indication and no evidence of such inefficiency or irregularity.

The general is four-square on the theory that the language should come out. I do not know what we can do in this country if we reach the time when we will not permit the Army Air Corps and their expert advisers to run the show as they think they have to do it in order to get a certain job done. Let me read from page 814 of the hearings:

The importance of the Arnold Engineering Development Center is indeed great. The research and test data and evaluations which its facilities will make possible could be the key to maintenance by the United States of air superiority in this very fast moving field where superiority is so essential to defense and survival. It is of the utmost importance that the facilities be completed and placed in operation at the earliest possible time. In obtaining the maximum benefits from these facilities, their optimum utilization through effective and efficient management and operation is of equal importance to the facilities themselves.

It has been and remains the considered judgment of the Air Force that private operation for profit, as matters now stand, is most economical and productive.

Second, Aro's performance to date has been satisfactory and no information nor evidence has been developed by the Air Force, or otherwise advanced, establishing a justifiable basis for terminating the existing arrangement. Aro's performance to date has been largely of a make-ready and preparatory nature, including the recruitment and training of the necessary technical personnel. The Air Force has no proper basis for being critical or dissatisfied. It has the entire matter under careful consideration and will give most careful study to any recommendations or conclusions which the General Accounting Office may make upon completion of the investigation which it is now making. If at any time it appears that the arrangement no longer remains in the best interest of the Government, the Air Force will not hesitate to take appropriate action. In any such eventuality the most careful planning and preparations will be required in order to hold to a minimum the disturbance and disruption of operations and the demoralization of personnel. The proviso in question affords little opportunity for the type of planned and orderly adjustment

which is so essential if the entire project is not to be seriously damaged.

We are all against the useless and unnecessary expenditure of money. However, we should stop any misconduct and useless and unnecessary spending of money but not wreck the work of a company doing defense work so vital and important to our defense effort. It appears to me that we should listen to these officials.

General Doolittle and these other officials plead in dynamic language that the language be deleted or that this Senate amendment be accepted.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to say to the Air Force, "We are not going to let you run this show," especially when we lay down safeguards. I will go as far as anyone to practice the most rigid economy and to stop waste, but I will not vote to cancel a contract they have made and tell the Army Air Force that they do not know what they are doing. In this key activity in our defense program I must accept their recommendation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I intend to vote for the preferential motion, as the gentleman from Arkansas does.

I think the House made a mistake in the action it took.

I am told that when General Sverdrup appeared before the Senate committee he made a conclusive case for himself and destroyed completely the charges that had been made against him on which the House action was based. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Iowa will be agreed to.

Mr. NORRELL. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. I am afraid not to go along with the unanimous recommendation of General Doolittle and the Air Force officials.

I trust the Senate amendment may be accepted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I first want to try to get this thing squared away, because I have had many people come to me who do not seem to understand the motions and the situation.

If you will refer to page 35 of the bill, you will find Senate amendment No. 43. When this bill passed the House the following proviso was added to the regular appropriation for research and development:

Provided, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to Aro, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

When this bill went to the Senate, the Senate adopted amendment No. 43 striking out this language I have read to you. In the conference the House did not agree with the Senate, and the Senate would not yield.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] moves to insist upon the House disagreement to the Senate amendment, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] moves that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. The result is that if you vote "aye" on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa to recede and concur, this prohibition against the use of the money for Aro would be eliminated. If you vote "no," it would be practically the same as refusing to concur in the Senate amendment and wanting to keep the language in the bill.

That would be followed immediately by a motion by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time because I wanted to explain just what that situation was so that the membership would know how they are voting.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. In other words, this development center is under construction, and is far from completed. This company was formed a few months ago to operate as a contractor to run the Army Engineering Development Center when it is completed, and they are now developing their personnel and are, to some extent, exercising minor management prerogatives in view of the fact that the installation is not by any means complete. The money to operate this facility is in the bill, and that is not in issue. The issue is whether or not Aro, this corporation, shall run the facility or whether they must be displaced from their position, and the Air Force called upon to operate the facility itself or work out some other means of operating it.

Mr. TABER. In other words, if the vote is "aye" for the Jensen amendment, these people would go on, that is the Aro people would go on and operate it. But if the vote is "no," the operation would go back to the Air Force to operate in some other way than through this Aro setup.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALE. If a vote "no" prevails, as a matter of fact is that not somewhat tantamount to a vote to recommit the conference report? What would happen?

Mr. TABER. Neither vote would be tantamount to a motion to recommit. If the "noes" carry, the motion which the gentleman from Texas has made to further insist, would then come up for consideration. It undoubtedly would be carried because there is no use in our having a division on the same thing twice.

Mr. HALE. If the motion to insist, offered by the gentleman from Texas, were to prevail; we would still be in disagreement with the Senate, would we not?

Mr. TABER. Yes, but the Senate might yield to us if we voted quite decidedly one way or the other.

Mr. HALE. But what if the Senate did not yield to us?

Mr. TABER. We would have to go back again to conference and work the thing out somehow, that is on that particular thing. We would not throw out the conference report that we have already agreed upon—that would hold.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have two questions that I would like to ask, or perhaps three. What department of Government, if any, operates the wind tunnel on the California coast near San Francisco?

Mr. TABER. I thought that the Air Force operated that—I am sure they do.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand this situation, and I think the gentleman has explained it very clearly, we are engaging Aro to do an operating job for the Air Force. That is the issue; is it not?

Mr. TABER. The issue is whether we should throw out this contract with Aro and refuse to permit them to go on with that operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And make the Air Force do the job?

Mr. TABER. Well, to do it some other way than through Aro. It does not necessarily mean that they would be prevented from entering into a contract with somebody else.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, there is a contract now in existence?

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What would be the cost of canceling that contract as related to perhaps a continuation of the contract?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, no one can answer that because no one could tell how much is being wasted as a result of the way it has been operated, or how much their fees are going to be or anything like that, and nobody in the world could answer that question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I favor this Senate combat pay amendment to the Defense Appropriation Act. I do not feel that this will be too difficult to administer and I know that the people of America feel that those who are bearing the brunt of the burden of battle should at least have this consideration in the form of additional compensation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. How much investment has this Aro Corp. actually made?

Mr. MAHON. About $150,000.

Mr. GORE. And they are drawing a $95,000 fee on their investment of $150,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the situation in which we find ourselves in the closing hours of this Eighty-second Congress, to do other than go along with the preferential motion would simply mean that we would have to go back to conference on this bill and no one knows when it would end.

I hold no brief for or against Aro. This is not only a situation that has developed in this case but it is a situation that has developed in this Nation where other corporations are doing much the same thing. It is a matter of policy. To pick on one corporation at this time, without taking the same position against all of the other corporations is not just. In view of this situation I would at this time support the Jensen motion and urge the Defense Department, not only the Air Force to study this policy of operating these different installations by a corporation which is in many respects merely an effort on their part to escape the civilian employee ceiling that Congress has tried to place upon them. It is a matter of policy that should be studied, and I suggest that in the hope that we can work out by future legislation or Defense Department policy, some solution that will relate not only to Aro but to every corporation that is doing this type of work.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 37, noes 112.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 44: Page 37, line 2, insert ": *Provided further*, That units and headquarters of the Air National Guard of the United States, when they are in the active service of the United States, shall have the same privilege of free transmission of the official mail matter as the Department of Defense."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ": *Provided further*, That units and headquarters of the Air National Guard of the United States, whether or not they are in the active service of the United States, shall have the same privilege of free transmission of the official mail matter as the Department of Defense."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 45: Page 38, line 16, insert ", and such amounts as may be required to meet increased costs of pay and allowances as authorized by the act of May 19, 1952 (Public Law 346) may be transferred from such unobligated balances of appropriations available to the Department of Defense as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense to applicable appropriations contained in titles II, III, IV, and V of this act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 55, line 10, strike out:

"SEC. 636. No funds contained in this act shall be used for the purpose of entering into contracts containing article 15 of the Standard Government Contract, which reads as follows."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"No funds contained in this act shall be used for the purpose of entering into contracts containing article 15 of the Standard Government Contract until and unless said article is revised and amended to provide an appeal by the contractor to the Court of Claims within 90 days of the date of decision by the Department concerned, authority for which appeal is hereby granted."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 59: Page 56, line 22 insert:

"SEC. 635. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law and for the purpose of achieving an efficient, economical, and practical operation of an integrated supply system designed to meet the needs of the military departments without duplicating or overlapping of either operations or functions, no officer or agency in or under the Department of Defense, after the effective date of this section, shall obligate any funds for procurement, production, warehousing, distribution of supplies or equipment or related supply management functions, except in accordance with regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) This section shall be effective 60 days after the approval of this act."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 63: Page 58, line 4, insert:

"SEC. 639. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to submit revised tables of organization and tables of equipment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, together with recommendations for decreasing the number of personnel positions, clerical positions, supply positions, and other administrative positions so that the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces may be improved. The respective Armed Services Committees shall scrutinize such recommendations and, if necessary, recommend legislation to require the Department of Defense to reduce the number of such positions so that the combat effectiveness of the armed services can be improved."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 639. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to submit revised tables of organization and tables of equipment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to the Congress, together with recommendations for decreasing the number of personnel positions, clerical positions, supply positions, and other administrative positions so that the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces may be improved."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 may be considered en bloc; they all involve the matter of combat pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 58, line 17, insert:

"TITLE VII

"Combat duty pay"

Senate amendment No. 65: Page 59, line 19, insert:

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'Combat Duty Pay Act of 1952.'"

Senate amendment No. 66: Page 58, line 21, insert:

"SEC. 702. As used in this title—

"(a) The terms 'uniformed services', 'member', 'officer', and 'secretary' (except as hereinafter specifically provided) shall have the meaning prescribed for such terms by section 102 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and the terms 'incentive pay' and 'special pay' shall mean the pay authorized by section 203, 204, or 205 of such act.

"(b) The term 'member', when used in relation to any combat unit, means any member of the uniformed services serving and present with, or on board, such unit under competent orders.

"(c) The term 'combat unit' means—

"(1) any military unit, not larger than a regiment, while such unit is engaged in actual combat on land; or

"(2) any element of, or detail of personnel from, any military unit not larger than a regiment, while such element or detail is subjected to hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance (A) directly to a military unit, not larger than a battalion, which is engaged in actual combat on land,

or (B) by fire to any military unit engaged in actual combat on land; or

"(3) any military unit (not larger than a regiment) engaged in any amphibious or airborne operation, while subjected to hostile ground fire in the course of rendering aid or assistance, to a military unit which is engaged in actual combat on land, by the performance of duties which require its employment at or near a beach or airhead; or

"(4) any vessel while subjected to hostile fire or explosion in the course of any operation; or

"(5) any aircraft while subjected to hostile fire in the course of any operation.

"(d) the term 'actual combat on land' means direct contact with and opposition to a hostile force by any military unit while such unit is subjected to hostile ground fire.

"(e) the term 'military unit' means any unit of any of the uniformed services other than a vessel or aircraft.

"(f) the term 'Korea' shall mean the geographical area specified for income-tax-exemption purposes by Executive order 10195, approved December 20, 1950."

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 60, line 16, insert:

"SEC. 703. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of $45 per month for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which such member was entitled to receive basic pay and during which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea on—

"(a) not less than 6 days of such month; or

"(b) one or more days of such month included within a period of not less than six consecutive days on which he was a member of a combat unit in Korea, if such period began in the next preceding month and he is not entitled to receive combat pay under this title for such preceding month."

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 61, line 5, insert:

"SEC. 704. Each member and former member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to receive combat pay in the amount of $45 per month for each month beginning after May 31, 1950, for which he was entitled to receive basic pay and in which—

"(a) he was killed in action, injured in action, or wounded in action while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter during which he was hospitalized for the treatment of an injury or wound received in action while so serving; or

"(b) he was captured or entered a missing-in-action status while serving as a member of a combat unit in Korea, and for not more than 3 months thereafter during which he occupied such status."

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 61, line 20, insert:

"SEC. 705. No person shall be entitled to receive for any month—

"(a) more than one combat pay authorized by this title; or

"(b) combat pay under this title in addition to any incentive or special pay."

Senate amendment No. 70: page 62, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 706. (a) The Secretaries of the services concerned are authorized and directed to promulgate regulations for the administration of this title, which regulations shall be as uniform as practicable, and in the case of the military departments shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) Such regulations may include appropriate provisions for the withholding of combat pay under section 203 of this title from any member or former member of the uniformed services (or any class of such persons) for any period during which such person or class of persons was not placed in substantial peril by the action of any hostile force, as determined in conformity with such regulations."

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 62, line 16, insert:

"SEC. 707. (a) The Secretary of the service concerned, or such subordinate as he may specify, may make such determination of fact as may be required for the administration of this act, and any such determination shall be final.

"(b) Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for the payment of combat pay under this title for any month prior to the date of enactment of this title."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 64 through 71, inclusive.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD moves that the House recede and concur in the amendments Nos. 64 through 71.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is the combat-pay amendment. This language calling for combat pay for the Korean veterans is in the bill, and I think you will all like to know that it was placed there by the unanimous action of the other body without any protest at all. I think it is permissible to tell you that when we had a poll of the House Members the vote was 6 to 5 among the House Members that we concur in the Senate amendment. So you see how close the whole problem is as far as both bodies are concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says this was passed unanimously in the other body?

Mr. FLOOD. Unanimously in the other body; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That includes all of the economy-minded Members?

Mr. FLOOD. It includes the other body. This is the $45 combat-pay amendment and it applies to the combat veteran. Certainly I cannot conceive, Mr. Speaker, that this body would adjourn this week with this matter before it on the 4th of July and that you are going to agree that the nine existing categories of hazard pay that now exist be permitted to continue, but that the infantry soldier in the foxholes of Korea is not considered on hazardous duty.

I understand there is a commission and that there is a committee dedicating itself to examining the whole problem of combat pay in all branches, the Air Force, Army, Navy, and so forth. I have no quarrel with that. I hope they will come back with an excellent report next year. We will be glad to see it, and act on it at that time if and when they do, toward the end of 1953.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Am I to understand this is an amendment to put the troops in Korea on a comparable basis with submariners, fliers, and other who get extra pay and other things? I think this legislation is long overdue, and I will vote for this combat-pay provision.

Mr. FLOOD. It is exactly that. It will permit the same hazardous pay that is given to submariners, to me who go up in the air, and I hold no brief for them. In the United States they receive hazardous pay. Boys who are training as deep-sea divers in New London and in New Haven, the boys who handle high explosives, the demolition squads, and others all over America, receive hazardous pay.

When we ask American people to give their blood plasma for combat troops, how in the world, Mr. Speaker, can we go out on campaigns to give blood to combat troops in the fox holes over there, then say that they are not on a hazardous duty? It may be hard, and it will be said that you cannot administer this bill, that it is too tough to administer. But it is not half as tough for the people who administer this bill down in the Pentagon as it is to be in some fox hole in Korea. That is pretty tough, too. I cannot shed any tears about somebody in a swivel chair who is going to be embarrassed and discommoded in some way so far as administering combat pay is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand also that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, Senator RUSSELL, has introduced a bill calling for $50 a month; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct. The Senator from Louisiana introduced a bill calling for $50 and $100 for officers, but the Senate, in my judgment, very properly adopted this compromise. This was cosponsorsed by 42 Senators, and I repeat for the purpose of emphasis, it was unanimous there.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The gentleman well knows that we agree on at least one thing, and that is, when there comes about any situation such as this, there should be no discrimination between an enlisted man and an officer.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course. I might add, in case you were not clear about that point, there is no discrimination, as there is in most other cases, in this bill between enlisted personnel categories and officer or commissioned personnel. By the way, the money necessary to meet this requirement can be absorbed. There is no reason why it cannot be absorbed and this whole proposition met today.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania has just presented the same amendment which I had ready to pre-

sent. I did not realize that he was about to do it, but as a member of the Appropriations Committee it is right that he should present it. I simply want to say that I concur in his amendment and say to you that this is one amendment that this House by all means should adopt before we adjourn.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman, I know, understands the problem very well, but I forgot to mention that this is retroactive. Of course, we could not conceivably discriminate against the men who have been there, and this is retroactive to the beginning of the Korean conflict.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say that this motion simply does, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, for the GI in the fox holes in Korea what we have been doing for nine other categories. Take, for instance, a flight mechanic. One was in my office last week, a boy, a sergeant in the Air Force, stationed in the United States. His rating is flight mechanic. He happens to be with the Military Air Transport Service and he said that because his rating is flight mechanic instead of plain mechanic, and because he goes up in a plane maybe once or twice a month, he gets $50 extra. I do not object to that. That has been standard policy with the Air Force to give hazard pay to people who are in active duty and flying. But I certainly think that it would be rank discrimination if we refused to give hazard pay to the fellow in Korea who is out on the front lines, who is fighting the battle.

Two years ago some people said that this is not going to amount to anything in Korea; that all we would have to do would be to use the Air Force and the Navy. And I said then, "Yes; but the fellows who are going to win these battles are the ones that go in there with their feet on the ground." I do not take any credit away from the Air Force or the Navy. They can bomb up and down the coast line, but to hold the territory you have to have good old GI Joe, and I believe in treating him as we treat the rest of them. I trust the House will approve this motion unanimously.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to call something to the attention of the House that I am quite sure you will be interested in. On last Saturday night when we were considering the conference report on the Defense Production Act the House was under the impression, and language was used on the floor that further confirmed that impression, that the Wage Stabilization Board had been abolished. This colloquy took place between the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]:

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman might also point out that the conference abolishes the present board and in addition contains language in effect limiting them in the issuance of orders as of midnight last night.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That was one of the concessions we insisted upon before we agreed to take the Senate language in relations to the constitution of the board.

No one on either side corrected the impression carried in that language. The House had no other course than to rely upon that language because we did not have the printed word at our disposal. I was certainly under the impression that it was abolished and certainly under no circumstances would they enter the disputes field again. That board has been been repudiated by the Committee on Education and Labor which spent weeks and weeks thoroughly investigating it. It was repudiated by this House and it was repudiated by the Senate.

On yesterday afternoon a release was issued by the Wage Stabilization Board. I am unable to say whether they expected the House to adjourn last night, but I want to quote from this release of yesterday afternoon. Before I read this paragraph, may I say that the first page of the release is used for indirect digs at the House for the kind of bill it passed:

Under the new law, the present 18-member Wage Stabilization Board created by Presidential Executive Order 10233 and composed of 6 public, 6 industry, and 6 labor members, will continue in operation through July 29. The National Board, the 14 regional boards of the WSB staff will continue processing the present backlog of some 13,000 wage adjustment petitions, requests for rulings and interpretations, a few pending dispute cases, and any new wage adjustment petitions received.

I am just wondering what kind of action this House must take to stop a board that certainly had an opportunity to know that the legislative bodies of the United States are not in line with their views and wish them to cease operations. This House and the Senate of the United States intended for them to liquidate, not to make recommendations and to continue their operation in the field of disputes. If they had any desire to carry out the will, wish, or intent of Congress they would bring their activities in line with the expressed policy of Congress and stay out of the disputes field, even if they dealt with other cases.

I happen to know there are many dangerous cases pending right now. If they issue their famous union-shop order in connection with those disputes, we are going to be involved in a strike practically as large as the steel strike right now. I do not think there is any question in the mind of anybody but that that Board is one of the great contributors to the steel strike in which we find ourselves involved at the present time.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think probably I owe it to the House to say that when I made the observation I did, to which the gentleman has made reference, it was my understanding that the operations of the Board were to be stopped as of the midnight before we were acting on the conference report. That was the reason I made the statement I did. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], is present at the moment, but I am confident that he was under the same impression, else he certainly would not have responded as he did. No one made any different sort of statement in respect to that interpretation of the conference report.

I join with the gentleman by saying that the Wage Stabilization Board as it is presently constituted was abolished by the action of Congress. It would have been abolished instantly except everybody said it was reasonable to give them 30 days in which to get out of business. On the disputes pending, if they intervene and cause further trouble, to my mind it will be inimical to the best interests of the country. I happen to know that several of those disputes are now in the process of collective bargaining, and that is where they should be. If the Wage Stabilization Board will keep out, I think they will be settled.

Mr. BARDEN. I had no intention of criticizing the gentleman from Indiana or the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. WOLCOTT]. None of us had accurate information. I feel that those who did have the accurate information should have given it to the House. We intended to abolish that Board, and it ought to be abolished.

Mr. HALE. Would not the purported decision of an abolished board be a nullity?

Mr. BARDEN. They are not abolished. The language is here in the law. I do not know how it got in there, but it is there. It was not brought to our attention. It says that the Wage Stabilization Board shall issue no regulation or orders except with respect to individual cases pending before the Board prior to such date. It apparently was put in in conference but the House was not told about it and we did not have a printed copy of the report. Apparently that is one of the penalties we must pay for such hasty action; at least that is one of the reasons why I voted against the conference report. I am very definitely of this opinion, if Congress was not already in the process of adjourning tonight or tomorrow, this Congress would deal with them in a manner they could understand.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out in fairness to the House Banking and Currency Conference Committee, and also to Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. HALLECK, that while I

did not sit in on the conference report, when the conference report got back to the House last Saturday, I understood very clearly, and I know that a lot of other members did too, that the old Wage Stabilization Board was to be discontinued but a new Board was to be set up as quickly as it could possibly be done. I know from my own experience with the Wage Stabilization Board, because I happen to have had cases before it in my district, that the Board is fit to operate. Its past history shows that in 90 percent at least, and possibly even more, of the cases handled by it, the Board has done an outstanding job; and while some responsibility for this steel strike may be at its door, nevertheless you have to have some sort of agency to go ahead now and proceed with the cases on wage adjustments that are coming up constantly between now and the time that the new Board takes over. If we did not have such continuing agency, you would have nothing but paralysis on the part of management and labor.

Mr. BARDEN. Why don't they stay out of the field of disputes?

Mr. McKINNON. I did not yield to the gentleman. The gentleman had 6 minutes, and I have only 3.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman can answer the question in less time than that.

Mr. McKINNON. The gentleman says that they should stay out of the field of disputes. I do not know exactly what the gentleman is referring to, and I do not think the gentleman does either. But I do know that the Board is currently engaged in disputes of several months standing. Is the Board to walk away from there and leave the parties high and dry? What would happen to the interest of the general public if it did? To stop those right now would mean that you would create paralysis instead of having the flow of operations so essential to business and commerce. After all, there is a lot of business that has to go on. You cannot paralyze everything just because you are dissatisfied with the Wage Stabilization Board and want to see it changed.

Mr. BLATNIK. Is it not true most of those matters that are now before the Board were brought there at the joint request of both management and labor, and that they have asked for help?

Mr. McKINNON. That is true in most of the cases, practically all of them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. My particular interest, I may say, is in respect to the big disputes where the Board is asserting the right to make recommendations for settlement. Those are the cases that concern me. I am not concerned about routine matters of wage adjustment. I am not concerned about that, but I am concerned about the danger, which I think is involved in the Board undertaking to do as they did in the Steel case, in respect to these disputes which involve economic matters.

Mr. McKINNON. I had a conversation with one of the members of the Board the day after we passed the conference report. He confirmed my understanding and your understanding that they were to stay out of industrial disputes of a new nature, and anything that involved any major policy change in wages. There is no confusion on that point. I think it is unfair and unfortunate to criticize any agency—or any individual, for that matter—until we get all the facts and know the complete situation. Oftentimes we find that once we have the facts we have no room for criticism.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS] to discuss this matter and I must state now that I will not yield further for a discussion of this matter which is extraneous to the conference report now under consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent to me that the different speakers on this subject are not talking about the same thing. While it is true that the Wage Stabilization Board has jurisdiction under the bill which we passed to handle purely stabilization matters, it was the intent of Congress, very clearly expressed, in my judgment, that the Wage Stabilization Board was not to make any recommendation in labor-dispute matters. Twelve dispute matters have been certified to the Board and not all of them have been finally settled. In those cases where they have made recommendations, they have created more strife than would have resulted had the matters been settled by collective bargaining. It is the desire of the Congress, as expressed in the bill which we passed, that these matters be handled by collective bargaining under the other labor laws of the land. When we talk about labor disputes, it is evident to me, and I think the Congress very clearly expressed itself on the subject, that the Wage Stabilization Board was to issue no more regulations or recommendations in disputes cases, and if they do issue such recommendations, they are violating the intent of Congress, plainly expressed.

Congress wants no more of the havoc the Wage Stabilization Board visited upon this country in the union-shop recommendations, as in the Steel case.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to answer questions which have been asked relative to this particular section now under discussion.

This pay is to be given to men in actual combat. The question has been asked, Does that cover men back in the supply areas? The answer to that is "No," because to get this combat pay they must be subject to hostile ground fire. Even though they might be subject to airplane bombing, that does not give them combat pay.

The question has been asked, Does it apply to members of the Navy? Yes, it does, if they are serving on a vessel near the beachhead which is subject to fire or explosion in any of their operations.

Third, Does it apply to the Air Force? It applies to the Air Force ground crews, if they are working on any aircraft which is subject to hostile fire in the course of operation, but they cannot receive two hazard pays. In other words, if a man is receiving flying pay he cannot also receive combat pay.

This is for Korea, as defined by the Income Exemption Act of 1950. It is retroactive. It will be allowed to every man who has been in actual combat as defined, in Korea since the 31st of May 1950. He cannot get it by going into combat one day. He has to be in actual combat 6 days each month, or if he should happen to go into combat on the last day of the month then he must continue in actual combat under hostile ground fire for the next succeeding 6 days.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does it apply to soldiers guarding prisoners?

Mr. SCRIVNER. It does not unless they are under ground fire from the enemy.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. In support of the excellent explanation of the gentleman from Kansas, who is especially well versed in these problems, I would like to ask if actual combat is not defined as direct contact with and opposition to hostile forces while subjected to ground fire?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Mr. FLOOD. It is intended only that by this definition coverage in this bill will be limited to those units which are actually in contact with the enemy under fire?

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is right.

Another point that should be mentioned is this: It applies to personnel serving with elements not larger than a regiment. In other words, when you get back into a division it does not go. We call this hazard pay. It is hazard pay. There are some types of hazard pay today where there is no hazard, where some of the men receiving what is called hazard pay undergo no more danger than many Members of Congress have undergone without hazard pay. I am talking about the hazard in flying, the hazard in visiting these various fronts and fields of activity in Korea. Anybody who has ever been in Korea, who has ever smelled it, who has ever been there in the mud, in the subzero weather, where these men are and have been fighting, and will probably continue to fight for no one knows how long, will agree that you cannot pay these men enough money to properly reward them for what they have to undergo.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a very gallant soldier.

Mr. TEAGUE. Would the gentleman tell the House generally what group of men will receive this pay?

Mr. SCRIVNER. The infantrymen.

Mr. TEAGUE. By that I mean it is the privates, the corporals, sergeants, and lieutenants.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh, of course, if a colonel should happen to be under ground fire for the 6 days he will get the pay, but primarily it goes to the enlisted men of the Army, in the infantry, along with tankers, artillerymen, medics, all men who are under ground fire, but primarily since it is the doughboy who has to crawl on his belly in the mud and the dust, the majority of those receiving this combat pay will be those in the infantry.

Mr. FLOOD. And of course my friend includes the platoon leaders.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Oh surely, for they, too, will be under the same fire as their platoon.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt this motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. Speaker, combat pay for the men who really do the fighting is long overdue. I believe the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] and I were the first Members of Congress to introduce combat pay bills almost 2 years ago.

If there is one inequity anywhere in the Federal pay structure, the fact that we do not pay the front line infantrymen combat pay, is the greatest inequity of all. We have millions of men in the service and they are all there for one reason, to support those few men in the fighting part of the service. Mr. Speaker, I realize this bill will be difficult to administer and probably it should not be in an appropriation bill but it appears the chairman of the Armed Services Committee will not keep his promise to do something on this bill and this is the only way that we will be able to pass combat pay. I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is for this legislation and very concious of the men fighting in Korea and I congratulate him for his job well done.

If this House will stop to realize that this group of men about whom we are talking represents somewhere around 15 percent of the men in the service and yet they suffer 80 to 85 percent of the casualties, I am sure every Member of the House will support this legislation.

As I understand these amendments, they apply as far as the ground forces are concerned from the regiment down—this means that the men who really do the fighting are the ones who are going to get the pay, maybe it should be from the battalion down but I will not object to regiment. Also this means the privates, corporals, lieutenants, captains are the ones who get the pay.

I hope the House will agree to this motion.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. SECREST. I think this a fair statement to be made: In view of the fact that when an engagement or operation at the front has been going on a long time and those boys can get so far and seem unable to move further, for one reason or another, does not the gentleman think this will be one of the biggest morale builders those boys could have?

Mr. TEAGUE. There is no question about it. This is some recognition of what they are doing, Mr. Speaker, if anywhere in this world there are a group of men to whom we owe a debt it is to those men who fight in the front lines in our wars.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas made a significant remark when he said that many men were now drawing pay for special hazards which in fact entailed but little hazard. If there is a subject to which the Committee on Armed Services could properly devote its attention it appears to me that this would be it.

As a conferee, I voted to bring this back in disagreement, feeling that the House had a right to express itself on this matter. I now join in support of the motion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. In other words, if the House wishes to vote to award this combat pay they vote "yes"; if they do not, they vote "no."

Mr. GORE. That is right, and I join with the gentleman in his feeling of opposition toward some of the hazard pay that is now being paid. Actually I have not been one of those favorably disposed to the present system of flight pay. It seems to me that we pay men entirely too much to fly too little. However, if we are to continue, as is now the case, flight pay and hazard pay for other dangerous assignments, surely we cannot with logic deny hazard pay to the group of men who undergo the greatest hazard and suffer the greatest casualties.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Right on that point I want to say that I think the gentleman agrees that the gentleman from Kansas has made it clear that under the terms of these amendments you have to do something more than make one flight over the territory or go on a sightseeing trip; you have to do something to earn this hazard pay; you have to be there 6 days out of the month. In this particular part of the legislation we have taken care of that or will take care of the objection which I think the gentleman very properly entertains.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. I am quite sure the gentleman knows that if we are ever to get combat pay this is the only way we will get it; because while we have been promised time and again by the Armed Services Committee, yet nothing has been done.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. I thank the gentleman. The point of my remarks is this, if I may bring it to a close: This is an opportunity for the House to vote affirmatively on this question, but it should not close the question. Indeed, it should serve to promote a thorough study of special payments.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I really believe this effort to reward these deserving men is not the proper method. It should be handled through the Legislative Committee and made retroactive. An appropriation bill is no place for the consideration of such involved legislation because all complicated aspects cannot be thoroughly analyzed.

As you look through the conference report, starting on page 58, you must come to the conclusion that for every fighting outfit that goes into the field, for every ship that goes into combat waters, for every aircraft unit that sends a plane into combat, you are going to have to have more administrative officials trying to interpret these provisions than you have people in combat. You are going to have people determining whether or not a ship, a plane, a group, or an individual has been in combat under the definition of this amendment. It will increase your administrative cost to a prohibitive figure. Your combat units will be bogged down with red tape.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I thought there was so much complaint about the administrative people not doing anything that here was a chance to put this whole galaxy of Army administrative people to work for a change.

Mr. FORD. The answer is that the gentleman does not understand what the problem is in combat. I am not arguing one way or the other as to the fundamental merits of this legislation, but if anybody has ever been on board ship, upon the ground, or been with aircraft where they were in combat they ought to know it is administratively impossible to handle the terms of this amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of combat pay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely hopeful that the Flood motion on the appropriation bill will be agreed to, so that the men will be given combat pay of $45. Certainly no men have ever fought under more unpleasant conditions than our men in Korea. It is very horrible. These men are assuredly entitled to combat pay. I may state that I signed the discharge petition to bring the combat

pay bill to the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind about voting combat pay for those at the front lines. If we pay flight pay and submarine pay, then it is only logical that we do justice to those soldiers who are subjected to the most terrible of hazards, at the front.

Such additional compensation will serve not only to compensate our fighting men but it will serve to build morale. It will be a just token of our appreciation. We must not lose sight of our obligation to them.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I favor this $45 for Korean incident combat pay. Yes; even if costs considerable more to administer the provisions of this combat pay, I favor it. But, perhaps the Military Establishment will adjust its total workload so it will not cost any sizable sum. In any event, combat pay is mere even justice and reward for extra hazard; no matter else. There are already about nine other groups in the Military Establishment the members of which get this hazard pay so by allowing it to these Korea war fighters, it will bring them more in line with fair justice. Nor, is any difference to exist between officers and men as to this $45. That is right and sound.

I am informed that to earn it the soldier or sailor or Air Force member or marine will have to have been in actual combat conditions for at least 6 days out of the month. He will have to have been under actual fire conditions and in direct contact with enemy fire, and subjected to it. This sum is little enough.

I am also informed that most of such hazard pay will go to the men in the infantry; the men who fight on ground, inch by inch; fox hole to fox hole. This fighting is where over 75 percent of the casualties occur, I am informed.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services of this House, I am very happy this provision is here and now, before we adjourn. Furthermore, the Armed Services Committee should promptly study the whole field of hazard pay and advise this House its findings.

The retroactive feature of this conference provision is splendid for it goes back and pays these distinguished hazard fighters who have been so close to death since May 31, 1950, in Korea.

And may I add, that I am very proud to daily sit on the floor of this House, with our distinguished veteran members. They, and each of them, add much to our edification and inspiration.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Mr. MAHON, and other Members of the House in urging favorable action upon the provision for combat pay for Korean veterans.

Apart from the fact that there are ample precedents for this measure in the instances, where hazard pay is provided for members of the Armed Forces, on the strict merits, this bill is more than amply justified. In fact, as has been generally acknowledged here, there would be no practicable way of adequately evaluating or compensating the gallant heroes of Korea for their unselfish service to the Nation.

It has been stated that the passage of this bill will strengthen the morale of our forces in Korea and, to an extent, that may be true. But in the light of the tremendous sacrifices these boys have been making and their tenacity, fortitude, and courage in facing up to the almost impossible situation of stalemate war that exists in that theater, I do not think that anyone knowing the facts would contend that their morale has been anything but the best and highest.

These boys are fighting an unusual war. The first war in American history, to my knowledge, where victory is not the goal. They have been required, under our current policy, to play sort of a waiting game, not to strike their hardest at the enemy but to hold the line, as it were, and mark time until peace can be effected.

The spectacle that has been before us for more than a year of United States representatives holding conferences in a tent with surly and insulting Red negotiators is not a pleasant one. The negotiations have not served to bring peace. They have been a sounding board for extensive, malicious, and false Communist propaganda.

That our boys have been able to maintain their high morale and accept the reverses, uncertainties, hazards, and horrors of this inexpressible situation is most eloquent testimony, not only of their morale, but to their magnificent patriotism and heroism in a bloody, brutal, and barbarous war. These boys have again superbly demonstrated the indomitable spirit of America.

It is imperative that we should provide this additional combat pay for them, but it is even more appropriate that we should strive with all our strength to settle the incredible war in which they are engaged, so that they may be soon relieved of their heavy burdens and enabled to return to their homes.

I am very happy to join the overwhelming membership of this House, who, I know, will support this measure.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to take the time of the House, I know the Members want to vote, and I know they are going to vote in the affirmative. The administrative argument does not stand up because you now have an elaborate administrative set-up for rotation. It is worked on the 4-3-2-1 point basis and you can use that set-up for payroll purposes in this act. Men on the front line to whom this bill applies win 4 points a month, men back at corps headquarters get 3, in the Eighth Army headquarters they get 2; and, as I understand it, in Tokyo, they get 1.

I rise to throw out a thought for the future. In any future engagement, assuming the Korean truce is successful, let us put into immediate operation this type combat duty pay legislation synonymously with a rotation system. The machinery used to compute rotation points can serve to compute payroll points for combat duty. This should be s. o. p. That means "standard order of procedure."

By the current rotation system, we have, I believe, wiped out any possible hue and cry in the land "to bring my boy home" in the manner the cry went up after the last war. I am sure this rotation system is going to be a standard operating procedure for the Armed Forces, and a boon to good battle performance.

This combat-duty-pay bill is not perfect. It is a start. It is flexible and can be interpreted for rear-area men's benefit in the event of guerrilla raids or behind-the-line enemy paratroop drops. The key is, I think, duty and action under enemy fire such as goes on within a regimental area in the face of enemy fire. Medics and others can qualify. It is fire power directed at you that counts—except, of course, fire from planes. This seems arbitrary. But a start in such legislation must be made and this act does just that.

The act seems to play down the value of staff planning and action in rear of regiment. It seems to affront logistical supply lines and the men who move them under enemy fire. It seems to affront combat engineers who work under sniper or concentrated enemy fire on specific tasks. It affronts many good and true men and officers in rear of regiment. I am sure they will take consolation in the fact that Congress has at last moved in the right direction. And, while it does so, it can adjust for perfection.

I hope the bill will be perfected to make combat bonus money coincide with rotation points, month to month. This will do many good things. It will take in a whole combat zone and stimulate, I trust, a desire to get higher points and more money. A desire for more men to get into "pay dirt" battle zones. It will make for more pride.

Carried on in peacetime, this type pay system might be termed "preferential duty pay," points and pay for field duty, for duty in overseas zones, barren, and health-threatening ones. It should, if used, stimulate officers and men to keep rotating on their jobs and not seek soft-spot assignments where they chew cuds.

I am proud to say that when I returned from Korea, my first bill in Congress was termed the "double-time, double-pay bill" for combat men. I am not pleased that it was tabled, of course. But we do our best in this job. Hence, I grabbed at this chance, with both hands, to support this bill.

In closing, this bill will right a social slight to the infantry soldier—a slight such as I overheard at table one night at a club. A youngster had just completed his first year at college. He was home for a few days before going away for summer training in the Army. His mother asked, "What did you make son?" He replied, "I'm in Signal." "Oh, I'm so glad," she said, "so glad you didn't get in the infantry. Those boys haven't much brains and besides you spared us a social stigma." This bill should pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to speak because I know everyone, or most everyone, is in favor of this motion to agree with the Senate proposal, but I feel I should say what is in my heart. I think the most frustrating thing I have experienced in the last 2 years, and we all have our frustrations, is the knowledge that we have not reported out a combat pay bill.

This bill, I think, is a great improvement on the suggestions of the Pentagon for combat pay. I do not think it is going to be a very expensive bill. It requires certain ground fire, a certain number of days in actual combat, and I think these requirements will cut down the cost of the bill. I do not think it is a bill which will be impossible to administer.

It is a bill which the hearts of the people of America require at this time.

The situation is that the casualties are coming from this group of people. They are the people who are doing the fighting in this war; it is the group that we should recognize here. We should have recognized them a long time ago. I urge that this motion be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, when the House voted a while ago on the Korean GI-benefit bill—the so-called Teague bill—I regret to say that I was in conference with the Committee on Armed Services public-works bill here in the Capital. I did not receive word of the roll call, and therefore I did not vote on the bill. I am very much in favor of the measure. It was no lack of interest on my part, because we were working on another very important bill to try to get it out before the close of this session of the Congress tomorrow night. I want to offer that explanation for the RECORD at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I might have kept quiet on this bill here before us because I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I spent years working on that committee, and its predecessor, the Committee on Military Affairs. But I do not want to keep quiet on this measure because I think it is a very meritorious bill. I doubt that I can add a great deal in the way of information to what has already been said, but I can add the assurance of one who has made a very thorough study of this matter that this bill is practical in its arrangement and is susceptible of being properly administered without heavy cost. I have checked into the cost. I have talked to high officials in the Army about it, and they tell me that the total cost, covering the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should not be more than $135,000,000, and I think, considering all of the vast sums we are spending, that we can well afford to spend that money on the men who actually bear the brunt of the fighting. They in the Defense Establishment tell me it can be administered relatively easily. They brought a typical service record of a Korean veteran to show me how such a measure would be administered. They showed me how you could take the service record and find out right away whether a man was in a combat outfit. When you determined that he was in a combat unit, you merely turn the pages to find out if he was in that unit at the time when it was in a combat zone. It is not a difficult proposition, and it is not going to be an expensive arrangement to run it down and work it out.

You might say that the bill should have been put through the Armed Services Committee; that we should have had extensive hearings on it before the bill went to the floor of the House, but I think today it will amount to a grave injustice to the Korean combat veteran if you do not pass it. I have wanted hearings, but we have not had hearings; and as a result of it, this is the best way to put the bill through. I think we will do a serious injustice to the combat Korean veterans if we do not pass it now, and in putting it through I do not think it will create any great additional administrative problem, and certainly will not involve any unusual administrative costs. So, I think it ought to go through, and in going through we then place the Korean combat veteran on the same basis that we do those in other extra hazard pay categories. The time may perhaps be at hand when we should study the entire matter of extra pay for the armed services to see that equity is done, where equity is due, and where we should increase pay because of the hazards; that we will meet that obligation, and where the hazard, because of the change in conditions, has diminished over the years, perhaps we should remove the extra hazard pay in those instances.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, I hope the conference report will be adopted. It brings delayed justice to the Korean combat man.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all I saw at the front in Korea 8 weeks ago convinces me I should vote for this measure and urge the House to approve it without delay.

I can best describe Korea as one Heartbreak Ridge after another with thousands of rice paddies thrown in—the worst terrain in all this world to fight a shooting war. There I saw the cream of our American youth in action against a Godless, ruthless enemy whose build-up during the truce talks has far outstripped our own.

There are times when our fighting men in Korea wonder if the folks back home realize the awfulness of their assignment and it makes me sick at heart when I read of our failures in production of the weapons in which they are deficient, when I hear of the difficulties being experienced by the Red Cross in getting needed blood donations, and when I review the general apathy on the home front. Those in the midst of the fighting in Korea do not like the fact their Government still talks in terms of a police action even though our casualties have passed the 100,000 mark and we are in the third year of struggle. They have a right, too, to charge their Congress with being remiss. It was not until this very day that we approved the GI bill of rights for Korean veterans. And now we debate the matter of combat duty pay.

The record will show that there are nine different categories of men in the armed services listed for higher pay than is received by others of their rank without extending the same consideration to those who are actually fighting. In other words, so-called hazard pay is not being paid to those now fighting in the foxholes and rice paddies of Korea. It is a discrimination that just doesn't make sense.

It will be recalled that in World War II extra pay was provided for men in combat and I am certain that overwhelming approval of this bill now will serve a tremendous morale service to those who cannot help but wonder at times how much they are being backed by those at home.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will be shocked, indeed, if there is a vote against the proposition of providing combat pay for our servicemen now fighting our battles in Korea. This is but simple justice—a well-deserved but all too meager bonus for those who face the enemy in actual combat.

It is regrettable that the Congress finds it necessary to provide this pay by means of a rider on an appropriation bill. The desirability of legislation along these lines has never been questioned publicly by anyone, but the Committee on Armed Services has somehow failed to provide authority for it.

Regardless of this, I am delighted that Congress has finally decided to take this long-overdue action, and hope that the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may prevail unanimously.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the poor little old Appropriations Committee has its problems. We are admonished from time to time not to bring in legislation on an appropriation bill. Yet, here we have five pages of very intricate legislation on an appropriation bill, which should more properly be handled by the legislative committee, the Committee on Armed Services.

Why is this legislation in the bill? The matter was brought up by an amendment in the other body. No one made a point of order against this. It was unanimously adopted, I believe the record shows. Therefore, the provision got into this bill and was there when the bill was considered in conference, and here it is today. The conferees have brought the issue back in technical disagreement for the determination of the issue by the House. Some of the conferees were opposed to combat pay, and others were not opposed to it. I, myself, for many months, have been in favor of combat pay and I shall vote for it. Of

course, we recognize this: We did not have combat pay as such in World War I or World War II. In my judgment, there is no way whereby one can advocate and provide funds for larger pay for fliers, that is, flight pay, and paratroopers and submariners and deny hazard pay to the people who are in the front line in combat. That seems to me to represent the position of most Members of the House. If anybody is entitled to incentive pay or hazardous-duty pay, it is the front-line combat soldier. It is inconsistent to provide hazardous pay for fliers and deny combat pay to front-line soldiers, sailors, and marines.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that during World War II we actually paid our merchant-marine men a premium, hazard pay, when they went into troubled waters?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. Was this amendment offered when the bill was in the House?

Mr. MAHON. This amendment would not have been in order and could not have been considered in the House as this is an appropriation bill, not a legislative measure.

I would say for the benefit of the House that the Committee on Armed Services has been warned of this legislative matter which is pending, and the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has spoken on the measure.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. TEAGUE. I believe the gentleman is incorrect when he says we did not have any combat pay in World War II. We did give men in combat a combat merit badge, and we paid them $10 a month additional while they were in combat.

Mr. MAHON. I believe the gentleman's statement is correct. Yet that was not exactly the type of legislation which we are here considering in this combat-pay bill.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. We had flight pay in World War I. I drew flight pay in the Naval Air Service 35 years ago for nearly 2 years. I would not trade what I went through in any month for what these men in ground combat go through in Korea in a month in hardship and hazard. We did not have combat pay in the Revolution or the Civil War, either. But if we are going to have hazard compensation for flying service nowadays, and for submarine service, we certainly ought to have it for those who are in combat on the ground. I am for the combat pay provision.

Mr. MAHON. I wholly agree with the gentleman. It should be pointed out that this legislative provision for combat pay does not give additional combat pay or additional hazard pay to people who are already getting it in the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Air Force, as fliers, and so forth.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. May I ask the gentleman if he can interpret this point for me: As the gentleman from Texas knows, an aircraft carrier does not operate within distance of shore batteries nor does it operate within distance of ships afloat where there are batteries. In other words, there will be 100 planes on board an *Essex*-type aircraft carrier, and those planes will go out and be in combat. Those planes are shot at. They come back and land on board the aircraft carrier. The aircraft carrier itself is never in a combat zone. Do the pilots and the crew members on those planes get combat pay but the people who operate the carrier do not?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman raises an important point. It demonstrates all the more reason why it is better procedure not to consider legislative matters of this complicated nature on an appropriation bill. Yet action was required and we had no other alternative. Now, if the gentleman will look at page 60, he will find any vessel while subjected to hostile fire would be included, and if it were not, I presume it would not be included.

Mr. FORD. That section is the one I have been looking at, and it does not answer at all the problem that I raise.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Any vessel, whether it is a carrier or any other vessel, to get this must be operating near a beachhead and not out in the ocean.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF SECTION NUMBER

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the section number on page 62, line 10, to change "203" to "703."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 12

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I direct attention to page 8, amendment No. 12. In the abbreviated reading of the statement on the part of the managers in lieu of the reading of the report, there was no mention made of amendment No. 12. An amendment was offered, which was offered by the gentleman from Missouri, restricting the amount of recruiting money which could be spent by 15 percent of what was spent during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952. I would like to inquire of the gentleman how that was handled in the conference?

Mr. MAHON. The figure "25" on line 1, page 9, was changed to "50." The committee was of the opinion that too much money is being spent on recruiting, but the committee did yield partially to the other body in increasing those funds.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO CORRECT CHAPTER, TITLE, AND SECTION NUMBERS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 239), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of general appropriation bills enacted during the remainder of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress the Clerk of the House may correct chapter, title, and section numbers.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 90.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Interparliamentary Union has not met in Washington, District of Columbia, since 1926; and

Whereas United States delegates have attended 22 meetings of the Interparliamentary Union in other capitals of the world since the meeting in Washington, District of Columbia: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the American Group of the Interparliamentary Union be requested to invite the Interparliamentary Union to hold its annual

meeting for the year 1953 in Washington, District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2485)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 10, 11, 14, 20, 31, 39, 42, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, and 44, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$87,325,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$9,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,877,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$264,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,810,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,390,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$120,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,991,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 604. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant after July 1, 1952, through the fiscal year 1953: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percentum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the department;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to the Department of Justice;

"(e) to the Judiciary Branch;

"(f) to the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

"(g) to the operational personnel of the Weather Bureau, National Bureau of Standards, the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Bureau of Public Roads;

"(h) to the Patent Office;

"(i) to the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"(j) to employees under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 as amended;

"(k) to construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(l) to employees in grades CPC–1 and 2; *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel in a department subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1953, this section may cease to apply."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 605. (a) No appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be available to pay—

"(1) for personal services of personnel above basic rates;

"(2) for transportation of things (other than mail); or

"(3) for travel of employees.

for more than 90 percentum of the amount which the budget estimates heretofore submitted in connection with appropriation or authorization contemplated would be expended therefrom for such purposes, respectively; and the total amount of each appropriation, any part of which is available for such purpose, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 per centum of the amount requested in such budget estimates for such purpose less an amount representing the reduction, if any, between the amount requested for such purpose in the budget estimates and the amount appropriated herein for such purpose.

"(b) This section shall not apply to—

"(1) construction, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

"(2) the Foreign Service, Department of State.

"(3) the Department of Justice.

"(4) the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

"(5) the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(6) the operational personnel of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Bureau of Public Roads, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau.

"(7) the Field Office Service of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

"(8) the Patent Office.

"(9) the Bureau of the Census.

"(10) the Judiciary Branch."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 3 of said amendment strike out "75" and insert in lieu thereof "87½"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4, 13, 21, 23, 24, 43, and 52.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $76,000,000 as proposed by the

House instead of $72,936,907 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2—Acquisition of buildings abroad: Appropriates $6,500,000 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Contributions to international organizations: Appropriates $30,484,749 as proposed by the Senate instead of $27,923,163 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4—Contributions to international organizations: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5—Missions to international organizations: Appropriates $1,321,112 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6—International contingencies: Appropriates $1,500,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, construction: Provide that the Anzalduas Diversion Dam shall not be operated for irrigation or water supply purposes in the United States unless suitable arrangements have been made with the prospective water users for repayment to the Government of such portions of the costs of said dam as shall have been allocated to such purposes by the Secretary of State, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—American sections, international commissions: Appropriates $505,344 as proposed by the Senate instead of $525,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 10—American sections, international commissions: Strikes out the provision of the Senate to make $45,000 available for American section, International Joint Commission.

Amendment No. 11—International information and educaitonal activities: Strikes out language of Senate to include television.

Amendment No. 12—International information and educational activities: Appropriates $87,325,000 instead of $86,575,000 as proposed by the House and $88,556,516 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—International information and educational activities: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 14—International information and educational activities: Strikes out the provision of the Senate stating that $7,967,958 shall be available for the exchange of persons.

Amendment No. 15—General provisions—Department of State: Strikes out House language (sec. 111) as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16—General provisions—Department of State, section 111: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17—General provisions—Department of State, section 112: Inserts language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18—General provisions—Department of State, section 113: Inserts language proposed by the Senate. The conferees on the part of both Houses agree on Senate amendment No. 18 and it is the intention of the conferees that the wording of the amendment will not preclude the Department of State from observing the activities of the International Materials Conference in the same manner and to the same extent that the United States might observe the activities of other international organizations to which the United States does not belong.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Legal activities and general administration

Amendment No. 19—Salaries and expenses, general legal activities: Appropriates $9,900,000 instead of $9,750,000 as proposed by the House and $10,030,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20—Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals: Appropriates $13,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $13,850,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Amendment No. 21—Salaries and expenses: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Prison System

Amendment No. 22—Buildings and facilities: Appropriates $824,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23—Buildings and facilities: Reported in disagreement.

General Provisions—Department of Justice

Amendment No. 24—Section 208: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 25—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $1,877,000 instead of $1,850,000 as proposed by the House and $1,904,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26—Technical and scientific services: Appropriates $264,500 instead of $270,000 as proposed by the House and $259,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 27—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Census: Appropriates $6,810,935 instead of $6,975,000 as proposed by the House and $6,410,935 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28—Seventeenth decennial census: Appropriates $1,700,000 instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $1,650,005 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29—Censuses of business, transportation, manufactures and mineral industries: Appropriates $1,390,300 instead of $1,450,000 as proposed by the House and $1,330,617 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30—Census of agriculture: Appropriates $120,700 instead of $125,000 as proposed by the House and $116,382 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31—Census of governments: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $806,841 for census of governments.

Civil Aeronautics Administration

Amendment No. 32—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $105,594,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $106,470,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33—Establishment of air-navigation facilities: Appropriates $11,091,499 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,091,499 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34—Technical development and evaluation: Appropriates $1,162,972 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,225,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Appropriates $19,821,154 as proposed by the Senate instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 36 and 37—Federal-aid airport program, Federal Airport Act: Provide that $2,571,154 shall be available for necessary planning, research, and administrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38—Maintenance and operation of public airports, Territory of Alaska: Appropriates $433,594 as proposed by the Senate instead of $435,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 39—Transport aircraft development: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,383,074.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Amendment No. 40—Departmental salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,792,932 as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,900,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41—Field office service: Appropriates $1,965,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,925,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42—Export control: Appropriates $5,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $5,504,300 as proposed by the Senate.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 43—Operation and administration: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 44—Operation and administration: Appropriates $1,351,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,140,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45—Research and testing: Appropriates $4,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of $4,156,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46—Radio propagation and standards: Appropriates $2,750,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,910,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 47—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $27,250,000 instead of $27,000,000 as proposed by the House and $27,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—THE JUDICIARY

Other courts and services

Amendment No. 48—Salaries of clerks of courts: Appropriates $4,991,850 instead of $4,900,000 as proposed by the House and $5,042,850 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49—Probation system: Appropriates $2,420,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,445,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50—Miscellaneous salaries: Appropriates $2,900,000 as proposed by the House instead of $2,995,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $837,200 as proposed by the House instead of $855,200 as proposed by the Senate.

General provisions—The Judiciary

Amendment No. 52—Section 404: Reported in disagreement.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54—Section 604: Restore the provision of the House with certain amendments, and strike out substitute provision proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55—Section 605: Inserts provision of the Senate with certain amendments.

Amendment No. 56—Section 606: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate with an amendment proposed by the House.

JOHN J. ROONEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
PRINCE H. PRESTON,
FRED MARSHALL,
GEORGE MAHON,
CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Will the gentleman explain whether Senator KNOWLAND's amendment was retained or whether it was rejected?

Mr. ROONEY. That is contained in amendment No. 24, section 208, at pages 31 and 32 of the bill and is in disagreement. It is not a part of the conference report recommended by the conferees. It is an amendment that will be discussed and decided upon after the adoption of the conference report. As the matter now stands, it is in strict disagreement between the two Houses. The Senate conferees insisted upon it and the majority House conferees are 100 percent against it.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 4: Page 6, line 9, strike out line 9 and down to and including the word "organizations" on line 13, and insert "No representative of the United States Government in any international organization after fiscal year 1953 shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the United States representatives to the inter-American organizations.

"No representative of the United States Government to any international organization of which the United States is not now a member shall, unless specifically authorized in an appropriation act or other law, make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of such international organization."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the amendment in controversy here is the language which was written into this bill by the House, limiting the use of funds appropriated under this bill to pay no more than one-third of the budget of these various international organizations. The Senate wrote different language into the bill. They said that no representative of the United States Government in any international organization after fiscal year 1953 shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget, et cetera.

The language written in by the House applied to this particular appropriation. This is the fourth time that the House has insisted that we limit our contributions to these international organizations to 33⅓ percent. Just a week ago the House voted to llimt our contributions under the mutual security bill to 33⅓ percent. Yet we are again faced with the proposition of yielding on a matter that we have four times endorsed.

The language which the Senate wrote into this bill provides that our representatives cannot make commitments after the fiscal year 1953. What does that mean? It means that in 1953 they will be making commitments for 1954. It means we will be unable to limit to one-third our contributions to these United Nations organizations until after 1954.

This means that in our appropriations for these international organizations it will be 1955 before we can cut them down to 33⅓ percent as this House has already voted four times and is getting ready to vote the fifth time today.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. And by that time, sir, through the passage by treaty rights of human rights conventions and genocide conventions we will not even have a Nation to pay anything.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is debatable, but as far as I am concerned I think the House should stand by its action on this matter and insist that we limit this—not in 1955 as the Senate provision calls for—but now.

I hope that the House will vote down the motion made by the gentleman from New York and insist upon its disagreement with the Senate in order to show to the people of America that Uncle Sam is tired of being made the sucker for these international organizations; that we will pay up to 33⅓ percent, which is still a disproportionate share, but we will go no further. It is time that some of these other countries assume some of the responsibility if they are to enjoy the benefits.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the pending amendment let me say that your conferees have done the very best they could concerning the Williams amendment as it was passed by the House. You must remember that the other body has an equal voice in this matter.

The conference committee has accepted the Senate language which says that no representative of the United States Government in any international organization after fiscal year 1953 shall make any commitment requiring the appropriation of funds for a contribution by the United States in excess of 33⅓ percent of the budget of any international organization for which the appropriation for the United States contribution is contained in this act. The language excepts inter-American organizations.

This I submit, and I believe the other side will fully agree, is the best that we were able to work out in behalf of the House. I trust that the motion which is now before the House will be carried.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee if the Senate has ever had an opportunity to vote on the Williams amendment as an independent matter.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, yes; every time it has been passed by the House the Senate has passed on it, not only in the Senate Committee on Appropriations, but every time it has been brought up on the floor of the other body.

May I say to the House that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] are in thorough accord on this decision as to our international contributions. As the result of their efforts they succeeded—and they are entitled to the credit—in having the United States contribution to the United Nations reduced from 38.92 to 36.9 percent; and under the Senate language, after the end of this fiscal year no representative can commit the United States to anything beyond 33⅓ percent.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. On what date did the Senate vote on the Williams amendment? And what was the vote?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will please refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I believe it was before the Senate on June 26.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out the one thing that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] emphasized in his comments, the year 1953. That is for the reason that all of the international organizations to which we belong, I would say at least 95 percent of them, operate on a calendar-year basis while we appropriate on a fiscal-year basis. After 1953 this will be the basic law of the land. There will be no controversy about this in the future because this will be the law. It is a fair law, it is a good compromise between the position that I have taken on one side and the very opposite position that the gentleman from Mississippi has taken.

Let me emphasize one other thing in conclusion. All of the specialized agencies of the United Nations are at this one-third figure. Our contribution to the U. N. itself is the only exception. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] fought at the last session to bring our contribution down. You gentlemen of the House heard him state during general debate on this bill when the bill was under consideration in the House that he felt satisfied with the representation that the American delegation made in trying to bring our contribution down to one-third.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The Senate language says: "No representative after fiscal 1953 shall make any commitment," and so forth. That means in December our representatives could make a commitment; in January of 1954,

1 month later, we will start considering appropriations for 1955, and it means this limitation can only be put into effect beginning in 1955.

Mr. ROONEY. That is incorrect. The fiscal year 1953 ends on June 30, 1953.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to say for the RECORD that three outstanding Members of this Congress, first, Senator Vandenberg, second, Senator LODGE, and third, Congressman VORYS, who had membership on Committee No. 5 in the U. N., did the best they could to bring the level of American contributions down to 33⅓ percent. Each one of them was able to reduce it progressively, and, as I understand the language of the Senate amendment 1953 would be the last year we would pay anything in excess of 33⅓ percent in any organization of the United Nations.

Mr. ROONEY. The language could not possibly mean anything else.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that this subcommittee seriously considered the very thing the gentleman speaks about. This committee was in Paris with the gentleman from Montana and the gentleman from Ohio when this matter was under discussion in the United Nations budget section and the gentleman from Ohio made an exceptionally fine presentation. He could not have been better. The gentleman from Mississippi himself has never more earnestly presented our position. If you think that anybody representing us is going to resort to subterfuge, this committee would not stand for it for a minute, and I agree with him on that.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's request comes too late. We must get along with this conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 13. Page 15, line 15, insert "of which sum, $200,000 shall be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding: *Provided*."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", of which sum, $100,000 may be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: Page 24, line 19, after "incumbent", insert ": *Provided further*, That the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation hereafter is authorized, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, to place 20 positions in grade GS-16 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 27, line 21, after "appropriation", insert ": *Provided further*, That the limitation under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for construction of a complete Federal jail at Anchorage, Alaska, is increased from '$400,000' to '$484,000'."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 31, line 1, strike out:

"SEC. 208. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States (1) against a State of the union; or (2) against in excess of 2,500 defendants."

And insert:

"SEC. 208. (a) Consent is hereby given to join the United States as a defendant in any suit (1) for the adjudication of rights to the use of water of a river system or other source, or (2) for the administration of such rights, where it appears that the United States is the owner of or is in the process of acquiring water rights by appropriation under State law, by purchase, by exchange, or otherwise, and the United States is a necessary party to such suit. The United States, when a party to any such suit, shall (1) be deemed to have waived any right to plead that the State laws are inapplicable or that the United States is not amenable thereto by reason of its sovereignty, and (2) shall be subject to the judgments, orders, and decrees of the court having jurisdiction, and may obtain review thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances: *Provided*, That no judgment for costs shall be entered against the United States in any such suit.

"(b) Summons or other process in any such suit shall be served upon the Attorney General or his designated representative.

"(c) Nothing in this act shall be construed as authorizing the joinder of the United States in any suit or controversy in the Supreme Court of the United States involving the right of States to the use of the water of any interstate stream.

"(d) None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of the suit in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, Southern Division, by the United States of America against Fallbrook Public Utility District, a public service corporation of the State of California, and others."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY].

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment No. 24 as put in by the Senate, contains language rewording an amendment which this House put in the bill when it was before us, and since the amendment which was put in on my motion when the bill was before the House was also put in by the Senate but simply reworded, there really was no dispute between the two Houses. The amendment I am speaking of now is contained in subsection (d). This prevents the use of funds by the Justice Department for suing what has been estimated to be some 14,000 farmers along the Santa Margarita River in southern California where the Government is contending it has paramount rights to all of the water in this nonnavigable stream by virtue of the fact that it bought some land on that stream.

Having built a huge military establishment there, when it became obvious that without conservation measures there could not be enough water for the military and the farmers and the home owners they all sat down together around a conference table and worked out a plan to build a dam on the Santa Margarita River and to divide up the water on an equitable basis so there would be enough water for both the military and the people on the stream. The men at the working level, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Interior, the Corps of Engineers, with Justice Department consultation, and the private owners, reached a working level agreement to build this dam and divide up the water.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the motion of the gentleman from New York mean that the language known as amendment 24 of the bill is stricken out? If that is done, it brings no relief to these people who own the water in the Fallbrook area as long as subsection (d) is left in the bill.

Mr. YORTY. The thing that would happen if the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] were adopted, would be that we would have lost the fight to bar the use of these funds to sue all these farmers on the Santa Margarita River. If the motion is lost, I intend to offer a motion, and I informed the gentlemen 5 days ago that I was going to offer this motion and ask for time, and I was promised time. I am going to offer a motion to recede and concur in the language of the Senate. That means we must defeat this motion of the gentleman from New York and permit me to proceed to make my motion.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I trust we can defeat this motion and adopt the motion to be offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. YORTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. What the gentleman proposes to do is cut off any funds so that the United States Government can protect its investment at Camp Pendleton, which amounts to something like $100,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY. That is the question.

Mr. YORTY. The Justice Department does not need to proceed with this lawsuit in order to protect the Government's investment at Camp Pendleton. What the Justice Department is doing is urging that the Government has paramount rights based on national defense, which harkens back to the tidelands case, paramount rights based on national defense and sovereignty, and a lot of other nebulous rights, to take all the water in the stream, and they are not offering the private home owners and landowners one drop of water. They are urging the paramount right to 35,000 acre-feet of water on a stream that has an annual yield of 20,000 acre-feet.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YORTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Is it not a fact that every Californian on both sides of the aisle in this House is in complete accord with the position taken by the gentleman now? All of us ask that this amendment be defeated so that we can face this matter squarely on the issues.

Mr. YORTY. Not only that, but the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] in conducting a hearing into this matter, looked at the complaint filed by the United States Government in this suit and observed, very correctly, I think, that "It looks like a complaint in eminent domain, except that they do not offer to pay compensation." That is the kind of suit they are bringing into California against our little farmers. Every farmer that is sued, no matter if his right is perfect, has to hire a lawyer and come in and defend himself against the great United States with its unlimited funds. That amounts to levying a fine against these people.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the discussion with regard to the conference report the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX] put his finger exactly on what the problem is in relation to amendment No. 24. Of course, if we were all from the State of California and concerned with the votes of water users in that State, we might be for section 208 as a united delegation. However, this is a matter which vitally affects every one of the 48 States of the Union. I think I can convince you to vote against the legislative rider called section 208 by reading to you the position of the United States Marine Corps, which is in command of Camp Pendleton which is on the Santa Margarita River in California and directly affected by this legislation on an appropriation bill.

Let me first tell you that the other body incorporated at pages 31 and 32 of this bill, an entire Senate legislative bill known as S. 18.

I shall now read you the communication from the Marine Corps:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS,
June 30, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ROONEY: At your request through Mr. James T. Patterson, Member of Congress from Connecticut, I am forwarding you herewith the Marine Corps' position in regard to section 208 of House of Representatives bill 7289, "Appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary."

The Marine Corps' position in regard to section 208 is outlined under enclosure (a), comments on H. R. 7289, and further explanation is given in enclosure (b) entitled "Reclama," which was delivered to the Senate Armed Services Committee (Senator RUSSELL D. LONG) on June 28, 1952.

It is hoped that the two encloures will give you a full picture of the Marine Corps' stand on this bill.

Thank you for your interest in the matter.

Very sincerely yours,
W. P. T. HILL,
Major General, United States Marine Corps, Quartermaster General.

Enclosure: (a) Comments on H. R. 7289; (b) Reclama.

ENCLOSURE (A)

Section (208) incorporates into the appropriation bill the language of S. 18, which gives consent to join the United States as a defendant in any suit (1) for the adjudication of rights to the use of water of a river system or (2) for the administration of such rights where the United States is an owner or contemplated owner. The effect of such legislation to give a blanket waiver by the United States of its immunity from suit in actions of this kind, opens the way for piecemeal adjudications of water rights in the various State courts, with the United States compelled to defend itself in a multiplicity of actions. In such a situation the United States will be subjected to the probable loss of valuable water rights. The Department of Justice protested vigorously against the enactment of S. 18, which now has been inserted in the appropriation bill where no such legislation belongs.

While amending the bill so as to include section 208, making the United States a defendant in suits over water rights, the Senate also adopted another amendment to the proposed section 208, offered by Senator KNOWLAND, the effect of which would be to prevent the use of the funds appropriated by the bill to carry on the suit brought by the United States to have its rights in the Santa Margarita River in California adjudicated. This case is set for pre-trial on July 8. It involves the use of water, the rights to which were bought and paid for by the United States as part of its $100,000,000 investment in the great Marine base at Camp Pendleton in California. Water, belonging to the United States, is now being diverted by private interests from the Santa Margarita River Valley over into another watershed, and efforts have been made over a long time, not only to deprive the United States of its rights, but also to prevent the suit to determine the extent of its ownership from being tried in the court. Congress is being used through this proposed amendment, and through other legislation still pending in Congress, to impair and destroy the necessary water rights purchased at great cost, for the benefit of private interests. If Camp Pendleton is to remain where it is, and such legislation is enacted, the taxpayers will be compelled to spend approximately $1,000,000 annually for water supplies to substitute for what it already owns, and which this legislation is designed to take away for nothing. It is unthinkable that Congress should in an appropriation bill pass substantive legislation making the United States defend itself in all manner of suits over water rights, and, at the same time, preventing the United States from obtaining an adjudication by the courts of its own rights in such a vitally important matter.

Under the language of section 208, you would have to have an assistant attorney general defending the United States Government in every one of the State courts of the State of California and other Western States, and the cost therefor added to the payroll of the Department of Justice merely to defend valuable water rights of the Federal Government would be enormous. This is about as spendthrift a proposition as I have seen in a long time.

Here are the pertinent parts of enclosure (b):

RECLAMA

* * * * * *

2. Camp Pendleton is one of the two large Marine Corps training bases in the United States, the other being at Camp Lejeune, N. C. Because of the large expansion of the Marine Corps it is imperative that these bases be utilized to the utmost.

3. The troop housing situation at Camp Pendleton is becoming critical. When the 1953 construction program was initiated, there were in existence at Camp Pendleton 32,486 billeting spaces in barracks and huts. In addition, there were available 10,480

spaces in tents, making a total of 43,966 billeting spaces. In order to take care of the anticipated load of 46,000 men, it had been planned to increase the billeting spaces by a 13,000-man expansion of the field training camps and funds for that purpose were appropriated. However, in order to provide space for these huts, the tents must be struck, leaving only 32,486 billets. Completion of this 13,000-man expansion will result in a total billeting capacity of 45,486 spaces to take care of the anticipated load of 46,000 men. This construction has started. In fiscal year 1954, the planned enlisted strength at Camp Pendleton will be 57,000 men. In order to take care of this increase, which must be completed prior to arrival of the men, another project was instituted for an 11,000-man expansion of the field training camps. This is the project that was included in H. R. 7694 at an estimated cost of $16,252,000 for construction during fiscal year 1953.

* * * * *

5. Contentions relative to rights to the water supply should not be allowed to interfere with this project for supplying billets. The necessity for supplying additional barracks is unchanged. The men will be there and must have a place to sleep. They cannot be deployed elsewhere because other stations will also be filled to capacity.

* * * * *

7. The question of water supply at Camp Pendleton is one of long standing. Many surveys by capable engineers, not only within the Navy Department, but by the Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and the United States Army engineers, as well as private engineering concerns have proved conclusively that there is more than ample water in the Santa Margarita River to supply the requirements of Camp Pendleton, including this project for an additional 11,000 men, provided the Government is able to secure and retain the water to which it is entitled.

8. The pending litigation between the Government and private interests on the west coast is to adjudicate the question of water rights. There is no question in the minds of the Department of Justice as to the Government rights and the Department of Justice considers that there is little doubt that it will win its case. It is merely a matter of the time required to comply with the judicial procedures for the Government to secure all of the water which it requires and to which it is entitled.

Now, that, simply is the proposition. If you are for common sense and economy and do not wish to pay out a million dollars a year additional for water at just one military base, and do not wish to add huge figures to the Department of Justice budget, you will vote favorably on the motion now pending.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POULSON) there were—ayes 85, noes 62.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 119, nays 181, answered "present" 1, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—119

Addonizio	Forand	Mahon
Andrews	Frazier	Marshall
Barden	Garmatz	Miller, Md.
Barrett	Gary	Mills
Blatnik	Gathings	Morgan
Bolling	Gordon	Multer
Bonner	Gore	Murray
Brooks	Granahan	Norrell
Brown, Ga.	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Bryson	Green	O'Neill
Buchanan	Greenwood	O'Toole
Burnside	Gregory	Passman
Burton	Hardy	Patterson
Canfield	Hart	Perkins
Cannon	Hays, Ark.	Polk
Carnahan	Herlong	Preston
Celler	Howell	Priest
Chatham	Irving	Rabaut
Chudoff	Javits	Radwan
Clemente	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Cooley	Jones, Mo.	Ramsay
Crosser	Jones, Hamilton C.	Reams
Davis, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Rhodes
Deane	Keating	Ribicoff
DeGraffenried	Kee	Riley
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Denny	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Denton	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Devereux	Kirwan	Rooney
Dingell	Lane	Roosevelt
Donohue	Lanham	Sasscer
Dorn	Lind	Secrest
Doughton	McCormack	Sieminski
Durham	McGrath	Staggers
Eberharter	McGuire	Thomas
Elliott	Machrowicz	Trimble
Fallon	Mack, Ill.	Wier
Feighan	Madden	Wilson, Ind.
Flood	Magee	Yates
Fogarty		Zablocki

NAYS—181

Aandahl	Fernandez	Martin, Iowa
Abbitt	Ford	Mason
Adair	Fulton	Meader
Albert	Gamble	Merrow
Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Miller, Calif.
Allen, Ill.	Golden	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Miller, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Graham	Mumma
Andresen, August H.	Gross	Murdock
Angell	Gwinn	Nicholson
Arends	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Aspinall	Hale	O'Konski
Ayres	Hall, Leonard W.	Osmers
Baker	Halleck	Ostertag
Baring	Harris	Patten
Bates, Mass.	Harrison, Nebr.	Philbin
Battle	Harrison, Va.	Poulson
Beamer	Harrison, Wyo.	Prouty
Belcher	Harvey	Rankin
Bennett, Fla.	Havenner	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hays, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.
Berry	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Hill	Roberts
Bishop	Hinshaw	Rogers, Colo.
Boggs, La.	Hoeven	Rogers, Mass.
Bosone	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Bow	Holmes	Ross
Bramblett	Horan	Sadlak
Bray	Hull	Saylor
Budge	Hunter	Schenck
Burleson	Ikard	Scott, Hardie
Busbey	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Bush	Jackson, Wash.	Scudder
Byrnes	James	Seely-Brown
Carrigg	Jarman	Shafer
Cheif	Jenison	Sheppard
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jensen	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	Jones, Woodrow W.	Sittler
Cole, Kans.	Kearns	Smith, Kans.
Colmer	Kersten, Wis.	Smith, Miss.
Corbett	King, Calif.	Smith, Va.
Cotton	Lantaff	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	LeCompte	Stanley
Crumpacker	Lovre	Steed
Cunningham	Lucas	Stockman
Dague	McConnell	Taber
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Talle
Dempsey	McDonough	Teague
D'Ewart	McIntire	Thompson, Mich.
Dondero	McKinnon	Thornberry
Donovan	McMullen	Vail
Doyle	McVey	Van Pelt
Ellsworth	Mack, Wash.	Van Zandt
Engle	Mansfield	Velde
Vursell	Whitten	Vorys
Walter	Widnall	Wilson, Tex.
Weichel	Wigglesworth	Winstead
Werdel	Williams, Miss.	Withrow
Wheeler	Williams, N. Y.	Wood, Idaho
		Yorty

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Cox

NOT VOTING—129

Abernethy	Forrester	Moulder
Allen, La.	Fugate	Murphy
Anfuso	Furcolo	Nelson
Armstrong	George	Norblad
Auchincloss	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Bailey	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Hara
Bakewell	Hand	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Harden	Phillips
Beall	Hébert	Poage
Beckworth	Hedrick	Potter
Bender	Heffernan	Powell
Bentsen	Heller	Price
Blackney	Herter	Redden
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Hillings	Regan
Boykin	Hoffman, Ill.	Richards
Brehm	Holifield	Riehlman
Brown, Ohio	Hope	Robeson
Brownson	Johnson	Sabath
Buckley	Jonas	St. George
Buffett	Judd	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Burdick	Kean	Sheehan
Butler	Kearney	Shelley
Camp	Kennedy	Short
Carlyle	Keogh	Sikes
Case	Kilburn	Spence
Chiperfield	Kilday	Springer
Church	King, Pa.	Stigler
Cole, N. Y.	Klein	Sutton
Combs	Kluczynski	Tackett
Cooper	Larcade	Taylor
Coudert	Latham	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Tollefson
Curtis, Nebr.	Lyle	Vinson
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Watts
Dawson	McGregor	Welch
Dollinger	McMillan	Wharton
Dolliver	Matrin, Mass.	Wickersham
Eaton	Mitchell	Willis
Elston	Morano	Wolcott
Evins	Morris	Wolverton
Fenton	Morrison	Wood, Ga.
Fine	Morton	Woodruff
Fisher		

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Fugate with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Price with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Forrester with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Armstrong.
Mr. Robeson with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Short.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Bakewell.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Kennedy with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Cooper with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Morris with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Willis with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Elston.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Case.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Butler.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Spence with Mr. George.

Mr. WHEELER, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. AYRES, Mr. FULTON, and Mr. HARRIS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recede and concur in Senate amendment 24 on page 31.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YORTY moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 24 on page 31.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 43: Page 49, line 2, insert "not to exceed $175,000 for construction and equipment of cafeteria facilities."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 52: Page 59, line 13, insert:

"SEC. 404. When the buildings in Judiciary Square now occupied by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia are vacated by such courts, the Architect of the Capitol shall cease to perform any duties in connection with such buildings and any duties theretofore performed by him with respect to these buildings shall thereafter be performed by the General Services Administration. Such amounts of the appropriations herein provided for expenditure for such buildings by the Architect of the Capitol as may be unobligated at the time of transfer of duties shall be transferred by the Architect of the Capitol to the General Services Administration. The building now occupied by the district court shall, when funds are made available therefor, be renovated by General Services Administration for the use of The Tax Court of the United States. The General Services Administration is authorized to prepare plans and specifications therefor, to be paid for out of such funds, under the direction and supervision of the Chief Judge of The Tax Court."

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ROONEY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 404. When the buildings in Judiciary Square now occupied by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia are vacated by such courts, the Architect of the Capitol shall cease to perform any duties in connection with such buildings and any duties theretofore performed by him with respect to these buildings shall thereafter be performed by the General Services Administration. Such amounts of the appropriations herein provided for expenditure for such buildings by the Architect of the Capitol as may be unobligated at the time of transfer of duties shall be transferred by the Architect of the Capitol to the General Services Administration."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the conference report just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COPYRIGHTS

Mr. BRYSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2486)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589), to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIS SMITH,
ALEXANDER WILEY,
HERBERT R. O'CONOR,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HOMER FERGUSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill (H. R. 3589) as it passed the House, limited the coverage of performing and recording rights in nondramatic literary works to those made "for profit." The purpose of this limitation was to avoid a holding of infringement by "a teacher reading excerpts from a copyrighted schoolbook in a schoolroom, a minister reading from text in a church or a speaker at a civic meeting." Amendments numbered 1 and 2 of the bill (H. R. 3589) as it passed the Senate inserted the word "pecuniary" after the word "for" and before the word "profit" to ensure that the quotation of a portion of a copyrighted poem or literary work or a speech for which no monetary compensation was received would not be deemed an infringement. This result appeared desirable to the House and was intended to be included in the bill passed by the House by means of the words "for profit."

The conferees believe that the objective of the first and second Senate amendments is obtained without the addition of the word "pecuniary" and that the addition of such word may create uncertainties in the law. The concept of "public performance for profit" has been in the copyright law since 1909 and the courts have construed the phrase to mean a material, tangible, commercial profit. The inclusion of the word "pecuniary" might cast doubt upon the phrase "public performance for profit" appearing elsewhere in the law. The use of different language to achieve the same result in the same law appears to be undesirable.

Accordingly, the conferees have agreed to strike out the Senate amendments numbered 1 and 2 with the understanding that the word "profit" as used in the bill refers only to a pecuniary remuneration.

Senate amendment number 3 was passed to permit a record company to dispose of certain inventory that would otherwise be covered by the bill. Although, a record company would not have had to pay a royalty on records manufactured or sold prior to the effective date of the bill, a royalty would have been payable for records manufactured or sold after the date of enactment. As record companies have large investments in original or master recordings, they might find themselves in the position of having made a large investment and if they could not obtain a license at a reasonable rate, be unable to make and sell records after the enactment of the bill. To reduce the possibility of loss from such a contingency, the conferees have agreed to accept the Senate amendment number 3, which moves the effective date of the bill up to January 1, 1953 and, accordingly, will exclude from coverage of the bill works manufactured or sold prior to January 1, 1953.

The managers on the part of the House believe that the legislation herewith presented to the House should be approved and accordingly they recommend the approval of the instant conference report.

JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, since the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, living expenses have risen so steadily, that it is imperative that final action be taken on H. R. 7800 before adjournment.

This bill, which passed the House on June 17, provides increases in retirement benefits for those covered by the Social Security Act; liberalizes the retirement test; establishes wage credits for military service during the emergency period; preserves insurance rights for those permanently and totally disabled; removes the bar to coverage for certain persons under State and local retirement systems; and corrects defects in benefit computation provisions.

The Senate, in approving the bill on June 26, deleted the provision in the House bill which would have preserved the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled persons, and the provision extending to the States the option of bringing under old-age and survivors insurance, certain State and local employees covered by existing local or State retirement systems. The Senate also increased the amount a retired person could earn and still receive his benefits under the Social Security Act. The House-approved bill allowed earnings of $70 monthly, while the Senate bill allows $100 monthly.

Personally, I would like to see the two provisions deleted by the Senate, included in the bill, but rather than delay the passage until next year of the other important provisions, I hope that the House conferees will agree to the Senate action.

Over 4,500,000 persons are now on the old-age and survivors insurance rolls, and the benefit rates they are now receiving were computed on the cost of living early in 1950, before the Korean outbreak. Many persons have received increases in their incomes since that time, but those on the retirement rolls must depend upon action by Congress to provide them with a much-needed increase.

At the present time, the average old-age insurance benefits for a retired worker is about $42 a month; for an aged couple the average is $70; for an aged widow, it is $36. For most of those people, this is their chief source of income, and for many, their only income. We all realize that these amounts do not begin to cover the bare necessities of life. This makes it necessary for many of them to apply for public assistance to meet their minimum living requirements. It was to prevent just such action, that the social security law was adopted in 1935. To carry out the original intent of the law, it is imperative that benefits under old-age and survivors insurance be increased.

Under H. R. 7800 individuals receiving benefits based on earnings from 1937 on would have their benefits increased at least 12½ percent or $5, whichever is greater. These increases would apply also to future beneficiaries whose benefits are based on earnings beginning with 1937.

Under the present law, persons receiving old-age benefits can not earn more than $50 a month, or they forfeit their rights to the old-age benefits. Under the bill approved by the House, this amount would be increased to $70. The bill approved by the Senate would increase the amount to $100.

To me, any limitation on a person's earnings is absolutely unfair. There is no limit to the amount he can receive if he is fortunate enough to receive any income from investments, and so forth, why then limit the amount he can receive as wages? When we are finally coming to a realization that older persons can be very valuable workers and when in some industries there is a vital need for their skills and experience, we are not only doing the workers a grave injustice by depriving them of their right to supplement their income, but we are depriving industry of valuable manpower, needed in the defense effort. I hope that the House conferees will accept the Senate provision to raise the limit to $100 and that in the next Congress, the limit will be eliminated.

In closing, I would like to emphasize that old-age and survivors insurance benefits are not part of a welfare program, but are benefits paid to persons from a fund made available through contributions from covered workers and their employers. The law was intended to provide security for old age and not leave the older citizens dependent upon charity. It is a pension program just as are those programs maintained by many private concerns for their employees, to which the employees contribute.

Therefore, to provide the security for which it was intended, the benefits granted under the social-security law should be reviewed regularly so that the amounts provided are equal to the need and in line with the cost of living. H. R. 7800 is a step in that direction and it was a pleasure to support it. However, I hope that the next Congress will make a further study of the matter with a view toward making the additional amendments which are necessary.

AMENDING SECTION 112 (N) OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8270) to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 18, insert:

"CLARIFICATION OF EXISTING LAW AS TO JURY TRIAL IN ACTIONS FOR RECOVERY OF INTERNAL REVENUE TAXES

"SEC. 3. (a) Nothing in Reorganization Plan Numbered 26 of 1950 or Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 of 1952 shall be construed to impair any right or remedy, including trial by jury, to recover any internal-revenue tax alleged to have been erroneously or illegally assessed or collected, or any penalty claimed to have been collected without authority, or any sum alleged to have been excessive or in any manner wrongfully collected under the internal-revenue laws.

"(b) For the purpose of any action to recover any such tax, penalty, or sum, all statutes, rules, and regulations referring to the collector of internal revenue shall be deemed to refer to the officer whose act or acts referred to in subsection (a) gave rise to such action. The venue of any such action shall be the same as under existing law."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendment?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment makes it clear that jury trials which have been permitted in suits against Collectors of Internal Revenue are still to be permitted under Reorganization Plan No. 1, which plan reorganizes the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Office of Collectors was abolished by this plan.

As the bills passed the House, it permitted the tolling of the time that members of the Armed Forces are on active duty so as to permit them to take advantage of the provision in the Revenue Act of 1951 which exempts from the tax on capital gains the proceeds from the sale of a residence where a new residence is purchased within 1 year before or after the sale of the old residence or a new residence is constructed within 18 months from the sale of the old residence.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 3268 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5734) to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. Subdivision (a) (4) (D) of the Renegotiation Act, as amended by section 201 (c) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 and by section 617 of the Revenue Act of 1951, is hereby amended by striking out 'October 31, 1951' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1952.'"

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 3. Section 201 (h) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 is amended by striking out '12 months' and inserting in lieu thereof 'two years.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the Senate amendments extends the time for filing claims for net renegotiation rebates arising under the World War II statute from October 31, 1951, to December 31, 1952. I am advised that the Department of Defense favors this amendment.

The second Senate amendment extends for 1 year the period of time in which the United States may be substituted for the old War Contracts Price Adjustments Board as a party in court proceedings in connection with renegotiation cases arising under World War II renegotiation law. This board has been abolished and it was necessary to make such a substitution.

As this bill passed the House it would have exempted from the $20 a year occupational tax bowling alleys and pool tables where they are used by members of the Armed Forces on United States property and there is no charge for their use.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the action taken by the House today disagreeing to the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 651) and requesting a conference and appointment of conferees.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue patents to those persons (or their heirs, assigns, or successors in interest) who purchased in good faith prior to January 1, 1936, lands from Charles A. Gann located in section 1, township 6 north, range 16 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, in accordance with their respective deeds received by them from the said Charles A. Gann, which are not within the south half northeast quarter or north half southeast quarter of section 1, as shown in a plat of survey of section 1, accepted April 1, 1943.

"No patent shall be issued under this act unless application therefor is filed with the Secretary of the Interior within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act and until the applicant has paid to the United States the cost of survey of the land to be patented.

"Each patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of a right-of-way for a forest highway, together with the right of the United States, its officers, agents, or employees, to enter upon the lands patented pursuant to this act at any time for the purpose of constructing and maintaining such highway."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann."

The Clerk read the amendment offered by Mr. ENGLE to the Senate amendment:

In line 4 of the Senate amendment, strike out "1936" and insert "1938."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, the insertion of the date in this bill was in error. The purpose of the amendment is to correct the clerical error.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the Senate amendment.

The amendment to the Senate amendment was agreed to.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIEF JOSEPH DAM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6163) to provide the basis for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to proceed in relation to the Chief Joseph Dam project on the Columbia River, Wash., initially authorized by section 1 of the act of July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 637), in accordance with the provisions of this act to make a study and report to Congress of means of providing financial and other assistance in the reclamation of arid lands in the general vicinity of the project. In making such study and report the Secretary shall be guided by the provisions of applicable laws.

SEC. 2. The report of the Secretary of the Interior shall state, among other things, the construction cost of the proposed works, including said authorized project and proposed reclamation units; the portions of said cost allocable to various functions; the operation and maintenance costs of all functions (of the project); the amount of the construction cost allocable to irrigation which the irrigators may reasonably be expected to repay, together with the proposed charges for water service and proposed repayment period upon the irrigation allocation; the amount of the cost allocable to irrigation in excess of that which the irrigators can repay, which the Secretary proposes shall be recovered from power revenues; the proposed charges for power, and proposed repayment period on the amount allocable to power; the proposed interest rate on the power investment, and the disposition which the Secretary proposes to make of the interest component and other components of the power revenues; the unrecovered cost to the Federal Treasury of the works proposed, in connection with the means of financing recommended by the Secretary; the ratio of net costs to net benefits; the ratio of net benefits per acre to irrigators' repayment per acre; and a complete financial analysis of repayment program together with all other data reasonably required to enable the Congress to pass upon the economic feasibility of the proposed works.

SEC. 3. Any such reclamation works proposed to be constructed under the study authorized by this act may be undertaken only after the Secretary of the Interior has submitted a report and findings thereon under section 2 of this act and section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), and only if the works so reported on are thereafter specifically authorized by act of Congress.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall modify in any way the requirements and provisions of existing laws with respect to the availability of funds for construction and operation and maintenance of the Chief Joseph Dam and power plant.

Amend the title to read: "An act to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY FOR SIGNING OF DOCUMENTS, COMMERCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2657) to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), is amended by striking out the following words: "including the Chief Clerk and Superintendent, who shall be chief executive officer of the Department and who may be designated by the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) to sign minor routine official

papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department."

SEC. 2. The language preceding the semicolon in the third sentence of section 2 of the Act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825, 826), is amended to read: "There shall also be such clerical assistants as may from time to time be authorized by the Congress."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOMER C. BOOZER

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3356) for the relief of Homer C. Boozer.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $32.60, $34.12, $18.78, $18.78, and $35.68, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, Wilmington, Del., during the period beginning December 16, 1951, and ending December 31, 1951, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, a similar House bill was laid on the table.

EXTENDING TIME FOR FILING CLAIMS ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1095) to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or lapse of time, suits may be instituted within 1 year after the enactment of this act, in the appropriate United States district court, under the provisions of subsection (a) (2) of section 1346, title 28, United States Code, or in the United States Court of Claims, in accordance with the provisions of section 1491, title 28, United States Code, by all persons who claim that their property, easements, rights in land, mineral interests, rights of ingress and egress, or other rights or interests were taken and not paid for by, or as a result of, the construction of the Denison Dam or the impounding of the waters of Lake Texoma: *Provided*, That any such claim shall be barred forever unless suit thereon is instituted within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to create any liability against the United States not existing prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING BENEFIT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7721) to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 13, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) The rate of compensation of any employee who was changed from a position, the rate of pay of which was fixed in accordance with prevailing local wages upon recommendation of wage boards or other similar authority, to a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and placed in the appropriate step of the grade during the period between the effective date and the date of enactment of Public Law 201, approved October 24, 1951, shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the new rate provided by section 1 (a) of Public Law 201, Eighty-second Congress, for the step in which he was placed at the time of such assignment.

"(b) This section shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951.

"(c) Retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid under this section only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive compensation or salary shall be paid a retired officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of his retirement, or the person or persons specified in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government,' approved August 3, 1950 (Public Law 636, 81st Cong.), in the case of a deceased officer or employee for services rendered during the period beginning with the first day of the first pay period which began after June 30, 1951, and ending with the date of said officer or employee's death."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT PROVIDING FOR CENSUS AND APPORTIONMENT

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7202) to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216), with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 16 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress,' approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 16. That there shall be taken, beginning in the month of October 1954, and in the same month of every tenth year thereafter, a census of agriculture. The census herein provided for shall include each State, but shall not include the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or such other areas or territory over which the United States exercises sovereignty or jurisdiction: *Provided, however*, That as to the areas excluded from such census it is directed that data available from various Government sources shall be included as an appendix to the report of such census. The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to collect such preliminary or supplementary statistics, either in advance of or after the taking of such census, as are necessary to the initiation, taking, or completion thereof. The inquiries, and the number, form, and subdivisions thereof for the census provided for in this section shall be determined by the Secretary of Commerce. Employees of the Department of Commerce and other departments and independent offices of the Government may, with the consent of the head of the respective department or office, be employed and compensated for field work in connection with each census provided for by this section.'"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PARTICIPATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN FUNERALS OF DECEASED MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES WITHOUT LOSS OF PAY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7806) to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay

or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Solicitor of the Department of Commerce shall hereafter be designated as the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce, and all laws and orders relating or referring to the Solicitor of the Department of Commerce shall be deemed to relate or refer to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTRA COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7204) to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion" approved June 19, 1948, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "services" insert "due to any emergency."

Page 2, line 3, after "capacity" insert ", not in excess of 30 days."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H. R. 6845, to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 6, after "1953", insert ": *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lead scrap."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISE AND CODIFY LAWS RELATING TO PATENTS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7794) to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 9, line 3 of paragraph (d), strike out "or" and insert "on."

Page 29, in paragraph (1), strike out "Non-infringement or" and insert "Noninfringement."

Page 29, in paragraph (1), strike out "infringement," and insert "infringement or unenforceability."

Page 29, at beginning of last paragraph, strike out "Upon adjudging a patent valid and infringed," and insert "Upon finding for the claimant."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 3209. An act amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7655. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor; and

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution to favor the economic development and improvement of the south Asian subcontinent.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) entitled "An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN KOREA

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, today America is tremendously concerned and involved in Korea. Thousands of our boys are living in the towns, and in the fox holes of that Asiatic peninsula. How we became involved, why we are there, or what is involved is not the immediate question. The die has been cast and no regrets or tears can alter the situation in which we find ourselves today.

However, what we do and how we conduct ourselves on that foreign land does make all the difference in practice, and in principle, for free God-fearing men.

A few weeks ago the newspapers told us that the Korean Government and its President Rhee had refused to permit our Voice of America programs to be broadcast over their radios. Our State Department, which plans and operates these Voice of America programs, became indignant over the fact.

Now the facts show that these programs were planned and composed to criticize and discredit the present Korean Government and its administration

and to propagandize toward making radical changes or even an overthrow of its leaders. All of these programs were being broadcast over the Korean radios. It is little wonder that the Korean administration objected, and that they refused to permit the Voice of America programs to continue to be broadcast over their radios.

Frankly, this situation is so absurd as to be almost humorous if it were not that the friendship of a friendly nation, and of a people with whom our own boys are fighting and dying side by side, is being endangered.

I am not critical of any newspaper, commentator, or American citizen who voices his opinion for or against the present government of any party or faction of Korea. That is the American right. But I do say that it is absolutely not the business of our Government to interfere by propaganda, or otherwise, in the internal affairs of any friendly sovereign state.

Before proceeding further, I would also like to point out in no unmistakable terms that I am not defending or attacking the Korean Republic or President Syngman Rhee, nor am I stating that he is proceeding properly or improperly, or that he is or is not the proper person to be the President of the nation of Korea. There can be many things said for and against President Rhee and his administration.

I do not intend to state whether or not President Rhee is right in his present dispute with the Assembly of Korea. To intelligently compare the relative merits of President Syngman Rhee and his plan for Korea to that of his political opponents would necessitate the delving into Oriental poltical philosophy, Korean economics, various personalities, and other multiple subjects. Although I have lived in Korea and have studied the country and background considerably, and am personally acquainted with several of the parties involved; I do not pretend to be an authority on Korea and capable of properly discussing this entire subject. Frankly, I doubt that any members of the staff of the Voice of America are sufficiently informed so as to be the last word on what is best for Korea.

These facts, however, are indisputable. The present government of the Republic of Korea, headed by President Syngman Rhee, is extremely anti-Communist; is friendly to the United States; and is providing more soldiers at the front than is the United States. President Rhee has also instituted land and other reforms that are necessary throughout the Orient. He also has an enormous personal following among the Korean people. As to our State Department charges that President Rhee is a dictator; that may be true. But it is also true that President Rhee is insisting that the people of Korea, instead of the Assembly, be allowed to elect the President. He also insists that the Assembly consist of two houses instead of one, with checks and balances similar to the Government of the United States. While this may not be according to the Korean Constitution, it can scarcely be called undemocratic. It is also true that President Rhee, by the constitution, had the authority to appoint the governors of the various provinces and the mayors of the cities; but instead of using this authority, he allowed the people to elect these officials. That may not have been according to the constitution of Korea, but such action could not be called undemocratic. As for the justification of the calling of martial law by President Rhee, I will not say that that action is justified. I do, however, know that five American soldiers were recently killed by Communist guerillas at the edge of the city of Pusan and large bands of Communists even yet control a considerable portion of southern Korea.

I am merely making these observations to show that there are at least two sides to the present internal political dispute in Korea. But I do insist that the present political dispute between President Rhee and the Korean Assembly is an internal problem that should be solved by the Republic of Korea, and not by the United States.

Now I want to point out the fact that the government of South Korea is in its infancy, that it is the first real attempt of a people to establish for themselves freedom and sovereign independence. When I was in Korea with military government, there was one thing that every Korean wanted wholeheartedly and sincerely. That was a free Korea. The Korean conceptions of constitutional government and individual liberty are entirely different from ours. But as I stated previously, practically every Korean has one dream and hope in common. He wants a free Korea, not dominated by any other country. They had varied and vague ideas of just what it was and how to go about establishing it but it was almost an obsession with them. They now have a government of their own. We have officially recognized them as a free Republic of Korea. We are assisting in the defense of their freedom as against Communist forces of North Korea and China. We are fighting with them as friend with friend, and neighbor with neighbor, against a common foe and for a common cause of freedom.

My thoughts on the subject keep returning to the community in which I was raised. It is in the hills of southern Indiana. There we get along with each other. We may not agree with the way our friendly neighbor manages his affairs. We may not like the boy his daughter goes with. We may not like the way his son drives or his wife cooks pancakes, but we figure that that is his business. Yes, I have seen Mr. Buttinskies in that community. I have seen Mrs. Probes who always want to interfere in the affairs of their friends, but I have noted that regardless of how honest and sincere these Mrs. Probes or Mr. Buttinskies may be, a sigh of relief is heaved throughout the community when they finally leave.

I frankly believe that we can apply the same common sense to our affairs with other countries. If our State Department could only learn that we can be good neighbors and friends to other countries without being Mrs. Probes and Mr. Buttinskies we would be so much more appreciated and much more useful in world affairs. Of course, the government of Korea is going to make mistakes in its climb from the depth of slavery to a state of liberty and freedom for each citizen. The climb will be difficult but the climbing must be done and can be done by no one but them. Buttinsky plans of our State Department to dominate other countries may be founded upon the belief of our diplomatic corps that they understand better than anyone else what is best for other countries. Perhaps they sincerely believe that they are better informed than the Koreans as to what is best for Korea. And it may be true that our State Department has better plans for Korea than can be worked out by the Koreans, but the clear fact remains that Korea must be allowed to develop on her own if she is ever to take her place among free people and free nations.

The question is being properly raised at this time as to the reason that our State Department is so aggressive in its plans to discredit the Republic of Korea to the citizens of Korea. I am certain that I cannot answer this question. Is it merely another State Department plan to "butt into" the internal affairs of another country on the "Papa knows best" theory? Is their interest merely that of a feeling that they know better what Koreans should do than the Koreans themselves know? Is it that they do not approve of the principles and general administrative policies of President Rhee? Or could the special interest of our State Department be a part of some far-reaching plans for some kind of negotiations with the North Koreans and China of which the government of President Rhee would never approve? While in Korea last November and several times since then I have been told that our State Department desired to make terms with North Korea and the Chinese—terms that were not agreeable to President Rhee and the Republic of Korea. I do not know the truth of these stories. However, we do know that in the past the United States has been involved in agreements and treaties that have been embarrassing and unorthodox. Naturally, we want peace. Perhaps our Government would and should accept a peace that would not be agreeable to the President of Korea. I do not attempt to pass on the question of exactly what concessions we should make to obtain peace in Korea. Nor do I state that we should not make terms of peace which are not agreeable to the Republic of Korea.

However I do insist that whatever concessions we might make to obtain peace in Korea, we should eliminate all secret negotiations. We have had enough agreements of the Yalta and Potsdam variety. I choose not to criticize the recent errors of our State Department except to point out that those errors can be used as signposts to guide us from similar errors in the future. But I do call on our State Department to cease making future Yaltas, Teherans, and Potsdams. I do call upon it to lay before the American people their plans for future international commitments.

I am not attempting to state the reason for the State Department's effort to discredit the present government of Korea; nor will I attempt to guess the

effect the State Department's action will have upon our boys fighting in Korea, or upon us here in the United States. But I do emphatically say that whatever the reason is, we must conduct our relations with Korea as we would have them act toward us—fairly, friendly, and sympathetically. Let us be a true friend to a friendly country and not a Mrs. Probe nor a Mr. Buttinsky.

We must ever keep the God-given flame of freedom burning brightly, that all the world may see. We hope that this light will guide other peoples along the paths to freedom, but we must always remember that we cannot drive people along the paths to freedom.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 738) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the period of any adjournment or recess of the House of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress until January 3, 1953, the Clerk of the House is authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House an amount equal to 6 months' salary of any deceased employee of the House at the rate such employee was receiving at the time of his or her death and an additional amount not to exceed $350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of any such employee to whomever in the judgment of the Clerk is justly entitled thereto subject to the approval of the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVENTIONS BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3975 will permit a Government employee who makes an invention before entering the Government service and his joint patentee, not in Government service, to sue on the patent covering that invention the same as any other patentee, except where the Government employee is actually in a position to induce the use of his patented device by the Government. It will also permit a Government employee who makes an invention completely outside of his official function to maintain a suit against the Government.

Government employees sometimes make inventions that are wholly unrelated to their official functions and in the making of which neither Government time nor materials are used. In these cases, equity demands that the employee-inventor be adequately rewarded if his invention is used by the Government.

Section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, provides for suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for compensation for the unlicensed use or manufacture by or for the United States of a patented invention. The section denies such right to a patentee who is an employee of the Government when the suit is brought and does not apply to an invention made while the patentee is in the employ of the Government.

Section 1498 of title 28 was written into the act of June 25, 1910, in order to provide a safeguard against a patentee in the Government service utilizing his official position to influence the use of his invention by the Government and then maintaining a claim for compensation and also to prevent a Government employee who made an invention in the course of his official duties from maintaining a claim for the use of the invention by the Government.

In 1910 the individual was big and the Government was small. Now we have just the reverse; the Government is big and the individual is small. And any inventor cannot influence the adoption of almost any invention. It is an extremely difficult thing to do because there are many people who have to pass on it. The people in the research laboratories have little or nothing to do with the adoption of the invention for ultimate use.

Obviously, it was inequitable and unnecessary to prevent all Government employees from maintaining a suit against the United States in order to erect safeguards against those few who might be in a position to benefit unjustly from use of their inventions by the Government. For instance, if a person made an invention in private life relating to armaments and later entered Government service, say in the post office, there is no valid reason why he should not maintain a suit against the United States if the Army or the Navy ordered the manufacture or use of a device which infringed his patent. The same would apply if he made the invention after entering Government service so long as it did not relate directly to his official duties.

The Supreme Court has held that if an inventor is hired to invent or assigned to invent, title is in the employer. If he is not so hired or assigned and he uses the time, facilities, information, or the like of the employer, then title remains in the employee, but the employer has a license. In any other instance, full right, title, and interest remains in the employee. The right to sue, pursuant to this bill, in large part, follows title under the present law as established by the courts. If title is in the employee and he is not in a position to influence or induce the use of the invention by the Government, he is accorded the right to bring a suit against the Government in the Court of Claims.

Under the present law, a joint patentee, not in the service or employment of the Government, because of the indivisibility of the patent right, is under the same disability as regards the right to sue the United States as is his copatentee in the Government service. The present bill, would remove that disability as far as inventions wholly unrelated to the Government employees' official functions are concerned.

The bill would afford ample safeguards against any improper action by a patentee in the Government service in furtherance of his own interests and at the same time would remove the inequitable and unnecessary provision of the present law which is applicable to all employees of the Government, regardless of the relation of their inventions to their official functions.

AMENDING PART I OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3161) to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 49), is hereby amended by inserting, after section 20b, the following new section:

"SEC. 20c. Any mortgage, lease, equipment trust agreement, conditional sale agreement, or other instrument evidencing the mortgage, lease, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad cars, locomotives, or other rolling stock, used or intended for use in connection with interstate commerce, or any assignment of rights or interest under any such instrument, or any supplement or amendment to any such instrument or assignment (including any release, discharge or satisfaction thereof, in whole or in part), may be filed with the Commission, provided such instrument, assignment, supplement or amendment is in writing, executed by the parties thereto, and acknowledged or verified in accordance with such requirements as the Commission shall prescribe; and any such instrument or other document, when so filed with the Commission, shall constitute notice to and shall be valid and enforceable against all persons including, without limitation, any purchaser from, or mortgagee, creditor, receiver, or trustee in bankruptcy of, the mortgagor, buyer, lessee or bailee of the equipment covered thereby, from and after the time such instrument or other document is so filed with the Commission; and such instrument or other document need not be otherwise filed, deposited, registered or recorded under the provisions of any other law of the United States of America, or of any State (or political subdivision thereof), territory, district or possession thereof, respecting the filing, deposit, registration or recordation of such instruments or documents." The Commission shall establish and maintain a system for the recordation of each such instrument or document, filed pursuant to the provisions of this section, and shall cause to be marked or stamped thereon, a consecutive number, as well as the date and hour of such recordation, and shall maintain, open to public inspection, an index of all such instruments or documents, including any assignment, amendment, release, discharge or satisfaction thereof, and shall record in such index the names and addresses of the principal debtors, trustees, guarantors and other parties thereto, as well as such other facts as may be necessary to facilitate the determination of the rights of the parties to such transactions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRIS: Page 2, line 23, strike out the quotation marks and on page 3, line 10, insert quotation marks.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFEREES ON H. R. 2968

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 2968) may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION, FINAL REPORT, RECORD AND FORECAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for great decisions on the Presidency we recognize that there must be no indecision in our national policies until the day the next administration takes over. At such a time the active and continued interest of our people in the Government, and not alone in the political campaign, gives stability to the ship of state. The people are entitled to the maximum amount of information on which they can base their judgment in these days, and it is the responsibility of every public official, insofar as he is possibly able to accomplish it, to see that every citizen in his area is fully informed. This is a gratifying partnership in public affairs and is the purpose of this final report.

THE ISSUE OF PEACE

Peace continues to be the dominant issue of our time. It is an issue which is being misused and abused by the Communists who suggest that anyone who is against their policy of surrender to anything the Soviet Union wants or to Communist pressure within any country is thereby acting against peace. The American people will never accept a peace which is bought at the price of slavery under Communist domination, yet this is the likely alternative if we fail to resist Communist aggression against weaker peoples and subversion within free states. Resistance to such aggression and subversion does not mean war; it means our only honesty in the quest for peace. It seeks to avoid the mistake which the free world made when it permitted Japan to take Manchuria in 1931, Hitler to march into the Rhineland in 1934, and Mussolini to seize Ethiopia in 1936. Once such actions were permitted to go unpunished they assured the start of World War II—that is, unless all the free peoples were ready to surrender to Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese military clique.

A great deal is made by Communists and Communist sympathizers about the immediate calling of a five-power conference between the United States, Great Britain, and France on the one side and the Soviet Union and Communist China on the other. In principle there is no inconsistency between being always willing to talk and at the same time establishing our capabilities for securing the free peoples against aggression. Yet we always have before us the examples, first, of the Deputy Foreign Ministers Conference in Paris in 1951 which started out only to establish an agenda for a widely heralded conference to include the United States, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, before Communist China was consolidated, was used as a sounding board for Communist propaganda for over 3 months, and then came to nothing; second, the truce negotiations in Korea which are being cynically used by the Communists for world propaganda about such bare-faced frauds as "germ warfare" while covering up greater military preparations to endanger our and the other U. N. forces in Korea. The right course is to be willing to meet with the Soviet Union under fair conditions and an agreed-upon agenda for the discussion of all major causes of friction. Such a meeting should be held under the auspices of the United Nations as the best way to inspire confidence in the nations which do not participate. We should not relax our preparations for defense until the Communists show by their deeds that they really seek peace. There is furthermore ample opportunity for discussion without a special conference in the United Nations to which the Soviet Union and a number of its satellites belong.

Increased emphasis needs to be placed in our own policy upon the United Nations. In too many circles it is becoming popular to condemn the United Nations without recognizing that it is a world forum where words, not bullets, can be exchanged, and which remains mankind's best, perhaps last, hope for peace. The whole United Nations structure has the greatest potentiality for securing the peace and giving economic and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas, providing assistance in health, food production, labor conditions, education, scientific and cultural interchange, and immigration to all peoples who need them. But the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc insist on seeking to frustrate the will of the free peoples in the United Nations at every turn with vetoes of new members and other action for peace, delays, false propaganda, and finally with insults and falsehoods. So long as this effort to sabotage the United Nations from within continues no fair-minded person can believe the protestations of the Soviet bloc about peaceful intentions or even of sympathetic interest in the problems of men and women everywhere.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

As permitted by the United Nations Charter, regional organization for self-defense has been strengthened through the North Atlantic Pact, by our mutual security treaties with Japan, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, and by the Rio pact with our Latin-American neighbors. Our partners in these undertakings are being strengthened militarily and economically.

A large part of the foreign policy of the United States is expressed today by the Mutual Security Program. Under this program, there has been appropriated for the current fiscal year $6,031,947,750, a reduction from the $7,900,000,000 requested by the President. Of this amount, $3,415,614,750 is for military aid and $1,282,433,000 for defense-support aid of an economic nature to Europe; $560,316,500 is for military aid to Greece, Turkey, and Iran; $50,822,750 is for technical and economic assistance to the countries of the Near East, and for the relief of refugees there $130,291,250 is provided. For the Far East there is provided $564,807,500 in military assistance to Indochina, Formosa, and the Philippines, and $321,412,500 for economic and technical assistance to these countries and to India, Pakistan, Burma, and Thailand. In Latin America the Mutual Security Program calls for $57,685,750 in military aid and $20,329,000 in technical assistance.

Funds are also provided by the defense appropriation bills for United States forces which are now stationed in Europe and in Japan and which are engaged in the fighting in Korea. The whole appropriation for defense is considered under a separate heading of this report.

I fought against the effort to prevent American participation in the International Materials Conference which, though a foreign policy and defense question, was tacked onto the Defense Production Act. The Conference is composed of the major states producers and buyers of strategic materials and is engaged in allocating strategic materials like tin and rubber among the free peoples. As we import all or much of—about two-thirds—the strategic items of material we need for defense, fair international allocations of these materials at fair prices are vital to us. Our lack of participation in the IMC can only result in higher costs for the United States in the defense program, with greater tax burdens for everyone and higher costs to American consumers, as well as a reversal of our efforts to have greater world trade. It is a subject requiring the most urgent attention from the new Congress.

KOREA

As this is written, efforts to bring about a truce continue to be frustrated by the Communists. It has been one excuse after another with them; now, it is the excuse of repatriation of prisoners. The Communists state that all prisoners, whether or not they wish to go back into Communist hands, must be delivered to them. This means to hundreds of thousands almost certain death to themselves and destruction to their families. It means we have to go back on our word to thousands to whom the U. N. promised immunity if they surrendered. It is a key issue in the whole anti-Communist struggle. If we wish ultimately to win the world away from the Communists, people must first be convinced that we can be trusted not to deliver them back to the Communists once they are free.

It is vital to understand what we are fighting for in Korea. It is for nothing less than to punish armed aggression

against peaceful people and to deprive the aggressor of the fruits of his aggression. This we have done successfully, so far. It is not necessary to become involved in a major Asiatic war on the mainland of China in which millions of Americans could be drawn, to accomplish this purpose. We are accomplishing it now even if we do no more than hold where we are. For Korea represents the first time that any organized international force had taken military action to resist aggression.

It is tremendously heartening to free peoples to see that organized international police action can punish aggressors. It demonstrates that the concentration of effective armament in an international police organization is our best hope for finally solving the problem of recurring wars. This is of vital importance to every American.

The other U. N. ground forces in Korea are only 20 percent of our own and we need all the help possible from the other free peoples. But those best able to supply forces, like Great Britain and France, are already fighting full-scale actions against Communists in Malaya and Indochina respectively and are suffering great losses in the process. They are protecting us in those areas just as we are protecting them in Korea.

Other powers which have military potential are either too poor economically or too disturbed internally to make their contribution to the Korean action. What we have to do is to help them straighten out some of their problems, economic, social, and political, to get more aid in Korea. It must not be forgotten, also, that almost half of the fighting in Korea is being done by the South Koreans themselves in the ROK divisions while our divisions are 50 percent of the total ground forces engaged.

The answer in Korea is to doggedly resist any effort to take South Korea, knowing full well that the Communists are being bled in the process and suffering far greater losses than we are. Korea ties down the Communist Chinese and means they cannot move elsewhere in other parts of Asia as easily. In the meantime we should seek greater contributions from the other United Nations in relieving our manpower in Korea. This can work as effectively as our own present rotation policy is working in Korea in keeping the morale of our troops there very high and in sharing the burden among the free peoples even of a long stalemate, militarily speaking even though vital to future peace.

EUROPE

The most significant development of recent months is the struggle over the integration of West Germany into free Europe. The contractual arrangement with the German Federal Government will in all likelihood be approved, and this is tied in directly with the participation of German military formations in the European Defense Community—European Army.

There is reason for deep disquiet in the contemplation of any German military formations, but a study of the European Defense Community agreement shows that real efforts are being made to prevent German domination either of the European army or of its directing staff and to prevent the danger of Germany's withdrawing and utilizing the forces which it contributes for its own purposes. The United States, Great Britain, and France have given guarantees that this will not be permitted and these guarantee agreements are to be approved at the same time as the agreement with the German Federal Government.

This contractual arrangement with the German Federal Government is weak in many respects, primarily as to the dispositions regarding the Nazi war criminals, restitution of property taken away by the Nazis, indemnification for suffering in concentration camps to the victims of the Nazis and their families and effective control against any threatened return of ultranationalist excesses. The agreement is strong in maintaining allied authority over West Berlin, over any agreement for the unification of East and West Germany and over any final settlement of German frontiers. The Soviet Union continues its propaganda efforts regarding German unification with the intention of making all Germany a Soviet satellite. The United States, Great Britain, and France have indicated their willingness to discuss German unification but only and necessarily on the basis of free all-German elections under international supervision. There is an element of risk in such a settlement but our willingness to make it is inherent in the liberty and freedom for which we stand.

NEAR EAST AND NORTH AFRICA—ARAB AND JEWISH REFUGEES

This area is troubled by two major problems—ultranationalism and refugee resettlement. United States aid is mainly directed toward dealing with refugee resettlement, but the United States lacks a positive policy for dealing with ultranationalism. Our Government has apparently been content to follow the British lead and to consider the Near East a British responsibility. This was perhaps understandable, in view of the fact that Great Britain had long-standing commitments for the defense of that area and maintained extensive defense forces there before World War II. But its difficulties in Egypt and Iran and Britain's grave errors and injustices in seeking to block Jewish immigration and the establishment of Israel in 1946 and 1947 have shown that the United States must have a policy of its own in this area. This policy should be built upon aid to resettlement of the refugees who are the most nettling problem in the whole area and defense based on dependable factors in the area.

The settlement of Jewish refugees in Israel and of the Palestine Arab refugees in the surrounding Arab countries can now be pressed forward under the continued support of both programs contained in the 1952–53 mutual security appropriations referred to above. These appropriations provide $60,063,250 for resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees—the United States contributions for this year to the 3-year $250,000,000 U. N. resettlement program—and $70,228,000 for the resettlement of the Jewish refugees in Israel. There is also provided for the Arab States over $20,000,000 in technical assistance, while for Israel $3,000,000 is provided for technical assistance. Therefore, the total for use in Arab problems is over $80,000,000, and for Israel it is about $73,000,000. Vigorous efforts, with the full aid of the United States, with the surrounding Arab countries in the implementation of the United Nations resettlement plan, is essential for the resettlement of the Palestine Arab refugees. Continued United States assistance to Israel, which has been performing so magnificently in this field, is necessary to help with the Jewish refugees.

Peace is most urgently needed between Israel and the Arab States, which are still practically at war, being only under existing armistice agreements. Israel wants to negotiate for peace, but the Arabs are seemingly unwilling. We must make every effort to bring about a just and lasting peace, recognizing the permanency of the brave, young state of Israel.

As the Middle East Command for the defense of this area cannot be formed, due to the unwillingness or unreadiness of the Arab States to participate, protection of the area should be extended by Greece and Turkey, which are already members of NATO, joined by Israel, which should be invited to come in for that purpose. Israel admittedly has the most effective military forces, outside of Greece and Turkey, of any Near East state. Negotiations should be opened for the development of bases in that area, bringing about participation in the area's defense of such countries as are willing to engage in it, rather than endangering the whole area by permitting the unsettled conditions there to defer actual defense measures. The vital character of this part of the world, considering its enormous oil resources, the fact that the Soviet Union is very short of oil, and the social and political ferment and disorder in the Near East are all signals of doubt there. Vital defense measures can no longer be deferred.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

Together with a bipartisan group composed of members of the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I sponsored a resolution expressing our country's concern in India and Pakistan and our desire to extend economic and technical help for their plans to improve food production and living conditions. This has a vital bearing upon the kind of society and government which will exist in this area.

The group took this action in view of the need to assure the people of the whole south Asian subcontinent of backing in their fundamental struggle against recurring famines, very low standards of living, and economic underdevelopment which the group believes to have a vital bearing upon the kind of society and government which will exist in this area.

India and Pakistan are vital elements in the free world's security in an area of the world in which they are being the most directly and aggressively threatened by the Soviet Union and its satellites. The people of the subcontinent have taken careful note of the fact that

Communist China has already swallowed up Tibet, right on their border. They know the synical disregard shown by the Communists for India's famine relief needs last year. A resolution of this kind is the only way under the constitutional processes of the United States in which the American people can express to the people of India a continuing interest in their economic development. It will be an important matter before the new Congress.

PUERTO RICO

Congress has approved, with certain reservations, a constitution for Puerto Rico giving that territory full self-government. These reservations brought into question certain of the social aspirations of the Puerto Rican people regarding full employment and higher living standards as expressed in this document. Only one of these reservations, to protect the right of parochial school children to continue to attend the schools of their choice, was called for. I believed that the Puerto Rican people were entitled to full expression of their aspirations in their constitution so long as they had representative and free government. A needed reservation to protect the right of parochial school children to continue to attend the schools of their choice was in another category. Puerto Rico accepted the reservations and they do not seem to have diluted the self-government the constitution gives to Puerto Rico. It is another expression of a great American policy toward its territories and possessions—both peoples are to be congratulated on the outcome.

VETERANS

The most significant development at the close of this session was the enactment of the Korean GI bill. This law provides for servicemen who have at least 90 days of service subsequent to June 27, 1950—not necessarily in Korea—up to 36 months of free schooling with monthly allowances, on-the-job and farm training, home and business loan guaranties up to $7,500, mustering out pay and rights to unemployment compensation. Basic allowances to veterans taking education or training are $110 per month for single veterans, $135 per month for married veterans, and $160 per month for veterans with more than one dependent. Benefiting from the experience of the World War II GI bill, the law is designed to minimize education and housing frauds which have victimized so many veterans in recent years. Education payments are made directly to veterans and loan guaranties may be refused on homes built by persons who had previously sold defective housing to veterans.

I have done my utmost to encourage voting by our troops on active service through the introduction of legislation to that effect, by communicating with the President who sent a special message to Congress on the subject and by other means. In the State of New York such voting is relatively simple. The serviceman—as well as his family living out of the State with him—should make application before October 24 to the Division of Soldier Voting in Albany or on standard form 76 provided at all military installations. I strongly urge that all who have relatives or friends serving in Korea urge them to vote in this vitally important presidential election year.

PRICES AND CONTROLS

The wage-price stabilization law has been extended in the main until April 30, 1953. Changes made in the law have weakened, not strengthened, it. Fresh and canned fruits and vegetables are exempted from all price controls despite strong opposition in which I joined. Guaranteed profit margins to distributors and manufacturers are raised, not lowered.

The preferences to the prices of agricultural products which have resulted in record highs for food prices are further raised by inserting a floor in the shape of a guaranteed price support of 90 percent of parity for major farm products. I fought against such a guaranty both in the Defense Production Act and in the bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act where I blocked consideration of action which was sought to be taken on consent. Notice is gradually being served on the representatives of agricultural districts in the Congress that the consumer is waking up to the meaning to him of unjustified and unreasonable preferences and guaranties. I believe that my fight on them here since I first was sent to Congress is gradually beginning to show some results.

Only two gains were obtained for consumers in the price-wage stabilization law. One was to open our markets to the admittance of cheese from France, Italy, and Denmark to a limited extent but still to a greater extent than the law had previously allowed. The second was to require a report to be made by a congressional committee on how the law will be affecting prices for consumers. I succeeded in introducing this amendment into the bill, and it became law. This is the first time consumers have been specifically mentioned in this law which is supposed to have been entirely for the benefit of consumers.

Wage-stabilization procedures have caused some delays in the decision of cases by the Wage Stabilization Board granting wage increases, thereby holding up wage adjustments for many workers whose families were affected seriously by the high cost of living. I have worked with some success to break the log jam on such applications.

The Federal fair-trade law, permitting prices stipulated by a manufacturer or distributor to be charged for goods bearing his brand or trade-mark in States having State fair-trade laws, will be law when this report is issued. It is a measure of vital importance to every small-businessman and therefore businessmen should insure that it is utilized with fairness to the consumer.

RENT CONTROL AND HOUSING

The Federal wage-price-stabilization law also contains the rent-control law. This law has been covering 8,000,000 American families in other States which, unlike New York, do not have their own rent-control laws. This Federal law was further and materially weakened by the Defense Production Act amendments adopted at this session, by an automatic decontrol provision. It provides that unless the affected town or city, if it is not a critical defense area, specifically requests Federal rent control to continue until it ends as of September 30, 1952. This endangers every community now under Federal rent control except those actually having extensive defense work. It again demonstrates my conviction that the people of New York are getting through the New York State rent-control law better protection than they could hope to get under Federal law. People in my district with rent problems continue to be welcome at my congressional rent clinics about which information may be obtained by writing to me.

Despite a great struggle, the Federal publicly assisted low-rent housing program again suffered in the Congress. It took almost superhuman effort to win back 35,000 units for this year as against the 5,000 which was at first voted by the House of Representatives. This means that New York City can only be allotted under 5,000 Federal public-housing units this year despite the urgent shortage, though it had been hoped to make this figure 10,000.

I joined with others of my colleagues to sponsor a bill which facilitates slum clearance under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 by permitting municipalities to collect assistance payments on account from the Federal Government. This amendment is now Public Law 370 and is already aiding the housing effort in our community.

In recognition of the fact that middle-income families earning $3,500 to $4,500 per year are the worst off in getting new housing as they do not qualify for public housing and cannot afford high priced newly built private housing, I introduced the Middle Income Housing Act of 1952. This bill seeks to provide $3,000,000,000 in very low interest rate loans by the Federal Government for middle-income housing that cannot otherwise be obtained and provides other aids for slum clearance and to reduce construction costs. The $3,000,000,000 in low-interest loans could provide upward of 400,000 additional units at rents middle-income families could afford to pay. Though action could not be effected on this bill this year, due to the adjournment of Congress, the issue is so vital that it must be put before the country and kept before the country during the coming election campaign to be sure it gets attention early in the next Congress.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil rights promises to be one of the burning issues of 1952. It is a tribute to the vast amount of work which had been done in this field that it should emerge as perhaps the leading domestic issue.

Civil-rights legislation in the Congress, including a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission with enforcement powers, anti-poll-tax and anti-lynching legislation, legislation against discrimination and segregation in housing, education, transportation, and public facilities and to eliminate the last vestiges of segregation in the Armed Forces have been made almost impossible by the rule of unlimited debate in the Senate. It is vital that the fight be made on this rule at the opening of the new Congress. Debate in the House of Representatives is

in the control of a majority and this should be generally so in the Senate. In this way the people's will cannot be frustrated. Our country's position in the world which will be so heavily determined by the colored races and the vindication of our own Constitution require us to act on complete civil-rights legislation in the next Congress. I have introduced an omnibus civil-rights bill for this purpose, H. R. 5945. Almost at the very end of this session a subcommittee of the Senate's Committee on Education and Labor reported out the Ives-Humphrey FEPC bill, sponsored by Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York, and Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, which provides for an FEPC with full enforcement powers and which is the most promising FEPC bill to have come before the Congress. The next Congress could very well have a chance to act on this bill—if the fight is won against filibustering in the Senate—and everything possible should be done to see that it acts favorably. The end of filibusters in the Senate and the enactment of civil-rights legislation can be the soonest obtained by a coalition of progressive elements in the Congress regardless of party. It is cruel and deceptive to use this issue for partisan advantage—as I feel the party in power has done—knowing that it is unable to make good on its promises.

IMMIGRATION

We now have a new immigration bill, the result of the overriding by the Congress of the President's veto of the omnibus immigration bill. I voted to sustain this veto and have fought consistently against this law as being a step backward. First, it establishes a color line on immigration from the Caribbean, breaking down the long-established practice by which people from the West Indies were admitted under the British quota. Second, it aggravates discrimination against immigration from southern and southeastern Europe inherent in the quota immigration law by adding new preferences to those already existing. Third, it jeopardizes the status of those who come in as immigrants, making them liable for deportation or even loss of nationality for years to come. It will be necessary in the new Congress to do everything possible to bring about amendment of this law to correct its glaring deficiencies.

Though the law lifts the ban on the entry and eligibility for naturalization of Asiatic peoples it does so under miniscule quotas of 100 per year per state of origin for an aggregate of only 2,000 per year, and makes those of one-half or more Asiatic blood, no matter where born, subject to those quotas. A final end to oriental exclusion is highly desirable but could have been effected under separate legislation which was before the Congress without involving the injustices of this new law. It will be necessary in the new Congress to do everything possible to bring about amendment of this law to correct the glaring deficiencies which led the President to veto it.

I consider the liberalization of our immigration policy to be required also by the need for cooperation with the other free peoples for the absorption of the surplus working populations of Europe. This is considered to be properly a major element of our foreign policy. Such a program, so important for the free world, cannot be realized without the kind of American leadership which resulted in the settlement of the DP problem—by our taking our fair share of those who had to emigrate.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLDER WORKERS

The Congress has enacted into law a measure increasing social-security benefits by an estimated $540,000,000 yearly. This bill increases monthly old-age and survivors insurance benefits by $5 or 12½ percent, whichever is greater; increases to $75 the amount a person may earn each month and still qualify for old-age and survivors insurance payments; gives those serving in the Armed Forces an automatic social-security credit on the basis of $160 monthly earnings; increases to $25 the minimum benefit payable to a retired person and increases the maximum benefit payable to a family from the present $150 to $168.75 a month; increases by $5 a month the Federal share of direct assistance payments to the needy aged and persons who are blind or totally disabled and increases by $3 a month Federal grants for dependent children. While I believe the limitations on earnings should have been eliminated entirely and benefits should have been increased more in line with living costs, this bill is a step forward and will help ease the burden of our older citizens.

Also enacted into law, as a part of the independent offices appropriation bill, was a provision seeking to eliminate age qualifications for employment under the Federal civil service. I fought for this measure as part of my efforts to secure equal opportunity for workers over 45—the subject of my bill, H. R. 4731.

COST OF GOVERNMENT

Though personal income taxes were not increased in this session, they are already so high that every citizen is necessarily interested in Government expenditures and economy. In addition the heavy deficits even under present high taxes contribute further to inflation and reduce the value of savings and the purchasing power of those living on fixed incomes.

The deficit for the current fiscal year was about $4,000,000,000 and the deficit for the fiscal year which began July 1, 1952, and which will end June 30, 1953, is estimated at $10,000,000,000. Congress cut appropriations from the amount requested by the President by over $8,000,000,000, granting approximately $80,000,000,000, as opposed to requests of approximately $88,500,000,000. Essential appropriations for defense and veterans are the biggest part of these figures.

Injustices and false economy need to be righted just as forcefully as true economy needs to be imposed. Agricultural conservation payments costing $250,000,000 could be drastically cut even according to the leading farm organizations themselves; so could the cost of agricultural price supports. "Pork barrel" projects for rivers and harbors could be sharply reduced without disturbing urgently needed flood control. Defense Department's appropriations, essential as they are, aggregating over $46,000,000,000 with an additional amount of over $4,000,000,000 for construction still have some water in them. On the other hand, the denial of $300,000,000 for Federal aid to schools, $30,000,000 for Federal aid to college students, the drastic cut in the publicly assisted low-rent housing program, and the cuts of appropriations for conserving national resources where they were needed were ill-advised.

There are loopholes and inequities in the personal income-tax structure which urgently need righting by the next Congress. It is estimated variously that $1,000,000,000 to over $3,000,000,000 in additional tax revenue a year is lost.

CIVIL SERVICE AND POST OFFICE

Pensions for retired civil-service employees have been raised, beginning September 1, 1952, and ending June 30, 1955, by $36 for each full 6-month period between the date of retirement and October 1, 1952, with a ceiling of $324, or 25 percent, whichever is the less. The increase when added to the present annuity must not exceed $2,160 annually. This increase will be discontinued on June 30, 1954, unless Congress appropriates money by that date for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. This increased annuity also applies to those receiving survivorship benefits, becoming effective September 1, 1952. The Congress set up a committee to make a study of the various Government retirement systems and report back to Congress not later than December 31, 1953.

The Whitten rider making appointments and promotions temporary only, has served, I believe, as a serious block to the merit system. It has been modified to permit permanent promotions under some circumstances, to give consideration to all prior service in promotions instead of only service immediately prior to the proposed promotion, and to permit the Civil Service Commission to make exceptions to the promotion restrictions of the law in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity.

The shortsighted policy of the Post Office Department in curtailing mail deliveries and other postal services continues despite many protests. This has resulted in an actual increase in the aggregate number of employees substitute, temporary and regular, rather than a reduction and has markedly increased the number of disability retirements among postal workers. I am continuing my fight against the curtailment and for justice in earnings, conditions, job security, and retirement for postal employees.

AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENTS

The increasing rate of accidents and fatalities due to motor-vehicle traffic, the rising rates for automobile liability insurance which are a result and the rejection by the State of New York of a motor-vehicle inspection law caused me to take an interest in this subject. I introduced a resolution calling for an investigation by the Congress of automobile-accident rates and fatalities, State laws regulating the operations of motor vehicles and motor carriers, auto liability and insurance rates and measures which

the Federal Government can take in these matters. This bill has received a tremendous response as it brought forcibly to the attention of many Americans a situation which has been gradually created due to the vast increase in interstate travel by auto and in which the Federal Government could, therefore, take a useful part. Considering the amount of support which this bill is receiving, it is very probable that there will be action on it in the new Congress.

MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES

Man does not live by bread alone. For this reason I introduced a bill to establish as a branch of the Smithsonian Institution an American Academy of Music, Drama, and Ballet, as part of a National War Memorial, for the education of selected pupils in the various phases of these arts. Funds would be drawn largely from public endowments, admission charges to Academy performances and from the unexpended balance of the funds of the National Capital Sesquicentennial. This is in the great American tradition and in line with previous efforts made by the Congress to advance these arts by the establishment of the National Conservatory of Music in 1891 under the direction of such prominent citizens of the time as John Hay and Chauncey Depew, and the establishment of the American National Theater and Academy in 1935.

I did my utmost to save Champlain College at Plattsburg, N. Y., from being taken over by the Air Force for use as a military installation as it is so important to encourage low-cost, nondiscriminatory education, an opportunity for which is being denied so many young people. Though the fight was lost for the moment in the Congress so much interest was stirred up that I believe some way will be found to continue to make these facilities for higher education available in New York.

The effort to televise and broadcast important congressional sessions upon which I have been working is being confirmed by current political experience. It is becoming inevitable that broadcasting and televising of important congressional sessions will soon be considered a "must" by the American people.

Individual instances endangering our moral strength constantly arise. I fought against the retention by the Air Force of a German doctor it had hired alleged to be implicated in the shocking medical experiments conducted by the Nazis during the war. I am glad to say that this doctor's contract was not renewed and that he has left the country.

EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD VOTE

We are facing as important an election as we have ever had in what is not too accurately called peacetime. The collective judgment of all our people and no less is required in fairness to ourselves and our posterity. A new President and a new Congress will make decisions involving peace and the economic, social, and political future of our people which will determine the course of our lives for decades—and because of the tremendous power and influence of the United States in the free world will probably determine the lives of the free peoples for decades. It is the duty of every citizen under these circumstances to make it his business between now and election day to read, to listen, to observe and to consider our national issues, then to register and to vote with the dignity and responsibility that such interest will bring, on election day, November 4, 1952.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

UPRISINGS IN KOREA AND JAPAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to call the attention of the House to a document that came to the State Department yesterday, July 3, in answer to my resolution, House Resolution 664, a resolution of inquiry, regarding communistic uprisings in Japan. The letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I understand that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has very voluminous documents on the subject. I felt, when I introduced that resolution, that the public is entitled to know what is going on in the matter of communistic uprising in Japan and Korea and all over that area. It is a very vital matter to all of us. I have felt that the tendency was to hide all the unpleasantness and forget it. That is not the American way of doing.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY, TEACHER, LAWYER, STATESMAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my distinguished colleague and friend from Michigan, the Honorable WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY. He is one of the 38 Members of this body withdrawing from public service.

His has been an outstanding and illustrious career: school teacher, lawyer, statesman. He is one of the best-informed men in the country on the genesis and substance of the American Constitution.

Here in the House of Representatives, where he served the Nation for 16 years, he has been known by his colleagues for his quiet, studious, and careful attention to legislation. He never failed in his defense of the basic principles on which the Nation was founded. He discharged his trust and responsibility to his people and the Nation with ability and distinction.

Our colleague possesses one of the finest private libraries in this country. He started his library when he was a school teacher, then only 16 years of age. As the years went by, his library gradually grew. During the 10 years he was teaching school, many books on education were added; during the many years he practiced law, numerous volumes on the Constitution and the Government were added.

Now his library consists of more than 6,000 volumes, and is widely diversified in character. He has more than 200 books on constitutional problems; nearly 200 books on the Bible and biblical literature; hundreds more dealing with history and biography. The library also includes many standard books of fiction, such as Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Shakespeare, Robert Louis Stevenson, Kipling, and others.

This library, accumulated over a period of 50 or more years, fills 6 rooms of his home at Flint, Mich. It is widely used by friends and constituents who are interested in finding certain books that are not available in the public library.

His theory of a private library is that it should fit the changing moods of the mind. If in a serious mood, then one studies solid and heavy works; when fatigued by the problems of life, then one turns to books written in lighter vein.

It has been my privilege to have known BILL, as he was affectionately called by his colleagues and host of friends, for many years before he came to Congress. He was a leader and prominent citizen in his home city of Flint long before he was elected to the House of Representatives.

He will be missed in this Chamber. He takes with him, from us his colleagues, best wishes for his future health and happiness. He richly deserves that satisfaction and reward as he lays aside the toga of a useful and busy life.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I wish to concur in all that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has said about our beloved colleague, BILL BLACKNEY. I sincerely regret he is leaving even though it is of his own volition. Ever since I came to the Congress, he has been one of the truest and finest friends I have known. It happens that BILL BLACKNEY and I are graduates of the same law school, except that the year that he graduated was the year that I entered. Therefore, we have much in common. Not only for myself, but for every member of the Iowa delegation, I wish to say a word of appreciation of BILL BLACKNEY. He has been a tower of strength to all of us here, and we all sincerely regret his decision to retire.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is a more splendid gentleman in the Congress than Mr. BILL BLACKNEY. In the 14 years that I have served here, I have always admired the quiet way which he has gone about his business. He has always been courteous, and helpful whenever he could be. I sincerely regret that he has decided to retire voluntarily from the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the entire California delegation, I know I can speak, as have the other gentlemen, praise of our good friend, BILL BLACKNEY. He is a splendid fellow not only personally but as a legislator. I am delighted to have been associated with him for these past many years and regret, indeed, that he is not to be with us in the next session.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, and all of the others who are paying a very well deserved tribute to our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY]. I hope before the gentleman yields the floor he will obtain permission for all Members to extend their remarks, if they so desire.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD with regard to our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, WILLIAM BLACKNEY is one of the finest gentlemen it has ever been my privilege to know. He has been a good and an able Representative. His lovely personality has endeared him to every Member of the House, and he will be missed by all.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I served for 4 years on the old Committee on Naval Affairs with BILL BLACKNEY. I do not believe I have ever met a more conscientious and more sincere Member of Congress in the 12 years I have been here. I believe he was one of the most devoted public servants I have ever met.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for the entire Massachusetts delegation. It is late and they are not here at the moment. We all have a great admiration for our colleague, Mr. BLACKNEY. He has been a model of courtesy and ability and kindness. I think some of us are apt to push other people aside when we are worried about our legislation and our problems. We think they are the most important problems in the world. That has never been true of Mr. BLACKNEY. No matter how tired he was, or how much he had on his mind, and how important the things were that concerned him, he was always courteous and helpful. I remember the many times that I have gone to him for his advice and suggestions. He always responded. He is a great patriot and a great statesman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I bespeak the thoughts of the entire New York delegation here in the House, all of whom have served with Congressman BLACKNEY, when I say that it has been a great pleasure to have served with him. He is a fine, decent, conscientious, fair man. We all wish him godspeed and good fortune, and that he may have many, many years of good health and happiness upon his retirement.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHAT PRICE—WORLD WAR III?

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 35 years the United States has been trying in one way or another to solve the social, economic, and military problems of Europe. In 1945 we added Asia to our already overloaded agenda of areas whose economic and military burdens we propose to underwrite. History records how fruitless our efforts have been. If that history is to serve any useful purpose it must be studied and utilized to delineate clearly the mistakes of the past so that our policymakers, no matter how stupid or inept, can avoid their repetition.

The record shows that in spite of our mistakes and blunders in trying to preserve world peace, we have learned nothing by experience. In the pursuit of that phantom hope to preserve world peace, we have fought two great wars. Yet, we are worse off today than when we embarked on our adventure of saving the world some 35 years ago. Moreover, the rest of the world is no better off. The trials and tribulations of the world's family of nations are more acute at this moment than at any time in recorded history. Hundreds of thousands of American boys have perished on foreign battlefields. We have spent nearly a third of a trillion dollars. We have depleted American resources which should have been the heritage of our children. What is the result? A struggle in Korea which may ultimately become a conflict of such enormity and intensity as to dwarf—in its tragic and disastrous consequences—any previous experience of mankind—and the ever-growing Communist aggression in Europe.

We might profitably at this time ask ourselves two soul-searching questions, the answers to which—if heeded—should provide a way out of our foreign-policy dilemma. The questions are simple:

First. By fighting World Wars I and II did we successfully establish the means of preserving world peace?

Second. Will the foreign policy we have been following since the end of World War II establish a basis for permanent world peace?

The answer to the first question is neither difficult nor controversial. Our efforts in World War I and World War II admittedly did not contribute toward the establishment of permanent peace—and admittedly were futile. Thus, in our search for a solution to the world's problems of today we must write off our experience from 1917 through 1945—except that we would be well advised to use these past mistakes as road signs against future pitfalls.

The second question is controversial but, in my judgment, the answer is clear. If it were a fact that our participation in the wars of this century had contributed toward the settlement of those problems which cause wars, there would be some justification for doing the things which are being done today. But, unless future hopes can be predicated on the tragic failures of yesterday, it must be evident we are following the wrong course. We are repeating past mistakes on the false assumption that success will supplant failure through a repetition of blunders. The errors of the past have provided no lessons for us. We are following the old tracks that, in the end, only can lead to blind alleys—to bankruptcy, choas, despair. We are not headed for permanent peace. We are headed for permanent war.

If you will indulge me, Mr. Speaker, I propose to substantiate these conclusions and prove that we must either reduce our global commitments—or suffer the consequences. Consequences, which will involve the loss of our liberties and the ultimate destruction of the best form of government the world has ever known.

We have won two wars and each time have lost the peace. No one in his right mind should want this country to engage in another titanic struggle in foreign lands—nor to win a war which would create as many problems as it would solve. Yet, one of the basic causes of our present difficulty in foreign affairs is the assumption that if we stop the spread of Communist aggression, the world's troubles will be ended and the causes which give rise to wars will disappear. Thus, unless we have reasonable assurance that our efforts in world war III would result in greater success in bringing permanent peace than have those in the past, it is clear we should avoid participation in such a conflict—except on a limited scale.

Those who assume that a defeat of the rulers of the Kremlin would end the world's troubles engage in wishful thinking. An all-out land war with the Communists in Europe and Asia would be the bitterest and most exhausting conflict the world has ever experienced. It would take many years to terminate such a war successfully. It probably would involve loss of life to more than a million American boys. It almost certainly would deplete our resources completely, to say nothing of bankruptcy and chaos for our domestic economy.

But, these terrific obligations—both in manpower and resources—would not end with the defeat of Communist aggression. We would then have to undertake once more the rebuilding and rehabilitation of the war-torn continents of Europe and Asia. The financial implications of such a postwar program are beyond comprehension. Every sensible person must realize, then, that the colossal problems following world war III would stretch our capabilities beyond the breaking point. If we are realistic, we must recognize these facts, and we must do so before it is too late.

There you have our postwar financial obligations and our questionable ability to assume such a load.

Let us now consider a still more important and difficult problem. What kind of peace would follow upon our defeat of communism on two continents? Is there any certainty that it would be a just or enduring peace? I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have no basis for

believing the terms of peace following the defeat of Russian communism would be any more just or durable than the one which took place after World War II.

All one needs to do is to recognize the diversity of interests and conflicting objectives of our present Allies to reach a conclusion. Some of our friends of yesterday are our principal enemies today. Only the Good Lord knows who will be our friends tomorrow.

It is only a few years ago that Russia was on our side in the fight against Adolph Hitler. We gave the Russians more than $14,000,000,000 of our resources to help them produce a colossal military machine—the machine which is now being used against us.

It is only a few years ago that we fought side by side with the Chinese. We spent billions to aid them economically and militarily. Today we are engaged in a bitter struggle with those who are Communists in that Nation, in a war that already has produced 120,000 casualties.

It is only a few short years ago that we were compelled to build the largest military machine in our history in order to defeat the ruthless dictators of Germany and Japan. At this very moment we are allied with the governments of Germany and Japan in preparation for an all-out war with the Communists of Russia and China.

In these circumstances is it not appropriate to speculate on who will be our enemies and who will be our friends in the days that follow the hostilities of world war III?

President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson are engaged in a program of alliances with foreign countries—as if it were inevitable that we should switch friends and enemies when a shooting war has ended. In effect, they ask us to recognize the futility of our predicament—and make the best of it.

In order to stem the tide of Communist aggression in Europe it is expedient from the military standpoint to have allies wherever we can find them. On that basis we are committed to a program of rearming Germany, whose help we would so badly need in any war with Russia. On the same basis, and for the same military reasons, we must accept the help of countries like Spain and Yugoslavia. Similarly, if we are to carry on an extended war against Communist aggression in Asia, we must have the armed assistance of Japan. To that end it would be necessary to rebuild the military power of the Japanese Government. There is no alternative to this course of action, unless we propose to carry the entire military burden as we now are doing in Korea.

Can anyone predict the nature and scope of the new problems which are bound to arise in Europe as the result of the rebirth of German military might? Does anyone believe that a rearmed Germany would be a docile country to deal with at the peace table after the defeat of the Russians? What postwar price do you think we might be called upon to pay in return for German aid against the Russian horde? Almost certainly we would find that Germany had come to have more than a platonic interest in the satellite countries released from Russian domination.

Can anyone predict peaceful cooperation from Franco and Tito after we have built up their military strength as we did for the conspirators in the Kremlin? What postwar price would we have to pay for military aid from the dictators of Spain and Yugoslavia? I think we would find that both of these countries had been able to conjure up reasons for expanding their territorial borders.

And, what about Japan? What would the price be for aid to that country? Does anyone believe that rebirth of Japan's military power might not endanger the future peace of Asia when the Communists have been defeated? Is it reasonable to assume that a powerful Japan would no longer be interested in the subjugation of Asiatic countries prostrated by war? Is there any assurance that having regained her military supremacy in Asia, Japan would use this power for peaceful pursuits and objectives? Is it not more realistic to assume she would again turn traditionally jealous eyes in the direction of China and other nations in the Far East. For, unless we kick history squarely in the teeth, we should find Japan once more knocking on China's door, and forcing entrance if necessary.

All these nations would have dominant voices at the peace table following Stalin's defeat. I venture to predict that Germany and Japan, rearmed to the teeth and flushed with military victory would not prove to be amiable allies. Instead, we might learn—to our sorrow—that these countries again made powerful through our help, were more interested in new conquests than in peace.

We would indeed be in a desperate plight if, after defeating the Russians we should find that two of our major Allies had become the aggressors of the future on a scale as extravagant as that pursued by the present rulers of the Kremlin.

Because of these things we must not rush headlong toward world war III on the false premise that it will provide a decent, honorable, and durable peace. We need only remember that our principal accomplishment in World War I was the elimination of Prussian militarism. That did not bring about a durable peace. We need only remember that our principal accomplishment in World War II was the elimination of the dictatorships in Germany and Japan. We need not be fortune tellers to predict that our sole important accomplishment in world war III would be the elimination of the Communist menace generated in Moscow. Only a stargazer would venture to guarantee anything more.

The nations of the world should realize that there can be no freedom anywhere unless America remains free. We cannot remain free unless we preserve our solvency and the integrity of our form of government. We cannot remain free if we continue the wanton dissipation of our manpower and resources in Korea and other far-flung corners of the globe and, at the same time, support the domestic economies of bankrupt governments in two hemispheres. This program is being paid for by the rank and file American citizens, who is not only being taxed to death—but who has had 50 percent of his savings confiscated by the Federal Government through the inflation generated by this vast spending program. How much more can he be expected to absorb?

Mr. Speaker, this country has had all of this administration's foreign policy it can take. It is time to call a halt. We must have a choice in the manner, method, and extent of contributions in resources and manpower which we make toward the settlement of the world's problems. We must reserve the right to place a limit on these commitments. Above all, we must zealously guard and protect our own security and welfare—because if we fail—there will be no foreign nation either willing or able to save us.

We can supply the air power and the atom bombs—we can supply the major part of the sea and naval power—we can supply in large degree the arms and ammunition—but, why in the name of common sense should we be called upon to furnish troops? I do not believe we should be obligated or committed in any way to furnish land troops to fight wars in either Europe or Asia. The free nations on those continents have ample manpower—if properly utilized. If the millions of men in Europe and Asia are not willing to put on uniforms in the defense of their own countries against Communist invasion—why should we do it for them? The minute we send one division to foreign soil our obligation to send additional divisions is—for all practical purposes—without limit and beyond our control. By refusing to fight the battles of other countries we can save the lives of hundreds of thousands of American boys who have no obligation to die on foreign battlefields—and we can save billions of dollars if we keep our troops at home.

The whole basis for committing troops to foreign countries seems to be that the best way to keep war from this hemisphere is for us to fight continuous wars in other hemispheres. It is ridiculous to believe that American armies in Europe and Asia can prevent the dropping of atom bombs on our towns and cities—the greatest external threat to our safety and security. Ten million foot soldiers in Europe and Asia could not stop an atomic air attack upon the United States. Every military man knows that an adequate air force is the only effective defense against such an attack.

Then, too, everyone knows that if the Russians move in Western Europe, there would be an immediate clamor for more American troops to join with those we now have in that area. From that point on, we would be engaged in another European land war—whether we wanted to be or not. Thus, I think we should take our troops out of Europe and be without obligation to return them there. Similarly, I think we should take our troops out of Korea as quickly as we can under reasonably honorable conditions.

These, then, Mr. Speaker, are the reasons for my objections to involving American troops in the fighting of land wars in other hemispheres. I hasten to assert that this does not mean I object to our cooperation with the other free Nations of the world in stopping Com-

munist aggression. My only reservation is that our cooperation be limited to our ability and capacity—having proper regard for our own survival.

The considerations I have outlined here, Mr. Speaker, I believe must be heeded if there is to be any sensible solution to the foreign-policy dilemma. The very fact that we have no reason to assume that another world war would provide permanent peace is the all-important reason why we should stop to get our bearings before we become embroiled in all-out war in Europe and Asia. We should realize this time that it is suicidal for us to engage in long and ruinous wars in other hemispheres; wars which may liquidate totalitarianism; but, which serve also to substitute in its place some new form of aggressive military power—equally dangerous to world peace and equally difficult to subdue.

We must remember, above all, that if we wear ourselves out in another global struggle, we shall have neither strength, energy, nor resources with which to preserve the peace—if peace finally comes. We can foresee the future only in the light of the past, and then but dimly through the fog of our own hopes and fears. But such is our only recourse. As best we can, we must seek to profit from the mistakes of the past which have brought us to our present hour of danger. Otherwise, what price—world war III.

ADDITIONAL OFFICIAL REPORTER TO COMMITTEES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 739) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation for the employment of an additional official reporter to committees of the House of Representatives, to be appointed in the same manner, and to receive the same rate of compensation, as the other official reporters to House committees.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Bow (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and the include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. TRIMBLE and to include an address by President Truman.

Mr. MAGEE.

Mr. MULTER in three instances, and to include extraneous matter in each, in one instance to include an article entitled "To promote the General Welfare" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $840.

Mr. BARTLETT and to include two letters.

Mr. WIER and to include a statement.

Mr. VINSON.

Mr. BOLLING and to include an article.

Mr. ARMSTRONG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENNY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneout matter.

Mr. ANGELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND.

Mr. GWINN in two instances.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAIL.

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AYRES and to include a letter.

Mr. HAGEN in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES in two particulars; in the first to include a report of the proceedings at the meeting of the State Civitan Clubs in Charlotte, appointing Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON as the man of the year; and in the second instance to include a speech by State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for North Carolina, Mr. Charles Truett Myers, at a Fourth of July meeting.

Mr. PRIEST and include a summary of an address by Mr. William J. Chaney, executive vice president of the National Foundation for Consumer Credit.

Mr. CRAWFORD and to include supporting statistics and quotations.

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $280.

Mr. PASSMAN.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article entitled "the Candid Congressman from Connecticut" which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a statement on the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BUCKLEY (at the request of Mr. FALLON).

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include an article which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $378.

Mr. REED of Illinois in two instances and to include a report of the American Bar Association, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan following the conclusion of the legislative business of tomorrow.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include an address by Hon. WILLIAM BENTON, United States Senator.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN and to include a speech.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia and to include an article from the American Metal Market.

Mr. MCGUIRE and to include two articles and certain petitions.

Mr. JONES of Alabama.

Mr. SHAFER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER and to include a statement by a group of teachers in his district which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $100.

Mr. DENTON.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances.

Mr. VURSELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. WIDNALL and to include a resolution.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a letter.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug; and

H. R. 8499. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake;

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 638. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;

S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;

S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the Council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the

Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks;

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7151. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7216. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county;

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953; and

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for the remainder of the session prior to adjournment, on account of very serious illness in the family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1635. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the first supplemental report on the Missouri River Basin agricultural program. This report is a supplement to the report entitled "Missouri River Basin Agricultural Program" submitted September 29, 1949, and which was printed as House Document 373, Eighty-first Congress, first session (H. Doc. No. 530); to the Committee on Agriculture, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1636. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the fourth interim report by the Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce on the study of causes and characteristics of thunderstorms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to print proceedings at unveiling of bronze replica of Declaration of Independence; without amendment (Rept. No. 2482). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7391. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 2483). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Eighty-second Congress"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on conference. H. R. 7289. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2485). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 3589. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works (Rept. No. 2486). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee of conference. S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (Rept. No. 2487). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8523. A bill to establish a program of financial aid to students in higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 8524. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 8525. A bill to further amend the act of May 26, 1948, entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 8526. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Airport Act with respect to expansion of airports to meet national defense needs in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 8527. A bill to provide biweekly pay periods for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 8528. A bill to provide severance pay to certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGEE:

H. J. Res. 496. Joint resolution authorizing an inquiry by the Federal Trade Commission into certain practices and activities of private companies engaged in the production, distribution, or sale of electrical energy in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 740. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a full and complete investigation of the Department of State with a view to determining whether its operations and its activities have been conducted efficiently, economically, diligently and effectively; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 741. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 740; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey relative to

protesting to the United States Department of Agriculture, objecting to the proposed enlargement of the milk marketing area so as to include therein an area of northern New Jersey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 8529. A bill for the relief of Frank B. Pindle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 8530. A bill for the relief of Andres Mendez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY (by request):

H. R. 8531. A bill for the relief of John Charles Keansley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 8532. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 8533. A bill for the relief of Max Steinsapir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 8534. A bill for the relief of Heinrich Henoch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8535. A bill for the relief of Ely Schapiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 8536. A bill for the relief of Everett A. Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 8537. A bill for the relief of Jose Florencio Caamano Fernandez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H. R. 8538. A bill for the relief of Stylianos Harlambidis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

789. Mr. BEAMER presented a petition of 104 members of the Russiaville, Ind., community in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister of the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and merciful God, our Redeemer and our Judge, before Thee and this Nation we dedicate the services of the Senate of the United States of America. Let the memory of the days and the weeks now fading into history be blessed in Thy sight and full of sacred recollections for all who have shared in the deliberations of this session. Confirm what has been right; correct what has been wrong; and prosper all such good deeds as shall promote Thy kingdom.

Let Thy heavenly benediction attend all who have served this Nation here, granting unto each the inward compensation of a high trust worthily fulfilled.

In the lingering hours of this day may this body be given clear insight, sound judgment, and moral courage in every word and act. Abide in our hearts and in our homes. Grant unto Thy servants journeying mercies, rest of body, and peace of mind. May goodness and mercy follow us all the days of our lives that we may dwell in Thy house forever.

Bless this Nation with righteousness and truth. Visit our cities, towns, and countryside with a new and lofty patriotism and with pure religion. Strengthen our institutions. Endow us with nobilty and virtue. In all the contests and decisions of the coming fateful days grant that we may all live in obedience to Thy holy laws. Protect us from enemies without and from unworthiness within. Guide all who take counsel for the peace of the world that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth. And may we ever remain a Nation whose God is the Lord.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 4, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414) and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825); and

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) favoring the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union for 1953 in Washington, D. C.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3161) to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee, No. 152419, for certain land in California, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide the basis for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam, to provide for financial assistance thereto from power revenues, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the Act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents"; and

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Army Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955; and

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 981. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 4755. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm;

H. R. 5485. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf;

H. R. 6633. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site;

H. R. 7304. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Jennings;

H. R. 7365. An act for the relief of Clifford Robinson;

H. R. 7363. An act for the relief of Felix Garcia and others;

H. R. 7494. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the furtheir development and growth of the educational fine arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Jack Carpenter;

H. R. 7827. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; and

H. R. 7917. An act for the relief of Agnes Ishikawa and Shirot Moriyama.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 239) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in general appropriation bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 45, 59, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 28, 37, 44, 53, and 63 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 21, 23, 24, and 43 to the bill, and concurred therein, and the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 52 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MARTIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate after 6:30 p. m. today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

INVITATION TO CONFERENCE OF INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a note from the Minister of Switzerland to the United States, extending on behalf of the Swiss Federal Council, an invitation to the Congress of the United States to be represented at the forty-first conference of the Interparliamentary Union at Bern, Switzerland, on August 28, 1952 (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF CHIEF OF WEATHER BUREAU, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Chief of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce on the study of causes and characteristics of thunderstorms (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION ON CLAIM OF FRED B. WINES VERSUS UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman, United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the claim of Fred B. Wines, doing business as United Shipping Co. versus the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION ON CLAIM OF P. F. FELTEN AND R. J. LABENNE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the claim of P. F. Felton and R. J. LaBenne, a partnership, doing business as Kansas Transport Freight Lines against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION ON CLAIM OF CASSELL TRANSFER & STORAGE CO. AGAINST UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Motor Carrier Claims Commission, Kansas City, Mo., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the claim of the Cassell Transfer & Storage Co., a corporation against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of laws enacted by the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Resolutions urging the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation for a complete and effective national civil defense organization

"Whereas responsible Federal officials, and military leaders representing the Department of Defense have strongly urged an adequate civil defense organization as a fourth arm of our national defense to serve as a coequal partner with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and

"Whereas the President of the United States and Federal civil defense officials have requested the Congress of the United States to support these officials and military leaders by providing an adequate appropriation; and

"Whereas adequate financial assistance for civil defense will insure the completion of a strong and effective national civil defense organization, which will be an integral part of, and indispensable to, the national security program; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the said Congress a budgetary request for civil defense purposes, which will, in no small manner, serve to attain this desired goal: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate the amount requested by the President of the United States and the Federal civil defense officials in the pending budgetary request now before that honorable body, in order that there shall be no further delay in providing an effective national program of civil defense at community, State, and national levels; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the mayor of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to the public housing program in the Los Angeles area; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Reformed Church in America, New York, N. Y., signed by J. E. Hoffman, stated clerk, remonstrating against the construction in the United States of concentration camps; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 6007. A bill to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2118); and

H. R. 6812. A bill to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Texas, be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 2119).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 5954. A bill to provide for the release to the city of Camden, N. J., of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city; without amendment (Rept. No. 2120); and

H. R. 7126. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2121).

REPORTS ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the fol-

lowing reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENATE

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,864.04	3,432.00
Emily Z. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Blanche Holder Bros, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,452.18
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Miles Seull, Jr., professional staff member	10,815.02	5,407.50
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	10,400.26	5,200.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$11,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong	3,235.03
Balance unexpended	6,764.97

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION (S. RES. 252)

JULY 5, 1952.

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel. Staff work performed by professional staff members of Committee on Government Operations.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure, under S. Res. 252 (unexpended balance of the amount authorized under S. Res. 54, 82d Cong.)	$11,168.21
Amount expended	340.63
Balance unexpended	10,827.58

Approved:

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 5, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to "Harry Strunk Lake";

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board;

S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;

S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member States on the Council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks;

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes;

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 3489. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3490. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana Benjamin Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

S. 3491. A bill prohibiting the exhibition in educational institutions, or the use by departments or agencies of the Government, of motion picture films based upon script written by persons having Communist or Communist-front connections; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 3492. A bill to establish in the Civil Service Commission an Incentive Awards Unit, to repeal certain acts, and for other purposes;

S. 3493. A bill to provide for greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials by the development of more effective methods for selecting supervisory personnel in the Government service; and

S. 3494. A bill to secure economical use of manpower by preventing abuses in the education and training of Federal civilian officers and employees and of members of the Armed Services in non-Federal facilities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR:

S. J. Res. 171. Joint resolution stating a declaration of policy concerning war damage; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FREAR when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

WAR-DAMAGE DECLARATION OF 1952

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution constituting a war-damage declaration. I ask that a statement prepared by me to accompany the joint resolution and a memorandum may be printed in the RECORD. I am taking this action at the present time in order that there may be available for consideration during the recess or adjournment of this session of the Congress a legislative declaration of the recognition of the responsibility of the Federal Government for war-caused damage. The statement I have prepared explains the action taken by the Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking of the Committee on Banking and Currency in this field.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 171) stating a declaration of policy concerning war damage, introduced by Mr. FREAR, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement and memorandum presented by Mr. FREAR are as follows:

STATEMENT PREPARED BY SENATOR FREAR TO ACCOMPANY THE WAR-DAMAGE DECLARATION OF 1952

Our Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking has been considering various proposals for war-damage legislation since December 1950. While we have four specific bills before us on this matter (S. 114, S. 439, S.1309, and S.1848), our discussions of the problem in hearings and conferences with interested organizations have covered numerous variations of the proposals contained in those bills.

A great deal of staff work has gone into this action, in addition to the formal and informal activities of this subcommittee. In the two documents attached the staff has gathered together the pertinent action taken by the subcommittee on war-damage legislation and comment made to the subcommittee about such legislation. The first of these documents covered the period from December 1950 through the end of the first session of this Eighty-second Congress. The second document picked up the thread of action at that point and carried it through to April 3, 1952.

Due to the pressure of other Senate business, it has not been practicable for your subcommittee to accomplish much in the way of holding additional conferences with interested parties during the 2½ months which have elapsed since the last staff report in April. The Ford Motor Co., the Packard Motor Car Co., and the Nash-Kelvinator organization have submitted to me as chairman of the subcommittee a recommendation for legislation providing Federal reimbursement for war-caused property damage and Federal insurance against workmen's compensation losses. The subcommittee has not yet found it feasible to meet with a representative of the Associated General Contractors of America, Inc. However, it has received the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget denying a possible overlap of title I of S. 1848 (the bill presented to us by the Budget Bureau) with powers of the Federal Civil Defense Administration. In my opinion, both these matters should be attended to before any detailed bill following the pattern of S. 1848 should be reported to the Committee on Banking and Currency by this subcommittee. I understand, too, that the National Security Resources Board is again studying for the executive branch certain phases of this broad war-damage problem. It might well prove helpful to have the benefit of that study before any detailed legislation is recommended to the Senate.

However, in my opinion none of these actions is a condition precedent to the broad declaration of policy type of legislation which I am introducing in the form of a joint resolution.

In the course of proceedings, we have gathered a myriad of arguments pro and con on each specific measure under consideration. Our files are filled with background information. As a result we have at our disposal sufficient data from which to fashion several alternative pieces of legislation covering this subject.

After consideration of this data, however, I personally do not feel the subcommittee ought to recommend at this time any bill on this subject which would cover in detail the action the Federal Government would take to provide relief, rehabilitation, and repair in the event of war-caused damage. I believe we cannot now know the likely extent of such damage and therefore cannot pass detailed legislation without running the risk of binding the Federal Government to a greater amount of financial obligations than it could effectively bear.

At the other extreme, I do not believe we should recommend against any legislation in this field. I fear such action would leave us open to the charge that we do not truly appreciate the dangers that confront us in our present international relations. We would also be charged with failing to recognize any Federal responsibility for war-caused damage.

I therefore at this time favor an intermediate course. The joint resolution I have presented for consideration would recognize a degree of Federal responsibility for war-caused damage but would leave the legislative details of meeting that responsibility for a future date at which the probable extent of war-caused damage and the Federal Government's ability to aid in repairing that damage could be more definitely ascertained.

The resolution I have proposed is consistent with the past policy of the Congress and the executive branch in insuring against war-caused property damage through the War Damage Corporation. But the development of weapons since World War II and the possibility of widespread war damage in the continental United States seems to me to make detailed legislation inadvisable at this time. I am introducing the joint resolution at this time so that thought can be given to it by interested parties before the convening of the next Congress.

APRIL 3, 1952.

Memorandum to: Senator FREAR, chairman, Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking

From: William F. McKenna, counsel:

You have requested a summary of the subcommittee and staff action on war damage legislation during the current session of Congress.

You will recall that a similar summary was prepared at the close of the last session of Congress and is now available. In addition to that, the subcommittee has taken the following action this year:

1. Conferred with representatives of the life insurance industry in informal conference on January 18. Briefly, the life insurance people neither approve nor oppose legislation on this subject at this time, but suggest certain points for consideration if the subcommittee decides to report a bill on the subject.

(a) Restrict the program to emergency needs.

(b) Oppose a moratorium on payments which apply only to insurance companies, feeling that if the moratorium approach is adopted it should apply to all financial obligations.

(c) In doubt whether property damage should be covered by general indemnity by the Federal Government rather than by a premium plan similarly used by the War Damage Corporation during World War II.

(d) Oppose provision setting up complete records on values of properties in United States.

(e) Oppose provision of bill which split immediate payment of claims for property damage at $5,000. Feel this would discriminate against properties of greater value which are more likely to sustain greater damage.

2. Subcommittee conferred in informal conference with representatives of the Blue Cross Commission on March 5. The following is a digest of the Blue Cross' opinion:

(a) Neither advocates nor opposes legislation in this field at this time.

(b) If subcommittee decides to approve legislation, Blue Cross wants to be certain that the language in the bill is broad enough to include nonprofit organizations such as Blue Cross which supplies hospitalization services and Blue Shield which supplies medical services.

(c) Opposes United States Government's right to subrogation against Blue Cross for claims paid by the United States Government. Feels this would make the Federal Government the dominant creditor of Blue Cross and it might put Government into the insurance field permanently.

(d) Blue Cross rates are not now loaded for war risk.

(e) Rather than subrogation approach, would prefer the Federal Government reimburse Blue Cross for all claims paid by Blue Cross, or provide a reinsurance program run by the Federal Government for private companies.

(f) Suggests clarification of language of bill to limit President's authority to invoke title I on medical services only in actual time of war risk upon declaration of an emergency by the President.

(g) Suggests President be limited to granting relief only to those in want due to war injuries and not to those in want from other causes.

3. Staff has conferred with Federal Civil Defense Administration and Budget Bureau representatives concerning possible overlap of title I of S. 1848 with present authority of Federal Civil Defense Administration. FCDA submitted report on this matter to Senator FREAR dated January 5, 1952. This has been forwarded to the Budget Bureau for study.

FCDA admits it lacks authority in two general fields which are covered by title I; namely, (i) permanent rehabilitation of community facilities; (ii) authority to lend or grant funds to private industries for rehabilitation for industrial plants damaged by war risk. Query is whether it would be preferable to expand FCDA's authority in this area rather than create overlapping authority in title I. To date the Budget Bureau indicates it prefers flexibility in program so that the rehabilitation powers granted in title I can be exercised by the Federal agencies best fitted to do so at the time it becomes necessary to exercise them. Suggests that FCDA might well be that agency at that time. Expects to have further comments available within next 2 weeks.

4. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., has requested an informal conference with the subcommittee. They are interested in coverage for incompleted construction of buildings. The subcommittee is to set a date for this conference.

5. The National Board of Fire Underwriters has reached the following conclusions as set forth in correspondence to Senator FREAR:

(a) A paid premium program is not feasible because of catastrophic war losses which are possible.

(b) A program of full indemnity without premium is not feasible for such losses.

(c) Legislation now would probably have to be limited to cover continuance of the war effort, relief measures, and restoration of facilities essential to preserve life and health.

(d) Agree with the basic premises outlined by the Budget Bureau in presenting S. 1848 to the subcommittee, but suggest following amendments:

(1) Delete presently authorized appropriation.

(2) Delete present implementing of administration set-up in title III for property damage.

(3) Delete provision for preserving records of cost, value, and ownership of property.

(4) Revise present split of claim payments at $5,000 by letting all payments await end of hostilities.

(5) Add provision of termination of entire program instead of present open-end provision.

(6) Allow authorized claims to be presented by survivors of original claimant.

(7) Afford review for claimant similar to that provided by Administrative Procedure Act.

6. The subcommittee has received no requests for hearings on this matter. The main groups interested have submitted views by letter or by informal conference. When it receives the comments of the Bureau of the Budget on the possible overlap with FCDA, the subcommittee will be in a position to consider what action ought to be taken by it in this field, assuming it has held an informal conference with the Association of General Contractors of America, Inc.

7. The staff has suggested the following alternatives for disposal of this problem by the subcommittee.

(a) Prepare a specific bill based primarily on S. 1848 to constitute legislation in this field.

(b) If it is felt that no detailed legislation is advisable at this time, adopt a declaration of policy of Congress recognizing the responsibility of the Federal Government for war-caused damage and assert an intention to adopt detailed legislation in this field as soon as the danger of war caused damage becomes imminent.

(c) Reach a conclusion that the problem is so vast and unforeseeable that no legislation should be adopted at this time, but should await the actual happening of war-caused damage at the time Congress would be confronted with a specific set of facts upon which to base action. The danger of this approach is that action will then be immediately required by the Congress with little chance for deliberation.

Should the subcommittee decide to adopt approach No. 1, the staff has available ample suggestions for legislation received periodically since December 1950 from which to prepare a specific bill for consideration by the subcommittee.

RÉSUMÉ OF SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION ON WAR-DAMAGE LEGISLATION IN FIRST SESSION OF EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

In December 1950 the House passed and the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported favorably a bill, H. R. 9802, to reactivate the War Damage Corporation. Insufficient time was left in that Eighty-first Congress, however, to meet the objections of those who wanted the bill amended to include reinsurance by the Government of workmen's compensation liability insurance.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress three bills were introduced in the Senate on this matter. S. 439, by Senator MAGNUSON, would reactivate the War Damage Corporation. S. 114, by Senator FERGUSON, would do that and also provide Federal protection through reinsurance (and insurance of self-insured employers) against workmen's compensation liability for war-caused losses. S. 1309, by Senator IVES, includes all features of the S. 114 and also authorizes the War Damage Corporation to provide through insurance, reinsurance, or otherwise, reasonable compensation for personal injury or death suffered by and civil defense worker in performing his duties.

Public hearings on these three bills were held on April 18, 19, 24, 25 by the Subcommittee on Securities, Insurance, and Banking. At the April 25 session testimony was received from the Bureau of the Budget indicating its views on war-damage legislation were then tentative.

The subcommittee urged the Bureau to hasten its work on the problem, so that we in the legislative branch might know the final views of the executive branch on this type of legislation.

Chairman FREAR, as soon as the Budget Bureau completed this task, on July 11 called another hearing of the subcommittee. The views then expressed by the Budget Bureau were incorporated in a bill he introduced by request, so that it might be available for comment. That bill is S. 1848, known as the War Disaster Act of 1951.

In general it adopts an indemnity, rather than an insurance, approach to the problem and provides broad authorization to the Executive Department to use Federal Treasury funds to provide intermediate restoration of community services (such as waterworks) damaged by warlike actions (title I); provide income maintenance for injured civilians and dependents of civilians killed and also for civilians in want due to warlike actions (title II); and recompense partly owners of real property (public and private) damaged by warlike action (title III). There is an open-end authorization for appropriations to carry out titles I and II. For title III, $20,000,000,000 is authorized for private property claims, with added authority to accept up to $2,500,000,000 of obligations of local governments as collateral for loans to them by the Federal Government to repair or replace damaged public property. Title II contains provisions letting the President declare a moratorium on payments from any workmen's compensation system. (This is meant to be broad enough to cover self-insured employers). It could be declared only if the President feels war injuries or deaths endanger the solvency of any State workmen's compensation system. It could last not more than 6 months after the calendar month in which ends the first full regular session of the State legislature after enactment of the act. The theory is that by then the State would have excused employers and insurers from liability for payments for war injuries to workmen. Title II also contains a provision for matching Federal grants to States to compensate civil defense workers injured or killed on duty or in training.

Because of the comprehensive scope of S. 1848, the subcommittee decided to let sufficient time elapse for those interested to digest and comment upon the bill before taking any further action. Some subcommittee members and the staff held two informal conferences in August with representatives of the casualty and surety companies interested in workmen's compensation liability. The latter urge amendments to have the Federal Government excuse them from liability for payments to workmen injured by warlike action. Similar conferences have been requested by representatives of life insurance companies, but they will not be ready until after the middle of this month. Representatives of the fire companies writing property damage insurance have not yet indicated whether they wish to comment on the bill. The Chamber of Commerce has opposed S. 1848, urging a premium insurance approach to compensate for war damage to property. To date no requests have been received for further public hearings.

By January 1952, all will have had a fair opportunity to decide how they feel about S. 1848. By then, the subcommittee should recommend a course of action to the full committee for war damage legislation. Meanwhile, work on the matter is progressing on the staff level and is serving to crystallize opinion on legislation of this nature.

AGENDA

1. Review what subcommittee has done on war damage to date.

2. Subcommittee has before it four bills:

S. 439, revive War Damage Corporation.

S. 114, adds reinsurance of workmen's compensation liability to S. 439.

S. 1309, adds insurance of civil-defense workers to S. 114.

S. 1848, payments out of Federal Treasury for community facility restoration, injured and needy persons, and property damage.

3. Establish that subcommittee not yet ready to report a bill to full committee, due to requests of segments of industry to be given opportunity to present suggestions to subcommittee before January.

4. Proceed to outline subject matter to be worked up into a tentative bill.

(a) Real property.

(i) Shall we devise a premium plan, or

(ii) If a premium plan is used, shall participation in the program be voluntary or compulsory?

(iii) Shall we cover sabotage, bacteriological warfare?

(iv) After the first premium, shall we suspend premiums while no losses occur?

(v) Shall we refund surplus premiums at end of program?

(vi) How soon after loss shall payment be made?

(vii) What arrangements shall we make for priorities and allocations for rebuilding?

(viii) Shall we include public property?

(b) Personal property.

(i) Premium plan or indemnity.

(ii) Shall we include accounts receivable?

(iii) Shall we include money and securities?

(c) Workmen's compensation liability.

(i) Shall we excuse employers and insurers from liability for war risk?

(ii) If not, shall we provide Federal reinsurance?

(iii) Shall we indicate the rate to be charged?

(iv) Shall we cover self-insurers?

(v) Shall we include unemployment compensation disability and nonoccupational benefit plan?

(d) Civil defense workers.

(i) Should they be in this bill or handled separately as in S. 1924 (Senator IVES).

(ii) If in this bill, should coverage include training duty?

(iii) Is the matching grant approach to States satisfactory?

(e) Other civilians.

(i) Shall we provide benefits for civilians injured or dependents of those killed?

(ii) What scale shall we use as a guide, e. g., Federal Workmen's Compensation Act or State workmen's compensation acts?

(iii) Shall we use minimum payments under either plan adopted?

(iv) Shall we provide benefits for civilians placed in want by war risk, although not injured?

(v) What scale of payments shall we use as a guide, e. g., Federal old age survivor's insurance?

(vi) Shall benefits include hospitalization and medical care?

(vii) Shall cash benefits be in form of a non-interest-bearing loan recoverable at a later date from the recipient?

(f) Community facilities restoration.

(i) This is title I of S. 1848. Shall we cover this in our bill?

(g) Area.

(i) Shall we limit benefits to real and personal property in or in transit to points between the United States and its possessions?

(ii) Shall we include property abroad owned by United States citizens?

(iii) Shall benefits for personal injury be limited to those occurring in the United States and its possessions?

(iv) Shall we suspend writing insurance in areas over which the United States loses control?

(h) Phasing.

(i) Shall we try for a comprehensive bill?

(ii) Or shall we adopt separate bills to cover the above subjects step by step, making each compatible with an over-all plan?

(iii) If the latter, shall we start with a bill covering real and personal property and workmen's compensation liability?

(iv) Under this phasing plan, can't we use one administration to handle war damage and the Carlson-Schoeppel-Kem catastrophe insurance bill?

5. Decide whether to announce staff will receive suggestions during recess until January. Unless an earlier crisis arises requiring action on this matter at a special session, the subcommittee will meet in January to review the staff work and come to a decision on marking up a bill.

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON WAR DAMAGE BILLS

1. Chamber of Commerce of United States: Opposes S. 1848. Favors immediate premium plan for property insurance.

2. Drafting committee on American Association of State Workmen's Compensation Insurance Funds, American Mutual Alliance, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, and National Council of State Self-Insurers Association. Suggest specific amendments to S. 1848 as it affects workmen's compensation liability.

Amendments would—

(1) Exempt insurers and employers from liability for war-caused injuries.

(2) Require Federal program of benefits be set up as soon as any war damage occurs to an employee.

(3) Let President hire private insurance companies in making payments to injured civilians and dependents.

3. Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.: Opposes S. 1848. Favors reactivating War Damage Corporation with premium collections for property insurance.

4. National Association of Insurance Commissioners: No comment on S. 1848. Favors reactivating War Damage Corporation; Federal reinsurance of workmen's compensation liability insurance, Federal aid to States for injured civil defense workers and later consideration of nonoccupational civilian injury and death from war causes.

5. Associated Industries of New York State, Inc., Buffalo, N. Y. (1,500 industrial concerns): Favors immediate reactivation of War Damage Corp.—Opposes bounty scheme of S. 1848.

6. American Association of Managing General Agents: War-caused losses aren't proper subjects for insurance. Should be absorbed by Federal Government to its capacity.

7. State Director of Civil Defense, Delaware: Urges section 208 of S. 1848 (re civil-defense workers) be enacted as a separate bill.

8. American Life Convention; Life Insurance Association of America: Its committees have met on S. 1848 including a 15-hour session on war-damage risks during recent convention in Toronto, Canada. After another board meeting of the Life Insurance Association, Friday, October 19; will be ready to confer with subcommittee or staff to make suggestions for amendments.

9. National Board of Fire Underwriters: Interested in the entire subject. Has held some committee meetings with more to follow in a few days. Would like chance to make suggestions to subcommittee but aren't ready yet.

10. Wm. J. Keller, Inc. (printers), Buffalo, N. Y.: War-risk insurance would help small business.

11. Kenworthy Educational Service, Inc.; Kenworthy Printing Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.: Reenact war-risk insurance immediately.

12. Air Transport Association of America, Washington, D. C.: Suggests amendments to S. 114 to include coverage against sabotage; to avoid duplicating insurance under Aviation War Risk Insurance Act (Public Law 47, 82d Cong., 1st sess., June 14, 1951).

13. Everbody's Daily, Buffalo, N. Y.: Why is your committee holding up the passage of necessary war-risk insurance? Put a basic law on the books, then amend it if necessary.

14. R. W. Watt, Morristown, N. J.: Federal Government should pay war losses to private property as a Government expense.

15. L. S. Kendell, Digby Management Co., New York, N. Y.: Pass war-damage legislation—loss payable out of taxes.

16. National Association of Credit Men, New York, N. Y.: Quickly pass war-damage law for reinsurance of business-property insurance and workmen's compensation liability.

17. J. Emmet Connell Co., insurance brokers, San Francisco, Calif.: Clients urge quick action on war-damage legislation.

18. Association of Washington Industries, Seattle, Wash.: War-damage insurance should cover industrial insurance on workmen's Compensation.

19. M. A. Cornell, Jr., Mund-McLaurin & Cornell, Los Angeles, Calif.: Cover unemployment compensation disability and nonoccupational benefit plans.

20. Ed Lawrence Agency, San Francisco, Calif.: Pass war-damage legislation.

21. Joseph L. Myers, general insurance, San Francisco, Calif.: Our clients want war-damage insurance.

22. The Real Estate Board of New York, Inc.: Property-damage insurance is needed, if only on a stand-by basis. Renew policies without additional premium in each year when there is no war damage in United States.

23. American Retail Federation: Revive War Damage Corp.; reinsure workmen's compensation liability insurance; waive premiums in no-loss years; refund surplus premiums at end of program; insure accounts receivable.

24. Insurance Brokers Association of Massachusetts, Boston (1,000 members): Concerned about delay in enacting war-damage legislation.

25. Joses & Brown, insurance brokers, Palo Alto, Calif.: Up to 10 clients a day ask for war-damage insurance.

26. Sault Insurance Agency, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.: This city wants war-damage insurance—against property loss.

27. National Savings and Loan League: Reactivate War Damage Corporation.

28. William C. Brewer, Jr. (insurance lawyer), Boston, Mass.: Vitally need war-damage insurance to cover property damage and workmen's compensation insurance.

29. Fowler, White, Gillen, Yancey & Humkey (lawyers), Miami and Tampa, Fla.: Some form of Government insurance for war damage is needed.

30. American Surety Co., of New York; New York Casualty Co.: Favor Federal insurance of workmen's compensation liability.

31. National Automobile & Casualty Insurance Co., Los Angeles: S. 114 is of immediate importance.

32. U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co., Atlanta office: Favors S. 114.

33. Cotton, Fire, and Marine Underwriters, Memphis, Tenn.: Reactivate War Damage Corporation.

34. Cotton Insurance Association, Atlanta, Ga.: Reactivate War Damage Corporation.

35. Industrial Commission of Arizona, Phoenix, Ariz.: Cover workmen's compensation liability.

36. Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Co., Ltd., Chicago, Ill.: Reactivate War Damage Corporation with coverage for workmen's compensation liability.

37. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., Hartford, Conn.: Reactivate War Damage Corporation, but cover workmen's compensation liability.

38. Guarantee Insurance Co., Los Angeles, Calif.: Favors S. 114.

39. North American Cos., Philadelphia, Pa.: Hurry action on S. 114.

40. Hood Rubber Co., Watertown, Mass.: Broaden War Damage Corporation to cover workmen's compensation liability.

41. Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society, Ltd., New York, N. Y.: Favors reactivating War Damage Corporation.

SCOPE OF PROGRAM

1. Should war-damage coverage include self-insurance for unemployment compensation disability and nonoccupational benefit plans for employees? Letter, M. A. Cornell & Co., consultants, employees' group coverages, September 19, 1951.

2. Should such insurance cover American-owned property abroad? Letter, H. F. Prioleau, New York, N. Y., August 24, 1951.

3. Self-insurers should be included in benefits of war-damage legislation. They are to be: Massachusetts Self-Insurers' Association, August 22, 1951, letter to Senators LODGE and SALTONSTALL; and Bachman Oxbridge Worsted Corp., Massachusetts, June 5, 1951, letter to Senator SALTONSTALL; Essick Manufacturing Co., Los Angeles, Calif., April 24, 1951, letter to Senator MAYBANK; Pacific Lighting Gas Supply Co., Los Angeles, Calif., April 23, 1951, letter to Senator MAYBANK; Naumkeag Steam Cotton Co., Salem, Mass., June 21, 1951, letter to Senator MAYBANK.

4. Should cover injured civil-defense workers. Delaware Director of Civil Defense, July 23, 1951, letter to Senator FREAR.

5. Should cover sabotage. Air Transport Association of America, July 13, 1951, letter to Senator MAYBANK.

6. Avoid duplicating air insurance under Public Law 47, Eighty-second Congress, June 14, 1951, Aviation War Risk Insurance Act. Air Transport Association of American, July 13, 1951, letter to Senator MAYBANK.

7. Collect no premiums after the first one until war damage occurs in United States. Real Estate Board of New York, Inc., April 16, 1951, letter to Senator FERGUSON.

8. Insure accounts receivable; refund surplus premiums; waive premiums during years with no war damage; reinsure workmen's compensation liability insurance. American Retail Federation, April 23, 1951, telegram to Senator MAYBANK.

9. Refund surplus premiums. Ray W. Wakeland, Indianapolis, Ind.

10. War damage insurance shouldn't be suspended in areas where United States may lose control. Blue Lake Packers, Inc., Salem, Oreg.

WILLIAM N. OATIS AND JOHN HVASTA

Mr. McCARTHY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 350), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 175, Senate Resolution 200, and Senate Resolution 279, relating to the imprisonment by Czechoslovakia of William N. Oatis, and Senate Resolution 336, relating to the imprisonment by Czechoslovakia of John Hvasta.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Speech delivered by him to a school in Philadelphia, which will be published hereafter.

Remarks made by him at the power conference recently held in Washington, D. C., which will be published hereafter.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered entitled "Chesterfield—Home of the Jeffersons," delivered by him at

celebration of Ruritan Clubs, at Chesterfield Court House, Va., July 4, 1952.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Address delivered by Senator BENTON at the annual convention banquet of the Grand Lodge of Connecticut, Order of Sons of Italy in America, in June 7, 1952.

Article entitled "Let's Elect Another Democratic President," written by Senator McMAHON and published in the September issue of See.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address entitled "The Soviet System of Mind Control," delivered by George S. Counts before the Tri-State Area School Study Council, Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 13, 1952.

News articles dealing with the subject of news objectivity, published in the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard and in the New York Times.

Article entitled "Labor Law: Eminent Domain: Compensation to be paid by the United States Government for Temporary Seizure of an Operating Enterprise: United States vs. Fewee Coal Company," published in the Cornell Law Quarterly.

Article entitled "The Independent Spirit," by Prof. Clark Kerr, of the University of California.

Excerpts from an address delivered by the Rev. Neil B. Danberg before the National Reunion of the Navy Clubs of America on June 27, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Excerpts from address delivered by Senator BENTON at the Wisconsin State Democratic Convention in Oshkosh, Wis., on June 28, 1952.

Resolution adopted by the judiciary committee of the Federal Bar Association of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut urging the appointment of at least 5 additional district court judges.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Book review entitled "German-Soviet Relations" written by Edward Hallett Carr, and published in the summer issue of the magazine Prevent World War III.

By Mr. WELKER:

Grand Chapter Oration, The Sigma Chi Fraternity, delivered by Past Grand Praetor Elvis J. Stahr, Jr.

Editorial entitled "The Lesson for the GOP," published in the Idaho Statesman of July 1, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Letter written to him by Mr. Walter W. Johnson regarding Mr. Johnson's tax claim.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT TO PROVIDE FOR FILING OF EQUIPMENT TRUST AGREEMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3161) to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment, which were, on page 2, line 23, to strike out "documents." " and insert "documents", and on page 3, line 10, to strike out "transactions." and insert "transactions."."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. The amendments merely correct typographical errors; they do not make any substantial change whatsoever in the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement, not to exceed 4 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Texas may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as the majority whip of the Senate, I take this opportunity to extend my heartiest congratulations to Senator McFARLAND for the extremely able manner in which he has performed his duties as majority leader during the Eighty-second Congress.

Senator McFARLAND has occupied a difficult position, and has acquitted himself well. He has brought to his post of leadership ability, talent, conscientiousness, honesty, and a spirit of cooperation which have made him liked on both sides of the aisle.

His outstanding characteristic, however, is that he trusts the Senate. He trusts the Senate, and the Senate trusts him.

He is not one to block the will of the Senate. He is not a man who seeks to defeat legislation by indirect processes and by foreclosing opportunities to debate and vote.

He believes in the democratic method, and he believes that the Senate is the sole judge of its own destiny.

To my mind, this mutual trust between the Senate and Senator McFARLAND is the true source of his success as majority leader. He has faced up to the issues and because he has, he has helped to save our position of world leadership.

When efforts were made to whittle away at the defenses of our lives and liberties, he took a courageous, forthright stand. I believe that the Senate recognized his courage and his forthrightness, and that they were the basic factors in rescuing our military preparedness.

I spent a quiet evening in my home, the other night, with the Speaker of the House—the distinguished and able gentleman from my own State of Texas. The Speaker is rounding out his fourth decade in the House. He has served as Speaker longer than any other man in history. As he looked back over the years, he told me that there has never before been better cooperation, and greater trust, between the two branches of Congress. He said that cooperation and trust exist because ERNEST McFARLAND is one of the ablest, one of the most genuine, one of the finest men he has ever known.

The people of the United States owe a deep debt of gratitude to Arizona for the quality of the Senators it sends to Washington.

Except for the long, hard hours and the fine statesmanship that ERNEST McFARLAND has put into his task, many legislative problems of the Senate would never have been solved.

We of the Southwest know that there is a great day in the offing for our part of the country. We know that there are new economic empires to be built, new resources to be tapped, new industries to spring from our vast lands. But for the people of Arizona, that day has dawned already in the Senate. With ERNEST McFARLAND as majority leader and CARL HAYDEN as the ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, they are assured of the finest representation that they can obtain.

No State—great or small, rich or poor—has sent better men to Washington that has Arizona. The people of that State are to be congratulated for their wise selection. The Nation has been enriched.

Mr. President, the full measure of Senator McFARLAND's success as a legislator can best be demonstrated by the number of bills that have gone through Congress bearing his name. Since he first came to the Senate in 1940, he has been responsible for more than 60 measures which became public laws or passed the Senate, through his sponsorship or cosponsorship. Many of those measures are law today, and the Nation is benefited by them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a tabulation of those measures be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEASURES INTRODUCED OR COSPONSORED BY SENATOR McFARLAND FROM 1940 TO 1952 WHICH BECAME PUBLIC LAW OR PASSED THE SENATE

INDIANS

1. To promote economic recovery of Papago Indians and the better utilization of the resources of the Papago, Gila Bend, and San Xavier Reservations. S. 107, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. Obtained Senate approval of an increase of $6,500,000 for road construction, schools, and irrigation facilities on the Papago and Navajo Reservation. H. R. 7176, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

3. Obtained Senate approval of an increase of $200,000 for range water development on the Papago Indian Reservation. (H. R. 7176, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

4. To authorize necessary expenditures to be made by the Joint Committee on the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

5. Obtained an increase of $250,000 in the appropriation for an additional water supply on the Navajo Reservation. Public Law 254 (H. R. 5650), Eighty-second Congress, first session.

6. To promote the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians and the further development of the resources on the reservations. S. 1407, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

VETERANS AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

1. To establish national cemeteries in the State of Arizona. S. 2621, Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. To provide educational and other readjustment benefits to the veterans of Armed Forces since beginning of the conflict in Korea. Public Law 550 (S. 3199), Eighty-second Congress, second session.

3. To make bonus payments to members of the Armed Forces who engage in combat duty. Public Law 346 (H. R. 5715), Eighty-second Congress, second session.

4. To provide medical, hospital, and pension benefits to veterans of military service since beginning of Korean conflict. Public Law 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

5. To equalize the pay and retirement benefits of certain commissioned officers of the Coast Guard. S. 2477, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

6. To facilitate the retirement of those who were automatically transferred from the Customs Bureau to the Coast Guard. Public Law 308 (H. R. 1824), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

7. To incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II. S. 2326, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

8. To provide allowances and educational benefits to all veterans of World War II. Public Law 268 (H. R. 3749), Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

9. To provide for the readjustment of veterans of World War II to civilian life. Public Law 346 (S. 1767), Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

10. To provide for a tax exemption on playing cards sent to servicemen outside the United States. Public Law 235 (H. R. 3687), Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

11. To enable all members of the Armed Forces to send mail free of cost. Public Law 507 (S. 2208), Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

AGRICULTURE

1. To provide price supports for long staple cotton similar to those for short staple cotton. Public Law 585 (H. R. 8122), Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. To prevent the entry into this country of certain mollusks which spread a highly communicable disease among farm animals. Public Law 152, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

3. To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to establish marketing quotas subject to vote by farmers. Public Law 272 (S. 1962), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

4. To permit the Secretary of Agriculture to apply certain subsidy provisions to perennial agricultural crops such as citrus and to encourage their export to ECA countries. Public Law 47 (S. 1209), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

5. To provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities such as waste cotton for processing and sale in occupied countries. Public Law 820 (S. 2376), Eightieth Congress, second session.

6. To provide for the construction and maintenance of the Western Land Boundary Fence project. Senate Joint Resolution 46, Eightieth Congress, first session, S. 1115, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

7. To increase subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation on lambs and livestock with corresponding decreases in any subsidy paid by the RFC. Public Law 164 (S. 1270), Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

8. To encourage the growing of important war crops by preserving the acreage allotments of cotton, wheat, and peanuts which might otherwise be lost. Public Law 12 (S. 338), Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

9. To provide for the deferment from military service of persons essentially engaged in agricultural occupations. S. 729, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

10. To provide for payment of compensation to holders of grazing permits on public lands for losses sustained by reason of the use of such lands for war purposes. Public Law 663 (S. 2599), Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

MINING

1. Enabling the State of Arizona to make leases encouraging the further development of its oil and mineral resources. Public Law 44, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

2. To place a tax on the importation of foreign copper. Public Law 33 (S. 2022), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

3. To encourage and stimulate exploration for and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals. S. 2105, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

4. To bring about the continued production of copper, lead, and zinc by continuing an effective subsidy program. Public Law 88 (S. 502), Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

5. To authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to those desiring to engage in producing minerals of value to the United States in time of war. S. 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

SOCIAL SECURITY

1. Increase payments to aged persons and to the blind by $5 per month and to dependent children by $3 per month. Public Law 590 (H. R. 7800), Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. Increased payments to the aged and to the blind by $5 per month, and to the dependent children by $3 per month. Public law 642 (H. J. Res. 296), Eightieth Congress, second session.

3. Increase old age assistance payments and blind persons' assistance by $5 per month and dependent children's assistance by $3 per month. Public Law 718, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

4. To prevent the earnings of aged persons from barring their old age assistance payments. H. R. 1752, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

COMMUNICATIONS

1. To make the first major revisions in the Communications Act of 1934. Public Law 554 (S. 658), Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. To amend the Communications Act of 1934. S. 1973, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

3. Repeal of the Post Roads Act of 1866 to eliminate telegraph rate discriminations between the United States and private persons. Public Law 193 (S. 816), Eightieth Congress, first session.

4. To continue an investigation of international communications by wire and radio. Senate Resolution 24, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

5. To permit consolidations and mergers between domestic telegraph carriers and between international telegraph carriers. Public Law 4, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

1. Obtained Senate approval of $125,000 for research to develop an inexpensive method for converting salt water into water which can be used for irrigation and domestic purposes. Eighty-second Congress, second session.

2. Central Arizona project. S. 75, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

3. To protect the scenic beauty along the south approach highway to the Grand Canyon within the Kaibab National Forest. Public Law 77, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

4. To preserve the Gila Pueblo and make it an archeological laboratory. Public Law 254, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

5. Central Arizona project. S. 75, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

6. To authorize the withdrawal of public notices in the Yuma reclamation project to encourage the filing of water right applications. Public Law 383 (S. 1542), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

7. To allow water to be furnished to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project. Public Law 102 (S. 690), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

8. To grant consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact. Public Law 37, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

9. To permit the disposal of withdrawn public tracts too small to be classed as a farm unit under the Reclamation Act. S. 1543, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

10. To allow the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District to drill, equip and acquire wells for use on the district and for reimbursement. Public Law 10, Eightieth Congress, first session.

11. To provide for the creation of the Wellton-Mohawk irrigation district and the Yuma Mesa division of the Gila project. Public Law 272 (S. 483), Eightieth Congress, first session.

12. To amend the San Carlos Act with reference to repayment charges. Public Law 149, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

13. To provide for an investigation of hydroelectric power development and irrigation projects. Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

14. To authorize construction of flood-control projects, including Holbrook project on the little Colorado. Public Law 534 (H. R. 4485), Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

15. To provide for an investigation of the supply and distribution of hydroelectric power. Senate Resolution 155, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

16. To provide for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of transmission lines from Parker Dam power project. Public Law 764 (S. 2369, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

EDUCATION

1. To make grants to the States for surveying their need for elementary and secondary school facilities and for emergency school construction in districts overburdened with enrollments resulting from defense activities. S. 2317, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

2. To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Gila reclamation project to the University of Arizona. Public Law 90 (S. 118), Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

3. To extend the operation of the school-lunch program. Public Law 425 (H. R. 4278), Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

TRANSPORTATION

1. To protect the scenic beauty along Oak Creek Canyon within the Coconino National Forest. Public Law 70 (S. 812), Eighty-first Congress, first session.

2. To amend the Transportation Act of 1940 with respect to the movement of Government traffic. Public Law 256, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

MISCELLANEOUS

1. To extend the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures. Senate Resolution 5, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

2. To relieve barbers and beauty shops from the prohibitive burden of keeping books on purchase of supplies for purposes of the Revenue Act. Public Law 250 (H. R. 5417), Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me? I wish to add a few words to the tribute paid to the Senator from Arizona by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia would be happy to do so, because he also would like to join in what has been said about the majority leader, and which was so richly deserved.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to say, in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who has paid tribute to the majority leader, that I have found ERNEST MCFARLAND to be fair, courteous, and impartial. He is a man whose word is as good as his bond.

I will admit to the Senate that I should much prefer to have the majority leadership on this side of the aisle, and I hope it will be after the first of the year. But if it should remain on the other side, I appreciate the excellent judgment of the Democrats in selecting ERNEST MCFARLAND as their leader, because of his fairness, impartiality, courtesy, and kindness, and the way in which he has performed the duties of his position during the session now drawing to a close, and during the preceding session as well.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to identify myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], my colleague on this side of the aisle, in expressing appreciation for the fine service which the majority leader has rendered to all of us during this session, and to tell Senator MCFARLAND that I have always personally appreciated his uniform courtesy and the assistance he has extended to me in many problems with which I have been faced.

While I am on my feet, I should like to add a word about our own minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES]. In the leaders on both sides of the aisle we have had two men who have done a remarkable job during this session under great difficulties. They have worked well together in bringing about harmony on both sides of the aisle in connection with the enactment of highly important legislation.

I should also add a word of commendation for a piece of work which has been done on our side of the aisle by the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. They constitute what we refer to as the watchdog calendar committee. In my judgment, both those Senators deserve thanks for the work they have done this year in seeing that the calendar was expeditiously handled, and seeing to it that the work was done as it should be, while at the same time carefully watching all the danger signals.

I am happy on this occasion, as Congress is winding up the session, to pay this tribute to a few Senators to whom I think we all owe a debt of gratitude.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR RUSSELL—SOLUTION FOR THE RACIAL PROBLEM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, apparently there is not a newspaper or radio commentator who does not frankly concede the outstanding qualifications for the high office of President of our Georgia colleague, DICK RUSSELL. Yet most of them wind up by saying: "But he won't get the nomination because the leaders of the big industrial States do not like his position on civil rights." In recent weeks I have had an opportunity to discuss RUSSELL'S candidacy with western leaders all of whom are agreed that if the Democrats nominated RUSSELL he will sweep the farm vote of the West regardless of previous party affiliations.

The late President Roosevelt had no more loyal supporter in the Congress than DICK RUSSELL and he has actively and efficiently supported the foreign policy and most of the domestic policies of the Truman administration. But administration leaders object to him on account of his stand on the subject of civil rights. It is most unfortunate that they apparently are unable to realize that if DICK RUSSELL were elected President of the United States he would be able to do by persuasion in the South what no compulsory FEPC law could hope to do. He has promised if elected President to work out a solution of the problem in the South and he could be counted upon to do so.

One reason that some northern Democrats still insist upon a compulsory FEPC is that they do not understand the fundamental relationship between the white people and the colored people of the South, nor the respect, the esteem, and the warm affection which the white people of the South have for deserving Negroes. When I was a boy I spent my summers on my grandfather's farm in Culpeper County, Va. The foreman of that farm, on which there would be as many as 30 hands during the harvest season, was a colored man named William Fields. I was his constant companion. He loved me as much as he did his own children, and I loved him as much as I did my own father. When my grandfather died in 1903 he left William Fields what would now be the equivalent of $35,000 and with it he bought a fine farm, sent his four children to college, and lived in comfort in his sunset years.

My father was dead when I was first nominated for the House of Representatives in 1932. One of the first things that I did after receiving that nomination was to drive over to Culpeper to see William Fields because to me his joy and pride in my success took the place of what my father's would have been had he still lived.

In the summer of 1932 I was standing on a street corner in Chicago waiting for a bus to take me to the convention auditorium. A colored man approached me, saying that he had had nothing to eat for 2 days and would I give him enough to buy breakfast? I asked him where he was from and the minute that he heard my Virginia accent he said, "Oh, Lordy, boss, ain't you from Virginia?" I said, "Yes," and he said, "I am, too, from Norfolk, Va." And then he went on to say, "It is so good to meet some of my own white folks again because the white folks of this city will let a Negro starve to death."

We in Virginia do not want any compulsory Federal law to interfere with the progressive program of Virginia in recent years in which we are gradually and successfully solving a racial problem which never would have existed had northern representatives to the Philadelphia Convention of 1787 been willing to accept the Virginia proposal to include in the new Constitution a provision for the abolition of slavery.

Recently there retired from school work in Virginia after 58 years of active service a colored man known as Prof. John E. J. Moore. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a news item from the Buena Vista News of July 3 discussing Professor Moore's outstanding services to his day and generation and the high esteem in which he is held by all in Virginia who had the privilege of knowing him. That news item recounts but one of the many instances in our State where sympathetic understanding, esteem, and human affection have accomplished far more than any compulsory law could possibly accomplish.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUENA VISTA MAN RETIRES AFTER TEACHING COLORED YOUTHS FOR THE PAST 58 YEARS

(Mrs. V. T. Strickler)

After 58 years spent in teaching the colored youth of Virginia, Prof. John E. J. Moore, as he is generally known here, retired from his beloved work early this month and has returned to his home in Buena Vista.

He began teaching just before he was 18, his first school being in King William County where he remained for 3 years. Coming to Buena Vista in 1896 he served as principal and teacher of the one-room Negro elementary school at a salary of $25 per month. During his stay here which extended over a period of 28 years he was closely associated with Prof. J. Parry McCluer, then superintendent of Buena Vista Public Schools. Moore recalled the pleasant relationship which existed between them.

In 1924 he went to Disputanta where he became principal of the four-room school there. Under his leadership of 25 years the school grew until now it is a fully accredited high school known as the Disputanta Training School. Nine buses transport the more than 600 pupils from over Prince George County and there is a staff of 22 tecahers. During the shortage of certified teachers this school was chosen by the State department of education as one of the high schools authorized to offer courses in rural school problems, physical inspection, theory and practice of teaching. The school also has departments in home economics, agriculture, shop and business and there is a well organized cannery, too.

A native of Richmond where he graduated as valedictorian from Richmond Normal School, now Armstrong, Moore holds a master of arts degree from Rochester University, Columbia, N. Y. This was acquired by attending summer sessions over a period of years, financed by waiting on tables in hotels in that section and holding evening classes during regular school sessions. He recalled that once he was sent with a tray to the rooms of Mrs. Jefferson Davis and her daughter, Miss Winnie Davis, who were stopping at a New York hotel. He has an unusual record in that through all the 58 years he was never a minute late for school and never

late in sending his reports to the superintendent. He has taught every subject except home economics, he stated.

Upon his retirement on June 2 Professor Moore, who is 76, was signally honored. During commencement week a special night was devoted to him in appreciation of his services, attended by all school officials. He was presented with an Elgin watch, a purse containing $100 and other gifts. Resolutions adopted by the board of education included the tribute: "We recognize the long efficient and unselfish service Mr. Moore has rendered to Prince George County. We commend him for his splendid moral and personal qualities which have influenced so many Virginia youths during his distinguished career"; for his inspiring and courageous leadership, not only of the teachers under his direct charge but of the entire membership of Prince George Teachers Association.

Who's Who in Colored America, which is published in Brooklyn, has carried Moore's history in its last three editions and his life and picture have appeared in Caldwell's History of Leading Colored Virginians.

In dedicating this year's annual to the retiring principal the Disputanta senior class expressed itself thus: "In years to come, may the spirit of Moore linger in the minds of the class of '52 and may it recall his dignity, refinement, courtesy, and interest throughout the years to come."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE IN DEFENSE OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for 5 minutes in defense of a colleague of ours in the Senate who, I think, is being subjected to one of the most unjustifiable smears within my recollection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I make this statement as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as a member of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which has been chaired throughout the year by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. We have spent several weeks, off and on, during this session of Congress conducting hearings on the issue of communism in American trade unions.

The chairman of that subcommittee, the Senator from Minnesota has, in my opinion, done a remarkably fine job with complete impartiality, and with devotion to the truth, in seeing to it that we made a clear record bring out all the facts available to us in regard to the extent to which communism in some trade unions has wormed its way into those unions to the detriment not only of the labor movement in the United States, to the extent that it constitutes a threat to the security of the United States. In time of great emergency, such unions could do great harm to the security of our Nation.

There is no doubt but that Communist-dominated trade unions in a sensitive defense industry is a threat to our national welfare. Our investigation, therefore, and our hearings have received the cooperation of the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, the responsible public leaders, and the agencies of our Government. A great many experts, concerned as Americans with the preservation of our democracy in a time of national emergency, have given us valuable advice for stimulating thought. Our subcommittee is still in the midst of its study. We do not know where the results of that study will take us. We have no preconceived solutions or panaceas which the hearings are designed to help establish. We seek the facts and are eager for proposed solutions within the democratic framework of our Constitution.

The Communist press and the Communist-led trade unions, true to their fashion, have reacted to the study which we are making with a violence and intemperance quite characteristic of the Communist movement all over the world. The Communist Party of the United States has seen fit to use the chairman of the subcommittee as the target for a series of attacks, misinformation, and lies. I believe they have done so because they appreciate that liberals such as he will be the greatest threat to their designs. They know that our investigation and our opposition to them cannot possibly be misinterpreted as antilabor, anticivil liberties, or antidemocratic, because of the chairman's wholehearted friendship and dedication to the cause of democracy, civil liberty, and the free-trade union movement of the United States. The communism criticism, therefore has only served to persuade me conclusively that the task of our subcommittee is a vital one, that it should be continued and extended, and that it can bring results.

Criticism is very important to a man in public life. It is the virtue of our democracy that it can be freely granted. It acts as the refining fire through which our ideas and activities must pass before they reach fruition. Criticism also serves, however, Mr. President, to let us know whether we are on the right track. Because it is true not only by our friends but also by our enemies shall we be known.

For many years now Senator HUMPHREY has been the subject of much hostile comments among those totalitarians in our society who would destroy our democratic principles in favor of a dictatorship. Both Fascists and Communists have seen fit to list him as one of their enemies. I know that he is proud of the distinction. He can take pride in the fact that he has been an active and effective opponent of communism and fascism. I believe the intensity of the totalitarian opposition to him is evidence of that effectivenes. To the best of his ability, he has attempted to undermine Communist influence in his State of Minnesota and in his political party while he was a mayor. And he is proceeding to the best of his ability to undermine Communist influence in the Nation and in the world through his activities as United States Senator.

Thus, I say that as a result of the fearlessness of the Senator from Minnesota in conducting those hearings it has now become the Communist Party line in this country to smear him. The Communists are circulating throughout the country, through the Daily Worker and other media of Communist propaganda, some of the most vicious smear propaganda against an American public official that I have ever read.

Irrespective of the fact that the Senator from Minnesota belongs to the Democratic Party, so far as I am concerned, as a Republican, I think I would be derelict in my duty as a member of the Labor Committee and as a Member of the Senate if I did not rise on the floor of the Senate today and speak out in defense of the statesmanship which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has performd throughout this session of Congress as chairman of the Labor subcommittee.

So far as the record is concerned, if people would only go to the record, the Senator from Minnesota would need no defense. But the sad thing is that in these days of hysteria in American politics too many of the people in our country have come to accept smears as the truth. Here we have another example of a vicious application of the big lie technique in the field of American smear politics.

I think the best defense I can make of the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. President, is to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks certain material on this matter.

For the information of the Senate, I am going to introduce many of the Communist criticisms against the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee in the body of the RECORD. It is important that we be fully aware of the sinister and irresponsible character of the Communist press. I know it will surprise many of my colleagues to see that the Communists in their attempt to attack him are going to such lengths and to such distortions as to accuse him of being anti-Roosevelt, antilabor, anti-Negro, and anti-Semitic. Following the theory of Adolph Hitler's Mein Kampf, they are undoubtedly assuming that the big lie can be effective if it is repeated over and over again. I can assure them, however, of a fact which we all know, namely that they do not understand the character and integrity of the American people and of the American worker.

First, I want to place in the RECORD a series of friendly stories and editorials from the A. F. of L. and the CIO, further testifying the basic Americanism of those great democratic institutions. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, editorials of the January 31, 1952, issue of the Machinist, publication of the International Association of Machinists, A. F. of L.; March 22, 1952, issue of Labor, publication of the Railroad Brotherhoods; June 2, 1952, issue of the IUE-CIO News, publication of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers; and an editorial from the CIO News of March 24, 1952.

Now, Mr. President, for the unfair attacks, I shall ask to insert the following article. From the Union, publication of the Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers for January 28, 1952; another article from that publication by Graham Dolan, Who's This Guy HUMPHREY, dated February 25, 1952, including a box entitled

"He Wants To Make T-H the Humphrey-Taft-Hartley Act"; reprinted in condensed form in People's World Magazine, Communist publication, for May 23, 1952; an editorial from the Daily Worker of February 19, 1952; another editorial from the Daily Worker front page, dated March 21, 1952; an editorial from the ACA News, publication of the American Communist Association for March 1952; an article by Harry Bridges appearing in the Dispatcher, publication of the International Long Shoremen and Warehouse Men's Union for March 28, 1952; a story in the UE News, publication of the United Electrical Workers for March 31, 1952; an article by George Morris in the Daily Worker of March 26, 1952; a story by Graham Dolan in the March of Labor for April 1952 called Senator Humbug; article by Russ Nixon in the April 28, 1952, issue of UE News; a press release from the Progressive Party, dated May 9, 1952; a story by Russ Nixon in the May 1952 issue of March of Labor called "Unholy Matrimony"; an article from the Electrical Union News, publication of UE Local 301, Schenectady, N. Y., for May 2, 1952; another article from that publication dated May 9, 1952; an undated article from the Union, entitled "HUMPHREY Wants Wishy-Washy FEPC"; and a pamphlet being widely distributed throughout the United States by the Communist Party and the Communist-led trade unions, issued by the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, called the Real HUMPHREY.

I ask for that consent at this time for the insertion of the material I have just identified.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Machinist of January 31, 1952]

REDS OUT TO SMEAR HUMPHREY, DESPITE HIS FINE LIBERAL RECORD

Ever since United States Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, was elected to the Senate in 1948, he has drawn the fire of big business interests. HUMPHREY has fought hard for Taft-Hartley repeal, a higher minimum wage, effective price control, and an end to the special tax privileges of corporations and wealthy individuals. As a result he has been under constant attack from the reactionaries on the right.

Now the reactionaries on the left have joined the barrage. Communist-line publications are labeling HUMPHREY as "union buster," "demagog," and "enemy of the workers." The March of Labor, party-line monthly magazine published at New York, is now attacking HUMPHREY as the "bitterest enemy of those who resist the war measures, frozen wages, higher taxes, restricted civil rights."

Here's what's riling the Reds. HUMPHREY is leading an investigation by a Senate Labor Subcommittee to determine how to wipe out the remaining influence of the few Communist-dominated unions.

HUMPHREY sent out a questionnaire to 70 leaders in bona fide labor unions, industry, and the Government asking their views on the question. IAM President Al Hayes was queried. The responses are now being combined in a report. The report will become the basis for hearings, expected to open late in February.

HUMPHREY's action inspired a full-page attack in the recent issue of March of Labor, including this typical statement:

"Following his return from Europe, where he worked feverishly for the rearmament of Germany and the incitement of anti-Soviet war sentiment, HUMPHREY can be expected to launch his new antilabor crusade with fanatical zeal."

The Humphrey article was written by Anthony De Maio, field organizer for the United Electrical Workers at Minneapolis, HUMPHREY's home town. UE was expelled from the CIO in 1949.

The party-liners are worried. They know that an investigation of the unions they dominate by labor experts such as HUMPHREY, WAYNE MORSE, Republican, Oregon, MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, West Virginia, and PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinios, all members of the investigating committee, will be thorough. HUMPHREY and his colleagues can expect to be called a lot more names—by the Communists and their supporters.

[From Labor of March 22, 1952]

UNIONS PRAISED FOR SUCCESS IN PURGING RED INFLUENCE

There were significant developments this week in the effort to drive out what little Communist influence remains in certain segments of the American labor movement.

1. Hearings were launched by a Senate Labor Subcommittee headed by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, which is seeking to determine whether additional legislation is needed in that field.

2. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, headed by Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat of Nevada, made public testimony in which it was charged that leaders of the United Public Workers, including President Abram Flaxer, were Communists.

This union, which once claimed 100,000 members among Federal, State, and local government employees, was kicked out of the CIO in 1950 on the grounds of Red domination. Since then its membership has dropped drastically.

PRAISES WORK OF UNIONS

Senator HUMPHREY paid an impressive tribute to the labor government in opening the hearings of his subcommittee. He said most unions already have shown that they can deal with the problem of Communists and that the committee has an open mind on the question of whether additional legislation is needed.

"The American people owe the unions a great debt for the forthright action they have taken to clear out the Communists," he declared. He mentioned both the A. F. of L. and the CIO, and added that "particularly the railroad unions" are worthy of praise for being free of Reds.

He also asserted that the efforts of the patriotic unions to clean out actual Communists are hampered often by wild smear charges spread by forces which are really antiunion rather than anti-Communist.

"Some who appear most anti-Communist," he declared, "actually do a great disservice by seeking to brand all labor as Red. The Communist label has, not infrequently, been applied indiscriminately, maliciously, and inaccurately. It has been used as a smear word instead of as a tool of precision."

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT A FLOP

HUMPHREY said that the Taft-Hartley Act, with its requirement for non-Communist affidavits from union officers, has been a flop in dealing with the problem of Red influence.

Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin was one of the few witnesses who made definite proposals for legislation, although, he said, "there is no doubt of the loyalty and patriotism of the vast majority of union members, including most members of those unions which are Communist-dominated."

Tobin suggested that any persons who have "taught or advocated overthrow of the Government by force and violence" since January 1, 1949, should be barred from holding union posts and that dealing with Red-dominated unions should be made an unfair labor practice.

The first witness was John D. Small, chairman of the Munitions Board, who discussed the problem from the standpoint of national defense.

He also paid tribute to organized labor when he said "the great majority of American unions have a membership made up of loyal Americans, interested in doing their daily jobs for the benefit of their country and their families."

After relating the steps which the Defense Department and other agencies have taken in the past to guard their secrets, he said he had no legislation to suggest.

"The danger to industrial security from the Communist-dominated union is a real one, and very dangerous," he declared. "However, in meeting that danger we must preserve the basic rights of the millions of loyal union members."

Others heard during the week included representatives of the Labor and Justice Departments, National Labor Relations Board, and Atomic Energy Commission.

Chairman Paul M. Herzog, of the NLRB, revealed in his testimony that the handling of the non-Communist affidavits has cost the Government about $1,000,000 since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. He said he felt no "black-and-white appraisal" of their effectiveness is possible.

He also praised the major labor organizations for the "vigorous job they have done in recent years in cleaning house themselves."

[From the IUE-CIO News of June 2, 1952]

UE'S OWN LEAFLETS SHOW BETRAYAL OF WORKERS

Besides reading the Daily Worker, one of my more painful tasks is to read the UE News and other UE materials.

In front of me now are a number of UE leaflets and communications.

One UE leaflet libels a liberal Senator, whose voting record in the upper Chamber has been 100 percent on the side of the people.

While Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, is participating in a valiant fight to defeat the oil lobby in the Tidelands bill; to fight off the unfairness of the McCarran immigration legislation and to expose the evils of the Smith antilabor act, the UE attacks him as a pro-Wall Streeter.

All this because HUMPHREY is heading a subcommittee investigating communism in certain unions. HUMPHREY has not given any indication of what type of legislation, if any, will come from these hearings. He says he has an open mind.

But, the UE, knowing that the hearings will further expose its Communist ties, is smearing a liberal.

The smear won't get anywhere.

In another leaflet, UE spends its members' money to defend two of its creeps, Julius Emspak and Tom Quinn.

Emspak and Quinn were convicted of contempt of Congress because they refused to answer questions concerning their membership in the party.

In Russia, they would now be in a concentration camp, or worse, if they had refused to answer questions concerning membership in an organization which was plotting the overthrow of the Government.

But, in this country, they are out on bail pending an appeal.

The UE membership's money is also spent on another leaflet bemoaning a Government attempt to deport James Lustig, UE organizer, who is accused of having concealed his party membership when he took citizenship.

Lustig, who if found guilty is a liar, is pictured as an ideal family man and patriot.

Lustig's long party record certainly doesn't indicate patriotism, except to Hungary, from which he sprang, and to Hungary's boss, the Soviet.

UE organization director—an empty title, if there ever was one—Matles sends out a letter to board members and staffers in which he bemoans the fact the IUE-CIO refused to fall for UE's phony proposal that 16 unions in GE and Westinghouse join to fight management.

Matles ignores the fact that UE held down wages and working conditions of GE and Westinghouse workers and it was only when IUE-CIO came along that the inequities began to be wiped out.

In its report on What's What in Congress, UE bares the fact that it is standing beside NAM and the chamber of commerce in the fight to end effective controls.

THE COMMIE COMPANY UNION IN ACTION

There are also communications dealing with the Emspak-Quinn and Lustig cases. These are in line with the leaflet.

Judging by the tone, quality, and despair of these leaflets and communications, life must be pretty dull for the organizers who have to read them.

Life must be pretty dull in any event for organizers who cannot organize anyone because of UE's horrible record.

[From the CIO News of March 24, 1952]

WORTHWHILE PROBE

The problem of protecting the rights of free democratic unionism in America, while at the same time checking the spread of Communist infiltration in labor, is one that requires serious and constant consideration. Thus, the Senate Labor Subcommittee, headed by liberal Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, is performing a valuable service in its current hearings on this subject.

Senator HUMPHREY has long since proven himself a steadfast friend of labor. He recognizes that a blunderbuss approach, which would do more harm to decent unions than to the Communists, will not provide a democratic solution and will in fact harm the national welfare.

Thus, the Humphrey hearings are providing a forum for serious and thoughtful discussion of both facts and suggested remedies.

The remains of the Communist-dominated bloc of unions in this country are not large. They do, however, hold contracts in some plants of very considerable strategic importance.

The CIO, as President Murray pointed out in a letter to Senator HUMPHREY a few weeks ago, recognizes the problem but does not believe that special legislation is the answer. If there is any demonstrable weakness in our present sabotage and espionage laws, those statutes should, of course, be strengthened. The Communists, of course, are fighting both legislation and security regulations, to save the skin of their stooge unions, and they have attempted—with more noise than logic—to smear Senator HUMPHREY in the process.

Obviously, such propaganda is nonsense. The CIO fully recognizes the value of Senator HUMPHREY's investigation, and feels confident it will add to our understanding of how to protect and strengthen democratic trade unions from attack or infiltration by any outside group seeking control and perversion of American labor's program and policies.

[From Union of January 28, 1952]

MORE MINE-MILL BOARD STATEMENTS—THE HUMPHREY INVESTIGATION

The new technique in raiding is making its appearance on the labor scene as our union begins another year. In the last 2 years, Mine-Mill has decisively defeated raids against scores of our local unions in every section of the United States and Canada. The raiders' millions in dues money, their alliance with employers and antilabor politicians, their bankrupt Red-baiting campaigns, their slanders, their goon squads, their attempted murders—all of these resources were unsuccessfully employed against Mine-Mill. Our members stood their ground and smashed the raids.

Mine-Mill emerged from the fight stronger, larger, and more unified.

The new raiding technique to be used against all progressive and militant, rank-and-file unions has been blueprinted in the first place by antiunion employers, eagerly assisted by the CIO and a big-business Representative in Congress, United States Senator HUBERT E. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota. HUMPHREY has announced that his subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will conduct an investigation into the unions expelled by the CIO on charges of so-called Communist domination.

While the technique is new as a method of raiding, it is as old as the first attempt to use the power of government to smash the trade-unions. It is of the same mold as the discredited Dies committee and Dies' methods of gossip, rumor, and character assassination. Congressional investigations have become modern inquisitions notorious for their parades of stool pigeons, psychopaths, and antidemocratic perjurers.

In the case of our own union, it was precisely because Mine-Mill's members defeated Philip Murray's attempt to take us over that he now has to resort to guerrilla warfare against us instead of the direct assault which proved so disastrous to the raiders. This has led the raiders to join hands more openly with those who seek to use the war hysteria in order to weaken and destroy the trade-unions and to revive the open shop.

The frameup character of the so-called "investigation" is exposed before the first witness is subpenaed. Interviewed by big business magazines and anti-labor newspapers, HUMPHREY has announced that he will base his inquiry on the reports of the trial committee appointed by Raider Murray to the railroad nine affiliates out of the CIO.

The CIO "report," based on spurious charges in star-chambers, kangaroo court proceedings before a handpicked Murray committee, was printed at HUMPHREY's instigation by the United States Senate as an official document. HUMPHREY presented the CIO report as his own, although less than 150 words in the introduction actually were written by HUMPHREY.

The obvious intent of the CIO-Humphrey action in having the Government print the CIO report was revealed in a recent magazine interview when HUMPHREY was asked:

"All of these documents about the CIO proceedings and trials now have become 'privileged,' haven't they, and the papers can now reprint those documents without any fear of libel action?"

To which HUMPHREY answered: "That is correct. This is an official Senate document, and may I say I had the fullest cooperation of the officers of the CIO in obtaining these reports."

What has happened, is that HUMPHREY intends to conduct an "investigation" of our union based on the speculations of certain CIO leaders, who in arbitrarily expelling our organization, violated all due process, ignored all the rules of evidence, and tailored the proof to fit the charge.

The CIO falsehoods and rigged "evidence" are now given official Government sanction and the raiders undoubtedly will play heavily on this fact, attempting to mislead our members and the general public into believing that the discredited CIO "evidence" is fresh material dug up by the Senate subcommittee.

A united mine-mill membership will understand, however, that the Humphrey "investigation" has been inspired by the desperate CIO leadership and it will understand, too, that the testimony and findings of the Humphrey committee are nothing more than a rehash of the star chamber trials held by CIO. Understanding these two basic facts, mine-mill's membership will beat back this new raiding attempt as it has all previous attempts.

The Humphrey investigation is fraught with danger for all labor. The anti-Roosevelt Minnesota Democrat has let the union-busting cat out of the bag. Asked if it wouldn't be a violation of the Taft-Hartley law for an employer to play one union against another, HUMPHREY said:

"Oh, yes. But we must be sophisticated about this. There are a hundred subtle ways in which an employer, if he wants to, can play off one union against another. And he can do it without technically running afoul of the law."

No further proof of HUMPHREY's motives are necessary than this damaging admission.

It is HUMPHREY's announced intention to deny bargaining rights to unions which the CIO has branded "Communist dominated." And he has said brazenly that he wants to amend the Taft-Hartley law to that effect. He would deny our union and others the right to represent the workers in a plant or mine "even if that union gets a majority" in an election. Mine-Mill is to be punished, according to the CIO-Humphrey plan, because its membership has remained loyal and has turned back the raiders in National Labor Relations Board elections.

"Communist-dominated" unions to HUMPHREY means unions whose leaders are "spiritually and morally" members of the Communist Party; this is something, he complains, which will be difficult to prove "by rules of evidence." But HUMPHREY has made it clear in his public announcements that he will not be so "unsophisticated" as to be restricted in his union-busting spree by "rules of evidence." The greatest congressional smear campaign since Martin Dies' is about to be launched.

Who is this new enemy of Mine-Mill who represents a State in which there is not a single Mine-Mill member? Who is HUMPHREY?

HUMPHREY began his career as a radio commentator sponsored by General Mills, the monopoly that controls Minnesota politics which is linked to the Cowles publications and to the House of Morgan, the same financial interests which own the majority of operations in Mine-Mill's industry. General Mills was the chief supporter of the anti-labor Harold Stassen.

HUMPHREY was elected mayor of Minneapolis with labor's support, but was in office only a few days when he double-crossed the unions by selecting an antilabor chief of police and by breaking his promises on charter reform.

HUMPHREY was anti-Roosevelt. Once he associated himself with an anti-Semitic, isolationist wing in the Farmer-Labor Party and later joined an anti-FDR faction in the Democratic Party. He was defeated both times.

HUMPHREY helped to sponsor five amendments to the administration's Taft-Hartley repeal bill which renewed the old provisions of the law.

HUMPHREY helped to sponsor a successful bill which guaranteed continuance of the antidemocratic, poll-taxes' filibuster.

HUMPHREY spoke and voted against an amendment to prohibit racial segregation in Federal housing projects.

HUMPHREY sponsored a provision for concentration camps which was incorporated into law.

HUMPHREY was the first of the Fair Dealers to repudiate the administration's health program.

HUMPHREY has consistently refused to support the Brannan farm plan.

HUMPHREY has supported every measure designed to provoke a third world war.

These facts and others about HUMPHREY will be made known to every Mine-Mill member in the coming weeks and months. Armed with the same degree of unity which beat back the raiders and cracked the wage freeze in 1951, Mine-Mill members will expose and attack the Humphrey-Morgan-CIO plot in every city and hamlet where they live. As we did in 1951, we will mobilize every resource at our command to beat back the 1952 raiding conspiracy.

[From Union of February 25, 1952]

WHO'S THIS GUY HUMPHREY?

(By Graham Dolan)

HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY is perhaps the only known American adult who really believes the advertising agency's claim that "Wheaties is the breakfast of champions."

The men who sell Wheaties comprise the board of directors of General Mills, the grain monopoly in the Morgan empire. Wheaties is just one of their products. Gold Medal flour is another. HUMPHREY another.

Hubert has wanted to be a champion all his life. And Wheaties is as good a way as any for an ambitious young man to achieve his goal. HUMPHREY is General Mills' champion.

HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY is United States Senator from Minnesota. He has come a long way for a man of less than 42 years; a long way for a lad they called "Windy" in South Dakota, where his late father owned a drug store and was active in local politics. And there is no doubt in the minds of Minnesotans who know HUMPHREY and his consuming ambition that he would like to live in the White House.

Minnesota has a great number of voters who are schooled in practical people's politics. They gained their experience in the historic Farmer-Labor Party days of Minnesota's two greatest governors, the late Floyd B. Olsen, and the revered Elmer Benson, who is now national chairman of the Progressive Party. These dirt farmers and workers know a political phony when they see one, and it is no surprise to them that HUMPHREY today is leading a conspiracy in Congress to amend the Taft-Hartley law in order to hasten the destruction of the labor movement.

HUMPHREY'S recent proposal to investigate the unions expelled by the CIO hierarchy and then to deny them bargaining rights shocked even CIO President Philip Murray and AFL bigwigs into protesting. Minnesota workers and farmers have joined in the protests, but they want to know why the rest of us are so surprised. They say the record is clear: HUMPHREY is a big-business puppet who talks like a liberal when it suits his "operation White House," and like any other reactionary when it seems the expedient thing to do.

When HUMPHREY was mayor of Minneapolis he revealed his typical methods of operation in trying to be all things to all men.

"Whenever I've mentioned Roosevelt in a public address," he said, "I've mentioned Willkie, and whenever I've mentioned Stassen I've mentioned some good Democratic governor like Arnall."

Joseph Driscoll, writing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch in December 1948, put it a little more bluntly when he said:

"Friendly critics say that HUMPHREY is a rabble rouser and a demagog. Their dread is that he might become enthralled by the piping of his own flute and some day, if things get tough all over, and if he thinks he's hearing the people crying for a leader, he might lend his wondrous voice in the wrong direction. They can only mention that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in his quest for popularity and votes, will go to extremes."

Driscoll called HUMPHREY the Voice.

It is HUMPHREY'S oratorical prowess which is his main political asset. The youthful nickname "Windy" was not hung on him lightly. Rufus Jarman, in the Saturday Evening Post (September 29, 1948) called HUBERT the Senate's gabbiest freshman, explaining that HUMPHREY'S greatest weakness is to make rousing statements on subjects about which he is not well informed.

But it was one of Hubert's college professors who told the talkative "Horatio" that "if God had given you as much brains as he has given you wind, you would be sure to be another Cicero."

The June 1948 issue of Survey Graphic magazine quoted political critics of HUMPHREY as saying that the then Minneapolis mayor "is the cockiest and the gabbiest know-it-all who ever sought public office."

"At the drop of hat," Survey Graphic said, "he will deliver a speech, and for lack of any ready provocation has frequently been known to drop the hat himself."

In Minneapolis and St. Paul they'll tell you that HUMPHREY'S affection for his own voice was an important factor in one of his most astute political coups. That was his shrewd interception of the ball at the 1948 Democratic convention when the delegates were split on the inclusion of a civil-rights plank in the platform. A firm believer in the adage that opportunity knocks but once and opportunism never gets tired, HUMPHREY made political hay with a rousing speech on civil rights that prompted Alabama's "Bull" Connor and his Dixiecrat "rebels" to walk out of the convention and return home to iron their bed sheets.

"I do not believe," HUMPHREY told the delegates in pious, revival-meeting oratory, "that there can be any compromise of the guaranties of civil rights."

"Almost in an instant," gloated the big business mouthpiece, the Minneapolis Star, "HUMPHREY had become a national figure—a fact that cannot be overlooked."

Wheaties and a swivel tongue had done their job. HUBERT HUMPHREY was now a fullfledged champion of the common man, the downtrodden and the oppressed. His potentialities as a left-wing spokesman for the House of Morgan were boundless. HUMPHREY ran for the Senate. He began to smell the pine knots in White House fireplaces. Mr. HUMPHREY went to Washington.

A few short months later—January 26, 1949—the ultra-reactionary news magazine Pathfinder confidently predicted: "Senator HUMPHREY will lie low on civil-rights legislation until the measures the Democrats agree on are out of the way."

HUMPHREY'S burning ambition has cooked most of the civil rights juice out of his system. Civil rights, it seems, is an issue which cereal kings and political bosses permit in platforms, but a young man with his eyes on the White House should not take such pledges seriously if he wants to maintain his political and financial support.

The young orator who told sweltering delegates at Philadelphia in 1948 that he didn't believe there could be any compromise of the guaranties of civil rights now proposes a stronger Taft-Hartley Act, the law that Philip Murray called a long step toward fascism. The man credited with making the Dixiecrats bolt the Democratic Party in 1948 now has written to hundreds of southern editors, assuring them that his civil rights speeches of old were not to be interpreted as a blow to the South. He told the editors that "nothing is further from the truth. I am not being sentimental when I say that I have a deep affection for the South."

HUMPHREY began his letter to Dixiecrat editors by expressing his deep respect for the traditions of the South. When they speak about traditions in the South, as any Negro trade unionist down there will tell you, they mean what Negro-hating Gov. Herman Talmadge of Georgia said in a radio address on October 22, 1949, when he warned:

"We intend to fight hand to hand with our weapons and we will never submit to one inch of encroachment on our traditional pattern of segregation."

Every southern white-supremacist uses the word "traditions" when he means Jim Crow hospitals, Jim Crow restaurants, Jim Crow hotels, Jim Crow theaters, Jim Crow trains, Jim Crow busses, Jim Crow parking lots, and Jim Crow cemeteries.

HUMPHREY has assured the southern editors that he has strong links with Dixie. He cites his graduate training at Louisiana State University, the late and unmourned Huey Long's citadel of culture via the every-white-man-a-king route. Some of HUMPHREY'S former associates in Minneapolis believe, in fact, that HUBERT'S sojourn in Louisiana taught him much in the art of political bombast and hypocrisy. His record on the civil-rights issue—the chasm between word and deed—is indeed reminiscent of the Kingfish in his more deceitful moments.

The Democrats are desperate for Southern support. HUMPHREY was Peck's Bad Boy in the South after his 1948 fireworks—so what better way to convince the Dixiecrats that they really don't have to worry about civil rights than to have HUMPHREY himself put on sackcloth and ashes and pen an act of contrition to the white supremecists?

Although HUMPHREY'S epistle to the Dixiecrats is full of delicate phrasing and fragile hints, the sum total of the latter's meaning is that those who hold the Negro people in bondage in the South have nothing to fear from the man who made most of the noise at the 1948 convention.

HUMPHREY was born in Wallace, S. Dak., on May 27, 1911. He was educated in South Dakota public schools and was graduated with a degree from the Denver College of Pharmacy. He received his bachelor of arts degree at the University of Minnesota and his master's degree from Louisiana State. He worked as a pharmacist from 1933 until 1937.

Pills and marshmallow nut sundaes were not as exciting, however, as the sound of his own voice. He much preferred the political medicine shows which offered quick cures for all social ills. His favorite prescription soon became two parts of hot air, one part corn, and one part Dale Carnegie (How To Win Friends and Influence People). Stir well and administer in large and frequent doses.

Came Pearl Harbor and HUMPHREY was named State director of war production training and reemployment (WPA) and State chief of the Minnesota war-services program. In 1943 he was named assistant director of the War Manpower Commission in Minnesota and he taught political science at Macalaster College in 1943 and 1944.

It was of this premayor period that Time magazine (January 17, 1948) said:

"In his WPA job he printed and mailed out thousands of diplomas signed by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Jr. He joined everything in sight."

Time wasn't kidding. HUMPHREY'S plan for a personal success reads like that of Sinclair Lewis' character, George Babbitt. HUMPHREY is a member of any organization which can conceivably be of political assistance. Are you a trade-unionist? Well, Hubert of the golden voice is a member of the American Federation of Radio Artists. Are you an employer? He is a member of the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce. Are you a lodge member? He is a member of the Elks, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Masons, Moose, and the Sons of Norway. Are you a college fraternity man? He is a Delta Sigma Rho, besides wearing

the key of Phi Beta Kappa. Are you a member of a minority group? HUMPHREY holds memberships in the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the National Council for a Permanent FEPC, and the National Citizens' Council on Civil Rights. If it's foreign affairs you're interested in, Hubert's name is found on the rolls of the Foreign Policy Association, the National Committee for the Marshall Plan, and the United Nations Committee.

Among his other organizations are the First Congregational Church of Minnesota, American Academy of Political and Social Science, American Bible Society, American Municipal Association, American Pharmaceutical Association, American Political Science Association, American Public Administration Society, Boy Scouts of America (scoutmaster 5 years), Inland Waterways Corporation, Minnesota Welfare Conference, National Conference for Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, National Municipal League, National Public Housing Conference, Optimists, and the YMCA.

His political enemies have criticized HUMPHREY's draft record. His CONGRESSIONAL RECORD biography lists this entry: "Assigned as instructor United States Army Air Corps, Three Hundred and Forty-seventh Training Detachment." His opponents say this was a civilian assignment. Considerable research has failed to turn up any HUMPHREY denial.

The fact remains that the Republicans publicly accused HUMPHREY of avoiding the draft. They charged that Elmer Kelm, Federal collector of internal revenue in Minnesota, had written a letter to HUMPHREY's draft board asking that he be deferred. HUMPHREY at the time was involved in campaigning for the Democrats.

HUMPHREY's association with Elmer Kelm is said to have begun back around 1942 when the Kelm forces picked up Hustling HUBERT and began to give him the kind of political nourishment an ambitious youngster needs to make his way in the world. The flexibility of HUMPHREY's political convictions are not demonstrated better than in his embracing the Kelm and Congressman Elmer Ryan, an anti-Roosevelt Democrat, who was responsible for Kelm's appointment as Democratic State chairman.

Ryan organized an "all party" committee for Republican Stassen. His hatred for Roosevelt and the New Deal program is legendary. Ryan had the support of the General Mills crowd.

Kelm, a small-town banker, never associated himself with the Roosevelt cause until it became apparent that the anti-FDR forces in Minnesota had isolated themselves and lost their effectiveness. He was appointed collector of internal revenue by President Truman.

General Mills came into the picture again in 1944 and 1945. The time had come to give HUBERT the additional buildup he needed.

Wheaties took over.

HUMPHREY of the dulcet voice and gift of gab became a radio news commentator. It was quite an event. His sponsor? General Mills. The cereal monopoly had never sponsored such a program before HUMPHREY, nor did it sponsor one after HUMPHREY. He was their sole radio voice.

Wheaties and the program did the trick and HUMPHREY was elected mayor of Minneapolis in 1945. Lots of people where happy about the whole thing, especially "the breakfast of champions," the Northwest National Bank crowd, and the Cowles newspaper chain, the owners of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. The Cowles press in Minnesota has never attacked HUMPHREY. The Star and Tribune joined with the junior chamber of commerce to name HUMPHREY "the outstanding Minneapolitan of 1945 and man of the year in Minnesota and outstanding young man of the year in the State."

HUMPHREY effectively consolidated his support during his first term as mayor of "Cereal City." His was a masterful job of fence-building and expedient deals. He was yet to be exposed before the Nation's workers as their enemy. So he tailored for himself a flashy cloak of "labor" support. Wheaties and other industrial giants in Minnesota were unworried. They gave him even greater support when he ran for and won reelection in 1947.

Of his first term as mayor, Survey Graphic said:

"Most remarkable, perhaps, he had won the confidence of a large number of business and industrial leaders who had once been frankly suspicious of his labor backing."

The "volunteer committee" for the reelection of HUMPHREY included some very questionable "labor" backers, the president of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce, and such executives as Samuel C. Gale, vice president of General Mills; Alfred M. Wilson, vice president of the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co.; Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, Inc., and David J. Winton, lumber baron. The antilabor Cowles press went all out for HUMPHREY.

HUMPHREY's so-called labor support is worth mentioning here. His chief labor front man is Robert Wishart, who led a secession movement from the independent United Electrical Workers (UE) into Jim Carey's IUE. Wishart climbed fast in CIO circles, even becoming regional director. He is business agent of the Minneapolis-Honeywell Local 1145, IUE, and chairman of the Hennepin County CIO council. Oddly, Wishart is not too fond of Carey; he has told more than one politico in Minneapolis and St. Paul that he'd like to take his members into the AFL.

Wishart's brand of trade-unionism received considerable publicity in August of 1950 when the Minneapolis Star carried a feature story on Wishart's secret-police committee at Minneapolis-Honeywell. The committee was an official stool-pigeon outfit designed to help the company weed cut any workers who were too militant. The committee's method of operation were reminiscent of the infamous Burns and Pinkerton detective agencies. To quote the Star:

"They chatted casually with new employees. They took the newcomers to union meetings, drew them into discussions of union and political affairs, asked their views on various issues."

Describing the committee, the Star said:

"They are members of a special unit designed to detect, expose, and closely watch Communists and persons of lesser shades of red."

The person of a lesser shade of red is described by the Star as follows:

"He might merely comment on the terrible cost, in men and war goods, of the intervention in Korea, and follow that up talking about the impact of the Korean war on American domestic economy, and how the workingman is caught in the price-rise squeeze."

The luckless complainant, said the Star, was reported to the company and either fired, or prevented from working in certain departments.

Wishart's alliance with HUMPHREY provides an insight into Hubert's typical method of political operation. HUMPHREY is a past-master in the school of if-you've-got-a-hot-potato-to-handle-appoint-a-commission-or-a-stooge. According to the Associated Press in a dispatch dated January 31, 1947:

"He got swamped with complaints from city employees, members of an AFL union. So he put an AFL man on the civil service commission. A CIO union had organized city welfare workers. So Mayor HUMPHREY put a CIO man (Wishart) on the Minneapolis welfare board."

It is a matter of record that Wishart never gave HUMPHREY any trouble. Neither did the city welfare workers.

Typical of HUMPHREY's labor support, also, was a character named Pat Whalen. Whalen came out of the teamsters union of Chicago. He went to Minneapolis as an international representative for the building service employees. Whalen organized bowling alley pin setters, pin-ball machine collectors and salesmen.

He told Minneapolis employers that he was "always available to enforce a contract" and if his opposition was too big he'd use his "persuader," a pistol which he always carried to demonstrate the Whalen ideology of trade unionism.

Whalen became one of HUMPHREY's closest advisers. When Hubert ran for mayor, Whalen was treasurer of the "labor finance committee for HUMPHREY." He was chairman of the eleventh ward Democratic Farmer-Labor Party, the Minnesota version of the Democratic Party.

HUMPHREY's other main "liberal" support comes from the Americans for Democratic Action, of which Senator HUMPHREY is national vice president. ADA is the outfit which "didn't want Truman" in 1948 and pleaded with General Eisenhower to run for President.

The ADA has consistently allied itself with the chamber of commerce in Minneapolis on the political scene. The most noteworthy example of this was its support of HUMPHREY's "city charter reform." The charter "reform" advocated by HUMPHREY was to have a smaller city council and to give the mayor more power. The labor movement was almost unanimous against these reforms and had been given assurances before the election that HUMPHREY would not do anything contrary to "labor's interests." After the election he told organized labor to go peddle its papers and went ahead with his program backed by big business and the ADA. Twenty-four out of 26 councilmen opposed the plan.

Another Humphrey double-cross of labor was even more brazen. The word got around during HUMPHREY's first successful campaign for mayor that one Joseph Ryan, a cop notorious for his anti-labor record, was being considered for police chief. Labor queried HUMPHREY, urging him not to make such an obvious anti-union appointment. Hubert promised not to appoint Ryan. His first official act as mayor was the appointment of Ryan.

The Humphrey record is filled with incidents of opposition to or double-crossing of labor. And it is consistently evasive on issues in which Minnesota unions have been interested. It is difficult to find a single occasion when HUMPHREY, without reservations, allied himself with trade unionists against the employers.

Labor and other forces in Minneapolis made some insistent demands for action to relieve the city's acute postwar housing shortage. Real-estate interests and the industrial taxpayers were against a housing program. The issue grew hot with the return of war veterans who could find no places to live. HUMPHREY appointed a commission, and the nature of the commission was such that its deliberations were doomed to failure from the very beginning. The AFL and CIO were represented, but so were the landlords, the realtors, big business, etc. And upon appointing the commission, HUMPHREY demanded that all decisions be unanimous.

The commission labored, agreeing on practically nothing. It drafted a weak-kneed report and HUMPHREY took to the air. His speech had one point. Minneapolitans with large homes would please rent out rooms to returning GI's. This ended the housing program of Mayor HUMPHREY and nothing else happened on the subject after that.

Another example of HUMPHREY's devious dealing with labor was his attitude toward the candidacy of Congressman ROY W. WIER, who represents Minnesota's Third District in the House. WIER is a trade-unionist, an AFL stagehand, who has been active in Minneapolis' labor movement since 1920. He was the representative of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Minneapolis. AFL members in Minneapolis complain that HUMPHREY took a typical "hands off" policy attitude toward WIER's candidacy in 1948 and there are some trade-unionists who'll tell you that HUMPHREY didn't want WIER elected. At any rate, WIER was not looked upon with favor by HUMPHREY's political backers, including General Mills and other industrialists.

HUMPHREY gave labor another double-cross when he nominated and supported Edward McKeever, attorney for the big lumber companies, as State chairman of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. McKeever's record was anti-labor, anti-Roosevelt, anti-Floyd B. Olson and anti-Elmer Benson. He was a Stassen supporter.

Humphrey forces in the State also went to bat for the chamber of commerce in 1946 when they opposed a labor-endorsed slate of candidates for the school board. On another occasion, these same forces unsuccessfully supported a payroll tax proposal which would have shifted the tax burden to wage earners and small-business men.

Insofar as labor has been concerned, HUMPHREY always has played the role of a confidence man. In retrospect it can be seen quite clearly that HUMPHREY never really was a friend of labor, but was successful in "fooling some of the people some of the time."

In 1944, when it was expedient for supporters of President Roosevelt to merge the Farmer-Labor and Democratic Parties in Minnesota, HUMPHREY was assigned to help effect the consolidation. HUMPHREY and his political mentors saw a chance to do a hatchet job on the Farmer-Labor forces.

HUMPHREY and others called the CIO-PAC representative to their traditionally smoke-filled hotel room in Minneapolis and "ordered" him not to bring "his people" to the Democratic State convention.

Unbeknownst to the White House, HUMPHREY and his political backers were seriously endangering the merger out of a desire to weaken the Farmer-Laborites and progressive forces in both parties. They stalled and a legal deadline for the filing of proper party documents was only hours away.

Labor forces inside the Democratic convention called in Oscar Ewing, of the Federal Security Administration, who was on a speaking tour in the South. Ewing flew to Minneapolis and cracked the whip over HUMPHREY and others, making it clear that F. D. R. wanted the merger and unity of Farmer-Laborites and Democrats because he felt that Minnesota was a key State in the elections and that he would carry Minnesota only with a unified campaign. The merger was approved with 25 minutes to spare. Only labor's intervention had saved the day for F. D. R.

Whether political enemy or the little man who wasn't there is responsible never will be known, but they are still wondering in Minnesota about the newspaper accounts of an assassination attempt against HUMPHREY.

The Minneapolis papers of March 18, 1947, carried a story about three shots having been fired at the mayor as he entered his home on the night of February 6, more than a month before. He said he didn't know who did it. His wife heard the shots. No neighbors had heard the shots. No signs of bullets were found. Asked why he didn't make the incident public earlier, HUMPHREY said modestly: "I don't want to talk about it."

HUMPHREY's record in Washington is that of an ambitious man who would rather be President than right. His voting record is very carefully planned. Sometimes his vote is at variance with his deeds off the Senate floor. His present campaign to worsen the Taft-Hartley law through amendments is typical. His voting record shows he voted right on Taft-Hartley and subsequent amendments. But his actions since then in trying to "strengthen" the law reveal him as an enemy of labor.

The procedure is reversed on issues affecting the Negro people. He talks a good game, but his voting record on Negro rights is one of the worst in the Senate. He voted against an amendment to prohibit discrimination in public housing. He voted wrong on an amendment to prohibit segregation in education. He voted wrong on prohibiting segregation in the Army.

Notorious among his "wrong" votes was his vote on the McCarran Act. He also helped sponsor a measure for concentration camps.

HUMPHREY was the first of the so-called Fair Dealers to repudiate the health insurance program. From a farm State, he has withheld his support of the Brannan plan, designed to help small farmers.

At the same time that he was demanding legislation to make the Taft-Hartley law tougher for labor unions, HUMPHREY appeared in Minnesota's iron range to address a group of miners. In that speech he called the Taft-Hartley Act discriminatory and attacked it valiantly.

His double-talking on hot political issues also was demonstrated when he was interviewed by Protestant churchmen on the Truman proposal to name an Ambassador to the Vatican. HUMPHREY's answer was a masterpiece in equivocation. He said in effect: "At the moment I am against naming such an envoy, but if upon my return to Washington I learn some compelling reasons to appoint the Ambassador I may change my position."

Another cute HUMPHREY stunt was to lay low on civil-rights legislation until Congress adjourned. Then as a parting shot, while embarking for Europe, he made a strong pitch for a civil-rights measure.

Sometimes the HUMPHREY method of operation is even more devious and sleight-of-hand. He introduced an antilynch bill, then hit the papers and the wire services with a challenge to the southern poll taxers to oppose the bill. He obviously had no intention of winning support with such belligerent tactics. And he failed to do any of the things necessary for a Senator to get a bill passed.

And just in case there were fighters for Negro rights who were pleased with HUMPHREY's introduction of the antilynch bill, their respect for the Minnesotan took a nose dive last month when HUMPHREY's protégé, United States Ambassador to Denmark Eugenia Anderson commented at a press conference that shooting and bombing Negroes was not lynching: "Lynching is where a person is hanged by a mob." Mrs. Anderson, who got her appointment through her friendship with HUMPHREY, tried to cover up about conditions in Dixie by boasting that there was "only one lynching" in 1951.

HUMPHREY is one of the loudest exponents of a third world war. He has voted for every single measure to further the war hysteria and to silence opposition to the whole war economy and program of militarism. The HUMPHREY who was saved from the draft in World War II is now working feverishly to send other mothers' sons to battle. He is carrying the ball for a new big-business assault against the labor movement—potentially the greatest force for peace and democracy. This time, however, he may have stepped too far—even for a political tightrope walker like HUMPHREY.

The Minneapolis Tribune said last May that "HUMPHREY's still close to the leadership of the CIO, too—so much so that some critics charge him with being a CIO errand boy in Congress."

There is no doubt that CIO Secretary-Treasurer Jim Carey is one of those responsible for HUMPHREY's publishing as a Senate document the CIO executive board report against Mine-Mill, and other unions. But apparently Philip Murray thinks things have gone too far. Murray has written HUMPHREY "that if the Government undertakes to determine what unions can represent the workers in this country it will have embarked upon the long trail toward Government control of unions."

Carey and other labor misleaders may hope to use the Humphrey "investigation" of certain unions as a new springboard for raiding, but they will have to be reminded of what mine-mill's international executive board had to say when it warned that the Humphrey investigation is fraught with danger for all labor."

One thing is certain, however—the big-business backers of HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY are lining up at the pay window. Hubert has run the gamut. His ambition affects him like a drug. He is an addict of his own opportunism. It was almost embarrassing to watch him operate in getting his name on the Minnesota primary ballot as favorite-son candidate for President. Perhaps Harry Truman believes his sincerity about wanting to hold the primary line for the President. Perhaps that was one of HUMPHREY's motives in having his candidacy announced. But there are too many signposts on HUMPHREY's road to the top that convince many Minnesotans that running as a favorite son in 1952 is just another HUMPHREY tactic, with 1956 shaping up as his real goal.

In the process of defeating HUMPHREY's attack on the labor unions, American workers will help place a political embargo on fuel for Hubert's rocket ship. That will be good for labor, and good for America. The man is dangerous.

Time magazine once quoted one of Hubert's political lieutenants as saying:

"The trouble with HUMPHREY is he never takes time out. He's never alone with himself. If the guy would only sit down with himself and say, 'What am I all about?' But he's afraid to ask himself that question."

It is to be hoped that the American workers will give HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY enough "time out" to ask himself that question.

[From the New York Daily Worker of February 19, 1952]

HUMPHREY'S REAL BACKERS

The real forces back of "liberal" Minnesota Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY's move for more legislation to thought-control unions, is the National Association of Manufacturers and such notorious enemies of labor as L. R. Boulware, General Electric's vice president in charge of labor relations.

William H. Ruffin, NAM president, told the Humphrey subcommittee that the Taft-Hartley Act and its affidavit do not go far enough to purge union militancy to suit him. Ruffin, owner of a large southern textile plant, has had some personal distinction in the employers' campaign to wipe out the conservatively led textile union in the South.

Boulware, in his statement, was even more specific. He wants the institution of a purge list of organizations in labor designed to eliminate militant progressives not only as officers of unions, but as well "from any vantage points" from which they can have an "influence over others."

It is equally interesting that both AFL President William Green and CIO President Philip Murray, acting on behalf of their organizations, declared flat opposition to any more legislation giving the Government a right to thought control and otherwise interfere in the affairs of labor unions. These

labor leaders can hardly be taken as conciliatory to Communists even by men like Ruffin and Boulware. But they recognize that the intrusion of Government in the affairs of unions under the guise of "purifying" them of "Communist influences" has now reached the point that the independence of unions is seriously impaired.

It may seem ironic that HUMPHREY, who rode into the Senate mainly with the support of the CIO and AFL, while the Boulwares and Ruffins called him a "radical," should sponsor legislation to out-Taft Taft-Hartley. But it isn't surprising to those who know that Red baiting is a sign of a reactionary, no matter how well he advertises himself as a "liberal." And for a demagogue, Humphrey has few equals.

Basically, back of the expressions of Green and Murray is the growing realization even on their part that Americans in general, and trade-unionists in particular, are sick of Red baiting and that it is not popular these days to ask for more Red baiting antilabor legislation.

[From the New York Daily Worker of March 21, 1952]

THE GOVERNMENT WANTS TO RUN YOUR UNION

The organized trade-unions of the United States of America—all of them—are becoming one of the main targets of the so-called drive on communism.

The latest move by a top Truman appointee, Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, shows what is going on.

Tobin wants Congress to outlaw Communist-dominated unions as bargaining agents for the workers in any plant, office, or shop.

It makes no difference if the workers in these shops have elected these unions. It makes no difference if the workers in these shops support and back these unions and their policies. A Truman Cabinet officer wants Congress to move in to decide just which unions are approved by the Government, Congress, and the employers. The workers' choice for a union is therefore to be limited even further than the Taft-Hartley law limits them now.

The drive to push congressional-FBI control still further into the ranks of the trade-unions is being sparked by the phoney "liberal" Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat of Minnesota) along with Truman's man, Tobin.

The reason they frankly give is that the Taft-Hartley law has not succeeded in smashing up the progressive unions. There has been plenty of screaming in the press, and the fingering of officials and members by Congress-hired stool pigeons in the Un-American Committee, the McCarran committee, and various subcommittees like the House Labor Committee.

But the workers have continued to elect their trusted leaders who have been the victims of stoolie fingering.

The CIO's expulsion of these progressive-led unions has not succeeded in breaking them up; the workers have judged them by their deeds, not by hysterical Red baiting.

There, the anti-Communist attacks on the union membership is being shoved up another notch. To make sure that the trade-unions shall be robbed of their right to choose own officers, and decide their own policies in accord with their interests, the Truman forces are putting new and sharper teeth into the Taft-Hartley Act they were once pledged to oppose.

That is why the labor-hating McCarran committee has just cited Abram Flaxer of the United Public Workers for contempt because he refused to turn membership lists over to this labor-hating group.

Membership lists. This would pave the way for blacklists, newspaper, and stoolie fingering and intimidation on a scale not seen since the days of the yellow-dog contracts and the public blacklist.

The circle is being closed.

The same MCCARRAN who is now holding hearings to get the membership of the Communist Party to register is moving into the trade-unions with the demand for registration of their membership lists.

The same thought control of the Smith Act—under which Communists are in jail and many more are being tried is now being moved further into the trade-unions.

First, the political ideas of the Communist movement are falsely branded as a conspiracy. Now, the ideas of the trade-unions and their leaders must be tested and approved by an employer-dominated Congress or also be outlawed.

Communist dominated? What is this, anyway? It can be anything the employers or the warmongers don't like. Trade-union officials like Reuther who are opening the gates to this invasion imperil the whole labor movement.

Secretary Tobin himself gives it away. He implies that in normal times it is O. K. for unions to have the right to decide their own policies and choose their own leaders. But these are "not normal times" he says. With this alibi—whipped up by the warmongers to justify their destruction of the Constitution—they want to rob the unions of the right to demand higher wages, the right to strike, the right to resist speed-up, etc.

All unions are in danger, whether they are right, left, or center.

They are in danger simply as trade-unions defending the economic interests of the American workers. Anticommunism is the smokescreen behind which the enemies of labor are creeping up against the unions.

Everyday makes it clear why it is of vital interest for the trade-unions to help defeat the Smith Act frame-ups and help repeal all these anti-Communist conspiracies against labor embodied in the Taft-Hartley, and Smith and McCarran Acts. The Tobin proposal must be stopped dead in its tracks by an aroused labor movement.

[From the ACA News for March 1952]

HUMPHREY RIDES AGAIN—A NEW THREAT TO LABOR

As Senator HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, self-proclaimed liberal, banged the gavel to open the latest in a long series of Red-smearing investigations of militant unions on March 17, evidence mounted that the hearings will open the door to even more repressive laws than the present Taft-Hartley slave-labor act.

Though HUMPHREY'S recent efforts were apparently conceived in collaboration with certain labor "statesmen" who hoped to use a new drive against so-called Reds in the labor movement to help their raiding attempts, indications now are that they are beginning to worry over the fact that they may have raised a Frankenstein which could consume all unions.

SEE LABOR FRONT

In answer to a questionnaire sent out by HUMPHREY to determine attitudes toward proposals to strengthen anti-Communist provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, CIO President Philip Murray replied: "We believe that if the Government undertakes to determine what unions can represent workers in this country, it will have embarked upon the long trail toward Government control of unions."

American Federation of Labor opposition was expressed by Secretary-Treasurer George Meany, who said further legislation would be of no help. Instead, he said, "It would be most helpful if the Taft-Hartley Act were repealed by Congress."

BOSSES APPROVE

Spokesmen for the Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, on the other hand, strongly seconded the proposals of "labor's friend," the junior Senator from Minnesota.

A look into HUMPHREY'S background reveals that he has virtually made his career out of posing as a friend of labor, only to double-cross labor when his immediate purposes were achieved.

With the support of organized labor, HUMPHREY successfully ran for mayor of Minneapolis. Commenting on his first term as mayor, the conservative magazine, Survey Graphic, said: "Most remarkable, perhaps, he had won the confidence of a large number of business and industrial leaders who had once been frankly suspicious of his labor backing."

Perhaps HUMPHREY'S double-cross of labor in the matter of the appointment of a police chief helped convince the moguls that he was really their boy. During HUMPHREY'S election campaign he had promised union leaders that he would not appoint one Joseph Ryan, a cop notorious for his antilabor record, as police chief. His first official act as mayor was the appointment of Ryan.

Usually careful to build up his reputation as a liberal, HUMPHREY is sometimes compelled to show where he really stands. For example, he was the first of the so-called fair dealers to repudiate the health insurance program.

He talks a good game on civil rights, but his voting record on Negro rights is one of the worst in the Senate. He voted against an amendment to prohibit discrimination in public housing. He voted wrong on an amendment to prohibit segregation in education. He voted wrong on prohibiting segregation in the Armed Forces.

Notorious among his "wrong" votes was his vote on the McCarran Act, which was universally condemned by organized labor. He also helped sponsor a measure for concentration camps.

Back in 1948, Joseph Driscoll, writing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, summed up the HUMPHREY potential:

"Friendly critics say that HUMPHREY is a rabble-rouser and a demagog. Their dread is that he might become enthralled by the piping of his own flute and some day, if things get tough all over, and if he thinks he's hearing the people crying for a leader, he might lend his wondrous voice in the wrong direction. They can only mention that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in his quest for popularity and votes, will go to extremes."

As the Humphrey subcommittee witch-hunt opened in Washington last week, organized labor of varying views was worrying about the deadly accuracy of Driscoll's description. New and grave dangers to labor were clear on the horizon.

[From the Dispatcher of March 28, 1952]

ON THE BEAM

(By Harry Bridges)

Almost a year ago in this column and at the longshore caucus in Longview, January 1950, I made mention of a couple of matters that developments since that time have shown to be only too true.

I had recalled, through this column, a talk I had in the fall of 1945 with Lee Pressman, then general counsel for national CIO. Pressman told me, as a result of an interview he and Philip Murray had had with Truman, the domestic and foreign policies of FDR were going to be dumped and instead a program was going to be adopted by Truman and his political aides and administration of blaming everything wrong in the country and in the world on communism and Communists.

The story sounded too far-fetched at the time, and I paid little attention to it, but recently Truman has published a book entitled "Mr. President," which confirms the

fact that as far back as the latter part of 1945, just a few months after he had taken office upon F. D. R.'s death, he decided to scrap the idea of Big Three unity and the one-world program of Roosevelt and Willkie for a program that would divide the world into the two parts we have today.

It was in December of 1945 that Truman called for drastic anti-labor legislation, and a little later called for the drafting of strikers into the Army, steps which even Philip Murray labeled as the first steps toward a Fascist America.

Since that time, we have had a whole flood of antilabor and antipeople legislation, not only the passage of Taft-Hartley, but the McCarran Act, indictments under the Smith Act, and the establishment of concentration camps by Truman's Attorney General.

That this was all a deliberately planned and long-range program is easily perceived by reading Truman's own book, "Mr. President," in which, incidentally, he has the gall to picture himself as the perfect man who never makes a mistake.

At the Longview caucus in January 1950, I made mention of the fact that the present administration had in mind a plan to outlaw unions that refuse to support the politicians in power—not only support their domestic and foreign policies, but also endorse and support their election campaigns.

In the past few days, we have witnessed one favorite son of the Truman administration, Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, conducting a Senate hearing for the express purpose of outlawing labor unions, especially one like ILWU that stands firmly on its right of economic and political autonomy and independence, unless such unions get in line with the politicians, including those politicians whom recent investigations have shown to be about the most corrupt in the history of the Nation.

Another spokesman for Truman, Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, appeared before HUMPHREY'S committee and urged the committee to recommend that Congress pass a law that would forbid employers to deal with any union that the politicians, through control of a Government agency, such as the NLRB, might classify as Communist dominated.

This is a proposal direct from such characters as Almon P. Roth, former head of the Waterfront Employers Association, the architect of the waterfront lock-out technique that used to be practiced, and the guy that constantly says that what the country needs to deal with labor is a few big unsuccessful strikes. It is also the spelled-out program of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

So here we have the whole deal coming out in the open. Just as we were able to predict as far back as January 1950 two leading spokesmen for Truman and his corrupt political gang called for a penalty on employers that deal with unions that refuse to support the corrupt politicians.

Nothing as raw as this has even been proposed in the United States, even during the many antilabor Republican administrations of the past. And this should be the final proof that there is no essential difference between the two major political parties.

"Mr. Republican" TAFT wrote the Taft-Hartley Act which "Mr. Democrat" Truman enforces in spite of his objections to it. "Mr. Democrat" MCCARRAN wrote the McCarran Act, which the Democratic administration intends to enforce with concentration camps for any American with the guts to stand up and say he doesn't like what's going on.

We take no credit for predicting things like this, long before they happen. And if you read Mr. Truman's so-called book, you will see exactly how he started to betray the ideals of FDR, almost before his body was cold.

Oh, no, it's not that we have any crystal ball so that we can look into the future. All that is needed is a little good trade-union common sense and a knowledge that the first thing every politician thinks of is his own welfare and his own security. Let's remember it when they come around this political year, looking for the votes of our membership.

[From the UE News, of March 31, 1952]

GE PROPOSES GOVERNMENT SYSTEM TO BAN UNIONS

WASHINGTON.—The General Electric Co. has just submitted to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, the corporation's plan for depriving working people of the right to choose and operate their own unions.

The company's proposals were sent to the United States Senate subcommittee, which HUMPHREY heads, by request of the Senator, who has been soliciting the opinions of corporations and professional labor haters on the best procedure for setting up a Nazi-model labor front in the United States.

HUMPHREY'S ambition in this matter was outlined in his now-notorious interview in the big-business magazine, U. S. News and World Report, in which industry's program for outlawing unions, either by legislation or by dictate of the administration was clearly foreshadowed. It has since been revealed that specific plans to achieve this were laid at a meeting between a representative of HUMPHREY'S subcommittee and representatives of the National Industrial Conference Board in Chicago in November.

Legislation to accomplish what HUMPHREY and the industrialists have in mind has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator MCCARRAN of Nevada.

WHAT GE WANTS

The General Electric Co's. proposal for outlawing unions is:

1. That a Government "commission" should be set up in Washington with the power to "designate" any union it chooses as "communist-dominated" and therefore subject to outlawry by Government order.

2. That the "commission" should be empowered to order the membership of the union to take "affirmative action" to get back into the commission's good graces.

3. If the union refused to do as the commission ordered, the union should be stripped of bargaining rights and put out of operation.

Various other means of accomplishing the same objective of bringing the labor movement under the direct political control of the Government for the benefit of the employers were suggested by various administration witnesses during 3 days of hearings before HUMPHREY in Washington.

Among those appearing were Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, Paul M. Herzog, chairman of the Taft-Hartley board; John D. Small, Chairman of Munitions Board; Thomas Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, and General Counsel Bott of the Taft-Hartley board.

Tobin dropped the administration pretense of opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and advised HUMPHREY to make it worse, making it an unfair labor practice for a company to deal with a union that the Government did not like.

Tobin acknowledged that his recommendation would hit all organized labor, admitting, "Any new legislation amending the National Labor Relations Act along the lines of this proposal, might in practice have the effect of unduly hampering the activities of loyal unions."

Tobin talked about political strikes, citing the North American strike of 1941 conducted by the UAW-CIO, as an example of disloyalty. He said that strikes with good trade-union objectives might also come under his loyalty ban.

It was noticeable that Munitions Board Chairman Small, while agreeing with the general objective of HUMPHREY and the rest, showed by his own testimony that there is no basis for their pretended fears. Small showed that there have been no cases of sabotage or political strikes in defense industry and described the innumerable precautions and screening processes that are already in use in defense plants.

OUT TO CONTROL LABOR

The HUMPHREY hearings have already made it plain that under pretext of fear of subversion and sabotage, industry and the politicians hope to seize full control over the labor movement by setting up an outside agency to dictate program, policies, and leadership to the labor movement.

This program, although aimed in the first instance against the most progressive and democratic unions in the labor movement, such as UE, nevertheless threatens all unions, UE has pointed out. Once it is established that Government can set up lists of outlawed and officially-approved unions, any union desiring to maintain its status on the approved list must conform in policy and program to the rules that the politicians and employers establish.

[From the New York Daily Worker, of March 26, 1952]

THE DOUBLE GAME OF THE CIO HEADS AND HUMPHREY

(By George Morris)

Some weeks ago, both the CIO and AFL informed a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, that they are opposed to any new legislation that is ostensibly aimed at communism in the unions. The "liberal" Senator, who is conducting one-man hearings, ignored their views, however, and proceeded to put a parade of business, military, and Government spokesmen on the stand in support of measures for a super Taft-Hartley law.

The last issue of CIO News, however, carries an editorial entitled "Worthwhile Probe," lauding HUMPHREY as a "liberal," and his hearings a "valuable service." A reminder in the editorial that Murray in a letter told HUMPHREY the CIO wants no further legislation to strengthen the Taft-Hartley law makes little difference. The point is that HUMPHREY is holding these hearings to put through a measure giving the Government new and unprecedented police powers over unions. The CIO News editorial reveals a double game; on the one hand the top leaders put themselves on the record with the members as opposed to the proposed legislation; on the other, the moves taken by HUMPHREY, Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, war mobilization heads, and other stooges of the NAM and Chamber of Commerce, are lauded as "valuable service."

The specific law HUMPHREY wants, first proposed by the Chamber of Commerce, would not permit any of the unions expelled by the CIO to qualify for NLRB elections and collective bargaining under any circumstances. The CIO leaders, who have spent millions of dollars in their futile effort to smash these unions, are apparently also in favor of the proposed legislation, but they cannot be openly in favor of it. They cannot openly admit that for factional, union-busting purposes they are willing to go so far as to put unions—all of them—under the thumb of the Department of Justice and the FBI.

Little wonder, then, that the new report of the United States Chamber of Commerce Committee on Communism outlining a blueprint for fascism in America gloats over the way CIO leaders have come along in recent years, and writes:

"Only a few years ago, it was considered bad manners to attack Communists in the CIO. Now that the shoe is on the other foot, tactics have changed considerably. Not

only is the CIO using the Communist issue to the hilt in its raiding campaigns, but its leaders have attacked industry for not turning over Red locals on silver platters."

The latter apparently refers to the time when James B. Carey propositioned General Electric's vice president in charge of labor relations for a deal. The latest example to justify the Chamber of Commerce boast was Walter Reuther's collusive game with the House Un-American Committee on the plot to seize Ford Local 600.

This takes place despite convention resolutions of the CIO, and the respective unions involved, calling for the abolition of the un-American. It's the same double-game pattern.

Factionalism and a passionate desire to smash the unions they expelled is the sole guide of the CIO leaders. It seems that even the sincere people among them don't see that they are cutting their own right-wing throats, too. They occasionally raise the cry against what they call McCarthyism. But at the same time they hate to admit that McCarthyism is the strategy of big business and fascism of shifting the "Red scare" against the very labor leaders who fan it against the left.

In this connection, the New York Post last week ran an interesting item reviewing an Author Meets the Critic TV program in which Senator MCCARTHY, as author of American Retreat From Victory, faced his critic, Leo Cherne, executive-secretary of the American Research Institute. Cherne, as our readers may recall, first gained prominence in the Red-baiting racket when his outfit produced a manual for employers on How To Deal With Communist Unions. He has been a prominent speaker at business conventions, being recognized as an "anti-red expert."

After reporting on the argument between Cherne and MCCARTHY the Post concludes:

"At the close of the program, Benjamin Friedman, an admirer of the Grand Mufti and a McCarthy camp follower, walked over to Cherne and advised him to 'go back to Russia'."

[From the March of Labor for April 1952]

SENATOR HUMBUG

(By Graham Dolan)

Webster's Collegiate Dictionary defines a demagog as a speaker who seeks to make capital out of social discontent and gain political influence. You could search a long time before finding a more fitting description of HUBERT HORATIO HUMPHREY, Democrat, United States Senator from Minnesota.

There is considerable speculation in Minnesota as to where and when Senator HUMPHREY became expert in the fundamentals of demagogy.

Some voters believe he was inspired by the success of Huey Long, when he studied for his master's degree at Louisiana State University, the late Kingfish's temple of Southern bourbonism and pot-likker culture. They cite HUMPHREY's clever infringement upon the Long patent for talking big and doing little.

Other Minnesotans, however, will tell you that HUMPHREY hasn't needed inspiration from any source save his own ambition. He is, they insist, a clever politician in his own right who has a burning desire to live in the White House.

Shortly after HUMPHREY's election to the Senate, Reporter Joseph Driscoll wrote in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch: "Friendly critics say that HUMPHREY is a rabble rouser and a demagogue. Their dread is that he might become enthralled by the piping of his own flute and some day, if things get tough all over, and if he thinks he's hearing the people crying for a leader, he might lend his wondrous voice in the wrong direction. They can only mention that HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, in his quest for popularity and votes, will go to extremes."

There are a great many people who are not enthralled by HUMPHREY's flute. These are the workers and dirt farmers, who were schooled in practical people's politics during the Farmer-Labor Party successes of the State's two greatest governors, Elmer Benson and the late Floyd B. Olson. They sent men like John T. Bernard, now an organizer for the United Electrical Workers (UE), to Congress.

While HUMPHREY has cloaked himself in a toga of liberalism, the masquerade is not so effective in Minnesota, where they know him. Once you get into HUMPHREY's own back yard, you find too many skeletons buried there.

HUMPHREY, elected to the Senate as a liberal, is now hell-bent on amending the Taft-Hartley Act. He proposes a tougher law which would deny bargaining rights to unions representing hundreds of thousands of workers. He proposes this on the grounds that the unions expelled by CIO leaders are Communist-dominated. Even HUMPHREY's liquid oratory can't make his present-day statements sound any different than the dry, deadly voice of TAFT.

The "liberal" HUMPHREY is exposed as just another Wall Street tool when you shovel aside the oratory and get a peek at his record.

Minnesotans will quietly discuss three phases of HUMPHREY's political career and let you draw your own conclusions. First they tell about HUMPHREY's political backers; then they examine his record on labor and civil rights. When they are through, you get back to Webster again and his definition of a demagog.

HUMPHREY's main political support comes from General Mills, the Morgan-controlled manufacturer of Wheaties, Cheerios, Kix, Gold Medal flour, and other cereal products. General Mills is woven like a thread all through the fabric of HUMPHREY's political career.

WHEATIES' MAN

In was General Mills that first shot him into prominence with a radio program on which "Hustling" Hubert was the commentator. This program was credited as the most important factor in HUMPHREY's first election as mayor of Minneapolis in 1945.

The Wheaties influence on HUMPHREY is said to have begun around 1942, when Hubert was picked up by the political forces of Elmer Kelm, then Democratic State chairman and now regional collector of internal revenue, appointed by President Truman.

Kelm was picked as State chairman by a General Mills mouthpiece in Congress, Representative Ryan, anti-Roosevelt, antilabor, anti-Olson, anti-Benson. Ryan once organized an "all party" committee for Republican Harold Stassen.

The "volunteer committee" for the reelection of HUMPHREY as mayor in 1947 included such questionable "labor" backers as the president of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce; Vice President Samuel C. Gale, of General Mills; Vice President Alfred M. Wilson of the Minneapolis-Honeywell Co.; Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, Inc.; and David J. Winton, lumber king. The anti-labor Cowles press, publishers of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, has consistently supported HUMPHREY.

CAREY'S FOR HIM

HUMPHREY's chief "labor" support has come from Robert Wishart, top CIO man in the Twin Cities, who is business agent of Minneapolis-Honeywell Local 1145 of Jim Carey's IUE and chairman of the Hennepin County CIO Council.

The Minneapolis Star exposed Wishart's brand of unionism in a feature story in August 1950. It reported that Wishart had organized an official union committee to spy on Minneapolis-Honeywell workers.

Of the committee, the Star said: "They are members of a special unit designed to detect, expose, and closely watch Communists and persons of lesser shades of red."

As to the kind of worker spied upon, the paper said: "He might merely comment on the terrible cost in men and war goods, of the intervention in Korea. * * *"

On the AFL side, HUMPHREY had a close political adviser in Pat Whalen, representative of the building service employees, who boasted he carried a pistol in case his opposition got too big. He told employers he was "always available to enforce a contract."

Americans for Democratic Action, of which HUMPHREY is national vice president, completes the main body of his support. In Minnesota, ADA has consistently supported the chamber of commerce on political issues.

HUMPHREY has a long record of double-crossing labor, or double-talking to trade unionists. Some of the high spots:

He double-crossed labor on housing demands when he appointed a commission to "investigate," and then tied its hands by demanding unanimous conclusions. HUMPHREY's housing program turned out to be a plea to owners of large mansions to rent rooms.

He promised not to appoint Joe Ryan, antiunion cop, as chief of police. His first official act as mayor was to appoint Ryan.

He took a hands-off attitude in the election of Congressman ROY W. WIER, AFL leader. Many AFL'ers have never forgiven him for this.

He supported Edward McKeever, anti-Roosevelt attorney for the big lumber companies, as State chairman of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party. Labor was opposed to McKeever.

The Humphrey forces opposed a labor-supported ticket for the school board.

He tried to bar labor delegates from attending the Democratic State Convention in 1944.

He supported certain city charter changes, opposed by labor, to strengthen his own powers as mayor.

He has supported the McCarran Act and concentration camps.

LOW ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HUMPHREY made political hay at the 1948 Democratic Convention with a rousing speech on civil rights. But a few months later Pathfinder magazine could assure its reactionary readers that "Senator HUMPHREY will lie low on civil-rights legislation."

Now HUMPHREY has written to hundreds of southern editors, assuring them he has "deep respect for the traditions of the South." His letter made it clear that the Democratic administration considers Dixiecrat support a far worthier goal than Negro rights.

As Senator, HUMPHREY voted against an amendment to prohibit discrimination in public housing. He voted wrong on an amendment to prohibit segregation in education. He voted wrong on prohibiting segregation in the Army.

TALKS BIG, DOES NOTHING

Another cute HUMPHREY trick was to do nothing on civil rights until Congress adjourned. Then, as he embarked for Europe, he "demanded" civil-rights legislation. On another occasion, he introduced an antilynch bill, then assured its defeat by "daring" the poll-taxers to oppose it.

Recently HUMPHREY's protege, United States Ambassador to Denmark Eugenia Anderson, of Minnesota, told reporters that shooting and bombing Negroes should not be considered lynching: "Lynching is where a person is hanged by a mob."

It is hard to see how HUMPHREY could ever have been considered a friend of labor. The Minneapolis Tribune has said that he is

"still close to the leadership of the CIO; so much so that some critics charge him with being a CIO errand boy in Congress."

But apparently Philip Murray thinks things have gone a little too far when a CIO-supported candidate proposes to strengthen the Taft-Hartley Act for the employers. Murray has written HUMPHREY that "if the Government undertakes to determine what unions can represent the workers in this country, it will have embarked upon the long trail toward Government control of unions."

AFL leaders have spoken out in a similar vein.

It looks as though labor is going to have to cut HUMPHREY's political career short. He's only 42 now. Most of his adult years have been spent in a mad scramble to the top of the political heap. The friendly critics who hinted that HUMPHREY might lend his voice in a Fascist direction and go to extremes can see it happening now.

[From the UE News of April 28, 1952]

ON CAPITOL HILL

(By Russ Nixon)

Hearings on bills to set up a permanent FEPC have begun in a Senate Labor Subcommittee. Will this be just another phony political gesture, or will a real fight for FEPC be put up in Congress? The signs aren't too encouraging.

This Senate subcommittee headed by HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, has had FEPC bills awaiting its attention since S. 551 was introduced by Senator IVES, Republican of New York, on January 15, 1951. Why did HUMPHREY wait 15 months before even starting hearings on FEPC? Why were hearings delayed until toward the very end of the congressional session? Why no hearings even until election time, 1952?

This question of ending Jim Crow discrimination in jobs has been kicked around from pillar to post for many years. Both the Republican and the Democratic Parties pledged FEPC both in 1944 and 1948. Nothing resulted.

The 25 percent of the United States Congress from the South all go big for racial discrimination. They believe in white supremacy, just like Hitler preached Aryan supremacy. This includes not just extremists like RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, but the entire solid southern bloc upon which the Democratic leadership of Congress is based.

But how come 25 percent of the Congress can constantly defeat the (alleged) will of the 75 percent? Only by tricks, sell-outs, and double-talk by the 75 percent.

The northern Republicans use their combination with the southerners to pass the Taft-Hartley Act, limit social security, stop public housing, etc. They pay off by selling out FEPC. When Republicans controlled Congress in 1947 and 1948, FEPC didn't even get on the floor.

The northern Democrats use their combination with the southerners to have a Democratic majority in Congress pass partisan measures and control patronage. They pay off by selling out FEPC, too.

Behind these bipartisan sell-outs killing fair employment practices, there is the dollar sign. Somebody makes money out of job discrimination. It helps maintain low wages and keeps workers disunited—that leads to more profits. It helps keep 13 Southern States as undemocratic, open-shop, sweatshop areas—sending antilabor Congressmen and Senators to Washington and undercutting union wages and working conditions in the North. That helps boost profits.

The fight for FEPC is a fight against an evil practice that hurts all workers, whether white or colored. The sell-outs of the double-talking, double-dealing politicians on FEPC can be stopped by the people. The drive of UE; the National Negro Labor Council and other groups for 1,000,000 signatures demanding FEPC now is a real weapon in the fight to give meaning to democracy for all Americans.

[From the Progressive Party release of May 9, 1952]

Denouncing Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, for his demagogic maneuvers which demonstrated the Democratic Party's lack of genuine concern for civil-rights legislation for the Negro people, C. B. Baldwin, secretary of the Progressive Party, in an open letter to the Senator demanded the reopening of the Senate Labor Subcommittee hearings on FEPC, in order to mobolize support. In his letter to the Senator, Mr. Baldwin stated that "the Senator had deliberately refused to hear spokesmen of the Progressive Party on the bill for an FEPC as part of his empty maneuvers to garner publicity instead of passing civil-rights legislation.

The letter follows:

"MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I am shocked beyond belief at your letter of May 5, waiting a whole month to deny us time to present evidence in support of FEPC legislation. We wrote you on April 8 requesting time. A month later, your letter dated May 5 announces the close of the hearings on May 6. The delay in answering our request is inexcusable. The delay is throughly consistent with your own demagogic delays on FEPC.

"It is perfectly obvious that neither you nor your party leadership have any real interest in advancing civil-rights legislation such as FEPC. You have had more than a year of the Eighty-second Congress to hold these hearings. You know perfectly well that you have sealed the doom of this bill by delaying hearings and refusing to mobolize full public support. You know it will be virtually impossible for the bill to reach the floor before adjournment, particularly in an election year.

"But it is precisely because it is an election year that you have waited so long—and you would keep from the hearings those who have consistently fought for genuine civil-rights legislation. Your sole aim is to garner publicity for yourself and your discredited Democratic Party by putting up a token call for FEPC.

"Fortunately, the people most concerned will not be fooled by your empty maneuvers. The record of your party and the Republican Party is a record of consistent betrayal of the promises made to the Negro people by both parties for civil-rights legislation.

"The Democratic Party both on the executive and legislative level, is particularly dishonorable. The present administration has been in power for 7 years. Except for two of those years, the Democratic Party also controlled the Congress. As a direct result of the fact that your party has shown no genuine concern for civil-rights legislation during those 7 years, the Negro people are losing the economic gains they made under Roosevelt, and are being subjected to increasing violence and repression."

[From the March of Labor for May 1952]

UNHOLY MATRIMONY

(By Russ Nixon)

The Humphrey hearings in Washington are the scene of efforts by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce, General Electric, and other employer outfits to bring together in unholy matrimony that old devil, the Taft-Hartley law, and the McCarran witch-hunting act.

The intended offspring of this evil match is Government control of unionism, wiping out the workers' freedom to choose their own unions and their own union officers, and their personal freedom of political views and action.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the phony "liberal" from Minnesota, is misusing the Senate Labor Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations to push this antilabor scheme. His Senate partner is the notorious PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, who has introduced two Senate bills (S. 1975 and S. 2548) to put into operation such Government control of workers.

AFL AND CIO OPPOSED

Both the CIO and the AFL, despite their leaders' well-known redbaiting disease, have strongly opposed the Humphrey-McCarran proposals. They do so because it is obvious that all unions and all unionists would be victims of what is really an employer scheme to wreck the free labor movement in the United States.

CIO President Philip Murray wrote to Senator HUMPHREY: "We believe that if the Government undertakes to determine what unions can represent the workers in this country, it will have embarked upon the long trail toward Government control of unions. * * * We in America do not want to take a single step in that direction."

AFL President William Green wrote Senator HUMPHREY along similar lines, saying: "No legislation of any kind whatsoever is necessary in order to prevent any of these unions being dominated by Communists. * * * Legislation would serve to substitute compulsion for voluntarism. Workers resent compulsion. * * *"

The main proposal for Government control of unionism is to have the Government set up a list of "approved" and "disapproved" unions, and then to make it impossible for the "disapproved" unions to function as the workers' bargaining agent.

The General Electric Co. suggests that this be done by taking away from a "disapproved" union all rights to use the National Labor Relations Board and all protections against injunctions and other Federal court actions.

Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin wants to be even rougher. He has suggested making it an "unfair labor practice" for an employer to deal with a "disapproved" union.

Senator MCCARRAN would have the Board set up under his McCarran Act rule out of activity any unions and union officers which it claims to be subversive.

James B. Carey, who has a personal ax to grind for interunion-raiding purposes as president of the IUE-CIO, proposed to turn over the dirty job to the Munitions Board—which is headed by John D. Small, former vice president of the Emerson Radio & Television Co.

Senator HUMPHREY, judging from his interview in the United States News and World Report and his conduct of the committee hearings, doesn't much care how labor is shackled, just so it's done.

The cover-up for all of this is Red-hunting, in line with the chamber of commerce proposals and the MCCARRAN shotgun smear technique.

Over and over again, at the hearings, those pushing for government destruction of the workers' union rights have spoken of the need to act against political strikes. But they have made it very clear that the anti-strike weapon they are trying to forge could be used to make all strikes political and therefore outlawed.

Munitions Board Chairman Small, for instance, declared: "It is very easy for the leadership to furnish ostensible grievances as a facade behind which to hide their true objectives, without the membership becoming aware that the strike was, in effect, an act of sabotage."

Labor Secretary Tobin testified that "Communist leaders will use the legitimate grievances and aspirations of their members to lead them into strikes which, while ostensibly for good trade-union objectives, are designed to disrupt the defense program."

EMPLOYERS' LINE

What worker who has ever been on strike will fail to recognize here the typical employer propaganda against every union struggle for better conditions? And who is so blind as not to see the bosses' union-busting aims behind the proposals made before the HUMPHREY committee?

The purpose is clearly to destroy such basic American labor rights as the right to strike and the right of workers to unions of their own choice.

AFL, CIO, and independent unions are united in opposition to such plans for Government and employer control of unions and destruction of the workers' rights. This united labor position should lead to united labor action. Besides opposing extension of the Taft-Hartley and McCarran Acts, as proposed in these schemes, labor must act unitedly for the complete repeal of these infamous antilabor acts.

[From the Electrical Union News of May 2, 1952]

HUMPHREY REVEALS WHY HE SWITCHED

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, who has proved he is willing to go to any lengths to wipe out workers' choice of their union or their officers, finally made clear last week just what his ambitions are.

The newspaper headlines read: "Senator HUMPHREY is available for place on ticket—Would run for President or Vice President."

There has been much speculation as to why HUMPHREY, who has had a reputation as a "liberal," should be trying to out-Taft-Hartley the most hard-bitten opponents of labor.

His game is now clear. The year is 1952 and HUMPHREY obviously has been trying to prove himself respectable to the big money sources needed for approval and cash to launch his bid for president.

[From the Electrical Union News of May 9, 1952]

POST WRITER'S ANTI-UE LINKS REVEALED

That Saturday Evening Post Writer who recently spent a week in Schnectady asking a lot of questions about UE's election victory last fall has branched out into other cities.

Many members who were interviewed were suspicious that the writer, a Lester Velie, might be prepared to tell a different story than he heard—one that would please GE, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, and other avowed enemies of UE.

His latest activities would seem to confirm that suspicion, since he has appeared in other cities, usually led around by IUE-CIO leaders and it has been disclosed that he has consulted with Senator HUMPHREY and is closely connected with GE Vice President Lemuel R. Boulware.

An article by Velie might appear around June. UE leaders have warned members to be on guard against any attacks that might be forthcoming.

[From the Union]

HUMPHREY WANTS WISHY-WASHY FEPC

WASHINGTON.—Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, whose "friendship" for labor proved phony, is now showing that his "friendship" for the Negro people and other minorities is equally phony.

HUMPHREY is chairman of a Senate labor subcommittee which last week began hearings on proposed FEPC legislation. As the hearings opened, the Minnesota Democrat revealed that his new drive for enactment of a Federal fair employment practices act will place special emphasis on States' rights.

"The great progress that is being made is at the local level and comes through education," HUMPHREY insisted at the first hearing. And he said that under his own FEPC bill a Federal commission could turn over enforcement of fair-employment standards to local, county, or State agencies.

Backers of a strong Federal FEPC law saw in HUMPHREY's statements the danger that some kind of State-enforced FEPC would come out of the committee discussions.

Those who want a strong FEPC with Federal teeth pointed to a letter sent by HUMPHREY to southern editors last November, which said: "My program for civil rights places its main emphasis on community activity, individual responsibility, and education and moral values supported by legislative standards."

HUMPHREY wrote the letter in an effort to convince southern newspapermen that he did not intend to use a "big stick" to enforce FEPC.

This is the same HUMPHREY who heads the Senate subcommittee holding hearings on the same Humphrey proposals to treat progressive unions the way the old Wagner Act treated company unions—take their bargaining rights away.

[From UE Publication No. 224]

UNION BUSTING'S NEW LOOK

Behind every attack on unions stands big business.

The employers are behind Taft-Hartley, behind the wage freeze, behind the frame-ups taking place against labor leaders today.

The employers' latest helper is Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, who is conducting hearings in Washington designed to call for more antilabor laws.

What are HUMPHREY and his big business backers after? They want to take away freedom of workers:

To choose their own union.
To choose their own union officers.
To hold their own political beliefs.
To fight for economic security.

This is why the General Electric Corp., for example, informed HUMPHREY on February 5, that there should be new legislation to increase political control of unions.

To do all this, employers need a liberal front. They need to hide their aim behind some politicians who pretend to be labor's friend. Such a front is HUMPHREY. Actually, HUMPHREY is working hand in hand with Senator PAT MCCARRAN, vicious enemy of labor, author of the McCarran "concentration camp" bill.

HUMPHREY: LET POLITICIANS DECIDE

HUMPHREY's idea is to have politicians in Washington decide through law what union workers may or may not join. He wants to put this over, despite the democratic choice of the workers involved. If politicians don't like the union, HUMPHREY states, "even if that union gets a majority, it shall not be given bargaining status."

It is not that politicians like HUMPHREY don't know how employers operate. He confesses, "there are a hundred subtle ways in which an employer can play off one union against another."

The fact is that big business fears unions that are not dominated by politicians who themselves are owned body and soul by the corporations. This is why HUMPHREY admits he thinks unions like UE are too strong because UE continues to win bargaining elections.

FAKE LIBERALISM

Behind HUMPHREY's fake liberalism and his pretended concern for fighting subversives lie the wealthy corporations who today are waging war against the labor movement.

The corporations want to strengthen the Taft-Hartley Act.

They want to pass new laws which create a labor front similar to what was created in Nazi Germany placing all labor organizations under strict control of employers by means of politicians.

They want to break national agreements, destroy conditions won through the years, and squeeze greater and greater profits by cutting wage rates and speeding up workers.

They want to forbid strikes by outlawing what they term "political strikes." Actually, however, effective strikes for real wage gains have always been smeared as political.

They want to destroy the unity of union men and women—above all—to split unions by use of the Red scare.

THE FACTS SPEAK FOR THEMSELVES

The real aims of the Humphrey plot to destroy effective unionism were actually exposed at recent hearings of the Humphrey committee. Here are some facts:

Testifying before the Humphrey committee, John D. Small, former vice president of the Emerson Radio & Phonograph Co. blurted out the fact that legislation is under study which would permit exclusion or removal from national defense facilities of individuals who fight to protect their union, who strike or demand adjustment of grievances. This is what is meant by "willful activities intended to disrupt the national defense program."

Another politician, Secretary of Labor, Maurice Tobin spelled this out in detail when he said: "There may be some employers, even at this date, not reconciled to trade unionism who would take advantage of such a provision by making frivolous charges of Communist domination against unions organizing their employees."

Senator HUMPHREY talks about possible sabotage on important defense work by "subversives." The record shows that labor stoppages that have taken place are due to the dissatisfaction of workers with wages and conditions of work.

Business Week (April 5, 1952) states the facts:

"Strikes have cost more than 1,500,000 man-hours of delay at atomic energy plants since 1949, according to a survey just made at four Government projects. None was reported inspired by Communists."

Schemes for Government control of workers' freedom to choose their own unions and union officers—like the Taft-Hartley laws, injunctions, and the wage freeze—are bosses' weapons used against all unions.

Mr. MORSE. In closing my remarks I want to say that any fair-minded person who reads the trash put out by the Communists in this country against the Senator from Minnesota will know how absolutely untrue the statements are.

I also wish to take advantage of this incident, Mr. President, to point out to my colleagues in the Senate and to the American people that these attacks follow a pattern which will characterize political propaganda in this country for the months ahead. It is an example of what constitutional liberals in American politics must expect because they are the prey of the reactionary and Communist forces in this country. It is the constitutional liberals which the extremists on the left and on the right must destroy if they are to have their way in setting up the kind of totalitarianism which they would impose upon this country. It is such constitutional liberals as the Senator from Minnesota that I am proud to rise and defend in the Senate for their sound Americanism.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not more than 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, when Grover Cleveland was nominated at the

Democratic Convention, I believe in 1888, the man who nominated him said:

We love him for the enemies he has made.

Mr. President, we love the Senator from Minnesota for the enemies he has made on the extreme right, and we love him for the opposition he faces from the United Electrical Workers, the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, and all Communist and leftist organizations.

A STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was my intention to speak at some length before the close of the session on an impressive statement of fiscal policy made by Mr. E. C. Sammons, president of the United States National Bank of Portland, Oreg., before the California Bankers Association. The discussion contained in this document is so basically sound that I recommend it most heartily to my colleagues in the Republican Party. I believe careful consideration should be given to it in Chicago when the time comes to draft the Republican platform.

Therefore, without taking the time to read it, I ask unanimous consent that it may be made a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WANTED: 100,000 FOGHORNS

In the summer of 1918 I soldiered at the Presidio in San Francisco. Every evening, as is customary in the summertime, the fog started rolling in through the Golden Gate and the foghorns at the entrance to the bay and the one on Alcatraz started their monotonous routine. Those stentorian tones are embedded in my memory forever. I visualize, as you native San Franciscans do, that the foghorns are there for a purpose—to warn shipmasters of the dangers of the rocks that lie ahead. The present financial position of this Nation is on a similar basis: We have been drifting too long toward dangerous shoals of loose fiscal policy, and I think that we need 100,000 foghorns to awaken America and its citizens to the dangers that confront us. Where better can we get these foghorns than from the bankers of America? There are nearly 15,000 banks in the country. As Bob Downie, president of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association, asked in his talk a month ago at the annual meeting of the New Jersey Bankers Association: "Who speaks for the millions of depositors in our banks? Your job and mine," he said, "is to combat well-organized opposition to our well-known freedom to make sure our customers understand the basis of our God-given freedom and the need to preserve that freedom. The depositors we bankers represent are the backbone of this Nation—the industrious, thrifty, loyal American workers, home owners, businessmen, and farmers—those who bear the burden of the heavy tax load; they stand to lose most in a regimented society. Who speaks for the millions of depositors in our banks? Who is taking the leadership to point out the dangers we face? Is our responsibility only to return their dollars in whatever the depreciated value may be? Do we not owe a duty to our depositors to defend their interest and our own? Who else, if not you and I, as trustees of other people's money, should make it crystal clear that the destruction of individual initiative and thrift is the goal of the social planners?"

Listed in the Banker's Directory there are 77,180 bank directors, and approximately 100,000 bank officers. From this formidable group of stewards of American dollars in our banks, we certainly should be able to gather the forthright and clarion voices of 100,000 people who are willing to energize public opinion in sufficient urgency perspective to make the Members of Congress conscious of the need of a turnabout in the direction in which we have been going for lo, these many years.

The American people delegate to one man in the White House, and to 531 men and women in Congress, the job of running America, which in turn means the job of maintaining peace in a troubled world. But these elected representatives do not exercise absolute power as in a dictatorship—the sovereign power is public opinion. They constantly watch public opinion.

Fortunately, within the huge mass of people, there is an intelligent class of men and women who really care what goes on in Government, who manifest interest not only by their votes on election day, but by their constant alertness to what goes on every day. This intelligent class is an active group of great influence and great power. It comprises those American men and women who make or unmake public opinion on vital issues, irrespective of which party is in power. These people furnish the leadership in our American system; they even affect the ebb and flow of world-wide tides of economic power. They are the active leaders in business, in labor, in agriculture, in industry, in education, in the church, in the professions, in finance, and even in the Government itself. Tom McCabe, former chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in an appearance before the Douglas Committee of Congress on Fiscal Monetary and Credit Policy, gave this testimony, and I quote:

"There is no antidote to inflation equal to the development of a budget surplus, and the use of that surplus to retire debt."

So you can see that if we become vociferous on the subject, we are in very good company.

I wish to be more specific as to how to do this job of alerting the people. (Talk to the people, clubs, and so forth.) Ask the people in your audience to write personally to their Senators and Congressmen; tell them also that the most important thing is to get their wives interested and get the women to write letters personally. Get the subject discussed by such groups as the League of Women Voters, chapters of the Association of University Women, and other groups of business and professional women. Remind them they are Americans. That's the way public opinion is formed; it's the only way it is formed. Pressure groups of other kinds are working to get more money for spending—we should bring pressure in the direction of economy and lower taxes. In the preamble to the Constitution—of this, the greatest country the world has ever seen—our forefathers referred at the very outset to "We the people." And at its rebirth at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln, the savior of the people, again referred to "The Government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This is our Government—it belongs to the people, and we (you and I) are part and parcel of that phrase "We the people" and by our action we shall, as Lincoln also said "either nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

We as citizens should accept our undeniable responsibility and take our proper part in forming and guiding public opinion and help stimulate the people into action to reverse these dangerous trends. But if we sit passively by and "let George do it," we shall get into trouble. Our patriotic obligation is to work earnestly for a prompt reversal of present Government financial policies.

Toynbee, in his great history, tells us that since the birth of Christ, we have had 21 major civilizations and almost every one is dead. This seems incredible but it is true. Up and down in order: the Near East, Greece, Rome, northern Europe, Britain. And history further shows that a fair share of responsibility for the collapse of these civilizations has been due to loose fiscal policies and to subordination or enslavement of citizens. It can happen here if we permit further continued drifting.

Let's take a look at our financial situation which Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, says comprises a peril which is as great as war itself. He said that between the day in 1789, when George Washington took oath as our first President, and April 30, 1945, the month in which Mr. Truman inherited the Presidency, the United States Government collected from its citizens a total of $248,000,000,000 in taxes. Between April 30, 1945, and June 30 of last year—all within the life of the present administration—the Government's total tax collection was $260,000,000,000. In 6 years, the Truman Administration has taken more from the American people in taxes than all the domestic taxes our Government levied in the previous 156 years. No wonder the Administration hopes that our citizens will have a "mental rest" from thoughts like these.

There can be little reduction in Government expenditures until Congress regains control over them. "The time has come," testified Lindsay Warren, Comptroller of the United States, "to reexamine grants to executive officers and final and conclusive authority over their spending operations, to reevaluate them and to determine whether some or all of them should not be repealed or greatly modified."

"If Members of the Senate and House of Representatives here in no uncertain terms from their constituents about the burden which the present tax law and unessential nonmilitary spending puts upon them," Senator BYRD continues, "and if those protests continue during this session of Congress, the steady progress of this country toward financial ruin might be arrested. The peril that confronts us in this respect is as great as that of war itself."

Not one of us can spend himself rich—not one of us charged with the responsibility of managing a bank would think of trying to spend the bank rich. Unfortunately there are people who are so optimistic or so careless as to try such foolishness. I hold in my hand a statistical circular, published by Dun & Bradstreet, of business failures running back to 1857 from which I note that during the last 5 years, 29,261 American business concerns tried to spend themselves rich, and they went through the wringer of bankruptcy to the tune of $1,052,970,000. That is prima facie evidence. I think that business concerns cannot spend themselves rich. No segment of government can either—whether it be a school district, a town, a city, a county government, a State government, or a Federal Government, powerful as its taxing power is. When we see the President's budget for the new fiscal year at $85,440,000,000, we are shocked into the realization that something must be done about it.

The Committee for Economic Development has made a searching study of the President's proposed budget. It finds that the $10,400,000,000 cash deficit which is indicated can be eliminated without raising taxes or damaging the security programs in any way.

First, the committee says in its report, actual expenditures for military functions of the Defense Department and for foreign military aid will lag at least $3,500,000,000 behind the President's estimate of $58,000,000,000, "even assuming adoption of the whole Presidential program."

Second, it observes, another $4,000,000,000 can be saved by eliminating waste and inefficiency in the military program.

Third, it recommends that about $2,800,000,000 be cut from the $26,700,000,000 proposed for other than military and foreign aid expenditures.

A number of other studies of the budget have been made by authoritative groups and organizations. It is significant that almost all of them, even though they differ over some details, indicate that the budget can be cut in the neighborhood of $10,000,000,000 without harming the national security; and they argue that this must be done, lest a new wave of inflation which would really undermine our security be started.

Waste in military spending is every bit as bad as any other waste. The taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of goods and services for each dollar spent—whether that dollar goes through the hands of the Defense Department or the Post Office. Rigid economy is in itself a powerful weapon of defense.

Is there waste in the military expenditure? I can answer that in the affirmative, I think, beyond any question of doubt. Let's go back to the reports of the Hoover Commission on Government Reorganization. You may recall that President Truman asked for such a Commission, and in July 1947, Congress gave it to him by unanimous vote. The Commission was bipartisan with six members from each party. It was but natural that the chairmanship should fall to Herbert Hoover. Always rated among the ablest administrators of all times, he alone of the 12 appointees, knows intimately the problems which confront President Truman.

The Hoover Commission made a characteristically thorough approach to its mighty task. It began by defining some 24 of the principal problems of government management. Having thus cut its cloth, it created special research committees called "task forces." These comprised 300 leading researchers, some of the most eminent specialists available in each field. After a period of 10 to 14 months, these task forces returned to the Commission with their findings.

The result was the most imposing collection of facts, figures, and opinion on government that has ever been assembled—some 2,500,000 words of basic data of the most valuable sort. From this massive bulk, the Commission carved out its model of a streamlined modern government.

Herbert Hoover and his associates have presented the American people with a blueprint for good government. This is of the utmost significance, since, as a people, we have reached the point at which the size and cost of government can easily impair the effectiveness of our economy and lower our standards of living.

When Mr. Hoover was President, the Government employed 600,000 persons, at a cost of $4,000,000,000 a year. Today the proposed budget is more than $85,000,000,000 and the Government employs more than 2,500,000 persons, comprising a maze of departments, bureaus, sections, divisions, and what have you—consisting of 1,816 different organizations. Manifestly, no President can carry a responsibility for personal direction of this establishment and have any time left for the broader duties of his office.

I crave your indulgence while we examine a few phases of the Hoover Commission Report of Government inefficiency. First, let's go back to Wheeling, W. Va., on October 19, 1932, and hear Franklin D. Roosevelt talking. This is what he said:

"If this Nation wants to know what is wrong with its National Government, I will give them the answer in one word. That word is 'mismanagement.'"

Well, he was talking about four billions a year and 600,000 employees. Imagine the situation today as revealed by these facts from the Hoover reports regarding the 1950 budget:

The Army asked for funds to buy 838,000 tropical worsted uniforms at $129 each—enough for all enlisted men in the Army and then some. How many of you are wearing suits that cost you $129?

The Air Force requested funds to build 910 homes for families in Alaska that would have cost $58,350 each, without land cost; and on the island of Guam, they asked for 828 family houses at a cost of $48,000 each.

One Hoover task force found a lot of enlightening things. For instance, they found that the Bureau of Indian Affairs employs 1 person for each 32 Indians under their care. They found that there is so much duplication in the Department of Agriculture that a farmer received conflicting advice about fertilizer from five different units of that Department. Herbert Hoover reported that, as an indication of waste, there already existed in Federal hospitals at the time of the Hoover task force investigation, beds for 225,000 patients, and only 155,000 were occupied. Yet Congress had made appropriations for, or authorized, hospitals with 50,000 additional beds, despite the fact that 70,000 were empty. The cost of the additional hospitals was estimated at $1,300,000,000. President Truman canceled out $300,000,000 of this program, but Congress restored the authority.

I have mentioned the Army and medical situations. Let's take one look at the Navy, whose Bureau of Ships is financed from 27 different appropriations; and the task force that studied that division tells us the Navy cannot even tell how much it costs to run a ship. How long do you think your business could survive such practices?

Remember that Government is your business. You are paying for it, and it is within your power to help bring about reforms.

While it was impossible for the Hoover Commission to investigate all the work in the Agricultural Division, they did claim that it is a loose confederation of independent bureaus and agencies. A spot check disclosed that there were 47 agents from 7 separate services working with 1,500 farmers in one cotton-producing county in Georgia; there were 88 agents working among 3,400 farmers in one county in Maryland. Bankers work closely with farmers, and can safely say that the farmer would be twice blessed by the adoption of the Hoover report, for he would find his dealings with Federal agencies much less confusing and irritating and he would share with all other taxpayers in the benefits of reduced Government costs. So much for the Hoover report. I could talk here another hour on that subject, but time is running against me and I must hurry along.

I hold in my hand the testimony taken this year, during the months of February and March, by a Special Subcommittee on Procurement of the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives. Representative F. Edward Hébert, of Louisiana, is chairman of that committee. He is the man who established what he called The Chamber of Horrors in one of the committee's rooms. I was in that room 2 weeks ago today and saw the evidences of waste and extravagance. Here are a few of the highlights from the testimony submitted, and they are only a few: The Marines buy a combat boot for $16.80; the Army buys exactly the same boot for $24.65. The Marines offered to buy the Army's boots for them at their price, but "no go"—the Army would not think of such a thing. The Air Force's dress shoe costs $7.19; the Navy's dress shoe, practically identical, costs $6.08. On 1,700,000 pairs, the Air Force could have saved $1,700,000 had it bought the Navy's shoe, but again "no go." For blankets, the Medical Service pays $21.75 each; the Air Force $14.15; the Navy $19.75. Other testimony shows the Army engineers are building homes on military bases for $16,500 per family; whereas, FHA indicates the same home can be built for an average of $9,400. The Government now has about $27,000,000,000 of equipment in storage, and it turns out from the testimony that the Navy has anchors enough to last 50 years. The Army has enough jeep parts to last 104 years. Last year the Armed Forces bought close to a year's supply of coffee, thereby creating a civilian shortage. Admiral Joseph Fowler was brought from retirement to compile a master catalog for the Munitions Board. He discovered that the various procurement agencies had 12,000 categories of window shades, in addition to which there were 9,000 different listings of Venetian blinds. The admiral went on to tell about the Navy's eight different bins of bushings. Some of these bushings cost $9 apiece, others $65 apiece. You can imagine his surprise when he discovered that all were identical.

Congressman BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, said that he heard there were not 8 bins of duplicate bushings but 208 sets of duplicates. "Correct," agreed Admiral Fowler, "8 in the Navy and 200 sets in other outfits using bushings." The admiral also testified that the services have 200,000 separate listings of lumber; many of these are duplicates. And it turns out also that Uncle Sam never gets rid of anything. He buys something and hangs on forever so now he has a nice assortment of Civil War cannon balls, brass hubcaps for horsedrawn caissons and carriage bolts which were useful in the transportation of Gen. U. S. Grant. Admiral Fowler now has about 3,500 men in the field checking up on the stocks of goods that need to be cataloged. He will be disappointed, he said, if they do not save something more than a billion dollars a year in the process.

Illustrating the way the military throws money away without regard to the taxpayer or civilian economy, Congressman HÉBERT makes mention of a savings of $450,000 recently made in the Navy's purchasing of water-distilling machines. This illustrates how one lone taxpayer can help save money: The lone taxpayer is John E. Pottharst, of the Meco Co., New Orleans, who, when he bid low on a Navy contract, yet didn't get the contract, notified watchdog Congressman HÉBERT. The Cleaver-Brooks Co., of Milwaukee, bid $200,000 higher on the distilling machines than Pottharst in New Orleans. But despite that, the Navy, apparently unconcerned about saving money, instructed the Army engineers to award 75 percent of the contract to the high bidder. The other 5 percent went to Refinite, of Omaha, which was $100 lower than Meco, of New Orleans. However, when Pottharst, of Meco, protested to Congressman HÉBERT, the Navy finally began to have some slight consideration for the taxpayers' money. As a result, Cleaver-Brooks reduced its bid by about $355,000. This was a slice of about $2,000 on each water-distilling unit. So, while bidder Pottharst didn't get the contract, he did help his fellow taxpayers save a lot of money. A few other "Chambers of Horrors" examples, and there are thousands of them: Congressman HÉBERT showed in his expose that the Army is paying $48.05 for a typist's chair, although another Government agency gets such a chair for $16.80 to $18. Field jackets were listed at a price of $9.81 in Japan to $14.31 at Fort Monmouth, N. J. A pillow is shown to cost 76 cents at Fort Holabird, Md., and $1.15 at Fort Lewis, Wash. It just isn't in the Military Establishment alone where our taxpayers' money is going to waste. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, under date of April 25, reports as something you must know:

"The Census Bureau, in a press bulletin dated April 6, 1952, reported that the production of lilium longiflorum in this country is so limited that only one family in seven can have one."

All of which is just a fancy way of saying that in 1949, there was a census of green-

house producers which showed that 5,595,894 Easter lily bulbs were produced. The Census Bureau waited until Palm Sunday, 1952, to tell a breathless public the results in a news story. This urgent release, sent out in thousands of copies by Census public relations men, is an example of the manner in which the taxpayers' money goes down the drain. The release was paid for out of the budget which, you'll recall, the President said was pared to the bone and geared to the needs of defense. He didn't tell us that the budget included lilies gilded with our own tax gold.

There is one way to get relief from these high taxes: We can tell our elected representatives, Congressmen, and Senators, that they must take the money away from the spenders. What do you do in your business when you have to curtail? You call in your department head and say something like this: "Listen, Bud, you asked for a $50,000 budget. You can't have it! $25,00 is all you get!" The department head may scream his head off, but he takes it or leaves it. Listen to these startling figures. Here are the appropriations for five of our major departments for the budget for 1940, and the asking budget for 1953, with percentage of increase in that 13-year period:

	1940 budget	1953 budget	Percent increase
Commerce Department	$51,500,000	$981,200,000	1,709
Interior Department	98,800,000	685,000,000	594
Labor Department	30,900,000	253,800,000	720
Justice Department	50,500,000	188,800,000	273
State Department	16,500,000	335,000,000	1,934

We just cannot stand that kind of expenditure and stay off the rocks of loose fiscal policy. What can you do about it? Well, you can talk to your Congressmen and your Senators the way I have talked to mine. If you take the time to give them the facts, you can get the necessary action. As a result of conferences with Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, here is what he now says in writing:

"I am afraid that too many of the most ardent supporters of the very sound mutual security thesis in foreign affairs are too prone to let their idealism cause them to run away from or develop a myopia toward the practical economic facts that are involved in our ability to pay. For example, an $85,000,000,000 budget as proposed by the President is impractical today from many standpoints. First, it cannot be spent economically during the next year. It will, in and of itself, produce waste and inefficiency in administration. Second, it is not needed as of now. Sure, I know that if the goods were available we could use $85,000,000,000 worth, but they are not available. The attempt to spend that much money will only result in contracting for a lot of goods and services that will not serve any vitally needed purpose. We simply cannot produce this next year vitally needed goods to the amount called for by that budget because we will not be industrially mobilized to do it. Let us spend less but produce the most vitally needed goods such as planes and new atomic weapons. I am convinced that a lot of wild spending is going on which is not in fact strengthening our defenses. The American taxpayer is entitled to full value for every tax dollar spent.

"Third, an $85,000,000,000 budget will increase inflation pressures and thereby weaken our greatest defense weapon. We simply cannot make the progress we would like to in normal peace times as far as civilian programs are concerned. They must be cut out in large measure until we are first secure. We must win the peace first, and that calls for the strictest of economy in public expenditures. How much can we save? That is a relative matter. How much should we save? That too is a relative matter. How much will our economy stand during this hot political year by way of spending for defense and civilian needs? I throw discretion to the winds by suggesting that if we are to have the national unity and public confidence we need in order to take this country through a presidential election and at the same time protect our economy, the Congress should not approve a budget beyond $70,000,000,000. Savings can and must be made in the military budget. Savings can and must be made in the civilian budget. Sacrifices on the part of all of us are going to be burdensome but small indeed compared with the values of freedom we will be protecting and preserving."

You can do the same thing with your Congressmen and Senators.

If there is a better way to destroy a country from within than to permit inefficiency, graft, and corruption in government, no one has thought of it. The people are being bled white by taxes now and the incentive to work and save is being destroyed. If we keep going in the present direction, there can be only one end and that is national bankruptcy and national ruin. It happened to great empires in past times and it can happen here. It need not happen here if you and I and the "100,000 foghorns" I am asking for, go to work.

Bill Mullendore of the Southern California Edison Co., a great American on my score sheet, put it this way: "The realization that for two decades we have been marching down the wrong road comes at a late date. Only by summoning our utmost wisdom and our devotion and our financial reserve or strength can we regain our way and recapture the glory that was America in its finest." I propose to each and every one of you fellows in this audience to devote the equivalent in time of one game of golf each week between now and next November and write letters to your Congressmen and your Senators, pointing out the absolute necessity of reversing the trend we have been traveling and to get customers of yours, or stockholders, or members of your family, to do likewise. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, the great watchdog of the Treasury, says that we must stir up sentiment from the grass roots. The bankers of America can do it. Let's do it before it is too late. Let's make a demand on Congress that they cut the President's asking budget to a maximum of $75,000,000,000. This will be a start in the right direction.

Last January, 3,500 shareholders of the United States National Bank of Portland, either in person or by proxy, reelected our board of directors to tell me, as the pilot of their ship, how they wanted their property managed. Many of you in this room had similar experiences, and I want to call your attention to the fact that you and I, each and every one of us, are shareholders in the greatest corporation in the world—the United States of America. We elect directors to manage our properties—but call them by different names; we elect Congressmen for 2 years; we elect another group called Senators for 6 years; but how many of us attempt to guide them in their handling of our properties? Mighty few of us, but we have got to begin to do it, and this is the challenge I leave with you—we must do something about the consequences of a loose fiscal policy. And we have got to make the citizens of America "at the grass roots of America" understand the forces of inflation if we are to survive. An analysis shows that 76 out of the 96 Senators—79 percent—are elected by rural majorities, and that 54 percent of the Representatives represent more rural counties than urban counties. For the purpose of study, a rural county is considered to be one in which there is no community with more than 10,000 population. The point I make is that in spite of the growth of cities, this is still a grass-roots country. People on the farm, in the villages, and in the small municipalities have the dominant voice when it comes to electing the men who make our laws.

The bankers of America are in touch with the people at the grass roots. On March 10, 1933, Franklin Roosevelt, in his message to Congress, said: "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policy." If he was right then, and the people seemed to think he was, judging by their votes, and he was talking as he said about $4,000,000,000 budget and 600,000 employees, think how much more important it is now to examine our fiscal policy. As a starting point, we can all talk about the importance of getting the Hoover report adopted in its entirety. At the moment it may be 50 percent approved; a lot more than that must be done.

This whole program is like a diamond—it has many facets, and time has permitted me merely to present a few. If you really want to go to work on things, and I think you do, you can go to your public library and get plenty of data on the Hoover report and waste in Government.

Again quoting Franklin Roosevelt—this time from his address at Pittsburgh, October 19, 1932: "I sought to make two things clear: First, that we can make savings by reorganization of existing departments, by eliminating functions, by abolishing many of those commissions, which, over a long period of years, have grown up as a fungus growth on American Government. These savings can properly be made to total many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year." He spoke of thousands of dollars—the Hoover report talks of millions of dollars.

As evidence of men leading the fight for economy, the Governor of Idaho recently appeared before a House committee to voice his strong disapproval of a proposal to construct a Government tax-exempt power dam on the Snake River. He testified that a highly taxed private power company was ready to develop the power through a system of smaller dams, and urged that this be done.

The Governor was cross-examined by a lady Representative who indicated that she was astonished that Idaho officials failed to be in favor of obtaining the financial advantages of Federal projects for their own State.

What this Representative overlooked is the fact that there are still people—some of them in high offices of public trust and responsibility—who don't believe in feeding at the public trough. There are still people who think in terms of local rights and obligations, and who want to maintain local control over local resources. And there are still people who will fight socialism whenever the threat arises, and will unequivocally support American traditions and freedoms.

The Idaho case is a perfect example of the effort to force socialism on the people without the slightest justification. Investor-owned enterprise is ready and willing to develop the power, and it will do it without the huge tax subsidies involved in the Government plants. Another example is found in New York, where an effort is being made to put the Government deep into the power business on the Niagara River—even though a group of business-managed, taxpaying utilities is ready to do the job. The Socialists want their way come hell or high water—and regardless of what it would do to the country.

Men like Idaho's governor are leading the fight against a philosophy which would eventually destroy representative government itself.

We need 100,000 foghorns to awaken America, to awaken American citizens to a dangerous impending emergency. We need the bankers of America to make these foghorns sound in stentorian tones that no one can

fail to hear; nor is there time to wait. It is later than we think. Let me again quote Lincoln, the Emancipator. By our action we shall "either nobly save or meanly lose the last best hope on earth."

THE CHINA LOBBY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which I received from David Bruce, Assistant Secretary of State under date of June 24, 1952, in answer to a letter which I wrote to the Secretary of State under date of June 9, asking for assistance from the Secretary of State in investigating the authenticity of certain documents which I had introduced in the RECORD previously in connection with the China lobby.

The letter from the Department of State is just another example of the type of run-a-round which I have been receiving from the Secretary of State with regard to this whole matter as well as other matters. Because I believe it should be a matter of official record, so that the American people can see how the State Department fails to live up to what I consider is a clear executive obligation on its part with respect to its duty to protect the American people in the field of foreign policy. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

I also ask unanimous consent that there may be printed my reply to Mr. Bruce.

All I asked the State Department to check into when I wrote to the Secretary of State under date of June 9, was whether or not certain officials in the Chinese Embassy made misstatements of fact to me concerning the authenticity of certain cablegrams which were allegedly sent by officials of the Chinese Embassy. I am convinced that the cablegrams which I introduced into the RECORD are authentic. If they are then these Chinese officials have lied to me. If they have lied to a United States Senator, whether it is I or any other Senator, then they should be recalled by their Government. If the State Department wishes to protect them it should say so frankly. The fact is that the State Department has made a sorry record in the entire matter of investigating the China lobby and it will stand in history to the discredit of the responsible officials of the State Department.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 24, 1952.

The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have received your letter of June 9, 1952, in which you requested the Department to determine the authorship of several documents in your possession.

I regret to inform you that the Department does not have the facilities to make such a determination which involves an analysis of handwriting. However, I am taking the liberty of referring your request to the Attorney General whose Department does have the facilities for taking appropriate action on your request.

I am also attaching for your information a copy of my letter to the Attorney General asking him to take this action.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID BRUCE.

JULY 5, 1952.

Hon. DAVID BRUCE,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In reply to your letter of June 24, I only wish to say that it is the type of letter which I expected to receive from the Department of State. In my judgment the Department of State has had a clear obligation to conduct an investigation of the allegations which have been made concerning the existence of the China lobby. It has the same obligation in connection with allegations concerning the existence of any other foreign lobby, if there is any basis whatsoever in fact for the making of any such allegations.

The Department of State has the responsibility, as far as the executive branch of our Government is concerned, of protecting the interests of the American people in the field of foreign policy. In my judgment the present administration of the Department of State has failed on many counts in carrying out that responsibility, and one of those counts is in connection with the China lobby matter.

You people in the Department of State have ducked and evaded this matter, with the result that you have left the impression with many people that you are afraid of the issue, because a thorough investigation of it might prove to be very embarrassing to the Department of State, as well as to others in the administration, past and present.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

REQUEST OF GOVERNORS OF STATES TO TAKE ACTION TO AFFORD MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, yesterday I informed the Senate of the fact that no action has been taken by the House of Representatives on the question of soldier voting. As Members of this body know, and as the distinguished President of this body knows, the right to vote is fundamental. It is particularly important that the persons who are serving in our Armed Forces be provided every facility for voting at the coming election.

Inasmuch as no action will be taken by Congress, in spite of the fact that the Senate passed such a measure, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 349, which is lying on the table.

The resolution was submitted by me for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. We would be delighted to have other Senators join us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 349.

The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 349), as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should cooperate with the Governors of the States in seeing that members of the armed services wherever assigned may exercise their voting franchise in the 1952 National and State elections.

The Secretary of Defense is hereby requested to cooperate with the several States in carrying out the purposes of this resolution.

The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Governor of each State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Resolution favoring Federal and State cooperation to provide opportunity for absentee soldier voting in the 1952 elections."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BRIDGES

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed at this time for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Idaho may proceed.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I cannot see this session of Congress adjourn without expressing, on behalf of the Senators on this side of the aisle, our appreciation to our minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, STYLES BRIDGES, for his excellent and masterly leadership.

Mr. President, to know STYLES BRIDGES is a pleasure indeed. To have his trust and confidence is something I shall always cherish and consider an honor.

I recall that all of us were pleased to hear the great tribute which was paid to our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. Yesterday I was especially pleased to hear the Senator from Arizona say that he was grateful for the cooperation given to him by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. That is the kind of cooperation this body needs and I hope will always have.

The Senator from New Hampshire became minority leader of the Senate last January, following the loss of that distinguished statesman, Senator Kenneth Wherry, of Nebraska, whose pass-

ing was mourned by all of us. Naturally, Mr. President, Senators on the Republican side of the aisle were then confronted with the necessity of selecting a leader who could perform the functions of that office in such a way as to promote harmony and win the confidence and respect of his colleagues. With almost complete unanimity we turned to the Senator from New Hampshire.

As you know, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has served longer in the Senate than has any other Member on the Republican side of the aisle. I do not need to remind you, Mr. President, that the duties of the Senator from New Hampshire have been manifold and heavy. Not only has he directed the minority in a skillful, courteous, and extremely satisfactory manner, but he has been the leading Republican, in point of service, on the tremendously busy Appropriations Committee. In addition, he has devoted a great portion of his time in serving as a very active and efficient member of the Armed Services Committee. He also is the ranking member of that powerful and busy committee.

Mr. President, the fine accomplishments of the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire will always be remembered by a grateful country, and, I know, will be particularly appreciated by the people of the great State of New Hampshire. In times like these, when expenditures of public funds are straining the pocket nerves of every taxpayer of the United States, America thanks the State of New Hampshire for sending to the Senate such a distinguished son of hers, such an outstanding saver of public funds, the eminent and beloved senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], whose sweet and gracious personality has endeared him to every Member of the Senate, particularly those on this side of the aisle.

Furthermore, let me say, as one of the newer Members of this body, that no Member of the Senate has afforded greater encouragement or been of greater assistance to the younger group of Senators, the new class which came in in 1951, than has the clear-thinking senior Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I have been a lawyer for nearly 23 years. The senior Senator from New Hampshire is not a lawyer, but I remember his very profound statements, uttered on the floor of the Senate when the Senate had under consideration the constitutional question involved in the steel seizure only minutes after the President of the United States had seized the steel industry, and before the Supreme Court had issued its historical and able opinion. At that time the senior Senator from New Hampshire, stated, in effect, as I recall:

"I am not a lawyer, but I realize that if we allow the President's action to go unchallenged and unchecked by Congress, some day, several years from now—10 years, 20 years, or 30 years—after such a precedent was established, it could be used by another President of the United States under circumstances which might affect the very heart of our country, and the liberties of our people."

On the same occasion, the senior Senator from New Hampshire told the laboring people of the United States, and especially their leaders, that if they believed the President's action in seizing the steel mills was a constitutional act designed to help them, they were living in a dream, because some future President might well use that power to demolish the gains which have been made by the laboring people of America; in short, that the precedent which would be established by the President's seizure of the steel mills, if that action were allowed to go unchallenged by Congress, could well constitute the basis for future action which would be seriously detrimental to and even destructive of the rights of the working people of this Nation. That, Mr. President, is only one example of the clear thinking of Senator BRIDGES. I would that more of us had that brilliance.

Mr. President, STYLES BRIDGES, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, is a watchdog of the Treasury of the United States. He is one of the Members of this body who has constituted a stalwart guard against encroachment by any one of the three coordinate branches of our Federal Government against the others. He is indeed the very best of public servants.

The people of this Nation should know, as we in the Senate know, that Senator BRIDGES was the first United States Senator to warn our country against the menace of communism. Yes, he is the one United States Senator who has been personally denounced by Vishinsky. He, along with the late and great Senator Wherry, raised his voice and fought the evil Communists, both in and out of Government, who now threaten the world.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege to have many fine friends, and to hold them in the highest esteem; but I say to you that in the last year and a half I have come to know as one of my finest friends and, indeed, to love, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire. In making this statement, I am sure that I am joined by every Member of this body, regardless of political affiliation. Senator BRIDGES has at his side a sweet helpmate in his lovely wife Doloris. Her charm—her brilliance and her exemplary character merely add to the lustre and brilliance of the service of this able man. Indeed, the State of New Hampshire occupies a leading position among all the States through the statesmanship of Senator BRIDGES.

Senator BRIDGES works as hard for the laboring and manufacturing people of his State; and certainly the farmer of New Hampshire has a great leader and advocate in him. New Hampshire I am told is a State which abounds in scenic beauty and recreational facilities. I do not know for I have never been there, but I am sure, Mr. President, she has no attraction that matches the precious warm smile of this great man.

STYLES BRIDGES is, as I say, a kind man, but yet so firm, that no man dares meet him in debate unless he has right upon his side. His power, his ability, his absolute devotion to honest public service is known and respected by those of us who serve with him. Those who remember the history of New Hampshire, which in years past has furnished to the Nation great leaders, can well count Senator BRIDGES among them.

Senator BRIDGES uses the desk once used by another New Hampshire immortal, Daniel Webster. When the history of this leader is consulted, it will be found that the work of STYLES BRIDGES was on a par with that of Webster, because Mr. BRIDGES exemplifies the highest qualities of statesmanship, and does only that which is right and just; that which is destined to save and preserve this country for all of the people.

In addition to all I have said, Mr. President, I admire Senator BRIDGES most because he is a God-fearing, religious man; he goes about his religion in a quiet, unpretentious way. He would never permit his religious thoughts to be publicized or used to further him in public life. I know Senator BRIDGES, even though he is the hardest-working man in this Senate, always has time to visit with and be guided by his God. Nothing greater could be said of Senator BRIDGES.

Let me say in concluding these remarks, Mr. President, that I pay tribute to STYLES BRIDGES, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, as a great servant of both his State and his Nation. He has served them well.

I wish him health and happiness. May he continue to serve in this body for many, many years.

RELEASE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CAMDEN, N. J.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to call up House bill 5954, a bill to provide for the release to the city of Camden, N. J., of certain land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerks at the desk seem to be unable to locate the bill.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to have that measure considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill seems to have been passed by the House of Representatives the day before yesterday, and was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It will be necessary either to have the committee report the bill or to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the bill before it can be taken up by the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thought that bill was on the calendar. I stated that I would have no objection to having the distinguished Senator from New Jersey ask that the bill be taken up. I believe it is one of the bills the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce told me on yesterday he wished to have considered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the distinguished Senator from New Jersey will call up the bill again, when the chairman of the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce is in the Chamber, I think we can dispose of the bill. It is a small one, but of course is important to the State of New Jersey.

So I shall appreciate it if the Senator from New Jersey will wait until the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is on the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to wait until he is on the floor.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1084) to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to inquire about the unfinished business, Senate bill 1084. All the amendments have been agreed to, and the bill has been read the third time.

The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that measure is in charge of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. I do not know whether the House has given consideration to a similar bill.

Today will be the last day in the Senate for the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland. He has had a most creditable record here. He has represented his State well and faithfully. I have enjoyed working with him, and I wish him to know that he has my very best wishes in his new work, after he leaves the Senate.

We regret very much that he is going to leave the Senate, because he is one of those rugged individualists who try to do what they think is right, regardless of the consequences. I am proud to have been associated with the Senator from Maryland in his work during the time he has been in the Senate. I should like to have the honor accorded him of having this bill passed by the Senate on this the last day of his service. So I hope the bill may be promptly passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

BILL SHOULD BE CONSIDERED ON ITS OWN MERITS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield precedence to no one in the honor and respect I hold for the Senator from Maryland. I should be very glad to pay tribute to him on any and all occasions, and I am very happy to add my eulogy at this time. He has been a most splendid Senator and a most genial colleague. But this bill, after all, should not be passed merely as a personal tribute to the Senator from Maryland. It should be passed or rejected according to whether it serves the purposes of the people of the United States; and I am sure the Senator from Maryland would not wish to have it passed in any other way. I know that he regards legislation as a public concern, not as a matter of private placation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope I was not misunderstood. I want the Senator to know that the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I also noted the comment of our genial majority leader that he hoped the bill would be passed as a tribute to the Senator from Maryland. I wish to pay full tribute to the Senator from Maryland, but I wish to do it in another way.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, certainly. I yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. No bill that might be passed would be a tribute to any Senator, unless it were a just bill and a bill which would serve the people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is what the majority leader meant.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire if any Senator is going to rise in defense of this bill? We are again in a situation very similar to that with which we were faced a few nights ago, when the resale price maintenance bill was before the Senate, and when the very efficient Presiding Officer was about to declare the bill passed. I should be very glad to yield the floor, though I temporarily hold it, to any Senator who wishes to explain this bill and to defend it.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, after making my acknowledgments and expressing my thanks to the distinguished majority leader and the Senator from Illinois for their gracious remarks about me personally, I avail myself of the opportunity so very generously extended by my very warm and valued friend, the Senator from Illinois, to speak to the bill.

First, it goes without saying that his observation is well founded, that the bill ought to stand or fall upon its own merits, rather than upon its advocacy by any individual. But, Mr. President, in asking that this bill be passed, I do so because I am confidently of the belief that it gives recognition to the rights and to the sovereignty of the various States of the Union. The bill seeks to insure to the States of the Union rights to regulate companies which are engaged exclusively in intrastate operations and which are subject to regulation by the various States of the Union. In other word, Mr. President, matters which are primarily of local concern we seek to have supervised by the State regulatory bodies, and not to be subject to the regulations of the Federal Power Commission. However, there are included within the bill certain conditions which must be recognized, and which we feel afford absolute assurance that nothing detrimental to the public interest will result if this bill is passed.

Mr. President, there are set forth three conditions which must be met before the various companies are exempt from regulation by the State, in connection with the distribution of natural gas. The conditions are First, that the gas in question must be consumed within the State of receipt; second, the transmission facilities must not be used for or in connection with the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale, or the transmission facilities of natural gas, for hire; and third, the company must not be engaged in such transportation for sale. These conditions, if observed, will prevent companies which are engaged in interstate operations being exempted from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, one very important factor which, we feel, gives assurance that nothing detrimental to the public interest will result if this bill is passed, is that the Federal Power Commission itself recommends the passage of this bill. Prior to the consideration of the bill by our committee, we submitted it to the Federal Power Commission, and requested its recommendations. The Commission unanimously reported that the bill would receive its approval, subject to our adoption of certain language. The chief counsel of the Federal Power Commission and the attorney for the State regulatory bodies met and agreed upon language which in their opinion would safeguard the interests of the public. Our committee adopted verbatim the language proposed by the Federal Power Commission, and which had been set forth by its counsel. So, Mr. President, the fact that the Federal Power Commission has unanimously recommended the passage of this bill, and, as I said before, the fact that its own counsel proposed the language which is now to be found in the substitute, give assurance, we feel, that every interest of the public will be observed. I might say in addition that the State regulatory bodies, through their association, also unanimously recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. President, there is one other provision in the bill which should be mentioned, and that is the provision which, I understand, my valued friend, the Senator from Illinois, agrees to be a salutary one, known as the New York facilities amendment. This proposal would permit the Federal Power Commission, under certain circumstances, to exempt companies whose operating facilities for the transmission of natural gas are located wholly within a metropolitan area in one State, and where all the gas is ultimately consumed within that metropolitan area.

I call attention to the fact that the amendment permits the Federal Power Commission to exempt such companies; it does not require it to do so. It merely vests the Federal Power Commission with the right and power to exempt from its jurisdiction such a company or such companies, operating exclusively within a metropolitan area. For example, it would exempt from its jurisdiction companies such as the Consolidated Edison Co., of New York; the Brooklyn Union Gas Co.; and the Kings County Lighting Co., which own and operate facilities for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire, but which are located wholly within a single metropolitan area, as I said before, and the gas, delivered or transported through such facilities is ultimately consumed within that metropolitan area.

Mr. President, that briefly states the situation as we see it. As I said before, the bill was introduced in the hope that it would not meet with objection, and

with the understanding, really, that it was noncontroversial.

Before taking my seat, Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I hold in my hand the report from the Federal Power Commission which not only gives endorsement to the bill, but which sets forth the desired language to cover the situation which the Federal Power Commission and its counsel believe would safeguard the interests of the public, which language, I add, was adopted unanimously by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in reporting the bill.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel that the enactment of the bill would serve the general public, and, therefore, we urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend and colleague from Maryland for his very clear and lucid explanation of the bill. On its surface it is a very simple and a very worthy bill. There are portions of it which, in my judgment, are extremely worthy. There is, however, one grave danger which lurks within it.

THE WORTHY PORTIONS OF THE BILL ARE IN THE DOUGLAS SUBSTITUTE

First, let me take the worthy portions of the bill, which would also be covered by the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I intend to offer in just a few minutes.

The bill removes, and should remove, from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission the so-called "stub-lines" that are owned by distributors taking gas a short distance off high-pressure lines to serve local communities, and the bill transfers the power over these stub-lines to the State commissions. I think that would be a distinct improvement, and it is provided for in my substitute.

It also provides that the metropolitan gas companies, like those in Brooklyn, and serving a part of Manhattan, may be taken out of the Federal Power Commission's present control and transferred to the control of the Public Service Commission of New York.

That, I think, is a very proper provision, and is also covered in my amendment. The State regulatory power in these situations seems adequate and the exemption justified.

EAST OHIO GAS CO. IS NUB OF CONTROVERSY

But the real nub of this measure concerns the East Ohio Gas Co. The East Ohio Gas Co. is a company which owns part of a gas pipeline which starts in West Virginia and part of another interstate pipeline starting in Kansas, Texas, and Oklahoma, both of which run up through Ohio. The East Ohio Gas Co. takes over the ownership of these pipelines at the point where they cross the Ohio lines, owns those pipelines in Ohio, and also owns connections and retail distribution facilities in some 65 communities, going as far west as Knox County, and including the big industrial region of eastern Ohio, Cleveland, Akron, Youngstown, and so forth. This, I think, involves the nub of the entire situation.

The East Ohio Gas Co. is a corporation set up to handle a portion of the trunk line plus the distributing outlets in Ohio itself. The pipe line, as well as the feeder lines in West Virginia, are owned by the Hope Natural Gas Co., and both companies have in the past been owned by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, though there has been some distribution of stock ownership in recent years. In other words, there has been underlying unity of ownership of this organically inter-related system, but the system has been divided for corporate purposes into two parts, just at the Ohio State line. The other main line into Ohio with which East Ohio Gas Co. connects is the Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co. from the southwest.

The Federal Power Commission has been on the point of finding what the original cost of the trunk line owned by the East Ohio Gas Co. actually was. Its final determination has been energetically resisted in the courts, and after final decision by the Supreme Court it has again been postponed for a period of time by the Federal Power Commission.

If this bill is passed it will be impossible for the Federal Power Commission to make such a finding of fact, because the East Ohio Gas Co. will no longer be subject to the act and particularly to section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act which gives to the Commission the power, on its own motion or on request of a local commission, to determine the cost of production or transportation rates by a natural gas company in cases where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate.

Apparently the Federal Power Commission does not have the power to regulate the final price of the gas to the consumer. That power does not belong to it, nor, as a matter of fact, does it belong to the Ohio Public Service Commission. Such local rates are instead, regulated by local authorities in Ohio. The question vitally affecting these rates, however, is what the facts are in the valuation of the pipe line which lies inside the State of Ohio.

RECORD REVEALS $15,000,000 WRITE-UP IN VALUATION OF EAST OHIO GAS CO.

I should like to speak in measured terms and not make any wild charges, but it is a matter of historic fact that some years ago when the Federal Trade Commission went into the affairs of the East Ohio Gas Co. it found a $15,000,000 write-up in the valuation of the East Ohio Gas Co. I cite the material beginning at pages 1696 and 1697 of Senate Document 92 of the Seventieth Congress, first session, part 83. In other words, the East Ohio Co. has been found at one time to have written up its valuation on the books by $15,000,000 by a stroke of the pen.

S. 1084 WOULD ELIMINATE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION'S AUTHORITY TO FIND BASIC FACTS

Under the statute law of Ohio, not under the rulings of the Commission, the local and State utilities commissions are compelled to take reproduction cost, which, in periods of advancing prices, we know is an extremely high valuation. I am not at all certain that if the Ohio law on this point is unchanged the Federal Power Commission would have any power over the rates which the East Ohio Gas Co. would charge to the local consumers, or the allocation it would make in justifying the transportation costs or rates to the locality, but it would be able to find the facts as to what the original cost actually was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to get that point straight. Is the Senator saying that if the law remains as it is, the Federal Power Commission may not have any rate-making powers in the intrastate area of commerce, but if the law is changed it may deny the Federal Power Commission the right to make economic surveys which have a great deal to do with the statistical information upon which the rates would be judged at the local level?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator has hit the nail precisely on the head.

I think I should read section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act:

> The Commission upon its own motion, or upon the request of any State commission, whenever it can do so without prejudice to the efficient and proper conduct of its affairs, may investigate and determine the cost of the production or transportation of natural gas by a natural gas company in cases where the Commission has no authority to establish a rate govering the transportation or sale of such natural gas.

In other words, even though the Federal Commission does not have the power to fix a rate, it may, upon its own motion, without detriment to its business, make a finding of fact as to what the costs actually are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The findings of fact become public property, so there is a chance for an honest appraisal of the valuation for the purpose of rate making.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is absolutely correct. So that the localities, on the one hand, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio on the other, and the public as a whole, would know what the facts were and the disparity between the original cost or prudent investment and reproduction cost would be evident to the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it not also be true that there would be public notice of the so-called write-ups, which are the practice of many utilities, particularly where there has been a consolidation of facilities?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That does not mean there would be any disciplinary power or legal power to change the rates, but it does mean the Commission could provide the public with information, does it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Therefore, along with the good features of the bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], whom I regret I do not see on the floor now, S. 1084 would blow out the candle in a dark room. It would still leave the citizens of Ohio confused, uncertain, and ignorant as to the disparity between original cost and reproduction cost.

It is for these reasons that I offer my amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I ask the Senator from Illinois another question, in order to get the argument into final summation? As I understand, the reason why the Senator is so concerned about the Federal Power Commission being denied the investigatory right for the purpose of securing information is that under Ohio law the rates are set upon the cost of reproduction of the facility. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. That is by statute fixing the standard, and then the Ohio commission is merely given the power to determine what the reproduction costs are.

I do not know that all rates would be affected, because the Ohio commission would still be bound by statutory provisions, but it would at least enable the citizens of Ohio to see the disparity between reproduction costs in a period of greatly advancing prices and what the original cost, or prudent investment, actually was.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So the Senator, when he uses the simile of snuffing out a candle in a dark room, means that the light of public information would be snuffed out in an area where there was great opportunity for excessive rate structures and unfounded valuations of property. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, it would affect the rate the consumer would have to pay, would it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would have an indirect effect upon the rate and it would be an adverse effect.

Mr. LANGER. Why indirect?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because it is not within the power of the Federal Power Commission to regulate rates charged to consumers in the localities of Ohio.

Mr. LANGER. But it would certainly have an adverse effect?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The ultimate effect would be adverse, with the amendment in its present form. What my amendment proposes is to turn over to State control the power over stub lines, and also the situation in Brooklyn and Manhattan, but it would retain section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act in its application to an extensive trunk line like East Ohio, so that the Federal Power Commission can make a statement of fact as to what the original cost and what the prudent investment were in the East Ohio Gas Co. I think the issue is pinpointed on that company.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator's substitute bill then grant the Commission the right whenever it saw from the facts that it might be desirable to do so, to cede to the States or the localities all the rights of investigation and of rate making?

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no obligation under section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act for the Commission to make such an investigation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no obligation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The Commission may do it but it is not compelled to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is discretionary?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is discretionary.

I may take on a little bit more ground than I should technically take on, but I must confess that I do not have much confidence in the present composition of the Federal Power Commission, particularly after some of the changes which have recently been made in the composition of the Commission. I think the Federal Power Commission has been hamstrung. However, I shall not go into that. They have in the past been trying to lead a life of virtue on the question of valuation and that is the point. They should be given at least a chance to be virtuous in the future.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Maryland will permit me to do so, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that I assume he believes in the university, but he may disagree with the faculty. He believes in the Federal Power Commission and its authority under the Natural Gas Act, but he is somewhat dubious as to what may happen.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I have recently seen my fondest hopes decay in connection with the Federal Power Commission. I predict that the situation probably will get worse and worse, but—

> While the lamp holds out to burn
> The vilest sinner may return.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator if he does not entertain quite a high regard for the individuals who comprise the State regulatory bodies, including that of his own State of Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Illinois, with the change in the State administration, and the coming in of Governor Stevenson, we now have a very fine State utility commission. They would still be able to control stub lines under my amendment.

Mr. O'CONOR. The reason why I ask the question is that the Senator from Illinois seems to have such little confidence in the Federal Power Commission and such great confidence in State regulatory commissions.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In Illinois.

Mr. O'CONOR. Does not the Senator from Illinois think it would be a good idea to utilize the powers of State regulatory bodies, rather than to place in the Federal Power Commission such overwhelming authority when he himself believes that the Federal Power Commission as now constituted is not worthy of such great power?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Maryland that section 5 (b) of the Gas Act, which the bill would repeal, in effect, so far as these lines are concerned, does not give mandatory powers to the Commission; it merely gives them power to investigate and make findings of fact concerning costs. I see no harm in permitting those facts to come out. The field of public utility valuation is dark enough anyway. Why blow out the lamp or the candle?

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. If I may preface my question by a statement concerning the Senator from Illinois, I think there is general recognition of the fact that he is one of the best qualified individuals in the United States on this entire question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I disavow this praise, even though it is sweet to my ears. I disavow it.

Mr. O'CONOR. I mean it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate it, but it is excessively generous.

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator from Illinois knows I am sincere in saying that. We are real and sincere friends.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator, Is there any area which would be left unregulated if the bill were passed? Is it not true that every phase of the operation would be under either State or Federal supervision and control?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator mean as to rates or service?

Mr. O'CONOR. Either or both.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us take rates. I would say that the localities in Ohio, under their home rule, would still have power to determine ultimate rates, but they would have to accept the cost of gas coming from the main trunk line into their local distributing systems. In regulating the cost of delivery of gas from the main pipeline into the local distributing systems there would be control, of course, by the Ohio Public Utility Commission, but they are bound by statute to observe reproduction costs. I think they probably would continue to be bound by statute even if the Federal Commission acted under this provision. But if S. 1084 passes, the people of Ohio would be denied the right to know the difference between what the valuation of the trunk line would be under the original cost, or prudent investment theory, and under the reproduction cost. So they would not see how much the reproduction cost standard would take out of their pockets.

Mr. O'CONOR. Would it not be possible for the public in Ohio, for the consumers in the State of Ohio, to use the Senator's illustration, to appear through counsel, through people's counsel, or through their attorneys, before the regulatory body and ascertain the facts to which the Senator refers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe it was back in 1938 that the city of Cleveland went before the Federal Power Commission and asked for a finding of fact about the valuation of the trunk line of the East Ohio Co. Interestingly enough, the man who got the city of Cleveland to act was Harold H. Burton, then mayor of Cleveland, subsequently our colleague in the Senate, and now a highly esteemed Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Mayor Burton really wanted to establish the facts, and he went to the Federal Power Commission for its find-

ing. As I understand it, the case has been in litigation for 13 years. The Federal Power Commission, as I understand it, is ready to go ahead and complete its finding. It has postponed the final steps and publication of its finding. If the bill is passed, it will never be possible for it to complete the investigation and publish its finding.

Mr. O'CONOR. Judging from the Senator's low estimate of the Federal Power Commission, nothing would be lost.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it will be very difficult for the Federal Power Commission not to complete its work in this case and publish its findings, in view of the debate on the floor of the Senate, much as it may desire not to publish the findings. What is the phrase of Lowell's—

Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again;
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes in pain,
And dies among his worsh'pers.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. In connection with the question as to whether or not there may be any area uncovered, which would thereafter not be subject to regulation either by the State or by the Federal Government, I am sure the Senator has noted the inclusion in the substitute of subsection (d). My primary reason for asking the question is to have it emphasized in the RECORD that in the substitute about which we are now speaking there is included the language in subsection (d), which reads as follows:

"(d) To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is afforded by this section, the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I noticed that.

Mr. O'CONOR. I wanted to ask if the Senator had noticed that, and whether he feels that that makes abundantly clear the fact that operations which are entirely intrastate, and which are now subject, we think, to regulation by the States, unquestionably thereafter would be subject to supervision by the regulatory bodies of the several States, in the light of this language.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make two replies. First, I should like to say a word about the cost study which apparently has been conducted by the Federal Power Commission. If it were stifled as it would be by the bill before us, I cannot quite see the State authorities starting over from scratch and going through with it after the Federal Power Commission has been dealing with the issue for some 13 years. It would mean that the facts as to the original cost and prudent investment of the East Ohio Gas Co., so far as its trunk lines are concerned, would never become public.

S. 1084 MAY ELIMINATE ONLY EFFECTIVE AUTHORITY TO COMPEL SERVICE TO COMMUNITIES

The second point I should like to make is in connection with service, which the Federal Power Commission can now compel under section 7 of the Natural Gas Act. I have read the Illinois Natural Gas case of some 10 years ago. It is not at all certain that even if the Federal Government cedes jurisdiction to the States, the States can then order feeder lines or stub lines to be put in to an exclusively State trunk-line company, when it is an organic part of an interstate pipeline. A summary of the ruling in the Illinois Natural Gas case, with which the Senator from Maryland is familiar, reads as follows:

A corporation, engaged within a State in the business of piping natural gas and selling it wholesale to distributors, whose supply of gas comes from sources outside of the State and moves in continuous streams from the pipeline of an affiliate at the State border to points where the corporation delivers it to its customers, is subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act of June 21, 1938, and cannot be required by State authority to extend its facilities and make sales in an area already served by another natural gas company similarly engaged and subject to the act, when no certificate of public convenience and necessity for such proposed extensions and sales has been granted by the Federal Power Commission under section 7 (c) of the statute.

2. It is unnecessary to determine whether the interstate commerce comes to an end when the company reduces the gas pressure before delivery into the service pipes of distributors so that the sales to distributors are intrastate in character, since the extension of the company's facilities as proposed in this case is so related to interstate commerce as to come within the congressional power to regulate not only interstate commerce itself, but also those matters which materially affect such commerce.

The Court expressly stated it would not in that case pass upon the precise question the Senator has addressed to me, because it did not have to do so in view of exercise of Federal authority by section 7 of the act. But the legal question is not at all clear and there may well be a gap in regulatory power at this point if the Federal power is surrendered by S. 1084 and the State is legally barred from exercising this authority over service.

If the amendment of the Senator in its present form is passed, I can picture the attorneys for the East Ohio Gas Co., if they object to extension of service which the local commission seeks to order, saying that while the East Ohio Gas Co., is a State concern, nevertheless it is a part of an organic interstate business, and, being such, the State commission cannot compel service.

Mr. President, I should like now to offer my amendment.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask the Senator whether he is in favor of having the stub lines supervised by the States?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONOR. And also the New York facilities?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Absolutely. My amendment does those two things, but it permits the Federal Power Commission to make a finding of fact as to original cost of the East Ohio trunkline and to retain its power to compel service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the parliamentary status. The bill is now before the Senate on reconsideration of the passage of the measure. That is now the question. It will not be open to amendment unless the action by which it was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading is reconsidered by unanimous consent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment in the nature of a substitute may be considered.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object, because I do not think we ought, by any technical means, to interfere with the orderly presentation, but should try to get at the merits—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the splendid attitude of the Senator.

Mr. O'CONOR. I think it would be entirely proper to enable the Senator to offer his amendment. He has not done this suddenly or without ample warning. Several days ago he placed his amendment in the RECORD, together with an explanatory statement giving the details, so there is no objection whatsoever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his characteristic courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Illinois, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717), as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a subsection (c) as follows:

"(c) The Commission upon its own motion may, or upon application shall, exempt from the provisions of this act a person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural gas and who owns or operates facilities used or to be used for the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce, or for the sale of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce, or for or in connection with the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire: *Provided*, That (1) such facilities do not extend beyond a community or metropolitan area, and (2) all gas delivered or transported through such facilities is ultimately consumed within such community or metropolitan area. To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is granted pursuant to this subsection the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to follow (9), to be numbered paragraph (10), to read as follows:

"(10) 'Community or metropolitan area' means the area of a community or city, and a zone adjacent thereto, which the Commission upon the basis of commercial, economic, social, or other relevant factors, or upon the basis of facilities, organization, and arrangements for the distribution of natural gas, finds to constitute a community

or an area properly integrated for the local distribution of natural gas, and within which the Commission finds that the transportation or sale of gas does not require regulation by the Commission in order to protect the public interest."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to be heard very briefly with reference to the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wished to speak for a minute, but I yield.

Mr. CASE. I merely wish to say that I regret that a bill of this character comes to the floor of the Senate on the final afternoon of the session, with so little opportunity for debate and with so many Members of the Senate absent.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, it seems to me it is very difficult for one to justify voting for a measure of this character, even though one may be in sympathy with the general purpose of the bill. It seems to me it is hardly fair to the general public or to Senators who are absent from the Chamber today.

I merely wish to register this point of view, so that however I may vote, my vote may be understood.

I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I realize that any bill with the word "gas" connected with it labors under a handicap in the Congress. In short, a bill containing the word "gas" already has two strikes against it, apparently, when it comes before the Congress. Members seem to believe that a bill containing that word has something wrong with it.

Mr. President, enactment of this bill is required because there is a jurisdictional dispute between the State public utilities commissions and the Federal Power Commission. This bill is an effort to work out those differences and to reconcile them.

We have taken up the matter with the Federal Power Commission and the State public utilities commissions. This matter has been going back and forth from one to the other, until finally we have been able to work out a satisfactory agreement between the Federal agency, on the one hand, and the State agencies, on the other hand. They agreed upon the bill which we have brought forward.

We did not think there would be any argument about the bill; we did not think any Member of Congress would object to the compromise which was worked out. We thought the bill might go through readily. But, unfortunately, we have run into this snag.

The Senator from Illinois, who has submitted an amendment on the floor of the Senate, had months and months and months in which to submit his amendment to the committee, and the committee could then have passed it on to the Federal Power Commission, and also taken it up with the State public utilities commissions. But the Senator from Illinois did not do that. He waited until the last moment, until we had the bill under consideration on the floor of the Senate, and then he offered the amendment.

I do not know what will be the attitude of the public utilities commissions of the States in regard to his amendment, but in my opinion, his amendment would completely destroy the bill. There are one or two portions of the bill which would not be destroyed by the amendment, but otherwise the amendment would completely change the entire complexion of the bill.

I believe it would be much better to defeat the whole measure, rather than to amend it in that way, on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. O'CONOR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall yield first to the Senator from Illinois. I mentioned his name, and I believe I should yield first to him, when I do yield. But, first I should like to finish the statement I was making.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have received from the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Colorado.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF COLORADO,
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
Denver, Colo., February 5, 1952.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: The Colorado Commission, in the past, has taken an active interest in the proposed amendment to the Natural Gas Act, Senate bill 1084. I believe that we have had some correspondence with you, too, on this matter.

At the sixty-third annual convention of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, which was held in Charleston, S. C., October 19, 1951, and which was attended by Commissioners Horton and Winchell of the Colorado Commission, the NARUC adopted a resolution favoring the enactment of a bill to amend section 1 of the Natural Gas Act along the lines of Senate bill 1084.

Subsequent to the national convention at Charleston, the NARUC executive committee unanimously voted to recommend a revised bill to Congress, which bill, as we understand it, is to be introduced in the Senate today as a substitute for Senate bill 1084. This bill will provide as follows:

"(a) Section 1 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U. S. C. 717), as amended, is amended by adding thereto two subsections (c) and (d), as follows:

"'(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to a person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the local distribution of natural gas or to any facilities used or to be used by such person to transport, whether or not in interstate commerce, natural gas received by such person within or at the border of a State to points of consumption within such State: *Provided, however,* That this subsection shall be operative only if none of such facilities is used or to be used for or in connection with the sale of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale or for or in connection with the transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire: *Provided further, however,* That the transportation of gas owned jointly or severally by two or more such persons through such a facility or facilities owned and operated singly or jointly by one or more of such persons, with or without charge, shall not be deemed transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce for hire within the meaning of the foregoing proviso, if such facility or facilities do not extend beyond a single metropolitan area and if all gas delivered or transported through such facility or facilities is ultimately consumed within such metropolitan area.

"'(d) To the extent that exemption from the provisions of this act is afforded by this section, the matters exempted are hereby declared to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the several States.'

"(b) Section 2 of such act is amended by adding thereto a new paragraph to follow paragraph (4), to be numbered paragraph (4–a), to read as follows:

"'(4–a) "Metropolitan Area" means the area within a single State, of a city, or a city and a zone adjacent thereto, which the Commission, upon the basis of commercial, economic, social, or other relevant factors, or upon the basis of facilities, organization and arrangements for the distribution of natural gas, finds to constitute an integrated community or an area properly integrated for the local distribution of natural gas, and within which the Commission finds that the transportation of gas does not require regulation by the Commission in order to protect the national interests'."

The Colorado Commission has for some time felt that there was a necessity for an amendment such as hereinabove set forth to the Natural Gas Act. Recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court interpreting the Natural Gas Act as it is presently written, it has seemed to us, have interpreted the power of the Federal Power Commission to be far beyond that contemplated by the Congress when it enacted the Natural Gas Act of 1940. The State commissions as a group are well equipped to handle the regulation of the local distribution of natural gas within a particular State, and the purpose of this bill is to more clearly define the regulatory responsibilities of the State commissions vis-à-vis the Federal Power Commission with respect to such local distribution of natural gas.

We will certainly appreciate your interest in this matter and we will be glad to furnish you with any information that you may wish to have further.

Very truly yours,
THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO,
By JOSEPH W. HAWLEY, *Chairman.*

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, at this time I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has said that I

had ample time to present my objections to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and to suggest my alternative amendment.

Let me inquire from my esteemed colleague, the Senator from Colorado, whether the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce carried on correspondence between the Federal Power Commission and the public utilities commissions of the States, in order to resolve——

Mr. DOUGLAS. But did the committee hold hearings on the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not know that we held hearings this year, but the matter has been before us for a long time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If no hearings were held on the bill this year, how could the Senator from Colorado expect me to know what was the internal procedure of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? I am not a mind reader. I do read the calendar. If I had known that committee hearings were being held, I would have appeared at such hearings. But I examined the calendar, and did not find any notice of hearings, and apparently no hearings were held.

So how can the Senator from Colorado say that I should have made such a suggestion, when the committee did not hold hearings at which I could have appeared to make the suggestion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois takes the position of being naive in this matter.

Let me say that this measure has been on the calendar since April 17. The Senator from Illinois could have taken up the matter with the two groups and could have found out what they thought of his proposal. The committee's report on the bill has been on the desk of the Senator from Illinois since April 17. We have included in that report a statement from the public utilities commissions of the States and from the Federal Power Commission. So the Senator from Illinois is not so naive in this matter as he pretends to be.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Now I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado tell the Senate what charges were preferred against Mr. Buchanan, a member of the Federal Power Commission, that prompted the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to refuse to approve Mr. Buchanan for reappointment to office? I think it is common knowledge that Mr. Buchanan has been a strong public member of the Federal Power Commission and has performed his duties satisfactorily in every way, insofar as the public is concerned.

So I believe the Senate is entitled to know why the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the Senator from Colorado is chairman, did not see fit to approve Mr. Buchanan for reappointment. Certainly the public is entitled to have some members on the Commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is bringing into the discussion a totally extraneous matter, one which has nothing to do with this subject.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not sure that it has nothing to do with it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I ask the Senator from Illinois to wait a minute, please. One question has already been asked of me.

Mr. AIKEN. Have public charges been preferred against Mr. Buchanan?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask the Senator to wait a minute, please. I have the Senator from Illinois on one side, badgering me, and I have the Senator from Vermont on the other side, badgering me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would not think of badgering the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not mind being badgered, but I want only one badger at a time. [Laughter.]

Let me reply to the Senator from Vermont. He asked a question, and he is entitled to an answer. The President sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Buchanan. It was referred to our committee. We conducted lengthy hearings, complete hearings on it, during which every one who desired to be heard, either for or against Mr. Buchanan was given the opportunity to testify. Hearings were printed. If the Senator from Vermont is interested, he can obtain a copy of the hearings, and may learn from them what complaints were made against Mr. Buchanan, and what statements were made in his favor. We shall be glad to make those hearings available to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us briefly what the charges were against Mr. Buchanan, intended to show that he was unfit for office?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I regret that I do not now have the time to do that. I would prefer that the Senator consult the hearings and reach his own conclusions.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in my understanding that there were no legitimate charges against Mr. Buchanan, to the effect that he had failed to perform his duty as a public member of the Federal Power Commission, but that certain vested interests did not want him reappointed? Did that appear to be the case?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I may say that when a vote was called for, nine members of the committee opposed his confirmation, four favored it.

Mr. AIKEN. Are we entitled to know the reasons?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I am not a mind-reader. I do not endeavor to explore the mind of each member of the committee, to try to determine what motivated him in voting as he did, or what caused him to reach a certain conclusion. If the Senator will read the hearings on Mr. Buchanan's nomination, he will then know what charges were made, or complaints—I do not think there were any charges. I do not think anyone brought any charges against Mr. Buchanan. Differences of opinion always exist among lawyers. If the Senator will read the hearings, he will be able to reach his own conclusion. I am unable to say why each member voted as he did.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is reported that the chairman of the committee voted to approve the nomination of Mr. Buchanan. If that be true, I wish to compliment him upon doing what he did, in the public interest. But, so far as I can learn from persons who followed the hearings, there were no legitimate charges made against Mr. Buchanan, except—and this is to his credit—that he had undertaken to protect the public interest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The question now being discussed is not associated with the subject we have before us today.

Mr. O'CONOR and Mr. DWORSHAK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. Merely for the RECORD, and in support of the statement made by the Senator from Colorado, and without bringing in the question of the confirmation or proposed confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Buchanan, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether it is not a fact that the public expressed themselves as to Mr. Buchanan in that governors of States and utility commissioners representing the public testified, and that all of them testified in opposition to Mr. Buchanan? So it must not be said that the public was not heard from in any sense, because it is to be assumed that the governors of States and members of State regulatory bodies represent the public. They expressed dissent and asked for an adverse report on the nomination. Is not that a fact?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that is a fact.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say in regard to the merits of the proposed substitute by the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I must qualify that answer by saying that the Wisconsin Commission favored the nomination of Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes; I did not mean that they all dissented. I meant that there were numerous complaints from State officials representing the public interest.

It is not a fact, I may ask the Senator from Colorado, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, if adopted, would result in dual supervision and regulation of a number of these companies, throughout the country; and that the Federal Power Commission

could step in and require intrastate companies to set up books, to change accounting practices, and to change depreciation practices, resulting in confusion and overlapping of jurisdiction between the Federal and State Governments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is precisely the case, and that is why I am so much opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. Instead of straightening out a situation which should be straightened out in the interests of good government, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, if adopted, would result in confusing it.

Mr. O'CONOR. Very true. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, I should like to ask him one further question. He asked whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would meet with the approval of the Federal Power Commission and of its counsel. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado, is it not a fact that the amendment proposed by the committee conforms in every respect to the recommendation of the Federal Power Commission, unanimously made, including concurrence by Mr. Buchanan, and that the language of the bill as now before the Senate, and as reported by the committee, is exactly in the wording of the Federal Power Commission, as submitted through its counsel?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I merely desire to speak for a moment or so in order to clear up certain of the points raised by our esteemed colleague, the Senator from Colorado, and in order to make the real issues clear.

The Senator from Colorado has said that the bill was unanimously approved by the Federal Power Commission. I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the statement of Chairman Thomas C. Buchanan, of the Federal Power Commission, who I think has a few days left to live on the Commission. His statement appears at page 12 of the committee report. It is as follows:

> I concur in the belief that the proposed amendment will accomplish the stated objective, i. e., to exempt the East Ohio Gas Co. and other gas companies similarly situated from the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. However I am not in agreement that it is the only method by which the removal of so-called stub lines from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction can be accomplished.
>
> The so-called stub lines physically and practically are clearly apart from East Ohio yet they are governed by the East Ohio decision because they transport natural gas in interstate commerce. I believe the matter can be better handled by the adoption of language similar to part II, section 204 (a) (4a) of the Interstate Commerce Act giving the Commission discretion to exempt facilities from jurisdiction where the public interest would not be violated by such action.
>
> Not being able to convince others with the merits of my idea and realizing that even it could be an instrument in the hands of a Commission so minded, to exempt East Ohio from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction, I have agreed to the new language submitted herein as revised in order to dispose of the stub line issue effectively. I wish it understood, however, that I believe the East Ohio operation, as distinguished from the "stub" line situation, is a proper subject for the retention of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction.
>
> I have not reservations as to the so-called New York amendment.

Mr. President, my amendment conforms completely to Mr. Buchanan's opinion, namely, that it exempts stub lines from Federal Power Commission regulations, as it should, and it exempts the Brooklyn-Manhattan situation, but it does retain, as applying to extensive trunk lines like East Ohio, section 5 (b) of the Natural Gas Act which gives the Federal Power Commission authority to make findings of fact as to what the original cost of the East Ohio Gas Co. pipe line actually was and hence to compare the cost with the reproduction cost which the chairman says the Ohio Commission would have to adopt. It also retains the Federal Power Commission's authority to order service to communities not now connected with the line. The real purpose of the committee bill would seem to be not the exemption of stub lines, but rather to blow out the candle on the question of costs and valuation of the pipe line. This I oppose, and I hope by amendment may be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and that pair has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—21

Aiken	Hill	Monroney
Benton	Humphrey	Moody
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Chavez	Kilgore	Murray
Douglas	Langer	Neely
Ferguson	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Hennings	Magnuson	Wiley

NAYS—52

Bennett	Hayden	Martin
Bridges	Hendrickson	Maybank
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Conor
Cain	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Hunt	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Dworshak	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Flanders	McCarran	Underwood
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	
Green	Malone	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Ives	Seaton
Brewster	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Knowland	Sparkman
Byrd	Lodge	Taft
Carlson	McMahon	Thye
Dirksen	Millikin	Tobey
Duff	Nixon	Young
Eastland	Russell	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe all Senators feel that the majority leader is entitled to commendation for his efforts in bringing the Senate to an early adjournment. I personally feel that a remarkable job has been done. I would add also a few words of praise for his ability and energy in a specialized field—the field of mining. I feel that the second session of the Eighty-second Congress should not come to a close without a few words of commendation being directed at the junior Senator from Arizona for the contribution he has made to the mining industry not only in this Congress, but throughout his years in the Senate.

It is a consistent record the majority leader has made in this field in the 12 years he has been a member of the Senate. He may well be proud of it.

One of the first bills the junior Senator from Arizona presented as a freshman Member at the beginning of the Seventy-seventh Congress was a mining bill. It was S. 267, a bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make small mining loans for the purpose of financing preliminary development work.

That bill set a pattern of interest and concern in the growth and prosperity of the mining industry in his own State, and an over-all, sincere interest and concern in the protection and development of the minerals, ores, and metals as key materials in our national defense.

The majority leader has never lost sight of the fact that the mining industry is one of tremendous importance to the economy of his State.

Arizona copper production last year shattered all records, having a gross value in excess of $200,000,000 and representing 45 percent of United States output. The highest previous Arizona figure was $196,000,000 worth in 1917, a record that stood for 35 years.

Largely because of copper, Arizona has for many years led the Nation in total value of nonferrous materials produced. Last year's mineral production in Arizona was worth almost double World War II high of $121,000,000. During the past 10 years Arizona's mineral output has exceeded $1,500,000,000 in value.

The junior Senator from Arizona has served his State and its important mining economy with untiring diligence. He rightfully assumed he was not only helping the mines and the men who work in them when he fostered their interests in the Congress, but that he was rendering even wider service to all in his State as the wages, taxes, and sales at the mines trickled down through the other economies of the State. When a single industry develops into $1,500,000,000 business in a single decade, the policy of the junior Senator from Arizona is patently sound. He certainly never has let Arizona down, and few in Congress today have a finer record of steady vigilance and tireless activity in behalf of interests of his State than has the majority leader.

It is on a basis of national benefit, as well as of provincial aid, that I would speak in praise of the Arizona Senator's activity and interest. Second only to his interest in the development and growth of the industry in Arizona has been a continuing interest in the importance of minerals, ores, and metals in strengthening our national defense. As we have had to tighten our belts, in the demands for strategic minerals and metals in more recent years, the insistence of the majority leader in encouraging and developing such supplies becomes significant. For 12 years he has sought to provide incentives, and to employ every means to encourage exploration, in order to find within our own borders new supplies of ores that could replace depleted stocks as heavier demands built alarming shortages.

The outlook of the junior Senator from Arizona has been broad on this matter. He has thought of the prosperity of the industry as it exists today in terms of wages, taxes, employment, defense stockpiling, and furnishing raw material for domestic and defense production in fields dependent upon such supplies.

New mines meant all these things in added volume. Finding a new "glory hole" meant new jobs, new taxes, new revenue, greater supplies for war needs, and a greater prosperity for his own State and the Nation.

He has championed proposals, both of his own authorship and those of colleagues, to aid the prospector who required help for exploration, and to aid the marginal mining operation that in hours of national need would be important but must be helped through the lean years. He has battled consistently, time after time, to protect not only Arizona copper, but all other American copper, from suspension of a tariff differential that would permit the product of peon miners in other parts of the world to flood the American market. America first—in copper and in full dinner pails at the mines—has been a policy to which the junior Senator from Arizona has been committed always.

In his service in the Senate, the Arizona Senator has sponsored or cosponsored 19 different measures dealing with mining. His voting record on beneficial mining legislation has been as impressive as that of any Member of the Senate.

All of the measures he has authored have not been enacted into law, though many of them have. Even when a measure of value to the industry is not enacted into law, however, the fight for it in committee and in debate stresses again and again the importance of strategic ores, minerals, and metals to the national defense. Such reaffirmation before the Congress can be a factor in paving the way subsequently for benefits to the industry. A selling job has been done, even if a bill has not been passed.

Mineral and metal exploration is particularly important in his own State, where the Arizona Senator feels that the record of past discoveries indicates that much mineral wealth is still undiscovered.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, Senator McFARLAND authored a bill to afford relief to owners of gold mines which had been closed or in which operations had been curtailed because of the War Production Board limitation order.

Continuation of premium payments with respect to copper, lead, and zinc was sponsored by Senator McFARLAND in the second session of the Seventh-ninth Congress, when these metals were of such importance in the defense picture of America.

A legislative approach taken by Senator McFARLAND to further the development of mineral resources of Arizona and the Nation was his sponsorship of a measure to create an incentive payment division within the Department of the Interior. It was designed "to stimulate the production and conservation of critical ores, minerals, and metals."

In taking a role of fighting leadership in the Senate when periodical efforts were made to lift foreign import levies on copper, Senator McFARLAND was the author of Senate bill 2022 in the Eighty-first Congress—an act to place a tax on the importation of copper—a bill that became Public Law 33.

He joined in sponsoring a bill to make public lands held in trust by the State of Arizona available for mineral exploration, development and production for a term to last until such deposits are commercially exhausted, with a 12½ percent royalty reserved to the State. Because of previous limits on the terms of mineral leases, prospectors and developers were unwilling to take exploration risks for the reason that the tenure of beneficial use to them was unfairly restricted. The measure, which became Public Law 44, tended to extend exploration and add to Arizona's mining worth.

Arizona's tremendous stake in the mining industry in its expanding economy has been kept constantly in mind by Senator McFARLAND, both as a member of the Senate and, in the Eighty-second Congress, as the majority leader. Measures having any bearing on the welfare of the mining industry and a full dinner pail for the men who work in the mines has always found in him a ready and willing champion.

In the first session of the present Congress he sponsored a bill enabling Arizona to make leases encouraging to further development of its oil and mineral resources, this measure becoming Public Law 44.

Senator McFARLAND's efforts played an important part in providing a manganese ore purchasing depot for his State. The current week marks the opening of this depot at Wenden, Ariz. It is the fourth manganese depot set up in conjunction with the Government's 5-year domestic purchase program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of manganese in the United States.

Session by session, year by year, the junior Senator from Arizona has built an enviable record in this field. Giving it formal recognition and praise on the floor of the Senate puts on the RECORD the appreciation of myself and the colleagues who have been associated with him in these matters. I trust it expresses, also, the appreciation his State of Arizona must feel as it has watched his untiring efforts through the years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I believe all Members of this Congress, at its adjournment hour, feel a sense of pride in our achievements. By the yardstick of time, adjourning as we are before the conventions, the session has been a short one. The measure of achievements, however, is a full and favorable one. Many important matters have come before this session of Congress, and good legislation has come forth.

The measure of any legislative body is not the number of laws passed but the manner in which problems of the country have been handled. Quality, not quantity, is the test.

In the field of veterans' legislation I believe this Congress has made a splendid record. In this field the activities of the majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona, have been outstanding. He has sponsored and fought for benefits for the veterans not only of his

own State but of the Nation. In legislation involving primarily Arizona veterans' problems and benefits, he has been farseeing and aggressive.

Few in Congress, I believe, have a finer record of helping the men and women of the armed services—past and present—than Senator MCFARLAND. In his years in the Senate, he has been the author or cosponsor of 32 pieces of veterans' legislation. Many of these have been enacted into law. Of those that failed in final passage in the other House of Congress, the Arizona Senator was at least successful in steering them through the Senate.

A recent example of this is his bill, S. 2621, to establish a national cemetery in the State of Arizona. This measure passed overwhelmingly in the Senate, but on the House side ran into opposition and placed mercenary considerations ahead of the desires expressed by veterans' organizations and military men in all parts of his State. Even a memorial from the State legislature in Arizona in support of Senator MCFARLAND'S bill was ignored under the pressure of private interests forming the opposition.

Two measures authored or cosponsored by the Senator from Arizona in this session of the Eighty-second Congress passed both Houses and became public laws.

The first was the Servicemen's Readjustment Act to provide educational and other benefits to the veterans of Armed Forces since beginning of the conflict in Korea.

The second was a bill providing bonus payment to members of the Armed Forces engaged in combat duty.

Senator MCFARLAND'S efforts in behalf of veterans began in the first Congress in which he sat as one of Arizona's Senators. In the Seventy-seventh Congress, he introduced a bill enabling all members of the Armed Forces to send mail free of cost. This became Public Law 507 of that Congress.

In the intervening years, many bills carrying benefits for veterans have come from the desk of Senator MCFARLAND, and his voting record shows a consistent support of all measures serving the interests of those of the armed services.

Bills which were enacted into law or brought successfully through to Senate enactment are numerous in the veterans field on Senator MCFARLAND'S record. Among others were these:

A bill providing medical, hospital, and pension benefits to veterans of military service since beginning of the Korean conflict.

A bill to equalize the pay and retirement benefits of certain commissioned officers of the Coast Guard.

A bill to facilitate the retirement of those who were automatically transferred from the Customs Bureau to the Coast Guard.

A bill to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II.

A bill providing for the tax exemption on playing cards sent to servicemen outside the United States.

A bill amending the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to provide allowances and educational benefits to all veterans of World War II.

A bill to further provide for readjustment of veterans of World War II to civilian life.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, though I shall not take the time of the Senate to read a statement I had wished to make. I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURE, RECLAMATION, IRRIGATION

Mr. President, in the closing hours of a session of Congress we may well take cognizance of achievements of our colleagues. In this connection, I think particularly of the majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona.

We are all aware of the effort—the hard work and the energy—that his responsibilities have involved. This is particularly evident if we look back a few weeks at the stacks of legislation and appropriation measures that awaited us and then realize that the session is nearing adjournment. Adjourning before the conventions—that was the pledge of the majority leader, made several weeks ago. At the time it seemed to be more of a hope—a somewhat fantastic hope—yet we are near the hour of adjournment and the gavel is yet to fall for the first of the Chicago conventions.

A tremendous amount of work has been involved for all of us to meet this goal. But a larger job has been that of the majority leader in making sure that we did that work in the allotted time and closed up shop.

I make this preface to a few remarks I want to make about the Senate majority leader in another field of activity—one that is very close and vital to his own State.

Senator MCFARLAND has had two jobs—that of majority leader and that of representative of the State of Arizona in the United States Senate. Let me say that the Arizona Senator has been a majority leader who never forgot that second responsibility. It has been closer to his heart than the honor he has achieved in the role more in the country's eye—that of majority leader.

Senator MCFARLAND has been a farmer—he still has a farm near his home town of Florence, Ariz. Because of a personal interest in farmers and their problems, it makes an interesting side light on his career in the United States Senate to see just how faithfully he has maintained his interest in farming, despite all the stress and strain involved in his other job as majority leader. Let me assure you, Mr. President, it is a remarkable record and one that rounds out impressively his record in this body.

Agriculture and irrigation are the Siamese twins of Arizona's economy. They can't be separated. It is therefore to be expected that the legislative interest and effort of the Senator from Arizona has been divided between the two.

Just how important agriculture is to Arizona is indicated by that fact that the total crop and livestock business there in 1951 totaled $352,712,000. In a compilation made last month, Arizona was shown to lead the Nation in the percentage increase of farm income over 10 years ago. The majority leader's State had an increase of 369 percent between 1941 and 1951 in farm and ranch income.

The annual value of livestock and animal products in Arizona shows a corresponding gain—from just over $25,000,000 in 1929 to nearly $100,000,000 in 1950. In a State with less than 1,000,000 people, agriculture thus becomes really big business. It is one of the legs on which the whole economy of the State stands.

It is interesting, therefore, to know that the junior Senator from Arizona has authored and cosponsored 37 measures in the fields of agriculture and reclamation in his busy, hardworking years in the Senate. Many of these have become public laws that have helped vitally not only people in his own State but those of the whole Nation. Many of the bills he has worked for have involved only his Arizona constituency and have contributed magnificently to its prosperity.

To indicate the caliber of some of these measures that the majority leader has seen enacted into law through his own efforts, I would mention a few.

A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to apply subsidy provisions to perennial agricultural crops such as citrus and to encourage their export.

A bill amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act to establish marketing quotas subject to vote by farmers.

A bill to prevent the entry into this country of certain mollusks which spread a highly communicable disease among farm animals.

A bill to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities such as waste cotton.

A bill providing for the construction and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project.

A bill authorizing an increase in subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation on livestock.

A bill to encourage the growing of important war crops by preserving the acreage allotments of cotton and other crops which might otherwise be lost.

A bill to provide for the deferment from military service of persons essentially engaged in agricultural occupations.

A bill providing for payment of compensation to holders of grazing permits on public land for losses sustained by use of such lands for war purposes.

In the fields of irrigation and reclamation, an equally fine and impressive record of accomplishment stands to the credit of Senator MCFARLAND.

One nearest the heart of the junior Senator from Arizona is a measure which he has yet to see become a reality. Such deferment is no fault of the Senator's—he twice has slugged it out against powerful opposition and seen it successfully pass the Senate. I refer, of course, to S. 75—the central Arizona project measure. In two different sessions, he has waged a glorious and successful fight on this measure.

To high light some of the measures of which he was either author or cosponsor that became public laws would best show the range of Senator MCFARLAND'S tremendous job in this field of legislation. I cite a few:

A bill authorizing water to be furnished to the Yuma auxiliary project through the works of the Gila project.

A bill granting consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact.

A bill to protect the scenic beauty along the south approach highway to the Grand Canyon within the Kaibab National Forest.

A bill authorizing withdrawal of public notices in the Yuma reclamation project to encourage filing of water-right applications.

A bill to authorize disposal of withdrawn public tracts too small to be classed as farm units under the Reclamation Act.

A bill authorizing the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district to drill, equip, and acquire wells.

A bill providing for the creation of the Wellton-Mohawk irrigation district and the Yuma Mesa division of the Gila project.

A bill to amend the San Carlos Act with reference to repayment charges.

A bill to provide for an investigation of hydroelectric power development and irrigation projects.

A bill authorizing construction of flood-control projects including the Holbrook project on the Little Colorado River.

A bill to provide for the acquisition of Indian land required in connection with the construction, operation and maintenance of transmission lines from the Parker Dam power project.

No more consistent voting record in behalf of reclamation and agriculture is found in the records of Congress than that of the junior Senator from Arizona.

It has been a matter of pleasure and pride to have been associated with Senator MCFARLAND. The people of Arizona may feel a deep sense of pride to have, as their representative here in the Senate, a man of such capabilities and with such a fine record of achievement.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I present a resolution which was adopted today by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, with reference to the chairman of that committee, the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, and I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as follows:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE—RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY HON. TOM CONNALLY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Whereas Senator TOM CONNALLY has been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations since 1931 and served as chairman from July 31, 1941, until December 1946 and again from January 1949 until the present; and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY has been chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations during years most critical to the destiny of this Nation; and

Whereas, in the discharge of his duties as chairman, Senator CONNALLY has at every opportunity encouraged the development of a bipartisan foreign policy; and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY has served the people of this Nation by his initiative and hard work in obtaining approval by the Senate of such important measures as the Connally resolution, the United Nations Charter, the Economic Cooperation Act, the North Atlantic Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Mutual Defense Assistance Program, the Connally-Russell resolution, the Japanese Peace Treaty, and the treaties and agreements relating to the German settlement; and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY has never failed to devote his full energy and ability to the service of his Nation; and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY, through his energy and vision, has contributed immeasurably to the development of vigorous United States leadership in world affairs and to the establishment of better relations among nations and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY has announced his intention to retire from the Senate in January 1953; and

Whereas Senator CONNALLY's leadership will be sorely missed by his colleagues on the committee and his many friends in the Senate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations expresses its warm affection for Senator CONNALLY, and its deep appreciation for his devotion to duty and for the outstanding service which he has rendered to the committee, to the Senate, to the United States, and to the entire free world by his great ability, initiative, and statesmanship.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that this resolution was unanimously approved by all of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee who were present. All but two members were present, those two being absent from the city.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, unless something unforeseen takes place, this will be the last day on which we will sit in the Senate with our beloved and distinguished senior Senator from Texas, TOM CONNALLY.

This is a day to be recorded in history—not only for Texans, but for all Americans. This is a day that marks a close to the legislative career of one of the most able, most patriotic men who has ever served in this body. After nearly four decades of fighting the good fight, he is retiring to a richly earned rest.

To describe Senator Tom as able and distinguished, however, is to tell only half the story. Those of us who have served with him and known him through the years will testify that he is more than that. He is also a man of great warmth, of deep perception, of broad humanity.

He is one who loves his fellow man, and in turn is loved by his fellow man. He is also a fighter who will battle for his fellow man.

To us who are Texans, it is incredible that TOM CONNALLY will not be back in the Senate fighting for us next year. Nearly two generations of Texans have grown to manhood knowing of no other name in political life than TOM CONNALLY.

Thirty-five years have passed since TOM CONNALLY first took his seat in the House of Representatives. Thirty-five years have passed since he first came to Washington to begin the battle for the people he loved and who reciprocated his affection.

The achievements and accomplishments of those 35 years are engraved deep in the most glorious chapters of the history of our State.

He fought for soil conservation—and our broad and fertile fields are dramatic testimony to his success.

He fought for rural electrification—and the lights that shine nightly in thousands of Texas farm homes are the prize of his struggle.

He fought for our small-business men—and today they can hold their heads high—secure in the protections he won for them.

He fought for the development of our oil fields—and the rich and mighty cities that have sprung up on our plains are the monuments to his triumphs.

We understand and respect the reasons for his decision to retire. But it leaves us with a sense of loss—a feeling that a mighty leader will no longer be in the forefront of our battles.

We of Texas are proud—very proud—of our great men. We honor and revere those who led us as a republic and fought for our development as a State—James Bowie, Davy Crockett, Sam Houston—the glorious names of the past. But when the final chapter is written, even among those men, TOM CONNALLY will be a giant.

Yes; we of Texas are jealous to claim TOM CONNALLY as our own. But jealous though we may be, we know we must share him with the Nation. For TOM CONNALLY is not only a great Texan but a great American. He fought for Texas and he fought for America and both his State and his Nation have been enriched.

It is impossible to write the history of this era without engraving the name TOM CONNALLY on every page. Since 1924, when he attended the Interparliamentary Union in Geneva, he has been a commanding figure not only on the national scene but in the world scene.

At international conferences, in the United Nations, in world councils, his keen mind and his powers of oratory have been a mighty force for the United States. His grasp of the present and his high vision of the future have brought to the entire globe a picture of America at its best.

TOM CONNALLY is a man among men, a statesman who belongs to the ages.

But in the years to come, those of us who know him, who cherish his sage counsels, who have followed his wise leadership, will always think of him on the Senate floor.

We will remember his command of the English language, his flashing wit, his uncanny ability to explain the intricate and complicated problems of modern life in the homely terms of the average American. We will also remember his patriotism, his courage, his sense of responsibility that led him to fight for what we believed to be right.

Something is leaving the Senate—something great and very human. A splash of color, a surge of vitality, a vision of statesmanship, a rare quality of humanity. That is TOM CONNALLY—the TOM CONNALLY who will not be with us when we meet next year.

He will be enjoying the peace and tranquillity which he has earned by the many years of struggle in the arena of public service. We will be the richer for having known him—and the poorer for his absence.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes himself as a Senator emeritus from Kentucky. [Laughter.]

Under the rules of the Senate, every former Senator not only is entitled to come to the floor of this Chamber, but is welcome to come here. We have with us today a former Member of the United States Senate, who served with distinction, ability, and fidelity for 10 years. If he had attained no other honor he would be welcome on this floor as a former Senator from the State of Missouri.

He is the President of the United States. He is a great President, a President who has displayed vision, courage, and determination, a President whose

administration and service, in my judgment, will go down in history as outstanding in one of the most crucial and critical periods this Nation and the world at large have ever known.

The Chair feels that he speaks for the entire membership of the Senate, without regard to politics, in welcoming to the floor the former Senator from Missouri, the President of the United States. [Prolonged applause, the Senators rising.]

I may add that the object of the President's visit here today is not political in the slightest degree. In these days of economy and on this last day—as we hope—of the Eighty-second Congress, the President has come here for a final square meal in the Senate. [Laughter.]

The Chair is glad to recognize the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, I wonder if I could obtain unanimous consent, without calling a special session to listen to a message, to reply to the most cordial remarks of the President of the Senate. May I have that permission?

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, nearly every year since I left the Senate I have come back for the last day of the session. As a Senator, I went through 10 sessions, and they marked 10 of the happiest years of my life. I think the Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the history of the world. In making that statement, I hope no Members of the House will quote me on the floor of the House, because I still have to get legislation through the House, as well as through the Senate.

I came here today at your invitation, as you have remarked, Mr. President, to get one square meal. The expenses of the White House since we moved into the reconstructed building have become so great that it is almost impossible to provide enough groceries for its larder. Therefore, due to your generosity, I have been able today to enjoy a good meal and to visit with Members of the Senate, with nearly all of whom I am personally acquainted. It has been a great day for me, and I appreciate it.

As I said a day or two ago down in Arkansas, I am not in the position of the man whose wife had died, and who was told, on the day of the funeral, that he would have to ride to the cemetery in the same car with his mother-in-law. He said he could do it, but that it would spoil the whole day for him. [Laughter].

This day has not been spoiled for me. It has been made a perfect day. I appreciate the privilege which has been extended to me. It has been a pleasure indeed to visit with my former colleagues, as well as with Members who have come to this great deliberative body since I left.

I hope that after January 20 you will let me come back once in a while and have a square meal, because they will be harder to get then than they are now. [Laughter and prolonged applause, Senators rising.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, anything that I could say about the recent presence in the Chamber of the President of the United States would be anticlimatic. It was a wonderful thing to see the President of the United States sitting in the same seat which he occupied when I first came to the Senate. He was sitting there while the junior Senator from Texas was paying his beautiful tribute to the senior Senator from Texas, TOM CONNALLY.

Mr. President, I doubt if any Senator has had or will have a more colorful career in Congress than TOM CONNALLY has had. He is a rugged individualist, willing to stand on his feet and match wits with anyone. Some of us did not care to match wits with him because we knew that we would be at a disadvantage. He has distinguished himself in the field of his country's foreign relations. I believe that through the efforts of TOM CONNALLY great steps have been taken to promote a lasting peace in this war-torn and troubled world. He has been unselfish in what he has done. In many instances he has been willing to step aside and let others do work which was properly his own, in order to bring about better harmony in our bipartisan efforts to promote peace.

Mr. President, TOM CONNALLY has not been merely a Senator who has become a great statesman. He has been a true representative of the people of the great State of Texas. He has fought for many projects in behalf of Texas on the floor of the Senate. He has always been willing to help new Senators with advice when they came to the Senate. I am proud to be numbered among those Senators. I am proud to have been considered a friend of TOM CONNALLY.

Mr. President, I have not the words properly to describe the career of this great statesman. His record speaks for itself.

PRIORITY OF RECOGNITION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to make an announcement for the information of the Senate. Inasmuch as this is the last day of this session of Congress the Chair feels that it is his duty to give priority of recognition to Senators who wish to bring up conference reports and other necessary measures which must be passed upon before Congress adjourns.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. HOEVEN, of Iowa, had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, vice Mr. HILL, excused.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6839. An act to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; and

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes;

S. 1041. An act to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2922. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 707. An act for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of John George Papailias;

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyk;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1448. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1477. An act for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin;

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1814. An act to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan;

H. R. 1843. An act for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2447. An act for the relief of George M. Sanger;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2856. An act for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel);

H. R. 2906. An act for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Vito Aiuto.

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Anny Scher;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3382. An act for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi;

H. R. 3438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80);

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse.

H. R. 3705. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju;

H. R. 3776. An act for the relief of Wong See Sun;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Aldo Vallesa;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of Franco Berardi;

H. R. 4001. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the City and County of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian home lands;

H. R. 4407. An act to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4797. An act to ratify and confirm act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of Act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of Act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935;

H. R. 4799. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4800. An act to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Silas B. Morris;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5055. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5087. An act for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5120. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 5198. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 5327. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5481. An act for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana;

H. R. 5788. An act to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi; and

H. R. 5911. An act for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CLERK OF HOUSE TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 239, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of general appropriation bills enacted during the remainder of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Clerk of the House may correct chapter, title, and section numbers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO TOWN OF DEDHAM, MAINE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
HUGH BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANNUITIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9595–9596 of House proceedings of July 5, 1952.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9441–9442 of House proceedings of July 4, 1952.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is objection to the conference report itself, it will be agreed to.

Mr. CASE. I wish to make brief remarks on the amendment the Senate adopted, but which I understand was dropped in the conference. I do not care whether my statement is made following adoption of the conference report or now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7289, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 4, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 21, 23, 24, and 43 to the bill (H. R. 7289) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: ", of which sum, $100,000 may be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting, under private auspices but under the supervision of the Department of State, radio programs to Western Europe and Latin America, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendships with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 404. When the buildings in Judiciary Square now occupied by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia are vacated by such courts, the Architect of the Capitol shall cease to perform any duties in connection with such buildings and any duties theretofore performed by him with respect to these buildings shall thereafter be performed by the General Services Administration. Such amounts of the appropriations herein provided for expenditure for such buildings by the Architect of the Capitol as may be unobligated at the time of transfer of duties shall be transferred by the Architect of the Capitol to the General Services Administration."

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 52.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, when the Senate passed the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill last week, the Senate adopted an amendment, submitted by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, to apply a 10-percent reduction to the Foreign Service budget of the State Department. The vote on that amendment was 46 to 36. The Senate also voted for a reduction of approximately $4,500,000, which the amendment made possible.

Regrettably, the conference report before us lifts the 10-percent cut from the Foreign Service, and restores two-thirds of the dollar saving which the Senate voted.

In the discussion of this amendment, both on and off the floor, this past week, two points have been made by those who oppose it and whose views apparently are going to prevail.

It has been said that much of the increase in our foreign mission staffs is due to the information program and other activities performed for other agencies. The figures, however, as I have been able to assemble them, refute that assertion. Yesterday, the State Department supplied me with a table which tells the story for the same 10 foreign missions which I cited to the Senate on June 26. Senators may refer to pages 8102 and 8103 for the earlier citation.

I have that table before me. It is entitled "Personnel on Duty for State Department, Americans and Locals, Selected Posts." The countries listed in the table are: Argentina, Belgium, Cuba, England, France, Iceland, India, Iran, Japan, and Mexico; and the figures given are for the years 1940 and 1952. The figures are broken down to show the number of employees engaged in the basic activities, those working on USIE support, those working on the USIE program, and those whose services are performed for other agencies. The totals are also given.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Personnel on duty for State Department, Americans and locals, selected posts

Country	Salaries and expenses (basic activities)		USIE support		USIE program		Services performed for other agencies		Total	
	1940	1952	1940	1952	1940	1952	1940	1952	1940	1952
Argentina	68	102	.....	15	.....	77	.....	21	68	215
Belgium	38	126	.....	15	.....	42	.....	83	38	266
Cuba	73	125	.....	7	.....	23	.....	7	73	162
England	215	384	.....	33	.....	102	.....	213	215	732
France	185	485	.....	89	.....	308	.....	219	185	1,101
Iceland	2	22	.....	3	.....	9	.....	4	2	38
India	68	235	.....	132	.....	478	.....	42	68	887
Iran	29	103	.....	58	.....	132	.....	62	29	355
Japan	132	306	.....	19	.....	37	.....	5	132	367
Mexico	209	387	.....	38	.....	109	.....	8	209	542

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in studying the table, I hope Senators will note that the left-hand column shows only the number of employees for the basic, ordinary activities of the Foreign Service. It was in the appropriations for those activities that the Senate voted a 10-percent reduction. The 10-percent reduction voted by the Senate applied to the personnel engaged in those basic activities. That is the force of employees which has been enlarged since 1945.

The information program personnel, or so-called support personnel for the information program, and personnel that do work for other agencies are shown in the other columns. All of these persons are paid from other funds. The 10-percent cut would not have affected them at all. It would have applied only to the personnel listed in the left-hand column.

Let me also say that this table does not show mutual security personnel or per-

sonnel of other departments and agencies who are overseas.

Increases of from 2 to 10 times the personnel shown for 1940 are cited for 1952, and yet we are told that a 10-percent reduction is impossible.

It has also been said, against the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself, that the Foreign Service was cut from 10,455 in 1946 to 8,694 in 1952. These figures are very misleading, for in 1945 the Foreign Service totaled only 6,028—some 2,500 persons below the present level.

The facts are that in 1946 some 2,100 persons were taken into the Foreign Service en bloc from various war agencies, and many others were added under a new program which made possible lateral entrance into the service, and greatly weakened the excellent career system which had been established over the years.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate may recall that the OWI and other wartime agencies were bodily transferred into the State Department following 1945. That transfer resulted in the larger figure for 1946. But the State Department itself in 1945 had only 6,028 employees, or 2,500 less than the present number.

It is true that the Congress has been cutting back toward the war and prewar levels. But we have a long way to go, and many 10-percent cuts will be needed before we arrive.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the State Department personnel, by totals, for the years 1938 to 1951, inclusive, for both the domestic and the foreign service. The table shows factually that the total has increased from 4,657, in 1938, to 13,908, in 1951. That is an increase of more than three times, over that period of years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Department of State personnel—General Functions

Year	Domestic	Foreign	Total
1938	947	3,710	4,657
1939	1,002	4,075	5,077
1940	1,028	4,129	5,157
1941	1,130	4,123	5,253
1942	2,006	3,882	5,888
1943	2,204	4,598	6,802
1944	2,645	5,158	7,803
1945	3,209	6,028	9,237
1946 [1]	8,228	10,455	18,683
1947	7,920	10,371	18,291
1948	5,841	11,304	17,145
1949	4,999	11,377	16,376
1950	4,948	9,393	14,341
1951	4,892	9,016	13,908

[1] In 1946 the regular domestic personnel increased to 3,831. In addition, 4,397 were added to the domestic budget from various war agencies which were incorporated into the Department. The regular Foreign Service grew to 8,335 in 1946, and 2,100 more were added from war agencies. Since 1946, some of these personnel have again been transferred to other budgets or are paid from reimbursed funds.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I secured that table yesterday from the State Department. The table does not include any personnel for the information program, for support of that program, or for any other outside activities. It includes, in other words, no reimbursable personnel.

Mr. President, the Department of State needs further and drastic cuts in both its domestic and foreign staff. The State Department would be more efficient if it cleaned house.

I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for the reductions it has effected in this Congress; but I commend to the Eighty-third Congress a painstaking and thorough examination of duplication, waste, and inefficiency in the department which remain to be corrected.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely desire to make a statement in connection with the conference report.

As chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and the Joint Committee on Defense Production established pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950 and chairman of Senate conferees on the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, I feel it incumbent upon me to state my own position on amendment 18 to section 113 of H. R. 7289, which contains as Title I "Department of State Appropriations Act 1953."

Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Chair wishes to state that there is no conference report before the Senate at the moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that, Mr. President, but I desire to quote from the conference report on State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations, 1953, House bill 7289.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report on that bill has been agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand, but I am making a record in connection with the conference report. I did not object to it. I had no intention of objecting to it when it came up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. There was a little confusion.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what I was trying to do was to make a short statement for the RECORD, if I am in order, I shall appreciate it if the Chair will permit me to continue.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Chair has said there was a little confusion. I would say the Chair was very conservative in his statement. There is a great deal of confusion. I hope that, aside from secretaries and those who are assisting Senators, other persons will retire from the Chamber, if they have no business on the floor. I know that everyone is anxious to observe what is done in the closing hours of the session. I wish that those whose attendance is not required on the Senate floor would retire to the galleries, in order that the business of the Senate may be expedited. We are trying to proceed in an orderly fashion, and to see that no mistakes are made. It is difficult for Senators who have the responsibility of observing closely what is being done, to know what is going on. I hope we may have order on the Senate floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to make this statement: The confusion to which the Chair referred was the confusion at the desk as to whether there was a conference report before the Senate. The Chair takes the position that there is no conference report before the Senate at this time. The conference report on House bill 7289, making appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, for 1953, has already been agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am well aware of that. I was called in when the conference report came before the Senate. I said I was not going to object to the report, but what I desire to do is to place in the RECORD a statement regarding the conference report, as a matter of legislative history.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator from Arkansas feels as I do, since what I am about to say affects an amendment of his.

Section 113 of House bill 7289, to which I referred, as contained in the bill passed by the Senate on June 26, reads as follows:

> No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference.

The statement of the managers, appearing on page 9441 of the RECORD for July 4, has this to say about amendment No. 18, which concerns section 113 of the general provisions pertaining to the Department of State appropriations:

> The conferees on the part of both Houses agree on Senate amendment No. 18 and it is the intention of the conferees that the wording of the amendment will not preclude the Department of State from observing the activities of the International Materials Conference in the same manner and to the same extent that the United States might observe the activities of other international organizations to which the United States does not belong.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear that, in my opinion, the effect of this language in an appropriation bill pertaining to Department of State funds does not and cannot set aside the legislation approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President last week amending and extending the Defense Production Act of 1950 wherein continued participation in the International Materials Conference by the United States Government was recognized.

All this appropriations act pertaining to the Department of State does or can do is to prevent that Department from using its appropriation under that title to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference. I agree fully with the statement of Senator FULBRIGHT at the time this section 113 of the State Department Act was passed by this body on a voice vote that—

> The adoption of the amendment does not constitute an expression on the part of the Senate that the United States should not participate in the International Materials

Conference. That question has been decided by the Senate. The latest expression of the Senate on that issue is June 11, when it adopted, by a vote of 46 to 31, an amendment which I proposed to the Defense Production Act. It occurs to me that the question of whether we should participate in the International Materials Conference is a legislative question (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 26, pp. 8108–8109).

That legislative question was decided by the Congress when it approved the Defense Production Act amendments of 1952 and the bill became law.

I also agree with Senator FULBRIGHT'S further statement:

As I read the amendment, it would affect only the State Department appropriations.

I want to make clear to this body that nothing in this appropriations rider serves to prevent the President of the United States from carrying out the full provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, including the section pertaining to the IMC.

Mr. President, I agree fully with the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], at the time section 113 of House bill 7298 was before the Senate, and when it was approved by a voice vote. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read further from the record, but what I desire to make clear is that the legislative question was decided by the Congress when amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1952 were agreed to, and when the bill was passed. I had no intention of objecting to the conference report on House bill 7289, making appropriations for State, Justice, and Commerce, 1953. I merely desired to make a contribution to the legislative history, and point out that the Congress had passed this bill since hearings were begun on the Defense Production Act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any conference report awaiting the attention of the Senate? If so, the Chair will recognize the Senator who may wish to submit it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I have not yielded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from South Carolina had concluded.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President. I desire to yield now to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], provided I may do so without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Arkansas, without losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the amendment to title I of H. R. 7289, providing that none of the funds appropriated for the State Department shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference.

This provision originated in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and when that bill came before the Senate on June 26, I pointed out that the amendment did not constitute an expression on the part of the Senate that the United States should not participate in the International Materials Conference.

That question was passed upon by the Senate when it adopted the conference report on the Defense Production Act. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Michigan disapproved of the conference report, most emphatically, because, he said, the compromise worked out by the conference committee legalized the International Materials Conference. I do not agree with this, because, as a matter of fact, the IMC did not need to be legalized. Nevertheless, the effect of the conference report on the Defense Production Act was to continue legislative sanction for the IMC. The purpose of this statement is to emphasize that fact, and the further fact that the bill appropriating funds for the State, Commerce and Justice Departments does not deny the authority of the United States Government to continue to participate in the IMC.

I make this statement because I know that representations will be made to Mr. Fowler and to others responsible for the defense production program that the Congress has expressed itself to the effect that the United States should not participate. I deny this, and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as the Joint Committee on the Defense Production Act, I will insist that the Government has authority to continue to participate. I maintain that the question is one under the jurisdiction of those committees, and I further believe the Committee on Appropriations has gone rather far afield in legislating upon this subject.

I recall quite well in the discussion on June 26 that we understood members of the committee intimated then that they thought it was a proper matter for a legislative committee, and even the statement on the part of the conferees in the conference report would seem to try to create the impression that they could restrict the use of funds for the participation of the IMC.

Mr. President, I am not quite in accord with the position of the Senator from South Carolina in that I would have objected to the report if I had had an opportunity, not only because of this amendment but also because of amendment No. 16.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that last year, in the case of the item dealing with appropriations for the exchange-of-persons program, under the authority of the Smith-Mundt Act, the Senate voted 52 to 16 to put into the bill a provision similar to this, for $10,000,000. The conferees on the part of the Senate at that time did not see fit to retain any part of the amount provided by a vote in the Senate of 52 to 16. This year the Senate adopted such an amendment, but again, apparently, the Senate conferees were unable to hold any part of it, for the provision which was accepted by the Senate was stricken out.

I want to emphasize that I know of nothing we can now do in the Senate to maintain it, since even in the face of a very heavy vote in its favor by the Senate we were unable to make any headway on that program in the conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. I had not objected to the conference report for the reason that the report was signed by all the members of the conference, and also that if I had objected we would have gotten the same report back.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that objection would have been fruitless, and I have no doubt it would have been unfair under the circumstances existing in the Senate committee. I only say that I want the RECORD to indicate very clearly that as one Senator I do not personally approve of the action of the conference on these items.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator understands that I did not approve.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the conference provision is emphatic. The language is as emphatic as any language can be made, that no part of the appropriation is to be used to pay salaries, expenses, or contingent expenses for those from the State Department who attend the International Materials Conference. If they receive money from other sources, that is a different thing. But the action of the conference committee in this instance is emphatic to the effect that the money appropriated to the State Department shall not be used for this purpose, save and except as regards observers who may attend the conference. The State Department may pay them as it sees fit, but not out of these funds.

RETURN OF CERTAIN TREATIES TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on July 3, upon my recommendation, the President of the United States sent to the Senate a message suggesting that—

It is desirable from time to time to remove from the Calendar of Treaties of the Senate treaties which have become obsolete because of their replacement by new instruments or because of other circumstances rendering their provisions unsuitable to current conditions, or at least subject to reappraisal.

As the same time, the President expressed his desire to withdraw from the Senate three treaties. They are as follows:

First. An agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London September 24, 1945—Executive H, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session.

Second. A protocol dated at Montreal May 27, 1947, relating to an amendment to the Convention on International Civil Aviation—Executive GG, Eightieth Congress, first session.

Third. Notes exchanged at Washington December 23, 1948, between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, providing for temporary emergency divisions of water for power purposes from the

Niagara River—Executive J, Eighty-first Congress, first session.

Mr. President, since these treaties are not controversial, and since it is helpful to us to have the calendar kept on a current basis, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to return the treaties to the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the treaties will be returned, in accordance with the request.

POSSIBILITY OF CONSTRUCTION OF ATOMIC ENERGY POWER PLANT AT EUREKA, NEV.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD press dispatches describing the proposal to construct an atomic energy power plant or installation at Eureka, Nev.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Reno Evening Gazette of July 1, 1952]

NEVADA MAY GET ATOM POWER—AEC SEEKS SITE FOR TESTING A-POWER PLANT—FIRST COMMERCIAL USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY MAY BE IN STATE

The Atomic Energy Commission keenly interested in setting up an experimental atomic power plant, may pick Nevada for a testing site just as it chose this State to detonate bombs and devices.

That was the pronouncement here this morning by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, who arrived yesterday from Washington, D. C.

MEETING CALLED

His disclosure came on the heels of a meeting he called in Reno earlier today, attended by the Senator, University of Nevada officials, Reno civic leaders, mining men and Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad.

Dr. Hafstad is Director of the Division of Reactor Development of the Atomic Energy Commission. Currently on an AEC project in the Northwest, Dr. Hafstad flew to Reno at the request of Senator MALONE.

The Nevada junior Senator has interested the AEC in what would be the world's first commercial atomic power plant. Senator MALONE then recommended to Washington authorities that they give consideration to building such a plant in Nevada—in the intermountain mining region where long transmission lines for mining and domestic needs are of doubtful feasibility.

"I pointed out that such a plant, located in strategic mineral areas, would be of great value, not only to the State but the Nation as well," he said.

RUBY HILL PLANT

The Senator suggested that the AEC determine the possibilities of building the plant at Ruby Hill, a few miles west of Eureka on property of the Eureka Corp., Ltd.

Following this morning's meeting, Senator MALONE and Dr. Hafstad flew to Eureka with George Mitchell, mine superintendent, for a first-hand look at the Ruby Hill operation. They were to return to Reno this afternoon so that the senator could catch his flight back to Washington.

At Ruby Hill operations are at a virtual standstill because of inability to rid a deep shaft of a large quantity of water. If the water can be pumped out at low cost, then a vast ore body, estimated at upward to $175,000,000, can be tapped. Diamond drilling has confirmed presence of the ore deposits.

Operations at Eureka were halted several years ago because of the high cost of providing power in sufficient quantities to dewater the mine shaft.

BOON TO MINING

There is now reason to believe that an atomic power plant—with its ability to provide ample low-cost electrical energy—may solve the problem and thus become a boon to Nevada's mining industry.

"I have been working closely with the AEC on research projects for our university including a reactor technology course as well as on this commercial power plant," Senator MALONE declared.

Not only is Nevada the only continental proving ground for nuclear bombs and devices, but the AEC recently approved a $60,000 research project for the University of Nevada.

That program, initiated through Senator MALONE'S persistence, started today at the University of Nevada. The joint university-AEC program calls for studies and investigations into new and improved methods of processing uranium ores and concentrates.

Senator MALONE, the only engineer in the United States Senate, is working on still another AEC program for Nevada.

That concerns a commission supported research program at the university in the field of biology.

Several weeks ago Senator MALONE arranged a meeting between university and AEC officials to discuss the general nature of research projects in the field of biology which the AEC was interested in stimulating.

A short time later, Dr. John E. Bugher, Deputy Director of the AEC Division of Biology and Medicine, visited the university and became acquainted with its facilities and its faculty. Still later the university was inspected by Dr. Karl Wilbur and Dr. Harold H. Plough, both of the biology branch, Division of Biology and Medicine, AEC.

They discussed specific research projects with the following university faculty members: C. B. Hutchison, dean of agriculture and Profs. W. D. Billings, Thomas M. Little, and Ira LaRivers, all of the biology department.

Later Dr. Plough told university president, Malcolm Love, that "it seemed possible that one or more of the projects outlined at this time could be put into written form as research proposals and submitted to the Commission for consideration. We have in mind, for example, the study of the effects of the tests at Frenchman's Flats on the desert plants of the area, and a correlation with the radiation tests on similar plants at the university."

Dr. Plough told Dr. Love that the Commission studies such proposals and they are acted on in the Division of Biology and Medicine by its research committee.

Senator MALONE has been informed by the AEC that just as soon as members of the university submit necessary information to the AEC that the Commission will give a prompt decision on the biological program.

"The advent of atomic energy for commercial power usage is a revolutionary advance into a completely new frontier of development," Senator MALONE said. "It conceivably could have more effect on the individual lives of our citizens than the discovery and use of electricity."

[From the Reno Gazette of April 17, 1952]

ATOMIC ENERGY RESEARCH PROGRAMS SLATED FOR U. N.

Nevada, currently the only continental testing ground for atomic bombs and devices, soon may be the site of another vital Atomic Energy Commission project, Senator GEORGE W. MALONE announced today.

Senator MALONE disclosed that a research program dealing with atomic energy is to be inaugurated soon at the University of Nevada, one of the few schools in the Nation to be thus considered.

"A contract is being prepared by the AEC and the University of Nevada calling for further research at the State school in new and improved methods of beneficiation, and processing uranium ores," he said.

SIXTY THOUSAND DOLLARS AVAILABLE

As soon as that contract is signed, approximately $60,000 is to be made immediately available in Federal funds to the University of Nevada for first-year operation, Senator MALONE added.

Additional sums as required will be made available later on.

First expenditure of Federal funds will go for needed equipment and for personnel needed to handle various courses of instruction.

Nevada's junior Senator said that four Nevadans—all of whom are now associated with the university play key roles in the establishment of the vital project.

They are Dr. Joe E. Moose, chairman of the department of chemistry, Vernon E. Scheid, dean of the Mackay School of Mines; William I. Smyth, professor of metallurgy and mining, and John B. Zadra, chief of the United States Bureau of Mines station at the university.

"Those four men are now being 'cleared' by the Atomic Energy Commission," Senator MALONE said. "Afterwards they will be qualified to handle the necessary atomic information now listed as classified."

Enthusiastic endorsement and leadership for the program is being furnished by Dr. Malcolm A. Love, president of the university, and university regents, represented by Roy A. Hardy, a prominent Nevada mining engineer, also are lending their wholehearted support.

The contemplated University of Nevada AEC program includes five proposed projects:

1. New and improved methods for the beneficiation of uranium ores will be established.

2. New and improved methods in prospecting and exploring for new sources of uranium ores will be undertaken.

3. Studies will be made concerning the installation of an atomic energy commercial power plant in a Nevada mining region.

4. Studies to determine the effect of radiation dust on plant and animal life, soils and water, will be under a special project.

5. Research will be launched for new and improved heat resistant metals, such as zirconium, hafnium and thorium, in an attempt to develop new heat resistant metals to improve heat transfer methods for atomic power.

MALONE disclosed that only recently Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., sent Frank McQuiston of the Washington AEC branch to Reno to inspect university facilities to determine if it would be suitable for the beginning of such a program.

He reported back to his superiors that the Nevada school with the necessary improvements, was entirely adequate for such a program, MALONE added.

Senator MALONE, who has long been working on such a program for the University of Nevada, said that the prospective State school program would be patterned after one now in effect at North Carolina State College in Raleigh, N. C.

Dean J. H. Lampe and Dr. C. K. Beck of the North Carolina school are expected to work closely with the three University of Nevada professors and John B. Zadra in the establishment of a reactor technology school.

Senator MALONE, along with Dr. Moose and Hardy, recently conferred with Gordon Dean, Chairman of the AEC, in Washington.

Later they toured atomic installations at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and at Brookhaven, L. I.,

for technical information needed for the establishment of the University of Nevada projects.

The Nevada Senator said that establishment of such a project at the university would prove a boon, not only to the school itself, but to those students enrolled in mining courses.

"Atomic energy is the big thing in this day and age," he declared. "Students will have an opportunity to acquire valuable and necessary training in the science which today is so vital to our country in both peace and war. Young people of Nevada are entitled to training in technical advances of this field so that they can compete with engineers of their day."

The Senator was of the opinion that first steps in establishment of the atomic energy program very well could be commenced with the fall semester at the University of Nevada.

Senator MALONE will return to Washington this week. He has been in the State the past few days discussing river control and upstream storage problems in various sections of the State.

[From the Nevada State Journal of July 2, 1952]

NEVADA PROPOSED AS TEST GROUND OF ATOMIC POWER—AEC IS CONSIDERING RUBY HILL SITE FOR PLANT

Possibility of Nevada's becoming the testing ground for an atomic energy power plant was expressed here yesterday.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE announced that the Atomic Energy Commission is interested in setting up such a plant, and may pick Nevada for the site.

Nevada is already the United States continental testing grounds for atomic bombs. It also offers space for atomic energy power experimentation, and in turn might receive very definite benefits from such a plant.

RUBY HILL SUGGESTED

Senator MALONE suggested that Ruby Hill, a few miles west of Eureka, would be a good location. The land is owned by the Eureka Corp., Ltd., but its mining developments have been almost inoperative because of deep water in shafts. Diesel power to pump water is too expensive for realization of any profits. If cheap power—atomic energy power—could be used to pump the water, an ore body estimated at $175,000,000 may be made workable.

An atomic power plant, turning out ample low-cost electrical energy, may solve the Ruby Hill problem as well as many other similar troubles in Nevada. Provision of low-cost power to the State's mining industry might very well result in a considerable increase in mining enterprises here.

AEC DIRECTOR HERE

Announcement of the AEC's interest in Nevada for the latest development of atomic energy uses came following a meeting of Senator MALONE with others in Reno yesterday morning. Attending the session was Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, AEC's director of the division of reactor development, who flew here for the meeting. University of Nevada officials, mining men, and Reno civic leaders were also present.

Following the discussion, Dr. Hafstad and Senator MALONE flew to Eureka with George Mitchell, mine superintendent, to inspect the Ruby Hill country.

WOULD BE FIRST

If the AEC's experimental power plant is set up here, it would be the first of its kind in this country.

Coincidentally, the University of Nevada yesterday began its $60,000 AEC research program. The joint university-AEC program calls for studies and investigations into new and improved processes for uranium ores. Still another AEC program is being considered at the university in the field of biology.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SEATON

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, as the second session of the Eighty-second Congress comes to a close, one of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], is voluntarily retiring, and will not be with us at the opening of the Eighty-third Congress.

I am sure I speak the feelings of every Member of this body when I say that in the short time that Senator SEATON has been a Member of the Senate we all have profited by the experience of knowing and serving with him, and we recognize his outstanding, sterling qualities.

In civilian life, Senator SEATON serves his State as a publisher of several Nebraska newspapers, and his fellow Nebraskans have a right to a justifiable pride in his accomplishments in private life, as well as in the various public offices he has occupied, including the United States Senate.

In Nebraska, Senator SEATON is a powerful force in the upholding of our American traditions; and here in the Senate he has contributed materially to maintaining our free enterprise and the American way of life.

While the junior Senator from Nebraska and the junior Senator from Wyoming are not members of the same political party, it has been a pleasure to work with him, and the United States Senate is suffering the loss of a fine public servant in the retirement of this distinguished citizen.

There are many rewards to one serving his State and Nation in the United States Senate, and one of the most enjoyable of all is to come to know and appreciate our colleagues. In every respect, knowing Senator SEATON has been a rewarding experience. He is an example of the best type of statesmanship for which the West is famous. It is my hope that he has enjoyed his work in this body as much as we have enjoyed having him here.

Mr. President, I wish for him—and I know the rest of the Senators join me in the wish—success and happiness as he returns to private life. Mr. President, since my neighbor State of Nebraska seems determined to send Republicans to serve in this honorable body, it is my hope that the great State of Nebraska will soon decide to send the Honorable FRED SEATON back to the United States Senate as a permanent Member thereof.

RECESS INSTEAD OF SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, before the end of the day, the leadership will make a decision as to whether this is to be the last day of the Eighty-second Congress, or whether the monumental issues before the Nation may require that the Congress meet again.

The junior Senator from Washington, like nearly every other Member of this body, naturally desires to go home, to be among his constituents and friends at the earliest possible moment. Nevertheless, as an individual, I have reluctantly but firmly come to the conclusion that our work at this session may not yet be done. The undeclared Korean war is still taking American lives and our substance. The steel strike is still gnawing away at the sinews of our national defense. Important constitutional problems, such as the tidelands question, are still pending.

These and other issues are the responsibility of the Congress, as the elected representatives of the American people.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the majority leadership to recess the Congress, not to adjourn it.

The decision to meet again in 1952 should not be left to the whim of a Chief Executive in an election year. Let us not again have the call for the reconvening of the Congress of the United States be issued as a political matter from the podium of a political convention.

Mr. President, the responsibility is ours. Let us meet it.

REPORT BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the past 4 years, the Committee on Government Operations, of which it is my privilege to be chairman, has been engaged in a continuing study and examination of administrative, budgetary, and fiscal aspects of United States participation in international organizations, pursuant to authority contained in section 102 (1) (g) (D) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

For 3 years, this work was carried on by the Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations, which was created during the second session of the Eightieth Congress to discharge the committee's responsibilities in this field. First, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and subsequently, under the equally able leadership of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], this subcommittee prepared and submitted five reports upon various aspects of United States relations with international organizations, which reports have appeared, from time to time, as reports of this committee.

After the submission of the fifth report, the subcommittee was discontinued, upon its own recommendation; the professional staff member of the subcommittee, who had devoted full time to these reports, was transferred to the staff of the full committee; and the work was absorbed by the full committee as part of its regular program, but on a modified scale.

Mr. President, I am informed that these reports have been of considerable assistance to the members and staff of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of the Congress in connection with their consideration of the budget requests of the Department of State for United States participation in international organizations, and have been widely used and referred to by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Many weaknesses and deficiencies which were brought out in these reports were called to the attention

of appropriate authorities and corrective action has been taken which, in some instances has led to substantial savings, either as a result of retrenchment in some of the activities or because of improved administrative operations. In any event, I believe that the very fact that these activities are under constant surveillance by a standing committee of this body has served, at least to some extent, as a restraining factor upon the executive branch in connection with commitments and expenditures in international organization affairs.

Mr. President, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations has under preparation a sixth report which we hope to have completed and filed in the Senate in the near future. It deals primarily with administrative, budgetary, and fiscal aspects of United States participation in international organizations during fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952. Particular emphasis will be placed upon the expenditures and outlays which our participation involves. In addition, the report will contain findings and comments with respect to other pertinent matters, as well as progress reports concerning reforms which were recommended in earlier reports.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to summarize briefly some of the more important findings which will be covered in this report. First of all, United States contributions and outlays to the United Nations system alone, including its specialized agencies, emergency relief agencies, and programs and advances on the United Nations building loan have totaled approximately $651,000,000 from fiscal year 1946 through and including fiscal year 1952. Of this amount, approximately $87,000,000 represents regular annual contributions to the United Nations; $44,000,000 represents regular annual contributions to the permanent specialized agencies of United Nations; $458,300,000 was paid out as contributions to temporary, emergency organizations for emergency and special programs; and $61,600,000 was advanced to the United Nations on the building loan, of which $2,000,000 has been repaid to date. I ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, marked Appendix "A," which shows the breakdown of these outlays, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX A

United States contributions and outlays to the United Nations, its specialized agencies, emergency relief projects, and other special activities, fiscal years 1946–52 [1]

Organization	United States, fiscal year—						
	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952
A. Permanent organizations: [2]							
United Nations	[3] $6,153,500	[4] $9,495,347	$10,949,805	$13,841,032	$16,601,021	$13,576,243	$16,394,244
Food and Agriculture Organization	625,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,250,000	[5] 1,250,000	[5] 1,420,800	1,355,000
International Civil Aviation Organization	[6] 119,160	[6] 294,400	509,278	498,004	463,979	453,319	698,610
International Labor Organization	532,639	487,656	521,697	[5] 1,091,739	848,058	1,269,868	1,466,412
International Telecommunication Union	8,215	59,309	6,983	58,393	146,311	[5] 497,086	375,000
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization			[10] 3,500,385	[11] 3,601,424	2,887,173	2,814,381	2,785,400
Universal Postal Union	[12] 4,899	[12] 5,783	[12] 7,025	[12] 8,781	[13] 12,056	[13] 12,341	13,867
World Health Organization				1,860,884	1,918,220	[10] 3,070,931	2,481,159
World Meteorological Organization							24,855
Subtotal	7,443,413	11,592,495	16,745,173	22,210,257	24,126,818	23,114,969	25,594,547
B. Temporary organization and emergency and special programs:							
International Civil Aviation Organization, joint support program				$1,104,466	$547,939	$650,000	$676,312
International Refugee Organization			$71,024,899	70,643,728	70,447,729	25,000,000	
United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund			32,795,833	25,491,692	15,356,361	7,106,114	
United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees				8,000,000	8,000,000		
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East					2,000,000	25,450,000	[17] 50,000,000
United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency							[18] 10,000,000
United Nations Expanded Technical Assistance Program						12,007,500	[19] 12,000,000
Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe							[20] 10,000,000
Subtotal			103,820,732	105,238,786	96,352,029	70,213,614	82,676,312
C. Advance on United Nations Building Loan				[14] 11,465,934	[15] 25,675,860	[16] 14,502,062	[21] 9,924,969
Grand total	$7,443,413	$11,592,495	120,565,905	138,914,977	146,154,707	107,830,645	118,195,828

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, United States participation in international organizations listed has been financed from appropriations made or allocated to the Department of State.

[2] This list does not include the International Bank or Reconstruction and Development or the International Monetary Fund, which are financed by capital subscriptions from member governments and from income or operations rather than by annual contributions.

[3] This represents a United States advance to the working capital fund which stands to the credit of the United States.

[4] This includes $1,824,500 as a United States advance to the working capital fund which stands to the credit of the United States.

[5] The United States assessed contribution was $1,302,500, but the maximum amount authorized to be appropriated annually for the payment of the United States contribution was $1,250,000 when the appropriation was approved. Public Law 805, 81st Cong., approved Sept. 21, 1950, raised the limitation so as to permit an appropriation on the full United States share.

[6] This includes the unpaid balance from the previous year, and an advance of $13,300 to the working capital fund, which stands to the credit of the United States.

[7] This represents a United States contribution to the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization.

[8] Includes $312,918 as a United States advance to the working capital fund which stands to the credit of the United States.

[9] This figure is an estimate. The amount shown includes a contribution of $72,086 to the regular budget and an estimated $425,000 for extraordinary expenses for the years 1949, 1950, and 1951.

[10] Includes $440,300 as a United States advance to the working capital fund, which stands to the credit of the United States.

[11] Includes $397,300 as a United States advance to the working capital fund, which stands to the credit of the United States.

[12] United States participation is financed from appropriations made to the Post Office Department.

[13] Includes an advance of $551,024 to the working capital fund, which stands to the credit of the United States.

[14] Represents advances through June 30, 1949.

[15] Represents advances through June 30, 1950.

[16] Represents advances through June 30, 1951. It should be noted that on June 27, 1951, the United Nations made the first installment of $1,000,000 on the $65,000,000 building loan.

[17] As of June 30, 1952, a total o $30,000,000 was paid over to the agency. The balance of $20,000,000 has been obligated.

[18] As of June 30, 1952, a total of $10,000,000 was paid over to the agency. The balance of $40,250,888 was appropriated, but not expended or obligated.

[19] As of June 30, 1952, a total of $6,000,000 was paid over to the agency. The balance of $6,000,000 has been obligated.

[20] As of June 30, 1952, a total of $5,000,000 was paid over to the agency. The balance of $5,000,000 has been obligated.

[21] Represents advances through June 30, 1952. It should be noted that on July 1, 1952, the United Nations made the second installment of $1,000,000 on the $65,000,000 building loan.

Summary, fiscal years 1946–52

Contributions to United Nations	$87,011,192
Contributions to permanent specialized agencies	43,816,480
Contributions to temporary organizations and emergency and special programs	458,301,473
Advances on United Nations building loan	[1] 61,568,825
Total	650,697,970

[1] Of this amount $2,000,000 has been repaid in accordance with the provisions of the loan agreement.

Mr. McCLELLAN. With respect to fiscal years 1950, 1951, and 1952, the total expenditures and outlays involved in United States participation in between 45 and 48 international organizations, including the United Nations, its specialized agencies, the inter-American

agencies and a number of smaller international bodies, during these three fiscal years, amounted to approximately $400,000,000. Of this amount, approximately $372,000,000 was paid out to the United Nations system and includes contributions to emergency projects and special programs, such as relief and refugee programs, technical assistants, and so forth; $12,000,000 was paid to the inter-American system and other international organizations; $11,600,000 represents the cost of attendance by representatives of our Government at some 300 conferences involving some 6,000 meetings during each of these years, held in virtually every part of the world, and the cost of maintaining permanent missions to international organizations; and a total of approximately $4,500,000 was expended for salaries and expenses of the Department of State arising directly out of United States participation in international organizations.

On a fiscal-year basis, the following breakdown results: During fiscal year 1950 the United States participated in 40 permanent and emergency international organizations and 8 temporary agencies at a total cost of $154,608,485; during fiscal year 1951 our participation in 38 permanent and emergency agencies and 8 temporary bodies involved outlays and expenditures of $117,782,460; and in fiscal year 1952 our participation in 38 permanent and emergency agencies and 7 temporary bodies involved a total cost of $127,225,171. I ask unanimous consent that charts, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, marked, respectively, "Appendix B, C, and D," reflecting expenditures and outlays during each of these fiscal years, be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the charts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX B

Cost of United States participation in international organizations during fiscal year 1950

Contributions to 38 permanent and emergency international organizations as regular contributions and for emergency purposes: [1]	
United Nations and specialized agencies	$120,478,847
Inter-American organizations	2,609,673
Other international organizations	227,326
To 8 temporary international organizations	251,532
Subtotal	123,567,378
United Nations building loan (through June 30, 1950)	25,675,860
Cost of United States missions at the seat of international organizations	1,842,464
Cost of participation in meetings of international organizations	$1,180,931
Subtotal	3,023,445
Cost of United States representation at occasional meetings, miscellaneous international groups, and United States missions on special assignments	827,842
Salaries and expenses, Department of State:	
Bureau of United Nations Affairs	1,304,015
UNESCO Relations Staff	209,945
Subtotal	1,513,960
Grand total	154,608,485

[1] It should be noted that during fiscal year 1950, the United States held membership in 40 permanent and emergency international organizations, and 8 temporary agencies. However, no annual contributions are made to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The United States was required to subscribe only an initial share of the capital stock of these organizations when it acquired membership.

APPENDIX C

Cost of United States participation in international organizations during fiscal year 1951

Contributions to 35 permanent and emergency international organizations as regular contributions and for emergency purposes: [1]	
United Nations and specialized agencies	$93,288,873
Inter-American organizations	3,961,523
Other international organizations	250,281
To 8 temporary international organizations	162,608
Subtotal	97,663,285
United Nations Building loan (through June 30, 1951)	14,502,062
Cost of United States missions at the seat of international organizations	1,790,617
Cost of participation in meetings of international organizations	1,276,693
Subtotal	3,067,310
Cost of United States representation at occasional meetings, miscellaneous international groups, and United States missions on special assignments	958,548
Salaries and expenses, Department of State:	
Bureau of United Nations Affairs	1,379,390
UNESCO relations staff	211,865
Subtotal	1,591,255
Grand total	117,782,460

[1] It should be noted that during fiscal year 1951, the United States held membership in 38 permanent and emergency international organizations and 8 temporary agencies. However, no annual contributions are made to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The United States was required to subscribe only an initial share of the capital stock of these organizations when it acquired membership.

APPENDIX D

Cost of United States participation in International organizations during fiscal year 1952

Contributions to 36 permanent and emergency international organizations as regular contributions and for emergency purposes: [1]	
United Nations and specialized agencies	$107,662,870
Inter-American organizations	4,210,645
Other international organizations	240,511
To 7 temporary international organizations	95,584
Subtotal	112,209,610
United Nations building loan (through June 30, 1952)	9,924,969
Cost of United States missions at the seat of international organizations	1,400,000
Cost of participation in meetings of international organizations	1,160,000
Subtotal	2,560,000
Cost of United States representation at occasional meetings, miscellaneous international groups, and United States missions on special assignments	1,176,500
Salaries and expenses, Department of State:	
Bureau of United Nations Affairs	1,139,207
UNESCO Relations Staff	214,885
Subtotal	1,354,092
Grand total	127,225,171

[1] It should be noted that during fiscal year 1953, the United States held membership in 38 permanent and emergency international organizations, and seven temporary agencies. However, no annual contributions are made to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The United States was required to subscribe only an initial share of the capital stock of these organizations when it acquired membership.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In summary, Mr. President, it appears that regular, annual contributions to the various international organizations in which the United States participates average between $26,000,000 and $29,000,000 annually; the cost of attending meetings and conferences amounts to about $2,000,000 each year; permanent missions at the seats of international organizations involve $1,500,000 annually; and salaries and expenses of the Department of State in connection with international organization participation involve an annual expenditure of $1,500,000. The major expenditures arise out of the United States contributions to various emergency agencies and programs and special projects such as United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Arab Refugees, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency; United Nations and Organization of American States Technical Assistance Programs, and substantial expenditures in connection with refugee programs. These have amounted to between $70,000,000 and $90,000,000

annually, or a total of between $200,000,000 and $325,000,000 during the past three fiscal years.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there are on the calendar only four bills. There are two or three other matters which I think we can attend to by unanimous consent. If there is any objection, we shall not take them up. I shall ask Senators to confine their remarks to 5 minutes.

We should like to have a call of the Executive Calendar. I think that is all the business we shall have time to transact, except action on conference reports.

I ask the Members of the Senate to cooperate with me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have a conference report on the military appropriation bill. It has been agreed to in conference, and in the House with the exception of one amendment.

It will be my intention to ask the Senate to stand by its amendment, and to ask for a further conference with the House. I understand the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], desires to make some comments upon my motion and will probably resist the motion. That being the case, I think it is important, in the interests of the objective of adjournment, to have the conference report considered as quickly as we can. But I shall be guided by the desires of the majority leader, because I realize the terrible pressure under which he is working in these closing hours. I am sure he did not understand that there would be some discussion of the conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did understand, but I think we can dispose of the bills I have in mind in just a few minutes. If we cannot, then they will just have to go. I wanted to have a call of the calendar. I ask Senators kindly to withhold their speeches until the important conference report is acted upon. Senators will be afforded ample opportunity to make speeches on the floor, but if we are going to finish our work, we shall have to proceed in an orderly manner, and Senators will have to conform with some of the desires of the Senate.

I recognize that any Senator may rise and claim the right to the floor. I have stayed many a night until 9 o'clock listening to speeches, and I am willing to remain here until 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock tomorrow morning in order to enable Senators to make all the speeches they may desire to make. As a matter of fact, they can insert them in the RECORD as statements. I think Senators ought to cooperate on the last day to expedite the work, and permit the Senate to act on "must" matters first.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN CAMDEN, N. J.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, yesterday the majority leader gave notice to the Senate of two House bills which I desire to call up. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 5954.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5954) to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the bill on the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, it has just come from the House. The bill passed the House without objection, and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The purpose of the bill is to perfect title to a small tract of land owned by the city of Camden, N. J. The particular tract was granted to the city in 1928 with a proviso that it should be used for a park, street, or for other public purpose. The Public Service Co. desires to construct on this acreage in Camden a much needed bus terminal and waiting room for the citizens of Camden.

The bill would enlarge the proviso contained in the 1928 grant, so that there would be no question that the city would have the right to use the property for the construction of a bus terminal.

The proposed legislation has the approval of the Secretary of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget. There is no objection to it from any source that I know of. Representative WOLVERTON, the author of the bill, has advised me that the bus terminal and waiting room facility are greatly needed by the people of Camden, and that they are most anxious that the bill be passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that the bill is not at the desk. It has not been reported.

Without objection, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will be discharged from further consideration of the bill. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered by the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I was trying to get the floor before the Presiding Officer announced that the committee would be discharged. Has the bill been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was referred to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The committee have discussed it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The distinguished Senator from Colorado says the bill was referred to the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was referred to the committee, yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was taken up individually by members of the committee, and we all approved it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Has the bill been reported by the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been ordered reported, but it has not actually been officially reported.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Reserving the right to object, I may say that I am interested in a somewhat similar proposition. I merely wanted to see what the procedure was going to be.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand what the Senators have in mind. If the Senators have any objection, they have a right to object. We are not going to pass any bills under the consent procedure if there is objection. If a Senator objects, we shall have to take the bills up one by one. I hope Senators will not discuss other bills until we have concluded action on the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND IN RICHMOND, CALIF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado will state the next bill he desires to have considered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to call up H. R. 3177.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up H. R. 7126.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7126) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator reporting the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill has been reported, and the Senate has the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object. I should like to understand what the matter is about.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana reserves the right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall read a statement about the bill for the benefit of the Senator.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the State of California approximately one-quarter of an acre of land. This tiny parcel is a portion of a 20-acre tract which the Government acquired in 1943 for the purpose of erecting warehouse facilities in connection with the Richmond Shipyard, which has been retained by the Maritime Commission.

The one-fourth acre to be conveyed by the bill is marshy, not usable in its present condition, and therefore is of doubtful value. The Government will benefit by passage of the bill, because the

State of California will construct a public highway and drainage system which will improve the contiguous land owned by the United States, and will afford additional means of entering and leaving the property.

The bill provides that the land shall be used for the construction and maintenance of a public highway, and for no other purpose. Immediate action is necessary in order to take advantage of certain funds that have been set aside for the purpose by the State of California for the current year.

The Department of Commerce recommends enactment of the proposed legislation. The bill passed the House without objection. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce knows of no opposition to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. How long has the bill been on the calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It has just come from the House.

Mr. MURRAY. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. We have not yet finished with the bill under consideration.

Does the Senator from Montana reserve the right to object to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MURRAY. I reserve the right to object, but I have no intention of objecting. I merely wished to find out what the bill was about. Objection was made during the day to other legitimate and important proposed legislation because it was not on the calendar for a sufficient length of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This bill came from the House yesterday. This morning the majority leader gave notice to the Senate that the two bills I have reported would be brought up, and that unanimous consent would be asked for their consideration.

The bill now being discussed is a meritorious bill. It involves the ceding of a quarter of an acre of land. The Government owns 20 acres which would be greatly benefited by the transfer of the land with which the bill is concerned. The quarter acre would be used for a public purpose. I do not know how any bill could have more merit than does this bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with the Senator's statement that it has merit, and I do not intend to object to it. However, objections have been made to other meritorious bills, one with reference to air pollution, on which action is being demanded by people all over the country. A series of disasters have occurred in some sections of the Nation as a result of pollution of the air.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Colorado did not object to the bill.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely desired to find out if there were not other bills in a situation similar to that of the bill I have proposed with reference to air pollution.

I have no objection to the bill reported by the Senator from Colorado. I think it is a worthy one, and I should like to see it pass.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I see that we are not making any progress on these bills.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may call up Calendar No. 1731, to which the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had an objection? The bill has been before the Senate for months. The Senator from California has withdrawn his objection, as the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey knows.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina is correct. The Senator from California has withdrawn his objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I yield if the bill can be passed without prolonged debate.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill is unanimously approved by the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3177) to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none, and the bill is passed.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the request was to take the bill up. The Chair ruled that it had passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was a unanimous consent request to take it up. The Chair asked if there was any objection. The Senator from Michigan was seated in his chair when the Chair made the announcement. If the Senator wishes to object, the Chair will reopen the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been trying to get the floor on another matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan would not object to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan was not on his feet when this matter came up.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My inquiry is in the nature of a statement. I can testify to the fact that the Senator from Michigan was on his feet. I realize that the Presiding Officer was looking toward the other side of the room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan was interested in another matter. The Chair did not understand that he wished to object to this bill.

INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me so that I may make a statement?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, some statements have been made with respect to the International Materials Conference, and I feel that the RECORD should be made clear.

When the Defense Production Act came to the floor of the Senate, it had a certain provision in it in relation to the International Materials Conference. It was clear to me that at least the State Department would undertake to use the language of the Defense Production Act as authority for participation in the International Materials Conference, and as approval by Congress of the International Materials Conference, although the language was not broad enough to grant authority, to do more than use the expression "International Materials Conference" as a means of creating control of material.

When the Senate approved the part of the appropriation bill for the State Department, it included an amendment known as Senate amendment 18, which has been referred to by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

It is apparent from the RECORD now that there is an attempt, in the legislative history of the appropriation bill, to have the State Department use the language of the Defense Production Act as authority for saying that Congress has authorized the International Materials Conference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My own position is that I think the State Department has the authority to participate in the International Materials Conference. It derives such authority from the Defense Production Act of last year, under the power to make allocations. What we are trying to do is to prevent the Appropriations Committee, by means of a rider on an appropriation bill, from legislating in such a way as to defeat the intention of Congress. That was my intention.

Mr. FERGUSON. Both bodies have now legislated on an appropriation bill. I should like to read from the proceedings in the House at the time this matter was taken back to the House for action by that body. I read from page 9207 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 3, 1952. Mr. DURHAM said:

> My immediate concern with this language was whether we were being asked to legalize the International Materials Conference, because the IMC has such an adverse effect on our national security. I made an inquiry of the Parliamentarian and received his ex-

pert advice that such was not the case. I voted for this bill because I had this assurance that we were not in any way legalizing United States participation in this illegal cartel by adopting this language.

When Senate amendment numbered 18 was sent back to the House, Mr. TABER made a motion, which appears on page 9214 of the RECORD of July 3, 1952, as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the committee of conference with instructions to agree to Senate amendment No. 18 prohibiting the expenditure of any expenses incident to or in connection with participation in the International Materials Conference on page 21.

Illegally, and without authority, the State Department has used $359,108 of the taxpayers' money as contributions to this agency, from February 26, 1951, to the present, as appears from page 9211 of the RECORD. It has violated the principle established by Congress, that no share in an international agency should be more than 33⅓ percent. This is more than 50 percent.

This organization is an illegal cartel. Congress recognizes in the appropriation bill that it is an illegal cartel. There is no legal authority to spend one dollar for that purpose, and Congress has prohibited the expenditure of one dollar in relation to this illegal cartel. In the House report appears language to the effect that the State Department can send an observer, as it does in the case of other organizations of which it is not a participating member.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wish the RECORD to be clear. I am afraid that it may be misinterpreted. I will say that I do not agree that participation of the State Department in the International Materials Conference is illegal. I think its participation not only has been legal, but is very much in the public interest.

I also invite attention to the fact that the Senate adopted an amendment which I originally proposed to the Defense Production Act, by a vote of 46 to 31, I believe, showing the Senate's approval of it in a legislative bill, as distinguished from an appropriation bill. Normally in an appropriation bill the Congress is not supposed to make legislative policy. We know that there are exceptions, however. In the legislative act the Senate certainly expresses itself in no uncertain terms as to the desirability and legality of this operation. I also believe that the amendment which finally came out of the conference on the Defense Production Act with the approval of the House conferees acknowledges the legal status. I think it already had legal status.

The amendment at least recognized IMC. I want to state as firmly as I can that I do not agree that it has been illegal in any sense. I think it has been highly beneficial to the welfare of the country.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senate did agree to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas. It had previously agreed to an amendment which I had offered, which provided exactly the opposite. When the amendment went to conference it was rejected by the conference, and it came back to the Senate in the language which I have quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 9207. I have shown that it did not create a right to participate in this agency. Therefore, Mr. President, it is not an authorized participation, and the House has rightfully prohibited the use of any money for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not the Senator from Michigan think that this is a type of matter that should be properly decided by a legislative committee? The Committee on Banking and Currency held hearings on the subject and took testimony from persons who participate in the program. I remember that the chairman of the subcommittee stated on the floor of the Senate that he thought it was a matter that should be decided by legislation. It seems to me that the Senator from Michigan is insisting that the Appropriations Committee, which to my understanding normally does not make that kind of decision, should insist upon restricting the activities of our Government in an important foreign relations matter. I do not see the logic of the Senator's position.

Mr. FERGUSON. Congress has acted on the appropriation bill by legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think it was done improperly.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. McFARLAND. There are only four small bills on the calendar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That being the case does not the majority leader think it would be a good idea to limit the time of discussion of the bills?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope there will be no discussion with reference to the bills on the calendar. If objection is made to a bill, it will have to go over. It is important that we dispose of conference reports, and to call the Executive Calendar, so that we may find out whether there is any objection to the nominations on the Executive Calendar. Therefore, I have asked unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the four small bills on the calendar. If any discussion arises with respect to them, I shall have to ask that they go over until a later time. I believe we can dispose of them in short order. The distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] must leave the floor very soon. The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has already left the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair will interpret the unanimous-consent agreement to mean that the Senate will operate under the usual 5-minute rule which is in effect on the call of the calendar.

The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2337) to provide for the national defense by enabling the States to make provision for maternity and infant care for wives and infants, and hospital care for dependents, of enlisted members of the Armed Forces during the present emergency, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard; the bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 6558) for the relief of George Blech, and others, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

TRANSFER OF THE JEREMIAH CURTIN HOME

The bill (H. R. 4792) to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin Home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVEMENT OF DULUTH-SUPERIOR HARBOR

The bill (H. R. 8321) to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, Calendar No. 2026 is a bill similar to Calendar No. 2025, House bill 8321, which has just been passed. It was reported by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we will try to take up that bill if agreement can be reached with respect to it. However, since the bill is not on the calendar objection would be made to its consideration at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cain	Cordon
Bennett	Capehart	Douglas
Benton	Case	Dworshak
Bridges	Chavez	Ecton
Butler, Md.	Clements	Ellender
Butler, Nebr.	Connally	Ferguson

Flanders	Kem	Murray
Frear	Kerr	Nixon
Fulbright	Kilgore	O'Conor
George	Langer	O'Mahoney
Gillette	Lehman	Pastore
Green	Long	Robertson
Hayden	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Hendrickson	Malone	Schoeppel
Hennings	Martin	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	McCarthy	Stennis
Holland	McClellan	Underwood
Humphrey	McFarland	Watkins
Hunt	McKellar	Welker
Jenner	Monroney	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Moody	Williams
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Beginning with new reports.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William P. Cole, Jr., to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the name of James Augustine Walsh to be United States district judge for the district of Arizona.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul Moss to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, later in the day I shall again move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, because the distinguished Senator from Georgia may wish to take up a nomination which has been reported adversely. He will be given the opportunity to do so. There may also be some further nominations to be confirmed, which will have to be taken up by unanimous consent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Some reports may be made by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me? I am trying to help the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if we are going to dispose today of the business that is before the Senate, we must give priority to the conference reports.

I know that many Senators wish to make speeches about various matters, and I assure them they will be given opportunity to do so between action on the conference reports or after action on the conference reports. No Senator will be deprived of an opportunity to make any speech he may desire to make.

On the other hand, some of the conference reports may have to be returned to a further conference. Thus, if we are to expedite the work of the Senate, we must proceed in the way I have just stated.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida; and

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Izumi;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions and for other purposes;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the Act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 5917. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government; and for other purposes;

H. R. 6025. An act for the relief of David Daryl Dalko;

H. R. 6070. An act for the relief of Paul Gust Williams;

H. R. 6083. An act for the relief of Amalia Architetto;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6278. An act for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi);

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6356. An act for the relief of William J. Martin;

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Ayako Sukiura;

H. R. 6446. An act for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 6544. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 6556. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay;

H. R. 6637. An act for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino;

H. R. 6640. An act for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu);

H. R. 6681. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins.

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie Irrigation District, the Goshen Irrigation District, and the Pathfinder Irrigation District, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6869. An act for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7009. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yariott.

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7255. An act to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans);

H. R. 7301. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7303. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7366. An act for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son, James Robert Eder;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray;

H. R. 7502. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters;

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Service Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan;

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

AIRPLANE PRODUCTION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a statement in regard to the production of airplanes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

The Congress has today decided to appropriate to the Air Force the sum of $12,685,000,000 for the procurement of aircraft and related materials. In the 3 years covered by fiscal years 1951 through 1953, the total appropriated is thirty-one and a quarter billion dollars.

However, less than one-half of this stupendous sum is for the actual purchase of new airplanes, only $14,400,000,000 in round figures. Nine billion and two hundred and fifty million dollars of the total sum has been designated for spare parts. In addition during the same fiscal years nearly two billions more for spare parts has been carried in another appropriation, for a total of $11,250,000,000 for parts alone.

This means that for every 100 new airplanes turned over to the Air Force and placed on an air field, the equivalent of 64 planes is stored in the form of spare parts.

Testimony was presented to the subcommittee that the "stretch-out" would postpone the final date of completing the 143-wing Air Force from July 1, 1954, to July 1, 1955. It seems to me that it would be far better to have more airplanes and less spare parts and achieve the goal of the 143 wings by the end of the 1954 calendar year, if not earlier.

Is it not more important to have the planes and have them at the earliest possible date? I believe there is no question about this.

When a contractor is building airplanes it is simple to continue the contract, as nearly all the production lines can be continued, for the purpose of providing parts.

Representatives of the Air Force testified before the subcommittee that 64¼ percent of spare parts is more than is needed, in fact it was a necessity for the Air Force to reduce this very large percentage of spare parts because of the excessive costs.

I believe the Senate should emphatically suggest to the Air Force that we want planes and that we want them today, not tomorrow.

I will be glad to vote for more funds for spare parts, if needed, any time the Air Force finally establishes a sound standard as a basis for procurement.

I repeat if we need the planes at all we need them just as soon as we can get them. It might mean converting $4,000,000,000 earmarked for parts into complete airplanes. But I say we can replace the funds for spare parts but the day could come, perhaps tomorrow, next year, 1954 or later, when we will need those planes and need them very badly.

I contend the Air Force has sufficient funds, with the 1953 appropriation, to produce the full 143 wing air force. I believe the decision is in the hands of the top officials of the Air Force. The Congress has done its part.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that testimony was submitted that we are only using 40 percent of the total available aircraft production of the country today. It is time for action.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9425–9426 of the House proceedings of July 4, 1952.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7391, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 4, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 45, 59, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the figure "$75,000" in the last line of said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$37,500."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the figure $75,000,000" named in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the figure "$70,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount stricken and the amounts and matter inserted by said amendment, insert "$12,685,044,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "*Provided further*, That units and headquarters of the Air National Guard of the United States, whether or not they are in the active service of the United States, shall have the same privilege of free transmission of the official mail matter as the Department of Defense."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"No funds contained in this act shall be used for the purpose of entering into contracts containing article 15 of the Standard Government Contract until and unless said article is revised and amended to provide an appeal by the contractor to the Court of Claims within 90 days of the date of decision by the department concerned, authority for which appeal is hereby granted."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 639. The Secretary of Defense is hereby directed to submit revised tables of organization and tables of equipment of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to the Congress, together with recommendations for decreasing the number of personnel positions, clerical positions, supply positions, and other administrative positions so that the combat effectiveness of our Armed Forces may be improved."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to said bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Missouri to pardon me, please. I shall deal justly with him.

Let me say in regard to the conference report, Mr. President, that there has been complete agreement, with the exception of one amendment, amendment numbered 43. That is the amendment upon which the Senator from Missouri desires to make certain remarks. I shall not raise that question now.

At this time I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the Senate amendments Nos. 4, 28, 37, 44, 53, and 63.

After that motion is agreed to, I shall raise the question in which the Senator from Missouri is interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, amendment No. 43 is one under the subject of research and development for the Department of the Air Force. This paragraph, which appears on page 35 of the bill as reported to the Senate, reads as follows:

For expenses necessary for basic and applied scientific research and development, by contract or otherwise, and transportation of things, to remain available until expended, $525,000,000,

In the House, the following proviso was included:

Provided, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to Aro, Inc., for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

The Senate voted to strike out that proviso, doing so in the belief that to insert such an amendment in this bill at this time, with the fiscal year 1953 already beginning, would create a serious impediment to the development of the modern aeronautical devices which it is necessary for the United States Air Force to have in order to maintain superiority over Soviet Russia. In order to maintain that superiority, it is necessary for the United States to have the best engineering, technological, and scientific management and advice that it is possible to obtain.

In the House of Representatives this provision was inserted because of allegations that the Aro Co. was making unjust profits. Numerous charges were made against the Aro Co.

Mr. President, we have searched the hearings held by the House committee, but we do not find in them one line to show that any request was made for testimony from the representatives of the corporation which was proposed to be cut off. They were condemned without a hearing. They were charged with what amounted to inefficiency and corruption, but they were not given an opportunity to answer the charges which were brought against them; and the provision was stricken out.

The charges were so serious, Mr. President, that when this bill came to the Senate, I called to a hearing everyone in the Air Force and everyone else having anything to do with Aro, Inc.

When the bill came before us, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], spoke to me about this particular amendment, and asked me to give him notice of the time when the hearing was to be held.

I sent that notice to his office. The Senator from Missouri did not appear. But in that hearing, because I was seeking the truth and the facts, I interrogated General Sverdrup, head of the firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., which created the Aro Co. I interrogated him just as though I were a prosecutor before a grand jury. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] was there, and he also interrogated these men.

I shall not take the time of the Senate at this time to engage in a long discussion, but I may state that among those present at that time were the highest officials of the Air Force, as well as General Sverdrup and the others whose names were mentioned. Among the representatives of the Air Force was General Doolittle.

I should like to read the questions and the answers with respect to what General Doolittle believes about this matter. The testimony I shall read appears on page 542 of the Senate hearings. As a result of the previous testimony, I had asked the general, whether he believed that the Arnold Engineering Development Center was a necessary installation, and whether its functions were necessary. I read now from the testimony, beginning with General Doolittle's answer:

General DOOLITTLE. My conclusion is that this center is an essential facility; that without it the Air Force cannot carry out its obligations and that we will not be assuring the maximum development of our defensive and offensive equipment for the future.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you personal information with respect to the capacity of Aro to manage the job?

General DOOLITTLE. That has not been a specific chore of mine, but it has been a general chore. I have watched the work that Aro has done. I have investigated and inspected the work no later than day before yesterday on the site at Tullahoma. I have read all the correspondence and literature and reports in connection with it, and I am satisfied that Aro is doing an excellent job and should be retained and that if they are not retained that we will lose a great deal of time.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Have you read the testimony and the material on which the House acted?

General DOOLITTLE. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the light of that testimony you want to tell this committee that you believe Aro ought to be retained?

General DOOLITTLE. I believe that if there is any irregularity or any inefficiency in the manner in which Aro has done its job, it should be removed, despite the fact that that would seriously impede our military effort. I have seen no indication and no evidence of such inefficiency or irregularity.

That was the tenor of the entire examination. Full opportunity to be heard was extended, and every Member of the Senate committee who sought to question the witnesses was present. A lengthy study was made. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] submitted a whole series of interrogatories, which were answered; and on the basis of those answers the committee came to the conclusion that it would be a great impediment to the upbuilding of American air power to put this amendment in the bill. I am perfectly willing that there should be complete investigation of the policy involved in employing management corporations. I propose to ask the conferees to do that.

Mr. KEM rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Missouri wish me to yield?

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator from Wyoming care to yield now, or would he prefer to yield later?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I desire to ask the Senator whether it is true that this project will not be ready for operation for many months, and that the first unit will not be completed before 1953.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that the project will not be entirely completed for 3 or 4 years, but that it is in progress, and that if we cut it off in this manner, we will stop the development.

Mr. KEM. The point I want to make is, this is an operating contract, and the project is not yet in operation. So, if we are to change horses so to speak, now is the time to do it, before the operation is actually commenced. Does the Senator not agree with me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But we should not change horses without hearing those who are being accused of irregularity and inefficiency.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment. It is not my intention to take the time of the Senate in debating this matter. I hope we can vote upon it. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment No. 43, request a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference. I do that in the confidence that the conferees on the part of the House and on the part of the Senate can speedily find a solution to this matter which will serve every purpose raised even by those who are now criticizing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything about this matter until I obtained a copy of the report made by the General Accounting Office. When I read that report and saw the cold facts therein set forth, I felt that, in conscience, I could no longer remain silent. The fact about this matter is that the Air Force had under consideration three ways of operating this great wind tunnel, which is being constructed at a cost of approximately $378,000,000. One was the standard type of military civil-service operation, which is the type now being used in the operation of a similar project at Wright

Field. It is the kind of operation which is being used by the National Aeronautical Council at three different places. It is a perfectly usual and customary method of operating a project of this kind. Another type of operation considered was a contract with a nonprofit institution such as MIT, or Columbia University, or the University of California. The third was a contract with an industrial or engineering organization.

The Air Force undertook to proceed in a very proper and scientific way. It appointed a committee of experts to decide how the operation should be conducted. That committee, called the Ridenour committee, made a report, in which it said the operation should be under a nonprofit contract, and they gave four reasons: First, that Government administration would involve red tape; second, that it would be possible to get better men and to pay more than under Government operation; third, that civil-service difficulties could be avoided; and, fourth, that military assignments of personnel are not permanent enough in a Government operation. The report of the Ridenour committee was rejected, and another committee was appointed, headed this time by Prof. John R. Markham, of MIT, one of the great authorities in the engineering field. Hearings were conducted and a report was made.

Mr. President, I think the chronology is given here, and it tells us that the Markham committee report, submitted on April 12, 1950, advised a nonprofit corporation operation, headed by a board of directors composed of scientists and industrial executives. Seven days later, on April 19, 1950, the Air Force rejected that report. A second report was made. The Air Force rejected the second report, and on April 19, 1950, it entered into this contract with a firm of engineers in St. Louis, Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., high-class, distinguished engineers, for the operation of this project, and they then caused to be organized a company called Aro, Inc. Aro, Inc., was a subsidiary of Sverdrup & Parcel. It had a capital of $150,000, the majority of the stock being owned by Sverdrup & Parcel. The rest of the stock was in the hands of private individuals. It was quite a nice privilege to buy stock in this corporation because on a capital of $150,000 the Government immediately advanced $100,000.

Aro, Inc., got a contract with the Air Force on the basis of cost, plus a fixed fee, the fee to be based on 3½ percent of the amount disbursed by the company for the Government. For the first year, when they were just getting under way, the contract returned a net, above all charges, which were paid by the Government, of $23,000. The next year it paid $90,000, and they received $5,000 to cover interest on investment.

The expectation is that when they get under way that fee will amount to more than $300,000. This is the kind of fee it is: It is above all costs of operation. The Director's fees are paid by the Government; the salaries of the officers are paid by the Government. The fee is simply a bonus, a melon that goes to the owners of the capital stock of the company. After the Government has paid for everything, they get this fee. Just what it is for, I have not been able to understand. The General Accounting Office evidently was not able to understand.

I shall not go into detail, Mr. President, about who is getting any of this melon, but I shall give some high lights.

When W. Stuart Symington was Secretary of the Air Force there was a man in his employ named Steve Leo. He has been called by David Lawrence the world's greatest ghost writer. He was a very able and competent publicity man, a very good man in his line.

On April 24, W. Stuart Symington resigned as Secretary of the Air Force, and Mr. Leo resigned on the same day, and almost immediately showed up with the title of Director of Administration of Aro, Inc., at a salary of $20,000 a year, to be paid, of course, by the Government. That does not come out of the $90,000; it is all in addition to that.

Mr. President, the stock was distributed in a rather interesting way. It so happens that one of the stockholders was David R. Calhoun, a close friend of Mr. Symington. He is also president of the St. Louis Trust Co.

Another man who got stock was J. Wesley McAfee, president of the Union Electric Co., of St. Louis, who happened to be a large customer of the engineering firm of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc.

Sverdrup and Parcel, Inc., 670 shares.
L. J. Sverdrup, 70 shares.
E. R. Grant, 60 shares.

I shall not read them all, Mr. President.

J. Wesley McAfee, 50 shares; Barbara McAfee, a young woman, the daughter of J. Wesley McAfee, 75 shares.
Thomas McAfee, the father of J. Wesley McAfee, 25 shares.
David R. Calhoun, 50 shares.
Barbara Bechtel, 100 shares.
Stephen D. Bechtel, Jr., 100 shares.

Mr. President, the able and eloquent chairman of the subcommittee has had a great deal to say about the testimony at the hearing which was held. I was not present at the hearing and I did not intend to take any part in the discussion of the matter until there came into my hands a report of the General Accounting Office, dated June 27, 1952. I went through it and saw some facts, Mr. President, that stood out like a sore thumb. For instance, on page 12 it gives the names of three outside stockholders, and then it says—and please note this language carefully:

It appears that this broadening of the ownership base of Aro, Inc., was brought about as the result of the urging of the Air Force.

In other words, the Air Force urged that these personal friends and associates of W. Stuart Symington be brought into the transaction.

On page 16 we find this interesting statement:

Concerning the extent of his participation in the directorship of Aro, Inc., or the participation of the members of his family, Mr. Bechtel's statement is as follows:

I have served on the board of directors of the corporation and attended one or two meetings of the board. At the time I was elected a director of Aro, Inc., it was understood that I would attend meetings only when I could do so conveniently. For that reason, and as I remember, at my suggestion, an executive committee of the board was created consisting of Messrs. L. J. Sverdrup, J. M. McAfee, and E. R. Grant. Neither I nor any member of my family have visited Tullahoma. I have, from time to time, advised with Mr. L. J. Sverdrup, president of the corporation, in connection with policy matters pertaining to the corporation and its activities.

On page 17 there is this interesting paragraph:

The minutes of the board of directors of Aro, Inc., show that Mr. Calhoun has attended four of the five directors' meetings held since he became a director, and the Aro fiscal records show that Mr. Calhound received a $100 fee provided in the bylaws of Aro, Inc., for each meeting attended.

There is an interesting statement on page 42 of the report:

The transcript of the September 13, 1951, negotiations on the second Aro contract shows that General Carroll related the Aro fee to capital investment in such a way as to indicate that he considered capital investment to some extent, at least, a valid basis for computing the fee. The essence of General Carroll's remarks is contained in the following paragraph from the conference transcript:

As you will recall, both the Ridenour committee and the Markham committee were of the opinion there should be no profit to the operator of such Air Force facilities.

Giving due regard to the uncertainty always inherent in enterprises of this nature and the fact that any contract with the Government may be terminated for cause or for the convenience of the Government, I am inclined to be more liberal in arriving at a figure which I deem to be an equitable return upon the investment made than I normally would be. Careful and prudent management of the affairs of Aro, Inc., will keep the amount of nonreimbursable items of expense to a very small figure. I can see very little risk to the capital investment in this situation beyond the risk of faulty management of the corporation's affairs. $25,000 as a fixed fee would constitute an approximate 16⅔ percent return, before Federal income tax, upon the total invested capital for a 1-year period of time. I cannot bring myself to believe that such an amount would be anything less than a very handsome profit on the investment made and I can only bring myself to that figure by giving due weight to the uncertainty inherent in Government contracts.

In other words, Mr. President, General Carroll recommended that $25,000 a year was an adequate fee. Instead, these gentlemen adventurers are getting $90,000 as of now, which may well go up to $300,000 a year on an investment of $150,000. Please understand that this fee is above all expenses of every kind and character.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator state what happened to General Carroll when he protested the terms of the contract?

Mr. KEM. He received an order relieving him from duty and ordering him to return to Washington, where he was given a desk with little or nothing to do. He immediately resigned from the service and went into private employment. That seemed to be by way of discipline for his independence in the matter.

In other words, the directors received $100 for each meeting, paid by the Government. That is over and above and in addition to the fee of $90,000 a year which they now receive and which may go up to as much as $300,000.

In order to show how this contract can work out, $90,000 is supposed to cover some sort of managerial expense that was not covered by the salaries of the officers of Aro, Inc., and the director's office. Still we find Aro, Inc., employing, at Government expense, a firm of engineers to give them professional advice. The firm employed was Griffenhagen & Associates, of Chicago, Ill. That contract is set out and commented on on page 49 of the report of the GAO. Then, on page 50, there is an interesting comment on the contract by Maj. Richard E. Mitchell, USAF, Chief, Management Analysis Branch, reading in part, as follows:

Mr. Leo took special effort to explain to me the scope and background of the Griffenhagen and Associates contract. I understand that this contract was verbally discussed with the administrative contracting officer who approved it. This command (AEDC) had no knowledge of it as far as I know. Mr. Leo used an Air Force directive covering the use of management consultants as the basis for entering into this agreement. This is a very expensive contract and this headquarters should obtain a copy of this agreement for review and proper evaluation. It is difficult to see how Aro, hired because of their management ability, should go out and hire more consultants.

That shows the utter foolishness and inefficiency of this arrangement. The Government is put in a position where it has to foot the bill for everything Aro wants to do. If they want to hire more experts, the Government has to foot the bill. When they get through Aro, Inc., will get a fixed fee of $90,000 on an investment of $150,000. That $90,000 is paid before operations start at all. When they get started, it is estimated that the fee will be at least $300,000, or 200 percent per annum on the investment of Aro, Inc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the St. Louis firm are basic contractors for the project?

Mr. KEM. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the St. Louis firm actually doing the construction work?

Mr. KEM. It is my understanding that Sverdrup & Parcel are the engineers who have drawn all plans for the whole project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the primary work which the Aro Co. is performing at this time?

Mr. KEM. The primary work, and the only work, according to the GAO report, which Aro, Inc., is performing at this time is to review the plans which have been prepared by the parent company of Aro, also at Government expense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, Aro is primarily controlled by the Sverdrup company, and then Aro checks on the plans of the company which owns them?

Mr. KEM. That is correct. General Sverdrup, through one alter ego, prepares the plans, and through another alter ego reviews the plans, and the Government pays for both operations. According to the GAO, that is all that has been done so far, because they have not gotten into operation at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the function Aro is supposed to perform?

Mr. KEM. Aro is the operating company. The project involved is a tremendous one. It cost the Government $278,000,000. Instead of the Government operating it, as they operated at Wright Field, and as they carry on the work at many other places through a combination of military and civilian personnel, they entered into a contract with Aro to operate this project. The contract is on a cost-plus basis. Everything Aro spends is spent for the Government account. When they get through, they will receive a fee per annum of 3½ percent based on the disbursements. As I have said, they have not begun operations yet. That fee already amounts to $90,000 a year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the 3 percent figured on?

Mr. KEM. It is on the disbursements of the Aro Corp. for the Government account.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it for the purchase of material, for construction, or for what?

Mr. KEM. It is principally, so far, for salaries. For instance, they made the contract with Griffenhagen & Associates to give them professional advice. It is a very expensive contract. Griffenhagen gets its fee, which is paid by the Government. Then Aro, Inc., gets a fee on top of that.

One thing that was criticized very much in the House was the fact that they were buying power from the TVA, and Aro insisted on getting a fee on the power the Government bought from itself through TVA. I do not know the details about that.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has insisted that there ought to be a fair hearing, and then he told us at the same time that he conducted a fair hearing, and that he went into the matter in great detail. Knowing the Senator from Wyoming as I do, knowing his fairness and his sense of justice, I have no doubt at all that Aro was given a fair hearing. Knowing the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay Warren, and knowing the capacity of his assistants, I have no doubt at all that those assistants reported the facts accurately.

There is one statement in the report which is a little difficult to understand. In the letter of transmittal, dated June 27, the following statement is contained:

While the investigation discloses certain decisions in the realm of opinion or judgment made by the Department of the Air Force in the negotiation and administration of the contracts which are inevitably subject to question, no evidence has been developed which would indicate that any actions were taken or decisions made by the former Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. W. Stuart Symington, or by other responsible officials of the Department of the Air Force connected with the project, otherwise than under proper motives.

I think that is a statement to which we will all agree. There is no evidence there of any improper motives. But, since no improper motives are charged, why the Comptroller General in the letter of transmittal should have taken occasion to mention that, I do not know. But the facts are known. They carry their own story.

From page 52 I wish to make a final quotation:

Construction work had not been started on the test facilities at AEDC at the time the first Aro operating contract was let, and the principal activity of Aro during the first contract period, aside from the task of completing its own organization and recruiting and training the necessary staff to carry out its duties, was to review the designs of Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., for functional adequacy. Even at the present time Aro has taken over for operating purposes only certain incidental service facilities.

Since for all practical purposes Aro, Inc., is controlled by Sverdrup & Parcel, Inc., a question naturally arises as to whether Aro engineers are prejudiced in the performance of their review function by the fact that, in a sense, they owe their allegiance to S. & P., Inc.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A few minutes ago the Senator from Missouri said that the Aro Co., was to receive a fee with respect to the purchase of TVA power.

Mr. KEM. I said there was some contention about that before the House. I do not know whether or not that was true. I think that any claim for that was withdrawn by Aro.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point a single paragraph. As a preliminary, let me state that in the examination of General Sverdrup and his associates in the Air Force, I took up, as best I could, every single allegation that had been made in the House, because I wanted the facts.

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not want the Government to be victimized, any more than does the Senator. General Partridge, of the Air Force, was on the stand. I shall read from page 553 of the hearings on the Department of Defense Appropriations for 1953, as follows:

Senator O'MAHONEY. You made some reference, General Partridge, to power. There have been some intimations that ARO or S. & P. wanted to receive payment from the Government based upon the power obtained from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. SVERDRUP. May I answer that question?

General PARTRIDGE. Let me answer the question because he asked me. I would like to scotch this rumor if I can, once and for all. It was agreed at the start of the negotiations—this is at the start of the negotiations, that in the purchase of power, fuel, and other items which could be bought more economically by the Government, that the Government would do the purchasing. There was never any question during these conversations that Aro would actually receive money for buying things from one Government agency and transferring it to another as in the case of power in the TVA. We do, however, have to use the Aro company to schedule the power out of the TVA. For this they will receive a fee. In other words, they have to have people to do this and those people will be on the Aro payroll.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let us get this record straight. Are they going to receive a fee for that?

General PARTRIDGE. I said it badly.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Or are they going to be paid the cost of the overhead required to make the transfer?

General PARTRIDGE. They will be reimbursed for the overhead necessary to schedule, receive, and handle the power.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In other words, the Government will pay the salary of the employees who do this job of scheduling power.

General PARTRIDGE. That is correct.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It does not enter into the fee of $95,000?

General PARTRIDGE. Only to the extent involved in the overhead, the paying of the people who handle it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It does not raise that fee, does it?

General PARTRIDGE. It does not.

So I think the record is clear that there was no fee.

Mr. KEM. I am glad the Senator explained that. I was not exactly clear as to how the fee entered into it. I knew there was some charge, but I did not know exactly what it was. I had not had the benefit of attending the hearings. I had only seen the hearings before the House, where the question was brought up and discussed at considerable length.

I suggest that any Senator who really wants to inform himself about this contract should read the debate in the House of Representatives yesterday. The subject came up on motion of Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, who moved that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43 and concur in the Senate amendment. That motion was discussed in a very interesting and able way by Members of the House, on one side, particularly by Mr. MAHON, of Texas, and Mr. GORE, of Tennessee, and on the other side by Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and others. At the conclusion of the argument in the House a vote was taken on the motion of Mr. JENSEN, of Iowa. The question was taken on a division, demanded by Mr. JENSEN. There were ayes 37, noes 112.

In other words, after going into this subject again, and after the House conferees had come back to the House and explained what had taken place in the conference, the House voted 3 to 1 to sustain the action of its conferees in refusing to accept this agreement.

There is a great deal of background to this contract. There are a great many reasons why it is an improvident contract, and one which ought not to be entered into at this time. Those reasons were discussed in the House. For example, it was shown there that this contract is merely a way of circumventing the control of the Congress over this great operation. By rule of the Congress and by law there is a limitation on the number of personnel who may be employed in the military service. By entering into a contract of this kind the will of Congress is completely nullified, and the Air Force can do whatever it wants to do. It can employ 100,000 men, or 1,000,000 men, and the wise limitation placed on the operation by the Congress is made ineffective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the appropriation bill there is a limitation of 500,000 on the number of civilian personnel. As indicated by the RECORD in the House, this contract is a method of getting around that limitation. If a corporation is hired, rather than individuals, to perform governmental functions in connection with the military, of course the ceiling of 500,000 personnel is not violated. That is one point in this kind of case. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has examined the question.

I know the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has gone into the facts. Representative GORE of Tennessee argued this question before the committee. The Senator from Michigan feels that it would be well, under the circumstances, for the Senate to recede, not by way of saying that these people have any ulterior motive, but merely because this is the wrong method of going about doing this kind of job.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate what the able Senator from Michigan has said. His work on the Appropriations Committee is well known to every Member of the Senate.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I do not for a moment charge any ulterior motive on the part of any of these gentlemen. They are well known, highly regarded, highly respected citizens of St. Louis, and I know that they will be such for the rest of their lives. I do not for a moment say that their motives are wrong. However, I do say that this is an improvident and improper contract for the Government to enter into. As the guardians of the public welfare we, as Senators, should reject it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have followed the arguments with reference to the contract, both in conference and in the debate this afternoon. While I readily agree as to the improvident nature of the contract, like the Senator from Missouri I do not think there is anything illegal about it. In my opinion this is not the case of an innocent private corporation which is trying to do business with the Government. The situation arises from a custom which has prevailed for some time. An Army officer—perhaps a procurement officer—leaves the service, either by retirement or resignation, and immediately joins the corporation which was doing business with the agency with which he previously served. I think that is where the viciousness of the whole system lies. I believe that Congress is partially responsible. We should not permit an admiral or a general who has awarded millions of dollars' worth of contracts to a private corporation to go to work for the same corporation immediately after he retires or resigns. Under the present system we find a general here, a general there, and another general somewhere else. To my mind that constitutes the viciousness of the whole system.

Mr. KEM. What would the Senator say about the position of Mr. Steve Leo, who was publicity agent for Mr. Symington when he was Secretary of the Air Force? This contract was made April 19, 1950. Mr. Symington and Mr. Leo resigned April 24, 1950. Mr. Leo immediately appears as director of administration of Aro, Inc., at a salary of $20,000 a year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I complain whether it be someone from the Tax Bureau of the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, the Navy Department, the Defense Department, or from any other agency of Government. Congress ought to assume its responsibility and keep persons from going to private corporations at least for 2 or 3 years after they leave the service.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from New Mexico is exactly right. I would make the further point that now is the time to take action, before operations are started. If we allow the contract to continue for another year and allow operations to get under way, we will have lost all control over the situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I disagree with the Senator from Missouri because of the circumstances. We are in the last day of the session. I do not like the contract any more than does the Senator from Missouri, but, as has been so ably stated by the Senator from Wyoming, it is not a question of whether an improvident contract was made. We are confronted with the necessity of passing the appropriation bill. A standing committee of Congress should go into the matter, and possibly a contract could be renegotiated or investigated by the proper committee of Congress.

Mr. KEM. Why is it not the sound and fair-minded way of handling the situation to say to the House, "We will accept your position in this matter. We have reexamined it. We do not like the situation any more than you do. Therefore, we are content that the contract be canceled next September when it expires. Then, for the time being at least, we propose that the Air Force take over and operate Tullahoma, just as they are operating at Wright Field. If it is necessary to employ civilian consultants, there is plenty of time to do it."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to agree with the Senator from Missouri, but I do not believe we have the time to do it without jeopardizing all other items in the appropriation bill. I think that a standing committee of the Armed Services Committee or of the Appropriations Committee should look into the matter, especially with reference to former Army and Navy officers who participate in the making of contracts.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I fail to see how it would hold up passage of the appropriation bill if we were to disagree to the amendment. If we recede from our position and allow the House amendment to prevail, we would not hold up the appropriation bill for even 1 minute. The House amendment is very simple. The House amendment reads:

Provided, That no part of such appropriations shall be used to make any payment to Aro, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center.

In other words, next September when the contract expires, the Air Force would have to make another arrangement. We would be telling them in effect that we are not satisfied with Aro, Inc.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If Congress were to do as the Senator from Missouri suggests, the Air Force would have 2 months in which it could either (a) provide plans and supervise the work itself, or (b) adopt the plan originally suggested by the Ridenour and Markham committees.

Mr. KEM. That is correct. Or (c) they could make another profit contract with some other organization. We are simply saying that we have weighed the Aro contract in the balance and have found it wanting. That is all we are saying.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield gladly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Missouri think it is sound practice to have an operating company review the plans of the group which really owns the operating company itself?

Mr. KEM. I think it is not only perfectly ridiculous, but scandalous. If the Senate votes to permit this thing to continue I am sure that the people will be very much surprised.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true regardless of whether or not there has been bad faith. Neither the Senator from Missouri nor anyone else charges bad faith.

Mr. KEM. I am not charging bad faith. I am resting my argument entirely on the undisputed facts which have been presented to the Senate by the Comptroller General in the GAO report. In all fairness I would say that the report came to hand after the Appropriations Committee had acted on the matter in the first instance. So if we decide, as we should, to recede from our amendment, we will be merely saying that we have received additional information from the General Accounting Office; and, in view of that information, we have decided not to go ahead with the Aro contract.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not also true that if the Senate goes along with the constructive suggestion now being offered by the Senator from Missouri and recedes from its position, when we return in January, if by that time the Air Force puts before us new evidence and new data indicating that a new type of contract with the Aro Co. is desirable, it will still be possible at that time to enter into a contract even with that concern, provided the contract is properly arrived at.

Mr. KEM. Exactly, provided the proper steps are taken to protect the interests of the people of the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not also correct to say, with reference to the statement of the Senator from New Mexico about expediting the business of the Senate on the last day, that by receding from the Senate position at this time we eliminate all items in disagreement in the conference report? So that from the standpoint of expedition, it would help rather than delay?

Mr. KEM. If we recede from our position on the amendment, all differences between the House and Senate are immediately eliminated.

Mr. MUNDT. Whereas, if we were to insist on our amendment—and, as I understand the yea-and-nay vote in the House was 3 to 1 in support of its position—it is conceivable that we may involve ourselves in a legislative snarl which will take hours to unravel, and even then the Senate may have to recede from its position.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to make one further point. With reference to what the Senator from New Mexico has stated, I agree completely about the hazards and the undesirability of having retired Army officers and Government procurement officers associate themselves with large corporations and then engage immediately in business with the Government. One of the nastiest and ugliest and most disgraceful scandals which our committee of investigation worked on involved Signal Corps procurement officers in Philadelphia who were doing business with a New York concern which was headed by retired officers of the Army. The amounts of money involved were small, but the activities were scandalous and disgraceful. They involved a great many small contracts on which competitive bids were unnecessary. Without any reason whatever, except because of connections established between men in the service and men recently retired from the service, business was allocated to the New York concern at tremendous cost to the taxpayers. I hope we can take some action in the Senate which will provide some regulatory solution to a situation which is increasing alarmingly.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri would inform me if I understand correctly the statement of Representative GORE on the floor of the House on April 9th, which is to be found at page 3887 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, namely, that General Carroll, who was originally in charge of the project, thought that the maximum outlay which the Aro Co. should make was a million and a half dollars during the current year, and that at 3 percent the fee would have netted $45,000. Representative GORE charged that General Carroll's superior, General Partridge, fixed the amount at $3,000,000, which would give the Aro Co. a fee of $90,000, and then removed General Carroll. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Missouri that the statement of Representative GORE is correct?

Mr. KEM. Yes; that is my understanding, with one exception. I understand that General Carroll's recommendation was a fee of $25,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. On an outlay of approximately $840,000.

Mr. KEM. He considered that to be adequate. In that connection there is an interesting comment on the GAO report, which the Senator from South Dakota mentioned. It illustrates the pitfalls from the standpoint of the Government and taxpayers with respect to a contract of this kind. There was a very eminent engineer in the employ of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that General Farrell?

Mr. KEM. Yes. He was getting $17,500 a year and the Aro Co. employed him at $30,000. They took him away from the Atomic Energy Commission and raised his salary from $17,500 to $30,000. Of course, the taxpayers paid the difference. In the case of this type of contract we are in the position of bidding against ourselves for talent, which, of course, is a very ridiculous position from the standpoint of the taxpayers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a further question. The Senator from Missouri has mentioned Mr. Leo, who was hired by Aro to be its operating head at $20,000 a year.

Does the Senator from Missouri understand that Mr. Leo had previous experience in the field of construction or of aerodynamics which would peculiarly qualify him for that position?

Mr. KEM. I am not acquainted with Mr. Leo, but my information is that his talents are along publicity lines, that he is one of the most skillful men in that field who ever operated on the Capital scene. David Lawrence has paid him the tribute of saying that he was the greatest ghost writer in Washington. With talents of that kind, and after taking the time required to attain that position in the field of ghost writing, it would be unusual if he also attained an outstanding position in the field of aerodynamics.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to engage in punning, but evidently if he was an expert in the field of wind, it was a different kind of wind. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 43, request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. KEM. When this motion is disposed of, will it be in order for me to move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not without having the Senate reconsider its vote on the preceding motion.

The motion referred to by the Senator from Missouri would be in order at this time.

Mr. KEM. Then, Mr. President, I now move——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that the same issue will be decided in either case, regardless of the way the matter is presented? In other words, is it not correct that an affirmative vote on the motion I have made will be a vote to send the bill to a further conference, and a negative vote will be a vote to deny that, and to result in the defeat of the Senate amendment, in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, at this time I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the motion of the Senator from Missouri is in the form of a substitute for the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, and takes precedence over the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the new motion, that of the Senator from Missouri, which does have precedence over my motion, from a parliamentary point of view, presents the following situation: Senators who desire to stand by the Senate amendment should now vote "nay," against the motion of the Senator from Missouri, which is a motion to recede from the Senate amendment numbered 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll; and Mr. BENNETT voted "yea" when his name was called.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The roll call has already begun, and one Senator has voted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask for a statement of the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 43.

The roll call has already begun, and the clerk will continue with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WELKER. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent because of illness in their respective families.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bennett	Flanders	Monroney
Butler, Md.	Fulbright	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Hennings	Morse
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Case	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Cordon	Jenner	Smathers
Douglas	Kem	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Williams

NAYS—34

Benton	Hunt	McKellar
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ellender	Kerr	Robertson
Frear	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
George	Langer	Stennis
Gillette	Lehman	Underwood
Green	Long	Welker
Hill	Maybank	Young
Hoey	McClellan	
Holland	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—35

Anderson	Hendrickson	O'Conor
Brewster	Ives	Russell
Bricker	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Bridges	Knowland	Seaton
Byrd	Lodge	Smith, Maine
Cain	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Malone	Sparkman
Dirksen	McCarran	Taft
Duff	McMahon	Thye
Eastland	Millikin	Tobey
Ecton	Neely	Wiley
Hayden	Nixon	

So Mr. KEM's motion was rejected.

Mr. WELKER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to change my vote from "nay" to "yea" on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 43 to House bill 7391. The change in vote would in no way affect the outcome of the final vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the Senate insist on its amendment numbered 43, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr.

SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to request again that persons, other than Senators, retire from the Senate Chamber, unless they have business requiring their attendance on the floor. It is difficult to transact business under the circumstances.

I have made a request of Senators that, when a conference report is pending, they refrain from making speeches on other matters until the conference report is disposed of. I hope that request will be observed. I know everyone is anxious to get away. Senators will have an opportunity to make their speeches, even if I have to sit here until 6 o'clock in the morning to listen to them.

PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say that in the conference on House bill 8122, the major point in disagreement was section 2 of the bill as passed by the House. That section would extend the level of price support at 90 percent for the basic commodities if marketing quotas had not been disapproved for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, or a period of 3 years. The conferees agreed to strike out "1955", so that the support will remain in effect at 90 percent for the years 1953 and 1954.

As to price support for long-staple cotton, it was agreed that the support price for 1 year, that is for the 1953 crop, would be based on the support price of American upland cotton. Thereafter it would be based upon its own parity price and supply level.

That is what the conferees agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not sign the conference report on this bill, of which the Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has just been speaking, and I think I should give my reason for not having done so. There are three provisions in the bill, none of which are necessary at this time, even though one may believe in the wisdom of one or two of the provisions. The first would provide for the extension of the dual-parity formula for 2 years more. There is no need of acting on that at this time, because it continues through 1953, anyway. I have no serious objection to the extension of time provided in the bill, however.

Another provision deals with mandatory supports on long-staple cotton, at a rate somewhat in excess of parity for 1 year, and thereafter, as in relation to other types of cotton. It may be recalled that in 1948, when we enacted price-support legislation, we provided certain supports for cotton. At that time it did not occur to any of us that the Secretary of Agriculture would rule that long-staple cotton is not cotton. In my opinion that was a strange interpretation, but that was the interpretation, nevertheless, along with several others of similar character, which have since emanated from the Department of Agriculture. The amendment would not be needed in this bill, were the Secretary of Agriculture to do his duty as intended by the Congress. It is true that in preparing for war we must have substantial quantities of long-staple cotton. Last year, the growers in the Southwest produced cotton of this kind, for which they received something like 70 cents a pound, as I am informed. The Government then entered the Egyptian market and paid up to $1.47 a pound for the same kind of cotton.

I do not blame the long-staple cotton growers of the Southwest for not wanting to trust their future to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the administration which is now handling matters. However, the Secretary of Agriculture is supporting the price of long-staple cotton this year at 153 percent of parity, using the emergency provisions of existing law with which to do it. However, it appears that the cotton growers of the Southwest do not trust him to continue to support their commodity at a high level in the event that the Egyptians want the market.

Mr. President, I do not object to this provision particularly, inasmuch as the high-level support is continued for only 1 year. What I do object to, primarily, is a provision which extends minimum 90-percent supports for the six basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, for 2 years following this year. I am not opposed in the least to 90-percent supports for those commodities this year. Under the law there is a guaranty of 90-percent support for those commodities for next year, but I do not believe we should fix the levels of support too far ahead if we are going to have the flexibility in our agricultural economy which is necessary in mapping our course for the future.

The conference report which we are asked to support guarantees 90 percent of support to six basic commodities for this year and the 2 years following. It does not take into consideration any of the other agricultural commodities. It does not consider turkeys or other poultry, or hogs, dairy products, beef, soybeans, dried beans and peas, or a host of other products.

When we guarantee a high level of support for the feed crops we are putting a squeeze on the users of those crops, particularly on the agricultural industry of this country. I believe it is unfair to guarantee years in advance a high level of support to the producers of those six commodities and not take into consideration the producers of dairy products, and meats, peas, beans, and other commodities.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of the fact that the National Defense Production Act provides 90 percent for next year, there is actually only 1 year in question, is there not?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The House bill would have fixed the level of support of 90 percent for 3 years in advance. The conference report fixes it for 2 years in advance, bringing it up again for consideration in an election year. We should have an opportunity to consider it when there is not an election in the near future.

Mr. MUNDT. It is entirely possible that in the next 2-year interval we can reappraise the whole agricultural situation.

Mr. AIKEN. It is entirely possible. I do not think agreement to the conference report is going to be fatal by any stretch of the imagination. My position is well fixed against applying a level of support 3 years in advance——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the purpose of the price support to protect the amount of production needed to meet the demand?

Mr. AIKEN. The purpose of price supports is to assure adequate production and to maintain the national economy by not permitting prices for agricultural commodities to fall below a safe level. In the event that crops are needed, an additional production of certain crops in the interest of national defense, there is no limit to the support which the Secretary of Agriculture can place upon those crops, after a hearing. He has done that in the case of long-staple cotton, by fixing the support for this year at 153 percent.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not to insure the producers of crops and in order to encourage them to produce?

Mr. AIKEN. That is one of the major objectives.

Mr. KILGORE. Does not the Senator from Vermont think it might be wise, in fixing these guaranteed-price supports, to have them on a 1-year basis? I may remind the Senator from Vermont that we got into very serious difficulty with reference to potatoes a short time ago. Now we face a shortage of potatoes. Had we run from year to year we might have kept our crops in line from year to year.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from West Virginia is stating exactly the position

of the Senator from Vermont, that the levels of support should be fixed from year to year and not fixed for several years in advance.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I am very glad to be in agreement with such an able agriculturalist.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is not the Senator from Vermont mistaken when he says we should not plan ahead for 3 years? In the Middle West farmers must plan their crops as far as 4 years ahead. A farmer may want to plant clover and plow it under to get his land in better shape.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator is referring to the production of wheat, I think, if the law were handled better, the wheat growers of the Senator's State would be getting more for their wheat in the open market. I have pointed out that the bill applies a high level of support for this year and 2 years following to basic commodities only, and does not include other commodities which are of greater importance to the Nation and to our agriculture as well.

I should like to point out another reason why the high levels of support should not be fixed years in advance, which is brought to my attention by the question asked by the Senator from North Dakota.

What we should be concerned with primarily is farm income. Income is production multiplied by price. If there is a high guaranteed price for too many years, if it is guaranteed for too many years in advance, it is almost certain that the commodity affected will be thrown into quotas. If it were not for the proclaimed emergency, we would be facing quotas right now.

The Secretary of Agriculture asked for a high production of wheat, a production so high that next July 1 we will have not the normal carry-over of 163,000,000 bushels of wheat, but it appears now the carry-over of wheat will be around 500,000,000 bushels.

The Secretary has also announced that there will be no quotas on wheat next year, in accordance with his authority under the emergency provisions of existing law. Suppose, if there should be another surplus of 200,000,000, 300,000,000, or 400,000,000 bushels of wheat next year, we would be in such a situation that quotas would be almost necessary. When we apply quotas, the farm income is still production multiplied by price. But when we reduce production and hold the price up to where it was, farm income is reduced seriously.

Take the case of tobacco. Tobacco is working itself into trouble through the matter of quotas. We have just passed legislation which will permit the reduction of quotas of one type of tobacco down to seven-tenths of an acre. A man cannot live by producing seven-tenths of an acre of tobacco. He cannot possibly do so.

Peanuts are under permanent quotas now. In the event the emergency would terminate, as we hope it will, I can only see trouble ahead if we should have to apply quotas to wheat. If the emergency does not terminate, if we continue carrying substantial surpluses—and I think we have to in order to be safe—then we are faced with very substantial loss as to the Federal Treasury.

We have found in our investigations in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this year that wheat and corn do not keep in good condition very long. Theoretically, wheat can be kept for 4 or 5 years. Actually, we are told, it starts to spoil within a year or two. It deteriorates in value. Corn becomes rancid after a year or a year and a half, and its value depreciates. The millers will not use old grain unless they are forced to do so. That means that it is necessary to dispose of the grain for whatever price can be obtained. That means a substantial loss.

We should not have a substantial loss, in the interest of the public welfare, of farm commodities in this country. I also wish to point out that today, because of high-support levels, 90 percent in the case of wheat, amounts to cost plus a considerable profit in eastern Colorado and western Kansas. It means cost plus a substantial profit in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and throughout the eastern States, including Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio, and throughout those areas which would not normally be producing very large quantities of wheat.

Wheat should be produced in the areas best suited to this crop, including North Dakota, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, and other States in the West, but wheat will be produced throughout the eastern States in large quantities so long as there is a guaranty of cost plus a profit in the high-cost States.

Mr. YOUNG and Mr. WELKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. As the Senator from Vermont has pointed out, this year we will probably have a carry-over something like 500,000,000 bushels of wheat. That is because of the Department of Agriculture's program for a wheat surplus for security needs.

The fact that we will have this year a 500,000,000 bushel carry-over, or thereabouts, and the fact that, at the request of the United States Government, there will be wheat added to that quantity for the next year and the year following, indicate that farmers should have protection against price fluctuations, because they have purposely gone against their best judgment in building up surpluses. I think there should be an additional year for higher supports.

Mr. AIKEN. I have no quarrel with the statement of the Senator from North Dakota that when farmers are asked to produce crops large enough to break their own markets, they should have price protection. I would have no objection to fixing the support price at 100 percent or whatever level is necessary to get the required production, for 1 year at a time.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true, however, without entering into the over-all question of the validity of the position which the Senator from Vermont has taken, that his argument applies persuasively in normal conditions, but not in world conditions like those of the present, when we are engaged in a program of national defense, a program which we know is going to run well beyond a 2-year extension of the act? We are engaged in a program in which we have certain fixed responsibilities from the standpoint of supplying food abroad. There are arguments in favor of maintaining the 90-percent provision for another year which would not prevail in normal times.

Mr. AIKEN. They are certainly good arguments in connection with price supports for this year and next year. I would not go beyond a time 2 years in advance in encouraging a high level of supports.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator agree that there are good arguments for maintaining them this year and a year in advance, and fairly good arguments for one other year, which is in question in the proposed legislation?

Mr. AIKEN. That depends on whether we can determine that the threat of war is not going to be as acute 3 years from now as it was last year—I do not know how serious it is today. When the Senate voted down the St. Lawrence seaway proposal, I came to the conclusion that the threat of war was not so acute as some people said it was.

Mr. MUNDT. I can assure the Senator from Vermont that I agree with him in his statement about war and his desire for the St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. That would help wheat.

Mr. MUNDT. I voted with the Senator from Vermont for the seaway.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. And my reason for supporting him is due to the fact that the Senator from Vermont has stood steadfast in his position for many years. He is fair-minded enough to recognize that the world situation is such that at least there is more justification, in his mind, for extending the floor than would ordinarily be the case.

Mr. AIKEN. I would not assume that the threat of war might be as acute three years from now. There may be a change of administration which would result in a far better understanding among the nations of the world, and perhaps eliminate the threat of war.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has mentioned two eventualities devoutly to be desired. There is no question about it. If those eventualities develop, we will be very happy to have had an extension of 1 year more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am wondering what is before the Senate. I am a little confused about what is being discussed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the conference report on House bill 8122.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Vermont, who has had experience in agriculture, if it is not true that rigid price supports for potatoes wrecked the price-support program for that commodity, because that policy encouraged an expanded acreage and created such a surplus that a reaction took place, and in 1951 we entirely eliminated price supports on potatoes?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Idaho is correct. So long as we had a 60 percent support price for potatoes, 60 percent of parity was all the farmer could get for his potatoes. When the support price was eliminated the very next year the farmers, as a rule, received from 90 to 100 percent for their potatoes. I say that so long as we have 90 percent support on wheat—and I am for it this year and next year—the farmer cannot hope to get more than 90 percent for his wheat. He cannot hope to get 100 percent for his crop, unless we actually have war. I have already pointed out that too high a level of support, particularly if fixed too far in advance, continues production in uneconomic areas. It prevents conversion to crops which might be even better adapted and more profitable in that area.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont can explain why at the present moment wheat producers are receiving about 35 cents a bushel under the loan price.

Mr. AIKEN. They are receiving that price for several different reasons. First, the operation of the machinery for price support is not nearly perfect. Second, some will accept a lower price by selling their wheat immediately after the harvest, rather than to unwind the red tape involved—and it is not too serious—in obtaining a Government loan. Third, some are saving a little on their income taxes by disposing of it now, if I may throw in the last reason. Perhaps I should have not mentioned the third reason, but I think it is true.

Another reason why I object to fixing high support levels for farm commodities too far in advance is that when we do so we undertake not only to support the market of the American farmer at the high level, but we assume the support of the world market, or much of it.

In 1948, when the first permanent agricultural price support legislation was enacted, the administration asked us to strengthen section 22 so that the President might keep foreign imports from breaking down price support programs in this country. We strengthened that section, as requested by the administration, but the President has not used it to maintain prices. Instead, we have seen foreign commodities come into this country in such great quantities as to break down our price support programs, and the President has not seen fit to use section 22 to do anything about it.

We recall that only 2 years ago huge imports of cheese and butter started to break down the support of the dairy price program. The result was that section 104 was put into the Defense Production Act last year. That was inserted for the simple reason that the President did not see fit to use the provisions of section 22 to take care of the situation. We have seen this year the effect of huge imports of grain from Canada. The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] was telling me just the other day that because of huge Canadian imports oats in his area will bring only 55 cents a bushel to the farmer. That is a little less than the support price. So when we fix too high a level of support too far in advance, we must expect that other countries will seek to take advantage of it, and we must be prepared to support the world price as well as the price to our own farmers.

I may point out one other thing which happens if we seek to get the price too high; 90 percent parity is not too high for this year. I say it is not too high for next year, for the basic commodities, either. Beyond that I do not want to commit myself. But when the prices of particular commodities, particularly fibers, are to high, we are simply inviting substitutes any synthetics to come in and take that market away from us, or we are inviting a huge production of cotton or other commodities in the so-called underdeveloped countries, to be financed by our own investment bankers in the United States, who can get labor for as much per day as we pay per hour in this country, and then ask to have our trade barriers broken down. They get their 40 or 50 percent dividends on their investments, and call for the United States Armed Forces to protect them if necessary. What happens to the American producer in that case? He does not fare very well.

My principal objection to support levels that are to high is that it means dependency upon Government and political control of the farmers of this country.

Let me mention another factor, namely, the psychological effect upon the consumers. I can imagine what the consumers of the country and the press which claims to represent them are going to say when they read that we have guaranteed 90 percent support for some years in advance on the six basic commodities. They are not going to think in terms of the six basic commodities. They are going to think of the farmers as a whole, and every commodity they produce when they read that news. It is not going to do us any good. We must stop and reflect that only about 16 percent of the population of the country live on farms today. We must have the support of the people who live in the cities and in the suburbs—all the people of the country—in order to maintain agriculture in as strong a position as is necessary.

Suppose labor were guaranteed 90 percent of parity? We would howl if they got 90 percent for unemployment compensation. Of course, that is not an exact parallel, but labor is getting its high price today in a free market. To be sure, it is guaranteed a minimum wage. However, that minimum wage does not compare with the wages labor is actually receiving. The minimum wage is to protect labor in the event of a depression.

Our aim should be not to put the farmers in the position where they are dependent on Government for their income, whether it be 90 percent parity or 100 percent—100 percent, of course, would be state socialism.

For any percentage of parity, our aim should be 100-percent income to the American farmer as compared to the income of other factors of our economy. This can be achieved through research, which our Department of Agriculture has not exploited to the degree authorized by the Congress some 6 years ago. It can be brought about through the judicious use of the provisions of section 22, which can regulate large imports from other countries when they start to break down our prices in this country. It can be brought about through better use of marketing agreements, and it can also be brought about through our own cooperatives. I think our cooperatives, if used to the best advantage, stand between the American farmer and Government controls, if he will only depend upon the cooperatives rather than look to the Government to support him and his family.

After we have used these things to the fullest degree, if the farmer is still deficient in income, we should talk about supporting the price so that he will be on a level with the other factors of our economy. I do not want to drive the farmer any further toward political and economic dependency upon the Government by fixing a high level of support too many years in advance. I do not want the farmers to get the idea that they can depend on a Government check for their income for that period of time. I believe 90-percent support for the basic commodities during this year is proper. Probably it will be all right for next year. I do think that we are heading for trouble if we fix it too far in advance. That is why I believe fixing it for 1 year after this year is sufficient. For that reason I did not sign the conference report which extends it for 2 years after this year.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Vermont in opposing the conference report. I believe we will make a serious mistake if we set up this program for an indefinite period. I believe Congress should give the American farmer a program on which he can rely, and not legislate constantly under the threat of war. If the threat of war is such that we must today, in the closing hours of the session, adopt a long-range

farm program projecting higher levels of support—which is the only argument that has been used—we cannot very well talk about taking a 6-month vacation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO URGE PROPOSED LEGISLATION IN THE NEXT CONGRESS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to give notice that when Congress reconvenes, if I have the honor of being a Member of the next Congress, I shall urge legislation which will be of aid to the civilian components of the Army in the construction of warehouses, and so forth.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR O'CONOR

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, this is probably the last day my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Maryand [Mr. O'CONOR] and I will serve together on this floor. When Senator O'CONOR announced that he would not seek reelection, I stated on the floor of the Senate at the time that in his going the Senate, the State of Maryland, and the Nation would lose a fine and able statesman. I now reiterate that statement. I shall miss him, as I know every other Senator will.

THE NATICK LABORATORY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I prepared relative to the laboratory at Natick, Mass., and also a copy of a letter which I wrote to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] under date of July 1, 1952. The letter is also signed by several other Senators.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The decision of the conferees to recede on the amendment I introduced to halt the expenditures of funds for the Natick laboratory is disappointing, particularly as the amendment was adopted unanimously by the Senate.

It is not my intention to object to the conference report, because of the failure to uphold this amendment and the other which I offered regarding the National Guard.

It is true the bill contained no funds for the Natick laboratory, but this amendment would have the effect of preventing any diverting of funds to expand the laboratory beyond the original appropriation, and it also would have had the effect of demonstrating strongly the sentiment of the Congress. The fact that the conference rejected the amendment must not be considered in any way an endorsement of this wasteful move.

The grave questions which were raised on the floor on Monday remain unanswered and the facts revealed in the course of our study of this problem must still be explained.

Our position and the outline of the disturbing evidence is contained in the letter which my colleagues and I submitted to the senior Senator from Wyoming on July 1. It is signed by Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, UNDERWOOD, SMITH of New Jersey, HENDRICKSON, CLEMENTS, CAPEHART, JENNER, HUMPHREY, THYE, LANGER, and myself. It contains the 10 major reasons—which have never been answered—for our objection to this consolidated laboratory.

I for one do not intend to rest until we get to the bottom of this campaign to create something obviously unnecessary and a duplication. I hope Senator MORSE presses an investigation by the Senate Preparedness Committee.

In closing I should like to mention our efforts to get together with the Secretary of Defense to reach some honest clarification of this matter. On March 17, 10 Senators and 69 Representatives wrote Secretary Lovett outlining our findings and requesting a meeting. We were not received by the Secretary.

Again our able colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], expressed our desire to confer. Again we were referred to subordinates who had no power to act.

Thursday the Secretary of Defense reached me and offered to meet with our group next Monday. The Secretary must know that Congress will have adjourned and that all of us have urgent obligations out of the Capital. We hope the Secretary will extend this offer so as to meet with him at the earliest practicable date.

The Secretary wrote me yesterday that "the question of delaying it for any extended period" presents a serious problem. I think we are correct in assuming that Secretary Lovett will at least hold up any contract letting and obligating of money for the Natick laboratory until such time as we have had an opportunity of meeting with him as a group—or until a few of us empowered to speak for the others have a chance to confer with him personally.

There is nothing so urgent about this so-called consolidation to compel Secretary Lovett to disregard this request to a group representing one-fourth of the population of the United States.

I never spoke more sincerely than when I state that it is the feeling of the group that this is a question which overrides any local or State interest. This is a matter of principle. We all support research, and we want development to benefit the fighting soldier. However, we resent and refuse support to needless construction done in the name of research.

JULY 1, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your desire to obtain fuller information regarding the efforts of the Quartermaster Corps to establish at Natick, Mass., a consolidated research and development laboratory, in order that you and the other Senate conferees may effectively represent the Senate's stand on the amendment introduced by Senator MARTIN and adopted last evening, the undersigned respectfully present the following information and suggestions:

As was made clear during the debate on the Martin amendment, the 10 Senators from the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania sought unsuccessfully to see the Secretary of Defense and to present to him personally information which, they felt, would prompt him to abandon the Natick project as wasteful and unnecessary.

The Senate group recognized that Secretary Lovett has full authority to cease the expenditure of funds for the construction of the laboratory. It was felt that he would take such action after listening to the group. Unfortunately, a meeting could not be secured with Secretary Lovett. The group was referred to the Undersecretary of the Army, Mr. Karl Bendetsen. Only 2 of the 99 Representatives and 10 Senators opposed to the project chose to meet with the Undersecretary.

When a meeting with Secretary Lovett failed to materialize last week, the group decided to take the issue to the floor of the Senate.

The documents introduced in the RECORD last evening, and the charges made by individual Senators, speak for themselves. They outline facts sufficiently strong to warrant a full investigation by the Johnson subcommittee.

The unvarnished truth is that the project from the very beginning was so grossly misrepresented as to deceive its proponents—who have acted in good faith—as well as those of us who had unsubstantiated misgivings over its validity. Since the enactment of the authorizing statute, we have found the following to be true:

1. Existing R. and D. facilities are excellent, with room for expansion.

2. Location of present R. and D. laboratories is based on their proximity to certain established industries, thus assuring constant and efficient contact.

3. Less than 10 percent of the employees to be moved are research scientists, the remaining 90 percent being engaged in applied development, specifications, and similar practical industrial occupations.

4. Consolidation of R. and D. activities at any vulnerable point violates the dispersal principle.

5. The Quartermaster has been unable to show any reduction of jobs through the consolidation. On the other hand, consolidation will require increased travel and long distance telephone.

6. The initiators of the project were aided in their efforts to secure the enactment of Public Law 424 by testifying time and time again that there was no intention to include in the consolidation the Chicago Food and Container Section. Yet—as was brought out in the debate last evening by Senator DOUGLAS—after the money was authorized an immediate effort was started to include the Chicago laboratory.

Except for the watchfulness of the congressional group, this expensive addition to the project would have been achieved. Moreover, the argument now made by the Quartermaster General that the movement of the Chicago Food and Container Section is not necessary for effective consolidation destroys his whole case. In any investigation held, it will be possible to show through expert testimony that if consolidation is valid at all, the Chicago Food and Container Section should be the first to move.

We feel that this is a perfect example of duplicity, a demonstration of the old Army tactic of getting the camel's head under the tent.

7. Special equipment required by the Quartermaster Corps is now available in other installations throughout the defense establishment. Failure to utilize such equipment, when surplus to the needs of another branch, violates the unification principle.

8. The transfer of present personnel and their families from Chicago, Philadelphia, Jeffersonville, and Washington to Natick would require vast new housing. We believe an investigation will reveal that speculators have been busy from the beginning seeking to exploit this situation. A $25,000,000 real estate promotion is involved in the consolidation.

9. The Department has disregarded the explicit instructions of Public Law 424 in selecting the site. The excuse given for changing the site recommended by the impartial ad hoc committee is that a million dollars was saved thereby. Planning was so poor that the Army was attempting to orient the land to a building which had already been designed. Had the original site been Boston Common, the Army could have claimed a saving of $200,000,000 by shifting to Natick.

10. The most ominous factor involved in the whole project has been the suppression of honest opinion given by qualified QM personnel whenever that opinion ran contrary to the ambitions of the Quartermaster Corps. The record reveals a disinclination to admit errors and the pursual of a program designed to justify the project at all costs. Information has been withheld, suppressed and distorted. The scope, cost, and purpose of the consolidation has been changed frequently—whenever our group has called attention to inconsistencies. Military considerations, as well as principles of sound management, have been cast aside.

As the Senator from Wyoming realizes, it is always difficult to pinpoint waste in a budget as large as that advanced by the Defense Establishment. By careful study and investigation, the undersigned have found this clear example of water in the Defense budget. The eventual cost of the Natick laboratory may well exceed $50,000,000. We are convinced the whole sum will be wasted unless action is now taken to halt the project. Public funds will be spent to achieve results far inferior to the highly successful work now being performed without the expenditure.

Recognizing that the Congress will adjourn shortly, it is urged that you express to the Secretary of Defense the desire of the Senate that all further expenditures for the Natick project will be halted until the Congress again meets and after a full opportunity has been afforded to investigate the charges that the consolidated laboratory is wasteful and unnecessary; that it can only hope, at best, to duplicate functions already being performed most adequately at the existing R. and D. laboratories in Philadelphia, Chicago, and Jeffersonville, Ind.

It should be stressed that not one of the $11,000,000 appropriated will be used for research. The entire sum will be used for consolidation.

Any delay in the expenditure of these funds would not in any way interfere with or retard the valuable research now in progress at the three laboratories named. Even Senator SALTONSTALL admitted during the last evening's debate that great contributions have been made in the R. and D. field during the past several years at existing laboratories.

The revocation of Public Law 424, Eighty-first Congress, could undoubtedly be achieved if time permitted. Since it does not, we are hopeful you can convince the Secretary of Defense of the wisdom of halting the expenditure of funds already appropriated. Under the Martin amendment none of the funds contained in the pending appropriation bill for the defense establishment could be used for the consolidated laboratory.

It is regretted that the unwillingness of the Secretary of Defense to meet with the Senators from the five States concerned compelled a somewhat unorthodox parliamentary procedure. Nevertheless, the uniqueness of our effort should not be used as an argument against making a possible saving of $50,000,000.

It should be noted that the first major bids on this project are to be opened tomorrow.

With assurances of our high regards,

Very sincerely,

MARTIN,
DOUGLAS,
UNDERWOOD,
CLEMENTS,
CAPEHART,
JENNER,
HENDRICKSON,
LANGER,
MORSE,
HUMPHREY,
SMITH (New Jersey),
THYE,
Senators.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if the conference report is the unanimous report of all conferees; and to explain it very briefly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; it is the unanimous report of the conferees of both the House and the Senate. We agreed to the so-called McFarland amendment, with some amendments added to it. The McFarland amendment provided an expiration date of 2 years from the date the law became effective on October 1. From the so-called McFarland amendment there were deleted provisions with respect to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico. So far as the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are concerned, the present law still is effective.

The Senator from Massachusetts will recall that in our retirement test in the Senate version we provided earnings of $100 a month. The House provided $70 a month. We agreed upon $75 a month and $900 a year for those who are self-employed.

With respect to wage credits for veterans, we took the Senate version, and the credits will be paid out of the trust fund.

With respect to section 3, which provides for permanent and total disability, we agreed on a formula, but it will not be effective until June 30, 1953. Affirmative action by Congress will be required before any part of the provision will become effective. That is the so-called socialized medicine provision. We amended the provision until there is no hint whatever left of socialized medicine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Approximately how much will the bill cost the Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator refers to the whole bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Old-age assistance will cost about $250,000,000, and old-age survivors insurance will cost about $400,000,000 in addition. The Senator from Massachusetts will recall that old-age-assistance payments and blind-assistance payments were increased by $5 a month, and assistance to dependent children was increased by $3 a month. The total cost would approximate $625,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I did not fully understand what the distinguished Senator from Colorado said with regard to the amendment which I offered, and which was taken to conference with reference to allowances for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We had great difficulty with that amendment. We conferred for several hours on three separate days. The Senate conferees finally had to recede and the amendment was eliminated. Therefore, the present law will apply to the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I know the Senate conferees did their utmost to secure the inclusion of this provision. I am grateful to the majority leader for accepting my amendment when it was under consideration here on the floor.

However, I cannot help but say that I am greatly disappointed, for I think the treatment we are giving to our fellow American citizens in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands is unwise and shabby. We are treating them infinitely less well than we are treating any of the citizens in the States of the Union, despite the fact that the economic difficulties of the citizens living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are vastly great, and in some cases they are under a load which it is almost impossible for them to bear.

In this case we are giving public assistance to the extent of less than $9 a month, on the average, and to the extent of less than $8 a month to help the children, the blind, and the crippled. That is infinitely less than we provide for the people living in the States.

I do not believe there is any excuse for treating one fellow American citizens less well than other citizens—merely because they live in a different part of the hemisphere and because they differ from us in their surroundings, their customs, their habits, their ancestry, and in some cases, in their color.

I cannot help but express my deep disappointment. Without desiring to be critical at all of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I can say that I intend to pursue this matter in the coming years, in the hope and in confidence that the Congress will see that justice is done to our American fellow-citizens in Puerto Rico and in the Virgin Islands.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in reply to the Senator from New York.

I am sure we shall wish to give further consideration to this matter, because we realize that it does need attention.

However, the argument which was used successfully against the Senate con-

ferees was that the people of Puerto Rico pay no taxes whatever to the Federal Government of the United States. That argument was effectively used against the Senate conferees. Nevertheless, the matter does need adjustment and further attention.

I am sure that when we have a little more time and when we are not working under as much pressure as that under which we were working in the conference, we shall be able to work out an arrangement which will be more or less satisfactory to the able Senator from New York.

He will understand, I am sure, that we were able finally to agree and to have the conference report signed at 1 o'clock today, after 3 days of conference.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I fully realize and appreciate the great difficulties and pressure under which the conference committee has worked.

Nevertheless, I feel that a grave injustice has been done to our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands—an injustice which we should seek at the earliest possible moment to remedy.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. There may have been a misunderstanding in regard to one item. The Senator said our amendment for the aged, the blind, and the dependent children provided for 2 years. Let me say that the Senate version provided for permanent legislation, and the conference committee agreed upon a limitation of 2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; the Senate version was a permanent one; but the conferees agreed upon 2 years from October 1.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Colorado and the other conferees for the hard work they have done, for I know they had a difficult time obtaining any conference report at all.

To my mind there is no question that at the end of 2 years we shall be able to extend this provision, increasing the payments for the aged, the blind, and the dependent children.

I am glad that at this time these persons will be able to set the increase provided by the conference report—an increase which they need so badly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon during the discussion of the conference report on the so-called social security amendment a colloquy occurred with regard to the amendment on old age pensions which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and as to what happened in conference. I had intended at the time to place in the RECORD a summary of the very long and arduous fight which was waged by the distinguished Senator from Arizona on the subject of social security legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the colloquy, a statement which I desired to read to the Senate with respect to the record of the Senator from Arizona on this vital subject matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Senator McFARLAND has a long and consistent record in the Senate as a friend and a champion of the aged, the blind, and the dependent children.

On two different occasions before this Eighty-second Congress, he sponsored measures to increase the assistance to these deserving persons. He saw his efforts result in public law providing increased payments to thousands of persons who needed such increases for their very existence.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, Senator McFARLAND sponsored a bill increasing old-age assistance by $5 a month, blind-persons assistance by $5 per month, and dependent children's assistance by $3 per month. This became Public Law 718.

In the second session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senator from Arizona again sponsored a measure to provide the same increase for a second time. This became Public Law 642.

This year, Senator McFARLAND has once again succeeded in obtaining an increase for this group of needy Americans.

His amendment to increase old-age assistance payments by $5 per month, aid to the blind by $5 per month, and assistance to dependent children by $3 per month was adopted by both the Senate and the House of Representatives for a 2-year period.

To me, Senator McFARLAND's success in obtaining assistance for these people represents one of the greatest accomplishments in this field in the history of the Senate.

Another bill, in his long record of concern with these needy persons was a measure to prevent earnings of aged persons from barring their old-age assistance payments. On this, in an earlier Congress, he made a determined fight that identified him to the needy of his own State and to hundreds of thousands throughout the country as a friend watchful of their interests and ready to take off his coat and fight for their welfare.

Back in 1946, when he introduced S. 1769, providing for an increase of 35 percent of existing Federal contributions to States for old-age assistance, assistance to the blind, and for aid for dependent children, he made one of the classic pleas for these people. He said: "Wages have gone up and prices are high. But because these old people, these blind people, these dependent children have no powerful Washington lobby, because they are not represented nationally by a union or a chamber of commerce or a trade association, we in Congress have been blind to their plight. The old people of this country are the forgotten people. I for one will not sit idly by while honest, worthy American citizens who have worked all their lives and have reached old age without the means to live decently are permitted to starve."

These remarks, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1946, were a declaration to a principle and purpose to which he has been faithful in all his years as a Member of this body.

In this same session of Congress he offered an amendment to H. R. 1752 to the Social Security Act of 1940 which would enable persons drawing old-age assistance to obtain war work without having money earned used as a basis of excluding old-age payments to them. The proposal was for the duration of the war and served to ease the manpower shortage, particularly in agriculture and allowed the aged to supplement their very inadequate old-age assistance. The amendment was accepted and thousands of these people put their skills and energies into the war effort without being penalized for their patriotism.

For one, I want to commend Senator McFARLAND for his efforts through these many years in behalf of these needy people. They could not have a finer champion of their interests or a more sympathetic and earnest friend.

JOINT STATEMENT OF AGREEMENT AFFECTING STATE BANKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the executive committee of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System have issued a joint statement encompassing agreement of the parties concerning areas of responsibility of the parties in respect to chartering of banks, examination of banks, capital requirements, directors meetings and other matters.

The agreement contained in the joint statement is the result of meetings between the parties suggested by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Because this matter is of great interest to the banking profession, and to others, I request that this statement together with a letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] from Mr. Harl, Chairman of the Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, July 3, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: We are enclosing herewith a joint statement of the executive committee of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

You will recall that at the hearings last fall relative to the confirmation of Mr. H. E. Cook and the undersigned to be directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the following two operating requirements of this Corporation were discussed: (1) the requirement that the examiner call a meeting of the board of directors of a bank after he had finished an examination; and (2) the requirement, in applications for deposit insurance, that new banks agree at all times to maintain a capital ratio at least equal to the national average. At the time these requirements were discussed before the Subcommittee, of which Senator FREAR is the Chairman, we stated we would be glad to sit down with the State Bank Supervisors and work out an agreement satisfactory to both parties. We have done so, and the enclosed agreement is the result of our discussions.

This agreement covers not only the two points raised during the hearings, but also several other matters which we believe will tend to make for more satisfactory working arrangements between the various banking agencies and will strengthen our dual banking system.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes for your continued success, I am, believe me,

Cordially and sincerely,

MAPLE T. HARL, *Chairman.*

JOINT STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SUPERVISORS OF STATE BANKS, THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY, AND THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The executive committee of the National Association of Supervisors of State Banks and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have considered through joint conferences, matters of mutual interest touching upon bank capitalization, meetings of bank examiners with boards of directors, problem banks, and internal audit and controls of banking institutions. While the matters which gave rise to these conferences concerned only the supervisors of State banks and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board were invited and participated in the discussions and lent valuable advice and counsel during the conferences and join in the understandings reached as a matter of desirable public policy.

In preparing this statement with respect to the coordination of the practices of the several agencies in fields of mutual or joint responsibility, it is intended, of course, that each agency will fully carry out the duties and responsibilities vested in it by statute, and all the agencies mutually recognize the statutory prerogatives of the others.

State banking authorities have the sole right to charter State banks, the right to authorize or deny branches of such banks if permitted by State law. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the case of nonmember insured State banks, must give its prior approval to the establishment and operation of any new branch of such banks, and in the case of out-of-town branches of State member banks, the Board of Governors must authorize any new branch of such banks. State banking authorities have the primary power over State banks as to solvency, capital adequacy, and sound management, including disciplinary action. State authorities also have the final sanction of revocation of State bank charters. State banking authorities recognize the protection and benefits derived from Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insurance and Federal Reserve membership and will conduct their supervisory powers with a view to minimizing the insurance risks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and maximizing the ability of those State banks which are Federal Reserve members to take advantage of their Federal Reserve membership.

The Comptroller of the Currency has the sole charter power over national banks, the sole right to authorize or deny branches of such banks if permitted by State law, and the primary power over national banks as to solvency and sound management, including disciplinary action. In case of deliberate violation of law by a national bank, suit may be brought in the name of the Comptroller of the Currency for the forfeiture of bank's charter. He has special and additional concern for adequate capitalization and sound management due to the obligations of his office to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Federal Reserve System which agencies are automatically involved when a national bank is chartered and which normally do not examine or exert disciplinary action over national banks.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has the sole responsibility for granting to or withholding deposit insurance from nonmember State banks and of withdrawing insurance protection from insured banks. Normally, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation examines only insured State nonmember banks and normally it exerts influence toward adequate bank capitalization and sound management of such banks through State banking departments in the interest of protecting depositors and reducing the loss exposure of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has the sole power to grant to or to withhold Federal Reserve membership from the State banks and to withdraw membership privileges from State banks. Federal Reserve authorities normally examine only State member banks and normally exert influence toward adequate capitalization and sound management of such banks through State banking departments in the interest of maintaining a sound credit structure and maximizing the ability of State member banks to use their membership privileges. They recognize a special and additional concern as to adequate capitalization and sound management of State member banks due to their obligation to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which agency is automatically involved by the granting of Federal Reserve membership to a State bank and which normally does not examine or exert disciplinary action over State member banks.

In the case of problem banks, it should be the objective of the agencies directly concerned to achieve and maintain close liaison in working out solutions of the problems. Periodic consultations should be held to lay plans for such disciplinary or corrective action as may be necessary. It would be expected that the State supervisory authority would take the lead in carrying out the appropriate disciplinary or corrective policies where State-chartered institutions are concerned, although the Federal agency involved would retain its right to act independently if circumstances warranted.

As to new banks, the State banking authority has the power to charter any new State bank which has capital funds sufficient to meet requirements of State law and the commissioner's judgment as to adequacy, likewise, in such circumstances, to authorize any new branch of a State bank when permitted by State law. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, in the case of nonmember insured State banks, must give its prior approval to the establishment and operation of any new branch of such banks, and, in the case of out-of-town branches of State member banks, the Board of Governors must authorize any new branch of such banks. The Comptroller of the Currency has the power to charter any national bank which has capital funds sufficient to meet the requirements of the National Bank Act and the Comptroller's judgment; also, in such circumstances, to authorize any national bank branch if permitted by State law. Before approving the application of a State nonmember bank for deposit insurance, the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is required by statute to give consideration to the adequacy of the bank's capital structure as well as to the other factors specified in the law. The Federal Reserve authorities have the power to admit any newly chartered State bank to membership if it has minimum capital funds required by the National Bank Act or they can refuse to admit to membership a newly chartered bank whose capital funds seem inadequate in their judgment. There should be consultation between appropriate Federal and State authorities if the prospective bank is to have a State charter and is to become an insured bank or a member of the Federal Reserve System and between all Federal authorities if the bank is to have a national charter.

In determining the adequacy of capital of new institutions the agencies should use at least a 3-year projection of the probable amount of deposits and should take into account other factors, such as type of community, overbanking, ability to generate earnings sufficient to provide adequate compensation for good management and the accumulation of additional capital funds for future growth, risk asset ratio, etc., as well as any other factors required by law.

We believe that much good can come from consultations between supervisory agencies on matters of mutual interest. To better provide for such consultations, it is agreed that a standing committee, consisting of one official representative in each of the four supervisory entities referred to in the first paragraph of this statement, shall be organized and that this committee shall hold at least two meetings a year in Washington, D. C.

We acknowledge also the benefits that may often flow from conferences between bank managements and bank examiners or other agency officials. Where these conferences are sought by institutions at the conclusion of examinations or at other times, their requests should be readily granted.

The primary responsibility for calling disciplinary conferences with problem institutions rests with the supervisory agency primarily responsible for solvency and sound management, that is, the Comptroller of the Currency or the State banking department. Where the problem bank is a State member bank or a nonmember insured State bank, the appropriate Federal agency may call a disciplinary meeting, if the State banking authority does not call such a meeting.

Boards of directors of banks should be encouraged through the examination procedure to interest themselves in the adequate audit and internal control of their institutions. Boards of directors of banks too small to maintain competent internal audit staffs should be encouraged to employ qualified outside auditors for periodic inspection of their banks' affairs.

WILLIAM A. LYON,
Chairman of the Executive Committee, National Association of State Bank Supervisors.
MAPLE T. HARL,
Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
PRESTON DELANO,
Comptroller, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.
WILLIAM McC. MARTIN,
Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
JULY 3, 1952.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 457 OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in the executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I re-

port favorably the nominations of five colonels in the Reserve, who have been nominated to be brigadier generals in the Reserve.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the following nominations:

Col. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general.

Col. Hugh Barclay, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general.

Col. Michael Joseph Galvin, Armor Reserve, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general.

Col. Hugh Stanford McLeod, Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general.

Col. Lamar Tooze, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States, to be a brigadier general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a kindred matter, namely, the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy (retired), who presently is serving——

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am strongly in support of the nominations, but I have been informed that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] wished particularly to be present at the time of the consideration of any nominations on the Executive Calendar.

For that reason, I feel constrained, in fairness to him, to suggest the absence of a quorum.

In the interim, I shall immediately attempt to secure the presence of the Senator from South Dakota.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR SEATON

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to pay well-deserved tribute to my junior colleague, Mr. SEATON of Nebraska, who is necessarily absent today, and will not likely be on the floor of the Senate again. I am sorry he is not present to receive the good wishes of his many friends who have served with him during this session.

Senator SEATON was appointed by the Governor of Nebraska to complete the term of our late and dearly beloved Minority Leader, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry.

Senator SEATON began his life here in Washington, when his father was secretary to a United States Senator from Kansas. He later specialized in journalism, and has held every job in newspaper work, from printer's devil to editor and publisher. He and his family operate a number of very successful newspepers and radio stations in Nebraska and neighboring States.

Early in life, he became intensely interested in Republican Party affairs, and distinguished himself as a leader of the Young Republicans in his home State of Kansas. I first met him during the 1936 Presidential campaign, at which time he was an aide to the Honorable Alf M. Landon, Republican candidate for President.

FRED SEATON came to Nebraska in 1937, as editor and publisher of the Hastings, Nebr., Daily Tribune. He soon gained deserved stature in the business and civic affairs of the Hastings community, and twice represented his district in the State Senate of Nebraska.

Since coming to this Chamber, he has displayed a commendable zeal in the work of the Senate, and has labored diligently as a Member of this body.

I know my colleagues join me in extending every good wish to FRED SEATON upon his return to the editor's desk. I am certain he feels himself enriched by his service in this body, and will be affectionately regarded by the many friends with whom he served.

I very much regret that he is not with us today to express his personal appreciation of the fine friendships and pleasant associations he has experienced as a Member of the United States Senate. Because of his absence, I am speaking for him today in expressing to the Senate his sincere thanks to every Member for the fine and courteous treatment he has experienced here. It has been an experience that he will long remember. I hope he will be a frequent visitor during the years ahead.

Mr. President, there were quite a number of Senators who had expected to join me in making this statement today who, due to their train and plane schedules, have found it necessary to leave. One Senator whom I want to mention in particular is the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have enjoyed my association with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON]. I think he is a very able man, and he has made a good record in the short time he has been in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I also would like to join the distinguished Senator in his remarks, and to add my praise of the junior Senator from Nebraska. I hope that he will enjoy a happy life in the future, out of the Senate, as I know he has enjoyed it here.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I appreciate the words of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I also would like to associate myself with my colleagues who have had words of praise and felicitation for FRED SEATON. I knew FRED SEATON long before he came to the United States Senate, for he is the publisher of one of the really great small daily newspapers of the country in a typically American community. In addition to his newspaper interests in Nebraska, Mr. SEATON has newspapers in the Black Hills area of South Dakota, where he is the owner of a very fine publication.

I should like to say this about FRED SEATON. I think it is a quality we have observed in his service here in the Senate. He possesses that happy combination of party loyalty and individual independence which is somewhat typical of the West. He goes along with his party, unless some compulsion of conscience or reason compels him to exercise his independence of thought. He is a fine young citizen of America who, I know, will return to private life richer, by far, as the result of his experience in the United States Senate. Through the columns of his newspapers he can make other Americans aware of the type of problems with which we have to wrestle on the floor of the Senate. I wish for him and his family the best of good fortune. I hope he will have a long and distinguished career in private life, if he chooses to continue in private life, or again in public life, if, once having returned to Nebraska, he again feels the yen to sojourn here on the banks of the Potomac River.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his kind words with reference to my colleague.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I desire to join with the senior Senator from Nebraska in what he has said regarding his colleague and to thank Senator SEATON for having given us the opportunity of knowing him during the all too few months he has been with us. I found him to be a man who could be looked upon as a friend, and whose judgment and common sense could be held in the greatest respect. I am sorry he is leaving this body.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I also should like to join with the very able senior Senator from Nebraska in the kind things he has said about his colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON]. I think FRED SEATON has done an excellent job in the short time he has been here. I think it would be unfortunate were he to retire permanently from public life. We need men like him in public life.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I want to join with the distinguished and able senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] in the tribute he has paid to his colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], who is retiring from the Senate, or at least from the active sessions of the Senate, at this

time. I have found Mr. SEATON to be a very eager, cooperative Senator on all legislative matters. He has always been most gracious and courteous, and we of the Senate will miss his friendly associations.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I simply wish to join most sincerely and enthusiastically in all the splendid and deserved comments which have been made about our colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON].

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I too, join in the very fine things which have been said about the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON]. He came here with full knowledge of the fact that he was to spend but a few months in the Senate. But, with the genius, with the zeal, and with the good hard work for which he is noted, as well as with the intelligence of which he is possessed, he made a great contribution to the Senate and a great mark in the Senate, during the few months of his membership in this body.

I shall not add to the other fine things that have been said, except to join at this time in the compliments paid him, and to express the hope that he will return often for a visit with the many friends on both sides of the aisle he made in the short time that he was here.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I would not inject myself into this proceeding were it not for the fact that the tributes to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] have come almost predominantly from the other side of the aisle. I want to say that FRED SEATON served as a Member of the Senate as a whole, not merely as a member of any one party. He won the respect and affection of those of us on this side of the aisle. He is a noble American, and we mourn his departure from the Senate. We hope he will come back.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words of commendation concerning the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON]. He served with me on the committee of which I am chairman. I must say that in that committee he at all times endeavored to promote what he thought was for the best interests of all the people. So far as party affiliation is concerned, Democrat or Republican, I do not think that ever entered his mind in deciding how he would vote. In committee he at all times reached a conclusion as to what was best for the people, and he voted accordingly. I commend him for having been broad-minded in casting his votes in the committee of which I am chairman. He is a fine gentleman.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I, too, want to express my regret that Senator SEATON is leaving the Senate. In the short time in which I have had the privilege of serving with him, I gained a great admiration for him and a very real affection. I found him to be a man of high ideals, a man of good judgment, conscientious, and devoted to the interests of the country. I am very sorry that he is not going to be with us next year.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Senator SEATON. It appears to me that he has demonstrated unusual qualities of independence and courage in his votes in the United States Senate. I have had the privilege of knowing him, not only as a colleague in the Senate, but as a friend. I feel all the better and all the richer because of this friendship and this association. I think the State of Nebraska is to be congratulated upon having such a splendid citizen, and upon having sent him here to serve with us in the Senate. I extend to him my very best wishes. I say that it has been good that he came. It has been a fine tribute to his great State that he could have served in the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I desire to join in the remarks previously made with reference to the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON]. Surely there is no more attractive and likable Member of the Senate than is the junior Senator from Nebraska. I feel that there is a common bond between us, because, when he came back from Europe, he had with him two lovely adopted children. Mrs. Benton and I have three adopted children. I have talked with him a good deal concerning that trip, and I congratulate him, as he leaves this body, not only on the warmth and friendliness of his personality, but on the many marks of courage and leadership which he has exhibited.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska and with other colleagues who have spoken in paying my respects to the junior Senator from Nebraska. He has made a great record in the brief period in which he has served in the Senate. It has been my privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. No man has ever in a short time obtained a firmer grasp on public questions or demonstrated more courage and more ability than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. He will take back to his newspaper work in his home State a better understanding of the problems which face America today and how they are handled by the United States Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, once upon a time, in the old days, an old colored wheelwright was called to pass upon a store-bought wagon which nearly everyone was criticizing. He was asked what he thought about it, and he said, "Yes; I agree with all you white gentlemen, but the biggest thing that is wrong with it is that I don't own it."

I want to agree with all the nice things which have been said about the junior Senator from Nebraska. My only regret is that he is not coming back to the Senate.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of Col. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States; Col. Hugh Barclay, O402854, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States; Col. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304, Armor Reserve, Army of the United States; Col. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285, Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States; and Col. Lamar Tooze, O107927, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States, to be brigadier generals be confirmed and the President be notified.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has just sent word that he has absolutely no objection to the confirmation of the nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask that the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy (retired), of California, presently serving as Director of the Munitions Board Supply Management Agencies, to be Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency in the Department of Defense, be confirmed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there was a distinct agreement with regard to nominations coming up. We were to be notified, and I object.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New Hampshire had been notified.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not been notified. It is a violation of the agreement.

Mr. STENNIS. I had not made any agreement. I understood that the Senator from New Hampshire had been notified and had approved this particular appointment. It is not a promotion in rank.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have nothing against the nominee. I have great admiration for the Senator from Mississippi, but the request is not in accordance with our agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thought the nominations had been cleared, or I would not have suggested that they be brought up. I thought they had been cleared with the other side. I am trying to do the best I can to see that everything has been cleared. If I had known that the nominations had not been cleared, I would have objected, myself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I do not want to stymie the works here. As a matter of fact, I have no objection to this man, and I know the Senator from Mississippi is very sincere in whatever he does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With reference to the five colonels whose nominations were just confirmed, we talked to Senators on the other side of the aisle, and understood that there was no objection.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] conferred with other members of the committee, and a staff member told us that he had talked to other members of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I consulted with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. I specifically inquired about the Senator from New Hampshire, and was told by a staff member that the matter had been cleared with him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in view of the explanations by the Senator from Mississippi, whom I respect, and the Senator from Texas, whom I respect, well knowing that they would not attempt to do anything like this unless they had an agreement or understood they had one, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy—retired—is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified of the confirmation made this day.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7289. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

COMMENTS ON THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, yesterday evening I laughed, as many of my colleagues must have laughed, at Jim Berryman's cartoon on the front page of the Evening Star. Berryman showed Chairman Gabrielson before a microphone with his gavel raised, with a flag giving the backdrop of the Republican National Committee, and with this caption "Before we adjourn, are there any further suggestions as to how we can lose the election?"

I speak of this cartoon because I do not wish to suggest that my own anticipation of my own victory next November is necessarily due to any particular confidence I may have in my own ability. Many before me have commented on the fact that the Republican Party seems to have a genius for snatching defeat out of the jaws of victory. And no one in this body can ever know for sure whether he has won his elections due to his own skill and ability, or due to the fumblings and blunders of his opponents.

Perhaps this knowledge, or lack of sure knowledge, which we in the Senate acquire from the realities of politics, is what makes this body humble. Humility is the first of the Christian virtues and, as I leave tonight for Connecticut on this the last day of our session, I attest to the fact that I do not know a Member of this body to whom the adjective "humble" or the noun "humility" might not be applied. I do not suggest that the adjective or noun could be applied in all circumstances and at all times to all Members. I merely attest to the fact that this group, more than any other group with which I have ever been associated, can boast this particular Christian virtue. Perhaps this is because all of us lead highly competitive lives, and through the pressures and tensions of competition—the virtue of humility is born and nurtured.

Some months after I resigned as Assistant Secretary of State in 1947, I spoke to the Sales Executives Society of New York. This is a group that knows me well because a large part of my life, and all of my young manhood has been devoted to the development of the techniques of selling, promoting, and advertising. In 1947, based on 2 years of intimate work with many committees of the Congress, I told this audience that the United States Congress was the most remarkable group of men I had ever met. I told them there could not be another such group anywhere. I told them that I did not know another process of natural selection which uncovered and developed such extraordinary men.

Thirty of our own body, the last time I checked, had been governors of their States. And as many more had served in the House of Representatives.

Only a few first termers can be called accidents, due to unknown or unpredictable factors in their States which accounted for their election or appointment. The real test is, of course, the second try, when a man must answer for his record.

As we prepare to adjourn today, I want the Senate to know that it would never have occurred to me to introduce my resolution calling for the expulsion of one of our Members if I had not read the report of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections dealing with the Maryland election campaign. The report referred to the back-alley aspects of the campaign. This report, unanimously signed by five Senators, including two most distinguished Republican Senators, recommended that legislation be passed under which the Senate could in the future expel any Senator who engaged in such practices. The reasons why such legislation has not been passed are, of course, known to well-informed Senators.

My resolution, which was based on the report of this subcommittee, in effect merely stated that the immediate issue was a moral one and not political or legislative. As a moral issue, it transcended the question of the present lack of sufficiently stringent corrupt practices acts.

In my testimony before the Gillette subcommittee last September I stated:

> Is it not a part of our duty as Senators to encourage within and for the Senate the standards of morality and justice which we wish proudly to proclaim to the world as representative of the best qualities of our country?
>
> I submit that the failure of any Senator to set a high standard of morality is not the failure of a man alone. In the eyes of the world, it is the failure of a nation. Thus the question of standards of character for a Senator cannot be deemed a matter of merely local concern, for a single State, or merely a matter of personal concern, for the Senator or his family. The question we are to discuss today is not only a matter of national but of world concern.

Mr. President, I have been asked about the speech on Wednesday afternoon of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. As he indicated in the speech, we have had pleasant and cordial personal relationships. Only recently I heard Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, pay him high tribute.

I must say that his speech made me think that my own speech in Wisconsin last Saturday must have been a far more successful political speech than I had realized. Last Saturday I was the featured speaker at the Democratic State convention in Wisconsin. I am sure he understands the purpose of such speeches, because he himself must have been called on to make them many times himself. The purpose is to arouse the enthusiasm of the political organization.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I shall be finished in 3 or 4 minutes, if the Senator will indulge me, as I did with him the other day. I refuse to yield, and shall finish my remarks.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator's interesting indulgence of the other evening was self-imposed.

The VICE PRESIDENT The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, one traditional way to arouse this enthusiasm is to attack the opposition, and most particularly when it deserves to be attacked. I do not apologize in any way for my Wisconsin speech. Indeed, my opinion of it has gone up greatly since the Senator from Washington's speech. Nothing I said in Wisconsin remotely compares to what the Republicans are saying about each other in Chicago.

Yes, I did refer to six of our colleagues. If the Republican Party comes back into power in the coming election, I shall regard this as a terrible event—indeed, a "terrible" catastrophe for the American people. This happens to be my own analysis of the political trends of our times, both domestically and internationally.

I do not regard the adjective "terrible" as applied to a group as in any way comparable to its application to an individual. Among these six are men whom I like, with whom I have had cordial and pleasant relations which I treasure and hope to continue.

I want to make it clear that I have not engaged in personal quarrels with any Senator. My resolution calling for the expulsion of one of our Members is not a personal quarrel. It is not a feud, as some newspapers have suggested.

As we adjourn tonight, I hope my colleagues will remember my admiration for them, my affection for them, my willingness to defend them against the barbs of the Communists' propaganda which constantly attack our democratic system and most notably our Congress.

It is, of course, known to all students of Communist propaganda that one of its perpetual and unending themes is the steady stream of attacks against the American Congress. This is one way in which Communists seek to undermine and destroy the confidence of our people in our democratic processes.

I again repeat my own conviction that this group of 96 Senators is the most remarkable group in the world. I would rather trust my destiny to it, and the destiny of my family, than to any 96 men who could be selected by any other process with which I am familiar. This group far excels in experience, knowledge, intelligence, character, and skill, any group which the business community has ever learned how to select, or which any other community, to my knowledge, has ever learned how to select.

As we leave today, I hope that some of my colleagues at least will take my compliments back to their wives. The wives of the Members of Congress are the most extraordinary group of women I have ever discovered. Only when I became a Member of the Senate did I fully realize the great potentialities of my partnership with my wife. She had never made a speech until I came to the Senate. She had to learn how to speak during my 1950 campaign. I remember her first speech, which she wrote herself, an 8-minute speech, and her knees were trembling as she gave it. I remember when she lost her place, looked up, wagged her finger at the audience and said, "You'd better hope I find my place, or I shall have to start all over again." The papers hailed her for captivating her audience.

I remember a later speech when she looked out across a group of women and suddenly said to them, before beginning her address, "I like women. I even like women who don't like women." You will see from this why there are many in Connecticut who advise me to stay home and let my wife do the campaigning. In politics our wives are our full partners outside the home as well as in the home. I once told a women's group in my State that the reason men do better in politics is that they have wives. I know of only two other fields which are at all comparable on this particular point, that of being a university president, or the pastor of a church.

Mr. President, I look forward to resuming my place on the floor of the Senate next January, and to the opportunity of cooperating with my distinguished and eminent colleagues in the interest of the American people. To their best interests, in these days of peril and world crisis, we in the Senate must increasingly dedicate ourselves.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, there is one Government board of which we have taken little note recently. Yet I think it has done an important, monumental task during the past year. I refer to the Subversive Activities Control Board, which came into being upon passage of the Internal Security Act. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the splendid work that has been done by this Board during the past year under very difficult circumstances.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement relative to the work of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Few Government agencies have started their work under less favorable auspices than the Subversive Activities Control Board. Few have shouldered duties more onerous and found their accomplishments so belittled. It was as if the same hard knots engrained in the problem of legislating the Board into existence were repeated in the Board's own undertakings. On Tuesday of this week the last of about 3,000,000 words of testimony was taken in the Board's first proceeding, *McGranery v. the Communist Party of the United States*, a fundamental case which accords an occasion for stock-taking. This I want to attempt because it will show, first, that contrary to the general impression and with a finding on the party's status still to be rendered, the Board has already made an important contribution to the national security. I present this view also because in it will be found evidence that the statecraft of Senator MCCARRAN, who fathered the enabling legislation, was fused to constructive purpose with the sound administrative judgment of the President in reforming the membership of the Board.

Dealing first with the legislative problem faced by Senator MCCARRAN, it will be recalled that in compliance with the public demand for control of communism, Congress had already made several efforts to draft legislation, all abortive, when the Senate Judiciary Committee 2 years ago first grappled with the task. The problem was in essence constitutional. The alarming sweep of the Marxian revolution in Europe and Asia had by then demonstrated the power of the Soviet drive for world domination, while congressional investigations had left no doubt that the movement included disciplined American cohorts. The Communist Party-USA had found in the Bill of Rights what it believed to be a snug refuge from interference. Moreover, labor unions and liberal organizations once on easy terms with the party were anxious lest those relations, though long discarded, might become the basis for their repression. Finally, as an augury of the obstructive tactics they might apply against a control proceeding, party spokesmen announced they would defy any control law.

The consummate legislative skill of Senator MCCARRAN resolved these problems in the control bill he reported for the Senate Judiciary Committee. The bill declared communism to be an international conspiracy and directed the Department of Justice to bring petitions for registration of American organizations it believed parties to the conspiracy. The Board, established by the bill to hear the petitions, was enjoined, however, to accord respondents every due legal process accorded by the Constitution. Moreover, neither the controls of the finances and propaganda of organizations ordered to register, nor the restrictions placed upon the travel and employment of their members, in any way infringed their constitutional right to engage in political activity.

Senators will recall the administrative difficulty that arose upon passage of the measure. The President, advised that existing surveillance of the party was adequate and that controls would merely drive it underground, interposed his veto. The passage of the bill over his veto thrust upon the Executive the obligation of finding Board members willing loyally to administer an act he had found needless.

Let it be granted that departures from the Board in the early days of the hearing impaired the Board's stability. Ill health compelled the resignation of one member, and the term of a second member unseasonably expired. But let it be affirmed also that when the President, in his search for a permanent chairman, turned to Peter Campbell Brown, he found a lawyer combining those qualities of judicial balance, patience, and stamina which the task required.

The evidence that Peter Campbell Brown has the first two traits may be found in the comments of those few discerning writers who have commented on his conduct of the hearings, writers, by the way, whose opinions usually are in conflict. In his appraisal of the hearings, Mr. Raymond Tucker,

conservative columnist for the McClure Syndicate, remarked on the hearing panel's sound judgment, while his colleague of the liberal persuasion, Mr. Marquis Childs of the United Features Syndicate, paid tribute to the panel's scrupulous regard for due process. The justice of the enconiums, which apply also to Chairman Brown's colleague on the panel, Dr. Kathryn McHale, have been confirmed by many other expressions.

The entire record constitutes the most formidable documentation of the Communist conspiracy ever assembled. It was presented through 22 witnesses and buttressed by 590 documentary exhibits, the whole filling about 20,000 pages of transcript. However the Board may regard the testimony of the party's three witnesses, it seemed to me perfunctory. But to maintain impartiality, as Messrs. Childs and Tucker attested they did, and which is necessary for that Supreme Court review of the case which the importance of the proceedings makes inevitable, indeed took stamina.

Whether the Board will find for or against the party I do not know. But, regardless of that and of the party leaders' possible defiance of a registration order (severe penalties stand as a strong deterrent), the proceedings afford proof of Senator McCarran's far-sighted statecraft. Implicit in the predictions that a control order would drive the party under ground was the premise that the underground is a haven. But this premise is clearly refuted by the evidence. For the testimony has shown that, far from being an escape hatch, the underground is merely a place in which clandestine leaders can more easily be identified. In drill practice for going under ground, some of the supposed party elite actually turned out to be FBI undercover agents who, notwithstanding party precautions, were able there to identify others.

None of the apprehensions of embarrassment in labor and liberal circles has materialized. In confining the issue to the question of the party's alleged subservience to Soviet Russia, the act obviated any need of exploring its domestic ramifications, except with those Communist-front organizations already on the Department of Justice subversive list against whom the Department may proceed by registration petitions in event of a Board finding that the party is foreign-dominated.

To Senator McCarran, then, should go the thanks not alone of his many admirers in the Congress but of those who unthinkingly question his statesmanship. Through the act he sponsored, the party's structure has been laid bare and the country is the safer for it. Controls may or may not be applied. Either way, the constitutional process enjoined by the act, faithfully applied by the President's Board, of which Peter Campbell Brown now is the chairman, constitutes a crushing rejoinder to the party's claim that in the United States democracy and freedoms are illusory.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR CONNALLY FROM JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to resign from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, effective as of this date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Texas having resigned as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Chair, under the law, has a right to appoint his successor. The Chair appoints the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] to the position.

PRODUCTION OF LEAD AND ZINC

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to an alarming situation which has developed recently in connection with the production of lead and zinc resulting from the recent drastic decline in the prices of these metals, so vitally needed for our defense effort.

The price of lead has fallen from 19 to 16 cents a pound; the price of zinc has fallen from 19½ to 16 cents a pound. Our western mines cannot survive under these prices.

I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues, however, the fact that lead-zinc ores of the West contain silver, and that the credit for silver in these ores has long been the one thing that has kept the mines operating. Wages have advanced nearly 100 percent, and a further advance will probably be necessary this summer. All of this advance has taken place since the price of domestically mined silver was set by statute in 1946 at not less than 90½ cents an ounce.

As I have on many previous occasions informed the Senate, the silver content of these ores—together with copper ores—has paid a substantial amount of the production cost of the base metals. With no further advance in the prices of these metals in sight, their production will be seriously curtailed and in many instances mines will be closed. This must not happen while we are striving to produce these most important metals for defense.

These mines can be kept open and in a healthy condition without any expense to the taxpayer by reducing the seigniorage now being squeezed out of the miner by the Treasury Department. If the seigniorage were removed the Treasury would still be able to acquire all the silver needed for coinage without cost to the Government. No appropriation would be necessary to accomplish this.

I have information enough at hand today to know that the miners are in serious difficulty, and am now urging the Secretary of the Treasury to authorize the mints to pay the miner the full monetary price for domestically mined silver, less coinage costs, in order that the present producers may survive and be enabled to continue the exploration and search for new ore bodies. The present war effort plus civilian consumption is seriously depleting our ore reserves. We cannot afford to be in a position of having to import any more metal than we are now importing. Every one knows what a serious condition has arisen due to the fact that a great tonnage of copper must come from a foreign country. This country is now holding a gun at our head and charging exorbitant prices for copper. We cannot allow this condition to continue. We must explore for new ore bodies and to do this the miner and prospector must have an incentive.

The payment to the cosmetic miner of the full monetary price for silver will provide one of the greatest incentives for exploration that has heretofore been offered.

AUTHORIZATION TO JUDICIARY COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING ADJOURNED PERIOD

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, or the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to submit reports during the adjourned period of the Eighty-second Congress, and that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TRIBUTES TO SENATOR BREWSTER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is advised that the minority leader is anxious to leave the city to fly to evils he knows not of. Therefore, the Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the distinguished Vice President. I hope the minority leader will be able to assist in clearing up some of the difficulties.

Mr. President, this may be the last day of the Eighty-second Congress. I wish to say a word or two about an old, valued friend of all of us, and an associate of ours for the past 12 years. I refer to OWEN BREWSTER.

It is difficult to realize that OWEN BREWSTER has been in public life for 31 years. His active participation in the duties of a Senator, his keen brain, and his eager participation in all the legislation in which he was interested indicate to me an experience as a Senator which is attained by few.

Senator BREWSTER has served his own State in the State legislature and as governor of his State, as a Representative in the National House of Representatives for 6 years, and in the United States Senate for 12 years. During that period he has contributed much to the welfare of our country, and he has also contributed much to his party as an advocate and exponent of its principles. I am sure we shall all miss him in the Senate. I know that I speak for other Senators when I wish for him every good fortune and Godspeed in whatever he may undertake in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Senator BREWSTER served for a long time on the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee will miss him. He displayed extraordinary ability especially in matters concerned with aeronautics. He has been a valuable member of the committee. Because of his great ability and because of his devotion to the things which are so important to the country, particularly in the field of aeronautics. On behalf of all the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I express regret that he is not going to be with us next session.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to join the able Senator from New Hampshire in the tribute he has paid to Senator BREWSTER. I personally consider Senator BREWSTER one of the finest legislators with whom it has ever been my good fortune to work. He is one of the hardest working, most intelligent, and finest men ever to serve in the Senate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington will miss OWEN BREWSTER as a personal friend and as a public servant of high qualifications. He is a man of outstanding intellect. I wish for him and his family the best of good fortune in the future.

SUPPLEMENTAL PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 651, to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
July 4, 1952.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee numbered 152,419, for certain land in California, with an amendment as follows:

In line 4 of the Senate amendment to the text of said bill strike out "1936" and insert "1938".

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the House amended this bill by correcting a typographical error in the numerals indicating a particular year. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

REVOCATION OF AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN WATER CARRIER CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the other day when the calendar was called Senate bill 2364, Calendar 1613, was passed. Later the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] stepped into the Chamber and learned that the bill had passed, and called for reconsideration of the bill. Through an error the bill was not objected to, as the Senator from Vermont had requested.

I now ask unanimous consent that the House be requested to return to the Senate the papers in connection with Senate bill 2364, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the House be requested to return the papers in the case to which he has referred. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF GLADYS MORELOCK TO BE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT OF THE UNITED STATES AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a nomination as in executive session. I have cleared the matter with the minority leader and with the majority leader. The situation is this:

The superintendent of the Denver Mint has died. This afternoon the President sent to the Senate the nomination of Gladys Morelock to take the place of the deceased superintendent. So I send forward the nomination of Gladys Morelock and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I very much regret having to raise an objection in a matter of this kind at this time, and particularly under the circumstances described by the Senator from Colorado. However, I had taken the position earlier in the day—and had so stated to certain Members of the Senate—that I would object to the consideration of any nominations which had not had committee consideration.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. This nomination has had committee consideration. I polled all the members of the Finance Committee. I even telephoned the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] at Chicago. I have obtained the approval of everyone concerned. In the case of the death of the superintendent, I wonder if the Senator would not make an exception, because of the great responsibility which is assumed by the superintendent of a mint. He has a vast amount of responsibility.

Mr. CASE. When did the death take place?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Several weeks ago. However, the FBI had to examine the person who was being considered for the place. I suppose the FBI report has come in only recently. There is a tremendous amount of responsibility involved. A very heavy bond will have to be put up. I cannot tell the Senator from South Dakota how many billions of dollars are in the custody of the mint.

Mr. CASE. I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he withdraw his request at this time. I shall be glad to talk to him about the matter. Under the circumstances I would have to object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT The Senator from South Dakota objects.

FEDERAL PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies I should like to address the Senate briefly at this time on the progress of our study and certain finds to date. As Senators know, the job of the subcommittee is to conduct a thorough study into the personnel policies and practices of the Federal departments and agencies. The object of this study, as defined by the Senate, is to formulate policies which will promote the effective conservation and utilization of our civilian personnel during the period of the national emergency.

The subcommittee's interim report to the Senate on March 19 largely emphasized the complexity of our Federal personnel structure and pointed up its cost, its obsolete procedures, and its inherent waste.

Certain of our studies are now complete and we have developed the first group of a series of legislative recommendations aimed toward the substantial improvement of manpower administration in the Federal Government.

I am introducing three bills at this time which embody the subcommittee's recommendations. The purpose for introducing them now is to give Senators the opportunity to examine and study them in detail. In the very near future the subcommittee will make a complete background report covering each of these proposals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3492) to establish in the Civil Service Commission an Incentive Awards Unit, to repeal certain acts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That as used in this act, the term "department" means an executive department or independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, and shall also include (1) the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, (2) the Library of Congress, (3) the Botanic Garden, (4) the Government Printing Office, (5) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, and (6) the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. (a) The head of each department is authorized under such rules and regulations as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe, to grant monetary awards to civilian officers and employees of the Government (or to the estates of deceased officers and employees), and to incur necessary expenses for the honorary recognition of officers and employees, who by their suggestions, inventions, superior accomplishments or other personal efforts contribute to the efficiency, economy, or other improvement of Government operations or who perform special acts or services in the public interest.

(b) To assure adequate promotion of the Government incentive award program there is hereby established in the Civil Service Commission an Incentive Award Unit, the head of which shall report directly to the Executive Director, United States Civil Service Commission.

(c) A cash award under this act shall be in addition to the regular compensation of the recipient and the acceptance of such cash award shall constitute an agreement that the use by the United States of any idea, method or device for which the award is made shall not form the basis of a further claim of any nature against the United States by the officer or employee, his heirs or assigns.

(d) Awards to officers and employees and expenses for the honorary recognition of officers and employees may be paid from the funds appropriated or otherwise available for carrying out the activity primarily benefiting or from the funds appropriated or otherwise available for carrying out the various activities benefiting, as the head of the department may determine.

(e) An award under this act shall be given due weight in qualifying and selecting employees for promotion to positions in higher grades.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, to the extent the Secretary of Defense deems feasible, the provisions of this section shall be applicable to members of the Armed Forces.

SEC. 3. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) Sections 702, 1002, and 1003 of the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954; 5 U. S. C. 1122, 1152, 1153).

(2) Section 14 of the act entitled "An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Government service, and for other purposes", approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 809; 5 U. S. C. 116a).

(3) The act entitled "An act authorizing payments of rewards to postal employees for inventions," approved December 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 591; 39 U. S. C. 813).

(4) The act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to pay a cash award for suggestions submitted by employees of certain establishments of the Ordnance Department for improvement or economy in manufacturing process or plant," approved July 17, 1912 (37 Stat. 193; 50 U. S. C. 58).

(5) The act entitled "An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior," approved June 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 360; 5 U. S. C. 500).

(6) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 35 of the act entitled "An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1946, and for other purposes," approved August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 857; 5 U. S. C. 416).

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its approval.

The bill (S. 3493) to provide for greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials by the development of more effective methods for selecting supervisory personnel in the Government service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares that the interests of efficiency and economy in the performance of the authorized functions of the Government would best be served by the establishment of planned methods and procedures for the selection of personnel for supervisory positions which will—

(a) provide that the supervisory selection program shall be stated in writing and made available to all employees;

(b) provide for establishment of minimum qualifications for each supervisory position;

(c) provide the widest practicable areas of competition;

(d) emphasize supervisory ability as well as technical skill;

(e) provide suitable methods for evaluating supervisory potential or past supervisory success; and

(f) furnish appointing officials with a reasonable number of eligibles from which to make appointments.

SEC. 2. Immediately upon the enactment of this act the head of each department and independent agency in the executive branch of the Government is authorized and directed to review the methods currently employed in the selection of supervisory personnel within his respective agency. In any case in which the head of any such department or agency determines pursuant to such review that such methods do not meet the standards set forth in the first section of this act, he is authorized and directed, with the technical assistance of the Civil Service Commission, to take such action as may be necessary to establish methods and procedures which will comply with such standards.

SEC. 3. The Civil Service Commission shall secure from the agencies and transmit to the Congress within 6 months of the date of enactment of this act, a report concerning the progress achieved under this act in each of the departments and agencies.

The bill (S. 3494) to secure economical use of manpower by preventing abuses in the education and training of Federal civilian officers and employees and of members of the Armed Services in non-Federal facilities, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be a policy of the Congress to secure effective use of manpower in the performance of the authorized functions of the Federal Government by preventing unwarranted expenditures in the education and training of Federal civilian officers and armed services personnel in non-Federal facilities, and to provide further for an annual report to the Congress on all phases of training under this act.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "department" includes all departments, independent establishments, agencies, and corporations in the executive branch of the Federal Government, and includes also the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

(b) The term "Commission" means the Civil Service Commission.

(c) The term "training" means the provision of opportunities to civilian officers and employees to acquire skill or knowledge concerning methods, procedures, technical developments, and discoveries related to the work of their respective departments.

(d) The term "training by non-Federal facilities" means training provided civilian officers and employees by public or private agencies, institutions of learning or laboratories or industrial or commercial organizations, which derive their support in whole or in part from private funds, but exclusive of training conducted by the departments.

SEC. 102. The head of each department, to the extent that he finds that such training will be in the interest of the Federal Government and will substantially contribute to the more effective functioning of his department, is authorized to—

(a) Provide training within his department to civilian officers and employees of his department, or when appropriate training is not available within his department, to provide such training through training programs of other departments under agreement with such other departments. To avoid unnecessary duplication, departments are authorized to conduct such programs jointly, and any department not having an appropriate training program shall, to the fullest extent practicable, utilize existing training programs of other departments in meeting its training requirements; and

(b) Assign scientific, technical, professional, and administrative officers and employees for training by non-Federal facilities as a part of, in addition to, or in place of their normal duties, and if he deems it appropriate, to pay the salaries of such officers and employees for the period of their training, or any part thereof, and to pay the cost of their transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and training charges incident to their assignments, including tuition and other related fees. The nature and amount of expenses to be incurred by the Government shall be specified in any such assignment.

SEC. 103. (a) Training programs carried out by the departments under authorizations contained in this title shall be established and conducted in accordance with standards established by the Civil Service Commission, which standards shall relate to, but need not be limited to—

(1) Determination of training needs;

(2) Selection of officers and employees for training;

(3) Scope and conduct of the training program;

(4) Evaluation of the effectiveness of training;

(5) Reports on departmental training programs; and

(6) Selection of non-Federal facilities to provide training, such standards for selection of facilities to be established by the Commission only after consultation with the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.

(b) Training by non-Federal facilities authorized in subsection 102 (b) shall be provided only under plans governing such training which have been prepared by the respective departments and approved by the Commission. The Commission shall establish standards for the content of such plans which shall require, among other things, statements of—

(1) The methods for determining the need for training by non-Federal facilities;

(2) The method of justification for each type of training, by non-Federal facilities. Such a statement shall include statements of the need for such training and certifications that due regard has been given to the availability and utilization of persons already fully trained and the availability of training facilities within the Government;

(3) The means of identifying non-Federal training facilities which are to be used to meet the specific needs of the department;

(4) The methods to be followed in selecting officers and employees for training; and

(5) The methods which will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of such training.

(c) The Commission shall review the training activities of each department authorized by this title to determine whether such activities comply with the Commission's standards and with the department's approved plans for training by non-Federal facilities, and shall report to the head of each department whenever it finds noncompliance. The Commission may withdraw or suspend its approval of any plan or part of a plan for training by non-Federal facilities if it finds noncompliance with such plan.

SEC. 104. Training of officers and employees by non-Federal facilities under this title shall be subject to the following restrictions except when the head of the department finds with the approval of the Commission, that such restrictions would be detrimental to the effective conduct of the activities of his department:

(a) The number of man-years of such training in any fiscal year for employees of any department shall not exceed one-half

of 1 percent of the total man-years of personal services in that department.

(b) No officer or employee having less than 1 year's service in the department shall be assigned for such training.

(c) No officer or employee shall be eligible for training under this title if he is within 5 years of the mandatory retirement age provided in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended: *Provided, however,* That if the head of the department shall make a determination that the training of such an individual is essential to the effectiveness of the department, then this provision shall not be applicable.

(d) Any officer or employee who shall have received such training for a total of 18 months under section 102 (b) of this title shall not be eligible for any further training thereunder if such further training would result in more than 18 months of such training during any 10-year period of Federal civilian service.

(e) No officer or employee shall be assigned to such training until he shall have procured a commercial surety bond or a private bond under which the Government will be indemnified for the actual expense of such member's training, exclusive of pay and allowances, should he resign from his respective department within a period of 3 years after the completion of such training.

(f) Whenever an officer or employee fails to fulfill his agreement as to the length of time he will remain in the employ of a department because of transfer to another department, the officer or employee shall not be required to make reimbursement under subsection (d) above, if such transfer is approved by the Civil Service Commission as being in the best interest of the Government.

SEC. 105. The Civil Service Commission shall maintain information on effective training methods and programs and, at the request of a department, shall provide advice and assistance in the planning and conduct of training programs.

SEC. 106. No department shall provide training for any of its employees in any field in which such department determines that it would be feasible to recruit trained personnel from private life, or make use of trained personnel already in the department, unless such training can be shown to be economical and advantageous.

SEC. 107. The Civil Service Commission shall report annually to the Congress, through the President, on training activities of 7 months or more duration under this title. Such report shall include, among other things, summaries of the man-years of training by non-Federal facilities provided its employees by each department, the total number of persons who have undergone training during the period of the report, the course or courses or type of training pursued, and the expenditures of each department under this title for such training, and a statement to the effect that the standards referred to in section 103 (b) (2) of this title have been complied with in each case.

SEC. 108. Appropriations or other funds available to the departments concerned for salaries and/or expenses shall be available for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 109. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(a) Section 803 (8) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1946, as amended, U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 49, sec. 603), approved August 8, 1946.

(b) Section 307 (b) of the Civil Aero- 1940 edition, title 49, sec. 603), approved August 8, 1950.

(c) Section 13 (b) (1) of the Act of January 3, 1946, as amended (59 Stat. 678; 38 U. S. C. 151), approved March 10, 1950.

(d) Section 16 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 770, ch. 474).

TITLE II

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this title—

(a) The term "department" means the Department of Defense.

(b) The term "armed services" includes the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force.

(c) The term "members" is limited to male and female enlisted personnel, and male and female warrant officer and commissioned officer personnel, Regular and Reserve and any other component of the armed services on obligated active duty for a period of 18 months or longer.

(d) The term "training" means the provision of opportunities to members of the armed service to acquire skill or knowledge concerning methods, procedures, technical developments, and discoveries related to the work of the respective armed service.

(e) The term "training by non-Federal facilities" means training by public or private agencies, institutions of learning, laboratories, scientific institutions and foundations, research organizations, and industrial and commercial organizations, both within the United States and elsewhere, which derive their support in whole or in part from private funds, but exclusive of training conducted by the armed services.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of each of the armed services, to the extent that he finds such training will be in the interest of his respective service and will substantially contribute to the more effective functioning of his service, is authorized—

(a) To assign members of his service for training by non-Federal facilities as a part of, in addition to, or in place of their normal duties, and if he deems it appropriate;

(b) To pay the compensation of such members and all other emoluments incident to permanent change of duty orders or temporary additional duty orders necessitating a transfer of such member and his dependents from his regular place of duty to a place of training; and

(c) To pay all charges incident to such training assignment, including tuition and other related fees. The nature and amount of expenses to be incurred by the Government shall be specified in any such assignment.

SEC. 203. (a) Training programs carried out under authorizations contained in this title shall be established and conducted in accordance with standards established by the respective armed services and approved by the department. The department shall establish standards for the content of such programs which shall require, among other things, statements of—

(1) The methods for determining the need for training;

(2) The methods of justification for each type of training. Such a statement shall include statements of the need for such training and certifications that due regard has been given to the availability and utilization of persons already fully trained, and further certification that a member so trained will be utilized in the field in which trained immediately on completion thereof;

(3) The availability of training facilities within the department;

(4) The means of identifying non-Federal facilities which are to be used to meet the specific needs of the armed services;

(5) The methods to be followed in selecting members for training; and

(6) The methods which will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of such training.

(b) The department shall review the training programs of each armed service authorized by this title to determine whether such activities comply with the department's standards, and shall report to the head of each service whenever it finds noncompliance. The department may withdraw or suspend its approval of any program or part of a program for training if it finds noncompliance with such plan, or for any other reason.

SEC. 204. Each armed service shall select non-Federal facilities to provide training in accordance with standards established by it for such purpose. Such standards for selection of cultural, scientific, and professional facilities shall be established by the service after consultation with the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, and approval thereof by the department. Such standards for the selection of trade training facilities shall be established by the service after consultation with the Bureau of Apprenticeship, Department of Labor, and approval thereof by the department.

SEC. 205. Training of members of an armed service under this title shall be subject to the following restrictions except when the Secretary of such armed service, with the approval of the department, finds that such restrictions would be detrimental to the effective conduct of the activities of his service:

(a) No commissioned or warrant officer having less than 2 years' service shall be assigned for such training.

(b) No enlisted member shall be eligible for such training until he shall have completed a period of basic training.

(c) Any commissioned or warrant officer member who shall have received such training under section 202 of this title by completing a course of study, or who shall have received a professional degree shall not be eligible for any further training thereunder until he shall have completed at least 2 years of service in his trained field: *Provided, however,* That where a member undergoing training demonstrates outstanding ability and the non-Federal facility recommends further training, the Secretary of such member's armed service may waive the foregoing provision, but the further training in any such case shall be in the same or a related field.

(d) Any enlisted member who shall have received such training under section 202 of this title shall not be eligible for any consecutive further training thereunder if such further training would require more than 12 months to complete.

(e) No commissioned or warrant officer member shall be eligible for training under this act if he is within 6 years of the age of compulsory retirement, or if he has more than 24 years' service.

(f) No enlisted member who is within 1 year of the termination of his enlistment shall be eligible for training under this title unless he has agreed in writing to reenlist.

(g) No commissioned or warrant officer member shall be assigned to such training until he shall have procured a commercial surety bond or a private bond under which the Government will be indemnified for the actual expense of such member's training, exclusive of pay and allowances, should he resign from his respective service within a period of 3 years after the completion of such training.

SEC. 206. All training under this title must be related to the mission or missions of the armed services and the various components thereof, and the department shall make the final determination whether such training is relevant.

SEC. 207. The armed services shall not provide training for any of their members in any field in which the department determines that it would be feasible to recruit trained personnel or to make use of trained personnel already in the service, unless such training can be shown to be economical and advantageous. Where the department makes such a determination, each of the armed services shall establish its own methods and procedures for procuring such personnel.

SEC. 208. The department shall report annually to the Armed Services Committees of

the Congress on training activities of 7 months or more duration under this title. Each such report shall include the total number and rank or rating of members who have undergone training during the period covered by the report, the institutions attended and course or courses, or type of training pursued, a statement of the costs involved, and whether or not such members have received clerical or stenographic assistance from Government employees on Government time, together with a statement to the effect that the standards referred to in section 203 (a) (2) of this title have been complied with in each such case. Such report shall further list any new schools established within the armed services during the period of the report.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that a statement which I have prepared be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

I am glad to report that one of the first proposals for substantive legislation formulated by the subcommittee is aimed at improving methods of selecting our supervisors throughout Government.

Good supervision is basic to proper manpower utilization. Conclusive evidence shows that the Federal Government is not always obtaining the best available personnel for supervisory positions. The subcommittee is convinced that the first-line supervisor holds the key to improved personnel utilization and efficient and economic programs.

We believe that the legislation developed by the subcommittee will result in the use of more effective methods throughout Government for selecting the very best supervisors. When that is done—we can expect much greater economy in the use of manpower, money, and materials throughout the Federal Government.

The second legislative proposal developed by the subcommittee is designed to streamline the Government's Incentive Awards program.

Congress has voiced considerable dissatisfaction with the progress made in this area. As Senators know, the program is designed to grant employees monetary and honorary awards for suggestions, or improved work performance, which further efficiency and economy in the operation of Federal agencies.

The legislation we are proposing makes possible a forceful and well-balanced program and, we believe it will lead to higher employee morale as well as substantial dollar-and-cents savings.

The third proposal formulated by the subcommittee provides for sorely needed legislative controls over the training of both civilian and military personnel in schools and colleges. This bill authorizes such training for all departments and agencies, and at the same time, imposes strong restrictions guarding against the abuse of this training.

We feel that proper technical training has a very definite impact on the effective conservation and utilization of our Federal working force. It is important, not only during the emergency, but in the long-range efficiency and economy in the use of personnel.

The subcommittee has found that the authority which already exists in certain areas, for the training of civilians and military personnel, in schools and colleges, is being abused. We have found, on the other hand, that there are other areas where there is no legislative authorization whatsoever for outside training.

The subcommittee feels that it is imperative to proper manpower utilization to find a middle ground between too much training in one area, and the total lack of training in the other. Consequently, the legislation we are proposing will extend the authority for training to all departments, but it will include such legislative restrictions as are necessary to assure the intelligent and proper administration of the program.

I should like to turn now to a consideration of our findings to date in four principal areas: reduction in force; personnel staffing ratios; title 5 of the United States Code; and the use of military personnel in civilian-type jobs.

There is probably no area in Government today as costly, in terms of wasted manpower and money as the present reduction-in-force system. These lay-off procedures and practices are equally objectionable both to management and to employees.

Management throughout Government views the lay-off system as a wasteful and entangling web of red tape. They see it as hindering rather than promoting efficient and economical operations. Personnel officers point to the complicated procedures and regulations, which require, among other things, placing of agency personnel into 26 different categories in order to establish priorities for retention on the job. They point to the administrative work involved in maintaining the retention registers. And they provide compelling proof that the Government often cannot attract new employees, or rehire former workers, as a result of its basic reduction-in-force policies.

Operating officials, responsible for getting the work out efficiently and economically, properly object to the widespread bumping and retreat privileges which hang over every job and unit in their organization. This bumping process often results in the virtual restaffing of their units as agency personnel are moved up, down, and across agency lines. They express serious concern over the fact that, in a reduction in force, there is little likelihood they can insure the retention of the most efficient and skilled employees. Indeed, merit or individual efficiency is the factor given least weight of all. As a result, they say it is next to impossible to create an incentive for economy in the minds of their line supervisors when any reduction in force might well rob them of their most valuable employees.

Agency heads unanimously criticize the excessive costs inherent in the present system. The costs in terms of both wasted man-hours and reduced operating efficiency are excessive. They report, for example, direct and indirect costs for laying off a single worker to be anywhere from $312 to $6,000.

Federal employees are equally incensed over current lay-off procedures. They offer convincing proof that the present reduction-in-force regulations are too complex to be understood and regarded with confidence. The complicated regulations cannot be readily reduced to individual rights easy of ascertainment. Government employees charge that the extensive bumping and retreat privileges lead to a serious lowering of morale and and to an undermining of individual security. They point to the recurrent downgrading in every reduction in force, carrying in its wake a lowered economic and job status. Finally, workers throughout Government have expressed a keen disappointment over the failure by the agencies to develop workable mechanics for the placement of employees who are separated by a reduction in force. They feel we should avoid bringing new employees into Government at a time when, and into positions for which, experienced employees are available.

The subcommittee is convinced that these basic defects can be corrected. We feel that by overhauling the Government's lay-off procedures, thousands of man-hours and millions of dollars can be saved each year through better utilization of our Federal working force. Recommendations formulated by the subcommittee for revising the entire reduction-in-force system are being given final consideration.

Our first recommendation calls for a simplification of the manner of compiling retention registers. It will greatly reduce the number of retention categories. It will permit all employees to compete with each other on a far more equitable basis. And, finally, it will provide a system sufficiently simple in operation to engender real confidence on the part of all Federal workers.

Another recommendation is aimed directly at reducing the major costs of conducting a reduction in force by restricting existing "bumping" and "retreat" rights to reasonable limits. In addition to cutting the costs, this proposal should also insure maximum operating efficiency during the layoff period.

Other recommendations compensate employees and provide them with greater protection when affected by a reduction in force. This includes, among other things, the provision for allowing downgraded employees to retain their previous salaries for a much longer period than is now possible. These recommendations will assist employees actually separated in a reduction in force in receiving first chance at job openings in other agencies within the geographical area.

The proposals are aimed at four principal objectives:

First, they are designed to drastically cut the cost of laying off Federal workers and result in savings of thousands of man-hours and millions of dollars.

Second, they are designed to spur incentive among supervisors to economize in the use of personnel, as the fear of losing their most efficient personnel is removed.

Third, they are designed to increase the impact of individual merit in reductions in force, and to insure that the Government is better able to retain its most efficient and highly skilled employees.

And, fourth, they are designed to render Federal employment more attractive and thus make it possible for Government to secure new employees and rehire former workers when they are urgently needed.

As Senators know, budget limitations imposed by Congress will require considerable personnel reductions during the coming months. For this specific reason we are making every possible effort to finalize our proposals and to arrive at mutual solutions with the Civil Service Commission and get a revised system into effect as soon as possible.

The subcommittee has found that there is a great need for revising and codifying title 5 of the United States Code.

In our interim report we estimated that well over 1,000 laws governed personnel and manpower practices in the Federal Government. We indicated that substantial procedural and operational economies could be effected if the complicated legal picture could be simplified.

The bulk of the laws governing personnel practices is in United States Code, title 5, which is designed as the guide to all laws pertaining to executive departments. Unfortunately, however, title 5 does not contain all laws governing personnel practices. Others may be found throughout the titles of the United States Code, often without proper cross-referencing or proper indexing.

The subcommittee has found many instances of poor organization in title 5. Provisions are often conflicting, duplicating or overlapping. For example, sections 51, 69, 70, 71, and 72 all prohibit payment of extra compensation or allowance. In one sense these statutes are obsolete because their subject matter has been covered almost entirely

by the dual compensation laws, the Classification Act, overtime and holiday-pay statutes and subsistence and quarters legislation. We feel they should either be deleted or reduced to one statement of policy adequately cross-referenced to other related sections. Furthermore, many title 5 provisions and other laws governing personnel practices have become patently obsolete, but have never been explicitly repealed.

Many sections now found in title 5 were derived from the Revised Statutes, indicating that they were in effect prior to 1878. Others are based on isolated statutes or appropriation provisions adopted more than a half century ago. Many of such sections are obsolete because other statutes, subsequently enacted, cover the subject adequately but in a different fashion. In the case of others, the reasons for enactment no longer exist or have been forgotten. As an illustration, section 48 reads: "Employment of attorneys prohibited except through Justice Department." Now, this prohibition still appears in the United States Code, although practically every agency has authority and receives appropriations from Congress to support a legal staff.

We are assured by the Civil Service Commission staff, the General Accounting Office, and the Attorney General's staff, that title 5 in its present form is an inadequate legal guide for the governing of personnel practices in the Federal Government. Therefore, the subcommittee feels it is imperative that appropriate action be taken to insure complete revision and recodification of these provisions.

We propose that two projects be visualized—one on the revision of those laws that are obsolete, archaic, inadequate, conflicting, or overlapping, and the second, on the actual recodification of the material in or similar to title 5. The procedure to get this revision and codification under way is being considered at the present time and the subcommittee plans to make a detailed statement at a later date.

In conducting its Government-wide study of manpower policies and practices, the subcommittee has given considerable attention to the organization and administration of agency personnel offices. This inquiry is not complete. We have reached, however, one conclusion of major significance. It has a direct bearing on efforts to achieve maximum utilization of our Federal work force both during and after the national emergency.

The conclusion of the subcommittee is that arbitrary ratio limitations on the staffing of agency personnel offices act as deterrents to the establishment of effective manpower utilization.

The Independent Offices Appropriations Acts for 1950, 1951, and 1952 contained provisions limiting the employment of persons engaged in personnel work to an arbitrary ratio of one such employee to 115 other employees. For fiscal year 1952, ratio limitations were placed on Agriculture, Labor, Federal Security Agency, Justice, Interior, State, and Commerce, varying from 1 to 105 up to 1 to 115. For fiscal year 1953, the personnel staffing ratio for the independent offices was fixed at 1 to 135.

The main intent of these ratio limitations, of course, was to promote efficiency and economy in Government personnel offices by trimming the fat from the staffs.

Everyone of these personnel ratio limitations were adopted despite the fact that there never has been a fact-finding study to determine whether the ratios were attainable and achieved the objective which prompted their enactment.

Ratio limitations are still being applied to agency personnel offices; they are being applied merely on the basis of the number of employees served. Our study reveals that little consideration is given to other vitally important factors—such as the nature of the work of the agency, the geographical dispersion of its activities, seasonal and periodic employment, scarce manpower skills needed by the agency, and the relative stability of its program. These factors cannot be ignored if there is going to be any semblance to efficiency in the agency's operations.

Our findings reveal that the major effect the ratios are having on agency programs is the forced curtailment, and in many cases the complete abandonment, of those vital functions of personnel management which are designed to increase the efficiency and quality of the organization and work force. We find that savings in salaries of personnel employees resulting from the ratio are more than offset in lowered morale, high turnover, reduced productivity and ineffective utilization of manpower. One agency reported to the subcommittee the loss of at least $100,000 annual savings because one position, costing around $5,000 had to be abolished to meet the ratio. This amounts to a direct charge to the taxpayers of $95,000 each year in order to comply with ratio provisions.

In another case, 23 operating jobs were eliminated by the good work of a personnel worker. The savings amounted to $83,000. Nevertheless, in order to bring the staff down low enough to meet the ratio, that personnel employee's job was abolished and he was laid off.

Another effect of the ratios is an alarming tendency to transfer personnel functions to operating officials. We all know that when this happens—when unrealistic ratios force legitimate personnel functions underground—operating officials have less time for program activities. In addition, it results in staff increases under varying disguises along operating levels to carry the burden of unfamiliar personnel functions. The indirect cost of this practice is difficult to gage in terms of money, manhours, employee confusion and reduced efficiency of program operations.

The direct impact of personnel ratios has had far-reaching implications in program activities of the agencies studies. As an illustration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in order to comply with the ratio, has had to reduce certain units below desirable strength. This makes it impossible for the FBI to assign personnel to units in anticipation of increased work needs, or to provide for fluctuating workloads, or for training and replacement. Another case example is the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It has had to close its Border Patrol training school at El Paso and it has not been able to train adequately several hundred new enforcement officers.

Manpower conservation and utilization programs in the Federal Government are ultimately the responsibility of personnel people. Congress depends upon them to perform six major management tasks:

First. Recruitment, testing and screening of all applicants to insure that suitable and competent employees are found for public service.

Second. Providing adequate training and incentives to stimulate productivity.

Third. Carrying on fair placement and promotion programs to get the right talent in the right places.

Fourth. Appraisal of performance to maintain productivity and eliminate the unfit.

Fifth. Continuous survey of jobs to keep classifications in line with the Classification Act and abolish unnecessary positions.

Sixth. General economy in the selection and utilization of manpower.

If our personnel directors and their employees are going to perform these functions, and if these objectives are to be attained, we must guard against the systematic whittling away of their effectiveness by an unsound rider to appropriation bills which limits personnel staffs to an arbitrary ratio.

Our inquiry to date convinces us that standard personnel office staffing ratios are unrealistic. They are worthless when used to forecast and measure personnel program needs and workload requirements of different organizations. They are costly in total agency efficiency when personnel staffing fails to meet the changing needs of program operations.

Further study is necessary to identify any common criteria which might be used in a comparative appraisal of these personnel functions which are measurable. Preliminary study, however, has convinced the subcommittee that personnel ratios, per se, are totally incompatible with management-improvement goals sponsored by Congress and the President.

The subcommittee raised the question in its interim report of the use of military personnel in civilian jobs. We have, in the meantime, conducted a detailed inquiry into the practice, both in Washington and in field installations. The study may be divided into two general categories: First, the assignment of military personnel to civilian-type jobs in military agencies; and, second, the assignment of military personnel to civilian-type jobs in nonmilitary Government agencies.

With regard to the use of military personnel in civilian positions in the Department of Defense, we emphasized in our interim report the necessity for developing realistic criteria for distinguishing between those jobs which are inherently military in character and those jobs which are properly civilian. It was our view that such criteria could serve several uses:

First. They would provide information as to personnel requirements in terms of both military and civilian needs and thereby serve as useful tools for the military services in realistically determining their manpower needs.

Second. Such criteria would be invaluable in assisting both military and civilian personnel officials in making proper placements of available personnel.

Third. These criteria are important in assuring that reservists and other military personnel are assigned to the type of work which justified their recall, namely, strictly military assignments.

Fourth. They would establish a real basis for assuring civilian employees that the Department of Defense recognizes that certain work is more properly performed by civilian workers.

Finally, they would lay down the rules of the game and enable both civilian and military employees to recognize readily those positions and assignments which are available to each.

The subcommittee is now able to report that such criteria have been developed and established by the various military departments. Aside from some slight differences in the language used, they are essentially the same in all of the services.

Briefly, the common criteria for identifying individual military positions are these:

(a) Do provisions of law require military personnel?

(b) Does the job require specific military background and knowledge?

(c) Does the job require security restrictions which would make civilian occupancy difficult or impossible?

(d) Does the job provide necessary training for future military assignments?

(e) Is the location of the job such that civilians are not available?

Any position which meets one or more of the criteria is a position which should be occupied by military personnel. Conversely, unless the position does meet one or more of the foregoing criteria, it should be filled by a civilian employee.

The development of these criteria represents a major step forward in promoting

better utilization of both military and civilian manpower in the Defense Establishment.

The subcommittee has recently completed the analysis of approximately 400 individual positions filled by military personnel—both officer and enlisted. These positions were selected, in order to obtain a fair sampling, from rosters of military agencies in Washington and in the field. The analysis of these positions, conducted both by our own staff and the agencies concerned, indicates that at least 35 percent of the jobs we studied could be filled by qualified civilian personnel.

The Department of Defense has stated that the average cost of maintaining a military person is $5,500 per year, while the Civil Service Commission reports that $3,800 is the average annual pay of a classified employee. Thus, if the 35 percent of the positions analyzed were actually filled by civilians the total savings alone on the 400 jobs sampled would be $238,000.

If this same percentage were projected to cover even as few as 10,000 jobs in the Defense Establishment, a saving of $17,000,000 would result.

The subcommittee extended its inquiry into the difficulties in applying the criteria. We have been informed that the difficulties in a large measure stem from problems arising out of contradictory objectives. We are remineded, in this respect, that the military services are charged by Congress with training and equipping an Army, Navy, and Air Force sufficient to make secure our country against the aggressor. At the same time, Congress has imposed a strict ceiling limitation on the number of white-collar civilians who can be employed to carry out the civilian functions of this program. This limitation has, in operation, frequently required a choice between reducing the defense program or assigning military personnel to civilian-type positions.

Another reason offered relates to the assignment of rotated personnel. The Congress has, of course, approved the principle and practice of rotation of military personnel between overseas and Stateside assignments. Such rotation allows for rest and reorientation of military personnel after overseas assignment or sea duty. Frequently, military personnel in the States on rotation or shore duty must be assigned civilian type employment in the absence of any appropriate constructive military assignment. From a morale standpoint it is necessary to keep both officer and enlisted personnel in a purposeful type of employment. This responsibility often leaves the armed services with the choice between taking exceptions to their own above-listed criteria, thus adversely affecting civilian morale, or assigning military personnel to unimportant "made" work.

At the present time, while there is no limitation on the number of blue-collar workers, there is, as I have stated, a strict limitation on the number of white-collar or classified personnel who may be employed by the armed services. If a personnel ceiling is necessary, it appears that an over-all allotment covering all classes of employees—both military and civilian—would enable the services to utilize their manpower resources more adequately.

The second part of this study relates to the use of military personnel in strictly civilian Government agencies. It has been completed and a detailed report is now being compiled. We have found that 469 Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force officers are assigned to duty in 13 civilian Government agencies. Justification may exist for the assignment of a comparatively small number of these officers to all but one of these agencies. We cannot find a justification, however, for the use of 379 military officers in civilian positions in the Selective Service System.

The Selective Service Act, as amended, expressly prohibits the use of military personnel as members of local or district draft boards—as well as appeal boards and agencies of appeal. While the act further provides that officers may be assigned to the agency, except to the aforementioned boards, it permits the assignment of nonmilitary personnel to the system.

We have not been able to agree, in view of the basic nature of the agency and the fact that the work is primarily civilian in character, that the continued employment of military personnel in its operations is necessary. Analysis of the positions indicate that military background or skills are not needed to procure the numbers of men required by the services or to determine from what source these people are to be procured. Not only are the services deprived of the proper use of this group of trained officer personnel, but here again the cost factor should be considered. Accepting the statement of the Defense Department that the average annual cost across the board is $5,500 for the maintenance of military personnel, and the Civil Service Commission's figure of $3,800 per annum as the cost of a graded civilian, a simple calculation will show that a military person costs almost half again as much per year as a civilian.

In bringing my remarks to a close, I should like to say that during the course of our study, we have not overlooked the need for a thorough examination of the management machinery of the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the General Services Administration.

Our objective is to determine how well these central management agencies are carrying out their responsibilities for insuring that no agency is overstaffed, that nonessential activities are eliminated, that Government is geared to provide efficient and economical operations, and that all other actions are taken to bring about maximum effectiveness and economy in the use of Federal personnel.

Our inquiry is by no means complete, but we have found certain things which are having an adverse effect on the proper use of Federal employees. These findings point to a need for formulating legislation to strengthen administrative machinery and practices throughout Government.

We cannot help believing in this respect, that much more than is being done can and must be done if we are to see real results from the management improvement and manpower utilization programs. The management improvement and manpower utilization programs, as written are well designed and well intended, and if vigorously pursued would go a long way toward improving the efficiency of our Government's operation with substantial reductions in manpower needs and correlative costs.

In conclusion, I should like to emphasize that there is an untapped reservoir of energy and efficiency in our Federal working force. Federal employees are reliable, conscientious, and hard-working people who want to do a good job. If we can rid the Federal structure of red tape and antiquated practices, Federal employees will be able to set an example to the whole country as efficient and productive workers.

The success of our efforts at improving manpower policies and practices ultimately depends upon the cooperation and assistance of operating officials throughout the executive branch.

They have given us their wholehearted support; they have pointed out problem areas; they have spent considerable time gathering information and statistical data; and, finally, they have examined our tentative recommendations and have given us the benefit of their views. With their continued cooperation, we will be able to formulate recommendations sufficiently authoritative to justify serious consideration by the Senate in its objective to insure proper manpower ultilization in the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which I addressed to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, on the subject of personnel office staffing ratios.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONNEL OFFICE STAFFING RATIOS

The Honorable BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The Congress imposed on certain departments and independent agencies for fiscal years 1950, 1951 and 1952 staffing ratios ranging from one personnel employee for each 100 employees to one for each 115. The staff of the Federal Manpower Policies Subcommittee, believing this practice to have an impact on governmental efficiency and manpower utilization, sought information as to the effect of such ratios on agency operations.

Full development of the facts has not been possible during the short length of time the project has been under study. Preliminary analysis, however, of information from 25 departments and independent agencies having gross appropriations of $14,273,870,000 and available comparative data from industry, reveals the following:

1. Funds appropriated or allotted for salaries for personnel office employees in agencies studied was $19,290,724 for fiscal year 1952. This is slightly more than one-tenth of 1 percent (0.125 percent) of gross appropriations.

2. The average expenditure of personnel office fund allotment per agency employee was $30.35. One industrial survey of 30 private companies in 1947 found an average expenditure of $45 to $50 per employee per year.

3. Although the reduction in ratio from 1:115 to 1:135 as proposed by the House would provide an apparent saving of $2,893,000, or slightly more than two-one hundredth of 1 percent (0.02 percent) of gross appropriations, the effects of such a ratio would actually decrease the efficiency of the agencies and lessen the effectiveness of the Government operations.

(a) It would require a cut-back in personnel activities of about 15 percent. Processing of personnel actions, record, and reports would be seriously impeded in many cases, but would not be diminished, since they must be accomplished to insure compliance with laws and regulations.

Curtailment would be in those vital functions designed to increase the efficiency and quality of the manpower of the agency.

(1) Job orientation and skills training.
(2) Executive development.
(3) Supervisory selection and training.
(4) Testing and examining.
(5) Utilization and manpower.
(6) Performance ratings and standards.
(7) Annual review of positions, as required by the Whitten amendment.
(8) Placement follow-up, employee appraisal and exit interview.
(9) Diminished personnel office recruiting activity.
(10) Incentive awards program and management improvement activities.
(11) Employee relations, counseling and services.
(12) Analysis of turn-over; excessive sick leave; morale factors; reduced productivity; unfavorable work situations.
(13) Promotion and placement.

(b) The saving would be only apparent and not real:

(1) Employee turn-over, now 31.88 percent per year, would increase.

(2) Employee morale and, consequently, productivity would decrease.

(3) Personnel functions would be transferred to operating officials, lessening their time for program activities. Operating staff increases would result under varying disguises.

(4) The principles of open competition and equal opportunity would be seriously jeopardized for lack of adequate control and direction. Personalized recruitment by operating officials, for example, would be the only recourse to filling vacancies.

(5) There would be a tendency to split personnel functions which could be performed by one unit among several units so that the time of employees performing these activities would be reduced to below 50 percent and, hence, not chargeable to personnel ratios. These are known as the forty-niners. Such splitting of functions and employees assignments is both inefficient and costly.

(6) Aims of the President and the Congress for improved administration of the programs of the Federal Government would be abrogated with respect to personnel administration and its impact on all agency activities.

4. Standard personnel office staffing ratios and other uniform criteria are worthless with respect to forecasting and measuring personnel program needs and workload requirements of different organizations.

(a) Many industrial surveys have confirmed the inadvisability of seeking a "standard" ratio. "Individual situations vary too greatly and personnel programs differ in content too much to develop a measure of general application." (National Industrial Conference Board.)

(1) 30 manufacturing companies: ratios from 1: 50 to 1: 830.

(2) 46 representative firms in four different locations across the country: 1: 32 to 1: 364 (Veterans' Administration).

(3) 525 firms surveyed by the University of Minnesota: 1: 96 to 1: 159.

(4) 10 industrial plants: Average, 1: 30 (Dartnell Corp.).

(5) One plant, 1,184 industrial relations employees, approximately 75,000 total employees: 1: 60 (Dartnell Corp.).

(6) 26 industrial concerns: 1: 47 to 1: 641 (Bureau of the Budget).

(b) Operating programs of agencies suffer in direct proportion to the extent to which personnel staffing fails to meet their requirements. Realistic personnel programs—the most economical and efficient—are impossible to achieve under arbitrary standard ratios of any kind. The following factors militating against standard ratios are among those reported by three or more agncies as requiring major consideration in their personnel programs:

(1) Geographical dispersion of personnel activities to a large number of personnel offices.

(2) Heavy employee turn-over.

(3) Large seasonal or periodic employment.

(4) Need for a substantial amount of recruitment in scarce skills categories.

(5) Personnel activities performed for other agencies or for employees not on the agency's payroll.

(6) Unusually large numbers of applicants for positions.

(7) Special requirements of laws and regulations.

(8) Necessity to operate under two or more separate personnel systems.

(9) A major reorganization or a number of minor reorganizations.

(10) Backlogs of work, in classifying or reclassifying positions, examining, recruiting, etc.

Other factors which must be considered in determining the personnel program are:

(1) Nature of work of the agency.

(2) Newness of the agency and expected duration.

(3) Relative stability of agency programs.

The general effect congressional ratio limitations have had on personnel administration in the agencies, and the effect anticipated by the proposed ratio of 1:135 are summarized in representative statements, attached. Twenty-five agencies and departments responded to the subcommittee questionnaire, and 200 subordinate field activities responded. No significant deviation from the summary opinion was found.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Personnel programs must be designed by agency heads to meet the respective needs and singular workload requirements of their agencies.

2. An intelligent standard staffing ratio or criteria for uniform application to all agencies, or a number of agencies, is impossible of attainment with present knowledge.

3. The management functions appertaining to modern personnel practices in Government and industry are presently curtailed to the point of inefficiency under existing ratios ranging from 1:100 to 1:115, and would be virtually abandoned by all agencies on which the proposed ratio of 1:135 might be imposed.

4. If the Congress reaffirms previously declared management improvement goals, legislative personnel ratios should be abolished as they are incompatible with attainment of such goals.

I shall be glad to discuss this with you at your convenience, if you so desire.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies.

GENERAL EFFECT OF LEGISLATIVE PERSONNEL OFFICE RATIO RESTRICTIONS

SUMMARY OF OPINION

(Twenty-five responding departments and independent agencies and 200 field activities)

Department of Commerce: "We have indicated some 25 different phases of personnel work which we have (already) been forced to curtail or eliminate entirely, because of inadequate staffing. A reduction would obviously mean virtually complete abandonment throughout the Department of our present limited efforts in each of the 25 areas of personnel management listed above, except for compliance with mandatory requirements of law as to position classification, appointments, and changes of employment status, and the processing of required personnel records and reports. (In the mandatory fields) very serious delays would inevitably result, impairing the efficiency of the service. The unavoidable effect would be to handicap operating officials in carrying out their programs, and undoubtedly to cause them to attempt personally to perform various phases of personnel work themselves. This would lead to chaotic conditions in the employment, management, and separation of personnel, to reduced efficiency in the conduct of operating programs, and to higher costs to the Government for personal services."

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: "The new reduction must necessarily come through a curtailment of those personnel functions not required by law but designed to increase the efficiency and quality of the work force."

Department of Justice: "While the Department has complied strictly with the ratio imposed by existing legislation, this has been accomplished only with considerable difficulty and the sacrifice of essential functions of personnel management. The limitation, like any arbitrary yardstick, has failed to take into account problems peculiar to the operations of the individual agencies. In the case of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, compliance with the ratio has required the reducing of certain units of personnel below the desirable strength making it impossible to assign personnel to units in anticipation of increased work needs of fluctuating workloads, or for training and replacement purposes. If the limitation of 1:135 were imposed it would be necessary to reduce the present operations still further (and) to continue examinations with personnel reductions in other (operating) activities."

Atomic Energy Commission: "We will be forced to give very serious consideration to reversing our policy of decentralized personnel management. This, of course, would have a further adverse effect upon the quality and speed of the personnel job."

Department of Agriculture: "In fact, all training, employee relations, and services activities would have to be dropped from our personnel program, only the paper processing would be left."

(Approximately 90 percent of Government employees are located in the field and are acutely affected by staffing restrictions based upon anything other than program requirements.)

Denver, Colo.: "Assistant personnel officer carrying out clerical duties in connection with recruitment and placement activities to detriment of classification (and other) programs. We continue to have considerable transient and wage dissatisfied employee turnover. Training essence of good personnel administration. Progress slow. Orientation of new employees practically nonexistent. No cross departmental training in past year. Management is calling on personnel officers to an increasing degree to assist in management functions directly concerned with proper personnel administration. Personnel ceiling should be elastic to provide for increases or decreases as the needs of service require. This station currently needs an increase of one to provide for training officer" (teletype).

Columbia, S. C.: "Current restrictive ratios have caused personnel training and relations activities to be drastically curtailed during period when continuing reductions in force have emphasized need for such programs. This regional office has actually been in a constant reduction in force since September 1951, because of revised tables or organization and returning veterans exercising their restoration rights. Important placement follow-ups often have been omitted, as reductions in force have required such a large percentage of time to be utilized on RIF activities by the personnel office employees" (teletype).

San Francisco, Calif.: "When there is a sufficient staff in the personnel office to take care of the legal and regulatory requirements, then minor additions to that staff increase tremendously the management effectiveness of the office. Addition to the staff of a training officer in an office of this size as discussed above is an illustration. We are practicing rigid economy in the filling of vacant positions even though this has entailed the sacrificing of some very desirable refinements in our personnel program. If given more latitude in staffing, the personnel division, the effectiveness of our management-improvement program would be materially increased" (teletype).

Roanoke, Va.: "By imposing personnel ratios, Congress has greatly hampered the current drive to conserve manpower through management-improvement activities, insofar as a good personnel program can be utilized to accomplish this result. Because the per-

sonnel officer must "put out fires" as they occur, there is little or no time available for planning an effective personnel program."

IMPROVEMENT OF HUMBOLDT BAY, CALIF.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Arizona. The majority leader is aware of the fact that H. R. 6007 was reported to the Senate unanimously by the Committee on Public Works. Because some of us must leave the city by train very shortly, I wonder whether it would be possible to have the bill considered at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be agreeable to me. Has the distinguished Senator from Washington cleared it with the minority leader or the acting minority leader? I have no objection.

Mr. CAIN. The answer is that I have discussed it with the acting minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6007) to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6007) to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Enginers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MODERNIZATION AND ENLARGEMENT OF THE MAIL EQUIPMENT SHOPS IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7471) to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes. I have obtained clearance on the bill from the other side of the aisle, particularly from the Senators who objected previously to the bill when it was taken up on the call of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. To which bill does the Senator from South Carolina refer?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is H. R. 7471. It has been cleared with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. It is a bill which ought to be passed immediately.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from South Carolina state the calendar number?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It is Calendar No. 1721. I shall be glad to explain the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the bill was objected to previously, but that the objection has since been withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is in line with the announcement which has been made.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the equipment in Washington shop has been in use since 1918.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe an explanation was made at the time it was considered previously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7421) to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from South Carolina assure the acting minority leader that he has cleared the bill with this side of the aisle.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] was supposed to bring it up today, but he had to leave the city. If it were not for the fact that he had to leave he would have asked that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. He cleared it with the minority side of the aisle.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The purpose is to modernize the postal equipment shop in Washington, D. C.?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is that the only purpose of the bill; or is it proposed to enlarge the shop?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course the shop will have to be enlarged. The equipment has been in existence since 1918, and the shop has not been enlarged since that time. In 1918 the income was $389,000. This year it will be $2,153,000. They are very much handicapped.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill does not contemplate that the shop will take on a new function, does it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Its function will not change.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7471) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHIPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FILMS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3491) prohibiting the exhibition in educational institutions, or the use by departments or agencies of the Government, of motion-picture films based upon script written by persons having Communist or Communist-front connections, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the bill has to do with the shipment of educational films in interstate commerce. I have in my hand a catalog entitled "Educational Film Guide." It contains a listing of the various educational films available to schools and colleges throughout the country.

Mr. President, I had my staff pick the names of some of the script writers who prepared the educational films, and had the names submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in order to get a run-down on some of the individuals named. We find a fantastic picture, Mr. President. We submitted 17 names of individuals who prepared scripts for educational films used in the indoctrination of American children, and of the 17 names submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we find that 8 have very extensive records of Communist-front activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, the report from the House Un-American Activities Committee on a typical case. I do not intend to have the report on all 17 names printed in the RECORD at this point because they are too lengthy.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 16, 1952.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For Hon. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY.
Subject: Robert S. Lynd.

Public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning Robert S. Lynd:

On December 14, 1939, the day before the one hundred and forty-eighth anniversary of the Bill of Rights, a statement signed by 65 prominent citizens was sent to the American press. The releases stated that we recognize particularly that serious efforts are being made to silence and suppress the Communist Party. We regard as significant the fact that precisely now Earl Browder, its general secretary, has been indicted on data which the Government has evidently had for years. We observe that a charge 4 years old has just now been revived against another official of the Communist Party, Sam Adams Darcy. Similarly, a minor technicality was invoked in order to rule all Communist candidates off the New York City ballot. * * * The statement related that we felt compelled to speak out sharply and boldly at this moment. When forces exist, as we believe they do now exist, whose objective effect * * * is the destruction of civil liberties, blindness to facts becomes dangerous, pious protestation of liberalism becomes mockery, and failure to speak out courageously becomes criminal * * * The statement was signed by Robert S. Lynd, identified as a professor at Columbia University.

Professor Lynd was one of the 16 distinguished Americans who denounced the trend toward disciplinary action against lawyers who defend political minorities, racial minorities, and labor organizations.

The statement pointed out that such actions may destroy the right to fair trial and adequate legal counsel as guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the American Constitution. The statement was a defense of the five lawyers who defended the 11 leaders of the Communist Party; the lawyers were cited for contempt by Judge Medina. (From the Daily Worker of February 1, 1950, p. 3.)

An invitation issued by the American Russian Institute to a dinner dedicated to American-Soviet postwar relations, New York City, October 19, 1944, named Professor Lynd as a member of that organization's board of directors. On December 12, 1947, the Daily Worker reported that the board of superintendents were planning to eliminate a course for teachers on culture in the Soviet Union which was sponsored by the American Russian Institute; the same article revealed that Prof. Robert S. Lynd, of Columbia University was a member of the board of directors of the institute. (See p. 3 of the Daily Worker of that date.) Attorney General Tom Clark cited the American Russian Institute (New York) as Communist (press release of April 27, 1949).

The call of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., to a congress to be held November 6–8, 1943, a letterhead of the national council dated March 13, 1946, and a memorandum issued by the council March 18, 1946, named Prof. Robert S. Lynd as one of the sponsors of the nationl council; he was a member of the sponsoring committee of the organization's committee on education, as shown on the proceedings of a conference on education about the Soviet Union, October 14, 1944, in New York City; a bulletin issued by the committee of education, June 1945 (p. 22), also named him as a member of the sponsoring committee. * * * The New York Times of May 18, 1943 (p. 17C), reported that he had signed the national council's open letter to the American people; he signed the national council's open letter to the mayor of Stalingrad, as revealed by Soviet Russia Today for June 1943 (p. 21); he signed the organization's appeal to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange for a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet, End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace, dated December 1948); he signed a statement issued by the council, praising Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (from the pamphlet, How to End the Cold War and Build the Peace, p. 9); on February 17, 1949, the Daily Worker named Professor Lynd as having signed a statement of the council, urging President Truman to have an interview with Premier Stalin.

In March 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities reported that in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship (report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944); Attorney General Clark cited the national council as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

As shown in the November 1937 issue of Soviet Russia Today (p. 79), Robert S. Lynd was one of those who signed the Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union, cited as a Communist enterprise signed by hundreds of well-known Communists and fellow travelers (special committe's report 1311).

The program of the fifth national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which was held in Atlantic City, N. J., March 29–30, 1941, named Professor Lynd as one of the sponsors of that organization; he was identified with Columbia University. In report 1311, the special committee * * * cited the American committee * * * as one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States (also cited in the special committee's report of June 25, 1942); Attorney General Clark cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948).

The Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact was cited as an organization which was formed as a result of the conference for peaceful alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and to further the cause of Communists in the United States doing their part in the Moscow campaign (Committee on Un-American Activities in report 378 dated April 1, 1951). Professor Lynd signed a statement of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives, * * * calling for international agreement to ban use of atomic weapons (statement attached to a press release dated December 14, 1949, p. 13).

A letterhead of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, dated December 1, 1939, named Robert S. Lynd as a member of the New York committee of that organization; he signed a petition of the organization, as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead dated January 17, 1940; he was one of the sponsors of a citizens rally in New York City, April 13, 1940, held under the auspices of the American Committee * * *, as shown on a leaflet announcing the rally; he signed an appeal of the same organization which was sent to Secretary Hull on behalf of anti-Fascist refugees trapped in France (Daily Worker of July 22, 1940, page 1, column 5); he also signed the organization's open letter to Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, denouncing his pro-war stand (Daily Worker of October 7, 1940, p. 3; October 12, 1940, p. 4; and New Masses of October 15, 1940, p. 17).

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was cited as a Communist-front organization which defended Communist teachers (special committee * * * in reports dated June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1941).

During 1937 and 1938, the Communist Party campaigned for support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing so-called relief groups, such as American Friends of Spanish Democracy (from the special committe's report of March 29, 1944). Robert S. Lynd signed the organization's letter to the President of the United States (Daily Worker of February 7, 1938, p. 4); and he also signed the organization's petition to lift the arms embargo against Spain (Daily Worker of April 8, 1938, p. 4).

Another organization which was set up during 1937 and 1938 (see last paragraph above) was Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; Professor Lynd was one who signed a letter of the organization, addressed to President Roosevelt and Attorney General Jackson, protesting attacks upon the Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the war hysteria now being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration. (Daily Worker of February 21, 1940). The organization was also cited by Attorney General Clark as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948).

According to a mimeographed letter, attached to a letterhead dated April 28, 1949, Robert S. Lynd signed an open letter of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, addressed to President Truman on Franco Spain; Professor Lynd was identified as being from New York City. He signed a petition of the same organization, addressed to President Truman, to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain (mimeographed petition attached to a letterhead of the organization dated May 18, 1951).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization headed by Edward K. Barsky (report 1311 of March 29, 1944); Attorney General Clark cited the organization as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948). Edward K. Barsky was cited on March 29, 1946, by the House of Representatives for contempt of Congress for refusal to produce records of the organization; he was convicted June 27, 1947 (Washington Star, June 28, 1947, pp. 1 and 6; and the Washington Post of June 28, 1947, pp. 1 and 6).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as the Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); it was cited as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International (special committee in report of March 29, 1944; also cited in report of June 25, 1942). New Masses for December 3, 1940 (p. 28), revealed that Robert S. Lynd signed an open letter of the council, addressed to the President of Brazil, urging him to save Carlos Luiz Prestes.

New Masses for March 2, 1937 (p. 28), and an undated circular of Consumers Union named Robert S. Lynd as one of the sponsors of that organization; he supported the Consumers Union's boycott of Nazi goods, as shown in Consumers Union Reports for December 1938 (p. 15). Consumers Union has been cited as a Communist front headed by the Communist Arthur Kallet (whose party name is Edward Adams). Ben Gold and Louis Weinstock, both well-known Communists, were also members of the labor advisory committee of Consumers Union (Report 1311 of the special committee dated March 29, 1944).

Robert Lynd was a member of the provisional sponsoring committee of the National Emergency Conference, as shown on a letterhead of the organization dated May 19, 1939; he was a member of the board of sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, as shown on the organization's legislative letter dated February 15, 1940, and a press release dated February 23, 1940; he signed the organization's open letter, as reported in the Daily Worker of May 13, 1940 (pp. 1 and 5).

"It will be remembered that during the days of the infamous Soviet-Nazi pact, the Communists built protective organizations known as the National Emergency Conference, the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights, which culminated in the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties" (Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947); it was also cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944.

The call to a conference on constitutional liberties in America, June 7, 1940, named Robert S. Lynd as one of the sponsors of that conference. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was formed at this conference which was cited as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party-front organizations" (special committee in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944); Attorney General Biddle cited the conference as a result of which was established the National Federation * * *, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7446).

The Civil Rights Congress was formed in April 1946 as a merger of two Communist-front organizations, the International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties; it was "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" (Re-

port 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated September 2, 1947); Attorney General Clark cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947 and September 21, 1948).

The Daily Worker of December 29, 1948 (p. 2), revealed that Prof. Robert S. Lynd was one of the sponsors of the Civil Rights Congress of New York State; he was identified with Columbia University. The Daily Worker of July 1, 1949 (p. 5), and the call to a Bill of Rights conference of the Civil Rights Congress, to be held in New York City, July 16–17, 1949, named Professor Lynd of Columbia University as one of the sponsors of that conference.

Professor Lynd was one of the sponsors of a conference of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, October 9–10, 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, To Safeguard These Rights, published by the Bureau of Academic Freedom of the national council; he signed the national council's statement for negotiations with the U. S. S. R., as reported in the Daily Worker of August 7, 1950 (p. 8); he was a sponsor of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, called by the national council, and held in New York City March 25–27, 1949 (conference call; conference program, p. 13; and the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949, p. 2); he supported a rehearing of the case of the Communist leaders before the United States Supreme Court, as shown in We Join Black's Dissent, a reprint of an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 20, 1951, by the National Council of the Arts.

The national council was cited as a Communist front in the committee's review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, dated April 19, 1949; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheel horses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

An undated letterhead of Frontier Films named Robert Lynd as a member of the advisory board of that organization, cited as a Communist front by the special committee in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944. He signed an open letter of the League of American Writers, addressed to Secretary Cordell Hull and the Pan-American Conference (Daily Worker of July 31, 1940, p. 7).

The League of American Writers was founded under Communist auspices in 1935, and in 1939 began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. The overt activities of the league in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communistic control (Attorney General Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7445). Attorney General Clark cited the league as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and September 21, 1948); the special committee cited the league as a Communist-front organization (reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1952; and March 29, 1944).

"In March 1937, a group of well-known Communists and Communist collaborators published an open letter bearing the title, 'Open Letter to American Liberals.' The letter was a defense of the Moscow purge trials" (Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report of June 25, 1942). The Daily Worker of February 9, 1937 (p. 2), and Soviet Russia Today for March 1937 (pp. 14–15), revealed that Robert S. Lynd of Columbia University signed the open letter to American liberals.

On May 11, 1937, the Daily Worker reported that Robert Lynd had signed a statement of the American League Against War and Fascism, protesting Franco spies (p. 1 of the Daily Worker). The American League * * * has been cited as subversive and Communist (Attorney General Clark, press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); as a Communist-front organization (Attorney General Biddle in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10); as having been established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union (Attorney General Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 6, p. 7442); and as being completely under the control of Communists (Special Committee in Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944; also cited in reports of January 3, 1939; January 3, 1940; and June 25, 1942).

Prof. Lynd opposed the amendment barring the American Youth for Democracy and declared "I'm glad the (Schultz) amendment was stopped and that I went on record against it" (Daily Worker of November 21, 1947, p. 5); the amendment would have empowered college faculties to outlaw so-called subversive student groups.

The American Youth for Democracy was cited as a front formed in October 1943 to succeed the Young Communist League and for the purpose of exploiting to the advantage of a foreign power the idealism, inexperience, and craving to join which is characteristic of American college youth. (From Rept. 271 of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 17, 1947; also cited in Annual Report for 1951 of the Committee, p. 13.) Attorney General Clark cited the AYD as subversive and Communist (press releases of December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948); the Special Committee cited the organization as the new name under which the Young Communist League operates and which also largely absorbed the American Youth Congress (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944).

The publication, In Fact, was cited as a Communist front whose president and editor is George Seldes (Special Committee in Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944). Robert S. Lynd wrote a letter upon the Tenth Anniversary of In Fact, as shown in the issue of May 22, 1950 (p. 2).

The Daily Worker of March 5, 1951 (p. 4), reported that Prof. Lynd had signed a letter to President Truman, urging him to recognize the seating of the People's Republic of China in the United Nations. Prof. Lynd was a member of the Planning Committee of the National Committee To Repeal the McCarran Act (letterhead dated May 25, 1951); a member of the National Committee (Daily Worker, May 14, 1951, p. 8); a sponsor of the group (Daily Worker, December 27, 1950, p. 9); and he signed the National Committee's Open Letter to President Truman, urging him to "call a halt to building of concentration camps in the United States" (Daily Worker of January 28, 1952, p. 8).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the report which has been printed in the RECORD is the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activties on one Robert Lynd, who is engaged in the preparation of films for educational use. In it we find a fantastic record of communistic activities, according to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been affiliated with 23 different organizations which have been listed by the Attorney General or by congressional committees as the secret tool of and doing the work of the Communist Party.

Lynd and the others on that list are script writers for an organization called Encylopaedia Britannica Films, Inc. This organization is owned by Senator BENTON, of Connecticut.

Mr. President, as we know, Hitler learned one lesson well. He said, "Give me control of the minds of the youth for a short period of years, and I can take over an entire nation without firing a single shot."

Mr. President, the Communists, too, have learned that lesson well. They have learned it just as well as Hitler learned it. The Communists know that if they can infiltrate our educaitonal system, they can control our Nation without firing a shot.

When we find an organization preparing films for the young people of the United States, and when we find the films being prepared by men presently engaged in communistic activities, I think steps should be taken to prevent the shipment of those films in interstate commerce.

That is the purpose of my bill. Even though I know the bill cannot be passed at this session, I have introduced it today, in order that the committee staff can be studying the proposal, which is one to prohibit the shipment in interstate commerce of educational films prepared by individuals who are engaged in Communist activities.

The bill provides that if such persons previously had a record of Communist activities, before the films can be shipped in interstate commerce, the Secretary of Commerce must be satisfied that they have reformed and are no longer loyal to the Communist Party.

At this time I call this particular problem to the attention of the Judiciary Committee, of which the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is chairman. That committee has done an outstanding job this year. It is composed of 4 Democratic Senators and 3 Republican Senators, but all of them are Americans first, and are Democrats or Republicans second. I suggest that they have their staff examine this educational film guide and take the trouble to see how many of the organizations preparing films are following the same line that the Encyclopaedia Britannica, Incorporated, is following, namely, the hiring almost exclusively of men with fantastic records over a number of years in communistic activities and Communist-front activities.

In regard to these Encyclopaedia Britannica film script writers, I have made no individual investigation of my own. I have relied upon the House Un-American Activities Committee to give us these reports. That committee furnishes very excellent reports. I am sending all these reports to the McCarran committee.

Today I have introduced into the RECORD only one report, for all the reports are too lengthy to be placed in the RECORD, and I do not care to clutter the RECORD with all of them. The one I have presented is typical.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is in receipt of a letter from the President of the United States, which the Chair believes should be read at this time. The Chair asks that the letter be read by the clerk.

The Chief Clerk read the letter, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 5, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

This rider and reduction in funds, coupled together, would mean that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be able to fulfill military requirements for atomic weapons. I cannot believe that the Congress would wish to adjourn with our national security jeopardized in this fashion.

I urgently request that this rider be eliminated before the Congress completes its action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will lie on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEETING OF COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE FOR FURTHER CONFERENCE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the further conference on the Department of Defense appropriation bill, in response to the request of the House of Representatives for a further conference on the so-called ARO amendment, will take place at a quarter of seven in room F–82. I wish to make this announcement so that the members of the conference committee who are on the floor will be ready to attend the meeting.

INCORPORATION INTO GULF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY OF EXISTING PROJECT FOR NAVIGATION CHANNEL ON THE GUADALOUPE RIVER, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6812.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6812) to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadaloupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf intracoastal waterway.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me say that the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has discussed this matter with me. I understand that the purpose is merely to incorporate two canals, that the bill involves no expenditure of money, and that the bill was unanimously approved by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under those circumstances, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6812) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRACY ANN CORLEY (ELISABETH LECORCHE)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 6515, for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley, and that the bill be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be ready by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6515) for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche).

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me say that this bill was passed by the House of Representatives on July 1st. The bill simply will permit an adopted German child, of about 1 year of age, to be brought into the United States. This bill is one of the adoption bills. The case is fully documented in every way.

I have taken up the matter with the distinguished chairman of the committee, with the majority leader, with the minority leader, and with the senior, ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee. I know of no objection to the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the opinion of the Senator from Arkansas, the proposed adoption is a proper one, is it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. The couple involved, a technical sergeant and his wife, already have adopted two other children. They are highly recommended in every respect, and the case is thoroughly documented.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6515) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POST OFFICE BUILDINGS AT BLUEFIELD, W. VA.; LAKE CHARLES, LA.; AND COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a resolution providing for the discharge of the Committee on Public Works from the further consideration of House bill 7778. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

At this time I wish to make a brief statement regarding this matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read at this time.

The resolution (S. Res. 351) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Works be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7778) to authorize emergency appropriations for the purpose of erecting certain post office and Federal court buildings, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall object.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Iowa requesting unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I have just requested the Senator from New Mexico to withhold his objection, in order that I may make a brief statement about this measure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I withhold the objection.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa withhold his statement for 2 minutes, in order to give me 2 minutes in which to make a statement on a matter of personal privilege?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object; and I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what does the Senator from New Mexico object?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object to the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well. Objection is heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I call for the regular order on the resolution submitted by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For what purpose does the Senator from Connecticut wish me to yield? Objection already has been lodged to the request made a moment ago by the Senator from Connecticut. Let me say that I have no personal objection, but the Senator from New Mexico has objected.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to a matter of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senator from Iowa yields, the Senator from Connecticut cannot pursue that matter.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two on the matter to which I have referred.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Iowa will be only a minute or two, I shall wait, and shall seek recognition when the Senator from Iowa concludes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall be very brief.

Mr. President, House bill 7778 provides authorization only for the building of three post offices, one at Bluefield, W.

Va.; one at Lake Charles, La.; and one at Council Bluffs, Iowa.

The bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives during the call of the Consent Calendar. There was no objection to the bill in the House of Representatives.

The statements which were made in the hearing on this bill in the House committee were to the effect that these are the three worst post-office situations in the United States today, in the opinion of the Post Office Department.

I shall not speak of the situation in the other two States, because I am not familiar with them; but I know that in Council Bluffs the post office has been condemned and has been torn down as unsafe for human occupancy. As a result, a part of the post office now is occupying a Moose hall or auditorium, and a part of the post office is located in whatever nondescript buildings can be obtained. The housing for the post-office facilities in that city is disgraceful. The post office serves 50,000 persons.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is in the Chamber; and in his State a similar situation exists, as I understand, on the boundary line between West Virginia and Virginia, at Bluefield, I believe.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to permit me to make a statement at this point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall conclude my remarks in a moment, and no doubt the Senator from West Virginia will be able to obtain the floor.

Mr. President, I understand fully the objections on the part of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. His committee has a great many post office bills on its calendar. I understand fully the pressure under which that committee and its chairman operate, especially at this late date.

However, I call attention to the fact that this bill was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives. The bill contains provision for the three most needed post offices in the United States. It is only an authorization bill. I realize it is too late to get the appropriations at this late date, but if we were to have to begin again at the next session and go through all the technical details and mechanics of getting a new authorization bill passed, I do not know what kind of rodents would, in the meantime, carry off the mail from these three important post offices. At each one of the three the situation for the handling of the mails is really disgraceful. Therefore, with all due respect to the Public Works Committee, I had hoped that, without inconvenience to that committee, perhaps we could get unanimous consent for the consideration of this authorization bill, so that next year we might discuss only the question of the appropriation and not have to go through the mechanics of an authorization.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am speaking through the courtesy of the Senator from New Mexico. He withheld his objection so that I might speak. Therefore, I feel that I have no right to yield to the Senator from West Virginia, but I am certainly of opinion that the Senator from New Mexico will yield to the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I do not know the condition in Council Bluffs, Iowa, but I personally know the conditions in Bluefield, W. Va., which also includes Bluefield, Va. The post office at Bluefield, W. Va., was built in 1901, at a time when Bluefield, Va., was a small city of about 8,000. Since that time it has been incorporated with Bluefield, Va., so that the city has grown from the small size of 8,000 to a population of 50,000. At the present time, the furnace room of the post office is used. There is only one general delivery window in the entire post office. The average number of people applying at the general delivery window is 2,000 a day. It is no uncommon sight, as I personally can assure the Senator, to see people lined up before that window in a long line, similar to the way people used to line up when there was food rationing. Mail sacks are piled outside the building upon the ground. When it rains, tarpaulins are put over the mail sacks, if possible.

An enormous amount of money is being wasted on extra help in order to maintain the service. I want to quote briefly from a statement made by the Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, as a result of an inspection recently made at Lake Charles, La. He said:

> We have here in Lake Charles, La., a situation that has no parallel in the United States with the possible exception of Bluefield, W. Va.

The reason he said that—and I talked to him about it—was that the Department has buildings at the two places named, whereas in the case of Council Bluffs, Iowa, the building had been condemned and torn down and the postal work was being divided among various buildings.

Another problem in the case of Bluefield, W. Va., is the fact that there are no buildings which can be rented for the purpose of taking care of post office work. In other words, this is an emergency situation, and the bill represents an effort to obtain even a halfway postal service. It is not simply a matter of getting a post office, or a post office building.

The building was built in 1901. At that time, by law, sessions of the Federal court were held in the building. The sessions were then short; but they continue about 14 weeks out of the year. There is a courtroom, a small office for the judge, another small office for the clerk, and another small office for the district attorney to take care of the two 7-week sessions every year. It is a serious problem, Mr. President, not so much because of the court, but because of the utter inadequacy of the postal facilities to serve the population of that community, which has multiplied about 12 times since the building was first erected.

Prior to World War II, there was a large program for the construction of these buildings. I happen to know that the Council Bluffs, the Lake Charles, and the Bluefield post offices were at the top of the list, but in 1941 post office construction was stopped, and has not been continued. Finally, the Bureau of the Budget permitted to be written to the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives a letter saying that the Bureau had no objection to recommending an authorization for the building of the three post-office buildings. It was thought that for the time being, a building could be rented in Bluefield which would take care of the post office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KILGORE. I should like to finish my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I would not complain greatly, but there is no building that can be rented. Mr. President, since the Senator from New Mexico was kind enough to yield to me, I shall now desist.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know that the statements made by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia are correct, but it happens that similar situations exist in every State of the Union. I know the post offices in the State of New Mexico, and I know that they are in a situation identical to that of the post offices in Iowa, West Virginia, and Louisiana.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Perhaps the Senator could explain the statement which appears in the House committee report, a statement contained in a letter from the Deputy First Assistant Postmaster General, who said:

> We have here in Lake Charles, La., a situation that has no parallel in the United States, with the possible exception of Bluefield, W. Va.

He was sent out to inspect postal facilities throughout the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not doubt that he made that statement. New York is also badly in need of post offices. As a matter of fact, we are 20 to 25 years behind in the construction of post offices. But it is not the fault of the Committee on Public Works. I firmly believe that we should have had a public works program years ago. But we are told about the necessities of Europe and of Asia, and, when an effort is made to build a post office in Los Angeles, the Bureau of the Budget objects. The delivery of mail is retarded in New York, in Iowa, in Louisiana——

Mr. HUMPHREY. And in Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. The mail is also retarded in Minnesota. But I do not think it either fair or right that at this late date, when the legislative committee having to do with public works has had neither a bit of evidence nor a recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget, except, in this particular instance, to proceed in this way. I may say that the Senator from Iowa did not introduce a bill for the construction of the post office in Iowa. We have no bill

before the committee. Suddenly, the House passes a bill, and, at the last moment, we are expected to pass it, without knowing one single thing about it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say that the bill came from the House on June 15, 1952, and was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But it does happen that the Committee on Public Works has not had one instant to give attention to this particular matter until the past 2 or 3 days. The Senator from Iowa, up to yesterday, had not called the attention of the committee to the bill. Do Senators think it is fair that we should construct a Federal building in Iowa or in West Virginia or elsewhere, and not build similar buildings in the other sections of the country?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think it was about 4 days ago that I first called the Senator's attention to the matter. It was not just yesterday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well—4 days ago.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I was after the Senator from New Mexico all day yesterday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield further, let me say to him, when he says the Bureau of the Budget objects, that the Bureau of the Budget O. K.'d this particular bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I happen to know some of the personnel in the Post Office Department and in the Budget Bureau, and I happen to know the Committee on Public Works of this body created by the Reorganization Act. Does the Senator want us to say to the other 48 States——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This is only an authorization bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes. I know what that means.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator remembers well that upon his return from New Mexico on Monday night the Senator from West Virginia called him and talked to him about this bill, does he not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. I was trying to arrange for hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would be leaving the door wide open for everyone.

Has the Postmaster General ever been to Hobbs, N. Mex? Has he been to Roswell, N. Mex.? Has he been to Santa Fe, N. Mex., the oldest capital of the Union? I know about Los Angeles, which has practically a million persons being served by the same post office building which was in use 30 years ago.

Last night this body passed a bill by which post office buildings can be taken care of by private enterprise. But what the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Iowa are trying to do is to get a special bill through in order to construct special buildings. We passed a bill which permits private enterprise to put up a post office in Bluefield, W. Va., or somewhere in the State of Iowa, and then the Post Office Department will lease the buildings at so much a month or so much a year. At the end of the period of the lease, the finances are amortized.

Mr. KILGORE. There were two bills, one of which had to do with general Federal buildings, which include post offices, and the other, office buildings. In most cities of the United States there are in post-office buildings internal revenue offices, alcohol-tax offices, district attorneys' offices, the Federal courts, and various governmental offices. Space is given to the recruiting offices of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps. The first thing we know, we shall have a building which is not used more than 50 percent by the Post Office Department, and the contract might be broken. In the case of leased buildings, the taxpayers of the United States are charged ground rent, taxes, and other items. Bluefield will collect its taxes; Mercer County will collect its taxes; and the State of West Virginia will collect its taxes for a period of 25 years on a leased post-office building, which is something that they cannot now do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason, Mr. President, that the chairman of the Committee on Public Works wants a regular omnibus public works bill passed by this body.

Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

INCREASING TENDENCY TOWARD CENSORSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in the closing moments of our session I should like to point out to the Senate the grave danger of the increasing tendency toward censorship in this country, sponsored at private levels and by public officials at the public level.

The first amendment to our Constitution is under attack as it has never before been in the history of the United States. It is a very serious and dangerous attack. It is going on in many communities and is seeping and spreading through our society. I want to bring this warning to the attention of the Senate before we adjourn, so that Senators may be alerted as they go back to their communities.

Mr. President, this great danger which the American people face today is not yet recognized by them. They are not yet sufficiently conscious of the forces which arrogate to themselves the dangerous doctrine of censorship.

I suggest that the proposal of the junior Senator from Wisconsin to ban films in interstate commerce is a very dangerous proposal. Who is this censor going to be? Who is going to determine which films should be banned? Who shall decide whether a consultant or writer is a Communist? This decision is life or death power over the film itself. Shall the film be banned if the alleged writer has been indiscreet enough to join the wrong organizations and has lived to regret it? Who judges him? Who decides his guilt? Who decides when and how the organizations became the wrong ones?

Shall we bar the works of Lenin from interstate commerce?

Most assuredly, we can agree that Mr. Lenin has been adjudged to be a Communist. Shall we ban from interstate commerce Karl Marx's Das Kapital in an effort to prevent our readers from reading the book? It has recently been published as a volume in a collection of new books under distinguished editors, a collection entitled "Great Books of the Western World."

What Senator would be willing to take upon himself the duty of judging what writers, books, or films are to be barred from interstate commerce?

If Stalin makes a statement of interest to the American people, shall we bar the New York Times from interstate commerce because it carries this statement by a well-known Communist? Does any Senator deny that Lenin, Marx, and Stalin are regarded by the Communists as distinguished exponents of the Communist doctrine? Shall we, because of this bar, bar them from interstate commerce here? Or shall we, in the traditional American way, by exposure to them allow our citizens and young people better to understand their fallacies and the falseness of their doctrine?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. No; the Senator will not yield. The Senator will make his statement and then yield the floor.

Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on the Senator from Wisconsin's "one typical case." I take his case of Professor Lynd, of Columbia University, who has served at Columbia under the presidency of General Eisenhower. Professor Lynd, Mr. President, with his wife, is the author of the famous book Middletown. I have no knowledge whatsoever of his private life or his political connections or convictions. I do know that the educational films on which he was a consultant, but which I have not seen, carry the titles The Growth of Cities and The Arteries of Cities. These two films, from their titles, would hardly sound like Communist propaganda even to a man who sees a Communist under every bed and table.

Professor Lynd was the adviser and consultant in connection with these two films. I do not believe he was the writer. He was the consultant selected. Consultants are selected on many educational films because of their distinguished and outstanding attainment in a particular field of scholarship.

Who selected Mr. Lynd? He was selected by the Western Electric Co. to make those two films. Who owns that company? It is owned by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. This sounds like a fine nest of Communists—the Western Electric Co. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.—hiring a consultant from Columbia University, another Communist most recently fi-

nanced under the leadership of General Eisenhower.

I suggest that this case is a typical case, Mr. President, but typical in a very different sense from that meant by the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It is typical of his methods and procedures. It has not been demonstrated that this is in any sense a typical case of Communist infiltration through the two films, The Growth of Cities, and The Arteries of Cities. Through these two films, made by Western Electric, no evidence has been submitted to show the alleged evil of the Communist menace against the minds of the young.

I should like to suggest to any interested Senators that I would gladly arrange for a showing of these two films to any Senator, so that he may judge for himself the nature of the alleged Communist threat which they contain. The charge is, of course, manifestly preposterous.

What we have just heard is not out of the pattern of conduct of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. It is this pattern of blackmail that has so seriously and desperately alarmed me, because if spread throughout our country, it seriously threatens our first amendment. It is our first amendment which undergirds our liberties and upon which our democratic processes depend. All of us are wholly dependent upon a free press to protect our democratic liberties, to expose fraud and corruption and to fight against dangers that would destroy us.

Not long ago I talked to a key editor of the Milwaukee Journal. He told me that twice the advertisers in the Milwaukee Journal have been warned not to advertise in that paper. Who is it that threatens the editor of the Milwaukee Journal by telling advertisers to withhold their business from the Milwaukee Journal? It is none other than a Member of this most distinguished body, the junior Senator from Wisconsin. Who is it that tries to threaten and blackmail and sabotage the Madison Capital Times, the Syracuse Post-Standard, and the Washington Post, and, most recently, Time magazine, whose advertisers have been getting letters, allegedly informing them of the nature and kind of magazine Time is, so that they will cancel their advertising? I am sorry I do not have here, Mr. President, the statement of 2 or 3 weeks ago by the publisher of Time magazine about this correspondence with Time advertisers.

These tactics of blackmail against media of communications, whether they be newspapers—or magazines—or motion picture companies—are a new form of direct blackmail and intimidation in this, the United States Senate, the most important deliberative body in the world.

I do not believe this great body has ever experienced anything like it in its history. That is why I rose immediately, on the strength of this astonishing bill, and this alleged typical case submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I can understand why the Senator from Connecticut is so deeply disturbed by my bill. My bill merely provides that there shall be banned from interstate commerce educational films—that is, films that go into the schools—if the films are prepared by Communist writers.

The Senator from Connecticut seems to be concerned about freedom of speech for Communists. The Communists are not interested in freedom of speech. They are not interested in freedom of thought. They have no freedom of thought, and they have no freedom of speech. Their thinking and their speaking lines are changed from day to day on orders from Moscow. The only thing they avoid, and will always avoid, is the free market place of public opinion.

I think it would be a mistake to try in any way to prevent anyone from saying and thinking what he pleases, regardless of how cockeyed his thoughts or sayings might be. But when we are dealing with the Communist Party, we are not dealing with freedom of thought or freedom of speech. I repeat, the loyal members of the Communist Party have no freedom of thought and no freedom of speech now, and they never have had.

As I pointed out before, the Senator from Connecticut is president of and owns the Encyclopaedia Brittanica Films, Inc. I have not had the time to check on all of the script writers for that organization, but I did send a list of them to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The report of that committee was that 8 of the 17 have long been identified with Communist-front activities.

The distinguished individual to whom the Senator from Connecticut referred, Robert S. Lynd, according to the report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has been engaged in Communist activities of the most vicious kind. This information is not the result of my investigation, but I think I can safely vouch for the accuracy of the report of the House committee.

Why does BENTON hire eight men to prepare his educational films who are either Communists or who in any event follow the Communist Party line? Incidentally, one of these writers, according to a photostat of the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, which I hold in my hand attended the Moscow University at the expense of the Russian Government. In other words, he received his training at the Moscow University at the expense of the Communist Government, came back to the United States and was hired by BENTON to prepare films to poison the minds of American youths with the doctrine of Marx and Lenin.

If any Senator thinks that we must give Communists the right to go into our colleges, high schools, and grade schools to twist, distort, and pervert the minds of our young people, then that Senator is either so stupid that he knows nothing about the Communist movement, or worse.

I very seriously urge the staff of the appropriate committee to check not only the films put out by the Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, but also all other such educational films.

We know that one of the prime objects of the Communist Party is to infiltrate all educational film organizations. We know also, from what we have seen in the Senate today, that the men who own some of these corporations will protect the right of the Communist writers to pervert and twist the minds of our youth. I urge again that the McCarran committee, which now has a staff of investigators, make a thorough investigation and check, to make sure that no longer will men who claim to fight communism be allowed to hire with impunity Communists as their tools to "fight communism."

Mr. President, my bill also would prevent the State Department from buying such films. The State Department has been buying films from Encylopaedia Britannica Films, Inc., which is owned by the Senator from Connecticut. The State Department was buying such films while the Senator from Connecticut was Assistant Secretary of State. They bought a very sizable number of films, then and are buying them as of today. They are buying films prepared by Communist writers, and are sending them abroad to "fight communism," they tell us.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, a question has been directed to me. I ask the privilege of answering it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin could not have been attentive to my comments a moment ago, because I pointed out that the two films in connection with which Professor Lynd served as consultant were films of a technical nature. Apart from all other factors, it is hardly likely that such films could contain Communist propaganda.

Two of the men whose names the Senator gave to the committee of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] the other day are deceased, and all of them were hired by the Western Electric Co. and the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and not by Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, as the Senator again alleged. Again, as I pointed out, these men were employed only as consultants. I so stated in my testimony the other evening, if the Senate happens to be interested. I repeated this a moment ago on the floor. To the best of my knowledge, none of the films with which these men were concerned have been purchased by the State Department. I submitted figures the other night to the committee of the Senator from Iowa with regard to State Department purchases of these films. It is extremely difficult to obtain the right films for the Department's film program abroad. Yet the average purchases of Encyclopaedia Britannica Films over the last 10 years has been less than $6,500 a year, which can hardly be said to be major business.

During a period of 3 years, beginning with my entrance into the State Department, the total purchases were under $1,500, or less than $500 a year, because while I was connected with the Department I prohibited such purchases

or dealings of any kind with my companies.

Mr. President, I submit that this proposal and its sponsor represent the spirit of fascism on the floor of the United States Senate. I am against fascism. I am against communism. Those two isms join together in their mutual desire to give power to the state to censor the media of communications. Who is to be the censor? Who is to decide whether this film is Communist, whether that man is a Communist writer, whether this film should be barred or that man should be prohibited? This is power in the state which is inherent in Fascist and Communist tactics. When the Communists move in, first of all they grab the media of communications. This is their first attack along with the labor unions, the police, and education. We have listened to that attack here tonight on the floor of the Senate. It is an attack which has been going on from the same source over a long period of months. It is as dangerous a threat as is abroad in this country today.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that the Senator from Wisconsin, in his alleged fight against communism, which in my opinion has stimulated communism almost more than anything else I know of, is invoking the very same things which communism does—threats, efforts to intimidate people from expressing themselves, from writing as they will, or from holding ideas different from the pattern which the Senator from Wisconsin would have us all follow?

He is invoking exactly the same evil things that the Communist Party is invoking—trying to censor, trying to destroy by smear, trying to control, trying to hold in the hands of a few men the destinies of all others, seeking to force them to mold their thinking to suit what a small group would have people think. That is what totalitarian forces the world over have sought to do. That is what the Senator from Wisconsin is seeking to do now. He is using the identical tactics of all totalitarian leaders, and these tactics, if not checked, will weaken the fabric of our democracy.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, if I may comment briefly, I welcome the eloquent and very moving statement of the most eminent Senator from New York.

When I was spending a good part of my time studying Communist propaganda tactics I learned that the Communists had a handbook on how to destroy a democracy. One could read in black and white how to proceed to destroy a democracy.

What is the tactic? The tactic is to undermine and destroy the confidence of a people in the democratic processes, in their leaders, in their constitution, and in their parliamentary processes; to sap and destroy the confidence of the people in their cabinet ministers—let us say their secretary of defense, their secretary of state, their premier, or their president, their congress, and their parliamentary practices. Those are the tactics of the Communists when they aim to take over, to sabotage and destroy.

I do not suggest that we have any Communist Members in this body, but I do suggest that, if any one of us were to go to Moscow and spend a year studying the handbook to which I have referred, and then come back here as a Senator and the agent of the Communist Government, we could hardly be more faithful followers of that handbook than we have seen in the Senator from Wisconsin and his tactics these past 2 years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Wisconsin. He informs the Chair that he will be very brief.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to talk about something more pleasant once in a while.

Mr. McCARTHY. This may not be pleasant, but it is very important. Mr. BENTON says that not he but someone else hired his eight script writers. In this respect BENTON does not speak the truth.

BENTON says that he has studied the Communist handbook of propaganda and I believe he has not studied but mastered it. He knows that the number one item in that handbook of propaganda points out the necessity of cleverly infiltrating our schools with Communist ideas. The best way to infiltrate our schools is the identical system which has been used by Encyclopaedia Britannica Films—hire Communist writers and let them do the job. I repeat that eight of the Senator's script men, according to the House committee, have long records of Communist activity. I think that something has been gained here tonight. After the Senator's tirade we now know that the Senator from Connecticut—and this should interest the people of Connecticut—objects to our banning works by Communist writers from our public schools.

In that respect I differ heartily with him. I think that to save America we must ban those Communist works from our public schools.

I thank the Senator from Connecticut for making it very clear how vigorously and how viciously he insists upon his right to hire Communist writers and spread their poison through our school system.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr President, one of the basic rights of Americans is to disagree. Without discussing the motives of either of the two Senators involved, I should like to talk about something pleasant. I wish to talk about the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BREWSTER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for 1 minute, if he may do so without losing the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Senator from New Mexico may yield to the Senator from South Dakota, without losing the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a great many fine tributes have been paid today to Members of the Senate who are about to leave this body. The junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is detained in Maine because of the illness of her mother. Were she here I am sure she would initiate the statement which I am about to make concerning my neighbor in the office next to mine on the fourth floor of the Senate Office Building, the senior Senator from Maine, OWEN BREWSTER. As we all know he has met with the fate feared by all of us at the hands of the people at the polling place.

I served in the House of Representatives with OWEN BREWSTER, and have served with him during my brief 4 years in the United States Senate. I have occupied the office next to his during the 4 years I have been in the Senate, and have had unusual opportunity to confer with him on matters of legislative business.

I should like to pay a word of tribute to OWEN BREWSTER as a man, as a public servant, as a leading member of the Republican Party, and as a Member of the United States Senate.

There is a fable to the effect that among the trees of the forest when a mighty oak falls other oaks gallantly dip their boughs and shed a flood of tears. I think OWEN BREWSTER is one of the oaks of the Republican Party. I am sorry to see him leave. I know nothing about his successor. I am sure that he is an estimable gentleman, and I look forward to meeting him.

But as one who has labored in the vineyard for many years with OWEN BREWSTER I salute him as a good, great American, and I wish his family the best of everything as they go up to the cool vastness of Maine shortly after the Senate adjourns.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the seat next to mine was vacated by the death of my distinguished colleague. It is now becoming vacant by the retirement from the Senate of the distinguished senior Senator from Maine. I have served with OWEN BREWSTER in the Senate for 10 years, and I have always found him to be a very able Senator and an outstanding legislator. I pay my tribute to him today, and express the hope that in all that he may undertake in the future he will have happiness and God's blessing and that he will prosper in all his undertakings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a Senator from New England I have always considered Senator BREWSTER as an energetic Senator full of common sense and always having the best interests of New England and the Nation at heart. I, too, am sorry to see him leave.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with all the kind and fine words that have been said

about the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] and the Senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I served in the House of Representatives with the senior Senator from Maine, and I know him well. I want to associate myself with all that has been said about him. My difficulty with the junior Senator from Nebraska and the senior Senator from Maine is politics. Outside of that they are all right, Mr. President.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, as a member of the same class of Senators which came to the Senate in January 1941, I, too, would like to add my endorsement of the fine sentiments which have been expressed in behalf of OWEN BREWSTER.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I said a while ago, I wish to talk about something pleasant. I wish to talk about the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The junior Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, is entitled to commendation for the effort he has made, not only in this session, but throughout his years in the Senate, in behalf of the Indian citizens of his State. Indeed in him they have a friend.

Twice in this final week bills sponsored by the junior Senator from Arizona have passed the Senate. Both reflected the deep regard he has for the Indian citizens of his State and of the whole United States. Each represented his effort to afford them adequately financed rehabilitation programs and equality of opportunity, which many of us like to talk about but about which we do so litte.

He sought for them the benefits of more and better schools, improved highways, and more adequate facilities for their health and welfare.

If these Indian citizens had as ardent champions in the other House of Congress as they have in Senator McFARLAND on this side a more rosy future would lie ahead of them as this Congress comes to a close.

What I mean to convey to the Senate is that Senator McFARLAND does not want to treat the Indian as an immigrant. He wants to treat the Indian as the rest of us would like to be treated, by being given equality of opportunity in every line of endeavor.

The most recent measure authorized by Senator McFARLAND to pass the Senate was S. 107, to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Indians and provide for a better utilization of their resources.

Let me invite the attention of the Senators to a fact which we are likely to forget. I am sure that most Senators have seen the picture of the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima. One of the Marines who helped raise the flag is a Papago Indian by the name of Hayes, who comes from Senator McFARLAND's home State. If they are good enough to raise the flag and if they are good enough to take the chance of dying, why are they not good enough to be the beneficiaries of sound legislation such as proposed by the Senator from Arizona? S. 107 authorized an appropriation of $23,000,000 for capital expenditures over a 10-year period.

A great many of us are inclined to talk a lot about economy. Mr. President, $23,000,000 was appropriated for the Papago Indians in Arizona, to be spent over a period of 10 years. We spent $27,000,000 to deepen the harbor at Athens, Greece. Now our own citizens are going to receive the benefit of the kind-hearted and red-blooded American idea of Americanism.

Senator McFARLAND sought to improve the lot of the 7,000 Indian citizens on the Papago, the San Xavier and the Gila Reservations in southern Arizona in this measure. These people comprise about 1,200 family groups living in 73 scattered villages over the 2,855,021 acres comprising the three reservations. Development of the resources and the development of the people was sought by the junior Senator from Arizona in the bill he successfully saw through the Senate. In the consideration of health needs alone, Senator McFARLAND felt a sympathetic urgency for pressing his bill, pointing out that the death rate of the Papago tribe is about three times the United States average and the infant mortality rate is about six times greater than that of the Nation.

Mr. President, I wish to make that point particularly, because I know how Senator McFARLAND feels about it, and I know how I feel about these Indians. I used the word "sympathetic." I do not like that word. I do not like charity either. I like rights. Those Indians are entitled to rights just as much as the rest of us are entitled to rights. What I admire about Senator McFARLAND is that while his heart bleeds and while he is sympathetic, he is also looking at the problems from the standpoint of giving these poor humans their rights.

A situation likewise speaking for itself, as Senator McFARLAND pressed for passage of his bill, was the fact that less than 40 percent of Papago people speak English, less than 20 percent can read and write, and less than two-thirds of the Papago children of school age are enrolled in schools. Why? They want to speak English. They know that their opportunities will be much better if they can speak English. When they try to gain employment in a store as a clerk, they do not get the job because they cannot speak English. It is not right. We have neglected the Indians, and it is about time that we get busy in their behalf.

Arizona's problem in relation to the Indian is unusual. Two-thirds of all the land in the United States given over to Indian reservations is within the boundaries of Arizona. One-sixth of the total Indian reservation population lives within the borders of that State, and one-tenth of the entire population of the State of Arizona consists of Indians.

The junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has waged many fights for these citizens. Few weeks pass that representatives of one or more of the Arizona Indian tribal councils do not visit the office of the junior Senator from Arizona. He has fought hard battles in their behalf on the floor of the Senate, in committee hearings, and in Washington agencies having some part in their affairs.

The Senator from Arizona, who has shown himself never to be too busy to work on Arizona problems, expended much effort, even during the days of driving the Senate through a crowded schedule to adjournment, in fighting a battle for the Indians. He fought valiantly before the Senate Appropriations Committee to have restored to the bill the funds which had been cut from the appropriation for the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program. In these same strenuous days, he likewise succeeded in getting favorable action on the Senate floor on the appropriations for these people, and for the Papagos of southern Arizona, as well.

The junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was one of the hardest workers in promoting enactment of the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation bill, which he cosponsored in the Eighty-first Congress. This comprehensive plan was designed to change existing chaotic conditions in the Navajo country, and proposed the expenditure of $88,570,000 over a 10-year program. The program involved improvement and enlargement of school facilities, construction of roads connecting key points on both reservations, soil and water conservation, range improvement, relocation of Indian families on irrigated lands, completion and extension of existing irrigation projects, and the development of additional employment opportunities both on and off the reservations.

In his second endeavor during the final days of this session to aid the Indians of his State and my State, the junior Senator from Arizona was successful in winning Senate approval of a $6,500,000 increase in the amount appropriated for the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation program. Included in this measure also were provisions for schools, roads, and irrigation improvements on the Papago Reservation. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that that was done by vote on the floor of the Senate.

Although the Senate's action was not included in the conference report, undoubtedly it was a factor in averting further cuts in the appropriation already set up for this activity. Therefore, the proposal which was made by the junior Senator from Arizona probably resulted in the appropriation approved being much greater than it would have been if he had not provided the ready target for the economy-mindedness that in the end finds its mark in appropriations made for the Indians. Of course, Mr. President, some persons always wish to economize at the expense of the Indians.

The importance of this aid to the Navajo people, particularly the provision for schools, is tremendous, when it is realized that of the approximately 26,000 Navajo children of school age, 15,000 have no schooling because there are

no schools for them. Another 5,000 have spasmodic schooling, but insufficient to turn them out as literate people.

Mr. President, nowadays we hear a great deal about treaties and we are told that we have to comply with this treaty with India or that treaty with France or a treaty with England or a treaty with South Africa or a treaty with Austria or a treaty with Germany. Mr. President, the United States made a treaty with the Navajo Nation, as a nation—not as subjects of the United States, not as menials of the United States, but as an independent nation. When the Navajos agreed to come in with us, by solemn treaty entered into by the United States of America, we promised the Navajos that we would educate them. We have failed to carry out that promise.

I am extremely glad that the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has taken this action.

A second measure, also sponsored by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] increased by $200,000 the Interior Department appropriation for range-land development on the Papago Reservation. That amendment was adopted by the Senate, but, like the Navajo amendment, was lost in conference.

The junior Senator from Arizona has served tirelessly as a Member of the "watch dog" committee of Congress, the committee that sees that the intent—and appropriations—of Congress relative to the big rehabilitation program are carried through.

In the first session of the present Congress, the junior Senator from Arizona was the author of a bill to increase by $250,000 an appropriation for an additional water supply on the Navajo Reservation. That bill became Public Law 254.

Mr. President, I know the Indians of the entire West. My folk have been living with the Indians for the last 400 years. The Indians are fine, decent people. They do not want an Indian Bureau; they are not interested in an Indian Bureau.

We know what the Indians want from the United States, as citizens. They want education, just as the rest of us do. They want health, just as the rest of us do. They want water. After that, the Indians want to be left alone.

Today the Indians are doing their duty, just as the rest of us do.

Who are we, Mr. President? I believe my ancestors were among the earliest immigrants to this country. Who are we to treat those poor Indians improperly? They have been abused throughout the centuries, in this white man's country.

Now that we are sermonizing about free peoples, about other peoples throughout the world, let us do the right thing for the Indians.

I am extremely happy to say these few words in tribute to the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], who is so greatly interested in the welfare of the Indians.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me, in order that I may make a brief statement in commendation of what the Senator from New Mexico has said about the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The junior Senator from Arizona and I have served together, now, for a good many years on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We have traveled the country together, visiting a good many Indian reservations.

I believe that he and I see about eye-to-eye on the Indian question.

I was also delighted to hear the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] state that the Indians do not want an Indian Bureau, for the statement he made on that point is in keeping with my own theory and idea of what we owe the Indians.

I think we owe to the Indians of the United States exactly the same treatment that we owe to every other class of our citizenry.

I do not know of any other people, native or immigrant, except the Indians, who have been placed on reservations and held down, instead of being permitted to advance themselves in the way that the people of all other classes of our citizenry are permitted to do.

I dare say that had we treated the immigrants from the other nations of the world, as they came to the United States, in the same way that we have treated the Indians—namely, putting them on reservations and keeping them under the controls under which we have kept the Indians—the peoples who have emigrated to the United States from the other nations of the world would today find themselves in the same situation in which too many of the Indians on the Indian reservations find themselves today, namely, without an education.

So I hope the able junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] will join me, in the forthcoming session, if all of us are here, in an effort to obtain the enactment of a measure which has been proposed so very, very many times.

I believe perhaps it means a little more to me, even, than it does to the Senator from New Mexico, who claims to be a descendant of people who have been the longest in America, for I claim the distinction of having Indian blood in my veins, and consequently I believe my sympathy for the Indians is a little greater, on that account.

Many Indians have graduated from our best colleges and universities. Some, of course, have not advanced as others have advanced, or as we would like to have them all advance. Those poor Indians are not going to advance and make the progress we hope for them until they are given full rights of citizenship and treated as every other American is treated. I believe that even though the Indians may need assistance, it should be given to them exactly as it is given to any other needy American. When they need assistance, they should be treated exactly the same as any other citizen in America. We in Nebraska treat them that way.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the Indian is on the battle front, no special regulations are made for him. When he is being made the target of enemy bullets, no special regulations are made for him. The Communist does not care whether the man who opposes him is of Anglo-Saxon stock, Scotch, or Irish, or whether he is an Indian—he shoots him. So why should the Indian not be accorded equal rights in this country?

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 3333) to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor, and for other purposes.

The message returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 2364) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits.

The message also announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RILEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes.

INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES BY CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution, and ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed by me to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, be printed in the body of the RECORD along with the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 352) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining (1) the amounts of money expended by or for each of the various candidates for President in seeking the nomination of the Democratic or Republican Party for such office, and the amount of money expended by and for the candidates for President in the general election, and the specific purpose for which any such expenditure was made; (2) the identity of any individual, group, firm, or organization which has contributed or expended money for the purpose of assisting any such candidate to receive such nomination, and the amount of money contributed or expended by such individual, group, firm, or organization for such purpose; and (3) any other pertinent facts relating to the means used in the campaigns of such candidates, including the use or promise of patronage, that would be of public interest, and significant to Congress in considering any remedial legislation. The committee shall report its findings and recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

The letter presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

JULY 1, 1952.

Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am introducing a resolution calling for an investigation by your subcommittee of the campaign expenditures of the various presidential candidates of both parties. I am suggesting an immediate investigation because I believe that you and your committee can restore a sense of sanity and responsibility to American political life. Candidates for the Presidency and their supporters are leveling serious charges against one another of political deals and manipulation based upon financial considerations. These charges are serious because they threaten the nominating processes in American political life.

It is very clear that the 1952 campaign will be the most expensive in history, far exceeding the record of $40,000,000 spent by the two parties in 1940. It is reported that both the Democratic and Republican Parties each spent approximately $700,000 for radio and television in 1948. In planning ahead for the fall campaign there seems no doubt in my mind but that the radio and television budgets will probably be double the 1948 size. Some idea of the fabulous cost of television time is illustrated by the National Broadcasting Co. network rate. Half an hour of class A time—between the hours of 6 and 11 p. m. and Saturday and Sunday afternoons—costs $30,365.

The expense of radio and television while a major item, however, is only one of the many costly expenditures in a campaign. Such essentials as campaign buttons, literature, and campaign trains have become extremely expensive with the rising inflation. A witness before your own subcommittee last fall estimated that it would cost at least $450,000 to distribute just one piece of campaign literature to 10,000,000 homes.

This problem is serious because of its effect on the integrity of our political campaigns. We must have a study made as to the actual cost of the national campaign for the Presidency. It is important that we know whether the expenses of such a campaign will be so large as to make the Presidency unattainable for any other than the wealthy or those whom the wealthy support. This problem is particularly significant in the light of the many suggestions which are today being made for a national presidential primary.

Many Americans, furthermore, are seriously disturbed by the charges of political deals, "stealing" of delegates, "smear literature," use of patronage, and the like, being made today by many of the presidential candidates and their supporters. If these accusations are true, we are witnessing a degradation of the nominating process. This can result in an increasing public cynicism about politics, and if the trend is not stopped will, in fact, mean that we have allowed a price tag to be placed on the Presidency. The vote in a democracy is priceless. It is the most sacred heritage of the American people. We must be vigilant in our determination to preserve the electoral process from being put up for sale.

You will recall that in 1920 our Nation was shocked by disclosures concerning campaign expenses and the purchase of delegate votes. It was a Senate committee having the jurisdiction now held by the subcommittee, of which you are the chairman, that brought the facts before the American public. Yet the practices revealed in 1920 are inconsequential in comparison with what is today being communicated by the press, radio, and television to the American people. If attempts are being made today by different candidates to purchase delegates in order to insure victory, the American people must know the facts. The first of our political parties' national nominating conventions will begin very shortly. It is, therefore, urgent that your subcommittee begin to investigate immediately, in the hopes that the facts can be made available at the earliest possible date.

You are well aware of the danger to democracy when money becomes the decisive factor in the selection of public officials. You said:

"The situation has become worse and worse. More and more loopholes have been found by which the purposes of the law are avoided. Expenditures of exorbitant sums have reached an unconscionable point. Unless we can control it in some way no man of moderate means can possibly conduct a campaign."

One of the most effective weapons by which to preserve the integrity of our democratic electoral system is truth and full disclosure of all the facts. The American public is entitled to know the sources of campaign funds being raised by candidates for public office.

In your hands, and in the hands of your subcommittee colleagues, lies the power to ascertain the facts for the American people. With regard to the activities of those candidates for the Republican and Democratic nomination for President, it is imperative that light be shed as soon as possible. I urge you and your subcommittee to assert legal and moral compulsion on all candidates to disclose the source of their funds, the manner in which those funds are expended, and to identify, register, and assume responsibility for all committees operating in behalf of those candidates for the Presidency with their knowledge and consent.

I am well aware that some or all of the accusations being leveled in the midst of the heat of a political campaign may be exaggerated or untrue. This, too, is a fact of value to the American voter. The truth is not complicated. The American people deserve the truth.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the light of the tremendous cost of campaigns, I think this resolution should bring forth a very worth-while investigation and study.

INTEGRATION OF FIRE DEPARTMENT FORCES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared in reference to the work of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and pertaining to their program of integration of the fire department forces in the District of Columbia. With that I attach a series of photostatic copies of communications which I have received from other parts of the country where such a program has been undertaken, where it has proved outstandingly successful, and has greatly improved the quality of the professional ability of those who serve in the department. I ask unanimous consent that my statement, together with the photostatic copies of communications thereto attached, be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement, with attached communications, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUMPHREY

With the Senate session coming to an end I want to address a few words to the Senate and to the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia with regard to the decision that they made last October 2, integrating the fire department forces in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the segregation of white and colored firemen. I desire to commend the Commissioners for their most democratic and intelligent decision. I am, however, deeply concerned over the 9-month delay in putting the integration order into effect.

The recommendation for integration of the fire department came last fall from Washington Fire Chief Mayhew. His recommendation had one purpose in mind, that of improving the efficiency and the operation of the fire department. When a fire starts, lives and property are at stake. There is a job to be done and it is inhumane, insensitive, wasteful and unwise to ask whether the people in the burning house are white or colored. It is likewise ridiculous to debate whether white firemen or colored firemen should be called to protect the lives and property.

The evidence is clear and unmistakable that more "so-called" white fire companies in the District of Columbia are now under strength and have been called on to do their duty with insufficient manpower. It is also clear that there are many surplus fire fighters in "so-called" colored companies who because of the arbitrary and artificial rule of segregation cannot be transferred to the companies where they are needed. This is a threat to the safety of lives and property in the Nation's Capital. The present system of segregation is wasteful of manpower and funds.

More than mere efficiency is involved in the problem of racial segregation, however. It is important that we in the United States practice the democracy that we preach. It is particularly important that our Capital City, Washington, D. C., be a model for democratic behavior. It was with that in mind that I heartily welcomed the order of the Commissioners. It is with that in mind that I urge the Commissioners in the District of Columbia to proceed to carry out that integration order without any further delay. We must show to the world that we in the United States judge a man by his worth, by the job he can do, and not by the color of his skin.

There is no doubt in my mind but that integration can work. There is evidence to

that effect. I shall like at this point to put in the RECORD, copies of letters from some of the public officials of the city of St. Paul, Minn., testifying to the success of integration in the fire department in that city.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 10, 1952.*

Mr. DON S. WILLNER,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: With reference to the Davis bill, which comes before Congress in the very near future, let me give you my observations regarding the integrating of Negroes and whites.

Prior to October 13, 1942, we had maintained a group of 12 Negroes, segregated to one engine company. On the above date we integrated these 12 men amongst the white companies and found that—

1. These men were well received and treated as equal among all white companies on which they were placed.

2. There were no quarrels, other than those which the whites had in their company arguments.

3. The efficiency of the men was as good, and, in some cases, better than those of the whites.

4. No resignations took place because of the integration.

5. The over-all efficiency of the department remained the same.

I was made district fire chief September 2, 1931, and assistant chief in 1943, and am still chief of the third district. I had very close contact with the different companies where integration took place.

Respectfully yours,
ROY J. LANGEVIN,
Third District Chief, St. Paul Fire Department, St. Paul, Minn.

CITY OF WEST ST. PAUL,
West St. Paul, Minn., January 11, 1952.

Re Negro firemen working with white firemen.

To Whom It May Concern:

Prior to October 1942 the city of St. Paul had one fire company of all Negro men. October 13, 1942, I disbanded this fire station and moved these Negro men to the various other fire companies within the city.

I left this department June 1948 on retirement, but from 1942 until my retirement we have never had any trouble or dissatisfaction among the Negro firemen and the white firemen.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM J. SUDEITH,
Fire Chief.

CITY OF ST. PAUL,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
January 8, 1952.

To Whom It May Concern:

We have never had any trouble in our fire department between white men and Negroes, that has been brought to our attention. We haven't found that it cuts down the efficiency of a fire company.

There were no resignations that have been brought to our attention because of the integration; nor have we any idea of any firemen publicly changing their minds in regard to this situation.

This information that I am conveying to you is my experience with the situation since I have been chief, from June 14, 1949, up to and including the present time.

WM. H. MATTOCKS,
Fire Chief.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 9, 1952.*

Mr. JOHN M. CULVER,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. CULVER: For at least 60 years the city of Saint Paul, Minn., has employed a number of Negro firemen. Prior to 1942 these Negro firemen were assigned as a unit to a fire station where only Negroes were employed.

One of the problems arising from this arrangement came when appointments to the force or promotions were to be made. In these instances, Negroes on the civil service eligible lists were required to waive their rights when a white man was to be appointed or promoted, and white eligibles were, in like fashion, required to waive their rights when a Negro was to be appointed or promoted. Upon waiving right of appointment or promotion the eligible at that time did not lose his standing on the civil service lists.

During 1942 our civil service bureau ruled that the name of any person waiving appointment or promotion was to be removed from the eligible lists. At this time, I (then Commissioner of Public Safety and administrative head of the Fire, Police, and Health Bureaus) together with the then Fire Chief William J. Sudeith, decided it would be necessary to discontinue the Negro-manned fire station and to assign the Negro firemen to stations manned formerly by white firemen only.

The change was made effective October 13, 1942, and has resulted in an equitable method of appointment and promotion in the Fire Department. There has been no loss of efficiency, nor has there been any dissension or friction caused by this change. No one has resigned his position because of this, nor has there been any increase in the number of Negroes employed. From my observation, this arrangement has proven to be entirely satisfactory.

Very truly yours,
G. H. BARFUSS,
Commissioner of Public Safety from June 1936 to June 1948.

CITY OF ST. PAUL,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
January 11, 1952.

Mr. JOHN M. CULVER,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. CULVER: I have checked into the matter of the employment of Negroes in the St. Paul fire department, and have been informed that for at least 60 years one fire station was serviced exclusively by Negroes.

All city employees were placed under civil service in 1914 and were subject to examination. When a vacancy occurred or a promotion was to be made at the fire station manned by Negroes, the white eligibles were required to waive their rights, and more often Negroes would have to waive appointment or promotions when white men were needed at other fire stations. This arrangement in no way affected the standing of the eligibles on the civil service lists.

However, in 1942 the civil service bureau ruled that any person waiving appointment or promotion would be dropped from the eligible lists. Shortly thereafter the Negro-manned fire station was closed, and the men were assigned to other stations throughout the city.

I have been Commissioner of Public Safety, with jurisdiction over police, health and fire bureaus since June 1948 and it is my opinion that the arrangements in effect for the appointment and promotion of both Negro and white firemen has worked out satisfactorily, without dissension or friction. Eligibles are appointed and promoted as their names appear on civil service lists, regardless of race or color.

Very truly your,
ROBERT F. PETERSON,
Commissioner of Public Safety.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF GLADYS MORELOCK TO BE SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT, DENVER, COLO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, an hour or so ago I called up the nomination of Gladys Morelock to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., and, as in executive session, endeavored to obtain confirmation of the appointment. However, I learned that an understanding had been reached on the Senate floor that nominations coming to the Senate today could not be confirmed.

This, Mr. President, is a special case. The Office of the Superintendent of the Mint at Denver is a very responsible position. Since there is a huge vault filled with gold and silver, a heavy bond is required. The Superintendent oversees the work of approximately 400 employees. Coins are being made in the mint as rapidly as possible because of the great shortage of coinage. There is a tremendous amount of work to be done. The former Superintendent died, and it became necessary to find a replacement. Recommendations were made to the Secretary of the Treasury some weeks ago, but it was necessary for the FBI to make a very careful and thorough examination of the applicant. The matter has perhaps dragged along more than necessary, the nomination having reached the Senate floor only this afternoon.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other members of the Finance Committee cooperated and recommended that the nomination be confirmed. I know that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] recognizes that there is an emergency, but he felt it his duty to oppose a unanimous-consent request. He has requested me to obtain certain information with respect to this nomination, and I have made every effort to do so.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Would the Senator care to answer three or four questions I should like to propound to him on this matter?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should be very glad to do my best to answer any questions.

Mr. CASE. First of all, has this nomination been considered by the committee, either at a session of the committee, or through an individual poll of the members of the committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. A poll was conducted this afternoon. We have had no meetings.

Mr. CASE. What was the result of the poll?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The result of the poll was approval on the part of every member whom we were able to contact. Mrs. Springer, chief clerk of the Senate Finance Committee, conducted a poll of members of the committee. One or two of the members she was unable to contact. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was in Chicago. I made a long-distance telephone call. I talked to Mrs. Dorothy A. McRae, his executive secretary, who told me she was certain it was all right, but that she would contact the Senator and if it was not all right, she would call back within 20 minutes. It has now been more than 3 hours since I talked with her, and she has not called back; so I am satisfied that it has the approval

of my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado. He is acquainted with the nominee, and I am sure has given the approval which Mrs. McRae stated she felt certain he would give.

Mr. CASE. Did a majority of the committee, as polled, express approval of the nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, a majority of the committee did. I think there were seven or eight members of the committee who were contacted, and who gave their approval.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the Senator from Colorado that I regard the attitude of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] as important in this matter, because, for one thing, he is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance, and, for another, he is from the State of Colorado. I think the contact with him was a little weak, but it can be understood that, in view of the responsibilities which the Senator from Colorado has at Chicago, he personally might have been unable to return the call. But the senior Senator from Colorado, of course, knows the administrative assistant of the junior Senator from Colorado, and I accept his statement on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I want to say to the Senator that I made every effort to reach my colleague, the junior Senator from Colorado, personally, and was unable to do so, because he was in a conference, performing the work he is supposed to perform on the resolutions committee of the Republican National Committee.

Mr. CASE. Did the Senator explore the possibility of filling this position through a recess or temporary appointment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As nearly as I have been able to ascertain, the Superintendent of the Mint is required to post a very heavy bond. I have been advised that, if the Senate failed to confirm the appointment, it would add to the difficulties in connection with the furnishing of bond. As a matter of fact, in view of the tremendous responsibilities involved in the position, I may say that this position could not be given to me, particularly in view of the size of the bond which is required. I would not under any circumstances have the job. But I suppose there are people who will take a chance of any kind. Of course, it is necessary for the applicant to undergo very careful scrutiny by the FBI. The present nominee has been subjected to that scrutiny, and has been approved, of course; otherwise the President would not have sent the nomination to the Senate.

Mr. CASE. For what term is the appointment to be made? What is the unexpired term? Is it a term of years, or what is the situation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I was unable to get in touch with the Treasury Department, but I talked to Mr. Bailey, who is the executive clerk in charge of nominations in the Senate, and he stated that it was his understanding that the Superintendent of the Mint held office at the pleasure of the President. We expect to have another President on January 20. The term of office of the Superintendent of the Mint would be only until the 20th of January, or at the pleasure of the President. There is no regular term.

Mr. CASE. By his answer, the Senator has indicated that he expects a new man in the White House after January 20.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. President Truman said there would be someone else in the White House on the 20th of January, and I think he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. CASE. In view of the statements which the Senator has made, if he cares to renew his request at this time, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed and the President will be notified.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a number of Senators have bills which have not been acted upon. There were two bills reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning, and one bill on the calendar which was objected to, but the objection has now been withdrawn. Members on both sides of the aisle, I think, would like to see some of these bills passed, but it is almost impossible to draw a line. Several Senators have objected, and there is nothing I can do about it.

Except for those three bills, so far as I know, the work as to which notice has been given is concluded.

One of the bills is Calendar No. 2019, House bill 6558.

I am assured by the minority leader that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would like to withdraw his objection, and I ask that that bill be called up at this time.

GEORGE BLECH AND OTHERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6558) for the relief of George Blech and others.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I understand that this bill and two bills reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, one affecting an airport in New Jersey, and the other, in California, were agreed upon by the minority leader and the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. A report has been filed. Notice was given yesterday by the majority leader that they would come up today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. These are the last three bills that the majority leader knows about?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think there should be a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I am not the author or the manager of the bill. The Senator who reported the bill was the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am acting for the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] who had to leave. He objected to the consideration of the bill yesterday, but when he received a full and complete explanation of it, he desired to withdraw his objection.

I hold in my hand a letter from the Department of the Navy addressed to the Senator from Kansas in which the bill is explained. The amount involved is $2,383.19. It has to do with 11 soldiers. It is a sort of rebate of their moving expenses. I presume it might be well to ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD the letter from the Department of the Navy to the Senator from Kansas, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: At the direction of Mr. Whitehair, the Under Secretary of the Navy, I am contacting you with regard to H. R. 6558, a bill "For the relief of George Blech and others," which passed the House on May 6, 1952.

Mr. Whitehair has asked me to advise you that Senator FERGUSON has been contacted by an officer affected by this bill and has agreed to withdraw his objections.

Mr. Whitehair also directed me to explain to you the reasons why the enactment of H. R. 6558 will not give rise to similar legislation in behalf of other officers of the Navy or other services.

In the first place, no case similar to those covered in this bill could arise after April 1, 1951, because of the issuance of joint travel instructions which clarify the authority to make the type of shipments which had been disallowed by the Comptroller General under earlier travel instructions in the 11 cases involved in this bill. Insofar as the Department of the Navy is concerned, all cases arising prior to the issuance of the joint travel instructions on April 1, 1951, have been reviewed on their merits and the Department of the Navy has supported the 11 cases involved in H. R. 6558 and has rejected all other cases and will not support them now or in the future.

Insofar as the Army is concerned, that Department has thoroughly investigated the matter and has determined that there are no legislative proposals pending in the Department of the Army to grant similar relief with respect to the shipment of household effects and that there do not appear to be any members of the Army affected by the situation or situations which gave rise to the introduction of H. R. 6558.

With regard to the Department of the Air Force, inasmuch as it was operating under Department of the Army regulations up until the issuance of joint travel regulations on April 1, 1951, the thorough investigation of this matter conducted by the Department of the Army would have revealed any Air Force cases of this type, and none were revealed.

In view of the relatively small cost of this bill to the Government, $2,383.19, as compared to the financial importance to the individuals

affected, your assistance in obtaining reconsideration and passage of H. R. 6558 on the floor of the Senate is earnestly requested.

Sincerely,

E. C. STEPHAN,
Captain, United States Navy, Director, Legislative Division.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is the only explanation I can give of the bill. It was reported favorably by the Judiciary Committee, without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 6558) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELEASE TO CITY OF CAMDEN, N. J., OF TITLE TO LAND

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] may bring up the bills which he wished to have considered and which were objected to this morning.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Reserving the right to object, what has transpired to change the situation after the bills were objected to?

Mr. McFARLAND. The reason why they were objected to was because of some difficulty occurring because a number of Senators wanted to bring other bills up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The first bill is House bill 5954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5954) to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this involves a grant of land. The Senator from Oregon has made a study of the matter, we know he has scrutinized it very carefully, I think he is entitled to the commendation of the Senate for scrutinizing grants on the part of the Federal Government to State agencies.

This particular bill is very important to the two Senators from New Jersey, and they are very anxious to have it passed. They have discussed the matter with the Senator from Oregon, and I shall be glad to yield to him at this time and let him make a statement with respect to the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to make a statement on the two bills mentioned by the Senator from Colorado in regard to their relationship to the so-called Morse formula in connection with the disposition of surplus public property.

I have studied the New Jersey bill very carefully, and I want the RECORD to show this analysis of the bill on my part so that it will be thoroughly understood in future sessions of the Congress that the Morse formula was not applicable to the facts in this particular bill.

The facts show that in 1928 the Federal Government conveyed property to the city of Camden, N. J., for certain public uses set forth in the conveyance. What this bill really sums up to, so far as its legal implications are concerned, is that it seeks to perfect the title which was clearly intended to be conveyed in the conveyance in 1928.

The conveyance was for the purpose of public use of this property in the city of Camden, N. J. I want to make it very clear that if I had been in the Senate of the United States in 1928, and if the Morse formula had been in existence at the time this conveyance was made, I undoubtedly would have objected to the consideration of the bill which was passed at that time. But I do not feel that I have any right at this time to seek to correct a mistake which was made in 1928 in regard to a possible reversionary interest the Federal Government may have in this piece of property.

What the city of Camden, N. J., seeks to do is to build on this property, which was conveyed in the first instance for park purposes, a terminal facility for busses to accommodate the public who go to the property, under the conveyance of 1928, for recreational purposes, and for other benefits which thereby accrue to the citizens when they go to a piece of property set aside for park purposes and other public uses.

The only question raised by the city of Camden is whether or not, in view of the conveyance of 1928, the Federal Government might have some reversionary interest that would conflict with the use of a very small part of this park or property for the purpose of building a bus terminal.

By way of analogy for illustrative purposes, there is in Washington, D. C., the Zoological Park, at the entrance of which there are terminal facilities to accommodate people who go to the park by way of public transportation.

In my judgment, in view of the purpose of the conveyance in 1928, I could not, by the most elastic stretch of the imagination, find an application of the Morse formula to this piece of property. Therefore, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of H. R. 7126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7126) to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish, for purposes of future reference, to make a statement for the RECORD in regard to this conveyance.

The facts in the case show that there is involved about two-fifths of an acre of Federal property near the entrance to a Federal dock and Maritime Commission facility located on 20 acres of Federal land. This two-fifths of an acre of land is needed for improving the highway that runs adjacent to the Federal Maritime Commission facilities and docks. The State of California is willing to fill in the land and build an improved highway across it, so that it will be available for the use of the Federal Government in making more efficient use of the Maritime Commission facility located on the 20-acre tract of Federal land, of which the two-fifths of an acre is a part.

Mr. President, I think it would be a very good horse trade for the Federal Government to enter into with the State of California because I have satisfied myself that the monetary benefit which the Federal Government would receive from the improvement and use of the Federal facilities located on the 20 acres of land justifies deeding the two-fifths of an acre of land to the State of California for highway purposes.

Therefore, I wish the RECORD to show clearly that, in my judgment of the facts, the Federal Government is getting many times in benefit the value of the two-fifths of an acre of land involved in this transfer. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] which he was unable to make before leaving the city.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL

Yesterday the Vice President laid before the Senate a letter from the Department of Agriculture transmitting a supplemental report on the Missouri River Basin agricultural program. If my information is correct, that report contains five watershed projects which the Department feels should be given top priority.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate that on May 16 Senators BUTLER, SEATON, KEM, HENNINGS, MILLIKIN, JOHNSON of Colorado, and I directed a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture urging that this action be taken so that consideration might be given to these projects during this session by the Congress.

I know that it is useless for me to plead with my colleagues to stay in session so that this report might be considered. I, therefore, urge the Committee on Agriculture to give it top-priority treatment when Congress reconvenes.

One of these projects, the Blue River watershed, is in my home State of Kansas.

Recently I appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Functions and urged that appropriations be made available for the construction of a dry dam on Tuttle Creek, a project which the engineers have recommended for years as one of the key projects for the control of floods.

The committee recommended that funds be granted and the matter is now pending in conference.

I do not think this is the complete solution to the problem for such a project will not be of value to smaller floods that occur above the dam site. The solution for such floods lies in a watershed program.

I should therefore like to see both the Department of Agriculture program and the engineers' program begun in this area. I think that a program of this nature would be of untold value to Congress in determining how funds should be spent on other projects.

ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BY POPULAR VOTE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, there is one matter to which I desire to direct the attention of the Senate as this Congress ends.

I have been in the Senate 11 years. When I came here, I had the great honor of being a member of the Committee on the Judiciary at the time the late George Norris was also a member of that committee. Prior to that time he had been chairman of the committee.

It always seemed to me that one of the greatest fights Senator Norris ever made on the Senate floor was the one in which he endeavored, some 25 years ago, to obtain passage of a joint resolution seeking the adoption of a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct election of the President by the votes of the people. For 3 weeks, some years ago, Senator Norris fought desperately to have that measure passed by the Senate after it had been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. I have read every word of that famous debate, when one amendment after another was introduced, until the measure he had introduced was in such shape that Senator Norris himself could not even recognize it, and finally voted against it.

Mr. President, what is the record covering elections of Presidents in this country? In the recent history of the United States, especially in the last 50 or 60 years, when there has been a convention—I would not say every time, but almost every time—there have been charges of delegates being bought, charges of fraud, charges of corruption. Within the last week we have seen all these charges renewed.

All of us remember that at the time Wendell Willkie was nominated, a representative of a great banking firm went to the Philadelphia convention to provide forged tickets of admission, and filled the galleries with fellows who shouted, "We want Willkie, We want Willkie. We want Willkie."

Later, a Mr. Sparks, representing the Arizona delegation, under oath said he had been offered a sum of money if he would deliver the votes of the delegates from the State of Arizona, chiefly because Arizona voted right near the top when the roll of States was called. I do not intend in any way by saying that to be derogatory toward Arizona. It just happened that the name of that State begins with the letter A.

Mr. President, in an endeavor to give the people of the United States the same right to elect their President, as they have a right to elect their governors, Representatives in Congress, and United States Senators, I have introduced bills to accomplish that purpose. I may say that there was a time in the history of our country when the people could not even vote for governors. The governors were appointed.

In my lifetime, I remember that my father, as a member of the Legislature of North Dakota, told me how that legislature was tied up for 60 days in a deadlock over who should be elected United States Senator from the State of North Dakota, and how practically all other business was laid aside because that fight influenced the passage of other legislation.

So I came here determined to back up Senator Norris in his great attempt to have a constitutional amendment reported out, if he possibly could. I am happy to say that I have made some progress. We all remember that our boys have been sent across the water to fight for democracy. The record shows that in some of the very countries where our sons went to fight for democracy, the percentage of people who had suffrage voted in higher ratio for their chief officials than did the people of the United States of America.

A little while ago the President of the United States sent down a message in which he said he wanted to appoint a commission to study the entire problem as to why more people in the United States did not vote. To mention some of the bills which the senior Senator from North Dakota introduced, there was one in which I provided that if a man or woman let two elections go by without voting he would lose his citizenship. I could not get that bill out of the committee.

I tried to follow the law in Australia, where a man or woman who does not vote at an election is fined. I could not get that bill out of the committee.

I introduced a bill similar to the law in some South American countries, where qualified voters are fined if they do not vote at an election.

I have had the same bill pending in practically the same form before the Judiciary Committee for approximately 7 years. I was very fortunate in this Congress, finally, to have it brought up as a substitute bill for one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. A very strange thing happened in the debate. The bill introduced by the Senator from Minnesota was closely modeled after the constitutional amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. He secured only 20 votes. That bill did not provide for the direct election of candidates for President and Vice President at a primary election. My substitute at that time provided that in the month of June in each year, in both the Democratic and Republican Parties—and I might add that I also provided for independent parties—every one who wanted to run for President should run just as candidates run today for United States Senator or Governor. In the present controversy we would find Mr. Stassen, and possibly Mr. Dewey—certainly Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. TAFT—all as candidates. In the month of June it would be decided which one of those men was the choice of the Republican Party. Likewise, all the candidates desiring to run on the Democratic ticket, and who filed petitions, would be candidates, and the Democrats would choose their candidate. In the month of November the people, having nominated the candidates of their respective parties, would fight it out.

I am familiar with the bill which was introduced by my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] some months ago, a measure which received no recognition whatever from anyone in authority, but which was very popular with many of the leading liberal newspapers in the United States, and, I might add, with some of the leading statesmen of the United States.

I rise today to say that I am hopeful of being reelected United States Senator from the State of North Dakota next November. I serve notice now that in case I am reelected I shall reintroduce the proposed constitutional amendment providing for the direct election of President and Vice President by the people of the United States. I feel very hopeful of its passage. Although the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was able to obtain only 20 votes for his proposal, without the primary feature, the senior Senator from North Dakota received 33 votes for his proposal, with the primary feature, or the votes of one-third of all the Members of the United States Senate. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] was absent, and was paired in favor of it, making 34 votes, far more than have ever been secured in the history of the United States for such a measure on the floor of the Senate.

So today, as Congress adjourns at the end of this session, I serve notice that upon my return I intend promptly to reintroduce the proposal for a constitutional amendment. I hope other Senators will join me. There will be a ceaseless, unremitting, and almost ruthless fight to give the people of the United States an opportunity to vote for the man whom they want to make their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. If we can get that measure through, I think the people of the country will be much more interested in voting on election day than they are in some States in every part of the country, where men and women do not go to the polls because they say, "Well, what is the use? We are outvoted anyway."

With this measure, under which all the votes would be counted in the primary, I think we would find democracy really functioning the way I believe it should function in a great republic.

BREAD STANDARDS ISSUED BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter, dated July 3, 1952, from the Cooperative League of the United States to Hon. Oscar Ewing, Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, relating to the bread standards recently issued by that Agency—and I think I may designate them as very unfair bread standards—together with a statement which I have prepared and some letters of my own on the same subject.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

In my view, the Cooperative League has been making a worthy effort to make a superior quality of bread available to the public, over the limitations and restrictions on certain nutritious ingredients which the Food and Drug Administration has persuaded Mr. Ewing to write into the bread regulations.

It is regrettable that while somewhat improved, the issued bread standards still seem to ban the elementary right of the Cooperatives' McCay-formula bread to compete in the regular bread market. It is shocking that the press release of Mr. Ewing on this bread misstates the facts so completely as to declare: "The McCay-formula bread has never been marketed as ordinary white bread," whereas, in fact, it has been so marketed for some time and production is now reported to exceed half a million loaves a day. The claim that confusion of buyers would result from permitting sale of this bread as regular bread is also outlandish in view of the open-formula labeling (describing its contents fully) on the cooperative bread wrappers.

I hope these final efforts of the Cooperative League to market the McCay-formula bread may be successful, and that the poor, unorganized consumer won't be made to suffer once again because some persons are unwilling to allow a superior bread to compete with the established, commercial breads in the regular bread market.

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., July 3, 1952.

Mr. OSCAR EWING,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: You will remember that the Cooperative League filed formal exceptions to the proposed standards for bread, white bread, and enriched bread, when those standards were published in the Federal Register, August 8, 1950.

The Cooperative League's exceptions were supported by accompanying letters submitted by the American Federation of Labor, Congress of Industrial Organizations, National Grange, National Farmers Union, National Association of Consumers, and the International Association of Machinists.

The final statement of the bread standards and their effective date, which we understand is August 14, 1952, faces us with several important decisions which we must make before that date. Since you were unwilling to talk with us prior to the final pronouncement of the standard, we would like very much to have your advice and counsel at this stage inasmuch as it will now seriously affect our operations.

In the Federal Register for May 15, 1952, on page 4456, paragraph 26, declares in connection with the sale of "golden triple rich bread" that "it is notable that the present label which appears to misrepresent the product as three times as rich as enriched bread bears neither the term bread unqualified nor white bread." The news release which was issued by the Food and Drug Administration declared that the co-op bread had never been sold as white bread.

This is in reference, as you know, to the formula of bread developed by Dr. Clive M. McCay, of Cornell University. Contrary to this statement is the fact that the consumer cooperatives in many areas from the east coast to the Pacific have produced and sold this bread as white bread. In addition, 35 commercial bakeries are baking, distributing and selling this bread as bread, white bread or enriched bread. As Morris Messing, treasurer of Messing Bakeries, Inc., declared in a letter to Senator PAUL DOUGLAS April 25, "Contrary to the belief of Commissioner Malcolm R. Stephens, Cornell Recipe Bread is being sold as a while bread. Frankly, we would be at a loss to know what else we could call it."

You will be interested to note further that Mr. Messing says, "It would be only fair for us to state that we did not originally promote the sale of this bread but that the demand came to us from schools, hospitals, and parent-teacher organizations. We have had it on the retail market since last September and during that time we have received a substantial amount of fan mail. This is a rather unusual occurrence in the baking business; so it is apparent that the Cornell formula bread has awakened considerable interest and is desired by the consuming public."

You will see from the above evidence that there is a substantial problem in the labeling of the McCay formula bread. We will be happy to give you a list of the bakers now producing the bread if you feel that would be of value to you in advising us as to our program of action.

As you will notice from the above quotation from the Federal Register, the Food and Drug Administration insinuates that the cooperative and other use of the label "Golden Triple Rich Bread" misrepresents the product as three times as rich as enriched bread. This apparently was an afterthought on the part of the FDA, for we had been in correspondence with officials of that agency for many months before the argument was used against us. No one in our organization or in the cooperatives associated with us had any intention of implying by the term "triple rich" that the bread was three times as rich as enriched bread. That concept apparently occurred to some official of Food and Drug seeking to find an argument against including the McCay formula bread within the white-bread standards.

We have asked Commissioner Crawford whether Food and Drug would be willing to allow us to call this bread either bread or white bread if the term "Golden Triple Rich" were not used. Our cooperatives are not wedded to that label. Dr. Crawford has not indicated that the dropping of the label would affect our use of the word "Bread" or white bread, indicating that Food and Drug Administration's concern with that title is merely academic.

The standards, in our judgment, by setting a ceiling on the quantity of nutritious elements which may be used in bread or white bread or enriched bread, provide a straightjacket of mediocrity which does not encourage the improvement of white bread, but freezes the bread at the current, comparatively low level of quality. There is a danger, we feel, that if the consumer in general learns that white bread has a ceiling on worthwhile ingredients and never tells on its label what the bread contains, it will be too easy for the consumer to say, "If it is marked white bread, don't bother to eat it."

To restate the situation, we would like to point out that the white bread which we are now distributing contains 8 pounds of nonfat dry milk solids, 6 pounds of full-value soy flour, 2 pounds of wheat germ, plus the usual ingredients of yeast, salt, sugar, and fat, for each 100 pounds of enriched, unbleached white flour. We have encouraged our organizations to print the ingredients on the label as an open formula. This follows a long-established policy in other sections of the consumer cooperative movement. Many of our cooperatives are using this open formula, and some of the regular commercial bakers follow that same practice.

Dr. McCay has not copyrighted the bread formula and draws no financial return from it. The Cooperative League of the United States of America also has no financial stake in the production or distribution of the bread.

Dr. McCay's testimony before the original hearings pointed out the scientific tests made in connection with the development of the bread, and pointed out that this formula gives a high-quality protein economically, increases the calcium in the food, and increases the riboflavin. This process also has an important value to the country in using up valuable agricultural surpluses. It provides a more nutritive quality as a yardstick for other baked products, and increases public respect for bread, and increases bread consumption. We concur.

We will not at this time go into the efforts which have been made by the Food and Drug Administration and others to discredit the McCay formula, but that itself would warrant investigation on your part.

The following questions and the answers to them, we feel, are pertinent and would help us in arriving at our course of action:

1. In your interpretation of the process of standardization, do you feel that standards of identity should simply reflect the current practices within an industry; or do you feel that the standards set should be sufficiently high to encourage a constant increase of quality within the industry?

2. Would you advise the cooperative movement and the commercial bakers now producing this bread to discontinue their efforts for securing a high upper limit in the standard of identity for bread; or should they seek, through your office and the Food and Drug Administration, to secure an additional standard of identity pitched at a level of quality above the current standard?

3. If the standard for white bread must stand as promulgated by the Food and Drug Administration, is it necessary to identify the white bread standard with the word bread? In other words, could our organizations continue to describe our product as bread if we dropped the word white? Is it logical to make the term synonymous with white bread?

4. Would you encourage our organizations to continue to sell our product as bread and white bread within State boundaries, but print separate labels to be used where they cross State boundaries in the sale of the bread?

5. If the bread standard is to be effective August 14, will there be a grace period during which we can use up our current bread and white bread labels; or must these be discontinued and destroyed prior to the effective date?

We are sure you are aware of the fact that white bread is now the dominant product in the bread market and is responsible, along with enriched bread, for approximately 85 percent of the total bread consumption of America. The Food and Drug Administration has recommended that we change our labels and sell the McCay formula bread as a specialty bread. This would take the product out of the major white bread market and require an extensive educational campaign to convince consumers that white bread is not a good buy for them and that they should buy some other product.

Our course of action to date has been to remain within the white bread market and

serve as a yardstick to help raise the level of the entire white bread product by selling a better product within this field. We have felt the cooperatives could be of greater public service following this procedure. The fact that 35 commercial bakers are producing this bread to distribute in the general market is evidence, we believe, of the soundness of our position.

Sincerely yours,

THE COOPERATIVE LEAGUE,
WALLACE J. CAMPBELL.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1951.

Hon. OSCAR EWING,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: I am disturbed by reports which I have received concerning the proposed ceilings on nutritious elements like soy flour, wheat germ, and milk solids in the bread standards soon to be issued by you. It is my earnest hope that you will review this issue with the utmost care before approving maximum standards that may unfairly limit competition in the bread industry, sacrifice the health interests of consumers and seriously reflect upon the Food and Drug Administration.

The memorandum on "The Facts About Bread Standards" from the Food and Drug Administration has come to my attention, and some months ago representatives of the agency made the same explanations to Mr. McCulloch of my staff. I regret that the attitude of FDA has shown no sign of adjustment to what appear to me to be the paramount public interests, and that it becomes necessary to raise these issues directly with you.

To say that the maximum limits on soy flour, milk solids, or other nutritional elements is a "protection" to the consumer and to the producer of these better breads, as the FDA memorandum does, is to employ a sort of "reverse English" for a justification.

If it is a "protection" to anyone, it is a protection to producers of common white breads against the competition of a new and better white bread. It is not claimed the competition is untruthful—for the co-ops would list the ingredients on the package and the consumer would know what he is getting. It is not asserted the competition would be cutthroat—for the new bread will cost a little more. It is not claimed the competition would have unhealthy results on consumers—for the health claims for the new bread are apparently supported by substantial evidence. It is only argued that since most consumers haven't bought such better bread as "white bread" previously, the regulations will not let them buy it as "white bread" now—and thus the estimated 95 percent of the bread market which is now covered by the demand for white bread will be "protected" from a new competitor.

But this is the very competition and fair trial in the market place where public tastes prevail which a free system would be the first to promote. This is the manner in which new and improved discoveries and formulas make their way into public acceptance. It would be ironical indeed if a Government agency designed to promote better foods and drugs should, while promulgating desirable minimum standards, put a ceiling also on nutritious elements. To narrow the scope of permitted competition to specialty breads will unquestionably lead to a suspicion, whether justified or not, that these maximum standards were injected by the bread industry to shut out newcomers. I believe you will agree this would be unfortunate and the use of the phraseology of "protection" will not cover up the actual effect of the regulation.

I will only add that the narrowing of access to the consumer for this new bread not only violates fair principles of competition, it will also be unwarranted hardship for existing producers and consumers of this improved white bread, and it will delay the beneficial health effects for our people who are potential consumers which your agency should be the first to promote.

I sincerely hope that these issues will have your most careful consideration.

You are, as it were, the judge in the handing down of the final decision on this case. The FDA, being a constituent part of your agency, has the fullest opportunity to present and argue its, I believe, mistaken recommendations on this point. I shall be glad to have them review my arguments. But would it not be helpful, as well as fair, in the presence of FDA representatives for you also to hear opposing arguments from such a responsible leader as Jerry Voorhis of the cooperative movement before arriving at your decision?

I shall be grateful indeed for your comments on these important questions and sincerely hope that the consumer interests I have mentioned may have real "protection" in your final decision.

Faithfully,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, April 27, 1951.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I have read with interest your letter of April 16, 1951, concerning the proposed regulations which will establish definitions and standards of identity for several types of bread, including white bread.

The entire matter of bread standards is now under consideration by the Food and Drug Administration. There are a number of controversial questions involved including what limits, if any, should be set on the amount of soy flour and other ingredients in white bread. I expect that in the near future the Food and Drug Administration will make its recommendations to me on all these points. When these recommendations reach me I shall go into the issues very carefully, and until that time I do not feel that I am in a position to discuss these questions with the thoroughness that they deserve.

The position of the Food and Drug Administration, I think, was well presented in the memorandum you referred to—"The Facts About Bread Standards." However, I am asking the Food and Drug Administration to consider the contents of your letter before making its recommendations to me.

OSCAR R. EWING,
Administrator.

DECEMBER 27, 1951.

Hon. OSCAR EWING,
Federal Security Agency,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. EWING: Since my earlier correspondence with you on the subject of the proposed bread standards, the Food and Drug Administration has supplied my office with copies of its statement on these standards and its correspondence with Mr. Wallace Campbell.

Subsequently, Mr. Campbell furnished me with a copy of his reply of July 12, 1951, to Mr. Crawford, of the FDA, which I found to be a very convincing analysis in support of their effort to prevent the imposition of "ceilings" on certain nutritious ingredients in white bread.

No further justification of its position, or information as to its plans, have been brought to my attention by the FDA. And, accordingly, I am writing now to renew my expressions of interest in this important decision and of hope that it will have your personal attention, including a hearing of those outside of FDA who sincerely feel the proposed ceilings on wheat germ, soy flour, and milk solids would be detrimental to consumers.

In reviewing the correspondence, you will find that FDA first relied heavily upon a faulty scientific analysis of the nutrients in cooperative "triple rich" bread. Since Mr. Campbell's letter patiently pointing out these errors, I have seen no answer to or acknowledgment of this point from FDA.

Instead, it seems to have shifted its main argument to the labeling of the cooperative bread. The "open formula" procedure of the cooperative bread producers, putting a list of the ingredients on the wrapper, seems a complete answer to any claim of misrepresentation. Indeed, "triple rich" is just as easily understood to mean "three ways" enriched, as "three times as" rich, and strained interpretation given to the words by FDA. And the open formula enables every buyer actually to know what it means and what he is getting. In any case, I am informed the Cooperative League has offered to sit down and discuss the name under which it is marketing its bread if FDA still has doubts on this point.

The nub of the controversy, however, still is the proposed ceiling on nutritive ingredients in white bread, not its labeling. This, in my opinion, should not be lost sight of in an argument on a side line. The quality of white bread, I am confident you will agree, should not be placed by the Government in a strait-jacket so as to eliminate the competition of better white breads in the market and to prevent the consumer from easy access to a more desirable, even if slightly more expensive, product. No conceivable public interest would seem to be served by such a step.

I do hope, therefore, that you are giving this decision on bread standards your most thoughtful consideration.

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

THE FEDERAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, December 29, 1951.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: I have your letter of the 27th inst. with reference to the proposed bread standards.

Any decision that I make regarding the bread standards must be based on the evidence in the record. The record consists of more than 17,000 pages of testimony and several volumes of exhibits. At the present time I am endeavoring to make a decision in the matter. I shall endeavor to see that you are notified when I make my decision.

With warm personal regards, believe me,

Cordially and sincerely,

OSCAR R. EWING, *Administrator.*

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 981. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Jake Alexander a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 6638. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Calvary Baptist Church, of Anchorage, Alaska, for use as a church site; and

H. R. 7304. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Jennings; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5485. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski;

H. R. 5541. An act for the relief of Capt. Walter C. Wolf;

H. R. 7365. An act for the relief of Clifford Robinson;

H. R. 7368. An act for the relief of Felix Garcia and others;

H. R. 7687. An act for the relief of Jack Carpenter;

H. R. 7827. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; and

H. R. 7917. An act for the relief of Agnes Ishikawa and Shirol Moriyama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7494. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Education to encourage the further development and growth of the educational fine-arts programs in State and land-grant and other accredited nonprofit colleges and universities and in other nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it seems that the Senate has now concluded its business except for the disposition of certain conference reports. For that reason, unless some Senator wishes to address the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 9 o'clock and 1 minute p. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dray Falls Dam.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 48, 51, 52, and 57 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 46 and 53 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 30, 53, and 64 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 32, 50, 67, and 87 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3363. An act to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds;

H. R. 6891. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 7262. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; and

H. R. 7555. An act relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma;

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue; and

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3363. An act to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds;

H. R. 6891. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 7262. An act to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.; and

H. R. 7555. An act relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there were only two items in disagreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is agreement on the conference report. The Chair understands the Senator from Louisiana to refer to two amendments which have not been agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Louisiana would state exactly what is done in the conference report with respect to the Senate amendment numbered 46.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was in the process of stating that, but first the conference report itself should be acted upon. I presume that is what the Vice President had in mind.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a conference report on which there is complete agreement. Then there are two amendments on which the Senate will have to take separate action. The Chair is advised that the amendment in which the Senator from Delaware is interested is one of those amendments.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report itself.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7313, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 48, 51, 52, and 57 to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment insert: "*Provided*, That for the two taxable years beginning after December 31, 1952, the place of residence of a Member of Congress (including any Delegate and Resident Commissioner) within the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which he represents in Congress shall be considered to be his home for the purposes of section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, but amounts expended by such Member within each such taxable year for living expenses shall not be deductible for income-tax purposes in excess of $3,000."

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Section 23 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions for bad debts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) Exception: This subsection shall not apply in the case of a taxpayer, other than a bank, as defined in section 104, with respect to debts owed by (A) any political party, (B) any National, State, or local committee of any political party, or (C) any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of Presidential or Vice Presidential electors or of any individual whose name is presented for election to any Federal, State, or local elective public office, whether or not such individual is elected. For the purpose of this paragraph, the terms 'contributions' and 'expenditure' shall have the meanings prescribed for such terms in section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code."

The amendment made by this paragraph shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert: "Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof, for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including five female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol who shall after June 30, 1952, maintain service in all facilities for the House of Representatives under his jurisdiction for not less than one-half hour after daily adjournment of the House of Representatives; in all $768,975."

Mr. ELLENDER. As will be recalled, when the bill came to the Appropriations Committee from the House it contained a provision, adopted by the House, declaring that for the taxable year beginning after December 31, 1952, the place of residence of a Representative or a Senator was to be his home State. It was thought that that would have permitted him to be in the same position with respect to deducting expenses while in Washington as would be a businessman who came here in the course of his business.

The Senate amended the House language by limiting the amount which could be deducted for living expenses to $2,400. Later the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was adopted by the Senate. The substitute provided that the loans made for political purposes could not for income-tax purposes be charged off and deducted as bad debts. The House conferees were adamant in adhering to the provision the House adopted, namely, to declare that the home of a Member of Congress shall be considered to be in his State, and they objected to the limitation placed in the bill by the Senate.

During a conference which lasted quite some time, the Senate conferees insisted on the limitation of $2,400, as was originally adopted by the Senate, but that was objected to by the House conferees, who insisted on a $4,000 limitation.

After a further conference lasting some time, the conferees unanimously agreed that the amount to be deducted for living expenses should not exceed the sum of $3,000, the provision to be in effect for only two years. In other words, the exemption would not be permanent.

The House conferees were reluctant to do so, but finally agreed to accept the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware; so the report contains the provisions adopted by the House, with the limitation proposed by the Senate, but increasing the amount from $2,400 to $3,000, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand the Senator from Louisiana to say that the House conferees were reluctant to accept my amendment, which would have stopped deductions for income-tax purposes of loans to political campaigns?

Mr. ELLENDER. The House conferees felt, as I did, that it had no place in a legislative appropriation bill. They agreed that the amendment itself was good, but that it should not have been made part of the legislative appropriation bill. That was the only objection on the part of the House conferees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did any Member of the House raise the question that perhaps it was just as much in order as the amendment they offered to the same bill, by which they were taking exemptions back for Members of Congress. Both were amendments to the same section or the Revenue Code.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the subject was discussed pro and con. That particular phase of it was not discussed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Is it not true that one was just as much in order as the other?

Mr. ELLENDER. The House conferees sought to amend the same section of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the point. Both amendments were to the same section of the code.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. However, one of them had a great deal more merit than the other.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat to my distinguished friend that there was no objection on the part of the House conferees to the amendment suggested by the Senator from Delaware, except that that they did not think it should have been attached to an appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am very much interested in the explanation of the Senator from Louisiana. I wish to say for the RECORD that I have never accepted the argument that, by analogy, we stand in a position of businessmen. On the contrary, I think we stand in a position of public servants, with a great public trust. I do not think we are entitled to any such deduction as the conference committee wants to make available to us, even for a 2-year period.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I too, am very much disappointed that this amendment for special tax exemption for Members of Congress was brought back. I was the author of the first amendment to the tax bill in 1951, which was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 77 to 11, by which we repealed all tax exemptions for Members of Congress and the tax exemption for the Vice President and the President of the United States. That was done on the basis that we felt that it was unfair for anyone in public life to have any special tax privileges which were not extended to every other taxpayer.

On the 27th day of June this year the House sent over, in an appropriation

bill, a proposal which would have restored $2,400 of the $2,500 exemption which had been repealed, and by a vote of 67 to 2 the Senate rejected that proposal, struck it out, and adopted the so-called Williams amendment, which would prohibit deductions for income tax purposes of contributions to political parties. At the time everybody agreed that this was wrong. We were all shocked when we first learned that in desperation during the 1948 campaign this questionable device had been resorted to.

I have yet to hear any Member of Congress defend the principle established by the Treasury Department in 1948 when, by a special ruling, it was allowing members of the Democratic Party to write off contributions under the guise of "loans" and, in effect, to finance the campaign out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator indicated that the House had sent to the Senate a proposal for a $2,400 deduction. As the proposal came from the House on the legislative bill, the deduction was not limited.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senate committee recommended an amendment limiting it to $2,400, and when it was reached the Senator from Michigan asked that the amendment be passed over so that he could make some remarks opposing the wording of the amendment and the idea of the amendment providing a deduction so far as Senators and Representatives were concerned. He felt that living expenses were not a proper deduction under any circumstances, nor should the problem be handled in that way. If we are entitled to higher salaries, we should approach the question affirmatively by way of a special bill rather than a tax deduction. I still feel the same way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Michigan. He is correct in stating that as the proposal came over from the House it would have allowed unlimited deductions. The Senate committee limited such deductions to $2,400, and the Senate struck out the entire provision. I think the entire problem of salaries of Members of Congress, of the Vice President, and of the President of the United States should be approached in an affirmative manner. We should fix the salaries at whatever level we believe is proper; but above all, Members of Congress should always pay taxes just as any other American citizen. When we vote for a tax bill to raise taxes 5 or 10 percent, we should be raising taxes on ourselves, to the same extent we raise them with respect to other citizens.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Delaware agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that in effect, the provision which is reported by the conference report amounts indirectly to a salary increase for Members of Congress?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it does. In effect, the House proposal, restoring the deduction in the amount of $3,000, would give Members of Congress more tax exemption than they had before I introduced the bill to repeal the $2,500 exemption. The unfair part of it all is that when we repealed the original provision, on September 27, 1951, by a vote of 77 to 11, we struck out the tax exemption for the Vice President and the President of the United States. I, as one of the sponsors—and I think the Senator from Oregon was a cosponsor of that amendment—had no intention whatever of repealing the tax exemption so far as the President and the Vice President were concerned; any more than I did with respect to our own exemption.

Today it seems to me just a little difficult to understand why the conferees should even consider coming back at this late hour on the last day of the session, and restoring the tax exemption even to a greater degree than it existed before, so far as Members of Congress are concerned, while at the same time they make no mention of the President or Vice President.

It is just as wrong for one as the other. It is a matter of principle involved.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Before I put my next question, let me say that I completely agree with the observations made by the Senator from Delaware. I ask him whether or not he agrees with the junior Senator from Oregon that, in all probability, millions of American citizens will interpret the action which we take tonight, if we adopt the conference report, as another indication on the part of the Congress of the United States that it is not willing to put on the necessary inflationary controls which ought to be put on, because when we vote ourselves an indirect salary increase we are in fact feeding the fires of inflation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the American people will understand or appreciate the fact that Congress, in a period when we have the highest peacetime tax level ever in the history of the country, is voting itself a special tax exemption. I think it is wrong, and I oppose it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. What is the Senator's understanding as to what was done by the action of the conferees with respect to the other portion of the matter in controversy, that is, the amendment to paragraph (23K), which deals with the treatment of loans as possible business losses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The House conferees accepted that amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Senate conferees, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] may make a positive statement on that question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I just finished making the statement that the conferees unanimously adopted the amendment which was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Delaware, which dealt with the deduction of bad debts.

Mr. CASE. So hereafter loans made to political candidates or political parties, and not repaid, cannot be treated as business losses.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I think the Senator from Delaware should be congratulated on getting that provision into the law. This happens to be an election year. If the Congress had failed to take such action at this particular time there would have been no remedy so far as this year is concerned. Certainly the Senator from Delaware is to be commended on getting that much written into the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Delaware made the statement—I am quite sure he made it inadvertently—that the purpose of the amendment offered by himself, for which I voted, and for which most Members on this side of the aisle voted, was to do away with the ruling of the Treasury which allowed members of the Democratic Party to escape taxation by calling loans bad debts. I am sure the Senator did not mean to have such a statement stand in the RECORD. If the Treasury made such a ruling, it would apply to all, would it not—Democrats as well as Republicans? It so happened that the case under discussion involved some members of the Democratic Party.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator can explain to me why, after 25 years of operation under the same tax law, with no change, the Democratic Party financed the campaign in 1948 by such means, when the same privilege was not extended to anyone else, I wish he would do so. Who conceived this idea?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not trying to explain that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am very much surprised that it did happen, because I have yet to find anyone who ever thought that the law on the statute books would permit such a thing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator has not answered my question. If the Treasury Department makes a ruling applying to a certain case, the ruling applies to everyone, does it not?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Treasury rulings are not publicized. It would from now on. There is no question about that. At the time I offered the amendment I made the statement that if we did not stop the practice, now that both Republicans and Democrats and everyone else knew about it, they would all be financing their campaigns by having loans written off as income tax deductions, which is something that we could not stand for. Apparently nobody knew about this arrangement except a few insiders until I exposed it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator from Delaware will agree that neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party has a monopoly on virtue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would be the first to agree with the Senator. But surely that is no excuse for corrupt practices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree thoroughly with my distinguished colleague from Delaware on everything he says. I agree that we should increase our salaries affirmatively if we want to increase them, not in a negative way. I should like to point out to the Senator from Delaware the position in which the Senate conferees found themselves. I was one of the conferees, as was the minority leader. The House had sent to the Senate an unlimited living expense deduction provision, and the Senate struck it out and put in place of it the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. The amendment was agreed to almost unanimously; there were only two votes cast in opposition. The Senate conferees felt under the circumstances they should insist on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, and the Senate conferees, led by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], did insist on it.

The House conferees said, "If you insist on that amendment we insist on leaving in the bill the unlimited-expense amendment."

We said that if they would leave the Williams amendment in the bill, and limit for 2 years the living-expense deduction, we would accept such a provision if it were limited to $2,400. The $2,400 limitation was not agreeable to the House conferees. Their first suggestion was $5,000, and they came down to $4,000. We finally compromised on $3,000. We were up against that proposition. In the end the House would have taken the living-expense deduction for its Members and Senators would not have been included. Consequently the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware with regard to bad debts, which was agreed to almost unanimously by the Senate, would not have been in the law.

We thought that in the end if we could retain the Senator's amendment, and limit the deduction provision to 2 years and keep it at $3,000 we would be making the best of the compromise. Otherwise, we would have lost the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, because the House would not agree to it. Consequently Senators would not have been in the same position as Members of the House. The House would have insisted on an unlimited living-expense provision. That was the situation with which we were confronted. Therefore, we think the way it was worked out was the best we could do under the circumstances.

I agree with my colleague from Delaware that we should affirmatively take action on the subject. I hope that in January we will go at it affirmatively and work out what we believe is a fair salary arrangement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to say good-naturedly and facetiously, that making the amendment more acceptable by limiting the amount to $3,000 and limiting the time to 2 years is like the difference between petty larceny and grand larceny. It has always seemed to me that a man was a thief whether he stole a little or a lot. What we are actually doing is demonstrating to the American people that we are not keeping faith with what I think is our duty under the great threat of inflation, when we take an indirect salary increase for ourselves while we ask the people generally, to forego increases which will feed the fires of inflation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I appreciate the fact that the conferees have retained in the report the amendment which I offered which would stop the deduction of loans to political campaigns as business expenses. I think it is one of the most important amendments that could be adopted by this Congress. I do not think that Members of Congress, after that situation has been exposed to exist, could afford—or even have the nerve—not to plug such a loophole. However, I do not want to be put in the position of having to accept the McCormack amendment, to give the Members of Congress a special tax deduction of $3,000, in order to have my amendment agreed to in conference. My amendment was one which every Member of Congress would be ashamed to vote against. I certainly do not think we want to be put in the position of being threatened that the Senate will either take the amendment giving a $3,000 exemption to all Members of Congress, or the House will retain in the law the provision which will give both Democrats and Republicans the right to advance money to their campaigns indirectly out of the Treasury in 1952. There is no man on the floor of the Senate tonight who has the nerve to say that that is what he wants to do. If there is, I will be very happy to yield to him at this time.

Mr. President, I do not think you will find any Senator who will be willing to stand up and oppose the principle of my amendment; and neither will you find anyone in the House to stand up and say so.

Mr. President, I want a record vote. I suggest the abesence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum may be withdrawn and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

Mr. MORSE. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon objects to the request of the Senator from Delaware.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the Senator from Delaware wishes to make further comments in regard to this matter. Therefore, I shall not object at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the order for a quorum call is rescinded, and further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that Members of the Senate will reject this conference report and send it back with instructions that they strike out this special tax exemption provision for congressional members.

We have already on two previous occasions repudiated this principle, let us not reverse ourselves at this late hour. As I have said before, I think none of us care to be put in the position of voting to ourselves special privileges at this late hour. I hope that the Senator from Louisiana will accept my suggestion in regard to taking the conference report back to the House to see whether the matter can be straightened out.

Mr. ELLENDER. I regret to say to the Senator that I think it impossible to do that. We tried it in conference. We contended for quite some time. Before the conference met, I discussed the matter on several occasions with the chairman of the conference, and with Representative MCGRATH who, at first, refused to recede from the position taken regarding the proposal originally adopted by the House. He wanted the provision to apply without limitation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did I correctly understand that Representative MCGRATH, who was mentioned by the Senator, wanted an unlimited tax deduction?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is, for the Members of Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, that is correct—an unlimited tax deduction. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] then suggested a $5,000 limitation. It finally came to the floor with a compromise figure of $3,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment was originally proposed, as I understood, by the majority leader. It was the so-called McCormack amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the RECORD shows.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was that a proposal for an unlimited tax exemption for Members of Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under that amendment it would be possible for a Member of Congress to charge off all his salary as an expense, if he were so inclined, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would so interpret the amendment as originally presented,

and as it came to the Senate from the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was an interpretation given as to what would be the result of putting this amendment in the bill? Would the Senator care to make a statement regarding that?

Mr. ELLENDER. As well as I can understand, it is very plain. It simply proposes to place the Members of Congress in the same position as a businessman who leaves his place of residence in the regular course of business. Under the rulings of the department a businessman may deduct his traveling expenses as well as his living expenses while absent on business from his place of residence. Under this amendment, Members of Congress can deduct their traveling and living expenses while in Washington, but only up to $3,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. During the discussion, we have heard a good deal from the Senator from Louisiana, and also, I think, from the Representative in the House who sponsored the amendment about the fact that they wanted to give to Members of Congress the same exemption as that given to businessmen.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator from Delaware had decided in favor of doing that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does not the Senator think that Members of Congress who want to be businessmen should go home, and be businessmen? They would soon find out that the problems of a businessman today are not easy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think the Senator from Delaware was supported by the distinguished Senator from Florida. We read to him an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When the Senator proposed to strike out, and succeeded in striking out the $2,500, I think he was in agreement that a deduction for living expenses should be made. The Senator so stated at the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not. I asked the Senator this question——

Mr. ELLENDER. The RECORD will speak for itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the Senator this question. I asked it before, and no one answered it. Will the Senator tell me, now, any section of the Internal Revenue Code or the tax laws which exclude Members of Congress from enjoying the particular provisions which were set up for businessmen? Can the Senator name any section of the Internal Revenue Code which says that such and such an exemption is lawful, except in the case of Members of Congress. There is no such section and the Senator knows it. If I am wrong name it here and now.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that the question was debated here for 2 days, and that the provision was made because of a ruling of the Department that the expenses of Members of Congress could not be deducted. The Senator will recall that we presented rulings showing that an appointee of the President could leave his home for the purpose of coming to Washington to work, and could remain here for 8 months, and still be able to deduct all his living expenses and all his traveling expenses; but that, when it came to an elected official, the ruling was to the contrary. To me, it did not make any sense.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that our executive secretaries, administrative assistants, and those who work in our offices are in the same position as we are plus many other Federal employees.

When they come to Washington they cannot deduct their expenses. If one person gets tax exemption for working in Washington why not another. If we give it to one or all we will be setting up in America a "privileged class." That is against every principle of equality that we in America stand for. I am not arguing that congressional salaries are too high. But if they are not high enough raise them but never should we have any special tax exemption.

Mr. ELLENDER. Their place of employment is here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but does this tax exemption apply only to Members of Congress?

Mr. ELLENDER. It applies to Members of Congress only.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Members of Congress only are going to get the benefit of this special provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to point out that this amendment is being put through for the sole benefit of Members of Congress, partially exempting them from the high taxes that we impose on the rest of the American people. I think that is wrong.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope that Senators who vote for this special tax exemption will later this year when making speeches say to their constituents, "I believe I am entitled to this special tax exemption." I venture to say that we would soon find out how they feel.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have been very curious about the trend of the argument in this matter. I think we should specifically and affirmatively say what our salaries should be and tax them all, just as everyone else is taxed.

I realize that there is a dispute as to whether a Member of the Congress who is required to live in Washington is pursuing a trade or business. I do not think so. I have said so heretofore, and I stand on that proposition. I do not think a Member of Congress is pursuing a trade or business within the meaning of the Revenue Act, when he comes to Washington to pursue the functions of the office to which he has been elected.

But what I rise to say is, that the Senator from Delaware is very largely responsible for all this difficulty. He came up with the brilliant idea of taking away a statutory exemption from taxation. In that he was right. Then he came up with the further idea—and this is the point to which I shall address myself—that when a citizen makes a loan to a political party and the loan is subsequently unpaid, he should not be entitled to a non-business-loan deduction against his income tax. I have no objection to that. On that, I agree with the Senator from Delaware. But I should like to invite attention to the fact that the implications of his statement are that that is solely a Democratic practice.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amendment was sponsored by the majority leader of the Senate——

Mr. McFARLAND. I beg the Senator's pardon; it was not sponsored by the majority leader of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. No more inaccurate statement has ever been made on the floor of the Senate. It is just about as accurate as are some of the other statements the Senator from Delaware has made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I meant to say the majority leader of the House. I did not intend to say the majority leader of the Senate. I think the RECORD will show that I previously stated it properly. Originally the repeal of the exemption provision was adopted by a vote of 77 to 11 supported by both political parties. There were only 11 dissenting votes. The other day the amendment was adopted by a vote of 67 to 2. Therefore, it was almost unanimously adopted. We cannot get away from the fact that the political campaign contributions which were ruled as deductible for income-tax purposes were for the benefit of the Democratic Party only.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, that is the point to which I wish to address myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree with me that the benefits which have accrued under the ruling so far accrued solely to the Democratic Party. However, if we do not repeal it, both political parties will now use the loophole since it is so widely publicized.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask Senators please to withhold the demand for a vote. I have never delayed the Senate very much.

I have no objection to the Senator's main position, that a senatorial office is not a trade or business. If it is, I am out. That has always been my position, and I have agreed with the Senator from Delaware that a loan to a political party, unsecured, should not be allowed as a nonbusiness loan and made deductible. But I am rising to say that the Senator has made a grievous error in saying that

that is a Democratic practice, the inference being, of course, that the Republicans never indulged in that sort of thing. I grant that in the days of Republicans no one had enough money to loan either to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party. Therefore they could not write off their losses.

Mr. President, I want to remind the Senator of something which he probably does not know, namely, that the limitation upon the contributions to a political party and political committees was imposed by a Democratic Congress, not by a Republican Congress. Theretofore, the Republicans paid out all the money they could dig up and all they could borrow and, I sometimes think, all they could steal, if I must be a little partisan about it.

The Senator from Delaware is entirely wrong in the respect to which I advert. I agree with his premise. I do not think a loan by an individual, unsecured, to a political party or a political candidate should ever be allowed as a deduction, but I do not think the Senator should attribute that practice and habit to Democrats, when before the passage of the act Republicans gave to their own party all they could get, all they could borrow, all they could beg, and all they could steal.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not yield.

I am surprised at the Senator for making a partisan issue out of it. It was only when the Democrats came into power and the people became reasonably prosperous that anyone had any money to loan to anyone else. A few very foolish Democrats made some loans to Democratic committees here and there. They were not repaid. So they went to the Treasury, and the Treasury made the ruling. I agree with the Senator that the ruling should not have been made. I do not think such a loan should be charged off and be deductible as a nonbusiness bad loan. I do not think such loans are business loans. But, in my opinion, it was the kind of practice which had been followed before we Democrats came into control and passed a law saying, "You cannot give more than so much to a political committee."

All I differ with the Senator about is that he blames the Democrats because a few Democrats have grown prosperous enough under Democratic administrations to be able to have a little money to lend; and because they did, they loaned it to Democratic committees here and there. They thought it was for a good cause, and that is what the Senator is now complaining about. But before the Democrats came into control, there was no law against what could be given or contributed or loaned. No one had any money to lend to anyone else.

So I believe the Senator is all wrong. He reminds me very much of my old friend down in Georgia, Charles Hill, who was Solicitor General of the Fulton Superior Court, and who, by the way, was a son of the great Senator Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia. He was speaking of Republican days, not of Democratic days, when he said that he did not understand how anybody could have enough money to loan or enough liquor to sell. And in Republican days he was quite right; nobody had any.

So the Senator from Delaware is quite wrong to make a partisan issue out of the matter. The merits of the case are sound, and I am not quarreling with him about the merits of the case. I do not think the senatorial office is a business or a trade. If it is, it is an extremely poor trade, very poor. I do not think it is the meaning of the Revenue Act that deductions should be allowed in such cases. But the Senator undertakes to say that because a few Democrats made enough money under Democratic administrations to make a loan to their own party, then they were all wrong in asking that their loans be allowed as deductions against their income tax. The only difference was, and the only difference is, that the Republicans did not ask to have the loans allowed as deductions. Anyway, there was no law against the size of campaign contributions until we poor Democrats came in and passed the law.

I am surprised that the Senator from Delaware, great patriot that he is, a purist in politics, reforming us all, would attempt to make a partisan issue out of this question. Democrats are no worse than Republicans. Republicans simply did not live under the law in the first place. But in the second, and lamentable place, they did not have any money to lend to their political committees.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is trying to get it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are very few Members of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard than I do for the Senator from Georgia. But now that we have reduced the discussion to a political issue, and perhaps it is very appropriate because within a few hours we shall adjourn this Congress and go into the midst of a political campaign, we might just as well start here as anywhere else, so for a few minutes I shall make my remarks strictly political and direct myself just to a review of the history of the special tax exemption to Members of Congress, and executive officers. This was passed in 1945 by a Democratic controlled Congress and signed by a Democratic President. The act was repealed by Congress, but it was passed again by another Democratic Congress, and now being passed here today.

So with all due respect to the Senator from Georgia, it was a Democratic Congress of which he was a Member, which made the decision originally, and which has made the decision again today, that Members of Congress are entitled to a special tax reduction which we do not pass on to members of the American public. You claim credit for all the good so take credit for this.

As the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, we are in agreement on the fact that it should not be done. I hope there will be enough Senators in agreement on that so that we can defeat the proposal here tonight.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield, I merely suggest that I am a little surprised at the statement of the Senator from Georgia this evening that the Republicans had no money and that there was no money under a Republican administration. The Senator's great reputation for accuracy should lend credence to his statement, but I have been checking the figures, and I find that under Republican administrations from 1920 to and including the so-called nefarious year of 1932, and then beginning with 1933, under Mr. Roosevelt and the Democratic New Deal, to and including the middle of 1939, the Democratic peacetime administration, the national income averaged $10,500,000,000 less than under the Republican years beginning in 1920 through and including 1932.

The Senator from Georgia indicates that under Republican administrations there was no money in the country, and that there was more under Democratic peacetime administrations—and I take it the Senator does not include the blood of American boys as causing the prosperity of 1941 and 1942, and since that time. Under the peacetime administration the Democratic administration never came within $10,000,000,000, on the average, in national income, of equaling the national income of Republican administrations of 1920 through 1932.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, if he wishes to reply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa does not have the floor. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia, if he wishes to reply.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say anything about the blood of American boys. The Senator from Iowa was just unduly excited.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I beg the Senator's pardon; I was not excited. I merely said I did not assume the Senator from Georgia included the so-called prosperity of the war years; that he did not include the blood of Americans in the Armed Forces in the so-called prosperity.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I did not say the Republicans had not prospered under Democratic administrations. They have. They have enjoyed great prosperity throughout the country. The Senator from Iowa will be greatly surprised when he goes back to Iowa this year to find many stanch Republicans, Republicans from principle, who will say to him, "Well, we are very sorry, sir, but we have enjoyed greater prosperity under Democratic administrations than we can recall under Republican administrations."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Wait just a moment. The Senator yielded to me. The Senator does not have any right to monopolize the floor all night.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am perfectly willing to allow the Senator from Georgia to complete his address. I am enjoying it. Tell them how you did all this on borrowed money.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator is enjoying it. I hope he is. The country will enjoy it. They will understand it.

There is no doubt that Republicans had money. There is no doubt that Republicans have made a great deal of money. But they have made more money since the Democrats came into power than they themselves imagined could have been made prior to that time.

I desire to ask one question of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Iowa, if they wish to answer it.

A Democratic national chairman by the name of Boyle borrowed money from the RFC and paid it back. A Republican national chairman also borrowed money from the RFC. Has he paid that loan? Answer that question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Very well. I will answer it. The Senator addressed that question to me. I will say——

Mr. GEORGE. Wait a minute. That question is capable of a categorical answer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. GEORGE. Answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say that there may have been more money flowing in recent years under Democratic administrations, but there have been more American boys killed under Democratic administrations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I cannot hear the Senator's answer.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The regular order is that the Senator from Delaware has yielded to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Answer "Yes" or "No." The Republican national committeeman did not even pay the interest.

Mr. GEORGE. The Democratic chairman has repaid the loan, and the Republican chairman has not even paid the interest.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will whoever has the floor yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has the floor. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, we can debate the question of politics all night long. We are going to debate it until the election next November. However, I believe that the thing to do is to vote on the question before us. If any Senator does not like the conference report, he can go back to his constituents and say so. If he does not like what has been said, he can go back and tell them that. We can become worked up and talk politics all night, or we can go ahead and transact the business of the Senate. I think the businesslike thing to do, inasmuch as businessmen have been the subject of discussion here this evening, is to transact the affairs of the Senate and get out of here.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators will please be seated.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For what purpose does the Senator desire to have me yield? I should like to complete my remarks.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to ask a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of fun had here tonight. I think many statements have been made which it might have been better not to make. However, the question I wish to ask the able Senator from Delaware is this: Is it not a fact that Chairman Boyle of the Democratic National Committee never personally borrowed any money; and is it not a fact that the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Gabrielson, never personally borrowed any money from the RFC?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the connection Mr. Gabrielson had with the RFC was that of an attorney for the corporation which did borrow money from the RFC; and is it not a fact that Mr. Boyle was an attorney for a company which borrowed money from the RFC?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I was the first one on the floor of the Senate to denounce both William Boyle and Mr. Gabrielson. I have never retracted my position in that respect, and I think the Senator from Georgia will bear me out. At no time, in any work I have done, have I made any distinction on the ground of whether a man was a Republican or a Democrat, if I felt he had done wrong. I think it was improper for a member of either national committee to represent a client before a Government agency. I will go further than that. I do not recall that the Senator from Georgia ever denounced Mr. Boyle until after he resigned. I have denounced both Mr. Boyle and Mr. Gabrielson plus a lot of other administration stalwarts whose action I question.

Another thing I wish to point out—since we are going into a few of the activities of Mr. Boyle—is the situation in which a $38,000,000 tax case had been lying around the Bureau of Internal Revenue for several years, without a decision being reached. Then the former boss of Mr. Boyle was elevated to the Presidency of the United States. Two months after he was elevated to this high office Mr. Boyle opened a law office in the city of Washington, and 2 months later he was employed as an attorney for the firm which owed the United States Government, according to Treasury records, over $38,000,000. That firm fired all its other attorneys and hired Mr. Boyle. At the same time they also hired a former employee of the Treasury Department, Mr. Hanlon. After they had employed those two men, one who served as Democratic National Chairman and the other a former employee of the Treasury Department, the tax lien was settled for $850,000. This one item represents a great deal more money than has been spent on all the Republican campaigns since Abraham Lincoln.

We will go on—there are many more interesting cases I think you will be interested in——

Mr. MAYBANK. Why not explain Mellon's taxes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators have no right to interrupt the Senator from Delaware unless he yields. If any Senator wishes to ask him to yield, he should rise and address the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have yet to hear many Members of the Democratic Party stand up and denounce some of the corruption which has been found in the Treasury Department. I do not say that you have all condoned it. I think many of you are just as much interested in cleaning it up as I am but it would help a lot if you exercised more affirmative action. A little assistance instead of criticism would be appreciated.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware declines to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to review another case. On the 7th of May 1951, I called attention to the record of the collector in the city of St. Louis. At the time I made a statement which has since been supported by court conviction in that the collector has been convicted—charging this collector with irregularities in office while serving as collector of internal revenue under this Fair Deal administration.

This collector had previously been investigated by agents of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and every report, covering every charge I made on the floor of the Senate on the 7th day of May 1951, was in the files of the Treasury Department at the time the first grand jury was in session in St. Louis, from March 1 to March 14, and yet not one scrap of the evidence upon which Mr. Finnegan stands indicted tonight was presented before that grand jury. It was withheld by the same New Deal administration you are defending here tonight. If I am in error in making the charge that this evidence was covered up let someone stand up and speak. The records are conclusive; they cannot be denied. That is another indictment against this administration.

I repeat, every statement I made in my speech on the 7th day of May 1951, was taken from three reports which were in the files of the Treasury Department. One report was filed in June 1950; another in July 1950; and the last report was filed on February 19, 1951—months before I made my speech.

On the first day of March, Judge Moore convened a special grand jury in St. Louis. The Senator from Missouri

[Mr. HENNINGS], who is in the Chamber, will bear out my statement. I take this opportunity to commend Judge Moore for the excellent job he did. First, he convened a special grand jury in St. Louis on March 1 to investigate certain charges of irregularities which had been called to his attention. That grand jury was in session for 14 days, and brought back a verdict completely exonerating Mr. Finnegan. It found nothing wrong. Two days later we called both Mr. Schoeneman, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Mr. Bolich, the assistant commissioner, before the Finance Committee. The records of the Finance Committee will show that George Schoeneman testified that there was nothing in St. Louis that he knew anything about which would in any way reflect on the character or integrity of Mr. Finnegan. Mr. Bólich supported that statement by a similar denial. Charles Oliphant, chief counsel, made the same statement. All three of those men have since resigned for reasons of "health."

Apparently they suffered from an extreme case of "overexposure."

At the time these three men came before our committee and made denial that there was anything wrong with Mr. Finnegan, they had in their own files those three reports upon which Mr. Finnegan stands indicted tonight. They lied before the committee. I invite anyone to read the record and dispute that charge.

I wrote a letter to Secretary John Snyder, and told him that I was not satisfied with these denials, and I asked him to check the records of the Treasury Department to determine if they had not missed some reports. In April 1951 he wrote me a letter—this letter was previously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—emphatically denying that there was anything wrong with Finnegan's conduct of the office. He said it was a purely voluntary resignation, and, according to the press, the President had accepted it with great reluctance. At the same time that they were making these denials and covering up for Mr. Finnegan, all that information was in their files right here in Washington, and would be there gathering dust today had someone not found and exposed the facts.

The same situation is true with respect to New York. The New York situation was called to Secretary Snyder's personal attention on three different occasions. Those facts are all in the RECORD, and I challenge the Secretary or anyone on this floor to deny their accuracy.

I called his attention to the deplorable condition existing in the New York office in February 1951 and asked him to take some action. It took 7 months to get any action. I have yet to hear anyone on the other side of the aisle take to task the man who, as the Secretary of the Treasury, sat on the lid of this cesspool of corruption. He either knowingly allowed this situation to exist in his own office or, if he did not know about it, he is grossly incompetent to hold the office. Incidentally I called the New York situation to Commissioner Schoeneman's attention in the spring of 1950 and furthermore I called it to the personal attention of the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Finance Committee, in August 1950. It was August 1951 before the collector was removed.

It has been said that perhaps the Republicans were deducting their campaign contributions also in the same manner as the Democrats. I want to settle that question once and for all. I asked the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish me with a copy of every Treasury ruling that had ever been made with respect to any political party during the past 20 years. I have copies of every one of those Treasury Department rulings with me here tonight, and I shall ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

In 1948 every one of the rulings was of benefit to the Democratic Party. There is not one case granting exemption to the Republican Party. I do not say that the Republicans cannot now get the same benefit, but this is true only because I published the rulings. They could not find any with respect to any Republican. It seems logical to assume that if there were any they would have found them.

I am not speaking of individual members of the Democratic Party. Personally, I feel that the overwhelming majority of the members of the Democratic Party are honest. They are just as honest as members of the Republican Party. But I say the record of this New Deal administration is one of corruption and of covering up.

From time to time we hear people say, "Well, we have had corruption under every administration." I admitted in colloquy with the Senator from Washington that no political party has a monopoly on virtue. We had a scandal in the Republican Party in the 1920's. It was a deplorable scandal. I am ashamed of it as a Republican. But I am proud of the record which the Republican Party displayed when it was called to its attention. The President of the United States at the time fired his Attorney General. If anyone doubts it, let him read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator Wheeler, who sat on the other side of the aisle, a Democrat from Montana, and one of the leaders in that exposure, said that he had the utmost cooperation from President Coolidge. He said all the files were opened to him. As the result, a member of the President's own Cabinet went to jail. He was not allowed to resign for "health." No such cooperation has been displayed on the part of the present administration. I could go on indefinitely citing this shameful record. I have given case after case to the Secretary of the Treasury, and I cannot even get an answer from him.

I called one particular case to his attention months ago which involved a certain collector. This collector was found to have a substantial amount of cash in his possession and that he had appeared at a certain bank with the proverbial black bag one day last December. I realize that a person can under the law have cash in his possession. However, when one finds a collector of internal revenue with $40,000 in cash which he is turning into Government bonds just 10 days before the time the Treasury Department has called for a financial statement so that the collector can show in his statement the possession of Government bonds instead of cash in his lockbox, I say we are entitled to an explanation. How did he get that money?

The Secretary of the Treasury does not deny the fact that the man had that cash in his possession. He cannot; I gave him the full story. I have not and will not name him because I do not think it would be fair to do so until I know more about the case. But that information apparently will have to be obtained without the aid of the administration.

I talked with some Members on the other side of the aisle and told them about this case and said that I could not get an answer from the Secretary of the Treasury. Again I say that is only one example of cover up and obstruct. That man is on the payroll of the Federal Government tonight collecting your taxes. The Senator from Georgia will not deny that statement.

Other similar cases have been called to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury, but time will not permit, unless you want to hear more, which I doubt.

I say that when any Member of Congress calls to the attention of any member of the Cabinet an irregularity on the part of an employee of the Cabinet member's department and asks for an investigation of the employee, and in fairness to the employee is willing to withhold his name pending the investigation which I think should be done, that Cabinet officer has the responsibility of answering the Member of Congress. That responsibility has not been met by the executive officer in charge of the great tax-collecting facilities of this country and as long as this administration continues to allow these culprits to merely resign for reasons of health I shall have no confidence in their intentions to clean house.

Resignations merely mean that these men are being placed on retirement for life in many instances.

Instead of cooperation in cleaning up this corruption all I have received from the executive branch is denunciation. They speak out in support of clean government but their actions belie their words.

To clean up the question of who has been financing campaigns indirectly out of the Federal Treasury. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of every ruling which has been furnished by the Treasury Department in response to my request, purportedly covering every ruling that has been made in the last 20 years with reference to any political party. Every one of the rulings refers to members of the Democratic Party.

There being no objection, the rulings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1950.

Hon. JOHN E. MANNING,
Collector of Internal Revenue, Post Office and Courthouse, Newark, N. J.

MY DEAR MR. MANNING: Reference is made to your letter dated September 12, 1950, in which you request advice with respect to a letter from Mr. John J. Dickerson, chairman of the New Jersey Republican State Committee.

In his letter Mr. Dickerson states that the New Jersey Republican State Committee is sponsoring a dinner in Atlantic City on September 30, 1950, and that a question has arisen as to whether or not the purchase of tickets would constitute a deduction for Federal income tax purposes. Mr. Dickerson further states that it is his understanding of the State law that if the taxpayer can clearly show that the purchase of the ticket was in the ordinary course of business and if his business was benefited thereby, he is entitled to deduct the cost of the ticket as a business expense.

It appears that the view expressed by Mr. Dickerson is based upon his belief that the purchase of the tickets in question may be deducted under section 23 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code as an ordinary and necessary business expense. The application of this provision of the law, however, depends upon the existence of facts which have not been given by Mr. Dickerson, such as the purpose in the purchase of such tickets and the use to which the money so expended will be put. It is well established that political contributions are not deductible. See section 29.23 (q)-1 of Regulations 111; *Textile Mills Securities Corporation* v. *Commissioner* ((1941) 314 U. S. 326, C. B. 1941-2, 201; I. T. 3276, C. B. 1939-1 (Part I), 108). On the other hand, contributions made by local tradesmen to business or civic organizations for the purpose of attracting and playing host to conventions or similar gatherings which will draw sizable numbers of guests and visitors to the community, may be deducted provided that such contributions are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount contributed. See section 29.23 (a)-13 of Regulations 111, and I. T. 3706, 1945, C. B. 87. Accordingly, if the tickets are purchased to support the political aspects of the occasion in question (as distinguished from the business aspects attendant on obtaining new money and customers from the event, regardless of its nature), a deduction is not allowable.

Since the occasion for which the tickets are to be purchased is apparently a political one, it cannot be assumed that the purchase of such tickets by a business concern will give rise to a deduction.

Mr. Dickerson also asked to be advised whether or not a corporation is permitted to purchase tickets. Since this question concerns matters not necessarily in the jurisdiction of the Bureau and detailed information is not furnished, it does not appear to be appropriate for comment by the Bureau.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

APRIL 19, 1950.

Mr. STUYVESANT PEABODY, Jr.,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. PEABODY: Reference is made to your inquiry as chairman of the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee to be held in Chicago on May 13, 14, and 15, 1950, with respect to whether contributions made to the committee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in business in the city of Chicago would be deductible for Federal income-tax purposes.

You state that the Chicago Host Committee is playing host to thousands of guests who will participate in extensive panel discussions pertaining to the issues of the day. It is also intended to pay tribute to Thomas Jefferson through parades and pageants depicting his contributions to the welfare of our country. It is expected that the thousands of guests and visitors spending 3 days in the city of Chicago will bring new money into the community and will benefit the business of the community.

The contributions from local tradesmen are solely intended to defray the expenses to be incurred in playing host and running the above-mentioned functions. It is understood that the contributions referred to in your letter will not be used to defray the expenses of the political aspects of the event.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Chicago Host Committee for National Jefferson Jubilee by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, in their Federal income-tax returns, provided that such donations are made with a reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Very truly yours,
GEO J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

JULY 26, 1951.

Mr. WILLIAM NEALE ROACH,
Assistant Treasurer,
Democratic National Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ROACH: Reference is made to your letter of July 12, 1951, transmitting a letter from Mr. Wilson Gilmore, president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America requesting a ruling concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Young Democratic Clubs of America for their convention.

He has stated that such clubs will hold their national biennial convention at the Jefferson Hotel in St. Louis, Mo., on October 4-6, 1951. In order to defray the large amount of expenses that will be incurred by the convention program, they are seeking contributions. It is stated that it has been their idea to organize a convention corporation under the benevolent corporation laws of Missouri, and to obtain a pro forma decree for this nonprofit corporation. Such corporation would be the recipient of all convention funds and would pay all expenses and attend to all other official business of the convention. After the convention such corporation would be dissolved. A ruling is requested as to (1) whether contributions from corporations would be deductible by them for Federal income-tax purposes as business expenses if given to the Young Democratic Clubs of America, and in the alternative (2) whether such contributions would be deductible if given to the proposed convention corporation.

On the basis of the information submitted it is held that contributions for the purposes of the convention made to either the Young Democratic Clubs of America, or in the alternative to the convention corporation when organized by corporations engaged in a trade or business in the city of St. Louis and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in the Federal income returns provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of donations.

Very truly yours,
GEORGE J. SCHOENEMAN,
Commissioner.

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. DAVID A. SCHULTE,
Care of Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. SCHULTE: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner dated April 26, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof. The letter dated April 8, 1949, from Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer of that committee making such offer was submitted with the letter of April 26, 1949. In the absence of a power of attorney authorizing Gale, Bernays, Falk & Eisner to represent you this letter is being addressed to you.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss incurred by your acceptance of said offer would constitute a nonbusiness bad debt loss.

It is stated that in 1944 you were asked to lend the committee $50,000; and that you were assured that after the campaign in 1944 the note would be gradually repaid as different finance programs made funds available. The $50,000 was loaned to the committee and you were given a promissory note in that amount. Such note has not been paid, and the committee has informed you that it would be unable to make payment on the note or to its other note-holding creditors, but that it has been promised sufficient money to offer in settlement 10 cents on the dollar to all of its creditors.

The committee has also informed you that its principal creditor, Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, has accepted its offer and received payment, and that Mr. Marshall Field, another noteholder, had also consented to accept the offer.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered as a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,
E. I. MCLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

MAY 18, 1949.

Mr. MARSHALL FIELD,
Care of Mr. Howard A. Seitz,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. FIELD: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Howard Seitz, your attorney, dated April 15, 1949, in which it is stated that you have received an offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York, hereinafter referred to as committee, of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of a note of the committee in full settlement thereof.

A ruling is requested as to (1) whether the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income tax purposes, constitute a gift; and (2) whether the loss thus incurred by your acceptance of the offer of settlement would be considered a nonbusiness bad debt loss.

It is stated that in 1940 you were asked to lend to the committee the sum of $50,000. The loan was made and you accepted a promissory note. The matter of payment has been discussed with the committee, and the officers of the committee have informed you that they have insufficient funds to make payment. In December 1948 you were informed by the committee that it would be unable to make payment of the note to you or its other note-holding creditors. You have decided to accept the offer of settlement of 10 cents on the dollar.

You have been informed that Mr. Richard J. Reynolds, the principal creditor of the

committee, has already accepted a similar offer of the committee, and that Mr. David A. Schulte, another creditor, has consented to do likewise.

Based upon the information submitted it is the opinion of this office that acceptance of the offer of the committee will not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and that the loss resulting from such acceptance will be considered a nonbusiness bad debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

Mr. RICHARD J. REYNOLDS,
1206 Reynolds Building,
Winston-Salem, N. C.
(Attention Mr. Stratton Coyner.)

DEAR MR. REYNOLDS: Reference is made to a letter written in your behalf by Mr. Stratton Coyner, attorney, dated December 28, 1948, in which it is stated that you have received a final settlement offer from the Democratic State Committee of New York of 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of unpaid demand notes issued by the committee, which you now hold for collection.

A ruling is requested as to whether (1) the acceptance of such offer would, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) the loss representing the difference between the aggregate face value of the notes and the amount received in full settlement would be considered as a nonbusiness debt.

The letter states that you now hold the following notes of the Democratic State Committee of New York:

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, treasurer, $75,000.

Note dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand, signed by Carl Sherman, Treasurer, $100,000.

Note dated October 14, 1944, payable on demand with interest after demand at rate of 1 percent, signed by Carl Sherman, Treasurer, $96,000.

Note of Democratic State Committee of New York dated February 27, 1947, payable on demand to Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, endorsed without recourse by the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, by (not stated in letter), $39,110.45.

The notes presently held by you are represented to have been issued in consummation of a series of transactions involving advances to the Democratic State Committee of New York. In all transactions it is represented that the advances were in the nature of loans inasmuch as notes were received as evidence of the obligations incurred by the committee. The representations in respect of advances made over a period of years extending back to the year 1940, the notes issued in respect of the obligations and the payments made on such notes are fully disclosed in the letter of your attorney.

It is stated in the letter that you were assured at the time the loans were negotiated that repayment of the loans, fully covered by demand notes, would be made on an annual basis. Subsequent events, however, precluded the committee from discharging, as contemplated, the several notes issued as evidence of its obligation to repay the advances made by you. It is stated further that demands have been made at various times for the payment of the notes which have resulted only in the receipt of renewal notes.

The possibility of instituting legal action against the committee, it is stated, was of no avail inasmuch as reducing the notes to judgment and throwing the committee into bankruptcy would have accomplished nothing toward the payment of the obligations. Furthermore it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has no assets of any consequence and no uncollected enforcible pledges. A certified page from the official report of the Democratic State Committee of New York dated November 2, 1948, showing the outstanding loans payable by that committee has been submitted, and supplementary thereto, it is stated that the Democratic State Committee of New York has only a small bank balance of less than $5,000 and office furniture for four offices and a reception room in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City.

It appears that your demands for payment of the notes finally resulted in the submission of an offer on the part of the Democratic State Committee of New York to pay in full settlement, in cash, 10 percent of the aggregate face amount of the outstanding notes. The offer is contained in a letter addressed to you under date of December 23, 1948, and signed by Mr. Carl Sherman, treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York.

In view of the representations and data submitted it is concluded that (1) the acceptance of the offer of the treasurer, Democratic State Committee of New York, would not, for Federal income-tax purposes, constitute a gift, and (2) any loss incurred resulting from such acceptance would be considered as a nonbusiness debt within the meaning of section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Very truly yours,

E. I. McLARNEY,
Deputy Commissioner.

APRIL 24, 1951.

Mr. BARNET HODES,
Secretary of Citizens Committee To Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. HODES: Reference is made to your letter of April 11, 1951, requesting an opinion from the Bureau of Internal Revenue concerning the deductibility by corporations of contributions to the Citizen's Committee To Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952.

You have stated that the Citizen's Committee is a nonpartisan committee which will play host to thousands of guests who will come to Chicago if the conventions are held there. New money will be brought into the community, which will benefit business of the community. In the sample letter to be sent out to prospective contributors it is stated that the tentative plan is to obtain, as soon as possible, the necessary subscriptions, one-half to be paid not later than December 1, 1951, and the remaining half not later than March 1, 1952. If only one convention is obtained, then half the subscription is to be canceled, and if neither convention is obtained, then the entire subscription is to be canceled.

On the basis of the information submitted, it is held that contributions made to the Citizen's Committee To Bring the Republican and Democratic National Conventions to Chicago, 1952, by corporate and individual taxpayers engaged in a trade or business in the city of Chicago and its environs would constitute allowable deductions as ordinary and necessary business expenses under the provisions of section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code in their Federal income-tax returns, provided that such donations are made with reasonable expectation of a financial return commensurate with the amount of the donations.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 46 and 53.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for a division.

The Senate proceeded to divide.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, with reference to this conference report, the President of the United States has sent a letter to the Vice President, which was previously read. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the letter again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read the letter.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JULY 5, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

This rider and reduction in funds, coupled together, would mean that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be able to fulfill military requirements for atomic weapons. I cannot believe that the Congress would wish to adjourn with our national security jeopardized in this fashion.

I urgently request that this rider be eliminated before the Congress completes its action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that we cannot delete the proviso in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission. It was my clear understanding, however, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who disagreed with the rider in committee today, as I recall that it would not prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from starting its third large plant, and would not prevent their buying certain machinery and other equipment

necessary to be acquired for the purpose of proceeding with the third plant. I do not know where the third plant is located. It is somewhere in the Midwest.

I do not want to have any misunderstanding that the rider on the bill—and I understand the conferees agree with my statement; and all I am trying to do is to make legislative history—will prevent the Atomic Energy Commission from proceeding with the third plant, because they can use funds which are now available. Therefore, it is not a question of providing any more money. It is a question presented by the rider which provides that unless they can complete something, they cannot start it.

My understanding from the House conferees is that perhaps this could be started, and later on be completed. But we do not want 6 months' delay; we do not want delay until January, when we shall return.

I wish to make clear for the legislative record that this rider does not affect the subject of the President's letter to the distinguished President of the Senate; this rider does not say that we cannot move forward in our atomic energy program.

Some of the Senators who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy perhaps will speak later. Among the Senators who are on the joint committee is the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who appeared before the Appropriations Committee, as did the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking minority member of the independent offices appropriations subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee. I wish to say that it is our understanding that the Atomic Energy Commission can go forward with its program, and can go forward with the third plant, and can go forward with what is necessary at Oak Ridge, and can go forward with what is necessary at Savannah Valley, and can go forward with what is necessary at Paducah, under the provision to the effect that certain sections of the installations—of course, I do not have the exact provision in front of me——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am confident that the legislative history of this proviso should be made clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I was trying to do.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I appreciate that. That should be done, because the President has been misinformed. His letter conveys entirely the wrong idea.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that I do not think the President has been misformed. Unless we make clear the legislative history——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina request unanimous consent that he may yield to the Senator from Michigan, to permit the Senator from Michigan to make a statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to think the President has been misinformed. The President is right.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am making this statement with all due deference to the President, for I do not mean this as any criticism at all.

The President has in mind that there are large projects—for instance, let us take a hypothetical one, which would consist of various buildings, various power plants, railroads, and different kinds of buildings. There might be 10, 15, or 20 buildings in a project for the production of atomic energy.

Here is what the President has in mind:

> I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific constructon project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic-energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, it is not a question of money; I simply do not want this proviso to stop the third big plant.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to show how the proviso will not stop the project. Let me refer to the language of the proviso. I am a member of the committee of conference, and I speak as a member of the committee of conference, just as does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I think we should make the legislative history clear.

Here is the proviso:

> *"Provided further,* That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

All that means is that if they have enough money to erect a building, and if they can go ahead and construct that building, or if they have enough money to build a utility, they can build it, no matter how large or how small it may be; or they can, in that way, build any other specific part of the program.

There is no intention on the part of the House of Representatives, as I am sure the legislative history will show, to hold up this whole program merely because the Commission does not have available billions of dollars with which to complete it. The situation simply is that the House of Representatives does not want to give contract authority for the commencement of a building or a utility or something of that kind if sufficient funds are not available for the construction of such building or utility.

There is talk of entering into a contract with a utility. Most of these contracts are with the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Tennessee Valley Authority will enter into a contract. There will not be any question. The contract can be made for a year. It is not necessary that a contract be made with the TVA for 50 years, and that all the money required for a 50-year contract be available at this time.

I believe this legislative history ought to be made clear; and it is clear that there is no attempt on the part of the House or on the part of the Senate to hold up the whole project because the Commission does not have enough money to build a particular building. The restriction applies only to a particular building in the project, a specific part of the project—a particular building or a particular utility.

In other words, when we appropriate $1,450,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, we realize that Congress will be in session next January, no matter what happens, and that the appropriation now being made is enough to enable the Atomic Energy Commission to begin any building in any of the three projects or in any further development.

I wish to be of help to the atomic energy program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan is eminently correct. He was a friend of the Commission in the conference today.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the the statement of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was only trying, as is the Senator from Michigan, to make the legislative history clear, so that they can go ahead.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, so they can go ahead. I am in favor of this program; I have favored all the appropriations for the atomic-energy program, and I do not want the Commission or the program to be held up by anything that is said here on the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I simply wish to make the legislative history clear. I wish to have it clearly understood that this rider will not hold up the Commission's program.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. All we are seeking to do is to make the legislative history clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, who first requested that I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I should like to join with the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Michigan. I do not like this proviso. In the conference we tried to delete the proviso, but the House would not yield on it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The conferees on the part of the House explained the position of the House. The position of the House is substantially as it has been explained by the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. I see the distinguished Senator from Michigan talking now to a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the State of New York.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the question is one of interpretation of the language, namely, whether the words "a project" are to be interpreted as meaning a great big entity, or whether, under the language of the proviso, the words "a project" are to be interpreted as meaning any specific portion of a project—in other words, whether the words "a project" mean a particular building or a particular utility or any other specific portion of a project.

One billion four hundred fifty million dollars is appropriated for this purpose. Personally, I should like to have seen the appropriation substantially larger than that.

Mr. MAYBANK. Both the Senator from Massachusetts and I suggested $2,500,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes, I agree. However, that is not the issue which is before us at the moment.

The principal issue at the moment is as to the proviso. If the proviso is interpreted as not meaning a great big project, such as one of the two or three the Commission may be building, but is interpreted as meaning perhaps one building, perhaps one-one hundredth of any one of these projects, then the Atomic Energy Commission will have all the money it can spend between now and January. It already has all the authority it needs to make plans.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Atomic Energy Commission already has all the authority it needs to proceed with the construction and to purchase the equipment if the provision is interpreted in that way; and I hope and I trust that it will be interpreted in that way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have just one more comment to make.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, Mr. President, the making of the plans would be a specific portion of the project, and, in my judgment, would not be subject to the limitation. I hope that is clear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate left out the proviso, but the House was adamant on keeping the priviso in the bill.

I agree with them that the Atomic Energy Commission is no longer a growing child. It is now a full-grown man, so to speak.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is a maverick.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It must be able to look forward, for its new construction, a little more accurately than it did in the case of its past construction. So there is merit in that suggestion.

But the language is limiting, and it must be interpreted liberally. I, for one, hope the Atomic Energy Commission will interpret it liberally. If the Commission does interpret it liberally, I, as one Member of Congress, will support the Commission in that interpretation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that the conferees on the part of the House stated exactly that; namely, that the restriction or limitation was to cover individual items, but not the whole project. The Senator from Massachusetts recalls that, I am sure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That was one of their arguments, namely, that it was not a limitation on the whole project, but was a limitation only on whatever was being built. For example, let us assume there were a plan of some kind costing $100,000,000. They would have plenty of money for it. They have $1,450,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the Senator will remember that we put in the full amount that was required for the TVA for power.

Mr. MAYBANK. That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina whether it is not true that, under this vast atomic-energy program, a single gaseous fusion plant can run into hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not necessary then, under this amendment, that $1,000,000,000 be earmarked for that plant before a cent of it could be used?

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr MAYBANK. We are endeavoring to make it absolutely clear, that that is not the case. The machinery can be bought, the land can be cleared, the pipes can be bought under the contract authority.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield further to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. My distinguished friend from South Carolina said, as I understood him, that he opposed the proviso, and my colleague from Michigan said he opposed it. The Senator from Massachusetts also said he opposed it. I should like to have it explained here tonight, by Senators who have been defending it. I should like to have an explanation of the purpose of this amendment, if it means anything.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was a proviso to the House amendment, from which the House conferees refused to recede, and the instructions of the conference were—and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], was in charge—that we were to write into the report a statement that this could not happen, and that, with the proviso as it was changed, as shown by the report, it could only apply to certain parts of a total plant. So it is possible for them to start any plant they want to start, tomorrow. As I remember, the appropriation was $1,450,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. MOODY and Mr. HAYDEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield further to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, here we are in a race for our survival——

Mr. MAYBANK. We shall win the race for survival if we make the proper legislative history and get this program going.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to know the purposes, if I may, of putting a brake on the atomic energy program.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I think I can help him answer that question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The conferees representing the Senate—and I was one of them—made it perfectly clear that heretofore it had been impossible to get detailed information from the Atomic Energy Commission as to its plans, and as to what it intended to do. It was decided that this had been going on long enough, and that there ought to be a better business arrangement and a better understanding between the Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Therefore, this provision was included. It was explained. We said that we did not know whether it was going to have a crippling effect or not, that, when it was thoroughly settled that any particular item or any particular project could be approved, inasmuch as the total amount could be expended between now and the next session of the Congress, it would be possible to spend more than a billion dollars. There is ample money with which to start any particular feature or any particular project that is necessary. Under those circumstances, we agreed. That was the understanding, and it is so written into the report. I want to confirm all that has been said by the Senator from Michigan, by the Senator from Massachusetts, and by the chairman of our committee. That was our understanding.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who did more than all the rest of us put together to try to work it out as it was worked out.

Mr HICKENLOOPER rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I want the floor in my own right. I want to make a speech on this matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask our esteemed colleague from South Carolina whether I am correct in my belief that the clause referred to is in the House amendment to Senate amendment 41, the last proviso, "*Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation will be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is the clause referred to. I appreciate the desire of the Senate members of the conference to create a favorable legislative history in this matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was only after we were defeated in the effort to knock out this proviso that we yielded.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. I may say I appreciate the desire of the Senate members of the conference committee to create a favorable legislative history, which will permit the interpretation which the members of the committee have attached to this proviso.

Mr. MAYBANK. And the House has agreed with us.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The courts have always held that legislative history does not have precedence over a statute itself, but that the statute is controlling. Therefore, before I would accept this legislative history, I would want to be clear on the meaning of this provision. I do not know how much of this material is classified, and how much is not classified.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately, too much of it is classified.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask a further question while we are on this point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I stated that the House agreed thoroughly with what we did.

Mr. HAYDEN. Entirely so.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us suppose there is a series of plants—I will not say what type of plant—but let us suppose there is a series of plants, the first of which would cost $1,400,000,000, the second of which would cost a very large sum, and the third of which would also cost a large sum. What I fear is that with this House proviso, instead of starting all three plants simultaneously with the appropriation given, only the first plant could be started, and it would be impossible to start the second and third plants.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from South Carolina yielded to me for a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am an outsider, asking these questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is such a complicated question that I would not be able to answer it, but I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois—because this entered my mind in connection with his questions—that it is my understanding that we may assume that there are three projects, each involving, let us say, $500,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That would be safe. But suppose one of them involves $1,450,000,000, that another involves $500,000,000, and that another involves $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This proviso, if the Senator will read it—and I shall be glad to supply it to him if he does not have it——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have it before me.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator will note that the language is "a building, utility, or other specific portion of a project." I agree that it may be a slightly liberal interpretation, but it is my interpretation—my hope, anyway, and my understanding that if, let us say, three large projects are contemplated each of them could be started. There might be 10 buildings built in 1 project, 10 in another, and 10 in a third—they might not be able to start work on 30 buildings in 1 project, 30 buildings in a second project, and 30 buildings in a third project—and they could keep them all going until the matter came back to the Senate next January.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MAYBANK. I first yield to the Senator from Wyoming, a member of the committee who has worked on this all day long.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] I may say that what the committee understood about this language is that the word "or" appears throughout. Every lawyer and every grammarian knows that the word "or" has a different effect from that of the word "and." I read:

> No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project—

That means that these three subjects are separate—any building, or any utility, or any specific portion of a project—

> unless funds are available for the completion of—

What?—

> of such building or such utility or such other specific portion of a project.

Let us consider the largest possible project one may have in mind. There is a specific portion of it. It could be the east wing, or the south wing, or the north wing, or it could be the basement. It could be any specific portion. The only purpose of this language as presented to us in the conference with the House was to make it certain that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be launching upon a vast project far beyond anything that had been presented to the Congress in justification of the appropriation.

I say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] that when this matter was first called to my attention and before I had the opportunity of reading this proviso, I was inclined to think that the proviso should be taken out, and I feared that unless it were taken out it might cause great danger to the progress of development of atomic energy. But when I listened to the explanation of the House members of the conference and when I read the proviso and saw the word "or" I lost all fear about it.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. My distinguished friend from Wyoming has read that the money shall be available for the construction of any building, any utility, or other specific portion of a project. In other words, the money must be there for the construction of the building. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. Bear in mind that there has been appropriated $1,400,000,000. Bear in mind that this is the 5th day of July. Bear in mind that Congress will be back in Washington on the 3d of next January. Bear in mind that it is physically impossible for the Atomic Energy Commission to spend that large amount of money between now and January.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that under this proviso the Commission could not contract for the construction of a gaseous diffusion building if it were necessary?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It could contract for the building of such a plant, or for the building of a utility, or the building of specific projects. Of course it could.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator does not let me finish my sentence. If a billion-dollar plant were to be contracted for, that would leave how much for the rest of the program?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is disregarding the word "portion."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in helping to make the legislative history clear I think it would be helpful to have in the RECORD the words of the chairman of the House subcommittee who was the author of this proviso. He is quoted in a press report on the ticker. I read:

> Chairman ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, of Texas, of the appropriations subcommittee which handled AEC funds said the rider would not "hamstring or slow down" the atomic-energy program.
>
> THOMAS told newsmen that the position was aimed at forcing the AEC to come up "with reasonably definite plans and specifications."
>
> He claimed that AEC was asking for "a blank check," but that careful planning and specifications could save up to $500,000,000 "and some time, too."

Thomas insisted that Congress had "no disposition to slow them down or stop them."

He insisted that Congress was asking only that "they come up with definite plans and specifications."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator served in the House along with the distinguished Representative from Texas. Congress does not intend to slow up anything.

Mr. CASE. That is true. It happened to be my privilege to work on the first appropriation for the Atomic Energy Commission. When the first money was appropriated for the Manhattan District project I was a Member of the House. We dealt with Army engineers.

I followed it through the course of the war. I was a member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. I was the majority member of that subcommittee at the time I left the House. I know something of the difficulty in appropriating for the Atomic Energy Commission. They started out with something for which they could not draw a blueprint.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. The whole history of the legislation has been to try to get the language a little more specific. All the rider does is to say very simply that "you shall not start a portion of a project unless the money is available." I have been told this evening by a distinguished member of the House Appropriations Committee, Representative TABER, of New York, that the committee was told by the Atomic Energy Commisison that they could not obligate, between now and April 1, more than $600,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE. The committee has provided two and one-half times as much as the Commission said it could obligate itself for in connection with the construction of a gaseous diffusion plant.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator knows that it takes a long time to develop such a plant.

Mr. CASE. They can start units of it under this language.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think we might well learn a lesson from what occurred tonight. If the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate continue to try to legislate on appropriation bills, we may as well do away——

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with the matter which we have been discussing.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator does not want to yield to me, I shall speak on my own time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly; the Senator should speak on his own time. I do not want anyone to think that we are legislating on an appropriation bill. The House had a right to put such provisions in with reference to the expenditure of the funds. I shall conclude by reading from the report:

Amendment No. 41—Plant and equipment: Restores the proposal of the House appropriating $1,450,000,000 for plant and equipment, in lieu of the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,450,000,000 plus contract authorization for the remainder of the expansion program. In restoring the limitation on the availability of funds for construction as set forth in the House provision, it is the intention of the conferees that funds provided shall be available for the purchase or procurement of machinery, equipment, and materials required for the entire expansion program as submitted to the Congress. The conferees invite the Commission to appear to present additional needs, if any, if the Congress is in session later in the year, or at the new session in January, at which time full consideration will be given such needs.

That is all I have to say.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee, who is in charge of the conference report, was on his feet earlier in the evening. The Chair thinks that if the Senator wishes recognition——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was on my feet asking for recognition. The Chair does not have any right to say who is going to get the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona knows it is the custom for the Chair to recognize those who are in charge of a bill or a conference report.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; and it is also the custom to recognize the majority leader when he rises to ask recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is welcome.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I was saying a few moments ago, when we attempt to legislate on appropriation bills, it is a serious matter. Most of the trouble in the Senate tonight has been due to attempts to legislate on appropriation bills. The only result is that it leads to trouble. The Senate has rules against such a practice, and the rules shcuild be observed. It makes no difference which House does it, whether the House or the Senate. It is worse when the House does it, because when the bill comes to the Senate, the question then is one of germaneness. When we vote on germaneness, there is no limit to what can be done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not at present. I will yield in a few minutes.

Mr. President, a serious question confronts the Senate this evening, as to whether the provision in controversy would permit to be done the things that should be done. Members of the Atomic Energy Commission and members of the Atomic Energy Committee say that the provision is not sufficient. I merely wish to say that I would rather spend all night here than to do something that would jeopardize the defense of this Nation.

We can talk about explaining the legislative history. We should not be compelled to do so. It is plain, and should speak for itself.

I do not intend to take any more time. I want the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who is a member of the Atomic Energy Committee, to explain the position of the committee. Much of the testimony has been taken in secret. I say that in times like these we cannot afford to play with the defense of America.

Perhaps some money has been wasted. The chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], has been sending messages from his bedside because he is terribly worried about the situation that is presented to us this evening.

It is all very well for Senators to take the floor and say that this provision is sufficient. But suppose it is not sufficient. Are we willing to take a chance? We could have sent the bill back to conference in the time that has already been consumed in trying to state the legislative history.

I hope the Senator from Iowa will make his explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not believe the proviso is legislation. The proviso is only a limitation, and is within the province of the Appropriations Committee. It should be clear that this particular proviso is not legislation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Many crimes are committed in the name of limitations.

I do not wish to use any more time. I want to hear what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has to say about the provision. I know that what he has to say will come from the depths of his heart, and will reflect what he thinks is best for the Nation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no desire to take the time of the Senate tonight unduly. I would not have sat around all evening and missed my dinner in order to be sure to be here when this proposal was before the Senate; I would not have asked every senior member of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to be here this evening; I would not have asked my old friend, Representative DURHAM, who is vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, one of the most zealous and informed men on the subject there is in Washington, to be here; I would not have spoken to the Senators on this side of the aisle, and a great many on the other side, more than I have on any other piece of legislation since I have been in the Senate, if I had not thought we were facing a very important and critical time in a most important and, in many ways, novel atomic energy development in this country, and if I had not thought that the proviso in the bill, regardless of legislative history and interpretation by individual Members or committee members, did not, in fact, stymie the adequate development of the program. I think it does.

I will say now that I think the bill must go back to conference, and that by some

legerdemain we must get the House conferees to realize that they are doing a disservice to American defensive power by retaining this proviso in the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the proviso says that—

> No part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available—

The words are "no part"; it does not say "half of it"; it says "no part"—

> shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

That is just as plain as language can be. To prove how plain it is, I shall read from the Appropriations Committee hearings on the bill. The exact date is not shown, but the hearings were held this summer.

This very provision was before the Appropriations Committee. This is the way the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] interpreted it at that time. With respect to this same language, he said:

> Senator MAYBANK. You could not start any part of the total program, if I may say so.
>
> Mr. DEAN. I think that is a question—whether you could start.
>
> Senator MAYBANK. I would say that.
>
> Senator HILL. You could not start unless what you started could be finished with all the money in this bill.
>
> Senator MAYBANK. That is right.
>
> Senator MCCARRAN. That does not require much interpretation. This language seems very clear.

Mr. President, the atomic energy program has a great deal of mystery about it. It has a great deal of secrecy about it, and necessarily so. But I assure Members of the Senate that the atomic energy program is not a static program. It has never been, and it will not be, for the foreseeable future. The atomic energy program is a rapidly changing and developing program. Science is reaching out into the unknown. The nuclear scientists never know from month to month what those reaching fingers will find out in the mists of this new science. Seldom does a quarter go by that some plans or programs do not have to be discarded because experience has shown that they might have been slightly on the wrong track or that the emphasis might have been misplaced, so that the scientists have to back up or go ahead with greater emphasis, depending upon what their discoveries are.

We have reached further into the unknown in atomic energy than man has ever gone in science, and we have only started to tear the veil aside. The program we are discussing, and to which this prohibition applies, is a package program. I am not privileged to discuss the details of that program on the floor of the Senate. They come under the category of things which the Atomic Energy Commission and our defense people believe should be kept quite secret in their details; but I assure Senators that the program is a package program. It is a $3,100,000,000 program which must be started, if it is to be economically successful, as a general entity. It cannot be successfully started piecemeal. It is like starting to build an automobile. We may say, "We will build the motor this year, and next year we will build the rear axle, and the year after that we will build the transmission. Then after a while we will get around to building the wheels."

If we are to have an automobile within a reasonable time, we must build the automobile, the axles, the frame, and every other part, so that the car will be in operation when the package project is completed.

But if it is built piecemeal, the end results, which are power for the defense of this country, will be delayed and delayed and delayed. I am not going to tell Senators how long the delay would be, but there is no question that there would be delay in the end result, which is power for the defense of this country—and more power than any of us, or all of us put together, could possibly imagine. Power for the defense of this country will be unduly and perilously postponed; make no mistake about that. I make this statement not as a partisan politician, not as a Republican or a Democrat. I say that speaking for every one of the 18 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have been living with this problem.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I wish to conclude.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask a question at that point.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I correctly understand that all the members of the joint committee agree upon that statement?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me be completely specific——

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to know the answer to that question. The Senator has the information.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Let me be completely specific. Let me check with the vice chairman of the committee, Representative DURHAM. I think there were about 12 members present the other day. At any rate, about two-thirds of the members were present. Others had been consulted. I had in my pocket the proxies for several members if it had been necessary to use them.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator is giving us his best information.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator that I am sure that no member of the joint committee opposed the resolution. Every member who was present was vitally interested. The action was unanimous. I had the right to vote about five proxies, if it had been necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely wished to be reassured. I think other Members of the Senate would like to be reassured.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The action was unanimous.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That statement carries great weight with me. I do not know much about the subject. The Senator and his colleagues are members of the committee. They have information which other Senators do not have. I am interested in the defense and security of the country, and I want to know the answers to some of these questions. Can this risk be taken? If it is the judgment of the committee that it cannot be taken, I should like to have that fact definitely stated.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I assume that any risk can be taken. The risk is not only unwarranted, but may be costly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me put it this way: Would it be prudent, under all the conditions, to take the risk?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be utterly imprudent to take the risk.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I want to know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am speaking this evening for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, because I am the only member of the committee who is present on the floor of the Senate. I have asked Representative DURHAM to come over. He is vice chairman of the committee. So I must speak for the committee.

The joint committee was so concerned about this matter 2 or 3 weeks ago that we held a meeting and passed a special resolution, which was unanimously agreed to, that we would earnestly request the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate not to include this rider. This is not an ordinary proposition. It is not like constructing buildings in units. In constructing buildings, one unit can be used after it is built, and another unit can be built and used. This project is like an automobile. If it is going to run, we cannot build the motor today, the rear axle next month, the wheels next Michaelmas, and expect it to operate by the time the motor is built. We must build it as a package project, if we are to have an operating vehicle.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa has said that this is a package program, which would cost approximately $3,000,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Slightly more than $3,000,000,000—three billion three or four hundred million. I cannot give the exact amount.

Mr. MOODY. As I understand, the appropriation in this bill calls for about half that amount.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It calls for approximately $1,400,000,000.

Mr. MOODY. So if the Senate should foolishly consent to this proviso, it would mean that only about half the atomic-energy program could be started. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We believe so. The Atomic Energy Commission and its lawyers believe so. The joint committee is united in its opinion that that is so.

I wish to make clear to the Senator from Michigan that it is not a question of whether $1,400,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 is appropriated now. In my judgment the extra $600,000,000 would not accomplish anything, because there

would still be the proviso. I think this statement can be verified by those who are familiar with the situation. The extra $600,000,000 in the appropriation would not accomplish anything, because there would still be the proviso that the program cannot be started unless all the money is in hand to pay for it. As I say, this project ought to be a package deal.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that unless we want to put the brakes on our atomic energy program we must appropriate $3,000,000,000 instead of one and one-half billion?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; we do not have to appropriate $3,000,000,000. All that it is necessary to do is to take the rider off.

Mr. MOODY. The alternative to taking the rider off would be to double the appropriation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Oh, yes. If we want to appropriate approximately $3,400,000,000 and leave the rider on, that is all right. But so long as we leave the rider on and appropriate only half the money, the job cannot be done.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], chairman of the joint committee, has devoted a great deal of time to this subject. He is ill and unable to be on the floor at this time. He has sent to me a statement which he asks me to read into the RECORD so that he may be on record in this matter. He says:

I am distressed and alarmed to learn that the destructive and crippling rider directed at the atomic energy program has been left in the bill as reported by the conference committee.

I very much hope that the Senate will act to recommit the bill, for purposes of eliminating this rider; for I have been assured by the Chairman and General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission that the program will be seriously delayed if the rider stands.

We are dealing here with issues of war and peace. If the rider becomes law, and therefore threatens our capacity to prevent war, I shall have utterly no alternative except to request the President to call the Congress back into session for purposes of enabling the atomic program to go forward as asked by the President, the National Security Council, the Defense Department, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Atomic Energy Commissioners.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement released by the office of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which reads:

In response to a joint committee inquiry, Mr. Gordon Dean, chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made the following comment upon the action of the House in cutting atomic-energy funds by more than one-half and in adopting a rider which provides that the AEC cannot start a project unless it has on hand the funds to complete it:

"I am confident that if the Congress understands the effect on our production of this proviso on construction, it will eliminate the language. Under this proviso we cannot achieve the weapons production which the program was designed to accomplish.

"The purpose of the expansion program is to get more bombs in a hurry. Weapons material would begin to flow from these plants in less than 2 years.

"You cannot say in one breath that you are blessing the total expansion program, then cut the fund for that program more than one-half, then slap on a rider that we can't start any project until we have the money for it without at the same time saying that we can't start the total program. The fact is that we could start only half of it."

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, all through that statement which the Senator from Iowa has read the reference is to the starting of a project. As I read the rider, it refers to a portion of a project.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would say to the Senator from South Dakota that we have had interpretations given us. I believe the Committee on Appropriations is utterly sincere in believing that this does not handicap the atomic energy program. I think they believe that they are sound in their interpretation. I would not accuse any member of the committee of desiring to injure the program. They have always tried to help it. However, it is the deep conviction of the Commission, the joint committee, and those of us who have examined the rider that it is in fact a complete block to the beginning of a package program.

Before I conclude my remarks I wish to say that the $3,000,000,000 program is not the entire atomic energy program. We are making substantial progress on atomic energy. It is something that is vitally needed to be developed with speed and with strength.

No one has criticized waste and mismanagement in the atomic energy program more than I have. There is no one who will criticize it quicker than I will. There is no one who is more nonpartisan in his attitude toward atomic energy development than I am.

Mr. President, I say to you that I earnestly believe, the joint committee earnestly believes, and the Commission earnestly believes, that the $3,000,000,000 program which is so important and so vital must be started as a package program for its ultimate efficiency and its ultimate success; and that this rider as it now stands will hamper that program and hamper or slow down the day of realization of its final efficiency and success, and will postpone that day to a period which may be unwise in the light of future events.

I say, to the majority leader, who has been very kind in his consideration of this matter, and very cooperative in his interest as to what is best for the program, that I earnestly hope the bill can be sent back to conference. This is the only provision in the appropriation bill with which I have any quarrel at this time. I think it is so vital that it ought to be sent back, with firm determination on the part of the Senate conferees to correct the proviso, either by eliminating it or by adding certain other provisions to it, so that it will permit the starting of the program, and then rely upon future appropriations for the money which may be required in the future. I earnestly hope—and I say this with all sincerity—that the Senate should send the bill back to conference, and that the House conferees should understand the vital necessity of more latitude in the beginning of this program in the interest of our national defense.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will take only a few minutes, because I desire a vote on the report, and I want the vote to come promptly.

Mr. President, I have been connected with the atomic-energy efforts from the beginning. The first plant was established in my State, at my request. The engineers found the place and put it there. I am tremendously interested in it. No man is more interested in the atomic-energy program than I am.

If we were to take the bill back to conference we would not get anywhere with it. The House has made up its mind about it. They are an equal party with us in matters of legislation. If we send it back it is not going to do any good, in my judgment. Let me read the language. It does not mean what Mr. Gordon Dean says it means. It does not mean what the distinguished and eloquent Senator from Iowa says it means. It does not mean what my good friend the Senator from Arizona thinks it means. Let us look at the amendment. Nothing is said in it about a package project or any other kind of project. The word "project" is excluded from the proviso. I will try to read the amendment in such a way that everyone can understand that it will not hamper the Atomic Energy Commission in the least. If I thought it did I would not agree to it, because I want the project to go forward. Let us consider the language:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction—

Does it say anything about a project? Oh, no; the word "project" is not used.

of any building—

The House said that at one time additional buildings were erected when the money was not available with which to build them. I do not know whether that is correct, but the House thought so.

of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project—

Specific portion of a project. It does not mean the building of a great project costing a billion dollars or half a billion dollars. That is excluded from this proviso.

The word "project" means the entire project.

This provision refers only to a building, a utility, or some "other specific portion" of a project—

unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

The language is perfectly clear. There can be no doubt about it. Any lawyer who would put a different construction on it, should study law longer.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have great respect for the opinion of the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. But if the language is perfectly clear, why did the committee strike it out in the first instance?

Mr. McKELLAR. We did so in order to get some kind of bill to help this

great project, this great development along. We tried in every way to form such language that there could be no opposition to it.

I never dreamed that a fight of this kind would be made at this late hour in the session. The House has already adopted the resolution of adjournment.

I do not know whether we can get a further conference with the House; and if we did, it would be a useless conference.

If this provision does have a different effect, it can easily be corrected. The President can call us back into session at any time, and no doubt he will do so if this provision does affect the program adversely. The President should do so, and I believe he will do so, if it affects the program adversely.

But I do not believe it will affect it a single particular.

Senators will notice from the hearings that when Mr. Dean was testifying, he was very much more concerned about the amount of the appropriation than he was about the language of the proviso. The language of the proviso seems to be an afterthought.

Let us look at the practical proposition, Mr. President. It is now half past 11 at night, and we are debating a question of this kind, when we know the House will not change its position on this matter. Is there a Senator here who believes that we could get the House to change its position? If so, I should like to have him rise.

So what is the use of advocating an impractical proposition?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President, I think the House may change its mind. I think the House ought to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that is one Senator who takes that position.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So do I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So do I.

Mr. MOODY. So do I.

Mr. MONRONEY. So do I.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that makes five Senators who think that way. But those Senators are not on the committee of conference. I know that we do not have a chance to change this provision.

The Senate should do what the committee has recommended.

Mr. President, I call for a vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have listened not only with interest, but with alarm, to the discussion this evening about this section of the conference report on the appropriation bill.

Very frankly, Mr. President, there is doubt as to what these words mean. That doubt has been expressed by a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That doubt has been expressed by him in what I consider to be a statesmanlike presentation on this floor. I wish to commend the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for his statesmanship this evening.

That doubt has been expressed by resolution in the committee, and that doubt has been expressed by the Atomic Energy Commission, and that doubt has been expressed by well-meaning, patriotic, loyal Senators on this floor.

Mr. President, I wish to say very frankly that a doubt of this nature cannot be left unresolved. It is imperative that Congress remain in session until we are perfectly clear what the Atomic Energy program is going to be.

By the action which Congress already has taken, the Air Force program has been extended for 1 year, and the military program has been reduced by several billion dollars, and the foreign aid and military assistance and economic assistance budgets have been reduced.

Mr. President, we are playing with our security; we are playing with disaster.

I repeat what I said a few days ago on this floor, namely, there is no dove of peace cooing in Stalin's ear. He is rattling the saber. He is making trouble in Berlin. He is clearing out those in the satellite countries about whom he has any doubt. He is causing riots in Japan. There is trouble brewing, and the Congress cannot close its eyes to it.

I will never vote for this conference report until this body removes any doubt whatsoever from that language.

It is not important that the Senate adjourn tonight.

It is important that this atomic energy program go on.

I know nothing about the mysteries of that program, and I seek no knowledge of that sort. All I know is that surely the members of the Appropriations Committee do not have as much information on this matter as do the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Minnesota that we have more. So he can forget that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield.

I wish to say that throughout the years the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the members of the Atomic Energy Commission have made this matter their business.

It is wrong to say that the language is clear, because it is not clear to the Senator from Michigan or to the Senator from Illinois or to the Senator from Iowa or to the Senator from Oklahoma or to me.

This is the most serious issue which has been before this body. We are talking about atomic bombs and hydrogen bombs, and about the survival of our Nation and of the world.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not yield at this moment.

Until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and until the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—unfortunately, he is absent tonight—tell me that this language is all right, the Senate will not leave this Chamber for a long time, because I have the floor. Let us make up our minds about that right now.

Mr. President, this language is not clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not yield for the moment, Mr. President.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield just for a statement?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator to wait just a moment, please.

Mr. President, I have all the affection and all the respect in the world for the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee. My words are not a reflection upon their integrity or their honor or their ability or their experience or their intelligence. They are more experienced than I am; they are more capable. Surely they have much more knowledge than I do of the workings of this body.

But, Mr. President, let me say in all candor and in all frankness that I think it is our job to resolve this issue.

The House of Representatives has sent back one conference report after another. The House of Representatives wrote into these appropriations bills rider after rider.

The situation is such, for instance, that my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is chairman of that committee, of which I am a member, was told—or at least they tried to tell him—that his bill could not be passed.

Mr. President, there are two bodies of this Congress; the Congress has two branches, the Senate and the House of Representatives. We do not have to take the advice and the counsel of the other House all the time; the Congress is not a one-way street.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator from Minnesota know that to a very great extent the attitude prevails that in the case of appropriations, the Congress should be a one-body organization?

I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for what he is saying. Some day we are going to come to grips with this issue, and the Senate will insist upon accepting its proper share of the responsibility in connection with the expenditure of public funds.

I am not so experienced as are some of the other members of the Appropriations Committee; but I can say to you tonight, Mr. President, that this issue is becoming more and more and more pronounced. I know whereof I speak. I have seen horse trading, without regard to merit, in order to get a bill reported. So far as I am concerned, I am ceasing to be a party to it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to say to the Senator from Minnesota that he has spoken words I believe to be true. I think the Senate conferees did the best they could, and I am sure that the

Atomic Energy Commission feels that way about it; otherwise, I would not say it. But I think appropriation bills have been swallowed in certain instances, through conference reports that have come to the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. And how hard the members of our Appropriation Committee have worked. I commend them, I honor them, and I sympathize with them, in view of the tremendous pressure under which they have worked. All I say, Mr. President, is that I do not think it right in this instance to ask those of us who are quite as concerned about the security of our country as are the members of the Appropriations Committee, to accept language or a proviso in this bill which I honestly do not believe meets the situation.

The Senator from Iowa convinced me beyond the shadow of a doubt as to what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has in mind. I submit that we place a great trust in that committee. Time after time, in the few years I have been here, I have sat here to listen silently as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have come before us to tell us some of the things that are going on. We do not know. We never get on the inside of these organizations. We must accept the word of someone. And whose word do we accept? We accept the word of the Chairman of the Commission. We accept the word of whom else? The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the word of the other members of the Joint Committee. Here are Members of the House and of the Senate, members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and if I understand correctly, the Joint Committee, composed of Members of the House and Members of the Senate, believe that there is a doubt as to the meaning of this language, they believe that it is restrictive, they believe that it does not represent prudent judgment in the terms of the security of our country.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator is making a very splendid and convincing argument, but the situation, as I see it, is this—and after saying this, I intend to ask the Senator a question. There is a disagreement as to the language of this bill, which is most vital. It should be determined by the Congress. What we do here might make a difference as to whether some of our homes shall be bombed and the welfare of our Nation seriously affected. I do not say that some of the distinguished members of the Appropriations Committee may not be correct, although they struck out the language in the first place. But the hour is late, and it seems to me that the entire Senate should understand this proposition now. It seems to me it would be better if we would not debate it any further. I do not mean that as a criticism of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I think we should vote on this proposition. I believe we have the votes to reject the conference report and send it back to conference. I believe that in that manner we shall come nearer to getting an agreement than in any other way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that I want to yield to the Senator from New Mexico, because he requested me to yield a moment ago; after which, I will yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the only point I wanted to make is that this is an appropriation bill. I know the Senator from Minnesota does not intend to create such an impression, but it would seem that the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from Michigan feel that they are more patriotic and more interested in trying to save the country than is the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, Mr. President, no Member of this body is to be more honored than is the Senator from Tennessee. I have spoken publicly again and again of his fine qualities, of his fine character, and of his attributes as a statesman.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to say that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has proved himself to be about the youngest one among us.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. He has worked longer hours and he has worked harder than anyone else. He stood before us to make a wonderful speech here preceding the last vote. I am proud of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has been kind enough to yield to me. The point I am trying to make is that I do not want any Member of this body to feel that he is more patriotic, more loyal, or more earnestly seeking to protect the country than is the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. MAYBANK. No one is ever more patriotic or loyal than he.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. He has just made an extremely fine explanation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am told that one building planned by the Atomic Energy Commission—I am informed that this information is not classified, and that it is therefore proper for me to mention it—I am told that one building planned by the Atomic Energy Commission will cost about $1,000,000,000 of the $1,450,000,000 appropriated. I should then like to ask the Senator whether, if the Commission were to start this one building and were to tie up $1,000,000,000, it would be possible for the Commission then to start the remaining $2,500,000,000 worth of projects which, as I understand, must be completed simultaneously, and therefore presumably must be started simultaneously.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall ask the Senator to pardon me if I do not give him a completely concise answer, for I am not certain about the classification of figures. I am not certain whether the Senator's figures are correct. I cannot say that the Senator is completely accurate in his illustration of the point, and whether it should be $1,000,000,000, or $1,250,000,000, or $1,500,000,000 or $500,000. He is illustrating a point. There are several operations in this program that cost very substantial amounts of money to complete. If the Atomic Energy Commission were compelled to have the money necessary to complete these most expensive programs in its hands the result would be that the projects would only be built piecemeal. The Senator is illustrating the point.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as long as I am answering the question of the Senator from Illinois, I may say that I earnestly hope that no one, by the slightest imagination, thought that I was in any way impugning the patriotism of the Senator from Tennessee, who is one of the most patriotic men we have ever had in the United States Senate. I grant that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a resolution of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, adopted June 27, 1952.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, JUNE 27, 1952

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy met this morning and considered with the Atomic Energy Commission the proviso beginning on page 12, line 6, in the supplemental appropriations bill now pending before the House. It is clear that if this proviso becomes law, the Atomic Energy Commission will not be able to meet military requirements for atomic weapons as laid down by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The joint committee has unanimously requested that the House and Senate give consideration to deleting the proviso in question. In effect, as the proviso stands, the Commission cannot start on the programs necessary to meet military requirements because the funds requested of the Congress were cut in half and because the proviso provides that no building project may be started unless funds are available to complete it.

The joint committee has studied this program over an extended period of time and believes that the rider will prevent this program from going forward as national security requires.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for a division.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A division is requested. Those favoring the conference report will rise, and will remain standing until counted. Those opposed will rise, and will remain standing until counted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. The Chair is in the process of counting the vote. The vote is a tie, and the conference report is not agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 8370, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 30, 53, 63, and 64 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike the word "additional" in line 4 of said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for inquiries and investigations, Committee on Appropriations, $250,000.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies, and examination of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution No. 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, $250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"RESEARCH IN THE UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATER

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952, authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive used, $125,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FOREIGN COUNTRIES

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert in addition thereto the following:

"Any appropriation available to the Department of Defense shall be available for mustering-out payments as authorized by law."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "including not to exceed $186,900 for personal services for those persons in a publicity office of the Mutual Security Agency in the District of Columbia the major part of whose activities is the dissemination of information in the United States and for expenses incident to the dissemination of such information."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by said amendment insert "$6,743,026."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 32, 50, 67, and 87.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon the amendments in disagreement and ask a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

ADDITIONAL MATTER PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, additional matter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Material prepared by him entitled "Truman Foreign Aid Program."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 5, 1952, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution providing that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 1999. An act relating to withholding, for State income-tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, Stat. 825);

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere;

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands

of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor, and for other purposes; and

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings for today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send forward a conference report——

The VICE PRESIDENT. We have not yet acted on the last one.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am going to object to the conference report on civil functions appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not a question of objection. It is a question of agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to discuss the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I intend to discuss the report at length.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in order that he may move to bring up another conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside to take up another conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I understand my colleague from South Carolina and other Senators are prepared to speak at some length. We are not going to be persecuted in this manner in the Carolinas and in the Southeast. I want to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. No civil functions appropriation bill will be passed tonight, so I shall start to read, Mr. President, from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Friday, July 4:

> The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.
>
> Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:
>
> Eternal God, the strength of our years and the light of all our days, we turn again from the clash and clamor of our times, from the confusion of voices—

The confusion of voices, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. To what does the Senator object?

Mr. MAYBANK. Every member of the South Carolina delegation in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, every member of the Georgia delegation, and every Member of Congress from the Southeast resents the action of the conferees in connection with the Hartwell Dam.

Mr. McKELLAR. No one was any more strongly in favor of the Hartwell Dam than I. The conference committee was in session for hours.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senate will be in session for hours—until Monday morning if necessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would withdraw this conference report temporarily.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should be glad to have that done; but there will not be any civil functions appropriation bill passed tonight without the money for Hartwell Dam. I shall read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am still a young man and quite able to stand here for some time. I shall read the entire RECORD.

I do not intend to have the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee run the Congress of the United States.

I do not intend to let my dear devoted friend, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR], have this item kicked out. It is a direct slap at the delegations from South Carolina and Georgia and particularly at the junior senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that this conference report be withdrawn temporarily until the Senate can get action——

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that the distinguished majority leader has been on our side in this fight, along with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I will withdraw my objection with the understanding that the civil functions conference report will never be agreed to until I am heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A conference report is a privileged matter and can be brought up at any time.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read by the legislative clerk.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none and the question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

THE NATICK LABORATORY—PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF THE QUARTERMASTER CORPS.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement regarding the inclusion of the Natick Laboratory in an earlier conference report presented by the Senator from Wyoming, but in the interest of saving time I merely ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement in which I announce that I shall ask the Johnson subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to make a thorough investigation of the Quartermaster Corps in connection with the Natick Laboratory.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> This so-called Natick Laboratory will, if constructed, stand as a monument to the wastefulness, bad planning on the part of the military. We are going to find out who wants this project—why they want it.
>
> I am in favor of keeping food research in Chicago, leather and tentage at Jeffersonville, clothing and textiles at Philadelphia, until we find out why they should be abandoned. Many leaders of industry and of labor oppose this project. It violates common sense and economic experience. The Under Secretary of the Army, Karl Bendetsen, admits that it will not reduce the research and development staff or budget in any way. Yet, in the name of consolidation, it is urged.
>
> If it is half built, all built, or just begun, we should get to the bottom of this so-called Institute of Man. And when we do, I think we'll find that it is the "institute of a man" or some special group of men, who have a private interest for pushing this set-up. I am completely confident that exposing the entire story of Natick will expose a pattern of waste and whitewashing throughout the entire Quartermaster organization.
>
> There has been a campaign to put over this laboratory. In the name of research, a new, vast, and unnecessary building is being erected, which will, according to the Army, suddenly produce miraculous research by up-rooting a thousand industrial technologists, who are now doing an excellent job with industry, since only 5 percent of them have ever had anything to do with research.

EXPANSION OF THE AIR FORCE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the debate which took place during December 1941 with respect to the expansion of the air

power, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 9, pages 9721 to 9724, together with the discussion on the same subject which took place on August 26, 1949, which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 9, pages 12303 to 12315. This matter, reprinted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, 1941, and August 26, 1949, together with the record of the debate on Monday last, June 30, 1952, when the Senate adopted by a yea-and-nay vote of 70 to 0 my amendment to assure a 143-wing combat force, is the long story of building up American air power. I offered the first amendment in the Committee on Appropriations on the day before Pearl Harbor. It was designed to provide $500,000,000 for the expansion of what was then the United States Air Corps. It was defeated in the committee, but when I presented it in the Senate on December 12, 1941, five days after Pearl Harbor, it was adopted by a voice vote.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 12, 1941]

EXPANDED AIR FORCE NECESSARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To which amendment does the Senator refer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To the amendment the clerk has just read, on page 4, line 21.

In connection with this amendment I should also like to call attention to the amendment on page 39, line 20. I speak now on behalf of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and myself to urge an increase in both these items.

The appropriation on page 4, line 21, includes an increase of $390,000,000 above the House figure for the construction of aviation facilities by the Army. As it was justified to the Appropriations Committee, this item of $390,000,000 included $75,000,000 for the housing of 54,000 men of a technician program upon the completion of training; $100,000,000 for housing to complete the first aviation objective; and $215,000,000 for the completion of 14 skeletonized fields included in the estimates.

Mr. President, I think everyone will agree that the events of the last few days have demonstrated beyond any possibility of challenge that the most effective arm of the Military Establishment is the aviation arm; the most effective method of both defense and attack in warfare is by the use of the airplane. I have heard Senators upon this floor speak with a good deal of feeling with respect to the terrible disaster that occurred last Sunday at Pearl Harbor, and there was a disposition upon the part of some to feel that the Navy was possibly at fault in that disaster; but what happened a few days later at Singapore when the mighty new British battleship, the *Prince of Wales*, was sunk, and the mighty cruiser *Repulse* was also sunk, demonstrated to my satisfaction, at least, that the fault at Pearl Harbor lay not with the personnel upon any of our naval vessels but to the fact that the new weapon of warfare, the air force, which is capable of executing tremendous destruction, has not been sufficiently developed by this Nation. We in Congress must accept some blame for our lack of preparation. The British battleship *Prince of Wales* and the British cruiser *Repulse* were not taken unawares. Yet they suffered exactly the same fate that was visited upon some of our vessels in Pearl Harbor.

Not only is it true that the American and British Navies have suffered great losses from attacks by enemy airplanes, but it is now known to us and to all the world that the Japanese Navy has likewise suffered from the attacks of our planes. A Navy flyer, Captain Kelly, of Florida, lost his life only yesterday in a daring attack upon a Japanese battleship, an attack which resulted in the sinking of that vessel. Other flyers, notably a flying officer named Wagner, helped to revenge our losses at Pearl Harbor by the destruction of enemy airplanes; and the gallant defenders of Wake Island, through the use of aviation, have sunk two Japanese vessels.

Mr. President, to me this means but one thing, namely, that if we desire to perfect our defenses we must make certain that we shall have an adequate Air Force. The sad truth is that we have been building up our air defense by little bits and pieces instead of undertaking to build it thoroughly and completely.

A year or two ago we began with 16 groups for the Army and then we increased it to 36. A little later we increased it to 54, and now we are increasing it to 84. I know that in the judgment of the experts of the War Department we ought to have an Air Force of 150 units, and yet in this bill, which comes to the floor of the Senate after the disaster at Pearl Harbor, after the disaster at Singapore, we are still appropriating for only 84 units. This is a program that was adopted before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Of course, the Senator knows that we have appropriated for the air service just what we were requested to appropriate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MCKELLAR. We cannot go over the heads of the departments; that would be unwise; but certainly we have appropriated for every airplane for which they have asked us to appropriate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my point is that the War Department should not attack this problem in bits and pieces, and that the Congress of the United States should not be content to have them attack the problem in bits and pieces. The evidence which was submitted to the committee shows clearly that $100,000,000 included in the $390,000,000 is for housing to complete the first aviation objective. Why should we stop with the completion of the first aviation objective? It seems to me, Mr. President, to be quite clear that we should tolerate no delay whatsoever in carrying out as full a program as it is possible to carry out.

A year or more ago the Civil Aeronautics Authority came to the Congress with a recommendation for the building of certain auxiliary airfields. That recommendation was followed partially in the House of Representatives, but when it came to the Senate it was rejected. I stood upon this floor at that time, Mr. President, urging that it was a mistake to reject the recommendations of the CAA, because I was then and am now convinced that the defense of the Nation demands that we have the largest possible number of airfields in the shortest possible time.

If there is one thing certain it is that an air force cannot be used efficiently unless there are sufficient fields from which planes may rise and upon which they may alight. An air force without a large number of airfields cannot realize its full effectiveness.

The bill which the committee brings in calls for 104 auxiliary airfields. I know that the experts of the Civil Aeronautics Authority are of the opinion that we ought to have 240 additional auxiliary airfields; so the amendments which I am offering on behalf of the Senator from Nevada, Mr. MCCARRAN, and myself provide for an increase of $100,000,000 in the item on page 4 for the Army, and an increase of $68,000,000 in the item on line 20, page 39, for the Civil Aeronautics Authority. If we are to defend our Nation, we must have the greatest air force on earth.

Mr. President, without further argument upon this point, I move to amend the committee amendment on line 21, page 4, by substituting for the figure reported by the House, which was $434,320,000, the sum of $927,820,000, so that the Army may have an opportunity to proceed with its program beyond the first objective; on page 39, line 20, strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$127,115,300" and at line 21, strike out "$2,375,000" and insert "$3,815,450."

Mr. President, I suggest that it might be a very advisable thing for the chairman of the subcommittee to accept this amendment and take it to conference, where he will have an opportunity to discuss the matter fully with the War Department, and see whether or not this is a desirable thing to do.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike more than I can say to disagree with my good friend from Wyoming, who has been so greatly interested in this bill and all its provisions, and has looked at it in such an intelligent way; but I feel that I must do so.

We cannot direct the administrative officers of the Government and say that they need more than they have asked for. I am sure supplemental appropriations on this subject will very soon come before us. I entirely agree with the Senator about the necessity of building as many planes as it is possible to build, but I do not feel that we ought to appropriate more money than our executive officers ask for. After all, we have to depend on the administrative officers to do this job. We ourselves cannot do it.

For that reason I cannot accept the amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point is that by offering this amendment I am not asking the Army to do what it does not intend to do. The Army intends to do this. The Army is of the opinion that instead of having only 84 airfields we should have 150 airfields; and I am merely asking the Members of the Senate now to provide funds so that the Army may more nearly approximate the number of airfields that it believes to be necessary.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know what the Army intends to do. We can determine what their intention is only when they make recommendations to the Congress.

As I recall, I have voted for every appropriation which has ever been made for airplanes during my entire service in this body; and if the Army wants more I shall help them in every way in the world. They may come in at any time and get them; but when we have appropriated $390,000,000 more than the House appropriated, and that is what the Department asked for, it seems to me we ought not to go beyond that amount.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the expressions of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] must of necessity appeal to those who are interested in our national defense from the standpoint of air defense.

It has been proven beyond all doubt that in order for us to have a successful national defense, and to carry on the war successfully, we must have an adequate air force. In order to have an adequate air force, it is absolutely imperative that at once—not by delayed process, but at once—we go about building that air force from the standpoint of adequacy.

That being true, the Army has looked forward; but the Army must come through the Budget Bureau in order to get to Con-

gress, and on many occasions requests on the part of the Army are curtailed by the Budget Bureau. I am not saying that that has been done in the case of this item, but I know and we all know how it operates. If we, as the Congress of the United States, are interested in building our Air Force from the ground up, we should be interested in building it at once; not piecemeal, not a little at a time, but grossly, if you please, and determinedly.

We now have throughout the length and breadth of this country only a few air bases. Hundreds and thousands of young men every day are applying to enter military aviation. It is not very long since my attention was drawn to the fact that a whole contingent of trained pilots, men who held pilots' certificates to go into the air, were denied the right even to take hold of a plane, and were held in a camp in the South where they could not have access to a plane. That complaint was brought to me by young men who were in that camp, who were ready, willing, competent and trained, and held pilots' certificates to go into the air, but they were denied the right. Why? In all probability because the facilities were not available.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming in conjunction with myself is to make immediately available training bases and other bases for aviation purposes, so that our young men who are crowding into that side of our military defense may be afforded the opportunity. If, on the other hand, we do this only by piecemeal, eventually it will be asked, "Why did you not prepare by air, for air is the greatest arm of defense?"

I think this is the time for the Congress to act and urge our experts in the Army to go forward. We say to them by this amendment, "We are affording you the money. You have set up the plan, or if you have not set it up, you should set it up, and you should go forward at once."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Nevada whether he knows about the time of the budget's recommendation upon this point. That is to say, had the United States been assaulted by Japan? Had the demonstration of the supremacy of the air forces been made before the Budget Bureau made its recommendations?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I am inclined to believe—and in this matter the Senator must take merely my conjecture by way of answer—that the Budget Bureau had passed on this item before the incident to which the Senator refers. I come to that conclusion merely by taking events as they have come along, and because of the bill having come through the House.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Exactly what was done was this: The House appropriated $434,320,000 before war was declared. After war was declared, the Army came in with an additional estimate of $393,500,000 and the Senate committee has reported $393,500,000 additional. In other words, this has been done by the Senate committee since the declaration of war, and it has been done during the past 2 or 3 days.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, just one last expression on this matter. I think it has been demonstrated, as I have before stated, that the arm of our military defense based on air development is perhaps our most potential arm. That being true, and the demand in our armed forces for training being so great, and training bases for the use being so necessary, we should not hesitate to say to the Army, "We are affording you all of the money which will be required to install 150 air bases, or 150 units. Now go forward under the plan you have set up, or any plan you will set up."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know the Senator understands that I am greatly interested in the development of the air arm in both civil and military aeronautics. But the question which seems pertinent, or one which occurs to me, at least, is whether the Budget Bureau learned from the military department, from those who should know, that any larger sum of money could be used practicably at this time in that branch of the service.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I am not advised.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to be able to say to the Senator from Vermont that it is the intention of the War Department to seek larger appropriations for this very purpose, but in the few days which elapsed between the day the bill was passed in the House and the attack upon Pearl Harbor the War Department laid before the Bureau of the Budget only the program for this so-called first objective. The purpose of the amendment is to enable the War Department to begin to go forward at the earliest possible date with the program with which they intend to go forward.

It will be said that the matter will be taken care of when the Budget Bureau sends up some new estimates to be included in another deficiency bill. My point is that there is no sense in waiting. Let us act now, and let us indicate to the people of the country that we intend to sustain the efforts to expand our air forces.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I merely wish to say that the War Department has asked for $390,000,000 at this time with which to increase the air bases, and to meet the attendant expenses for the purpose of providing housing, and to care for the number of new units for which they have prepared. They have a carefully prepared plan, they have prepared for so many units, and the number was increased recently. It was 54 units, now it is 84, and this bill provides for the air bases for those 84 units.

The committee will be open at all times, I assure both Senators, and whenever the Department makes the recommendation for additional units and for additional appropriations, we must appropriate according to their plans. We cannot make the plans for them, it seems to me, and I say to my two distinguished friends that it would be better to wait until the Department sends in its recommendations. Whenever it does, I am sure the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will call the committee together, and if necessary we will have hearings, and will pass on the matter immediately or as soon as possible.

I agree with the Senator as to the importance of airplanes, and we are doing everything the Department asks. But let us not outrun them in the matter, because it is their business to arrange the plans and specifications for what should be done.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I do not advocate outrunning them, but I do advocate making the pace whereby they may carry out their own program, and their own program calls for approximately 150 units, of which 84 are provided for in the bill before us. It seems to me that it behooves Congress, in view of what has happened, in view of the example we have set, not to outrun them, but at least to keep up with the Army and give them adequate means for carrying out the program which they have already established. If that is done we cannot be blamed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. If the Senator will yield further, I assure him we will keep up with them, and when they make recommendations for the planes and bases they need the money will be furnished quickly, and they can go to their task.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Now is the time to furnish the money so they may proceed with the program.

* * * * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], on page 4, line 21, in the committee amendment in lieu of "$827,820,000" to insert "$927,820,000"; in the committee amendment on page 39, line 20, in lieu of "$59,115,300" to insert "$127,115,300"; and on the same page, in the committee amendment, line 21, in lieu of "$2,815,450" to insert "$3,815,450."

The amendments to the committee amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments, as amended.

The committee amendments, as amended, were agreed to.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1949]

BALANCED AIR POWER REQUIRES CONSISTENT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I marvel at the equanimity of those who are willing to reduce the appropriation for the Air Force. I have observed this attitude over a long period of years. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee prior to World War II when suggestions were made in that committee that we ought to have an air force. I sat in the Appropriations Committee when even the Secretary of War said we were fully equipped with planes. I, myself, in 1941, offered an amendment in the Appropriations Committee to the military bill providing for an increased appropriation to build up an Army Air Force. It was an Army Air Force then. The committee, upon the advice of the Secretary of War, rejected that amendment. I brought the amendment out upon the floor of the Senate. The Senate had a better view of the part that air power plays in war than did the Secretary of War, even though the Secretary of War at that time was the very able Henry Stimson, and the Senate adopted the amendment. But the advice of the War Department against building up an air force prevailed in the Congress, and the amendment died.

It was by reason of the defeat of that amendment on the appropriation bill for the year 1941 that we had the condition so ably described by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] just a few moments ago with respect to what happened at Bataan and Corregidor.

Mr. President, I would rather have obsolete planes than too few planes. But I submit there is no danger of having obsolete planes. We should not overlook also the additional fact that an air force is not made up of planes alone. It is made up of personnel as well.

I have no apprehension about our studies. We fought that matter out in our consideration of the independent offices bill, and the Senate stood by the recommendations of the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of the independent offices appropriation bill, and provided funds for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to extend its studies. We knew then that the great strength of Hitler was in the fact that he had pursued his studies and had built up his air force. We know now that while we are endeavoring to the best of our ability

as a Nation and as a people and as a Government to lay the foundation of permanent world peace, there is at large an aggressor nation which has the strongest army in the world and which is now endeavoring to build up its air power. It can have only one purpose, Mr. President. I think it is little short of disastrous for the United States, in the face of this condition, deliberately and willingly to cut down the United States Air Force.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the able Senator from Wyoming, who has contributed greatly to the debate with his experience as to what has taken place in other prewar days, agree with me that this is a responsibility which, under article I of the Constitution outlining the duties and the obligations of the Congress, we ourselves have to assume and which we cannot surrender to any other branch of the Government, and that if in our judgment the national defense of the country requires an air force in being which will at least approximate what responsible officials have declared we should have, we have an obligation to exercise our judgment under the constitutional provision of raising and supporting armies and navies, etc.?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not the slightest doubt of it. I say that the time is here now. If the Congress does not insist upon having an adequate air force, we shall be without it again, as we were in 1941. Why temporize with such a thing? It is perfectly apparent that if there is to be another war it will be fought in the air. Of course it costs money. Of course it will be a burden to the taxpayers. But the burden which will be cast upon the taxpayers by the maintenance of an effective, efficient, and already-in-being Air Force will be utterly incomparable with the disastrous burden they will have to bear if there should be an attack.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming how the Secretary of Air, Mr. Symington, feels about this appropriation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know. I have deliberately not consulted the Secretary of Air.

Mr. WHERRY. He testified before the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; he testified before the committee. But at the same time, he was under orders. He was under a chief. He was under the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary of Defense came before the committee saying, "We will save a billion dollars." I say to the Senator that we are running before the wind, as though we did not know what the needs of the country are. There is a clamor in the headlines and in the editorials for the reduction of Government spending. We know that the civilian expenditures of Government constitute less than 10 percent of the total outlay. We know that this great burden of Federal expenditure comes by reason of the fact that we have not yet written the treaties of peace. Yet we are willing to try to balance the budget at the expense of the national defense. We are trying to make a little cut with respect to the United States Air Force. I think it is absurd for us to put ourselves in that position.

Mr. WHERRY. Where would the Senator go to get information relative to the strength of the Air Force which would be more authoritative than the views of the Secretary of Air?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That evidence is in the record. We do not need any details here. All we need to know here is that this reduction, which has been recommended by the committee, is a reduction from a 58-group Air Force to a 48-group Air Force. In my judgment a 58-group Air Force would be too little.

AIR FORCE EXPANSION HAS BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I remember the testimony of the Secretary of Air very vividly. Let me say to the distinguished Senator, before I ask the next question, that while the Secretary of Air may be under orders, he was not under orders during the Eightieth Congress, because he came out for a 70-group Air Force, and I supported him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So did I.

Mr. WHERRY. It was on the basis of his judgment that I felt we should have a 70-group Air Force.

Now the Secretary of Air comes before the committee and is perfectly willing to take a 48-group Air Force. Once again I rely upon his judgment. He was very forceful in his testimony before the Appropriations Committee a year ago that a 70-group Air Force was necessary. I am sure the distinguished Senator will remember his testimony. I asked the question, "What do you mean by a 70-group Air Force, a 48-group Air Force, or a 50-group Air Force?" There has always been some question as to what was meant. If I am correct, there is nearly as much money being spent now as there was a year ago, although the number of groups has been reduced. It was difficult for me to reconcile the amounts with the number of groups.

As I remember the testimony, the Secretary of Air said that the number of groups did not mean anything, that we could have a 70-group Air Force, a 50-group Air Force or 48-group Air Force. It depended on how large the groups were. Is it not true that the appropriations are about the same whether the number of groups be 48 or 70? The Secretary of Air told the committee that the amount proposed would be satisfactory to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the first place we have a law which forbids an executive officer to ask Congress for an appropriation above the budget. We have a budget estimate, which has been submitted. We have a report from the Senate committee which reduces the appropriation recommended by the House. I think that is short-sighted. I think we ought to supply the Air Force with as large an appropriation, within reason, as it is possible for us to do. I feel that the action of the Appropriations Committee in this connection is decidedly short-sighted, considering the conditions which now exist.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that I completely agree with the distinguished Senator about appropriating for an adequate Air Force. I took the same position in the Eightieth Congress. I believe that the Defense Establishment should have not only sufficient money to defend but also to produce an offense. When the Secretary of Air came before the Congress a year ago, even though he might have been foreclosed by the law, he took the initiative. He had the courage flat-footedly to recommend a 70-group Air Force, even in the face of opposition from those in authority in the administration, who were against that recommendation.

So I submit again to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that in view of the position the Secretary of Air took then, and in view of the position he takes now, I am guided by his judgment. The Secretary of Air stated that this was a sufficient appropriation. I know what he did during the Eightieth Congress. My conclusion then was that he had the courage to recommend what he believed to be necessary. I have no reason to disregard his advice now.

I want the RECORD to show that so far as the junior Senator from Nebraska is concerned, he is just as anxious to have an adequate Air Force as is anyone else. An adequate Air Force is absolutely vital. As I relied upon the Secretary of Air a year ago, I rely upon him now in his suggestion with respect to appropriations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, the able Senator from Nebraska was not present during the earlier part of my remarks, when the question was asked. If we do not get this information from the service, where can we get the information upon which to base our judgment? I read into the RECORD the report of the President's Air Policy Board, which stated that in their judgment the minimum requirement for the national defense would be 79 groups. I read into the RECORD the report of the Joint Policy Committee, established by the two Houses of Congress, in which they stated that in their judgment, in phase A, it was essential that we have a minimum of 70 groups.

I read into the RECORD a recent statement, which has been published as a column in Newsweek magazine, by Gen. Carl Spaatz, who was the head of our strategic Air Force during World War II, and who was later Chief of Staff of the Air Force, in which he stated that it was not in the interest of the national defense to make this reduction. Even the program which the House has provided, as the able Senator from Nebraska well knows, does not propose a 70-group Air Force, which competent witnesses have testified is essential. It would provide only for a 55-group air force. By the Senate committee action that would be cut to a 48-group Air Force.

I invite the attention of the Senator to the testimony given last year in the universal military training hearings, which were held in March and April 1948. I turn to page 380 of the hearings, and begin with the statement of Stuart Symington, Secretary of Air. This testimony is not in this year's hearings. This is from the universal military training hearings. Secretary Symington said, on page 380:

"Secretary SYMINGTON. Today we plan to report to you on the present status of the United States Air Force.

"My report is presented in summary; General Spaatz will provide that degree of detailed information you may wish. He is prepared to discuss with you our present capabilities as a fighting force and the effect of the increased program presented by the Secretary of Defense.

"The Air Force has only recently begun to emerge from the wreckage of demobilization. Last summer General Spaatz determined that by December 31, 1947, we would assemble our limited combat resources into manned and equipped 55 combat groups, plus 17 separate squadrons. The efforts of the entire Air Force were directed toward that goal, and it has been substantially achieved. Today we have 55 combat groups in fairly good shape but at peacetime strength, very feeble in contrast to our World War II strength of 243 fully manned groups, but nonetheless a nucleus for an Air Force in being."

Then Secretary Symington continues his statement for several pages. I should like the Senator from Wyoming to yield to me further, for a moment, so that I may "button up" this particular point.

Then we come to the situation described on page 387 of the same hearings. I wish to read what occurred at that point. Mr. Symington was on the witness stand, and was being questioned by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I read the following:

"Senator LODGE. But last year when I called up to find out what the minimum was, I was

told the minimum was 70, and I remember I offered an amendment on the floor of the Senate, and just did not get it passed, and we adopted the 55 limit.

"From what you say here on page 4 of your statement, the minimum this year is not as high as the minimum was considered to be last year. What is the minimum this year; not 70, is it?

"Secretary SYMINGTON. The minimum of what?

"Senator LODGE. The minimum of air groups.

"Secretary SYMINGTON. That we recommend?

"Senator LODGE. That you consider essential.

"Secretary SYMINGTON. Well, in the Finletter Commission report, where we were under oath, we recommended the 70-group program, which consisted of the 70 groups, the 27 National Guard groups, and the 34 Air Reserve groups, and the 22 squadrons.

"That has been our recommendation for, I think, the last three budgets, and I know the last two. That is the Air Force, Department of the Air Force, or the Air Department of the War Department.

"Senator LODGE. So you still cling to the 70-group figure?

"Secretary SYMINGTON. We never changed that, sir.

"Senator LODGE. But this statement of yours on page 4 indicates that, what will this give you, 55 plus 34; is that the way it should be read?

"Secretary SYMINGTON. No; this gives us 55 groups.

"Senator LODGE. What is the difference? Why is there that reduction from 70 to 55? That is what I am trying to get at.

"Secretary SYMINGTON. Well, because we only have enough to run 55."

That was the basis of the situation. In other words, they were not being furnished the funds which the Department of Air Force felt were essential for the national defense.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator from Wyoming will permit me to finish reading from the hearings at this point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A little later in the testimony of the same witness, at the hearings on universal military training, we find the following at page 389:

"Senator LODGE. Why does the minimum drop from 70 to 55? You cannot answer that "Yes" or "No."

"Secretary SYMINGTON. My answer is we have not got the men because we have not got the money and we have not got the airplanes because we have not got the money.

"Senator LODGE. Why do you not ask for the money, and then you can get the men? Congress will give you the money, I think. I cannot speak for Congress, but the conversations I have had around here, I think the public will support the money to get the men to get the 70 air groups.

"Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to ask a question. I am not a member of this committee, but I am a member of the Department of the Army subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which will be discussing this subject in the not too distant future. If the Air Force had in either appropriations or contract authorizations sufficient funds for the 70-group program, is it your judgment from the point of view of over-all national defense that the 70-group program would be essential to the Nation's security?

"Secretary SYMINGTON. Well, under a direct question like that, I would say, Yes, sir, it is, and it has been for 2 years."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from California for reading that material into the RECORD.

In answer to the Senator from Nebraska, who questioned me about the position of Secretary Symington, I have here the summary of the testimony which was presented to the Appropriations Committee this year.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that on the side slips?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is what Secretary Symington said, as quoted in this summary:

"The Air Force is presenting today the requirements for funds, based on the program proposed in the President's budget message. From a purely military standpoint, we have testified that in our opinion a large force is necessary, and have so recommended in the past. Our views were based upon our estimate of the requirements of the situation which may be expected to confront us during the next few years, and these views have been supported by the President's Air Policy Commission and by the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board. The Air Force recognizes, however, that, as previously pointed out, armed forces are only one component of our total national strength. We recognize, further, the great burden of responsibility on those of highest authority to balance the several components of this strength to meet the needs of the United States; and therefore we support the President's budget."

Mr. President, I submit that is the statement of a good soldier who is following the orders which have come to him. He is supporting a budget; but he has not sacrificed, and neither have the experts in air matters, the conviction which they expressed before, namely, that the United States Air Forces should be large, effective, and adequate to meet the situation.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. WHERRY addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with every word the able Senator from Wyoming has said, and I wish to point out to him the additional fact that the Finletter report which recommended the 70-group Air Force did not contemplate that we would build a 70-group Air Force in any immediate period of time. It set it as a target to be eventually reached.

There are two facts in connection with that report which should be mentioned. First, the Finletter report was made at about the time of the Berlin air blockade and the very tight conditions in Berlin. The testimony the Senator from California has read was given at the time of the air blockade. So there was then in being a situation which is not in existence now; and therefore Mr. Symington, as has been pointed out, and as he has told me specifically, is thoroughly satisfied with the 48-group Air Force, as of this moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, now I wish to resume the floor for a moment, because I do not desire to prolong this discussion.

I wish to say that the RECORD should be quite clear that the various armed services, in preparation for fiscal year 1950, made request of the Bureau of the Budget for appropriations totaling approximately $24,000,000,000. The then Secretary of Defense, the late Mr. Forrestal, sent those figures back to the various services, and said, "You must reduce them below that."

They then came forward with a recommendation for approximately $18,000,000,000, which went to the Bureau of the Budget, and there it was again reduced. We are striving to balance the budget, at the expense of national defense.

The budget now before us is $13,248,960,700 for all the armed services. My point is simply this, Mr. President: To date we have cut the budget submitted by the President in the appropriation bills which have thus far passed the Senate by almost $1,500,000,000. We have demonstrated our desire to eliminate unnecessary expenditures. We have passed the bill authorizing the President to reorganize the executive departments. We have therefore demonstrated our willingness to abolish overlapping bureaus and agencies of Government. The Congress of the United States has done everything in its power, it seems to me to cut expenditures.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment. My position on the item before us, which involves about $500,000,000, is that in my judgment it is not an item with which we can afford to trifle. We should make certain by the appropriations we provide that the United States Air Force is adequate in view of the great danger in which the world finds itself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should merely like to point out, in addition, that the Finletter report, which recommended the 70-group Air Force, and which was published about 2 years ago, also recommended that in the year 1950 its recommendations be again reviewed in the light of what might then be world circumstances.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Maryland will agree with me there has been a great deal of progress in the building up of the Russian air forces since the Finletter report was written. I do not desire to temporize with the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Referring to page 27 of the report, does the Senator reconcile the testimony of Secretary Johnson with the additional request now being made for $500,000,000?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not attempt to reconcile it. I think Secretary Johnson, like others, is trying to balance the budget through the reduction of military expenditures. I say to the people of the United States that until the peace treaties are written we cannot afford to temporize with the most important of all the arms of national defense.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I mention the matter is that in former colloquy with the distinguished Senator I mentioned the Secretary of Defense, and it appeared as though he might take exception to what the Secretary of Air might recommend. But Secretary Johnson supports the President's request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The request is for a 48-group Air Force.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. On that basis I again ask the question, because there appears to be a conflict in the testimony.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My position is perfectly clear.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not asking about the Senator's position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The record is obvious. The budget estimate is the tightest estimate which has ever been submitted for the United States Air Force since we came to realize the importance of the air arm.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the appropriation this year for the Air Force as great as it was last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not certain. It may be.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure it exceeds the appropriation for last year. Is it not also true that the total over-all appropriations for military defense are much greater than they were last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think they are less.

Mr. WHERRY. I think there is a difference of between $2,000,000,000 and $3,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not certain.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure they are greater. I think the difference is in excess of $2,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not certain.

Mr. WHERRY. I am very sincere about this matter. I agree with the distinguished Senator we should have an adequate Air Force, and it was because of that fact, as I have already stated, that I took the evidence of the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Symington, and the report which has been read by the Senator from California, and similar reports, as the basis for standing upon the floor of the Senate and asking for an increase to 70 groups last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was right.

Mr. WHERRY. But the same person upon whose testimony I relied last year, in answer I think to a question which I asked—I cannot put my finger on it at the moment—stated he was entirely satisfied with the amount of the appropriations for the year as outlined in the President's budget. I then asked the question, because I could not be clear in my own mind, why it was, if he was for 70 groups last year, he would accept 48 groups this year. It was then that he gave the explanation that groups really did not mean anything, it was the total amount of the appropriations which counted. So I submit to the distinguished Senator there certainly is a conflict of testimony, and it is very difficult for one who believes in an adequate air force, to say now that we should provide this group or that group, in view of the fact that the over-all appropriation is even more than it was last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am not attempting to argue upon what Secretary Symington's views are.

Mr. WHERRY. Nor am I. The testimony is contradictory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am saying that for myself the evidence is sufficient to convince me it would be a tragic error for the United States Congress to deny the United States Air Force the appropriation which was granted to them by the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator from Maryland is still in the Chamber. The able chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as I understand, indicated that at the time of the Finletter report there was generally a serious situation in the world; that at the time the testimony was given on the UMT bill, the Berlin situation was approaching a climax, and that since that time the situation has changed, as I understood his statement. The fact of the matter is—and I wonder whether the Senator from Wyoming agrees with this—the situation has not changed a great deal. It is true the Russians were not successful in their attempt to blockade Berlin, but the situation is still so critical that the administration comes to the Congress, saying we need $1,400,000,000 to help implement the North Atlantic Pact, to put arms in the hands of our potential allies, who may be subject to an overt overrunning by the Russians. That is not a measure which can be postponed until January of next year. It is a measure which the Congress of the United States must stay here to pass, and pass within a matter of weeks. I say to the Senator from Wyoming, if the situation was so critical in the blockade of Berlin, it is far more critical now when the administration itself comes to the Congress and asks for $1,400,000,000, and says it is a matter of such urgency that the committee must consider it, that the Congress must pass the bill forthwith, and that even the modest request of some of the Members of the Senate that we appropriate a limited amount and take another look at it next year would be a mistake, because it is urgent that the entire amount should be provided. I say if that be true, then this certainly is no time, when it seems to me we should be increasing our Air Force to 70 groups which adequate testimony has set as our minimum need, to be cutting our Air Force from 58 to 48 groups.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. In my judgment, the House appropriation for the United States Air Force will do more to help the western nations of Europe than any other appropriation we can pass to place guns in the hands of soldiers over there. It is not the infantry which those nations can build up that will prevent the overrunning of Western Europe. It is not the appropriations for ordinary military arming that will prevent the expansion of the Communist force. It is the existence within the United States of an Air Force, the size and ability of which is recognized in the Kremlin. That is the thing which will do more for peace than anything else we can do. It was the strength of the United States Air Force in serving blockaded Berlin that did more than any other one thing to prevent aggression by Russia during the past 12 months. After that demonstration of success, if we willingly cut down our Air Force, it seems to me, Mr. President, we are weakly and supinely surrendering to the opinions of those in the street who do not understand the gravity of the international situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have concluded.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to say that I fully agree and fully associate myself with the able Senator from Wyoming. It is my judgment, also, that from the point of view of perserving the peace of the world and of protecting our allies in the North Atlantic Pact we could do more good for their security by keeping our Air Force at the 58-group level and take the amount out of the arms implementation bill than we could by reversing the situation, cutting down our Air Force, and sending the same amount of money over there, because the realistic men in the Kremlin will pay more attention to a first-class Air Force in being in this country than they will to a few additional armed divisions when they have such overwhelming numbers that we cannot possibly match them on the ground.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think that the opinion of the committee should be expressed at this point. I realize that I am totally incapable of arguing this question when I have such a distinguished and experienced opponent.

The amendment involves upward of a billion dollars.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator if he has not made a slightly inaccurate statement. He has stated that this involves a billion dollars——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Upward of a billion dollars.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does it not involve nearer $2,000,000,000, because, if the Air Force is increased, to the extent the Senator from California has indicated in his amendment, the Army appropriation would have to be increased $1,460,740,000 as testified by General Bradley and in accordance with the figures submitted by the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I appreciate the statement just made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to get into the debate and cause delay, but I should like to say that the Senator from Massachusetts is exactly correct. It is not only planes that will have to be bought with the money, but we shall have to have the necessary supporting troops to support six more groups. General Bradley has pointed out that in the event the money is spent for planes, the Army must expand and furnish supporting troops, and the amount will be closer to $2,000,000,000 than to $1,000,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot find the pages of the testimony of Mr. Symington, but the Senator said he had told him personally——

Mr. TYDINGS. And also the committee. I simply wanted to associate myself in every particular with every remark made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, another distinguished Senator has advised the Senate with respect to what should be done regarding our military affairs. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] served creditably and with great distinction in World War I. Naturally, I am not qualified to discuss this question with him.

Another distinguished Senator, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], rendered distinguished service in World War II. From practical experience I feel utterly inadequate to discuss the question with him.

In World War II, I had the opportunity of being chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate which was charged with the responsibility of recommending the appropriation necessary to supply and equip our fighting men. I was chairman of the Army Subcommittee and was a member of the Navy Subcommittee. One thing the military authorities must say is that from the beginning of the war until the end of it, they never wanted for money. The Army never wanted for money, the Navy never wanted for money, and the Air Force never wanted for money. In the middle of the war they were carrying as a balance a surplus of approximately $30,000,000,000 upon which they could draw from time to time if it were needed. So if there was any deficiency any place in our war program, there was no deficiency of money.

In World War I, I was not in the Congress. I was in my own State senate, where I had charge of appropriations. I registered for service in World War I, but, for obvious reasons, I was not called. With reference to the Spanish-American War. I remember quite well that I might have gotten into that war, but I happened to be in college and was a member of a college company which drilled with wooden sticks for lack of guns. While one company from my college was called into service, my particular company was not called. In my last campaign the charge was made against me that I was a slacker in World War I, a slacker in the Spanish-American War, and on one occasion it was suggested that I was even a slacker in the Civil War. Well, I have a perfect alibi to the latter suggestion and that is that I was not born until many years after that horrible war was ended.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator's modesty should prevent him from telling the Senate of the great work he performed in the War of 1812 and the War of the Revolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I was just coming to that. The Senator from Maryland anticipated my admissions.

Mr. President, I am glad this discussion has taken place, because this a very important bill, and this particular item is very important. The appropriations for 1949 were made last year. The total appropriation was $10,454,477,413. The budget estimates for 1950, which we are now considering, total $13,248,960,700, a substantial increase over and above the amount appropriated for last year.

Mr. President, the remarks made by the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] were entirely in point. The Senator believes, as I do, that we should leave nothing undone to keep abreast of military preparedness. To do that we should be constantly trying to improve the weapons we provide our men with which to fight.

Let me invite attention to what happened in the recent war. Notwithstanding the money appropriated prior to the breaking out of that war, when we thought we had the best planes in the world, having given the Department all the money it asked for, when the war broke out we came to learn what kind of equipment we had to meet on the battlefield and in the air, and we found that the planes made by Germany and those made by Japan were, in three particulars, better than the American planes. The three particulars were as follows: We found, first, that the enemy planes were equipped with leakless gas tanks. The gas tanks were lined with composition rubber of such a character and so made that a rifle bullet could be shot through the tank, but immediately the rubber would close the bullet hole, and the gas would not escape. That was defect No. 1 which we found in our own planes.

* * * * *

Certainly Congress cannot expect that if now we appropriate more money for airplanes the appropriation will be activated and carried into effect in direct contradiction of the whole defense policy which has been decided on by the administration. Because of the fact that I do not have knowledge as to whether we should have more airplanes in the Navy or in the Air Force, or whether they should be B–36's or jet planes or some other kind of planes, I believe Congress can adjourn with a clear conscience if it accepts the recommendation which comes from the Military Establishment and the administration, because it is certain that items of this size must be dovetailed in together with our whole national security plan.

Mr. President, I shall not stand on the floor of the Senate and say that I believe Congress could not feel safer if we had 100 or 200 more B–36's. I believe, however, that our first defense is keeping our economy sound. The placing of a further load of $500,000,000 on the backs of the taxpayers does not seem to me to be a good idea at this time.

With respect to mechanical means, material things for the protection of our country, I should rather have our resources in aluminum sheets, in productive capacity, for I believe that if we were to get into a war in a year or two years from now we would be better served if we could then build the newer type of planes that we would have knowledge of at that time.

For all these reasons, and many more—and I will say I have spent some time studying the national security problem—I shall support the committee amendment providing for $1,415,000,000 in contract authority for the Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 69, line 17.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Has any Senator answered to his name?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator has yet answered to his name.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it not a fact that the vote comes on a proposed reduction for the Air Force sufficient to eliminate 10 groups, and that a vote "yea" means a vote to support the committee amendment, and a vote "nay" is a vote against the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote in the affirmative is a vote in favor of the committee amendment making a reduction in the appropriations for the Air Force. A vote in the negative means a vote against the committee amendment, and, in effect, for the higher amount in the House language.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—49

Byrd	Hoey	Saltonstall
Cain	Holland	Schoeppel
Chapman	Humphrey	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Ives	Stennis
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Donnell	Kerr	Taylor
Douglas	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Ecton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Long	Vandenberg
Flanders	Lucas	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Wherry
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Malone	Withers
Gurney	Murray	Young
Hayden	Reed	
Hendrickson	Robertson	

NAYS—9

Hill	Morse	Pepper
Johnson, Tex.	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Know'and	O'Mahoney	Sparkman

NOT VOTING—38

Aiken	Fulbright	Magnuson
Anderson	Graham	Martin
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Maybank
Brewster	Hunt	Miller
Bricker	Jenner	Millikin
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Myers
Butler	Kefauver	Neely
Capehart	Kem	O'Conor
Chavez	Leahy	Russell
Downey	Lodge	Thye
Dulles	McCarran	Tobey
Eastland	McCarthy	Tydings
Ferguson	McMahon	

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CONNALLY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this afternoon when some tributes were paid to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I was busily engaged in the Committee on Appropriations, and did not have an opportunity of saying a few words with reference to my distinguished friend from Texas.

Mr. President, I endorse all the beautiful things that have been said this evening about the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. He served in both Houses of Congress, and made a great name for himself in each House. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, he not only became a national character, but his name and his fame are known throughout the world.

I met Senator CONNALLY soon after he came to the House and we have been warm and devoted friends ever since. His only son by his first wife, Ben Connally, is now a distinguished district judge in the southern district of Texas. While the Senator was a widower he and I had an apartment together at the Mayflower Hotel, and I was associated with him very intimately. I never knew a man who had a quicker and brighter mind. He was quick and agile in debate, a fine speaker, an incorruptible legislator, and in his career here he not only did a great service to his State and to his Nation, but has always taken a high place in his work in the Senate.

When he told me that he was thinking of not running again in Texas, time and time again I urged him to run. I am absolutely sure that he would have been elected if he had run. His record, his personality, his brilliancy, in my judgment, would have overcome any opposition. I sincerely grieve that he will not longer be associated with us in the Senate after this term. His absence from the Senate will be a great loss to his State and the Nation. We shall all miss his fine personality, his great work in the Senate, and his lovable, kind, and splendid disposition, and perhaps above all, his sparkling and incisive wit and humor.

May God bless him and his lovely wife all the days of their life.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I have much appreciated the remarks just made by the Senator from Tennessee regarding the Senator from Texas. I did not rise particularly to speak of the Senator from Texas, although I should like to say at this time that when I read that he was about to announce his retirement at the end of this Congress, I wrote him a note and told him that although I had differed with him on occasion on the floor of the Senate, I regretted his decision, because I thought the Senate, when he retired, would lose some of the flavor it had had.

I now wish to speak on another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McKELLAR

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I rise to say a few words about the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. The Senator holds up his hand to deter me, but I should like to make a few remarks if he will permit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee yields for that purpose.

Mr. CASE. Many kind references have been made to the Senator from Tennessee tonight, but I have been interested, as one Member of the Senate and as a legislator, in noting the work and activities of the Senator. I know something about what it means to go through a drive in the handling of appropriation bills. It may be recalled by some that the Senator from Tennessee was not in the best of health some weeks ago, and some comments were made in the press and otherwise about whether he would be able to take charge of the

Committee on Appropriations, and whether he would be able to meet the rigors attending a drive for adjournment about this time.

Let me say that in my observation I have been amazed, during the past few weeks, to see the activity of the Appropriations Committee under the leadership of the Senator from Tennessee, in handling the jam of appropriation bills which necessarily had to be considered and acted upon in order to enable Congress to adjourn. I have been amazed to see the ability and the strength the Senator has displayed in stating his point of view, and never more so than this evening. At this late hour, after several days and nights of meeting and conferences, working on the hearings, reporting and handling the supplemental bill on the floor, after the jam-packed sessions which were necessarily required in order to report the appropriation bills, about half an hour ago the senior Senator from Tennessee presented his point of view in as logical, clear, and emphatic language as any Senator ever spoke on the floor of the Senate.

It is remarkable that the Senator from Tennessee could have done as he has. As one Member of the Senate I thought he had this little word of praise coming to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I bow in humble thanks to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, there is another subject to which I should refer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the floor.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McFARLAND

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes of the Senate's time to make a statement about a subject which appeals to me.

I was present in the Senate a day or two ago when my friend, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] took occasion to say many beautiful things about me. I was so moved and touched by what he said that for once in my life I could not talk. Indeed, upon listening to what he said, and to what other Senators said about me, just as I have listened to the Senator from South Dakota this evening, it was with the greatest difficulty that I could restrain the tears which came to my eyes.

I humbly thank the Senator from Arizona, and while I know I was not worthy of all he said, indeed, I doubt whether I was worthy of any part of it, I thank him with all my heart for his beautiful expressions, and I thank my other friends who took part in the sentiments expressed about me.

Mr. President, during the long time that I have been in the Senate we have had a number of able, efficient, and splendid leaders, but I do not think we have ever had a leader who has been more successful than has the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

His courtesy, his consideration, his efforts to treat all Senators fairly, his efforts in bringing about settlement of disputes which constantly arise in the Senate, his engaging personality, and his consideration for all has endeared him to all Senators, and have won for him the highest praise and distinction.

Mr. President, in the statement which I prepared a little while ago I said that I hoped the Senate would adjourn on July 5. I doubt whether it will, but that is what I said in the statement which I prepared a little while ago. I had hoped that the Senate could adjourn without the necessity for a continuing resolution with regard to appropriations. The Senator from Arizona has been remarkably successful. His wise counsel and advice have not only greatly aided me as a member of the Appropriations Committee, but they have greatly aided all the members of that committee in getting appropriation bills through at the earliest date.

For a number of years the Senator from Arizona has had a wonderful record as majority leader. I believe that he enjoys the respect, esteem, and admiration of all his fellow Senators, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I join wholeheartedly in the sentiments which the Senator from Tennessee has expressed regarding our majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank both Senators very kindly.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, before the civil functions conference report is voted upon, I wish to be perfectly frank and honest. I made only one request in the interest of my people. That request was denied. Before this conference report is voted upon I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, and I shall move that the conference report be recommitted. Otherwise I shall speak for the remainder of the night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report is not now before the Senate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am saying what is going to happen when it comes before the Senate. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. It will require some time to get a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. It does not make any difference how long it takes. I have been here day and night, working for the people of this country. I have worked for price controls, and other measures.

Mr. McFARLAND. I recognize that, Mr. President. I do not think there has been a more diligent or effective worker than the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I need no praise, Mr. President, but there is going to be a quorum call if there is to be a vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that the Senator has the right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, and I am going to do it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the majority leader will ask for an adjournment subject to the call of the Chair, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that would require a morning hour. Nothing would be gained by an adjournment. We would lose time. I know what the distinguished Senator has in mind. Nothing would be gained, and I believe we might lose a great deal.

I ask——

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. One reason why the Senator from Arizona wanted to recess is that he would like an opportunity to go over and see what the possibility is of arriving at some agreement with the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator ask for a recess until 1 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. I made the request for a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Why not make the time definite?

Mr. MAYBANK. Make it 1 o'clock.

Mr. McFARLAND. What is the use of making it definite? We shall give notice when we return. There will be a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to request a quorum call. I do not want to embarrass anyone. However, I do not think it is fair to do what has been done. I do not want a quorum call. I do not want to embarrass anyone who has gone to Chicago. I want to go to Chicago myself. But I do think that I am entitled to justice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not object.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let one Senator at a time speak. The Senator from West Virginia reserves the right to object.

Mr. KILGORE. The only objection the majority leader has to an adjournment to a definite hour is the question of the morning hour. We have already had a morning hour today. If Senators want to introduce matters for the RECORD or if they have motions to make, they will find time to do it anyway.

There will be no loss of time. That is my reason for objecting to the recess.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to reserve the right to object?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have not yet finished. I think it is only fair to have another legislative day. According to the calendar, we have been operating on the same legislative day since about the 23d of June. Why not have another legislative day? That is my reason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator object?

Mr. KILGORE. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m., Sunday, July 6, 1952, the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 1 o'clock and 10 minutes a. m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the Hartwell Reservoir project. Naturally, I would be interested in it, because it is upon the Savannah River, between South Carolina and Georgia. It happens to be on a river where I lived as a boy. I know of the need for the Hartwell Dam. For that reason, I am prepared to make a lengthy address, not for just a few minutes, not for just a few hours, but, if necessary, I am willing to speak the rest of this night and into tomorrow, because I am thoroughly convinced that the dam is needed as a defense measure. All the Army engineers who have looked into the project favor building the Hartwell Dam.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the project sponsored by the distinguished Senators from South Carolina is a worthy one. I am sure that those who favor it would prefer that we try to get the money rather than to talk about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Of course, we want the dam to go forward.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand. That is the reason why we wanted to have a further conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the conference report there is involved what I consider to be another very worthy project, namely, Ice Harbor Dam on the Snake River. The need for this dam is in the same category as is the dam of which the Senator from South Carolina has just spoken. The Ice Harbor Dam not only has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, but also there has been submitted what is probably the most forceful letter I have ever seen addressed to Congress on the necessity for uninterruptible power for the great Hanford atomic energy plant.

Inasmuch as the report is to be returned for further conference, I sincerely hope that the House conferees will again consider the need for not only the Ice Harbor Dam, but also for the dam on the Savannah River, which involves practically the same conditions as does the dam in the State of Washington, to which I have just referred.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not true that both projects were approved by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Both of them were. The Ice Harbor Dam has been included by the Senate in appropriation bills, not once, but three times. The Atomic Energy Commission is quite concerned about the whole matter, because of the need for a source of uninterruptible power, not only at the Hanford project, but also at the great project now being built in Georgia and South Carolina.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, is the Senator from Washington informed about the great need for a new bridge over the lower Delaware River?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I am.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator believe that it is a worthy project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I do. I voted for it.

Mr. FREAR. I understand that the Senator voted for it, and I wish to congratulate him upon doing so. I think that consideration should be given also to the proposed Delaware River Bridge in conjunction with the consideration to be given to the Hartwell Dam and the dam on the Snake River.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the Senator from Delaware that I have been in Congress for a long time, although perhaps not so long as some other Senators now on the floor. Whenever there is pointed out to me a public works project constructed within the past 20 years that has become a so-called white elephant, I shall begin to scrutinize requests for public works projects, and vote against those I believe to be unworthy. All of the projects Senators have mentioned, so far as I know, not only are worth their keep, or worth the money that has been spent on them, but many projects are worth from 10 or 12 times the amount that has been spent on them, down to 3 or 4 times, or at least double, the amount that has been spent on them in the interest of the welfare of the country.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Washington that his project also is a worthy one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not know what is contained in the conference report, but I might suggest to the majority leader that there was a provision for funds to conduct a flood survey in my section of the country, which was outmaneuvered in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. I would not like to return home and explain that we were outmaneuvered in the second session, after our seventh flood in 9 years. Of course, we do not expect to receive any flood control projects. Apparently we have not had enough floods to satisfy some people of the need for flood control.

However, we would like to have a few surveys made along the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers, so that at least plans may be prepared for the future.

In the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate, I think by unanimous vote, strongly recommended that surveys be made, after the Senate Appropriations Committee had approved them following extensive hearings. But again the House of Representatives and the conference said, "No, there will be no survey funds." That may be the correct view in the opinion of the conferees, but it is not the view of the people who have suffered. My State has suffered hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage again this year, and suffered several millions of dollars in damage last year.

I have been told that some of the survey funds have been eliminated from the conference report. Funds were eliminated from the Interior appropriation bill for transmission lines after they had been recommended and voted for by the Senate in two other bills.

New they have been eliminated again. Where are the projects knocked out? Someone from the House of Representatives, in conference says, "No transmission lines." I suggest that the conference examine the bill carefully.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes a. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 23 minutes a. m. the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Vice President.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the conferees are ready to report on the supplemental appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report must first come from the House before the Senate can take it up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suppose there is nothing for us to do until the report comes to the Senate, unless Senators would like to discuss it. They know what is contained in the report. Some Senators believe it is as unsatisfactory as the first report. We have not arrived at any agreement with respect to the Army civil functions conference report. It is beginning to look as though the Senate will have to recess until Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in all fairness to the Members of the Senate who are in the Chamber, I should say in advance of the receipt of the report that, based on the information I have with respect to the new agreement of the conferees on the supplemental appropriation bill, what is proposed with reference to atomic energy, from the standpoint of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the best interests of the atomic energy program, is utterly and completely unacceptable.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that the conferees agreed that the difference between $1,450,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 is to be added.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; but as I said a short time ago when we were discussing the subject, the extra $600,000,000 in my judgment, and I am sure in the opinion of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, means nothing, and adds nothing.

The $1,400,000,000 is enough with which to start the program. Having $2,000,000,000 adds very little to it. The important point is the starting of the over-all program. The $1,400,000,000 will apply on it, and the other money is to be appropriated next year and the year after.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that the $1,450,000,000 will not only start the program, but it will complete the equivalent of one-half of the whole program? I make the statement because that is the statement which was made by the members of the Atomic Energy Commission before the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is approximately 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Mr. CORDON. It is 50 percent of the cost of the program, but it represents a completed portion.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am quite sure that that is not the view of the Atomic Energy Commission or of the joint committee.

Mr. CORDON. At the proper time I shall be very happy to read the record of what the members of the Atomic Energy Commission said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have read the record of what the members of the committee said, namely, to the effect that the proviso would block the operation of the program. I have read that statement. The point is that the Atomic Energy program is not like building apartment units. The misconception that it is possible to build one unit and pay for it, and thus have an operating unit, is unfortunate.

It takes all the operating units to complete the operating program. I used the illustration of building a motor for an automobile and not building the transmission. There cannot be an automobile without the transmission or the wheels. It is like saying that $3,000,000,000 are available with which to build a gasoline cracking plant, which takes crude oil and cracks it into gasoline for use in the operation of airplanes and automobiles. It is possible with that amount to build the central part of the plant, which costs three times as much as the two ends, but not the ends. However, when the central part of the plant is built it is still not possible to take crude oil into it and produce useful gasoline without the ends being constructed. It is necessary to complete the plant.

The program we are considering, involving two or three projects, is not quite so simple as that. I have rather oversimplified it. Two or three products are to be made under the new program; and in order to get the defensive weapons which this country must have against the time of need, in the shortest and most reasonable period of time, and with the greatest efficiency for the national defense, I am of the opinion, and so is the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that this program ought to be started in its entirety. It cannot be started in that way because the proviso says that all the money to pay for all the contracts must be provided before it can be started.

I say with all humility—and I hope my statement is taken in all verity—and with all due respect to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which has been as unpolitical as any committee I have ever observed, and which is interested in the success of atomic energy and in the defense of this country, knows more about atomic energy than any group of people in the United States outside of the Atomic Energy Commission. We have lived with this subject since 1947.

I say, with humility and with respect for the Appropriations Committee, that honestly and truly we think we know more of what we are talking about in the atomic energy field than does any other group in the Congress. If we do not, the Congress made a mistake in creating the joint committee.

We have access repeatedly to daily reports, progress reports, scientific reports, and reports of great secrecy.

We know in the main what they propose to do 1 year from now, 2 years from now, 5 years from now. We know what they have done in the past 5 years, and we know it intimately and in detail.

Mr. President, I say to the Senate that when the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of 18 members, tell the Senate and tell the House of Representatives, without a dissent in the committee, that this proviso ought to be stricken out in the interest of the defense and the cumulative security of this country, within reasonable limits of time, I earnestly hope the Congress will accept their recommendations.

Again I cannot over-emphasize that I do not wish to criticize the Appropriations Committee. That committee is trying to save money; it is trying to do everything it can in that direction.

Normally there is no one who has voted for more limitations on the spending of money than I have.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for several questions?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator from Iowa in a position to say that the Appropriations Committees have less knowledge than does the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy? I ask that question in all sincerity. We have to deal with a delicate problem.

Does the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have such information? Does the Senator from Iowa think the Appropriations Committee has less information, or does the Senator from Iowa think the Appropriations Committee acted with the same information the joint committee has?

I realize the delicate and strategic position in connection with the entire matter of national defense.

Has the Appropriations Committee acted upon the same information that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has, or is the Senator from Iowa able to say to this body that the 18 members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have information the public does not have and that the Appropriations Committee does not have—information that the joint committee cannot release to us?

Must we rely, in the interest of national defense, upon the judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy because it has the advantage in possesssing information and knowledge?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to answer the Senator from Arkansas as frankly and as fully as I can. Yes, the Appropriations Committee has less information than we have. In the main, I think the Appropriations Committees are given the major, overall, general information.

When I say the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has more information than do the Appropriations Committees, I say to the Senator from Arkansas that not a day goes by that progressive, developing information in the atomic program is not submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator from Iowa mean by that that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has more advance information than the Appropriations Committees are able to secure?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is a rather hard question to answer; I do not know what the Senator from Arkansas means by "advance information."

Mr. McCLELLAN. I mean information that has not been developed to the point where it is recognized that the information could be made available to the public and to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I suppose 80 percent of the information we get is classified in the very high secret brackets.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As one Member of the Senate, let me state what it is that I wish to know. I am not interested in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or in the Appropriations Committees, as such; but I know that with world conditions as they are today, an armament race is going on—we had just as well admit it—for the most destructive power the ingenuity of man can create.

We have been ahead in certain fields. What I should like to have is the judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I should like to know whether that joint committee says that if this provision is put into the bill, it will simply mean that we shall be taking a desparate risk in the race for continued superiority in atomic weapons.

If I am convinced of that, I want to have this provision taken out of the bill. I think that is all we want to know. I think that is what all of us are seeking to know. We want to rely on our committee.

We are not asking the Senator from Iowa to divulge secrets which should not be divulged, but we want the absolute best judgment given to the Senate and to every Member of the Senate, namely, that when we follow the joint committee in this matter—even though all of us are interested in making economies—we are doing it in the interest of national defense, as an absolute necessity and to avoid unnecessary risk.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can say "Yes" to the Senator from Arkansas, without qualification.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I wish to know. I think that is what every Senator wishes to know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that by eliminating this proviso, we shall arrive at a position of reliable security much quicker than we would otherwise. In other words, by including the proviso we would delay the program; and it might be too late, and it might cost us a great deal more money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me ask another question: A little earlier tonight, the Senator from Iowa illustrated this point by saying that science is reaching out and is feeling its way and is moving; that it may move a bit in the wrong direction, then find that out and come back in the other direction; in other words, that experiment is being developed.

What I wish to be assured of is this: If we impose this restriction upon the Commission, will a handicap be placed upon them in that work?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Indeed, and a definite handicap in point of time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Could it be serious? Could it be fatal? Could it be so serious that it might be fatal?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It would be extremely serious from the point of view of our ability to assure our own defense. Whether it would be fatal, I could not say, because no one can say what would be fatal.

Mr. McCLELLAN. One other question: Suppose we include this provision in the bill. Can the Senator from Iowa assure me or can any other Member of the Senate assure me that it will ultimately save a dollar?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Arkansas mean——

Mr. McCLELLAN. With the restriction left in the bill, will it ultimately save a dollar to the American taxpayers?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator from Arkansas refer to what I advocate, or does he refer to what the conference committee advocates?

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the conference committee advocates: Will it ultimately save a dollar?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In my judgment it will cost money. In my considered judgment and in the considered judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, it will cost—well, I hate to give the Senator from Arkansas a figure, but it will cost several percentage points more—perhaps 10 or 15 percent more.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is important. All of us are under the stress of the effort to economize.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is what it will cost if we adopt the conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All of us are under the stress of the effort to economize, but, of course, there can be false economy; we can practice false economy.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield on one point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator said "the conference committee." I think it should be made plain that it is not the conferees on the part of the Senate. The Senate struck out this proviso. The House conferees are the ones who are insisting on it.

So I think the blame should be placed where it belongs. The conferees on the part of the Senate have worked like troopers and have done the best they could. So let the House take the responsibility.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No. I should like to comment upon what the majority leader said?

The majority leader is correct. The Senate has been favorable to the elimination of this provision. The Senate is on record, as I believe it should be, in the proper position. Unfortunately the House has been adamant in its purpose to include this proviso, and I must say that it stems from the policy established by the House a year or so ago against contract authority, and against writing contract authority into appropriation bills. Generally speaking, I am thoroughly in agreement with that policy. However, this happens to be an exception, and I am sure the Senator from Arizona knows that no Senator has voted more frequently to save money or to restrict bureaucratic agencies than have I.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is one of the reasons for my having listened so attentively to what the distinguished Senator from Iowa has had to say, because in my opinion he cannot be classified as an administration man.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Any similarity would be purely coincidental. [Laughter.]

Mr. McFARLAND. It would probably be accidental, rather than coincidental.

Mr. President, I am not blaming the House conferees. I shall assume, and we must assume, that they are just as sincere as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want it to be construed that I am casting any reflection upon them. But, Mr. President, we may be dealing with the destiny of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment, if I may. So far as the Senator from Arizona is concerned, I may say that I would not be standing here at 15 minutes to 3 o'clock in the morning quarreling over words, did I not consider the situation to be serious.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who, having studied this proposition, has, from his sick bed, written to us, pointing out the seriousness of the situation. He is drawing upon his diminished energy. I certainly hope he will be with us within the next week. I understand he is improving. Mr. President, I repeat that

this matter is very serious; in fact, so serious that I would be willing for the Senate to let the matter go over until Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Please do not say that.

Mr. McFARLAND. What are we to do? We have done our best. We have accomplished nothing. The House will not have a quorum, but we shall simply have to get a quorum. When it comes to dealing with what is best for the country, we are required to do many things. When the future of the Nation is involved, if it is necessary to call Senators back from the conventions, either the Democratic or the Republican Convention, it will have to be done. That is how serious it is. I am dependent upon the experts to make it unnecessary for us to do that.

Mr. President, we are dealing with the lives of the people of the United States, and with the possibility of the wiping out of cities. We should think twice. Possibly we should not be trying to do too much thinking at 15 minutes to 3 o'clock in the morning, but should go over until another day, and in the meantime do a little more thinking.

I thank the Senator from Iowa. I trust he will pardon the interruption.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the action of the distinguished Senator from Iowa in bringing up this question. Whenever, in the committee, I have had a chance to vote against the proviso I have done so. Any time I have had an opportunity to say a word against the proviso, which would delay the program 6 months, or that would delay the production of weapons for a year, I have done so. I am most grateful to the Senator from Iowa for having made this statement on the floor He is better qualified to make such a statement than am I.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, as every Member on this floor knows, I am not concerned with advancing the political destinies of either the President of the United States or the Democratic Party.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am a Republican, and I shall do everything I can to advance the destinies of the Republican Party. Whatever Republican nominee is named at the convention, I shall do all I can to support him. But, above all, I am deeply concerned, as is the distinguished majority leader, with the security of the United States and with the most rapid advancement of that security within reasonable limits. The same may be said of the Senator from Arizona. We join in that concern as well, in mutual regard and personal friendship.

Mr. McFARLAND. And that is more important than either the Democratic or the Republican Party.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I say to you that I would not stand here myself at a quarter of 3 in the morning advancing this thought, merely to be talking or to be objecting to a conference report. I call attention to the fact that several of us, including Representative DURHAM of the House, the vice chairman of the committee, who was on the floor a while ago, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other Senators whom I see on the floor at this time, in fact, most of us have had something to do with the atomic-energy problems since the first special committee was created by the Senate of the United States to write the Atomic Energy Act. In some respects it has been our baby.

I have probably spoken out in criticism of what I considered to be waste in the atomic-energy program louder than any other individual. Whether I was right or wrong, I contend that within the past 4 years, the management of the Atomic Energy Commission has made substantial and material progress toward effecting the ultimate security of the United States. I do not want to see that march toward the reasonable, sound, and economic security of this country, beyond the possibility of any nation to defeat, destroyed by a mistaken idea of restrictions.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. CAPEHART addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] requested that the provision now under discussion be stricken out. He is not here tonight, but I wanted to say that in justice to him. What the Senator from Iowa is saying is completely correct, as was the position of the Senater from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Many Republicans and Democrats may be correct in regard to various incidental issues. But that is not the reason why Senators stand here at 3 o'clock in the morning on the day of adjournment to argue in this manner. There is no ulterior purpose on the part of anyone in regard to this subject. All that any of us is interested in is in providing the ultimate and most speedy defense of this country, and in assuring that it will have the greatest possible power. Let us not miss that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been sitting here all evening, for 2 or 3 hours, listening to this debate, and to the expressions of different Senators as to the seriousness of the present situation. I say in all sincerity and in all fairness that Members on the Democratic side of the aisle, both in the Senand in the House, have the votes to settle this matter and they could do it. It is their responsibility, because they control the Congress of the United States.

The able Senator from Iowa has on two occasions tonight explained his position. Now it is the Senate's responsibility. We stand here ready to cooperate. Why can we not get together? The Democratic Members control this Congress. We should like to get the question settled. If Senators want to take a recess for 2 or 3 weeks, it is all right; but if we recess for 24 hours or for 2 weeks, it is not going to reconcile the difference. Senators are disagreeing among themselves. The Democratic Senators cannot point any fingers at any Republican either in the Senate or in the House, because the Democrats control the committees and the chairmanships. We stand ready to cooperate tonight. I beg Democratic Senators to put their house in order and use their own forces, because they control the funds and the chairmanships. The organization is in their hands tonight, and we stand ready to cooperate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I want to make a record of this matter, and I am sure the minority leader and the majority leader will join me.

The proviso which is obnoxious and which, in my judgment and in the unanimous judgment of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and of the President of the United States, who saw fit to send a letter to the Senate this evening, reads as follows:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project.

That was the obnoxious provision, one which many of us would like to have stricken. After the conference report was rejected a couple of hours ago, some of us, including representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission, were asked to suggest language which might reconcile this obnoxious provision with a workable provision which would not slow down the program. So we got busy and submitted to the conferees this proposal:

Provided further, That this proviso shall not apply in cases where the President of the United States shall certify in writing to the Commission, to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that the commencement of immediate construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project is essential to the common defense and security.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offered that proviso, and the House conferees would not agree to it. Several of us tried our best to get them to agree, but, as I said before, they were adamant.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May I complete the record, because I have read the two provisos in order that there may be a chronological record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as to what happened.

We submitted this as an additional proviso with which we believed the Atomic Energy Commission could live and start the project with some security. Here is what the conferees came back

with—and I am not speaking critically of the Senate conferees—

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent—

Listen to this, Mr. President—

to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building, or the procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, or any utility or any portion of a unit of a specific project if the funds—

And this is the "stinger," and it is the same one that was in the original proviso—

if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such buildings, machinery, equipment, or materials or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion of a unit of any such project.

It was more restrictive when it came back from the conference than it was when we first dealt with it, and it is utterly unacceptable and unworkable.

I shall not take any more time of the Senate. I do not know any way in which I can adequately express my feeling as to the seriousness of this situation and the unworkability of this proviso. I know that the Members of the House are just as patriotically interested in strengthening the Nation as are the Members of the Senate. I think their attitude is due to a misconception of what we have to do in an atomic-energy program in order to get out of the spigot at the end the things necessary to save the country.

Mr. President, I said earlier this evening that it is a pioneering proposition. The House has been adamant that every building, every bit of equipment, and everything else must be designed starting the program. That cannot be done because it is not known what the end design is. The only sensible way in which the Atomic Energy Commission has been able to operate has been to design just ahead of construction. In the long run it probably saves money.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in reference to designing, the Senator will recall that the Senate passed a bill last night appropriating a billion dollars for military works on classified items. There was nothing further specified in the bill than $1,000,000,000 for classified items. The money has now been appropriated. Is not that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understand it is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. It is a fact. This bill carried $1,400,000,000 for atomic energy projects. It is a reasonable inference that the bill, to which I just referred, which carries no proviso such as this has to do with air power and air bases connected with the possible missions on which the bombers might go.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. We are putting no limitation on the construction and making of bombs and turning the Air Force entirely loose. It seems to me that those facts themselves prove the inconsistency of the position which has been taken elsewhere. If we can release funds for air bases without restriction we can certainly do the same in connection with atomic energy.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I again say to the Senate that no one gives more careful and meticulous attention to the expenditures of this Government or of the departments of the Government than I do. The Senate Appropriations Committee has been unusually meticulous. They are always careful and cautious. But several things have occurred. The President of the United States finally has become fearful, as he did today, about this proviso; the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, on the 27th of June, approximately 2 weeks ago, was so concerned about the proviso that it unanimously adopted a resolution urging both Houses of Congress to eliminate it in the interest of the efficient development of the program; that committee unanimously says to Congress today, through its chairman and all of its members, that the proviso should be eliminated; the Atomic Energy Commission itself says it cannot live and does not dare operate under this proviso, because the General Accounting Office certainly will charge them with violating the restrictions of the law if they go ahead. I merely suggest those points to the Senate.

So far as I am concerned, if what I have said, and what other Senators have said, cannot convince the Senate, there are no words of mine and no actions of mine that can convince the Senate. I can only say that every Member of the Senate is as zealously interested in safeguarding the security of his Nation as I am. There is no difference in patriotism here.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I merely wish to say, with regard to the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] that the responsibility is on our side, that he cannot escape responsibility in that manner. This is a question which involves the entire United States.

I talked to the conferees, and the Republican conferees were just as adamant as the Democratic conferees. So we cannot escape the responsibility in that way. There is equal responsibility. If there is one thing that should call for equal responsibility, it is the security of the United States of America. We should not talk about politics or responsibility when it comes to a question such as this.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In a moment. I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona that we engaged in one political hassle 3 or 4 hours ago, and I am not going to engage in another one. The Senator and I are in full agreement as to responsibility. I desire to approach the subject completely relieved from any political implications, and I am sure the Senator from Arizona feels as I do.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I do. I am willing to take my share of the responsibility, but I do not want any Senator to think that he cannot assume his responsibility as a Senator, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat. He cannot say that he may balance the vote one way or the other. He has got to vote. He has his responsibility. So we cannot always be talking politics.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I certainly agree with the able Senator from Arizona that it is a responsibility of all of us to look out for the best interests of the country. However, I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact, which he cannot deny, that the majority of the conferees on the part of the House are Democrats, and the majority of the conferees on the part of the Senate are likewise Democrats. The chairmen of the conferees of the respective Houses are Democrats. The Senator cannot escape that fact. If the Republicans as members of the conference of the House and in the Senate voted solidly, we still would not have a sufficient number of votes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will admit all that. I do not mean to inject politics into the debate. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the majorities are so small that it will depend on the absentees in order to determine who is in the majority.

Mr. CAPEHART. A majority is a majority, regardless of how small or how large it is. The Senator cannot get away from that fact. I say the responsibility is on the Senator's side, and that he ought to accept it. I hope he will accept it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to take the responsibility if my good friend, the Senator from Indiana, does not wish to accept any responsibility in the matter. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I are willing to assume the responsibility and to let the Senator from Indiana out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is typical of the way——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, that is typical of the way some persons do business. They completely avoid the facts. The facts are that the Democratic Party controls both Houses of Congress. It controls the chairmanships and controls the conferees who are in charge of the question being discussed tonight. The Senator's party could pass what it desires to pass and what the Senator advocates, because his party has the votes to do so. Why try to fool the people?

I hope the Senator will succeed in his purpose. I am with him. I shall vote with him. All I ask him to do is to get some action and to accept the responsibility. We are ready to vote whenever the Senator is.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is all very well, but when the Senator goes before Saint Peter, he will have to answer for his own sins, not for those of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CAPEHART. Thank God I shall not have to answer for the sins of the able Senator from Arizona, for I shall have to answer for enough of my own.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have finished speaking. Nothing more I could say could add anything to what I have said, and I do not believe I should monopolize the time on the subject. I have attempted to say, as clearly as I could, what I believe, and earnestly believe, namely, that a vital part of the assured security of the United States is wrapped up in the speedy development of this program. Perhaps it could be delayed, yes; and if the Lord was with us, the delay might not be harmful. But under other conditions the delay might be fatal to the United States of America. I do not want to take that chance, especially when I believe that carrying out this program rapidly will cost less money than to string it out over a longer period of time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield to the Senator, or I will yield the floor. It makes no difference to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We must be practical. We have learned that throughout our lives. When there are people of one view, and people of another view, it is necessary to try to resolve the different views, so that progress can be made. None of us can have his way about everything. I suppose everyone has had the same experience. I must cut my jacket to fit the cloth, constantly and continually. I have learned to live that way. If there are two viewpoints, and each of us is set in his own viewpoint, we are not going to get anywhere and it is idle to work longer on the matter. So what will the outcome be? Shall we destroy everything simply because we cannot have things as we would like to have them?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I will say to the Senator from Colorado. The outcome will be that the majority will determine the question. All I am trying to do is to make clear my position, the position of the members of the Joint Committee, and the position of the Atomic Energy Commission. The President has already made his position clear in a letter.

A majority in the Senate and in the House of Representatives will decide the issue. I must abide by that decision. I shall not mourn about it or go into a great silence about it. I will merely say, "I have made my record," but I shall be sorry if the decision goes against me. I repeat, I am merely trying to make my position clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think that is fine. I believe that anyone who feels intensely about a matter should make his position clear and make the record clear. But it is not quite so simple as that. In theory, of course, the majority is going to decide the question, but that is not quite the way it is.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. By "majority" I did not mean a political party. I meant that the numerical majority would decide it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I know the Senator did not refer to a political party. He means a majority of the Congress. In our present situation we cannot bring about a rule by majority in the Congress. The Senator knows that we are handicapped, and he knows the reasons why we are handicapped. He knows that we cannot do things in the normal way at this stage of the game. We have handicaps, and we must live within them. We must do the best we can within those handicaps. I think a person is taking a good deal of responsibility into his hands if he says, "Under these circumstances I will not play ball. I will quit. I will pick up my baseball mask and my baseball and my bat, and go home. I will not play the game any more."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator insinuate that I am saying that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I am not saying that the Senator is saying that, but I wonder where all this leads us. Where are we going?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will tell the Senator where it leads us. It leads to my making utterly clear what I believe to be the sound position which we should take in the interest of our national defense and security. When the majority of this body comes to a decision, I am through. I may disagree with the majority, but I am going to submit my case and my view, and the view of the joint committee of which the Senator is a member.

A few minutes ago I stated on the floor that the committee was 100 percent opposed to the proviso. I thought it was. The Senator from Colorado was not present at the meeting to which I referred. I do not know how he would have voted, but I do know that every proxy I had, and all the 13 members present, voted unanimously on this very important question. I am merely trying to make my position clear.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator from Colorado had been present at that meeting he would have voted just as the Senator from Iowa voted, because that is the ideal way of handling the situation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I want to yield the floor. I do not want to monopolize it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not want the Senator to yield the floor yet. I merely wish to reply to both the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Colorado. We have talked about responsibility. I have talked with the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Mr. CANNON, and the ranking minority member, Mr. TABER. One was just as adamant on this question as the other.

That is not all. They were also adamant with respect to the civil-functions bill. I do not know how we on that bill stand, because there is a difference about it. I am not adamant on anything. I am willing to have the Senate take a vote.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I am willing to have a yea-and-nay vote now.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator does not, by any stretch of the imagination, interpret anything I have said as accusing any Democrat or Republican of choosing up sides on this question, does he?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have not said that.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was putting the two leaders on the other side together.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think they are opposed to our view.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Arizona are together. I hope we are.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not think there is any politics involved in this question.

Mr. McFARLAND. We are not trying to force our views on anyone. The whole question is, What are we to do under the circumstances?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa has taken a great deal of time tonight to explain to us for the second time the importance of the decision of this question. Very frankly, I was here, as was the Senator from Arizona, and other Senators were here, in 1949 when something happened which was world-shaking in its importance. Immediately after World War II our scientists predicted that the Soviet Union could not have the atom bomb before 1955. That was a conservative estimate. The simple fact, and the hard truth, is that in the month of September 1949 an atomic explosion took place in the Soviet Union. A year later a certain scientist who was on the inside of the major projects in this country, a man by the name of Klaus Fuchs, was captured as an atomic spy. The fact of the matter is that not only was he an atomic spy, but he also had critical materials, top-secret material, in reference to the hydrogen bomb.

This Congress made a terrible decision, a decision which made every man wonder whether or not we dared even think about it. At tremendous expense, we set up a plant designed to create the most monstrous instrument of destruction the world has ever known, the hydrogen bomb. There are scientists today who say that they do not want to go ahead with it because they do not know what may happen. I am sure that the Soviet Union is not moved by any moral scruples as to whether or not it ought to go ahead with it.

What is Congress doing? What are the conferees of the House of Representatives telling us? Let us face up to it. They are telling us that we should disregard the Atomic Energy Commission, composed of top-grade men, and

Gordon Dean, a top-grade attorney, one of the great legal minds of this country, who surely can understand legislative history and the meaning of a proviso in a legislative enactment. He says that this proviso should not be in the bill. The Commission says it should not be in the bill. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy says this proviso should not be in the bill. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, says that this proviso should not be in the bill.

When the Commander in Chief, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the United States Senate say the proviso should not be in the bill—when that much of ability, experience, and knowledge put together says that it ought not to be in the bill, I submit that the two Members of the House of Representatives, whoever they may be, who are trying to drive this provision into the bill, should not have their way. Even if we must stay here a long time to show them that they are not going to get their way, let us do it. They have no right to overrule the best brains of America, in terms of our defense. Is there any Senator who thinks he knows more about atomic energy and the security of the country than does the Atomic Energy Commission? I am sure that the Senate does not feel that way, and I hope no one in the House feels that way. I do not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am willing to have a rising vote on this question, and to abide by the decision of the Senators present as to whether we shall approve the conference report or return it to conference.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. The House has asked for a conference on the civil-functions bill. I am willing to grant the request. If we send this report back, perhaps we can get what we should have. I hope we may have a rising vote on the question of whether or not to adopt the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report is not here. There is no way by which the Senate can vote on it at this time. It is not here.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we have heard from those who oppose the provision which I understand is now in the conference report. I believe that the Senate should hear from those who were in the conference and who know what took place as to what they believe the report means.

It is true that the Senate committee struck out this proviso. They felt that they should put in a provision for contract authority. We did the same thing in the defense bill in connection with the building of the 143 air wings. We were compelled in the conference to eliminate the contract authority. We put in the amount of money that was required to build the 143 air wings.

We have heard an explanation of the proviso. The members of the committee, including the chairman and other members of the conference committee, came to the floor of the Senate and explained what they believed to be the meaning of the proviso. Not one Senator on either side of the aisle disagreed as to what the proviso meant. It was our opinion that the construction of any particular building, any particular unit, or any particular part of a project or unit, for which the money was available could be started.

Mr. President, there are three projects. One is at a site not yet determined, with the plans not yet ready, which is a project with many buildings.

If the Appropriations Committee is not to have sufficient facts upon which to determine the amount of money to be appropriated we should take away from the Appropriations Committee the right to recommend appropriations for atomic energy and give it to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, if they are the only ones who have sufficient facts upon which to appropriate the taxpayers' dollars. There is not any doubt that that is what the Congress should do.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this time. We are told here today that the Appropriations Committee cannot be given sufficient evidence upon which it can base an opinion in order to submit to the Senate their recommendation of what should be appropriated.

What is being asked for, Mr. President, is a blank check. We are being asked to give a blank check in an amount to be filled in by the Commission, with the advice of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is that procedure to which the House has objected. We can understand that there may arise some objections to giving a blank check, when it is believed that if the facts and circumstances were known it would not be necessary to give a blank check in order to permit the Atomic Energy Commission to start every building, every utilitiy, and everything that they want within the next 6 months, when Congress will have returned. We know that we always receive urgency, deficiency, and supplemental appropriation bills immediately after the first day of January. We know that anything they desire could be taken care of.

I know that every member of the committee who spoke on the subject did so in good faith when he explained what was intended by the proviso. It is a well-known fact in law that if there is any ambiguity in a statute the legislative history in the Senate or House will aid in clearing up the ambiguity. I am satisfied that every member of the conference and every member of the Appropriations Committee felt that in the event the General Accounting Office were called upon to make an interpretation it would interpret the statute in the manner in which the committee interpreted the bill.

Mr. President, of course in the Appropriations Committee we do not receive daily reports as to how much is being manufactured, or as to how many bombs are being made, or anything of that nature, because we do not desire to have that information. But I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who has had a great deal of experience with the independent offices program and who has knowledge of the workings of the Atomic Energy Commission and its building programs.

I also see on the floor the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is the chairman of the subcommittee handling the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I talked against the provision. I asked that it be stricken out. When it was not stricken out the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I talked with Mr. Boyer. He said it would wreck the Atomic Energy Commission. I am against the provision from first to last, because it will wreck the program of the Atomic Energy Commission. Not only that, but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], who discussed the matter with the Atomic Energy Commission, came to the committee and pleaded with it not to put the provision in the bill.

I will say to the Senate that the conferees did not put it in the bill. I have fought the provision since 10 o'clock this morning. I am not worried about any small thing. I am interested in America. I am worried about the Atomic Energy Commission. Mr. Boyer and Mr. Dean are against the provisiion. The President of the United States wrote a letter opposing it, and the letter has been read to the Senate. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. A good many of us who are not members of the Appropriations Committee or of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are very much concerned about the facts with respect to the application of the proviso. I should like to present a hypothetical case to the Senator from Michigan.

The Senator from Michigan knows me well enough to realize that I always put my cards on the table. Since the debate started I have been advised by a member of the staff of the Atomic Energy Commission that one of the things that is disturbing the members of that Commission is this situation: Suppose that under the bill they proceed with the building of a very important building. The most essential part of that building so far as the Atomic Energy Commission is concerned is the machinery which is to go into the building for very important scientific purposes. They advise me that the lead time which is required on much of that machinery is from 18 months to 2 years. They advised me that their legal staff interprets the proviso to have the effect—and it will be so interpreted when it reaches the General Accounting Office—that they will not be able to contract for the manufacture of the machinery which they will sorely need for atomic-energy purposes 18 months to 2 years from now, as long as the proviso stays in the bill.

I do not believe it is necessary to argue about facts. We should find out what the facts are and not argue about

them. I am asking the Senator from Michigan if he can tell the Senate whether the fears of the Atomic Energy Commission are well grounded. They say that the proviso which refers to buildings, utilities, and other portions of a project will apply to the machinery to be placed in the buildings.

If they are right, there is no doubt in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon what ought to be done. We ought to have a quorum call and we ought to wait until the Sergeant at Arms takes a plane to Chicago and brings back some Senators in order to constitute a quorum, and then proceed to vote. This is a question affecting the national interest, Mr. President. If, on the other hand, the Atomic Energy Commission is wrong in their interpretation, and we can convince them that they are wrong, then the proviso, on the basis of the explanation which has been made by such distinguished Senators as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and others, can be allowed to stay in the bill, with the legislative history that has been made. Put, if that is to be done, I must be satisfied that the facts are not as the Atomic Energy Commission is representing them to be.

Mr. FERGUSON. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the item covers plant and equipment. There is not any doubt that the amount of money, which has been increased to $2,000,000,000, covers both plant and equipment.

The new wording which has been placed in the limitation provides for just such a thing. If they could buy the equipment, they could order up to $2,000,000,000 worth of plant and equipment. Within that limit, they could order any particular building or any particular part of a project or of a unit.

Therefore, as was said by the representative of the Commission, as appears on page 391 of the hearings:

The Commission feels that even though funds were appropriated in the amount requested, there would still be some question—

It is to be noted that the representative of the Commission did not say it would be absolutely certain—

under this provision as to the authority to proceed with the construction at the new site.

That is the site whose location has not been stated on the floor. I doubt that the Commission knows the exact site.

Mr. MORSE. We have not provided the funds for it, either.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, we are giving them $2,000,000,000.

Mr. MORSE. But that is an amount short of what they will need to complete the project.

Mr. FERGUSON. They have said that they cannot use more than about $600,000,000 in the next 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. But they can contract for machinery in excess of $600,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true; but they say they do not know yet, and that they do not have plans and designs for the kind of machinery which may be required. They go from one day to the next, fitting in a unit in relation to another unit they are setting up.

Mr. MORSE. Very well. If they do not know and if they cannot order the machinery, then what is the benefit of the proviso? If they are not going to do it anyway, why include the proviso?

Mr. FERGUSON. So they will come back to Congress.

Here is what they will spend in cash; I read from the hearings:

Senator SALTONSTALL. You do not intend to spend this $3,000,000,000 in 1953?

Mr. DEAN. We do not. We expect actually to spend, in cash, something on the order of $600,000,000.

That would be for the entire year 1953.

So the House was convinced. Each unit is not a unit of one building, but of many buildings. Anyone who has been at Oak Ridge or at Hanford realizes the number of buildings there. Even a town site is built, together with railroads, roads, hydroelectric plants or steam plants, and so forth.

Here is the answer, from Mr. Dean:

This figure that you have just given represents the cost of an entire complex at a new site.

Certainly it is a complicated proposition. Anything that costs $1,000,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 is a complex thing. But it comprises many units.

As the distinguished Senator from Iowa has said, the reason the plans and specifications cannot be made is that they themselves do not know what changes may be necessary. Science is moving from one day to the next.

Mr. MORSE. They cannot spend more money than Congress has appropriated. Then what good is the proviso? We have given them up to $2,000,000,000, and that is as far as they can go anyway.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the proviso is not included, we shall have given them a blank check. They would not be satisfied——

Mr. MORSE. The figure is now up to $2,000,000,000, and that is all they can spend until Congress meets again, at which time Congress can provide them with more money.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is right.

Mr. MORSE. But the question is whether with the proviso included, they will get into trouble with the General Accounting Office, because no matter what the legislative history may be, as it is made on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives, the courts will apply the language that is written into the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I can eliminate some of the difficulty upon this measure.

It is only necessary to refer to the amendment which was adopted by the Senate committee. That amendment was drafted largely by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. It had the complete agreement, we understood, of the Atomic Energy Commission.

A reading of a few lines of this amendment demonstrates completely, it seems to me, the futility of this entire argument.

I say to the Senate, Mr. President, in the first place, that the basic fact which is being neglected in this argument is that the money which was estimated for the continuation and expansion of the atomic energy program cannot possibly be expended during the fiscal year 1953. That is the basic fact, and it is proven by the Senate amendment which the Atomic Energy Commission was willing to accept.

I read it:

Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for "plant and equipment," $1,450,000,000, of which $1,355,398,000 is for (1) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

In other words, by agreeing to this amendment, which the Senate Committee on Appropriations for the supplemental appropriation bill adopted, the Atomic Energy Commission was telling us in the plainest of plain words that all the money it could spend in 1953 was $1,450,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Or contract for.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming read the next phrase?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed, I will:

Or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $3,518,800,000.

So here is a statement that even the $4,450,000,000, although authorized to be expended during the fiscal year 1953, might not be expended during the fiscal year 1953, or else they would not have consented to the insertion of the words:

Or thereafter—

After June 30, 1953—

under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes.

Here the record is clear that the total contract authority which the Atomic Energy Commission wanted was $3,518,800,000; that of that sum, not to exceed $1,450,000,000 could be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953.

So the question arises, What are we talking about? The second conference which was held agreed to increase this appropriation from $1,450,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. So the second conference was saying, "You may have $2,000,000,000, and you may enter into contracts against it in any way you please; but we only put on the limitation"—which the House insisted upon, to clarify it—and I thank Mr. Scott, of our staff, for handing me the exact provision:

Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project.

With an appropriation of $2,000,000,000, when the Atomic Energy Commission, through a staff member, tells a Member of this body that the machinery will not be ready for 12 months, in some

cases, how can it be said that the proviso constitutes a restriction? All in the world it amounts to, is a statement that the Congress of the United States is not issuing, as the Senator from Michigan has well said, a blank check to be spent, and authorizing contracts for any amount of money.

We are proud of the fact, and we have said it over and over again, that the Congress of the United States holds the purse string. I say to this body, Mr. President, that when the Congress of the United States transfers funds to an executive agency, without any strings, as was proposed in the substitute which was offered this evening by the Senator from Iowa, then, indeed, the Congress of the United States is surrendering the purse string. I say, without the slightest doubt in my own mind, that this supposed limitation is not a limitation. The whole difficulty has arisen out of the fact that spokesmen for the Atomic Energy Commission have been arguing against a construction which would open the door for them. They seek to close the door. Why? Because they want to have an unlimited demand upon the Treasury of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin, and Mr. FORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori and her minor child; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of answering two questions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. As usual, I find the explanations of the Senator very helpful. My first question is this: There is no doubt about the fact that they cannot possibly spend more, or contract for things involving expenditures in excess of the $2,000,000,000. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct?

Mr. MORSE. Is it not also true that they cannot spend any part of that $2,000,000,000 for any specific physical project that has not already been authorized?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They can spend it for the new project.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is aware of the new project?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware of the new project, certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Is it true that the new project has congressional approval?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is my understanding that it has.

Mr. MORSE. If the answers to my two questions are as I understand them to be, No. 1——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I can answer that question, if the Senator would like to have me do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There is a general blanket authorization in the original act, so an authorization for an appropriation is not necessary.

Mr. MORSE. We have projects that we may designate as projects X, Y, and Z.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are all authorized, if appropriated for.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. We know of the projects X, Y, and Z, and we know that the maximum amount of money which is appropriated for X, Y, and Z happens to be $2,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Then why the proviso?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the members of the House Appropriations Committee were of the firm opinion that the Atomic Energy Commission should not have the liberty to contract for the expenditure of funds which could not possibly be spent within the fiscal year for which we were appropriating, without any supervision, let, or hindrance upon the part of the appropriating body.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It seems from the Senator's argument that, although, cording to the RECORD, they could not possibly spend more than $600,000,000, yet the committee has given them $2,000,000,000. So that the argument seems to be somewhat fallacious.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, I said nothing about $600,000,000.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator to indicate that they could not spend more than $600,000,000 in the year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then that must have been said by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I read that from the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the committee now gives them $2,000,000,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for that, clearly, is because we want to give them authority to make contracts in the future for that amount.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then I ask the Senator this question: Does the Appropriations Committee approach this project, as a $3,500,000,000 project, or as a $2,000,000,000 project? I may simply say that, obviously, if the Senate Appropriations Committee, or the House approaches it as a $3,500,000,000 project, which I think it is, then there is no reason for stepping it down to only a partial starting of the program.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned—and I think this is the view of the Appropriations Committee—it accepts the estimate made by the Atomic Energy Commission that the cost of this proposed project will not exceed $3,518,800,000. That is for all four projects. I may say further to the Senator from Iowa that as a member of the Appropriations Committee, when I was chairman of the subcommittee on independent offices appropriations, before which the Atomic Energy Commission came—both in open session and in secret session—my experience with the Atomic Energy Commission was that its estimates are not firm, and that they overrun their estimates constantly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I agree thoroughly with the Senator. He has done a splendid job in times past in snubbing down their preliminary estimates. No one has been more critical than have I.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If a splendid job was done in snubbing them down in times past, what possible exception can there be now to a provision which gives them $2,000,000,000, and which authorizes them to make contracts, when we know that the contracts cannot be fulfilled during fiscal 1953, and furthermore, when we know that a new Congress will take over in January, with ample power and ample authority to review any plans which the Atomic Energy Commission may have, and will provide the money? There is money enough in this bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If it were as simple as that, it would present no difficulty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the construction which the Senator ought to accept, I may say, and if the Senator accepts that construction, there is no one in the General Accounting Office who would deny it. But Senators would close the door in their own faces by construing this language as meaning that nothing can be done.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We do not. It is the construction of those who have intimately studied the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are lawyers on the Appropriations Committee, too.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield once more to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will bear with me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon. He has a very keen legal mind, and I am glad to have his questions.

Mr. MORSE. One more question. Let us assume a hypothetical question, namely, that the totality of this project can be described as units X, Y, and Z, for which, in this bill, there is appropriated $2,000,000,000. Is the effect of the proviso to say to the Commission "You must complete project X; and you cannot go ahead now to let contracts for any item of any other units of project Y or project Z, whether it be for new machinery or for any other item, unless you can certify that you are completing project X, first. Then you can move to Y and then to Z?" If that be the effect does it not place the Atomic Energy Commission in such a position that it cannot let contracts in part for units X, Y, and Z, because units X, Y, and Z in their totality will require more than $2,000,000,000?

So we say to them, in effect, by this proviso, "You cannot plan now for the lead time you are going to need, 2 to 3 years from now, for the full completion of X, Y, and Z because you cannot now certify that you have enough money to complete the three units, and you will have to confine your attention to the units for which you have enough money to complete within the $2,000,000,000."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator would read the amendment again he would find that a project of this kind consists not of a single building——

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It consists of a multiplicity of structures. It consists of machinery, equipment, and raw materials of various kinds. The money which is provided is ample to cover everything that can possibly be done during the fiscal year 1953 and is ample to cover contracts for the future, beyond 1953. All in the world that this amendment is saying is, "You shall not contract for more obligations against the Treasury of the United States to be expended 3, 4, or 5 years ahead, when you have full authority to spend $550,000,000 more than you asked for in contract authority for 1953."

Mr. MORSE. I have just one more question. On the basis of that explanation, let us assume that the Atomic Energy Commission knows that in 1955 it is going to need a particularly complicated electrical machine, which will take 3 years to build, and which will cost $500,000,000 upon completion. It is to be put into a unit which will be built in 1954, but the contract has to be let in September 1952. Can they make such a contract with this proviso in the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the first place, the Senator's hypothetical question is without foundation in fact.

Mr. MORSE. I do not know whether it is or not. It is a hypothetical question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], in explaining the totality of this project, told the Senate only a few hours ago, or sometime yesterday afternoon, that the atomic-energy program was an expanding program; that the Commission did not know from week to week or from month to month what it might turn out to be, so it is not able to plan for any type of machinery to be delivered in 1955. What the committee was trying to do was merely to say, "When you have your plans ready, come and get your money."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. When the atomic-energy program was first started, we had to place a little trust in it. If it had been attempted to run the program on a business basis it would not have gotten any place. I hope we can get a vote, whatever it may be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am ready to vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think my friend from Iowa will confirm the statement I am about to make. He advised me that my proposition is not hypothetical at all, that it is exactly the problem which confronts the Atomic Energy Commission; that the Commission does know of certain types of equipment it wants to order this year, and it will take considerable time to complete it. The Commission does not have a unit at this time in which they could place the equipment, because of the lead time they need in which to manufacture the item. What we are doing by this proviso is closing the door to them so that they cannot, when they find within the next few months that they need to order a piece of machinery to be placed in the unit 2 or 3 years from now, issue that order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can only say that from all the argument I have heard I am convinced beyond any shadow of doubt that the report of the conference committee on this matter will not impede in any way, shape, or form the development of the atomic-energy program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that the conference report has been messaged over, and the Chair would lay it down, but there is apparently a copy downstairs which will have to be brought to the Senate before that can be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what the proviso in its present form may well mean is this: The Government cannot start more than $2,000,000,000 worth of projects, even though three and a half billion dollars' worth of projects are needed eventually to complete the new development. What good does this proviso do?

It obviously does not save any money, because the House conferees are willing to appropriate $500,000,000 more than they were willing to appropriate a few hours ago. The proviso does not save money or reduce appropriations. All it may do is to reduce the scale of building, and apparently this is such a project that we have to take all of it or take nothing. We cannot reduce the scale. It has to be all or nothing. What good does the inclusion of the proviso do? It can do a great deal of harm.

Mr. President, I am informed that the House has not had a chance to vote as to whether it will uphold its conferees. I have great respect for the managers on the part of the House, but it is quite obvious that we are dealing with very stubborn men. It is not at all certain, however, that the House would vote to uphold its conferees if the matter could be presented to them. They may defeat the program by their stubbornness. I very much hope that we shall stand our ground and insist that this proviso be eliminated from the bill so that the project may go ahead.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not a question of stubbornness. As I see it, it is a question of what is good for the United States of America.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know the conferees are tired; I know they would like to get out of Washington; but, Mr. President, if a bomb were dropped and we did the wrong thing, they would be a great deal more tired and much more eager to get away. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Arizona is completely right. In justice to the House, I think we should give them another chance to repudiate their conference committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator had a distinguished record in World War II——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish the Senator from Arizona would not bring up that matter. Many privates who fought had far more distinguished records than I did, and received no praise.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator did not ask me to bring it up, but I say that he did have a distinguished record.

I wish to ask the Senator if this is not the one program that might save many deaths among the foot soldiers?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course; and it is also essential to the survival of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. In the long run, what is the most important program today for the defense of the United States? What will save us? What will save our fighting men? What is the big factor that is keeping war away today?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is well known that our atomic-energy power probably is the factor which, more than anything else, has deterred the Russians from attacking. It is quite obvious that the Russians are beginning to catch up with us. But apparently there is some mysterious development we have which the Russians, thank God, do not have at the moment, which can again give us atomic superiority. I believe it is necessary that we take it all in one piece and go through with it. I do not believe that we can take it on the installment plan.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. What position will we be in——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator will yield momentarily, I wish to assure the Senator that we have atomic superiority today. I want no one to be deluded about that. The Russians undoubtedly are making progress, but all the talk to the effect that we have lost our superiority is not a fact.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. What will be our position if we do not go forward as we have in the past?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We must go forward in order to maintain increasing superiority. But I do not want the American people to be deluded by the statement of the Senator from Chicago that we are losing superiority in atomic energy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think the Senator from Chicago intended his statement in that way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am very proud to come from Chicago, but I also happen to be a Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Illinois yield so that the Chair may lay before the Senate a conference report?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report on House bill 8370, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see pp. 9680–9682 of House proceedings of today.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have the clerk ring the bell two times, without asking for a quorum, but merely to notify Senators in conference or who may be in cloakrooms that there will be a vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, let me say only that I was on the conference, but I never signed the report. It will never be agreed to tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the clerk will ring the bell twice. Without objection, the clerk will ring the bell twice.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think both sides are ready to vote on the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, there cannot be a vote on the conference report until it is discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report that has been submitted does not include amendment 41. The amendment will have to be passed upon separately.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on amendment numbered 41. As to the rest of the conference report, there is no question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The conference report would still have to be agreed to. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall not talk more than a few minutes. I merely wish to say that I feel in all seriousness that the second report of the conference committee should be agreed to. In the short time we had in which to act, I tried to get certain available factual data from the Atomic Energy Commission. I inquired particularly of Mr. Dean with reference to the major proposition, whether the money provided in the House bill could be used alone and of itself to extend or increase the production of the Atomic Energy Commission. The answer to my question was that it could be so used.

I then asked about the percentage increase of the $1,450,000,000 in the bill as compared with the remainder of the bill, which would run about $1,250,500,000. I may say that that was an inquiry made by the Committee on Appropriations of the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It should be understood that we must rely upon the executive office of the Government for our information.

The answer to the inquiry was that there was a definite percentage relationship. The chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission asked to go completely off the record with respect to his answers. There was not a scratch of a pen; nothing was taken down. It is not a case of a record having been made and then sequestered. No record was made.

I can only say that I could give percentages as they were presented to the committee. The percentage statement was then further illustrated with a chart which hung on the wall. The chart indicated the present production of fissionable material. It indicated in graduated steps the amount of fissionable material production as it would be increased year by year. At the top the chart indicated the additional amount of fissionable material that would be included if the full amount requested, which would be $2,880,000,000, were appropriated.

We interrogated the chairman of the Commission with reference to the chart. I was particularly anxious to determine the answer to one question, namely, as to whether we were dealing in units? Or was each portion of the appropriation dependent upon another portion? If the latter were true, then there was no question left, so far as our committee could be concerned. It would be the full amount or nothing. But the answers were that if the money provided in the House bill could be used, it would represent a very definite appreciation in construction capacity.

There can be no question about the answer. There can be no question about each side understanding the other. With respect to the balance of the money which is here involved, we now have illustrated the percentage increase in fissionable material that would result from the expenditure of the other fund. With that information at hand the committee took the steps indicated in the bill as reported. We struck out the proviso which the House put in, and we put in the equivalent of contract authority.

In the conference we were able to add to the $1,450,000,000 the sum of $550,000,000. Certainly the House is a coequal body with the Senate; and I, for one, feel that it does a very good job of investigation because it has more time than we have. Members of the House Appropriations Committee serve on only one subcommittee, whereas our committee members serve on five subcommittees. The House took the view that it wanted to get as much of the atomic energy program up for competitive bidding as it could. The House Members felt that that should include all residential construction, all hospital construction, all school construction, and such things, all of which constitute a part of a new community which must be built for the new project. That category does not include additions to existing plants of the Commission, plants which by themselves represent complete operating units. As to the remainder, which is $1,250,500,000, that will create a new community, with sanitary facilities, streets, and all the things which go into the making of a town. The House felt that in that field the Atomic Energy Commission could and should open the bidding to contractors and have competitive bidding so as to lower the cost. That was the basic argument in that field. Frankly, I say that I agree.

As to the expenditure of the funds, there is no question that the $600,000,000 can all be expended in the next year. That is actually beside the point, because it is not a question of how many dollars are going to be spent within that period. It is a question of what can be done toward the creation of a completed productive unit. The Atomic Energy Commission could not begin construction of the entire unit, which would represent a completely new project, not an additional or expanded plant, but a completely new producing unit with a complete city around it.

The Commission cannot do any more than spend $600,000,000 within the year. We got $550,000,000, in addition to the $1,450,000,000. We felt that under the circumstances it now being midyear, that money could be used for land acquisition. No determination has yet been made as to where the site is to be. The Commission has no options. It can obtain them and go ahead with such planning as is necessary to create such facilities as could be constructed by competitive bidding; and by the first of the year Congress will be in session and the remainder of the project can be taken up.

We are now working with a gun at our heads and with our brains practically numb. Under all the circumstances, I express the hope that we can approve this report and go on to the other matters at hand and get our job done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will explain the parliamentary situation. When this report came over earlier it was one complete report, which the Senate rejected. It comes back now in two documents, consisting of a conference report, which apparently is not controversial, and the amendment of the House to Senate amendment numbered 41, which is the subject of the controversy which has been in progress.

If the Senate adopts the conference report, it will vote separately on Senate amendment numbered 41; and if it

adopts that, that ends it, the House having already adopted it. If it rejects amendment numbered 41, automatically the matter will have to go back to conference.

The question now is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to House bill 8370, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 6, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment, or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this report, if anything, is more offensive than the original conference report. It comes back in a more un-understandable hodgepodge of confusion and restriction.

I should like to mention one further matter which I had not intended to bring up because I did not want to confuse the main issue. The conferees have limited the settlement value in connection with contract termination to $57,000,000 in this conference report, as they did in the other. If fate is with me, and I live until next January, I am sure I shall join with the other members of the joint committee in attempting to take out this utterly unworkable $57,000,000 contract termination item.

It is necessary in this program for the Atomic Energy Commission to make contracts with public utilities, which will cause the installation or the acquisition of more than $400,000,000 worth of equipment on the part of private investors and private utilities, in order to service most of these facilities. We hope that the contracts will run for 25 years and that there will be no termination damages. But if by some quirk of fate in this unknown field it should become necessary to terminate these contracts within 2 or 3 years, there would be far more than $57,000,000 of termination costs on any kind of an equitable basis. But that is a matter which I think can go over until January. That is why I did not bring up the question. I merely wish to serve notice now that I think this is a nefarious conference report. I do not think it is sound, and I am against it for that reason.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment numbered 41, ask for a further conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I may say that the amendment which the Senate added to the bill was largely sponsored by the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe it is an amendment which can be lived with very properly. I think it is a very excellent amendment, with the addition of the suggested reservation. I earnestly believe that if the Senate conferees will insist on the so-called Saltonstall suggestion and induce the House conferees to agree with them, the matter can be worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Iowa be willing to accept the House language if the figure were to be raised to $3,580,000,000, which is the amount in the Saltonstall amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The amount of $3,580,000,000 would, of course, solve the entire problem, but it would unnecessarily contribute to the Federal deficit. We do not need to appropriate that much money.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amount were made $3,580,000,000, with the provisio, does the Senator feel that it would not be restrictive and would allow the Atomic Energy Commission to go full steam ahead?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would be reluctantly forced to accept it if the appropriation were made $3,580,000,000. I still say it is unnecessary and will increase the Federal deficit. There is no need to appropriate that much money. If that is the best we can do, that is the answer, I suppose.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would not increase the national debt until the amount was actually expended. So there would be nothing objectionable in that regard. It would amount to a larger appropriation, but it would not increased the national debt.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. On the question of the national debt and the deficit, if the suggestion is satisfactory to the Senator from Michigan, I have enough respect for his guardianship of the national debt to go along with him.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 24 minutes a. m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

The Senate reassembled at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes a. m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret very much that we have had to keep the Senate in session for such a long time. I greatly appreciate the patience of the Members of the Senate and the hard work they have done in trying to arrive at an agreement, especially the conferees. Questions of great moment to our country are involved. Had it not been so we would have adjourned sine die and would have been in bed quite a long time ago. I think it is no more than proper that the Senate should recess until Monday and have time to think things over. I think we can determine the matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator proposing to recess now until Monday and transact business on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think we should try to determine that now.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have got to determine it tonight. It is very unfair to those Senators who have left to attend the convention. A political party is having a national convention in Chicago. We all know that.

Mr. McFARLAND. It may very well be that the conferees will come in with a conference report by Monday, and we can then adjourn.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it possible to decide that tonight?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I cannot decide that question. The conferees will have to decide it. I do not know what they are going to do.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it was my understanding at the time of adjournment of the conference on the civil functions appropriation bill that the conferees of the House, Members of the minority party, were all leaving today, and the suggestion was made that the conference resume at 1 o'clock today, but that could not be done because they were all leaving. Therefore it was left, so far as the conference was concerned, that they could not get together again until after the week of the Republican Convention.

I should like to have that statement confirmed by the senior Senator from Arizona or by some other Senator who was present.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no fixed time when the conference broke up.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have known Members to change their minds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator consider a unanimous consent agreement that the only business to be transacted on Monday will be the two conference reports?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the Senator's motion would be that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would give the Senator assurance that we shall not transact any business on Monday other than the two conference reports.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator considered the eventuality of no conference reports being available on Monday, and what action would then be taken?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not trying to take advantage of anyone. I have known Senators to change their minds.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would the Senator consider a unanimous-consent agreement that the only business to be transacted on Monday would be the consideration of the two conference reports?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; that is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, the motion would be to recess until 12 o'clock Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I give the Senator assurance that we will not transact any business on Monday other than in connection with these two conference reports.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will there be day-by-day or 3-day recesses?

Mr. McFARLAND. We will determine that when we know whether the conferees are willing or unwilling to work.

Mr. CORDON. In any event, until such time as the Senators who have in good faith gone on the official business of their party can get back, there will be nothing but the two conference reports taken up, nothing else will be done?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Would that exclude a motion to adjourn sine die?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not making such a motion. If the conference reports are disposed of, we could then adjourn.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator about to suggest a recess until 12 o'clock on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. With the understanding that the only business to be taken up at this session would be the two conference reports? No other business whatsoever would be taken up?

Mr. McFARLAND. What does the Senator mean by "this session"? I do not know what the Senate might decide to do later on, but I would say that on Monday——

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator plan to suggest a program for the time beyond Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know what the Senate might decide to do. I am not trying to take advantage of the minority. We will give the minority Senators an opportunity to return.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator understands that we have a special situation to be handled, which the Senator appreciates as well as we do. We know that he is not going to take advantage of the situation. But there is a question whether or not those who are here tonight, and have a very good purpose to be away on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, will understand what happened here tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Would it be possible to recess tonight until Monday noon, with the understanding that only the two conference reports would be taken up at this session of Congress, and after they were disposed of, the Senator would make a motion to adjourn sine die?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would not want to have that understanding. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that nothing will be taken up until the minority has had a chance to return.

Mr. CAPEHART. What does the Senator mean by "had a chance to return"? Why not recess until a week from Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. We cannot do that under the Constitution. Nothing will be taken up on Monday except the two conference reports. I am not trying to take advantage of anyone. But when the Senators return, I do not know what they might want to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under a unanimous-consent agreement, we could agree to do anything.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. We could not recess for more than 3 days.

Mr. MORSE. I think we can have a very simple understanding. Some of us will be in Chicago by tomorrow night. One of the first questions that will be asked us by our Senate colleagues is the kind of understanding which was arranged with the majority leader. I think it should be just this simple, that we recess from tonight until Monday, with the understanding that the only matters to be taken up on Monday would be the two conference reports, if they were ready.

Mr. McFARLAND. Or the only matters to be taken up during the Republican convention.

Mr. MORSE. That was to be my next point. If the reports are not ready on Monday, we can decide to recess until some other day during next week, with the understanding that the conference reports will be the only matters to be taken up. We can continue to recess during the next week until the Republican Senators are in a position, at the close of their convention, to return and transact business. I believe that is the only fair thing to do. If we can have that understanding with the majority leader, it is good enough for me, and I should think it would be good enough for everyone else.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I wish to say to my colleagues of the minority that under the circumstances I certainly have no objection to such procedure. I know of no other procedure that could be taken.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator knows that I would not try to take advantage of our colleagues.

Mr. CAPEHART. We understand that, too.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the members of the conference should change their minds, and we could adjourn sine die, I would suggest that we do so. But I give assurance that we will not take up anything else next week. Perhaps the Republican Convention will be concluded in 2 days.

Mr. CORDON. I am canceling my reservation. I shall remain here until the question is settled.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator would not have to do that.

Mr. CORDON. Or until we know there can be no conference report.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have just one question. The Senator will limit the agreement to the conference reports, but does that mean that unanimous consent may not be obtained to make insertions in the RECORD? May we have that point clarified?

Mr. MORSE. Such permission has already been granted.

Mr. McFARLAND. I see no reason to deny Senators an opportunity to make insertions in the RECORD so long as no business, other than the conference reports, is transacted. I would agree to allow insertions to be made in the RECORD. Or if someone desired to speak, I think that would be all right. I do not know.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator have any report at this particular moment as to what, if any, progress has been made on amendment 41 in the supplemental appropriations bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not.

Mr. CORDON. Perhaps I can help a little on that point. A statement was made—it was not official—that at the present time the feeling was that if the matter came before the House based on present views, there probably would be a request for a quorum, but a quorum could not be obtained. However, that situation can change overnight.

Mr. McFARLAND. Sometimes Senators change their minds, and if we could adjourn, it would be a wonderful thing.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What are the present views of the conference?

Mr. CORDON. They were not expressed. Nor were they asked for.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say that I shall be here, and I will never change my mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the next 30 days on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. We shall miss the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I am sorry he will have to be absent, but I shall not object.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate the Senator's compliment very much.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the fact that the Senator from Indiana has been granted a 30-day leave indicate that the Senate will continue its sessions for 30 days?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am going on an official mission for the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the present request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I also ask leave to be absent from the Senate next week. I have reservations for departure for Chicago at 8:30 this morning. Although I have planned to go to Chicago, I am very much interested in the conference report, and I would dislike being in Chicago and then perhaps having to return on Monday. But I suppose there is nothing that can be done about it. I may send some long telegrams stating my position in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. I want to be sure that I understand the agreement. The Senator from Arizona proposes a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow, and there might well be a recess then until Thursday. However, no business will be transacted other than the two conference reports, although Senators will be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. And no votes will be taken.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes a. m., Sunday, July 6, 1952) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Monday, July 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Chester E. Stovall, of Missouri, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the remainder of the term expiring April 9, 1954, vice James O'Connor Roberts, deceased.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT AT DENVER, COLO.

Gladys Morelock, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 5 (legislative day of June 27), 1952:

UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

James Augustine Walsh, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Rear Adm. Joseph W. Fowler, United States Navy (retired), of California, presently Director of the Munitions Board Supply Management Agencies, to be Director of the Defense Supply Management Agency in the Department of Defense.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Paul Moss, of Texas, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT AT DENVER, COLO.

Gladys Morelock, of Colorado, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States, at Denver, Colo.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

William B. Savchuck.
Biagio J. Cosentino.
Oliver D. Harvey.

To be assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

William O. Engler.
Jack D. Robertson.
Herbert Swerdlow.
Edgar K. Anderson.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 37 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be brigadier generals

Col. LeRoy Hagen Anderson, O239452.
Col. Hugh Barclay, O402854.
Col. Michael Joseph Galvin, O279304.
Col. Hugh Stanford McLeod, O143285.
Col. Lamar Tooze, O107927.

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Frieda A. Davey, Naknek.

FLORIDA

Franklin F. Rhode, Arcadia.
George P. Brantley, Jr., Lakeland.

GEORGIA

Thomas R. Wood, La Grange.

ILLINOIS

Carl E. Erler, Streator.

INDIANA

Wayne M. Crider, Greenfield.
Dean I. Lauver, New Carlisle.

MASSACHUSETTS

John F. Condon, Brockton.

MICHIGAN

Casimir A. Rakowski, Mount Morris.
Phillip N. O'Brien, Pentwater.

MISSISSIPPI

Clarence E. Arnold, Saltillo.

MISSOURI

Estella C. Lawrence, Fenton.

MONTANA

George N. Westland, Frazer.

NEBRASKA

Harold S. Conroy, Shelton.

NEVADA

Irene B. McCormick, Empire.

NEW JERSEY

Ettore T. Minervino, Denville.
John P. Panella, Mendham.
David B. Morgan, Paterson.
John L. Malley, Trenton.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harriett R. Cowley, Ambrose.
John B. Wright, Antler.
Elmer W. Hoppa, Cayuga.
Chester C. King, Donnybrook.
Joseph P. Roubal, Lawton.
Malvern E. Thorson, McGregor.
Francis L. Gerou, Mooreton.
Milford L. Carlson, Rhame.
Lawrence J. Petz, Ryder.
Charles L. Stedman, Sheyenne.
Alvin O. Herberg, Wildrose.

OKLAHOMA

Robert L. Dobry, Pocasset.

OREGON

Samuel R. Veatch, Cottage Grove.
Franz L. Kranenburg, Prairie City.

VIRGINIA

James E. Harris, Ewing.

WEST VIRGINIA

Hazel M. Pritt, Ward.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 5, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou infinite and eternal God, the coming in and the going out of all our days are in the keeping and control of Thy kind and beneficent providence.

Hitherto our lives have been abundantly blessed and Thou hast not withheld from us anything that was needful.

Grant that, as the hour of adjournment draws nigh, we may lift our hearts in thanksgiving for the high and holy privilege of walking and working together in the service of our God, our country, and humanity.

We humbly confess that we are conscious of many failures; we have often been recreant to our duties and responsibilities; we have been unfaithful to the sacred vows of our high office. Wilt Thou now give us the grace of repentance and amendment and the joys of Thy pardoning grace.

We pray that Thou wilt bestow the benediction of Thy peace upon our President, our Speaker, the chosen Representatives of our Republic, and all who have served our Nation during this session of Congress in whatever capacity. We leave this Chamber commending and commiting one another to Thy love and care.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. LANDERS, its clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Milagros Aujero;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Johann Komma;

H. R. 5442. An act for the relief of Martin A. Dekking;

H. R. 5624. An act for the relief of Tokusaburo Imamura Glasscock;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (S. 827) entitled "An act for the relief of Fred P. Hines," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the Senate, in which it originated, and passed by the Senate on the recommendation of the same, it was

Resolved, That said bill do pass, two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7656) entitled "An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8122) entitled "An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 8271) entitled "An act to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code, disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, and Mr. MARTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2592. An act to amend section 403 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to permit the granting of free or reduced-rate transportation to ministers of religion; and

S. 3186. An act to authorize the President to appoint to the grade of general in the Army of the United States those officers who, in grade of lieutenant general, commanded the Army Ground Forces or commanded an army during World War II, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 2364), entitled "An act to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H. R. 651), an act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee, No. 152419, for certain land in California.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the last special order entered, his remarks to appear at the end of today's proceedings in the body of the RECORD.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2487)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 736c), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(c) (1) The annuity of any retired employee or of any survivor of a deceased or retired employee who, before the date of enactment of this amendment, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, shall be increased, effective on the first day of the second month following enactment of this amendment, by $36 for each full six-month period elapsed between the commencing date of annuity and October 1, 1952: *Provided*, That such increase in annuity shall not exceed the lesser of $324 or 25 per centum of the present annuity: *Provided further*, That no annuity shall be increased to an amount in excess of $2,160 by reason of the enactment of this amendment: *And provided further*, That the increases to retired employees provided by this subsection shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors.

"'(2) The increases in annuity provided by this subsection shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and shall terminate, without subsequent resumption, on June 30, 1955, or on an earlier date under any one of the following conditions, whichever may first occur:

"'(A) At the end of the second month following the third consecutive month for which the Consumers' Price Index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics is less than 169.9, the index for the month of April 1948. In

the event that the Bureau of Labor Statistics revises the basis of calculating the Consumers' Price Index, it shall immediately furnish to the Commission a conversion factor designed to adjust to the new basis the index figure of 169.9 described herein, and such adjusted index shall be used for the purposes of this subsection.

"'(B) On June 30, 1954, unless an appropriation is made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in the applicable annual appropriation Act, for the fiscal year 1955, or in any prior appropriation Act, for the specific purpose of compensating said fund for the cost, as determined by the Commission, of increases provided by this subsection during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.'

"SEC. 2. (a) There is hereby created a body to be known as the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which shall be composed of a chairman appointed by the President and, ex officio, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

"(b) The Committee shall make a comparative study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel and report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1953. Its report, including findings and recommendations, shall include the following:

"(1) the types and amounts of retirement and other related benefits provided to Federal personnel, including their role in the compensation system as a whole;

"(2) the necessity for special benefit provisions for selected employee groups, including overseas personnel and employees in hazardous occupations;

"(3) the relationships of these retirement systems to one another, to the Federal employees' compensation system, and to such general systems as old-age and survivors insurance; and

"(4) the current financial status of the several systems, the most desirable methods of cost determination and funding, the division of costs between the Government and the members of the systems, and the policies that should be followed in meeting the Government's portion of the cost of the various systems.

"(c) The Chairman of said Committee, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, is authorized to procure services pursuant to section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such attorneys and other personnel as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 3. Section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended (5 U. S. C. 716), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"'Any person entitled to annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund may decline to accept all or any part of such annuity by a waiver signed and filed with the Commission. Such waiver may be revoked in writing at any time, but no payment of the annuity waived shall be made covering the period during which such waiver was in effect.'"

And the House agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
WILLIAM LANGER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2968) to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, and except for technical and clarifying drafting changes, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

The first section of the Senate bill added to section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, a new subsection (c) which provided for increases in annuities of retired employees. The House amendment granted the same increases to retired employees and, in addition, granted such increases to survivors now receiving or entitled to receive annuities. The Senate bill did not limit the aggregate annuity which might be received by reason of any increase granted in such subsection. The House amendment provided that no such aggregate annuity shall be in excess of $2,000. Under the conference substitute, no such aggregate annuity shall exceed $2,160.

The conference substitute adds to paragraph (1) of such subsection (c) a proviso which makes it clear that the increases granted by such paragraph (1) shall not apply to future annuities of survivors of retired employees who receive increases under such paragraph (1). This proviso was contained in the Senate bill.

Paragraph (2) of the new subsection (c) as contained in the House amendment provided for termination of the annuity increases on June 30, 1955, or for termination on an earlier date if certain conditions occurred.

Under subparagraph (B) of such paragraph (2) the annuity increases would terminate on June 30, 1953, unless an appropriation were made to the civil-service retirement and disability fund in order to finance the increases payable during the fiscal years 1953 and 1954. Under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph (2) the annuity increases would terminate on June 30, 1954, unless a corresponding appropriation were made to finance such increases for the fiscal year 1955.

Under the conference agreement these subparagraphs were combined and modified so as to provide for termination of the annuity increases on June 30, 1954, unless an appropriation is made to finance the increases payable during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955.

Section 2 of the House amendment created a Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, to be composed of five members, which was to make a comparative study of all retirement systems for all Federal personnel and submit a report to the Congress not later than December 31, 1953. Section 2 of the conference substitute contains provisions identical to those of the House amendment with respect to such committee, except that the membership of the committee is increased to include the Secretary of Defense.

TOM MURRAY,
GEORGE P. MILLER,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, this conference report contains virtually the same amendment that was passed by the House. There were only three changes made by the conferees: One to make the limitation $2,160 instead of $2,000, a raise of $160; and the other to make the increases effective until June make the increases effective until June 30, 1954. The House date was June 30, year or until June 30, 1954, for Congress to make the necessary appropriation for the cost of this legislation or else the increases would stop. The other change was to add the Secretary of Defense to this committee that will make a broad and comprehensive survey of the entire retirement systems. This is a unanimous report on the part of both the Senate and the House conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on S. 2968, is a unanimous report of all conferees in the House and Senate. The agreement represents, in a large measure, the provisions contained in the House version of this legislation.

One of the important features in the House bill, not contained in the Senate measure, is with respect to increasing the annuities for widows and children of deceased employees.

The House, you will recall, has placed a limitation whereby those who receive annuities in the sum of $2,000 or more, would not receive further increases under this bill. That limitation was increased to $2,160 or $180 per month. The savings in this provision, nearly offset the cost of giving annuity increases to widows and children. This is an important feature in the House bill. The average annuity for widows and children is approximately $50 per month, compared with the average annuity for the retired employees of $98 per month.

It was agreed that annuities would be paid from the present fund until June 30, 1954. It was also agreed that unless appropriations are made for the fund to take care of the extra charges, no further payments would be made. In other words, Congress would be required to make appropriations to take care of the extra charges and not permit further impairment of the retirement fund.

Members of the conference committee were especially concerned that a study be made of the present retirement fund, to determine whether such fund is economically sound and whether the provisions of the present law are being followed. The committee felt that in order to legislate wisely on the question of Federal personnel retirement, that all Federal retirement systems should be examined. It should be observed that the committee appointed hereunder makes recommendations and that such recommendations are not binding upon the committee or Congress.

One of my concerns—and it should be the concern of every Federal employee—is the constant pressure to combine the Federal employees civil service retirement system with the social-security system. The Federal employees have the most liberal retirement system of any that I know about. They should see that it is protected in the form in

which it now exists. This means the civil service retirement fund must remain unimpaired. It must not be made a part of any other system. Pressures, many of them from the employees themselves, to get away from the sound fund theory may possibly lead closer to the combination with the social-security system, which would be, in my judgment, a great disappointment.

I call your attention again to the fact that this legislation although compromise legislation is practically the House version of the bill that passed the House with very little opposition. I take it that this conference report is reasonably satisfactory to the Members of this House, since no one appears to express any opposition from either side.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for their fine work in rushing to final passage bill S. 2968, liberalizing annuities of retired civil-service employees.

The committee is to be commended, too, for insisting on the inclusion of additional pension benefits for widows and children to retired civil-service employees.

Mr. Speaker, I have given my full support to the passage of this legislation because I believe that retired civil-service employees, and widows and children of retired employees, are entitled to and deserving of increased annuities to offset the increased cost of living.

I again commend the committee for its splendid action on this measure.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY AND NAVAL INSTALLATIONS CONSTRUCTION BILL

Mr. VINSON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2488)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 14, 21, 22, 24½, 36, 57, 63, 87, 93, 96, 98, 100, 111, 112, 119, 125, 127, 134, 135, 137, 138, 141, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 154, 155, 158, 161, 162, 169, 171, 172, 176, 177, 191, 196, 200, and 201.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 150, 153, 156, 157, 159, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 170, 173, 174, 175, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 229, 233, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 241, and 242 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Covered storage and community"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Operational maintenance, and training"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Fort Jackson, South Carolina: Administrative facility and utilities, $182,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "training building, open storage,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$1,286,000."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Troop support facilities and rehabilitation, $1,980,000."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indiana: Administrative facility and training building, $5,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Training buildings and facilities research"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 228: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 228, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$124,420,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$328,047,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 231: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$328,047,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 232: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 232, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$138,183,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 234: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$256,875,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 240: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 240, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 407. In the case of any public work authorized to be established or developed under the authority of section 102, 202, or 302 of this Act, the Secretary of the military department authorized to establish or develop such public work, or his designee, shall come into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the cost of construction of such public work, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
JOHN C. STENNIS,
WAYNE MORSE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

LEGISLATION IN CONFERENCE

On June 12, 1952, the House passed H. R. 8120, the fiscal 1953 military public works bill, containing a total authorization of $2,758,318,000. On July 3, 1952, the Senate passed H. R. 8120. The conferees agreed on a bill with a total authorization of $2,398,282,800, a decrease of $360,035,200.

SENATE AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL

The Senate amendments to the bill are for the most part reductions in the amounts for the specific items. In virtually every case these reductions reflect certain formulas with respect to unit prices, such as the square-foot cost for warehouses, the square-yard cost for airfield pavements, and other unit costs appropriate to the particular item of construction. These unit prices were in every instance lower than those estimated by the military departments; they were, however, based on technical advice.

The belief that the unit costs estimated by the military departments are too high is founded almost entirely upon the basis that the particular structures are too expensively designed in the first instance. It is the view of the conferees that the original design of these structures should be conformed to the unit prices agreed upon by the conferees. It was agreed that there should be a limitation of $1,700 per man for permanent-barracks construction and a limitation of $1,400 per man for 10-year barracks construction Bachelor officers' quarters are limited to $5,000 per unit and warehouses to $6 per square foot.

Other amendments made by the Senate involved the deletion of troop housing, the deletion of a few other particular construction items within a project, and, in a few instances, the deletion of individual projects in their entirety.

Particular note is made of the item involving Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. This item provided for "Administrative facility and training building, $7,600,000." The Senate deleted this item in its entirety but receded from its position except with respect to the amount of money, concerning which the conferees agreed that $5,000,000 would be sufficient for the construction of this facility, and that this amount should not be considered merely as an increment but as the complete cost of the proposed facility.

In order that proper control and surveillance can be maintained over the classified construction and land acquisition which are the subject of sections 102, 202, and 302, the Senate inserted a new section 407 which will require the Secretary of the military department authorized to establish or develop a public work contemplated by one of the sections to come into agreement with the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the cost of such construction and with respect to the real-estate actions pertaining thereto. This amendment was agreed to by the conferees.

The conferees also agreed that the Secretary of Defense should maintain direct surveillance over the planning and construction by the military departments on all public works projects, such surveillance to be maintained through a civilian official of the Department of Defense to be known as the Director of Installations. The Senate, therefore, inserted a new section 408 establishing a Director of Installations, who shall make such reports directly to the Secretary of Defense with respect to public-works projects under construction by the military departments as he may deem necessary to keep the Secretary of Defense currently and fully informed with respect thereto. This amendment was agreed to by the conferees.

The Senate, by amendment, made provision for the contract aspects of public works by the insertion of a new section 409 reading as follows:

"SEC. 409. Whenever—

"(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this Act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this Act; and

"(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts,

the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress."

Aside from the new sections referred to immediately above, the total effect of the conference action, with certain exceptions, was the acceptance by the Senate conferees of the language of the bill as passed by the House and the acceptance by the House conferees of the money figures of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
CARL T. DURHAM,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8120) to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point the corrected bill agreed to by the committee conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The corrected bill reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 101. The Secretary of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop military installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Field Force facilities

(First Army Area)

Fort Devens, Mass.: Covered storage and community facilities, $324,000.

Fort Dix, N. J.: Medical facilities, $116,000.

Fort Totten, N. Y.: Utilities, $46,000.

Camp Wellfleet, Mass.: Troop housing, administrative, operational, maintenance, ammunition storage, and community facilities, $1,097,000.

(Second Army Area)

Fort Campbell, Ky.: Operational, maintenance, and training facilities and utilities, $822,000.

Fort Knox, Ky.: Training buildings and facilities, research and development facilities, maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and utilities, $11,411,000.

Fort George G. Meade, Md.: Administrative, operational, maintenance, and communications facilities, ammunition storage, and utilities, $335,000.

Camp Pickett, Va.: Training buildings and administrative facilities, $142,000.

(Third Army Area)

Fort Benning, Ga.: Administrative, operational, and maintenance facilities, ammunition, cold, covered, and open storage, and utilities, $5,193,000.

Fort Bragg, N. C.: Maintenance and operational facilities, ammunition, liquid fuel, covered and open storage, and land acquisition, $9,507,000.

Fort Jackson, S. C.: Administrative facility, training buildings, and utilities, $182,000.

Camp Rucker, Ala.: Ammunition storage facilities, $96,000.

Fort McClellan, Ala.: Administrative, operational, and maintenance facilities, covered storage, and land acquisition, $961,000.

Fort McPherson, Ga.: Ammunition storage, $42,000.

Camp Stewart, Ga.: Utilities, $512,000.

(Fourth Army Area)

Fort Bliss, Tex.: Training buildings, administrative and maintenance facilities, $4,856,000.

Camp Chaffee, Ark.: Maintenance facility, $432,000.

Fort Hood, Tex.: Maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $10,090,000.

Fort Sill, Okla.: Maintenance facilities, training building, open storage, and utilities, $1,286,000.

(Fifth Army Area)

Fort Custer, Mich.: Maintenance facility and ammunition storage, $115,000.

Camp Crowder, Mo.: Troop support facilities and rehabilitation, $1,980,000.

Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.: Administrative facility and training building, $5,000,000.

Fort Riley, Kans.: Operational and maintenance facilities, $132,500.

(Sixth Army Area)

Camp Cooke, Calif.: Maintenance facility, $150,000.

Camp Hanford, Wash.: Troop housing, administrative facilities, ammunition and covered storage, and utilities, $528,000.

Fort Huachuca, Ariz.: Operational facility, training buildings and covered storage, $504,000.

Fort Lewis, Wash.: Operational and maintenance facilities, open and liquid fuel storage and utilities, $272,000.

Yuma Test Station, Ariz.: Troop housing, administrative, communications, medical, operational, maintenance and training facilities, research and development and test facilities, covered and ammunition storage facilities and utilities, $2,488,000.

(Military Academy)

United States Military Academy, N. Y.: Training building, $280,0000.

Technical service facilities

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.: Training buildings and facilities, research and development and test facilities, ammunition storage, airfield pavements and utilities, $5,419,999.

California Institute of Technology, California: Research and development and test facilities and utilities, $897,000.

Detroit Arsenal, Mich.: Administrative and research and development facilities, $2,370,000.

Malta Test Station, N. Y.: Research and development and test facilities, land acquisition and utilities, $479,000.

Michaud industrial facilities, New Orleans, La.: Acquisition for conversion without reimbursement to General Services Administration for any interest it may have in the facilities.

Picatinny Arsenal, N. J.: Research and development and test facilities, and land acquisition, $1,356,000.

Redstone Arsenal, Ala.: Maintenance and operational facilities, research and development and test facilities and utilities, $6,447,000.

Watertown Arsenal, Mass.: Covered storage, operational facility and utilities, $320,000.

White Sands Proving Ground, N. Mex.: Troop housing, training buildings, medical and maintenance facilities, research and development facilities, and utilities, $8,214,000.

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Md.: Research and development and test facilities and ammunition storage, $800,000.

Camp Detrick, Md.: Research and development and test facilities, land acquisition, utilities, and deficiencies, fiscal year

1951 and fiscal year 1952 programs, $17,197,000.

Dugway Proving Ground, Utah: Research and development and test facilities, and land acquisition, $864,000.

Fort Terry, N. Y.: Administrative, operational and maintenance facilities, research and development and test facilities and utilities, $5,386,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Monmouth, N. J.: Research and development facility, $7,500,000.

Tobyhanna Signal Depot, Pa.: Deficiency fiscal year 1952 program, $352,000.

Two Rock Ranch, California: Troop housing and utilities, $564,000.

Vint Hill Farms, Va.: Family housing, $341,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Va.: Administrative, operational, and maintenance facilities, training buildings, covered ammunition and open storage, research and development and test facilities and utilities, $2,968,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Brooklyn Army Base, N. Y.: Maintenance and operational facilities, $315,000.

Fort Eustis, Va.: Administrative and operational facilities, liquid fuel, open and covered storage, airfield pavements and utilities, $3,233,000.

New Orleans Army Base, La.: Covered storage, $42,300.

(Army Medical Service)

Madigan Army Hospital, Washington: Operational facilities and utilities, $274,000.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C.: Operational facilities and research and development facilities, $731,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(Alaskan Area)

Big Delta, Alaska: Family housing, troop housing, ammunition, liquid fuel, open, closed, and cold storage, community, operational, research and development and test facilities, training building and utilities, $5,109,000.

Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska: Administrative, operational and maintenance facilities, ammunition storage and utilities, $2,969,000.

Kenai, Alaska: Family housing, operational, maintenance, community and waterfront facilities, liquid-fuel storage, training building and utilities, $3,907,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska: Family housing, administrative and maintenance facilities, ammunition storage and utilities, $4,737,000.

Fort Richardson, Alaska: Family housing, troop housing, administrative, operational and maintenance facilities, open, covered, ammunition and cold storage, and utilities, $20,257,000.

Whittier, Alaska: Family housing, troop housing, administrative, operational and maintenance facilities and utilities, $2,847,000.

(Far East Command Area)

Okinawa: Family housing, troop housing, administrative, operational, maintenance, training buildings and facilities, ammunition and coverage storage, and utilities, $20,700,000.

(Caribbean Area)

Corozal, C. Z.: Operational and maintenance facilities, open storage and utilities, $1,800,000.

Fort Buchanan, P. R.: Cold storage facility, $942,000.

Quarry Heights, C. Z.: Administrative facility, $310,000.

(Hawaii)

Helemano Radio Station, Territory of Hawaii: Communication facility, $39,000.

(General)

Various locations: For restoration or replacement of facilities damaged or destroyed and provision for other urgent construction requirements, $5,000,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities in a total amount of $135,010,000.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to establish or develop naval installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval Shipyard, Boston, Mass.: Waterfront shop and storage building, barracks and bachelor officers' quarters, electronics and electric shop expansion, $3,499,000.

Naval shipyard, Brooklyn, N. Y.: Reconstruction of drydock No. 3, construction of new crane tracks, $6,325,000.

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, S. C.: Extension to battery overhaul shop, barracks, galley and messing facilities, steam and electric services, addition and modifications to electrical system and new building for electronic and electric shops and electronic laboratory, $6,006,000.

Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa.: Submarine battery assembly and charging building, electrical services for pier C, $1,065,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Increase of enlisted barracks capacity, $319,000.

Fleet facilities

Naval Base, Newport, R. I.: Planning for fleet berthing facility, $140,000.

Commander in chief, Atlantic Fleet Headquarters, Norfolk, Va.: Expansion of facilities, $374,000.

Naval Base, Norfolk, Va.: Additional facilities for convoy escort vessels including construction of one new pier, extension of three existing piers and acquisition of land; ammunition barge mooring facilities and fleet landing, $3,083,000.

Aviation facilities

Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Beaufort, S. C.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities and acquisition of land and easements, $2,522,000.

Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Edenton, N. C.: Barge fuel delivery, including waterfront facilities, dredging, pipeline, pumping plant, and unloading facilities, $195,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Miami, Fla.: Airfield pavements, land acquisition, fuel storage facilities, ammunition storage, and roads, $2,600,000.

Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.: Additional research and development and test facilities, operational facilities and supporting facilities, $4,337,000.

Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia, Pa.: Research and development and test facilities, $2,300,000.

Naval Air Station, Lincoln, Nebr.: Land acquisition, operational facilities, airfield pavements, fuel storage, communication facilities and roads, utilities and services, $3,372,000.

Naval Air Missile Test Center, Point Mugu, Calif.: Guided missile test and evaluation facilities, $3,717,000.

Naval Air Facility, Weeksville, N. C.: Sewage treatment plant, and helium purification plant, $237,000.

Supply facilities

Naval Supply Center, Byron, Ga.: Administrative facilities, maintenance facilities and shops, medical facilities, storage and supply handling facilities, railroad facilities, security fencing and buildings, utilities, architectural and engineering services, and acquisition of land, $9,102,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Great Lakes, Ill.: Covered storage, utilities, security fence and site preparation, $2,481,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Jacksonville, Fla.: Acquisition of land and architectural and engineering services, $682,000.

Naval Supply Center (Cheatham Annex), Norfolk, Va.: Training facilities and troop housing, $564,000.

Naval Supply Depot, Scotia, N. Y.: Covered storage facilities, utilities, acquisition of land, and security fencing, $2,600,000.

Naval Supply Depot (Point Loma), San Diego, Calif.: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage facilities and distribution system to Naval Air Station, Miramar, Calif., pumping plant, water-front facilities, utilities, acquisition of easements, and architectural and engineering services, $3,933,000.

Naval Supply Depot, San Pedro, Calif.: Aviation fuel pipeline from bulk storage, Norwalk, Calif., to the Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, Calif., including pumping plant, utilities, acquisition of easements, and architectural and engineering services, $1,670,000.

Puget Sound Area, Seattle, Wash.: Administrative and covered storage facilities, aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk fuel storage facilities, utilities, water-front facilities, land acquisition, and architectural and engineering services, $2,204,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps Depot of Supply, Albany, Ga.: Depot and Supply School facilities, $13,687,000.

Ordnance facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston, S. C.: Improvement of ammunition issue and transhipment facilities, including dredging, $735,000.

Alleghany Ballistics Laboratory, Cumberland, Md.: Testing facilities, storage facilities, operating facilities, maintenance facilities and shop, administrative facilities, and security fencing, $593,000.

Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern, Calif.: Electric power system extension and improvements, and runway extension, $1,629,000.

Naval Degaussing Station, Norfolk, Va.: Deperming facility, $2,000,000.

Naval Ammunition Depot, St. Juliens Creek, Va.: Quality evaluation laboratory, $326,000.

Naval Station, San Diego, Calif.: Deperming facility, $288,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Md.: Underwater weapons assembly and test building, $379,000.

Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown, Va.: Barracks, $500,000.

Penn State College, State College, Pa.: Addition to Ordnance Research Laboratory, $315,000.

Various locations: Additional magazines and inert storehouses and guided missile storage, test and conditioning facilities, $14,443,000.

Service school facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Improvement of academic buildings, $1,800,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, Calif.: Amphibious assault trainer and galley and messhall, $1,555,000.

Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek, Va.: School and training building and acquisition of land, $2,325,000.

Post Graduate School, Monterey, Calif.: Completion of engineering school, $3,500,000.

Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Point Loma, Calif.: Purchase and installation of technical and collateral equipment, $3,300,000.

United States Naval Supply Schools, Athens, Ga.: Acquisition of real estate including improvements, purchase and installation of technical and collateral equipment and construction of new buildings and improvement of existing buildings, $2,030,000.

Medical facilities

Naval Medical Supply Depot, Edgewater, N. J.: Site preparation, storage facilities, utilities and services, and transfer of stores and equipment, $1,155,000.

Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va. Area: Construction of permanent hospital, $12,815,000.

Communication facilities

Naval Communication Station, Annapolis, Md.: Site preparation, utilities and communications facilities including building, $1,616,000.

Naval Communications Station, Snohomish County, Wash.: Super high power VLF facilities, collateral equipment, accessory construction and family housing, $1,450,000.

Naval research facilities

Naval Research Laboratory, Anacostia, D. C.: Fireproof chemistry laboratory, and modernization of electrical distribution system, $500,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Davisville, R. I.: Site preparation, troop housing, brig, medical facilities, training buildings, covered storage and utilities including heating plant, $2,424,000.

Key West Aqueduct, Key West, Fla.: Improvements to aqueduct system, $495,000.

Various locations: Construction of AFDL floating drydocks, $4,500,000.

Naval observatory facilities

Naval Observatory Time Service Substation, Richmond, Fla.: Permanent facilities, $96,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Fleet facilities

Naval Station, Adak, Alaska: Marine barracks and facilities, $2,700,000.

Naval Operating Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Dredging, mooring, new pier, target-repair facilities, $3,185,000.

Naval Operating Base, Guam, Marianas Islands: Oxygen, carbon dioxide, and acetylene plants, $820,000.

Naval Base, Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: Submarine water lines, fresh-water lines, dock facilities, $2,442,000.

Naval Station, Subic Bay, Philippine Islands: Dock construction, sea-wall extension, $2,774,000.

Aviation facilities

Naval Air Station, Agana, Guam, Marianas Islands: Administration and operational facilities, troop housing, and messing facilities, $1,171,000.

Naval Station, Argentia, Newfoundland: Airfield pavements, and family quarters, $1,322,000.

Naval Air Station, Barbers Point, Territory of Hawaii: Airfield lighting, $346,000.

Naval Air Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba: Operational and maintenance facility, airfield pavement, $795,000.

Naval Air Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Airfield lighting, operational facilities, and water-front facilities, $1,480,000.

Naval Air Facility, London, England: Operational and administrative facilities, airfield pavements, utilities and storage facilities, $692,000.

Ordnance facilities

Naval Ammunition Depot, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii: Quality evaluation laboratory, $847,000.

Communication facilities

Naval Communication Station, Guam, Marianas Islands: Permanent communication facilities, $1,721,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Various locations: Replacement of temporary family quarters, utilizing military construction personnel and facilities, at no more than $5,000 per unit for cost of materials, supplies, and collateral equipment, including transportation thereof, $12,000,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment as temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities in the amount of $86,397,000.

SEC. 203. Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Supply Facilities" in section 201 as reads as follows:

"Navy Shipyard, Boston, Mass. (Fuel Facility): Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage; $2,766,500."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Harpswell Neck Fuel Facility, Portland, Maine, Area: Aviation gasoline and jet fuel bulk storage; $2,766,500."

SEC. 204. So much of title II, section 201, Public Law 910, Eighty-first Congress, approved January 6, 1951, as authorizes the construction of a dam at Camp Pendleton, Calif., is hereby repealed.

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is hereby authorized to establish or develop installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, and utilities, as follows:

CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Strategic air command

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, La.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $1,832,000.

Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $773,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Tex.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and research, development and test facilities, $13,889,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, Calif.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, and utilities, $1,029,000.

Clinton Naval Air Station, Clinton, Okla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $9,932,000.

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Tucson, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, $5,067,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $8,014,000.

Fairchild Air Force Base, Spokane, Wash.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $9,421,000.

Forbes Air Force Base, Topeka, Kans.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $15,520,000.

Homestead-Dade County Airport, Homestead, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $24,805,000.

Hunter Air Force Base, Savannah, Ga.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and shops, $5,185,000.

Lake Charles Air Force Base, Lake Charles, La.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $6,566,000.

Lakeland Airport, Lakeland, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $13,966,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, utilities and medical facilities, $22,892,000.

Limestone Air Force Base, Auxiliaries A and B, Limestone, Maine: Land acquisition, $596,000.

Lincoln Municipal Airport, Lincoln, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and land acquisition, $9,093,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Ark.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $23,749,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Airfield pavements, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $9,906,000.

MacDill Air Force Base, Tampa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids, and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $7,168,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, Calif.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,776,000.

Mountain Home Air Force Base, Mountain Home, Idaho: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communi-

cations and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and medical facilities, $12,568,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, and utilities, $281,000.

Plattsburg Barracks, Plattsburg, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $28,426,000.

Rapid City Air Force Base, Rapid City, S. Dak.: Aircraft maintenance facilities, $3,185,000.

Selman Field, Monroe, La.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $18,285,000.

Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, medical facilities and storage facilities, $19,810,000.

Smoky Hill Air Force Base, Salina, Kans.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $5,962,000.

Stead Air Force Base, Reno, Nev.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $1,583,000.

Tye Feld, Abilene, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $23,472,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, and aircraft maintenance facilities, $3,091,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Mass.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $23,239,000.

Air Defense Command

Burlington Municipal Airport, Burlington, Vt.: Operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $579,000.

Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth, Minn.: Navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $704,000.

Geiger Field, Spokane, Wash.: Operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $744,000.

Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis, Pa.: Airfield pavements, operational facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $976,000.

Hamilton Air Force Base, San Rafael, Calif.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids facilities, and utilities, $588,000.

Houma Gunnery Range, Houma, La.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $3,000,000.

Kinross Air Force Auxiliary Airfield, Kinross, Mich.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $740,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Wash.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $10,866,000.

Majors Field, Greenville, Tex.: Land acquisition, $23,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Wash.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $5,895,000.

McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville, Tenn.: Airfield pavements, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,179,000.

Minneapolis, St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis, Minn.: Land acquisition and storage facilities, $450,000.

New Castle County Airport, Wilmington, Del.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,776,000.

Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $1,394,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Ill.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $3,301,000.

Oscoda Air Force Base, Oscoda, Mich.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $612,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Mass.: Communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $2,402,000.

Oxnard Air Force Base, Oxnard, Calif.: Operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $746,000.

Paine Field, Everett, Wash.: Operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,251,000.

Palmdale-Los Angeles County Airport, Palmdale, Calif.: Airfield pavements and airfield lighting facilities, $380,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oreg.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $973,000.

Presque Isle Air Force Base, Presque Isle, Maine: Utilities and storage facilities, $581,000.

Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Mich.: Airfield pavements, and storage facilities, $185,000.

Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $3,520,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, Long Island, N. Y.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $2,335,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wis.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $1,518,000.

Charlotte County Airport, Punta Gorda, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $2,731,000.

Yuma County Airport, Yuma, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $1,965,000.

Tactical Air Command

Alexandria Municipal Airport, Alexandria, La.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $2,852,000.

Ardmore Municipal Airport, Ardmore, Okla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $4,045,000.

Blytheville Municipal Airport, Blytheville, Ark.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $11,602,000.

Bunker Hill Naval Air Station, Peru, Ind.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $18,663,000.

Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis, N. Mex.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $906,000.

Galveston Municipal Airport, Galveston, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $5,746,000.

Myrtle Beach Airport, Myrtle Beach, S. C.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $8,457,000.

Raleigh-Durham Municipal Airport, Raleigh-Durham, N. C.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $14,838,000.

Seymour-Johnson Field, Goldsboro, N. C.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing

facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and shops, $7,092,000.

Air Training Command

Big Spring Air Force Base, Big Spring, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $6,270,000.

Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and shops, $3,440,000.

Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $2,339,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $4,563,000.

Foster Field, Victoria, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $4,383,000.

Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $3,820,000.

Harlingen-All-Valley Municipal Airport, Harlingen, Tex.: Airfield pavements, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,796,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $6,333,000.

Laredo Municipal Airport, Laredo, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition and storage facilities, $4,266,000.

Laughlin Air Force Auxiliary Field, Del Rio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $4,601,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $5,167,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, Calif.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $5,839,000.

Moody Air Force Base, Valdosta, Ga.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $1,846,000.

Moore Field, Mission, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, family housing, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and shops, $10,309,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nev.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $5,306,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Tex.: Airfield pavements, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $4,810,000.

Pinecastle Air Force Base, Orlando, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $10,341,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, communications and navigational aids facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,693,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $7,356,000.

Scott Air Force Base, Belleville, Ill.: Airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $1,691,000.

Tyndall Air Force Base, Panama City, Fla.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $1,885,000.

Vance Air Force Base, Enid, Okla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and storage facilities, $7,275,000.

Wichita Air Force Base, Wichita, Kans.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, land acquisition, storage facilities, and shops, $9,703,000.

Williams Air Force Base, Chandler, Ariz.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $1,776,000.

Air Material Command

Birmingham Modification Center, Birmingham, Ala.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $1,507,000.

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, and utilities, $4,935,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Communications facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, land acquisition, and research, development and test facilities, $1,620,000.

Kelly Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $7,964,000.

Lynn Haven (petroleum storage area), Panama City, Fla.: Utilities, $72,000.

Norton Air Force Base, San Bernardino, Calif.: Airfield pavements, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $4,790,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Okla.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,564,000.

Military Air Transport Service

Palm Beach County International Airport, West Palm Beach, Fla.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, utilities, and shops, $1,200,000.

Continental Air Command

Godman Air Force Base, Fort Knox, Ky.: Troop housing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $995,000.

Long Beach Municipal Airport, Long Beach, Calif.: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, navigational aids facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, and utilities, $112,000.

Research and Development Command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tenn.: Research, development, and test facilities, $12,000,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, N. Y.: Communications facilities, operational facilities, utilities, land acquisition, research, development and test facilities, and storage facilities, $1,806,000.

Hanscom Field (Bedford Research Center), Bedford, Mass.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $10,520,000.

Holloman Air Force Base, Alamogordo, New Mexico: Troop housing facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, $990,000.

Lockland Plant, Cincinnati, Ohio: Research, development and test facilities, $2,800,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Fla.: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, utilities, research, development and test facilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, design planning, port facilities, and miscellaneous facilities, $39,838,000.

Special Weapons Command

Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Airfield pavements, communications facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, and land acquisition, $8,543,000.

Air Proving Ground Command

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Fla.: Utilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $3,242,000.

Headquarters Command

Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.: Troop housing facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $560,000.

Air University

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Troop housing facilities and utilities, $1,290,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.: Training facilities, troop housing facilities, and utilities, $6,060,000.

School of Aviation Medicine

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Tex.: Communications facilities, training facilities, utilities, and research, development and test facilities, $8,000,000.

Communications and navigational aids facilities

Various locations: $7,990,000.

OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Alaskan Air Command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and community facilities, and utilities, $14,479,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, administrative and community facilities, and utilities, $31,325,000.

Galena Air Force Auxiliary Field, Galena, Alaska: Utilities, $130,000.

Ladd Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, operational facilities, utilities, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $14,856,000.

Naknek Air Force Auxiliary Field, Naknek, Alaska: Liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communication and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $3,914,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Communications facilities, administrative and community facilities, and utilities, $800,000.

Far East Air Force

Various locations, Pacific area: Airfield pavements, liquid-fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop housing facilities, administrative and community facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, shops, and miscellaneous facilities, $27,014,000.

Strategic Air Command

Ramey Air Force Base, Aquadilla, Puerto Rico: Land acquisition, $3,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized to establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by the construction, conversion, installation, or equipment of temporary or permanent public works, including buildings, facilities, appurtenances, family housing, and utilities in the total amount of $1,012,398,000.

SEC. 303. Public Law 155, Eighty-second Congress, is hereby amended as follows:

(a) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational Support Facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Friendship International Airport, Baltimore, Md.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $43,478,000."

and so much as reads as follows:

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, hazard removal, operational facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $23,773,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, N. J.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, hazards removal, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troops facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, medical facilities (or medical facilities at Fort Dix, Wrightstown, N. J.), storage facilities, and shops, $62,500,000."

(b) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational Support Facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Hammer Field, Fresno, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications, navigational aids and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $22,303,000."

and so much as reads as follows:

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, storage facilities, and shops, $17,561,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, Calif.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communication and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, training facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, storage facilities and shops, $28,432,000."

(c) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational support facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $19,063,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.: Airfield pavements, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, troop facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, medical facilities, and storage facilities, $12,708,000.

"Sioux City Airport, Sioux City, Iowa: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and navigational aids facilities, operational facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, and medical facilities, $1,746,000."

(d) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Operational support facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Hensley Naval Air Station, Dallas, Tex.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, troop facilities, family housing, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, and storage facilities, $3,022,000."

(e) Strike so much thereof under the heading "Continental United States" and subheading "Depots and Logistical Facilities" in section 301 as reads as follows:

"Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown and Lancaster, Pa.: Airfield pavements, fuel storage and dispensing facilities, communications and airfield lighting facilities, operational facilities, aircraft maintenance facilities, administrative and supporting facilities, utilities, land acquisition, test facilities, storage facilities, and shops, $74,093,000."

and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pa.: Utilities, and storage facilities, $570,000.

(f) In clause (3) of section 502 thereof delete the amounts "$1,993,603,800" and "$3,480,661,800" and insert in lieu thereof the amounts "$1,896,271,800" and "$3,383,329,800, respectively.

SEC. 304. In the prosecution of military public works projects authorized by this title, the Department of the Air Force may utilize the services of either the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, in such manner and to such extent as will promote efficiency in operation.

TITLE IV

General provisions

SEC. 401 (a) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, under the direction of the Secretary of Defense, are respectively authorized, in order to establish or develop the installations and facilities authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act, to acquire lands and rights pertaining thereto, or other interests therein, including the temporary use thereof, by donation, purchase, exchange of Government-owned lands, or otherwise, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes, as amended. When necessary, construction of a public works project authorized by this act may be commenced prior to approval of title to the underlying land by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended.

(b) The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are respectively authorized, to the extent administratively determined by each to be fair and reasonable, under regulations approved by the Secretary of Defense, to reimburse the owners and tenants of land to be acquired for any public works project of the military department concerned for expenses and other losses and damages incurred by such owners and tenants, respectively, in the process and as a direct result of the moving of themselves and their families and possessions because of such acquisition of land, which reimbursement shall be in addition to, but not in duplication of, any payments in respect of such acquisition as may otherwise be authorized by law: *Provided*, That the total of such reimbursement to the owners and tenants of any parcel of land shall in no event exceed 25 percent of the fair value of such parcel of land as determined by the Secretary of the military department concerned. No payment in reimbursement shall be made unless application therefor, supported by an itemized statement of the expenses, losses, and damages so incurred, shall have been submitted to the Secretary of the military department concerned within one year following the date of such acquisition. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be delegable by the Secretary of the military department concerned to such responsible officers or employees as he may determine. All functions performed under this subsection shall be exempt from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act of June 11, 1946 (ch. 324, 60 Stat. 237), as amended (5 U. S. C. 1001–1011), except as to the requirements of section 3 of such act (60 Stat. 238; 5 U. S. C. 1002). Any funds appropriated pursuant to any act authorizing civil or military public works projects for any military department to the extent available, may be used to reimburse the owners and tenants of such acquired lands for such incurred expenses, losses, and damages. The authority for reimbursement of owners and tenants for moving costs conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to but not in duplication of authority contained in subsection 401 (b) of the act of September 28, 1951 (65 Stat. 365) for the reimbursement to owners and tenants of land acquired pursuant to authorization contained in said act.

SEC. 402. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may

be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act, but not to exceed—

(1) for public works authorized by title I: Inside continental United States, $124,420,000; outside continental United States, $68,617,000; classified facilities, $135,010,000; or a total of $328,047,800.

(2) for public works authorized by title II: Inside continental United States, $138,163,000; outside continental United States, $32,295,000; classified facilities, $86,397,000; or a total of $256,875,000.

(3) for public works authorized by title III: Inside continental United States $708,352,000; outside continental United States, $92,610,000; classified facilities, $1,012,398,000; or a total of $1,813,360,000.

SEC. 403. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in titles I, II, and III of this act may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be carried upward 10 percent but the total cost of all work so enumerated under each of such titles shall not exceed the total appropriations authorized in respect of such title by section 402 of this act.

SEC. 404. No family quarters shall be constructed under the authority of this act with a net floor area in excess of 1,250 square feet, and the average net floor area of all such family quarters shall not exceed 1,060 square feet.

SEC. 405. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available with respect to public works projects authorized by law for expenses incident to construction, including administration, overhead, planning, and supervision.

SEC. 406. Any public works project authorized by this act may be prosecuted under direct appropriations or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriations.

SEC. 407. In the case of any public work authorized to be established or developed under the authority of section 102, 202, or 302 of this act, the Secretary of the Military Department authorized to establish or develop such public work, or his designee, shall come into agreement with the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives with respect to the cost of construction of such public work, including those real-estate actions pertaining thereto.

SEC. 408. The Secretary of Defense shall maintain direct surveillance over the planning and construction by the military departments of all public works projects. Such surveillance shall be maintained through a civilian official of the Department of Defense to be known as the Director of Installations, who shall be appointed by and directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,800 a year. The Director of Installations shall, from time to time, make such reports directly to the Secretary of Defense with respect to public works projects under construction by the military departments as he may deem necessary to keep the Secretary of Defense currently and fully informed with respect to the status, progress, and cost, and all other pertinent matters concerning, such public works projects. No person shall be appointed as Director of Installations unless the Secretary of Defense is satisfied that he has had a substantial amount of experience in the construction of public works of the types constructed by the military departments. The Secretary of Defense shall provide for furnishing the Director of Installations with such engineering, clerical, stenographic, and other personnel as he may require in order adequately to perform his functions.

SEC. 409. Whenever—

(a) the President determines that compliance with the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress, in the case of contracts made pursuant to this act with respect to the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of the provisions of this act; and

(b) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods for conducting an adequate audit of such contracts,

the President is authorized to exempt such contracts from the requirements of Public Law 245, Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD at this point a breakdown by States showing what public works are authorized.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Military construction authorization bill H. R. 8120—Summary of public works authorization, fiscal year 1953, continental United States

	As agreed to by conferees
ALABAMA	
Army:	
Fort McClellan, Anniston	$361,000
Redstone Arsenal, Huntsville	6,447,000
Camp Rucker, Daleville	96,000
Air Force:	
Craig AFB, Selma	2,339,000
Modification Center, Birmingham	1,507,000
Brookley AFB, Mobile	4,935,000
Gunter AFB, Montgomery	1,290,000
Maxwell AFB, Montgomery	6,060,000
ARIZONA	
Army:	
Fort Huachuca, Nogales	504,000
Yuma Test Station, Yuma	2,488,000
Air Force:	
Davis-Monthan AFB, Tucson	5,067,000
Yuma County Airport, Yuma	1,965,000
Luke AFB, Phoenix	5,167,000
Williams AFB, Chandler	1,776,000
ARKANSAS	
Army: Camp Chaffee, Fort Smith	432,000
Air Force:	
Little Rock AFB, Little Rock	23,749,000
Municipal Airport, Blytheville	11,602,000
CALIFORNIA	
Army:	
California Institute of Technology, Pasadena	897,000
Camp Cooke, Casmalia	150,000
Fort Ord, Monterey	----------
Camp Stoneman, Pittsburgh	----------
Two Rock Ranch, Petaluma	564,000
U. S. Disciplinary Barracks, Camp Cooke	----------
Navy:	
Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado	1,555,000
Naval Ordnance Test Station, Inyokern	1,629,000
Post Graduate School, Monterey	3,500,000
Fleet Air Defense Training Center, Point Loma	3,300,000
Naval Air Missile Training Center, Point Mugu	3,717,000
Naval Station, San Diego	288,000
Naval Supply Depot, San Diego	3,933,000
Naval Ordnance Depot, San Pedro	1,670,000
Air Force:	
Castle AFB, Merced	1,029,000
March AFB, Riverside	1,776,000
Hamilton AFB, San Rafael	588,000
Oxnard AFB, Oxnard	746,000
CALIFORNIA—continued	
Air Force—Continued	
Palmdale-Los Angeles County Airport, Palmdale	$380,000
Mather AFB, Sacramento	5,839,000
Norton AFB, San Bernardino	4,790,000
Long Beach Municipal Airport, Long Beach	112,000
DELAWARE	
Air Force: New Castle County Airport, Wilmington	1,776,000
FLORIDA	
Navy:	
Naval Supply Depot, Jacksonville	682,000
Key West Aqueduct, Florida City to Key West	495,000
Marine Corps Air Station, Miami	2,600,000
Richmond	96,000
Air Force:	
Homestead-Dade County Airport, Homestead	24,805,000
Lakeland Airport, Lakeland	13,966,000
MacDill AFB, Tampa	7,168,000
Charlotte County Airport	2,731,000
Pinecastle AFB, Orlando	10,341,000
Tyndall AFB, Panama City	1,835,000
Lynn Haven (petroleum storage area), Panama City	72,000
Palm Beach County International Airport, West Palm Beach	1,200,000
Patrick AFB, Cocoa	39,838,000
Eglin AFB, Valparaiso	3,242,000
GEORGIA	
Army:	
Fort Benning, Columbus	5,193,000
Camp Gordon, Augusta	----------
Fort McPherson, Atlanta	42,000
Camp Stewart, Hinesville	512,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Depot of Supply, Albany	13,687,000
Naval Supply Center, Byron	9,102,000
Athens Supply School	2,030,000
Air Force:	
Hunter AFB, Savannah	5,185,000
Moody AFB, Valdosta	1,846,000
Dobbins AFB, Marietta	----------
IDAHO	
Air Force: Mountain Home AFB, Mountain Home	12,569,000
ILLINOIS	
Navy: Naval Supply Depot, Great Lakes	2,481,000
Air Force:	
O'Hare International Airport, Chicago	3,801,000
Scott AFB, Belleville	1,691,000
INDIANA	
Army:	
Camp Atterbury, Indianapolis	----------
Fort Benjamin Harrison, Indianapolis	5,000,000
Air Force: Bunker Hill Naval Air Station, Peru	18,663,000
IOWA	
Air Force: Sioux City Municipal Airport, Sioux City	19,820,000
KANSAS	
Army: Fort Riley, Junction City	132,500
Air Force:	
Forbes AFB, Topeka	15,520,000
Smoky Hill AFB, Salina	5,962,000
Wichita AFB, Wichita	9,703,000
KENTUCKY	
Army:	
Fort Campbell, Clarkville, Tenn	822,000
Fort Knox, Louisville	11,411,000
Air Force: Goodman AFB, Fort Knox	995,000

	As agreed to by conferees
LOUISIANA	
Army:	
Camp Polk, Leesville	----------
New Orleans Army Base, New Orleans	$42,300
Air Force:	
Barksdale AFB, Shreveport	1,832,000
Lake Charles AFB, Lake Charles	6,566,000
Selman Field, Monroe	18,285,000
Houma Gunnery Range, Houma	3,000,000
Alexandria Municipal Airport, Alexandria	2,852,000
MAINE	
Air Force:	
Dow AFB, Bangor	8,014,000
Limestone AFB, Limestone	22,892,000
Limestone AFB, Aux, A and B Limestone	596,000
Presque Isle, Presque Isle	581,000
MARYLAND	
Army:	
Aberdeen Proving Ground, Baltimore	5,419,999
Army Chemical Center, Baltimore	800,000
Camp Detrick, Frederick	17,197,000
Fort George G. Meade, Baltimore	335,000
Navy:	
Naval Academy, Annapolis	1,800,000
Naval Communication Station, Annapolis	1,616,000
Alleghany Ballistics Laboratory, Cumberland	593,000
Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River	4,337,000
Hydrographic Office, Suitland	----------
Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak	379,000
Air Force: Air Research Headquarters, and Development Command, Baltimore	----------
MASSACHUSETTS	
Army:	
Fort Devens, Worcester	324,000
Watertown Arsenal, Waltham	302,000
Camp Wellfleet, Wellfleet	1,097,000
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Boston	3,499,000
Air Force:	
Westover AFB, Chicopee Falls	23,239,000
Otis AFB, Falmouth	2,402,000
Hanscom Field (Bedford Research Center), Bedford	10,520,000
MICHIGAN	
Army:	
Fort Custer, Battle Creek	115,000
Detroit Arsenal, Detroit	2,370,000
Air Force:	
Kinross AF Auxiliary Airfield, Kinross	740,000
Oscoda AFB, Oscoda	612,000
Selfridge AFB, Mount Clemens	185,000
MINNESOTA	
Air Force:	
Duluth Municipal Airport, Duluth	704,000
Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, Minneapolis	450,000
MISSOURI	
Army: Camp Crowder	1,980,000
NEBRASKA	
Navy: Naval Air Station, Lincoln	3,372,000
Air Force:	
Lincoln Airport, Lincoln	9,093,000
Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha	281,000
NEVADA	
Air Force:	
Stead Air Force Base, Reno	1,583,000
Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas	5,306,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	
Navy: Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth	$319,000
NEW JERSEY	
Army:	
Fort Dix, Trenton	116,000
Fort Monmouth, Red Bank	7,500,000
Picatinny Arsenal, Dover	1,356,000
Navy:	
Naval Medical Supply Depot, Edgewater	1,155,000
Air Force: Hammonton Air Force Base, Hammonton	----------
NEW MEXICO	
Army: White Sands Proving Ground, Las Cruces	8,214,000
Air Force:	
Walker Air Force Base, Roswell	3,091,000
Clovis Air Force Base, Clovis	906,000
Holloman, Alamogordo	990,000
Kirtland Air Force Base, Albuquerque	8,543,000
NEW YORK	
Army:	
Brooklyn Army Base, Brooklyn	315,000
Malta Test Station, Saratoga Springs	479,000
Fort Tilden, Rockaway Park	----------
Fort Totten, Whitestone	48,000
Fort Wadsworth, Staten Island	----------
U. S. Military Academy, West Point	280,000
Fort Terry	5,386,000
Navy:	
Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn	6,325,000
Naval Supply Depot, Scotia	2,600,000
Air Force:	
Plattsburg Municipal Airport, Plattsburg	28,426,000
Niagara Falls Municipal Airport, Niagara Falls	1,394,000
Stewart Air Force Base, Newburgh	3,520,000
Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach	2,335,000
Griffis Air Force Base, Rome	1,806,000
NORTH CAROLINA	
Army: Fort Bragg, Fayettesville	9,507,000
Navy:	
Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Edenton	195,000
Naval Air Facility, Weeksville	237,000
Air Force:	
Raleigh - Durham Municipal Airport	14,838,000
Seymour - Johnston Field, Goldsboro	7,092,000
OHIO	
Air Force:	
Lockbourne, Columbus	9,906,000
Lockland Plant, Cincinnati	2,800,000
OKLAHOMA	
Army: Fort Sill, Lawton	1,286,000
Air Force:	
Clinton Naval Air Station, Clinton	9,932,000
Ardmore Municipal Airport, Ardmore	4,045,000
Vance Air Force Base, Enid	7,275,000
Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City	2,564,000
OREGON	
Air Force: Portland International Airport, Portland	973,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
Army:	
Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Harrisburg	
Tobyhanna Signal Depot, Tobyhanna	352,000
PENNSYLVANIA—continued	
Navy:	
Naval Air Material Center, Philadelphia	$2,300,000
Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia	1,065,000
Pennsylvania State College	915,000
Air Force: Greater Pittsburgh Airport, Coraopolis	976,000
RHODE ISLAND	
Navy:	
Construction Battalion Center, Davisville	2,424,000
Naval Base, Newport	140,000
SOUTH CAROLINA	
Army: Fort Jackson, Columbia	182,000
Navy:	
Marine Corps Auxiliary Landing Field, Beaufort	2,522,000
Naval Ammunition Depot, Charleston	535,000
Naval Shipyard, Charleston	6,006,000
Air Force: Myrtle Beach Airport, Myrtle Beach	8,457,000
SOUTH DAKOTA	
Air Force: Rapid City AFB, Rapid City	3,185,000
TENNESSEE	
Air Force:	
McGhee-Tyson Airport, Knoxville	1,179,000
Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma	12,000,000
TEXAS	
Army:	
Fort Bliss, El Paso	4,856,000
Fort Hood, Killeen	10,090,000
Air Force:	
Biggs Air Force Base, El Paso	773,000
Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth	13,889,000
Tye Field, Abilene	23,472,000
Majors Field, Greenville	23,000
Galveston Municipal Airport, Galveston	5,746,000
Big Spring Air Force Base, Big Spring	6,270,000
Bryan Air Force Base, Bryan	3,440,000
Ellington Air Force Base, Houston	4,563,000
Foster Field, Victoria	4,383,000
Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo	3,820,000
Harlingen—All-Valley Municipal Airport, Harlingen	5,796,000
James Connally AFB, Waco	6,333,000
Laredo Municipal Airport, Laredo	4,266,000
Laughlin AFB, Del Rio	4,601,000
Moore Field, Mission	10,309,000
Perrin AFB, Sherman	4,810,000
Randolph AFB, San Antonio	2,693,000
Reese AFB, Lubbock	7,356,000
Kelly AFB, San Antonio	7,964,000
Brooks AFB, San Antonio	6,000,000
UTAH	
Army: Dugway Proving Ground, Tooele	864,000
Air Force: Hill AFB, Ogden	1,620,000
VERMONT	
Air Force: Burlington Airport, Burlington	579,000
VIRGINIA	
Army:	
Fort Belvoir, Alexandria	2,968,000
Fort Eustis, Newport News	3,233,000
Camp Pickett, Blackstone	142,000
Vint Hill Farms, Warrenton	341,000
Navy:	
Naval Amphibious Base, Little Creek	2,325,000
Naval Base, Norfolk	3,083,000
Naval Degaussing Station, Norfolk	2,000,000
Naval Hospital, Norfolk	12,815,000

VIRGINIA—continued	As agreed to by conferees
Navy—Continued	
Naval Supply Center, Norfolk (Cheatham Annex)	$564,000
Marine Corps Schools, Quantico	----------
Naval Ammunition Depot, St. Juliens Creek	326,000
Naval Mine Depot, Yorktown	500,000
Atlantic Fleet Headquarters, Norfolk	374,000
WASHINGTON	
Army:	
Camp Hanford, Hanford	528,000
Fort Lewis, Tacoma	272,000
Madigan Army Hospital, Tacoma	274,000
Navy:	
Puget Sound Area, Seattle	2,204,000
Naval Communication Station, Snohomish County	1,450,000
Air Force:	
Fairchild AFB, Spokane	9,421,000
Geiger Field, Spokane	744,000
Larson AFB, Moses Lake	10,866,000
McChord AFB, Tacoma	5,885,000
Paine Field, Everett	1,251,000
WASHINGTON, D. C.	
Army:	
Army Map Service, D. C.	----------
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, D. C.	731,000
Navy: Naval Research Laboratory, Anacostia, D. C.	500,000
Air Force: Bolling AFB	560,000
WISCONSIN	
Air Force: Traux Field, Madison	1,518,000

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, when the House passed the public works bill we authorized $2,758,318,000. As a result of the conference, we have agreed to a total authorization for the three services of $2,398,282,800. There is a total reduction under the amount contained in the House bill of $360,035,200.

The reductions for the most part were due to the application of a new formula to military construction items.

First. Troop housing, except for those installations which are obviously deficient in troop barracks, all troop housing, both permanent and temporary, has been deleted from the bill.

Second. The unit cost for troop housing in the original bill was approximately $2,000 per man for permanent-type barracks and $1,900 per man for temporary barracks. Under the formula applied, these figures were reduced to $1,700 per man for permanent barracks and $1,400 per man for temporary barracks.

Third. Bachelor officer quarters carried an original unit price of $6,000 per man. Under the new formula, this was reduced to $5,000 per man.

Fourth. Warehousing. In the original bill permanent-type warehousing was budgeted at $7.50 per square foot. Under the formula, this was reduced to $6 per square foot.

While the application of this formula deleted only a very few bases from this bill, it did result in substantial reductions in a large number of bases listed.

One of the Senate amendments added a new section 407 to the bill requiring additional congressional control over classified construction items and land acquisitions in connection therewith. A revised version of this section which will give the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services substantially the same authority as they already have by law on other real-estate transactions was agreed to by the Senate.

The Senate added a new section 408, which establishes a civilian Director of Installations in the Office of the Secretary of Defense to maintain direct surveillance over the planning and construction by all the military departments was agreed to by the House conferees. It is not intended that this new office shall mushroom into another large agency. On the contrary, it is intended that it shall consist of a very small number of persons having construction capabilities and experience who will be able to keep the Secretary of Defense better advised on military construction matters.

With a limited number of exceptions, the net effect of the action of the conferees was that the Senate conferees accepted the House language and the House conferees accepted the Senate figures.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that we are building housing units for the officers at $5,000 per unit?

Mr. VINSON. Officers' quarters in the House bill were set up at $6,000 per man. Under the formula, we have reduced it to $5,000 per man.

Mr. GROSS. And a maximum of $1,700 for noncommissioned officers?

Mr. VINSON. One thousand seven hundred dollars per man for enlisted men's permanent barracks. There would be two men in the bachelor quarters. It would be equivalent to $2,500 per individual and $1,700 per man for permanent barracks for enlisted personnel.

Mr. GROSS. We are doing right well by the officers.

Mr. VINSON. We are doing right well.

This bill authorizes public works of $320,492,800 for the Army, $255,735,000 for the Navy, and $1,813,360,000 for the Air Force.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Will the gentleman tell us what the net effect of the Senate reduction has been on this bill, as it now comes before us?

Mr. VINSON. The net reduction dollarwise has been $360,035,200.

Mr. HAND. It has resulted, of course, in the curtailment of activity in many of the bases proposed by the Air Force.

Mr. VINSON. It has resulted from a new approach as the result of an engineer's examination in the hope that they will be able to design with a little bit more economy than was set out in the program, as submitted by the Department in the original bill.

Mr. HAND. At the gentleman's convenience, I hope he will yield me a little bit of time to discuss one of the bases.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I am very much disturbed by the action which was taken by the other body on this bill. The bill came before that body with innumerable amendments, many of which were very drastic in character, and it stayed on the floor for a very short time. In my judgment, it did not have adequate attention. Many, many installations proposed by the Air Force—and I confess I am most sensitive about what the Air Force proposes, because I think our security and our defense lies with the Air Force—as I say, many, many drastic amendments were made, which the conferees have been obliged to accept. Among those—and I hope I will not be accused of too much personal and local interest—which were eliminated in the other body, was the Hammonton Air Base, located incidentally not in my own district, but very close to it, and in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWELL]. That base was designed as a military air transport base, and also as a maintenance and supply depot for the entire northeastern Air Force. I think I am privileged to say without violating any confidences that it was a No. 1 priority of the Air Force in this program, and it has been eliminated. I feel so strongly about this matter that I have been debating with myself for sometime about the possibility of a motion to recommit the entire bill with instructions to deal more adequately with the Air Force construction which is so necessary to our security. I have concluded, however, that I cannot take that responsibility because if the motion should succeed, the gentleman from Georgia tells me we might wind up with no bill at all because the other body is adamant in its position. However, I must express my disturbance and say with respect to that particular base, I am sure it was defeated by influences which ought not to have been in this picture.

But we will try again.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern of my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], particularly with reference to the Hammonton Air Force base which the Senate conferees insisted upon taking out of this bill. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] and I have been following and working with and cooperating with the Air Force in the development of these plans for this very, very necessary base for some months.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWELL. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I hate to interrupt the gentleman, but I did want to add for the RECORD that when this bill with that base was before the House, it was passed with a vote of 332 to 7. I think that was the figure.

Mr. HOWELL. That is right. I thank the gentleman. I think what the gentleman has said on this matter is really of serious concern. The Air Force has advised us that this project was their No. 1, top, and foremost priority item in their construction program for the coming year. It happens that all of the land

for this base is in my congressional district, although the nearest large town is in Mr. HAND'S district. It does not have any political significance one way or the other. The establishment of a military installation in one's district can bring many problems that make more work for us. But I think it is in the national interest that this base be established. I hope that early in the next session of Congress the appropriate committees in both Houses will do something for this most important base and give them authority to proceed with the construction of the base which, as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] has mentioned, is designed to serve supply and matériel in the entire eastern area and for the overseas bases, which are so vitally needed at the present time. We have to place great reliance on our Air Force as our first line of defense, and be very realistic about it today. It is the top, foremost priority, and I regret that this base was left out of the program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the authorization for all of the troop barracks in this bill was eliminated. Is that true?

Mr. VINSON. The conferees eliminated all troop housing. We did that for this reason: When the bill was before the House troop housing for the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy, particularly the Army, was at permanent installations. It was proposed that troop houses be built at these permanent installations. The Senate conferees did not find themselves in accord with our viewpoint, so we decided to eliminate, wherever it appears in the bill, "troop housing," with the understanding that a complete study of that question will be undertaken during the recess, and I can almost assure the lady from Massachusetts that it is merely a postponement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am glad it is only a postponement. Several troop houses would have been built under the original bill in Fort Devens, Mass., in my district. They are vitally needed there. I am glad it is only a postponement, I am very sorry for the delay.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of this session of Congress, I, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, am glad to report that from the standpoint of legislation for the benefit of our servicemen, it has been one of the most successful in history.

On yesterday the House adopted the conference report on the Korean veterans' bill by a vote of 322 to 1, and the Senate passed it unanimously. It has not yet received Presidential approval, but I am sure he will sign it within the next few days.

It provides education and training, housing guaranties, unemployment compensation, and mustering-out payments for the men now serving in the Armed Forces, or who have served since June 27, 1950. Educational allowances have been liberalized, and the veterans' dependents have been taken into consideration. The amount of time for educational training is determined by the length of service rendered by the veteran, not to exceed 36 months, or at the rate of 1½ days of training for each day of service. The housing is the same as that guaranteed to World War II veterans, with certain additional provisions, which, it is believed, will be a safeguard to the veterans themselves. The interest rate of 4 percent is retained, and the maximum guaranty of $7,500 is made the same for both World War II veterans and the veterans of the Korean conflict.

Unemployment compensation for 26 weeks is provided, along with mustering-out pay, and they have been made to apply equally to the veterans from every State in the Union without discrimination.

This is one of the most important pieces of veterans' legislation that has ever come before the Congress of the United States, especially as it effects our Korean veterans and their dependents.

This marks the culmination of a long drawn-out battle during this Eighty-second Congress, which has resulted in enacting into law 23 different bills and joint resolutions, which emanated from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman.

One of the most important of these measures was H. R. 1, a bill which I introduced, and which passed both Houses and became Public Law No. 23 of the Eighty-second Congress. It provided automatic insurance to our veterans "who die in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950," in a maximum amount of $10,000, without cost to the individual serving. This measure makes it certain that in the future every veteran's family will be protected by this insurance.

All the benefits concerning compensations and pensions were extended to the veterans of the Korean conflict by the terms of the joint resolution which I introduced in the House, and Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, introduced in the Senate. It passed both Houses and became Public Law No. 28 of the Eighty-second Congress.

Another important measure enacted into law during the Eighty-second Congress was H. R. 4394, which also came from the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and which became Public Law No. 356 of the Eighty-second Congress. It guarantees an increase in the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans, as well as an increase in the rates for the ones suffering from nonservice connected disabilities. Increases were included for widows with children, as well as for the veterans qualifying for aid and attendants' pensions. This rate is made uniform for the veterans of all wars.

Congress has in the past provided by statutory law for the more severely disabled veterans who lost the use of one hand or one foot or for blindness in one eye and other similar disabilities. Public Law No. 427, which also emanated from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, increased that compensation, and also raised the maximum ceiling on the amount that can be paid to such disabled veterans each month; while a flat rate of $67 per month is provided for certain tubercular cases, which applies to veterans of all wars. Formerly it applied only to veterans of World War I.

It would be useless to go into detail and try to enumerate all the provisions of the various measures which have been reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and passed by the Eighty-second Congress, for the benefit of our veterans and their dependents. We have simply done our best to see that our veterans are properly cared for, and to avoid the abuses that occurred under former legislation.

I want to thank the Members of both Houses of Congress for their generous support. Every once in awhile you hear someone speak of certain Members of Congress as being "against veterans." In reply to such charges I desire to say that so far as I know, I have never seen a Member of Congress who was "against the veterans." We may differ on legislation, but I do not believe I have ever seen a Member of either body who deep-down in his heart did not want to do the very best that could be done for our servicemen, and at the same time avoid waste and extravagance.

I make this statement advisedly. I believe I have seen as much of the aftermath of war as any other man who has ever served in the Congress of the United States, and probably more. I have been a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs ever since it was organized, and have served as its chairman for almost 20 years. During that time I have had brought to my attention, not just once, but time and time and time again, the tragedies, the sufferings, and the heartaches of our veterans and their dependents. They are not responsible for these wars, but they have done the fighting, the suffering, the dying, and they and their dependents are entitled to every consideration at the hands of the Congress of the United States. They have received that consideration by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and by the Congress as a whole, and I feel safe in saying that they will continue to receive it during the years to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to state that as far as the air base in New Jersey is concerned, the committee felt very keenly that military necessity warranted and justified its being at the designated place. But we were unable to get our viewpoint across. Certain things developed. I sought to eliminate the designation of the place and to have it written in "northeastern section of the United States," in the hope that it might be put in that same vicinity, but we were unable to accomplish that. I feel satisfied that a complete study will be made as to the proper place for its location.

I might state there is a little friction up there in regard to locating it at this

place, and while we want to live in peace and harmony with every community in which we put a base, the national defense comes first. We hope that in the time between now and January all the objections may be ironed out, because the Armed Services Committee went into the matter very carefully, and we are thoroughly convinced that military necessity requires it to be located at this described point.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. Certainly.

Mr. HAND. I am happy to have the gentleman make that statement, and I want to say that I know of my own knowledge he has worked hard and diligently, not only on this particular item but on the entire program. If we are both fortunate enough to return, I look forward to working in harmony with the gentleman on this proposition.

Mr. VINSON. I trust the gentleman is in as good a fix as I am. I have already received my commission without opposition, to come back here.

Mr. Speaker, we eliminated certain items in the bill. The breakdown that I will put in the RECORD will show the items and the amounts involved. I ask every Member to read it; it will be in today's RECORD.

As to the results of the conference, I am satisfied you will conclude that the House conferees did a fairly good job, because with the new formula we adopted we save money for the time being. It may be possible that this formula is too rigid; it may not be possible to build warehouses all over the country at $6 per square foot, but we will try, we will do our best. It may not be possible to build barracks for the maximum amount we have set out as a formula; but as I say, we will try because we want to save as much money as we possibly can without hurting national defense.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO LEASE QUARTERS FOR POST-OFFICE PURPOSES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6839) to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 5, strike out lines 11 to 15, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 8. No proposed lease-purchase agreement shall be executed under this act until it has been submitted to and approved by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Committee on Public Works of the Senate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the House passed this bill with a provision that no project could be initiated under the bill until submitted to and approved by the House and Senate Public Works Committee. The Senate modified that amendment, using the same language except it provides that no project can be started or initiated unless it is submitted to and approved by the House Public Works Committee, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the Senate Public Works Committee, and the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Certainly the gentleman would have no objection to that because representative committees of both bodies of the Congress must be consulted and give their approval before these projects can be started.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGES ACROSS COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2572) to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike out all after "of" where it appears the third time over to and including "harbors" in line 5 on page 4 and insert "Engineers."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBSTITUTION OF CONFEREE ON H. R. 8122, CONTINUING PARITY FORMULA

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] be excused as a conferee on the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and that some other member of the committee be named in his place.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

The Senate will be notified accordingly.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN LANDS TO TOWN OF HOPE, N. MEX.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7317) authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "in $1,950," and insert "of the appraised fair market value of the property."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED P. HINES—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 827) for the relief of Fred P. Hines, and the message vetoing the bill.

(For the veto message see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 30, 1951.)

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

THE HONORABLE JOHN H. KERR

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is this objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, bear with me a moment as I pay tribute to a mighty and a moral man, a gentle, a great, and a good man, our beloved friend and colleague, JOHN HOSEA KERR. His name shall never perish from the recollections of men, but rather he shall long be remembered by the good he has done.

In speaking of royalty, Voltaire said, "He who serves well his country has no need for ancestors." For 52 years this man has labored in the field of public service and with honor and distinction. He was born of noble parents and in every public trust he has reflected credit upon his proud ancestors and the people of his State. If honors and titles were conferred by kings in this country, surely

JOHN H. KERR would be one of the grandest of knights. He has never been infamous enough to be fond of fame. Modesty and simplicity have marked his life, truth has been his master, and his unblemished character the tower of his strength. The purity of his life and the promptings of his spirit exemplify the finest virtues of patriotism and causes all of us to want to emulate his goodness.

It is given to but few men to serve so long in so many high positions of responsibility. In every capacity which JOHN KERR has served his people, he has proved himself worthy of every trust. Pope, in his Essay on Man, said, "An honest man is the noblest work of God." Surely this man is the soul of honor. When I came to the bar as a young lawyer, he was a judge and with becoming dignity, great impartiality, and competency he interpreted and administered the laws of his State. As a legislator he has written his name high on the scroll of fame. He has nurtured the strength of spirit which shall shield him in all misfortune and his inflexible faith and friendliness have endeared him to thousands of friends.

Ralph Waldo Emerson said:

Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong—
Men who, for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long.

Brave men who work while others sleep,
Who dare while others fly—
They build a nation's pillars deep;
They lift them to the sky.

Surely our Nation's pillars are a little deeper and a little higher because this man has lived. In all the noisy confusion of life he has kept peace in his soul. In this world of sham and drudgery and broken dreams, and in the changing fortunes of time, he has not surrendered one spark of his manhood. As he goes from this forum back to the bosom of the commonwealth he loves, he will take with him life's richest compensations; the comfort and satisfaction of knowing that he has performed well his part in the making of a better world in which to live. He has a right to enjoy his grand achievements and to be proud of his great record. Those who know him well love him best. May I say to you, Judge KERR, that we who have labored with you here realize your worth and love you better than you will ever know.

May God bless you and keep you, and may the light of heaven mark your pathway and all the good things of life be yours. Blessings and a sure reward always wait on virtuous deeds. You need no monuments for us to remember, you have made your monuments in the loves and lives of the people of your State and Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I like to think of Judge KERR as a neighbor and as a friend. Judge KERR's people came to this country in the early days of the formation of our civilization in America. Right north of the county in which I live his ancestors were born, and from that vicinity Judge KERR moved to the eastern part of North Carolina. Judge KERR, in my opinion, typifies the real American. Yesterday we celebrated Independence Day. I like to think of him as one of those carrying on from the days of the Revolutionary period when the early settlers in this country were having their difficulties in the formation of a republic. We know that today there are forces in the world who would destroy those rights for which we fought in those days. In my opinion, Judge KERR's ancestors had as large a part as any in establishing in one of the Original Thirteen Colonies of America those rights and privileges. He has carried on here in this body and has typified what those in that day believed to be sound.

I said I liked to think of him as a friend and a neighbor. Judge KERR graduated with one of my father's brothers from what is known as Bingham Academy, established in the early colonial days. That was a long time ago, 1882. The Bingham family, as we know, is one of the great families of this country, and includes a former Ambassador to England. Judge KERR came from those people who taught and believed in what we believe in here today, that is, that we will carry on in America for independence, justice, and the right of the individual to be free.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in 1928, elected at a special election and then for the next regular term, the first committee to which I was assigned had as its chairman my dear friend from North Carolina, JOHN KERR. I sat at his knees and learned of committee work and legislative procedure, and for much of the little wisdom I might be possessed of I am indebted to my dear friend from North Carolina because of the example he set as a gentleman and as a legislator. I sat in his committee day after day in the fine, noble atmosphere engendered by that nobility of mind of which he is possessed and which is known to everyone who has had an opportunity of seeing, knowing, or being with him.

During the years I have been here he has been a constant source of influence and inspiration to me. There is no one with whom I have served that has occupied in my mind dearer and deeper sentiments of respect, esteem, and friendship than my dear friend JOHN KERR.

It is difficult on an occasion of this kind to express one's thoughts adequately, but in the few words I have just expressed I have tried to convey to the House and particularly to that sweet gentleman whose journey through life has been constructive and who has left his imprint on the mind and personality of everyone who has contacted him, the deep respect, the strong affection, and the equally deep and strong friendship I have for him. I sincerely hope that God will bless him for many, many years more to carry on that great and noble work that he has exemplified in such an outstanding manner throughout his beautiful life to date.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, JOHN HOSEA KERR, a resident of Warrenton, N. C., was born at Yanceyville,, N. C., and was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress at a special election held on November 6, 1923, and has served continuously since that time.

He brought to the Congress a fine family background, his father, John H. Kerr, being a brilliant captain in the Confederate Army and his mother, Eliza Catherine Yancey Kerr, came of a very prominent family in northeastern North Carolina.

Judge KERR, as he is frequently known, was a student in the celebrated Bingham School and graduated from Wake Forest College with a bachelor of arts degree. He studied law and was admitted to the bar and moved to Warrenton and entered upon the practice of his profession. He was given a doctor of laws degree at Wake Forest College on June 4, 1945.

His background of service to the State and Nation is quite unusual and remarkable. He has served his State and county continuously for 50 years, being elected solicitor of the district and serving in this capacity capably for 11 years, and then served as judge of superior court for 7 years and, prior to this time, holding other positions which made his service continuous for the long expanse of 50 years of able and conscientious service to his State and Nation.

Congressman KERR is a high ranking member of the important Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and has served on this committee and others with great distinction and unexcelled fidelity. His recognition of the duties to be performed is one of the outstanding qualities he possesses, and he has tackled with great ability any assignments that have been given him both in the Congress and in his native State and carried them through to conspicuous and successful conclusions, recognizing at all times the importance of the duties which he had been assigned to.

In recent years he has been especially interested in the development of a great power project for his district which was previously known as the Buggs Island Dam and has now been changed to the John Kerr Dam. His colleagues in the Congress are very proud of the services that he has rendered in this connection, and of the great honor that he has brought to our State by his distinguished service.

Judge KERR has always been a very fine citizen and a Christian gentleman and a leader in the Baptist church in which he has been a lifetime member. He is one of the most courteous and kindly men that it has been my privilege to know. He was always kind to me and seemed to know of my own family background, as I am sure is also true of other Members, and made me feel that in JOHN KERR I had a very fine friend.

The Congress of the United States and his many friends will miss this able, conscientious, and kind gentleman, and his retirement from active service in this body will be a loss to his State and Nation and his many friends and admirers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel certain that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] were here, they would want to join in all of these fine things being said about Judge KERR. They are now in conference on the civil functions bill. I personally want to add to what has said about him today. I do not think there has been a more splendid gentleman to my knowledge who has served upon the full Committee on Appropriations than Judge KERR of North Carolina. I deeply regret that he is leaving the Congress.

I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] if he would ask that Mr. TABER and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH might have permission to extend their remarks at this point.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, in 1923 JOHN KERR came to Congress from North Carolina at the same time that I arrived. We have been warm friends ever since. Most of the time he has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations and it has been a pleasure to work with him. He has always approached the responsibility with a keen sense of duty and has made a record of which any man might be proud. He was an able forthright citizen and the Congress will miss him very much. I wish to pay my tribute to his real service. I wish him many pleasant years in his retirement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Judge JOHN KERR, who is retiring from the House after a long beneficial career in the service of the people of North Carolina and the Nation.

Wherever the benefits of our national flood-control and waterways development have been extended, and this includes virtually every square mile of our land, the people have reason to be thankful for the diligent service in their behalf on the part of Judge KERR.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege these many years to have for my next-door neighbor in the New House Office Building Hon. JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina. To know him well is to have a real affection for him. I was highly honored when this distinguished legislator and outstanding attorney asked me to join with him on a brief in a case which had been appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge KERR won his case.

I have followed the legislative career of my friend, Judge KERR, for many years and with increasing admiration and respect for his ability in handling the many complex legislative problems presented to him.

I am sorry to lose my kindly legislative neighbor. Now as he retires I wish for my friend, Judge KERR, a long, happy, contented, and prosperous life.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, many tributes have been paid to the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR, who is leaving his position in the House of Representatives after this term. The tributes that have been paid are all deserved.

Having worked side by side with Judge KERR through the years on the House Committee on Appropriations, I have come to know him in a special way. I shall quote no poetry; nor shall I seek to be rhetorical. I simply want to pay tribute to a very great man who wrote the name of KERR in shining letters in the State of North Carolina and in the United States Congress.

He is the most beloved Member of the House Appropriations Committee upon which he serves. His lofty idealism and his nobility of soul have been the things that have marked his public service. May heaven grant that public officials of the future may carry on the tradition of Christian statesmanship which has been so well exemplified in the life and works of the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, we do not get very far unless we have friendship and fellowship in this House of Representatives of ours. It has been a pleasure for me, a heart-warming pleasure to be able to have the privilege of serving on the same committee with Judge KERR. I am only too happy to join with the others in extending the true hand of fellowship to Judge KERR today.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in everything that has been said about our colleague Judge KERR.

When I was made a member of the Committee on Appropriations a number of years ago I began to know Judge KERR. The way he goes about matters in his cool, collected, dignified, gentlemanly manner has always appealed to me. Judge KERR has never, in my opinion, asked this Congress for anything that was not justified.

Every member of the Appropriations Committee, as well as every Member of the House—and I say this in all honesty—holds in the highest esteem possible Judge KERR. He has been a great public servant. I have deemed it a great honor to serve on the same committee with this fine, able, patriotic gentleman.

I join with all his multitude of friends in saying that certainly we are losing a fine public servant in the resignation of Judge KERR.

I wish for you, Judge, many, many more happy years of a contented, peaceful life, with all the blessings that could be showered on you and your family.

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard for me to speak of Judge KERR, especially on an occasion like this. I have had many warm and true friends in the House of Representatives who on occasion after occasion have shown their respect and their friendship for me. There has not been one here who has shown that throughout the years more than has Judge KERR. He is the type of man I like to know. Big in character, great in soul, with a keen and fine, good mind; he is as fine a type of gentleman as it has ever been my privilege to know.

I regret his going more than my feeble words can express. To him and those he loves best, in the years that are allotted to him, I wish for him and them everything that is good, because he deserves it. I know he will be showered with God's richest blessings.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, for a great many years I perhaps was as close to Judge KERR as any man in this body. It was really odd how our lives were cast together. For quite a time I was his chairman, and after the Eightieth Congress I came back and was a member of the committee of which he was chairman. We have always been united in purpose. It was never a problem to explain your attitude to the understanding of our distinguished colleague.

I had the distinction of getting him to take his first airplane ride, and before we were through we flew the ocean together; we went to many parts of the world in the service of our country.

Judge KERR is not only a statesman but he is also a soldier of his country in every sense of the word. The description of his character and his qualifications have been so very ably told by his distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that it can hardly be enlarged; he seems to have such a complete understanding of our friend.

I feel like the words of the song:

> When I grow too old to dream,
> I will have dear John to remember;
> When I grow too old to dream,
> His devotion will be in my heart.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE.]

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, is the kind of man who has upheld the hand and helped many a young man who has come to this Congress. I have served with him; I have served under him on subcommittees. As a youngster it was perhaps but natural for me to show signs of impatience and perhaps a little intolerance of a point of view which disagreed

with mine. Judge KERR helped me; he taught me something of patience and tolerance. As a gentleman, as a scholar, and as a statesman, he demonstrated fairness, firmness, and vision.

May this great land of ours be replenished with more of his kind, and may God's blessing be attendant upon his retirement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for one to add to what has already been said here and will be recorded in the annals of this Congress about our friend, Judge KERR. However, after 20 years of service here with Judge KERR I should just like to add my feeble contribution in attestation of the high regard, and of the confidence, the love, and the respect I have had for him in those two decades. I feel my life has been enriched by my association with Judge KERR.

I am going to say something here about our friend that no one can challenge: In the rough and tumble of debate, in the often selfish conflicting desires and emotions arising here from time to time we are wont sometimes to feel resentment and momentarily at least fall out with our colleagues.

I do not believe there is a man who has served in this Congress with our friend who at any time ever had cause to have such resentment or such emotions as I have just described. Our esteemed friend has the most uniform, kindly disposition of possibly any man I have ever known. The warm handclasp, the cheery "good morning" that we always get from him when you pass him in the corridors or upon the floor or in the cloak room have always been most welcome and invigorating.

Our friend is going home to rest from his many years of arduous labor up here. It will not be long before I hope to join him down in my part of the Southland and when that time comes I shall think about my pleasant associations up here; I shall always remember my friend in terms of the poet who described the man who lived by the side of the road and was a friend to man.

Judge, you leave the halls of this Congress that you love so much with the respect, the devotion and the best wishes of every man who has ever served with you. May God's richest blessing abide with you always.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished dean of our delegation, our beloved friend from North Carolina [Mr DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be privileged to join with my colleagues in paying a word of tribute to my dear friend the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge JOHN H. KERR. There is nothing so immutable, I may say more immutable, than the truth. It will stand the test of time and eternity. Floods, fires, and storms do not affect the truth.

The simple truth concerning the life and character and public service of Judge KERR is the highest encomium, the simple unvarnished truth. There are no words that I can possibly find in the English language that could flatter Judge KERR. Few men to my knowledge have lived a life so useful, so upright, and outstanding as has Judge KERR. He is a devout churchman and Christian. I know that by having observed his habits since we have served together in Washington. Judge KERR is a successful, good businessman, a successful farmer, a great jurist, one learned in the law as much so as any man who has ever lived in our State. He had a brilliant record on the superior court bench of the Commonwealth of North Carolina. His outstanding services as a Member of Congress here are familiar to all of us. I know of few men his equal in the service he has rendered his country not only in North Carolina, but since he has been a Member of this, the greatest legislative forum in the world. His service on the great Committee on Appropriations has been outstanding, and is so recognized by all who have served with him. We are all familiar with that wonderful record of service and the contributions he has made to the legislation enacted by this great body. I regret, my friends, that I do not have language to adequately and satisfactorily express my own high opinion of the outstanding unexcelled record of my dear colleague and beloved friend, Judge KERR. He and I will retire from this body simultaneously. When he leaves the cares, duties, and responsibilities incident to public service here and retires to his lovely home and fine farm in North Carolina, I wish for him many years to enjoy that rest which he has so well earned and which he so richly deserves. May God bless Judge KERR.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know that Judge KERR is going to find a great deal of happiness when he returns to North Carolina, because from the way his colleagues know him here and the way they feel about him, you can just imagine how the people of North Carolina feel about him. He is beloved throughout the length and breadth of our State. He comes from one of the most illustrious families in the South. In colonial days his people were leaders in North Carolina. His public service in North Carolina and in the service in the Congress here has endeared him to all he has come in contact with. His main achievement for the people of North Carolina and Virginia and through that section is the great Kerr Dam in the Buggs Island area, which forever will be a monument to him and to the hard work he did for the welfare and the benefit of all the Southeast by this additional power and this flood control, which is going to mean that one of the finest and most fertile valleys in the world is going to bloom forever without fear of these great floods. This is partial recognition for his hard work and his thoughtfulness not only for the people in our State, but for the entire Nation. I have known the judge all my life. I know his sister, Mrs. Mary Kerr Spencer, chairman of the Democratic executive committee of my home county, and his nephew, John Kerr Spencer, one of my very closest friends. Judge KERR has had several people named after him all over our State, because it is considered a great honor, and while we are going to lose this dear friend he is going to be very happy back home, and the people of his State will be happy, too, and he will have many useful and happy years in which his counsel and advice will be of the greatest benefit to the State of North Carolina.

May God bless him.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has presented in the past many distinguished sons and daughters to our country. North Carolina, in the present, has given two of the finest legislators that have ever served in this Hall, the Hon. JOHN KERR and Hon. ROBERT DOUGHTON. Like my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GORE, I came here relatively a young man. I knew very little about the procedure of the House, and when I served upon the Committee on Appropriations for Civil Functions I learned the kindliness of Judge KERR. Questions that were intricate he solved and explained with a dispatch and a keenness of mind that few men possess.

We are sorry today at this closing session when we know that he will leave the great Congress of the United States. Personally, I feel that my work here would have amounted to very little had I not received his guidance, his friendship, and his advice.

While North Carolina may always claim him as her own native son, we of New York and the rest of the country feel that he is a part of us. We thank your State for sending him to us and sharing him with us.

I close with a thought that is in the mind of every man and lady in this House, that we wish him many years of health. We look forward to the day when, with God's blessing, all of us meet our Master and see the fullness of the beatific vision. May we join with him then and enjoy it forever.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I feel I would be a traitor to my thoughts if I did not join in the tributes paid to this great American.

When I first came to the Congress and was in difficulty, I would consult with Judge KERR. He was always found sympathetic. He is a great Christian American.

I wish I could pick out the best things of all the sentiments that have been expressed here this morning, and I would say that those are my sentiments. We need more men like Judge KERR. I want to say, Judge, that you have fought a good fight, that you have kept the faith. I hope the crown will be yours. May

God bless and sustain you in the future years of your life.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to join briefly but nonetheless sincerely in this deserving tribute to my friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR. I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Judge KERR on the great Committee on Appropriations for the past 8 years. I say with all sincerity that I have never in my life met a more lovable and kindly gentleman. He was of great help to me at the time I joined the Committee on Appropriations, just as he was to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], when he joined the committee. He always had a kindly word of greeting; he always had a smile. He was brilliantly capable and always fair and just. We are going to miss him on the Committee on Appropriations. The State of North Carolina has lost one of its most faithful and able public servants in the departure of Judge KERR from this House. I regret his departure very, very much. I know that God will be kindly to him and will grant him many years of good health and happiness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I will not trespass long upon the time of the House. I should like to claim as part of my remarks the many fine and just tributes paid to Judge KERR. I wish to express my thanks for the privilege of having had the opportunity to serve here in this body with him. The name is certainly well known in the State of North Carolina. I have known it for many, many years. It so happens that my father attended the same military school attended by Judge KERR. I graduated from the same university his son graduated from. I knew Judge KERR as a judge when I was a young, struggling attorney, and I knew him up here when I was a young, struggling Member of this House. He was always glad to help both when he was on the bench and in the Halls of Congress. It has been a real pleasure to serve with the judge. He is going back among some of the finest people in the world. They love him. He does not have to be introduced to anybody, and I am sure he is going to enjoy his association with those folks who are really anxious to have some time with him. Judge KERR, I wish you the best of luck.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has meant much to me to know and serve with Judge KERR in the Congress of the United States. Judge KERR is a fatherly man. Ofttimes he has put his arm around me to give me friendly words of encouragement and inspiration. He has helped me immeasurably in my work here on Capitol Hill. I shall want to keep in touch with him in the years to come, years I pray will bring him happiness and contentment in the North Carolina he loves so much.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy, of course, just to listen to these tributes to our beloved friend by his colleagues from the State of North Carolina. They have known him longer, but I am sure they will not mind if some of the rest of us join in the expression of regret that he leaves the House.

I recall the first speech I made in the House. Since I am known for loquaciousness in my home State, some of my friends wondered why I waited 5 months to speak, and even then why I spoke but 5 minutes. I think perhaps three of the Members listened, and the Chamber was full. But when it was over, my dear friend Judge KERR told me he wanted to hear me again sometime. In his fine way, he gave me encouragement. I recall I was speaking in his district recently. Incidentally, three Members of the House heard me then, and I said it was thrilling to be speaking to more Members than usually heard my speeches in the Chamber in the House of Representatives. So I feel peculiarly warm toward him because of the friendly and kindly interest he has taken in me. That is the personal side.

JOHN H. KERR is the third person bearing that name who has served in the House of Representatives. I doubt, Mr. Speaker, if the record has been matched by any other family, unless it is the Muhlenberg family from Pennsylvania. The judge himself will be able to enlighten us on that point. But he, as a third generation member of a remarkable family, graces the Halls of Congress. We are all grateful for the wonderful contribution he has made.

I recall the scriptural reference: "He that ruleth his spirit is greater than he that taketh a city." You would think from the quiet way in which he moves among us that he has never experienced anger. Yet, I am sure there are times, because he is a man of conviction, when he has been moved by feelings of that kind. Yet, he does not give way to them. It has inspired me greatly to have that example set for me during these 10 years.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has phrased his tribute to Judge KERR so well that I content myself with endorsing what he said about this man of great spiritual stature and I shall not extend these comments.

I do join heartily with my colleagues in wishing Judge KERR many more years of happiness and success and greatest satisfaction in contemplating his labors here.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, because of my great love and respect for JOHN H. KERR, I have enjoyed the many tributes paid him here this afternoon as much as, I am sure, he appreciates and enjoys them. Judge KERR has led an exemplary life. He is a splendid Christian gentleman, able and strong, gentle and firm. The tributes paid Judge KERR by our colleague Mr. COOLEY are well deserved and entirely true. He is loved by the people among whom he was raised. When he goes back to his home, the old town of Warrenton, he will be one of the senior statesmen of the State of North Carolina. He will be one of those to whom men will go for counsel. Not only is he loved and respected among men, but Judge KERR, because of his splendid disposition, character, and his kind way of life is loved and respected among women, and in paying my tribute to Judge KERR here today, I want to add the tribute of my wife: She is devoted to Judge KERR; she loves him—she loves him as a woman loves a friend. She admires him. He has been a friend to both Mrs. Bonner and myself. It is with a big lump in my heart that I think about Judge KERR leaving the Congress. He has my love and my respect, and I wish for him good health and happiness the remainder of his life.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS], I would be false to the impulse of this hour if I did not join in tribute to our friend Judge KERR, of North Carolina, and confirm everything that has been said about him. He may not remember, but I have a personal reason for paying my tribute to him as he leaves this historic Chamber. Years ago he had an opportunity to confer upon me an act of kindness which I have never forgotten. Maybe he has forgotten it. More than that, on two or three occasions he went out of his way to be kind and helpful to me, and I have always been grateful to him for it. His courteous, cultured, refined personality stamps him the perfect gentleman that he is. As he leaves us I am sure he takes with him the good wishes, the respect, and the admiration of all of his colleagues. I wish him life's richest blessings as he lays aside the mantle of a busy and useful life.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 20 years in my service in this Chamber I have met and learned to know men and women of the finest character; men and women who are as solid and pure as sterling. I have never in my associations here met a man of character, honesty, intelligence, ability, and devotion superior to that of JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina. Our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who is taking leave of this body also and whose record transcends that of any other, has, in my estimation, in his tribute to Mr. KERR, expressed my sentiments, even though they do not measure up in any way to what I would like to say of our distinguished friend. I take his departure as a personal loss. I cannot be reconciled to the thought that he officially leaves us, perhaps never to return. The loss is not mine alone, however. I cannot understand it, as I am

not reconciled, how it was that a man of this character, this service, this accomplishment should leave the Congress of the United States. The loss is primarily that of the people of that great district in North Carolina, of the State, and of the Nation which he has served so faithfully so long and so well.

My prayer, as he leaves, is that he may enjoy the rest and happiness that he can find among his people in the great State of North Carolina and the district which he has served so well.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, as I watched the minutes tick away on the clock, now for over 40 minutes, we have heard many wonderful statements made about this distinguished North Carolinian, our dear friend, JOHN H. KERR. I could speak a long time, but perhaps it is not words that count. All that I can say about Judge KERR is this, to know him is to love him.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. I should not intrude myself in this distinguished company for I find an inability to express adequately what I feel, but I greatly regret that the State of North Carolina is losing two such eminent and distinguished men from among us. Of course, I refer to Chairman DOUGHTON as well as Judge KERR.

As I have sat here during these minutes listening to these encomiums I have thought of the words of Daniel Webster as I can remember them—Daniel Webster at the laying of the cornerstone of the Bunker Hill Monument. Addressing these men before him, the little band of survivors who 50 years before had taken part in the battle of Bunker Hill, gray-haired veterans, one of them the distinguished man from France whose portrait adorns this Chamber and who fought for American independence back in 1775, Daniel Webster said to that remnant of the Revolutionary War:

> Venerable men, you have come down to us from a former generation. Heaven has bounteously lengthened out your lives that you might behold this glorious day.

A little later the orator said, wishing the veterans well:

> Late may you arrive in heaven.

Now that is the way I feel about these two eminent men from North Carolina, Chairman DOUGHTON and Judge KERR, late may you arrive in heaven, that you may the longer enjoy the heaven you have known here and have done so well to maintain in your own land in your day and generation. Distinguished gentlemen of North Carolina, each of you has earned a right to repose, but we know that you will be with your colleagues in spirit ever willing to continue to serve.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WOODROW W. JONES].

Mr. WOODROW W. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying a tribute to the long and faithful service rendered to our State and Nation by the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR. It has been my privilege to be associated with Judge KERR during the past 2 years here in the House of Representatives, and during that time, I have learned to respect and admire his sterling character and devotion to duty.

As he now leaves the Halls of Congress to return to his native North Carolina, he can do so with a strong feeling of satisfaction that comes only to those who have labored long and hard. He has had a long and distinguished career of public service to not only the State of North Carolina but to the Nation as a whole. We shall miss his wise counsel and his pleasant disposition. As he returns to North Carolina, I extend to him my best wishes for continued good health and happiness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if Judge KERR would admit the things that have been said about him, but I wonder if he wants a brief opportunity to deny some of the things that have been said; if so, I will be very glad to yield to you, Judge.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I have often heard it said that no person can make a speech when his or her heart is full. I face that condition today, but I want to assure this great body that I will always deeply appreciate the fellowship and friendship of the fine men and women who have been my colleagues during my service in the House of Representatives since 1923.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, we were all shocked, I am sure, to learn that, at the end of the Eighty-second Congress, Congressman JOHN KERR, of North Carolina, will no longer be a Member of this House. As one who has known Mr. KERR intimately for almost 30 years, I could not neglect the opportunity to express my great admiration for the great character and ability of my good friend from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] and to express my deep affection for him. This high regard on my part for Judge KERR and my genuine esteem for him has existed since I first met him.

Judge KERR has been a man for whom I have never ceased to hold a deep affection. He has been a friend not only to all of us who have served with him but to all men, because he has always been a friend of justice.

I should be pleased to liken my feelings for my friend to the sentiment expressed by the great poet of Scotland, Robert Burns, in his tribute to his friend the Earl of Glencairn. Burns, in closing his tribute to the Earl of Glencairn, said:

> The bridegroom may forget the bride
> Was made his wedded wife yestreen;
> The monarch may forget the crown
> That on his head an hour has been;
> The mother may forget the child that smiles
> sae sweetly on her knee;
> But I'll remember thee, Glencairn,
> And a' that thou hast done for me.

We will not say good-by, but as your ancestors would have said: "Fare ye weel, and come back often to favor us with your words of wisdom."

USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOODS AND COSMETICS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to file a statement of minority views to be printed as part 2 of House report No. 2356 on the investigation of the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics, and that such printing be hereby authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, AND HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, we of the Empire State are always proud and conscious of the greatness of our State and the greatness of its physical size. At all times we are and have been accustomed to doing things in a big way. We have sat here for the last few days and have heard with sorrow the announcement about those who are leaving us.

But New York is determined that it will do things in its usual big way. I have been asked on behalf of the New York delegation to announce to this House the departure of three members of our delegation, all three coming from the great city of New York. Ofttimes it is quite difficult to have Members, especially those from the South and West, understand the New York City delegation. You cannot quite grasp our philosophy and understand what you sometimes think is our provincialism. Bear in mind that your counties and your districts are hundreds of miles apart, and when you enter this body you meet your neighbor from the adjoining congressional district, and 9 times out of 10 you have never met him before. Our great city of over 8,000,000 people is concentrated in a small area, far smaller than most of your counties, and in most of your districts it takes many counties to make a congressional district. Due to our compactness most of us have known each other in the city of New York since childhood days; we knew each other's families; in many cases, we went to school together, grew up side by side, shared the same sorrows and the same joys, and as the result of this compactness there is a constant feeling of camaraderie—perhaps not quite as well known in other delegations as in the New York delegation.

The senior Member to leave this House is the Honorable JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, who was elected to the Seventy-seventh Congress; a man whose family has been part and parcel not only of the city of New York but of the old city of Brooklyn. Congressman HEFFERNAN'S family has played a part in the public life of Brooklyn since the year 1800.

The family has produced a succession of devoted, loyal, intelligent public servants. Generation after generation has given to the people of our community a splendid service and a high degree of intelligence. Congressman HEFFERNAN, himself, is one of the senior State committeemen in the Democratic Party of the State of New York. His counsel has been sought in the county parleys, in the State conventions, and in national conventions, for over 35 or 40 years. In the years that he has spent in this House he has gained a reputation for quietness, but a quietness coupled with wisdom, and here, as in his county and State, his advice has been sought. He leaves us to go on to a higher office in the city of New York. We, of the New York delegation, as well as the members of his committee and the membership of this House as a whole will miss him. He has shown strong devotion to his party and he has been strong in his devotion to the Nation. We, of the New York delegation, sincerely hope that he will be happy in the new honors that have been accorded him by the people of the city of New York, and we sincerely hope that he will come here frequently so that we may still retain the friendship that has been ours for so many years.

The next Member in order of seniority from the New York City delegation who is now leaving these Halls is the Honorable CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, a member of the Committee on Appropriations. Congressman MCGRATH, although young in years, likewise has been a faithful public servant to the city, to the State, and to the Nation. He served in the Legislature of the State of New York and there created a most enviable record. He was then placed by the people on the bench of the municipal court and served there, creating a record that is still talked about by members of the appellate division and the higher courts. It has been said that in his 12 years on the bench never once was a decision of his reversed by a higher judicial body.

In this House he has served on the Appropriations Committee and has earned a reputation for his ability and his willingness to work hard. He now goes back to the bench to become the surrogate of the great county of the Bronx. We of the delegation know that the conscientiousness, integrity, and honor that Judge MCGRATH has always shown in all of his public positions will now be extended to the widow and to the orphan.

The junior member of our group who is departing, VICTOR ANFUSO, came into this Congress having had a distinguished record before he entered these Halls. He served in the United States Army under hazardous conditions during the last war, working under Gen. Bill Donovan throughout the Italian campaign, and was there awarded decorations for the splendid work he did for the United States.

On his return after the war he became engaged in boy work both in this country and in Italy. He became head of the Italian Board of Guardians, to look after children in New York of Italian blood who had been deprived of either one or both parents. He built this organization into one of the best known groups in the city of New York and provided succor for many poor unfortunates.

Victor is not leaving through his own choice. He is a victim of reapportionment, and a selfish reapportionment. It is a loss to this House, and it is a loss to this Nation.

To all three men in behalf of the delegation we extend our most heartfelt thanks for the hours they gave to us. We want them to know that those memories are golden coins that are going to be put into the treasure chests of our minds.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as has been expressed by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], three of the stalwart sons of New York are departing these sacred precincts to enter various callings within our State. They have carved out for themselves niches of fame in this Congress. The three are men of kindness and humility. They have always been just and wise in their work here. They have been truly sterling Democrats, always liberal in their point of view, extremely tolerant of the opinions of others. They have always followed the admonition Jefferson set forth in the Declaration that one must have a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. These men have always placed human rights above property rights.

JIM HEFFERNAN has been my friend for decades. He served on the Armed Services Committee of this House. While he seldom spoke on the floor, he brought to bear upon his work, in his office, and in the committee deliberations keenness of mind, rugged honesty, courage, and common sense. He leaves us to become commissioner of elections of the city of New York, a very high preferment. I am sure he will bring to bear upon his work there the same high talents he has shown to this House.

The second who is leaving us is our esteemed friend, CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH. He was a judge before coming to the Congress, and he will again wear the ermine of judicial office. He becomes a surrogate of Bronx County in our State. That is a very high judicial honor. New York has seen fit to place many accolades of distinction upon him. Our good will, I am sure, ever accompanies him wherever he may be.

Lastly, VICTOR L. ANFUSO is to leave us. He is an honored son of a great people. He served ably and conscientiously here on the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office. Great honors, I am sure, lie in store for Victor. It is interesting to note that because of his great humanitarian services, he has been honored by Pope Pius XI who designated him as a papal knight. We extend to Victor as we extend to JIM HEFFERNAN and CHRIS MCGRATH our cordial greetings, and to them we say "Hale and farewell."

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add my voice to the deserving tributes to our three retiring colleagues from the State and city of New York, JIM HEFFERNAN, CHRIS MCGRATH and VIC ANFUSO. I have known Congressman HEFFERNAN ever since I was a young man. He has been in public life in the Borough of Brooklyn and the City of New York for many decades, and has the distinction of having a brilliant record of decent, faithful public service. He has served with distinction in this House for the past 12 years and as a member of the former House Committee on Naval Affairs, participated in many patriotic and important deliberations connected with World War II. When we adopted the legislative reorganization act of 1946, and the present Committee on Armed Services was formed, JIM HEFFERNAN was thought of highly enough by the leadership to be given membership on that highly important committee. It was only in the past few days that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] remarked to me concerning the faithful services of our colleague, JIM HEFFERNAN, on his committee.

JIM has always been a quiet, unassuming, kindly, capable gentleman, respected here in the House by all of his colleagues and in the Borough of Brooklyn by all its citizens.

The second of these retiring colleagues, Judge MCGRATH, has been my friend since law-school days at Fordham University, almost 30 years ago. He also has a brilliant record in public life first as a member of the Assembly of the State of New York, and then as a learned justice of the municipal court of the City of New York. Since he was elected to the House of Representatives 4 years ago I have had the pleasure of sitting alongside him as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations. I do not believe that the attendance record of any member of that great committee is any better than the record of CHRIS MCGRATH in those 4 years of faithful service. He has served here with distinction as chairman of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations and has displayed his ability here on the floor of the House on many appropriations bills.

I have been acquainted with the third of our retiring colleagues, VIC ANFUSO, for almost a quarter of a century. I have known him during those years as a capable practicing lawyer in the Borough of Brooklyn. He has the great distinction of having been the founder of the Italian Board of Guardians in Brooklyn, which is one of the most effective charitable organizations functioning today in that borough—an organization which has done a splendid job of helping underprivileged and delinquent children. He took a leading part in influencing votes against communism in the elections in Italy in 1948. Through VIC ANFUSO and the Italian Board of Guardians over a quarter of a million letters were sent to folks in Italy to influence them to vote against the Communists.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. MILLER of California. As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I would like to pay tribute to the work of our colleague, VICTOR ANFUSO, on that committee. He has shown a fine knowledge and understanding of human nature, and his approach to the problems affecting the employees of the Federal Government has been a wonderful one and he has made a great contribution to them. I regret to see him leave.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman for his remarks concerning my friend and colleague. I might say it is my understanding that the Federal employees and particularly the postal employees have given general approbation to the activities of our colleague [Mr. ANFUSO] on the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. MILLER of California. I would like to confirm that.

Mr. ROONEY. I thank the gentleman once again.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I say that I sincerely wish these three fine gentlemen Godspeed, good health, and happiness in the future endeavors. I am sure that each will carry on in his new office or field of endeavor in a manner of which the membership of this great House of Representatives shall be justly proud.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the Democratic side have heaped encomiums upon our three retiring colleagues from New York City, Messrs. HEFFERNAN, ANFUSO, and MCGRATH, as to their services in this House. Lawyers have a way of saying that we speak without prejudice. In view of the fact that these gentlemen, or some of them, are likely to be engaged in political campaigns on the other side of the fence from my party, I should like to leave that subject where my colleagues have left it, "without prejudice."

I would, however, like to say a personal word about these three colleagues, and it would be inappropriate if I did not. We are almost a city-State in New York City. Our New York City delegation in the House, which has relatively few Republicans and a large number of Democrats, nevertheless enjoys warm personal friendships. Where affairs of New York City are directly concerned there has been excellent cooperation among the Members on both sides of the aisle, and this is true of the three gentlemen who are leaving us. I have found them friendly and cooperative and understanding and about as much as one could ask of colleagues of different political parties. I am sorry to see them go, and I wish them all good luck and Godspeed in whatever undertakings they may have ahead in the future, and long and happy lives.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I have not been as fortunate as the gentlemen from New York in having had a long acquaintanceship with Judge MCGRATH. I first came to know him when we both entered Congress at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. I have found Congressman MCGRATH to embody, in my opinion, all the attributes which a good public servant and Congressman should have. Congressman MCGRATH, I believe, understands that basically politics is not a science but an art, an art which takes into account emotional and spiritual factors that make democracy great and make this Nation the leader of the free world. Congressman MCGRATH has always been conscientious about his duties. He understands that when you come to the Halls of Congress you assume an obligation not only to your own district and its people but to the Nation. Congressman MCGRATH I believe also appreciates the fact that to be a great Congressman not only must you represent your district but that you should represent Washington to the people in your district. He also understands, like all great men who have served in this House, the necessity for doing your work on a day-to-day basis, and taking on the burdens of committee work and the work that you share with your colleagues. I regret seeing him leave the Halls of the Congress of the United States. From my acquaintanceship with him I am sure that he will make one of the greatest judges that the State of New York has ever produced, and it does have a long and fine history of producing great judges who have served their State and Nation. All of us see him leave with regret, and I for one hope that as the years go by, whether in the Halls of Congress or elsewhere, I may keep up my friendship with Congressman MCGRATH.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE].

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues from New York in expressing my deep regret and sincere appreciation to my departing colleagues. Their effective, direct, and efficient manner of application to the everyday tasks of the Congress has helped us solve many problems.

I believe the State of New York owes a great debt of gratitude to them for the fine work they have done in their behalf.

I feel it a distinct privilege to have served with these gentlemen in these honored Halls.

Expressing to them my appreciation of their service here, and assuring them and their loved ones of my continued remembrance, I wish my colleagues, JAMES A. HEFFERNAN, CHRISTOPHER G. MCGRATH, and VICTOR L. ANFUSO on the new road they will travel good health, continued success, and many of God's blessings.

Praying the Giver of all good gifts be good to them, and assuring them and their loved ones of my continued remembrance, I bid them farewell.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have known these three colleagues of ours who are about to leave these Halls all of my adult life, and I can say "Amen" to everything that has been said about them by all of our colleagues. It is really too bad that these men voluntarily give up their service in the Halls of Congress to go on to serve their State and their Nation in other fields of public endeavor. I cannot miss this opportunity of saying that when men of their high character, varied extensive experience, and great capabilities leave for other avenues of public service the fault lies with the Congress in not making it sufficiently attractive, no matter what the other honors may be, so that they can afford to stay on here. Few of them would leave, if the Congress performed its constitutional duty and provided adequate compensation for its Members.

But the purpose of my speaking now is to pay a tribute to each of these three men. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN has served long, ably, and well here. He will go on to service in his State and city as a member of the board of elections of the city of New York. CHRISTOPHER MCGRATH will return to the bench to a higher court than the one in which he served before coming here, and a very important court where I know he will serve well.

The service that yet awaits our colleague, Mr. ANFUSO, has not yet been announced, but we all know it will be a good and honorable one and it will make him happy in being able to carry on his work in our community.

I cannot let this moment go by without commenting on the fact that while each of these three men has always been active in philanthropic, communal, and civic work, and while they have also been active in the lay religious activities of their church, never once did they turn down the call of any other religious group or any racial or minority group that needed help, in the traditional American way. They were always in the forefront in all of those movements regardless of their make-up as long as they sought to improve the American way of life in the best American tradition.

So I sadly bid farewell to them as colleagues, but gladly welcome them to continued but new public service.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to yield to Judge MCGRATH.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, one would indeed be callous if he did not at this moment have a deep feeling of regret at leaving the Members of this body. I have been selected by my two colleagues from New York [Mr. HEFFERNAN and [Mr. ANFUSO] to express to those who have spoken and to those who have come over to wish us well, our sincere and our genuine thanks.

It seems particularly unfair that we should be the recipients of these kind words when those of you who are carrying on, working in committee, working in conference and working on the floor, caring for your constituents on through the years, are just sitting by without any words of praise being expressed to you. So, while we have been selected at the moment, I say it should be, rather, our place to take the floor and pay tribute to the Members on both sides of this aisle for the work they have been doing.

I am leaving the Congress with a deep and abiding understanding that on both sides of the aisle the Members of Congress are doing a remarkably fine job. Their compensation is definitely inadequate, and if I might inject a personal word I would say that if my fortunes were such that I could afford to stay here, no position of honor would ever take me away from the bosom of this congressional family or from these legislative halls.

In closing, I want to say to each and every one of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that never once have we exchanged an unpleasant word on the floor or in committee, without regard to party, so far as I am concerned. So I say to you a fond farewell, a deep and genuine thank you for the kindnesses that have been given to me and to my colleagues, and to all a personal and sincere thank you.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I join in all the nice things that have been said here about our colleague from New York, Judge McGRATH. Last November and December I took a long trip with Judge McGRATH and my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Our deceased colleague from Oklahoma, Mr. Schwabe, was also with us.

We traveled through the trust islands, on to Japan, to Korea, and to the war front. During this time I became better acquainted with Judge McGRATH than I had been before. I learned to know his heart, I learned to know the fine qualities which he possesses.

Judge McGRATH has a keen judicial mind. He is not only schooled in the art of justice so far as the law is concerned, but also in the art of justice so far as it affects his fellow man.

This Congress will lose a very fine legislator when Judge McGRATH retires. I am sure that the United States of America has to some degree at least been benefited by his service here in the Congress. I know that his people have received the finest representation that is possible for a people to receive through the efforts of a Representative here in the Halls of Congress.

As I stated, I regret very much that Judge McGRATH has decided to retire from this body, but I wish for him all the blessings and all the good things in life, and that also is my wish for his fine family. I learned on this trip that he was a great family man. He talked about his family a lot. He often said, "I enjoy my family; we have fine harmony," and he was very prompt in writing to them from the different points we visited. That is one of the fine characteristics of a true father and husband. He has all the qualities of a great statesman, and again I say, good luck to you, Judge, and may God be with you.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion go by without saying a few words concerning Judge McGrath, with whom I became very well acquainted, as the gentleman from Iowa has stated, on our trip to the Southwest Pacific and Korea last November and December. As the only majority party Member on that trip, it naturally befell to Judge McGrath the duty of addressing different groups, whether it be a small group of natives in Majura or in Truk or in Saipan or Guam, or the several large assemblages we met with on that tour. It was always the judge's prerogative to get up and talk to them for the Congress of the United States, and listening to him as I did time after time I could not but be proud that we had a man of his caliber along with us to sell the United States of America to those trust island inhabitants 9,000 miles southwest of Washington, D. C. But I was especially proud on the occasion of his addressing a battalion of Turkish troops, Grecian troops, and American soldiers up at one of the division headquarters in Korea. The judge really that day raised the morale of those boys on the fighting front in Korea.

I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has had to say about the character of that great gentleman, Judge McGrath of New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

RETIRING COLLEAGUES FROM NEW YORK

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to add a humble voice of tribute to my three esteemed and beloved colleagues from the great State of New York, Congressman HEFFERNAN, Congressman McGRATH, and Congressman ANFUSO, all of whom have enjoyed and recorded outstanding service in this body. It was my choice privilege to enjoy the friendship of each of these distinguished Members. I am very proud of the fact that they are friends of mine, that I have been fortunate enough to number them among colleagues that I have known in a very special way, colleagues whom I have particularly admired and esteemed for their patriotism, statesmanship, and meticulous devotion to duty.

It has been my special good fortune to know my valued and beloved friend JIM HEFFERNAN better than the other two because for several years we served together as members of the House Armed Services Committee.

Congressman JIM HEFFERNAN is one of the truly devoted public servants I have ever known. Scrupulous in the performance of his duties, able, conscientious, kindly and generous of impulse, tenacious and unyielding in principle, manly and courageous by instinct, forward looking in approach, this noble son of New York has left an indelible imprint upon the annals of this body.

Descended from a proud heritage of public-spirited, natively talented, patriotic forebears, JIM HEFFERNAN has ever strived for the cause of those inarticulate groups among us not always able to speak and strive for themselves. In him the underdog, the underprivileged, the poor, the helpless, the lowly, the oppressed had an able and indomitable champion who, while he clung uncompromisingly to the solid, spiritual values underlying the Constitution, has fearlessly displayed a moving and dynamic faith in the inexorable surge of orderly human progress.

Gifted to a very unusual degree with a profound understanding of his fellow men and women, he gave unselfishly of himself to help common folk. His word was his bond, his trust not easily won, but never betrayed, his friendship a meaningful thing because it rests upon the unbreakable rock of loyalty and devotion.

The family life of JIM HEFFERNAN might well be a model for those who believe, as I do, that the family unit is the very center of our civilization and must be preserved if we are to retain our precious way of life.

Devoted father, loving husband, loyal brother, he kept fast to the true virtues that bind individual members of a family closely together and in turn bind the family in patriotic dedication to church, community, State, and Nation.

As he leaves this body to assume a very distinguished public office in his beloved native city, my heart is stirred by a sense of regret that this Congress is losing such a valuable, dutiful Member, and by a sense of personal sadness that such a dear, loyal friend will not be regularly with us.

I am certain that JIM HEFFERNAN will bring great luster upon his new position, and I express to him and the family he loves so well my sincere best wishes that the future will bring them continued and even greater success, prosperity, and happiness.

Godspeed and good luck, Jim.

Mr. O'TOOLE. In conclusion, Judge, to you and to your two comrades who are leaving, we wish the very best of everything, and it could best be summarized with an old Irish toast "May ye be in heaven an hour before the Divil knows you're dead."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have leave to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Judge McGRATH is my friend. He has been since the early days of the Eighty-second Congress, when he helped me learn the ropes, find my way around. Chris is a grand gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I shall miss him. Good luck, Chris. You are going to make a terrific surrogate. Look at your record. It is listed below, add to it.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA, VOLUME 27, 1952–53

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS MCGRATH, Congressman, judge; born, New York City, May 15, 1902; son of Michael J. and Anna (Donohue) McGrath; graduated Clason Mil. Acad., Bronx, N. Y., 1921; LL. B. Fordham U., 1924; married Helen Gaffney, June 29, 1929; children: Michael, Terrence, Kevin Barry, Christopher, Mary Ann, Kathleen.

Admitted to New York State Bar, 1927; and practiced in New York City, 1927–35; justice of municipal court, city of New York, 1935–48. Served as member New York State

Assembly, 1928–35; rep. of 26th Cong. Dist., 81st Congress, U. S., since 1949. Mem. Delta Theta Phi. Democrat. Roman Catholic. K. C. Home: 3254 Parsifal Pl., Country Club, Bronx, N. Y. Office: 32 Broadway, New York.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, Judge CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH has represented a district in the Bronx, of New York, but his understanding of the problems before our Congress from the viewpoint of the broad national interest has been a great service to the House of Representatives and to the United States.

Judge MCGRATH has been an outstanding statesman here in the House. The people of New York will gain through his decision to accept a local office there, but the people of the Nation will lose through his retirement from Congress.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while I rejoice with my colleague, JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, over the new high honors which have been bestowed upon him by the city of New York, I must say that in the Congress we are going to miss him.

As a member of the all-important Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, he has rendered notable service which the men and women in the uniform of our country will long remember and for which all Americans can be grateful.

Mr. HEFFERNAN'S tenure in this House through six consecutive terms has been marked by the victory of the United States arms over tyranny in World War II, and now again the great mobilization of our forces against the threats and aggression of world communism. In these two great enterprises his wise, friendly, and active assistance and encouragement have been of inestimable value.

He will be missed in the conference chambers and in the Halls of Congress.

Mr. HEFFERNAN leaves us to take a high office in the city of New York. He will continue to be of great public service. He comes from a long line of public servants who contributed splendidly to the development of their own great city. His forefathers were among the Irish pioneers who settled in lower Manhattan and South Brooklyn in the early 1800's.

A graduate architect by profession, Mr. HEFFERNAN has applied the principles of this science also to the building of a stronger Democratic Party, through his service in its ranks and as an official for some 40 years, to the building of a better community through his activity in numerous fraternal and benevolent organizations—and most important of all—to the building of a greater America.

He might well have been the model for the statement by John Ruskin:

> Whenever men have become skillful architects at all, there has been a tendency in them to build high.

There is no limit I am sure to the heights to which JAMES J. HEFFERNAN will build.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to three Members of the New York delegation who are retiring at the end of this session of Congress: JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, and VICTOR ANFUSO.

I have known all three for many years, I have served with two of them in more than one Congress, and with one, VIC ANFUSO, in this last Congress. I have found all three of them to be honorable, conscientious, understanding, and truly loyal representatives of the districts from which they were elected.

JIM HEFFERNAN is leaving to become commissioner of elections of the city of New York; CHRIS MCGRATH to become surrogate of the county of the Bronx; and VIC ANFUSO to return to the private practice of law which he abandoned when he was called to serve his constituents in the Halls of Congress. All of us know that Vic would have returned in the next session had he not fallen victim to the vicious reapportionment of districts in New York City; and I hope that he will be rewarded by the electorate of Kings County by election to higher office in the near future.

We wish all of them Godspeed and success in their individual endeavors. The gain of the populace of New York will be a great loss to the Congress and to the entire Nation.

Since many of my colleagues have already gone into detail on the backgrounds of these Members, I do not think I should, at this time, repeat all that has been said, particularly since all of us here know exactly what each has stood for.

I see them leave with a sense of personal loss; yet with a feeling of sincere appreciation and gratitude for the fine job they have done here. It is my sincere hope that they will return to visit with us in the future to maintain the bonds of friendship which have been formed during the past years.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, adjournment of Congress is always the occasion of some sadness as we part with friends we have made during the months and years of our common labors.

It is particularly a matter of deep regret to me that the conclusion of this Eighty-second Congress means the retirement from service in our ranks of my highly esteemed colleague from New York, CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH.

In his two terms here, Judge MCGRATH has set an example of industrious and intelligent application to duty. His departure from the Capitol of the United States will be a loss not only to the people of Bronx County, who sent him to Congress, but to the House of Representatives as well. He has been a sturdy worker on the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of its legislative subcommittee.

His prior service as a member of the State Legislature of New York, and as a jurist on the bench of the municipal court of the city of New York, gave him both a practical parliamentary experience and a judicial perspective which fitted him for the fine record he has made in Washington.

Now the Democratic Party, of which he is a loyal member, has seen fit to promote his elevation to the position of surrogate. He leaves us to serve in this new field.

We are certain the capabilities of this scholarly, cultured, and energetic man will be ever more widely recognized and utilized by the community from which he springs.

Judge MCGRATH personifies that unique combination in modern politics—a student of literature, of history, and of human affairs, and, at the same time, a practical legislator.

I am sure I speak for all his colleagues here regardless of party when I wish for him all success in his new career. He leaves here a host of friends, and we shall not forget him.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, when a valued friend and colleague leaves this House for other pursuits, our good wishes for him are tinged with regret at his departure. In the New York delegation, many of us feel today as if we have been given more than our just portions of mixed emotions.

Three men who have meant a great deal to us are bringing to a close their service in the House. We are moved to pray that the other endeavors they will undertake as they continue their useful lives will prove fruitful and pleasant, and that they will be blessed with good health and contentment.

The roots of the Heffernans are firm in the soil of our beloved Brooklyn. They were implanted there before the War of 1812 by proud and self-reliant Irish pioneers. Our friend, the Honorable JAMES J. HEFFERNAN, has honored the bright heritage of his name, and the citizens of Brooklyn, of the great State of New York, and of this magnificent Nation have benefited from his years of conscientious public service.

JIM HEFFERNAN is not closing that record of service. It is no more than a fitting tribute to his unquestioned integrity and innate fairness that he has been called to the responsible post of commissioner of elections of the city of New York. Those of us who have been privileged to share his friendship know that he will discharge his new mission with diligence and distinction, in the public interest.

Since he came to the House in the Seventy-seventh Congress, our colleague has earned the respect and affection of Members from States lying far from his home. This has been no marvel, for his is not the narrow or provincial mind.

In recent years, JIM HEFFERNAN has brought his sound common sense to bear on the problems of our national defense as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. And, when it became necessary and desirable to reconstruct this Chamber, his professional attainments as an architect were not forgotten; he was named to the special committee which supervised this important work.

We do not relish the thought that this fine public servant no longer will serve here, but we rejoice that he will be serving still.

The Honorable CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH leaves us to seek return to the bench as surrogate of Bronx County, a high judicial post for which his attainments in the law fit him admirably. Judge MCGRATH established an enviable record of appellate sustention during his service on the municipal court of the city of New York. Bronx County gets a superb surrogate and, again, we can be

glad in the knowledge that one who has devoted many years of his life to the common weal is not forsaking public service as he departs this House.

Judge McGRATH has the breadth of viewpoint which useful public life demands. His experience has been extensive and varied. In legislative work his indoctrination came in another great deliberative body, the Legislature of the State of New York. There he established a fine reputation as a specialist in matters involving public education. In this House he has labored earnestly and with high competence on the important Committee on Appropriations, ranging across the globe when the policing of public funds demanded.

We wish the best of fortune for a fine friend, gentleman, and judge. We are sincerely sorry to lose his advice and comradeship.

Through the years that we have been friends, I have to regard with something akin to awe the depth of feeling for his fellow man which reposes in the great heart of the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO. In his relatively brief service in this House he has taken command of the hearts of scores of his colleagues. There is nothing of the superficial in VICTOR ANFUSO. He offered himself for Congress solely because of his intense conviction that public service, in whichever form the opportunity is presented, is an obligation of every citizen.

As he returns to his Brooklyn home and prepares for other endeavors, I know his only regret is that he could not accomplish more for the betterment of the existence of his fellow citizens. His is the selfless spirit—the devotion to ideals. Those who have served on committee with VICTOR ANFUSO know well that he will continue, in any field in which he labors, his crusade for a better way of life—a fuller realization of the Godly principle of brotherhood.

The happy family, the healthy family, and full opportunity for the young—toward these goals VICTOR ANFUSO has worked here, and he will not change his course or dilute his fuel of resolution.

May God find these three good friends worthy of His blessing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in so large a body as the House of Representatives—where advancement and influence grow with the years—it is rare that a Member of Congress in a single term is able to attain full recognition of his abilities and such a position of respect and affection as the gentleman from New York, Mr. VICTOR L. ANFUSO.

We all regret that he is retiring from this body.

As the Eighty-second Congress adjourns, I cannot let this moment pass without saying that the Representative from the Eighth District of New York has left his mark upon its record.

His conscientious and devoted service to his duties quickly earned the attention of the leadership of this House. As a member of House Administration Committee and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service he performed his share of the labors with energy and diligence.

Mr. ANFUSO as a founder of the Italian Board of Guardians and of the Citizens' Welfare Association in Brooklyn, as an operative for the Office of Strategic Services in the Mediterranean theater during World War II, and as a member of the bar of New York City, already had shown his talent for public service before coming to Congress.

For his humanitarian work among the youth of Brooklyn, particularly those who, like himself, came to the United States as the sons of immigrants, he was knighted by Pope Pius XI in 1946. He is a commander of the Knights of the Holy Sepulchre.

Mr. ANFUSO will be missed by the Members of the House of Representatives, but I feel sure I speak for all my colleagues when I predict for him a future bright with opportunity for even further service to his fellow citizens.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, permit me to pay a well-deserved tribute to one of my colleagues from my State, the Honorable CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH, of Bronx County, N. Y. Congressman McGRATH is leaving Congress because he has been designated by the Democratic Party as surrogate of Bronx County. May I congratulate and wish him well.

Few men in public life have been as consistent as he in following progressive legislation.

FEPC always found a champion in Congressman McGRATH. He joined many of us from the various States who believe implicitly in this program because it was a program of justice to men of all races, creeds, and colors. No force, no matter how strong, could make him deviate or make him accept any compromise.

As a member of the important House Appropriations Committee, he took the position that America had to become a leader of the world and that could only be accomplished by cooperating and aiding the peoples of other nations.

Congressman McGRATH served as a member of the Appropriations Committee for the Marshall plan that greatly aided the people of Europe. Again this year, he served on the Committee on Appropriations that dealt with the Mutual Security Program; and, to his everlasting credit, when, as a member of the subcommittee, he opposed the reactionary forces that attempted to cut the Israel program from the $70,228,000. This figure had been approved by the great Administrator of the Mutual Security Administration, Averell Harriman. Thanks to his efforts there was no cut in the grant to Israel.

The American Zionist Council, on July 3, 1952, said as follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McGRATH: May I, on behalf of the American Zionist Council, express appreciation to you for the warm and effective support you have given to Israel's inclusion in the Mutual Security Program during the last two sessions of Congress.

We know of your efforts on behalf of this program during the recent hearings of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. We were deeply pleased by the fact that this subcommittee, of which you are a member, last week recommended that the full amount previously authorized for Israel be appropriated without any reduction.

This cause is in accord with the best of American humanitarian tradition and, at the same time promotes American welfare, for the economic consolidation of Israel will enable this new democracy to make its contribution to the defense of the free world.

With gratitude for your concern and friendship,

Sincerely yours,

I. L. KENEN,
Washington Representative.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security Act again finds the vote of Congressman McGRATH on the correct side of the ledger. He voted to increase the benefits to the recipients of social security.

There came before the Congress in this session a bill known as the McCarran Immigration Act. I opposed it and alongside of me was Congressman CHRIS McGRATH.

As a State legislator he was in the vanguard that fought for social legislation. CHRIS McGRATH endorsed one of the first anti-yellow-dog contract laws He sponsored cafeterias for our public schools, tenures for our teachers. He carried to the assembly floor the fight to outlaw child labor. His whole legislative life has been dedicated to humane, progressive, liberal legislation.

The liberal cause in America will lose a strong champion in the Halls of Congress, but we all know that his kindness, his understanding, plus his judicial training of 13 years on the municipal court bench—the poor man's court—will hold him in good stead when he assumes the office of surrogate of Bronx County.

CHRIS McGRATH, I wish you well.

HON. CHARLES EATON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep regret as this session comes to a close that I am conscious of the fact that with its conclusion there will be removed from our midst by his own choice a colleague who has endeared himself to every Member of the House, regardless of political affiliations, during his long service of 28 years. I refer to the distinguished Member from New Jersey, CHARLES A. EATON, of the Fifth Congressional District of that State.

Dr. EATON, or "Charlie," as he is affectionately termed by his close friends, has served with distinction in this House for upward of 28 years. He was first elected to the Sixty-ninth Congress. He has served continuously since that time to the present, having been elected to each succeeding Congress, with majorities that have left no doubt of the high esteem in which he is held by the constituency he has served.

His service has been one that has exhibited outstanding ability and rare devotion to duty. His activity has not been limited to promoting the interests of the congressional district that he has represented, although he has done that in a highly satisfactory manner, but he has had a part—an important part—in advancing the welfare of our Nation in its international affairs.

In the field of foreign affairs he has been privileged, by reason of his long service as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—chairman for a time and ranking Republican member for many years—to exert a great influence in determining the policies of this Nation in relation to the other nations of the world. He was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, at San Francisco in 1945. He was also a member of the American delegation to United Nations General Assembly, at London in 1945, and New York in 1946. In the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House and in the international organizations to which I have referred, his voice was always raised in behalf of those principles that would strengthen the peace and security of all nations throughout the world. His influence in promoting world peace and advancing the cause of freedom and justice has indeed been great.

Dr. EATON has lived a life of great usefulness both in Congress and out of Congress. Few men have had the opportunity of service to their fellowman in so many and varied activities. In every one of such activities he has made a record of achievement that makes him outstanding. Recognizing his obligation to promote the welfare of his fellowman he has labored faithfully and well to accomplish those things that would be of lasting benefit to them. He has lived a useful life in the highest and truest sense of the word.

The good wishes of every Member of this House, regardless of political affiliation, go with him as his service ends, and it is our hope and prayer that he may enjoy many more years of health and happiness and that his usefulness may continue unimpaired.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART].

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House know it is very seldom I detain them with any remarks of my own on the floor. But on this occasion, I feel a compulsion to express some views of genuine regret over the fact that my distinguished colleague and beloved friend Dr. EATON of the Fifth District of New Jersey will not be a Member of the Congress after the conclusion of this session. His voluntary retirement from the Congress will prove to be a tremendous loss to his State and to his country. I assert, and I think I am within the bounds of accuracy, when I say so that Dr. EATON is the possessor of one of the great intellects of his time, and he has shown that to be a fact through a generation of high statesmanship on the floor of this House.

Long before I came to the House, 18 years ago, Dr. EATON was known to me by his high reputation. I had first heard of him as an eminent pulpiteer, one of the most famous ministers of religion in this country, both in the great city of Cleveland and later on in the Madison Avenue Baptist Church in New York City. I knew of him by his reputation for a flashing wit which captivated his auditors whether in his public addresses or private conversation. I knew of him because of his kindly but crushing satire which ended most controversies in his favor, and which was reminiscent of another clergyman, the immortal Dean Swift. I knew of him because of his mastery of language which served him in such good stead in so many of his high endeavors and which he has manifested so often on necessary occasions on the floor of the House.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. WOLVERTON] has referred to the great versatility shown in the life and career of our beloved colleague, Dr. EATON. As already stated here, he was one of the most eminent pulpit orators in America. His eminence was equally shown in the editorial office of Leslie's Weekly, one of the most famous and widely circulated and one of the most long lived publications in this country during the latter part of the nineteenth and the early part of the twentieth century. Then he came to the Congress, and although of a party different from my own, and although disagreeing with me on nearly every question of domestic policy, I am glad to join in tribute to the great wisdom and great patriotism and the profundity of thought and consideration which marked his every effort in dealing with the great questions that arise on this floor.

In the field of foreign policy, Dr. EATON was among the first to recognize the need for new, essential features in a foreign policy for the United States which would meet the necessities of a perilous world, and without partisanship but with only the interest of his country and the welfare of mankind at heart, he studied and fathered many of the best features of the foreign policy which now marks the conduct of the United States.

He was, as Congressman WOLVERTON related, one of the delegates from the United States to the International Conference in San Francisco, was one of the fathers of the body which at the time was regarded by most people as the hope of humanity, the United Nations.

Dr. EATON is a man not only of great intellect, he is a man of great heart, great kindliness, great love, and of a great desire to be helpful. He has been helpful to all who relied upon his helpfulness in time of need. He is a giant among the figures of his generation.

God has been extremely kind to him. He has preserved him vigorous in mind and body for more than fourscore of years. Today we say to him ave atque vale, hail and farewell, and we hope that the farewell part of this salutation is but temporary; that he will continue as his years will permit active in the public affairs of this Nation thereby contributing by his wisdom, his patriotism, his clear logic, his understanding of the needs of these precipitous times that helpfulness which has always marked his 28 years of service in this great legislative body.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when I was visiting the marines in Tientsin, China, in January 1946 a young snappy marine came up to me, saluted and said: "Congressman CANFIELD, I am Charles A. Eaton III. I think you know my grandfather."

That grandfather, who is about to leave the House on the completion of 28 years of faithful and effective service has been a congressional father to me during my many years of service on Capitol Hill. When I needed sound advice, he gave it to me; when I was sick he called on me; and when I needed encouragement, he was always close by to accord such. I can hardly remember a legislative day during my membership in this body that he has not put his arm around me in a friendly greeting.

It has been truly stated that Dr. EATON, as we affectionately call him, is one of the most important and lease publicized men in public life.

Beverly Smith, Washington editor of the Saturday Evening Post, wrote in 1948:

> Dr. EATON is a character from way back. He has crowded half a dozen lives into one. Forty-five years ago he was a nationally known pulpit orator, and the friend and spiritual adviser of John D. Rockefeller, the elder. Thirty years ago he played a leading role in America's feverish World War I shipbuilding effort. In his frail and bookish childhood he was regarded as a prodigy. In youth he was a husky farm hand and star football player. He preached his way through college. He has been a reporter, a labor-relations expert, a prosperous dairy farmer and the editor of a national magazine. He is a patriarch with 21 living descendants. He sees his time on earth as a marvelous adventure, and marvels seek him out.

It is "Doc" EATON's philosophy that he must take time off in life to ponder the higher strategy. He says: "If a man lets his vision become blurred with minutiae, he gets to playing the flyspecks instead of the notes."

Those who will recall his famous speech on the Marshall plan in which he declared that freedom was the distinctive glory of man will be interested to know that in 1901, when he was 33 years of age he wrote a book and in the first chapter he said:

> The earth has shrunk to a neighborhood * * *. No country or civilization is any longer isolated. * * * The mightly hand of God is pressing the nations together. Henceforth no man can live or die unto himself. * * * Into the political and commercial impulse which has dwarfed the globe * * * we must breathe the spiritual impulse of Christian debtorship, Christian love and brotherhood: else the new propinquity will mean anarchy.

The record will show that it was "Doc" EATON who months before Pearl Harbor warned that men's basic freedoms would soon be challenged by war which would appear first in the Pacific. And long before the Western World came to realize the menace of Godless communism, he was warning our people of its dangerous portents. With all our woes, however, he believes that this is still God's world and he says: "My faith is unshaken and undimmed. The human race was not intended by the Divine

Creator simply to make its starless and hopeless way from one oblivion to another."

It is my prediction that when the history of these troublesome years is written, the contribution of the distinguished dean of the New Jersey congressional delegation will make up one of its most wholesome chapters.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee is suffering grievous losses at the end of this session. We are losing my friend CHRIS HERTER, that brilliant student of world affairs; we are losing MIKE MANSFIELD, level-headed and patriotic; and we are losing the Nestor of the committee, "Doc" EATON.

Back in the eighties the white-maned elder statesman that we know now was known up in Novia Scotia as "BLACK CHARLIE" EATON, as he drove his oxen along the road, because he had black hair and a cousin of his named Charlie was fair. Later he became a Baptist minister, and I have heard of the trial sermon he preached with John D. Rockefeller in the audience. The text of his sermon was "The love of money is the root of all evil." In the next few days John D. Rockefeller asked him to play golf. John D., after they played in silence for a while, said, "Young man, I like you; you tell me what I ought to hear." And so he became the pastor of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio, and had a lifelong friendship with John D. Rockefeller and helped him to profit by that initial sermon, as Rockefeller showed by his generosity to all the world.

Dr. EATON might be called the first great labor mediator and conciliator in the work he did in the shipyards during World War I and in the years that followed. Then he was an editor; then he came to Congress, and for 14 years it has been my great privilege to serve beside him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We have complex, difficult, and controversial matters up there, as you all know. But he has been a guiding light, and in the Eightieth Congress he was the chairman of that committee when it launched important pieces of legislation such as the Greek-Turkish Aid Act and the Marshall plan, which might have well been called the Eaton plan.

His contributions up there in committee and down here on the floor are well known during these turbulent, difficult years, when we have grappled with new concepts in foreign affairs to meet new problems and new challenges abroad. He has demonstrated his ability to see a problem whole. One of his sayings that has remained uppermost in my mind is, "Let us not play the flyspecks instead of the notes."

He has still that psychic quality that causes him to have an insight into the collective mind and heart of a group, whether it be a congregation in a church or a congregation in the House of Representatives.

As we look back, one of the contributions of this man has been that he came here on the floor and preached to us, and, as he did with John D. Rockefeller, he told the House of Representatives what its Members ought to hear. He lifted us up time and again during our debates to a higher plane, to the point where we could see distant places around the world and gain a perspective in time so that we could serve our country better.

So as he leaves, after a wholesome life, we can think of him in our memories with love and respect. He was, with his wit, with his matchless eloquence, with his deep spiritual insight, with his great kindliness, a man among men, a man of God.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, genuinely and sincerely do I regret Dr. EATON's decision to leave the House of Representatives. But since he has made that decision, I welcome this opportunity to say with equal sincerity and genuineness a few of the things that are in my heart and mind about him.

It is now nearly 18 years since I first came to the House of Representatives as the result of a special election. The time between my determination to try to come to the Congress and my getting here was very, very short. I had not had much chance to find out anything about a Congressman's job or what he was expected to do. I came here as a comparatively young man, and as I have indicated, I was quite unaware of the problems confronting me.

Accordingly I began to look about me, particularly on my side of the aisle, for someone who could help me. And, parenthetically, may I say that in those days there were not very many Republicans here—about 88 strong, as I recall. I began to look about me for people who not only could help but would help me, and I found such a man in Dr. EATON. I became acquainted with Dr. EATON, and as many have already said, I soon came to respect his great capacity, his oratorical ability, the soundness of his judgment, and his qualities of leadership. Also I came to love him and to respect him for something that for me went deeper than that. I found in him one of the most kindly, helpful, gentle, understanding persons I have ever been privileged to know. I think you will all join me in that appraisal of the fundamental worth of Dr. EATON. I can well say of him that if I had not been privileged to have my own father, I would have picked Dr. EATON. He means that much to me.

I want to say another thing—that knowing him and being with him and being permitted to sit at his feet and to hear his expressions of views, opinions, philosophies, and ideals, has made a great imprint on my whole career here in the House of Representatives. What little success has come my way, may I say, has been in a very considerable measure a result of my association with Dr. EATON.

As he leaves the House of Representatives I know that he must find genuine satisfaction in a job well done. He could not but know the deep affection that all of us have for him. I cannot think of anything that would give any man greater comfort than to have that satisfaction that he so well deserves.

Every now and then someone speaks of a colleague who has been here during the 18 years that I have been here, and on occasion it is difficult for me to remember him because I had not observed him much. Perhaps that was because he had not been very active on the floor of the House. But I want to say for Dr. EATON that everyone who ever served with him, if it was but for one term, will never need to cudgel his brain to bring to mind the memory of that great stalwart American we all affectionately call "Doc" EATON.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] spoke of Dr. EATON's continuing service to his country. Why, of course, he will continue to serve his country, and serve it well. He will find the places, he will find the opportunities to serve as he always has served. In the years that are yet before him, while his voice will not be heard on the floor of the House, it will be heard wherever he is, and will continue to have that profound, vital effect on the affairs of this country that it has had here in the Halls of Congress.

Dr. EATON, I wish you Godspeed, and just to say again, I am mighty glad that I have known you.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I would not be true to my own convictions if I did not take this time to pay my highest tribute to Dr. EATON, to CHRISTIAN HERTER, and to MIKE MANSFIELD, who are leaving the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives.

MIKE MANSFIELD is running for the Senate and I sincerely hope that he is elected to serve in the other body where I know he would continue to be a driving force for the good of our country.

Dr. EATON and CHRISTIAN HERTER have the ability, the integrity, and the spirit of the great leaders who have made our country the best in the world. I will miss all three of these distinguished legislators because they are my friends and the loss of their influence for good will be felt by our committee, by the House, and by the entire United States. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to pay my tribute to three fine gentlemen who have more than earned the respect and applause of their colleagues as well as their country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS].

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when a great American leaves Congress it is a loss to the entire Nation. The collective standard of thought, the integrity of mind, the zeal for constructive thinking of those left are affected and put at a disadvantage. We all realize that during these days our country needs the best minds in Congress that can be produced in order to solve the grievous decisions that confront us. There can be no controversy about that.

And so, when a man of CHARLIE EATON's stature retires from public life, a vacuum is left which present a challenge to all of us. "Doc" EATON, by his

character, by his record of service to his fellowman and his country, by his example of tolerance, by his patience and sympathy for the feelings of others, by his gentle good humor, and by his hatred of sham, has brought renewed courage to all of us who know him as a friend. He is truly a great man, a great American.

But most of all the spiritual qualities of "Doc" EATON are predominant. His faith in mankind, his faith in America, and above all his faith in his God are what have inspired all of us during his service in the House. These attributes of dynamic leadership will linger long with us and will never be forgotten. He has shown us what true Americanism really is, and we are better men and women for having known him.

He has certainly earned rest and relief from his labors, and I join with his many friends in wishing him in the days to come all the best that life can give. He can look back over his years of service to his country with the words of the Master ringing in his ears, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in these words of praise for Dr. EATON, because we have all known him as a good and true friend. I think somebody should describe him for the RECORD, so that those who read the RECORD 100 years from now can have an image of the gentleman's appearance. Here is a man who is 6 feet 2 or 3 inches tall, weighs about 225 pounds, has a body like a football player, and, for those of us who have known him for some years, is completely ageless. He has a shock of snow-white hair, more hair than the average Member of the House. He has a penchant for light-colored suits and for red neckties.

Doctor, we are recording for posterity what you look like.

My good friend, JOHN VORYS, said, "When you go up and feel his arm, it is just as firm as it always has been. It is like grabbing hold of the leg of a mule." That is strength personified.

"Doc" has a characteristic we admire. That is friendliness. When he finds sinners in the path of righteousness in these Halls, I have heard him behind the scenes try to bring them back on the right path again.

We who came on the Foreign Affairs Committee on the majority side in the Eightieth Congress know what a fine chairman he was. In fact, on the Foreign Affairs Committee there was no talk about who was chairman; rather, we sat around the table as equals. His reorganization of the committee, complementing the geographic subcommittees with functional subcommittees, assigning members as chairmen of each of these subcommittees, gave all of us a chance to work and to feel we were part of foreign policy.

I want to say something further about "Doc's" attitude on foreign policy. He has interested a new generation in it. He has made those of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee feel we are part of the world in which we live and that we have a very great responsibility in trying to have the United States live up to its responsibilities in this world.

When "Doc" talked to us younger members on the committee, he would say, "Don't get entangled in these current things. Keep your eyes toward the horizon. Don't keep looking down at your feet to see what your next political step is going to be. You will do better to take the long view of policy." I know of no better advice. Those of us that have taken it in spite of the troubled foreign scenes have been successful.

I believe the Congress is to be complimented on having such good leadership as we have had in Dr. EATON.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse everything that has been said about CHARLIE EATON. There is an old saying that great men are known for the fact that they never overlook the little things, and that they never overlook helping those who need their help no matter how small it may be. During my first term in Congress, I needed help. I needed it badly. I have a number of fine agricultural counties in my district. I had no farmers' bulletins to my credit. Each mail was bringing requests from the farmers of those counties for bulletins which I could not provide. I inquired of my friends in the House where I could get some farmers' bulletins, and someone suggested that I see CHARLIE EATON. I immediately went to his office. He was sitting in a chair in the middle of his reception room. When I walked in, he looked up at me and said, "Young man, what can I do for you?" I was particularly complimented when he said "young man." I told him of my need for farmers' bulletins, and he then said, "Did Iowa ever do anything for New Jersey?" I said, "No, and it never will." He smiled and said, "How many bulletins do you need?" I said, "I would like to have 1,000, but I would be very happy if I could receive 500." He said, "All right, young man, I will see what I can do for you." I thanked him and went out. Later that day his secretary phoned my secretary and advised us that CHARLIE EATON had ordered 25,000 farmers' bulletins placed to my credit. I have never had any need or want of farmers' bulletins from that day to this. I think that little incident tells a volume of the greatness of the character of CHARLIE EATON. He was an inspiration and a help to me in all the years that I have been in the Congress. He is a great man. He has performed a great service for his State and his Nation as well as for the entire world. Like CHARLIE HALLECK, I wish him Godspeed in everything and regret that he is leaving us.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I regard it as a distinct privilege to pay tribute to our beloved Member, Dr. EATON. In my 10 years of association with him I have enjoyed the warmth of his friendship, the sparkle of his humor, and those gentle qualities that are the real mark of character and achievement.

It is with good reason that we affectionately refer to him as "Old Foxy Grandpa." Only those of us who have worked closely with him over the years know how much he contributed to the molding of American foreign policy. With his fine sense of accommodation he made each of us a member of the team. Under his wise guidance we worked hard—and we loved him for it.

Partisan considerations did not mark his thinking. He was, and is, a stanch Republican. But when his country's interests were involved, he called them as he saw them. It has been one of the most inspiring periods of my congressional service to work with Dr. EATON. In a torn and embittered world we need men of his stamp and leadership.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on previous times during the consideration of bills on the floor of the House, I have said in debate that it is difficult for us, no matter how strong we might be, but with our human weaknesses, to see history in the making. Despite that fact, history is being made. The results of what we do in this body and what Americans do during this trying period in their thinking and the forming of public opinion will be evaluated by historians of tomorrow.

It is very difficult in a living generation where men and women are under severe strain, emotionally and otherwise, to see the course that history is taking. The amazing and the pleasing thing to me is that in these trying days public opinion throughout the United States is very strong in recognition of the fact that danger confronts our country and the necessity for preparation and defense in event the emergency takes a more serious course. Men and women in this body and outside may differ about this or that piece of legislation or this or that policy. Basically, public opinion in America is very sound and strong today. Yet we are living in one of the most trying periods of the known history of man.

Let me refresh your memory about the days succeeding the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia when the very Constitution that we all love was in process of being ratified by the Original Thirteen States:

On December 6, 1787, Delaware unanimously ratified the Constitution through its duly elected officials of that State at that time.

On December 18, 1787, New Jersey unanimously ratified the Constitution of the United States.

On January 2, 1788, Georgia unanimously ratified the Constitution of the United States.

On January 9, 1788, Connecticut ratified it by a vote of 128 to 40. Forty members of that body did not think the Constitution of the United States was for the best interests of the people of the Original Thirteen States.

On April 26, 1788, Maryland ratified the Constitution by a vote of 63 to 11, and they proposed 28 amendments to the

Constitution as a condition of ratification.

Pennsylvania, on December 12, 1787, ratified the Constitution by a vote of 46 to 23.

Massachusetts, on February 6, 1788, ratified it by a vote of 187 to 168. Mark you, the emotions of the living generation, all fine men, all men for independence at that time, but the differences of opinion that existed. Yet that was only ratified by a vote of 187 to 168, and there were proposed nine amendments.

South Carolina, on May 23, 1788, by a vote of 149 to 73, with four amendments proposed.

New Hampshire, on June 21, 1788, by a vote of 57 to 46, and they proposed 12 amendments.

Virginia, on January 25, 1788, by a vote of 89 to 79, and they proposed a Bill of Rights and 20 amendments as a condition of ratification.

New York, on July 26, 1788, by a vote of 30 to 27, and they proposed 32 amendments.

North Carolina, on November 21, 1789 with a declaration of rights and 26 amendments.

Rhode Island, on May 29, 1790.

Now, what has that got to do in connection with the eulogies we are paying our distinguished friend and colleague, Dr. EATON, today? Everyone who has ever served in this body is a fine American. We have our differences of opinion. As I say, it is difficult to see history in the making, yet history is being made.

Dr. EATON, years ago before World War II, was a leader, a man of vision who looked ahead, a man of courage who had a glimpse of what faced the world if Hitler ever got control of Europe and attained his ambitions. He saw the danger that confronted not only our own country but also the peoples of other nations of the world. A man of God, a man who believes in the dignity of the individual, a man who was willing to do everything he could to preserve governments of law under God; he was truly a man of vision, one of the most visionary men of this body. During this trying year, and again after World War II when others of us, our vision dimmed, were attempting to grope along and get a glimpse of what was to come and what was the right thing to do, Dr. EATON was a beacon light of soundness of vision and of courage of action.

He has been a tremendous personal influence to me, a man whose nobility of character is outstanding, and which was bound to have its effect upon each and every one of us. I regret very much that he is leaving this body, but he can leave it with the knowledge that he has made as much contribution as anyone else has in our country during the trying period preceding World War II and succeeding it to this very date in looking ahead and seeing the danger that confronted the free world and our country and his determination to take a pathway that would be for the best interests of ourselves in the first instance, and the best interests of the other men and women who wanted to be free, and in the best interests of the possible future permanent peace. He leaves here with a record that will always be outstanding in the annals of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to follow the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, and to take the corollary of what he said in speaking of the great vision of Dr. EATON. For what Dr. EATON has impressed me with as a person and as a legislator has been that he holds what he believes in sincerely, and he believes that when men live together and work together it does not engender hate and suspicion, but on the contrary it engenders love and the opportunity for a better life. I think that has been the fundamental source of Dr. EATON's strength and inspiration to all of us.

He has rendered wonderful service in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I think few of us can evaluate adequately the contribution he made toward the determination of our future in his support of the European-recovery program and similar legislation in the years from 1947 to 1948 when he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Not alone the American people, but the people of the whole free world owe him a very great debt of gratitude.

Dr. EATON has also expressed on this floor something that is very precious to me and I think to every Member, and that is the faith that he has in his fellowmen, individually as well as collectively. It has been a real influence in my life and I feel it has been the same kind of influence in the life of every Member.

While Dr. EATON carries the weight of years on his shoulders, yet he still impresses us as a man of great vitality whose influence is strong, vital, and good, who still has many years to come. As for ourselves and I know I speak for every one of us, we wish for him as he leaves us many many years of rest, happiness, and fruitful work, because he could not be happy without work.

And a final word about Dr. EATON, to show his youth, his many years of youth, is the fact that he makes his influence so felt among younger men and impresses them with his zeal. It is not easy to remain so many score years young.

And out of the depth of love and affection which we all have for him, especially the newer Members for whom he has done so much, as my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said so well, we wish for you Dr. EATON, many years of long and happy life. We feel that you are just going on your way as you always have, that you are not finishing but again beginning.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, our Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if I have ever known a man to whom I could apply the phrase "a scholar and a gentleman" it is Dr. CHARLES EATON. He measures up to the highest standards of anyone in our high civilization. His has been a rich life because it has been spent in service. Service is the greatest word in all the language and I pity the man who passes this way who has not been in service to somebody or to something in some way.

Dr. EATON has served his day and generation. I appreciate beyond expression the friendship of Dr. EATON and I may say that the love he has given me throughout the years has been an inspiration to me, as I am sure it has been to every Member of this body, always cheerful, always in good humor, even in the tensest moments of debate. He is really a happy debater, he is a happy warrior, he is a great warrior.

God bless him and keep him that he may serve his country longer and give him the strength to live to do that service.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would not be true to a sense of a deep gratitude to Dr. EATON, if I did not take the floor at this time for the purpose of adding a few inadequate but sincere words to the splendid tributes that have been paid the gentleman from New Jersey here on the floor this afternoon.

I came to this great body in the Eightieth Congress and it was my privilege and my good fortune to be assigned to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which committee was then under the chairmanship of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. I have come to have as deep an affection for Dr. EATON as I would have for a member of my own family. He was never too busy to stop for a friendly word, an encouraging pat on the back, a word of suggestion, a word of help.

Certainly, America is a better place in which to live today, because CHARLES EATON lived and gave to this country devoted service in the House of Representatives. Not only is this a better country in which to live, but it is a better world and it is a safer world today, because of the unselfish and farsighted service he has rendered.

As Dr. EATON leaves the Congress I am sure that he takes with him the love and the respect of Members on both sides of the aisle of this great forum.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, there is always a mixed note of sadness in the last days of a session of Congress. Members of course, are very happy to be freed for the moment of their responsibilities but there is always sadness in our friends leaving if only temporarily.

That friendship in the House between Members on both sides of the aisle is a tangible, palpable thing. You can feel it as you walk into the Chamber and as you walk around the corridors in pursuance of your duty. That I think has been illustrated by the number of Members on the other side of the aisle who today have spoken in eulogy of Dr. EATON and certainly exemplified by the elo-

quent speeches made by our good friend, the majority leader, and our very much beloved Speaker of the House. That note of sadness on the last day of the session this year I think is accentuated by the fact that we are truly losing one of our finest, one of our ablest, and one of our best beloved Members. As a very much younger man I can recall years ago that Dr. EATON was known to me and known to all of New Jersey as one of our outstanding public citizens. I did not have a personal acquaintance with him until I first ran for office in the House of Representatives. In 1944 Dr. EATON made a special trip from his district, which is removed from mine by 125 miles or so, to visit me and see if he could be of any assistance to me, when he should have been taking a vacation. That is the kind of thing that he was doing for friends and for complete strangers. He is a fine man in the best sense of the word. On the rare occasions when I had to disagree with some of his philosophy, and I have always done so with deep personal reluctance, Dr. EATON, instead of in the slightest degree resenting that disagreement, facetiously referred to me on some occasion as his good left hand. As he leaves the House of Representatives I can tell him, as we have told him this afternoon, that the House of Representatives truly loves him.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I came into this House in the Seventy-fifth Congress. At that time I was a lot younger, a lot more inexperienced, than I am today. I am very, very frank to admit to you that it was all quite confusing to me. To me it was the greatest degree of chaos that I had ever experienced. But, I was fortunate to have as my neighbor the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey. His calm counsel and sterling example and his profound wisdom was the greatest help that I ever received in this body. I, too, learned to love Dr. EATON, and I consider him to be the finest type of public servant that this country has or could produce. Unselfish, devoted to his party, devoted to his country, but at all times his thoughts, his ideas and his words have been characterized by a Christian philosophy, a philosophy that had no sting attached to it, a philosophy of forgive and forget, a philosophy of forget and overlook the weakness of other men. During the trying days before World War II there was no more patriotic, unselfish and strong American in this House than the gentleman from New Jersey. He was a source of inspiration to each and every one of us who did not have the vast fund of knowledge that he had at his disposal. I think, Doctor, that you are making a serious mistake in leaving the Congress of the United States. Truthfully, despite those things that you will hear about in the next 2 weeks at the Chicago convention, there are very few men that this country needs, although there will be a great effort by many of them to tell you that we do need them. But, I do feel that there is a need in the legislative halls of the Congress of the United States for Dr. EATON. We need his experience, we need his counsel, we need his clarity of vision. We sincerely hope, if he will not change his mind and decides to return to the green pastures, that he will be happy, and that wherever he goes the good Lord whom he worships so well will place His arms about him and preserve him for his family and for his friends for many years to come.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD if they so desire, otherwise within 5 days, in regard to Dr. EATON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will not be the same without "Doc" EATON. We will miss that shock of snow-white hair, that quick wit and that resonant oratory which have for so many years graced the Halls of Congress.

The good humor and kindliness of the dean of New Jersey's congressional delegation in his relationship with all other Members of the House have been outstanding.

In his career in the House—only started in his later years after he had had a full life and important duties in the ministry and other Christian callings—he has rendered notable service to his district, the State, and the Nation.

This was especially true in the Eightieth Congress when, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he had to pilot through Congress most important legislation leaning toward preserving the peace of the world.

The outstanding record of the Republican Eightieth Congress in foreign affairs is largely the result of his inspired work.

May he have many years of usefulness and contentment with his children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the House and the people of the United States are about to lose the services of an outstanding public servant. Dr. EATON'S decision to retire from the legislative scene after 28 years of faithful devotion to the country he loves so well, caused sorrow in the hearts of all who have been privileged to know him.

His kindness and understanding will always be remembered. Friendship with him means more than an empty word. The joy of life in the twinkling of his eyes warmed the day for all of us in contact with him.

"Doc" has been blessed with a fabulous memory and a sense of humor of the nth degree. He could captivate and charm the most hostile audience with a flow of oratory mixed with native wit.

As the years have passed for him the youth of his heart and mind remained. Few can match his zest for life.

In the years enriched by "Doc's" contribution through the ministry, in public relations and in the Halls of Congress with gentility but still with force he has fought a constant unswerving battle for the good of mankind.

In the few years I have had the opportunity to enjoy my association with Dr. EATON as a colleague in the House and Representative of the people of New Jersey, I have acquired the same respect and admiration for him so plainly demonstrated by the other Members.

"Doc" our fondest hope is for many happy years ahead for you—with the blessing of good health. No one more richly deserves a time of peace and comfort, a time filled with the memories of your record of achievements and the love and affection of all your countless friends. Congratulations for a job well done and best of luck for the future.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to Dr. CHARLES EATON for what he has meant to me during my few years of service in Congress. Like most men who have recently come to Congress I soon was attracted by the friendliness and the excellent example of Dr. EATON. He made me feel that I too was a part of this great body with an obligation to serve our great Nation and the cause of world peace with an earnest devotion.

The fact that Dr. EATON and I are across the aisle from each other politically has never made any difference in our friendship. More than any other Member, I have sought his council on difficult decisions and I have utter confidence in his honesty, integrity, and his ability.

Dr. EATON, I regret that you are voluntarily leaving the Congress. May the years ahead continue to bring to you and your loved ones, happiness and opportunities for continued service.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Dr. CHARLES EATON. It is a matter of great regret to all of us that he is retiring from this body, where he has served with such brilliance and distinction.

When I first came to Congress I had a contact with Dr. EATON because of his nephew, William R. Eaton, of Denver, who served as a Member of Congress from the First Congressional District in Colorado for two terms. Some of my most pleasant moments in this House have been spent with Dr. EATON. I have never met a man with a more charming personality, and he was always willing to tell of his wide and varied experiences. Dr. EATON has made a most valuable contribution to the spiritual, industrial, and public life of our country. I will not recite his many accomplishments, many of which have already been mentioned. It has been a great honor and privilege to serve in the House with this distinguished American. All of our lives have been enriched by being associated with him.

I want to wish for Dr. EATON many years of happiness. I hope he will fully enjoy the leisure which he so well deserves.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Doc. EATON is one of our American immortals of this generation. To strive to eulogize him would appear feeble indeed. His deeds bear best and eloquent tribute to this great American.

Strength, ruggedness, wisdom, purposefulness, determination, never-say-die spirit are his attributes. But there is nothing hard, or metallic, or impersonal about this giant of a man, this great American statesman. His whole being is permeated with warmth, sentiment, affection, the cheering and comforting qualities of the heart.

He combines the fortitude of the old New England founding fathers, a section where he spent his youth whence derives, I am convinced, much of his strength, with the breath of vision of a true statesman and the deep spiritual faith of a true humanitarian.

"Doc" EATON bears every mark of greatness, best of all, I think his warm, genial, unbounded love of his fellow man, in short, his plain, simple understanding and sympathy.

Yet his record is not yet complete. Glorious as it has been here in this body, his public service will continue. Of that I am fully persuaded.

May he have many more happy, constructive years and may his benign influence and beatific presence long be felt in our midst. Happy landings, Doc.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I first met the Honorable CHARLES EATON at table in January 1951 at the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce dinner here in Washington. I had read much of this distinguished Representative from New Jersey. Our State motto is "Liberty and prosperity." CHARLIE EATON personifies that motto. Liberty, then comes prosperity. At the dinner I came face to face with this great gentleman. My talk was on Korea and its Christian communities. Mr. EATON listened attentively. After the talk he shook my hand. He is a man of the cloth, a man of God. I regret he is leaving. I carry with me memories of his fiery talks against aggressors and tyrants.

Mr. EATON is young in heart. He can make you laugh—a rarity these days.

Here is what is said of him, in part, officially:

BIOGRAPHICAL DIRECTORY OF THE AMERICAN CONGRESS, 1774–1949; AND WHO'S WHO

EATON, CHARLES AUBREY (uncle of William Robb Eaton), born in Nova Scotia, March 29, 1868; attended the public schools; was graduated from Acadia University, Nova Scotia, in 1890, and from Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass., in 1893; pastor of the First Baptist Church, Natick, Mass., 1892–1895, of the Bloor Street Church, Toronto, Canada, 1895–1901, and of the Euclid Church, Cleveland, Ohio, 1901–1909; moved to Watchung, Somerset County, N. J., in 1909; pastor of the Madison Ave. Church, New York City, 1909–1919; sociological editor, Toronto Globe, Toronto, Canada, 1896–1901; associate editor, Westminster, Toronto, Canada, 1899–1901; head of the national service section, U. S. Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation from Nov. 1917–Jan. 1919; editor of Leslie's Weekly in 1919–1920; elected as a Republican to 69th and 12 succeeding Congresses (Mar. 4, 1925–Jan. 3, 1950.)

Expert Ind. Relations. Apptd by Pres. Roosevelt as a U. S. del. to the U. N. Conf., San Francisco, Feb. 28, 1945, signed the Charter June 26, 1945. Home, P. O. Box 126, Plainfield, N. J.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, in the retirement of Dr. EATON from Congress, our country loses one of its most devoted servants. In my service in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congress and during this session of the Eighty-second Congress, I have been aided and inspired by his wise counsel and helpful guidance.

It is a great pleasure to know that Dr. EATON intends to remain in residence in Washington where those of us who love him and admire him will be able to enjoy his genial company. We wish him long life and happiness as he ceases the arduous duties of serving the public.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, our esteemed colleague from New Jersey, "Doc" EATON, as he is affectionately known to all of us, is retiring to private life. We shall all miss him, not only for his kindly and friendly self, but for his sage counsel and wisdom. In his more than fourscore years, CHARLES AUBREY EATON has devoted himself wholly to public service. He has lived many lives in one, all of them outstanding for his unselfish dedication and untiring efforts in behalf of his fellowmen.

When Dr. EATON came to the House of Representatives in March 1925, he had already had a distinguished career in the pulpit. He brought with him to the House a rare depth of understanding of human problems that provided a broad foundation for his new career of public service.

Among the qualities for which we all love "Doc" EATON, and which have helped to make him a truly great man as well as a brilliant legislator, are his innate sense of fairness and his constant desire to help others. These basic qualities were emphasized during his chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Those who have worked with Dr. EATON as we in this House have, have all come to hold him in affectionate esteem and admiration. His self-effacing modesty is as strong a characteristic as is his desire to get the right things done the right way. This has caused him to be described as "one of the most important and least-publicized men now in public life. A brilliant legislator, still strong and subtle at 80, he gets results—and lets the credit go."

Well, Mr. Speaker, dear old "Doc" EATON can let the credit go. He is too great a man to be concerned with it. Nevertheless, in the minds and hearts of all who have been privileged to serve and work with him, he shall always have our love, our esteem and our good will. We regret to see him retire, but none would deny his well-earned right to what we hope will prove many long years of health, happiness, and tranquillity.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for many years I sat next to Dr. CHARLES A. EATON, of New Jersey, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House of Representatives. Dr. EATON was the ranking Republican member of this important committee.

Now he is stepping aside and does not intend to stand for reelection to Congress. All of us will miss his brilliant mind and his fine oratory.

We wish him Godspeed and contentment with his devoted family. He has served his country in times of great stress. May his retirement years be many.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, for 30 years I have had the honor and pleasure of serving in Congress with the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. CHARLES A. EATON.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to be the recipient of Dr. EATON's friendship, and thus I was able to know what a kindly and genial nature is his.

Dr. EATON is a man of great erudition and during his long service as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which he was formerly chairman, our friend EATON demonstrated great ability. As all of those who have served long here with Dr. EATON will remember, he was a master in the presentation of his case to the House.

I have been a resident of Cleveland since practically the beginning of the present century and this fact has made it possible to know about Dr. EATON, what the other Members of the House do not know, and that is that Dr. EATON was a very distinguished clergyman in Cleveland for a number of years. During the very early part of the present century Dr. EATON, during his residence in Cleveland, acquired the reputation of being an outstanding pulpit orator.

I am sure that Dr. EATON leaves the House with the best wishes of every Member.

Fare ye well, Friend EATON, and may you enjoy the greatest possible blessing, namely, true harmony.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, after 27 years of brilliant service in the House of Representatives Dr. CHARLES AUBREY EATON is retiring to private life. We who have been privileged to work with "Doc" EATON know this means not retirement to inactivity but the commencement of another career in a long life distinguished by outstanding successes and achievements in many fields of service. Dr. EATON is a man of such great vitality and influence for good that in the many years still before him he will seek and find further opportunity to serve his fellow men.

Dr. EATON was born in Nova Scotia March 29, 1868. After attending the public schools he graduated from Acadia University in 1890 and in 1893 from the Newton Theological Institution at Newton Center, Mass. His great intellect and oratorical ability, coupled with his sound Christian philosophy, made him nationally famous as a minister. He served as pastor of the Euclid Avenue Baptist Church in Cleveland and later of the Madison Avenue Church in New York City. While in Cleveland Dr. EATON was the pastor and spiritual adviser of the elder John D. Rockefeller.

In the years that followed Dr. EATON became editor of several important publications, including Leslie's Weekly, one of the most famous and widely circulated magazines during the first part of the century. He became an industrial-relations expert and did magnificent work as a labor mediator and conciliator in the shipyards during World War I and in subsequent years. Moving to the beautiful agricultural sections of New Jersey, "Doc" EATON became a prosperous dairy farmer.

"Doc" EATON was 57 years old when he came to the Congress in 1925, bringing

with him the broad vision and wisdom accumulated during his rich experiences as minister of the Gospel, editor, industrial relations specialist, and farmer. As early as 1901 he had written:

No country or civilization is any longer isolated. The earth has shrunk to a neighborhood. * * * The mighty hand of God is pressing nations together.

During his first term in the House of Representatives, "Doc" EATON was assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When he became chairman during the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress he had behind him nearly a quarter century of experience as a committee member, and had become an outstanding expert in foreign affairs.

As chairman, he initiated changes in committee procedure which have become permanent improvements, notably in a modification of the rules to insure adequate and equitable interrogation time for all committee members, both junior and senior, and in the further development of the subcommittee system.

If not the first, "Doc" EATON was certainly one of the earliest exponents of nonpartisanship in foreign affairs. It was under his able and brilliant chairmanship that the Greek-Turkish aid legislation and the original Marshall plan legislation, forerunners of the present mutual-security program, were adopted by the House of Representatives.

"Doc" EATON has been a living inspiration to us. It is a remarkable tribute to his greatness that he has and still does exercise great influence in the lives of much younger men. All who have had the honor and privilege of working with him hold him in deep affection and esteem. Although sharp and ready of wit he has never been unkind, but has always gone out of his way to lend a helping hand and extend the benefit of his sage advice. Never a seeker of the limelight, "Doc" EATON'S extreme modesty has kept hidden countless acts to advocate the welfare of others. It is no wonder that we all deeply regret his decision to retire, while at the same time we acknowledge that he has many times won the right. "Doc" EATON'S life has been a blessing to his fellow men in many ways. In return "Doc" EATON has been blessed with a strength and vigor that still keep him young in body and spirit. We, his friends, know that he is not really retiring. He is simply embarking on another phase of an already full and rich life. In the many years ahead of happiness we wish for him, we know he will find ways to continue his service, born of his love of the Lord and of his fellow men.

The Congress of the United States will sadly miss "Doc" EATON.

In closing, I must say a word in regard to what "Doc's" friendship has meant to me personally.

I became chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee early in the first year of the Eighty-second Congress, due to the death of another great and good man, Judge Kee, who had succeeded Dr. EATON as chairman. Always I found it comforting and helpful to find "Doc" sitting by my side. Out of the abundance of his wisdom and experience came generous and nonpartisan advice, but only when I asked and needed it—which was often. When tense moments came during hearings, wise, philosophic and nonchalant quips from his quick and charitable mind cast oil on the troubled waters.

But most of all, I shall miss his presence on the hill as a warm, tolerant, fearless and understanding personal friend.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Newark Sunday News with reference to Dr. EATON which contains information I think the House would be pleased to have.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

(The article is as follows:)

EATON AUTOBIOGRAPHY WAITED—STORY OF REPRESENTATIVE'S 83 YEARS SHOULD BE "DELECTABLE DISH"

(By Arthur Sylvester)

WASHINGTON.—Representative EATON, Republican, Fifth District, New Jersey, has done about everything in life. But now that he is retiring from political office—something those of us who have watched "Doc" EATON here still can't imagine—there is one thing he has not yet done.

That is to complete the four-volume autobiography he has been working at off and on. What his friends want him to do is finish the account of 83 years of a fiercely individualistic life which has been tempered by a deep feeling of kinship with and friendship for men and women everywhere. If the account is as rich and salty as "Doc" EATON'S private or even public speech it will be a delectable dish.

He has been writing it in longhand in composition books and his secretary has been typing it. His friends are thinking of giving him a recording machine into which he can tell his story, because—although he has a way with the pen—the full man comes out in his spoken word.

A MEMORABLE FIGURE

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is full of his gems of speech and those who have heard him in the full majesty of oratorical flight chuckle in recollection. During the 14 consecutive terms he held office as Congressman from the Fourth and now the Fifth District he has been a memorable figure.

Whether presiding with a firm grip over the Foreign Affairs Committee while the Republicans were in power or striding across the Capitol Plaza, hatless, and coatless, a shock of white hair atop a big powerful figure that belies its age, the Congressman is an imposing gentleman.

Curiously, while today he might be classed as an American Tory domestically speaking, it was two liberal Democratic Presidents, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, who made use of his talents. Under the former he served on the United States Shipping Board during World War I. Under the latter, during World War II, he was in the American delegation that helped write and adopt the United Nations Charter at San Francisco.

Those were the days when people were saying, "Let's not be beastly to the Russkys" but "Doc" EATON was saying: "No matter how much perfume you sprinkle on a pile of manure, you can't change its character."

VIEWS ON CHARITY

As a former Baptist preacher, EATON believes and practices charity but in politics, he thinks it begins at home. Thus, it is his boast that "in primaries I have spoken in behalf of only one man, and his name is EATON."

However, for the first time in his career he did interfere in 1947 by protesting at Governor Driscoll's apparent attempt to hand-pick the Republican candidate to oppose Senator Hawkes for reelection.

While "Doc" EATON sets great store by faith and hope too, again in politics he tries always to supplement them with more material sinews. Thus, at the midwinter dinner of the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce for the congressional delegation here, EATON always reminded his hearers to back up all their fine words by writing in their check books as election day drew near.

For the last two elections EATON had been threatening to retire. He talked about it prior to 1948 but, urged by his friends on the House Foreign Affairs Committee (his party was in power then), EATON said: "They told me that if I didn't run I would be the same as a deserter walking out on the commander in chief at a critical time like this."

He won again and though the Democrats took charge of the Capitol, Speaker RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas, directed that "Doc" be permitted to set up his congressional office on the gallery floor of the House wing of the Capitol. This was a special honor because all other Members, with the exception of some committee chairmen and House majority officials, are assigned office space in either of two House office buildings.

SEVERAL REASONS

Two years ago EATON ran again because he thought his long service might be of help because of party reasons in the district, because he likes the job and because, as he said, "My mind is still functioning and, physically I'm 35 years old—at least that's what the doctors tell me."

Then he would fix you with that dark eye of his in which a twinkle often struggles with a flash of fire.

But last year on his eighty-second birthday he was saying: "I find that I don't have as much wind as when I was younger. I suspect that the reason that I haven't is that I have been around Congress too long. I have had a very happy and satisfying life."

To prove he didn't have the decrepitudes usually associated with 82, he invited you to feel the hardness of his muscles, or as he puts it another way: "There may be snow on the roof, but there's still fire in the boiler."

WIT NOT CAUSTIC

Many men in the House have felt the "Doc's" wit. Since it is penetrating but never caustic, he has been able to use it upon them and retain their friendship. Perhaps one reason is that he has turned it against himself as well. At any rate, if he has an enemy in Congress the man has yet to identify himself.

President Truman made a practice of calling EATON personally to congratulate him on his birthdays.

Of course, it is natural for a President to woo the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, particularly when he is in the opposition party as EATON was in March 1947, but the greetings from the White House and from other top officials have a special quality for a special sort of man.

"Doc" EATON entered Congress at 57 and while he was conservative domestically he had for decades been a radical on foreign policy compared to the platform of his party. In the twenty's he had embraced world cooperation when his party was sabotaging the League of Nations.

He was just as opposed to Republican foreign policy in the next decade as he was to New Deal policies at home. In the forty's he was surprised to find himself helping to implement the ideas that he had written about in 1901.

ON MANKIND'S PROGRESS

He wrote a small volume then "to demonstrate my beliefs that the progress of mankind must inevitably end in some form of world civilization. No country or civilization is any longer isolated. The earth has shrunk to a neighborhood * * * the mighty hand of God is pressing nations together."

Fifty years later on his eighty-second day he was to say sadly: "I see nothing but very stormy weather ahead for the next generation or two. Never in all history has there been anything to approximate the present situation brought about by the cruel and terroristic philosophy of communism."

For him the only force able to combat communism "and between them there can be no compromise" is Americanism. For he said, "Americanism is actually Christianity. It is based on eternal and changeless moral principles."

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I met Dr. EATON when I first came to Congress and became a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee in January 1949. I have never received a warmer welcome from anyone in my life. I felt I had come into the most friendly atmosphere when Dr. EATON extended his hand, put his arm on my shoulder, and said "Welcome."

Since that time there have been votes and arguments in our committee, but I cannot recall a single occasion where Dr. EATON has ever considered one side over the other. If there has ever been a bipartisan approach concerning the foreign affairs of this country and our relationships, this good man has taken that approach.

He has been such an inspiration to me that I am heartsick at his leaving. I want him to know that I personally am most grateful for what he has done for me, for his good fellowship, for his kindly words, for his example and precept. I wish him well and congratulate his home folks, his neighbors, and the members of his community upon having him back again. I know that for many years they will have his wise advice and counsel.

May God bless Dr. EATON.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was one who considered it a very great honor to take part in a luncheon we gave for Dr. EATON, Mr. MANSFIELD, and Mr. HERTER, who are leaving our committee.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point copies of three telegrams that were received regarding Dr. EATON'S leaving, one from the President of the United States, one from Chairman JAMES P. RICHARDS of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who is engaged in a primary next Tuesday in his home State of South Carolina, and cannot be here, and one from Dr. WALTER JUDD, a member of the committee, who is out of town.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The telegrams are as follows:)

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

I am happy to learn of the luncheon being given today for CHARLIE EATON, MIKE MANSFIELD, and CHRIS HERTER and wish very much that it were possible for me to be with you as you pay tribute to them and to their service in the House of Representatives. As members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs those whom you honor today have played an important part in our bipartisan foreign policy and for this we are all indebted to them. Hearty good wishes to you, your fellow hosts, and your guests for a most enjoyable gathering.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JUIY 4, 1952.

Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR TOM: Please convey to Dr. EATON, MIKE MANSFIELD, and CHRIS HERTER my very best wishes and tell them I will be with them in spirit at the committee luncheon in their honor even though it is not possible for me to attend in person. The Committee on Foreign Affairs and the House of Representatives are losing three of their finest and most public-spirited members by their retirement from the House. I know that all of us join in wishing them happiness and success in their future endeavors.

Regards.

DICK RICHARDS.

JULY 4, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES A. EATON,
Care Hon. THOMAS S. GORDON,
Acting Chairman, House Foreign Affairs Committee Room:

It is with the deepest regret that I join in bidding you a fond farewell as you enter your well deserved retirement from Congress. I have met no man, in all my years in Washington, China, or elsewhere, with more wisdom, greater kindliness of spirit, and broader comprehension of our country's problems, and place in our world. Working with you in the Congress and on the Foreign Affairs Committee has been a constant source of inspiration to me. You will be greatly missed in public life and I, personally, will miss your friendly presence.

WALTER H. JUDD.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that Dr. EATON is retiring from the Congress. When I joined the Foreign Affairs Committee he was to me a true counselor. His sage advice will be sorely missed by many Members of Congress, and particularly by his colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee. He is kind, generous, and sincere and has given unsparingly of himself to those who called upon him for assistance and service. He will be long remembered by those of us who have been privileged to serve with him, because we have loved working with him. I wish him well in his retirement, and know that he will lead an active life and continue to share his profound knowledge and understanding of the trials and tribulations of the world, our country, and mankind. Dr. EATON, may the good Lord grant you many more years of continued service to your fellow man.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished Member, Dr. CHARLES EATON.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I feel profoundly moved as I stand here because in my long and interesting life I have enjoyed my relationship with this group beyond any other fellowship I have ever had. The American people ought to thank God every day for the kind of men and women who represent them in this body. That is my opinion based upon years of most intimate acquaintance. I have the most profound reverence and respect and affection for you men and women. God bless you and keep you worthy of the great responsibility you carry in representing the greatest and freest people on earth, and seeing to it that our country remains free, and keeps its place of supreme world leadership.

Now I am not going to bore you with a speech. That would be no way to end this wonderful occasion. I have done it in days gone by, and I used to label myself one very profound speaker. I never stopped until the last member of the audience was asleep. Sometimes they were a little wakeful, as the Republicans are in New Jersey, but otherwise they let me off pretty easy and I did them. I just want to say that in all my life, and it has been a long and happy one, and I have had many wonderful relationships with great bodies of citizens and people, my most sacred memory is my relationship with you men and women in this House. I do not know whether the American people realize the magnificent quality of the men and women they have elected to represent them here—but I do. I was trained in a pretty stern school, and you cannot fool me on a man although you can occasionally on a woman. I am bound to say in all my years of relationship with organized bodies in the church, education ,and in business and other phases of public life, I have never been associated with a nobler bunch of men and women than you are. Thank you for everything. I do not know whether I can ever realize on it financially or not, but the most sacred and precious possession of my life consists of the friendship that has blessed me in the days gone by. And not friendship beginning with my dear friend, the Speaker here and going on down—no friendship in my life has been more sacred or more inspired than your friendship for me and mine for you. God bless you dear men and women and continue in your health and happiness and service. Bless you in your hearts and minds and in your homes, and especially in your public service. Do not forget that once you knew an old has-been named CHARLIE EATON.

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY—HON. E. H. HEDRICK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, over on the crest of the Alleghenies, where the tops of the mountains reach up to greet the gods, we West Virginians like to think that we breed a class of men and women particularly endowed with high ideals of liberty, justice, and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, during the great Civil War, which we like to refer to as "the late unpleasantness," the western counties of Virginia found it necessary to separate from the Old Dominion, and we wrote upon our new flag of the State of West Virginia "Montani semper liberi"—mountaineers always free.

May I say that my State of West Virginia has lived up to that slogan nobly by sending to this Congress men of outstanding character and men of ability.

May I digress long enough to remind you of the service in the halls of this Congress of John W. Davis, and later on William L. Wilson, under the Cleveland administration. May I say that my State of West Virginia in its formative years was an agricultural State, but within the last several years it has become highly industrialized. It is the leading State in the production of bituminous coal. It is developing rapidly as a manufacturing center. This situation has brought about a rapid change in the political thinking of the people of our State.

Back in 1932, when the people of this country decided to heed the plea of Franklin D. Roosevelt and do something about the man at the foot of the economic ladder, they sent to this Congress as a Representative of the common people a gentleman who, as attorney and legal adviser, spent the greater part of his early life in the service of the common people of West Virginia, particularly organized labor. That gentleman, my colleague, Hon. ROBERT L. RAMSAY, upon coming into the Congress in 1932 was assigned to the Judiciary Committee. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the name of ROBERT L. RAMSAY is closely intertwined with much of the New Deal legislation that was written on the books during the thirties and the early forties. He has rendered outstanding service in the Congress. He has been returned to the Congress repeatedly by a district that is normally Republican—an appreciation of the gentleman's ability and his service to the people.

Later on, about the advent of the Seventy-ninth Congress, about the time that I was honored by election to the Congress, there appeared another gentleman from West Virginia, commonly and familiarly and pleasingly known to my colleagues as Dr. HEDRICK. This gentleman, upon election to the Congress, was immediately placed upon the Appropriations Committee where he has rendered valuable and valued service. His work upon the Appropriations Committee has kept him from appearance upon the floor in behalf of other legislation, but may I say to you, my colleagues, I have recognized since becoming a Member of this Congress that not all of the work is done on the floor of the House. The most valuable, the most effective work is done in committee. I can assure you that my colleague, Dr. HEDRICK, has lived up to the standards set up for members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE].

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with heavy heart that those of us in the West Virginia delegation bid farewell to two of our most beloved colleagues, the Honorable ROBERT L. RAMSAY, of the First District, and the Honorable E. H. HEDRICK, of the Sixth District.

Throughout many sessions of Congress, West Virginia has had a perfect record of fighting for the people. BOB RAMSAY and Doc HEDRICK were towers of strength around whom those of us with less service could rally.

During the last years of the life of my late, beloved husband, and predecessor, the Honorable John Kee, his duties as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House necessitated his absence from the office on many occasions, and, of course, he was absent many times during his last illness. He depended upon me to handle the routine of his office, to see that he was paired on important votes. His advice to me, at all times was to consult BOB RAMSAY on any question in which I was in doubt. My husband always said that if I followed the advice of BOB RAMSAY, I would be on the right track.

As the widow of the beloved John Kee, I can think of no greater tribute than to refer to the high esteem in which my late husband held his friend and colleague from the First District of West Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, BOB RAMSAY has been fighting for the people, and particularly those people who had few champions, all of his adult life. As an attorney in the private practice of law, as a public official, and as a loyal and hard worker in the Democratic Party in West Virginia, BOB RAMSAY was always fighting for humanity.

When he came to Congress for the first time in 1933, he helped forge the great reform legislation of the early New Deal. He was here in 1941–42 again to help prepare America for World War II, and he returned again in 1949 to help hold the line against the forces of reaction which would eliminate all the great social gains of the thirties.

Doc HEDRICK's career in Congress was briefer than BOB RAMSAY'S, but it, too, was a career marked by a voting record in favor of the people. It was a West Virginia record. As a good physician, Doc HEDRICK learned early in life the compassion for his fellow human beings that is the mark of a good doctor. That same compassion must have influenced his political career, for he, too, was motivated by great humanitarian principles.

Doc HEDRICK, serving on the powerful Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, was a real friend to West Virginia. He fought as hard for projects in other districts as he did for those in his own. His colleagues could always count on Doc HEDRICK to assist them in any matter before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, we shall miss the counsel and assistance and cooperation we received from BOB RAMSAY and Doc HEDRICK. As they close their careers in this body we wish them Godspeed and many pleasant years as elder statesmen of the Democratic Party in West Virginia. The party, the State, and the Nation are better for their contributions.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] in his remarks concerning ROBERT RAMSAY and Dr. HEDRICK. They have rendered outstanding service to their districts, to our State, and to the Nation; they have done things which are worthy of being remembered by all. Their friendliness and courage have been an inspiration to me. Both of them are men of gentlemanliness, honor, chivalry, clear-minded, God-fearing manliness; both believe in the dignity of the human being, both believe in man, the masterpiece of God's creation, the finest of the fine things in this world. Both of them believe in God, the infinite architect of the universe and the compassionate ruler of the destiny of mankind. And on the silver cord of destiny wherever it may take them along life's pathway I say: May fortune be kind to them and life be long and good to them, and may the face of God shine upon them.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. HEDRICK was a very popular physician, well thought of by the people of his district and especially by the miners. Long years of service he gave to the people of that district not only in Congress but also going out along the highways and the byways to tend to the needs of the people. I am sure as he goes back to practice his chosen profession the women will be greeting him, since he was a baby specialist, and that in this time of shortage of doctors our loss will be their gain.

We wish him Godspeed and that he may go back and treat these people the way he has been trained to treat them.

Mr. RAMSAY, affectionately known as BOB RAMSAY, is usually characterized as a fighter. Sincerity of purpose has been his watchword in life. He has given more than 30 years of service to the public.

BOB RAMSAY is of Scotch ancestry. His people brought from the mountains of Scotland splendid traditions. He is proud of the fact that "mountaineers are always free." Bob has fought throughout his life for the rights of the common man. He has fought fearlessly for the rights of the people of his State. The small-business man, the worker, and the farmer often have said in his district that whenever BOB RAMSAY tells you anything you can count on it. His word is his bond.

We will miss these two men. May God speed them on their way as they go back home and give the people the advantage of their rich lives of experience.

Our blessings we send with them. May the days of other years linger in their minds and may they remember their friends here in this House.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, regret to see both these distintinguished Members of the House retire.

My association and contact has been more definite and closer with Dr. HEDRICK than with Mr. RAMSAY. Dr. HEDRICK and I have served together on the select committee of the House, familiarly known as the Delaney committee, to study the effects of chemicals used in processing food, in cosmetics, and insecticides, and I have learned to respect his fine judgment. The fact that he is a physician was a great help to that committee with his expert knowledge he had of the effect of these chemicals upon the human system when they get into the human system through the processing of foods, the use of cosmetics, insecticides, fertilizers, and materials of that kind, which often cause serious poisoning and may lead to malignant disease and injury to the human system. Dr. HEDRICK's contribution to the public health and welfare has been great, both in his service in the Congress and before he came here, as a successful physician. Aside from that, and before I became a member of that important committee with Dr. HEDRICK, I learned to love and respect him and to appreciate his kindly attitude on all matters.

His reputation has gone far beyond the limits of the great State of West Virginia because I know of former West Virginians who now live in my district in Los Angeles, Calif., who have kind memories of Dr. HEDRICK in his early years as a practicing physician in West Virginia.

It is regrettable to see you leave, Dr. HEDRICK, but we wish you Godspeed and the best of everything in your retirement, and I am sure the people of West Virginia whom you have served over the years in your medical practice will be as glad to have you come back home as we regret seeing you leave the House of Representatives where you have served with such distinction.

The best of everything to you and Mrs. Hedrick and I wish also to include the best wishes of Mrs. McDonough to you and Mrs. Hedrick.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to concur in what all of the gentlemen have said in reference to Dr. HEDRICK. He is a man of courage, of character, and great ability. He will be greatly missed in the Halls of Congress, the greatest deliberative body in the world.

There is one thing I remember particularly about him. He has always placed the welfare of his country ahead of any partisanship or political considerations. It is with regret that I see him leave this great body.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the spendid tribute that has been paid to these two great men. I served on a committee with Dr. HEDRICK and regard him as one of our most useful and able members. We are going to miss the two gentlemen from West Virginia who are leaving us and I wish to endorse everything that has been said about them.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to these colleagues of mine who are leaving the Congress that I feel sure I can convey to them the thanks of their constituents and the people of West Virginia for their remarkable service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for giving the House this opportunity to express their feelings for these two eminent gentlemen. I would be remiss if I did not express my warm regards and pay my own tribute to the service these gentlemen have rendered to our country. I join the West Virginia delegation as well as the other Members of the House in paying this respect which these two gentlemen have so justly earned.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have served with Dr. HEDRICK for 6 years and I do not know of a more conscientious legislator nor a more intelligent nor a finer or more thoughtful man than he is. The evidence of what the people of his State think of him is recorded in the fine vote he received for Governor of his State just a month ago of over 100,000. The people of his State think what we think of him, that he is an excellent man and a fine legislator.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that we all love Dr. HEDRICK. The vicissitudes of politics sometimes do not result in measuring up to what one's expectations may be, but there is a genuine love for the gentleman in West Virginia and I might say the same thing for my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. RAMSAY].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Dr. E. H. HEDRICK by his gentlemanly demeanor, his fine personality, and splendid ability has endeared himself to every Member of this House. We will all miss him very much and wish for him every good thing in the years to come.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who wish to may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD in reference to these two gentlemen from West Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, ROBERT L. RAMSAY has been my close friend for many years. Bob is a man of high character and splendid ability. He is a man of deep conviction and a real friend of the people. His life and work have enriched all people everywhere. I shall miss this fine man and great public servant.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am unable to understand the vagaries of politics that temporarily at least have brought about the retirement of "Doc" HEDRICK from public life.

He has been a close friend of mine during my service in this body. I highly esteem and admire him. He is a very able, sound, far-sighted, and gifted representative of the people. He will be sorely missed in the Congress where he made such a distinguished record and he will be sorely missed in the public affairs of his district, State, and Nation.

I proudly join in this magnificent tribute the Members of the House are paying him today and sincerely wish for him and his family greatest success, prosperity, and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has been my great privilege to know ROBERT L. RAMSAY, of West Virginia, as a Member of the House of Representatives over a period of 20 years.

He was first elected in the dark, depression days of 1932. Bringing to his new job as a Congressman deep determination and strong convictions, he played an important part in enactment of the recovery legislation of that period.

In all his activities, he has shown a keen understanding of the problems of the dispossessed and the underprivileged, and he has been a constant battler for justice to all.

In his many years in this body, BOB RAMSAY has achieved an enviable reputation as a legislator. His outstanding legal ability was early recognized by the leaders of this body, and his advice and counsel has been enjoyed and appreciated by many. As a member of the Judiciary Committee he has made valuable contributions to the deliberations on important problems constantly coming under the purview of that group.

The Nation is indebted to Bob for his long years of devoted and accomplished public service. He has given much to us and we are thankful for his friendship. We rejoice with him in his accomplishments of the past and wish him well in whatever he might undertake in the future.

Congressman ROBERT L. RAMSAY is distinguished not only for his legislative record, but for his record as a gentleman. Truly, it might well be said of him that he is one of nature's noblemen.

HON. EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a high privilege to pay a well-deserved tribute to our colleague from Alabama, the Honorable EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED, who is retiring at the close of this session. It is with a deep sense of regret that we of the Alabama delegation see him leave this body, and his presence will be sorely missed by us all when the Eighty-third Congress convenes.

An able and devoted public servant, ED DEGRAFFENRIED has served the people of his district with fidelity and trust,

both before and since he came to Congress 4 years ago. In the House, he has been a member of the Committee on Armed Services, which has given him the opportunity to serve not only the people of Alabama but also the entire country in securing legislation vital to our national security. By his tireless, efficient, and conscientious attention to the duties of his office, he has won for himself the recognition of a job well done.

No tribute to Ed would be complete without a few words about his most splendid personal attributes which endear him to all who are privileged to know him. He is a fine southern gentleman, with a warm, courageous heart and a helpful and cooperative spirit; a true and valuable friend.

As he leaves the Congress to return to his law practice with his two fine sons in Alabama, Congressman DEGRAFFENRIED goes with the respect and admiration of his many friends here, and we all wish for him every good thing in life.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, mixed with the joy and gladness of finishing a long and arduous session of the Congress there is a tinge of regret when we come to remember that some of our esteemed colleagues will not be with us when next we meet in January. ED DEGRAFFENRIED, known to all of us in Alabama as an outstanding lawyer before he came to the Congress, in a way has my envy now. He, still young in years, can return to one of the noblest of all professions, the law. As my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] said, his father was a distinguished jurist on the supreme court bench of our State for a long time; Ed, himself, had a long and distinguished record at the bar before his election to Congress. His service here has been outstanding, his accomplishments for his State and Nation are many and great. I know that one of the finest compliments which can come to a man is to have the Members of this great forum, with whom he served, say about him that he was a genuine gentleman, and a true and faithful public servant. I can say that about ED DEGRAFFENRIED, and you can, because it is true.

Ed goes back to the land which Tom Heflin, that great and distinguished Alabama orator, referred to in these words: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; God said 'Let there be light,' and there was light; He made the morning's early glow, the noonday's sultry heat, and the evening's solemn hush; each bird, beast, and flower is the handiwork of His mighty hand. But when God made Alabama He did His level best."

While I am sorry that Ed will not be with us next year, I envy him in his return to the people he loves and to the people who love him. I wish for him long years of continued success in all his endeavors.

Mr. POULSON. I join with many others in paying my respects to ED DEGRAFFENRIED. If ever there was a person who typifies what has been described as a southern gentleman, Ed certainly fills that description. In addition to his personal charm Ed has demonstrated himself here in the Halls of Congress as a man of great ability. It was my privilege to become well acquainted with Ed because we are both members of the same college fraternity, Sigma Alpha Epsilon. It is only through knowing a man that you come to really respect him and I know that Ed has the respect not only of his fellow colleagues but of his many friends in Alabama who know him intimately. So I sincerely regret his leaving Congress but I know he will be most successful in the practice of his chosen legal profession.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I could not let the occasion of adjournment of the Eighty-second Congress pass by without expressing my deep regret over the retirement from this body of the gentleman from Alabama, EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED.

As majority leader of the House of Representatives I know and appreciate the important contribution he has made to the military security of this Nation as a member of the Armed Services Committee, where he has labored long and faithfully. The vital legislation emanating from this committee during ED DEGRAFFENRIED'S term of service bears, in many aspects, the imprint of his workmanship, his experience as a soldier in World War I, and his fine legal background.

In the vast program of expansion of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, to stem the tide of Communist aggression in Korea, to guard our own defenses, and to aid our allies abroad, he has played a notable part, particularly on subcommittees dealing with procurement and stockpiling of strategic and critical materials, civilian components of the armed services, and military and civilian personnel problems.

The people of his Sixth District, the State of Alabama, and of the United States can be grateful that we have had the benefit of his services here at the Capitol during these trying years.

I feel that I can speak for every Member of this House, on both sides of the aisle, when I say that ED DEGRAFFENREID as he returns to the practice of law in Tuscaloosa carries with him the friendship and high esteem of all of us, and our good wishes for every success in the future.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, our great group from Alabama has said so many wonderful things about ED DEGRAFFENRIED that I do not know how I am going to add anything to them, and I could not unless I say that we had in ED DEGRAFFENRIED one of the great men of this Nation.

Our districts join, at Demopolis, Ala., right on the Tombigbee River. He is going back to one of the greatest parts not only of God's great earth but the whole universe. He is one of the great men there.

In my judgment, had ED DEGRAFFENRIED gone home, as I did, and reported to his people, who are all upset about everything—nearly all our people are, back home—he would never have had a bit of trouble. He is a good man, a great man, and a smart man. When you see ED DEGRAFFENRIED in a courthouse down in Alabama, the people say that when they have him on their side they usually win their case.

He has two great sons. He has a fine family.

He has done a grand job here. Wherever he goes he is always going to do a great job.

He is leaving with some of the great men of this earth, good old BOB DOUGHTON, whom we all love. We could go right on down the line, with Dr. EATON and Judge KERR and so many other wonderful men. Whether they ever come back or not, I know this, that any man who comes here and works as hard as they have, whether we meet again on this earth, I know we will all meet in heaven, where we will never have to part again. But I expect to see ED DEGRAFFENRIED and work with him just as long as I live on this earth and then in the world to come.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege for me to take these few minutes to pay tribute to one whom I consider an outstanding public servant, our colleague, EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED. Ed and I were elected to Congress in 1948. Our districts adjoin for many miles.

This afternoon my mind goes back to some of the preparations we made for service in this body. I particularly recall one time 2 or 3 months before the first session of the Eighty-first Congress opened Ed and I were talking by long-distance telephone about our plans, our hopes, and our aspirations for the development of the great Warrior River, which is common to both our districts.

ED DEGRAFFENRIED has been active in the life of Alabama for many years. Though quite a young man himself, he told me not long ago that he had made, I believe, a total of nine campaigns in his public career. He early carved for himself an outstanding reputation as a lawyer and advocate in the courts of Alabama, following the wonderful heritage left him by his father, Mr. Justice deGraffenried, who served for many years on the Supreme Court of Alabama. As Ed's service here terminates and as he leaves us to return to his native Alabama, I am sure he must feel a sense of elation that he will be able to join his two fine sons, Jeff deGraffenried and Ryan deGraffenried, in the practice of his noble profession. I think of what a wonderful opportunity it is for those two fine boys who have entered the profession of law since Ed's coming to Congress, that they will have the privilege of sitting at the feet, so to speak, of one of the masters of Alabama jurisprudence. ED DEGRAFFENRIED'S service here has been very outstanding. He has served on many subcommittees of the great Committee on Armed Services of the House, and the legislation which that committee

has brought to the House for our guidance and direction in these very unusual times, and especially over the past 4 years, bears the imprint of ED DEGRAFFENRIED'S fine mind and his great legal ability. As great as these qualities of Ed's are, I should like to say, and I am sure my colleagues from Alabama and many others will agree, aside from his great ability, ED DEGRAFFENRIED possesses a great and kind heart and a sympathetic understanding of the problems of all people. Those qualities have allowed him for many years to measure his friends not by the hundreds but by the tens of thousands in Alabama. As he leaves us, I want to say that ED DEGRAFFENRIED goes with the feeling of the greatest respect and love of all his colleagues. I wish for him Godspeed in every endeavor that he undertakes, and I hope that he finds peace and contentment among his people. He has served them well.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with my colleagues in paying high tribute to ED DEGRAFFENRIED, of Alabama. I have had the privilege of serving with Ed for 4 years. It was a pleasure to do what little I could to help him get started off on the right foot here in the Nation's Capitol. As all of you know, ED DEGRAFFENRIED learned the ropes very quickly and he has made a very able Representative here in the House of Representatives. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services he has a distinguished record. I know because ED comes from a very great family, because of his fine training, and because of his keen interest in Alabama that he wants the members of the Alabama delegation to welcome his successor, Armistead I. Selden, Jr., and try to help him make an outstanding record in Congress, too. Ed, like the rest of us, believes in the State of Alabama, believes in the South, believes in working for the welfare and security of our Nation. The Alabama delegation works very closely, and he has been part of the team.

We will miss Ed very much when he leaves Congress. None of us knows what the future will hold for him or for us, but I definitely have the feeling that he will do all right for himself. I know he will be glad to get back with his boys in Alabama.

Ed is an intelligent gentleman with a kind heart and a long career of public service so, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take this opportunity to extend my very best wishes to him, to his wife, and to his family.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the high honor and privilege of joining my colleagues in paying my small tribute to this Member of our Alabama delegation who is retiring.

I shall not take your time to attempt to cover his service years. I came here as a new Member of this Congress. You know it is a pretty hard job to follow in the footsteps of a man who had served Alabama for eight terms in this great deliberative body. I speak of the Honorable Sam Hobbs, who died recently. In attempting to serve over 300,000 people, those first few days are days of awkwardness and uneasiness to a new Member. The only way that job can be undertaken is for the older Members of this House to take the new ones under their wings, so to speak.

I shall never forget one morning when my secretary told me that the Honorable ED DEGRAFFENRIED was in my outer office. I asked him to come in. He just came by to make a little social visit and to find out if there was anything he could do to help me get along. I will always be grateful to him for that courtesy and kindness.

I do not think of ED DEGRAFFENRIED as leaving public service, because I know that wherever he goes he will be giving his best for the betterment of his community, his State, and this great Nation of ours.

I am particularly touched by his retirement, because I have more installations in my district than in any other district in the State of Alabama. Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, has protected and helped me to maintain those installations so long as it did not interfere with the national interest. So I shall miss him greatly.

I hope that wherever he goes and in whatever endeavor he may become engaged his efforts will be eminently successful. We shall miss him in the Alabama delegation, and I know that his many friends in this House will miss ED DEGRAFFENRIED.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I did not know that anything was going to be said at this time about my good friend from Alabama, ED DEGRAFFENRIED. I have been on a conference committee. But I do want to say that it grieves me that a man of the caliber and type of ED DEGRAFFENRIED is leaving us. I have known ED DEGRAFFENRIED for about 30 years. We were in law school many years ago at the University of Alabama. Ed there made a most wonderful record. He was an outstanding student in the academic department and also in the law school of the University of Alabama. I followed his career throughout many years. He has applied himself to the law; he is an excellent lawyer and he is a leader in his community. I wish we had more time this afternoon to pay tribute to a Member of the House of the type of Ed, but in his departing I want to say that I am sure the entire membership on both sides of the aisle joins the delegation from Alabama in saying that we wish him everything good in the years to come.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Alabama delegation in paying tribute to ED DEGRAFFENRIED'S service here as a Member of this Congress. He has served on a subcommittee with me now since he came to Congress. His service as a member of the Armed Services Committee has been patriotic and it has been at a time when we really needed men of ED DEGRAFFENRIED'S type and character.

I can say that he has devoted his time earnestly, efficiently, and with a sacrifice here in the past few years. Ed, of course, has not served here in the House as long as some of us on the Armed Services Committee, but I personally feel that the country and the Committee on the Armed Services will suffer a great loss in his retirement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE].

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join my colleagues in paying my small tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED]. I was privileged to sit alongside of EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED on the great Committee on the Armed Services, and I know whereof I speak when I say he applied himself assiduously, incessantly, and worked diligently on all the problems before the Armed Services Committee without regard to time or effort. He definitely will leave his impression on the legislation which has passed through our committee. He has certainly made a valuable contribution to this Congress.

On the new road he travels I wish him continued success, health, and all the good graces the Lord may grant to him.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to sit next to the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman DEGRAFFENRIED, for 4 years as a member of the Committee on Armed Services; he on one side and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE], who just spoke, on the other; so I have been doubly blessed. But as to the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman DEGRAFFENRIED, I wish to say to the Representatives from the State of Alabama that I hope ED DEGRAFFENRIED, my personal friend and distinguished colleague, comes back. I hope that, regardless of who else may be here for awhile from Alabama, that we may have the privilege to have ED DEGRAFFENRIED back in the House of Representatives. We need him and his honesty and diligence back here.

I found him faithful—not only faithful but also, if I may say so, even more than faithful. He served in Congress at a large financial sacrifice, because I know he had a large law practice which he gave up when he came here. I wish him the very best. I wish his two distinguished sons, also lawyers, success. They will have joy with their own father. How fortunate they are to have their father back with them for awhile in their large law office. My friend and colleague, Ed, has the affection and blessings of every Member of this House.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to number ED DEGRAFFENRIED among my close friends. I served with him ever since he came here as a member of the Committe on the Armed Services. He has always been a hard effective worker, outstanding, able, legal scholar and a keen thinker upon public problems. He has distinguished himself here as a brilliant member of our committee and the House. I am proud indeed to number him among my friends. I join my colleagues here today in paying him such well deserved tribute and wish him well for the future.

Mr. Speaker, ED DEGRAFFENRIED has been my warm friend since he came to this Congress. His departure from this body at this time, I deeply regret, because he has rendered superlative and outstanding service to his district, his State, and his country.

Congressman DEGRAFFENRIED is a man of very great ability. He is distinguished not only as a highly trained, skillful, and profound lawyer but also as a statesman of broadest vision and stability.

His personal qualities have endeared him to every member of the Armed Services Committee and every Member of the House. Of genial and friendly personality, his gracious presence, sound thinking and breath of vision gave him the great respect, esteem, and admiration of our membership. There is no man I have ever served with who because of his high noble character, great ability, industry and sincerity of purpose I have had greater respect for than ED DEGRAFFENRIED.

His departure from political life is incomprehensible to me, but I venture to state that other days hold out great promise for him, not only as a distinguished practicing lawyer, but also in the public service, should he so desire it.

Success, good health, good fortune, and happiness to you, ED. May the blessings of the Almighty come down bounteously in the future days upon you and your family.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure to me to serve on the Armed Services Committee with ED DEGRAFFENRIED. He is one of the hardest workers on that committee. He is always in attendance and faithful to his duties. He has a sweet and charming personality. I know of no one on the committee or in the Congress better liked than is ED DEGRAFFENREID.

I personally endorse all that has been said about him, and regret that he will not be with us in the future. I wish him Godspeed.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of teaching in Alabama a number of years ago and I know of the splendid record of Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED'S father in those days and the profound respect his family enjoyed in that State.

I am also aware of the wonderful record he has made as a Member of this body and I wish him Godspeed as he returns to Alabama. I hope he will reconsider and come back and be with us in the House.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word of regret to that expressed by my colleagues concerning the departure from Congress of the Honorable EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED. Representative DEGRAFFENRIED has rendered invaluable service to the people of Alabama and the whole country through his work on the Armed Services Committee during one of the most trying periods in the history of our country. His efforts in behalf of important legislation for the defense of our country have greatly benefited the security of the Nation and the peace of the world.

Representative DEGRAFFENRIED'S service here is in the best southern tradition of unreserved support of adequate defense of our country.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately following mine on the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED].

There was no objection.

HON. LEONARD W. HALL

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Hon. LEONARD W. HALL, of the State of New York, who is retiring from the Congress. Our distinguished colleague has made a great contribution to the legislative record since he entered the House of Representatives. I regret exceedingly that he has decided to leave this body and return to the practice of law. I always regret to see a colleague who has demonstrated his ability and leadership in the House of Representatives retire at the very time when his experience and ability are so important to the welfare of his country. I recall what Hon. DeAlva Stanwood Alexander, A. M., L. L. D., a former member of Congress, had to say with reference to the value of long service as a legislator.

"Prominence gained in one vocation is rarely transferred to another. Legislation is a profession as much as medicine or law or journalism, the practice of which, to gain leadership, must be long and continuous, until proposed public measures and their treatment, worked out in the drudgery of the committee room, become as familiar as the variety of questions submitted to lawyers and physicians."

I am sure that every member who has served with the Honorable LEONARD W. HALL has recognized his fine legal ability. Furthermore, our good friend, Leonard, has made a splendid contribution in solving many complex problems that have come before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of which he is a distinguished member. I cannot question the wisdom of my good friend leaving Congress before he is too old to resume the practice of law. It is rather tragic in many instances to see men of great ability remain in the House until they are too old to return to their vocation or profession with any hope of success.

I feel very sure that our good distinguished colleague, who is a comparatively young man, will soon fill an important judicial position in the area where he is so well known and beloved. There is only one thing that we can do on an occasion of this kind and that is to wish for our fine colleague many years of health, happiness, and success in whatever field he may enter or to which he may be called.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, we will all miss LEONARD HALL very much in this Chamber because of his great ability as a legislator and also because of his charming personality which has always made it a pleasure to be associated with him, either in hours of business or pleasure.

As a legislator, LEONARD HALL always worked in a quiet way, without much fanfare, but most effectively. His most significant contributions have been in reconciling the conflicting views of those of us who sometimes go to one extreme or the other. He is essentially a middle-of-the-roader, who feels, as all of us know is the fact when we analyze it, that the most effective manner of securing good legislation is by attempting to reconcile the divergent views of those who so many times may feel too strongly either one way or the other and allow their emotions or outside pressures to prevail over better judgment.

He has made a great contribution here, not only to the work of his own committee but to the work in the Congress.

True, LEN HALL has been an intense partisan, but in the finest sense. As chairman of the Republican congressional committee, he performed nobly in that capacity; but I know that I speak for every Member on the majority side when I say that they always looked upon him as a happy warrior; there were no blows below the belt by LEONARD HALL in any way in any of his political or any of his other activities.

Personally, he has been one of my warmest friends since I came to Congress. He showed at all times, right from the very start, his desire to be helpful to me in my work, and his counsel and friendship have meant a great deal to me. He is leaving this body, as possibly the gentleman from New York who has the floor did not realize, to become a candidate as surrogate of his county under circumstances which virtually insure his selection. He has had, it is true, a very large law practice. He has been eminently successful. He could return to that practice, where his income would be a great deal in excess of the salary paid to him as a public official. But he has chosen, rather, of his own volition, to become the surrogate of his county and continue his career of service where he will have great responsibility, and where we who know him and know his ability as a

lawyer realize that he will serve with great distinction. For myself, and for many of his friends who today are not here on the floor, I know we all want to wish LEN HALL the very best success in everything, and we offer our congratulations to the good people of the county where he will serve, because it is my prediction that as a jurist he will display the same abilities and make the same fine record which he has made here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when I first learned of LEN HALL's decision to quit the Congress of the United States I went to him and did everything I could to dissuade him. I did that honestly, because my close association with him in the Congress convinced me that he was making a great contribution to the welfare of his country here as our colleague. As I talked with him about that decision and his determination to quit the Congress I asked him what motivated him. I wanted to know why a man who had achieved such great success here, who was so well liked and became so prominent, so effective in the work of the House, wanted to leave. The reasons he assigned, of course, were important to him. As I reflect upon them, I think they are important for the consideration of the people of the United States. As I understand it, his determination was based upon the unpleasantness involved in being here on duty in Washington away from his home and his family. Also, like a great many Members, he was beginning to feel the pinch of inflated prices, the high cost of living, and high taxes, on a congressional salary. So for those reasons we are losing one of the men who undoubtedly stands in the forefront of the Members of the House of Representatives. He has been here long enough to know his way around, to be really a leader; yet we are to lose his services.

In speaking of LEN HALL, except for those of the New York delegation I suspect I can speak out of an association as close as that had by any other Member of the House. First of all, I served on the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with LEN HALL. That committee has tremendously important work to do. He brought to the work of the committee not only a determination to do the right thing but the courage to follow through, and with it two attributes that I have come to consider about as important in any man's make-up as anything I can think of, and they are balance and judgment. LEN HALL is a balanced man of sound and good judgment. He would think things through; then, when he arrived at a decision, he would follow through on that decision.

Further, LEN HALL came to the chairmanship of the National Republican congressional committee, which is the political committee on our side, following my dropping out as chairman of that committee. He served with the committee during the time I was chairman. I had an opportunity to see there the splendid work he was willing to perform for his colleagues on the Republican side. Then, as chairman of the committee, and I say this as an ex-chairman, he is still the chairman and I want him to continue on through this coming campaign, as I think he expects to do—he is just about the best chairman on that committee we ever had. I think that is generally recognized by his colleagues on the congressional committee who worked with him there.

So I know that wherever LEN HALL is and wherever he undertakes to serve and to work he will be doing a good job, as he has done here. Again may I say that my only regret is that he has found it necessary to make the determination and the decision that will remove him from our midst.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD or later in regard to LEONARD W. HALL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add a few words to what has already been so well said with reference to the service of LEONARD HALL in this House.

It has been my privilege to have a close and intimate association with Mr. HALL. Our association as members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce enabled me to understand and appreciate his personal qualities and those that dominated him in the transaction of public business. He was at all times actuated by the highest and best of motives.

The work of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce covers a wide field of activity. Its legislative jurisdiction extends to practically all of the regulatory bodies of our Government. In addition thereto many other activities of our Government come within the scope of its jurisdiction. By reason of his great knowledge of the proper functions of government, as well as a wide experience in law and business, Mr. HALL was able to bring wise counsel and advice to the Committee in its consideration of the important matters that were brought before it for determination. He had at all times a judicial attitude that enabled him to carefully weigh and evaluate all the testimony presented to the committee.

LEONARD HALL was fair and just in all things. He had the confidence and respect of all the Members of the House. His friendly disposition made for him a host of personal friends. It is expressing it mildly to say, we will miss him.

In his voluntary retirement from membership in this House his congressional district, that he has represented so long and faithfully, will lose as fine a Representative as ever sat in this House.

We wish for him many more years of public service and health, happiness, and success at all times.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress with LEN HALL in the Seventy-sixth Congress. I hate to see him leave, but perhaps he is wiser than the rest of us. We were members of the Wednesday night club that, for many years, had dinner together, heard a speaker, asked questions, argued, and enjoyed ourselves. Long Island duck night, with LEN HALL as host, was always a great occasion for our club. He was always genial, cheerful, and friendly, but he was a wise and square and courageous Congressman. We shall miss him, but we wish him well.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in expressing my regret that LEONARD HALL is leaving the Congress. I am a relatively new Member of the House, having served in 1947–48, and having been returned to the Congress only since February of this year. But in the comparatively short time I have been associated with Len in the Congress, I have come to admire him and respect him as a friend and one of the outstanding men in the Congress.

As has been said time and again, Len will be missed in this Chamber as much as any other man who has ever served and voluntarily retired, because of his great ability and because of his genuine friendliness with every Member of the House, be he Republican or Democrat.

Although Len is retiring from the Congress, Mr. Speaker, he is most certainly not retiring from public service. The Republicans of the great county of Nassau have called him to take the position of judge of the Surrogate's Court, where he will render the same kind of fine service to that court that he has given to the Congress.

Those who knew Len intimately and who know the esteem in which he is held by the people of New York are predicting that he will be called upon in the very near future for an even greater service to the people of the Empire State.

Like all Members of this body, I sincerely wish for Len the greatest measure of success in his new role as judge.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not challenge the wisdom of LEONARD HALL's decision to retire from the House, but I do most heartily regret it. I have served with him for 6 years on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He is one of the most valuable members of that committee. He is distinguished for his legal ability, for his practical good sense and judgment, and for his good humor. He enjoys life and imparts to others his enjoyment of life. As it happens, he and I have shared many opinions in the last 6 years, but if we had always disagreed I should like him as well. I shall miss him and I wish him every success in his new activities. He eminently deserves the best.

Mr. POULSON. I join with the many others in the House in paying our respects to LEN HALL. We all regret his leaving and yet we know a man with his ability and opportunities will go on to greater heights. Len is not only an affable, likeable, and charming individual, but he is a man of physical and mental stature. His ability has been demonstrated many times here in the House. As chairman of the congressional committee he has been most help-

ful to all Republicans in their campaigns. He succeeds in everything he undertakes, and we know that he will be a great success in his future undertakings. We wish him all of the happiness and prosperity available to any individual.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am awfully sorry that LEN HALL has decided not to return to the House. I do not blame him, in view of the circumstances, but the place will not be the same without him.

I feel that he has been one of the most valuable Members we have. I know that he is one of the best friends I have in the world. He has helped me on a great many occasions, and his counsel and advice is always wise and kind.

I wish him every success in his new position, and I hope that he will come back and see us often.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this occasion to express my great regret at the decision of Hon. LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, to retire from Congress after the present session. I do not question the wisdom of Mr. HALL's decision; I am confident that the work which lies before him in his own State will be full of honors and satisfaction. But I shall very much miss Mr. HALL from this body where I have had close associations with him over the last 10 years, more particularly in the last 6 years when we have served together on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Mr. HALL has been a most valuable member of that committee, to whose work he has brought sound judgment, good knowledge of the law, and abundant common sense.

LEONARD HALL is one of the most companionable of men. Any sort of association with him is a pleasure. As it happens he and I have generally shared the same opinion on political and other questions, but even if we had not seen eye to eye I should have enjoyed my association with him no less. His tolerance, his humor, and his good humor, transcend party lines, as any of the majority members of the committee will agree. The House loses a valuable Member with Mr. HALL's retirement. My best wishes accompany him into anything and everything that he does.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the decision of our colleague, Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, to retire from the Congress and become surrogate of Nassau County, N. Y., is a distinct loss to the National Legislature where this friendly, able lawyer, was a mighty force for good.

LEN HALL and I were among the American Congressmen who in April 1945 visited the infamous concentration camp at Buchenwald, near Weimar, Germany, just a few days after it was liberated by Patton's Third Army. There we saw human barbarism at its worst, and I shall always remember my colleague's reactions followed by his repeated warnings that only an alert and strong American citizenry can save our land from such a fate.

I know something about LEN HALL's love of America and its freedoms and in this parting I can only say that Nassau County, N. Y., gains, and I predict history will record it never had a finer surrogate.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable LEONARD W. HALL has made his mark in the Congress of the United States. Through his service he has established a reputation as a careful, thoughtful, and sound legislator. He has always been a source of wise counsel and friendly consideration.

Len has chosen to voluntarily terminate his service in the House of Representatives. I wish this were not true. Our country needs men of integrity and soundness like Mr. HALL. I will miss him greatly.

It is my hope that this new undertaking will be enjoyable and that he will continue in the public service. I extend to him and to his fine family every good wish for the future.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, for a great many years LEN HALL and I have sat side by side on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I think I know him well. We know each other. The present occupant of the chair, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] is likewise a member of that committee, and I know he feels the same.

LEN HALL has done a magnificent job on our committee both for the committee in its work on legislation and for the country. He will be very sorely missed on our committee. We shall all regret having him leave. However, as the gentleman from Indiana has pointed out, the pressures to remain at home are strong upon us. Many Members of the House have come to feel individually the pressures that grow upon us from being separated not just a few months a year but over the past 14 years about 95 percent of the time from our home districts and frequently from our families.

It takes great courage, really, to break away from this body after long service to it. After years of service here one becomes really a part of the great legislative process. It becomes as familiar as one's own home. There always remains much to be done that we are eager to see accomplished. It is hard indeed to contemplate breaking away voluntarily.

But some among us find that they no longer can afford to stay here, as the economics of this position in recent years are very unsound. We are all sorry that Len has felt it is necessary to leave for personal and family reasons. We know that the section of Long Island, in which he lives, cannot have a better man to serve on the particular bench which I trust he will achieve. But in losing him to that place, the Congress and the people of the United States will be losing a very valuable public servant. I hope that something can be done in the Congress, particularly if we meet again before the 3d of January, to make it possible so that we may shut off this great necessity on the part of so many Members to leave the Congress. Thirty-eight Members are retiring voluntarily. I know that everyone here on this floor today fully appreciates those things, and I trust we can take care of that matter satisfactorily before too many months, and before the next Congress, the Eighty-third Congress convenes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, LEN HALL and I came to the Congress at the same time. I became acquainted with my friend, LEN HALL, just a few days after I arrived. It did not take me long to realize he was my kind of people even though he came from the thickly populated city of New York, and I came from Iowa soil. I had many interesting conversations with Leonard about the farm problems. He wanted to know them. He wanted to be a United States Congressman as well as a district Congressman—and that is what LEN HALL has been. The other day when the question of support prices on farm products was on the floor of the House, LEONARD HALL voted with the majority of the Representatives from the Western States in favor of the 90-percent support price on basic farm products, which proves that he is a United States Congressman and is interested in the welfare of all the people. I was also honored a few years ago when LEN HALL chose me as his secretary for the national Republican campaign committee. I worked with Leonard there. I have the highest regard for LEONARD HALL, and I am sorry he is leaving the Congress, and I hope for him all the fine things in life.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, am sorry to see our colleague LEN HALL, leave the Congress of the United States. Though I recognize the feeling of affection my colleagues on the minority side have for Len, I am sure I speak the sentiments of many of us on this side when I say, we, too, have the same high regard and great respect for LEN HALL. For 10 years I have served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with him. I have had the opportunity to watch him work in the committee which has jurisdiction of perhaps more controversial legislation as you will find in any committee of the Congress.

I have enjoyed the fine association with him in this House and in our committee. I have observed him in action and know of the leadership and fortitude he possesses. It is under circumstances like this a man's character, integrity, and judgment is tested. During these years I can say with all frankness and honesty, that the Members on the Democratic side have learned to know LEN HALL and appreciate the great legislator he has proved himself to be in this Congress.

Therefore, I regret to see a man of his ability, his outstanding character, splendid reputation, fine judgment, the type of man who is unafraid to take a stand, a man who has deep convictions and willing to carry them out, leave this Congress.

Speaking for the Democratic members of our committee, and I am sure Democratic Members in this House, we will miss LEN HALL in the years to come in this great body.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one Member of this House who served on the Republican National Congressional Committee with LEN HALL for many years. I have had an opportunity to watch him and judge the caliber of the man. He is one of the outstanding men in this House. In his leaving he leaves a vacant place that it will be difficult for any other Member to fill. It was a pleasure to work with him. He is an inspiring man. He has character and personality that we all could envy.

I regret very much that he has determined to leave public life. I wish him well in the new position that I understand he is about to fill. As one who has practiced law for nearly a quarter of a century, as I have, and did mostly probate work, I know the field which he enters will be a pleasant field, and one where his great talent and ability will serve the public in that area.

I am glad to endorse everything that has been said today about Mr. LEONARD HALL.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to LEN HALL. He has great and rare skill, he is a real American and a real legislator for he understands and desires that points of view other than his own be expressed, and he knows that by attrition we finally get to the right result. I have enjoyed working with LEN HALL very much. He has been wonderful to me. He has been very cooperative with every other Member of this House, and was much beloved here.

I would like to add as a citizen of New York myself that he is going on to fields of very great public service. This task of being surrogate of the great county of Nassau is one of greatest responsibility in which he can do great good as a public official. I feel he is going on to ever greater service, if that is possible, than that which he had the privilege of rendering here.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it has just come to my notice that the Honorable LEONARD HALL is going to retire from Congress. I want to express my regret at his leaving at this time. I have never known a finer, more outstanding American than LEONARD HALL.

I say to the gentlemen on the other side, with all deference, that if the Republicans were as wise as they ought to be, they would nominate LEONARD HALL for President of the United States.

He is a great American, one in whom the elements are so mixed that nature might stand up and say to all the world: "This is a man."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, when the Seventy-sixth Congress assembled there were about 80 new Members on this side of the House and probably 25 or 30 on the other side. Hon. LEONARD HALL, of New York, was one of the outstanding Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

He early showed his elements of leadership, and in 14 years has been always one of the outstanding Members of this House. We learned to love LEONARD HALL; we respect him, we admire him, and we loved his strong, American characteristics. He was always for what seemed to be in the interest of the general public.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks. I have also made that request for all the other Members of the House and now if I may I would like to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in regard to my very distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and my neighbor, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and the other Members who are retiring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ECONOMIC GROWTH OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, democratic government will only be strong if the people get the facts on what their government is doing. I have been particularly impressed with the eagerness of the people of my State to gain a knowledge of what our progress has been over the past 20 years.

Economic growth is a nebulous thing. Only when we break down programs and policies into actual facts of who has benefited from them, and show the extent to which living has been improved for all sections of the population, do we truly understand what we have been trying to accomplish and the degree to which we have succeeded.

I have, therefore, had this study prepared in order to inform the people of my State of the facts on their progress during the last two decades. It deals with the level of employment, production, and income in the State. It describes West Virginia's gains in health, education, and security—the improvement in wages, hours, and working conditions, and the steady growth of business under our system of free enterprise. The strides made by farmers in production, income, prices, and living conditions are enumerated, and the programs for aiding veterans are set forth on the State level.

Based on my conviction that an informed electorate is indispensable to democratic government, I provide the people of my State with the facts they deserve to have on how far we have come and where we are going.

THE WEST VIRGINIA STORY—HOW WEST VIRGINIA HAS BENEFITED FROM TWO DECADES OF FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION

The people of West Virginia have shared greatly in the Nation's tremendous advances of the past 20 years.

The last Republican administration left us with a dying economy. Today, thanks largely to progressive Democratic leadership, nearly everybody in the land is far better off than he has ever been.

This material progress has meant an immense growth in our feeling of human dignity and security. It has meant the greatest freedom from economic fear that man has ever known. That is the human meaning of the following three facts:

Last year America provided not 60,000,000, but 61,000,000 jobs.

High employment and improved productive methods have boosted the value of total national output, after all price adjustments, to three times the level of 20 years ago.

Americans' personal incomes, after all taxes and after allowing for increased living costs, have on the average, almost doubled since 1932—and are 42 percent higher than in 1929, the peak of Republican prosperity.

As in the Nation, so too, in West Virginia.

The people of West Virginia have gained with everyone—and stand to lose with everyone if the national Democratic policies that have brought us so far are now reversed, instead of being extended as they must be.

We in West Virginia cannot stand still. We dare not go back. We must continue to go forward.

Here is where we in West Virginia stand today, as described in the following pages:

I. Life is better and richer, folks are living better.

II. Workers have more jobs, higher real wages, greater security.

III. Business is good, better than ever.

IV. Farmers have come a long way, they are in far better shape.

V. Veterans are helped by a grateful nation.

VI. Our Federal tax dollars are buying a lot.

I. LIFE IS BETTER AND RICHER—FOLKS ARE LIVING BETTER

We have come a long way in West Virginia over the past 20 years. We have worked hard to do it. And the same reactionary forces whose policies would have stopped our progress are still threatening both our gains and our future. In the fight now shaping up it is well to consider just what these gains have been.

The average West Virginia family, primarily as a result of more steady and secure employment is far better off today than its equivalent of 20 years ago. A family which received $1,832 in 1932 would get $4,196 in 1950—both figures

in current dollars. Where there was $116 per person deposited in West Virginia banks 20 years ago, there is $410 today. A little over 4 families out of 10 owned their homes in 1930. Today even though West Virginia has nearly twice as many families, over 5 out of 10 own their own homes. We have more economic security than ever before. And our Federal Government is helping our State and county governments to aid the unfortunate few who have been unable to keep pace with our general prosperity.

Now our job is to extend as well as defend these gains.

HIGHER INCOMES

Total personal income in West Virginia in 1950 reached $2,110,000,000, an increase of 166 percent since 1929—the best of the years when the Republicans ruled the country—and of 357 percent since 1932. Even in terms of 1950 prices, total income has increased 90 percent since 1929, and 160 percent since 1932.

Income in 1950 amounted to $1,049 for each man, woman, and child in West Virginia. Even after adjustment for price changes, the equivalent per capita income in 1932 was $458 and only $649 in 1929.

BETTER HOUSING

Today, more West Virginia families than ever before have attained the goal of almost every American—home ownership, and "my own back yard."

Moreover, federally sponsored and financially aided slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects are transforming many squalid and deteriorated areas of our cities into beautiful garden areas for healthful and happy living.

The strongest single encouragement to the remarkable increase in home ownership has been the activities of the Federal Housing Administration in insuring mortgage loans and bringing down interest rates. By the end of 1951, FHA insured 79,551 mortgage loans amounting to $137,074,300 in the State.

Federal insurance of building and loan companies has helped untold thousands of families to acquire new homes or to repair and modernize their old homes by encouraging investors to make money available for these purposes.

Renters: For the renter group, rents have been held down better than other prices and now consume a smaller proportion of the family income. Moreover, a far better quality of rental housing is available.

Public housing: Through Federal-State-local housing agencies, 2,076 units of low-rent public housing have been constructed or are under construction in West Virginia, with 974 units in Charleston, 500 units in Huntington, and 302 units in Wheeling. The Federal housing agencies have contributed $13,298,000 to low-rent public housing in West Virginia.

GREATER ADVANCES IN HEALTH

The Federal Security Agency, in cooperation with West Virginia's agencies, in 1951 invested $2,838,429 in programs designed to improve the health and general welfare of the State population.

Additional modernized medical facilities have been provided. For example, the Federal Government contributed over $1,573,240 for the construction of medical facilities, greatly increasing the number of hospital beds and other hospital facilities for all of the people in the State. The number of nurses in the State increased from 14 per 10,000 people in 1930 to 20 per 10,000 in 1949.

Infant deaths per 1,000 live births dropped from 78 in 1929 to only 32 in 1951 in the State. Maternal deaths per 1,000 live births declined strikingly from 5.8 in 1929 to only 1.0 in 1949. The continuous emphasis which Democratic administrations have placed on our Nation's health has paid off in lives saved.

GROWTH IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

On the educational side, 79 percent of all children 5 to 17 years old were enrolled in school in 1950 as compared to 75.6 percent in 1929. Federal contributions for educational programs in the State increased from $76,756 in 1929 to $465,000 in 1951, benefiting 45,740 young people.

The adult population was not overlooked; vocational and rehabilitation programs, aided by $447,534 in Federal funds, improved the lives of 6,400 citizens of West Virginia in 1951. Land-grant college programs in West Virginia received $92,000 in 1951, benefiting over 7,000 college students enrolled in these institutions.

SOCIAL SECURITY HAS BUILT PERSONAL CONFIDENCE AND INDEPENDENCE

Democratic leadership in Washington put through the Social Security Act in 1935 and ensured a real extension of the system in 1950. As a result, 65,700 elder citizens in West Virginia are now receiving old age and survivors insurance benefits amounting to $27,052,000 a year.

In the Republican days you would have had to buy an annuity worth up to $15,455 to get the income that a retired wage earner and his wife, at 65, now get from social security. If you are married, with several young children, social security provides life-insurance protection worth up to $25,000.

For most of us, the fear of old-age in the poorhouse and the pauper's grave is forever banished.

A RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT PROTECTS MINIMUM LIVING STANDARDS

In any great human advance, some people have misfortunes. Both as a matter of right, and as a reinforcement against lack of purchasing power, this group must be assisted. The Federal Government, under the Social Security Act, makes grants-in-aid and contributions to States with approved welfare programs designed to assist the needy aged, dependent children, the blind, and the disabled. Here is West Virginia's record under this act for 1951 alone:

Program	Federal contribution	Number of persons aided	Average monthly payment
Old-age assistance	$5,832,744	25,886	$26.39
Aid to dependent children	8,539,063	49,315	20.32
Aid to the blind	262,800	1,079	31.14
Aid to the disabled	24,779	462	32.47

II. WORKERS HAVE MORE JOBS—HIGHER REAL WAGES—GREATER SECURITY

Those of us in West Virginia who work for wages have benefited more than almost any other group from the policies of the national Democratic administration.

West Virginia workingmen are gravely threatened by the danger of a Republican reversal of the progressive labor policies responsible for the gains which have been made in the State. Their only hope for further progress lies in continued Democratic leadership of the Nation.

DECENT JOBS AND HIGHER WEEKLY EARNINGS

Statistics alone can never indicate the human degradation imposed by the great depression. But let us remember that in 1932 over 12,000,000 men and women in the United States were totally and despairingly without work.

In 1951, 530,700 people in West Virginia had jobs in nonagricultural employment. Great gains have been made in the last 20 years. In manufacturing, for example, employment has risen from 93,800 in 1939 to 140,000 in 1951.

Consider the pay envolope's progress since 1932. Nationally, the average worker's weekly pay was $32.40 figured in today's dollars—if he had a job. In 1951 the average factory worker drew almost $65 a week in wages.

FORTY HOURS A WEEK, PLUS OVERTIME

Now the average workweek is down to 40 hours, despite the great expansion of output to meet national defense needs, and despite the rise in the pay and purchasing power of the worker.

Today, moreover, most workers get time and a half for work over 40 hours, paid holidays, and paid vacations.

In 1929, a factory worker had to put in 166 hours of work to pay for a 7-tube radio set. Today, he can buy a 20-inch television set for the price of 94 hours of work.

FROM POORHOUSES AND CHARITY TO INSURANCE AND SECURITY

Under Republican administrations in the past the average workingman was forced to rely on private charity, the poorhouse, and his children for help during periods of unemployment or temporary disability, and for security in old age.

Now, 381,000 West Virginia workers have Federal-State unemployment insurance if they lose their jobs. And the free Federal-State employment services will now help any worker find a new job. Last year, the West Virginia employment service found jobs for 31,186 workers.

Now, also, most of us are entitled to Federal social-security in our old age, and our families will get monthly insurance payments if the chief breadwinner should die prematurely.

FROM GOONS AND INJUNCTIONS TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Many of labor's gains since 1933 have come directly from stronger unions and strong collective bargaining. During Republican days unions were fought bitterly, and in 1932 union membership sank to an alarming low.

Democratic Government made these gains possible when in 1933 and again in the 1935 Wagner Act, it wrote into law—and enforced—the workingman's right to organize freely and bargain collectively. This is a right which many Republicans still do not accept. Where would unions—and workers—now be, had the Taft-Hartley crew been in power since 1933?

FROM EXPLOITATION OF THE WEAK TO LEGAL GUARANTIES

Today, cheap chiselers can no longer exploit working women. Today, we no longer suffer starvation wages—the Federal legal minimum is 75 cents per hour. Today, the handicapped are getting Government help in finding jobs. Today, race discrimination in jobs is fast on the way out. For all these accomplishments, we can thank national Democratic leadership.

III. BUSINESS IS GOOD; BETTER THAN EVER

Opportunities in West Virginia are good in almost all fields of business. And the businessman's efforts pay off today more than ever before—because the State's economy is stronger than ever before.

Democratic national policies have forever proved that what is good for the country is good for business. Selfishly short-sighted policies, however, can still bring business once again to the brink of ruin. Continued Democratic administration is the businessman's best insurance.

BUSINESS POPULATION

In 1951 there were 40,200 businesses in operation in West Virginia. Manufacturing establishments alone increased from 887 in 1933 to 1,602 in 1947, the latest year for which figures are available.

A total of 4,100 new businesses of all kinds were started in West Virginia in 1950, proof of the hollowness of Republican charges that so-called socialism is undermining American business.

BUSINESS OUTPUT

The value added to raw materials by manufacturing establishments in West Virginia soared to $882,401,000 in 1950, having stood at $251,615,000 in 1929, then dropping to $134,375,000 in the dark days of the depression.

Volume of retail sales of West Virginia businesses increased from $441,000,000 to $1,300,000,000 between 1929 and 1948. An additional indication of business growth is shown by the fact that businesses in West Virginia employed about 530,000 people in 1950 and paid them nearly $1,500,000,000 in wages and salaries, an increase of 351 percent since 1932.

Military purchases of equipment and supplies from West Virginia business firms also helped to expand the State's output, and provided a substantial source of business income in the State. Total purchases in West Virginia amounted to over $37,000,000 in 1951. Of this amount nearly $19,000,000 worth was purchased from small businesses.

TRANSPORTATION

West Virginia business relies on transport. The Democratic administrations in Washington have helped tremendously to develop air transportation. Two airports in West Virginia were given Federal aid for improvement or expansion in 1951 amounting to over $313,000.

Truck transport has been greatly aided by highway construction in the State; Federal contributions in 1951, amounting to $3,703,000, aided in building nearly 100 miles of modern highway in West Virginia. Democratic administrations have helped the railroads to a fair return so they could afford to modernize equipment.

CONTINUED BUSINESS EXPANSION

Much of the business expansion in West Virginia has been possible because of Federal programs to aid businesses financially. Thus, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made a total of 10 loans amounting to $5,076,000 to businesses in West Virginia during 1951. Of these, 9 loans amounting to $1,300,000 were made to aid small businesses. Most RFC loans have been repaid in full.

A WORD ABOUT THE BANKS

Thanks to Democratic banking reforms, not a single depositor in any bank insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation suffered a cent of loss or a moment of delay because of bank failure last year.

In 1929, 14 banks with deposits of over $6,500,000 failed in West Virginia alone. Small businesses and individuals were hardest hit. Bank deposits are now insured by the corporation up to $10,000 per depositor. During the Republican administrations, not a single account or a penny of deposits were protected.

More facts about business progress in West Virginia

[This tabulation presents selected statistics not included in the text above]

Other available statistics	1929	1932	1951 [1]
Bank deposits, total private, time and demand:			
Amount	$318,553,000	$200,542,000	$821,710,000
Per capita	$184	$116	$413
Deposit insurance:			
Number of accounts fully protected			1,038,000
Number of accounts protected up to $10,000			10,635
Amount of deposits protected			$617,000,000
Percent of all deposits protected			63.1
Number of banks insured			117
Assets of banks insured			$1,104,000,000

[1] Or latest available year.

IV. FARMERS HAVE COME A LONG WAY; THEY ARE IN FAR BETTER SHAPE

Most West Virginia farmers and their families, through their own hard work, have lifted themselves in the past 20 years from poverty living to American living.

But West Virginia farmers have always worked hard. They worked hard during the Republican 1920's—and thousands of them went broke. They worked hard in Republican 1932—and by the end of the year they were all virtually bankrupt.

In the past 20 years Democratic national policies have made the difference—while most Republicans in Washington continued to obstruct, and are still obstructing.

Much still remains to be done for agriculture. It will not be done by an obstructionist Republican Congress. It can only be done by forward-looking Democratic leadership in Washington—the same sort of leadership that has already helped West Virginia farmers so much.

CATTLE PRODUCTION HAS INCREASED BY ONE-THIRD

West Virginia farms have boosted their output of cattle by over 30 percent since 1929, and greatly increased their yield of both crops and livestock since the early 1930's. Cattle production rose to 119,568,000 pounds in 1951, having been only 90,595,000 pounds in 1929. Hog production rose from 51,650,000 pounds in 1929 to 66,245,000 last year.

FARM INCOME, PRICES, AND WAGE RATES ALSO AT PROSPEROUS LEVELS

West Virginia farmers received $132,029,000 in cash for the products they marketed in 1951. In 1929, the peak year of Republican "prosperity," they received only $54,929,000, while in 1932 they made just $27,000,000—or only a fraction as much as last year.

For 12 years, during the last Republican administration, the prices of products farmers sold went down while the prices of the things they bought went up. The squeeze got tighter and tighter and ended in the 1930's with poor farm living, big farm debts, and foreclosed mortgages. The Democrats established parity price policies that keep the prices of products farmers sell in fair relationship with the prices of the things they buy.

The prices West Virginia farmers get for their cattle, and milk have about quadrupled since 1932. Beef cattle prices per hundredweight increased from $4.40 in 1932 to $27.20 in 1951. The price of milk per hundredweight likewise increased 180 percent since 1932.

Farm wage workers in the State have also prospered. They now work fewer hours, and their wage rates have risen from only 13 cents per hour in 1932 to 51 cents per hour in 1951. Taking into account increases in prices, the purchasing power of these wages about doubled.

FARMERS NOW GET AMPLE CREDIT AT REASONABLE COST

Advances in farming, as in other major businesses, have depended on credit—the ability to secure loans at reasonable rates and terms. In 1932, farm credit was both expensive and hard to get. Since 1938, farm credit agencies of the Federal Government have been making loans at reasonable interest rates to help farmers in West Virginia purchase land and operate farms.

In 1951 alone, Federal farm loans extended to West Virginia farmers num-

bered about 1,800 and totaled nearly $4,000,000. These loans averaged $7,600 for farm purchase, over $1,300 for farm operation, and $2,500 for production credit.

GREATER USE OF MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AND INCREASED FARM PRODUCTIVITY

Evidence of progress is shown by the far greater use of mechanical equipment on farms in West Virginia over the past 20 years. Trucks for farm use numbered 7,000 in 1930, 12,000 in 1940, and 25,000 in 1950. Tractors increased from 3,000 in 1930 to 16,000 in 1950. The number of milking machines reported, doubled over the period.

For promotion of better methods of farm production, the Federal Government spent $268,000 for agricultural experiment stations in West Virginia in 1951; cooperative agricultural extension work was carried on, supported by $560,000 in Federal funds.

Farm efficiency and conservation measures have been greatly improved by these developments. For example, 61 percent of West Virginia cropland is included under agricultural conservation programs, and virtually all of West Virginia farmland is included in soil conservation districts. This program was promoted by Federal payments of about $2,096,000 in 1950.

FARMERS ARE BETTER OFF AND ARE LIVING BETTER, TOO

Farm ownership and foreclosures: Today 73,000 farmers in West Virginia own their own farms, as against 66,500 who owned the farms they ran in 1930. In the early thirties, 13 farms out of every 1,000 were foreclosed. In 1951, less than 2 out of every 1,000 was foreclosed.

The value of farmland and buildings owned by farmers in West Virginia stood at $66 per acre in 1951, having been $39 per acre in 1929, and only $30 per acre in 1932.

Life on the farm is easier: In the last 20 years, living on a farm has become modernized American living.

The general prosperity of West Virginia farmers has enabled farm women to buy modern household appliances that make housework easier and more pleasant. Now almost every West Virginia farm has an automobile. Over 17,184 miles of rural roads were surfaced by 1949, enabling farm families to get to town.

Electrification through Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives—a program that Republicans in Congress still seek to throttle—has brought electric power to West Virginia farm homes. In 1930, 2,800, or slightly over 6 percent of all West Virginia farms had power-line service. In 1950, 56,610 farms had such service. And since 1949 REA has begun to repeat the same story on telephone installations.

Today 68 percent of West Virginia farm homes have radios, not to mention the rapidly increasing number acquiring TV sets. Only 2 percent had a radio before 1929. Today the farmer keeps in touch with weather, crop and market news, as well as with national and world news.

More facts about farmers' gains in West Virginia

[This tabulation presents selected statistics not included in the text above]

Other available statistics	1929	1932	1951 [1]
Federal expenditures for—			
School lunch programs	None	$21,000	$2,083,000
Number of pupils served	None	15,000	122,000
Cooperatives: Amount of business	$4,800,000	$3,200,000	$7,100,000
Production Credit Administration loans: Amount of loans outstanding	None	None	$3,000,000
Federal land banks: Amount of loans outstanding	$8,100,000	$8,000,000	$3,900,000
Farm mortgage debt	$27,437,000	$24,292,000	$26,996,000

[1] Or latest available year.

V. VETERANS ARE HELPED BY A GRATEFUL NATION

When a serviceman comes home he may carry no wound scars—but he still has sacrificed a lot. He has sacrificed, for his country's need, a part of his life. The country owes him all the aid it can afford toward making up for those years, toward helping him catch up on the progress he otherwise would have achieved.

This modern approach to veterans' needs was first sponsored by Franklin D. Roosevelt and was enacted into law by a Democratic Congress, in the GI bill of rights of 1944.

Now similarly, President Truman in his 1952 state of the Union message has urged Congress to "start a sensible program of readjustment benefits for our veterans who have seen service since the fighting broke out in Korea." A Democratic Congress will quickly follow through on this recommendation.

THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS: CATCHING UP ON SCHOOLING AND TRAINING

Over 14,000 West Virginia veterans took advantage of the GI bill's provisions for tuition and other expenses to continue education or training in 1951. On these VA programs the Federal Government spent nearly $14,500,000 in West Virginia.

THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS: BUYING THAT NEW HOME

By 1951, 14,000 West Virginia veterans had joined the ranks of home owners by taking advantage of the small down payments and 4 percent interest rate provided by the Veterans' Administration guaranty program under the GI bill. From late 1944 to June 1951, as a part of this program, the Federal Government insured or guaranteed $65,000,000 worth of low-interest loans to assist West Virginia veterans in buying homes.

THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS: STARTING OUT ON ONE'S OWN

The Democratic Party has always sought to encourage small independent business, and owner-operated farms. Under the GI bill, over 600 West Virginia veterans have opened their own businesses and nearly 400 have been helped to buy their own farms. The principal amount of farm and business loans approved by the VA through June 1951 totaled $3,514,000.

DISABLED AND ILL VETERANS ARE WELL CARED FOR

Medical care for disabled veterans and for all other veterans who need it has been greatly improved since 1946, when a Democratic Congress raised salaries for VA medical and profesisonal staffs and otherwise enabled the best standard of medical care to be developed. The same law provided arrangements that allow veterans to get free treatment in many cases from their home-town doctors and dentists.

The VA maintains a modern hospital at Huntington, W. Va., to give hospitalization and medical care to nearly 7,000 veterans in the State in 1951.

Vocational rehabilitation has helped over 3,200 disabled veterans get back to work and normal living. Over 1,300 were in training in 1951, entailing $2,125,000 in Federal funds for subsistence, tuition, supplies, and equipment.

Compensation for wartime disabilities now range generally from $15 to $150 a month, rising to $260 a month in special cases. Peacetime cases get 80 percent of these rates.

PENSIONS AND INSURANCE ON AN ADEQUATE BASIS

Since the enactment of the low-cost national service life-insurance program sponsored by President Roosevelt in 1940 and later endorsed by President Truman, about 6,000,000 policies were issued to servicemen in the United States through 1950. These policies provided $39,000,000,000 worth of insurance to veterans and their families.

Today, 37,853 West Virginia veterans or their survivors are receiving a pension, a compensation, or a retirement payment amounting to over $25,608,000.

Since April 25, 1951, congressional action on President Truman's recommendation makes it possible for every serviceman, in West Virginia, as in all other States, to get a free $10,000 life-insurance policy.

VI. OUR FEDERAL TAX DOLLARS ARE BUYING A LOT

The progressive Democratic programs and policies that have helped us so greatly do not run themselves. Money has to be spent in order to get the benefits of these programs to the people of West Virginia.

Taxes have been collected, and this has been done on the basis of ability to pay. The average person has far more left over after taxes than he or his family had before taxes in 1929.

If the Republicans had their way, they would not only cut sound and progressive programs which have promoted West Virginia's tremendous growth over the past 20 years.

They would also shift the burden of taxes to the backs of workers and professional people.

A WARNING ON FALSE PROPAGANDA ON FEDERAL SPENDING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Some Republicans complain that the people of West Virginia are being shortchanged; they argue that the Government does not turn back enough of its tax collections to West Virginia.

Here are three reasons why such comparisons of taxes collected and money spent are phony and do not measure the benefits West Virginia gets from Federal spending:

First. Spending in West Virginia alone does not tell the whole story.

West Virginia residents can benefit just as much from Federal investments in other States as from investments in their own. After all, West Virginia citizens are United States citizens as well. An airplane built in California guards people in West Virginia.

The soldiers in Korea are not being paid in any one State, but they certainly are keeping a third world war from the doorsteps of West Virginia citizens as well as those of all Americans.

And people of West Virginia benefit from Federal expenditures that cannot be allocated to any one State, such as the postal service, the Immigration Service, the FBI, and the over-all costs of running the Government.

Second. It is not possible to list all Federal money spent in West Virginia.

Accurate State breakdowns of all Federal expenditures are impossible to get. More State information is available, however, than the Republicans usually include in their taxes versus expenditures. The pages at the end of this section, as well as all that has been described in the sections before, give information on a large number of programs for which money is being spent to benefit the people of West Virginia.

Third. Federal taxes collected in West Virginia do not necessarily reflect the amount of taxes that the people actually pay.

For example, certain excise taxes are collected in advance from manufacturers in West Virginia, but they are actually paid by consumers in other States. Some corporations pay their taxes at their home office rather than in the States where the factories are located. Also, people sometimes file their income-tax returns in the State where they work or do business, rather than where they reside.

THE FACTS OF FEDERAL SPENDING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Republicans also say that they want to cut out unnecessary Government spending.

Who does not want to cut out unnecessary spending? The question is, Just what is unnecessary?

Is aid to the blind unnecessary? Ask a blind man.

Is public housing unnecessary? Ask the two-hundredth family on a project waiting list for decent housing at a rent they can afford.

Are public-health clinics unnecessary? Ask the mother whose child might have died because the family could not afford a private physician.

Listed below are some of the major programs paid for by our tax dollars, which are bringing benefits to a cross section of West Virginia citizens.

It might be revealing to find out from the Republican economizers just which ones they think the people of West Virginia think they can do without.

Federal grants to West Virginia State and local government to help them with their programs

PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS AND FEDERAL FUNDS ALLOTED FISCAL YEAR 1951

For workers:	
Administration of unemployment insurance and State employment offices	$1,385,348
Vocational rehabilitation for disabled	348,070
For farmers:	
Agricultural experiment stations	258,757
Agricultural extension services	553,718
Better marketing facilities	46,150
For veterans:	
Administration of unemployment and self-employment allowances	36,891
Supervision of on-the-job training for veterans	59,937
For our needy population:	
Aid to the needy aged	6,153,433
Aid to dependent children	94,880
Aid to the permanently disabled	8,810,745
Aid to the blind	279,584
Child-welfare services	179,608
Surplus foods for public institutions and schools	1,198,660
For our health:	
To fight cancer	36,695
To fight heart disease	20,608
To fight venereal disease	158,593
To fight tuberculosis	89,920
To build hospitals	780,828
To fight water pollution	14,300
To promote mental health	45,364
To promote basic health services	215,146
For maternal and child health	256,036
For services for crippled children	215,297
For low-rent public housing	87,394
For education:	
Free books for the blind	1,867
Vocational training for future workers for farm, homes, and industry	432,753
Construction of schools in communities crowded by children of workers on Federal projects	13,603
Instruction in land-grant colleges	91,707
School-lunch program	1,465,326
Schools (and roads) from a sharing of Federal forest revenues	22,758
For transportation and communication:	
Airports	$526,402
Roads and highways	3,563,471
For development of natural resources:	
Protection of non-Federal forests	193,789
Wildlife conservation	190,335
Total grants-in-aid	27,830,976

Here is a list of some other Federal expenditures and payments recently made in West Virginia. Thousands of citizens and businesses profited from these payments.

For defense work:	
Value of prime contracts awarded for military procurement and construction from July 1950 through December 1951	$300,000
For forest highways in or near Federal forests	60,720
Some payments made for farmers:	
For soil conservation, sugar production and emergency loans to needy farmers	1,964,095
Veterans' benefits	$58,093,575
Interest on Government bonds held by individuals (1950)	16,800,000
For rivers and harbors and flood control projects of the Corps of Army Engineers	8,080,000
For Federal payrolls, 1950:	
Civilian employee payrolls	36,700,000
Civilian employee pensions	1,914,000
Military pay and allowances, including dependents' allowances and retirement pay	18,885,000
Social Security payments from Social Security funds, 1950; of course these payments are made from funds contributed by workers and employees. They are not expenditures, but they are made because of the Federal social-security program:	
To unemployed workers	15,343,000
To retired workers	14,905,000
To retired railroad workers	5,463,000
To unemployed railroad workers	1,793,000

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Landers, its clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3177. An act to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 4792. An act to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis.; and

H. Con. Res. 239. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to make corrections in general appropriation bills.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7289) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 13 and 52.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8120) entitled "An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 2190) entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2968) entitled "An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 707. An act for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of John George Papailias;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Izumi;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyk;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 1448. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1477. An act for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batromn;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin;

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1814. An act to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan;

H. R. 1843. An act for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2447. An act for the relief of George M. Sanger;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2856. An act for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel);

H. R. 2906. An act for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Vito Aiuto;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Anny Scher;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3382. An act for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi;

H. R. 3438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80);

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3705. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju;

H. R. 3778. An act for the relief of Wong Soo Sun;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Aldo Vallesa;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of Franco Berardi;

H. R. 4001. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the status of Hawaiian home lands;

H. R. 4407. An act to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4797. An act to ratify and confirm Act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of Act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of Act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935;

H. R. 4799. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4800. An act to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Silas B. Morris;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5055. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5087. An act for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5120. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 5198. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 5327. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5481. An act for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5788. An act to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 5911. An act for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde;

H. R. 5917. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6025. An act for the relief of David Daryl Dalko;

H. R. 6070. An act for the relief of Paul Gust Williams;

H. R. 6083. An act for the relief of Amalia Architetto;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6278. An act for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi);

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6356. An act for the relief of William J. Martin;

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Ayako Sukiura;

H. R. 6446. An act for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 6544. An act to amend the Act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 6556. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the Act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay;

H. R. 6637. An act for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino;

H. R. 6640. An act for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu);

H. R. 6681. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins;

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water-right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6869. An act for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7009. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott;

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7255. An act to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans);

H. R. 7301. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7303. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7366. An act for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son, James Robert Eder;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray;

H. R. 7502. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters;

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Service Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan;

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes;

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1041. An act to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2922. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes; and

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida.

REPORT OF ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 742.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Architect of the Capitol on the reconstruction of the roofs and skylights over the House wing of the Capitol and remodelling of the House Chamber, made to the chairman of the Special Committee on Reconstruction of Roofs and Skylights Over House Wing of Capitol and Remodelling of House Chamber, be printed with illustrations as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHOSHONE AND ARAPAHO INDIAN TRIBES OF THE WIND RIVER RESERVATION

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3333) to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Arizona if this is one of a list of bills about which we talked a little while ago with certain Republican members of his committee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; this is different but I have a list here and I have taken this up with the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, for a reasonable consideration not to exceed $458,000, to be paid from funds appropriated for the Missouri River Basin project, to convey and relinquish to the United States of America the property and rights of the Shoshone and of the Arapaho Indian Tribes needed by the United States for the construction and operation and maintenance of the Boysen Unit of the Missouri River Basin project. Action heretofore taken by the Secretary of the Interior in granting rights-of-way over Indian lands for the establishment or the relocation of roads, highways, and railroads, and telegraph, telephone, power transmission and pipelines in connection with the construction of the Boysen Unit of the Missouri River Basin project is hereby confirmed.

SEC. 2. The conveyances and relinquishments shall be, in all things, in accord with the memorandum of understanding between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Indian Affairs as approved by the Secretary of the Interior on December 29, 1951, and as amended with his approval on May 1, 1952.

SEC. 3. The moneys to be paid to the Shoshone and Arapaho Tribes, hereunder shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States of America to the credit and for the use of the respective tribes in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 19, 1947 (61 Stat. 102), as amended by the act of August 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 208).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. LANSDALE G. SASSCER

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, back in 1938 after the Democratic primary election in Maryland, the candidate, Stephen Gamble, passed away before the general elections. At that time I was chairman

of the Democratic State central committee in Baltimore City. We were called upon to select a candidate from the State of Maryland to run in the general election in the place of Stephen Gamble.

It was my honor and privilege at that time to present to the delegation in the city of Baltimore the name of LANSDALE G. SASSCER. It was my privilege to appear before the convention and present Mr. SASSCER's name in nomination from that section of the State.

Today I have the privilege, but not the happy one I had at that time, of appearing before this body to tell you that today winds up approximately 30 years of public service for my colleague from Maryland, LANSDALE G. SASSCER. He has served well, not only the State of Maryland but the country as a whole. Always earnest and sincere, he has built his career upon conscientiously serving his community, the State, and the Nation.

Mr. SASSCER served as a member of the Maryland Senate from 1922–38, as majority floor leader and president of that body in 1935–37. He was elected to the Seventy-sixth Congress, February 3, 1939, and has served continuously to the present time. He put all his energy into every task he was called upon to perform. He performed his work well, establishing a fine record of achievement as a member of the Committee on Armed Services. He is a man of sound judgment and as a result of our close association I have had ample opportunity to observe his astuteness as a Member of Congress and his unswerving devotion to duty.

I feel it is a distinct loss to not only the State of Maryland but to the Congress of the United States that Mr. SASSCER is now retiring into private life, and I know that all Members of the House join with me in wishing him many, many years of continuing useful service to his State and country.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] in paying tribute to the long and faithful service rendered the community and the country by our colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished friend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] and also my colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], in the remarks that they have made about our friend, LANSDALE SASSCER, a man of quiet but effective activity; a man who is serious in committee and serious in the performance of his duties on the floor of the House; a man who is devoted to representing his people in as effective a way as is possible, and also in representing the people of our country in connection with the serious problems that come before the House during his years of service in this body. He is a remarkable gentleman and an outstanding legislator and a great American.

I am very glad, I repeat, to join my friends in paying this tribute to LANSDALE SASSCER, a tribute that he so richly deserves.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Maryland and others in paying tribute to our distinguished friend, LANSDALE SASSCER. I regret more than I can express to you to see him leave this House. I have a feeling of friendship for him that even extends beyond our service in the House. Our daughters were classmates at college, and I learned more about LANSDALE SASSCER in those days, as a devoted husband and father, than I could have ever learned in the Congress of the United States.

He has been a most useful Member of this House, a patriotic American, and one whose services will long be remembered. I join in expressing my profound regret at seeing him leave this body, and wish for him many, many more years of happiness and prosperity.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud and very much privileged to join the other Members of the House who have lauded the record of our dear friend, LANSDALE SASSCER. I served for several years with him on the Committee on Armed Services and I know of no man in the House whom I more greatly esteem or more greatly admire than LANSDALE SASSCER. During his service here, he has made a tremendous contribution; he has been faithful and a devoted servant of the people; he has exhibited great purposefulness and determination in all matters that he has undertaken. He has been an outstanding Congressman.

I greatly regret his departure from this body and wish for him and his family good health, success, prosperity, and happiness in the future.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I served on the Committee on Armed Services with LANSDALE SASSCER for the past several years. His services on that committee have been outstanding. He is devoted to his duty.

Mr. Speaker, all adjournment days are sad, but for some reason or other today seems to be much sadder than some of the other adjournments of this Congress. I am losing a number of friends here in this House who have been very helpful to me.

LANSDALE SASSCER has as wide a knowledge of naval affairs as any member we have on our committee. Our committee, operating as it does, made up partly of members from the old Committee on Military Affairs and the old Committee on Naval Affairs, has made up a team which, in my opinion, will be hard to surpass so far as carrying out its duty to see to the security of our country. LANSDALE SASSCER has contributed much to that. I join with his friends from Maryland in wishing him a happy retirement from this body.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a word about LANSDALE SASSCER. I dislike very much to see him leave the Congress. We have served together on the Committee on Armed Services. I have always found him diligent, able, and very friendly, one who has been always willing to go along with one who has the right ideas. I hate to see LANSDALE SASSCER leave this Congress.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleague, the dean of the Maryland delegation, LANSDALE G. SASSCER, who will not be with us the next session of Congress.

Six years ago when I came here to Washington I did not hesitate to go to our dean and seek his advice and guidance. He was a great help to me.

In addition to his services here, he served his country in France during World War I. He has been in public life since 1922. Today is his thirtieth year as a legislator, including service in both the Maryland Senate and here in the House of Representatives. He began his work in the State Senate of Maryland, where he served until 1938. For the last 4 years of his term in the Maryland Senate he served as president of the senate. Since 1939 he has been a Member of the House of Representatives and a member of the very important Committee on Armed Services. He has been an outstanding example of a public servant, being very capable, conscientious, and valuable. His services will be sorely missed by both the State and the Nation. He will be greatly missed by me and the other members of the Maryland delegation, and I am sure by many Members of the House.

May I say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I think I can say for our friend, LANSDALE G. SASSCER, that he has been a devoted husband, a devoted father, a fine friend, a statesman, and a great legislator. In the years to come may he always enjoy the best and the finest things of life.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, of all the close attachments I have made since coming to the Congress, one of the most outstanding has been the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]. I admire somebody who fights for what he thinks is right. I have found it necessary to do so since becoming a Member of Congress. I remember the outstanding fight the gentleman from Maryland put up to improve the situation on Federal Route 1, known as the Baltimore Highway, out at Peace Cross. I have pledged to the gentleman from Maryland, since he will not be a Member of the Eighty-third Congress, that if I succeed in coming

back to Congress I will take his place in the fight to improve that situation. I made that promise to the gentleman and I shall carry it out. In closing may I say I am sure that Members of the House will miss his genial smile and his assistance when assistance was needed in any worth-while piece of legislation in the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member in the House, I think it is a fine thing to be given a few minutes to praise Mr. SASSCER. It is fortunate for Members like myself, new in these halls, to be able to meet gentlemen like Mr. SASSCER, not only here but personally and privately where I came to know him very well. He has been an inspiration, and on occasion has related his great background, not of his own choice, but because I asked him about it. It might interest the membership to know that Mr. SASSCER is a combat veteran of World War I where he served with great distinction as a first lieutenant. At 59 years of age, he is still as vigorous as his life shows him to have been in the past. He has a wonderful family and a charming wife. He is going to return to the practice of law, and is going to continue to contribute to the welfare of his State as he has here in these halls contributed to the welfare of the Nation. Mr. SASSCER is 1 of 38 Members of the House who will not be with us next session—not counting the turn-over we might have next November. I would like to salute him at this moment on behalf of my district, my family, and myself. Our dinner together at the Congressional Hotel with Mrs. Sasscer, Mrs. Sieminski, Congressman Sasscer, and myself is a delightful memory. Good wishes to you, Mr. SASSCER, and to your sweet lady and wonderful wife and family—Godspeed. You will be back.

Here follows, Mr. Speaker, more about Congressman SASSCER, from Who's Who:

[From Who's Who in America, vol. 27, 1952–53]

SASSCER, LANSDALE G., born Upper Marlboro, Md., September 30, 1893; son of Frederick and Lucy (Clagett); bachelor of laws, Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle, Pa., 1914; married Agnes Coffren, February 15, 1919. Children Agnes Lansdale (Mrs. Hal B. Clagett, Jr.), Lucy Clagett (Mrs. W. Murray Sanders), Landsdale, Jr., admitted to Maryland bar, 1915, and since practiced in Upper Marlboro; member firm of Sasscer & Diggs since 1939; member Maryland Senate, 1922–38; president, 1934–38; Member Seventy-seventh to Eighty-second Congresses (1941–53), Fifth Maryland District; publisher, The Enquirer Gazette (with S. A. Wyvill); director County Trust Co., Hyattsville Building Association, Pleasant Building Association.

Served as first lieutenant, Artillery, United States Army, AEF. Member American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars; Democrat; Episcopalian; Mason, IOOF, WOW, Elks; clubs, Lions (Upper Marlboro), Beaver Dam Country (Landover). Home, Upper Marlboro, Md.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, LANSDALE G. SASSCER has been an outstanding Member of this House. Learned in the law, he came to Congress well equipped for service here. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] is a fine type of man, able, conscientious, patriotic. His family life is ideal. He has a lovely family. I wish for him and all his loved ones many happy years together.

HON. MARVIN JONES, CHIEF JUDGE, COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 743) which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the transcript of the proceedings incident to the presentation of a portrait of Chief Judge Marvin Jones to the House Committee on Agriculture on Friday, June 27, 1952, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the amendments to the bill (H. R. 7391) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

Senate agrees to House amendments to Senate amendments Nos. 4, 26, 37, 44, 53, and 63; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate further insist upon its amendment numbered 43 to the above-entitled bill, and ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. SALTONSTALL be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the amendments to the bill (H. R. 8122) entitled "An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the amendments to the bill (H. R. 7800) entitled "An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amounts of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the amendments to the bill (H. R. 7391) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche); and

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway.

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a tribute to God's masterpiece of magnificent manhood, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, the great man of the mountains. A man who has lived magnificently and by his life and labor and love has enriched the world. The good and the great deeds he has done are but the embroideries of his life. The real core of his strength and greatness is his mighty heart. As he lays down his flawless armor, none shall find a stain upon his shield. He has never been cruel, but always he has been courageous. He has always been willing to compose differences, but never has he been willing to compromise principles. By his service he has built many living monuments in the hearts and lives of his people.

In this, the grand and golden hour of his great life, and in the full flower of his greatest achievements, he has taken kindly the counsel of the years and he gracefully surrenders the things of youth. When he walks from this Chamber the cloak of an Elijah will fall from his broad shoulders and never again shall it be worn so well. In the twilight he will see the glories of his achievements and receive his sweetest compensations.

Today he is the most distinguished and best beloved son of his native State and all North Carolinians everywhere will remember him by the eloquence of his actions, the nobility of his soul and the simplicity of his life, and will love him and cherish his friendship. He has by his life exemplied all of the fine virtues and tender sensibilities of true manhood.

I would violate the proprieties of this occasion if I should attempt to enumerate the multitude of his accomplishments. I shall sum it all up by saying, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON is one of God Almighty's really good and great men, and

a paragon of manhood. We shall not soon see his like again. As one by one great men leave this forum, and as I contemplate the joys of my friendships and time takes its toll, I find some little comfort in the words of Thomas Moore. I think the name of the poem is Farewell, and these are some of the lines as I recall them:

Let fate do her worst, there are relics of joy
Sweet dreams of the past which she cannot destroy,
That come in the nighttime of sorrow and care
And bring back the features that joy used to wear,
Like the vase in which roses have once been distilled.
You may break, you may shatter the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will cling 'round it still.

I am delighted to have this opportunity to publicly thank my dearly beloved friend for all of the many kindnesses and courtesies which he has accorded me during my service in Congress. He has helped me in a thousand ways; and in more than a thousand ways I am grateful to him.

The sun will never set on the dominions of his greatness. On the sunset seas of life his sails are set for pleasant ports. He is going back to the hills of home and to the scenes of his childhood; back to the land of his ancestors and to the household from which he sprang. His treasure chest of memories will be filled with the love and affection of all who have known him well, and when the curtains of heaven unfold he will receive the crowning glories which only come to a righteous man. His proud spirit shall never be distressed by fears that are born of fatigue or loneliness, for he shall never be tired and surely he shall never walk alone. His sterling character is the Gibralter of his life and it shall shield and sustain him; and thousands of friendships and the gratitude of a great Nation will give him comfort. May God give us more men like Bob DOUGHTON.

I yield to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES].

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1910 there was elected to the Congress of the United States—which was then the Sixty-second Congress—a North Carolinian who has rendered to his Nation and its people exceptional and outstanding service—service that is excelled by few men who served in the Congress since the founding of the United States of America.

The length of his service extended over a period of 42 years, covering each session of the Congress from the Sixty-second through the Eighty-second Congresses. Before being elected to Congress he was an outstanding farmer and banker, living in the mountains of North Carolina at Laurel Springs in Alleghany County, and had served his State most capably in several offices, climaxed by his election to the State senate in 1908, and served his State in this responsible position as a senator, indicating thereby that he possessed the qualities of splendid leadership and statesmanship. From his entrance into Congress, he early became a leader and was one of the outstanding Democratic Members of Congress during the long period of 42 years, serving as chairman of the important Ways and Means Committee of the House continuously since 1933, with the exception of 2 years during the Eightieth Congress.

There are few men who have served the Nation who are better qualified and possess greater intelligence and good, hard common sense than ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. The qualities that he possesses that made him the great man that he is cannot be dealt with satisfactorily in the short discussion that I am making here before the Congress at this time, but the following qualities are outstanding:

First. Patriotic citizen: He is a credit and an honor to the county and State that furnished him and to the Nation that he has served with such patriotic loyalty and fervor that no man would dare to question his loyalty or integrity or his fervent respect and love for his State and Nation.

Second. Successful businessman: In business, in spite of his manifold and very active career in the Congress, he continued his successful business career, which was started prior to the time he entered the Congress and has continued up until the present time. This is probably one of the qualities which made him such a great statesman and placed the businessmen of America under real obligation to him.

Third. Devoted Christian: Throughout his life he has been an active, conscientious member of the Baptist Church and set an example of real Christianity to his family and his friends.

Fourth. Brilliant Congressman: Throughout the active period in which Congressman DOUGHTON served his Nation, he probably established a record as a solon unexcelled by few men in the history of the Congress of the United States. He probably is the best authority on taxes in the Nation, his knowledge resting on good, hard common sense and ability and being developed year by year as the head of the great Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. People who know him well, such as his colleagues and associates in the Congress, really appreciate the greatness of the man and his unexcelled service to his country in difficult fiscal matters.

"Mr. Bob" is one of the most lovable and devoted friends that a man could have. This is especially impressive on the Members of Congress who have been fortunate enough to be his colleagues during his service in the House. How we can get along without him is impossible to solve. Personally, I shall miss him every day I am in the Congress, and feel as though I have lost a close member of my family, for "Mr. Bob" not only appeals to your heart, but he is just about the youngest, the ablest, and the most interesting associate that any person could possibly claim as a friend.

In his retirement the Congress is losing a great and brilliant leader and statesman, who leaves a record of 42 years of service that is unexcelled in the history of a Nation that has produced many brilliant leaders since obtaining its independence from the British Government.

In conclusion, may I add that we Members of the Congress, and especially his colleagues from North Carolina, are all devoted to "Uncle Bob" and are unable to appraise the loss that comes to us and to the Nation upon the retirement from an active career in the Congress of this great man.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if I were to address the House at this particular time at considerable length I suppose I would slow up business that we have yet to transact, but I cannot lose the opportunity of paying the highest tribute possible to my good and beloved chairman, Mr. DOUGHTON.

During the First World War I was going over a highway leading up to Verdun, France. It was the only highway that was available for the French troops to transport their military supplies. The battle was raging around this historic city. The enemy had spotted this one highway and the shells had blasted out great holes, stopping traffic for miles. It was in this crisis that there appeared old men, 80 and 90 years old. They kept coming by the hundreds, and as they arrived they said to the boys who were trying to fill these shell holes to release traffic, "Go to the front, boys—we'll keep this highway open." No word had gone out to the old men of France, but they came with wheelbarrows, shovels and pick-axes. Later this highway was named the "Sacred Highway", in honor of the old men of France. There is a lesson that we may draw from this—and that is that men are never too old to serve their Nation in the time of crisis.

I wish to say now that with the mental and physical vigor of Chairman DOUGHTON that if and when this country may be in need of his services he will be at the front lines discharging his duty with ability and fidelity.

I have heretofore often spoken of Mr. DOUGHTON as one whom we love and honor. He has been fair and just to the minority, and we certainly appreciate it. Mr. DOUGHTON is a hard fighter, a shrewd trader, but after all he is honest and considerate in every way. I am not going to speak at length, but I am reminded of a verse which I think applies to him, and explains why he has attained to his fine position in public life. It has been said:

Bad will be the day for every man when he becomes absolutely contented with the life he is living, with the thoughts he is thinking, with the deeds he is doing; when there is not forever beating at the doors of his soul some great desire to do something larger which he knows he was meant and made to do.

Mr. Speaker, our good chairman whom we honor today is just that type of man. There has been beating at the

door of his soul throughout his life a great desire to do something larger, greater, and finer for his State and his country, which in his heart he knew he was meant and made to do for his country. He has done just that. I can only say as he leaves the Congress of the United States that in his retirement I hope that he will be happy, prosperous, and contented, and furthermore that he will return to see us whenever the spirit moves him to do so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, taking the floor on this occasion to me is the saddest moment I have experienced since I became a Member of this House. To try to put into words what to say about this character we are speaking of here is almost impossible for me to do. His life has covered so much and it has meant so much to every American citizen, not just his own State, his own family, his own delegation, but his influence has been felt throughout America.

When he came to this body in 1911 the expenditures of this Government were something like $600,000,000 with an income of around $700,000,000. Think of what it is today. Think of the growth of this Nation in those 42 years of his life as a Member of this body, at all times carrying on the responsibilities of a public servant, being chairman of the Ways and Means Committee longer than any other Member that has served in this body, in a position that touches the life of every American citizen.

He has carried out his duty to his Nation efficiently and honestly, and I believe he has carried out his duty in a manner fair to all American citizens. Sometimes, of course, he is referred to as "MULEY" DOUGHTON, but when he is referred to as "Muley," meaning stubborn in making a decision, the decision is usually fair and in the best interest of all citizens and not for some particular pressure group.

He is not only a gift to this body and to this Nation, his life has been a gift to his own State of North Carolina.

I like to think of him in his early days. All Members here do not know of his background. He was a successful horse trader, he was a successful farmer, he has been a successful banker. Everything that he has touched with his hands has resulted in a very successful enterprise. And it has not been done in a selfish manner but for the benefit of his country and for the benefit of his people, whether it be Alleghany County or here in this body.

To me he has meant so much since I have been a Member of this body it is impossible to enumerate all at this time. I have been to him on many occasions when I did not know what decision to make. At all times I can say that he has given me sound advice, advice which I deeply appreciated. Think of his age today. On November 7 he will be 89 years of age. How many Members of this body will look as vigorous and be as active as he is today at that age? We do not like to lose him. The North Carolina delegation will probably feel the loss more than other Members. He goes back to those beautiful rolling hills and I hope he will live many more years in peace and happiness.

May God bless you with many more years of good health and happiness. I will miss you.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, there are men who in times of stress and strain provide the strength and the leadership required by a great Nation. I believe that when the history of these turbulent and difficult days is written that one of the names which will shine brightest will be that of BOB DOUGHTON, of North Carolina. Some men labor in the glory of the hero's reward and others just have to labor long and hard and diligently. BOB DOUGHTON has had a difficult job, sometimes the impossible job, of providing the revenues for operating the Government of the United States of America during its most difficult and crucial days. While many others have had the satisfaction of great publicity and acclaim, there is very little praise that ever comes to a man who has the job of raising taxes. But there is no job more vital or more important. BOB DOUGHTON can leave the Congress of the United States after having served longer than any man in our entire history as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means with the knowledge that despite the tremendous demands for revenues and for taxes he, through his guidance, has been able to meet that demand and still maintain the fiscal solvency of this great Nation. It has not been an easy task. As a matter of fact, BOB DOUGHTON is not an easy-going man. Someone told me in his office not too long ago that in his later years he had to become a little less energetic; that he did not come to his office at 5 a. m. any more; that he set it back until sometimes as late as 6:30, but usually at 6 a. m.

I must say it was an inspiration to serve on his committee, and while many Members find that oftentimes it is impossible to be there each time the gavel falls, because of some important business, practically without exception the chairman has been there. If there was one witness or 25 witnesses, he stayed there and heard them through. If the executive sessions lasted 1 day or 6 weeks or even 3 or 4 months, as some of them did, he was there on the job every day, every week, every month.

I say that BOB DOUGHTON has been a great inspiration to all of us and a great consolation to Americans. Those of little faith sometimes say that today we do not produce great leaders, men of faith, men of character, men of will, men of integrity. I say that Uncle BOB DOUGHTON, or "Muley" BOB DOUGHTON, or Chairman BOB DOUGHTON, or Farmer BOB DOUGHTON, call him what you will, gives the lie to all of those men of little faith.

Uncle Bob, you have been an inspiration to me. You have been an inspiration to every American. I am sorry that you are leaving because you are the most vigorous man in the House of Representatives. God bless you and keep you always.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, many times when I have sat before some great masterpiece of art, of painting, of sculpture, of architecture, or even before the great masterpieces of Nature such as the Grand Canyon or Niagara Falls, I have felt, as all of us feel on such occasions, the inadequacy of words and the limitations of language.

I have a feeling somewhat akin to that as I take the floor to say just a word or two out of my heart about our good and great colleague, Uncle BOB DOUGHTON, as he plans to retire from the House of Representatives.

He is a man so much bigger than anything I can say about him that I feel pretty nearly speechless on such an occasion. I say that very sincerely, for I do appreciate the bigness of his heart and his soul and his mind and, yes, the bigness of that very fine and vigorous body. Many times when I have left this Chamber, tired and worn, at the end of a day, and started to the House Office Building, somebody has passed me going at a pretty rapid stride, and I would look up and there was Mr. DOUGHTON going back to his office, walking fast, with his head up. Invariably, when that has happened, I have straightened up myself and shuffled off just a bit of that weariness that had overcome me at the end of the day.

I say to my good friend from North Carolina, you have been an inspiration in many ways to me during my service in the House of Representatives. Without taking any more time on this occasion, I join every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle in wishing for you the very fullest measure of God's richest blessings in all the days that lie ahead. May God bless you always.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, while I am not much at putting together adjectives, I do have the ability to love and admire a great man. When I came to this body 18 years ago he was more help to me than anyone I know. He led me around, so to speak, and I expect through the years if my votes were checked, you would probably find more of them alongside of Mr. DOUGHTON'S than any other one man in the House of Representatives. There is a reason for that. That is because I admire him and trust him absolutely. I have known his family. My first acquaintance with a member of his family was when I served in the State Legislature of North Carolina with his older brother. He was the same type, a hard-working, square-shooting, solid American that our friend, Uncle Bob, is. You know I was out in my garden sometime ago working, and I had a man helping me. He stopped work and said, "Do you know Mr. BOB DOUGHTON?" I said, "Certainly, I do. Do you?" He said, "Yes, sir." And he said, "I was just thinking—the hardest day's work I ever did in my life was try-

ing to pack down hay as fast as Mr. Bob would throw it on the wagon."

Now, Mr. Bob has been tossing not hay, but some very fine legislation for the American people for many years. He has the ability of just summing up a thing in a very few words, and when he expresses it he does it just right and you can talk for an hour. I recall very distinctly it was not so long ago when someone was calling for a degree of taxation in the committee, which Uncle Bob did not think was practical, and which he thought would probably seriously injure those who were to pay the taxes. He felt it was taking practically all at one time. Well, instead of arguing the question and giving all the reasons and illustrations, Mr. Bob just disposed of the matter by saying, "You can shear a sheep once a year, but you can skin him only once." Now that is language that anyone can understand. I do not know how to express my thanks for the privilege of being associated with him. The whole State of North Carolina loves BOB DOUGHTON and trusts him, and if you do not believe they do, you just go down and tell somebody in North Carolina that Mr. Bob is wrong about something—that kind of talk just will not go over. They have a right to trust him—the high and the low. And not only do they trust him, they respect him. When he goes back to his home, he will be the same leading citizen in that community, and he will still make great contributions to this Nation. He will make those contributions through the young people in many instances who will have him as an example to go by. He is an inspiration to the young and the old. If anybody thinks he is not going to keep up with this situation, I would suggest that some of you try to keep up with him from here to the New House Office Building when this session breaks up. We are just so glad to have the opportunity to serve with him—and Mr. Bob, the best of luck to you and that comes from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to pay tribute to a great man when he can hear what I say.

Mr. DOUGHTON has made a great contribution to public service. We all know what he has done in the field of taxation, as stated by our good friend from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS]. When he leaves here we will miss his wisdom and his guidance.

I want to make a comparison of some of the outstanding leaders of history, and I say this to Uncle Bob: He is a Moses with his meekness; a Job with his patience; a Lincoln with his honesty; a Robert E. Lee with his character; and a Solomon with his wisdom; a Patrick Henry with his patriotism.

I read a little poem which I have before me, and in rereading it I am going to dedicate it to Uncle Bob. I think Josiah Gilbert Holland, the author of this poem, had him in mind when he wrote this poem. I think he fulfills and fills full the sentiments expressed by this poem. He is the answer to this poem entitled "Wanted":

God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn creeds,
Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting justice sleeps.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to endorse everything that has been said about my distinguished friend BOB DOUGHTON. He was one of the first men I met when I came to Congress and he and his wife, one of the most glorious women I have ever known, lived in the same building with us for many years. I have never had a better friend. I realize he is up in years, but I regret to see him leave this Congress. He is young in mind and in spirit.

The average Member does not seem to realize it, but the oldest man who ever served in the Congress of the United States was from North Carolina, Maj. Charles M. Stedman, who was here when I first came to Congress. He was the last Confederate veteran to serve in this body.

I cannot adequately express my feelings as I see so many men, so many fine men, so many great Americans like BOB DOUGHTON, LEONARD HALL, and others leave this House never to return.

I am reminded of the expression of Thomas Moore, when he said in effect:

Oft in the stilly night,
Ere slumber's chain hath bound me
Fond memory brings the light
Of other days around me:
The smiles, the tears,
Of former years,
The words of love then spoken,
The eyes that shone,
Now dimmed and gone,
The cheerful hearts now broken!

When I remember all
The friends, so linked together,
I've seen around me fall,
Like leaves in wintry weather,
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted.
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed!

When I see these distinguished men who have gone through the fiery furnace, who have done so much for their country in the years gone by, leaving the Congress of the United States as they are doing today, when I look back and see others I have known that poem comes back to me and I feel as if I am treading alone some "banquet hall deserted whose lights are fled, whose garland's dead, and all but he departed."

Mr. DOUGHTON, I want you to know that you take with you my lasting friendship that has grown throughout the long years we have served together.

God bless you with many, many more years of a useful and happy life.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, when I think of BOB DOUGHTON I think of a great forest of big trees, and the biggest tree in the forest is inscribed "BOB DOUGHTON." He is a towering man, a giant physically, a giant mentally, and a giant in character; he is that fine type of human being who is generous to a fault yet courageous as a lion. When you meet him in combat many times you may think he is cruel, because he can argue his side of the question better than you unless you are mighty, mighty well prepared.

He came here just 2 years before I did. I lived in a hotel with a Senator from North Carolina before I came to know Mr. DOUGHTON. He was discussing Mr. DOUGHTON with me one day and he said: "He is the greatest campaigner in North Carolina. They call him Farmer Bob and nobody can beat Farmer Bob, and nobody can put on a greater or a more winning campaign than BOB DOUGHTON."

Young in spirit with a mind as keen as it ever was and physically fit, just why he is leaving is something that some of us cannot quite understand, but maybe he wants to go back and do like he did when he was a boy out on the farm, work 6 days a week from sun to sun. I have had this experience myself. There would be a great big tree in the yard, and on Sunday we would sit under that tree or lie under that tree and just rest. Maybe he has a tree; and, remembering the times that he rested under the tree, perhaps he wants to take a little time out just to rest some more. If there is a man alive today who deserves a rest, it is he; because, being chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means longer than any other man in the history of the Congress he has labored faithfully, long hours, day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out. This country is a better country for BOB DOUGHTON having lived in it. My life is better and richer because I have known a man like BOB DOUGHTON. I shall always remember, my dear friend, your many courtesies and kindnesses to me, I shall remember with gratitude and thanks your great service to your day and generation and the favors that you have done for me and every other human being under the flag.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I recognize that to attempt to say something about BOB DOUGHTON following the magnificent tribute of the Speaker is a difficult assignment, but I want to add my word of appreciation to BOB DOUGHTON.

It is a great privilege to serve in the House of Representatives, but service here also carries a great responsibility.

That responsibility heightens as Members come to important positions in the House of Representatives. To be chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means is one of the most responsible positions in this House.

The Ways and Means Committee, dealing as it does with the problems of taxation, is dealing constantly with the very lifeblood of America. The power vested in that committee as it proceeds from month to month and year to year to recommend legislation on taxation to the House of Representatives deals with what I think is one of the most important functions of a free representative government because all of us must realize that in the plans of taxation and in the applications of taxation, the country will either survive and prosper as a free land or it can go down to destruction and ruin.

Chairman DOUGHTON sits on the opposite side of the aisle from me but while that political aisle has separated us, I have always found in him an earnest, patriotic American who sought above everything else to do the best job he could for his country.

I have spoken of the privilege and the responsibility of being a Member of Congress. There are compensations for being a Member of Congress. Certainly there must be a great compensation for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] when he hears us say that his fine service here dealing with these vital problems before us has contributed to the survival of our country, yes, has given us assurance that this great land as it has come to us shall be given to those following us in the pattern and in the form that it came to us. For that BOB DOUGHTON is as worthy of favorable commendation from the American people as any man who sits among us.

As he leaves the Halls of Congress, I just want him to know, and I think I speak for the membership generally, that we appreciate his stalwart fight for the things he believes to be right and, yes, on almost every occasion the membership generally has believed to be right and fair for ourselves and for the generations yet to come and his great patriotic service here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM].

Mr. CHATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I speak of Uncle BOB DOUGHTON in a more personal way. Since I was old enough to walk he has been a visitor in my grandfather's home and my father's home. He and my father were the closest of personal friends. When my father died many years ago I came to Uncle Bob for advice and counsel, and I have been coming ever since. When I came here in the Eighty-first Congress, I saw another side that I had not known. He has done something that should be a great example and a great help to future generations who go into politics in this country. He has voted and worked absolutely fearlessly for what he thought was right. He never minded breaking with his own party in Washington, with his own Democratic administration, and his freedom from any domination politically made it so that he not only turned a Republican district in North Carolina into the Democratic Party, but he has never lost a nomination, he has never lost an election and he, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said, is the most outstanding beloved man in North Carolina. He is an example for the younger people coming along. If they vote their convictions and not figure what that vote is going to mean and follow Mr. DOUGHTON's example, I am quite certain they will go further in their political ambitions and in the service of the country than many people whom you can never put your finger on. He has been a fearless, courageous, upright and a Christian man. His family and my family have been friends for generations. One of his sons is one of my closest friends. I know him through and through. I can never repay my debt of gratitude personally for the wise advice and friendship he has given me. I can say from my heart that he has affection for me, because I know it, and I have such deep affection for him that I can hardly stand to see him leave this House. God bless him always.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER].

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, there has passed almost 40 years since as a young man beginning my service in Congress I met BOB DOUGHTON. I was a young fellow, of course, and he was a mature man. We had some earnest discussions in our day, but we always entertained the very best feeling toward each other. Bob is the kind of a man who could and would respect the views of another person if he knew that they were the earnest, conscientious views, however much they might differ from his own. He was always forthright and genuine, and when I say a man is genuine I pay him the greatest compliment I can pay to anyone. I think you might sum up BOB DOUGHTON's qualities in the language of John Ruskin when he said, "Mighty of heart, mighty of mind, magnanimous; to be this is to be truly great." I think Bob comes pretty well within that description, and although he is a few years older than I am, that will not make me jealous. I wish that Bob would stay in Congress for many more years. I know that everyone here agrees with the sentiment of Edwin Markham expressed in the words which I quote, as follows:

There is a destiny that makes us brothers.
None goes his way alone.
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own.

Farewell, Bob. We shall not say goodby. We shall all be anxious to see you from time to time and to enjoy your company.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the thought has often run through my mind as to what would be my recollections after I have terminated my service in this body and return to my home and my city to live for what remaining years might lie ahead of me. I have answered that question by saying to myself that I do not think my recollections would be of what I thought was some great speech I had made or some outstanding measure I had introduced or the contribution I had made to the enactment into law of some outstanding bill. Rather, one of my prominent thoughts would be of my friends of yesterday, particularly those with whom I had served in this great and distinguished body.

I know that one of my sweetest memories will be of BOB DOUGHTON. In my book of memories one of the foremost pages will be devoted to this fine, capable gentleman, who after 42 years of devoted service to his district, his State, and our country, is voluntarily retiring from Congress.

To me he has been an example of devotion to duty as well of many other characteristics, and his example has tended to ennoble me and others to whom he is and has been an inspiration. For 10 years I served on the Committee on Ways and Means and saw the masterful manner in which he as chairman of that committee conducted the hearings, the deliberations, and the affairs of that great committee. He is an indefatigable worker, a man of sincerity, a man of extreme fairness to all the members and to any witnesses that appeared before the committee.

During those 10 years I came to learn of BOB DOUGHTON's greatness as well as his humility. During the years I have been leader of this House our relationship has been very, very close. Not only will my associations with him be a pleasant memory as long as I live but the friendship that exists between us will remain indelibly and lastingly upon my mind.

As I stand here my mind goes back through the years I have been in this body with this distinguished gentleman and friend of mine, and I see again sitting up in the gallery that sweet girl he married many, many years ago. There comes to my mind the thought of how often Mrs. McCormack has talked with Mrs. Doughton. They often sat together up in that gallery. The thoughts of Mrs. Doughton were always about you, Bob. "Is he wearing his tie right"—those sweet little sentiments a wife has for the husband she loves. I am making this expression because I know you, Bob, would like to hear it. Very often when Mrs. McCormack and I are having dinner or chatting about this or that thing, she will talk about the late Mrs. Doughton and the fine, sweet, beautiful lady that she was, and how her whole life was wrapped up in this sweet but firm and determined gentleman. I am not relating this for any sentimental reasons other than to show the close union and the love that existed between Bob and the late Mrs. Doughton throughout their entire married life, and how inseparable they were. United in marriage as one, and living through their long married life as one.

Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to see Bob retire voluntarily. But in the exercise of his judgment that is his decision. He has served in this body for 42 years. The people of his district and the peo-

ple of North Carolina can well be proud of the services and contributions he has made toward the preservation and strengthening and progress of our country. The people of the United States are greatly indebted to him for his contributions during these many years.

In the annals of the Congress of the United States, and in the history of our Nation, the historians of tomorrow will write BOB DOUGHTON was one of the giants of the Congress of all times.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, before I am able to properly eulogize my good friend and colleague and leader, I should have to dig deep into the innermost recesses of my heart and soul. It is for that reason that I shall ask that the eulogy of "Daddy" DOUGHTON wait for its continuance until I have gathered my thoughts properly in the solitude of my home. It will then occur that I shall write my feelings as I have been impressed with them over these many years of my association with him on the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise and extend my remarks and eulogize this gnarled oak who has weathered the storm both here and in his beautiful hills of North Carolina.

For the moment, may I only say God bless you, "Daddy" DOUGHTON.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO BOB DOUGHTON

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during these three terms I have been a Member of this House, on many occasions I have met him entering the Office Building where his congressional office is located, as early as 7 a. m. and 7:15 in the morning. Upon some of these occasions and upon other occasions I have been blessed in the privilege of asking him a few questions. Always courteous, never too busy to be encouraging in his replies, he has been an inspiration to me. His firmness of opposition and his fairness in debate have been a joy to listen to these 6 years. In any forest of the tallest trees, Chairman DOUGHTON's name is on the very tallest one. His practical application of the American way of life by reason of helping to protect and strengthen it in the realm of taxation policies and proceedures, will continue and endure forever in the foundations of our great Nation's progress. I shall personally miss his leadership and presence in all matters relating to the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means for the past 6 years and throughout that time I have enjoyed the friendship of Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON to the utmost. I have admired him for his ability and devotion to duty and for his fairness and consideration to all members of the committee at all times.

Mr. DOUGHTON's tenure as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means establishes the all-time record and his continuous service in Congress for 42 years is grand proof of his service and devotion to the people it has been his privilege and honor to represent in Congress and of their appreciation of his good work.

I join with my colleagues in extending the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] our thanks for his service and our tribute to him for his great record; also to extend him our best wishes for many happy years of enjoyment of leisure and pleasant associations with his friends and neighbors of his home community in his native State of North Carolina.

MR. DOUGHTON'S PRAISE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Congressman DOUGHTON has just finished his magnificent talk. My heart, like his, is filled. So are my eyes. What a magnificent giant; he towers in every respect but most of all in love.

Earlier today, I was asked to write a note or two to Mr. DOUGHTON in a book being presented to the Congressman with sincere appreciation, gratitude, and devotion by Stella O. Miller and Percy W. Meekins, his congressional office staff, Ways and Means Committee. I wrote down my sentiments.

But, Uncle Bob, after your soul-filling prayer to us all, I ask unanimous consent to reproduce here, my little message of thanks to you, so that as I read and reread your farewell message, which I predict will rank with any in our history, and which I intend to frame and to have before me all the days of my life, I can remember how you made me feel, even before you rose to speak. It follows:

AVE ATQUE VALE FRATER

JULY 5, 1952.

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: It is an honor for a first termer like myself to have the pleasure of addressing you, who have served our Nation so long, so ably, and faithfully, in this manner. It is a handclasp that will serve me well.

And, just as you, in youth, received from others, old and wise in experience and inspiration, the best of their experience and inspiration, which you added to your career as you grew in greatness and devotion, so do you now, by this opportunity to me, of talking with you this way, extend to me your hand in friendship and in trust for years to come.

And when I, like you, no matter when, leave the Congress, I trust that I shall still feel your hand clasped in friendship. For I shall try to pass on to others the spirit of service in our Nation's interest that you pass on to me.

Ave atque vale frater.

Sincerely,

ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
Member of Congress, Thirteenth District, New Jersey.

WHO'S WHO IN AMERICA, PAGE 727

DOUGHTON, ROBERT L., Congressman; b. Laurel Springs, N. C., November 7, 1863; S. J. H. and Rebecca (Jones) D; ed. Laurel Springs High Sch.; married Lillie S. Hix, 1898. Merchantile business, farmer and stock raiser, Laurel Springs, 1894–1911; Pres. Deposit and Savings Bank, North Wilkesboro, N. C., since Jan. 1911. Mem. N. C. Senate 1908–10; mem. 62d to 72d Congress (1911–33), 8th N. C. Dist. and 73d to 82d Congress (1933–52), 9th N. C. Dist. Chmn. ways and means com. U. S. Ho. of Reps. 73d through 78th Congresses, Democrat. Mem. State Bd. of Agr. 1903–09, State Prison Board, 1909–11. Baptist. Home, Sparta, N. C.

God bless you Uncle Bob. There is indeed a hereafter. Else, why do we weep, so? Surely we shall all meet again. God's love is too great for other beliefs.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say what a great privilege I have had in serving for the past 10 years as a member of the Ways and Means Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, who is today completing his great work in the House of Representatives. Previous speakers have told of his remarkable leadership to his State and Nation; of his lofty character and high ideals; of his superb qualifications of leadership during the most difficult and trying days of this Republic; of his complete understanding, sympathy, and consideration; of his courage and fidelity to duty. To all of these I subscribe, but I wish to express in my feeble way how much it has meant to me to sit at his feet and learn as all members of the committee have done. His wisdom and qualities of learning will greatly be missed in this body. May his remaining years be happy and glorious. I salute him as our great elder statesman.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, today Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON returns from his long service in the House of Representatives to retire to his home in the picturesque great mountains of North Carolina. He has served his State and his Nation well, and few men match his long service in the House of Representatives. His chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means gave him an opportunity to look after the finances of this Nation. For 42 years he has been connected with important legislation and has dealt with the greatest finance activities of any nation on this earth. Mr. DOUGHTON is a great man, great in all respects, and his wonderful personality gives him the confidence of his fellowman and enables him to accomplish the achievements which he has done with great success for many, many years. I am proud to own the friendship of this great statesman, and I am sure that our personal friendship "is the deepest and highest sentiment of which the finite mind is capable. Mr. DOUGHTON has always been interested in his fellowman and because of that characteristic he made friends—friends that may well be called the masterpiece of nature. "Fame is the scentless sunflower, with a gaudy crown of gold; but friendship is the breathing rose, with sweets in every fold." "Blessed are they who have the gift of making friends, for it is one of God's best gifts. It involves many things, but above all,

the power of going out of one's self, and appreciating whatever is noble and loving in another." Mr. DOUGHTON has for a long number of years been the most beloved public official in the State of North Carolina, and this attainment was accomplished through the gift of friendship and love for his fellowman. It was Woodrow Wilson who said: "Friendship is the only cement that will ever hold the world together." Mr. DOUGHTON will go back to his home and be happy amid his loved ones and his historic achievements will last as long as the history of this Nation.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of any event of its kind in my 10 years as a Member of the House of Representatives that I regret more keenly than the decision of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], to retire from its membership.

In my opinion there have been few equals and no superior service to that of Mr. DOUGHTON from the standpoint of honorable and distinguished service to the great State of North Carolina and our Nation.

It has been one of the most cherished events of my career to have served under his chairmanship on the great Committee on Ways and Means these many years, and I wish to extend to him my very best wishes and may God bless him.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that such an outstanding Member of this body, my distinguished friend from North Carolina, "Farmer" BOB DOUGHTON has chosen to retire from Congress. He has served his district, our State, and Nation honorably and courageously for more than 40 years. He is a fighter and leader as has been shown by his many years as chairman of the powerful Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. He is a giant in physical stature and in mentality. Although retiring, he is in good health and I do wish for him many more years of happiness and good health. Though retiring from active service in Congress his heart will always be with the present, past, and future Members of this House. His interest in national affairs will ever be keen. There are many years of vigorous service remaining in his body and mind. This will be available to the Nation and the State of North Carolina. Those who desire wise counsel will ever beat a path to his door. I wish for Mr. Bob health and happiness throughout the remainder of his life.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to know intimately that most respected Member, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. However, that does not prevent me from admiring and respecting him as one of the great legislators in the history of our country. I listened with interest and wholeheartedly subscribed to the eulogies paid this great man whom our Speaker so aptly described as a great giant tree of the forest.

I would like to state that the speech made by this distinguished colleague in supporting the right of Congress to write its own tax bill without interference from the executive branch of the Government, shortly after our late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, vetoed the tax bill and in his veto message suggested the type of tax bill he wanted, was to me an occasion and a speech which I shall never forget. In these few words I pay my humblest and highest respect to this great man, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of the rare privileges of life is that of association with a man of Mr. DOUGHTON'S character and reputation. I have been honored to work under him on the Committee on Ways and Means for a number of years, and value the association highly.

As chairman of our committee, Mr. DOUGHTON has brought to it a dignity and understanding of the democratic processes at the committee level permitting full and free discussion of all matters before the committee—never denying the minority the right to be heard even though the discussions threatened disaster to programs dear to the chairman and the administration.

With the passage of time it has become advisable for Mr. DOUGHTON to end his career as a Member of Congress after 42 years. Each of us must know that a friend has left our circle to continue his work among his people in North Carolina who first honored him. Our kindest regards and most sincere wishes for many happy years accompany him as he leaves us. We shall look forward to his occasional visits with us in later years.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the House with a sense of humility in the realization that regardless of the quality of my remarks they will be grossly inadequate to do justice to the occasion of the departure from the membership of this body of my good friend and chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. The deep sense of loss we feel at his leaving can have no suitable expression.

This Chamber of the Congress of the United States can ill afford to lose a person so richly imbued with the qualities of outstanding statesmanship, great citizenship, and selfless devotion to country which Mr. DOUGHTON possesses in such full measure. His record documents a career of public service which few others have ever approached.

Mr. DOUGHTON was first elected to the Sixty-second Congress in 1910. In the ensuing 42 years his service has been continuous so that today his membership in this forum is of longer duration than any other man, past or present, except for our distinguished colleague from Illinois, ADOLPH J. SABATH.

Mr. DOUGHTON assumed the chairmanship of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Seventy-third Congress and has remained in that capacity ever since with the exception of the Eightieth Congress. His tenure as chairman has been longer than that of any of his predecessors.

This great record of long service is only surpassed by his even greater record of achievement during those years. Mr. DOUGHTON'S tenure as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has been abundant with honor, integrity, and accomplishment. I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means with our esteemed chairman since 1942. He has ever been an inspiration and the example to us, his committee colleagues.

His eminently successful chairmanship has occurred during an era when unprecedented demands were placed upon the Congress for revenues. Under Mr. DOUGHTON'S guidance the committee has equitably and successfully met this need. He found the way to fulfill our revenue obligations without stifling our period of greatest economic growth. The demands of our national defense were met without impairment of our free-enterprise economy. The humanitarian needs of our great progressive society were provided for under the aegis of Mr. DOUGHTON, the father of our social-security system. These great accomplishments stand as irrefutable evidence of our chairman's service.

You may well inquire what sort of a man is capable of these accomplishments? Mr. DOUGHTON is a farmer and banker who came to his country's service from North Carolina. His public career began in 1903 and has been continuous since that time. He has been acclaimed by persons and organizations from all walks of life for his contribution to the well-being of his fellowmen. A high standard of Christian morality has been inherent in his every action.

It is such a record as that achieved by Mr. DOUGHTON that stands as a challenge to each of us present in this Chamber. Who can claim to have known the man without acknowledging his inspiration? Who among us can claim to have served with him without praising his high character? Who here today can claim Mr. DOUGHTON as a friend without being a better man because of that friendship? The simple answer to those questions I have propounded is—no one. Our great chairman has unstintingly lent his keenness of mind, physical stamina and moral courage to his country. When duty called, Mr. DOUGHTON knew no compromise.

We shall sorely miss his wisdom in our deliberations. His guiding hand will be removed from our shoulders but the challenge of his example will remain.

May the God whom he has served so well go with our beloved chairman to his long and happy retirement among his loved ones in North Carolina whom he has represented with such distinction. God bless you Mr. DOUGHTON. Those of us who remain are infinitely enriched by your sterling example.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a number of the most gifted painters of word pictures in this House have offered today their tributes to our incomparable colleague from North Carolina, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. Despite their best efforts, every encomium attempted has been sheer understatement.

I shall not attempt to do justice to the career of Mr. DOUGHTON. The most competent and self-assured orators here admit, I know, that it would be an impossible task.

It has been my privilege to serve in this Congress on the Committee on Ways and Means. In the deliberations of that

committee, I have had personal contact, over a period of many months, with the impressive sagacity and fairness of the distinguished chairman. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON long has been synonymous with the chairmanship of this important arm of the House. Because the members of this committee have worked under his guidance, day by day, their sense of loss at the realization he is retiring and returning to his beloved mountain home is greater, perhaps, than that of most other colleagues of this great North Carolinian.

Mr. DOUGHTON has given his best to the people of North Carolina and of the Nation. He has become a symbol of faithful, diligent, intelligent public service—an example to all.

I want to join in wishing our beloved chairman continued good health and every happiness, but I shall not add "in retirement." Mr. DOUGHTON in retirement is a completely illogical picture, and we know his public service is not at an end. The people of North Carolina will call him again, and he will heed the summons. As always, he will set his sturdy frame behind the plow and guide it in a straight furrow.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in extending to my chairman and friend, ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, an expression of praise and appreciation for the remarkable service he has rendered to his colleagues, to his constituency, and to the citizens of this great country during the 42 years he has been a Member of Congress.

It is doubtful that anyone can boast of a period of greater and more fruitful effort devoted to patriotic duty than can our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. Under Chairman DOUGHTON'S guidance the Congress has successfully coped with the most difficult revenue problems that have ever confronted this forum. These problems have been sanely and fairly solved.

Mr. DOUGHTON'S high moral standard, unceasing diligence, and great wisdom have been an inspiration to his committee associates. His example has inspired us to surpass our own limitations and to seek to emulate his ways.

He has addressed to the problems of government the same ability that made him a successful banker and farmer in his beloved North Carolina. Mr. DOUGHTON has devoted to his public responsibility long hours of service that have become decades without asking for relief or rest.

Now our chairman is going to take the rest he so justly deserves. He is returning to his beautiful North Carolina to spend a long and happy retirement among his loved ones. His greatness will be sorely missed among us.

As our heritage from the distinguished career of the great chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means we have received the challenge of his example. If we would even approach his greatness, it will behoove us neither to falter in our duty nor to relent in our perseverance.

May God bless you, Mr. Chairman, for the unmatched patriotic duty you have rendered to your country and, indeed, all humanity. You are leaving behind men who admire and respect you; men who are better men because they have known you; men who will miss you.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to join my colleagues in giving an expression of good will and best wishes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

I have served with him on the Ways and Means Committee for 20 years. During that time while Congress was in session we have had almost daily contact. He has been the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee longer than any man in the history of our country and the Ways and Means Committee is the oldest of all congressional committees. It was set up the first or second day after the first Congress went into session.

There is no man in Congress for whom I have a higher regard. I have repeatedly said in private and in public that there were two men among the many men with whom I have served in Congress that I found it almost impossible to call by their first names. These men were Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON and Hon. Allen Treadway, of Massachusetts. I have called all of my other colleagues by their first names but Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. Treadway have and always will be Mister DOUGHTON and Mister Treadway to me.

While my distinguished colleague, Mr. DOUGHTON has reached a remarkable age he is yet active enough mentally and agile enough physically to enjoy life to its fullest extent.

I hope for him many years of contentment that his fine character and distinguished service have earned for him.

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to, in Reader's Digest language, "The most unforgettable character I've met."

I had heard, as most Americans have, of Mr. DOUGHTON long before I came to Congress a number of years ago but I did not have the slightest idea that I would eventually have the privilege of an intimate association with him. Later an assignment to the Ways and Means Committee placed me in position to know him well. Serving with him and under his leadership is a privilege only 24 Members of the House have. This is a rare opportunity and one which I shall always remember. Having served with ROBERT DOUGHTON these many years has been an inspiration and a challenge. One cannot be associated with him without being benefited immeasurably.

In my life I have never known a man of more character, more courage, more native intelligence, more determination, and more leadership than ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON. Having served with him has been a high light of my congressional experience, and the memory of this association together with his guidance and friendship shall forever with me be an inspiration.

He has served long, well, and faithfully. In retirement which he long ago earned no person in any walk of life wishes him more happiness and contentment than I, and when he has passed from the stage of life, as shall we all, I can think of no person whose influence will be longer felt than will the influence of ROBERT DOUGHTON.

In your well earned vacation from long years of service to your fellowman, Mr. DOUGHTON, may God bless you and yours. May your years be long upon the earth and may happiness and contentment accompany you as you return to the land of your nativity and the soil you love so well.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. It has been my high privilege to serve as a member of the Ways and Means Committee under his chairmanship for the past 4 years. I have never known a public official more devoted to his duties or who gave so unsparingly of his time and great talents in the performance of them. As chairman he has wielded his tremendous influence not merely because of his position but because also of his great ability, his vast experience, and the high regard in which he was held by every member of the committee.

As chairman, he has been a leader, not a driver. He has always respected the views of every member and at all times treated every member and everyone with whom he dealt with kindness and consideration. He has rendered a great service to his country through many years. He will be greatly missed, not only in the councils of the Committee on Ways and Means but by the entire Congress as well.

He has richly earned the rest that will come to him in retirement. I join you in wishing for him many years of peace and happiness and a full measure of all the fruits of a great and useful life.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the announcement of the decision of Chairman ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, that he is retiring from the Congress, has brought to me mixed feelings.

I am happy at the thought that this grand old gentleman, who has devoted so many years of his life to public service, will now have an opportunity to enjoy the future in rest and relaxation which he so well deserves. At the same time, his decision causes me sorrow, because I realize that his retirement will leave a great void in both the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. We shall miss Mr. DOUGHTON more than we can imagine at this time.

Our country today is better because Chairman DOUGHTON served in the House of Representatives, and our people are better off because of the great amount of important legislation which he sponsored and steered to enactment.

As he goes into retirement, Mr. DOUGHTON carries with him the love, the respect, and the admiration of all of us who have been privileged to serve with him. May God grant him many more years so that he may enjoy to the full the reward he has so justly earned.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no person to whom I can more sincerely pay tribute than to ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, the distinguished chairman of the committee on which I have been privileged to serve. Mr. DOUGHTON typifies all that is fine and noble and good in America. While I am sorry to see him leave this great body, I hope that his decision to retire brings him nothing but happiness and satisfaction in the years ahead.

I shared, in a way, one distinction with Mr. DOUGHTON when I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was at one end of the committee scale—the oldest and most experienced member; I was at the other, certainly the youngest and greenest. Yet, this difference in age and experience and the difference in our political faiths was easily bridged by Mr. DOUGHTON'S warmness and cordiality. During the years I served with and under him, his kindness and friendly willingness to be of help made the difficult task of learning something about the complex field with which we deal a pleasant and satisfying one. I will never forget his unfailing courtesy to me and to everyone with whom he came in contact during the course of the committee's long and difficult deliberations.

This House, the Congress, and the Nation will miss Mr. DOUGHTON. He has brought a basic common sense, a rocklike integrity, and a rare human understanding to the work of this body. We will miss his vast experience, his great ability, his warm personality, and his stanch friendship. No one will miss him more than I.

I join with all of the Members, Mr. Speaker, in wishing Mr. DOUGHTON everything of life's best as he concludes his historic service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of ROBERT L. DOUGHTON is a circumstance beyond the comprehension of most of us in this House. It is akin to removing a great pillar from this Capitol. It is the wrenching from us of a cherished hallmark of public service.

How can this servant of the commonweal be replaced? The citizens of his beloved North Carolina would be among the first to confess dismay at the task. Undoubtedly, that great State will continue to send to this House able representation, but the name of ROBERT L. DOUGHTON means much more than that. In the undiminished vigor of his intellect, in years of service, in friendly understanding of divergences in viewpoint, the gentleman from North Carolina has given much more than full measure to his State and his Nation.

We want to wish him the best of everything his great heart desires as he returns to the magnificent mountain country he calls home, but it is difficult for us to do this. We should have preferred to have been permitted to rejoice that, once again, he had consented to remain here. This House, without Mr. DOUGHTON, will seem somewhat strange for a long time. The Committee on Ways and Means, without him in the chairman's place, will be a sight to make one rub his eyes in wonderment and dismay.

To be sure, the people of North Carolina will send competent representation to take up his burden, and the committee will be provided, I am confident, earnest and fair guidance. But the gentleman from North Carolina is no ordinary mortal. He is a paragon, and paragons are hard to come by.

In this Congress, I have been honored to serve on the great Committee on Ways and Means. This has been a high privilege and a rewarding experience—to no small degree because it has given me day-to-day contact with an earnest, diligent public servant—a gentleman of perception and understanding; a valiant and determined fighter for the right as he sees it.

Now, with more than a little sadness, we wish our colleague well, and we take solace in the knowledge that North Carolina will continue to call on him for advice and counsel.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I view the retirement of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and my very dear friend with whom I have been privileged to serve as a loss so great as to be well nigh impossible to recoup. During ROBERT L. DOUGHTON'S 18 years as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means he has built up a mountainous credit of service and one never before equalled or even distantly approached by any of his predecessors, among whom were some very notable public servants.

The amount of revenue which he has been charged with producing, and which has been so ably accomplished, upon careful review staggers the imagination. He disliked the task of imposing or levying taxes upon his fellow citizens, but like a good soldier has carried out the orders when the needs of his country had to be met, especially throughout the last 20 years of his productive career.

His fairness, his good nature, and his own exemplary diligence, application, and driving force stimulated the subordinate members of the Committee on Ways and Means, regardless of political affiliation, to spend their energies without thought to personal welfare. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON is a giant physically, mentally, and morally with energies seemingly inexhaustible. He has been not only the hard-working chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means but has also been, despite the staff members and messengers, his own errand runner. "Daddy" DOUGHTON, as I always refer to him affectionately, between sessions of the committee carried on contacts with the leaders, the members of his committee, and with the Senate component of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Of course, he was constantly in consultation and in the process of harmonizing with Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate. He discussed his problems eye to eye and directly and to do this he had to be his own messenger. He had to seek out those with whom he wanted to discuss a given tax or revenue problem. ROBERT DOUGHTON, of pioneer North Carolina mountain stock, is a paragon of honesty and diligence and is beloved by all who knew and came in contact with him. He possesses all of the virtues so essential to the chairmanship of the most important and hard-working committee in the Congress. While I have met many intellectually big men I rate "Daddy" DOUGHTON as the greatest of them all. He has been an inspiration and a stimulus to me as he has been to anyone and everyone who was ever privileged to work with him. The respect which the Members of this House have for him is due to the same high rate of personal appraisal which I am glad to make on this floor. It is because of the known quality of his character that so many of the bills bearing his name have been accepted and passed almost on faith.

The membership of both Houses and the informed people of the Nation know and understand his honest philosophy which he often expressed during hearings and in our executive sessions. He would say, when speaking of raising a huge amount of revenue, that we must "pluck the goose in a way to cause the least amount of squawking" and again to illustrate a sound philosophy in imposing tax levies that "you can shear a sheep indefinitely but you can only skin it once." Upon these theories was founded much of the law and nearly all of the schedules of the "tax take," and thus the burden of the taxpayer was lightened by spreading it over a greater period of time.

It was not alone in regard to tax and revenue matters that Chairman DOUGHTON won imperishable fame. There were many other pioneer legislative measures originating in the Committee on Ways and Means which bore the distinguished name of ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. Included are renegotiation of war contracts, which brought about the reversion of billions of dollars of unjustified profits back to the Government, and the Bituminous Coal Act, which set back on its feet the sick and depressed coal industry throughout the Nation. As soon as the need passed such emergency legislation was either permitted to expire or was repealed.

To my notion the greatest monument to the name and fame of this physical and intellectual giant from the hills of North Carolina, and one which will endure as long as the Republic stands, will be found in the Social Security Act. His initiation and indefatigable work gave birth and nurtured over the years this great act which has brought comfort and happiness to the worthy aged citizens of our beloved country and has established an annuity system which is constantly being expanded and liberalized. It also provides within its structure for aid to dependent widows and orphans, and to the blind and handicapped as well as unemployment compensation insurance to help the worker during periods of forced unemployment. This same great instrument so skillfully fashioned by the committee bears throughout the mark of ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. The social-security bill has virtually eliminated the curse of the poor house and old folks who in the past

lived in dread and fear of separation in their declining years and relegation some times to two distant institutions now feel secure. In this state of mind their lives have been immeasurably prolonged. They remain together as they vowed to do on their wedding day, "until death do us part." This humane plan first proposed by one of the greatest Presidents America ever had, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was materially improved as it was fashioned in the Ways and Means Committee workshop back in 1935, and it was under the skillful piloting of Chairman DOUGHTON that all dangerous shoals and reefs were avoided, and that all of the concentrated opposition bent upon the destruction of the plan carefully circumvented or driven to cover. From that time on the efforts of the Ways and Means Committee have been directed toward its improvement and liberalization. Expansion to include other and deserving elements of our people has been the objective of Chairman DOUGHTON.

In this social-security legislation, as in all other legislative proposals, Chairman DOUGHTON has not only stressed but insisted upon the inclusion of prudent provisions and economic administration. He hates like sin the useless expenditure of even a single dollar of the taxpayer's money and has fought as successfully as any man could to save that which by law the taxpayer was called upon to contribute.

My prayerful wish for my eminent and affable friend, whom I love dearly, is that God may grant the longest possible extension in the allotted span of his life so that he may enjoy that well deserved rest and leisure with the people of North Carolina. When the story is finally and fully written ROBERT L. DOUGHTON for his 42 years of service as a Member of Congress, and 18 years as chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means, will be enshrined as one of the greatest citizens ever to be called to serve his people. May God bless him and grant him health and happiness which he richly deserves.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, had the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON never introduced a bill in Congress or piloted a measure through the House of Representatives he would go down in history as one of America's great.

He is great in mind and in character. His honesty has never been questioned. His rugged individualism is an inspiration to the most ambitious and puts the lazy and indulent to shame. He never hesitated to stand up and be counted. When others may have been tempted to be carried away by false notions, Uncle BOB always held steady. He has set an example in his fairness and courtesy to his colleagues. He has been interested in, and considerate of, every taxpayer in the United States.

Mr. DOUGHTON is a true patriot. To him, living within our national income and the payment of our national debt are absolute musts in the maintenance of our national honor. No one will ever be able to take the place of the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON in the Halls of Congress—what the Nation needs is more Members who will try to emulate him.

One of the rare privileges that has been mine as a Member of Congress has been to serve under this great man, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain defines repartee as something that you think about going home. Tomorrow and next week and next month and next year, I will often think of the things I wish I had said at this hour honoring our beloved colleague Uncle BOB DOUGHTON. This is an occasion which belongs peculiarly to Members of Congress. It is not often that you hear or read much in the way of complimentary statements made about Members of Congress or about public officials in general. I feel I speak not only for myself, but for millions of people in the United States who today recognize your services, Uncle Bob.

I am thinking of that time when the late President Roosevelt handed to you a great piece of legislation, social security, which you piloted through this House. These millions of beneficiaries thank you. I am reminded, too, of the fine son who is a constituent of mine. I recall the other members of your family. All that I could wish for me and mine I wish for you and yours during this and all the coming years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WOODROW W. JONES].

Mr. WOODROW W. JONES. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding service rendered by the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. No man in the history of our Nation can claim any finer record of service than the record made by Mr. DOUGHTON. He has had a long and distinguished career. When the modern history of America is written, Mr. Bob, as we fondly call him, shall occupy a prominent place.

I count it a privilege and honor to know him and to have served with him in Congress. He came to Congress 4 years before I was born, and I shall always cherish so long as I may live the fact that I have been privileged to serve with him and to sit at his feet. His sterling character, his wide experience and knowledge, his devotion to duty, his strong patriotism, his sound philosophy of government, his good humor and pleasant disposition, his wise counsel and sage advice have been, and shall always be, a great inspiration to me.

As he leaves us to return to the mountains of North Carolina, I shall miss him greatly and I beg of him to grant me the privilege of coming across the mountain to see him and to seek his advice. Surely this great man who is now voluntarily retiring can do so with the strong feeling of satisfaction that he has served his district, his State, and his Nation well. May God bless him and keep him and grant unto him many more years of happiness and service to his Nation. I salute Mr. Bob as a great North Carolinian and as a great American. Truly, he is North Carolina's first citizen.

AUTHORIZING INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO REVOKE OR AMEND WATER CARRIER CERTIFICATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate:

That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate S. 2364, to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water-carrier certificates and permits.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted.

There was no objection.

HON. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the dean of our delegation, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, and dear friends, I appreciate very much this kindly greeting which this body has just accorded me. I am so filled, I might say choked with emotions of gratitude and thankfulness, that I feel my tongue almost cleaves to the roof of my mouth.

I know I shall not be able, if I had the time, to express my deep, sincere, profound, gratitude, thanks, and appreciation for the kind and generous things that have been spoken of me this afternoon by so many of my colleagues.

An inspired writer has said that a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches; and, in my opinion, a good name, merited and properly achieved, is perhaps the greatest of all riches. True wealth does not consist in material things; the greatest wealth does not consist in houses, land, flocks, herds, stocks and bonds, and bank accounts; in my opinion true wealth consists in the friendships we have justly earned and the esteem in which we are held by those who know us best.

From the bottom of my heart and out of the fullness of my heart, and with all my heart, I thank our beloved Speaker for his kind and generous words; and I am thankful to him for having enjoyed his friendship and confidence through the many years that we have served together. He came to Congress 2 years later than I; I came to the Sixty-second; he came to the Sixty-third. As far as I know there has never been a harsh word or a misunderstanding between our beloved Speaker and myself. He has been helpful to me; he has been courteous to me; he has been considerate of me.

There is one charge I believe that not even Satan himself would ever bring against me—if he did I believe he could not sustain it even in his own court—the charge of ingratitude. I do feel that I do possess a reasonable amount of gratitude, and I wish to express my gratitude to the membership of this House, those who have spoken so complimentarily of me this afternoon, to the Majority Leader [Mr. MCCORMACK], the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, great statesman, great American, great man, who served with me on the Committee on Ways and Means for a

number of years. He knows my limitations, my weaknesses, my shortcomings; in spite of that he stood up in this presence and spoke in the most kindly and complimentary way of me, in words that touched my heart very deeply.

And I shall remember until I pass to the Great Beyond each member of the committee of which I have had the honor to be chairman for so long a time, longer than any other man in the history of our great Government. To each one of them I acknowledge my obligation; I express my sincere, deep, and profound thanks for their courtesy, their consideration, their helpfulness, their fairness. Whatever I have been able to accomplish, if anything, as chairman of that great committee, has been due to their cooperation, their assistance, and their help, in all my ups and downs as chairman of that great committee.

The distinguished gentleman from New York, ranking minority member of the committee [Mr. REED] while we differ politically, never has he let an opportunity pass to manifest in the most substantial form his friendship and his interest and desire to make the work of our committee a success. He fights hard but he always strikes above the belt.

To each member of the committee—I do not have time to name all of them—but to each member of our committee I here express publicly my most profound and sincere appreciation of your helpfulness, your cooperation, and the sympathy that you have extended to me.

Also I express my thanks to our able Parliamentarian, Dr. Deschler, and our able, courteous, and efficient majority whip, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PRIEST, both of whom have been most courteous and helpful to me.

I have served in Congress longer than any other living man in either House with the exception of our beloved colleague and friend the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH.

The confidence expressed in me by the people back home, continually overlooking my shortcomings, limitations, and all that, is a source of the greatest gratitude to me.

The minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has been most courteous and kind to me on every occasion. I appreciate the generous things expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I am pleased to regard many on that side of the aisle as my friends. You know, I have a definition of "friend." It is a person who will do you a favor if they know you will never find it out. I am sure I have a number of friends on both sides of this aisle who feel that way toward me. I appreciate their friendship more than I can express.

I have served during the terms of seven Presidents, beginning with President Taft, and under nine Speakers. The first vote I ever cast in this House on April 4, 1911, was to elect Champ Clark, that great statesman and American, Speaker of the House of Representatives. I have served with Speakers Clark, Gillett, Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, and our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MARTIN, and now again under our very distinguished Speaker.

I have had a long career in this House and what I have accomplished is not attributable to my ability. It is attributable to my effort to be able to get along with men with whom it was necessary for me to work. My strength has been the strength of the committee I have been chairman of because I have possessed their confidence, their respect, and esteem, and as a result of that respect, confidence, and esteem I have been the recipient of their helpfulness and their cooperation.

I return now to my home in the hills and mountains of North Carolina, my native land, the land that gave me birth, and will, in a very short time at the most, be my final resting place. I leave the House of Representatives with a most affectionate regard for every Member of the House of Representatives, a body of great men serving a great country in a great way. I leave here with a close feeling of friendship for all of you.

My last hope is that the kind Providence above and your people at home, your constituents at home, may extend to you that support and cooperation which you have so well earned and which you so justly deserve.

I again thank you all from the bottom and depths of my heart.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point with reference to Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have come to know, admire, and respect the great ability and the tireless work of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], regret his decision not to stand for reelection but to retire from the Congress at the termination of this session.

The gentleman from Kentucky brought several valuable assets to his service in the Congress. A stanch and highly principled American, a believer in the fundamental principles of true democracy plus a capacity for hard work, intelligently directed, all combined to render his service outstanding even among men unusually gifted.

His friends in the House will miss the ready wit and the warm friendship of the gentleman from Kentucky. As he returns to the land of the blue grass and the thoroughbred he takes with him the best wishes of those who have come to admire and respect him. His district in Louisville has been well served by Mr. MORTON. And it will not be an easy task to find a successor who will work as hard or as long as did the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I have always felt more young people should be in Congress. I regret that Congressman MORTON, of Kentucky, has decided to retire. He has been an excellent Congressman, a loyal friend, and a charming host. May he enjoy a well-earned rest at his home in the blue grass.

I sincerely hope he will choose to again represent his district in the United States House of Representatives. Good luck, Mort, to you and Clay Belle.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], is a gentleman in every sense of the word. Even though he has served in the Congress but a relatively short time he leaves an enviable record of service to his district and his country.

It has been a privilege to serve with him. It is most regrettable that he has elected to retire. He will be greatly missed.

I would like to wish him and his charming wife every good fortune and happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been not only a high privilege but a great personal pleasure to have had the opportunity to serve with that fine gentleman from Kentucky, THRUSTON MORTON. I regret exceedingly that he has decided not to run again. He brought to his congressional service a deep and clear perception of issues involved in legislation and their ultimate effect on our national life and welfare. He brought also a firm sincerity and high courage in maintaining his convictions. I, along with his host of friends, shall miss him greatly, not only because of the friendship of which he gave so graciously and unstintingly, but also out of profound respect for the incalculable worth to his State and Nation that his service here has and would have continued to contribute.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, has decided to retire from the House of Representatives. He is a Member of whom I have become very fond. He is a good-natured friend. He is always well-informed and interprets his information shrewdly. He has served his district well. He has a lovely wife and family. Like many of his other friends, I am sorry that our paths seem to be drawing apart.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today marks the final day of congressional service for a real friend and a fine Representative in Congress. On and off the floor of the House, THRUSTON MORTON, more familiarly known as Governor, was a congenial and effective worker for the legislation in which he believed.

THRUSTON MORTON never lacked political courage. On many roll-call votes, the name of THRUSTON MORTON would be found on the currently unpopular side, but the side which represented sound judgment and the protection of America's heritage.

Mrs. Davis and I numbered Governor and Mrs. Morton among our finest Washington friends. We shall miss them, but shall indeed wish them well, and shall look forward to seeing them here or elsewhere in the future.

Surely his voluntary retirement from Congress does not mean that his public service has ended. I cannot help but feel that the people of Kentucky will call on

THRUSTON MORTON for public service in the future.

And so farewell, Governor, may our paths cross again soon.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleague in tribute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON]. Soon after we came as freshmen to the Eightieth Congress he made his mark as one of the truly able Members of this House.

Keen and incisive in thought, direct and forthright in speech, stanch and fearless in character, he leaves the imprint of his personality not only on the records of the Congress but on the minds and hearts of all of us who have served with him.

We shall miss him from these halls but we shall hear more of him anon.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, it was with regret that I learned of the voluntary retirement from Congress of the Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON, of Kentucky. Thruston was one of the first fellows I met in Congress when I came in 1949. Since then it has been my good fortune to learn to know him personally and to observe his work on the floor of the House. The State of Kentucky is losing an outstanding Representative, the Congress a faithful worker, and I a real friend in Thruston's retirement.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that our good friend THURSTON MORTON is leaving the House of Representatives. All of us will miss him as a good friend and able colleague but the real tragedy is that the Nation will lose one of its best Members. THRUSTON MORTON has been one of the most constructive members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and he served on that committee when the pressure was greatest and the controversies most violent. He never faltered under pressure. I have always been guided by his advice and counsel on all matters under the jurisdiction of that great committee. It is regrettable that he is leaving this body. I hope he will return often and stay long even though such visits may not be on official business. It goes without saying that we will welcome him back as a Member, either in this body or the other.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, when the Eighty-third Congress convenes in January of 1953, some old familiar faces will not be present because these men have chosen not to be a candidate for reelection. Numbered among those not present will be a gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON, who has been a close personal friend of mine of long standing. I sincerely regret that Mr. MORTON chose not to return to the Congress, as the people of Kentucky whom he represents have lost an honest and sincere legislator. His intimate knowledge of those he represented and the problems peculiar to their section of the country equipped him to ably carry out the duties of the public office bestowed upon him.

About 15 months ago, Mr. MORTON was assigned to the House select committee investigating the educational and loan guaranty programs under the GI bill to fill a vacancy occurring from a resignation. His presence was a valuable asset and I for one welcomed his assignment to the committee. His work on the committee displayed another of his attributes, that of versatility. Based on his service in the Navy during World War II of well over 4 years, he harbored a deep interest in the veterans and their welfare. His contributions to this committee and his sincere and honest approach to the problems confronting it, were indeed an asset.

When the committee set about to look into the conduct of the loan guaranty program, Mr. MORTON's past experiences in the business and finance world assisted us greatly.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I consider Mr. MORTON's absence from this legislative body a great loss, not only to the people of the Third Congressional District in Kentucky, but also to the Nation. It was a distinct pleasure to have served with him in this governing body.

CONTINUING EXISTING METHOD OF COMPUTING PARITY PRICES FOR BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. COOLEY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2490)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 301 (a) (1) (G) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

"'(G) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the parity price for any basic agricultural commodity, as of any date during the six-year period beginning January 1, 1950, shall not be less than its parity price computed in the manner used prior to the enactment of the Agricultural Act of 1949.'

"SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of section 101 (d) thereof:

"'(6) The level of support to cooperators shall be 90 per centum of the parity price for the 1953 and 1954 crops of any basic agricultural commodity with respect to which producers have not disapproved marketing quotas.'

"SEC. 3. The Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended as follows:

"1. Add a new subsection (f) at the end of section 101 of such Act, as follows:

"'(f) The provisions of this Act relating to price support for cotton shall apply severally to (1) American upland cotton and (2) extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) and ginned as required by subsection (e) of section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that the level of price support which shall be made available to cooperators for extra long staple cotton of the 1953 crop if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas therefor shall be at a level bearing the same relationship to the level of price support determined for American upland cotton as the average farm price for extra long staple cotton during the period 1936-42, inclusive, bore to such price for American upland cotton. Disapproval by producers of the quota proclaimed under such section 347 shall place into effect the provisions of section 101 (d) (3) of this act with respect to the extra long staple cotton described in subsection (a) of such section 347. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of the Secretary under section 402 to make support available for extra long staple cotton in accordance with such section 402.'

"2. Add a new section 420 to such Act, reading as follows:

"'SEC. 420. Any price support program in effect on cottonseed or any of its products shall be extended to the same seed and products of the cottons defined under section 347 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.'

"SEC. 4. Section 347 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'LONG STAPLE COTTON

"'SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this part shall not apply to extra long staple cotton which is produced from pure strain varieties of the Barbadense species, or any hybrid thereof, or other similar types of extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable, and grown in irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States designated by the Secretary or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties or types.

"'(b) Whenever during any calendar year, not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton described in subsection (a) for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply thereof for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of such cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of cotton described in subsection (a) adequate to make available a normal supply of such cotton, taking into account (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year, and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year. The national marketing quota for cotton described in subsection (a) for any year shall not be less than the larger of 30,000 bales or a number of bales equal to 30 per centum of the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of such cotton for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed.

"'(c) All provisions of this Act, except section 342, subsections (h), (k), and (l) of section 344, the parenthetical provisions relating to acreages regarded as having been planted to cotton, and the provisions relating to minimum small farm allotments, shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments authorized by this section: *Provided*, That the applicable penalty rate for such cotton under section 346 shall be the higher of 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price for extra long staple cotton as of the date specified therein.

"'(d) Unless marketing quotas are in effect under subsection (b) of this section, the penalty provisions of section 346 shall not apply to any cotton the staple of which is one and one-half inches or more in length.

"'(e) The exemptions authorized by subsections (a) and (d) of this section shall not apply unless (1) the cotton is ginned on a roller-type gin or (2) the Secretary authorizes the cotton to be ginned on another type gin for experimental purposes or to prevent loss of the cotton due to frost or other adverse condition.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CLYDE R. HOEY,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing methods of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substituted new language which was in part the same as that in the House bill. The result of the Senate action was to leave section 1 of the House bill unchanged, to strike out all of section 2, and to add two new sections to the bill providing price support for extra-long-staple cotton.

The effect of the action taken by the committee of conference is to leave section 1 of the House bill unchanged, to reinstate section 2 with modifications, and to accept the new sections adopted by the Senate, dealing with long-staple cotton, with some modifications. Details of the changes are set out below.

Section 1: This section, which extends the dual parity provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, is the same as section 1 of the House bill.

Section 2: This section, which was eliminated from the bill by the Senate, has been reinstated with an amendment which makes the provisions of the section applicable only to crops of 1953 and 1954, instead of the three years 1953–55 provided in the House bill.

Sections 3 and 4: The purpose of these sections, as agreed to by the committee of conference, is to provide price support for the 1953 crop of extra-long-staple cotton based on the historical ratio of the price of such cotton to the price of upland cotton. As adopted by the Senate, these sections would have based the level of support upon a cost of production factor.

As agreed to by the committee of conference, the level of support for extra-long-staple cotton will be determined by the relationship between the farm price of long-staple cotton and the farm price of American upland cotton in the 7 years 1936–42 inclusive. The committee is informed that this will result in a support price for extra-long-staple cotton about 2.3 times the support price of short-staple cotton.

At present price levels this would provide a support price in the neighborhood of 75 cents per pound for long-staple cotton. Under the incentive production program announced by the Department of Agriculture to produce long-staple cotton for strategic purposes, the support price of the 1952 crop is about $1.05 per pound. The support level for 1953 provided in this bill, therefore, is approximately 30 cents per pound below the present level of price support.

As adopted by the Senate, these sections would have been permanent legislation. As agreed by the committee of conference, the provisions relating to the level of support for long-staple cotton will apply only to the 1953 crop.

These sections also require that price-support programs for cottonseed or cottonseed products be extended to cover the seeds or products of long-staple cotton.

The committee of conference also made a minor change in the provision of section 4 relating to the penalty rate for long-staple cotton. As adopted by the Senate, the bill provided that the penalty should be 50 per centum of the parity price. The committee of conference amended this provision to make the penalty 50 per centum of the parity price or 50 per centum of the support price, whichever is higher.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
GEORGE GRANT,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8122) to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report shows again what I have contended right along that this whole question of agricultural price supports by the Federal Government and its treatment in the Congress not being an adversary proceeding is not going to hold the proper balance between the interests of farmers and the interests of consumers. Here we have the whole fixed 90 percent support continued on the six basic commodities, the modern parity formula we adopted in a considered way shunted aside again and a new price support plan added for long staple cotton all in this conference report.

I made my fight on the bill when it was before us in the House but lost on a record vote. However, that vote showed that a very substantial minority questioned the validity of the inflexibility of this price support bill. I feel sincerely that this policy will prove to be unwise for farmers in that its very inflexibility has the difficulty of bringing on an unfavorable reaction from the 80 percent of the population who are now farm consumers and whose support for any kind of Government price supports is essential.

I hope that in the next Congress the whole program of Government farm price supports may be reviewed and a policy holding an even balance between farmers and consumers may result. Some support is needed to avoid a 1932-type economic break for the farmer but I feel the whole program has gone far beyond that into close to price guaranties. In addition this has had a tendency to cause the whole chain of middlemen and what they charge to be overlooked and this is of great importance to both farmers and consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRUE POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL ECONOMY WOULD ASSURE JUSTICE

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, the establishment and operation of true principles of political science and of political economy would assure the universal and continuous enjoyment of justice.

As to the requirements necessary for the establishment of such principles, every forward-looking and recognized authority on the science of government agrees that the most important element of human government is the requirement for the consent of those governed; in other words, it must be according to the will of the people.

TRUE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Provision must be made, of course, for the necessary officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of government.

Careful scrutiny of legislative measures and the proper use of the referendum will prevent the enactment of bad laws.

Under the referendum, if a reasonable number of the people, as required by law, disapprove of a measure passed by the lawmaking body, they can file a petition demanding a vote of the people upon such measure at an appropriate time and those opposed to such measure passed by the lawmaking body can vote against it and those who favor it can vote for it. If a majority of the votes are cast against it, the measure does not become law. If the majority favor it the measure becomes law.

On the other hand, by the exercise of the initiative, if there will have been filed with the proper official a petition bearing at least the number of voters' signatures required by statute, proposing the adoption of a measure, which the lawmaking body will have failed to enact, the said proposed measure will become law if the majority of the people vote for it at an election held at a time determined by law, but will not become law if a majority votes against it.

By the proper supervision and control of the official conduct of public servants, through the use of the scientific and practical legal device known as the recall, the people can be assured of faithful service by those entrusted with the work of the Government.

It can be provided by law that if there be filed with the official legally designated to receive the same, a petition, bearing at least the number of voters' signatures required by law, requesting the removal of a public official from office, an election shall be held to determine whether or not such official shall be recalled, that is, removed from office. If at such election a majority should vote for the recall the official would be removed, otherwise not.

Establishment by the people of a government embodying the aforesaid essential requirements will assure the existence and operation of genuine self-government, and make certain that the majority of the citizens of a government, embodying the principles which have just been explained and briefly discussed, will have it in their power to enact into law, in exactly the form they consider proper, such measures as they desire and will have the means also to prevent the taking effect of measures which they disapprove.

The framers of the United States Constitution provided no means by which the people could exercise direct control of the lawmaking function nor did they provide for the immediate, direct, affirmative control of the officials of the Federal Government. Under our present system all that can be done to change things is to wait for elections at fixed times and that is no assurance of a change in regard to specific policies or measures.

Nevertheless, the Federal Government has made some progress toward the realization of the ideal of democracy, which is, of course, the establishment of the ultimate direct control by the people of both the making of the laws and the administration or execution of the same.

Since the year 1913 the law has required the election of Senators to be made by the direct vote of the people. In a great many of the States the law requires the nomination of Representatives in Congress to be made by direct vote of the members of the respective parties.

While the improvement made in the method of electing Representatives and Senators has been substantial and very beneficial, nevertheless it is a fact that by far the most important improvement and the one most urgently needed in order to establish fundamental democracy, as the chief characteristic of the Federal Government, has not only been woefully neglected, but it has been strongly opposed. The whole principle of government by the consent of the people was bitterly opposed by Alexander Hamilton, the founder of the Federalist Party, the name of which later became the Republican Party. Hamilton's opposition has manifested itself through his successors in the party, who indicate an even more intense hostility than Hamilton's to the principle of popular government through the direct action of the people themselves.

The nomination of candidates of the respective parties for the offices of President and Vice President, should, according to every principle of justice, be made by the direct personal vote of the members of each party, voting throughout the United States, as the proper unit of government for which such nominations must be made.

Party nominations of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States should not be determined according to the unbridled notions of convention members to whom citizens of the United States may have delegated the solemn duty, which by every test of logic and principle of morality should rest upon the citizens themselves.

Who is not aware of the fact that nominations made in accordance with the history and spirit of conventions seldom reflect the earnest convictions of the majority of the citizens of the United States who are members of the party for which it is proclaimed that such nominations are made?

I do not even intimate that evil motives actuate the professionals who promote and participate in deals and maneuvers which are common convention practices. I think that the overwhelming majority of such persons sincerely believe that their activities and operations serve the best interests of the party. In fact, if we must assume that we are to be chained forever to the wholly undemocratic and discredited convention system, we should be fair enough to say that the so-called professionals serve the interests of the party as well if not better than many other persons could do.

Until, however, the voters of the respective parties in the United States have direct and complete control of the policies, decisions, and management of their party affairs, we cannot hope to enjoy the blessings of true democracy—the democracy which will enable the people of our country to realize and enjoy the freedom of the spirit and the attendant happiness and joy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have said in regard to the necessity of nominating, by the direct vote of the members of the parties of the United States, candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency by the members of the parties voting throughout the United States, as the proper unit of Government, applies with equal force, in suport of the practically universal demand for the abolition of the electoral college. It never did truly serve the purpose for which it was intended.

We should immediately also provide for elections to be held throughout the United States as the proper unit of government, for the electing, by direct vote of the people, the President and Vice President, from the nominees for said offices, chosen by the respective parties in the manner just discussed, that is, by the direct vote of the members of the respective parties as determined by the vote throughout the United States as the unit of government.

Thomas Jefferson constantly stressed the importance of keeping in the hands of the people the direct control of their Government.

In the year 1816, in writing to John Taylor in reference to the term "Republic," Jefferson said:

> Were I to assign to this term a precise and definite idea I would say, purely and simply, it means a government by its citizens in mass, acting directly and personally, according to rules established by the majority; and that every other government is more or less republican, in proportion as it has in its composition more or less of this ingredient of the direct action of the citizens.

It is also pleasing to know that James Wilson, a great member of the Constitutional Convention was a strong advocate of the election of the President and Vice President by direct vote of the people at elections held throughout the United States as the proper unit of government.

Let me quote Norton's volume entitled "The Constitution of the United States, Its Sources and Its Application" at page 4 as follows:

> It is interesting to notice with what singular clearness James Wilson of Pennsylvania, a scholar from Edinburgh, laid down in the Constitutional Convention the doctrine which was, eighty years later, removed from debate, by the Fourteenth Amendment the question under discussion being whether the State or the people should be represented in the Senate:
>
> A citizen of America is a citizen of the general government, and is a citizen of the particular State in which he may reside. * * * In forming the general government we must forego our local habits and attachments, lay aside our State connections, and act for the general good of the whole. The general government is not an assemblage of States, but of individuals.

I quote also from the same volume by Norton at page 102, as follows:

> Over and over the Constitutional Convention debated the question of how the President should be elected. * * * Mr. Wilson of Pennsylvania stood stanchly for the popular vote—(For the election of the President.)

Mr. Speaker, I have now stated and have briefly discussed the provisions which are necessary to assure the establishment and continuity of true self-government, that is, fundamental democracy.

In other words, I have outlined the means, measures and regulations necessary to assure the establishment of self-government as a fact. There has been stated the principles of political science, that is the science of government, the principles which must be observed in establishing the governmental system which assures direct control of the system and its functioning by the voters. We have discussed the structure and operation of the kind of government which constitutes fundamental democracy.

SOUND POLITICAL ECONOMY

Let us now briefly discuss the principles of political economy which should be adopted and promoted by the fundamentally democratic government which has just been discussed.

ECONOMIC JUSTICE

In the practical affairs of life, people realize that they can enjoy harmonious existence only by helping to promote the welfare of their fellow beings, by conducting themselves in harmony with the universal law of action governing all. In other words, harmonious existence requires the individual to regard scrupulously the welfare of those whom he regards as other and separate persons.

This means, from the standpoint of human government, that there must prevail absolute justice in the control of the

earth, which is the source of all material things used by mankind.

How, then, can we assure justice in the distribution of the wealth derived from the earth? The answer, in brief, should be as follows: "Discover the natural law, and, in harmony with it, enact and administer the laws of human governments."

The earth exists and is governed in accord with universal law which is altogether just. That law is not in any way dependent on the vain, conceited notions of any human being, or group of human beings whose egotism craves the official power to direct the lives of other people.

A proper understanding of the principles of political economy, and their correct application to the problems which distress the people, would soon bring about the reign of economic justice. The adjustment of men's conduct and actions, in harmony with the true laws of life, would thus be assured, and soon we would have the glorious rule of right with all of its joys.

Let us consider, then, the principles, which, if properly obeyed, will assure all men their rights, banish hate, and establish universal brotherhood.

FACTORS OF PRODUCTION

There are three factors engaged in the production of all goods. They are labor, capital, and what may be named as either natural resources, land or the earth. To assure, by law, to each of these factors its just share in what may be produced by the united action of the three factors, just named, must be the chief aim of true statesmanship.

Now, all commodities which people use or consume must be derived from the earth. Our first task, therefore, in our effort to find out what is the fair share of each of the three factors is to understand, first of all, what are men's rights in regards to the control of the land, called also natural resources or the earth.

First let us note that rightful ownership of anything whatsoever exists because the person claiming such ownership either has made what he claims to own or has given for it, something of equal value to someone who had rightfully acquired ownership of it.

ONE CREATIVE POWER

One power is the sole cause of the existence of the earth's population. It is clear, too, that the power which produced the earth's inhabitants created also the earth itself. Certainly no human being ever created or could create a single particle of the earth. Reason requires us also to regard the one Power as the Father of the earth's inhabitants. If, however, the Creator is parent of the earth's beings, then we cannot reasonably believe that that power, the Father, would or could be unfair or unjust to any of His creatures. On the contrary, instead of being unfair, He has provided equal rights for all His creatures in the bounty which He has supplied.

What then, with due regard for justice to all, is the true nature of men's rights in the earth?

Surely no person could be given exclusive ownership of the earth, or any part of it, without injustice to all other beings. No; on the other hand, the natural resources, the land, is the common heritage of all mankind and must be used on the basis of equal rights to all and special privilege to none.

Whatever part of production, from any part of the natural resources, called also land, is due to better natural advantage, such part of production surely belongs rightly to all the people in common, called society. Every person, of course, must be assured of possession of the land occupied by him, for the period of time for which he pays to society, or its government, the value of the amount by which the reasonably possible production from the land, occupied by him, exceeds the reasonably possible production, from a like area of the least productive land, occupied by any person.

THE COMMON HERITAGE

The value per year of this difference in productive power is what is called economic rent. Whether it be industrial land, city land, or farm land, the economic rent of such land is the value of what, by a certain amount and quality of labor, it will produce more than will be produced by the same amount of labor from a like area of the least productive land occupied by anyone.

Economic rent is the amount which is justly due to society, to all the people in common, for the right granted by society for the possession of natural resources. Economic rent is, therefore, the only proper source from which Government should collect the money necessary to pay its expenses.

Instead, however, of employing this just method, the method which would reward men for their industry and enterprise, resulting in better and increased production, the expense of Government has been wrongly taken by taxation from what, by their own efforts, people have produced. This method of securing revenue to pay the expense of Government has discouraged enterprise and retarded business.

INDEFENSIBLE TAXES

The cost of Government has been paid from taxes unjustly collected from values created in goods produced by labor and capital. It certainly should be clear to anyone that all taxes put upon goods are penalties which hold back production. Surely everyone can see also that such taxes increase the price of goods. They, therefore, lessen sales, because the higher becomes the price of goods the fewer are the persons who can afford to buy them, and, therefore, the smaller is the amount of goods that can be sold. The demand for goods lessens as the price of the same rises. That means less profit for the seller and less wages for employees.

The injustice and harm which results from such an unjust system of taxation may be seen on every side and continue during every minute of our lives. All things men produce are taxed. The owner is taxed—in effect, fined—on account of every improvement he may make on his house, barn, garage, fence, or any other of the changes made by him, which may improve the living conditions of himself, his family, and, in fact, of the whole community.

PUNISHED FOR WELL-DOING

Instead of being encouraged to make progress and to improve the standard of life, and instead of being commended for doing so, men are taxed—fined—punished because they improve conditions. Some governments even tax the householder on account of every pane of glass he puts in windows to allow the daylight to enter his house to brighten it. Practically all of the different kinds of goods needed by the people for their welfare are taxed many, many times—in fact taxes are collected on account of the sale of everything used or consumed by people during their entire lives.

Now all taxes on building improvements and on all goods which increase people's comfort and health must surely, unavoidably lower the standards of living and retard the progress of civilization.

All taxes on things produced by labor and capital reduce the sales of such goods. This is so because the taxes included in their cost price increase the sale price of such goods. That, of course, makes it harder for people to buy the goods. The wages paid workers are then less, because less goods are sold, and so, of course, fewer workers are needed to produce the smaller supply of goods manufactured. That results in unemployment for many people. The unemployed compete with each other in seeking the same jobs and offer to work for less than the regular wages in order to have a means of earning a living. Prosperity and progress are delayed, because governments, to pay expenses, take by taxation a big part of what is produced by labor and capital. Men are thereby punished for their industry and discouraged in their efforts to be enterprising.

Yes; every excise tax, sales tax, and every other like tax on the sale of goods, certainly, holds back business constantly.

Nevertheless, men are taxed more and more as they become more industrious and enterprising in the production of the comforts needed for a better general standard of living. Indefensible as is the taxing of men, as they become more industrious, more enterprising, and produce more goods—there results a yet greater evil. Because of the failure to collect government expenses, from the economic rent of natural resources, it is not expensive for the holders of the same to keep the resources out of use. This results in monopoly and deprives the people of the benefit of competition.

The failure to collect the expenses of government from the economic rent of natural resources, controlled by monopolists, causes the loss of vast amounts of revenue which would provide abundantly for the very best quality of government. Instead of doing this, however, people are taxed, punished, because they have been industrious in making useful goods and in improving property to make it more comfortable, more attractive, more sanitary, and better in every way for everybody.

JUST TAXATION

The collection of the cost of government from economic rent is the fairest and the most scientific method of securing abundant revenue for the best quality of government. The value of land, and income derived from land, results from the presence and activity o. society, of the community.

The market value of the land or natural resources exists because of the presence of population. In 1626 Manhattan Island, upon which New York City is located, was bought by a group of Hollanders from Indians for $24. On December 31, 1934, the official value of the land, exclusive of improvements, was $4,600,000,000. The land in and about the Cleveland public square originally had so little market value that it was used for pasture. Now the value of the land within a few hundred yards of the square is measured in millions of dollars. We could give an unlimited number of examples of like experiences involving great increases in the market value of land in all parts of the country. All of such increases in value are due to the same cause, namely, the increase in population. The increase in population results in the construction of more buildings, and the erection of new buildings requires much material and the employment of many workers. All this, of course, results in better business.

The improvement and increase in business raises the market value of the ground where such business is carried on. The presence of the greater population, the larger community, increases business, and the improved business increases the market value of the land. The value of the land was not created by the person who by chance may have had title to the land. Instead, the presence of the larger population, the larger community caused the increase in the value of the land.

THE COMMUNITY RIGHTS

The yearly income paid to the owner of land was not in any sense earned by the owner but was due altogether to the presence of a greater number of people whose activity and enterprise helped to improve business in general. Certainly, then, the community which has caused the increased income from the land is entitled to collect from that income the cost of the community government.

It will now be admitted, I am sure, that serious injustice and great wrong have been suffered by the people because of the unjust and the unwise methods of taxation commonly used by governments to secure money to pay their expenses.

We have shown that land values and the income or interest on the values created by the presence of a larger population, the larger community, have not been paid to society, to the people as a whole, whose presence, industry, and enterprise created the land values and the income or interest paid on them.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES FOR THE FEW

No; on the contrary, the increased land values and the income on the same have been handed over to private persons who were neither the cause of nor the creators of the land values or the interest or income paid on same.

The community's loss of the income on these increased land values, handed over to privileged private persons, is bad enough and violates every principle of justice. To add insult to injury, however, after giving the economic rent to private persons, we next find that such governments, in order to pay their expenses, rob the people, legally, of course, of what they produce by their labors. If the family improves the home then it is taxed—fined. If people erect buildings and increase the value of the land in the neighborhood, they are taxed for putting up the buildings which improve the community.

VICE OF LOW TAX ON IDLE LAND

On the other hand, the persons who hold their land idle—while it increases in value because of their neighbor's work, enterprise, improvements, and building—are not taxed, or are taxed but little on their increased land values. Taxes are put upon everything people make or buy from other makers to improve their standard of living, and improve community life. Business is retarded, the progress of civilization is slackened and halted because men are taxed—punished—for producing, to sell, things needed for the health, comfort, and refinement of the people in general.

There is a wrong, however, far greater even and much more harmful to the people than the loss of money caused by the failure to collect revenue from the land values created by the public; a wrong even greater than the taking by taxation, from the people, of a part of the value of what they produce by their labor to supply the needs of society and to make life more wholesome and pleasant.

FOSTERS MONOPOLIES

That evil consists of the monopolies, the power given to a few persons, as a result of the failure to collect from such persons the expenses of government from the values created, added to the land, by the presence and activity of the people, the community.

This failure to collect the cost of government from the income, created by the community's presence and activity, makes it possible and easy for the monopolists to hold out of use, or to use but inefficiently, the land or resources in their possession. They can and do hold out of use the land, the resources, because their refusal or failure to use them costs them little or nothing. While the land is held idle they are relieved of the necessity of exerting any effort. They need not use funds they may have, to carry on any business. The greatest wrong of all, however, consists of the fact that they can and do prevent other people from using the land.

SOLUTION FOR THE WAGE PROBLEM

Collecting the expenses of government from economic rent would make it impossible for anybody to monopolize the natural resources and to hold them for speculative purposes. The holders of land would be compelled, then, to make good use of the land or natural resources in order to have the money to pay their taxes. Because the monopolizers would be compelled to use the natural resources in order to have money to pay their taxes they would need workers and there would thus be created a demand for labor. The owners of land, of natural resources, throughout the country would be influenced and act in the same way and all industry, commerce, and agriculture would therefore flourish. Unwilling idleness would soon be unknown and the so-called wage problem would settle itself. The wage problem would no longer exist because, if men were not paid fair wages and given good working conditions, they could go to fair-minded employers who would be glad to hire them on just terms.

GLARING EXAMPLE GIVEN

To illustrate what has just been said, let us suppose, for example, that all the known oil lands were located in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia, and one or a few men were to have title to the full and unlimited ownership and control of the same and could hold it out of use by paying trifling taxes amounting to not much more than the taxes on poor farm land. This is what would likely happen: The holders of such oil lands would use such part of the lands as might be required to supply kerosene—coal oil—to the people burning the same to make what was at the time a new kind of light. The oil-land holders could then raise the price of coal oil as high as they might please, unless they should make the price so high as to cause people to stop using coal oil and to begin again to burn candles for light. Moreover, since the owners would be the only employers of expert oil workers, the monopolists could constantly reduce the wages paid the expert oil workers, unless they should reduce such wages to or below the level of unskilled workers' wages, and thus drive the oil workers to accept employment at work requiring no special skill.

UNEARNED WEALTH

We have here noted and explained the injustice which was the sure result of permitting the private monopoly of oil lands. Like injustice would result from permitting the private monopoly of other natural resources, such as iron-ore land, copper-ore land. zinc-ore land, lead-ore land, other kinds of ore land, and land underlaid with coal, or land which, because of the presence of a large population, is valuable for factory or business purposes.

Private monopoly of natural resources of any part of the earth makes it possible for the few who are given such monopoly to accumulate great wealth, which they do not earn by either manual labor or mental effort. A far worse evil than the possession by monopolists of their unearned wealth, however, is the power which enables monopolists to keep others from using the land, the resources. Because monopolists are required to pay so little in taxes that they need not use the land to earn the taxes, the land remains idle without any risk to the holder while it increases in value.

ADVANCE OR FAIL

The collection of the expenses of government from economic rent would put an end to the dog-in-the-manger monopoly control of the natural resources, and in no other way can monopoly be prevented. If even the larger part of the economic rent of land, of the natural resources, possessed by him, were collected from the owner to pay the expense of government, it would be necessary for him either to make good use of it himself or to allow someone else to use it. If he were to hold it without making good use of it, he could not afford to pay the tax, because he would be making no income with which to pay the taxes or rent. If he did not pay the taxes, someone else would do so and would have, then, the right to use the land. To make use of the land, however, it would be necessary for its new possessor to employ workmen and that would improve employment conditions, increase wages, and increase business in general.

COMPETITION NEVER REALLY TRIED

Whether or not the possessor may have properly used the land, the expenses of government should be collected, of course, from economic rent. The economic rent exists because of the presence and activity of society, that is, of all the people, and the failure of the holders of land to use it is no excuse for not paying what they owe to the people, to the community. Moreover, its proper use, as required by justice to all the people, would produce the money to pay the taxes, and would also provide fair compensation for the user.

By the champions of that kind of government, which is planned to be administered according to the personal discretion and direction of official agents, we have been told that competition has been tried and has failed. On the contrary, the fact is that, in modern times, there has been no opportunity for true competition. Competition in the fundamental sense has not had a real trial.

WOULD PREVENT ROBBERY OF PEOPLE

Control of the great bulk of natural resources is in the hands of a comparatively few persons. The possession and control of the greater part of the valuable natural resources, commercial sites and industrial land, enables the holders of the same, however, to put into their pockets large profits created by the presence and activity of large populations. After the monopolists have taken the unearned increment from what has been produced, the rank and file of the people are allowed to scramble with each other for a miserable existence out of what is left. Obedience to the principle, which I have discussed, would make it impossible for the few, even legally, to thus rob the many.

There has now been pointed the way to economic justice. When, in accordance with the principle just discussed, the reign of right will prevail, we shall cease to be harassed by industrial strife. The feeling of hatred and opposition will cease, and in their stead the spirit of cooperation and brotherhood will prevail.

THE TRUE LAW OF LIFE IS PERFECT

In the early part of these remarks I urged: Discover the natural law and, in harmony with it, enact and administer the laws of human governments. Whether we call it the law of life, the law of nature, the law of creative power, there certainly exists perfect law and the judgment of men's actions and conduct in harmony with that law will assure liberty and perfect happiness. Thomas Jefferson said: "The God who gave us life gave us liberty." We must understand, however, that human beings do not and cannot create justice. They can only discover, that is, become conscious of justice and its laws, established for the harmonious control of the universe. Men's actions and conduct and the laws of human governments should be brought into adjustment, into harmony with the law of creation.

Will the principles I have urged become law? My hope is unabounded. To noble minds and hearts of courage, duty's call is loud and clear. Doubt not at all right's final triumph. The cause of justice will prevail. Tyranny must vanish to the limbo of forgotten things. No longer then will hardship plague mankind when with courage we strike from men the chains of injustice.

AMENDING TITLE II OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2491)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 13, 20, 21, and 22, and from its amendment to the title.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 16, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken by the Senate amendment and in lieu of such matter insert the following:

"PRESERVATION OF INSURANCE RIGHTS OF PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED

"SEC. 3. (a) (1) Section 213 (a) (2) (A) of the Social Security Act (defining quarter of coverage) is amended to read as follows:

"'(A) The term "quarter of coverage" means, in the case of any quarter occurring prior to 1951, a quarter in which the individual has been paid $50 or more in wages, except that no quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)), other than the initial quarter of such period, shall be a quarter of coverage. In the case of any individual who has been paid, in a calendar year prior to 1951, $3,000 or more in wages, each quarter of such year following his first quarter of coverage shall be deemed a quarter of coverage, excepting any quarter in such year in which such individual died or became entitled to a primary insurance benefit and any quarter succeeding such quarter in which he died or became so entitled, and excepting any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability other than the initial quarter of such period.'

"(2) Section 213 (a) (2) (B) (i) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(i) no quarter after the quarter in which such individual died shall be a quarter of coverage, and no quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (other than the initial quarter and the last quarter of such period) shall be a quarter of coverage;'.

"(3) Section 213 (a) (2) (B) (iii) of such Act is amended by striking out 'shall be a quarter of coverage' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall (subject to clause (i)) be a quarter of coverage'.

"(b) (1) Section 214 (a) (2) of the Social Security Act (defining fully insured individual) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(B) forty quarters of coverage,

not counting as an elapsed quarter for purposes of subparagraph (A) any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.'

"(2) Section 214 (b) of such Act (defining currently insured individual) is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof: ', not counting as part of such thirteen-quarter period any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.'

"(c) (1) Section 215 (b) (1) of the Social Security Act (defining average monthly wage) is amended by inserting after 'excluding from such elapsed months any month in any quarter prior to the quarter in which he attained the age of twenty-two which was not a quarter of coverage' the following: 'and any month in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability (as defined in section 216 (i)) unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage'.

"(2) Section 215 (b) (4) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(4) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, in computing an individual's average monthly wage, there shall not be taken into account—

"'(A) any self-employment income of such individual for taxable years ending in or after the month in which he died or became entitled to old-age insurance benefits, whichever first occurred;

"'(B) any wages paid such individual in any quarter any part of which was included in a period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage;

"'(C) any self-employment income of such individual for any taxable year all of which was included in a period of disability.'

"(3) Section 215 (d) of such Act (relating to primary insurance benefit for purposes of conversion table) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'(5) In the case of any individual to whom paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of this sub-

section is applicable, his primary insurance benefit shall be computed as provided therein; except that, for purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) and subparagraph (C) of paragraph (4), any quarter prior to 1951 any part of which was included in a period of disability shall be excluded from the elapsed quarters unless it was a quarter of coverage, and any wages paid in any such quarter shall not be counted.'

"(d) Section 216 of the Social Security Act (relating to certain definitions) is amended by adding after subsection (h) the following new subsection:

"'Disability; Period of Disability

"'(i) (1) The term "disability" means (A) inability to engage in any substantially gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to be permanent, or (B) blindness; and the term "blindness" means central visual acuity of 5/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses. An eye in which the visual field is reduced to five degrees or less concentric contraction shall be considered for the purpose of this paragraph as having a central visual acuity of 5/200 or less. An individual shall not be considered to be under disability unless he furnishes such proof of the existence thereof as may be required.

"'(2) The term "period of disability" means a continuous period of not less than six full calendar months (beginning and ending as hereinafter provided in this subsection) during which an individual was under a disability (as defined in paragraph (1)). No such period with respect to any disability shall begin as to any individual unless such individual, while under such disability, files an application for a disability determination. Except as provided in paragraph (4), a period of disability shall begin on whichever of the following days is the latest:

"'(A) the day the disability began;

"'(B) the first day of the one-year period which ends with the day before the day on which the individual filed such application; or

"'(C) the first day of the first quarter in which he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).

"'A period of disability shall end on the day on which the disability ceases. No application for a disability determination which is filed more than three months before the first day on which a period of disability can begin (as determined under this paragraph) shall be accepted as an application for the purposes of this paragraph, and no such application which is filed prior to July 1, 1953, shall be accepted.

"'(3) The requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) (C) and (4) (B) are satisfied by an individual with respect to any quarter only if he had not less than—

"'(A) six quarters of coverage (as defined in section 213 (a) (2)) during the thirteen-quarter period which ends with such quarter; and

"'(B) twenty quarters of coverage during the forty-quarter period which ends with such quarter;

not counting as part of the thirteen-quarter period specified in clause (A), or the forty-quarter period specified in clause (B), any quarter any part of which was included in a prior period of disability unless such quarter was a quarter of coverage.

"'(4) If an individual files an application for a disability determination after June 1953, and before January 1955, with respect to a disability which began before July 1953, and continued without interruption until such application was filed, then the beginning day for the period of disability shall be whichever of the following days is the later:

"'(A) the day such disability began; or

"'(B) the first day of the first quarter in which he satisfies the requirements of paragraph (3).'

"(e) Title II of the Social Security Act is amended by adding after section 219 the following new section:

"'DISABILITY PROVISIONS INAPPLICABLE IF BENEFITS WOULD BE REDUCED

"'SEC. 220. The provisions of this title relating to periods of disability shall not apply in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment if such benefit or payment would be greater without the application of such provisions.'

"'DISABILITY DETERMINATIONS TO BE MADE BY STATE AGENCIES

"'SEC. 221. (a) In the case of any individual, the determination of whether or not he is under a disability (as defined in section 216 (i) (1)) and of the day such disability began, and the determination of the day on which such disability ceases, shall be made by a State agency pursuant to an agreement entered into under subsection (b).

"'(b) The Administrator shall enter into an agreement with each State which is willing to make such an agreement under which the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan approved under title XIV, the State agency or agencies administering the State plan approved under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, or the State agency administering the workmen's compensation law of such State, as may be designated in the agreement, will make the determinations referred to in subsection (a) with respect to individuals in such State.

"'(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the Administrator may, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to an individual who has been determined by a State agency pursuant to an agreement under this section to be under a disability, determine that such individual is not under a disability or that such disability began on a day later than that determined by such agency. Such a determination by the Administrator shall be the determination used for purposes of section 216 (i) in lieu of that made by such State agency.

"'(d) Each State which has an agreement with the Administrator under this section shall be entitled to receive from the trust fund, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be mutually agreed upon, the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement under this section. The Administrator shall from time to time certify such amount as is necessary for this purpose to the Managing Trustee and the Managing Trustee, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment from the Trust Fund at the time or times fixed by the Administrator, in accordance with such certification.

"'(e) All money paid to a State under this section shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money which is so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury for deposit in the Trust Fund.'

"(f) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 215 (f) (1) of the Social Security Act, the amendments made by subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall apply to monthly benefits under title II of the Social Security Act for months after June 1953, and to lump-sum death payments under such title in the case of deaths occurring after June 1953; but no recomputation of benefits by reason of such amendments shall be regarded as a recomputation for purposes of section 215 (f) of the Social Security Act.

"(g) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section and the amendments made thereby, such provisions and amendments shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1953, and after such amendments cease to be in effect any provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment and on page 32, line 5, of the House engrossed bill strike out "Title" and insert in lieu thereof "Effective as of July 1, 1952, title"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 8. (a) Section 3 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3 (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for old-age assistance, for each quarter beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State

other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received old-age assistance for such month; plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as old-age assistance, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as old-age assistance under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30, and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for old-age assistance, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(b) Section 403 (a) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to dependent children, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $30, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $30 with respect to one such dependent child and $21 with respect to each of the other dependent children, and not counting so much of such expenditure for any month with respect to a relative with whom any dependent child is living as exceeds $30—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of the expenditures with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $15 multiplied by the total number of dependent children and other individuals with respect to whom aid to dependent children is paid for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to dependent children, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to dependent children under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any dependent child for any month as exceeds $18, or if there is more than one dependent child in the same home, as exceeds $18 with respect to one such dependent child and $12 with respect to each of the other dependent children; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to dependent children, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(c) Section 1003 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1003. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the blind, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the blind for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A); and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the blind, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the blind under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the blind, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(d) Section 1403 (a) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC 1403. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State which has an approved plan for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, for each quarter, beginning with the quarter commencing October 1, 1952, (1) in the case of any State other than Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to the sum of the following proportions of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $55—

"'(A) four-fifths of such expenditures, not counting so much of any expenditure with respect to any month as exceeds the product of $25 multiplied by the total number of such individuals who received aid to the permanently and totally disabled for such month, plus

"'(B) one-half of the amount by which such expenditures exceed the maximum which may be counted under clause (A);

and (2) in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as aid to the permanently and totally disabled, equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the State plan, not counting so much of such expenditure with respect to any individual for any month as exceeds $30; and (3) in the case of any State, an amount equal to one-half of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as found necessary by the Administrator for the proper and efficient administration of the State plan, which amount shall be used for paying the costs of administering the State plan or for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, or both, and for no other purpose.'

"(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective for the period beginning October 1, 1952, and ending with the close of September 30, 1954, and after such amendments cease to be in effect any provision of law amended thereby shall be in full force and effect as though this Act had not been enacted."

And the Senate agree to the same.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS T. JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
HUGH BUTLER,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment strikes out section 3 of the House bill, which provided that the insured status of certain individuals under title II of the Social Security Act, and their average monthly wage for the purposes of that title, would not be adversely affected while they were permanently and totally disabled. The effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees is to accept the House provision but to provide (1) that no applications may be accepted under the House provision prior to July 1, 1953, (2) that the House provision shall cease to be effective at the close of June 30, 1953, and (3) that determinations with respect to whether or no an individual is permanently and totally disabled and the duration of any such disability shall be made by appropriate State agencies rather than by the Administrator.

The action recommended by the conferees will permit appropriate steps to be taken for the working out of tentative agreements with the States for possible administration of these provisions. It is the intent of the conferees that hearings will be held on this entire matter early in 1953 and at that time the congressional committees will go into the administrative and other provisions. It is intended to obtain the views at that time of interested groups on the methods of obtaining evidence of disability, under what circumstances and by whom determinations should be made, and whether or not these provisions or any modification thereof should be enacted into permanent law.

Amendment No. 2: This is a technical amendment changing the section number of section 4 of the House bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6: The House bill increased from $50 to $70 a month the amount of earnings from employment or self-employment which may be received in or charged to a month without subjecting the beneficiary to a deduction from his benefits. The Senate amendments increase this amount to $100. The effect of the action recommended by the conferees is to increase this amount from the $50 in existing law to $75.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10: The House bill provided wage credits of $160 a month for individuals while serving in the Armed Forces after July 24, 1947, and before 1954, and in addition authorized appropriations to the trust fund of the sums necessary to meet the additional costs resulting from such wage credits. The effect of the Senate amendments is to retain the wage credit provision of the House bill but to provide that the additional costs will be borne by the trust fund. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12, and 17: Section 6 of the House bill provided that the insurance system contained in title II of the Social Security Act would, upon the request of the State, be extended to employees covered by certain State or local retirement systems if one of two conditions was met: (1) State or local law in effect on January 1, 1951, provided for coordination of the State or local retirement system with the Federal system, or (2) two-thirds of the employees covered by such retirement system voted in favor of Federal coverage. The Senate amendments strike out these provisions. The House recedes. The conferees by this action intend in no way to imply that they do not favor the inclusion of similar provisions in the law; it is the intent of the conferees that the entire matter of the extension of Federal coverage to employees already covered by State and local retirement systems will be explored thoroughly early in 1953, when the disability provisions are to be reexamined.

Amendment No. 13: This is a technical amendment changing a cross-reference contained in the House bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15: The House bill raised from $50 to $70 a month the work clause applicable to individuals receiving survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act. The Senate amendments raise this monthly limitation to $100. The effect of the action recommended by the conferees is to increase this monthly limitation to $75.

Amendment No. 16: This Senate amendment relates to the computation of the increase in benefits under the bill for certain individuals who are entitled to benefits for August 1952 and whose benefits could have been derived from either of two primary insurance amounts which differ from each other by not more than ten cents. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 18: The House bill provided that earned income of a blind individual which is disregarded in determining under title X of the Social Security Act the need of that individual for aid to the blind may also be disregarded in determining the need of any other individual for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled. The effect of the action recommended by the conferees is to retain the House provision but to make it effective July 1, 1952, and to make it mandatory upon the States after June 30, 1954.

Amendment No. 19: There was no comparable provision in the House bill. The Senate amendment changes the formulas for computing the Federal share of State public assistance programs.

Under existing law the Federal share in the case of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, is three-fourths of the first $20 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $50. Under the Senate amendment the Federal share is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $55. The effect of the action agreed upon in conference is to accept the provisions of the Senate amendment on this point, but to limit the period to which such provisions apply to the 2-year period beginning October 1, 1952.

Under existing law the Federal share in the case of aid to dependent children is three-fourths of the first $12 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $27 for the adult caring for a dependent child, $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child in a family. Under the Senate amendment the Federal share is four-fifths of the first $15 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient, plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child, and $21 for each additional child in a family. The effect of the action agreed upon in conference is to accept the provisions of the Senate amendment on this point, but to limit the period to which such provisions apply to the 2-year period beginning October 1, 1952.

The Senate amendment also contains changes in the formulas for computing the Federal share of public assistance for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The effect of the action agreed upon in conference is to retain, for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the formulas contained in existing law.

Amendment No. 20: Under existing law the total amount certified by the Administrator under titles I, IV, X, and XIV for payment to Puerto Rico with respect to any fiscal year may not exceed $4,250,000. The Senate amendment increases this maximum amount to $5,000,000. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 21: This amendment contains a temporary provision relating to the amount of State and local funds which must be expended in order for a State to be eligible for the full amount of the increase in Federal funds for public assistance provided by the bill. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 22: This amendment provides that for the 1-year period beginning October 1, 1952, a State may exclude from consideration any income and resources not over $50 a month obtained by a recipient of old-age assistance for performing agricultural or nursing services. The Senate recedes.

Amendment to the title: The Senate recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
THOMAS JENKINS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7800) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have brought back the social-security bill, H. R. 7800, in a much improved form. Many of the objectionable features are now removed and its provisions have been liberalized with respect to rights granted social-security beneficiaries.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] will explain the bill and I wish to associate my views with his.

In view of its present form, I am happy now to be able to support it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on H. R. 7800 should be adopted because it eliminates the objectionable socialized medicine feature of the bill a sit passed the House; because the amount of money which a person can earn without losing his benefits has been increased over the House bill; and, finally, because in addition to the higher benefits provided for under the insurance program, the conference report increases public assistance funds for the aged, dependent children, and others on the assistance rolls.

The principal objection to H. R. 7800 as it passed the House was the new permanent and total disability program established by the bill. This entering wedge into the field of socialized medicine was eliminated by the other body and is for all practical purposes eliminated in the conference report. As a face-saving gesture the House permanent and total disability provision is retained in name in the conference report, but it is completely inoperative. The conference report provides that no claims for permanent and total disability can be made until after June 30, 1953, and provides also that the whole section will automatically expire on July 1, 1953, unless affirmative action by the Congress to re-enact this provision is adopted. Moreover, an amendment to the permanent and total disability provision in the House bill was adopted which places the examination of disabled individuals in the hands of State agencies. In substance the whole permanent and total disability provision which was vigorously opposed by those of us who are interested in preserving the integrity of the medical profession in this country and who are opposed to the extension of Federal authority over the medical profession has been effectively eliminated. It is in the conference report in name only, and it is for this reason that I signed the conference report and now support its adoption.

The second principal objection to the House version of H. R. 7800 was that many Members favored increasing the so-called work clause. The bill which I introduced increased the work clause from $5¢ to $100 and the conference report sets the limit at $75. In my opinion this amount is not nearly high enough, and the Republican conferees urged that the $100 figure agreed to by the other body should be adopted. In this we were defeated, and for this unfair limitation on the amount a person may earn without losing his benefits, the blame rests with the Democratic conferees.

A significant change from the House bill contained in the conference report is the change in the Federal share of payments to the aged, the blind, and the permanently and totally disabled. Under present law for old-age assistance, aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled the Federal share is now three-fourths of the first $20 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximum of $50. The conference report provides that the Federal share will be be four-fifths of the first $15 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $55. In the case of aid to dependent children the Federal share is now three-fourths of the first $12 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $27 for the adult, $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child in a family. The conference report provides that the Federal share will be four-fifths of the first $15 of a State's average payment per recipient plus one-half of the remainder within individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child and $21 for each additional child in a family.

The elimination of the operation of permanent and total disability, the increase in the work clause from $70 to $75, and the increased Federal funds for the public assistance—these are the major changes in the House bill made by the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report is a great triumph to the Republican Members of this body who stood up against the Oscar Ewing propaganda machine. It is a victory for those who are opposed to socialized medicine, for those who are opposed to expanding bureaucracy, and for those who are opposed to further encroachment by the Federal Government into fields of Government service which should properly remain with the States. It is unfortunate, indeed, that my bill, H. R. 7922, was not adopted in the beginning by this body. If it had been, we would have avoided the necessity for long conferences with the other body because in substance the provisions of H. R. 7922 have been embodied in the conference report.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I and the other House conferees are keenly disappointed that we were not able to make an adjustment in the conference report relating to the coverage of State and local employees in States where the State or local retirement system contemplated the coordination of the local retirement system with the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System. Our colleague on the committee Mr. BYRNES from Wisconsin, did everything within his power on behalf of the State and local employees under the retirement system of Wisconsin to have this provision of the House bill adopted. I can only say that the people of this great State are fortunate indeed in having Mr. BYRNES as their representative and that it is through no fault or lack of diligent effort on his part that this conference report does not contain the amendment permitting coordination of the Wisconsin retirement system with the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance program.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] in support of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this conference report on H. R. 7800 for the following reasons:

It increases the benefit payments under the old-age and survivors' insurance program by $5 or 12½ percent, whichever is larger;

It provides for a liberalization of the amount which a person may earn without losing his benefits from $50 a month to $75 a month;

It provides wage credits of $160 per month for members of the Armed Forces serving since the close of World War II through 1953. Under the conference report these credits will be paid out of the trust fund rather than be financed by the general revenues as provided in the House bill.

It increases the funds available to the States for payments to the needy aged, blind, dependent children, and permanently and totally disabled individuals.

And, finally, I am supporting this conference report because in effect it eliminates the total and permanent disability provision contained in the House bill which would have laid the foundation for socialized medicine in this country. Although the wording of the permanent and total disability provision of the House bill with an amendment providing for examinations by State agencies remains in the conference report, the whole provision is made completely inoperative. No claims may be made, no examinations held, and the whole provision will automatically expire July 1, 1953, unless the Congress takes some affirmative action before that time.

The adoption by the House of the conference report is a major victory for those of us who challenged the wisdom of granting sweeping authority to Oscar Ewing and the Federal Security Agency to control and regiment the medical profession of this country.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H. R. 7800, has had the most unusual history of any piece of legislation passed during my somewhat long service in Congress. Let us review its progress.

In the first place it was generally understood from the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress that no major legislation dealing with the tax laws or the social-security law would be considered. This course was followed by the Ways and Means Committee until well on into the last part of this, the last session of Congress. Then one day, without any notice to the Republican members of the committee or to the public generally, Mr. DOUGHTON introduced H. R. 7800. Then steps were taken immediately to crowd it through the committee without any public hearings. The Republican members practically unanimously demanded public hearings but their demand was denied. "What is the hurry?" we demanded. Our demand availed us nothing.

It was evident that the bill was a political bill and that the administration had ordered its passage. The Social Security Department, through its ever present Wilbur Cohen and his assistants came before the committee in executive session and the bill was soon reported out by the committee without the members thereof having had sufficient time to study it thoroughly.

The principal and only purpose of the bill was to increase the grant to those drawing social security and to give a foothold to socialized medicine. It was purely an election scheme. They were going to influence the social-security recipients by giving them a $5 per month increase.

In a day or two after the committee had taken this action and as soon as I could I gave the bill a careful study. I immediately found that it contained two sections that were absolutely unacceptable. One of these, section 3, was a section that without doubt would be a long step toward socialized medicine. The other, section 6, was the section that encroached on the retirement systems of school teachers and State and municipal employees.

When we made these discoveries we immediately started up an organized opposition that finally developed into the defeat of these two sections. I did my part of this without having received any communications from any medical society or from any of the many State employees or teachers' organizations. Most of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee joined me in opposition to the proposed legislation.

It will be remembered that the Democratic members of the committee induced the Speaker of the House to permit this bill, H. R. 7800, to be brought up on a motion to suspend the rules. Under this unusual procedure the motion must carry by a two-thirds majority and only 20 minutes debate on each side would be permitted.

The whole country was stirred up by this procedure. The impression went out that this $5 increase would also be paid to the old-age pensioners and to the blind. Those of us who were opposed to the measure were not opposed to paying this $5 increase to those on social security who would receive it but we felt that this $5 increase should also apply to the aged and to the blind. Apparently our position was misconstrued for we were not opposed to the $5 provision but were opposed to socialized medicine and to an invasion of the State employees system and an invasion of the teachers retirement system.

We were able to prevent the passage of the bill by a two-thirds majority under the motion to suspend the rules. Thus we had won a very signal victory. The Ways and Means Committee is proud of the fact that it is seldom defeated on the floor of the House. It was soundly defeated in this contest because it was attempting to advance the cause of socialized medicine and to invade the pension systems of the State and municipal employees of the country and of the teachers' retirement system. Some of these systems have many millions of dollars in their treasuries which these social-security chiefs in Washington would like to take over. It was defeated also because the membership of the House is overwhelmingly opposed to socialized medicine.

The administration was not to be denied, so the socialized medicine crowd in the Social Security Department brought out another bill. They claimed that this bill had been completely stripped of all socialized-medicine language. When this bill came on for consideration it came on under the regular rules of the House which require only a majority vote to pass it. But it provided for additional time for debate. The membership of the House had, in the meantime, been flooded by communications from the aged and the blind who thought that they were included in the bill. Under this pressure, the amended bill was passed by a large vote. Only 22 voted against it. I was one of these 22. We knew that the aged and the blind had not been included.

I was guided in my course by the knowledge that the bill had not been cleared from all socialized-medicine language and that it did not give one single additional penny to the old-age recipients or to the blind. I am proud to have been one of the 22, for now our position has been vindicated. We were right from the beginning.

When the bill went to the Senate that body accepted our view. They found one whole section of socialized-medicine language and struck it out. This was section 3. They also found that the bill did infringe upon the rights of the State employees and the teachers and struck out all of that language, which was section 6. The Senate also realizing that the old-age pensioners and the blind had been denied any increase, inserted in the bill such language as was necessary to increase the blind pensions and the old-age pension by $5 per month.

Therefore when the Senate bill came before the conference committee, consisting of four Senators and five Members of Congress of which I was one, we agreed upon the Senate bill quite completely. And that is in effect the bill that finally came before the House for consideration.

If this bill passes the Congress as the conference committee has recommended, it will be a great victory for us Republicans and those who assisted us in preventing the passage of a purely political bill just before the coming election and prevented the country from taking its first long step into socialized medicine.

I am proud of my part in this victory, for we have helped the blind and the old-age pensioners by giving them a small increase and we have increased their right to earn more from outside employment by permitting them to earn as much as $75 per month and in it we have stopped socialized medicine.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that this bill has taken a most unusual course but finally it is in shape that it can be supported by all who are opposed to socialized medicine and who are willing to raise the social-security payments by $5 per month and are willing to raise the payments of the old-age pensioners and the blind by $5 per month.

I am in favor of the bill and am proud to have had an active part in removing from it these two objectionable features.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the gentleman from New York chose to interject into the consideration of these matters which were in conference an imputation of politics, and to refer with such enthusiasm to his bill, H. R. 7922. I want to point out to you that the composite bill, H. R. 7922, introduced by Mr. REED came many, many numbers after H. R. 7800, the composite bill by Mr. DOUGHTON. Prior to the committee consideration of the composite bill, H. R. 7800, there were any number of social security bills which were introduced before the gentleman from New York got this very heavy thought and before he became so concerned with the unfortunate old-age pensioners and those covered by OASI. You know you can never get away from your own record. It is like your shadow. It follows you on forever. In the light of facts do not be overly impressed by Mr. REED'S concern. If you go back to the record when we built the great social security law in 1935 you will find that the gentleman from New York opposed this great social legislation.

There is no socialized medicine in this bill. The Senate conferees agreed with the position of the House in modified form, and everybody was pretty well convinced that the provision was appropriate, but seemingly two members of the House conferees insisted on speaking as a partisan minority.

The bill, as I said, introduced through the efforts of the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means, bearing the name of our distinguished chairman [Mr. DOUGHTON], embodies some very valuable amendments which will do much to make easier the way of the old-age pensioners and those under OASI. But certain things, because they were controversial as far as the Senate managers were concerned, had to be dropped in the interest of passing this needed legislation in the Eighty-second Congress. The House conferees endeavored to abide by the mandate issued by this body when the legislation, H. R. 7800, passed by a vote of 361 to 22. Bear in mind that H. R. 7800 passed this House under suspension of the rules. We chose that it come back here under suspension. We wanted to jam it down their throats, and we did, and they swallowed it. It gagged them, but they had to take it, 18 to 1. We were not satisfied with the previous vote which was a majority. We did not bring it here under a closed rule. We brought it here under suspension. We were going to have it passed as is, or nothing, and we whipped the reactionaries outside of this Chamber, who insulted your intelligence and mine, who said that to give protection to a man who had paid into OASI, which is an insurance plan, by providing a waiver of premiums, was socialism. The House proved by its 18-to-1 approval that it was not.

I want to emphasize what I have said time and time again, that there is not to my knowledge a single insurance company worthy of the name in the United States of America that does not give a policyholder exactly what you have here in this bill; namely, a waiver of premium in case of disability and a guaranty that he shall receive what he contracted for when the time arrives.

Let it be known that the Members on the part of the minority, did not favor the waiver of premium, and they were anxious and ready from the start to desert the position that the House had taken. That is not anything to brag about when you go into a conference. After you have had your battle here and you go into conference you are supposed to stand by the House. You are supposed to try to carry out the wishes of the House. What did the House minority conferees do? They undertook to follow the reactionaries, some of the character assassins in the AMA. I am not speaking of the rank and file of doctors. I am talking about the reactionaries, the president who just retired, the one who just came in and the one who not so long ago was kicked out of control. That is what I am talking about. They have never sustained their position. There were a thousand editorials, not only in Democratic but in Republican newspapers that pointed out the fact that this was the biggest mistake the so-called Grand Old Party ever made in this House. They changed their position wisely and properly and honestly. Still the ranking member on the minority comes here and tells you that this is still socialized medicine.

According to that, Senator GEORGE is an advocate and adherent of socialized medicine; so is ED JOHNSON, and so are all the rest of us; and I tell you the most practical thing that I ever did was in presuming to forestall such socialized medicine and any system that approximates it. I advocated health insurance.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think what the membership is most interested in is what will be the actual, practical result of the provision adopted by the conference with respect to the permanent and total disability provisions? No Member on the floor knew what was in the conference report until about 5 minutes ago; and as I look at it I cannot see that there is any provision in there which retains the feature of a waiver of premium for those who become permanently and totally disabled. If it does, if there is a provision that waives the premium

for those who are permanently and totally disabled, then I am in thorough accord with the conference agreement. But if it contains no protection whatsoever for those permanently and totally disabled, I think it is a surrender to the American Medical Association.

Mr. DINGELL. Let me assure my friend——

Mr. EBERHARTER. You tell us, then, specifically, where it grants waiver of premiums for those permanently and totally disabled.

Mr. DINGELL. It will not take effect unless we act affirmatively after the 1st of January. But it does do this, and it was a most difficult thing which we had to consider in conference, I may say to my friend from Pennsylvania, who is most anxious and always has been most helpful in matters pertaining to the welfare of those covered by the OASI, old-age pensioners, and other people coming under social security. I will say this, at the risk of bringing back nothing from conference, we saved many valuable contributions to these good people who are dependent upon a lift of this kind. But I am not bragging about what we were able to do, mind you. We had the opposition of four out of five Senators, to begin with. We did not have our own minority conferees with us, despite the decisive vote in the House. It was only through the efforts of our good friends Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. MILLS, as well as myself, who fought to the very last, that we did establish the principle that is going to be in the law when the President signs it—a recognition of the waiver of the premium principle. By January 1, I may say to my good friend from Pennsylvania, the public demand for the continuation of the waiver of premium that will reach the ears of those who are today serving in the House and who will be reelected, and those who are elected for the first time to the new Congress, is going to be so great and so powerful that it is going to drive the reactionaries and the opposition out of this Chamber.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the only thing this bill does, in the gentleman's opinion, is to recognize that we should have a waiver of premium for the permanent and totally disabled, but it will have no effect whatsoever unless the next Congress passes an affirmative act to that effect.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So that we cannot put ourselves in the position of saying to the people of this country that the permanent and total disability provisions are in this measure; is that correct?

Mr. DINGELL. That is right, but we did get the camel's nose under the tent.

ON THE FREEZING OF PERIODS OF DISABILITY UNDER THE OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE LAW

Mr. Speaker, because I did not want to detract from any credit due another, I have modestly refrained heretofore from pointing out that it was I and not the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] who first introduced a social-security bill providing for a freeze of periods of disability.

My bill, H. R. 6750, which goes much further than any of the bills pending before the Committee on Ways and Means in revising and liberalizing the social-security laws, was introduced on February 21, 1952. Mr. KEAN's bill, H. R. 7549, was introduced on April 23, 1952.

I am for improvements in the social-security laws and will support them regardless of who authors the legislation. I just wanted to set the record straight, however, in that I introduced my bill ahead of any others that have been introduced on this subject. I include a comparison of the differences in the several bills indicating the greater liberality of my bill, H. R. 6750—and I further refer you to the study headed "Major differences in H. R. 7800 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate" with a column showing what finally was agreed to in conference:

JULY 2, 1951.

MEMORANDUM

To: Mr. DINGELL.

From: Leo H. Irwin.

Subject: Comparison of H. R. 6750, H. R. 7549 and H. R. 7800; all pertaining to social security.

Pursuant to your request a comparative analysis is made herein of the major provisions of three principal Social Security bills introduced in this second session of the Eighty-second Congress; viz: H. R. 6750, H. R. 7549, and H. R. 7800. The comparison will be made under the major topics of (1) coverage, (2) benefits, (3) disability and rehabilitation, (4) financing, (5) public assistance, and (6) technical amendments.

	H. R. 6750	H. R. 7549	H. R. 7800
I. Coverage:			
A. Estimated number of persons affected by expanded coverage.	11,000,000	Not given	Not given.
B. Coverage of the self-employed.	Certain designated self-employed persons are covered.	All self-employed persons are covered	No change.
C. State and local employees.	Permits States to enter into agreements for retroactive coverage by Jan. 1, 1954. Also allows coverage if integration statute in effect as of Jan. 1, 1950.	No change	Permits States to enter into agreements for retroactive coverage by Jan. 1, 1955. Allows coverage if integration statute in effect as of Jan. 1, 1951. Permits coverage of State and local employees who are also covered by retirement system.
D. Wage credits for military personnel.	All military service after World War II is covered by a $160 per month wage credit. Makes permanent provision with respect to future service.	No change	$160 per month wage credit for military service between end of World War II and Jan. 1, 1954.
E. Miscellaneous coverage	Includes among other groups—farm workers, domestics, and employees of higher educational institutions.	Includes among other groups—farm owners and workers and domestics.	No change.
F. Coverage criteria	Eliminates the "regularity" test and retains a minimum ($50) for quarterly earnings.	Substantially similar to H. R. 6750	No change.
II. Benefits:			
A. Maximum earnings subject to coverage.	$6,000	No change ($3,000)	No change ($3,600).
B. Benefit formula	50 percent of first $120, 15 percent of next $360 plus 1 percent increment for each year of coverage. Best 10 consecutive years of covered earnings are used. The conversion table is adjusted upward.	80 percent of first $115, 15 percent of next $185. Best 10 consecutive years of covered earnings are used. Conversion table is revised upward.	55 percent of first $100, 15 percent of next $200. Conversion table is revised upward.
C. Benefit limits	Average increase is 35 percent. Minimum primary insurance benefit is $25. Maximum will depend on years of coverage. Family benefits minimum is $50. Maximum $200.	Benefit payments would be increased about 10 percent. Minimum primary insurance benefit is $22. Maximum $85. Family benefits minimum is $44. Maximum $165.	Average increase is in excess of $6. Benefits of those now on the rolls would be increased by $5 or 12½ percent, whichever is greater. Minimum primary insurance benefit is $25. Maximum $85. Family benefits minimum is $45, maximum $168.75.
D. Work clause	$75 with a corresponding adjustment for the self-employed.	No change	$70 with a corresponding adjustment for the self-employed.
III. Disability and rehabilitation:			
A. Disability and sickness benefits.	Provides disability benefits for disabled insured workers. Sickness benefits are provided for temporarily incapacitated insured workers.	do	No change.
B. Rehabilitation services	Rehabilitation services are provided for insured disabled individuals and disabled children entitled to child's benefits.	Rehabilitation services are provided for insured disabled individuals.	Do.
C. Waiver of premium provision.	Preserves the insurance and benefit status of disabled workers by freezing period of disability.	Preserves benefit status of disabled workers by freezing period of disability.	Preserves insurance and benefit status of disabled workers by freezing period of disability.

	H. R. 6750	H. R. 7549	H. R. 7800
IV. Financing	The tax rate would be 2 percent for employers and for employees in 1952-53. This would be progressively increased until by 1961 and thereafter the tax rate would be 4 percent. A different rate schedule would apply for Federal employees and the self-employed. The wage base would be increased to $6,000.	No change	No change.
V. Public assistance	No change	do	Provides that the $50 of earned income allowed blind in determining their need may be disregarded in determining need of others.
VI. Technical amendments			Provides 4 technical changes in the insurance program correcting inequities and simplifying administration. Makes corresponding changes to liberalize benefits under Railroad Retirement Act.

Major differences in H. R. 7800 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Item	Present law	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	As agreed to in conference
A. Retirement test	Earnings of $50 per month in covered employment; $600 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $70 per month in covered employment; $840 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $100 per month in covered employment; $1,200 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $75 per month in covered employment; $900 per year for self-employed.
B. Wage credits for veterans	Wage credits of $160 per month provided for service up to and including July 24, 1947.	Wage credits granted for the period beginning July 25, 1947, through Dec. 31, 1953. Cost of wage credits financed by general revenues.	Same as House-passed bill except cost of wage credits financed out of Trust Fund.	Accepted Senate provision.
C. Preservation of insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled.	No provision.	Maintains the insured status and benefit amount of qualified workers who are totally disabled for not less than 6 consecutive calendar quarters and the impairment is expected to be permanent.	Same as present law.	Provision of House bill retained but agreed to a termination date of June 30, 1953, that no application under the provision can be filed prior to July 1, 1953, and that the provision should be administered at the State level.
D. Coverage of State and local employees who are under a retirement system.	Coverage under OASI of State and local employees who are under a retirement system is barred.	Extends the option of State governments to enter into agreements with the Federal Government so as to cover State and local employees who are under a retirement system, but not policemen, firemen, and elementary and secondary school teachers. Option operative only if the members o. the State or local retirement system elect coverage by 2/3 majority of those voting. Special provision permitting a State to cover employees in positions under a retirement system without a vote of the employees if State or local law provided for coordination of the retirement system with OASI as of Jan. 1, 1951.	Same as present law.	Deleted.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

A. Earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients.	States must disregard earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients up to $50 per month in determining his eligibility for or the amount of aid to the blind.	Provision in present law is retained, but in addition the State may disregard earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients up to $50 per month in determining need for State-Federal assistance of other members of his family.	Same as House-passed bill except that after June 30, 1954, provision for exemption of earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipient in determining need of other members of family is mandatory upon the State.	Accepted Senate provision with an amendment making the provision effective July 1, 1952.
B. Federal share of assistance (other than Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands.)				
1. Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to permanently and totally disabled.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $20 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $50.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅘ of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $55.	Accepted Senate provision with an amendment providing for a termination date of Sept. 30, 1954.
2. Aid to dependent children.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $12 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $27 for the adult, $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child in a family.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅘ of the first $15 of a State's average payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child and $21 for each additional child in a family.	See above.
C. Federal share of assistance for Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands:				
1. Old age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.	Federal share is limited to 50 percent of expenditures. Maximum on individual payments of $30 per month. (For ceiling on total Federal payments for public assistance, see 3, below.)	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅗ of the first $26 of the average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $30.	Deleted.
2. Aid to dependent children.	Federal share is limited to 50 percent of expenditures. Maximum on individual payments of $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in a family.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅗ of the first $16 of the average monthly payment per recipient (including the adult in the family) plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $18 for the adult, $18 for the first child, and $12 for each additional child in a family.	Deleted.
3. Limitation on Federal share of public assistance expenditures.	Federal share is limited to $4,250,000 per year for Puerto Rico and $160,000 per year for the Virgin Islands.	Same as present law.	Federal share is increased to $5,000,000 per year for Puerto Rico; for Virgin Islands same as present law.	Deleted.

Major differences in H. R. 7800 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate—Continued

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—continued

Item	Present law	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	As agreed to in conference
D. Eligibility of States for increased Federal contributions.	No provision.	No provision.	States are required to pass on to recipients the increase in Federal funds received by them under the bill.	Deleted.
E. Exclusion of earnings from agricultural or nursing services.	No provision.	No provision.	For the period Oct. 1, 1952, through Sept. 30, 1953, a State may exclude from consideration any income and resources not in excess of $50 per month obtained by a recipient of old-age assistance for performing agricultural or nursing services. Provision is applicable only to old-age assistance recipients who are on the rolls in September 1952 and who do not receive more than $5 in excess of the rate paid them in September 1952.	Deleted.

And now, Mr. Speaker, let me comment upon the acceptance by the conferees of the disability waiver and explain what it means. I am very glad that the Congress is about to take a first step in the direction of helping workers who become disabled for gainful work. It is a positive action the principle has been established. The present legislation providing for the preservation of old-age and survivors rights of insured persons expires on June 30, 1953, while applications for a disability freeze cannot be filed until July 1 of that year. Obviously this is merely a stopgap which makes actual operation contingent upon the extension of this legislation next January, after hearings can be held. However, I have no doubt in my mind that the Congress will confirm and extend this eminently just and meritorious measure next year.

In this connection, I believe we ought to acknowledge the untiring efforts of certain members of the Committee on Ways and Means, notably our honored chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], to see this important provision through along with the rest of the bill. Unperturbed by the false accusations raised against this provision, they have defended it on its merits mindful of the hundreds of thousands of people who were to benefit from it. More than anybody else, the much-honored gentleman from North Carolina may take credit for preserving the bill unshorn of the disability waiver of premium provision.

However, to accomplish this even on the present temporary basis, it was necessary to agree in conference to a modification of the original proposal that may give rise to problems that could have been avoided. I am referring to the provision for disability determination by the States. Needless to say, the Federal Government being charged with the administration of the old-age and survivors insurance program and being responsible for the integrity of the trust fund must retain ultimate administrative responsibility for this new part of the program. It will have to lay down the over-all policies governing the determination of permanent total disability as one of the conditions of eligibility for a freeze of benefit rights. It will have to exercise controls to assure conformity to these over-all policies and a reasonable degree of uniformity throughout the Nation lest some applicants be treated inequitably. Most important, the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance having to defend a fine reputation for clean and efficient administration must see to it that this part of its program will be kept just as free from political patronage and other outside influences as has been true of our old-age and survivors insurance program up till now. Straight Federal administration would have made it easier to accomplish these ends.

For me personally, this day marks a turning point in my long fight for insurance protection under our old-age and survivors-insurance program for our blind, bedridden, and crippled workers. It has been a fight which started in 1943 when, with Senators MURRAY and Wagner, I introduced a bill which would have provided monthly cash benefits for workers who are prematurely retired on account of total disability. I reintroduced my bill in 1945 and again in 1947 and 1948. Not until 1949 was there a measure of success. In that year the House passed H. R. 6000, containing provisions for monthly disability benefits for prematurely and totally disabled insured workers. Although the disability provisions were deleted from H. R. 6000 by the conference committee, the favorable vote in 1949 by the House was a heartening experience. This year again I introduced a comprehensive social security bill, H. R. 6750, which would have provided, among many other needed improvements in the social-security program, benefits for totally disabled workers and their dependents. Time did not permit consideration of my bill. However, I am pleased that the disability provisions of H. R. 7800, limited though they are, were favorably considered by this body. These provisions, which assure a disabled worker that his survivors or at age 65 he himself will obtain social-security benefits undiminished by the years intervening after this disablement, will rectify one of the most glaring injustices in our Social Security Act. Of course this bill will not do anything for the disabled person and his dependents until he reaches age 65 or dies. We cannot long postpone facing the need for cash benefits replacing at least in part the earnings loss of workers who are totally disabled. But the fact that more remains to be done should not detract from our satisfaction at having at last made a beginning.

To me, one of the most encouraging things about this legislation is that it represents a recognition by the Members of the Congress that social security is an integral part of American life and, as such, is a dynamic thing which must keep pace with changing needs. We no longer regard our social security program merely as a defense in times of depression. We recognize that income maintenance following the death of the family provider or in his old age is as necessary during good times as it is in bad times.

In passing this bill, we recognize the fact that inability to provide for one's survivors or for one's old age is not necessarily the result of personal failure or inadequacy but is generally a consequence of the working of our industrial economy. And yet, the program this bill will strengthen is one that encourages people to provide on their own against these risks. That is one of the inherent strengths of the social insurance approach. With the enactment of this bill, we strengthen the foundation of a program in which we all believe. We show it is fully adaptable to economic changes. While the estimated $5 to $6 average increase in retirement and survivors' benefits which this bill would accomplish falls short of the increase proposed in my own bill, I think it is significant because the Congress has thereby recognized that to be meaningful, social-security benefits must be raised when those with the reduced incomes that result from retirement or death must face increased costs of living. I do hope that the many industrial pension plans now in operation which provide a fixed amount of benefits, including those paid by old-age and survivors insurance, will be revised so that the full amount of the present increase will be passed on and the beneficiaries will receive higher total payments.

There is little, if anything, in this bill that has not been expressly approved by the House on June 17. The disability freeze provisions and the benefit increases are self-evident needs. The increase in the amount which old-age and survivors insurance beneficiaries may earn while drawing their benefits encourages beneficiaries to do such part-time work as they are able and willing to do. Giving wage credits to veterans of Korea is but simple justice. I see no reason why this bill should not pass unanimously.

When the bill is passed, let us set our sights upon the next goals for action. I believe my bill, H. R. 6750, clearly pointed the way toward these accomplishments. In that bill I proposed, and I hereby give notice to the Congress that I shall continue to propose, the extension of the act to roughly 11,000,000 gainfully employed persons in agriculture, domestic employment, the Armed Forces, and other places who now lack its protection. I proposed further, and I shall continue to propose, that workers unable to work on account of sickness and disability, be it long or short, receive cash benefits geared to their previous earnings. Finally—and this is very important to me—I have proposed and firmly intend to drive home as forcefully as I can a constructive approach to the problem of disability. That approach would help an invalid to make the most of our wonderful gains in the fields of physical medicine and rehabilitation. To such invalids, both grown-ups and children, who are potentially employable, it would offer rehabilitation services at no cost to them.

Not until these things are accomplished can we pride ourselves of having done all we can to meet the common hazards and vicissitudes of modern life. Not until these provisions are on the books will I let up in my constant effort to amend and improve our social-security system.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on this subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAMBLETT. Mr. Speaker, being one of the Members of the House that voted against the original bill, I want to compliment the committee on doing a good job and to state that it is my intention to support the conference report on the H. R. 7800.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, now that the conference committee has removed the objections in H. R. 7800 which caused me to vote against the bill on two previous occasions, I am happy to have this opportunity to vote for the bill. I objected because of the socialistic implications involved and in particular that which would mean the beginning of socialized medicine. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to be able now to approve of the increase in social security payments provided for in the bill.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Speaker, as one of those who opposed the original House bill, may I say that since it has been corrected in conference I urge its support.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a brief analysis of the House provisions, the present law, the Senate provisions and what is contained in the conference report and also a short statement of the changes that were made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to above follows:)

Major differences in H. R. 7800 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate and conference agreement

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Item	Present law	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	As agreed to in conference
A. Retirement test.	Earnings of $50 per month in covered employment; $600 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $70 per month in covered employment; $840 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $100 per month in covered employment; $1,200 per year for self-employed.	Earnings of $75 per month in covered employment; $900 per year for self-employed.
B. Wage credits for veterans.	Wage credits of $160 per month provided for service up to and including July 24, 1947.	Wage credits granted for the period beginning July 25, 1947, through Dec. 31, 1953. Cost of wage credits financed by general revenues.	Same as House-passed bill except cost of wage credits financed out of trust fund.	Accepted Senate provision.
C. Preservation of insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled.	No provision.	Maintains the insured status and benefit amount of qualified workers who are totally disabled for not less than 6 consecutive calendar quarters and the impairment is expected to be permanent.	Same as present law.	Provision of House bill retained but agreed to a termination date of June 30, 1953, that no application under the provision can be filed prior to July 1, 1953, and that the provision should be administered at the State level as to disability determinations.
D. Coverage of State and local employees who are under a retirement system.	Coverage under OASI of State and local employees who are under a retirement system is barred.	Extends the option of State governments to enter into agreements with the Federal Government so as to cover State and local employees who are under a retirement system, but not policemen, firemen, and elementary and secondary school teachers. Option operative only if the members of the State or local retirement system elect coverage by ⅔ majority of those voting. Special provision permitting a State to cover employees in positions under a retirement system without a vote of the employees if State or local law provided for coordination of the retirement system with OASI as of Jan. 1, 1951.	Same as present law.	Deleted.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

A. Earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients.	States must disregard earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients up to $50 per month in determining his eligibility for or the amount of aid to the blind.	Provision in present law is retained, but in addition the State may disregard earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipients up to $50 per month in determining need for State-Federal assistance of other members of his family.	Same as House-passed bill except that after June 30, 1954, provision for exemption of earnings of aid-to-the-blind recipient in determining need of other members of family is mandatory upon the State.	Accepted Senate provision with an amendment making the provision effective July 1, 1952.
B. Federal share of assistance (other than Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands).				
1. Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to permanently and totally disabled.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $20 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $50.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅘ of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $55.	Accepted Senate provision with an amendment providing for a termination date of Sept. 30, 1954.
2. Aid to dependent children.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $12 of a State's average monthly payment per recipient plus ¾ of the remainder within individual maximums of $27 for the adult, $27 for the first child, and $18 for each additional child in a family.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ⅘ of the first $15 of a State's average payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $30 for the adult, $30 for the first child and $21 for each additional child in a family.	See above.

Major differences in H. R. 7800 as passed by the House and as passed by the Senate and conference agreement—Continued

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE—continued

Item	Present law	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	As agreed to in conference
C. Federal share of assistance for Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands:				
1. Old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled.	Federal share is limited to 50 percent of expenditures. Maximum on individual payments of $30 per month. (For ceiling on total Federal payments for public assistance, see 3, below.)	Same as present law.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $26 of the average monthly payment per recipient plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $30.	Deleted.
2. Aid to dependent children.	Federal share is limited to 50 percent of expenditures. Maximum on individual payments of $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in a family.	Same as present law.	Federal share is ¾ of the first $16 of the average monthly payment per recipient (including the adult in the family) plus ½ of the remainder within individual maximums of $18 for the adult, $18 for the first child and $12 for each additional child in a family.	Deleted.
3. Limitation on Federal share of public assistance expenditures.	Federal share is limited to $4,250,000 per year for Puerto Rico and $160,000 per year for the Virgin Islands.	Same as present law.	Federal share is increased to $5,000,000 per year for Puerto Rico; for Virgin Islands same as present law.	Deleted.
D. Eligibility of States for increased Federal contributions.	No provision.	No provision.	States are required to pass on to recipients the increase in Federal funds received by them under the bill.	Deleted.
E. Exclusion of earnings from agricultural or nursing services.	No provision.	No provision.	For the period Oct. 1, 1952, through Sept. 30, 1953, a State may exclude from consideration any income and resources not in excess of $50 per month obtained by a recipient of old-age assistance for performing agricultural or nursing services. Provision is applicable only to old-age assistance recipients who are on the rolls in September 1952 and who do not receive more than $5 in excess of the rate paid them in September 1952.	Deleted.

STATEMENT ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. R. 7800

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed on a retirement test—work clause—of $75. The House bill provided for $70 and the Senate for $100.

The House accepted the Senate provision providing that the wage credits of $160 a month for servicemen during the emergency period should be paid out of the trust fund rather than the general funds of the Treasury as provided in the House bill.

The provision preserving the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled persons is retained as in the House bill with amendments providing that the provision will terminate June 30, 1953, that no claim may be filed under this provision prior to July 1, 1953, and that determinations of disability shall be conducted at the State level.

The provision relating to State and local employees was stricken from the bill.

The Senate provision relating to the earnings of blind recipients of public assistance was agreed to with an amendment providing an effective date of July 1, 1952.

The provision providing for an increase in public assistance in the States was retained with an amendment providing for a termination date of September 30, 1954.

The provisions relating to public assistance for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands were deleted.

The provision requiring that States must pass on any increase in Federal funds for public assistance was deleted.

The provisions excluding earnings from agricultural labor or nursing services in determining need for old-age assistance were deleted.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, this measure (H. R. 7800) marks another milestone in the development of an adequate social security program for the American people. I am more than happy to support and vote for it. The Democratic Party initiated and established the social security program in 1935. For 17 years Democrats have led the fight to strengthen and improve this program. This year again the Democratic Party has taken the lead in improving the program and keeping it in tune with the times.

H. R. 7800 will mean $300,000,000 more in benefits for the 4,500,000 of our aged people, widows, and orphans already on the benefit rolls. It also provides larger benefits for persons who become beneficiaries in the future. In passing this bill we have recognized that the insurance program can be adjusted to changing economic conditions—that as wage levels rise, benefit levels can be increased without increasing contributions. The recognition of this fact by the Congress means a great deal for the security of every American. I am proud to be a member of the Democratic Party, which continues to protect, preserve, and strengthen the social security of our people.

The bill makes other very necessary improvements in the insurance program. Veterans of the Korean War will receive credits to their social security accounts for their period of military service. These veterans thus receive the same treatment as veterans of World War II. The bill increases considerably the amount that a beneficiary can earn and still receive his benefits. The bill as reported by the conference committee also contains a provision which will increase Federal contributions to the State public assistance programs. All of these changes are desirable improvements in our social security programs.

I hope we will adopt a permanent provision covering waiver of premiums for those permanently and totally disabled as soon as possible next year. I hope, too, that it will not be long before we adopt provisions to pay cash benefits to disabled workers, so that they can have something to live on until they reach age 65.

I regret that this bill does not make it possible for employees of the States and local governments who are under retirement systems and who want to be covered by the insurance program to obtain such coverage. At present public employees are the only group that cannot combine their staff-retirement programs with the basic Federal system. There is no reason for further delay regarding the groups for whom coverage was made possible by the House. Our version of H. R. 7800 continued the exclusion of every major group of public employees who objected to coverage. I regret that the conferees did not accept the position of the House on this matter.

It is fortunate, however, that the Senate has indicated that it will consider this much-needed amendment to the insurance program as soon as possible. I hope that we will enact a bill promptly next year making coverage possible for more employees of the States and local governments.

Definitely, our action next year should not be confined solely to the disability provisions and coverage for State and local government employees. The Democratic Party will not give up the fight

for a better social-security program until it has made the American program the best in the world.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, of course I am going to vote in support of this conference report, but I want the membership to understand that we are not in this measure giving any right to any person who may be permanently and totally disabled to waive the payment of his premium. As the conference report stands, and as it will pass the House this evening, having already passed the other body, the only thing we have in the report is perhaps recognition of the fact that the situation with respect to the permanently and totally disabled will be explored.

If the next Congress takes affirmative action with respect to this particular subject, then we will have a permanent and total disability provision. I repeat, the bill does contain very many desirable features which I wholeheartedly approve and which I think every Member of the House approves. I hope Members will not get a wrong impression as to what the conferees have agreed upon. I, myself, did not fully understand until the report was brought up for discussion on the floor, not being one of the conferees.

I do hope everybody supports this conference report, but I do not want them to be under the wrong impression that we are doing anything practical, except in the form of recognition of the principle and the hope the next Congress will adopt a permanent and total disability provision.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I have heard a number of figures here used in the last 2 weeks about exemption in employment. Do I get it correct that this conference report allows $75 a month?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is correct. The compromise is $75.

Mr. WIER. There were recommendations of $70 and $100?

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, because of the questions that have arisen I think I should take a minute to explain one or two matters contained in the conference report.

First I would like to say that the conference report contains the language of the House bill, H. R. 7800, with respect to section 3, which preserves the insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled workers, with two changes in the language. One is an amendment which we worked out in conference providing for the Administrator to enter into contracts with State agencies which are to make the determination of whether or not an individual is totally and permanently disabled.

The members of the Senate Finance Committee did not desire to enact this particular provision on a permanent basis until the committee could have an opportunity to conduct hearings which the committee had obligated itself to hold. Now we state in the statement on the part of the managers a termination date of June 30, 1953, was added solely for the purpose of enabling us after the first of January 1953 to look into this problem. This is the second amendment. In the meantime this provision would be enacted into law. The Social Security Administrator will have the opportunity of conferring with the States to determine whether or not examination and control of the determination of disability by State agencies are feasible and they can report back to us after the first of the year. The members of our committee and the members of the Finance Committee are taking a solemn obligation in connection with this provision to go completely into it after the first of the year.

With respect to section 6 of the House bill which had to do with the extension of coverage to those in State and local governments covered by their own retirement systems it is eliminated entirely. I regretted to see the provision in which my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is interested eliminated, because I could see no justifiable reason for anyone opposing it. The provision which my good friend from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] and others worked out with respect to college professors in State institutions was eliminated since it was also contained in section 6. So was the provision which would have taken care of employees of public-housing units as local governmental units. We also bind ourselves with respect to section 6 to conduct hearings and go into this matter of additional coverage of these employees shortly after the first of the year 1953.

Now, I believe it would be a great mistake for us not to accept this conference report. It is not what I wanted; it is not what anyone in the conference wanted, but those of you who have been on conferences know that these matters are always resolved in compromises.

There is a big amendment to this conference report that was not in the House bill, a provision, which we accepted, offered on the floor of the Senate by the distinguished Senator from the State of Arizona. The provision will increase the amount of money made available to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to the disabled under the new category we created in the 1950 amendments, $5 a month, and aid to dependent children, $3 a month.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. That was the amendment offered by the majority leader in the Senate, Senator MCFARLAND.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct. That amendment becomes effective the 1st of October 1952. The increase is for a 2-year period only, so that under the provisions of the conference report the increase would be discontinued on September 30, 1954. Of course, the Congress, if it wanted to, in its wisdom, could extend that provision. A Senate provision requiring that the States pass on the increase in Federal funds was deleted. It does not appear necessary since the provision only applies for 2 years and in my opinion it will not be extended if the States do not pass on the increases.

This is a fundamental difference in the bill that passed the House, but in my opinion it is actually, aside from the elimination of section 6, the only fundamental difference in the conference report from the bill that passed the House.

With respect to section 3 again, the section that so much has been said about, no one could file an application under the House bill for a freeze of his work record on account of total and permanent disability prior to March 1, 1953. We move that up three months to July 1, 1953. The conferees put the termination provision of June 30, 1953, in because it was thought by the conference committee on the part of the Senate and the House, before we undertook this new type of a program of freezing the word record of an employee under title II of the Social Security Act that we should first start off by seeing what progress can be made in determining disability and see whether or not the social security people can work out a plan that is feasible with the State people to do that. We wanted something more than just the theory that somebody had that it would work.

All in the world with respect to section 3 that we have to do, if this is feasible, if it is decided by the Congress after January 1, 1953, to continue it, is to strike out the termination date of June 30, 1953. Prior to that time the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee will have had this opportunity to consider the question on the basis of hearings. I hope my friends will not be too concerned one way or the other. Certainly the conference report merits the vote of every Member present here today.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. As always, the gentleman from Arkansas has made a very clear explanation of a very difficult problem. For my part, I want to thank him. May I say further that I wish to support this conference report but to go on record as saying that it is most unfortunate that the waiver of premium provision is not included. Also, I am sorry to see that the municipal employees were not included under the bill. I hope those two features will be worked on in the future. I wish they might have been in this conference report.

Mr. MILLS. I am in entire accord with the gentleman's thinking. I wish we could have brought it back to you.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WERDEL. I think the gentleman and the committee of conference have done a good job. I think they have made improvements in some respects.

Mr. MILLS. I bow to the wisdom of the gentleman from California.

Mr. WERDEL. I commend the gentleman. I want to support the conference report.

Mr. MILLS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. Did I correctly understand that the $75 work clause is for earned income and not income from any savings or investments or annuities?

Mr. MILLS. It applies to what an individual can earn in employment that is covered under title 2. In other words, if a man has been a carpenter working for a contractor, say, as an employee, and has been making $300 or $400 a month, and he retires at age 65, the fact that he continues to earn no more than $75 a month as a carpenter would not prevent him from drawing his benefit.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman. As one who originally opposed this bill, I hope the House will now pass it.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, disagree to the Senate amendment, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, SHEPPARD, RILEY, GORE, FLOOD, CANNON, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I present a report from the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

(The report is as follows:)

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1952, NEW LONDON, CONN., MAY 2, 1952

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated to constitute the 1952 Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

By the President of the Senate: Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, Democrat, Rhode Island.

By the chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Democrat, Connecticut; Senator WILLIAM BENTON, Democrat, Connecticut.

By the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, Connecticut; Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Republican, Connecticut.

By the chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN, Democrat, Alabama; Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, Florida; Representative ALVIN F. WEICHEL, Republican, Ohio.

Ex-officio members: Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado (chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce); Representative EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, New Jersey (chairman, House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries).

The following members of the Board were present: Representative EDWARD J. HART, Democrat, of New Jersey; Representative A. A. RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut; Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida; and Representative HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., Republican, of Connecticut.

The following officials of the United States Coast Guard Headquarters were present: Vice. Adm. Merlin O'Neill, Commandant; Rear Adm. James A. Hirshfield, Chief of the Office of Personnel; and Commander L. M. Thayer, Chief of the Personnel Training and Procurement Division.

INSPECTION TOUR OF GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS

Upon arrival at the Academy the Board, accompanied by Rear Adm. Arthur G. Hall, Superintendent of the Academy, and members of his staff, made an inspection tour of the Academy grounds and buildings. During the course of this tour the Board observed, among other things, the mess halls, the classrooms, the Academy hospital, various training facilities and laboratories and the practice vessel, *Eagle*. A battalion review was taken by all members of the Board.

MEETING OF THE BOARD

Following the inspection tour the Board members were joined by Admiral O'Neill and Admiral Hall in formal session during which the Honorable EDWARD J. HART was elected chairman and the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN was elected secretary of the Board. The general comments and specific recommendations arrived at by the Board are herewith presented for the serious consideration of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives:

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Board observed the highest degree of patriotism, spirit, and morale among the young men of the Coast Guard Academy. The curriculum appears to be on a par with the highest standards of collegiate education while at the same time fitting the graduates for their specialized service as members of the land and naval forces of the United States operating under the Treasury Department in time of peace, and as a part of the Navy in time of war or when the President shall so direct.

The Board was greatly impressed with the Academy and with the work it is doing and is pleased to commend the Superintendent, Rear Adm. Arthur G. Hall, and his staff.

As a result of the inspection tour, the Board noted that the present mess hall is not large enough to seat all cadets at one time, that though the Congress has approved sufficient funds for a modern, new galley, no money has been made available for a new mess hall, and that at this time cadets and officer candidates are being messed together in a reserve building, one of temporary construction. The Board further notes that some of the classrooms did not appear to be particularly good and were rather crowded. The Board, of course, recognizes that the crowding in classrooms and other buildings undoubtedly results from the size of the cadet corps in recent years. The Academy buildings (not including the Reserve establishment built during World War II) were constructed in 1932–33 for the accommodation of about 350 Regular cadets. The Board understands that in recent years there have been as many as 560 cadets enrolled at the Academy at the beginning of the fall terms. The Board also noted the excellence of the Academy hospital, which is approved by the American College of Surgeons, and has had such approval continuously since 1934.

The Board met in informal private session with the principal battalion officers of the corps of cadets without the presence of officials of the Academy. The Board was pleased with the high caliber of the many members of the Corps with whom they had an opportunity to converse and who are considered to be representative of the cadet corps as a whole. In this connection the Board found that the morale of the cadet corps was of the highest order and reflects the quality of the instruction, training, and living conditions.

During the course of the visit, individual members of the Board arranged for private interviews with the members of the cadet corps from the various areas represented by the members. These discussions were extremely productive and, without exception, bore out the correctness of the general impression of the high quality of the Academy and its curriculum, its staff, and its cadet corps. The Board found that almost all States and Territories of the United States are represented in the cadet corps, even though entrance to the Academy by means of a Nation-wide competitive examination is required. The young men appear to be of the highest morale and in excellent physical condition. The Board also formed the firm opinion that the school would compare well with any first-class college or university in the country.

In the course of its discussions with members of the cadet corps and officials of the Academy, the Board learned that while there is authority to grant up to 60 days' leave to cadets upon graduation, this authority is not being fully exercised. The Board notes that similar authority is available to the Military and Naval Academies. It is the impression of the Board that cadets of the Coast Guard Academy do not receive the benefits of the graduation-leave authority on a basis comparable with the other service academies.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Construction of new cadet mess hall large enough to accommodate 560 cadets. The present one is too small, having been built for a cadet corps of 350, whereas about 560 cadets are present at the start of each academic year in September. On May 2, 1952, the 460 cadets and 250 officer candidates all mess in a temporary building which was constructed during the last war.

2. The installation of two new oil-burning boilers in plant No. 1, since the ones now in use will soon be beyond the state of economical repair.

3. Construction of an additional wing to Satterlee Hall, the academic building. The necessity for this arises from the gradual increase in size of the cadet corps since the completion of the building in 1933. The Board feels that the classrooms are now too crowded.

4. The subject of intramural sports was discussed. It was the opinion of the Board that additional facilities should be provided to permit more participation in nonteam varsity sports by cadets who are not on varsity squads. An athletic program designed to improve the physical condition of cadets is deemed to be of primary importance, and accordingly adequate equipment

and facilities should be available for all members of the cadet corps.

5. The Board recommends that all reasonable steps should be taken to assure the availability to the cadets of the Academy of the benefits of the graduation leave authority to an extent equivalent to such benefits granted to graduates of the other service academies. The Board recognizes that the schedules of the operational units to which graduates are assigned may prevent the adoption of a completely uniform policy applicable to every individual cadet. Nevertheless, the Board is of the opinion that every effort should be made to see that the graduates of the Academy receive no less advantages in regard to this matter than the graduates of West Point and Annapolis.

FUTURE PLANNING

In connection with recommendations 1 through 4 above, the Board is pleased to note that plans are already in operation to accomplish such recommendations. A future construction planning program includes five major projects. These projects are on file in headquarters for inclusion in the construction program of the Coast Guard budget and are as follows:

1. The cadet mess hall to accommodate a new figure of 560 cadets has No. 1 priority in the Academy program. The mess hall will be approximately 40 feet by 175 feet and is part of the new galley which will be completed this year. The new galley cannot be used with the present cadet corps until the new mess hall is provided.

2. The installation of two new oil-burning boilers and accessories to replace the old boilers in boiler plant No. 1 and to eliminate the need of boiler plant No. 2 has the second priority in the Academy program. The need for the replacement of these boilers is most important and has been carried as a necessary item for about 5 years.

3. The construction of a wing to Satterlee Hall is carried as No. 3 priority in the Academy program. This structure is about 50 feet by 78 feet and is three stories high It is necessary to accommodate the expanded cadet corps classroom facilities. It is planned to use the space to accommodate the metallurgy and radio laboratories, the physics laboratory, and the drafting and navigation classrooms.

4. The extension of Chase Hall (cadet barracks) is necessary to house the expanded cadet program. The cadets are now crowded three in a room and it is necessary to use a three-story World War II temporary barracks to accommodate the present cadet corps.

5. A construction of two squash courts including spectator's gallery in the basement of Billiard Hall (gymnasium) annex is No. 5 priority in the Academy program. The proposed work is in accordance with the original plans for the development of this area.

CONCLUSION

The Board is pleased to enter upon the record its deep admiration of the high morale and spirit that exists in all ranks, from the superintendent down.

The Board thanks the superintendent of the Academy, Rear Adm. Arthur G. Hall, and his staff for their untiring efforts in maintaining, under difficult conditions, the high standards in evidence at the Academy.

The Board wishes to extend its thanks to Vice Adm. Merlin O'Neill, Commandant; Rear Adm. James A. Hirshfield, Chief of the Office of Personnel; and Commander L. M. Thayer, Chief of the Personnel Training and Procurement Division, for the assistance rendered by them.

The chairman and members of the Board wish to express their appreciation to the battalion officers and other members of the cadet corps for their very helpful assistance in enabling the Board to understand fully all aspects of the functioning of the Academy.

The Board earnestly recommends to all Members of the Senate and House of Representatives that at a convenient opportunity they should visit the classrooms and laboratories as well as the officers and cadets at this institution.

The Board is certain that those who have observed the value to our Nation of these young lives, dedicated to the service of their country, will assist in assuring that this Academy fulfills its purpose.

EDWARD J. HART, *Chairman.*
A. A. RIBICOFF.
CHARLES E. BENNETT.
HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. McGRATH submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2492)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 56.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45, 47, 49, 50, 55, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, and 63, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,470,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 51, 52, 53, and 57.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
WALT. HORAN,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
H. STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

SENATE

Amendments Nos. 1–45: Provide appropriations for the Senate which were not included in the bill as passed by the House.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Amendment No. 46: Reported in disagreement.

Office of the Clerk

Amendment No. 47: Appropriates $660,813 as proposed by the Senate instead of $655,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

Office of the Sergeant at Arms

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates $384,045 as proposed by the Senate instead of $385,545 as proposed by the House.

Contingent expenses of the House

Amendment No. 50—Miscellaneous items: Appropriates $501,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House.

Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures

Amendment No. 51: Reported in disagreement.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Capitol Buildings and Grounds

Amendment No. 52—Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 53—Senate Office Building: Reported in disagreement.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Amendment No. 54—Salaries, Library proper: Appropriates $3,470,000 instead of $3,400,000 as proposed by the House and $3,488,210 as proposed by the Senate.

Copyright Office

Amendment No. 55—Salaries: Appropriates $1,008,409 as proposed by the Senate instead of $975,000 as proposed by the House.

Legislative Reference Service

Amendment No. 56—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $866,300 as proposed by the House instead of $891,159 as proposed by the Senate.

Revision of Annotated Constitution

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Distribution of catalog cards

Amendment No. 58—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $648,607 as proposed by the Senate instead of $620,000 as proposed by the House.

Union Catalogs

Amendment No. 59—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $85,492 as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000 as proposed by the House.

Printing and binding

Amendment No. 60—Printing the catalog of title entries of the Copyright Office: Appropriates $44,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $39,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61—Printing catalog cards: Appropriates $586,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $550,500 as proposed by the House.

Miscellaneous expenses of the Library

Amendment No. 62—Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates $80,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $60,000 as proposed by the House.

Library buildings

Amendment No. 63—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates $794,820 as proposed by the Senate instead of $750,000 as proposed by the House.

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
GEORGE W. ANDREWS,
WALT. HORAN,
FRED E. BUSBEY.
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill

(H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, might I ask before we vote on the conference report that full information be given to the House relative to this $3,000 tax item? I think we should discuss this thing openly here. I think the Congress is entitled to know about it.

Mr. McGRATH. I will be very happy to discuss that fully and explain to the House when we reach that amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, several of the amendments in disagreement are so placed simply in order to comply with the rules, and as to those which relate to the Senate, I ask that they be considered en bloc. They are Nos. 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, and 44.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 8, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Majority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $33,310."

Amendment No. (9), page 2, line 17, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Vice President, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, $55,410."

Amendment No. 15, page 3, line 11, insert:

"For clerical assistance to the Conference of the Minority, at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman of said committee, $33,310."

Amendment No. 22, page 4, line 12, insert:

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, $133,275, including compensation for stenographic assistance at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress."

Amendment No. 23, page 4, line 19, insert:

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: For salaries and expenses of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, including the objects specified in Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $188,060, and including compensation for stenographic assistance at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress."

Amendment No. 24, page 5, line 3, insert:

"Joint Committee on Printing: For salaries for the Joint Committee on Printing at rates to be fixed by the committee, $38,125; for expenses of compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory, $1,600; for compiling, preparing, and indexing material for the biographical directory, $1,900, said sum, or any part thereof, in the discretion of the chairman or vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, may be paid as additional compensation to any employee of the United States; and for travel and subsistence expenses at rates provided by law for Senate committees, $4,500; in all, $46,125."

Amendment No. 28, page 6, line 1, insert:

"Reporting Senate proceedings: For reporting the debates and proceedings of the Senate, payable in equal monthly installments, $135,785."

Amendment No. 31, page 6, line 8, insert:

"Inquiries and investigations: For expenses of inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate or conducted pursuant to section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, including compensation for stenographic assistance of committees at such rates and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration notwithstanding the provisions of section 134 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress; and including $150,000 for the Committee on Appropriations, to be available also for the purposes mentioned in Senate Resolution No. 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Public Law 20, Eightieth Congress, $974,120: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for per diem and subsistence expenses (as defined in the Travel Expense Act of 1949) at rates in excess of $9 per day except that higher rates may be established by the Committee on Rules and Administration in the case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States."

Amendment No. 32, page 7, line 1, insert:

"Folding documents: For folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand, $31,765."

Amendment No. 35, page 7, line 6, insert:

"Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, equipment, and supplies for Senate kitchens and restaurants, Capitol Building and Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, to be expended under the supervision of the Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, $65,000."

Amendment No. 42, page 8, line 9, insert:

"Communications: For an amount for communications which may be expended interchangeably for payment, in accordance with such limitations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of charges on official telegrams and long-distance telephone calls made by or on behalf of Senators or the President of the Senate, such telephone calls to be in addition to those authorized by the provisions of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1947 (60 Stat. 392; 2 U. S. C. 46c, 46d, 46e), the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949 (63 Stat. 77; 2 U. S. C. 46d–1), and Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, Public Law 254, Eighty-second Congress, $14,550."

Amendment No. 43, page 8, line 15, insert:

"The Sergeant at Arms is authorized and directed to secure suitable office space in post office or other Federal buildings in the State of each Senator for the use of such Senator and in the city to be designated by him: *Provided*, That in the event suitable space is not available in such buildings and a Senator leases or rents office space elsewhere, the Sergeant at Arms is authorized to approve for payment from the contingent fund of the Senate, vouchers covering bona fide statements of rentals due in an amount not exceeding $900 per annum for each Senator."

Amendment No. 44, page 8, line 25, insert:

"The Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms are authorized and directed to protect the funds of their respective offices by purchasing insurance in an amount necessary to protect said funds against loss. Premiums on such insurance shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 9, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 28, 31, 32, 35, 42, 43, and 44, and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 46, page 9, line 19, after the colon strike out the word *"Provided"* down to and including the word "Code" on page 10, line 2, and insert the following: *"Provided*, That section 23 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions for bad debts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(6) Exception: This subsection shall not apply in the case of a taxpayer, other than a bank, as defined in section 104, with respect to debts owed by (A) any political party, (B) any national, State, or local committee of any political party, or (C) any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of Presidential or Vice Presidential electors or of any individual whose name is presented for election to any Federal, State, or local elective public office, whether or not such individual is elected. For the purpose of this paragraph, the terms "contributions" and "expenditure" shall have the meanings prescribed for such terms in section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code.'

"The amendment made by this section shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Minnesota, I would state to the House that the original McCormack amendment which was adopted in this body provided for the setting of the residence of a Member of the Congress at his home in his district. That was a provision which applied to the Internal Revenue Act. When we went to conference, it was pointed out that there was no ceiling as to that amount. It merely gave to the Members of Congress the very same right which a member of a profession or a business is now granted under existing law under the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. HORAN. You are referring to title 26, section 23, of the Internal Revenue Code?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

All the ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred during the taxable years in carrying on any trade or business, including a reasonable allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered; traveling expenses (including the entire amount expended for meals and lodging) while away from home in the pursuit of a trade or business; and rentals or other payments required to be made as a condition to the continued use or possession, for purposes of the trade or business, of property to

which the taxpayer has not taken or is not taking title or in which he has no equity.

In other words, the Members of Congress have merely not extended to themselves the full deduction which other people in professions and trades have, but have limited the expenses so that in no event do they get above the ceiling of $3,000. May I say this agreement was reached unanimously by the conferees both in the other body and in the House.

Mr. HORAN. That is correct. We are in agreement.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, while I signed my name to the report as one of the managers of the conference on the part of the House of Representatives for legislative appropriations, there was one feature of the bill objectionable to me. I wish to state that I am not in favor of permitting Members of Congress to deduct cost-of-living expenses in Washington from their income-tax returns. I appreciate that the circumstances under which we have had to operate during the last few days in the closing hours of this session of Congress made it absolutely impossible to get proper consideration of this matter.

It was the Seventy-ninth Congress, under the control of the Democrats, that put through a bill giving the Members of Congress a $2,500 tax-free expense allowance. Last year the House voted to rescind the tax-free provision of this law. This year the House voted to write into the legislative appropriations bill a provision allowing the Members of Congress to deduct all cost-of-living expenses while in Washington from their income-tax returns, the same as representatives of business concerns. This amendment was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. JOHN MCCORMACK. The Senate struck this provision from the appropriations bill. It was finally compromised by permitting a deduction of $3,000 for cost-of-living allowance in Washington. According to my understanding of the conference report, this is a flat sum deductible regardless of the actual cost. This is certainly an improvement over the House bill inasmuch as it puts a limitation on the amount that can be deducted.

My principal reason for opposing this type of legislation is that when a man files his candidacy for Congress he knows the salary and remuneration he will receive for his services. There is no doubt but that a great many Members of Congress serve the people of their districts at a tremendous sacrifice to themselves. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, legislation of this kind should never be enacted until proper and extensive hearings have been held. Then, if, in the judgment of the majority of the Members, they feel they should have some financial consideration, it should be done by increasing salaries and not by tax exemption features such as allowed by the Eighty-first Congress, or by giving cost-of-living allowances as proposed by the Democrat majority leader and included in the present appropriations bill.

I appreciate that a problem exists and if something is not done to meet it there is the possibility that eventually we may wind up having our membership divided largely into two classes: First, those who have an independent income and want the office for whatever social advantages and prestige it offers; and, second, those who cannot afford to be a Congressman from a financial standpoint and may rely on being subsidized by either labor or manufacturers. God forbid that such a situation should develop. I hope the time never comes when we find that men are willing to become Members of Congress for any purpose other than a sincere patriotic desire to serve our country.

Mr. Speaker, I know the attitude of the Members of the House, I realize that my views are in the minority, but I am sincere in my belief that inclusion of a cost-of-living allowance in this legislative appropriations bill is not the proper approach to the problem.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is my understanding that the Members of Congress personally will receive no more consideration in this legislation than would the ordinary businessman under the present taxation laws. Is that correct?

Mr. MCGRATH. The gentleman has stated it very clearly in his usual capable manner. I will go one step further and say that I do not think we are getting quite as much as is given to members of the other professions.

Mr. HORAN. That was my own conclusion; that we are not giving the Members of Congress anything at all. We are putting a limitation here.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MCGRATH. I yield with pleasure to one of the most able Members of the House.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Has any consideration been given to bringing to the floor of the House a bill providing for an increase in salary for Members of Congress? In my opinion that would be the preferable way to handle legislation of this nature, rather than to bring in an exemption of this type.

Mr. MCGRATH. In answer to the gentleman, I would say his question is a very proper one, but since this is an appropriations committee it is not within our province, and we had no disposition to go beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. I concur wholeheartedly that the Members of Congress are not receiving compensation that is comparable to the amount of work they are called upon to do. Earlier today, I said that was one of the reasons why so many of us, including myself, have made decision to seek greener pastures. Personally, there is no benefit in this legislation to myself, but I do know that the Members of this House are entitled to what we are now giving so that the Members may continue to serve their country properly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGRATH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to state how extremely sorry I am that the gentleman from New York is going to leave Congress. I have noticed his great facility in securing legislation easily and pleasantly and very effectively. I remember what he did in the merchant marine and I remember what he did in securing money for the greatly needed contact men for the Veterans' Administration and what he has done in this bill and in many other bills. I, for one, shall miss his help very much and I know the country will miss him.

Mr. MCGRATH. I will say to the lovely lady from Massachusetts that I am going to miss her help greatly.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I want to join with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. It has been a pleasure to work with Judge MCGRATH. I dislike very much to see him leave. He has been a very fine Member of this body.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MCGRATH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 46, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert *"Provided*, That for the two taxable years beginning after December 31, 1952, the place of residence of a Member of Congress (including any Delegate and Resident Commissioner) within the State, congressional district, Territory, or possession which he represents in Congress shall be considered to be his home for the purposes of section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code, but amounts expended by such Member within each such taxable year for living expenses shall not be deductible for income-tax purposes in excess of $3,000.

"AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

"Section 23 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions for bad debts) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"'(6) Exception: This subsection shall not apply in the case of a taxpayer, other than a bank, as defined in section 104, with respect to debts owed by (A) any political party (B) any national, State, or local committee of any political party, or (C) any committee, association, or organization which accepts contributions or makes expenditures for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence the election of Presidential or Vice Presidential electors or of any individual whose name is presented for election to any Federal, State, or local elective public office, whether or not such individual is elected. For the purpose of this paragraph, the terms "contributions" and "expenditure" shall have the meanings prescribed for such terms in section 591 of title 18 of the United States Code.'

"The amendment made by this paragraph shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1951."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 48: Page 11, line 13, insert "*Provided*, That in connection with the operation of the Joint Senate and House Recording Facility an additional position of laboratory technician, to be compensated at the basic rate of $3,500 per annum, is hereby authorized."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 20, line 3, insert:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

"For an amount to enable the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures to carry out the duties imposed upon it by section 601 of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726), to remain available during the existence of the committee, $20,000, to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 23, line 3, insert:

"Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For maintenance, repairs, and rebuilding of the subway transportation system connecting the Senate Office Building with the Capitol, including personal and other services, $10,100."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 23, line 8, insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including five female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol; in all, $768,975."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGRATH moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No 53, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; for purchase of waterproof wearing apparel and for personal and other services; including five female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,800 each, for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol who shall after June 30, 1952, maintain service in all facilities for the House of Representatives under his jurisdiction for not less than one-half hour after daily adjournment of the House of Representatives; in all, $768,975."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show at this point that I am opposed to the provision written into this conference report for a tax exemption for Members of Congress.

Congress ought to face up squarely to the issue of a salary increase and not resort to this form of subterfuge. In the dying hours of this session there is practically nothing that can be done since a conference report is not subject to amendment except by the committee.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, my position that Members of Congress should not seek tax exemptions that are not provided all other citizens. I am opposed to this provision and I am opposed to the manner in which it is being enacted in the closing hours of this session.

What is happening here today on this and other important bills emphasizes the repeated protests I have made in past weeks against long week end adjournments from Thursday nights until following Tuesdays—with perfunctory sessions on Mondays but usually with any important votes postponed until Tuesdays.

The citizens of this country are now paying the penalty in hastily considered and unnecessary legislation, for the weeks of virtual inaction at the start of this session and the long week end adjournments that have been the rule.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 57: Page 27, line 7, insert:

"REVISION OF ANNOTATED CONSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses: For necessary personal services to enable the Librarian to revise and extend the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, to include Supreme Court cases through the 1951–52 term, $3,000."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. MILLS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2493)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 4 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code (miscellaneous provisions relating to the computation of average base period net income) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(f) Companies Preserving Defense Capacity and Increasing Capacity for Manufacturing Peacetime Products From Certain Strategic and Critical Metals.—

"'(1) Eligibility requirement: In the case of a taxpayer which commenced business on or prior to January 1, 1936, and since such date has been primarily engaged in manufacturing, if—

"'(A) The percentage of the taxpayer's purchases of raw materials which were strategic and critical metals (as defined in paragraph (3)) was 80 per centum or more for each of the taxable years beginning with or within the taxpayer's base period;

"'(B) The taxpayer's average monthly excess profits net income (computed in the manner provided in section 443 (e) for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the first twenty-four months of its base period was 250 per centum or more of the average monthly excess profits net income (so computed) of the taxpayer for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the last twenty-four months of its base period;

"'(C) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) as of the beginning of its base period (when added to the total facilities at such time of all corporations with which the taxpayer has the privilege under section 141 of filing a consolidated return for its first taxable year under this subchapter) did not exceed $10,000,000; and

"'(D) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) on the last day of its base period was 180 per centum or more of the adjusted basis of its total facilities on the first day of its base period,

the taxpayer's average base period net income determined under this subsection shall be the amount computed under paragraph (2).

"'(2) Computation: The average base period net income determined under this subsection for a taxpayer entitled to the benefits of this subsection shall be the amount computed under section 435 (e) (2) (E) and (F) except that there shall be substituted for the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the six months in the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending December 31, 1949, an amount computed by multiplying the aggregate of the excess profits net income for each of the six months

in the period beginning July 1, 1946 and ending December 31, 1946, by the per centum determined by dividing the adjusted basis of taxpayer's total facilities (as defined in section 444 (d)) on December 31, 1948, by the adjusted basis of its total facilities on the first day of its base period. The average base period net income computed under the preceding sentence shall not exceed 80 per centum of the excess profits tax net income for the taxpayer's first taxable year under this subchapter.

"'(3) Definition of strategic and critical metals: As used in this subsection, the term "strategic and critical metals" means copper and zinc which on January 1, 1945, had been determined by proper authority to be strategic and critical under the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Stock Piling Act and shall include scrap containing such metals.'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 4, line 10, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "That, effective" and insert "Effective".

On page 6, line 2, of the Senate engrossed amendments, strike out "the Commissioner with the approval of".

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend sections 433 (b), 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
TOM CONNALLY,
ED C. JOHNSON,
HUGH BUTLER,
EDWARD MARTIN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The effect of Senate amendment No. 1 is to add to section 459 of the Internal Revenue Code a new subsection providing that, in the case of a taxpayer which commenced business on or prior to January 1, 1936, and since such date has been primarily engaged in manufacturing, if—

(1) The percentage of the taxpayer's purchases of raw materials which were strategic and critical metals (defined to be certain copper and zinc) was 80 percent or more for each of the taxable years beginning with or within the taxpayer's base period;

(2) The taxpayer's average monthly excess-profits net income for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the first 24 months of its base period was 250 percent or more of the average monthly excess-profits net income of the taxpayer for the period comprising all taxable years ending with or within the last 24 months of its base period;

(3) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities as of the beginning of its base period (when added to the total facilities at such time of all corporations with which the taxpayer has the privilege under section 141 of filing a consolidated return for its first taxable year under this subchapter) did not exceed $10,000,000; and

(4) The adjusted basis of the taxpayer's total facilities on the last day of its base period was 180 percent or more of the adjusted basis of its total facilities on the first day of its base period,

then the taxpayer's average base period net income determined under the new subsection shall be the amount computed under section 435 (e) (2) (E) and (F) of the code except that there shall be substituted for the aggregate of the excess-profits net income for each of the 6 months in the period beginning July 1, 1949, and ending December 31, 1949, an amount computed by multiplying the aggregate of the excess-profits net income for each of the 6 months in the period beginning July 1, 1946, and ending December 31, 1946, by the percent determined by dividing the adjusted basis of taxpayer's total facilities on December 31, 1948, by the adjusted basis of its total facilities on the first day of its base period. The average base period net income as so computed shall not exceed 80 percent of the excess-profits tax net income for the taxpayer's first taxable year under subchapter D of chapter 1 of the code.

The House recedes with an amendment which makes technical and clerical changes in the Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 2: Senate amendment No. 2 provides that the amendment made by Senate amendment No. 1 shall be applicable with respect to all taxable years ending after June 30, 1950. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 3: This amendment adds to section 433 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the computation of average base period net income for excess-profits-tax purposes) two paragraphs providing for adjustments in certain cases for base period losses arising from branch operations. The House recedes with technical amendments.

Amendment No. 4: This amendment added to the bill a new section relating to the effective date of the amendments made by section 319 of the Revenue Act of 1951 with respect to the allowance of percentage depletion for coal and metal mines and for certain other mines and natural mineral deposits. The 1951 amendments applied only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. The effect of the Senate amendment is to provide that in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1951, and ending after December 31, 1950, the allowance for percentage depletion under section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code is an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) That portion of a tentative allowance, computed under the provisions of section 114 (b) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable (without regard to the Senate amendment) to taxable years beginning before January 1, 1951, and ending after December 31, 1950, which the number of days in such taxable year prior to January 1, 1951, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year; plus

(2) That portion of a tentative allowance, computed under the provisions of section 114 (b) (4) applicable (without regard to the Senate amendment) to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950, as if such provisions were applicable to the entire taxable year, which the number of days in such taxable year after December 31, 1950, bears to the total number of days in such taxable year.

The House recedes.

R. L. DOUGHTON,
JOHN D. DINGELL,
W. D. MILLS,
DANIEL A. REED,
RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8271) to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have had an opportunity through the years to observe first-hand the facts concerning the Treasury's conduct in the field of fiscal policy and operations and its management of the national debt.

I want briefly to present some of the more important facts concerning these subjects. These facts reflect the actual dollars-and-cents operations of the Treasury Department, as well as the many steps it has taken to improve its fiscal and financial operations, under the administration of the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder.

First of all, I think it important that we recognize that the public debt of the Federal Government has not increased during the past 6 years, but, as a matter of fact, the debt has actually been reduced from $270,000,000,000 on June 30, 1946, to approximately $259,000,000,000 on June 3, 1952. This is a net reduction of almost $11,000,000,000 during the past 6 years. This reduction in the total indebtedness of the Government has been made possible through a net budgetary surplus of more than $3,500,000,000 during the entire period of the past 6 years and by the use of cash on hand in the Treasury's accounts when Secretary Snyder took office in 1946.

When we consider the very pronounced changes that have taken place in the Nation's economy and the international problems with which the Government has been confronted during the past 6 years, the budgetary surplus and the reduction of Federal debt that have been effected are even more strikingly significant.

There are other facts concerning the Treasury's management of the national debt that are equally important. Through its debt management policies, the Treasury has greatly reduced the inflation potential inherent in the national debt. As my colleagues in the House are all aware, that part of the debt which is held by the commercial and Federal Reserve banks has always been very important in relation to inflationary trends. During Secretary Snyder's management of the debt, the amount of Government securities held by the banks—including the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks—was reduced by almost $24,000,000,000 during the 6 years ended June 30, 1952. Nearly $23,000,000,000 of this reduction in bank-held Government securities has been taken out of the commercial banks, and the remainder has come from the

portfolios of Government securities held by the Federal Reserve System.

Both of these steps are highly important, and the decline in the Federal Reserve's ownership of Government obligations is particularly vital because of its effect in reducing the total amount of bank reserves. This acts to reduce the potential expansion of bank credit and the money supply. So the Treasury's operations in the debt management field during the past 6 years have not swollen the amount of money in the hands of the public.

On the contrary, the Treasury's operations have been geared to reduce the amount of bank reserves, curb the expansion of the money supply, and put a brake on inflationary forces. One further aspect of this matter should be stressed. This is the fact that since last December alone, the Federal Reserve holdings of Government securities have been reduced by nearly $1,000,000,000. This has been a very healthy development because everyone has feared during this period that there would be a resurgence of inflation, as a result of the Nation's defense production program. This, of course, has not developed.

Most significant of all, however, is the fact that the net budgetary surplus of the past 6 years—more than $3,500,000,000—the reduction of the total amount of Federal debt by $11,000,000,000, and the reduction of the bank-held portion of the debt by $24,000,000,000 inveighs heavily against those who loosely and wrongly state that the Federal Government has been embarked on a program of irresponsible financial operations, and slipshod management of the taxpayers' money and the national debt. The facts are directly contrary to these misstatements.

I know from my observations as a member of the Ways and Means Committee that one of the paramount policies Secretary Snyder has followed during the past 6 years is the maintenance of public and investor confidence in the credit of the United States Government. This is his duty under law, and he has fulfilled it thoroughly. Within the past several weeks, for example, there has been overwhelming evidence that the Secretary has maintained the public's confidence in the Government's credit. In connection with the debt-management program, the Treasury announced on June 10 its intention to borrow $3,500,000,000 at 2⅜ percent interest for 6 years, to finance defense expenditures authorized by the Congress for the fiscal year 1953. The investing public, including individual citizens, insurance companies, and other institutional investors, and the Nation's banks, offered to lend the Treasury nearly $11,700,000,000 in response to its request for only $3,500,000,000, more than three times the amount of money the Treasury stated that it would need in connection with that particular financing operation.

There could hardly be more overwhelming evidence than this of public confidence in the credit of the United States, because this confidence was backed by offers of the people and investing institutions of this country to lend their money to the Treasury. Institutional, nonbank investors alone offered the Treasury more than $3,600,000,000, and it was sound debt management on the part of the Secretary to allot these subscriptions in full. Purchase of Government securities by these investors is noninflationary because it does not result in an expansion of bank credit.

The commercial banks, which had been invited to participate in this financing operation, offered the Treasury many billions of dollars. However, in accordance with his prudent policies of debt management, the Secretary allotted these commercial bank subscribers only about half a billion instead of the billions they wanted to lend.

In refunding presently outstanding Government securities, the Treasury has been equally highly successful. Its latest maturity of $5,200,000,000 of 1⅞-percent certificates of indebtedness has been refunded into similar certificates in an amount of more than $4,900,000,000. This means that the owners of more than 95 percent of the maturing certificates were glad to acquire new ones in exchange for those which matured. Those who understand the money markets can appreciate the significance of this high percentage of investors who were willing to relend their money at the same rate of interest. It means that investors have confidence.

The offering of $11,700,000,000 in response to the Treasury's request for only $3,500,000,000, at 2⅜-percent interest for 6 years, is overwhelming evidence that the Treasury's debt management has been and is being conducted in ways that maintain full public and investor confidence in the Government's credit.

The Treasury's fiscal management, as distinct from its policies and practices in the field of debt management, has also redounded to the credit of the Treasury Department. This also seems to have escaped proper public attention. As many Members of the Congress are aware, a splendid plan—the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952—for the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, was passed by the Congress last March. Its provisions are now being put into effect throughout the country by the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Bureau. Now, some of the largest internal-revenue districts in the country have been completely reorganized, those in New York and Chicago, and plans are progressing splendidly for the reorganization of many other districts. Aside from the important streamlining of operations, and the direct lines of responsibility and authority which the plan provides, one of the chief merits of the reorganization is the fact that all of the employees of the Bureau are placed under the merit, or civil-service system. I might mention that the press in Chicago and New York expressed great interest in the reorganization of the internal revenue districts in those areas, and the plan has been received most favorably by the public. Still another benefit of the Internal Revenue Bureau reorganization is that its agents are now able to operate even more efficiently in apprehending and prosecuting those who commit tax frauds against the Government.

Inauguration of this entire reorganization program was by no means a simple thing. It was the product of many years of effort and research on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury and his staff, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue itself. It came as the capstone of a long series of carefully planned studies and steps to modernize and improve the Bureau's operations. The cooperation officials and employees of the Treasury Department and of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have given the congressional committees which have investigated the Bureau's functions, and the cooperation they have accorded individual members of both the House and Senate who have been concerned with the Bureau's problems and its reorganization, has been splendid. Secretary of the Treasury Snyder has publicly expressed his appreciation of the investigative work, committee recommendations, and the opinions of authorities outside the Treasury, in drafting the reorganization plan and putting it into effect.

As my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] pointed out to Members of the Congress on February 26, 1952, this attitude of the cooperation on the part of the Treasury officials and employees is in sharp contrast with the defiant attitude of the administration in office during the 1920's. Then the Bureau of Internal Revenue was plagued with the misconduct and malfeasance on the part of its employees—misconduct which was in many respects vastly more serious than the difficulties we have been considering during the past year.

You may recall that Senator Couzens was chairman of a committee of the Senate which had been delegated the authority to inquire into tax frauds, questionable and illegal tax rebates, and other practices within the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the 1920's. The essential difference between the difficulties of that era and this, is the fact that the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, under Secretary Snyder, have been anxious to cooperate with the Congress in every possible way in improving the Bureau's standards and operating practices. On the other hand, the committee headed by Senator Couzens in the 1920's received rebuffs from the administration then in office, and there was then a general lack of cooperation with the committee in its efforts to ascertain the facts. It is my understanding that Senator Couzens, in the 1920's, found it necessary to pay the committee's counsel out of his own pocket, at least part of the time that the committee was conducting its investigations.

No Member of this Congress, and no responsible official of the present administration, condones for a moment any irregular practices within the Bureau of Internal Revenue or among its employees. However, as Congressman YORTY has so wisely pointed out, it is important for us to keep our perspective and to realize that the difficulties and frauds of the past 2 years have been duplicated many times under previous

administrations, including Republican administrations.

The record of the past year speaks for itself. We now have throughout the country a Bureau of Internal Revenue that is being completely reorganized—with new administrative and operational procedures, direct lines of responsibility and authority, and improved auditing techniques that will enable the Bureau to discover promptly, and to ferret out any irregular practices on the part of the Bureau's employees, as well as tax frauds perpetrated by the very small minority of taxpayers who seek to escape their just tax liabilities.

The new Internal Revenue Bureau organization is one of which Secretary Snyder and other Treasury officials can be justly proud, and in which we, as Members of the Congress, can also feel pride because of our committee work and our legislative efforts. These have not only met with success, but have also publicly received the grateful plaudits of the Secretary of the Treasury and his staff.

The Treasury, throughout the past 6 years, has done an excellent job in managing the public debt and in coping with the enormously increased burden of tax collections. I know that all the Members of the Congress who have had an opportunity, as I have had, to observe these developments first hand through the past 6 years, share these views. The facts I have presented today, reflecting as they do great credit upon the Treasury and its Secretary, are inescapable and irrefutable.

AMENDMENT NO. 1

Mr. Speaker, this amendment gives in effect the benefit of the growth formula in computing the excess-profits credit to certain corporations using strategic and critical metals as their raw materials where the combination of rising raw-material prices and failure of increased manufacturing facilities to be reflected in the base-period income has prevented them from securing a fair base-period credit. It will afford relief to a few independent fabricators of brass who are having difficulty competing with large affiliated groups in securing raw materials. The amendment prevents the base-period credit from exceeding 80 percent of the taxpayers excess-profits net income. It is in accord with the principles of the growth formula which we have allowed other corporations, but which this particular group cannot take advantage of under the technical wording of the existing growth formula due to the fact that their earnings in the latter part of the base period were depressed due in part to the rise in raw-material prices and the fact that they were not able to realize fully profits from new facilities put in operation in the base period.

AMENDMENT NO. 2

Amendment No. 2 merely provides that the relief granted by amendment No. 1 shall be effective for all excess-profits-tax years.

AMENDMENT NO. 3

Amendment No. 3 also applies to the base period credit for excess profits tax purposes. It adjusts the base period credit by not having the base period income reduced by a loss from a separate branch operation. The amendment is very restrictive in its application. In order to have the branch loss added back to the base period income the following income conditions must be met: First, the company must operate the branch at a loss during two or more taxable years; second, the branch must be at a separate place from the other business activities of the company; third, the branch must differ substantially from the other business with respect to the character of its operation or services. In this connection the branch must be of such a nature as to be of a type classifiable by the Standard Industrial Classification Manual in a different major industry group or in a different subgroup of the taxpayer major group; fourth, the aggregate net losses of the branch must exceed 15 percent of the total excess profits net income of the taxpayer during the base period; fifth, the base period credit must be reduced by any loss from the branch in the current excess profits taxable year.

AMENDMENT NO. 4

This amendment relates to the depletion allowances and increases provided for under the Revenue Act of 1951. Under that act these increases and allowances were made applicable only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1950. Those corporations on the fiscal-year basis did not receive any benefit from the increased allowances with respect to that part of their taxable year ending in 1951. This creates a discrimination against the fiscal-year corporations as compared to the calendar-year corporations. This amendment corrects this inequity by permitting the depletion allowances and increases granted by the Revenue Act of 1951 to apply with respect to the part of the taxable year 1951 ending in 1951 on a pro rata basis.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. FRED G. AANDAHL

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no person that I have learned to love and respect more during my stay in Congress than the gentleman from North Dakota the Honorable FRED G. AANDAHL. Mr. Speaker, it was with sadness that I learned of Fred's retirement from the Congress of the United States. During his brief stay I have learned to respect and admire him for his complete and thorough understanding of the problems of Government; his devotion to duty and his sympathetic approach to all problems.

In the 2 years Fred has served in Congress he has made countless friends not only among the Republicans but with the Democrats as well. The Republican leadership recognized his ability within a short time after his entrance into Congress and appointed him to the powerful Committee on Appropriations. On this committee he has served well and with distinction. Mr. Speaker, Fred's service has been brief in the Congress of the United States but I am certain that the good people of North Dakota will recall him to public service again in not too distant a future. We have too few FRED AANDAHL'S in public life.

DEFENSE AND SECURITY OF THE NATION

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, we are passing final legislation appropriating a little over $46,000,000,000 for the future defense and security of our Nation. This represents only a partial payment, a down payment, which the American people must pay because of the blundering foreign policy of the present administration. Yes, we are compelled to take from the pockets of the American taxpayers this $46,000,000,000 appropriation because of repeated mistakes and bungling at Yalta, Potsdam—all as a result of misguided politics and leadership.

The present administration, fumbling from crisis to crisis, has collected more taxes, cried louder about inflation, and, in the name of defense has gushed more billions overseas than any administration in the history of the United States.

Yet, men in high places in the administration admit that the danger which confronts us is great and that our defenses are far too weak to meet such danger. We have more inflation than ever. In the light of all this, it is almost tragic when we consider the report that has just been filed with the Senate by the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which Democratic Senator MCCARRAN, of Nevada, is chairman. Here is a lengthy report which gives chapter and verse in case after case where witnesses have identified several individuals as Communists and fellow travelers, who obviously had access through American officials to the State Department and the White House as well. We have Senator MCCARRAN speaking not as a Democrat, but as an American, when he says:

> I am convinced, from the evidence developed in this inquiry, but that for the machinations of the small group that controlled and activated the Institute of Pacific Relations, China today would be free and a bulwark against a further advance of the Red hordes into the Far East.

Senator MCCARRAN continues:

> Our Government agencies have been infiltrated by persons whose allegiance is with Communist Russia. Our official secrets have

been bared to agents of the Soviet loyal and sincere men have been driven from their diplomatic posts; and, under the cloak of public office, messages have been written and words spoken that have tended to weaken this Nation's position in world affairs.

Can it be denied that this is but another way of saying that the American casualties in Korea, which now exceed 100,000, can be laid at the doorstep of the State Department? In the light of all this, is it any wonder that to this date no explanation has been made for the administration's suppression of the Wedemeyer Report, in which Lt. Gen. Albert Wedemeyer forewarned this Government as to the perils of our policy of appeasement and the threat of Communist aggression in the Far East?

Is it any wonder then that administration spokesmen dread the thought of a free and open debate on the issues of foreign policy in the coming election? In silly statements they say that we should look ahead—we are not supposed to look at their blunders and bungling of the past, they say.

Mr. Speaker, the present administration must account to the Nation on matters of foreign policy. A thorough and complete airing of the foreign policy issue as administered in the past is vital and necessary to the future security and well-being of this great Nation.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the resolution to adjourn will be a resolution sine die. I for one Member shall vote "no" on that resolution, because I believe we should recess, not adjourn sine die. At a time when the steel mills are still generally closed due to the strike and the Supreme Court has stated that the Congress, not the President, has the authority to do something about it if the emergency continues, and at a time when the war in Korea still continues without a truce, it seems to me that the Congress should not have to leave it to the President but should establish its own means for being recalled without the need for action by the President. Under the contemplated adjournment resolution we would leave only the President with the power to call us back.

I think we should adopt the procedure we followed in 1948 when we left it to the majority leadership to recall the Congress if warranted, and leave it to the majority and minority leadership to call us back if the national interest should require.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the position just taken by the gentleman from New York and I, too, shall vote "no" on any resolution to adjourn sine die. We cannot walk out on our responsibilities by saying the President can call us back any time within the next 6 months. We did not do so in World War II and we are now at war with a national steel strike preventing the production and shipment of military hardware needed to fill those deficiencies I noted in Korea 8 weeks ago.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I, too, desire to express my opposition to the Congress adjourning sine die and my vote on any such resolution at this time will be "no." The American people are looking to Congress for leadership in view of the strained conditions at home due to the steel strike and the war, not police action, in Korea. It is our duty as the duly elected Representatives of the people to measure up to these responsibilities and not leave the entire fate of our Nation to the whim of our President.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, a sine die adjournment would, in my opinion, leave the affairs of this Nation all too completely in the hands of the President. I concur in the expression of opinion by the gentlemen who have preceded me, and shall also vote "no" on any motion to adjourn sine die, believing that the Congress should be held available at the call of its leadership.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against adjournment sine die. With the condition the world is in today, with the dangers with which America is threatened, and the perils to which our boys are subjected in Korea, it seems to me that if we adjourn at all it should be to a day certain.

I am willing to vote to adjourn for 40 days, 50 days, or 60 days, or until the 1st of September, if necessary; I am willing to recess to a day certain, but I am not going to vote to adjourn this Congress sine die, which means for 6 months, or until January 1953. With the world in the condition in which it is today, I do not think Congress should adjourn sine die. We do not know what is likely to happen between now and next January.

I hope the resolution that is offered will be to adjourn to a day certain or to recess to a day certain.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration I present a resolution (H. Res. 733) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 436 of the Eighty-second Congress, first session, incurred by the Committee on Banking and Currency acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed an additional $35,000, including expenditures for employment, travel, and subsistence of accountants, experts, investigators, and clerical stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$35,000" and insert "$20,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INAUGURAL ADDRESSES OF THE PRESIDENTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I present House Resolution 726 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That a collection of inaugural addresses, from President George Washington to President Harry Truman, compiled from research volumes and State papers by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDUCTING INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 731) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 676, by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$15,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPENSES OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 744) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of $2,250 to the Clerk of the House for expenses incurred in compiling, arranging for the printer, reading proof, indexing testimony, stenography and typewriting, and supervision of the work in the contested-election cases of the Eighty-first and Eighty-second Congresses, as authorized by the act entitled "An act relating to contested elections," approved March 2, 1887.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF BURIAL GROUNDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6891) to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall acquire through purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise, the plot of land in Brooklyn, N. Y., in which 256 Maryland soldiers killed in the Battle of Brooklyn on August 27, 1776, are buried, and any adjoining land as is necessary, in his opinion, to establish a suitable cemetery in their honor. The Secretary shall erect an appropriate national memorial on such land, and shall restore, maintain, and care for the graves of these gallant soldiers.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make an investigation and report thereon to the Congress at not later than March 1, 1953, with respect to the advisability of establishing a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y., in honor of 256 Maryland heroes who fell in combat during the Battle of Brooklyn on the 27th day of August 1776. The report to the Congress shall include information regarding the following:

"(1) National historical importance of such a memorial;

"(2) Nature of burial site, identity of exact site of burial, size and present-day conditions of site, including improvements thereon;

"(3) Complete cost for the establishment of such memorial;

"(4) Cost of maintenance of such a memorial and amount thereof that will be paid for by the city of New York and/or the State of New York; and

"(5) Recommendations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELATING TO CERTAIN LAND IN MARION COUNTY, IND.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7262) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to donate, convey, release, and relinquish to Charles O. Grinslade, Sr., Indianapolis, Ind., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land located in Marion County, Ind. Such land, which was acquired by the United States in 1942 and reconveyed to William Ozman on May 16, 1946, subject to a reservation to the United States (pursuant to Executive Order No. 9071, dated March 4, 1946) of all fissionable materials therein, contains approximately seven and one-tenth acres and is more particularly described as follows:

Block "A" in the Joe Maloof Addition, sections 1 and 2, an addition to the city of Indianapolis, Marion County, Ind., as per plat thereof, recorded in plat book 27, page 80, in the office of the Recorder of Marion County, Ind.

With the following committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 4, inclusive, and insert "That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land located in Marion County, Ind., is hereby released and relinquished to and for the benefit of the lawful owner or owners of such land."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to release all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all fissionable materials in certain land in Marion County, Ind."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7555) relating to the exchange of land for purposes of the Colonial National Historic Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to improve the area and the administration of the Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States land or interests in land within the authorized park area as heretofore delimited by the Congress, and, in exchange for the property so accepted, to convey to the grantors any federally owned land or interests in land situated within the Colonial National Historical Park, of approximately equal value.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLAMATH TRIBAL LOAN FUNDS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3363) to authorize a depository for Klamath tribal loan funds.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872–873; 25 U. S. C. 530–535, inclusive), is amended to permit the Secretary of the Interior, under rules and regulations prescribed by him, to advance funds from the reimbursable loan fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, to the Klamath Tribal Loan Board for deposit in a depository or depositories designated by him, for the purpose of making loans and paying administrative expenses. All repayments and accruals on loans hereafter made by the Board may be deposited in the depository or depositories designated by the Secretary, and shall be available for making loans and paying administrative expenses under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to advance funds from the reimbursable loan fund established by section 2 of the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 872, 25 U. S. C., sec. 531), as amended, to a bonded officer of the Klamath Tribal Loan Board upon request of the general council of the Klamath and Modoc Tribes and the Yahooskin Band of Snake Indians (hereinafter referred to as the "Klamath Tribes"), for deposit in a National or State bank or banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and designated by the Board. Disbursements from the bank depository may be made by a bonded representative of the Klamath Tribal Loan Board for payment of administrative expenses of the Board, and for the purpose of making loans to members and associations of members of the Klamath Tribes for any purpose which will promote their economic development, for educational advancement, for financial assistance in cases of illness, death, or other emergency, and for the maintenance and

support of the aged, infirm, and incapacitated members.

"SEC. 2. Repayments on loans made by the Klamath Tribal Loan Board from its bank depository under section 1 of this Act, and interest, service fees, and other charges on such loans shall be deposited in the bank depository and be available for further loans by the Board, and for the payment of administrative expenses.

"SEC. 3. Acceptance of funds by the Klamath Tribal Loan Board pursuant to this Act shall relieve the Secretary of his trust as to funds advanced and accruals thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRY FALLS DAM

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project shall hereafter be known as Dry Falls Dam and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such dam is designated or referred to under the name South Coulee Dam shall be held to refer to such dam under and by the name of Dry Falls Dam.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2494)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35, 41, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 81, 82, 90, and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 74, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "fiscal year 1953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and the sum proposed, insert the following: "$88,094,000, of which $50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,909,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment "$3,183,498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$1,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,648,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$600,090,000" insert "$585,510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$386,409,840" insert "$361,254,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In the third line of the proposed amendment, after the word "programs" insert the following: ", other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "Documents Numbered 144, 154 and 157"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: Change the section number to "SEC. 1411"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1412"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1413"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said

amendment insert: "1414"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The Committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 3, 4, 30, 32, 50, 53, 57, 63, 64, 67, 79, and 87.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
STYLES BRIDGES,
HOMER FERGUSON (except 86 and 87),
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 5: Strikes from the bill language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out an appropriation for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 7: Makes appropriation for airport claims as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $5,200,000 for operating expenses of Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $625,000 for retired pay, Coast Guard, as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Government Corporation

Amendment No. 10: Provides $15,000,000 for administrative expenses of Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the House and $16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $60,000,000 for school construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores formal language to the bill.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Strikes from the bill appropriations for pay act costs proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $69,750 for Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $7,500 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21, and 22: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25, and 26: Strike from the bill appropriations for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $500,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the House instead of $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 30: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 31: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33: Reinserts a House item for emergency repairs and replacement of buildings and utilities damaged by fire, storm, and flood. Appropriates $262,500 instead of $525,000 as proposed by the House. The funds made available are to be used for buildings and utilities only, and not for roads, parkways or trail construction.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $240,000 for further research and control activities in combatting the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

CHAPTER VIII—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 36: Corrects a chapter number.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37—Alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion: Strikes out the provision of the House providing $50,000 for extraordinary alterations, repairs, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, as proposed by the Senate.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40—Operating expenses: Appropriate $88,094,000 for operating expenses, instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House and $141,188,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limits the amount available only for the weapons program to $50,000,000, instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House; limit funds available for expenses of program direction and administration personnel to $27,909,900, instead of $25,064,275 as proposed by the House and $30,755,526 as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to $3,183,498, instead of $2,709,350 as proposed by the House and $3,657,647 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41—Plant and equipment: Restores the proposal of the House appropriating $1,450,000,000 for plant and equipment, in lieu of the proposal of the Senate to appropriate $1,450,000,000, plus contract authorization for the remainder of the expansion program. In restoring the limitation on the availability of funds for construction as set forth in the House provision, it is the intention of the conferees that funds provided shall be available for the purchase or procurement of machinery, equipment and materials required for the entire expansion program as submitted to the Congress. The conferees invite the Commission to appear to present additional needs, if any, if the Congress is in session later in the year, or at the new session in January, at which time full consideration will be given to such needs.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 42—Salaries and expenses: Provides $125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 43—Limitation on administrative expenses: Strikes out the provision of the House, and inserts the proposal of the Senate, in this connection.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 44—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates $187,500 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates $150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000,000, as proposed by the House; and provides $1,648,275 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendment No. 47—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $250,000 for such purpose, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title I—Military Public Works

Amendment No. 48: Corrects a chapter member.

Amendment No. 49: Inserts formal language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 51—Department of the Army: Appropriates $585,510,000 for military construction, Army. The House had proposed a total of $600,090,000. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The reduction of $14,580,000 recommended below the House amount represents entire line item projects deleted in the conference agreement on the authorization bill, H. R. 8120, as compared with the House version of that bill.

Amendment No. 52—Department of the Navy: Appropriates $361,254,840 for public works, Navy. The House had proposed a total of $386,409,840. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The net reduction of $25,155,000 recommended below the House amount represents $28,527,000 reduced by the conference agreement on H. R. 8120 as compared with the House version; and $3,372,000 added as provided in H. R. 8120 for naval aviation training at Lincoln, Nebr.

Amendment No. 53—Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga.: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Department of the Air Force: Appropriate $1,200,000,000 for acquisition and construction of real property, Air Force, as proposed by the House. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill.

Amendment No. 56: Restores the provision of the House restricting the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts within the continental United States.

Amendment No. 57: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 58: Restores provisions of the House restricting the constructing, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facilities, and prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a separate supply service for the Air Force.

Amendment No. 59: Corrects a section number.

Title II—Department of the Army

Alaska Communication System

Amendment No. 60—Construction: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House earmarking $5,000 for painting a specific building in Alaska.

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI—MUTUAL SECURITY

Amendment No. 65: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Places a limitation on the number of persons employed at per diem rates as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 67: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 68: Includes explanatory language of the Senate with an amendment. The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes out language proposed by the House placing restrictions on employment of personnel.

CHAPTER XII—EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Amendment No. 70: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $1,250,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates $2,875,000 for Defense Production Administration instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $3,750,000 for Small Defense Plants Administration instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates $1,500,000 for revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates $28,750,000 for Department of Commerce instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House and $32,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $3,100,000 for Department of the Interior instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates $1,875,000 for Department of Labor instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates $60,000,000 for Economic Stabilization Agency instead of $57,130,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 79: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates $6,500,000 for General Services Administration instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: Appropriates $8,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as proposed by the House instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $15,000,000 for Federal Contributions as proposed by the Senate instead of $29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates $20,000,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendment No. 87: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 90 and 91: Limit the amount which may be paid for automobiles by the Government to $1,400 as proposed by the House instead of $1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106: Correct section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. COLMER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee what, if anything, is done in this bill with reference to a staff for the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, owing to objections made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], to consideration of the resolution proposed by the Committee on Appropriations in the House, we were unable to secure additional funds for that purpose.

Likewise, due to the fact that the Senate struck from the supplementary appropriation bill the amount reported by the Senate committee providing an appropriation for that purpose, no additional funds are provided in this bill.

I might say, however, that the committee is continuing the record it has made in this session and in previous sessions of Congress in the progressive increase of its staff and its investigations.

The Committee on Appropriations has conducted more investigations and used more operatives this year than ever before in the history of the committee. We have used 144 investigators this year, and have made arrangements for the continuation during the coming recess of comprehensive and exhaustive examinations in the Departments in order to have needed and authoritative information available when the Congress convenes in January. We have depleted the funds provided for such examinations to the point where we should have additional money to carry out all the examinations scheduled between now and next January.

But due to objections in the House to the consideration of the resolution providing additional funds and due to the failure of the other body to include the amount reported by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, we are unable to provide in this conference report additional funds for the purpose.

However, we bring back to the House Senate amendment No. 4 in technical disagreement with an amendment providing for an additional $500,000 for the purpose, half to be used in the Senate and half in the House. We trust it will be agreed to by the House, and that the funds which have been depleted by the extensive investigations that have been made up to this time will be replenished.

Mr. COLMER. If I understood the gentleman in the first 5 minutes of his statement, there were not any additional funds in this bill; but I understand now from the gentleman that there are funds.

Mr. CANNON. The Senate committee included additional funds, but when the bill went to the Senate floor, the Senate struck them out.

Mr. COLMER. There is $250,000 here now for additional staff?

Mr. CANNON. Not in the conference report. We offer an amendment to Senate amendment No. 4 providing $500,000, one-half to be used by the Senate and one-half to be available to the House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. If I understand the situation correctly, there is $250,000 in this bill, and I also understand there is no authority for such appropriation since no such matter was in disagreement. My parliamentary inquiry is: Should a point of order be made, at what point should it be made? The Speaker, of course, will understand that the Members know nothing about what is in these conference reports. The reports are not printed and no one has had an opportunity to even see the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to advise the gentleman in answer to his parliamentary inquiry that it is now too late to make a point

of order against the conference reports because unanimous consent has been given for the reading of the statement on the part of the managers in lieu of the conference report, and that part of the statement has been read.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MILLS]. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. The best anybody can tell except those who were on a conference is that there was no such matter in disagreement. Therefore, it could not be in the conference report. How can the ordinary Member of Congress anticipate what is coming up until he has an opportunity to ask those who do know what is going on and who are on the conference? How would we know how or when to make a point of order unless we did ask the question and get some information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi propounded a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Mississippi would have had to object to the unanimous-consent request that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report, and insist upon the reading of the report in order to have made a point of order against the report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? Does the gentleman favor the Committee on Appropriations having ample funds for this purpose?

Mr. COLMER. In reply to that question, Mr. Speaker, I think it is purely academic now. The gentleman from Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, had repeatedly stated in hearings that they did not need any additional staff, and has taken that position throughout.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will examine my testimony in the hearings before the Committee on Rules, he will find no such statement.

It is customary in most of the committees of the House—certainly in the Committee on Appropriations—to publish the hearings at least 3 days before a bill is called up in the House. But the Committee on Rules did not have its hearings printed before calling up their bill, and has not had them printed. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Appropriations has conducted so many investigations and used so many investigators this session that it has depleted its regular funds and requires additional money to handle the investigations which have been ordered during the approaching holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BAILEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, to ask a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may not reserve the right to object when the regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that the further reading of the statement of the managers on the part of the House be dispensed with?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, would it avail anything under the circumstances to now object to dispensing with further reading of the statement to permit a point of order to be raised?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order against the conference report would come too late, regardless of what happens to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. COLMER. Further reserving the right to object, I realize just what is going on. It may be a little late. I have attempted to try to do something about the situation and a number of the rest of us who are interested in that question have likewise done so. I have remained here, I have tried to find out whether this matter was involved. I do not want to object until I find out what is involved. Now we find ourselves under the parliamentary situation where there is nothing we can do about it. I therefore withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman from West Virginia be out of order in asking the Chair to kindly request the chairman of this committee to answer a question?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, the Chair will state to the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. I asked if I would be out of order in making such a request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may reserve the right to object.

Mr. BAILEY. I have attempted to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman reserving the right to object?

Mr. BAILEY. I reserve the right to object to ask a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentleman may proceed and ask his question of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like the distinguished chairman of the committee to advise the Members of the House what disposition they made of the items, Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, passed by the House at a total of $80,000,000 for construction and $11,500,000 for maintenance and operation; what action was the conference committee on these?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on the first item mentioned by the gentleman from West Virginia, "Payments to school districts," the conference report carries the full amount, $11,570,000.

On the second item, "For school construction," $80,000,000 was allowed by the House. The Senate cut it to $60,000,000. The House yielded to the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that at this late hour there is little that can be done about it, but I am sure that action does not meet the approval of the House. I cannot escape the observation that the members of the Appropriations Committee and the conferees, like so many other Members of the House, have been overlooking the necessity of taking care of these boys and girls. That proposition is not adequate, and it will not take care of the school boards that it was the intention of this House to take care of. It still leaves the problem unsolved. I would like the RECORD to show that it is a job only partially done.

Mr. CANNON. I am in complete accord with the gentleman from West Virginia in his interest in schools and school facilities. But in both the House and the Senate there is a wide difference of opinion on many of the items in the appropriation bills. In conference it is a matter of give and take. We must make concessions in order to secure concessions. At this moment the conferees are under heavy censure by Members of both Houses because of our prodigality and under even more severe censure by others because of our parsimony. The gentleman is not alone in his displeasure.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, when the bill was under consideration in the House a motion was made to strike certain language that appeared on page 25 of the print of H. R. 8370 in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission, which was in the nature of a proviso. We have on the news wires the indication that a letter has been written to the Speaker of the House by the President of the United States, and I have obtained a copy of that letter. It reads as follows:

JULY 5, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am informed that the supplemental appropriation bill, as reported from conference, contains a rider which, in effect, forbids the Atomic Energy Commission to start any specific construction project unless funds are available to complete the project; and that the amount of funds carried in the bill for the atomic energy program is less than half the amount I requested.

This rider and reduction in funds, coupled together, would mean that the Atomic Energy Commission would not be able to fulfill military requirements for atomic weapons. I cannot believe that the Congress would wish to adjourn with our national security jeopardized in this fashion.

I urgently request that this rider be eliminated before the Congress completes its action on this bill.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. Speaker, I will not consent to dispensing with further reading of the conference report unless the report in reference to item 41 concerning the plant and equipment for the Atomic Energy Commission be read. The reading of the balance may be dispensed with as far as I am concerned. If the gentleman will make his request in that form I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has reserved the right to object and states that if the statement with reference to amendment No. 41 is read he will not object to dispensing with the further reading of the report.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I think we will save time by reading the statement. I withdraw my request that it be considered as read.

The Clerk continued the reading of the statement.

Mr. McDONOUGH (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. If the gentleman from Missouri will yield me sufficient time to make a statement in reference to amendment 43 at this time, I would appreciate it. I want to know just how I can obtain the time? Is it in order to ask for that time now?

The SPEAKER. No, not at this time, because the statement of the managers on the part of the House is being read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the statement.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report carries appropriations aggregating $10,344,976,339. That is an astronomical sum, but it is $3,522,952,350 less than the estimates received by the committee.

On a tentative summary, which will be supplemented later by a detailed tabulation, the total appropriations for the session are approximately $10,000,000,000 below the amounts requested by the budget.

The Committee on Appropriations has made a notable record in this session in three particulars especially: First, it has passed the supply bills and messaged them over to the President in record time. This is the earliest the annual appropriation bills have been enacted for many years.

Second, the total of the appropriation bills for the session represent the heaviest cuts and the most drastic reductions in expenditure in the history of the Congress.

Third, the committee in processing the bills this session has made more extensive and comprehensive investigations than ever before, using 144 investigators, including some of the best trained and most experienced men from FBI, Treasury Secret Service, General Accounting Office, and others. The results speak for themselves.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House there was an amendment added to restrict the use of funds for the Public Housing Administration, and the language that the House put in the bill was corrected in the Senate and the conference, I understand, has accepted the language of the Senate. In the language of the Senate the words are almost identical to the House amendment with the exception, beginning on line 8, page 29, after the word "has" there appears the word "tendered." In the interest of those communities that have projects that may want to cancel out, it may be interpreted that the word "tendered" means that the money advanced is immediately on hand at the time the cancellation is made. I was intending to submit an amendment to this conference report, but I do not want to do that under the circumstances, and in light of that I would like to get an interpretation of the intention of the committee and the Congress as to the meaning of the word "tendered." I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices under which this bill passed when it went through the House if he will not agree that it is the intention of Congress that the word "tendered" as it appears here means to negotiate a satisfactory agreement between the Federal Government and the city, county, or State to tender or deliver to the Federal Government full reimbursement for the funds advanced on such project prior to cancellation of previous commitments.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has made a good interpretation. That makes good, common horse sense.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], agree with that interpretation?

Mr. TABER. I would say that that was the proper interpretation of the language and the intent of the Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, it would not be necessary for any community, if the amount was $10,000,000 or more, to have the $10,000,000 on hand at the time the agreement was made, to deliver the $10,000,000 at a future date.

Mr. TABER. I should say that they should agree to it and go through the normal process of raising the money.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would like to ask a further question on that particular point, because I think it is very important. This is subject to possible misinterpretation, I believe, and that is why I think it is essential that it be made perfectly clear as to the intent of the Congress. "Tendered" might be interpreted by someone to mean that the municipality or the city must be in a position to put down a certain set sum of money. I believe that it has been satisfactorily said that "tendered" might well be intended to mean the intent on the part of the city to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion for the discharge of the obligation which is due the Federal Government. Is that the understanding?

Mr. THOMAS. That is certainly a good definition of "tendered." I do not think you will have any trouble with that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is clear to me that it was the intention of the House that the language submitted here be just as favorable to the municipalities on the "tendered" proposition as was the language which was adopted in the House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is rather difficult to figure out just why an item which so many people in Minnesota, REA cooperatives, municipalities, private utilities, the Farm Bureau, the Farmers Union, the National Grange, and hundreds of thousands of electrical consumers want included, has again been rejected but I have been in Congress for 14 years and realize that it is impossible to get everything you want. I realize that for the present, at least, I am unsuccessful in securing this project. However, I do want to express my appreciation for the new language which has been put into this report. From that language I believe we in Minnesota can hope to secure full hearings during the next session of Congress on this very vital matter of bringing to the consumer the cheap electrical energy produced by the large dams on the Missouri River.

In closing, I want to thank the committee for their consideration of this item. I am sorry we do not see eye to eye on it. We accept the committee's decision and thank them again for the encouraging language in the report.

I quote here the language as finally agreed to in this report:

> Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of this body appreciates the fine attitude which our colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] has just expressed. He is a good loser. He is a hard fighter. He fought for what he thought was right and best for his people. I know his people will all realize that he did everything he could to get these transmission lines there, even though the long line he asked for did not square with the present transmission-line-building policy of Congress.

I hope that in the future the folks in Minnesota will ask for only a part of the line, which I was willing to agree to for this year. The line I suggested as a compromise was from the Garrison Dam down to the city of Benson. This would have given them an outlet to a load center.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] holds to the viewpoint of the 20 cooperatives and the 3 private utilities that a compromise offer as I have suggested will not do the job that is

necessary. I cannot agree with this viewpoint and urge upon the various parties affected that they be willing next year to accept this compromise, which I personally have assured the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that I will support.

Again let me pay a tribute to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. He has fought hard for these lines the past 2 years and the original request from the budget for this system of lines was commenced by him in April 1951. I have no doubt that he will eventually secure these lines, but today we are not in position to agree to his request. His fight for rural electrification over the years is well known to all of us. He has done much for agriculture in the past and his people will need his services here in the future.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield for an observation?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to make the observation that our distinguished colleague from Minnesota has made a valiant fight for his great people in Minnesota, as he always does. He has not lost his fight. This important question is to have consideration in the Eighty-third Congress, and he will, no doubt, attain his full objective, and all by reason of the good fight he has made.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 3, line 22, insert the following:

"CAPITAL OUTLAY, SEWER DIVISION

"For an additional amount for 'Capital outlay, sewer division,' to remain available until June 30, 1954, $1,200,000, including such additional amount as may be necessary for the preparation of surveys, plans, and specifications in connection with the construction of storm-water and relief sewers."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike the word "additional" in line 4 of said amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: On page 4, line 21, insert the following:

"Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953: To enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States, January 20, 1953, in accordance with such program as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police, $156,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (4) page 5, line 4, insert

"Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery of $300 for each Senator and the President of the Senate for the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, $29,100, to remain available for obligation until January 2, 1953."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount for inquiries and investigations, Committee on Appropriations, $250,000.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, by the Committee on Appropriations, including the purposes of Committee on Appropriations Resolution Numbered 11, adopted by the committee on July 2, 1952, $250,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, is it in order at this time, or at any later time to offer a motion to recommit to strike that item?

The SPEAKER. The conference report has been agreed to. The motion to recommit would be too late.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is there any motion to recommit that can be made at this or any later time?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, can we not ask for a division on this?

The SPEAKER. Of course, a vote can be taken on any motion that is made.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 119, noes 13.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 30, page 22, line 1, insert:

"CHAPTER VI

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Water conservation and utilization projects

"For an additional amount for 'Water conservation and utilization projects,' $190,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (32) page 22, line 10, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Research in the utilization of saline water

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of H. R. 6758 (as amended and passed by the Senate and House of Representatives) authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, $125,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Research in the utilization of saline water

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of Public Law 448, approved July 3, 1952, authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, $125,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment number (50) page 31, line 22, insert:

"Military construction, foreign countries

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries as authorized by the act of ———, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read the motion as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Military construction, foreign countries

"For establishment and development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries, $140,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 53: Page 33, strike all of lines 18 down to line 25, and insert:

"Naval Supply School, Athens, Ga., rehabilitation of existing facilities and new construction, $2,030,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 57: Page 35, strike out all of section 803.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and insert in addition thereto the following:

"Any appropriation available to the Department of Defense shall be available for mustering-out payments as authorized by law."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 63: Page 37, line 4, insert:

"CORPS OF ENGINEERS

"Rivers and harbors

"Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for 'Rivers and harbors,' including the objects specified under this head in the 'Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1953,' $5,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 64: Page 37, line 10, insert:

"Flood control

"Of the funds available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, not more than $450,000 shall be available, until expended, for the planning, construction, and furnishing by the Corps of Engineers of adequate elementary and high-school facilities in the new combined municipality (commonly referred to as Newtown) in North Dakota, which is for the acquisition of and to replace the school facilities in the villages of Sanish and Van Hook, N. Dak., which are located within areas acquired by the United States because of the construction of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on said river, conditional upon Newtown School District No. 1, Mountrail County, N. Dak., wherein such now combined municipality is located, contributing to the cost of such planning, construction, and furnishing the maximum amount of money which can be provided through a bond issue within the general debt limitation permitted by law for such school district."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 67, page 53, line 6, insert ", including not to exceed $186,900 for salaries and expenses for operating a publicity office in the District of Columbia."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert ", including not to exceed $186,900 for personal services for those persons in a publicity office of the Mutual Security Agency in the District of Columbia the major part of whose activities is the dissemination of information in the United States and for expenses incident to the dissemination of such information."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 79: Page 61, line 6, insert ": *Provided further*, That subparagraph (B) of section 204 (f) (1) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(B) In any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which, at a time when maximum rents under this title are in effect therein, and prior to September 30, 1952, declares (by resolution of its governing body adopted for that purpose, or by popular referendum in accordance with local law) that a substantial shortage of housing accommodations exists which requires the continuance of Federal rent control in such city, town, village, or unincorporated area; and'"

(2) of section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(2) Any incorporated city, town, village, or unincorporated area of any county which makes the declaration specified in paragraph (1) (b) of this subsection shall notify the President in writing of such action promptly after it has been taken.'"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 64, line 1, strike out "$6,489,954" and insert "$1,121,563."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 87, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the amount proposed by said amendment insert "$6,743,026."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

HON. WILLIAM G. STIGLER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks relative to the retirement of Hon. WILLIAM G. STIGLER.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute being paid to our retiring colleague, Mr. WILLIAM G. STIGLER. My association with Mr. STIGLER has been brief, but I have come to thoroughly appreciate the great comprehension which he has had of the agricultural problems of our Nation.

Representative STIGLER's fine work on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has been of lasting benefit to all the farmers of our great country. It will be of great benefit to every segment of our population, because he has been a true conservative in his efforts to conserve and replenish the natural resources of our land.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to BILL STIGLER who is retiring from the House after a long beneficial career of service to the people of Oklahoma and the Nation.

BILL STIGLER's devotion to the public began as city attorney of Stigler, Okla., in 1920. Subsequently, he served in the State senate, which included a term as president pro tempore, before his election to the Congress.

The Congress loses a fine legislator with BILL STIGLER's retirement. The United States has been a better place to live because of his service here, and the people of his district have received the finest reputation that it is possible for a people to receive.

BILL STIGLER is one of the most truly devoted public servants I have ever known. Scrupulous in the performance of his duties, able, conscientious, kindly, and generous of impulse, tenacious and unyielding in principles, manly and courageous by instinct, forward-looking in approach, his service is one of outstanding ability and rare devotion to duty.

By his example of tolerance, his patience and sympathy for feelings of others, by his gentle good humor and his courage, he has contributed to this Congress the best that God has made in man.

His life has been rich because it has been spent in public service.

The good wishes of every Member of this House, regardless of political affiliation, go with him as his service ends. It is my profound hope and wish for you, Bill, that many more happy years of contented, peaceful, and useful living are ahead of you.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I know that every Member of the House shares my regret that our distinguished and beloved colleague, WILLIAM G. STIGLER, is retiring from Congress. His voluntary retirement comes at the pinnacle of his strength both here and in his own district. Had he sought re-election he most likely would have been unopposed in the Democratic primaries in Oklahoma. His people loved him and had confidence in him as we who serve with him love and have confidence in him here.

BILL STIGLER is the dean of our Oklahoma delegation. Elected to the Seventy-eighth Congress in a special election on March 7, 1944, he has served in this body continually since that time.

BILL STIGLER has been a friend and constant adviser to me since I first came here. Time and again he has come to my assistance and given me the benefit of his

wise counsel both with respect to legislative matters and to problems arising in my district. Our districts are contiguous and embrace most of the hill country of eastern Oklahoma. We have many common problems. My success in my own district has been attributable in large measure to the work he has done and to the assistance he has given me.

BILL STIGLER is a big man. A proud member of the great Choctaw Indian tribe, his whole life has been characterized by those elements of generosity so typical of his people. I recall an incident that demonstrated to me his innate bigness. When the subcommittee on Indian Affairs was considering a bill introduced by him on the commutation of Choctaw treaty payments, he requested the committee to report out an identical bill bearing my name when he was much more entitled to authorship than I. This is typical of Bill. He is always anxious to give a hand to a younger brother and help him on his way.

BILL STIGLER'S retirement is a tremendous loss to our delegation. We are losing two Congressmen next year. Our delegation is young. It lacks experience and seniority. Bill's absence is going to be strongly felt by all Oklahoma. He was a member of the Committee on Appropriations which dealt with matters so important to our State and our country.

Congressman STIGLER'S record in the field of Indian legislation, particularly as it affects the Five Civilized Tribes, is unsurpassed in the annals of Congress. Bills bearing his name are landmarks in the history of Indian law. He was the author of the act giving authority to sell the coal and asphalt lands of the Choctaws and Chickasaws. A law bearing his name created the Indian Claims Commission. His rehabilitation bill passed the House in the last Congress. Its ultimate enactment will mean the final step in equipping all Five Tribes Indians for full responsibilities of citizenship among their white brothers. A former general counsel of the Choctaws, Mr. STIGLER came to Congress uniquely equipped to attack the lingering problems of the Five Civilized Tribes. His work here has resulted in the settlement of issues that have been hanging fire since Oklahoma became a State.

Congressman STIGLER has sponsored a great program of flood control and water, power, and recreational development for eastern Oklahoma. Through his efforts the ground work has been laid for the industrial expansion of our section of the State. Many projects on many streams have been built and others have been planned. For years to come his handiwork will be seen and his influence will be felt all over the eastern part of our State.

Congressman STIGLER'S work in the development of agriculture has gained him national stature. A member of the subcommittee on appropriations for agriculture, he has worked constantly for a better rural America. Wherever REA lines are built, wherever soil conservation practices are introduced and carried out, wherever farm families are helped through the Farmers Home Administration or the Extension Service, or the Production and Marketing Administration, there you will find the fruits of the efforts of our colleague and friend, BILL STIGLER.

Congressman STIGLER has had a long and distinguished career in Oklahoma. He was born in a town founded by his father and bearing his name, Stigler, Indian Territory. He was educated in the common schools of Oklahoma. He is a graduate of Northeastern State College in his own district and of the Oklahoma University Law School. He was admitted to practice law in Oklahoma in 1920 and has been an outstanding member of the Oklahoma bar ever since.

Congressman STIGLER is a veteran of World War I. He served overseas with the Three Hundred and Fifty-seventh Infantry on the battle fronts of St. Mihiel and Meuse-Argonne. On returning to America he became an active member of the American Legion and was Department Commander in 1933.

Mr. STIGLER served with distinction in the Oklahoma State Senate. He was President pro tempore of the Senate in 1931.

I know that Bill hates to leave us. We all hate to see him go. Every Member of this body knows that he has been a conscientious, hard-working, and outstanding Congressman and fine servant of his district and his country. Bill's district has been doubled in size. His work and responsibilities have increased and his physician has asked him to slow down. While his district and his State were most anxious for him to carry on even if it meant curtailing some of his activities, BILL STIGLER is not the type of person who would accept a job without putting his whole heart and life into it.

We all wish for Bill, as he leaves us, a long and happy life amid the surroundings which he has known and loved from infancy. We know that he will be an important force for good government in his State and country as long as he lives. So, in these closing hours of the Eighty-second Congress, I salute a great man and outstanding patriot and public servant, my good personal friend, BILL STIGLER.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine regret that I see our good friend W. G. (BILL) STIGLER retire from Congress. During the period that BILL STIGLER has been a Member of this Congress, he has at all times conducted himself as a fine citizen, a true and warm friend, an able advocate of the interests of his district with due regard to the national welfare. It has been my pleasure for the past number of years to serve on the same committee of five with BILL STIGLER. This committee has handled the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture in the House of Representatives. Due to the smallness of the committee, quite naturally we were thrown more closely together than might have otherwise been true. BILL STIGLER has made a fine impression on all Members of Congress. He is respected for himself, for his ability, and for his energy. I can say to the membership that in addition the more closely you are associated with him the more his fine qualities will impress themselves on you.

I know that all Members join with me in wishing for Bill many happy and successful years among the people he loves and who have been so good to him. We will miss BILL STIGLER here, but in his retiring to private life I can repeat what others have said before: It is the ones who you can least afford to give up who quit. Certainly BILL STIGLER is one we can ill afford to give up here, but we know that he will be making his contribution to his district and to his Nation wherever he is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the dean of Oklahoma's delegation to the House of Representatives, BILL STIGLER, has given us an example of a deep and an abiding faith in America by his service in the Congress.

All of us in the House regret that he is leaving us for other work.

Like his illustrious prototype, Carroll of Carrollton—signer of the Declaration of Independence—he is STIGLER of Stigler, Okla. During his lifetime his home has changed from Indian Territory into the great State of Oklahoma. He is one of the finest products of our westward frontiers.

It is to Bill's lasting credit that he has brought to bear his limitless talents and abilities upon helping his fellow Americans throughout his public life.

His courage—fiercely in the forefront during World War I at St. Mihiel and in the Meuse-Argonne—found its ultimate fruition in service here in this House. This courage, with his numerous abilities and his spotless integrity prepared him for his vital role in the deliberations of the Congress. His knowledge of the intricate problems of the American Indians spurred him to advocate legislation for the progress of all Americans and of all mankind.

Wherever he goes, whatever he does, BILL STIGLER will be outstanding. Our heartfelt wishes of Godspeed accompanies him into his new, his chosen paths of service.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD in tribute to Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, this last day of the session of the Eighty-second Congress is a rather sad one. Far too many of our able and distinguished Members are leaving us. I am informed that nearly 40 duly elected Members of this House of Representatives are voluntarily relinquishing their seats to return to the private life of a citizen. I am told by old timers who have served here for many long fruitful years that this is the largest number ever to leave in any one session of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Kentucky, the Honorable THRUSTON BALLARD MORTON, who has so ably and effectively represented the

Third Congressional District of Kentucky, the gateway to the South, that great city of Louisville, is among those who have seen fit not to seek reelection. THRUSTON B. MORTON has been a credit to old Kentucky during his outstanding service in this House. He has approached all legislative problems in a courageous and conscientious manner. He has supported legislation in committee and upon the floor of this House that was to the best interests of all Kentucky, the Nation and toward securing a balanced, honorable and everlasting peace throughout the world. I can never recall a single instance where THRUSTON ever let politics sway or influence his good, sound judgment.

In such times of peril, when the peace of decent, honest, God-fearing, liberty-loving peoples of the world is at stake, this House—this Nation—can ill afford to lose men of his sterling character, his vision, his honesty, and his ability. My colleagues, when this House is losing such outstanding men as MORTON, DOUGHTON, GORE, KERR, HEDRICK, EATON, SASSCER, LEONARD W. HALL, HENRY LARCADE, PICKETT, RAMSAY, STIGLER, FUGATE, BECKWORTH, MCKINNON, ANFUSO, J. CALEB BOGGS, J. M. COMBS, ELSTON, GRANGER, HERTER, HENRY JACKSON, KENNEDY, MIKE MANSFIELD, POTTER, HARDIE SCOTT, STOCKMAN, WOOD, TACKETT, WELCH, LEONARD ALLEN, and many other good and competent legislators far too numerous to mention—it makes one shudder. It is a frightful toll upon our leadership at a time in our Nation's history when we can least spare their intelligence, honesty, perseverence, candor, and capabilities. They shall each be sorely missed—but maybe somehow we can be a little comforted by the knowledge that in our loss here, their friends and loved ones "back home" will gain by their presence, their counsel and their experience.

May the good Lord bless and keep each and every Member who leaves us today. May the good Lord cause His face to shine upon them and give to them and their loved ones peace, happiness, and prosperity for many years to come.

They each have done a splendid job and have served their country well during one of the most crucial periods of its great and glorious history.

Good luck and good fortune to you all—yes, "forever and a day, till these walls shall crumble in ruins and molder in dust away."

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, when I became a Member of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I found as one of my colleagues in the group of Seventy-eighters CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, of Massachusetts. I knew when I first met Mr. HERTER that he had been speaker of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and for many years one of the leading members of the Massachusetts Legislature. It did not take me long to find out the qualities that had made Mr. HERTER so valuable in Massachusetts and that in the last decade have made him so valuable here. I very much admire the unselfishness which dictated Mr. HERTER's decision to seek election as Governor of Massachusetts. The gain to Massachusetts will be very emphatically a loss to this body.

Over the last decade Mr. HERTER has been in my opinion one of our ablest and most useful Members. I served with him on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries where he rendered invaluable service in writing the Ship Sales Act. Later he gave most useful service in the Committee on Rules. Mr. HERTER would be an invaluable member of any committee in the House, but no doubt his greatest contribution has been in the realm of foreign affairs. This was true before he went on the Foreign Affairs Committee as well as after. Mr. HERTER spent many years of his life in Europe, and few Americans are more familiar with the problems of that continent, which he has always regarded sympathetically without ever having been afflicted with a WPA complex.

Mr. HERTER would make an admirable Secretary of State, and I hope that he will sometime fill this post now scarcely less important than the Presidency itself. I also emphatically hope that Mr. HERTER will return to one branch or another of the Congress. We need his outlook on national and international affairs.

Mr. HERTER joins to very exceptional intellectual qualities a character and personality which endear him to everyone who knows him. To serve with him and to work with him has been one of my greatest pleasures in the last decade.

I hope that he will have an overwhelming success in the gubernatorial contest in Massachusetts. If he does, he will make that Commonwealth one of the most distinguished governors in its long history. But in any case, Mr. HERTER should never permit himself a moment of private life. His capabilities for public service are too outstanding. There has never been a time in our history when we could spare men like him. Certainly in our present crisis we must use him to the utmost.

HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. STOCKMAN's decision to leave is deeply regretted by his colleagues. We feel his going is a personal lose as well as a loss to the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Oregon is a man of irreproachable integrity who has ably, diligently, and zealously served his constituency and our country. He is a keen minded, conscientious, and industrious legislator. He is a successful man in every respect, professionally and personally, and his sympathetic, understanding nature has contributed immeasurably to the happiness of his lovely family and the strong bond of friendship which his colleagues feel for him. Mr. STOCKMAN has followed the advice given Andrew Jackson by his mother—he has made friends by being honest, and he has kept them by being steadfast. Nature endowed Mr. STOCKMAN with a warm personality and charm which have won him countless friends, and I consider myself most fortunate to be numbered among them. Good health and good fortune to you and yours, my colleague and friend.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 8:30 p. m.

Thereupon at 8 p. m. the House stood in recess until 8:30 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 8:30 p. m. by the Speaker.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2495)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate numbered 43 to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Incorporated, for operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center after March 31, 1953, unless Congress shall have directed otherwise"; and the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT GORE,
JOHN J. RILEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
HOMER FERGUSON,
STYLES BRIDGES,
L. SALTONSTALL,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 43—Research and Development: Restores language proposed by the House for use of funds by ARO, Inc., but in modified form.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ALBERT GORE,
JOHN J. RILEY,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7391) making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, this conference report provides that no funds shall be made available to the corporation known as Aro which manages the Arnold Engineering Development Center at Tullahoma, Tenn., after March 31, 1953.

It is contemplated that a corporate method will be used to operate this development center when it is completed, and the question of policy has arisen with respect to the matter. This request will give the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress until March 31 next year to determine what the future of this corporation shall be.

If no affirmative action is taken by the Congress, if the Congress does not direct the Air Force to continue this contract, then no funds will be available for further compensation to this corporation after March 31 next.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO TOWN OF DEDHAM, MAINE

Mr. ENGLE submitted the following conference report on the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 2496)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Managers on the Part of the House.
RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE SMATHERS,
HUGH BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House to the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommend in the accompanying conference report, namely, that the Senate recede from its amendment which would require the town of Dedham, Maine, to pay 50 percent of the appraised market value.

CLAIR ENGLE,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
WESLEY A. D'EWART,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2190) to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill was amended by the Senate. The Senate desired a conference to recede from its amendment. The House conferees agreed to the Senate receding and striking its own amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the chairman what matter remains before us? Is it the civil functions bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it proposed that the adjournment resolution follow that?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADWAN. Mr. Speaker, with the steel strike unsettled—with a war going on in Korea, I think it is sheer folly for the Congress to adjourn sine die. If the majority party insists upon jamming such a resolution through the House they will be thwarting the wishes of the American people.

I am vigorously opposed to adjournment sine die and will vote against it.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess at this time subject to call.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 745) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] as a committee to notify the President.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. RABAUT submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2497)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 8 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,160,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For expenses necessary for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interest of commerce and navigation; for surveys of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters, as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins, and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Debris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the Act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States; for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore authorized; for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; $236,788,800, of which amount $75,000 shall be available only for cooperative beach erosion studies as authorized in Public Law Numbered 520, Seventy-first Congress, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $5,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation not to exceed $3,584,100 shall be available for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for expenditure for the purposes of and in accordance with the provisions of the Act of August 8, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 756), and the Act of August 14, 1946 (16 U. S. C. 661–666; 33 U. S. C. 1, 5, 414–415, 441, 451, 540, 541; Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1952)."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Flood control, general: For expenses necessary for the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with flood control, $255,742,800: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike $62,020,000 and insert "$60,020,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$18,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 2.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
FRED MARSHALL,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WM. F. KNOWLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
GUY CORDON,
EDWARD J. THYE,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CEMETERIAL EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $4,160,000 instead of $4,000,000 as recommended by the House and $4,319,350 as recommended by the Senate.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 2: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $236,788,800, instead of $277,135,600 as proposed by the Senate and $189,521,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $255,742,800, instead of $294,777,200 as proposed by the Senate and $214,160,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5—Emergencies: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6—Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate and appropriates $60,020,000 instead of $59,355,000 as proposed by the House and $62,020,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7—Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, emergencies: Appropriates $250,000 as proposed by the House instead of $500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8—Sacramento River: Inserts language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9—Niagara power development: Appropriates $100,000 instead of $900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

Amendment No. 10—Canal Zone Government: Appropriates $18,000,000 instead of $16,139,500 as proposed by the House and $18,822,549 as proposed by the Senate.

1. Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 contain the funds for rivers and harbors and flood control projects respectively. It is the intention of the conferees that the funds contained in amendment No. 3 for rivers and harbors shall be allocated as follows:

Rivers and harbors	
Alabama: Demopolis lock and dam	$4,500,000
Arkansas: Arkansas River and tributaries	4,000,000
Florida:	
Jim Woodruff lock and dam	10,330,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Jacksonville to Miami	2,000,000
Georgia: Buford Dam	3,000,000
Illinois:	
Chain of Rocks Canal	1,150,000
Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis	70,000
Iowa:	
Keokuk, lock 19	1,000,000
Missouri River from Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	4,250,000
Maryland: Baltimore Harbor	500,000
Massachusetts: Channel, Buzzards Bay to Buttermilk Bay	25,800
Minnesota: St. Anthony Falls	1,350,000
Missouri: Missouri River, Kansas City to the mouth	2,300,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers	500,000
New York and New Jersey channels	900,000
New York:	
Buffalo Harbor	436,000
New York Harbor; entrance channels and anchorage areas	524,000
Ohio: Cleveland Harbor	4,750,000
Oregon:	
McNary lock and dam	63,000,000
The Dalles lock and dam	20,000,000
Pennsylvania:	
Monongahela River, lock 2	2,700,000
Schuylkill River (culm removal)	1,000,000
Tennessee:	
Cheatham lock and dam	5,000,000
Old Hickory lock and dam	10,000,000
Texas: Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Galveston district	1,150,000
Washington: Chief Joseph Dam	15,000,000
Reduction in salaries and expenses	−1,000,000
Planning	405,000
Current expenses	77,948,000
Total, rivers and harbors	236,788,000

Of the above amount for current expenses, $675,000 is allowed for river and harbor studies to be allocated as follows: general, $400,000; Arkansas-White-Red River Basin survey, $115,000; and New York-New England survey, $160,000.

In addition, $45,107,900 is allowed for maintenance of channels and harbors, with $2,000,000 to be allocated for realignment of the Missouri River at St. Joseph, Mo.; $20,118,000 is allowed for operation and care of locks, dams, and canals; and $3,100,000 is approved for operation and care of multiple-purpose projects.

The conferees are in unanimous agreement that the funds approved for the Missouri River from Kansas City to Sioux City and Kansas City to the mouth are to be used only for bank stabilization work.

The amount of $663,000 is allocated for salaries and expenses, Office, Chief of Engineers.

The conferees are agreed that not to exceed $250,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available for the repair of lock and dam 10 on the Muskingum River at Zanesville, Ohio. The use of these funds shall be contingent upon local interests supplying the remaining funds needed to repair the dam and upon their agreeing to take over operation and maintenance of lock and dam 10 in the future.

2. It is the intention of the conferees that the funds contained in Amendment No. 4, Flood Control, shall be allocated as follows:

Flood control, general

Arizona: Tucson	$400,000
Arkansas:	
Blakely Mountain Reservoir	6,600,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir	1,000,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam	325,000
California:	
Cherry Valley Reservoir	2,250,000
Folsom Reservoir	17,000,000
Isabella Reservoir	4,000,000
Los Angeles County drainage area	5,000,000
Merced County Stream group	200,000
Pine Flat Reservoir	8,750,000
San Antonio Reservoir	1,000,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir	5,500,000
Connecticut: Mansfield Hollow Reservoir	540,000
Florida: Central and southern Florida	5,000,000
Georgia: Clark Hill Reservoir	4,100,000
Idaho:	
Albeni Falls Reservoir	7,000,000
Lucky Peak Reservoir	5,000,000
Illinois:	
Columbia drainage and levee district	300,000
East Cape Girardeau and Clear Creek drainage district	225,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	1,300,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs	929,300
Grand Tower drainage and levee district	720,000
Prairie du Rocher and vicinity	656,000
Wood River drainage and levee district	848,000
Indiana:	
New Albany	231,000
Vincennes	500,000
Kansas:	
Hutchinson	1,400,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans.	3,750,000
Missouri River agricultural levees	500,000
Tuttle Creek Reservoir	5,000,000
Wichita and Valley Center	2,000,000
Kentucky:	
Ashland	780,000
Covington	825,000
Louisville	4,250,000
Maysville	1,000,000
Pineville	250,000
Louisiana: Natchitoches Parish	$350,000
Maryland: Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va	1,150,000
Minnesota:	
Aitkin	600,000
Red River of the North	625,000
Missouri:	
Perry County levee districts, Nos. 1, 2, 3	800,000
Table Rock Reservoir	3,000,000
Montana: Havre	350,000
Nebraska: Gavins Point Reservoir	7,750,000
New Mexico:	
Jemez Canyon Reservoir	2,155,000
Rio Grande floodway	350,000
New York: Corning	750,000
North Carolina: John H. Kerr Reservoir	6,840,000
North Dakota: Garrison Reservoir	31,000,000
Oklahoma:	
Fort Gibson Reservoir	525,000
Oklahoma City floodway	800,000
Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir	2,125,000
Oregon:	
Detroit Reservoir	10,350,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	16,625,000
Willamette River bank protection	400,000
Pennsylvania:	
Conemaugh Reservoir	4,000,000
East Branch Clarion River Reservoir	850,000
Swoyersville and Forty-Fort	900,000
Williamsport	1,042,500
South Dakota:	
Fall River Basin	427,000
Fort Randall Reservoir	32,500,000
Oahe Reservoir	3,000,000
Tennessee:	
Center Hill Reservoir	250,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir	1,491,000
Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek	700,000
Texas:	
Belton Reservoir	2,500,000
Dallas floodway	1,000,000
Fort Worth floodway	700,000
Garza-Little Elm Reservoir	4,200,000
Lavon Reservoir	462,000
Texarkana Reservoir	5,000,000
Whitney Reservoir	175,000
Snagging and clearing	800,000
Emergency bank protection	350,000
Sec. 212 projects	850,000
Reduction in salaries and expenses	−1,201,000
Planning	850,000
Current expenses	9,222,000
Total, flood control	255,742,800

Of the above amount for current expenses, $1,800,000 is allowed for preliminary examinations and surveys, to be allocated as follows: General, $1,200,000; Arkansas-White-Red River Basin survey, $350,000; and New York-New England survey, $250,000.

The amount of $663,000 is allocated for salaries, Office, Chief of Engineers.

The conferees are in agreement that of the $850,000 allowed for planning $50,000 shall be allocated to Hartwell Reservoir, S. C.

3. With respect to amendment No. 6, the conferees are in complete agreement that the Corps of Engineers shall use as much of the funds recommended therein as will not seriously impair the continuation of projects provided for in the budget estimates for construction of the Yazoo City cut-off and the lower St. Francis River Basin.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KERR,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
FRED MARSHALL,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan about the conference report. It is my understanding that the policy of the committee at the outset of this session of the Congress was to deny projects that were classified as new starts and that that pronouncement was made pretty generally to the Members of the House who inquired of the subcommittee as to the prospects for various and sundry projects recommended by the Corps of Engineers. Most of us pretty generally understood that was to be the formula which would be used by the Subcommittee on Civil Functions.

When the committee marked up the bill it applied that formula; but I believe that after the Senate took the bill up it included certain projects which were new starts. We on this side of the Capitol assumed that our conference would carry forward the policy that they had so clearly enunciated. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Michigan if that policy was followed in disallowing several projects, among them notably Hartwell Dam, and then by allowing a project known as Table Rock, in the same category as Hartwell Dam, Table Rock being in northern Arkansas and southern Missouri, the home State of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. In the first place, the gentleman knows that all legislation is a compromise. For example, the gentleman mentioned Table Rock. Table Rock had a definite project report. The gentleman certainly would not have any disagreement with that.

Mr. PRESTON. I am not informed about that.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, I am telling the gentleman now that it did have a project report.

Mr. PRESTON. I note the budget request came over 4 days after the Senate committee considered it.

Mr. RABAUT. The Hartwell project did not have a definite project report.

Mr. PRESTON. And Hartwell was one of two requested by the President in the interest of national defense.

Mr. RABAUT. That is true, but the situation is just as I stated. I am not quoting my personal opinion about it, but I am quoting what happened in conference. It did not have a definite project report and the cost estimates are not firm, and accordingly it was not adopted in the conference.

Mr. PRESTON. Is it not true that the engineers testified that it was not necessary to have the final project report; that it would be actually more

costly to defer the beginning of this project until the complete project report is filed?

Mr. RABAUT. That is true, but the House has always insisted upon a definite project report, because after all, we are spending the people's money. We have got to know what we are going to get for the money we spend.

Mr. PRESTON. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the time is not far distant when the House will be compelled to exercise more authority in the field of policy regarding flood control, hydroelectric projects and other types of projects in the public interest recommended by the Corps of Engineers. It is becoming increasingly difficult to get the kind of consideration from the subcommittee on appropriations dealing with this very important subject that the various projects really justify. If a firm rule is applied that will treat Tom, Dick, and Harry the same, then none of us has the right to complain, but where a rule is applied to fit one situation in one area of the country and another rule to fit another situation in another part of the country, when, if ever, will we have equitable consideration of these projects that are just as important in the State of Georgia as they might be in the State of Missouri? I hope that this conference report will not be adopted. I hope it will be sent back so that the Members here from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Alabama, Washington, Oregon, Kansas—I could go on naming them—will get the sort of consideration that they ought to have when the other body recognizes the worth of the projects, and then have our conferees adopt a policy that cannot stand up in choosing and selecting the ones to be started.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Do not forget that this same scheme was used to block the appropriation for the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, and the same subterfuge was resorted to. In my opinion, a dishonest, surreptitious report was dragged in here that had no semblance of truth in it.

Mr. PRESTON. I should have mentioned the State of Mississippi in naming the other States.

I think there is one way to stop it. This is the last night of the session. I will not resort to certain tactics that I am sorely tempted to resort to, because the time has come to adjourn the Congress, and I recognize that fact. However, it is quite a while until midnight, and one way to change this policy is by voting down this conference report and letting these distinguished gentlemen have another look at it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would say the State of Missouri was not given preferential treatment. May I point out one project that was turned down by the House because the House Appropriations Committee said there were three reasons for doing so. However, by the time it reached the Senate all of those reasons had been eliminated. The Senate put in $600,000 for Cape Girardeau, where we were flooded eight times in 10 years, stopping service on the main railroad through that city. The Senate put in $600,000. It had a project report before it came to the House. We have met every requirement. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee on what ground he could not include Cape Girardeau after we had met all the requirements of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. RABAUT. It was a matter of compromise. There was no definite project report.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I beg the gentleman's pardon. We do have a project report. It was put out by the engineers. The plans had been assembled. They had an estimate of the cost. It does have a defense significance. Every reason assigned by the House Appropriations Committee was met in the Senate, and the Senate put in $600,000 for it.

Mr. RABAUT. Variety of opinion makes a horse race. The gentleman has his opinion and I have mine. There was no definite project report.

Mr. PRESTON. One further observation and I shall close my comment.

All too often have Members of the House had to rely upon the Senators from their States to do what rightfully should have been done by the Members of the House. It is time to stop it. There is no reason, if a project is meritorious and meets every criterion laid down by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget, why Members of the House who originate these projects should not receive just credit for inaugurating the projects rather than passing them over as ripe plums to the distinguished Senators from our respective States.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BAILEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to object until some member of the committee explains why the item placed in the bill by the Senate was rejected by the House conferees, the item affecting the flood wall on the Ohio River at Wheeling, W. Va. I am not asking for excuses; I am asking for explanations.

Mr. RABAUT. I will have to reiterate my statement to my distinguished friend. I said a few minutes ago that all these matters are matters of compromise. Sometimes we must compromise on this and sometimes we must compromise on that. In this particular case, it was just another matter of compromise.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire further of the gentleman if he considered the House conferees cooperative on the matter of a compromise? Apparently you had your way. You struck out the full amount of $1,500,000. Were there any basic reasons why it was not planned, or was it a new project? Let us have some explanation why it was taken out.

Mr. RABAUT. I will say to the gentleman that the members of the conference committee of the House did everything in their power to do what they thought was right so far as the Members of the House are concerned. You cannot win on every subject.

Mr. BAILEY. I am asking the gentleman if he tried to win on this particular subject.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, we tried to win on all subjects.

Mr. BAILEY. All we get is excuses and no explanation.

Mr. RABAUT. This is not an excuse. I am making a statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for myself with reference to this particular bill, I have this to say. I do not have 5 cents in this bill—not 5 cents and I could even go down to 1 cent. I have taken a lot from my colleagues on this floor because of the fact that I happen to be on this committee. There is no pride on my part when I have to say to a colleague that I cannot do this or I cannot do that. If you people want to continue to make me the whipping boy on this particular bill, just keep this up. I am speaking for a committee—a committee composed of Democrats and Republicans from the House of Representatives. This bill is for America, not just money for the districts of individual Members of Congress.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. FORD. I might add to the comment by the gentleman from Michigan that not one Member on our side of the aisle has one penny of any money whatsoever in this particular bill. The managers on the part of the House got the best possible solution over all for all the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BAILEY. May I inquire of the gentleman from Michigan how much attention was paid to the Senate request for this item?

Mr. FORD. There were nine local flood-protection projects which were included in the Senate version of the bill. The President sent up 10 local flood-protection projects in a subsequent budget request and the other body knocked out one. We had to work out the best possible solution we could. An effort was made on behalf of the Wheeling-Benwood flood-protection project but in the compromise that was effectuated, Wheeling-Benwood had to fall by the wayside.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I feel compelled to say that I want to place myself in the category of the gentleman from Georgia who just preceded me in saying it is high time the House of Representatives took over the management of its own business.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are two projects for national defense recommended by the Director of the Budget. One was Ice Harbor and the other was Hartwell Dam. Every agency connected with the development of water power and electricity recommended that these two projects, especially the Hartwell Dam go ahead. The House Civil Functions Subcommittee turned these projects down, and set out about two pages in explanation about the Hartwell Dam, and gave the reasons why the Hartwell

Dam ought not to be started at this time. In the other body, the Army engineers answered question by question to the satisfaction of everyone to the effect that the construction of the Hartwell Dam should be started. On one of the projects in Kansas, known as Turtle Creek, practically all the benefit is in Missouri. I am not objecting to that project. There was not any report from the Director of the Budget to the House. There was not any report to the other body until after the Senate started the hearings.

Table Rock in Arkansas and Missouri is a project that ought to be started. There was not any report from the Director of the Budget in the House. There was none in the Senate until 4 days after they completed their hearings. You can confirm that by looking at this report. Still they go ahead with these two projects, but the two others, Hartwell and Ice Harbor which are essential to the atomic-energy projects and which were recommended by every agency, are turned down. I am not objecting to these projects which they have approved and I am not criticizing any member of the committee, but I cannot understand why the two essential projects which are 100 percent national defense are turned down.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to take this opportunity to compliment the committee on turning in a very fine performance. They have worked long and hard to bring in this conference report and have earned and deserve the hearty commendations of the Members of the House. However, I do want to take this opportunity also to agree with the expressions of my good friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] that greater consideration should be given to a more equitable distribution of the appropriations, whatever may be determined upon, to the various States which have river-and-harbor and flood-control projects. It is a difficult matter to find out how to get a project included in the bill when it is up for consideration. Even if you have a project reported favorably, it is difficult to get an appropriation included to have the project undertaken. In my State we have many flood-control projects that we would like to see some appropriations recommended for. Pennsylvania is a great contributor in taxes to all of these projects, whether they are hydroelectric, land reclamation, irrigation, flood control, rivers and harbors, or what not. Out of the $472,000,000 for flood-control and river-and-harbor improvements, my State pays around 8 to 10 percent. So what do we get? We get about eight or nine million dollars. We get four or five million dollars on rivers and harbors and perhaps four or five million on flood control. Pennsylvania pays approximately forty-five to forty-seven million dollars, and we see returned to our State eight or nine million. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] that there should be a more equitable distribution, according to the urgent need in the various States, when these appropriations for these projects are set up.

Here is the great State of New York. They, too, have many flood-control problems. They receive $400,000 for clearing New York Harbor. New York is paying about 17 percent of the taxes into the Treasury.

Ohio received some $3,000,000 for the Cleveland Harbor, and they pay around 7 or 8 percent of taxes.

North Dakota is allocated $31,000,000 and South Dakota $30,000,000, and many other States all over the country receive very favorable consideration and substantial appropriations. I am in favor of all of these projects for the development of this great Nation, and building up and expanding our resources, protection of soil, forests, and water. I approve relief from these devastating and recurring floods and harnessing our water for useful purposes and building prosperity for the welfare of all our people. However, I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] has really given us something to think about, that a little consideration should be given some of these other States which have not been receiving the consideration we feel we are rightfully entitled to. We, too, have projects that mean considerable to protection of our economies.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say also that I agree 100 percent with the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON], my distinguished colleague from across the river [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Georgia. I think it is high time that this House stand up for the rights and prerogatives of this body, and I hope that this conference report will be sent back, and that we not only stand up for what we are trying to do for our constituents but also for the American people in every single State of the 48 States. It is time for us to keep some money in America and not scatter it all over the world.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The conference report brought in the full budget estimate for the gentleman's project?

Mr. GAVIN. Not to my knowledge. I have a little flood-control project up in my district, now that you bring the matter up, that I have been working on for many years. Three towns in my district—Ridgway, Johnsonburg, and St. Marys—for the last 40 or 50 years every spring and fall have been subjected to devastating floods; the people should be afforded, and are entitled to, relief. This little project was included for $850,000, and what happened to it? The Appropriations Committee after I appealed to them to increase the amount necessary to complete the project, cut the appropriation $50,000.

Now, I do not mind; I will take my cut along with everybody else. I am for economy as my record proves, but when I see these gigantic hydroelectric projects in the Rhone Valley of France and the spending of billions of dollars all over the world, naturally, I am greatly interested in securing an adequate appropriation for any project in my district which means the protection of and contributes to the welfare of the people who sent me here to represent them. I do not particularly mind telling the gentleman from New York that I am interested in securing any project economically justified which will contribute to the progress and prosperity of my State and its 10,000,000 people.

We pay our share of the national income, and when these projects are recommended and appropriations set up, I think we should be fairly and equitably treated on all projects—flood control, rivers and harbors, and all the rest of them.

I take this time only to concur in the suggestion of my friend from Georgia that we, as representatives of the people, our States, should have a right to an opportunity when these recommendations are made to determine what we rightfully should have and are entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been unable to see a copy of the conference report. There was a project on which I appeared twice before the House Committee on Appropriations, a project that was authorized. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, because I was told in the Appropriations Committee twice that no projects would go into this bill that were not budgeted—I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there are any projects in the bill that have not been budgeted.

Mr. RABAUT. There are one or two. If the gentleman will allow the statement of the managers to be read he will learn what projects are in the bill.

Mr. BONNER. Then I object to the request the gentleman makes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina objects.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman asked that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. BONNER. I object.

The SPEAKER. The objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

(The Clerk continued reading the conference report.)

Mr. BONNER (interrupting the reading of the conference report). Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Will the gentleman tell me now if there are any projects in this bill that do not have budget approval.

Mr. RABAUT. I repeat my statement that there are projects that do not have budget approval. They were a matter of compromise and that is all you can do. As I said, all law is a matter of compromise, and we had to make some compromises in this bill. The gentleman with his long experience knows that that should be and always is the case; I do

not know why he takes such terrific exception to it on this occasion except that its affects him.

Mr. BONNER. Since the gentleman is getting personal about this matter, I think we all are interested in matters that affect us. Now I went before the gentleman's committee and he told me the reason that they could not give any consideration to the worthy project that I presented was because it had not come down with budget approval. Now, then, if I am denied on that ground, certainly I am not going to sit by and see a bill passed in this House, Mr. Speaker, where the same medicine is not fed to others; so when it comes to a matter of this kind, Mr. Speaker, I am going to do all I can to keep this bill from becoming a law tonight.

The SPEAKER. I think the gentleman should renew his request to read the statement.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request to read the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk continued the reading of the statement.

Mr. RANKIN (interrupting reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan if he will tell us whether I am correct in my understanding that $75,000 for elimination of the flood conditions at Bladensburg is included in the bill in a lump sum?

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland that $850,000 in a lump sum is included in this bill for flood-control planning. I think the gentleman's project, which is a worth while one, will receive money from that fund.

Mr. SASSCER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the gentleman be kind enough to advise the membership of the House what the conference did with reference to planning funds for this fiscal year?

Mr. RABAUT. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars for flood control and $405,000 for rivers and harbors.

Mr. HARRIS. Are these funds earmarked?

Mr. RABAUT. They are not earmarked.

Mr. HARRIS. The Army engineers have the authority?

Mr. RABAUT. It is within the discretion of the Army engineers. This is distinguished from what we had last year when they were allocated for national defense projects.

Mr. HARRIS. But are they tied down to particular policies that the Appropriations Committee has given which was a result of the action of about 2 years ago?

Mr. RABAUT. No. The House thought they should be tied down, but the Senate refused to go along, so they are free to use their discretion. We must assume that they will adhere to the projects requested in the budget, if possible.

Mr. HARRIS. They are free to take action on those projects that they think are desirable and in the general interest of the public?

Mr. RABAUT. My distinguished friend is absolutely right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman inform the House how much the various conferees and subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee have been able to cut the budget in this final windup of all appropriations—in round figures?

Mr. RABAUT. I will yield to my friend from Texas to answer that.

Mr. MAHON. I have not seen the exact figure, but I think it is approximately $10,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and all the other members of the Committee on Appropriations for the great work they have done during this session in attempting to save the taxpayers of this country over $10,000,000,000. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan and the conferees, and I hope this conference report is adopted. That is the most encouraging act we have had in this Congress for a long time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] this question. I understood him to say there was $850,000 in the conference report for flood-control planning money.

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I also understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are 28 projects either in the budget estimate or placed in the bill by the Senate; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. There are a good many of them.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. There was $30,000 placed in the bill by the Senate for Beardstown, Ill., to keep that city from floating down the Illinois River. In order to get that planning money we have to go to the Engineers and see if they will give it to us; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there was only $25,000 earmarked for the State of Massachusetts; is that correct? That State contributes a large amount in taxes.

Mr. RABAUT. I will have to correct the gentlewoman. It is $25,800.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In many occasions the gentleman from Michigan has been very cooperative. May I ask another question? I understand there is a certain amount of money that could be used by the Army engineers for projects, and the Merrimac Valley has an authorization to go ahead with projects locally if the Army engineers so indicate. So that my district may secure funds although they are not specified now.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, we have just been informed that we get $25,000 in Massachusetts. I want to thank the committee for putting that in there, because I have stood on this floor here for 5 years trying to get one of 16 projects through, and I have never been able to do it. I think instead of trying to find fault with the committee tonight, the time to find fault is when these bills are up on the floor, and not wait until the last minute when you want to compromise the thing and then try to kick over the traces on the last night.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is a perfect example to his constituents of the man who says: If at first you do not succeed, try, try again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman said there was about $800,000 in this report for planning.

Mr. RABAUT. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars for flood-control planning.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that planning for flood control and rivers and harbors?

Mr. RABAUT. In addition to the $850,000 there is $405,000 for rivers and harbors.

Mr. RANKIN. And it is left to the Army engineers as to where to spend it?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. It is in their discretion. There are no strings tied to it.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to call attention to the fact that we have spent $800,000 on planning on the Tennessee-Tombigbee, and it lacks only a small amount to finish it. Now, are they permitted to use that money for this purpose, under this bill?

Mr. RABAUT. If they deem it a meritorious project.

Mr. RANKIN. They can use it for that purpose?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I understand that the conferees agreed to change the name of the Burr Oak Dam in Ohio to the Tom Jenkins Dam; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. I want to congratulate the committee. It did not cost a dime and it is a good thing for the Congress, for the State of Ohio, and for the country.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee dealing with flood-control projects how much is in there for Colorado?

Mr. RABAUT. Flood-control planning, in which the gentleman is interested, is a lump sum of $850,000. It is up to the Army engineers to distinguish between the projects, and to allocate the funds.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But the committee cut the amount the Senate wanted put in exactly in half.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Colorado has no flood-control estimates here either for construction or planning.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The Army engineers, as I understand, and it appears in the House hearings, had some 90 projects in this country on which they wished to finish their reports. They said they needed a total of $1,600,000 to do that job. I wish to state to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the State of Colorado has the magnificent sum of $20,000 in that report. I am trying to find out whether or not the State of Colorado can get $20,000 to complete the investigation for projects which have been under way for some years.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my distinguished friend that you have Michigan beat by $20,000, and that is my own State.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The people in Colorado are not so much interested in what Michigan is going to get. We want to know what Colorado is going to get.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Before I propound this inquiry I want to state to the gentleman from Michigan that there is not a single penny in there requested for the district I represent, so the gentleman will understand that I am not talking about myself.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman and I are in the same boat.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman has stated in response to the inquiries propounded to him by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] that as far as the planning money of $850,000 was concerned it would be left to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers as to how that money would be expended on the projects that require planning money. Is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. This week the gentleman's subcommittee issued a report in which it found all the fault in the world with the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct, too.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. You state you do not have confidence in that arm of our defense forces, and you say they are not competent to carry out the task assigned to them. Why do you bring in a report here asking them to spend the money if you do not have confidence in them?

Mr. RABAUT. The statement the gentleman makes about the Corps of Engineers is true. I think I can prove to them that the Missouri River, which we have under consideration, had a greater capacity under natural conditions than it now has since the corps has been tampering with it. The Senate insisted that none of this be earmarked, that this be without any kind of string attached to it. We again had to come to the situation that "all legislation is a compromise."

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am not talking about the issue of compromise; I am talking about the statement made by the subcommittee that they did not have confidence in the Corps of Engineers to carry out its work, consequently it should not be entrusted with a responsibility usually imposed on them. Now you say, "It is all right; we are not going to assume the responsibility of telling the House, therefore we are going to dispense with the Corps of Engineers."

Mr. RABAUT. That is the report of our committee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Yes; that is the report. But, you are reneging when you come back here and say we are going to place it in their hands.

Mr. RABAUT. No; we have to compromise with the Senate, and that is why we placed it back in their hands. We still believe that the corps has been most specious and faulty in their handling of this project.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. When the gentleman explained to me a while ago about $850,000 of planning money for 28 projects in the United States, and that you would have to get the engineers to give it to you if you get it, I understand there are some additional unexpended funds in the United States engineers' fund for planning money; is that correct? And if so, I would like to know the amount.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. For flood control on May 31 there was $3,407,083 in unobligated funds.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Is that planning funds?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it obligated?

Mr. RABAUT. Unobligated.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. And that means there will be over $4,000,000—four million planning money available in this fiscal year for flood-control work; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. It would appear that the gentleman is stating the situation correctly.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. How much is unexpended for rivers and harbors?

Mr. RABAUT. For rivers and harbors, $1,261,465 was unobligated on May 31.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I think the chairman of the subcommittee is entitled to a vote of thanks for the way he has handled all of these questions here this evening.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pending the vote on the motion for the previous question, I hope the Members of the House will support the motion. I think in defense of my colleagues on this subcommittee who served as conferees that a word ought to be said about all the comments that have been made about equitable treatment. I think there have been some pretty tortured comments of what equitable treatment means exhibited on the floor here tonight. To some Members it means how much money are we going to distribute out of the Federal Treasury to this State or that district. We have heard all of these complaints about how much money such and such a State put into the Federal Treasury and how little they are going to take out. Then we heard complaints to make it sound as if the only kind of equitable treatment you could give would be to appropriate right here and now in this bill the complete $5,000,000,000 of authorized projects in this country today. Are we going to make these appropriations on the basis of how much money somebody has kicked in or how much money can be dragged out of the Federal Treasury, or are we going to make them on the basis of the need for these projects, and on the basis of the proper protection of the people of this country and the resources of this country, and the development of our natural resources?

I do not think it is fair to this subcommittee, and fair to the House of Representatives to have statements made which sound as if we are putting in appropriations in this bill on a State or sectional basis.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I hope the House will support the motion for the previous question.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PRESTON), there were—ayes 169, noes 19.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The motion to recommit goes to the minority. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the conference report?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the report to the committee of conference with instructions to further insist on disagreement to amendment No. 8.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I am disappointed over the action of the House conferees in reducing the appropriation for examinations, surveys, and other study programs from the Senate figure of $2,400,000 to $1,200,000, as contained in this conference report.

The State of Colorado has only one project that would be affected, and that is the Purgatoire River project at Trinidad, Colo. The Army engineers have requested the sum of $1,600,000 to complete reports on some 90 projects in different parts of the country. When this bill was debated in the House, I offered an amendment raising the appropriation to this amount. I regret that the House conferees did not see their way clear to accept the Senate amendment, which would have made the full amount available.

The Army engineers estimate that it will require the sum of $20,000 to complete the report on this Colorado project. I am hoping that the engineers will be able to make this amount available out of the funds appropriated. However, it would have been preferable for the full amount requested to have been appropriated to avoid any controversy over the projects to be included.

I think the time is here for us to be realistic about these appropriations for flood control. All of us are aware of the tremendous amount of damages caused by floods each year. The projects necessary to control these floods cannot be constructed unless the proper planning is done in advance. I think it is a mistake to cut these planning funds year after year and then expect the Army engineers to do the job that is expected of them.

Mr. Speaker, the amounts involved in this conference report are comparatively small as compared with the staggering sums we are sending to all parts of the world. It has been revealed that flood-control projects in all parts of the world are being constructed with money furnished by the United States and taken from the American taxpayer. Surely the time has arrived when we should take care of the needs of our own country and provide the necessary flood protection for our own people.

Congress has confidence in the Army engineers to adequately handle the flood-control problems of this country. They have always done a good job, and we want them to continue their effective work. To do this they must have the necessary funds for examinations and surveys to determine what projects are feasible. I regret that the House conferees insisted on this reduction.

Mr. IRVING. Mr. Speaker, reference has been made by the previous speakers in regard to two items in this conference report, namely, Table Rock and Tuttle Creek Dams, one of which is in Missouri, but just on the Arkansas line; the other is in the State of Kansas. It is the opinion of some of the experts that the Tuttle Creek Dam is badly needed to prevent floods in that area as well as help eliminate them on the Kaw River in Kansas on down to the Missouri River at Kansas City. Some of the worst flooding in 50 years occurred in Missouri and Kansas last year with millions of dollars of loss in livestock, crops, and farm buildings as well as the great losses in commercial and residential properties. Both the projects are not new, but rather have been planned or projected for the last 12 or 15 years. While I have a high regard for the gentleman from Georgia I did not exactly care for the unfavorable remarks in reference to Missouri and the full committee chairman. They were certainly not deserved and quite unfortunate as I see it. The committee has done a good job and this conference report should be adopted. All of this talk about the moneys spent or appropriated here not being distributed fairly is pure nonsense. Just because one does not get five hundred thousand for a dam project in his State but on the other hand gets an atomic-energy plant upon which the Government spends $200,000,000 or $300,000,000 he feels he has not gotten a fair break. I well remember about the Missouri delegation making a trip to see the Atomic Energy Commission Directors and also President Truman, trying to get an atomic plant located in the Eighth Congressional District of Missouri, which has been so capably represented by our colleague, SID CARNAHAN. There is an ideal location for such a project in that section of his district called the Irish Wilderness. Fate, or some other process, gave it to South Carolina, the State from which Mr. DORN comes, and I understand it is located near the Georgia line. The many benefits that come to the commercial business of the two States, South Carolina and Georgia should be appreciated by these speakers from the two States: I know that the State of Missouri would have gladly accepted this project with attending employment and general prosperity potential. Missouri has not had any such projects such as this or the ones in Tennessee or Kentucky. Yet, we hear criticism and innuendos being hurled because a small appropriation for some flood-control work has now been made.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] refers to his State, also to New York. I would say to him that if he can get his Governor to have his delegates help nominate their adopted son, General Eisenhower, that it is possible he might fare better. I would say that if in 1948 the great Governor of New York had not met up with a gentleman from Missouri that we could say this same thing about him and his State and possibly the gentleman from New York who was chairman of this great committee instead of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I would ask my good friends from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON and Mr. BROWN] also the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] how we all, on this side of the aisle, may have fared if it had not been for a gentleman from Independence, Mo., eliminating Mr. Dewey from the White House and the elephants tramping upon my good friends here in the House, especially some important committee chairmanships that are so useful and dear to the gentlemen from the South. How much pleasure would they have gotten out of going to the very kind and generous, but very practical, gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who might have continued on as a chairman of the Appropriations Committee after the famous economical Eightieth Congress had not the gentleman from Independence, Mo., convinced the people of this great country he should be sent to Washington to run a certain department of the Government and that along with him his party should be returned to control of the Congress. A couple of other times before I have felt it my duty to rise and call attention to unfairness of such references to participation by the State of Missouri in Federal projects. Actually we perhaps have not had our share, so to speak, nor benefited unduly because of our good fortune to be one of the few States that has been so privileged and honored as to be the home of a United States President. Let us adopt the conference report and give the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the members of his subcommittee a pat on the back for their excellent work.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 14, strike out lines 14, 15, 16, and 17, and insert:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of 1 motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Ouachita', and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Greeson': *Provided further*, That the project known as 'Burr Oak Dam, Ohio,' shall hereafter be designated as the 'Tom Jenkins Dam, Ohio'."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of 1 motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Ouachita,' and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Greeson': *Provided further*, That the project known as Burr Oak Dam, Ohio, shall hereafter be designated as the 'Tom Jenkins Dam, Ohio': *Provided further*, That $125,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be used for providing a suitable access road and bridge from the town of Blum, Tex., to the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad station, relocated in connection with the construction of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $250,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be expended for providing a suitable access road from United States Highway 70 north to the bridge built upon and across the Center Hill Dam in DeKalb County, Tenn: *Provided further*, That not more than $40,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Elbowoods, Sanish, and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to join a committee of the Senate to inform the President that the Congress is ready to adjourn, and to ask him if he has any further communications to make to the Congress, has performed that duty. The President has directed us to say that he has no further communication to make to the Congress and he concurs in the adjournment

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 240) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 5, 1952, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question. This question is not debatable.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JAVITS) there were—ayes 174, noes 14.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but I had offered the substitute before the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. No substitute can be offered after the previous question is ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but my motion was offered before any previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The motion for the previous question precludes further action. The gentleman being a good parliamentarian knows that.

Mr. RANKIN. If the Chair wants a point of no quorum made, I can do it. This is not fair treatment.

The SPEAKER. The House has divided and has ordered the previous question.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 163, noes 21.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. The Chair knows that several Members did not vote either way because he was looking at them. [After counting.] Two hundred and sixteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 241

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO APPOINT COMMISSIONS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Speaker be authorized to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 746

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, reports of the Comptroller General of the United States made to the Congress pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597) shall be printed during such adjournment as House documents of the second session of the Eighty-second Congress.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that reports filed with the Clerk following the sine die adjournment by committees authorized by the House to conduct investigations may be printed by the Clerk as reports of the Eighty-second Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE FOR ALL MEMBERS TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege until the last edition authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing is published to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and also to include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks, but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to

any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EVIDENCE AND DOCUMENTS REQUESTED BY COURTS OF JUSTICE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 747

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That in all cases involving the failure of witnesses to appear or refusal of witnesses to answer questions before committees of the House of Representatives properly certified pursuant to the provisions of section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended now or hereafter pending during the Eighty-second Congress in any court of the United States where subpenas duces tecum may be issued by the due process of said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives or any officer or employee of the House of Representatives directing them to appear as witnesses before the said court at any time and to bring with them certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives wherein such documentary evidence is needful in any said court of the United States that Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, or any officer or employee of the House be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpenas duces tecum so issued, but shall not take with them any papers or documents on file in their office or under their control or in their possession as officers or employees of the House; and be it further

Resolved, That when any said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpenas duces tecum then any said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said officers or employees that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said officers or employees shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said officers or employees; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Clerk to any of said courts whenever such subpenas are issued as aforesaid.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the conference report just previous to the passage of that report a while ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

"THE ROAD TO RUIN"

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we, as a Nation, produce more and better machines and implements of all kinds than any other country.

Our people have and enjoy more of the things everyone desires, than have any people anywhere, any time. A greater variety of palatable and nutritious food is available to us than to others anywhere.

Food, clothing, and homes—more of and better than any other people ever possessed—we have.

A cow which produced 726 pounds of butterfat in 305 days, was bred by the American dairyman.

The American cattle raiser puts on four feet more and better meat than is produced in any other country.

The American poultryman has given us a hen which has produced more than 350 eggs a year—the top record.

And, so on, down the list, indefinitely, one might go.

And did all this come about through accident? Certainly not. We are in our enviable situation and condition because, and only because, under our system of Government, man's inventive power and desire for progress have been fostered and encouraged. And—do not forget this—our progress in industry and husbandry in merchandising, in every single activity which has contributed to our advancement and our progress, is based upon the practice of ever seeking the better tool and method, the discarding of the less efficient.

From the days of our forefathers, we have recognized that only through the process of selecting the better, discarding anything and everything when it failed to meet the test of the times, could continued progress be achieved, maintained.

But, today with our one indispensable resource upon which we must depend, not only for our prosperity and happiness, but for the security of our Nation, we are ignoring, we have discarded, the policy which has served us so well in every field of human endeavor.

The industrialist, the merchandiser, the businessman, each and all send their scrap, their culls, to the junk heap.

We, as a people and a Nation have been so frightened by fear created by false propaganda, we have been seduced into the belief that we may abandon the methods which have made us the happiest, the most prosperous, contented, and powerful people on God's green footstool. We have accepted the idea that we may send the best of our young manhood in ever increasing numbers, to fight and die on foreign soil in wars in which we have no real stake, without losing either our prosperity, liberty, or security.

The physically, mentally afflicted young men, the "culls"—here used merely by way of emphasis and respectfully—we keep at home, send to college, hold in reserve for the husbands of our daughters, and upon them depend for the perpetuation of our race. And we bring from other lands hundred of displaced persons.

Of the 2,654,125 men examined between September 1948 and May 1952, 1,063,450—about 40 percent—were rejected as either mentally, morally or physically, unfit to fight the battles on foreign soil.

I am not saying, nor am I intimating, that those who are rejected by our conscripting officials are in the slightest degree to be criticized because they do not meet the standards imposed by the armed services.

What I am saying and intend to say and insist is true is, that if any businessman, any industrialists, any tiller of the soil, any inventor, any professional man, anyone anywhere, followed the practice of destroying the best implements needed in connection with his activities, kept and used the less efficient, his failure would be as certain as day follows night.

What would happen to the cattleman who kept the long-horned, long-legged, bony steer for breeding and thus attempted to produce beef?

What would happen to the poultryman, to the dairyman, the fruit grower, to the farmer, if each sought to further his activities by retaining for his own use—whether it was for production, breeding, planting or sowing—the less perfect materials at his command?

Oh, do I hear you say, "But only the best—those nearest perfection, mentally and physically—can render the utmost of service in wartime"? Quite true. But for how long and in how many wars may we, without disaster, continue to draw upon our store of young manhood?

The logical thing—and if we are to retain our security, make progress—is that we avoid entanglements in the affairs of others which inevitably lead us into wars in which the welfare of our people, the security of our Republic, are not directly involved.

It is axiomatic that we cannot support all those who, by our standards, are underprivileged; that we cannot fight in every war in which some other nation may become involved, without so weakening ourselves that our people will not only lose all those things which make life so enjoyable, lose our individual freedom and liberty, but we will destroy ourselves as a nation.

The time when we, as a people, should—as does every other nation—consider and act for our own security, is long past due.

The accomplishment of a good end is always to be hoped, striven, and prayed for, but foolish indeed is the individual and the nation which destroys itself in

the attempt to bring about the impossible.

Charitable we should be—as always we have been—as the Good Book admonishes us to be charitable, but it also tells us that the Lord helps those who help themselves.

We also know that he who first destroys himself will never be able to help anyone.

The nation which, decade after decade, sends the flower of its youth to fight and die in war, is on the road to ruin.

RECESS VERSUS SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my considered opinion that this House should not adjourn sine die. Instead, there should be a recess with agreement to meet at a day certain—say in 30 or 60 days—or under agreement that we may be called into session upon call of the leadership of either the majority or minority of the House and Senate as a date upon which they may agree. I believe it to be for the best interest of the country that the House and Senate recess and not adjourn.

The situation existing in this country and conditions throughout the world are in such serious condition that the Congress should not, in my opinion, adjourn sine die at this time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others; and

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill of the following title:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419 for certain land in California.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7391) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7313) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," and that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 46 and 53.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes"; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate amendments Nos. 14, 32, 50, 57, 67, and 87 to the above-entitled bill; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate request a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments in disagreement.

Ordered, That Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess subject to call.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 38 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 3 a. m. July 6, 1952.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The message announced that the Senate disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953"; be it

Resolved, That the Senate further insist upon its amendments and requests a further conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. THYE be conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 6, 12, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 35, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59, 81, 82, 90 and 91.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 23, 24, 25, 26, 31, 36, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 60, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 70, 71, 74, 83, 85, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99 and 100, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lines 2 and 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "to remain available until June 30, 1953,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum named insert "$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the following: "fiscal year 1953"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and the

sum proposed, insert the following: "$98,094,000, of which $50,000,000 shall be available only for the weapons program"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$27,909,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,183,498"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$1,750,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,648,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$600,090,000" insert "$585,510,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: In lieu of the sum of "$386,409,840" insert "$361,254,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In the third line of the proposed amendment, after the world "programs" insert the following: ", other than those financed from funds contained in this chapter,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$28,750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 77: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,875,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 78: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 78, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$60,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 86: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "Documents Numbered 144, 154 and 157"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: "Change the section number to 'SEC. 141'."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1412" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1413"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1414"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1415"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 106: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 106, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed by said amendment insert "1416"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 41.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 2: Inserts formal language in the bill.

Amendment No. 5: Strikes from the bill language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6: Strikes out an appropriation for the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER III

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 7: Makes appropriation for airport claims as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IV

Treasury Department

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $5,200,000 for operating expenses of Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of $4,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $625,000 for retired pay, Coast Guard as proposed by the Senate instead of $600,000 as proposed by the House.

Government corporation

Amendment No. 10: Provides $15,000,000 for administrative expenses of Reconstruction Finance Corporation instead of $14,500,000 as proposed by the House and $16,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V

Federal Security Agency

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates $60,000,000 for school construction as proposed by the Senate instead of $80,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Restores formal language to the bill.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15: Strike from the bill appropriations for pay act costs proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $69,750 for Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 17: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates $7,500 for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19: Strikes from the bill an appropriation for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 20, 21 & 22: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 23, 24, 25 & 26: Strike from the bill appropriations for the Public Health Service proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 27 & 28: Make appropriations for the Public Health Service as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates $500,000 for hospitals and medical care as proposed by the House instead of $750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER VII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 31: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 33: Reinserts a House item for emergency repairs and replacement of buildings and utilities damaged by fire, storm, and flood. Appropriates $262,500 instead of $525,000 as proposed by the House. The funds made available are to be used

for buildings and utilities only, and not for roads, parkways or trail construction.

Amendment No. 34: Appropriates $240,000 for further research and control activities in combatting the sea lamprey in the Great Lakes.

Amendment No. 35: Strikes out the amendment of the Senate to provide funds for construction of Minnesota transmission lines. The item has been stricken from the bill with the understanding that it will be given very careful consideration if it is proposed in the budget for 1954.

CHAPTER VIII

Independent offices

Amendment No. 36: Corrects a chapter number.

Executive Office of the President

Amendment No. 37—Alterations and repairs, Executive Mansion: Strikes out the provisions of the House providing $50,000 for extraordinary alterations, repairs, and so forth, of the Executive Mansion and the White House Office, as proposed by the Senate.

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40: Operating expenses: Appropriate $88,094,000 for operating expenses, instead of $35,000,000 as proposed by the House and $141,188,000 as proposed by the Senate, and limits the amount available only for the weapons program to $50,000,000, instead of $30,000,000 as proposed by the House; limit funds available for expenses of program direction and administration personnel to $27,909,900, instead of $25,064,275 as proposed by the House and $30,755,526 as proposed by the Senate; and limit funds available for expenses of travel to $3,183,498, instead of $2,709,350 as proposed by the House and $3,657,647 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 42—Salaries and expenses: Provides $125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 43—Limitation on administrative expenses: Strikes out the provision of the House, and inserts the proposal of the Senate, in this connection.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 44—Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art: Appropriates $187,500 for such purpose, as proposed by the Senate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: Appropriates $150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $85,000,000, as proposed by the House; and provide $1,648,275 for expenses of travel, instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the Senate.

War Claims Commission

Amendment No. 47—Administrative expenses: Appropriates $250,000 for such purpose, instead of $100,000 as proposed by the House and $400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER IX

Department of Defense

Title I—Military Public Works

Amendment No. 48: Corrects a chapter number.

Amendment No. 49—Inserts formal language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51—Department of the Army: Appropriates $585,510,000 for military construction, Army. The House had proposed a total of $600,090,000. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The reduction of $14,580,000 recommended below the House amount represents entire line item projects deleted in the conference agreement on the authorization bill, H. R. 8120, as compared with the House version of that bill.

Amendment No. 52—Department of the Navy: Appropriates $361,254,840 for public works, Navy. The House had proposed a total of $386,409,840. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill. The net reduction of $25,155,000 recommended below the House amount represents $28,527,000 reduced by the conference agreement on H. R. 8120 as compared with the House version; and $3,372,000 added as provided in H. R. 8120 for naval aviation training at Lincoln, Nebraska.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55—Department of the Air Force: Appropriate $1,200,000,000 for acquisition and construction of real property, Air Force, as proposed by the House. The Senate had stricken the entire amount from the bill.

Amendment No. 56: Restores the provision of the House restricting the use of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts within the continental United States.

Amendment No. 58: Restores provisions of the House restricting the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry cleaning facilities, and prohibiting the establishment or maintenance of a separate supply service for the Air Force.

Amendment No. 59: Corrects a section number.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Alaska communication system

Amendment No. 60—Construction: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House earmarking $5,000 for painting a specific building in Alaska.

CHAPTER X

Department of Defense

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI

Mutual Security

Amendment No. 65: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 66: Places a limitation on the number of persons employed at per diem rates as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 68: Includes explanatory language of the Senate with an amendment. The committee does not intend that the quantity of American agricultural products or commodities be reduced below that heretofore purchased because of this language.

Amendment No. 69: Strikes out language proposed by the House placing restrictions on employment of personnel.

CHAPTER XII

Emergency agencies

Amendment No. 70: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 71: Appropriates $1,250,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 72: Appropriates $2,875,000 for Defense Production Administration instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Appropriates $3,750,000 for Small Defense Plants Administration instead of $3,500,000 as proposed by the House and $4,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Appropriates $1,500,000 for revolving fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 75: Appropriates $28,750,000 for Department of Commerce instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House and $32,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 76: Appropriates $3,100,000 for Department of the Interior instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House and $3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 77: Appropriates $1,875,000 for Department of Labor instead of $1,750,000 as proposed by the House and $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 78: Appropriates $60,000,000 for Economic Stabilization Agency instead of $57,130,000 as proposed by the House and $75,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 80: Appropriates $6,500,000 for General Services Administration instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House and $8,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 81 and 82: Appropriate $8,000,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration as proposed by the House instead of $20,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 83: Appropriates $15,000,000, for Federal contributions as proposed by the Senate instead of $29,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 84: Appropriates $20,000,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of $50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XIII

Claims, audited claims, and judgments

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Inserts formal language in the bill.

CHAPTER XIV

General provisions

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 90 and 91: Limit the amount which may be paid for automobiles by the Government to $1,400 as proposed by the House instead of $1,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100: Insert formal language in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 101: Restores language proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, and 106: Correct section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 7, strike out:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $1,450,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project."

And insert the following:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'plant and equipment,' $1,450,000,000, of which $1,355,398,000 is for (i) expenditures during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, or thereafter under contracts and against other obligations in an aggregate amount of $3,518,800,000 for the foregoing purposes which the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to enter into pursuant to the authority of this act as necessary or appropriate to carry out the program as recommended by the National Security Council, approved by the President of the United States, and submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission and (ii) settlement and payment of termination claims under such contracts if additional appropriations to permit continuation of performance under such contracts are not hereafter made: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs as provided in the contracts, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, may be used, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding, to start new construction projects directly and primarily related to thermonuclear matters."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert the following: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,000,000,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available to the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment, or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, briefly, what this does is to add about $550,000,000 and explain the language in great detail. It is crystal clear.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, RABAUT, MCGRATH, GARY, TABER, DAVIS of Wisconsin, and FORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to call.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes a. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes a. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. LANDERS, its clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes"; be it further

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment numbered 41 and request a further conference in the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, MAHON, THOMAS, WHITTEN, GARY, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, and DAVIS of Wisconsin.

SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE NEXT WEEK

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet on the following Thursday and that when the House adjourns on Thursday next it adjourn to meet on the following Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7289. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents"; and

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 1999. An act relating to withholding, for State income-tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of the Emergency Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan.

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma;

2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, Stat. 825);

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson (Jr.);

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere;

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin;

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor and for other purposes;

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. VAN ZANDT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WERDEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. LANE) in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLATNIK and to include an editorial.

Mr. DENNY.

Mr. VINSON and to include a report on legislation enacted by the Armed Services Committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

Mr. SECREST and to include a radio address over Station WLW.

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri) in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an article.

Mr. MURRAY on the work and accomplishments of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service during this Congress.

Mr. BRAY in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HUNTER and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a resolution recently adopted by the Thirty-second Annual Convention of the New England Zionist Region.

Mr. MANSFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two separate instances.

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK).

Mr. POULSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming) in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. STAGGERS in three separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a speech made at Boston, Mass., on July 3 by Mrs. India Edwards, vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. DAWSON (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) and to include extraneous matter, which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $340.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include appropriate matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GAVIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. JAVITS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD following the statement by Mr. JENSEN on the Minnesota lines.

Mr. WOLVERTON in six instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURNSIDE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TABER and to include tables dealing with appropriations.

Mr. THORNBERRY (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

RECORD OF THE EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I arise to review the record of the Eighty-second Congress. We have worked in a grave and dangerous time, with the peace of the world and, indeed, the fate of mankind, resting upon our deliberations. The free world put faith in us and we have not failed.

No legislative body in all history has dealt with more difficult tasks in the cause of freedom. We have in the main passed legislation and made appropriations that have kept the fires of liberty burning. We have strengthened hope in the hearts of oppressed peoples the world over.

When this Congress met 18 months ago it truly had a rendezvous with destiny.

We confronted the terrifying problems: First, to marshal the free world to stop the march of communism short of all-out war and, second, to protect our own free-enterprise system as the living, vibrant proof that freemen are superior to men who are slaves, and that governments of free men and women can function effectively in a grave emergency.

Mr. Speaker, how have we answered these unprecedented challenges?

This Congress has committed the might of the greatest Nation on earth to the defense of freedom in the global struggle against the way of death of international communism. Destiny decreed that we should lead the free world in this crucial hour of history. We have provided—and will continue to increase—the means of military strength so powerful that no dictator in his right mind would dare attack us. Moreover, we are arming the free world with guns, with economic vitality, and above all, with spiritual force, for our mutual protection.

These are monumental achievements, Mr. Speaker, unmatched anywhere in history.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is one other.

We have brought about the greatest era of prosperity this Nation or any other nation ever has known, so abundant has been the energy and vision of our Government, our enlightened business leaders and our great working forces in factory and on farm.

Our people are better fed, better clothed, better housed than ever before, and they have more of all the things that contribute to a good way of life.

It is the prosperity of all of our people, not of a special group. It is the prosperity emanating from the people upward, and not the trickling process from the special interests downward, with very little of such prosperity getting down to our people generally.

Notwithstanding the pressure of building our defenses against threats of armed aggression, this Congress has found time to pass legislation to make these United States a happier place for its citizens. Over the last 20 years, under Democratic administrations, we have seen great improvements in the standard of living of the American family. And there lies the strength of America—in the family. A strong family life means a strong America.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty here to set down a summary of the work of this Congress, for the future generations to see the challenges we faced and how we dealt with them.

COMMUNIST AGGRESSION STOPPED

The most vital single accomplishment of the Eighty-second Congress in the direction of world peace was its authorization of the Mutual Security Program. This legislation is the keystone of American foreign policy today as it has evolved through this long trying era of the cold war.

Six years ago, amidst the rubble and ruins of a war-shattered Continent of Europe, lay the rich prize at which Kremlin leaders grasped; the coal, the iron ore for steel, the technical skills, and all the other potential resources of a war-making economy needed to further their plans for world conquest, as well as 200,000,000 more enslaved persons.

What communism did not conquer by force of its so-called "liberating armies" it gained by internal subversion, capture of the reins of government, and imposition of police-state rule, to the accompaniment of mass purges and deportations. One after another small nations on its northern and eastern borders—and beyond—were completely absorbed or subjugated within the orbit of satellite states, later to become provinces of the Soviet Union.

The march of the juggernaut was first stopped as it reached out for the Dardanelles, when the Truman doctrine was enunciated and then implemented by military assistance to Greece, beleaguered by Communist guerrillas, and to Turkey, with the Soviet pressure upon its borders.

Emergency postwar relief and rehabilitation measures carried out by UNRRA were followed by the Marshall plan to aid the economic recovery of Europe. In 3 years this policy, under the Economic Cooperation Administration, accomplished the miraculous restoration of the Continent's productive capacity.

Meanwhile, the Communist drives to capture France and Italy—and if successful, would in all probability have meant all of Europe—by internal subversion were beaten down and the allied airlift defeated the blockade of Berlin.

Now, with their economy on a sounder footing, their morale lifted, and their will to resist stirred by our aid and our determination, Europe's tired millions roused themselves to join in the program of mutual assistance. The revival of their moral strength was followed by a marked increase in their economic and military strength.

The North Atlantic Treaty was signed and a joint program of military build-up was undertaken. The Schuman plan to integrate the resources of the European defense community was adopted. Further important steps to implement and strengthen the Schuman plan are under way.

It was this Eighty-second Congress, by the Mutual Security Acts of 1951 and 1952, that set up the means for the people of the free world to build a common defense against the ravages of international communism. Under the mutual security agreements, we furnish European countries weapons and equipment, and the machinery for manufacture of armament; and the United States, in turn, obtains critical minerals and materials which are unavailable, or in short supply, here for our own defense mobilization program and for our normal business economy.

While some reductions in authorizations and appropriations were made, this legislation still covers a rounded program including not only military supplies but economic aid and technical assistance under the point 4 program.

Equally as important as weapons in the arsenal of democracy is knowledge with which to raise the standard of living among millions of people in underdeveloped countries. Through the point 4 program of technical assistance American scientists, agriculturists, public health experts, and other specialists are teaching the people of many lands to make better use of their natural and human resources in combating the hunger, poverty, and disease which makes them an easy target for communism. This plan should be extended in the future. It is putting the moral law we believe in, into affirmative and dynamic operation. It is invaluable in the battle of the minds that exists in the world of today.

The monumental legislation covering all the programs for the Far East, the Middle East, and Latin America, as well as Europe, provided authorizations totaling nearly $14,000,000,000 for the 2-year period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1953.

The Eighty-second Congress also contributed to the consummation of two historic steps which immeasurably strengthened the security arrangements of the United States. The state of war with Germany was terminated. Then a peace treaty with Japan brought World War II officially to an end. Thus, both of these former enemy countries—except for the Russian-occupied parts of Germany—were restored to the position of sovereign and independent members of the family of free nations, alined on the side of democracy against international communism.

Security pacts with Japan, as well as with the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, have firmly established a collective-security system in the Pacific.

Western Germany, as a new Federal Republic, was restored to the status of equality with other free nations by Senate approval of its convention with the three powers—United States, England,

and France. And ratification of a protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty gives guaranties of mutual assistance in the event of attack, to the members of the European defense community of which Germany is one.

This Congress also ratified the extension of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to Greece and Turkey, thus further buttressing the structure of strength designed to maintain the peace.

WE ENCOURAGED WORLD TRADE

Another major contribution to world security was enactment by the Eighty-second Congress of the reciprocal trade agreements program for another 2 years.

It is an old lesson of history that where the normal routes of trade are shut off they sooner or later become the highways for economic discontent, jealousy, and for marching armies. The free flow of commerce encourages peace, just as restrictions and trade barriers may lead to war. But the key word in this program is the word "reciprocal," and international trade operates only on a two-way street, between nations mutually desirous of maintaining normal and friendly relations.

Thus reciprocal trade fits directly into our program of mutual security with other free nations of the world. Put in simplest terms, the dollars which we expend to pay for things we need, helps their economy contribute to their own military strength and enables them, in turn, to buy from us the products they need.

This program is the greatest of the many contributions made to our progress by that great American, Cordell Hull, for this was the seventh renewal by Congress of its expression of faith in the policy inaugurated under Secretary of State Hull in 1934. Our action reemphasized our abandonment of the discredited theory of economic isolationism and acceptance of the common-sense view that we must buy from others if we expect to sell our own goods abroad.

The law giving the President authority to negotiate these agreements contains safeguards against possible damage to the interests of domestic industry and agriculture. It also carries certain Republican-sponsored restrictive clauses such as were enacted by the Republican Eightieth Congress. Fortunately, however, these cannot hamper the program to the same degree, since no general tariff and trade conference will take place before this law comes up for renewal in the Eighty-third Congress.

In view of the restrictive trade policies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and their satellites, their products, under the terms of this law, and properly so, are denied the benefits of concessions.

To shut off a flow of war materials to those iron-curtain countries this Congress imposed a ban on the export from the United States of military items to Communist-controlled nations. At the same time we provided for restrictions on aid to other countries making such exports. The effect of this legislation has been to close the cracks through which material that might later be used against the free nations was seeping into Communist hands in Europe, China, or elsewhere.

The authority of the President to control exports was extended, in another measure, to June 30, 1953, thus putting our Government in a position to make certain of the flow to our allies of items most essential to their needs in exchange for critical and strategic materials necessary for our own defense stockpiling.

In line with this policy is the provision in separate laws, for the temporary suspension of import duties and taxes on lead, zinc, scrap metal, and other items.

FOOD FOR HUNGRY MILLIONS

This Congress responded in its first session last year to the appeal of India for aid to feed the hungry millions of that famine-stricken land. This followed America's best traditions and highest ideals of aiding fellow men in distress.

The Eighty-second Congress authorized the Government to send up to 2,000,000 tons of food grains to India during 1951. The $190,000,000 emergency loan authorized for this purpose is financed over a long period of years. Its liberal terms are such as not to burden India during a period when it is beset by problems growing out of its recently won independence, and a series of catastrophes resulting from floods, earthquakes, and droughts.

While taking every necessary measure for the defense and the security of this country against the threats of attack by communism, this Eighty-second Congress has made unmistakably clear the sincere hopes and the desires of our people for peace. In Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 we reaffirmed the friendship of the American people for all the people of the world, including the inhabitants of the Soviet Union.

At the same time that we sought to have these heartfelt expressions pierce behind the iron curtain to our fellow human beings imprisoned there, we had no hesitancy in denouncing the police-state methods of their rulers.

This Congress, in House Concurrent Resolution 140, gave voice to public condemnation of the arrest and conviction of William N. Oatis, an American newspaperman, by the Communist Government of Czechoslovakia.

In the aftermath of World War II in which great masses of people were uprooted from their homes and wandered, as refugees, from one country to another, the problem of their resettlement became one of world-wide concern. This Congress, through appropriations in support of various international organizations, has contributed to efforts at solution not only of this great humanitarian problem but also of the whole larger problem of overpopulation. These appropriations give recognition to the fact that until these problems are solved complete political and economic stability cannot be attained in Europe and in other countries affected by them.

We authorized $9,000,000 for support of the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee on the Movement of Migrants from Europe, $130,000,000 for Arab and Israeli refugees, and funds to assist certain refugees who have escaped from behind the iron curtain.

In other legislation we have authorized funds for the relief of organizations in the Philippines which aided our Pacific forces in World War II so that their churches and schools may be rehabilitated.

WE BUILD OUR MILITARY MIGHT

Our program of mobilization for defense has centered on three objectives:

First. Build-up of our military manpower and organization.

Second. Gearing our economic system for defense production.

Third. Strengthening our safeguards for internal security against subversion and sabotage.

We provided funds to make possible the expansion of our Air Force to 143 wings. As a result of this congressional action the production of planes will be stepped up to reach that goal.

This Congress extended to July 1, 1955, the authority to induct men into the armed services. The ceiling on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces was raised to 5,000,000 men and women until July 31, 1954. The new law fixed the minimum draft age at 18½, with a reservation that no one can be inducted between 18½ and 19 so long as there are men between 19 and 26 available for induction. The term of service was increased from 21 to 24 months. This was essential for the defense of, and if necessary, the self-preservation of our country.

Legislation has been enacted reorganizing on a uniform and equal basis all Reserve components of the armed services and fixing the periods of duty required. This law also aimed at eliminating injustices.

The status of the United States Marine Corps was clarified by another act putting a ceiling of 400,000 on its personnel strength in peacetime, establishing it on a 3-division basis with supporting aircraft, and assuring that its Commandant will have a voice on the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all matters directly affecting the corps.

In the 2 years of the Eighty-second Congress we have appropriated for the maintenance of our expanded Army, Navy, and Air Force the huge sum of more than $100,000,000,000. This includes the cost of supporting our forces in Korea.

We also passed legislation authorizing—and providing funds for—a great program of conversion of old and construction of new vessels to expand our Navy, including immediate construction of a giant new 57,000 ton aircraft carrier, equipped to handle atomic bombers. A second supercarrier has been authorized. We allowed increased expenditures for experimental work on atomic-powered submarines.

At the same time, as a supplement to our armed sea power, this Congress promoted development of the American merchant marine by legislation to encourage a long-range program of ship construction and operation.

We approved a program and provided further funds for construction of a

globe-girdling string of new air-bases and expansion of old bases that will give our Air Force strategic take-off points for immediate retaliation in the event of attack on the United States or outbreak of new conflicts elsewhere.

Regular appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission were increased by more than a billion dollars to cover expansion of its plant capacity and to expedite stockpiling A-bombs and its other work. Research and experimentation by various agencies in the development of rockets, guided missiles, and other "fantastic weapons" was provided for in other appropriations. New construction at laboratories and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was authorized.

A research and experimental laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps was approved.

OUR ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION

The Defense Production Act is the main instrumentality of our economic and industrial mobilization. It provides the Executive with authority to obtain the increase in production needed to meet our rearmament program, and to supply our forces in Korea, and authorizes the President to expand the industrial base for production in event of all-out war.

As originally enacted by the Eighty-first Congress 2 years ago—after the Red invasion of Korea—this law was intended to enable the President not only to fix priorities for, and to allocate, defense materials and facilities but also to give him the power to combat inflation resulting from increased governmental defense expenditures.

Although the peak of this extraordinary but essential Federal spending has not yet been reached, this Congress, in twice extending and reenacting the law, has weakened the Executive authority to control consumer credit, prices, wages, and rents.

As the compromised new law stands today, the President will continue to allocate defense materials and facilities, to buy raw materials, and to guarantee and make loans for expansion of defense plants for 1 year, to June 30, 1953.

But price and wage controls—already weakened—are to expire next spring, April 30, 1953. All rent control authority extends to that same date, but cannot be effective beyond September 30 of this year, except in critical areas, unless local governments take affirmative action for its continuance.

The question of the wisdom of such drastic curtailment of authority in the face of possible resurgence of inflationary forces was discussed fully when the bill was before this House. I will not attempt now to resume the debate. In any event, under great difficulties, the bill was passed by Congress, in weakened condition but possessing control powers that may prevent uncontrolled inflation.

The new Defense Production Act retains provision for the Small Defense Plants Administration. This independent agency was created in the 1951 act to carry out the often-expressed intent of the Congress that small business should be given a greater part in the defense effort. It was granted powers to make contracts with the Government for subletting to small manufacturing plants, or to facilitate the channeling of contracts to them, provide technical and managerial aids, finance the equipment of plants, recommend loans and perform other helpful functions.

Continuance of subsidies for domestically produced minerals is authorized. Controls over imports of fats and oils, peanuts, dairy products, rice and rice products—to protect domestic markets—are also continued in modified form in this measure as finally enacted.

The Congress extended many of the statutory emergency powers granted the President during World War II. These powers normally would have expired with ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty but now are continued through the Korean emergency.

Presidential authority to revise and expedite defense contracts—contained in the title II of the First War Powers Act—was extended to June 30, 1953.

To speed the transportation of materials, increased appropriations were authorized for construction of access roads certified as essential to national defense.

WE STRIKE AT ENEMIES WITHIN OUR GATES

This Congress, in numerous acts, took steps to guard the Nation from subversive influences, saboteurs, and spies.

Especially intended to facilitate action against secret agents who may have infiltrated through use of false documents, a bill was enacted extending for 10 years the statute of limitations for prosecution of violations of passport and citizenship laws.

The establishment of facilities for detention of aliens who enter the United States illegally was authorized in another enactment.

To free the Federal Bureau of Investigation for its larger task against espionage the duty of making of certain loyalty investigations of new Federal employees was transferred to the Civil Service Commission.

Authority was granted by the Congress for withholding of certain patents whose publication might be detrimental to national security.

Strict Government control over electromagnetic radiation in time of national emergency was provided in another law to assure against sabotage of communications facilities. In addition the Federal Communications Commission was permitted to purchase sites for construction of radio monitoring stations which can quickly detect and locate the source of illegal broadcasts, and the construction of a geomagnetic station was authorized.

However, in the face of possible atomic attack on American cities and despite urgent requests of President Truman, the United States Conference of Mayors, and officials of various States, the appropriations for the Federal Civilian Defense Administration were reduced below budget estimates. I hope in the next Congress the importance of civilian defense will be recognized and the necessary appropriations made. For adequate civilian defense goes hand in hand with adequate military defense.

A SOUND ECONOMY

As this Congress adjourns we have just reached the end of fiscal year 1952 with a deficit slightly over $4,000,000,000; much less than had been expected. This deficit would have been far greater had we not, against powerful opposition, enacted at our first session a tax bill to provide additional revenues of more than $5,600,000,000.

Action alone is the best basis for judgment of true political motives. Demanding vigorous action against communism, many of my Republican colleagues refused to provide the funds to meet the cost of security programs at home and abroad. Calling for a halt to inflation, they nevertheless fought against controls. They want to have their cake and eat it too. These tactics will fool no one, least of all the voters at the next election.

PRICE OF FREEDOM

The truth is that there is no cheap or easy path to freedom or to peace. The cost comes dearly. But even the high price we are paying to avoid a third world war is cheaper in the long run—in lives and dollars—than the complete destructiveness of modern, atomic warfare on a world-wide scale.

However, in spite of partisan allegations that the Democrats are spending the country into bankruptcy, this Nation has never been richer, industry is prosperous and the individual is enjoying the highest standard of living.

That our national economy is expanding is evidenced by the fact that the gross national product—the market value of all final goods and services produced in the United States—today is at a record high. For the second quarter of 1952 it was running at the annual rate of $345,000,000,000.

Corporate profits—after taxes—were $18,900,000,000 at the end of 1951, third highest in history. Personal income—also after taxes—is continuing at the record peacetime rate of $228,500,000,000, and out of this individuals are saving $17,000,000,000.

Besides the tax increase voted by this Congress we assured additional revenues of approximately $117,000,000, again against powerful opposition, by increasing the postal rates.

An additional $1,000,000,000 is estimated to be forthcoming to the Government as a result of Congress' passage of a Renegotiation Act under which overpayments made on defense contracts will revert to the Treasury. By enactment of an amendment to the Assignment of Claims Act we encouraged banks and other financial institutions to lend to contractors engaged on Federal defense projects.

The Congress, conscious of the importance of highway transportation to a sound economy, authorized annual appropriations of $550,000,000 in each of the next 2 years for allocation to the States as the Federal Government's share of projects for highway construction and maintenance.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PAYMENTS INCREASED

While Congress was burdened with many problems, it did not overlook our elderly citizens or our needy citizens.

More than 9,000,000 persons will be aided by the action of this Congress increasing payments to beneficiaries of the old-age and survivors insurance fund of the social-security system, and enlarging Federal grants to the States for direct relief to the needy aged, the blind, the dependent children and the permanently and totally disabled.

The 4,500,000 retired men and women now on the social-security insurance rolls will receive an additional $5—or 12½ percent whichever is greater—on their monthly check. It is estimated that this increase averaging about $6 per month, will mean a total additional expenditure of approximately $300,000,000 from this fund. However, no increase in the present payroll tax which finances the fund will be required.

Under another section of the new legislation, $240,000,000 would be added to the annual grants allocated to the various States as the Federal Government's share in assisting more than 2,500,000 needy aged men and women, 2,000,000 dependent children and parents, 138,000 disabled persons and 97,000 blind. The increase in the Federal grant would be equivalent to $5 a month in each type of grant except that for children which would be $3.

Benefits now being received under federally aided State old-age assistance programs average $44.77 per month.

Of those now on the social-security rolls, a single, retired worker is paid an average of $42 per month, a widow $36, and a retired worker and his wife $70 per month.

This Government could make no worthier expenditure in this period of higher living costs than granting this larger measure of assistance to these people living on small fixed incomes.

FARM INCOME PROTECTED

The Eighty-second Congress, under Democratic leadership, took further steps in the long-range program to assure farmers of the Nation a fair return on their crops. Congress provided for continued price support for the basic crops at 90 percent of parity.

We have provided for a continuation of our great soil conservation program.

A broad program of land restoration and rehabilitation is under way in many States affected by recent floods. More than 10,000 farms in the heart of the Nation's most productive cropland—in Iowa, Missouri, Montana, Utah, Nebraska, Kansas, the Dakotas, Minnesota and Wisconsin—will benefit by this program.

In addition to soil conservation work on the farm, the program calls for restoring channel capacity in streams.

The shortage of domestic farm labor for harvesting our country's crops will be supplemented by Mexican workers under a new agreement with Mexico pursuant to a law enacted by the Eighty-second Congress. This legislation and the agreement executed under it will not only assure farmers of sufficient help by the importation of these migratory workers, but makes certain that no domestic worker is deprived of an opportunity for a job.

Other agricultural legislation made adjustments in peanut and tobacco marketing quotas and acreage allotments and liberalized the loan provisions under the Bankhead-Jones Farmer Tenant Act.

PROTECTIONS FOR LABOR

One of the admitted defects in the Taft-Hartley law was remedied when the Eighty-second Congress amended the Labor-Management Relations Act to remove unjust restrictions against union-shop agreements.

This action of the Congress shows the growing recognition of the need for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and for the substitution of organic legislation that will then make it possible for both management and labor to bargain in a friendlier and less restrained atmosphere and without the necessity for governmental intervention on the side of management.

To prevent a recurrence of recent fatal mine disasters in which hundreds of workers have lost their lives, this Congress has enacted improved amendments to the 1941 mine inspection law. While a compromise, this bill is an improvement over existing law. It should be strengthened in the future.

Under existing law, Federal inspectors could merely investigate and make recommendations, but they have now been given enforcement powers and authority to close mines where dangerous conditions are not corrected. Previously enforcement powers lay only in State agencies.

Railroad workers or their families are receiving larger annuities, pensions, and survivors' benefits due to the action of this Congress in voting increases under the Railroad Retirement Act. In addition we raised the benefits under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, and established a joint committee for study of all railroad retirement legislation.

In line with higher living costs, all Government employees were voted pay increases and their retirement annuities were raised. Reclassification and simplification of salary schedules in the postal service has removed inequities.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN BENEFITS

In recognition of the obligation to those who bear arms in the Nation's defense, the Eighty-second Congress has justly increased the benefits they receive.

More than 3,000,000 veterans and dependents of deceased veterans will get increased compensation and pensions under a bill approved at this session. A companion act liberalized the limitation on other income a person may receive and still be eligible for a pension.

These two measures, which apply to those in the Armed Forces since the Red invasion of Korea as well as to World Wars I and II veterans, will add an estimated $200,000,000 to payments made by the Veterans' Administration during fiscal 1953.

This Congress enacted a billion dollar a year program extending educational and training benefits to post-Korea veterans, similar to those under the original GI bill of rights, with safeguards against possible abuse of the program. In addition these later veterans have been put on a par with their comrades of the world wars for hospital, medical, housing and rehabilitation benefits.

To all members of the armed services we gave an increase in base pay and allowances, and to those in combat in Korea we gave an extra $45 a month.

In addition we authorized the issuance of $10,000 free life insurance policies to personnel of the Armed Forces.

These are but the major items in a comprehensive program of legislation affecting war veterans and our sons in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps today.

MORE HOMES ARE BUILT

Another important accomplishment in the interest of the security and welfare of our citizens was enactment of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act and amendments to veterans legislation.

This legislation, involving about $3 billion, renewed direct housing loans to veterans and promoted a program of new home construction in defense-production areas and in the vicinity of military installations. It increased the authority of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages.

A fund was created for loans and grants for construction and operation of community facilities such as waterworks and hospitals in instances where these projects cannot be financed locally. Provision also was made for purchase of housing sites and for loans to stimulate production and distribution of prefabricated houses.

Funds were provided to expand the public housing program.

We also extended and enlarged the authority of the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase mortgages on veterans' cooperating housing and projects in defense areas.

Another enactment at this session permits progress payments by the Federal Government as aid to slum clearance and urban redevelopment projects.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPED

The riches that abound in our natural resources are a treasured heritage which it has been the aim of the Democratic Party always to conserve and to develop for the benefit of the people. As in all other progressive legislation, the Democratic Party is the leader in this all-important field.

Through appropriations for soil conservation, irrigation, and reclamation projects we have made possible greater productivity of the land God has given us, and restored to use vast areas of the West. In 2 years this Congress has made available more than $700,000,000 for these purposes.

By providing funds for construction of dams, reservoirs, and hydroelectric plants we have not only built safeguards

against floods but also added much-needed electric power output at reasonable rates. These appropriations totaled over $160,000,000 for the biennium.

The Democratic Party inaugurated this program. It has courageously gone forward in saving and using the great natural resources of our country for the best interests of our people. And this has been done in a manner that strengthens our system of private enterprise. This great program should be extended in the years that lie ahead.

Through maintenance and improvement of navigation channels and flood-control projects on our waterways we have promoted water-borne commerce and prevented the costly waste caused by damage when rampaging rivers burst their bounds. In the past 2 years we have appropriated over $1,000,000,000 for such public-works projects.

GENERAL WELFARE

Disastrous floods and tornadoes which struck the Midwest and Southwest last year and this spring brought prompt action for relief by the Congress. Over the 2-year period more than $150,000,000 was made available not only for emergency relief of the victims but also for rehabilitation of the stricken areas for increased emergency flood relief work by the Corps of Engineers and for disaster loans administered through the Farmers Home Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

To protect the health of the people we enacted a more stringent law regulating the refilling of prescriptions for certain drugs. A thorough study was made of the problem of chemicals in food, drugs, and cosmetics.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

The Eighty-second Congress added two major reforms to the record of this Administration which has put into effect more than half of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission under the Reorganization Act of 1949. Studies were made looking toward further improvements in governmental functions.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue was reestablished upon a basis to bring about increased efficiency of its operations and to provide better machinery for assuring fair, honest and impartial administration for all the taxpayers.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was reorganized under another plan approved by this Congress. This agency was placed under authority of a single administrator with major responsibility. A loan policy board, including in its membership the Secretaries of Commerce and the Treasury, was created to coordinate the Corporation's loan policies with other policies, programs and activities of the Government.

Under reorganization of the RFC, all of its loans are of such character as to accomplish the objectives of the basic law and intent of Congress that it aid in financing industry, agriculture, commerce, encourage small business, help maintain the economic stability of the country, and assist in promoting maximum employment and production.

In recent months this revitalized agency was of great assistance to victims of Midwest floods by granting loans to business firms whose establishments were damaged in that disaster.

The Congress also approved the President's plan for reorganization of the government of the District of Columbia by reduction of the number of agencies and simplification and modernization of functions.

Three other plans proposed by the President—for reorganization of the Post Office, the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury Department, and the United States marshal's office in the Department of Justice—were disapproved by the Senate.

Congress itself initiated a much-needed improvement in purchasing practices of the Government by enactment of a law requiring the Department of Defense to do all its buying from a single catalog of the items required. This catalog is to be the basis for procurement by all Federal supply agencies.

Legislation was also passed reorganizing the structure and procedures of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Eighty-second Congress has put its mark upon history.

Despite great efforts by powerful forces to weaken progressive legislation enacted into law over the past 20 years, these efforts have failed. On the other hand, we have made some progress.

The Democratic Party is the party of progress. By its actions under the leadership of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman, the Democratic Party has saved America economically, preserved and strengthened the family life of our country, and has given to the country and our people the greatest prosperity of all time.

The Democratic Party is dedicated to the prosperity and happiness of the American people, and America can turn to the Democratic Party for continued leadership consistent with American ideals and for the best interests of our people.

The Eighty-second Congress has armed the free world to protect its liberties and it has looked to the welfare of the great masses of our citizens at home, the factory workers, the farmers, the veterans. We have preserved the American way of life. We have prepared our beloved country for any emergency that might arise.

As we look under the surface and view and analyze the true substance of what has been accomplished during the past 2 years, this Congress and the Democratic Party—the majority party—have measured up to America's destiny of world leadership.

We have prevented powerful forces from destroying or weakening the progress of the past 20 years and, despite this opposition, we have made some marked gains.

With the support of all progressive-minded persons throughout the country—whose support we deserve upon our record of service and achievements—the Democratic Party dedicates itself to a continuance of that service and leadership to meet with vision and courage the trying international problems which confront us in a manner that will bring permanent peace to a troubled world.

We also dedicate ourselves to a continuance of that leadership which saved our country from bankruptcy over 20 years ago and which leadership has brought to our people as a whole, and to all of our segments, the greatest prosperity of all time.

The Democratic Party is the party of safety for our people in the international field.

It is the party of prosperity and progress in the domestic field.

The Democratic Party is the party which has kept its promises to the fullest extent possible. The Democratic Party thinks and acts in terms of 1952 conditions, not in terms of 1850 conditions.

It is not the party of broken promises and inaction. The Democratic Party is the party of action and accomplishment.

We have kept the faith.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 39 minutes a. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, July 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. Con. Res. 242. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics. Report pursuant to House Resolution 74 and House Resolution 447, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolutions creating a select committee to investigate the use of chemicals in foods and cosmetics (Rept. No. 2356, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8120. A bill to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2488). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. Report on Investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to House Resolution 38 and House Resolution 114, Eighty-second Congress, first session, and House Resolution 557, Eighty-second Congress, second session (Rept. No. 2489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee of conference. H. R. 8122. A bill to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2490). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7800. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without

loss of benefits, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2491). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McGRATH: Committee of conference. H. R. 7313. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2492). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8271. A bill to amend section 457 of the Internal Revenue Code (Rept. No. 2493). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2494). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MAHON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7391. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2495). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 2190. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way (Rept. No. 2496). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 7268. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 2497). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8539. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to people in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 8540. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 8541. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the design, development, and service testing of jet transport aircraft in the manner recommended by the Civil Aeronautics Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8542. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study air safety conditions in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 8543. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Policy to study various methods for limiting the taxing, appropriating, spending, and borrowing powers of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 8544. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary center at Cushing Veterans' Administration Hospital at Framingham, Mass.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 8545. A bill to provide flood relief for Lake Erie and the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 8546. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide increased benefits for certain medical correctional officers of the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 8547. A bill to authorize the improvement of Mobile Harbor, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 8548. A bill to establish a temporary commission to study ethical and moral standards in the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 8549. A bill to establish a Federal Commission for the Physically Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8550. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8551. A bill to establish corporations to assist financial institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises and to provide capital for such enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8552. A bill for the establishment of a Commission on Old-Age and Retirement Benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8553. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 8554. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to conduct preference primaries for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 8555. A bill to revise the Federal election laws; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 8556. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8557. A bill to authorize the naturalization of parents of veterans without regard to certain requirements of the naturalization laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8558. A bill to enable States and their agencies and political subdivisions to plan for the construction of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 8559. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8560. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to investigate and make recommendations with respect to the distribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue within the framework of our Federal, State, and local systems of government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 8561. A bill to encourage expansion of business by allowing a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of certain capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8562. A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 8563. A bill to rescind the order of the Postmaster General curtailing certain postal services; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 497. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (by request):

H. R. 8564. A bill for the relief of Arthur Kalisz (Arthur Kalisch); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 8565. A bill for the relief of Harry Clay Maull, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 8566. A bill for the relief of Cathryn A. Giesener; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

790. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 118 citizens of Greene County, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

791. Also, petition of 338 citizens of Sullivan County, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

792. Also, petition of 11 members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, First Christian Church, Sullivan, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

793. Also, petition of 16 members of the Alpha Bible Sunday School Class, Methodist Church, Linton, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

794. Also, petition of 48 citizens of Gosport, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

795. Also, petition of 24 citizens of Brazil, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

796. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Newberry, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

797. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Owensville, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

798. Also, petition of 79 members of the Baptist Church, Sullivan, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

799. Also, petition of nine members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Jasonville, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 7, 1952

(Legislative day of Friday, June 27, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, minister, the National Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, bless with strength and wisdom the Members of the Senate of the United States and uphold by Thy righteous hand this Nation which they serve.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 5, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had further insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 7380) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON, Mr. MAHON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. GARY, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, and Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 7313) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 7, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes;

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky;

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1041. An act to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor son;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise,

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 1999. An act relating to withholding, for State income tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewellyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Petersen and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Nichiko Okuda;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antonette Kersenbrock;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility at Fort Logan, Colo.;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825);

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro;

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 2922. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950;

S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere;

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Ilida;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 3280. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin;

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor and for other purposes;

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet;

S. 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Leating, and Charles A. Paris; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION—THE HARTWELL DAM PROJECT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement, so that there may be no misunderstanding about my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, having any desire to hold up the adjournment of Congress because of so-called pork-barrel legislation.

The Government's hydrogen plant project is located in the Savannah River Valley largely because of the proximity of the Savannah River. I wish to read a very short statement from the report of hearings held this year. My concern about the construction of the Hartwell Dam arises from my great interest in the development of the atomic energy program in the United States. The statement I wish to read is as follows:

In passing, I think your attention should be called to the fine work that has been done by the United States Corps of Engineers in acquiring the land for the new facility. We also have watched with interest the work being done by the Corps of Engineers on Clark Hill Dam. Clark Hill Dam is of considerable interest to our project in several important ways. Construction of the new Hartwell Dam also would be of additional benefit in relation to long-time requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission in this area. We would like to see Hartwell Dam constructed.

Mr. President, just a year ago there was testimony that a flow of one-half million gallons of water a minute into the plant would be needed in order to keep the pots cool. I myself saw the pots about a year ago. I have obtained permission from Chairman Dean and Mr. Boyer to make this comment When I say "I have obtained permission," I mean I called Chairman Dean this morning, and I called Mr. Boyer, because it would never be my desire to make any statement on the floor of the Senate that might in any way give aid and comfort to the enemy, so I did not refer Saturday night or Sunday morning to these facts.

In case of a drought in the Savannah River area, I do not know what would happen to the Atomic Energy Commission development without the Hartwell Dam. I merely desired to read their sworn testimony, which indicates that the officials of the Atomic Energy Commission want to see the dam built because one-half million gallons of water a minute will be necessary to keep the pots cool.

I did not make the fight for Hartwell Dam solely because of its need for atomic energy uses. I do not say that Hartwell Dam was not considered before the atomic energy program was conceived. It would provide dual benefits. It was originally intended for soil conservation use, and would also provide for generating electrical energy. But those uses are not so important, to my way of thinking, as is the use of the dam to the Atomic Energy Commission project, which requires such large amounts of water to keep the pots cool. It is somewhat similar to the situation in the case of the Columbia River project, where there are large dams.

No one knows when there might be a drought in the Savannah River Valley and what might happen in that event. The only thing I was attempting to do on Saturday night and Sunday morning was to have included in the appropriation bill a small sum of money needed for starting construction of the Hartwell Dam.

The records show that a billion and a half dollars were appropriated for the hydrogen project, and the project is not completed.

I would appreciate having Senators understand that I was not seeking pork-barrel legislation, because when the Hartwell Dam project was included in the Senate bill, I spoke with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who opposed inclusion of pork-barrel projects in the bill. Unfortunately, I had to leave because of sickness in my family, so I told the distinguished Senator from Illinois that I would appreciate his considering the Hartwell Dam project on the basis of what I had learned from the Atomic Energy Commission and from Mr. Dean, and also from my knowledge of conditions in the Columbia River Valley.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say about the matter. I appreciate the distinguished majority leader's yielding to me. I merely want to make it plain that the Hartwell Dam must be built. We must not take a chance on what might happen if a drought should occur in the Savannah River Valley.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senators from South Carolina for their courage and statesmanship in standing up, and fighting for what they believe to be right. I served on the conference committee, and I may say, Mr. President, that the conferees on the part of the Senate were unanimous in supporting the project. The conferees did not believe it was of a pork-barrel nature; they felt it was in the interest of national defense. We feel that the Senators from South Carolina are right.

Mr. MAYBANK. There would not have been such a tremendous development as the hydrogen-bomb plant if it were not for the Savannah River. My secretary tells me that Mr. Ed Block, production manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, called this morning and said again that there would be need for one-half million gallons of water a minute. We cannot afford to take a chance of not having a sufficient flow of water, because it is necessary that the materials operations of the Savannah River plant, with all the secret materials there, be unbroken, and the water must be available in order to keep the pots cool.

I was fighting for the good of the United States and for the Atomic Energy Commission, because the President knows that the Savannah River site was chosen, not for any political purposes but for the good of America.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to associate myself with the statement of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, and to let him know that, so far as I personally am concerned as a Member of the Senate and as a member of the conference, I support his position.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator speaks, I merely wish to say that I understood the position of the Senators from South Carolina. My colleagues also understood it. I do not believe anyone on the Senate floor has insinuated that either of the distinguished Senators was guilty of asking for pork-barrel legislation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Some people might have thought so. I would not have spoken on this subject on Saturday night or Sunday morning because I had not discussed it with members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I would not have wanted to say something that would have caused any bad effect.

Mr. McFARLAND. We understood that the Senator was working in the interest of national defense, and that his colleague also had the same motive. Otherwise we would not have asked for a further conference on the item which is sought to be retained in the bill.

There are no Senators more patriotic than are the two distinguished Senators from South Carolina. Both of them in their service as Members of the Senate have had the interest of national defense in mind. The distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, has handled in an unexceptionable manner important legislation in his committee. He is to be commended for the splendid record he has made in connection with legislation relating to controls and other matters. The junior Senator from South Carolina likewise has rendered very valuable service to his country, and has fulfilled with great ability the important duties devolving upon him as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. South Carolina is to be congratulated upon having two such distinguished Senators, who are chairmen of important committees. So I was happy to work with them, and I intend to continue to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the so-called Hartwell project is partly in the State of Georgia, but it is definitely a defense project at this time. Perhaps one of the very largest hydrogen bomb plants in the world is being constructed in the Savannah Valley, and this is a development which ought to be made and must ultimately be made if that great defense project is to succeed.

There is, of course, the hope that other benefits will flow from a big hydroelectric development at the Hartwell Dam site; but at the same time, under existing conditions, and because of the location of the big hydrogen bomb plant in that area, it is an absolutely indispensable part of what is essentially a defense project. If all the projects in this bill were as definitely earmarked for defense purposes as is this particular project, there could be no just accusation that anyone was working for a pork-barrel project.

My distinguished colleague in the Senate, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is not present. Had he been here he would have been very active in behalf of this project, as he was active in seeing that a reasonable appropriation was inserted in the appropriation bill for the commencement of this dam at the Hartwell, S. C., site.

Mr. President, I am very glad to identify myself with the South Carolina Senators. I express regret that so much of the burden has fallen upon them. But if all projects in the civil functions bill were as certainly earmarked for defense needs as is this particular project, there could be no just criticism of any one of them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as Senators know, I have been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy ever since Hiroshima. I recall when the experts were looking around for a location for the hydrogen-bomb plant. They looked over every State, including the State of Colorado. They looked at a site in Arkansas with which they were very much impressed. After looking over all the States in the country on a nonprejudiced basis, and without any political interference of any kind from any quarter, they selected this site in South Carolina. I presume they

knew what they were doing when they selected it. They selected it without pork-barrel influence of any kind on the part of anyone.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator very much. I can say for the distinguished Senators from South Carolina, as well as for my colleague and myself, that none of us had any part in influencing the location of the hydrogen-bomb plant in the Savannah River Valley.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think all my colleagues in the Senate realize that what we are fighting for is not a pork-barrel project. This is a project which we believe will further the national defense.

Personally, I was persuaded by the Army engineers and by the Atomic Energy Commission. I should like to read from a hearing which was held in Aiken, S. C., where the bomb plant is now located. This hearing was held on February 22, 1952. This is Mr. Curtis A. Nelson, of the Atomic Energy Commission, speaking:

Mr. NELSON. Speaking for both the Atomic Energy Commission and our contractor, the du Pont Co., I would like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation for the splendid and unstinted cooperation that has been shown by the communities near the site. Even though the impact of the new atomic-energy facility has been severe, they have shown every inclination to work out their own problems and get things done for themselves. Their vision and initiative is praiseworthy.

But they cannot cope financially with all the new problems. They need some help from their Government in working out the problems imposed on them by the selection of the huge site in this area for a new atomic-energy plant.

The Atomic Energy Commission will continue to cooperate with them to the fullest extent. Meanwhile, we urge every feasible step that can be taken by the Federal Government to help them work out sound and effective programs.

In passing, I think your attention should be called to the fine work that has been done by the United States Corps of Engineers in acquiring the land for the new facility. We also have watched with interest the work being done by the Corps of Engineers on Clark Hill Dam. Clark Hill Dam is of considerable interest to our project in several important ways. Construction of the new Hartwell Dam also would be of additional benefit in relation to long-time requirements of the Atomic Energy Commission in this area. We would like to see Hartwell Dam constructed.

After the Atomic Energy Commission came out so clearly in advocacy of this particular project, and after the engineers had endorsed it, naturally I looked at it from the standpoint of national defense. At the same time, I believe it would be a prudent expenditure of Federal Government money, which would pay a return, even from a financial standpoint. So if it can pay its way and contribute toward building up our national defense, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not stand on the floor of the Senate and do all within my power to accomplish the building of the Hartwell Dam.

As has been brought out so clearly by my senior colleague from South Carolina, water is needed, and the only way to guarantee water in the lower part of the river—and the atomic energy plant is at the lower part of the river—is to have dams above the atomic energy plant. There is in existence what is known as the Clark Hill development, just above the atomic energy plant. Those in charge of the Clark Hill development tell us that they need some backing up of water above that development, so that the water may be allowed to flow in gradually and systematically, and not all flow into the Clark Hill Dam at one time.

As was brought out by the evidence, it is possible to guarantee 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours or more for the Clark Hill Dam. That indicates how much water it holds back. It allows the water to flow through gradually, as it should.

I am in favor of guaranteeing to the Atomic Energy Commission the necessary water in the future for military purposes. This project would do the job. If it is started this year, we shall be 1 year nearer the fulfillment of our obligation to the people. That is the reason why I think it should be started this year. We should not wait until next year, but should begin the construction now. I am not saying how much money will be needed this year, before Congress returns next January to enact the necessary legislation, but I think steps should be taken toward starting the project this year. That is my position. It is not pork-barrel legislation that we are interested in. It is something that will develop the country and guarantee our national defense.

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter which was written by Mr. F. J. Lawton, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Representative PAUL BROWN. The letter is printed in the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, second session, at page 818.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1952.

HON. PAUL BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: The following information is furnished you with respect to the proposed construction of the Hartwell Dam and Reservoir project on the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina.

Funds in the amount of $4,000,000 are included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1953 to permit initiation of construction of this project. Total cost is now estimated at $80,500,000 and a total power generating capacity of 180,000 kilowatts will be provided with 60,000 kilowatts scheduled for calendar year 1956 and 120,000 kilowatts scheduled for 1957.

In the early part of December 1951, the Defense Electric Power Administration completed a study of power supply and requirements of the various power regions in the United States through calendar year 1954 as a result of our request to the Defense Production Administration for such a study. This study was reviewed by a committee of four consultants in the electric-power field appointed by the Defense Production Administration and their report dated December 17, 1951, indicated that, if anything, the load estimates of the Defense Electric Power Administration on a national basis were too low. Assuming a full realization of the planned power expansion through 1954, without slippage, and allowing for operating reserves, scheduled maintenance, and below normal water conditions, the committee report forecasts a small national surplus by the end of 1954. However, the report indicates that the regional picture would be unsatisfactory with an over-all deficit forecast for the power supply regions which are interconnected with the southeastern area.

The DEPA report forecast a slight surplus on a national basis at the end of 1954 but indicated that the Southeast would be faced with a deficit in 1954 under either adverse or median hydroelectric conditions.

In view of this report a number of additional generation units were included in the 1953 budget for completion by the Tennessee Valley Authority after 1954 based on load estimates for that part of the southeastern area. The Hartwell project was included in order that a start could be made on it in time to permit completion when it could make a contribution to the additional supply needed in the region outside the TVA area. Construction of the Hartwell project will also permit an increase in the firm power output at the Clark Hill project below Hartwell by about 50,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually with resulting financial benefits to the United States Government and will provide flood protection downstream on the Savannah River.

The Federal Power Commission staff recently made a study of power supply areas 21, 22, and 23 which include most of North Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama, all of South Carolina, and parts of Mississippi and Florida, which is the logical market area for power from the Hartwell project. This study covered a period from 1952 through 1960 and was based on utility estimates of load through 1954 and staff estimates for subsequent years, and on dependable capacity of all generating plants now in operation or scheduled to be placed in operation by Federal agencies and major non-Federal utility systems. The load forecasts do not include possible defense requirements which are not definite at this time. Dependable capacity is based on adverse hydroelectric conditions and includes no allowance for operating reserves and scheduled maintenance. Results of the study are presented in the following table:

	Dependable capacity (1,000 kilowatts)	Estimated peak load (1,000 kilowatts)	Indicated reserves	
			1,000 kilowatts	Percent of peak
1952	5,591	5,626	−35	−0.62
1953	6,678	6,130	548	8.94
1954	7,076	6,616	460	6.95
1955	7,108	6,840	268	3.92
1956	7,145	7,160	−15	−.21
1957		7,440		
1958		7,600		
1959		7,760		
1960		7,920		

These data reflect the increases in 1951 over and above the loads predicted early in 1951 for that year. A deficit is indicated for the area in 1956 and thereafter unless additional capacity is provided. New starts for land and water resources programs in the 1953 budget are restricted to urgently needed power projects in critical shortage areas, flood-control projects in the Kansas-Missouri area, and emergency rehabilitation work. The Hartwell Dam and Reservoir is recommended as a power project in a critical shortage area.

The power output of the Hartwell project as scheduled in the 1953 budget would make a contribution toward meeting the anticipated deficit in 1956 and later years and would aid in providing power to defense facilities in the area.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Director.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. With all sincerity, I hope that the free conference will recommend sufficient money with which to start the Hartwell Dam project this year.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE OUTSIDE TO THE RECENT NORTH DAKOTA SENATORIAL PRIMARY CAMPAIGN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last week the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] challenged the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself to insert in the RECORD any material we might have pertaining to money contributed from outside the State of North Dakota to my campaign. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert such material in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MIGRATORY LABOR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. J. Oscar Lee, executive director, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, Division of Christian Life and Work, Department of Racial and Cultural Relations, dated July 2, 1952, referring to S. 3300, to establish a Federal Commission on Migratory Labor.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I am sorry that we did not have an opportunity to act on this important measure.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., July 2, 1952.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Chairman of Subcommittee on Labor and Management Relations, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: As executive director of the department of racial and cultural relations, I am writing to support in principle S. 3300, a bill to establish a Federal committee on migratory labor.

For 30 years, the churches have cooperated through the home missions council—now the division of home missions of the National Council of Churches—in providing a program of Christian service in thousands of migrant camps across the country. This service has brought our organization into intimate contact with many of the major problems confronting migrant workers.

The general board of the National Council of Churches adopted, on September 19, 1951, a statement titled "The Concern of the Churches for Migratory Farm Laborers"—a copy of which is enclosed. The two quotations from this statement which follow closely correspond with the purposes of S. 3300:

"While advances have been made, they are the exception rather than the rule. The most significant changes, such as the establishment of clinics to serve the migrant workers, the improvement in housing for migrants through a housing code for migrant camps, and the inclusion of migrant children in local schools by State regulation, have come in New Jersey and New York State, where interdepartmental agencies at the State level have coordinated the services of the various State departments and initiated a program to meet the needs of the migrants coming to these two States. Similar agencies in other States using migrant labor are needed and likewise an interagency body on the national level—to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of the public agencies. * * *

"Without assuming either responsibility or special competence with regard to the technical details of legislation, we believe that the churches should support measures intended to provide the following:

"1. A plan for the effective recruitment, fair employment practices, and equitable distribution of seasonal farm laborers.

"2. A more effective utilization of domestic seasonal labor.

"3. The importation of foreign workers only when necessary to supplement the domestic labor supply, with adequate provision made for their welfare.

"4. The discouragement of the practice of importing foreign workers from economically depressed areas as a means of their rehabilitation, with emphasis instead on the encouragement of efforts, such as the point 4 program.

"5. The extension of minimum wage legislation, social security benefits, and labor legislation to include migratory farm laborers.

"6. A Federal housing code for migrant camps to set a minimum standard for all States.

"7. The extension to migratory farm workers and their families by the communities in which they are employed of the health and welfare services available to their own residents.

"8. The regulation of the methods of transportation of workers from area to area and from State to State to insure their safety and humane treatment.

"9. The protection of the children of the migratory workers by more effective enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act as amended in 1950 to make it compulsory for children under 16 to attend school when schools are in session.

"10. Improved educational facilities for migrant workers and their children.

"11. Provision for the implementation of the above measures so that they apply equally to all workers without regard to race, color, or national origin."

Let me express my appreciation to you for the excellent leadership that you are giving in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

J. OSCAR LEE,
Executive Director.

ATTORNEY CONTRACTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent from the city because of illness. He was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which was directed to make a study of attorney contracts with Indian tribes.

The Senator from New Mexico and the other members of the subcommittee, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], have made a very thorough study of the subject. They have held hearings, at which testimony was taken under oath, and have submitted the report of the subcommittee, which, as chairman of the full committee, I have had printed as a committee print.

However, I feel that the subject is of great interest and of great importance. The evidence now in the RECORD justifies the delay in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior in approving Indian attorney contracts. The subcommittee report recommends prompt action by the Secretary and final decision upon pending applications.

The testimony taken by the subcommittee is available in the office of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the subcommittee to the full committee may be printed at length in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming if any action has been taken by the full committee on the report?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No action has been taken on it as yet.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the report of the subcommittee with reference to the approval of contracts of certain attorneys with Indian tribes some of us are very much concerned. I hope we may have the advantage of being able to read the report of the subcommittee within a short time. Will the report be printed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I have requested. I am asking that the report of the subcommittee may be printed in the RECORD. The reason I am asking that it be printed is that the matter is of such importance that all Members of the Senate should have an opportunity of reading the subcommittee report. The study has not been completed.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATTORNEY CONTRACTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES

A subcommittee consisting of Senators ANDERSON, LEHMAN, LONG, WATKINS, and ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, submitted the following report to the full committee:

JUNE 24, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is an interim report to the full committee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs from a subcommittee composed of Senators ANDERSON, LEHMAN, LONG, WATKINS, and ECTON, which was instructed to investigate the subject of attorney contracts with Indian tribes. The subcommittee held extensive hearings in Washington, D. C., Albuquerque, N. Mex., and New York City. In addition, the counsel of the subcommittee

conducted further investigations at seven different reservations. The transcript of the hearings comprises approximately 2,000 pages at the present time.

Although the investigation is not complete there is evidence that in the relationship between attorneys and Indian tribes there has been extensive solicitation; there has been brokerage of claim contracts; there have been instances where the original attorneys selected by tribes have been pressured out by other attorneys; there has been interference with employment by tribes of other attorneys; there has been violation of contract provisions by attorneys; there have been serious misrepresentation of facts by attorneys to the Indians, the Congress, and to the public; and Indian organizations have been used as fronts by attorneys to promote their own interests rather than that of the Indians.

In addition, there is uncontradicted evidence of attempts to set aside acts of the Congress, not in the courts or by proper constitutional test, but by misrepresenting by false propaganda. These attacks on the Nation's laws have not served the purpose of bringing new rights or additional benefits to Indians but appear to be attempts to develop "nuisance settlements" such as in the case of the Tongass timber development. There is also now pending an application for the development of the Katalla-Yakataga oil fields where the lands have never been part of an Indian reservation or been inhabited or used by Indians, and where the settlement attempted to be negotiated for the Indians represented only a "nuisance value" for withdrawing the obstruction to the orderly leasing and development of the lands.

The committee is not ready to pass final judgment on any of the assertions, claims, charges, or countercharges, but it does believe that this interim report should be made for the purpose of expressing four convictions:

(1) That as long as the law requires the Secretary of Interior to approve contracts for attorneys who desire to represent Indian tribes, the Secretary must exercise this authority diligently as trustee for the Indians and not in any fashion which would simply be rubber stamping all contracts submitted to him by the Indians and their attorneys.

(2) It feels that the Secretary of Interior, under his existing authority, should take vigorous action to clean up the pending contract situations, approving those which are proper and disapproving those presented by attorneys whose conduct has been improper.

(3) It suggests that the grievance committee of the American Bar Association review the subcommittee's files, for such action as it deems proper.

(4) Finally, the committee feels that if there is to be a change in the responsibility for the approval of Indian contracts, the Congress which placed the responsibility on the Secretary of Interior should be the agency which changes that responsibility and in doing so must find an adequate substitute to protect the rights of Indians against unscrupulous activities referred to above.

The subcommittee wishes to make it clear that the attorneys who have indulged in the abuses previously mentioned are a minority of those who represent Indian tribes and that their actions should not be allowed to cast reflection upon the integrity or the professional standards of others who have rendered outstanding service to the Indians.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
RUSSELL B. LONG,
ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
ZALES N. ECTON.

PROPOSED COMMISSION TO STUDY THE SUBJECT OF INCENTIVE AND SPECIAL PAY IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Secretary of Defense wrote a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] expressing his deep appreciation for the fine job done by the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, July 4, 1952.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter with respect to the establishment of a civilian commission to conduct a thorough examination with respect to incentive and special pay now authorized for members of the military services performing specified duties.

I followed with great interest the recent hearings conducted on this subject by the subcommittee appointed by you and wish to express my appreciation of the sincere and objective job done by Senator HUNT and the other members of the subcommittee.

The recommendation that I name a civilian commission, similar to the Hook Commission, to make a thorough examination of these pays is an excellent one. The selection and appointment of commission members of the stature required to undertake a task of such vital concern to the Department is a highly important and difficult matter and will have our immediate and earnest attention. We will keep you fully advised of the progress made toward the goal as outlined in your letter and the report of the subcommittee.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, according to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, the Senate will not transact any legislative business today, other than on the conference reports. Unless agreement can be reached on the conference reports, of course, we will not be able to transact any legislative business today.

Work is proceeding on the conference reports, but it may take a little time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader what he has in mind with respect to taking a recess? It is obvious that he is about to move that the Senate take a recess. Will the motion be that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Therefore, opportunity will be afforded later to Members of the Senate to make such comments as they wish to make on other matters?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, and that the bells be rung when the Senate reconvenes, without a call for a quorum.

I do not think there is any possibility that we shall be through before 2 o'clock, and probably it will be some time after 2 o'clock before the Senate reconvenes.

I wish to make that announcement, so that Members will not be standing around, waiting.

I now renew my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair?

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1953—HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to call attention to amendment 43, relating to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which was added by the Senate to the supplemental appropriation bill.

The amendment which the Senate added to the appropriation for defense housing read as follows:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration or for any other purpose so long as that agency proceeds with any public-housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

Mr. President, the language "and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project" was worked out in the Senate committee considering the supplemental bill, by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and myself.

Because of some discussion which took place in the House, I think it should be made clear—and I have consulted the Senator from Oregon upon this matter—that the word "tendered" does not mean negotiated or negotiate. It means, in its full legal significance, that the governing body which desires to cancel a contract with the United States, before such cancellation can be effective, has actually tendered to the United States full reimbursement of the funds advanced for such project prior to such cancellation, and has also tendered a release from all obligations.

I think it would be a great mistake, and might lead to a great deal of confusion, if anyone should gain the idea that in offering this amendment, the Senator from Oregon or I meant anything less than actual tender of the amount.

Let me ask the Senator from Oregon if he concurs in this statement.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in 100 percent accord with the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming.

I wish to add that the language is not subject to any interpretation, because there is no ambiguity in it; it means exactly what it says. When we speak of tender, we speak of an unconditional offer of money to satisfy a liquidated and determined indebtedness; and the term can mean only that there is an offer, by the governing body, of money in the amount that is agreed upon to settle the debt. There is no negotiation to it.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I want it understood, of course, that the Senate will not convene until after 2 o'clock. With that understanding, I now resume my unanimous-consent request for the taking of a recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, which will not be earlier than 2 o'clock.

Accordingly, at 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m., when called to order by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Milagros Aujero;

H. R. 2190. An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3177. An act to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 3209. An act amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4021. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo;

H. R. 4157. An act for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska, and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk;

H. R. 4163. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4326. An act for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Plandolit and Fuencisla Segimont;

H. R. 4632. An act for the relief of Linda Lee Converse;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Johann Komma;

H. R. 4709. An act for the relief of Maron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken;

H. R. 4762. An act for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson;

H. R. 4792. An act to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5442. An act for the relief of Martin A. Dekking;

H. R. 5624. An act for the relief of Tokusaburo Glasscock;

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadaloupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6839. An act to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-contruction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz;

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, New York;

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Al-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou;

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend sections 433 (b) 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLER. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 41: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment numbered 41 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert the following: "Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'plant and equipment,' including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,898,800,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding 25 years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse, or similar structure, utility, or other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment, or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."; and the House agree to the same.

KENNETH McKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT McCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
B. R. MAYBANK,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on the conference report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations, I wish to compliment the members of the conference committee for what they have accomplished. It was the opinion of the Senate and of the junior Senator from Arizona that the rider which had been placed in the bill would have prevented the expenditure of even the $600,000,000 which was contemplated to be spent in this fiscal year.

The only way to cure that situation and to enable the Commission to go forward with its program was either to strike out the rider, which provided that "no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any building, utility, or other specific portion of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion of such project," or to appropriate the full amount needed for the construction.

I have before me a letter from Gordon Dean, Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. The letter is addressed to me, and in it Mr. Dean states that if $2,898,800,000 were appropriated, then the full program could be completed, although some of it will not be completed until 1953 or 1954; but that such an apropriation would permit the Commission to go forward, and therefore the rider would do no harm.

The Senate conferees were able to secure that compromise, if it can be called that. They are to be congratulated, because it removes any question, and now we can be assured that this program can go forward without being crippled.

Just one provision remains in the bill which possibly may give some trouble. I shall read another portion of the letter, and then I ask to have the entire letter printed in the body of the RECORD:

I expressed to you our concern as to the $57,000,000 maximum cancellation costs for electric power which is now in the bill and which originated on the floor of the House.

I would be remiss if I did not make it clear to the conferees that this would prevent us from entering into the necessary power contracts at Oak Ridge, Paducah, and at the new site. We will, however, endeavor in some way to apply the $57,000,000 among the various power contracts with the hope that we might induce the various utilities to commence construction of the necessary facilities. If we are successful in making adequate tentative contractual arrangements, and this I cannot guarantee, it would require that in the next session of the Congress we obtain legislation to increase the amount of the limitation in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. It is altogether possible, is it not, to come forward with a supplemental appropriation at the beginning of the next session, without waiting to the end of the fiscal year, to correct that particular disability in the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that it would be far better if that provision were not in the bill. I know that it is necessary to eliminate the limitation if the Commission is going to enter into the contracts. But we can bring up this matter immediately after the first of the year, can we not?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is a conferee; and then I shall ask it of the chairman of the committee: It is my understanding that the Senate conferees feel that this provision does not prevent the Commission from making tentative arrangements and going forward, just so the liability incurred is not larger than the amount specified.

Mr. CORDON. There can be no question about that.

Mr. McFARLAND. This provision will permit the Commission to make tentative contracts, so long as the liability does not exceed the specified amount. Thereafter, as the Senator from Oregon has stated, the Congress can take any necessary further action immediately after the first of the year.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is what is understood.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator from Arizona will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that the chairman of the Commission, Mr. Dean, specifically recommends the acceptance of this compromise?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall read the entire letter, for I know all Senators are interested in it.

JULY 7, 1952.

DEAR SENATOR MCFARLAND: In response to your inquiry concerning the appropriation bill now pending in the Congress and covering an expansion of AEC facilities, I would make the following comments:

The proviso, under discussion, has always appeared to us to be a prohibition on starting with fiscal year 1953 funds construction of facilities, whatever their completion dates, for which funds are not available. As you know, the Commission could not, with the cut in appropriation coupled with the proviso, embark on the total program.

We have estimated that the total costs of those projects which must be started in the fiscal year 1953 to meet the presidentially approved program would be $2,898,800,000. Consequently, should the proviso remain in the bill, we could proceed under a bill which appropriated such a sum.

Let me say that is what was done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, if he has finished?

Mr. McFARLAND. I was going to read the remainder of the letter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Very well; I shall wait.

Mr. McFARLAND. I read further from the letter:

I expressed to you our concern as to the $57,000,000 maximum cancellation costs—

That is the part of the letter I read a moment ago.

Under the necessity, we have met this requirement. Since I have read the other portion of the letter, I may say that Mr. Dean states that the Commission will try to work it out, so that they will be able to go ahead.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to compliment the conferees upon this arrangement. I was deeply concerned about the amount included in the original bill as it came to the Senate on Saturday night. I think I was not on the floor at the time. Had I been on the floor, I certainly would have voted to reject the conference report, which was done. I believe that any lessening of our efforts along the line of developing atomic weapons would be disastrous to the Nation. I am very glad indeed to know that this amendment has been accepted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as one of the conferees, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], as well as the other members of the committee. The majority leader has read a letter. I desire to make one comment, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want to read a letter dated February 26, 1952, addressed to Lieut. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, National Military Establishment, by M. W. Boyer, General Manager of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. I understand that Mr. Boyer has a background of experience, coupled with integrity and honesty.

Mr. President, I may say that my reason for making the fight for the Hartwell Dam was because of the big hydrogen site on the Savannah. A site of more than 200,000 acres of land was procured in South Carolina. Also, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] so ably said earlier today, a site was approved in Oregon. I think the Savannah Valley was selected for one reason because of the plentiful supply of water. I am going to read the whole letter, but I read the following:

The Hartwell Dam will benefit the Savannah River project through the assurance of a uniform quantity of water supply and the reduction which we understand it will effect in the temperature of the water of the Savannah River which will be utilized at our Savannah River project. We also understand that it will contribute to the further reduction of flood hazards. Realization of these objectives will be of assistance to the operations at our Savannah River project. The lowering of the water temperatures will give some measure of increased efficiency in the operation of the reactors. The reduction of flood hazards will contribute to continuity of operations through avoidance of employee absenteeism resulting from real or potential flood threats.

Mr. President, I know what reactors are to be built. I have seen the secret documents about which the distinguished Senator from Iowa spoke Saturday night. In fighting for Hartwell Dam, I consider that I was fighting for America. And I was fighting for America because it is my country, the country I love. It was not because we wanted anything in South Carolina or Georgia, anything for ourselves in the way of flood-control legislation. We were confronted with the fact that the Savannah River project had to be constructed. We are now told that we cannot dam the Savannah River and bring about the desired reduction in the temperature of the river by 10 degrees. I am familiar with the proposed location of the reactors, upon which it is proposed to spend billions of dollars. I know where the funds are to be spent. I want to see an efficient operation.

As I understand, the conference committee agreed on an appropriation of $2,898,800,000, instead of $1,450,000,000, as proposed by the House, and a total authorization of $3,518,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Atomic Energy Commission to make an investigation at a cost of not to exceed $250,000 in connection with the proposed Hartwell project in South Carolina and Georgia with a view to determining its importance to the development of atomic energy plants in that area, and to submit such report at the next session of Congress.

I know that it will be impossible to provide necessary pots on the Savannah River, even though millions of dollars may be spent on the hydrogen plant, unless the waters are cooled and I know this will necessitate the construction of the Hartwell Dam. I regret that the provision has not been included in the Civil Functions bill. I regret that my colleague, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who knows so much about this matter, is absent. My friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], suggested to me that the Army engineers ought to make a report on this project as quickly as possible.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I see no reason in the world why, in view of the fact that the Corps of Engineers has substantially completed its investigation and has all the data, it has not yet compiled it in a final report.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CORDON. It yet has some work to do, but I can see no reason why the report on that project should not be prepared, filed, and be placed before the Congress shortly after the first of the year, when certainly there is every reason for requesting a supplemental for the Hartwell Dam.

I may say that the basis of the objection of the House to the Hartwell project was the fact that the Corps of Engineers had not filed the basic project report, indicating to the House Members that the preliminary work, which gives the engineering knowledge in the field of topography and in the field of land classification, and so forth, was not available; that, therefore, any estimate of

cost was too vague, and that the information necessary to start actual construction was not available. The Senate hearings indicate that the Army engineers have the information.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. But they had not compiled it.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is again correct.

Mr. CORDON. That should be done, and certainly I hope we can entertain a supplemental estimate.

Mr. MAYBANK. I know that a delegation from Georgia and another delegation of Representatives from South Carolina came before the committee to testify on this matter. We know that, regardless of the money which may be spent on the atomic energy project, it is impossible to build the necessary pots unless a dam is built for the purpose of cooling the water. The reason for selecting the Savannah River was that the headwaters have their rise in the mountains, and Hartwell Dam would be the best place of adequate size in which to collect the water.

I was here on Saturday night and Sunday morning fighting for the Hartwell Dam, as our distinguished chairman knows. I did not sign the conference report, proposing an authorization but without providing the money. But I signed it today. I was very happy to sign it. I congratulate the distinguished chairman. I hope the House will be able to work the matter out satisfactorily.

I want it distinctly understood that the people of South Carolina and Georgia in the vicinity of Augusta, Ga., and Aiken, S. C., are not desirous of having a large amount of fissionable material and secret material stored, near them unless it can be properly cared for. No other State of the union would ask their Senators to stand on the floor of the Senate to consent to such a thing. When the report is placed before us, stating the position of the Atomic Energy Commission, if I believe it is in furtherance of the defense of this Nation, I shall support it. If that is not the case, then I am going to insist that nothing be stored outside Augusta, Ga., or Aiken, S. C., of the sort I have described. I have nothing else to say.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire now to discuss the civil functions appropriation bill, which has just been mentioned. I think I have never been more disappointed in my life, that an amendment authorizing the Hartwell Dam has been rejected at this time. I do not know, and of course no one can tell until the votes are counted, but I believe I shall be reelected in the fall primaries. If I am reelected, I want to assure my good friend from South Carolina, who is one of the ablest members of the Appropriations Committee, that I shall again do what I have tried to do this time, but failed, namely, to include an ample appropriation for the dam at Hartwell.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am sure the Senator will be motivated by a consideration of national security.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. I am really deeply disappointed. I fought for the amendment in every way I could, but we were overruled—a thing which happens very frequently in connection with legislative matters.

Mr. President, I now want to move—and I shall yield to my friend from New Mexico in a moment—to discharge the Senate conferees from further consideration of the amendments in disagreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, we were just talking about a dam in South Carolina. In the civil functions bill there are two projects of that kind, and they are on exactly all fours with the South Carolina project. If there is going to be any agreement on one, there should be an agreement on both.

I know the problem which confronted the chairman in the case of the Hartwell Dam and the Ice Harbor Dam. They both involve the question of atomic energy and involve the same approach.

Before any conference report is adopted, I am going to say something to the Senate, because I have the strongest, most vigorous letter from the Atomic Energy Commission as to the necessity for both of these dams that I have ever seen written by any department. I may be overruled because of the fact that there are certain persons who seem to be adamant about this matter, but before we recede from the Senate amendment I want the people to understand and the RECORD to be very clear as to what we are doing. I say that in no derogation of the chairman of the committee or the Senate conference committee or the Members of the Senate who have fought to change the opinion of the House conferees. I want to preface my remarks with that statement, because the Senators from South Carolina and I appreciate what has been done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not so familiar with the Ice Harbor project as I am with the Hartwell project. I do not know why. Maybe it was because the Senator from Washington was not here at the time the committee considered the item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator must be familiar with it, because Ice Harbor has been in appropriation bills three times.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have always voted with the Senator not only for Ice Harbor but for every dam project in the country. [Laughter.] I want to tell the Senator why. Years ago, when we began the effort to provide for what is now known as the Tennessee Valley project, but which was then known as the Muscle Shoals project, it involved one of the first legislative fights in which I ever took part. The western Senators stood by us, and we were enabled, over the President's opposition at the time, or, at least, his halfway opposition, to secure the passage of the bill passed. He allowed his own commission which he had appointed to lobby against the Tennessee Valley Authority bill. Members of the commission were in the cloakrooms busy lobbying while the Senate was in session. But the western Senators stood by me, and the bill was passed, I think, by a majority of one vote, as to the first dam. Later the other dams were agreed to.

I am profoundly grateful to Senators from the great West for having helped me at that time. I made up my mind then that whenever it was humanly possible for me to help out the western Senators I would do so. Not only did the western Senators help, but the southern Senators and some of the northern Senators also helped. They were very kind and considerate. It was at a time when no one knew whether we could obtain electricity from water power at that point, but the bill was passed.

The Senator from Washington need have no fears about my support when his dam bill comes up. [Laughter.] I do not mean "d-a-m-n," I mean "d-a-m."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to discharge the Senate conferees.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield, so that I may ask immediate consideration of an order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read it.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That a committee of two Members of the Senate be appointed to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have listened to the discussion about the Hartwell project——

Mr. McFARLAND. This order does not have anything to do with that project.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand the purpose of the order. I have gone through several sessions. But I do not know whether we have completed our business. All the discussion has been with reference to one project.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have a very strong letter from the Atomic Energy Commission, setting forth that the Hanford project which now exists needs the water.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are on the same basis, exactly.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the order submitted by the Senator from Arizona.

The order was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] as the Senate Members of the committee to notify the President of the United States of the completion of the business of the session.

HARTWELL DAM PROJECT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the Senator from Tennessee make the statement that he will fight for the Hartwell Dam early in the next session.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that I said "If I am here."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know the Senator from Tennessee has been in favor of the Hartwell Dam in the past.

I want to commend the conferees of the Senate. I understand they have fought valiantly for the Hartwell project. It pains me to know that there are some Members of the House who are against almost all dams, so far as that is concerned. I do not know what we are going to accomplish next year with reference to them, but it is a game we can play in two ways. So far as I am concerned, I am going to be back in January fighting for the Hartwell Dam. I almost have a good notion to keep the Senate here until tomorrow, I am so strong for it, because I believe deep down in my heart it is just as important as is sending billions of dollars across the water to other nations, in order that they may prepare and arm themselves, to assure the bomb plant at Aiken, S. C., of having sufficient water with which to carry on the activities there as they should be carried on. That is the position we are in.

Let us consider for a moment what we are facing. The Hartwell Dam site is some 40 miles or more from the mountains. The streams would feed into a holding reservoir their full waters, which would feed to the Clark Hill Dam, some 40 or 50 miles below, and the water would move regularly into it. The water would then go on downstream to the bomb plant, some 40 or 50 miles below.

Other Senators know as well as I do that there are seasons when water is plentiful, when it should be stored up, to be ready to be turned loose to go downstream when it is needed. That is what the proposed dam would make possible. It would enable the Clark Hill project to pay back money to the Government though the development of 15,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power, more than would be available if the dam were built below that site. I believe the dam would also pay for itself with interest, and at the same time would guarantee to the bomb plant all the water necessary to carry on its activities.

For that reason, I think we would be almost derelict in our duty if we put off until another year what we must acknowledge is necessary, or will be necessary in the near future.

I express my thanks to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. He has been favorable to all dam sites; there can be no question about that. He has worked diligently, and I am one who hopes he will be reelected. I do not stand back and not say so, for the people of Tennessee owe it to the Senator to reelect him because of what he has done for the people of Tennessee, if in no other respect, for what he has done in regard to TVA. I hope he will be returned to the Senate in the coming election.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in regard to these two dams, I know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations did everything he could to get appropriations for both the Hartwell Dam and the Ice Harbor Dam. I know it, because I heard his conversations over the telephone. I myself went to Members of the House and made a plea for the dams. Everything that could be done has been done to obtain appropriations for the two dams, but funds for them could not be and cannot be obtained. The House was adamant in its opposition. The only thing we could do was to lay a foundation for action next January.

We have heard the distinguished chairman and other members of the Committee on Appropriations say that they are going to fight to include these projects in a supplemental appropriation bill when one is next considered. These are not the only dams for which appropriations are needed. The Senator from West Virginia is interested in a project, and other Senators likewise are interested in several projects.

Senators could hold up the report and deadlock proceedings by talking for 2 or 3 days, but it would not do any good. The chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations have done everything humanly possible to get appropriations for both these dams, and I honestly believe that sufficient foundation has been laid so that after the first of the year, when a deficiency bill is presented—and I have never known a time when one did not come from the House since I have been a Member of the Senate—while of course I cannot say with certainty, I am sure that both Senators from the great States of South Carolina, Georgia, and Washington, will have a good chance to obtain appropriations for their projects. I think they will have a better chance to get appropriations then than they would by holding up the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think more money could be obtained in January than could possibly be secured now. We just went the limit. We spent days and nights holding conferences. The Senators know how I felt about the projects. I was thoroughly in favor of them.

While he was in Nebraska, I received a telegram from the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], my devoted friend. We have been devoted friends for many, many years. The matter was of great importance to him.

I felt the committee owed inclusion of the Hartwell Dam to the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is a member of my committee, and has done such wonderful work. I assure him now that at the very first opportunity, in the first appropriate bill we have before the committee, we will include these projects, if it is humanly possible.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Tennessee just said he would do everything possible in January to get "it" into an appropriations bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will change the word to "them."

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was going to suggest that the Senator change the word "it" to "them."

Mr. McKELLAR. I have already changed the word.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not wish to criticize; I wish to thank members of the conference, as well as members of the Committee on Appropriations, because I know they have done their best. I seek not to dam waters up, but to dam them out.

The oldest steel center that exists in the United States is the Wheeling-Benwood Steel center. All the fissionable material which might be manufactured could not be delivered to the target without steel. Incidentally, the West Virginia project would be self-liquidating, because in any 10-year period, by reason of normal floods, more money from income taxes is lost from that area than the total cost of the proposed project would be.

I realize that the Senate conferees did the best they could. However, I deplore the narrowness which has been displayed and the holding back by the more numerous body across the Capitol, of bills like the measures we have been considering during the last 2 days until the last minute, thus putting the Senate in a position that is really shameful to face, in such a position that the Senate has to concede matters which they would otherwise never concede. It is my hope that some way may be found to have such bills properly prepared, so that the Senate will have time to effect reasonable compromises.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator knows——

Mr. KILGORE. I hope that a flood wall can be started in order to protect that steel industry at Benwood. The evidence before the Senate committee for such a project was preponderantly favorable.

The same situation exists with respect to the proposed flood wall in the case of the Hartwell Dam. The Corps of Engineers did not submit their report in time. Of course, that was a governmental failure which is very hard to explain to the flood sufferers, who, every time a flood comes along, have to foot the bill of five or six million dollars in flood damage. Incidentally, the taxpayers of the country bear the loss. In the case of the large corporations it is charged off as damage; but the poor humble people who suffer flood damage cannot charge it off. They pay the bill.

So the flood damage is far greater than the loss we sustain in income.

At one time I thought of insisting on a quorum. I think we could last possibly until after the fireworks end in Chicago if some Senator should insist on a quorum; but I do not want to punish my colleagues, who have helped me in every way they could. For that reason let me say to my good friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR] of which committee I am proud to be a member, that I am coming back to fight for a dam to keep water out, and not a dam to dam the water back. I shall fight for such a dam in the same way that the proponents of the Ice Harbor Dam will fight. I may say that I spell "dam" in the same way the Senator from Tennessee spells it. In the first possible supplemental bill we shall try to obtain a sufficient appropriation to protect the steel plant to which I have adverted.

I thank the Senators on both sides of the aisle who were in the conference for doing their best to retain this project, which, through no fault of theirs, was eliminated.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was because of the action of the House.

Mr. KILGORE. It would be interesting carefully to inspect the bill to see how many projects were eliminated in certain congressional districts which I might mention.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it is a very wholesome thing that various Senators have made it clear that not just one, not just two projects, but several, have been eliminated from the bill without any fault on the part of the Senate conferees, but because of the exigencies of the situation, and in order that a bill might be enacted before the Congress adjourned.

The item to which the Senator from West Virginia referred was the only item affecting his State. I want him to know that the members of the conference committee from the Senate forcefully called attention to that specific fact as well as to the importance of the project.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. LODGE] were present I would want them to know that we called specific attention to the fact that the only flood-control items in their State, the North Adams and the South Adams projects, were both eliminated and both are meritorious projects. Time after time we called the attention of the House conferees to that fact.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that time and again I brought up the two items from Massachusetts. They were both small items. It is perfectly outrageous that they were not agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee is correct.

Having sat in this conference for only 2 years, I have been impressed by the meticulous fairness and even-handed justice of the Senator from Tennessee in insisting that the claims of each area and of each great industry and each great activity in the country must be considered on a completely fair basis in comparison with projects relating to other parts of the country and other activities.

With reference to the Ice Harbor project, we had present as an active participant in the conference the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. If anyone ever fought hard for a project, the Senator from Oregon fought hard for the Ice Harbor Dam, as all members of the conference committee will remember. But in fairness to all concerned, it was pointed out that there were already in the bill many large items affecting the Columbia River and its tributaries, the Snake and the Willamette. As I recall, there were nine such projects, totaling some $137,000,000 in this bill. Every one of them were completely justified, and every one of them had a place in the national-defense picture.

Finally, when there was a yielding at long last with respect to this one project, it was only because it was apparently necessary to yield or have no report and no bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Such is my high opinion of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oregon that I have employed the Senator from Oregon to be my lawyer if I ever get into trouble. Thank the Lord I have never been in serious trouble, but if I ever commit a crime, I am going to have him as my lawyer. I already have the promise of his services. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate conferees had to go through the very unpleasant experience of yielding with respect to one proposal which we felt probably represented more emergency need than any other project in the bill. It was a comparatively small proposal, involving $350,000, as I recall, to take care of the situation in a California community which is on the Pacific coast, and which has been adversely affected by a Government structure, to such an extent that the houses are actually being washed away. We had to yield even with respect to that project.

I have been asked about the Tuttle Creek project. We did not yield on that. It is in the bill, with an appropriation of $5,000,000 instead of $10,000,000, which the Senate voted. We had to yield, however, with reference to the Toronto project in Kansas, which was to have been begun, but will not be started.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that we had to yield on at least two items in Texas, as I recall, one of which hurt me almost as much as not being able to get through the Hartwell Dam. But we had to do it. There was no other way out. Conference is a give-and-take proposition. We must compromise. That is what conference is for. We do the best we can, and we try to be fair to all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment.

The conferees put up everything they could in the way of a scrap. The RECORD will show that they gained more than two-thirds of the points at issue between the Senate and the House. While the RECORD will not show it, it is a fact that the conference remained in session, notwithstanding the exhaustion from which most of the conferees were suffering, until midnight on the night before the last night of the session. I have never seen a harder effort put forth; and I think the Senators from South Carolina, Senators from the Northwest, and Senators from all the other areas affected should know that to be the fact, and that some Senators even refused, on the first presentation, to sign the conference report, because they were so completely dissatisfied with the elimination of some of the projects.

I think the conference did everything that was humanly within its power. I think it would be the wise course for the Senate to accept the report as it is, as the best that can be done, and look forward to what may be done after Congress reconvenes next January.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I noticed that the Senator looked in my direction when he said that some of the conferees refused to sign the report on the first presentation of it. The only reason why I signed the report was that that was the only way to have a bill. I was very unhappy over my own problems in connection with the bill, and over what seemed to me to be an attitude of disregarding real merit in making the final decision with respect to projects which were wholly justified, proper, and right under all the circumstances. It does not seem fair to me to say, "We will give you this project if you will take off the next two or three down the list."

Mr. McKELLAR. It is perfectly unfair. It is not the way to legislate. It will be remembered that the Senate conferees were very positive in what they had to say.

Mr. McCLELLAN. We certainly were.

Mr. President, I wish to confirm everything that has been said about the chairman's fight for all these projects. All the conferees fought for them. Finally, at the last moment, I almost felt like not signing the report. I hope that if I ever have the privilege of serving on another conference like this, it will be free from any attitude, apparent attitude, or suspicion of an attitude on the part of some of the conferees of making it a contest between the Senate and the House of Representatives; but that all the conferees will be motivated by a spirit of serving the country, and if it takes a dollar here and another dollar there, for a necessary domestic project, the money should be provided, particularly when we are spending money all over the world for many things which I doubt have an equivalent value. Mr. President. the time has come when we

should meet the issue. Let us stand firm on the basis of justice and right, and serve our country on that basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that I felt he was very badly treated. It was very unfortunate indeed, and I was very regretful about it. No man ever made a more gallant fight for what he thought was right and what all of us thought was right, than the Senator from Arkansas. However, owing to a certain situation the result could not be avoided.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. My own State of New York has had projects eliminated or greatly reduced. The result has caused me much disappointment. I think it has been injurious to the people of the State and to the people of the Northeast. However, I wish to make it very clear that I have been informed that the Senate conferees worked fairly and industriously and with great devotion to maintain an even balance and to secure approval of projects which were in the public interest. I am grateful to them for it. I raise no objection whatever. I express my appreciation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first of all I want to reiterate what I said earlier, namely, that I too appreciate the efforts of the Senate conferees in connection with this bill and I appreciate what the leadership is trying to do. As a matter of fact, I hope the impression is not abroad that the House of Representatives as a body was a party to bringing about this situation.

Mr. McKELLAR. The House was not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The House was not. As a matter of fact, I know there were many Members of the House who attempted to help straighten out the situation; but in the case of this particular appropriation the whole situation got down to the House conferees, and, perhaps, to be perfectly honest, it might be said that it got down to just one or two of the House conferees.

I suppose in legislative procedure that is perfectly proper and perfectly legal; but, like the chairman of the committee, I think it is extremely disappointing and discouraging.

I do not want to place the Ice Harbor project, because it happens to be in the State of Washington, in the category, as someone has said, of a pork-barrel appropriation. It is not that at all. There were many projects in the bill. As a matter of fact, if I wanted to speak in that sectional frame of mind, I would point to a project in the bill which is located in the State of one of the conferees who objected to the other projects. However, that is neither here nor there.

We are discussing two projects, one of them located in my State, and the other one in South Carolina.

The Ice Harbor project has been placed in appropriation bills by the Senate not once but three times. It has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget on three occasions. It has been recommended for many years by those who are supposed to examine the feasibility and necessity of such projects. It has been authorized for many years. So far as I know, the planning, in the main, has been completed. All that has been added to the support of the Ice Harbor project is that the Atomic Energy Commission, from whom I have a letter, recommends it vigorously this year, as it vigorously recomended it last year.

Mr. President, a great deal was said on Saturday night about the importance of atomic energy. As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has said, a great many components go to make up the defense effort. Steel and aluminum are two of them. We have in the State of Washington a great atomic-energy plant at Hanford, which produces the ingredients of the atomic bomb in bulk. It is probably the greatest plant in the Nation. Most of us know what it does.

We also have a giant power pool in the Pacific Northwest from which all the industries involved in the defense effort draw power. Sixteen or eighteen months ago the power load on that line was so great that the power was cut off for a certain period of time. It seriously alarmed the Atomic Energy Commission management, because the process is a chain process; once power goes off it takes weeks to bring operations back to normal and to produce what is needed for our defense.

Ice Harbor Dam is a good dam in its own right, and is feasible. It is reimbursable with interest. However, because it happens to be a few miles up the river from the atomic-energy plant, the same situation is involved as at Hartwell with reference to cool water.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will yield, he refers to the cool Columbia River; is that correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct. The Atomic Energy Commission thought it ought to have a source of uninterruptible power. In other words, if something happened to the pool power line, a switch could be thrown, and power would come from a few miles away, generated at a dam which is not only feasible in its own right, but has the added defense value.

The Ice Harbor project is not new to the Senate. It has been before the Senate for a long time. It has been before the House for a long time.

Let me say something else for the RECORD, Mr. President. There was a controversy in the beginning as to whether or not the Ice Harbor Dam would destroy some of the fish runs on the Columbia River. No one wants to do that. There was a time when there was a controversy between the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Army engineers, the atomic-energy plant, and the Bonneville Power Administration as to whether or not the dam might affect the fish runs. The first time the project was rejected, it was for that reason. This time the atomic-energy situation has been added to the picture. I have a long letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service pointing out the necessity of the project and declaring that the dam would have no more effect on the fish in the Columbia River than a dam on any other river, and that they could take care of the situation. I have a letter from the Department of the Interior to that effect. Everyone is in favor of the dam but the House conferees, and perhaps only a few of them.

I have a telegram from the President of the United States directed to the chairman of the conferees, in which he says:

> I strongly urge that appropriation for starting Ice Harbor Dam be included in Army civil-functions appropriations bill as recommended in 1953 budget. Aside from other considerations, power from this dam is very important to the new atomic-energy expansion program. We should not delay starting this dam any longer.

That telegram was sent by the Commander in Chief. There is not one person in the Government with any responsibility in this matter who is against beginning work on the Ice Harbor Dam, not only for the usual reasons that it would provide cheap electric power and be reimbursable to the Government with interest, but because of the fact that it would provide an addition to the power pool.

The only ones who are against the Ice Harbor project are a few House conferees. They always leave the civil-functions bill to the last. They always wait to have a conference on the civil-functions bill until the end of the session, so they can say, "All right, if you don't agree, you can't have any bill at all." The first conference was held on July Fourth, with the knowledge that we were at the end of the session.

This is the third time the Senate has voted for the construction of the Ice Harbor Dam. The Senate took that action, not merely because I asked for it, but because the feasibility and necessity of the Ice Harbor Dam are so clearly established in the minds of the Members of the Senate. In fact, the Members of both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee are so keenly aware of the necessity as well as the feasibility of the Ice Harbor Dam, that this year I did not even appear before the Appropriations Committee, but merely submitted to the committee a statement in which I repeated what I have said about this matter for many, many years.

Mr. President, perhaps we should change the rules, if two or three conferees on the part of the House are able to prevent a development of this sort, after so many responsible persons have asked for its construction.

Mr. President, it is true that we are building up the West with the help of many able Senators, such as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and the conferees on the part of the Senate on the civil-functions bill. It is true that many appropriations have been made for the construction of public power projects in the West, such as the Chief Joseph Dam, the McNary Dam, and the other dams about which the Senator

from Oregon and I know a great deal. However, those projects have nothing to do with this one.

Mr. President, I heard some of the conferees say, "If the Ice Harbor Dam is built, Congress will have to provide funds for the building of three other dams on the Snake River." Of course, Mr. President, the over-all plan for the Snake River provides for the construction of three or four more dams, and also for construction of the very controversial Hells Canyon Dam. However, the Ice Harbor Dam stands by itself. The other dams do not have to be built unless their feasibility is proved.

Mr. President, I am becoming very tired of hearing the words "pork barrel." These projects are so-called "reimbursable projects," in that the cost of their construction will be paid back to the Government, with interest. As a matter of fact, we are way ahead in our repayment schedule. The only reason why we came to the Government in this case is that these developments are so big that no combination of private interests could raise the funds required.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the power potentials of the Columbia River Basin alone are sufficient to take care of all the power needs of the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course that is true. If we could find some method of transportation, whereby power would not be lost and boosters—which would add to the cost per kilowatt-hour would not be needed—it would be perfectly possible to do that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the development of a country such as ours, I still maintain that we have not even scratched the surface, so far as the power potentials are concerned. Furthermore, we need more power.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course we do. Already we have used every bit of power we have developed at these projects. All that power has been used for defense purposes or for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Such developments create wealth, taxes, work, and manpower, do they not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they do.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I remember that when I was a young Member of the House of Representatives some 16 years ago, and when we obtained one of the first appropriations for construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, Member after Member of the House—including Members on both sides of the aisle—would stand and would ask, "What will be done with the power? Will it be sold to the jack rabbits out there in the sagebrush?"

Of course, Mr. President, the Grand Coulee Dam cost a great deal of money to build, but today the average citizen knows that that dam is worth four times what the Government has spent on it. The United States Government has never lost a nickel on its investments in these projects.

In our section of the country we are a little more fortunate, in that our rivers run directly to the sea. However, I have yet to see one public works project that has been devoloped by the Congress that has not proved to be worth what it cost; in fact, sometimes these projects have proved to be worth twice, three times, or four times their cost. However, whenever we propose any of these developments, the opponents pick on the cost figures, and shout pork barrel.

Mr. President, the public works which have been developed by the United States Government have the greatest capital asset value of anything the Government has done.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of such developments in the Northwest, the West and the Southwest, including the TVA developments, the Government has never lost a nickel; in fact, those developments have made money for the Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course they have.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I concur in everything the Senator from Washington has said regarding the national gain as a result of development of the water-power resources of the country.

However, I do not think this matter relates only to the development of water power in the West, the Northwest, the Southwest, and the South. In New York State we have two great water-power resources—resources as great as the Bonneville Dam, the Grand Coulee Dam, and the other potential resources of water power throughout the country. I refer, of course, to the Niagara River and to the St. Lawrence River, whose waters now are going to waste, as they are allowed to flow out to sea. As a result, we are not developing even a small fraction of the potential water-power resources at our disposal. Thus we are failing to make the great gain which could be made not only for New York State—for my interest is in the entire country, not only in New York State—but also for the United States as a whole. The completion of that development would be a gain to Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the entire northeastern section of the country.

Yet when we proposed the development of water power on the St. Lawrence River, both Houses voted down that project. They also voted down the proposal for the St. Lawrence seaway.

When we proposed the development of the Niagara River, the Senate voted reasonable appropriations for the making of studies and plans in that connection, but last year the appropriation was cut off, and this year the appropriation of $900,000 was reduced to $100,000.

I can say to you, Mr. President, that I have voted for every great power development since I came to the Senate 3 years ago. I shall continue to do so, because I do not think water-power development is a local matter at all. It is a matter of national interest. What helps the State of Washington or the State of Florida or the State of South Carolina, also helps New York. Similarly, what helps New York helps the other States.

I mention this matter only because I shall continue to fight for the reasonable demands for the development of water power all over the Nation. On the other hand, I must ask that New York and the entire northeastern section of the country also be given a fair break, which they have not had.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am sure the distinguished Senator from New York knows that he has had my support in the fight he has made. I believe New England needs another TVA. At the present time I see New England gradually relegating itself almost to a vacation center. People and industry are leaving New England. The reason for that is the lack of power in New England and the highest power rates in the United States—all because of the failure to develop power. That is why I say these developments should be made there.

Mr. President, it is very difficult to understand the opposition to these developments. Both the Ice Harbor Dam and the Hartwell Dam could be built for the cost of one battleship, although I guarantee that their value to the country will be equal to that of a thousand battleships. That will be the case for years and years to come, and those developments will pay back the money they cost, with interest.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I have no doubt that if the United States were willing to sell the water-power developments which have been made up to now, in all parts of the country, the Nation would realize from them more than the principal which has been expended and the interest on that principal; in fact, I am sure the Nation would realize from them very much more than that. The private power companies would be delighted to buy those projects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, they would. Let me say that I have never yet had anyone point out to me a so-called "white elephant" in a public-works project. All of these projects have been worth what we paid for them, and in many cases they have been worth much more than that.

If the United States were to keep books on these projects in the way that an ordinary business establishment would do, and if, in that connection, the United States used a conservative figure as the value of these developments, I am sure the final figure in the account would be in the black. There can be no question of that, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield further to me, let me say that his remarks have brought up memories of another day.

From 1926 to 1933, one of the Senators from Washington was Clarence Dill. Mr. Dill was a Senator when President Roosevelt was elected.

Mr. Dill was extremely interested in the development of the dams about which the Senator from Washington has just spoken—the Grand Coulee Dam, Bonneville Dam, and the other dams.

In January 1933, before Mr. Roosevelt took office, he invited Mr. Dill, the late Senator Norris, and myself to come to see him to talk to him. I do not think Senator Norris ever took much of an interest in water-power development, except in the newspapers, but Senator Dill was very active in looking after the interest of water-power developments in the State of Washington, at that time, and he is entitled to the greatest credit for what he did. The remarks of the Senator from Washington recall the trip we took to Muscle Shoals.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will yield in a moment. Former Senator Dill, of course, was a very distinguished Senator from Washington, and one who did more, I think, to make this development in the State of Washington possible than any other man whom I know.

Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate further. I merely want to point out—and I do not say it particularly in regard to the State of Washington, the State of Oregon, the State of Idaho, or the State of Georgia—that the hydroelectric projects in this country are not only worth more than we put into them, but that they are also repaying the Government with interest, while at the same time creating a vast amount of new wealth with which to provide not only for the demands of an increasing population, but also the demands in connection with defense.

Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD this statement, in order that the RECORD may be clear. I understand that I have at least the best possible assurance that could be given individually on the part of the Senate conferees that, in connection with the first supplemental bill to come before the Senate in the future, we shall have an opportunity to take this matter up again, and in plenty of time.

Mr. MAYBANK. We certainly shall.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That applies to any and all worthy projects, including Ice Harbor Dam.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may be perfectly clear as to the unanimity of opinion, not only regarding the necessity, but also the feasibility of this dam, I want to place in the RECORD a very vigorous and strong letter which I received from the Atomic Energy Commission dated May 27 of this year—as late as that, Mr. President—which letter concludes as follows:

> It does appear to us, however, that the proximity of the Ice Harbor Dam to our Hanford Works would be a feasible and sound means of strengthening the Bonneville system so that they would have added system capacity to enable them to supply Hanford with its increased requirements and to afford added assurance against power interruptions.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 27, 1952.

Hon. WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: In accordance with your request to the Atomic Energy Commission for a statement of its views on the Bonneville Power Administration's proposal to construct Ice Harbor Dam, we submit the following:

The Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Works located in Washington State receives its operating power from the Bonneville Power Administration. In order to maintain our rate of production with the requisite degree of safety we must have a reliable, trouble-free, noninterruptible source of power supply. Because of overloading and other factors on the Bonneville system, we have over the past few years experienced several power outages which have caused loss in plutonium production and created potential hazards.

As you know, we are presently completing several new facilities at our Hanford Works. These facilities will add to our power requirements and thus to our demands on the Bonneville system for additional electric energy.

In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission has proposed an expansion program which includes further expansion at Hanford. We are hopeful that the fund request for this proposed expansion will be submitted to the Congress within a few days. If this program is approved by the Congress, substantially as submitted, it, plus our normal load growth, will cause our power requirements for Hanford to more than double our present-day load. We would expect the Bonneville Power Administration to supply this power since our present and proposed facilities are within the area served by the Bonneville Power Administration.

On May 5, 1952, the manager of our Hanford operations office wrote the Bonneville Power Administration and advised them of this potential load growth. In this letter it was stated that we assumed Bonneville would supply this load and if necessary to do so, would cut nonessential users off to provide adequate service to the Commission. Bonneville Power Administration replied to this letter on May 9, 1952, indicating their willingness to supply the added requirement but stating that the only way they can do so is through added system capacity. We understand from informal discussions with Bonneville that there are three alternate methods by which they could strengthen their system to meet this requirement. We have not examined these three alternate methods in detail because we do not believe it is our function to determine which method would be the most feasible. We feel this to be the responsibility of the Bonneville Power Administration. It does appear to us, however, that the proximity of the Ice Harbor Dam to our Hanford Works would be a feasible and sound means of strengthening the Bonneville system so that they would have added system capacity to enable them to supply Hanford with its increased requirement and to afford added assurance against power interruptions.

Should you desire any more information, we will, of course, be pleased to supply it.

Very truly yours,

M. W. BOYER,
General Manager.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also want to place in the RECORD a lengthy letter from the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, dated June 20, 1952, pointing out that the so-called controversy in regard to this matter is solved, insofar as they are concerned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1952.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: The Senate has voted a $3,000,000 appropriation to initiate construction on Ice Harbor Dam. I judge the civil functions bill will soon be in conference. Since there has been controversy in regard to the Ice Harbor project, with particular reference to its effect on the salmon runs, I thought it desirable to supplement the information contained in Mr. Day's letter addressed to you under date of March 18, 1952.

In that letter Mr. Day stated that our plans for handling upstream and downstream migration of anadromous fish will eliminate any threat of exterminating any species of salmon. He indicated further that we believe there will be some losses but that the fishery interests are prepared, through the best possible devices known to modern science, to keep those losses at a minimum—thus insuring that everything possible is being done to perpetuate the fishery resources in the Columbia River watershed as they may be affected by the Ice Harbor project.

Plans for Ice Harbor Dam call for fish facilities similar to those now under construction at McNary Dam, including collection systems, ladders from each shore, and temporary ladders for passage while the dam is under construction. The two permanent ladders at Ice Harbor consist of a series of interconnected stepped pools 30 feet long and 20 feet wide with a rise of 1 foot at each step, at an estimated cost to the Corps of Engineers of approximately $9,000,000. We will incorporate in the Ice Harbor fish facilities any improvements that may be dictated by the operating experience at McNary Dam The McNary passageways will be in operation for at least 2 years prior to construction of the permanent facilities at Ice Harbor. The McNary facilities represent an improvement over facilities installed at Bonneville Dam in 1938.

While the Corps of Engineers has the responsibility of construction, our field representatives have cooperated fully with the corps in planning and designing fish facilities for this project. Thus, the latest scientific and biological knowledge available to us will be incorporated in our over-all plan for protecting the fishery resource at this project.

The records of 15 years of experience in operating the dam facilities on the Columbia River with the provision of fish-passing facilities, fish hatcheries, and other means of offsetting losses, have been reasonably effective in preserving salmon runs on that river.

The Fish and Wildlife Service will cooperate in every way with the Corps of Engineers in assuring that fish passageways are integrated in the Ice Harbor project. This Service will also cooperate with the corps to make certain that the salmon runs are properly handled during the construction period.

Mr. Albert M. Day, the Director of the Service, is out of the city. I, therefore, am sending you this letter which explains the position of this Service with reference to the fish problem at Ice Harbor lock and dam.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. KASK,
Assistant Director.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Department of the Interior, also dated June 20, 1952, setting forth in great detail the necessity for this project, and attaching a statement of Dr. Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, stressing the vital necessity of proceeding with this dam.

There being no objection, the letter, with its attachment, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 20, 1952.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: I appreciate your letter of June 19, 1952, in which you express your deep interest in the continued comprehensive development of the Columbia River. I am pleased to set out in this letter the answers to the three questions raised in the House committee report in connection with the Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington.

In regard to the question that Ice Harbor Dam will not have an irreparable effect on the fish runs the following information has been obtained in collaboration with the Fish and Wildlife Service of this Department.

The fish facilities to be constructed as an integral part of the Ice Harbor project are similar to fish ladders now under construction at McNary Dam, including collection system, ladders from each shore, and temporary ladders for passage during construction. The two Ice Harbor ladders will be 30 feet long and 20 feet wide, with a rise of 1 foot at each step. Design and construction of Ice Harbor fish facilities will benefit from at least 2 years of operating experience at McNary Dam. McNary ladders have been improved as a result of the experience at Bonneville Dam.

Over the years there has been a continued effort to evaluate the effect of construction of main-stem dams on the Columbia River fishery resource. The records of 15 years of operation of the dam facilities on the Columbia River with the provision of fish-passing facilities, fish hatcheries, and other means of offsetting losses have been fairly effective in preserving salmon runs on that river. The provision of proper fish facilities, such as will be installed at Ice Harbor Dam, will eliminate any threat of exterminating any specie of salmon by that project.

The use of the 15-percent loss at each dam has not been substantiated by experience. Scientific developments today indicate a continuing fishery resource on the Columbia River if the Congress will provide necessary appropriation for a continuing cooperative engineering and biological research program.

With respect to the fishery of the Cowlitz River the Federal Power Commission's license to construct this project requires approval of the plans for fish handling facilities in advance of construction to insure propagation of the fish runs on this stream. The license requires that the licensee cooperate with the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Fisheries and Game of the State of Washington in the preparation of such plans and requires modification to protect fish as may be needed during operation of the project. In the case of the Pelton project on the Deschutes River the Department recommended facilities for the protection of the migratory fish in the event a license was issued for the project. Similarly these plans must be approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Oregon State Game and Fish Commission.

In light of the above facts I can assure you that the Fish and Wildlife Service of this Department will cooperate in every way possible to minimize any possible effects of Ice Harbor on the fishery resource of the Snake River.

In answer to the question as to whether the power needs of the area cannot be supplied from other sources I refer to my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Functions Appropriations. At these hearings I directed attention to the seriousness of the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest by pointing out that all private and public utilities in the Pacific Northwest were united as to the need for an additional 500,000 kilowatts annually for the next several years to meet the normal load growth in the area; the equivalent of a hydrogenerating plant the size of Bonneville each year. I further advise the committee that superimposed on the existing defense loads in the Pacific Northwest is a proposed major expansion of the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission. We have explored all possible means of supplying the additional Hanford load and have arrived at a decision that Bonneville Power Administration cannot undertake to serve the additional load at Hanford because such service would be at the expense of contractual commitments to other loads in the area. Unless new generation is provided for the expanded Hanford load, the power supply of the region will be crippled and there will be cut-backs to industrial defense loads, private utilities, and public agencies.

Attached is a copy of Dr. Paul J. Raver's Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, statement before the Senate Civil Functions Appropriation Committee. It reinforces my position as to absolute necessity for immediately constructing Ice Harbor Dam. Dr. Raver's statement presents facts and figures on possible alternative proposals for providing the electrical service for the expansion at Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission and clearly proves that there is no economical alternative to Ice Harbor Dam. Further, it makes evident that any alternative which does not provide additional new generation will seriously cripple the power supply of the Pacific Northwest and will result in cut-backs to industrial defense loads, private utilities, and public customers in the area.

The problem of providing an adequate and reliable source of power for the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford Works has been a matter of grave concern to this department since initial construction of this vital defense plant. The Bonneville Power Administration has been conferring with the Atomic Energy engineering people at Hanford continuously since June of 1950 in order to arrive at an engineering solution which would assure an independent and reliable source of power for the Hanford Works. After exploring all possibilities it has become obvious to all concerned that the immediate construction of Ice Harbor, which is located only 7 miles from the plant, is the only economical and practical solution to this problem.

As recently as June 9, 1952, Mr. Gordon Dean, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated in a letter to me, copy of which is attached: "It is our understanding that Senator MAGNUSON used this letter (containing information to the effect that AEC proposes to double the power load at Hanford) in connection with Senate Appropriation Committee hearings on the proposed construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

"At the same time, however, we feel that if Congress approves the AEC proposed expansion at Hanford and does not provide additional generating capacity on the Bonneville system, it will be necessary for some Government agency, possibly the Office of Defense Mobilization, to critically review the consumers on the Bonneville system to determine whether or not service can be curtailed to any of the consumers without material interference to national defense and the growing economy of the Northwest, in order to supply power needed by our Hanford Works."

My office has contacted the Corps of Engineers relative to the question as to whether navigation benefits of Ice Harbor, without construction of other projects, are significant. Attached is a statement furnished by that agency. In summary the attached statement prepared by that agency reveals that average annual commerce on and through the Ice Harbor pool over the life of the project is estimated at 2,547,000 tons, and will consist of the upstream movement of petroleum products, building materials, and manufactured products, and the downstream movement of limestone, ores, wheat and other agricultural products, and timber. Average annual navigation benefits for Ice Harbor, based on savings in transportation costs are estimated at $1,250,000. When completed, Ice Harbor will provide navigation benefits of $300,000 annually. These benefits will increase progressively as other authorized navigation facilities are completed. It may be noted, also, that with only the initial navigation benefits, the Ice Harbor project is still justified economically, and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

In closing I wish to take this opportunity to remind you that appropriations for the construction of the authorized Ice Harbor project have been continuously sought since 1949. Its extreme importance to our defense effort has now been attested to by the Defense Electric Power Administration and it has had the complete endorsement of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive Office of the President. There is complete unanimity among all defense agencies of the administration that this project should be constructed and integrated into the Pacific Northwest grid in such a manner as to provide an independent power supply for the Hanford Works of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Department of the Interior again wishes to give assurance that the Fish and Wildlife Service will collaborate with the Corps of Engineers in providing fish facilities which will be required to protect and preserve the migratory fish. I am heartened by the fact that the Senate has seen fit to provide $3,000,000 to initiate construction of this project and trust that the facts which have been set forth herein will answer all questions in order that this important work can go forward immediately.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

STATEMENT OF PAUL J. RAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, ON MAY 14, 1952

The Bonneville Power Administration has met with the Pacific Northwest Utility Conference Committee to discuss the power supply situation in the Pacific Northwest region in light of the action of the House of Representatives on the civil functions appropriation bill. The deficiencies indicated by the representatives of the committee do not take into account the requirements of the Hanford works of the Atomic Energy Commission. The requirements of the AEC present two problems which have to be met. One is the quality of electrical service and the other is additional power for a proposed expansion.

We have made an analysis of the various methods by which the atomic energy load

at Hanford works might be adequately served. I have furnished the chairman of the Appropriations Committee with a copy of a classified letter from the Atomic Energy Commission which sets forth their electric power requirements. The manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford plant has made it clear to us that he expects the Bonneville Power Administration to take care of their needs and in so doing to provide the quality of service which would assure uninterrupted continuity of electric power to Hanford. Three possible plans of service have been developed which do assure the necessary quality of electric service to Hanford. These, along with a table of comparative costs, are as follows:

PLAN A. ICE HARBOR

This method of service to Hanford utilizes the generation at Ice Harbor Dam to supply the increased requirements of the AEC. Small transmission additions are included to permit this power to be supplied into the 230-kilovolt loop at a suitable point thus providing the desired degree of reliability of service. Costs used for Ice Harbor generation are those applying prior to the construction of additional upstream storage and are based on a 67 percent plant factor.

PLAN B. STEAM PLANT AT HANFORD WITH BACK-UP TRANSMISSION FROM M'NARY DAM

Install adequate steam-generating facilities at some appropriate location on the Hanford reservation. This steam plant will be operated on an approximate 50 percent plant factor which would coordinate economically with hydro generation on the system thus increasing firm power of the region. To assure adequate emergency reliability to AEC at such times when the steam plant is not in operation, an additional 230-kilovolt circuit from McNary Dam to the AEC 230-kilovolt system would be needed.

PLAN C. STEAM PLANT AT A COASTAL LOAD CENTER WITH BACK-UP TRANSMISSION FROM M'NARY DAM

Install adequate steam generating facilities remote from Hanford reservation at some appropriate location on the Bonneville system and supply transmission backup to Hanford from McNary Dam in plan B. This plan would permit the region to take advantage of transmission benefits due to the strategic location of the steam plant. By utilizing the Federal transmission grid it is possible to operate this steam plant at approximately 50 percent plant factor.

Cost to Federal Government of system additions chargeable to AEC load

Source of power	Investment	Annual requirements [1]
Plan A. Ice Harbor and system hydro	[2] $102,015,000	$4,730,000
Plan B. Steam at Hanford	[3] 44,400,000	7,710,000
Plan C. Steam on coast	[4] 43,900,000	5,430,000

[1] Includes interest, amortization, replacement, maintenance, and operation cost including fuel.
[2] Includes: Ice Harbor, $74,150,000 (does not include $33,550,000 allocated to other purposes); system hydro, $26,200,000; transmission back-up, $1,665,000; total, $102,015,000.
[3] Includes: Steam plant, $42,200,000; transmission back-up, $2,200,000; total, $44,400,000.
[4] Includes: Steam plant, $41,700,000; transmission back-up, $2,200,000; total, $43,900,000.

In summary, the Bonneville Power Administration's studies of loads and resources in the Northwest over the next 5 years have included Ice Harbor Dam in the resources because it was an authorized project closest to the Hanford area and had been recommended for construction as early as 1949. Furthermore, all possible new generation is required to take care of estimated loads in the Pacific Northwest without the addition of any heavy industrial loads. Even with the provision of Ice Harbor Dam serious shortages will exist.

Last year, when Congress failed to approve appropriations for Ice Harbor, our ability to take care of our loads was reduced by the capability of that project, almost 200,000 kilowatts. This situation was made even worse when we were informed recently that there was to be an increase (the amount of the increase in AEC load is classified information which has been furnished to the Chairman of the Committee) over previously estimated loads of the Atomic Energy plant at Hanford. This increase had not been included in the Pacific Northwest loads. Therefore, this year Bonneville Power Administration recommended very strongly that Ice Harbor be resubmitted to Congress, and agreed that with the restoration of this plant the Administration would take care of the increased load at Hanford. However, if Ice Harbor is not restored, the Administration cannot undertake to serve the additional Hanford load because such service would be at the expense of contractual commitments to other loads in the area. The only alternative is to construct new steam generation. It is our understanding that the capacity for manufacturing steam turbines is so fully loaded that additional steam generating facilities for Hanford could be provided only by displacing equipment now scheduled for other parts of the country. Hydro manufacturing capacity on the other hand is reported to be less critical. There is no practical alternative to the immediate construction of Ice Harbor Dam if the expansion of the atomic energy load at Hanford is to be provided with a satisfactory amount and source of power. Therefore any alternative which does not provide additional new generation will seriously cripple the power supply of the Pacific Northwest and will result in cutbacks to industrial defense loads, private utilities and the public customers in the region.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1952.

Hon. OSCAR CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you for your letter of May 20, 1952, which was in relation to our potential added power requirements at Hanford.

We appreciate the concern expressed by you and previously by the Bonneville Power Administration officials concerning this added load on their system. However, with our Hanford Works, located as it is on the Bonneville network, it is, of course, only feasible that we look to Bonneville for the supply of power. We are hopeful that the Congress will authorize the necessary funds to strengthen the Bonneville Power Administration's system and, of course, are willing to at any time advise the interested congressional committees of our requirements and our interest in seeing the Bonneville system strengthened.

We have recently written Senator MAGNUSON a letter setting forth these interests, a copy of which has been sent to you. It is our understanding that Senator MAGNUSON used this letter in connection with Senate Appropriation Committee hearings on the proposed construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

At the same time, however, we feel that if Congress approves the AEC proposed expansion at Hanford and does not provide additional generating capacity on the Bonneville system, it will be necessary for some Government agency, possibly the Office of Defense Mobilization, to critically review the consumers on the Bonneville system to determine whether or not service can be curtailed to any of the consumers without material interference to national defense and the growing economy of the Northwest, in order to supply power needed by our Hanford works.

As stated previously, we are hopeful that you are able to obtain authorization for additional generating capacity and the curtailment of the consumers along the Bonneville system will not be necessary.

We appreciate the fine cooperation our people receive from Bonneville Power Administration officials and also appreciate your assurance of the continued cooperation of the Department of the Interior in regard to this matter.

Very truly yours,

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION.
GORDON DEAN, *Chairman.*

STATEMENT OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS ON NAVIGATION BENEFITS FROM ICE HARBOR DAM, JUNE 20, 1952

Ultimate full development of the navigation potential of Ice Harbor Dam and Reservoir area depends on the opening up to water transportation the extensive natural resources of northern Idaho and eastern Washington and the markets of this area. During the interim period, until this full program is realized, construction of the McNary and The Dalles Dams will materially improve existing navigation on the lower 330 miles of the Columbia River. Construction of Ice Harbor Dam will permit extension of this navigation through the lower 45 miles of the Snake River for year-round use and, by drowning out some of the most treacherous rapids, will make continuous navigation possible on the remainder of the river up to Lewiston during the higher stream flow period, generally April through September. With the present construction of the Columbia Basin project by the Bureau of Reclamation and additional markets and agricultural products will be developed tributary to the lower Snake River. Current inquiries are being made by organizations from that region and the large wheat producing areas both north and south of the river for frontage on Ice Harbor Reservoir for commercial development. Similar inquiries also are being made by oil companies in the region. In addition, Walla Walla County is currently planning a port commission with expressed interest for early development of water frontage on this pool. The trade area served by Ice Harbor pool will include portions of the Columbia Basin project, Ritzville, Lind, Washtucna and Connell. Seasonal water transportation will be provided for the big wheat producing area of Colfax, Pullman, Rosalia, and as far north as Spokane, together with western Idaho. Petroleum products would move to these same general areas with a joint barge-truck movement or barge-pipeline movement extending well beyond Spokane and into the northern arm of Idaho.

Ice Harbor Dam, when completed as a single unit in extension of the Columbia River navigation system, will afford navigation benefits conservatively estimated at about $300,000 annually to the region. These benefits would be independent of those which would accrue later from future development of the remaining three dams of the lower Snake River project. They are made up of estimated transportation savings on grain originating along the Ice Harborn pool, an estimated limited movement of grain through Ice Harbor pool from upstream areas and a limited movement of oil upstream into and through the Ice Harbor pool as an extension of a well-established petroleum movement on the Columbia River.

Average annual commerce on and through the Ice Harbor pool over the life of the project is estimated at 2,547,000 tons, and will consist of the upstream movement of

petroleum products, building materials, and manufactured products, and the downstream movement of limestone, ores, wheat, and other agricultural products, and timber. Average annual navigation benefits for Ice Harbor, based on savings in transportation costs are estimated at $1,250,000. When completed, Ice Harbor will provide navigation benefits of $300,000 annually. These benefits will increase progressively as other authorized navigation facilities are completed. It may be noted, also, that with only the initial navigation benefits, the Ice Harbor project is still justified economically, and has a favorable benefit-cost ratio.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Charles S. Murphy, addressed to the chairman of the Senate conferees, as to the necessity of this dam.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEY WEST, FLA., *March 13, 1952.*

Hon. WARREN MAGNUSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

President is sending following telegram to Congressman CANNON: "Strongly urge that appropriation for starting Ice Harbor Dam be included in Army civil functions appropriations bill as recommended in 1953 budget. Aside from other considerations, power from this dam is very important to the new atomic energy expansion program. We should not delay starting this dam any longer."

CHARLES S. MURPHY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with those matters in the RECORD, I hope that between now and January the Representatives who served as conferees on the part of the House in connection with the matter will have an opportunity to read them. I yield the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to make a request to file certain material.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that Senators wishing to place matters in the RECORD permit the Chair first to put the motion of the Senator from Tennessee, which is necessary in order to dispose of the matter now before the Senate. Following that, there will be ample time for insertions in the RECORD, and it would accommodate the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly will accommodate the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote of the Senate disagreeing to the conference report be reconsidered and that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7268, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 5, 1952.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill (H. R. 7268) making appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"The following appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase not to exceed 200 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only in the current fiscal year and hire of passenger motor vehicles and purchase of one motorboat (to be acquired from surplus stock where practicable) and the maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft: *Provided further*, That the reservoir formed by the Blakely Mountain Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Ouachita,' and the reservoir formed by the Narrows Dam, Ark., shall hereafter be designated as 'Lake Greeson': *Provided further*, That the project known as 'Burr Oak Dam, Ohio,' shall hereafter be designated as the 'Tom Jenkins Dam, Ohio': *Provided further*, That $125,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be used for providing a suitable access road and bridge from the town of Blum, Tex., to the Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railroad station, relocated in connection with the construction of the Whitney Dam and Reservoir project: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $250,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be expended for providing a suitable access road from United States Highway 70 north to the bridge built upon and across the Center Hill Dam in DeKalb County, Tenn.: *Provided further*, That not more than $40,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for expenditure, in addition to funds heretofore made available for the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, to pay to lawful occupants of properties within the towns of Elbowoods, Sanish, and Van Hook, N. Dak., for their improvements which will be rendered useless by the construction of the project, but for which compensation may not be made under existing law because of the occupants' limited right of occupancy: *Provided further*, That payment in each case shall be limited to the fair value of the improvements, or the cost of moving such improvements to the site of the new combined town, whichever is less, as determined by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated shall not be expended for the payment of business losses or other losses incident to the acquisition of lands for this project."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 2 be agreed to by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion is agreed to. The House amendment to Senate amendment No. 2 is agreed to. That ends the matter.

The Chair would like to congratulate the Senator from Tennessee, as chairman, upon the fine work done by him and his associates in the Senate Committee on Appropriations and in the subcommittee, including the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. All and sundry have done everything possible to complete this legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to thank very heartily the distinguished President of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE TO PRINT CERTAIN MATTERS IN THE RECORD

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted, following the adjournment of Congress, to file and have printed in the RECORD for the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency a report of the activities of the committee during the Eighty-second Congress.

I also ask unanimous consent to file and have printed in the RECORD any reports from the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Summary of legislative record of Senator MOODY of Michigan.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address delivered by Dr. C. O. Watkins at the Toastmasters Club in Sidney, Mont.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Article entitled "FEPC Is Political Fraud Says Negro Newspaperman," published in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette of July 4, 1952.

Article entitled "Race Issue Has Nation Boiling: Public Misled as to Facts," written by Davis Lee, and published in the Newark, (N. J.) Telegram of February 10, 1952.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 240, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, July 5, 1952, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be amended by striking out "Saturday, July 5, 1952" and inserting "Monday, July 7, 1952."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to. Without objection, the concurrent resolution, as amended, is agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 241, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the

two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AFTER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Ordered, That, notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the present Congress, the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives after such adjournment.

AUTHORIZATION OF VICE PRESIDENT TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS TO COMMISSIONS OR COMMITTEES

Mr. McFARLAND submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Ordered, That, notwithstanding the final adjournment of the session, the Vice President be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATOR McFARLAND TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS IN A CERTAIN CONTINGENCY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following order, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Ordered, That if delay ensues in the enrollment of any bills or joint resolutions, and the Vice President or the President pro tempore is not available to sign the same when duly enrolled, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] be, and he is hereby, authorized to sign such bills or joint resolutions as Acting President pro tempore.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY AND PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long. I merely rise to pay tribute to our majority leader for the outstanding work performed by him during the past few days, particularly in connection with the atomic-energy program. I am intimately acquainted with the work carried through by him as of yesterday. I know that he stayed up until 7 a. m. Sunday morning following a 5 a. m. session of this body; and yet, before the noon hour of that day he was calling me on his telephone. He was back at work within 3 hours after having gone to his room. But for his patient and painstaking efforts, the resolution of the differences between the two Houses might not have been accomplished. I pay tribute to him for what I consider to be an act of great leadership in guiding us through the settlement of a most vital problem. It would have been a tragic mistake had this Congress adjourned without having fully clarified the meaning and intent of the Congress insofar as the atomic energy development is concerned.

I also pay tribute to the conferees and to all the members of the Appropriations Committee. I felt very strongly about this matter, Mr. President, and I can go home now, feeling that we have done our job, and have done it well.

One final word. I regret that we have had to curb our activities in terms of certain public works developments. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] in his remarkable and splendid address here this afternoon on the whole subject of our public works development programs. My State has not shared in these programs, but in great degree we have shared in some development of the upper Mississippi. I deeply regret that I must return to my State with the full knowledge that in the Department of the Interior appropriation bill recognition of transmission lines was not granted us, that flood-survey funds were not granted us, and that funds for the caring of the Indian were not granted us.

Just as the Senator from South Carolina assured the Senate that he will be back here in January fighting for his project, so I can assure the Senate that, God willing, since there is no election in which I am directly involved, that I shall be back, greatly interested in the appropriations and authorizations of the Congress, to see to it that justice is done to the people of the State which in part I represent. I join with those who want to build our Nation into a greater Nation. Nothing could be worse than for the people to be divided so that there is a situation of section against section and State against State. Whatever is good for my friends in South Carolina is good for the people in Minnesota, and what is good for us is good for them.

Mr. President, we have a job to develop the resources of America. In recent days the President has called attention to the importance of saving to the American economy our minerals, our oil, and all the great substance with which God has blessed this Nation. That is something which alarms every Member of the Congress. Our job is to find new materials, new energy, and new resources for America. We are using them so rapidly that we must do something to save them for future generations. It is the job of the Congress to legislate and not to listen to the writers who talk about the pork barrel, and not to listen to those who are not willing to spend a dime for improvement. We have been told by certain sources that we should not spend for the improvement of the Nation, that we have got to dissociate expenditures from investments. They do not tell the truth. It is not an expenditure to improve rivers; it is not an expenditure to develop the great resources involved in our river system; it is not an expenditure to find new ores and new metals; it is not an expenditure when we appropriate for research to improve the health of the people and to build new industries and new areas of activity. I, for one, refuse to believe that the money we have spent for the resources of the people is an expenditure. It is a prudent and wise investment. It represents the cooperative effort of the American people to raise the economy of the Nation to higher levels. The reason why the economy of America is where it is today is because we have gone into those areas which have been at times classified as marginal areas, and we have made them productive. We have reforested our land. We have spent money to make money. But, more important, we have spent money to make a better life for our people.

That is the program to which I dedicate myself, and I am not going to be intimidated one little bit by budget pinchers, and by modern Scrooges who are opposed to spending some of the money of the United States to develop more money. America stands for capital investment and the improvement of the material and human resources of the Nation. The sooner the Congress of the United States makes up its mind to march forward with this program the better off we shall be. It represents democracy, a better country, and a better people.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I was very shocked to hear the distinguished Senator from Minnesota intimate that he had no interest in the coming elections. Thereafter he proceeded to announce a most attractive program. I hope I misunderstood him and that he does not mean that he has withdrawn his candidacy for the Presidency. The speech he has just made surely appeals to hundreds of thousands of citizens of the United States who believe in his program, and who will look to him as a candidate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I want to make it perfectly clear that I had reference to my personal interest. If I were personally interested in the campaign I would have proceeded to make a good campaign speech. I was talking about the ten commandments of American politics, including the importance of the development of America's resources. The committees of Congress have a job to carry on and not to listen to the pundits who would say, "Halt. Stop." Those persons would stop America on dead center. I want America to move ahead with a bold program such as we have been talking about.

Mr. GREEN. I shall be glad to be reassured that the Senator has not withdrawn his candidacy.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I may have the support of the Senator from Rhode Island I shall have plenty of glory in this session and in sessions to come. I pay him honor for his great inspiration and for his spirit and his vision. If I can live to be as young as the Senator from Rhode Island I shall be thankful and grateful, and if I can serve my country half so well as the distinguished statesman from Rhode Island serves his country, I shall be indeed grateful.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

A PHILOSOPHICAL OUTLOOK AND AN EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest that no man worth his salt ever lost ungracefully or accepted his defeat as more than a temporary set-back. I think our failures of today may be useful in guiding our actions tomorrow, and perhaps at the end of that day we shall be farther along the road.

So far as differences of opinion go—and they have shown up in connection with legislation ever since there has been legislation—we must always have in mind that the legislative process is of necessity one of compromise, that it is far more important that we have order and that we follow the rules than it is that we achieve each his own desires.

I am happy, Mr. President, that we are going to be able to close today, maintaining the historic tradition of the Congress as a legislative body. I regret some of the things that have happened, but that is water over another dam.

I want to take this opportunity to express my personal appreciation to the majority leader. He has had some difficult days in this session. He came to his job with a pretty fair facility for getting along with people, but necessity has required him to expand it enormously, and he has met the challenge in a remarkable way. He has been able to get conflicting wills to work together to get concessions. He has done an outstanding job, and it is a pleasure for me to commend him.

Mr. McFARLAND. I sincerely thank the Senator from Oregon.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. CORDON. I desire also, Mr. President, to express my appreciation of the President pro tempore. I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 353) was considered and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present Congress.

AFFAIRS OF GOVERNMENT—INTEREST OF THE PEOPLE IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had to say a few minutes ago and by the very gracious remarks of the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. There has been a great deal of evidence recently of a growing interest among the people of the United States in what goes on in this Congress of a free people.

We see many evidences of that in the great throngs that, day by day, have filled the corridors of the Capitol of the United States. I never fail to be moved by the presence of these citizens, young and old, who come to Washington to observe the functioning of their Government and to view the Government buildings which are here erected.

However, I have evidence of another kind of the growing interest of our people in the affairs of government. I have the honor to be chairman of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. It is the function of that committee not only to review the economic report of the President, which by law must be made at the beginning of each session, but also to study the effect of laws and business operations upon the economy of the country. In the process of these studies, the committee finds it necessary from time to time to publish various reports and documents. For some years there has been a standing rule in the Government Printing Office by which the Superintendent of Documents mails these documents without charge to some 500 depository libraries, and some 220 copies are made available through the document rooms of the Senate and the House.

However, as chairman of the Joint Committee, I have undertaken to provide for the sale of the documents of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, believing that the people of the United States themselves are interested in the deep and sometimes abstruse problems of economics. I am happy to be able to say to the Senate and to the country, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that some 27 publications of the joint committee which have been placed on sale have already produced an income of $27,560, and that the sales of the Economic Indicators, a publication that is issued each month, have produced $17,200.

In other words, the total sales of these documents, which under the initiative of our committee are now available through the Office of the Superintendent of Documents, have produced for the Treasury of the United States $44,760. That may seem like a small sum, but it means that more than 51,900 people throughout the United States have been sufficiently interested in these problems to write to the Superintendent of Documents and to purchase the publications. Of course, this distribution is in addition to the general distribution which is made by the committee in response to requests of Members of Congress and others.

I may say that the mailing list of the Joint Economic Committee includes 51 banks, 98 commercial firms, 50 lawyers and investment counsel, 19 public libraries, 45 labor organizations, 100 management and consumer organizations, 60 research institutions of libraries, 75 university libraries, and nearly 500 university departments and individual professors.

Other important groups on the mailing list include technicians and administrators in Federal, State, and local government agencies, representatives of foreign governments, regional Federal Reserve banks, and the regional and local press.

I think this record is a demonstration of the rising level of intellectual interest in the problems of the Government of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a list which I have prepared of the publications of the joint committee which are now on sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D. C., together with the prices of the documents.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLICATIONS OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT SOLD BY THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Economy of the South (the impact of Federal policies on the economy of the South), committee print: July 1949.

Factors Affecting the Volume and Stability of Private Investment (materials on the investment problem assembled by the staff of the Subcommittee on Investment) Senate Document No. 232. (Sale price, 60 cents): September 1950; reprinted from committee print of October 1949.

Low-Income Families and Economic Stability (materials on the problem of low-income families assembled by the staff of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families), Senate Document No. 231. (Sale price, 35 cents): September 1950; reprinted from committee print of November 1949.

Compendium of Materials on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies (a collection of statements submitted to the Subcommittee on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies by Government officials, bankers, economists, and others), Senate Document No. 132. (Sale price, $1): January 1950; reprinted from committee print of November 1949.

Highways and the Nation's Economy (materials assembled by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), Senate Document No. 145. (Sale price, 20 cents): January 1950.

Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies (report of the Subcommittee on Monetary, Credit, and Fiscal Policies), Senate Document No. 129. (Sale price, 15 cents): January 1950.

Employment and Unemployment (report of the Subcommittee on Unemployment), Senate Document No. 140. (Sale price, 30 cents): February 1950.

Low-Income Families and Economic Stability (final report of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families), Senate Document No. 146. (Sale price, 15 cents): March 1950.

Volume and Stability of Private Investment (final report of the Subcommittee on Investment), Senate Document No. 149. (Sale price, 15 cents): March 1950.

December 1949 Steel Price Increases (report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), Senate Report No. 1373. (Sale price, 20 cents): March 1950.

Handbook of Regional Statistics (material assembled by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), committee print. (Sale price, $1): April 1950.

Joint Economic Report (report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1950 Economic Report of the President), Senate Report No. 1843. (Sale price, 35 cents): June 1950.

General Credit Control, Debt Management, and Economic Mobilization (materials prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), committee print. (Sale price, 25 cents): January 1951.

Underemployment of Rural Families (materials prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), committee print. (Sale price, 20 cents): February 1951.

The Economic and Political Hazards of an Inflationary Defense Economy (materials prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), committee print. (Sale price, 30 cents): February 1951.

Joint Economic Report (report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1951 Report of the President), Senate Report No. 210. (Sale price, 30 cents): April 2, 1951.

Making Ends Meet on Less Than $2,000 a Year, Case Studies of 100 Low-Income Families (communication to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report from the Conference Group of Nine National Voluntary Organizations Convened by the National Social Welfare Assembly), committee print. (Sale price, 35 cents): July 1951.

The Need for Industrial Dispersal (materials prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee staff), Senate Document No. 55. (Sale price, 30 cents): August 1951.

Inflation Still a Danger (report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report together with materials on national defense and the economic outlook included in committee print mentioned above), Senate Report No. 644. (Sale price, 15 cents): August 1951.

Questions on General Credit Control and Debt Management (prepared by staff of the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report), committee print. (Sale price, 15 cents): October, 1951.

Monetary Policy and the Management of the Public Debt. Their Role in Achieving Price Stability and High-Level Employment (replies to questions and other material for the use of the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management. (Sale price: Pt. I, $1.75; pt. II, $2.50): February 1952.

Hearings, January 1952 Economic Report of the President (January 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, February 1). (Sale price, $1.25): February 1952.

Constitutional Limitation on Federal Income, Estate, and Gift Tax Rates (materials assembled for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives), committee print. (Sale price, 15 cents): February 1952.

Joint Economic Report (report of the Joint Committee on the January 1952 Report of the President together with National Defense and the Economic Outlook for the Fiscal Year 1953, materials prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by the committee staff): March 1952.

The Taxation of Corporate Surplus Accumulations, The Application and Effect, Real and Feared, of Section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code Dealing with Unreasonable Accumulation of Corporate Profits (study prepared for the Joint Committee on the Economic Report) committee report. (Sale price 55 cents); May 1952.

Hearings, Monetary Policy and the Management of the Public Debt. Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management. (March 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 31, 1952) (Sale price, $2.25): May 1952.

Monetary Policy and the Management of the Public Debt, Report of the Subcommittee on General Credit Control and Debt Management of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Senate Document No. 163 (Sale price, 25 cents); July 1952.

Economic Indicators (a monthly publication of the Congress under Public Law 120, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) (Sale price, 20 cents a copy, $2 a year); monthly.

CONCLUDING REMARKS BY THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, while we are awaiting the action of the House, I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation for the many kind remarks that have been made about me.

Had it not been for the cooperation of the chairmen of the various committees, of the minority leader, and of individual Senators, we would not have been able to accomplish what has been done by the Senate during this session. I deeply appreciate the remarks which have been made, not only on the floor of the Senate, but privately by individual Senators who have come to me and have shaken my hand. If I have put forth special efforts in the last 2 or 3 days, it was because I was inspired by the expressions by Senators. Their encouragement gave me the energy to work, as indicated by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, almost without sleep, in order that we might bring about adjournment of the Senate today, thus enabling us to return to our homes.

I stated the other day that I appreciated the helpfulness of the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. He has cooperated with me in dispatching the work of the Senate.

The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], as the minority whip, has also cooperated with me and with the Senate in accomplishing the tasks which faced the Senate. He, too, is an able Senator, and has accomplished a great deal during his tenure in office. He sat across the aisle from me during the last session, when the distinguished former minority leader, Senator Wherry, was ill. I have a great admiration for him.

I certainly appreciate the kind remarks of the acting minority leader [Mr. CORDON] this evening. He is one of our able Senators, and has done much in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and in the Committee on Appropriations, as well, to improve and facilitate the work of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Now, Mr. President, I want to pay a tribute to a man who has been my right hand through all the trying days—and the difficult situations—which have confronted me as majority leader. The man I refer to is the able Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] the majority whip.

To me he has been a tireless coworker, an ever willing and energetic aide. His judgment and his devoted assistance have meant more to me than I will ever be able to express in mere words.

In these days in which we have worked so closely, I have come to possess a profound admiration for the junior Senator from Texas. He has a fine mind that manifests itself in the sound thinking that will benefit his State of Texas in the days ahead, just as I have had the opportunity to profit by his attributes in the months during which we have been so closely associated.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Texas will, in the next Congress, be the senior Senator from Texas. He has truly earned this distinction by his diligent and effective service in the House of Representatives and his outstandingly good work in the Senate of the United States. When Senator JOHNSON came to the Senate from the House of Representatives, his reputation for integrity, and the ability to get things done had preceded him to this body.

Senator JOHNSON'S superb work in the Senate and on committees has continued to earn him recognition for outstanding achievement.

The people of Texas, of the United States, and of the world, can thank Senator LYNDON JOHNSON for the efficient work of his subcommittee on military preparedness which has time and time again been a vigilant watchdog of our national defense. No one can tell the ultimate savings that will result from the work of this committee, but we do know that it will be great. No one can say just how much faster our defense goals have been reached because of Senator JOHNSON'S work on this committee. But, we know it has speeded us greatly toward military security which is our greatest deterrent to war.

I cannot say enough in praise of the Senator from Texas, both in his capacity as the junior Senator from Texas, and in his work as the majority whip. Let me only remark, in all sincerity, that I have never known, and do not hope to meet, a finer son of Texas, a more able Senator, or a more helpful adviser.

Some reference has been made to the time when I went to bed and the time when I got up. I do not know whether Senator JOHNSON called me first, or whether I made the first call. I only know that both of us were up at about the same time after about 3 hours sleep yesterday morning, at work trying to iron out the problem that confronted us.

Texas is to be doubly congratulated. I have already spoken about the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is retiring. I wish to say that the State of Texas is to be congratulated on being represented in the Senate by one with the ability and energy of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. In my opinion, he is a true statesman and a truly able representative of the fine people of the great State of Texas. He is always working for the things that will be helpful to his people and his country. That is what I think a Senator is sent here to do and few are doing a more magnificent job of it than my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON The Senator from Oregon, who happened accidentally to be born in Texas, although he is a native Oregonian, has perhaps a keen appreciation of the feeling in the mind of the majority whip. I suggest that the majority whip feels that the majority leader gave him his greatest compliment when he said that the junior Senator from Texas is from Texas.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR McMAHON

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I could go on and offer my sincere compliments to each individual Senator, and I should like to do so, but time will not permit.

However, there is one other Senator whom I wish to mention in particular this evening. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is to be commended for the splendid work he has done as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. So wide has become his recognition in this field that he has deservedly come to be known as Mr. Atomic Energy. In spite of the fact that he has been confined to his bed for many days, he has continued to work diligently on matters of high importance to the Nation.

There is no better illustration of Senator McMAHON's devotion to duty than his successful efforts to prevent adoption of the amendment which would have seriously crippled our atomic-energy program. I believe that it can be fairly said that the action of the Congress with respect to this amendment was largely due to Senator McMAHON's vigilence and effort.

I wish to send to him the congratulations of the Senate for his splendid work and to express the hope that he will soon be up and among us again. I am informed and am most happy to hear that his health has greatly improved.

COMMENDATION OF SENATE OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES

I wish to speak a word of commendation for those who have served with us. I refer to the entire Senate staff, including the page boys. I wish to express appreciation for their fine work. We are particularly appreciative of the work of the Official Reporters of Debates, the Parliamentarian, the Secretary, and various others.

These men served long hours. When there are long speeches in the evening running until 9 or 10 o'clock, individual Senators may leave; but those whom I have mentioned must remain. They have their work to do, and they cannot leave. I do not want the Senate to adjourn without commending them and thanking them for the fine work they have done.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, it is seldom indeed that I echo a Democrat. But in this instance, because he so clearly expresses the sentiments of every Member of the Senate, I wish to echo the majority leader in his expression of appreciation to all members of the staff of the Senate.

INVITATION TO WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Before the final business of the session is transacted, let me say that there comes to my mind another occasion when I had the pleasure of extending to Members of the opposition party the privilege, after working hard, of visiting a little bit of heaven. In a week or 10 days the Democrats will be convening in Chicago. After sweating in Washington, and after naming their candidate, I suggest that if they want a little physical rejuvenation they should journey northward to the land, not of make-believe, but of 9,000 lakes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Do I hear Wisconsin being mentioned? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I am speaking of Wisconsin, where the trout sparkle in the streams, where the "muskies" play in the lakes, and where the cool breezes from Lake Michigan and Lake Superior play through the pine trees. I know that my colleagues will need all the energy they can recapture from beautiful Wisconsin.

I suggest that the distinguished President of this body, whose candidacy has been announced, take his fair bride and come to Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I have a great deal of competition in that field. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I suggest that the Vice President come to Wisconsin before he becomes too busy in the campaign. There he may take a little rest, take a shot of Wisconsin ozone, sink his teeth into Wisconsin cheese, and be really refreshed in body and soul.

Mr. McFARLAND. Why not eat an Arizona steak? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the wind-up of this session a great deal more than I have enjoyed some of the things that have been said on the floor of the Senate heretofore. There has been a spirit of harmony and good will. I agree with all the fine things that have been said about everyone, including our distinguished working force.

Mr. President, I wish for you good luck and success. If it should be your good fortune to become the President of the United States, I know, sir, that you will do a grand job. I know that in the Presidency we of the Senate would have a friend. We would be received as old-time coworkers.

So I say to all of you, come north after you get through in Chicago. Come up into Wisconsin and see what a little bit of heaven looks like. Breathe a little of the atmosphere which will rejuvenate you—because many of you are a little tired and need rejuvenation.

THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I wish to speak briefly upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 354) was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner with which he has presided over its deliberations during the present Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I arise to pay tribute to one of this Nation's most distinguished citizens, the Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

Mr. President, this man stands as a living example of what can be accomplished in this great democracy of ours by a poor boy who is willing to put forth the proper effort in work and service for others. After working his way through college, he became the prosecuting attorney of his county, and later the county judge.

When he was elected to the Congress of the United States and took his oath of office 39 years ago, he was recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of his State. Since he became a Member of Congress he has performed many important functions for his Government and for his party. Because of his leadership and ability he has been called upon to deliver many important addresses throughout the Nation, including the keynote address for the 1948 convention.

He made his mark in the House of Representatives, and was then elected to the Senate of the United States where he took the oath of office in the year 1927.

He served as minority leader during the Eightieth Congress and was so effective he helped to return the Democrats to power in the Eighty-first Congress, and the people in recognition of his great ability elected him Vice President of the United States.

He has at all times been willing to help new Members of the Senate. I am proud to have been one of those Members. All of us are honored to be able to be counted among his friends. In the Senate he was a fearless leader, willing to fight for the principles he thought to be right. He was respected by all the Members of the United States Senate. I know of no man who has a better understanding of the problems of our country or a deeper interest in the welfare of the mass of the people.

He has served as Vice President with the same high degree of excellence and fairness that characterized all his previous work.

Mr. President, I have not the words to depict the wonderful and colorful life of the Vice President, who was once majority leader in the Senate. The record which he has made speaks for itself. I am certainly gratified and happy to have had the opportunity to serve in the United States Senate with him, and under him as majority leader. I am most happy to have had the opportunity of serving in this body while he was Vice President, and to have been majority leader while he was President of the Senate.

Mr. President, it has been mentioned that you have announced yourself as a candidate for the Presidency of the

United States. I should like to mention one historical fact. If I do not have it wrong, 10 Vice Presidents have been elected to the Presidency, but only 3 have presided over the Senate after they were elected to the Presidency. They were John Adams, in 1796, Thomas Jefferson, in 1800, and Martin Van Buren.

I hope, Mr. President, if you are successful and are elected President that you will honor us as President-elect by coming back and opening the Senate when it convenes on January 3 of next year.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority I desire to ask whether there is any objection to agreeing to the resolution. Hearing none, it is agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Chair were to vacate the chair he would be glad to have the Senator from Oregon, whose friendship he cherishes as much as that of any Member of this body, preside while the resolution was under consideration.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon now withdraws his statement and takes over for the first time since he has been in the Senate, by the way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Inasmuch as I am not permitted to speak on the floor if I vacate the chair, may I, before yielding, have just a word to say?

Mr. CORDON. You may.

Mr. McFARLAND. Before the Vice President has his word to say, may the Senator from Oregon proceed to take the chair, so that we may have the resolution agreed to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, as a human being, and not as a chair, would like to express his profound appreciation for the resolution, and for its introduction by the Senator from Arizona, as well as for the generous words expressed by the Senator from Oregon.

We are about to adjourn and go to our respective homes. I profoundly hope that no emergency will arise which will require the President to issue a proclamation calling Congress back into an extraordinary session.

I have always had a feeling that it is not only good for Members of Congress, but it is good for the country, to have the people's representatives get back among the people, to associate with them and to strengthen the feeling which must prevail, in order that the people may understand the work of their representatives and may commend or criticize, as circumstances may require, the record which they have made.

I think that in this particular situation, in which the world is standing on tiptoe, wondering what will happen tomorrow, whether the democratic institutions will survive, and whether a world half free and half slave may long endure, as Lincoln said nearly a hundred years ago with regard to our own country, "It is well, it is good, and it is wholesome for the representatives of the people to return to the people and learn of their emotions and their desires and their will."

I wish for each and every Member of the Senate, regardless of his partisanship, his political affiliations, or his geography, a safe return to his people, and the enjoyment of a free and wholesome atmosphere in association with them; and that they may be strengthened and as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has suggested, be rejuvenated—which the present occupant of the Chair does not need—not only in body but in spirit and in soul, and in their faith in American institutions.

Before we return to the Senate the American people will have rendered a verdict between the two great political parties. Regardless of that verdict, regardless of the candidates, regardless of the name or identity of him who will assume the helm in conducting the affairs of this Nation for the next 4 years, I am very happy to feel that I have the profoundest confidence in the intelligence of the American people and in their patriotism. They may make mistakes now and then, but if they know the truth and know the facts and know the conditions we may depend upon them to act wisely.

Regardless of the political party that may win in the coming election, regardless of whoever may be chosen as President of the United States, I am sure we all feel, so long as he is supported and inspired by the American people with faith in our institutions and in their permanency, and with the guiding hand of Almighty God, our ship of state will chart its course between Scylla and Charybdis and come into a safe and sure harbor at the end of the journey.

Let me thank you all for the courtesies you have extended to me during this hard session—as hard working a session as I have ever seen. I have often felt as though I ought to explain to our visitors in the gallery, who have observed very few Members on the floor of the Senate, that they were not idle, but many of them were hard at work in committees preparing legislation for consideration by the Senate. Our visitors do not always know that. I think there ought to be some way by which they could be advised, when they visit the Senate and find only a few Members on the floor, that the other Members are hard at work in committee, frequently behind closed doors, where they receive no publicity, but where they are engaged in a conscientious effort to serve the American people.

May you all have a restful vacation and may God bless every one of you. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I want the distinct honor of seconding the motion made by the majority leader that the resolution in question be approved. I feel that it would be an honor because I have felt always that our Presiding Officer is a great American. [Applause.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORDON in the chair). Is there objection to the resolution? Hearing none, the resolution is unanimously agreed to.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now that the resolution has been under discussion and has been agreed to, the Chair would like to refer to the work of the majority leader, Senator McFARLAND, which has been so deserving of praise particularly this afternoon and during the past few days.

I know something about the obligations, burdens, and responsibilities of the majority leader. I wish to say that not since I have been in the Senate has there been a majority leader who has worked more diligently, more conscientiously, and more successfully to accomplish the purposes of the Senate than has the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]. It has been a pleasure for me as Vice President to work with him and to give him any assistance within my power.

It was my privilege and pleasure to welcome him here 12 years ago, when I myself was then majority leader of the Senate.

The State of Arizona is as well represented in the Senate as is any other State of the Union, not only in the Senator who is majority leader, but also in his colleague [Mr. HAYDEN], who came to the Senate on the same day I did, namely, on March 4, 1927.

With the permission of the Senate, I should also like to say a word in commendation of the majority whip of the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. The Senate will not soon know, and the country may never know, how the Senator from Texas has worked behind the scenes in ironing out differences between the Senate and the House and among Senators. The Senator from Texas, although here for only a relatively short time, as compared to the length of time we hope he will remain in the Senate, has attained a reputation and a standing never exceeded in the same length of time, in my judgment, by any other Member of the United States Senate. I am glad to say that because I am very fond of the State of Texas. I have been associated with the Members of the Texas congressional delegation, in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, for the past 39 years.

While I am speaking at this time, with the permission of the Senate, I should like to say a word about the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is departing from this body. He came to the House of Representatives 4 years after I became a Member of that body. He came to the Senate 2 years after I had been transferred from the House of Representatives to the Senate. He and I have worked together in the two branches of the Congress for all these years and during that time our families have been intimately associated.

I regret that the Senator from Texas is not to be longer a Member of the Senate. I commend him for the dignity with which he has served the State of Texas and for the dignity with which he voluntarily eliminated himself from further controversy in regard to reelection. I wish for him long life, happiness, and prosperity, and that he may rejoice in the pride of the inner knowledge—which, after all, is the greatest compensation any of us can have—of

having for a long time served his country in an outstanding manner and to the infinite advantage of the American people and all for which they stand.

If I had time to do so, and if the Senate were willing, I might commend other Senators; but I wished to commend those three, particularly.

Let me say, in his absence, of the minority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is away today on a mission which all of us understand—a mission which some of us will duplicate in several weeks—that I have appreciated his personal friendship and his cooperation. I wish for him and all his colleagues and associates a well-deserved vacation among the people. All I could ask of him and of our opponents on the Republican side of the aisle is that in the coming jamboree in which the American people will take part and will render judgment, those Senators will not be too hard upon us on the stump.

PRAISE FROM SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my very deep admiration for the patience and great degree of skill with which the majority leader has handled the affairs of the Senate in the last few days. We were in serious difficulties, with many differences existing between the two Houses. It must be a source of great satisfaction to him that they now have been ironed out, and that we are about to adjourn.

I also wish to congratulate him and the majority whip, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], for the spirit of unity which, under their leadership, has been achieved in this body during the last few days. I believe we are leaving Washington with as great a degree of good will among ourselves as any that has been achieved in any year within the memory of the Members of the Senate.

Again I wish to congratulate them and thank them for their leadership, particularly in the last few days.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Watson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 240) providing for the sine die adjournment July 5, 1952.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Texas, of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration Hospital near Amarillo;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army; and

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. CORDON advanced in the center aisle, and Mr. McFARLAND said: Mr. President, the committee appointed to wait upon the President, reports that it has notified the President that the Senate is about to adjourn, and that the President has stated that he has no further communication to make to the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is always a bit difficult to make this last motion. It gives us some happiness, yet we are saddened by the fact that we are parting from our good friends, some of whom will not be back in the Senate with us at the next session. I hope that each Member of the Senate will go home and enjoy fully the months that are ahead. I know that Senators will be glad to be home and to mingle with the people. I merely want to add one thing to what the Vice President has said. A Senator works as hard when he is at home, perhaps a little harder, than he does when he is here. He must get around, he must see the people of his State, he must talk with them about their problems; and he must do a great deal of other work at home. I wish every Senator the best of everything.

Mr. President, in accordance with the resolution heretofore adopted, I move that the Senate do now adjourn sine die.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned sine die.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, the President pro tempore, under the authority of House Concurrent Resolution 241, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 7268. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7800. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had approved and signed acts, as follows:

On July 7, 1952:

S. 2234. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64, subdivision h of section 70, and sections 118, 354, and 643 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith;

S. 2240. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase and fix the salary of full-time referees and to authorize increased salaries for part-time referees; and

S. 2545. An act to amend section 1823 (a) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the advance of payment of expenses of travel and subsistence to Federal officers or employees by one agency and reimbursement by another agency.

On July 8, 1952:

S. 1258. An act to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger; and

S. 2630. An act for the relief of Mary Fox.

On July 9, 1952:

S. 103. An act to change the name of Medicine Creek Reservoir in Frontier County of the State of Nebraska to Harry Strunk Lake;

S. 1020. An act to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1705. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for two United States commissioners for Great Smoky Mountains National Park;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter;

S. 1989. An act to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Chief Joseph Dam in the State of Washington as Rufus Woods Lake;

S. 2066. An act for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly;

S. 2067. An act for the relief of Maria Weiland;

S. 2334. An act for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossorio;

S. 2357. An act to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act;

S. 2393. An act for the relief of the State of New Hampshire and the town of New Boston, N. H.;

S. 2582. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey a certain tract of land in Russell County, Ala., to W. T. Heard;

S. 2603. An act to authorize the transfer of certain lands to the State of Oregon;

S. 2909. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630);

S. 3007. An act for the relief of Jimmy Lee Davis;

S. 3008. An act for the relief of Karen Christene Eisen Murdock;

S. 3276. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation"; and

S. 3277. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

On July 10, 1952:

S. 556. An act authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes;

S. 1741. An act for the relief of Samuel A. Wise;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 2042. An act to extend certain privileges to representatives of member states on the council of the Organization of American States;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2360. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to increase the amounts of securities issued by motor carriers without requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission;

S. 2605. An act to amend certain tax laws applicable to the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to change the name of the South Coulee Dam in the Columbia Basin project to Dry Falls Dam.

On July 11, 1952:

S. 1037. An act for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci;

S. 1513. An act for the relief of Thorvald Nin;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1724. An act for the relief of Elina Branlund;

S. 1863. An act to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national;

S. 1876. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.;

S. 2043. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property by the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the Secretary of the Interior;

S. 2084. An act for the relief of Mathilde Kohar Halebian;

S. 2051. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, certain property at Fort Worth, Tex.;

S. 3052. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions, and for other purposes; and

S. 3337. An act to authorize the loan of two submarines to the Government of the Netherlands.

On July 12, 1952:

S. 54. An act for the relief of Stella Jean Stathopoulou;

S. 1422. An act for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2252. An act to clarify the act of August 17, 1950, providing for the conversion of national banks into and their merger and consolidation with State banks;

S. 2637. An act for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas;

S. 2922. An act to amend subsection (d) of section 12 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950; and

S 3356. An act for the relief of Homer C. Boozer, Terry Davis, Leopold A. Fraczkowski, Earl W. Keating, and Charles A. Paris.

On July 14, 1952:

S. 1041. An act to provide for the eradication and control of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 2128. An act to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2573. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Walter Anson Pease;

S. 2646. An act to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation;

S. 2690. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to make unlawful certain practices of ticket agents engaged in selling air transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 3066. An act to amend defense housing laws, and for other purposes; and

S. 3195. An act granting jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims.

On July 15, 1952:

S. 423. An act for the relief of Orazio Balasso;

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky;

S. 732. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 1423. An act for the relief of Michiko Yamamori Wilder and her minor child;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Walter Koelz;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Adele Frattini;

S. 1606. An act for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro;

S. 1707. An act for the relief of the George B. Henly Construction Co.;

S. 1740. An act for the relief of Tom Tateki Iriye;

S. 1816. An act for the relief of Shizu Hasegawa Crockett;

S. 1840. An act for the relief of Tsuneo Tanigawa, also known as David Lawrence Rogers;

S. 1867. An act for the relief of Margherita Gentile;

S. 1896. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anni Franchina;

S. 1916. An act for the relief of Olga Madsen, a minor;

S. 2125. An act for the relief of Margit Stolz Bohm and Klaus Seigfreid Bohm;

S. 2166. An act for the relief of Jo Ann Fosberg;

S. 2185. An act for the relief of Annemarie E. Peterson and Wilhelm Ernst Geisel;

S. 2212. An act for the relief of Charles Michell;

S. 2249. An act for the relief of Biancamaria Cori;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of Nicholas J. and Elizabeth Miura;

S. 2289. An act for the relief of Michiko Okuda;

S. 2303. An act for the relief of Miki Takano;

S. 2313. An act for the relief of Hsieh Ta-Chuan or Der Ott-Kuan;

S. 2332. An act for the relief of Fumiko Ito Stewart;

S. 2395. An act for the relief of Ioannis Dimitriou Cohilis;

S. 2473. An act for the relief of Luciano Pellegrini;

S. 2498. An act for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Deborah Jayne Engelman;

S. 2577. An act for the relief of Mikio Abe;

S. 2609. An act for the relief of Iwanna Pryjma and Roma Pryjma; and

S. 2662. An act for the relief of Sadako Ishiguro.

On July 15, 1952:

S. 2733. An act for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.;

S. 2869. An act for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto;

S. 2938. An act to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 3032. An act for the relief of Bonnie Jean MacLean;

S. 3132. An act for the relief of Jun Miyata;

S. 3140. An act for the relief of Victor de la Bretoniere;

S. 3162. An act for the relief of Andrew Alexander Nara and Mary Kimberly Nara;

S. 3193. An act for the relief of Robert Royce Farkas;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Ichiro Iida;

S. 3248. An act for the relief of Mekaru Tatsubo;

S. 3260. An act for the relief of Sadie Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar and George Badir Ellis Nassif-Azar;

S. 3281. An act for the relief of Chiu But Yue;

S. 3284. An act for the relief of Beverly Jane Ruffin; and

S. 3343. An act for the relief of Hannah Crumet.

On July 16, 1952:

S. 525. An act for the relief of Jacob Gitlin;

S. 658. An act to further amend the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 697. An act for the relief of Teh-Jen Lee;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Stevan Durovic, Marko Durovic, Olga Wickerhauser Durovic, and Stevan M. Durovic;

S. 1310. An act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines;

S. 2046. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Llewllyn B. Griffith for retirement as an emergency officer under the provisions of the Emergency Officers Retirement Act or as a disabled officer of the Regular Army of the United States;

S. 2311. An act for the relief of Marie-Antoinette Kerssenbrock;

S. 2657. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1944 (ch. 294, title III, 58 Stat. 414), and the act of February 14, 1903 (ch. 552, 32 Stat. 825);

S. 2681. An act for the relief of Carlotta Olimpia Forgnone;

S. 2968. An act to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; and

S. 3161. An act to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for filing of equipment trust agreements and other documents evidencing or relating to the lease, mortgage, conditional sale, or bailment of railroad equipment.

On July 17, 1952:

S. 241. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes;

S. 1095. An act to extend the time for filing claims on behalf of certain persons, and for other purposes; and

S. 1999. An act relating to withholding, for State income-tax purposes, on the compensation of Federal employees.

On July 18, 1952:

S. 3333. An act to vest title in the United States to certain lands and interests in lands of the Shoshone and Arapaho Indian Tribes of the Wind River Reservation and to provide compensation therefor and for other purposes.

DISAPPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message also announced that the President had vetoed bills of the Senate of the following titles:

On July 17, 1952:

S. 1271. An act to permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board.

I have withheld my approval from S. 1271, "To permit employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company to appeal decisions under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to the Employees' Compensation Appeals Board."

This proposal has a worthy objective. Equality of treatment demands that employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company, who are aggrieved by final decisions upon their claims for compensation, should have the right of appeal enjoyed by other employees of the Government.

Unfortunately, the bill before me is seriously faulty. The executive branch advised the Congress of four defects in the bill and set forth recommendations for the overcoming of the defects. Why these remedial recommendations were not adopted is not shown in the record. I am convinced that they should have been adopted in the interest of avoiding needless costs, administrative burdens, and procedural encumbrances.

It has been suggested that the objectives of this bill may be legally capable of accomplishment by Executive order without the need of legislation. I shall see that this is examined at once.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 17, 1952.*

On July 18, 1952:

S. 2584. An act to provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Logan, Colo.

I have withheld approval of S. 2584, "To provide for the establishment of a Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Logan, Colo."

I have taken this action because I believe that the establishment of additional Veterans' Administration domiciliary facilities would not be warranted at this time.

The wartime-constructed Army hospital at Fort Logan was acquired by the Veterans' Administration in 1946 for temporary use pending the construction of a new hospital in Denver. In September 1951, the Denver hospital was completed and the Fort Logan hospital was vacated by the Veterans' Administration. At that time careful consideration was given to various proposals for the use of this facility including its use as a Veterans' Administration domiciliary home. I felt then, and I still feel, that it would be undesirable to increase the size of the Veterans' Administration domiciliary program at this time.

The service-connected medical needs of veterans in the Colorado area are now being adequately met by the new Denver hospital opened in September 1951 and by other facilities in that area.

After the last war, the Veterans' Administration obtained from the Army and Navy a considerable number of wartime-constructed hospitals for temporary use while its permanent hospital construction program was underway. As this construction program approaches completion, more and more of these temporary hospitals are no longer required by the Veterans' Administration. Naturally there are efforts, as in this case, to continue Veterans' Administration operation of these temporary facilities. Approval of these efforts by either administrative or legislative action would be unwise and costly. If facilities such as Fort Logan can be utilized economically for high priority Federal projects or programs, they should be so used. However, there is no reasonable justification for operating a facility just because it is owned by the Federal Government. Such action would not be consistent with the cut-backs in badly needed, high priority programs which the Congress has insisted be accomplished.

For these reasons, I have withheld my approval of S. 2584.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 18, 1952.*

On July 15, 1952:

DETROIT AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS CO.

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. (pocket veto).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS SUBMITTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate:

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Harker T. Stanton, counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
C. M. Mouser, chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.46
James M. Kendall, assistant chief clerk	8,735.34	4,367.64
Jean Douglas, clerical assistant	3,906.26	1,908.12
Harriet D. Willey, clerical assistant	3,906.26	1,908.12

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	3,334.70
Balance unexpended	6,665.30

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, MAKING INVESTIGATIONS UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 256, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul J. Cotter, chief counsel (from Feb. 14, 1952)	$11,646.00	(1)
Edward C. Kennelly, assistant counsel (from Mar. 6, 1952)	10,068.45	$3,216.28
Smith Blair, Jr., assistant counsel (Mar. 3, 1952 to June 27, 1952)	8,360.00	(2)
Allen J. Goodman, assistant counsel (from Feb. 25, 1952)	6,672.85	2,055.08
Frank J. Mack, assistant counsel (Feb. 19, 1952 to Mar. 19, 1952)	5,940.00	(2)
William E. Aud, investigator (from Feb. 18, 1952)	9,653.69	3,866.48
Robert L. Shortley, investigator (from Feb. 26, 1952)	8,552.84	2,699.30
Robert E. Shaw, investigator (from Mar. 14, 1952)	7,819.96	2,324.25
Mary E. Hutchinson, clerk (from Mar. 6, 1952)	4,856.61	1,551.39
David L. Goodman, stenographer (from Feb. 25, 1952)	4,187.45	1,465.59

[1] To be paid on reimbursable loan basis from Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
[2] To be paid on reimbursable loan basis from General Accounting Office.
[3] To be paid on reimbursable loan basis from Department of the Navy.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$50,000.00
Amount expended	34,689.49
Balance unexpended	15,310.51

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Everard H. Smith, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thomas J. Scott, assistant chief clerk	11,312.73	5,656.32
William W. Woodruff, assistant clerk	10,732.07	5,365.98
Cecil H. Tolbert, assistant clerk (to Jan. 31)	11,312.73	142.72
Herman E. Downey, professional staff member	11,312.73	5,656.32
Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,172.42
Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,172.42
Lawrence H. Wendrich, professional staff member	10,732.07	4,882.10
Kenneth J. Bousquet, professional staff member (from Feb. 16)	10,649.11	3,993.39
Cecil C. McDaniel, professional staff member	10,068.45	4,743.85

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Gordon A. Nease, professional staff member (from Feb. 16)	$10,068.45	$3,775.63
Earl R. Lind, professional staff member (from Mar. 12)	10,068.45	3,048.48
Paul E. Kamerick, professional staff member (from Mar. 24)	10,068.45	2,712.86
Edmund T. King, assistant clerk	9,321.88	4,660.92
Mamie L. Mizen, assistant clerk	6,959.63	3,479.76
Thomas Boyers IV, clerical assistant (from Feb. 13)	6,672.85	2,557.92
Corinne Bryan, clerical assistant	6,003.71	2,918.16
Gloria S. Butland, clerical assistant	6,003.71	2,834.52
Lois C. Joy, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,583.60
Velma M. Lancaster, clerical assistant (from Feb. 26)	5,334.57	1,852.25
Richard C. Venne, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Celka K. Prescott, clerical assistant (from May 29)	4,856.61	431.69
Leon DeVille, clerical assistant (from May 1)	4,091.85	681.96
Total		86,740.51
TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES		
Milo Farmer, agent	9,653.69	4,826.82
Katherine S. Florence, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24
Ira E. Gunn, Jr., agent	8,824.17	4,412.04
Joseph F. McDonald, Jr., agent	7,246.41	3,623.16
Dorothy L. Sankey, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Daniel W. Sullivan, fiscal officer	9,653.69	4,826.82
John W. Wedge, Jr., clerical assistant	4,761.00	2,380.50
June D. Whitmore, clerical assistant	3,613.89	1,806.90
Murry Brophy, agent (from Apr. 28)	9,073.03	1,587.76
Total		28,320.52

MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

Unexpended balances of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Jan. 1, 1952	$24,151.49
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	None
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	24,151.59
Eighty-second Congress:	
Unexpended balance of amount authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 162 and 204 as of Jan. 1, 1952	5,539.08
Funds authorized by S. Res. 335, 82d Cong	15,000.00
Total available for expenditure	20,539.08
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	2,810.94
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	17,728.14
Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1951, and Public Law 7, 82d Cong., as of Jan. 1, 1952	34,535.65
Amount expended, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	58.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	34,476.84
Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Legislative Appropriation Act, 1952, as of Jan. 1, 1952	63,663.79
Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	[1] 32,513.33
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	31,150.46

[1] Includes $28,320.52 payroll of temporary employees.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
William H. Darden, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Mark H. Galusha, staff adviser	11,646.00	5,823.00
Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser	11,646.00	5,823.00
Herbert S. Atkinson, assistant chief clerk	7,819.96	3,909.98
Georgia P. Earle,[1] clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,103.25
Maurine E. Dantzic, clerical assistant	4,474.23	2,213.20
Victoria Dobroska,[2] clerical assistant	4,474.23	186.43
Irene P. Gray,[3] clerical assistant	5,047.77	420.65
Edna E. Johnson,[4] clerical assistant	4,091.85	1,875.44
Sara Seeliger, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,077.77

[1] From Feb. 1, 1952.
[2] Resigned Jan. 15, 1952.
[3] Resigned Jan. 31, 1952.
[4] From Jan. 16, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for Committee expenses, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Funds authorized or appropriated for Committee by S. Res. 166, July 31, 1951	10,000.00
Total funds authorized	20,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1951, to Jan. 1, 1952	14,696.06
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1952	5,303.94
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952	3,980.23
Balance unexpended July 1, 1952	1,323.71

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ena G. Bartosh, stenographer	$3,900.68	$1,950.30
Ashbrook P. Bryant, chief counsel (from Mar. 24, 1952)	11,646.00	3,137.95
Hazel L. Burns, stenographer	3,327.12	1,663.56
Harold M. Devlin, accountant	9,321.88	4,660.92
Wallace L. Engle, investigator	4,761.00	2,380.50
Margaret H. Farnham, clerical assistant (June 10 to 14)	3,805.08	52.84
Daniel J. Freed, attorney to Feb. 20	4,187.45	581.58
George T. Gilman, investigator to Jan. 31	6,672.85	556.07
David Ginsburg, assistant counsel	9,653.69	4,826.82
Arthur D. Horner, investigator to Apr. 19	7,150.81	2,165.10
Joan F. Kaplan, research assistant to Mar. 10	5,334.57	1,037.26
Mary Frances Keadle, stenographer	3,900.68	1,950.30
Daniel F. McGillicuddy, Jr., attorney	7,150.81	3,575.40
George H. Martin, staff consultant	8,005.36	4,002.66
Kurt W. Melchior, attorney to Feb. 20	4,187.45	581.58
Mary M. Miller, clerk-typist	3,613.89	1,806.90
Dorothy J. Nichols, assistant administrative clerk to Mar. 31	5,430.16	1,357.53
George E. Reedy, Jr., staff consultant	9,819.59	4,909.74
Downey Rice, special counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Jane K. Robinson, stenographer from Feb. 25	3,613.89	1,264.83
Laurence P. Sherfy, special counsel	10,068.45	4,956.06
Willie Day Taylor, assistant to staff consultant	4,474.23	2,165.40
Lyon L. Tyler, Jr., assistant chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
John Wildenthal, Jr., attorney to Feb. 15	4,187.45	523.42

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee use under S. Res. 18 which expired Jan. 31, 1952:	
Balance unexpended Jan. 1, 1952	$69,677.31
Amount expended	17,290.34
Balance unexpended Jan. 31, 1952	52,376.97
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. No. 263	190,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1952	65,115.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	124,884.56

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Investigating Committee.

JULY 2, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 64 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 248

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, staff assistant	$8,644.09	$4,322.02
Carter E. Talman, staff assistant	8,644.09	4,322.02
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel [1]	6,099.30	508.27
Ira Dixon, staff assistant [2]	8,005.36	355.79
Mary Ryan, clerical assistant [3]	4,569.81	1,409.00
Daniel L. O'Connor, consultant [4]	32.35	1,358.70

[1] From Jan. 1 through Jan. 31, 1952.
[2] From Feb. 15 through Feb. 29, 1952.
[3] Appointed Mar. 10, 1952.
[4] Per diem.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$78,000.00
Amount expended:	
Feb. 15, 1951, through Dec. 31, 1951 (reported)	24,851.62
Jan. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	14,178.23
Balance unexpended	38,970.15

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JULY 2, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
A. Lee Parsons, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Joseph P. McMurray, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
William F. McKenna, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas H. Daniel, counsel [1]	11,646.00	517.60
Raimond Bowles, assistant clerk [1]	11,646.00	1,941.00
Norman W. Stevenson, counsel [2]	11,646.00	4,852.50
Ira Dixon, assistant clerk [4]	11,646.00	3,882.00
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.83
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant	5,908.12	2,954.06
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28

[1] To Jan. 16, 1952.
[2] To Feb. 28, 1952.
[3] From Feb. 1, 1952.
[4] From Mar. 1, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$30,000.00
Amount expended:	
Jan. 1, 1951, through Dec. 31, 1951 (reported)	10,685.76
Jan. 1, 1952, through June 30, 1952	6,208.92
Balance unexpended	13,105.32

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JULY 9, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Mollohan, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Gerhard P. Van Arkel, professional staff member (to Apr. 4, 1952)	11,646.00	3,040.90
William P. Gulledge, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,070.48
Arlene Williams, clerical assistant	5,716.93	2,858.46
Ruth W. Bryant, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.24

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure during 83d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,127.75
Balance unexpended	4,872.25

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INVESTIGATING CRIME AND LAW ENFORCEMENT (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 136, AS AMENDED BY S. RES. 267, 82D CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Arnold Bauman, chief counsel	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Harold W. Solomon, associate counsel	11,646.00	4,594.94
Rufus G. King, Jr., assistant counsel (from Mar. 26)	9,570.74	2,157.70
Jerome J. Sleiker, accountant (from Feb. 18 to June 25)	7,533.19	2,678.44
James C. Smith, accountant (from Mar. 17 to June 12)	7,533.19	1,799.57
Murry B. York, investigator	11,646.00	4,366.70
Frank O. Mosher, investigator (to June 20)	8,005.36	3,740.94
Raymond A. Taggart, investigator (from Feb. 6 to June 11)	7,533.19	2,636.39
Charles D. Barry, investigator (from Feb. 25 to June 9)	8,005.36	2,257.66
Mandeville C. Frost, investigator (to Feb. 25)	7,533.19	1,150.89
Joyce W. Mack, administrative assistant	8,907.12	2,813.62
Margaret J. Robey, stenographer	7,437.59	2,364.56
Freda Lustick, stenographer (from Apr. 7)	5,430.16	1,094.96
Nancy L. O'Rourke, stenographer (from Mar. 14)	4,283.04	1,210.61
Elinor Haight, stenographer (from Jan. 16 to Apr. 21)	4,283.04	1,042.56
Luella M. Stanton, receptionist (to June 19)	4,283.04	1,970.81
Kimball A. Wallis, file clerk (from Feb. 14 to June 25)	$2,432.13	$891.75
William H. Austin, stenographer (from Jan. 4 to Apr. 2)	3,805.08	940.68
John F. Preston, Jr., assistant counsel (from Feb. 25 to Mar. 24)	7,533.19	627.76
Samuel E. Rosenberg, chief accountant (to Feb. 5)	10,068.45	978.86
May M. Brooks, stenographer (from Apr. 7 to June 5)	3,805.08	623.60

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$86,200.00
Amount expended	65,413.73
Balance unexpended	20,786.27

MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to July 1, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth B. Springer, chief clerk	$10,649.11	$5,324.52
Evelyn R. Thompson, clerical assistant	6,099.30	3,049.62
Janice Graybeal, stenographer	6,099.30	3,049.62
Betty Mae Tapy, stenographer	6,003.71	2,829.20
Mary C. Murray, stenographer	4,378.64	2,085.73
Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk	4,378.64	2,189.28
Serge Benson, professional staff	10,566.16	5,283.06
Fedele F. Fauri, professional staff (from June 19)	11,646.00	388.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended Jan. 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952	8,808.60
Balance unexpended	1,191.40

WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, staff associate	11,646.00	5,823.00
Carl M. Marcy, staff associate	11,646.00	5,823.00
C. C. O'Day, clerk	10,815.02	5,407.50
Pat M. Holt, associate clerk	10,815.02	5,407.50
Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk	5,908.12	2,954.04
Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk	5,716.93	2,858.46
Mary Proctor, assistant clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
Nancy Hanschman, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
William L. Martin, Jr., assistant clerk [1]	4,378.64	2,189.28
June Pitts, assistant clerk [1]	4,378.64	2,189.28

[1] Under authority of S. Res. 146, Aug. 6, 1951, and S. Res. 249, Jan. 15, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$40,000.00
Amount expended	19,993.24
Balance unexpended	20,006.76

TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter L. Reynolds, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Ann M. Grickis, assistant chief clerk	6,864.04	3,432.00
Emily Z. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Blanche Holder Broz, clerical assistant	5,047.77	2,523.84
Ray Barnett, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,452.18
Katharine M. Ellis (Mrs.), clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Glenn K. Shriver, professional staff member	10,732.07	5,365.98
Miles Seull, Jr., professional staff member	10,815.02	5,407.50
Herman C. Loeffler, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eli E. Nobleman, professional staff member	10,400.26	5,200.08

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong	3,235.03
Balance unexpended	6,764.97

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REORGANIZATION (S. RES. 252)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No funds expended for subcommittee personnel. Staff work performed by professional staff members of Committee on Government Operations.

Funds authorized or appropriated for subcommittee expenditure under S. Res. 252 (unexpended balance of the amount authorized under S. Res. 54, 82d Cong.)	$11,168.21
Amount expended	340.63
Balance unexpended	10,827.58

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January

1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mills Astin, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk	9,238.93	4,619.47
Stewart French, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Albert A. Grorud, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Arthur A. Sandusky, professional staff	9,238.93	4,619.47
Charlotte Mickle, clerical staff	5,238.97	2,573.00
Marie Mather, clerical staff	5,238.97	2,573.00
Rosemary Donnelley, clerical staff	4,187.45	2,093.73
Thelma Leech, clerical staff	4,187.45	1,923.82

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	8,633.74
Balance unexpended	11,366.26

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE FUEL RESERVES OF THE UNITED STATES (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 242, AGREED TO JANUARY 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Mildred C. Brandon, clerical assistant	$4,187.45	$2,093.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	7,540.37
Balance unexpended	12,459.63

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 296, AGREED TO MARCH 26, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Louis D. Luttrell, staff director	$9,238.93	$4,619.42
Luna P. McWane, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.71

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$40,000.00
Amount expended to June 30, 1952	26,473.44
Balance unexpended	13,526.56

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Cecilia M. Cook, clerical assistant:		
Jan. 1 to Feb. 15	$4,569.81	$2,464.10
From Feb. 16	5,047.77	
Halford Davis, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Harriet S. Gray, clerical assistant:		
Jan. 1 to Feb. 15	4,569.81	2,464.10
From Feb. 16	5,047.77	
Edward S. Jarrett, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Edward R. Jelsma, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Frank Keenan, assistant chief clerk	7,724.37	3,865.14
Vera B. Rudolph, clerical assistant:		
Jan. 1 to Feb. 15	5,716.93	2,966.17
From Feb. 16	6,003.71	
Martha P. Shaffer, clerical assistant:		
Jan. 1 to Feb. 15	4,569.81	2,464.10
From Feb. 16	5,047.77	
Edward C. Sweeney, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Nicholas Zapple, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended, Jan. 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952	11,963.95
Balance unexpended	8,036.05

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(PURSUANT TO S. RES. 154, AGREED TO JUNE 29, 1951, CONTINUED BY S. RES. 258, AGREED TO JANUARY 24, 1952, INVESTIGATING PROBLEMS RELATING TO THE AIRLINE INDUSTRY, THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE, DOMESTIC LAND AND WATER TRANSPORTATION, AND RADIO, TELEGRAPH, AND TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John R. Butz, clerical assistant (Apr. 1 through May 31)	$5,047.77	$841.28
Pauline Chaternuck, clerical assistant	5,143.38	2,571.69
Evelyn B. Rosenkranz, clerical assistant (Jan. 1 through Apr. 31)	4,569.81	1,523.24
Charlotte D. Worden, clerical assistant (Jan. 1 to 14)	3,900.68	162.52

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (balance Jan. 1, 1952)	$25,524.31
Amount expended	7,175.63
Balance unexpended	18,348.68

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JULY 5, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(PURSUANT TO S. RES. 56, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 1, 1951, CONTINUED BY S. RES. 259, AGREED TO MARCH 3, 1952, INVESTIGATION OF EXPORT CONTROLS AND POLICIES)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to March 31, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John R. Butz, clerical assistant (Mar. 1 to 31)	$5,047.77	$420.64
James J. Kelly, Jr., special investigator (Jan. 1 to 31)	11,646.00	970.50
Norman Polski, counsel (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31)	6,194.89	1,548.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (balance Jan. 1, 1952)	$4,938.88
Amount expended	3,722.96
Balance unexpended	1,215.92

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Chairman.

JULY 4, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
J. G. Sourwine, professional staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
George S. Green, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Wayne H. Smithey, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
L. Clair Nelson, professional staff member	10,234.35	5,117.16
Thomas B. Collins, professional staff member	9,073.03	4,536.48
Joseph A. Davis, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
James M. Thomson, assistant chief clerk	9,073.03	4,536.48
Mildred E. Canon, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Barbara D. Fennell, clerical assistant (to Jan. 15)	6,481.67	270.06
Miriam O. Fox, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Mary Micheo, clerical assistant (from Jan. 16)	4,856.61	2,225.90
Mary Rogers, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
H. Joan Sheaff, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Mary Alice Turner, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78
Orrin E. Cressey, clerical assistant	6,481.67	3,240.78

Funds authorized or appropriated or committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	11,689.15
Balance unexpended	8,310.85

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 198, AGREED TO SEPT. 27, 1951, AND S. RES. 314, AGREED TO MAY 29, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Dorothy C. Baker, clerk	$5,812.53	$2,906.22
Drury H. Blair, staff member (from Jan. 31, 1952, to Feb. 20, 1952)	9,404.83	783.73
Charles Callas, research assistant (to June 6, 1952)	4,856.61	1,443.46
Mitchel M. Carter, investigator (to Mar. 31, 1952)	8,824.17	2,206.02
Carrie Lee Conner, staff member (from Mar. 15, 1952)	4,856.61	1,429.97
Donald D. Conners, Jr., investigator	9,570.74	4,785.36
Marilyn J. Cremer, clerk (from June 16, 1952)	3,709.49	154.56
Dorothy A. Davis, clerk (to Jan. 31, 1952)	5,525.75	460.47
Edward R. Duffy, investigator	8,907.12	4,453.56
Owen K. Earl, staff member (from Feb. 2, 1952)	8,096.60	3,351.06
George N. Franks, clerk	3,709.49	1,854.72
Stephen G. Haaser, research assistant	7,246.41	3,400.11
Elizabeth E. Horton, clerk (from June 1, 1952)	4,856.61	404.71
Ethel L. Johnson, staff member (to Jan 31, 1952)	8,824.17	735.34
Winton H. King, investigator	7,246.41	3,623.16
Aileen Lawrence, clerk (to June 23, 1952)	5,334.57	2,563.51
Theodore H. Lokke, clerk (to May 30, 1952)	3,709.49	1,236.48
William E. Lowell, editorial director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary J. McCloskey, clerk (to Jan. 3, 1952)	5,525.75	460.47
Vyonne G. McDonnell, clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Robert C. McManus, research associate (from Feb. 20, 1952)	9,653.69	3,512.85
Mary J. MacDevitt, clerk (to Jan. 31, 1952)	5,334.57	404.71
Maree R. Maher, typist	4,856.61	2,428.26
Benjamin Mandel, research director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary G. Michco, assistant clerk (to Jan. 15, 1952)	4,856.61	202.35
John F. Miller, staff member (to Mar. 31, 1952)	8,735.34	2,183.82
Robert Morris, special counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
LuDeen Roylance, clerk (from May 1, 1952)	4,263.04	713.84
Aaron M. Sargent, staff member (from May 1 to 31, 1952)	9,902.55	825.21
Naomi W. Somes, clerk	5,334.57	2,667.24
Jessie E. Stearns, staff member (from Feb. 4, 1952)	7,246.41	2,958.92
Marion L. Walker, clerk	5,525.75	2,762.82
William H. Webster, clerk (to Jan. 31, 1952)	5,525.75	460.47

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$263,378.42
Amount expended	102,940.15
Balance unexpended	160,438.27

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

JULY 8, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (S. RES. 6, AGREED TO JANUARY 29, 1951, AND S. RES. 261, AGREED TO JANUARY 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Richard Arens, staff director	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
William H. Arens, staff member (from Mar. 15, 1952)	8,096.60	2,383.97
Drury H. Blair, staff member (from Feb. 1, 1952)	9,404.83	3,918.65
Dorothy A. Davis, clerk (from Feb. 1, 1952)	5,525.75	2,302.35
Marilyn Humphreys, clerk (from June 23, 1952)	4,856.61	107.92
Ethel L. Johnson, staff member (from Feb. 1, 1952)	8,824.17	3,676.70
Mary J. McCloskey, clerk (from Feb. 1, 1952)	5,525.75	2,302.35
Louella C. McEnroe, clerk (from Feb. 15, 1952)	5,047.77	1,906.90
Mary J. MacDevitt, clerk (from Feb. 1, 1952)	5,334.57	2,222.70
Guy M. Massey, staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Fred M. Mesmer, staff member	9,404.83	4,702.38
Frank W. Schroeder, investigator	9,902.55	4,951.26
William H. Webster, clerk (from Feb. 1, 1952)	5,525.75	2,302.35

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$100,683.20
Amount expended	42,360.83
Balance unexpended	58,322.37

PAT MCCARRAN,
Chairman.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Tota salary received
Paul L. Badger, staff member	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Charles Brazman, staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
William H. Coburn, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Mary Jane Del Balzo, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
Vivien T. Harman, clerical assistant	6,290.49	3,145.20
Paul H. Menk, staff member	10,483.21	5,241.60
Helen H. Papps, clerical assistant	4,952.20	2,476.08
William G. Peidy, staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Paul Sample, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant	5,812.53	2,906.22
Philip R. Rodgers, assistant clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Thomas E. Shroyer, staff member	11,646.00	5,823.0

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$20,000.00
Amount expended	11,288.64
Balance unexpended	8,711.36

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 7, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR AND LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS (UNDER AUTHORITY OF S. RES. 244, AGREED TO JANUARY 24, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Elizabeth J. Anthony, stenographer (from June 16, 1952)	$3,237.76	$134.90
Jack Barbash, staff director	11,644.54	5,822.22
Merton C. Bernstein, attorney (from Feb. 18, 1952)	6,577.27	2,429.91
Alexander K. Christie, staff member	7,533.19	3,766.56
John R. Delebo, file clerk (from Jan. 8, 1952)	1,478.10	710.28
Muriel Gimble, stenographer (from Feb. 11, 1952)	3,709.49	1,442.56
Eleanor Hadley, staff member	8,279.10	4,139.52
Curtis E. Johnson, staff member	7,628.78	4,199.38
John Marshall, Jr., minority economist	9,238.93	4,619.46
Arthur E. Naftalin, special assistant to staff director (from June 15, 1952)	10,815.02	480.66
Cushing Niles, stenographer	3,805.08	1,855.26
Marjorie M. Whittaker, clerk-secretary	5,716.93	2,810.65
Elaine C. Dye, stenographer (May 16 to 31, 1952)	3,518.30	146.59
Evelyn M. Finnegan, clerk-secretary (Jan. 1 to 15, 1952)	5,716.93	238.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$85,485.00
Amount expended	35,341.94
Balance unexpended	50,143.06

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 71 (1ST SESS.) AND S. RES. 244 (2D SESS.), 82D CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Kenneth A. Meiklejohn, staff director	----------	$5,823.00
Melvin W. Sneed, assistant staff director	----------	5,823.00
Nora K. Piore, research assistant	----------	4,412.04
Harriet Gilfoyle, stenographer	----------	2,284.86
Adele Heller, stenographer	----------	2,284.86
Richard A. Beyer, research assistant [1]	----------	76.74
Katherine C. Esola, stenographer [2]	----------	761.62

[1] Appointed, June 16, 1952.
[2] Resigned, Feb. 29, 1952.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 71 and 244	$65,584.06
Amount expended (including $5,807.20 under S. Res. 71 returned to S. D. O. Jan. 31, 1952)	30,822.52
Balance unexpended	34,761.54

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.

JULY 3, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January

3 to June 30, 1952 together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Virginia Bobo, assistant chief clerk	$5,525.75	$2,762.82
H. W. Brawley, staff director	11,646.00	5,823.00
Costas D. Chrissos, clerical assistant	5,334.57	2,667.28
Mary E. Harper, clerical assistant	4,283.04	2,141.52
Mary A. Irwin, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
J. Austin Latimer, chief clerk and counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Alyce S. Oglesby, clerical assistant (to Feb. 29)	4,474.23	745.70
Olive T. Olson, clerical assistant (from Mar. 1)	4,474.23	1,491.40
E. Luise Shawn, clerical assistant	4,569.81	2,284.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (includes balance to Jan. 3, 1952, and S. Res. 322 agreed to June 6, 1952)	$14,213.33
Amount expended	1,186.77
Balance unexpended to June 30, 1952	13,026.56

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JULY 3, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES (OPERATING UNDER S. RES. 286, AGREED TO MARCH 26, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 3 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Robert H. Amidon, investigator-analyst	$8,005.36	$4,002.66
J. Ross Anderson, Jr., investigator-analyst (from June 1)	5,143.38	428.61
Nancy J. Brown, secretary	4,091.85	1,591.24
John G. Burnett, investigator-analyst (to May 31)	7,342.00	2,971.52
Marcia M. Callaghan, stenographer	5,047.77	2,444.18
Georgia H. Dodd, secretary	4,091.85	1,932.22
Ralph H. Drennen, investigator-analyst (from May 19)	8,461.59	987.18
Robert G. Dunphy, investigator-analyst	7,055.23	3,328.41
Hubert H. Finzel, investigator-analyst	8,552.84	4,276.38
Helena O. Fisher, secretary	4,091.85	1,659.44
Cecial A. Gasque, investigator-analyst	8,005.36	4,002.66
Joseph M. Hart, investigator-analyst	9,073.03	4,292.48
Guy B. Hathorn, investigator-analyst (from June 19)	6,577.27	219.24
Gustav C. Hertz, investigator-analyst	10,234.35	4,771.52
Colette E. Homan, clerical assistant	4,856.61	2,428.26
Virginia S. Hudgins, secretary (Feb. 4 to 7)	4,091.85	45.46
Katherine K. Jennings, stenographer (from Jan. 30 to June 1)	4,283.04	713.84
Edwin C. Johnson, Jr., investigator-analyst	8,005.36	4,002.66
Witmer H. Kelley, investigator-analyst	8,005.36	4,002.66
Rudolph H. Kroetz, investigator-analyst	6,959.63	3,479.76
William K. Levin, investigator-analyst	6,481.67	2,977.92
Myron F. Lewis, investigator-analyst (Jan. 1 to 29)	6,959.63	560.63
Charles B. Lipsen, investigator-analyst	4,856.61	2,428.26
W. Richard Lomax, investigator-analyst (to Apr. 1)	9,321.88	1,812.58
Richard F. McMahon, investigator-analyst (Mar. 3 to Apr. 6)	8,005.36	756.05
William L. Mabry, investigator-analyst	$5,430.16	$2,715.06
Theo A. Moore, investigator-analyst	6,577.27	3,051.09
Ethel P. Powers, stenographer	3,900.68	1,950.30
Melvin H. Purvis, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
John M. Sangster, investigator-analyst (from May 23)	9,653.69	1,018.99
Lloyd S. Smith, investigator-analyst	7,055.23	3,527.58
Betsy B. Thomas, secretary (from Apr. 21)	3,237.76	629.55
Christine Winslow, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,429.07
E. Charles Woods, investigator-analyst (to Mar. 31)	9,653.69	2,064.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure (includes balance to Jan. 3, 1952, and S. Res. 288 agreed to Mar. 26, 1952)	$197,660.96
Amount expended	85,768.44
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	111,892.52

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Ellsworth W. Bassett, professional staff	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Frank Burnett, chief clerk	11,646.00	5,823.00
Caira May Cook, clerical staff	5,621.34	2,810.67
Otto Dekom, professional staff (minority)	10,897.97	5,448.96
Ercilia Martinez, clerical staff	5,430.16	2,715.08
John L. Martinez, clerical staff	6,003.71	3,001.85
Frances Ortiz, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Eloise Porter, assistant clerk	7,437.59	3,718.79
Sovelda R. Romero, clerical staff (from June 16)	5,047.77	210.32
Theo W. Sneed, professional staff	11,646.00	5,823.00
Robert Zimmerman, clerical staff (to May 31)	6,003.71	2,501.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$10,000.00
Amount expended	5,031.86
Balance unexpended	4,968.14

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
Chairman.

JUNE 30, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Darrell St. Claire, chief clerk	$11,646.00	$5,823.00
Russell C. King, counsel and assistant chief clerk	8,552.84	4,276.38
B. Floye Gavin, clerical assistant	$6,003.71	$3,001.80
Ruth P. Noon, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Helen M. Smith, clerical assistant	4,665.41	2,332.68
Catherine L. Guyon, clerical assistant, to Jan. 20	6,003.71	333.53
M. M. Rabb, clerical assistant, from Jan. 24	6,003.71	2,618.23
John P. Moore, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
James E. Lynch, professional staff member	9,321.88	4,660.92
Philip R. Monahan, professional staff member (to June 15)	9,819.59	4,500.59

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong	$10,000.00
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, through June 30, 1952	992.07
Balance unexpended to June 30, 1952	9,007.93

CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman.

JULY 12, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Grace E. Johnson, clerk of subcommittee	$8,279.10	$4,139.52
H. P. Kiley, investigator (from May 14)	8,360.00	1,093.32
Genevieve Litwin, stenographer (from June 1)	4,091.85	340.98
Israel Margolis, investigator	6,672.85	3,336.42
Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator (from May 5)	7,437.59	1,156.94
Stanley F. Fisher, accountant	6,940.00	3,336.72
Mary K. Yanick, secretary	5,047.77	2,308.77

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure	$101,120.20
Amount expended: Expenses, $15,772.67; salaries, $15,712.67 or	31,484.74
Balance unexpended	69,635.26

G. M. GILLETTE,
Chairman.
CARL HAYDEN.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

(PURSUANT TO S. RES. 168, AGREED TO JULY 13, 1951; S. RES. 194, AGREED TO AUGUST 23, 1951; S. RES. 238, AGREED TO JANUARY 24, 1952; AND S. RES. 329, AGREED TO JUNE 12, 1952)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eighteth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds

available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Walter Adams, professional staff member (from June 20)	$6,959.63	$212.65
William D Amis, investigator	9,321.88	4,660.92
Kate W. B. Alfriend, professional staff member (from Mar. 10)	5,047.77	1,556.37
David C. Almon, messenger (from Feb. 16 to June 7)	3,327.12	1,035.10
Joyce H. Bissell, clerical assistant (from Jan. 15)	3,900.68	1,798.61
Patricia W. Hobbs, clerical assistant (from Jan. 16)	4,187.45	1,919.22
Gillis W. Long, professional staff member	7,914.11	3,957.00
Lee Loevinger, associate counsel (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 31)	6,672.85	556.07
Vivian V. Lynn, clerical assistant (from Jan. 1 to Jan. 6)	4,474.23	74.57
Gertrude C. Novak, clerical assistant (from Apr. 17)	4,378.64	900.03
Jeannette F. Sullivan, clerical assistant (from Jan. 1 to May 9)	4,187.45	1,500.48
Maurice N. Richter, Jr., messenger (from Jan. 3, to Feb. 12)	3,327.12	369.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong. $120,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong. 55,293.99

Balance unexpended 64,706.01

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 1, 1952.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (CREATED PURSUANT TO S. RES. 58, 81ST CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to June 30, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Saidee F. Blair, clerical assistant	$4,474.23	$2,237.10
Elizabeth A. Byrne, clerical assistant	5,621.34	2,810.64
Laurance G. Henderson, professional staff member	11,646.00	5,823.00
Sara Betty Laskey, clerical assistant	4,378.64	2,189.28
Charles M. Noone, professional staff member	10,068.45	5,034.18
Blake O'Connor, professional staff member	10,068.45	[1] 5,172.44
Minna L. Ruppert, chief clerk	9,653.69	4,826.82
Walter B. Stults, professional staff member	9,819.59	4,909.74
Ruth N. Thomas, assistant chief clerk	6,099.30	[2] 3,161.14
Margaret W. Tucker, clerical assistant	4,187.45	2,093.70

[1] January and February salary at rate of $10,897.97.
[2] January and February salary at rate of $6,748.45.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 82d Cong. $10,000.00
Amount expended, 82d Cong. 9,988.70

Balance unexpended 11.30

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman.

JULY 15, 1952.

REPORT OF SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1 to July 1, 1952, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Jerome S. Adlerman, assistant counsel	$9,321.88	$4,660.92
Edith H. Anderson, assistant clerk	4,474.23	2,237.10
Francis D. Flanagan, chief counsel	11,646.00	5,823.00
Howell J. Hatcher, chief assistant counsel	11,644.54	5,822.22
William A Leece, assistant counsel	8,644.09	3,468.64
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	5,621.34	2,810.64
Gladys E. Montier, assistant clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84
Martha Rose Myers, assistant clerk	4,091.85	2,045.88
James F. Sheridan, investigator	7,342.00	3,670.98
Nina W. Sutton, assistant clerk	4,378.64	1,094.64
James H. Thomas, assistant counsel	6,290.49	3,145.20
Ruth M. Young, clerk	5,047.77	2,523.84

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure $106,971.48
Amount expended 44,089.52

Balance unexpended 62,881.96

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.
CLYDE R. HOEY,
Subcommittee Chairman.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE GOVERNMENT INFORMATION PROGRAM AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

On August 8, 1952, the Vice President, under the provisions of Senate Resolution 74, appointed the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BENTON, and the Senator from South Dakota, Mr. MUNDT, as Members on the part of the Senate of the Subcommittee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Information Program of the Government.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

On August 8, 1952, the Vice President, under the order of the Senate of July 7, 1952, appointed the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, to fill the vacancy on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy created by the death of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MCMAHON.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO ATTEND COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION IN CANADA

Under the order of the Senate of July 7, 1952, the Vice President, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 86, appointed the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN (chairman), the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. STENNIS, the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and the Senator from Vermont, Mr. FLANDERS, members on the part of the Senate to attend the general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Canada.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 7, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou great God of all our years, whose blessings cannot be numbered and whose treasury of goodness is inexhaustible, may our minds and hearts always go out to Thee with feelings of adoration and gratitude for day by day Thou hast provided for our many needs.

Grant that when we come to the close of this session of the Congress we may all be worthy of receiving the diadem of Thy praise and the benediction of Thy love and grace, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Now unto Him who is able to keep us from falling into the forbidden ways of unrighteousness and sin and to present us faultless before the presence of Thy glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God, our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and forever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, July 5, 1952, was read and approved.

CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the House to consider conference reports received by the House today, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF RECESSES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the Speaker to declare recesses at any time during today, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under date of June 20, 1952, this House approved an amendment to the Defense Production Act, H. R. 8210:

No ceiling shall be established or maintained under this title for fruits or vegetables in fresh or processed form.

In my opinion the intent of the amendment is obvious, and the legisla-

tive record leaves virtually no room for doubt as to its meaning. It was the decision of the conferees that the amendment should be a part of the act, and by action of both House and Senate their report was accepted. The Defense Production Act of 1952 was signed by the President July 1, and became the law of the land.

Office of Price Stabilization officials must now recognize that no price-ceiling regulation can be continued in operation or issued which includes fruits and vegetables in fresh or processed form. The word "processed" should be easy to define in that Office of Price Stabilization itself has used the word in issuing price-control orders on many products moving through commercial channels, and any fruits and vegetables that have been covered by a ceiling-price order by virtue of being processed should now be exempt because they are processed.

There seems to be no question that Office of Price Stabiliza ion must interpret this amendment as including all juices, pastes, purees, sauces, dehydrated products, and frozen products made from fruits and vegetables, and fruits and vegetables fried or sold in their semifresh or cooked form, as chips, french-fried onions, potatoes, and so forth. This amendment obviously means any fruit or vegetable processed in any manner from the raw product. Equally obvious, I believe, is the fact that this exemption includes starches made from fruits and vegetables, as the starches from sweet or Irish potatoes, as well as the essence or extract of any fruit or vegetable.

Fruits and vegetables processed and placed in containers made of metal, paper, glass, synthetic resins, or other material that carries the product through commercial channels to the ultimate consumer are also obviously exempted.

It was the intent of this amendment, I believe, that in fresh form, or in the form of products derived essentially from raw materials defined as fruits or vegetables, products are exempt from regulation, providing the product offered in commercial channels of trade is not further processed or incorporated as a minor part of another commercial product.

I am offering this interpretation in order that it may be of assistance to the Office of Price Stabilization in effectively and fairly administering the Defense Production Act of 1952.

THE KOREAN FOX-HOLE AND LINEBACKER BILL

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see the $45-a-month Korean fox-hole bonus bill pass the Congress.

It is a good bill; a fine bill. It is pay dirt; it rewards fox-hole mud, blood, sweat, and tears. It will go down in military history as a great bill.

But there is something just not quite American about the way it is going to work. It overlooks team play. And when the President of the United States signs the fox-hole pay bill, I hope he will make a declaration of policy along this line:

In Korea, the goal posts are on the Yalu River and at Pusan. The ball is on the 43-yard line. You are, by this bill, giving $45 a month extra to the men on the line. It absolutely ignores the fullbacks and the quarterbacks that are backing up the line, defending our goal posts. These are the men who pass the ammunition, the food, and the clothes. The men who pulled out the wounded from the Pusan perimeter to the Yalu, from the evacuation of Hungnam to the line we now hold—the men who were there with the stuff when it was needed.

The fox-hole bill overlooks them. They can be included easily. On a graduated bonus basis, worked out like our rotation points are worked out.

Let us pay the men in Korea behind the men behind the guns. They are on the field; they are in the fight.

Our Air Force and our naval guns have hammered and slaughtered and wiped out, and are hammering, slaughtering, and wiping out, enemy installations, trucks, supply depots, and troop concentrations. Enemy casualties, since the truce talks started, have been greatest behind the lines.

The same could happen to our boys in Korea tomorrow. To the specialists behind the line as well as those on it.

Let us make this a team bill, an all-American fox-hole as well as a linebacker bill. I hope the President and you agree and that it will be done. I waive any compensation that might accrue me under the above.

NECESSITY OF A RECESS INSTEAD OF ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I think the House made a great mistake when it agreed to a sine die adjournment resolution last Saturday. I was strongly opposed to it, and I am sorry the substitute which was going to be offered by my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] could not be considered. This Congress should not quit sine die, with world conditions uncertain and serious and with the steel strike still unsettled. It is the duty of Congress to remain in session and be subject to being called back here. I think we should have a recess until about the 1st of September. If this sine die adjournment goes through, we will find that the President will call us back here, and I do not like to see that happen.

COMBAT PAY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the gentleman from New Jersey and I are both here this morning and you, too, Mr. Speaker, but I am interested that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey mentioned my combat pay bill for the Korean veterans. There is no doubt that a considerable amount of adjustment will have to be made subsequently in any such bill. That has happened down through the years. It will call for extension and modification and enlargement. In the hurry and heat of the debate the other day it may not have pointed out that by combat we mean those under ground fire, but it covers as well any unit up to the echelon of battalion or regiment which is in support of any unit up to the level of battalion or regiment under ground fire, hence would cover support troops coming up with munitions and supplies. At the same time, if there is any doubt, if there is any error of judgment to be made, then I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that at this time this House and this Congress acted very properly in resolving all doubts and in making all errors on the side of the combat troops on the ground under enemy fire. If anything else must be straightened out, we will straighten out properly and equitably later on.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

THE KOREAN SITUATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at a later time I would like to tell the gentleman from Mississippi that I saw Gen. Mark Clark in 1944 in Italy. His Fifth Army was the forgotten Army. That gallant Army fought under heartbreak conditions. They were not giving General Clark the replacements which would take care of the men and protect them, and were taking them away from him after they gave them to him only to take them away a little later. They were at the front day after day after day; they were weary in body and soul.

He is having the same situation here. In Korea, I believe, they are not giving him the equipment he needs.

Mr. Speaker, I have an article by the Associated Press dated Seoul, July 5, which is as follows:

FIRST AMERICAN SHOTS IN KOREA WERE FIRED JUST 2 YEARS AGO

SEOUL, July 5.—Two years ago today a small, ill-equipped band of American soldiers fired the first American shots, and lost their first battle, in the Korean war.

There were less than 400 men in that first group, the vanguard of thousands to come. They rushed from Japan to face a vastly larger and tank-supported column of North Korean Reds, streaming south from the captured capital of Seoul.

The GI's took their first stand in the hills near Osan, about 30 miles south of Seoul. They had rushed there from Taejon airfield in old busses, charcoal-burning taxis, and other assorted vehicles.

The Reds hit just before dawn.

AMERICANS DUG IN

The Americans dug in and fought back.

But it was a hopeless battle for B and C companies of the Twenty-first United States Infantry Regiment and a battery of the Fifty-second Field Artillery Battalion.

The Korean Reds swarmed over and through the GI's whose outmoded bazooka shells bounced off the Communist tanks like rubber balls.

About half the Americans escaped. All the artillery pieces were lost. The survivors withdrew to hills farther south and made another unsuccessful stand. Other soldiers of the Twenty-fourth Division joined them, but there just weren't enough.

Slowly the Reds drove them southward on "heartbreak highway."

DEAN LOST AT TAEJON

At Taejon the Reds captured their division commander, Maj. Gen. William F. Dean.

Finally they were squeezed into the tiny Pusan perimeter. They stood and held.

In the months that followed, the Allied forces grew. They burst out of the pocket, swept to the Manchurian border, were beaten back, and then surged forward again.

Now the battle lines are but 50 miles by air from the brown hills of Osan. Then men who fought that first battle and lived have left Korea.

A powerful United States Eighth Army, representing America and her United Nations Allies, bar the way for any new Red invasion of the south.

Mr. Speaker, today there is a powerful United States Army representing America and the United Nation allies, and they bar the way for any new offensive on the south. How much equipment they have, we do not know.

THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS AND THE STEEL SITUATION

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, much could be said about this Congress for good and for bad. However, for the most part they have completed the legislation which it was required of them to pass. One thing I am concerned about, with reference to adjournment, is the steel situation. All over the country today, we are having plant after plant close down because inventories have been exhausted. There is no more steel reserve. Therefore, we cannot continue to produce materials needed for defense, and that certainly creates a most critical situation. I sincerely hope now that adjournment has been delayed, Congress can do something yet to put the steel plants back into operation and the men back on their jobs in this important industry.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS PROJECT AT BRADFORD, McKEAN COUNTY, PA.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call to the attention of the Members that one of the reasons the Congress has not adjourned is because of a disagreement over the civil-functions appropriation bill for 1953.

I understand the disagreement is over the failure to include a project known as Hartwell Dam in Georgia and Ice Harbor in the State of Washington.

Now I have a project at Bradford, Pa., in McKean County, Twenty-third District, on which the project report will be undertaken during the coming year and will be in a somewhat similar status to the above projects. The reason for my statement this morning is to make it a matter of record that I will request the Chief of Engineers to consider an appropriation for inclusion in the 1954 civil-functions appropriation bill so this McKean County project can be undertaken.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Chair declares a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 241. Concurrent resolution authorizing the signing of bills after the adjournment of the Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 240. A concurrent resolution providing for sine die adjournment of the Congress July 5, 1952.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7268) entitled "An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes"; be is further

Resolved, That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 2 to the above-entitled bill.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2499)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment numbered 41 to the bill (H. R. 8370) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 41: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 41 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the House amendment to the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"Plant and equipment: For an additional amount for 'Plant and equipment', including the purchase (not to exceed an additional one hundred) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,898,800,000: *Provided*, That in connection with the expansion of facilities provided in this appropriation, the Commission is authorized without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes to enter into new contracts or modify existing contracts to provide for electric utility services for periods not exceeding twenty-five years, and such contracts shall be subject to termination by the Commission upon payment of cancellation costs of not to exceed $57,000,000, and any appropriation presently or hereafter made available to the Commission shall be available for the payment of such cancellation costs: *Provided further*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be available for the construction of any office building, residence, warehouse or similar structure, utility, or

other specific portion or unit of a project, unless funds are available for the completion of such building, utility, or other specific portion or unit of such project. The foregoing proviso shall not be construed to prevent the purchase of land for any project, the construction of any new building or procurement of any machinery, equipment or materials therefor, nor any utility nor any portion or unit of a specific project if the funds are available to pay the cost of such land, the cost of such building, machinery, equipment or materials, or the cost of such utility or the cost of any such specific portion or unit of such project."

And the House agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
PAT MCCARRAN,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
B. R. MAYBANK,
HOMER FERGUSON,
GUY CORDON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates $2,898,800,000 instead of $1,450,000,000 as proposed by the House, and a total authorization of $3,518,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees request the Atomic Energy Commission to make an investigation at a cost of not to exceed $250,000 in connection with the proposed Hartwell project in South Carolina and Georgia with a view to determining its importance to the development of atomic energy plants in that area, and to submit such report at the next session of Congress.

CLARENCE CANNON,
GEORGE MAHON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 8370) making supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as a House conferee on both the supplemental appropriation bill, now under consideration, and the civil functions appropriation bill, I wish to make it completely clear, as a part of the legislative history of the appropriation for investigation by the Atomic Energy Commission, with respect to the Hartwell Dam on the Savannah River, that no part of such funds are to be used to initiate any construction on Hartwell Dam.

The importance of Hartwell Dam to the atomic-energy program seems to have been greatly exaggerated, and I am therefore happy that an investigation is to be made.

I include a letter to General Pick, Chief of Army Engineers, from M. W. Boyer, manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, which, in my opinion, is a lukewarm statement at most.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

Lt. Gen. LEWIS A. PICK,
Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, National Military Establishment.

DEAR GENERAL PICK: The Chamber of Commerce of Augusta, Ga., has requested that we advise you as to the interest of the Atomic Energy Commission in the proposed Hartwell Dam in Georgia. Mr. Kenney of your office has also inquired as to our interest in this project.

The Hartwell Dam will benefit the Savannah River project through the assurance of a uniform quantity of water supply and the reduction which we understand it will effect in the temperature of the water of the Savannah River which will be utilized at our Savannah River project. We also understand that it will contribute to the further reduction of flood hazards. Realization of these objectives will be of assistance to the operations at our Savannah River project. The lowering of the water temperature will give some measure of increased efficiency in the operation of reactors. The reduction of flood hazards will contribute to continuity of operations through avoidance of employee absenteeism resulting from real or potential flood threats.

Sincerely yours,

M. W. BOYER,
General Manager.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I refer now to the colloquy on Saturday last on the conference report of the supplemental appropriation bill for 1953, among the Member from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH], the Member from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the Member from New York [Mr. TABER], and the Member from California [Mr. JACKSON]. Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of the word "tender" as discussed then, is not my understanding of the Senate substitute for the House language. Let me recite the language adopted by the conferees, both House and Senate, on this bill:

No part of this appropriation may be used for administrative expenses or to pay salaries to any employee within the Public Housing Administration, or for any other purpose, so long as that agency proceeds with any public housing project after such project has been rejected or previous approval thereof canceled by the governing body of the locality by resolution or otherwise or by public vote, and the governing body has tendered the United States full reimbursement of Federal funds advanced on such project prior to such cancellation and a release from all obligations incurred under such project.

It should be made clear, Mr. Speaker, that the word "tender" does not mean negotiated or negotiate; it means, in its full legal significance, that the governing body which desires to cancel a contract with the United States, before that cancellation can be effective, has actually tendered to the United States full reimbursement of the funds advanced for such project prior to such cancellation and has also tendered a release from all obligations.

It would be a mistake if anyone would believe that the adopted language meant anything other than that actual cash had to be tendered. There is nothing ambiguous about the language in the bill. When we speak of "tender," there is no question but that we speak of an unconditional offer of money to satisfy a debt. "Tender" can mean only that there is an offer of cash-in payment by the governing body of a locality in the amount that is agreed upon to settle the debt. Again I say that there is no ambiguity in the language adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 240) providing for sine die adjournment July 5, 1952, with Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 3, strike out "Saturday, July 5, 1952" and insert "Monday, July 7, 1952."

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for sine die adjournment July 7, 1952."

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association to be held in Canada the following members on the part of the House: Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, and Mr. VORYS.

THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the grand order of pessimists, the reactionary forces of the Republican Party, is meeting today in Chicago. It is a difficult task these delegates have taken. It will not be easy to put together the broken pieces of their party, or to breathe life into an organization that has been dead on its feet for 20 years. The clumsy elephant is in foul shape. In trying to resuscitate and revitalize his emaciated body, the delegates will blow a lot of hot air into his lungs. The writing of a Republican platform will indeed be a difficult task. The party has no record of which to be proud and nothing to point to with pride. Republican leadership is at an all-time low and in a state of utter confusion. The candidates have only confounded the issues. If we leave them alone, they will destroy themselves. The elephant, like Rip Van Winkle, has been sleeping for 20 years. I know he has had many nightmares, but I hope he has had some dreams.

While the Republican Party is just about 20 years behind the times, let us hope that they have been able to dream up something good, and that they will present a platform which will provide real issues for the campaign. In preconvention speeches the big shots and so-called leaders of the Republican Party, in a desperate effort to woo farmers and win farm votes, have preferred false and fraudulent charges against officials of the administration in power—charges to the effect that for political purposes and immediately prior to the 1948 general election Government officials rigged the markets and manipulated prices to make it appear that prices were declining because the public was afraid of the threat of a Republican victory. These charges clearly indicate weakness and desperation. They are vicious, infamous, and obviously politically inspired. The mere thought, however, that the Republicans might win was, of course, enough to terrify the grain trade and all other groups in our economy. While the fear of Republican rule may have, in itself, actually caused the markets to decline, there were also during the period referred to market fluctuations which were normal because of powerful economic factors, as will be disclosed by a look at the record.

Even the great Governor Dewey should know, and certainly the other gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol, who have been sounding off so loudly about this matter, should know that a big crop means low prices to farmers, and that is exactly the situation we were faced with in the fall of 1948. If, in fact, an evil and unholy conspiracy actually existed, and the overt acts complained of were actually committed, why, let me ask you, have these complainants waited four long years, and just before another general election, to prefer their charges? Obviously, they are politically ambitious and are trying to mislead the public and to win the farm vote.

As strange as it may seem, just before the 1948 election, some of these same orators and so-called leaders were accusing the administration of trying to keep farm prices up and of being, therefore, responsible for the increased cost of living. This, too, was an insidious accusation. Actually, farm prices have very little to do with the cost of living, and frankly, the Department of Agriculture did everything it could to protect farm prices and to prevent farm prices from being demoralized and farm purchasing power destroyed. The Price Support Program for corn, for instance, was scheduled to go into effect December 1, 1948, but when the Secretary saw the big crop starting to move to market and knew it would depress the prices, he took the most effective action he could to protect farmers against the falling market. He moved the effective date of the support program to September 15.

The corn crop of 1947 was one of the smallest for many years prior thereto—2,384,000,000 bushels. It brought the highest corn prices on record. The corn crop of 1948 was an all-time record crop of 3,682,000,000 bushels. Naturally, the price came down as this tremendous crop was harvested and came to market. And there is no telling how low the price would have gone if it had not been for the Government's price support program of 90 percent of parity. That program stopped the decline at just below the support level—as it was designed to do. Under the Aiken flexible program that support level might have been at 75 percent of parity instead of 90 percent which would have been $1.20 per bushel instead of $1.44.

The following table shows the cash price of corn in the months prior to the election:

TABLE I.—*Corn, No. 2 Yellow, daily cash prices at Chicago*

[Cents per bushel]

Date	September 1948	October 1948	November 1948
1	210	160½	138¾
2	207	161½	(1)
3	194	Sunday	140½
4	192½	162	142¼
5	Sunday	163½	142⅞
6	Holiday	166¾	141⅞
7	197	172½	Sunday
8	202¼	182	143
9	202-205	177	142½
10	200	Sunday	142¾
11	199½-200	171½	Holiday
12	Sunday	Holiday	142¼
13	202	167½	140¾
14	199½	156	Sunday
15	195-196	158	141
16	184-190	157	142
17	183-185	Sunday	144
18	185	155	142
19	Sunday	156	141
20	179-181½	153	142½
21	184	153	Sunday
22	182½	151	144½
23	177¾	144¼	146
24	177½	Sunday	145¼
25	169	143	Holiday
26	Sunday	141⅝	144
27	160½	144	143
28	164	141¼	Sunday
29	161	141	143¾
30	159¾	141	144
31		Sunday	

[1] Election day.

Source: Market News Records, Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

If the 1948 drop in the price of corn was brought about by some evil and sinister action on the part of the officials of this administration, then it is clear that the speculators and traders who deal in grain futures were on the inside of that deal and knew exactly what was going to happen. For these grain traders, probably the most expert judges in the Nation, predicted weeks in advance almost to the penny the price that corn would bring. The whole thing is preposterous and absurd and political.

It is interesting to note that the futures' traders have such good information about the administration plans that they bid the price of corn down to $1.38 on August 27, 1948, more than 9 weeks before the cash grain hit that price.

It would be absurd, of course, to assume that the traders had any advance knowledge of the administration's tactics if the administration, indeed, had any tactics or schemes such as has been charged. Actually, as every reasonable person knows, they were merely reflecting their own judgment of the effect of the big corn crop of 1948 on corn prices, and they hit it right on the nose, as is shown by the following table:

TABLE II.—*December 1948 corn futures—Closing Friday futures price*

Dec. 26, 1947	1.93¼
Jan. 2, 1948	1.91½
Jan. 9, 1948	1.93⅞
Jan. 16, 1948	1.95
Jan. 23, 1948	1.91¾
Jan. 30, 1948	1.87¼
Feb. 6, 1948	1.61
Feb. 13, 1948	1.54⅞
Feb. 20, 1948	1.55⅞
Feb. 27, 1948	1.63¾
Mar. 5, 1948	1.66⅛
Mar. 12, 1948	1.58¼
Mar. 19, 1948	1.62⅜
Mar. 25, 1948	1.64¾
Apr. 2, 1948	1.65
Apr. 9, 1948	1.68⅜
Apr. 16, 1948	1.72⅝
Apr. 23, 1948	1.67¾
Apr. 30, 1948	1.68⅞
May 7, 1948	1.69¼
May 14, 1948	1.71⅝
May 21, 1948	1.66⅞
May 28, 1948	1.69¼
June 4, 1948	1.67⅞
June 11, 1948	1.71⅝
June 18, 1948	1.68½
June 25, 1948	1.67½
July 2, 1948	1.66¾
July 9, 1948	1.62¾
July 16, 1948	1.61
July 23, 1948	1.57½
July 30, 1948	1.51¾
Aug. 6, 1948	1.48⅜
Aug. 13, 1948	1.44½
Aug. 20, 1948	1.41½
Aug. 27, 1948	1.38⅝
Sept. 3, 1948	1.39¾
Sept. 10, 1948	1.40⅛
Sept. 17, 1948	1.41½
Sept. 24, 1948	1.40½
Oct. 1, 1948	1.37½
Oct. 8, 1948	1.42¾
Oct. 15, 1948	1.40
Oct. 22, 1948	1.39¾
Oct. 29, 1948	1.39½
Nov. 5, 1948	1.41½
Nov. 12, 1948	1.42½
Nov. 19, 1948	1.44
Nov. 26, 1948	1.44⅛
Dec. 3, 1948	1.44
Dec. 10, 1948	1.42¾
Dec. 17, 1948	1.43⅛
Dec. 22, 1948	1.41¾

If you want the real reason why the price of corn fell from $2.10 per bushel on September 1, 1948, to $1.38 per bushel on the day before election, there are two very good reasons. First, there was a general but rather erroneous

impression prevailing to the effect that the Republicans were going to win the 1948 election. That in itself was enough to frighten all the people of the country. Farmers and grain buyers alike were afraid the Republicans would win the election, and that the new administration would be in the hands of those who had openly declared their opposition to the price-support program for the basic agricultural commodities at 90 percent of parity. Farmers and grain dealers were afraid that the Republican policy of sliding scale would be put into effect; that the 90 percent of parity support program would be done away with, and that supports would be weak when they were needed most. In other words, the sliding scale support program would penalize farmers if they produced abundantly. As production goes up the support program goes down under that sort of a policy.

Still another good reason for the decline in prices in the fall of 1948 was the pure economics of the situation. Prices came down because of the tremendous harvest of that fall. That is because farmers had produced abundantly.

The charge that hog farmers, too, lost money because of the drop in corn prices would not be made honestly by anyone who knows anything about agriculture. Any farmer knows that his profit or loss on hogs does not depend so much on the dollars-and-cents price he gets for his hogs, but on the corn-hog ratio. This is the ratio between the price of corn and the price of hogs. Hog prices did go down somewhat in the fall of 1948, but they did not keep pace with corn. The corn-hog ratio increased from 9.2 in May 1948 to 18 in November, indicating that hogs were almost twice as profitable to farmers in November as they were in May. The following table shows the steady climb of the corn-hog ratio in the last 8 months of 1948:

TABLE III.—*Corn-hog ratio 1948 (farm prices)*

January	10.8
February	11.2
March	10.2
April	9.3
May	9.2
June	10.6
July	12.5
August	14.1
September	15.4
October	17.9
November	18.0
December	17.0
Average	13.0

Other absurd and asinine charges have also been made to the effect that officials of the administration in power tried to lead farmers to believe that the Eightieth Congress had failed to provide adequate storage and that no storage space was available and consequently farmers piled their grain on the ground where it deteriorated or sold it at a great sacrifice. The answer to this silly charge is that if adequate storage space was available, why did farmers pile their grain on the ground and sustain great losses. Certainly farmers would not rely too much on radio speeches and press reports. They usually make proper inquiries at proper places.

Rather than depressing farm prices the record clearly indicates the contrary. For the first time in the history of this country, we have a program in operation under which farm and income prices have progressively increased. A look at the record indicates that in 1932 corn was selling at 31.6 cents per bushel; in 1934 it had gone up to 81.5 cents per bushel; in 1942 to 91.7 cents per bushel; in 1947 to $2.16 per bushel; in 1948, under the administration's price support program corn was being supported at the highest level in history—$1.44 per bushel; and today it is bringing $1.70 per bushel.

The real reason farmers did not take advantage of the price-support program before the 1948 election is not because they had heard a speech or read a press report, but actually because corn prices did not fall far enough below the support price to make it worth while for most farmers to go to the trouble of applying for a Commodity Credit Corporation loan.

The record shows that the price of corn was well above the support level until late October 1948 and never went as much as 6 cents below the support level.

TABLE IV.—*Corn-hog ratio 1948 (farm prices)*

January	10.8
February	11.2
March	10.2
April	9.3
May	9.2
June	10.6
July	12.5
August	14.1
September	15.4
October	17.9
November	18.0
December	17.0
Average	13.0

TABLE V.—*Corn, No. 2 Yellow, daily cash prices at Chicago*

[Cents per bushel]

Date	September 1948	October 1948	November 1948
1	210	160½	138⅜
2	207	161½	(1)
3	194	Sunday	140½
4	192½	162	142½
5	Sunday	163½	142⅞
6	Holiday	166¾	141⅞
7	197	172½	Sunday
8	202¾	182	143
9	202–205	177	142½
10	200	Sunday	142⅛
11	199½–200	171½	Holiday
12	Sunday	Holiday	142¼
13	202	167½	140¾
14	199½	156	Sunday
15	195–196	158	141
16	184–190	157	142
17	183–185	Sunday	144
18	185	155	142
19	Sunday	156	141
20	179–181½	153	142½
21	184	153	Sunday
22	182½	151	144½
23	177¾	144¼	146
24	177½	Sunday	145¼
25	169	143	Holiday
26	Sunday	141⅝	144
27	160½	144	143
28	164	141¼	Sunday
29	161	141	143¾
30	159¾	141	144
31		Sunday	

[1] Election day.

Source: Market News Records, Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

TABLE V.—*December 1948 corn futures—Closing Friday futures price*

Dec. 26, 1947	1.93¼
Jan. 2, 1948	1.91½
Jan. 9, 1948	1.93⅞
Jan. 16, 1948	1.95
Jan. 23, 1948	1.91¾
Jan. 30, 1948	1.87¼
Feb. 6, 1948	1.61
Feb. 13, 1948	1.54⅞
Feb. 20, 1948	1.55⅞
Feb. 27, 1948	1.63¾
Mar. 5, 1948	1.66⅛
Mar. 12, 1948	1.58¼
Mar. 19, 1948	1.62⅜
Mar. 25, 1948	1.64¾
Apr. 2, 1948	1.65
Apr. 9, 1948	1.68⅜
Apr. 16, 1948	1.72⅝
Apr. 23, 1948	1.67¾
Apr. 30, 1948	1.68⅞
May 7, 1948	1.69¼
May 14, 1948	1.71⅝
May 21, 1948	1.66⅞
May 28, 1948	1.69¼
June 4, 1948	1.67⅞
June 11, 1948	1.71⅝
June 18, 1948	1.68½
June 25, 1948	1.67½
July 2, 1948	1.66¾
July 9, 1948	1.62¾
July 16, 1948	1.61
July 23, 1948	1.57½
July 30, 1948	1.51¾
Aug. 6, 1948	1.48⅜
Aug. 13, 1948	1.44½
Aug. 20, 1948	1.41½
Aug. 27, 1948	1.38⅝
Sept. 3, 1948	1.39¾
Sept. 10, 1948	1.40⅛
Sept. 17, 1948	1.41½
Sept. 24, 1948	1.40½
Oct. 1, 1948	1.37½
Oct. 8, 1948	1.42¾
Oct. 15, 1948	1.40
Oct. 22, 1948	1.39¾
Oct. 29, 1948	1.39½
Nov. 5, 1948	1.41⅛
Nov. 12, 1948	1.42½
Nov. 19, 1948	1.44
Nov. 26, 1948	1.44⅝
Dec. 3, 1948	1.44
Dec. 10, 1948	1.42¾
Dec. 17, 1948	1.43⅜
Dec. 22, 1948	1.41¾

GOP when used by Republicans in speaking of agriculture means, get off parity. They want the sliding scale, which is nothing more nor less than a a falling floor.

I have spoken of charges, now I want to make a few challenges. I challenge the Republican Convention to adopt a plank in the party platform openly and boldly opposing a 90 percent of parity support price program for basic agricultural commodities, and in forthright fashion advocating a price support program based on a sliding scale. I challenge the Republican Convention to boldly and forthrightly name and number the laws they want repealed which are a part of the farm program now in operation.

I challenge the Republican Convention to adopt a plank in the party platform opposing the soil conservation program and the agriculture conservation payments to farmers.

I challenge the Republican Convention to name and to number the control laws affecting agriculture which they advocate the repeal of.

The farmers of the Nation have a right to know the views of those who

are seeking their votes. The farmers have a right to know whether Republican candidates want to destroy the soil conservation program, weaken the price support program or repeal the crop insurance program, Farmers Home Administration, the diversion program, and the laws which enable farmers, by making adjustments in production to cope with the law of supply and demand and to work together in the interest of the welfare of our Nation.

I challenge the Republican Convention to advocate the repeal of a single vital part or parcel of the present farm program.

It is not too difficult to understand why politically inspired men make erroneous and inaccurate statements in the present political environment in which we now find ourselves, but let it be said to the credit of the Democratic administrations of the past two decades that the farmers of the Nation have found their real friends. Notwithstanding the progress we have made and the success we have achieved, we must continue our efforts in behalf of those who till the soil to the end that they might receive a fairer share of the national income. Let it further be said, that this program now in operation has served well the needs of producers and consumers alike, both in times of peace and in times of war, and let it further be said, that even the Eightieth Congress, controlled by Republicans, did not repeal a single vital law or part of the program then in operation and those who are not now politically inspired and do not now have some selfish partisan political motive would not dare advocate the repeal or even a drastic change in the program we now have.

In the past 20 years there have emanated from the Committee on Agriculture some of the most important laws on the statute books today—acts of Congress that affect the daily lives, the prosperity, and the food supply of every citizen of the United States. There have at times been sharply divergent viewpoints on the committee as to the desirability of certain aspects of this legislation. In every case, except the two or three to which I have referred, that difference of opinion has had no relationship whatever to party politics and has been a reflection only of the sincere belief of the individual members of the committee as to what action would best promote the welfare of agriculture and of the Nation.

On almost every occasion, legislation reported out by the Committee on Agriculture has been reported with the overwhelming support of all members of the committee, both Democrat and Republican, and it is almost unknown for there to be a dissenting report on any legislation from that committee. In the truest sense of the word, the great farm program that we now have on the statute books and which has played such a tremendous part in the great production record of American agriculture in the past 10 years, has been truly a bipartisan—no, a nonpartisan—program. Republican and Democratic members of the committee have worked side by side and shoulder to shoulder to originate, enact, and perfect that legislation.

I think you will understand then, Mr. Speaker, it is with real sorrow that I have seen within the past few weeks some effort on the part of very prominent individuals to drag agriculture into the arena of partisan politics. Those who know me, know that I deplore this situation with all my heart, and it would make no difference to me, Mr. Speaker, whether the person seeking to make a political football out of agriculture were a member of my own part or the other. I have previously, as my record will show, opposed with equal energy ill-advised efforts of members of my own party to make a political issue out of our agricultural programs.

The particular incident to which I refer at this time is, of course, the statement made by Governor Dewey of New York on a radio program some 2 weeks ago, and since echoed by several other prominent persons, that the administration somehow manipulated the farm program so as to force down the prices of corn, hogs, and beans just before the election in 1948, in the hope of influencing the vote of farmers in the Presidential election of that year.

I was prompted to reply immediately to that charge, because it did not make sense to me when I first heard it. If it is sound political strategy for the party in office to seek to beat down farm prices just before election as an inducement to farmers to continue to vote for that party, it is the most cockeyed political strategy I have ever heard of and I should have obtained my political education in some other school. It would seem to me on the contrary, if the party in office could influence farm prices one way or the other, it would make every effort to increase those prices prior to election in order to demonstrate to farmers what a good job it was doing.

To sum up the situation, Mr. Speaker, I need only to say that notwithstanding statements and speeches which have recently been made by these so-called political leaders who are, of course, cherishing personal ambitions, the fact remains that during the session of Congress which is now closing both Houses of Congress by overwhelming majorities, and with the vote of Republican Members, continued the soil-conservation program and the agriculture conservation payments and approved the bill in the form presented by the committee. On Saturday, July 5, just before Republican Senators and Congressmen scurried out of Washington headed for Chicago and the convention, both Houses of Congress by unanimous vote approved the plan of mandatory price support at 90 percent of parity on the basic agriculture commodities and thereby repudiated flexible supports or the sliding scale, which is, as I have said, a toboggan ride for farmers. The fact remains that no real effort has been made by Republican Senators and Congressmen to repeal a single part of our farm program.

THE BULL WHIP ON DENMARK AND THE ARMED FORCES?

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, two items: One concerns Denmark, the whipping boy in the sale of ships to the Soviet Union; the other, an attack on our Armed Forces. Some say, man for man, our Army has less fire power than the Soviets.

On the Danish deal, we should reserve judgment, as some did in the Syngman Rhee situation. Europe and a great part of the free world appear guilty of trading at the expense of blood in Korea with the Soviet Union.

Why use the bull whip on Denmark alone, as was done on Syngman Rhee, before the full facts are in perspective? Do I hear a roll call of the names and the number of ships that have gone to the Reds since Korea? Who built them? Who got the cash?

Our Armed Forces are under attack; some say, man for man, we have less fire power than the Soviets. We seem to have too many chair warmers. Omitted in the odious comparison of our boys with the Reds is the parasitical operation of Soviet forces. Reds are like locusts. They live off crops of the country in which they move. They sleep in civilian homes by day and march by night. They lack medics and medical supplies and equipment. When they seized Vienna, they used civilian medics, supplies, warehouses, and facilities; they dragoon civilians to haul supplies, on A-frames, in Korea. They have no expense for extensive records and armchair specialists. Reds have no GI or veterans' benefits, hospitals, homes, schooling, or pensions. They keep few prisoners alive.

Our Armed Forces are charged with providing for the security of the Nation. They reflect the living standard and the esprit they are assigned to defend. Soviets do the same. Do those who snap the whip want our boys to reflect the Red way of life? To come down to their level, their degradation? Their shame?

Snap the whip? If we must, let's be sure of our target, be it Denmark or the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include as a part thereof an article appearing in a Baltimore paper regarding a Baltimore veteran found dead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is not very difficult to answer the challenge or the attack on the Republican Party by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The Republican Convention will answer that the election next November will answer that challenge. I believe we will have a change in the White House. The country fears an economic collapse. The country is thoroughly aroused, thoroughly angry, thoroughly unhappy over the Korean situation, a situation that cannot be answered no matter how much the other party talks, and I am not a partisan person, as the Speaker knows. They are thoroughly angry over the war and inefficiency of this administration, thoroughly angry that victory and peace have not been achieved.

I was at Walter Reed Hospital last night talking to our wounded men there, talking over the legislation that we passed for their benefit. We did not pass all that we might have. I was very touched at their gratitude for the little we have done. They have an unquenchable spirit. I am very much distressed at the lack of preparedness those men were given in Korea—blind men, with both hands gone, men with an arm gone, men with a leg gone; an eye gone; amputees. They talked about Robert Smith, the quadruple amputee, who had to have four limbs amputated because of frozen hands and feet, because of lack of clothing and equipment. Robert Smith started home to Pennsylvania in a Government-given automobile, started home alone. That showed his unquenchable spirit.

Those wounded men think, they and their families are doing a lot of thinking, and we here have been doing a lot of thinking, and people all over the United States are doing a lot of thinking. I know those on the other side of the aisle are just as sorry for these men as am I, but I believe those veterans and their families are going to demand more equities in order that they may receive justice in the matter of employment in their home districts in order that there may be an end to the horrible Korean war.

There is utter confusion in the Department of Defense. I have reason to know, because I have been there time and time again; I have sat in committees with 10 and 12 of these national defense officials. With most of them wanting to keep plants open, some of them, the newer ones, some of the new lawyers decided to close plants; they forced them into bankruptcy. There are many areas in the country today, some even in the South, Mr. Speaker, where work is supposed to be plentiful, that are suffering because of lack of proper distribution, lack of going ahead with the defense program. I believe, Mr. Speaker, the American people are thoroughly aroused and we will have a Republican President.

But, Mr. Speaker, to speak of happier things, I want to thank you and all of your staff and all of the Members on the floor for the help that has been given to me, for your own tireless work, for your courtesy under trying conditions. I believe that the Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle although they may not agree with me are sent here by their constituents to do what they consider is their duty and they so conduct themselves and I have a great liking and respect for my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I thank everybody here, the clerks and all of the people attached to the work at the Capitol, and I thank the press. I wish for them happiness and a respite for a while at least from their heavy and anxious work.

RESOLUTION OF THANKS TO THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] kindly take the chair.

(Mr. GAMBLE assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 748) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the House are presented to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the able, impartial, and dignified manner in which he has presided over the deliberations and performed the arduous duties of the Chair during the present term of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it is a high privilege to serve in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives is the greatest legislative body of all the world. We of the Eighty-second Congress have been further privileged to serve under a Speaker who has been diligent, a man who has been fair in his decisions, and a man who has upheld the honor, the dignity, and the traditions of the House of Representatives.

I am sure I speak for every Member of the House of Representatives in expressing thanks to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN for his services as Speaker of the Eighty-second Congress. He has performed those duties in an able and dignified manner. He has always been courteous and fair. He has adhered to the rules of the House of Representatives and has set an example in good parliamentary procedure.

As this session draws to a close, we not only extend to him our thanks for a job well done, but we wish him well. We hope that in the coming weeks and months that he will have a most enjoyable vacation and that we will see him again come next January.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The Speaker resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. My beloved colleagues of the House of Representatives, I shall not detain you because I know you have put in strenuous weeks just past, and I certainly have. But I must take this opportunity to thank from the bottom of a grateful heart each Member of the House of Representatives for the uniform kindness and courtesy shown me. You have made a job which cannot escape being an arduous and strenuous one tolerant and pleasant because of your friendship. I shall never cease to be grateful.

Again I thank you. I wish you a happy holiday back among your people and that you will find them prosperous, healthy, and contented.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Milagros Aujero;

H. R. 2190. An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3177. An act to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 3209. An act amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4021. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo;

H. R. 4157. An act for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Giuchowska, and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk;

H. R. 4163. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4326. An act for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Rahel Zaker Peters;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Plandolit, and Fuencisla Segimont;

H. R. 4632. An act for the relief of Linda Lee Converse;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Johann Komma;

H. R. 4709. An act for the relief of Maron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken;

H. R. 4762. An act for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson;

H. R. 4792. An act to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4865. An act for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haeland;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5442. An act for the relief of Martin A. Dekking;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo;

H. R. 5624. An act for the relief of Tokusaburo Glasscock;

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Biech and others;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6839. An act to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7313. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz;

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes.

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the general counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.;

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Al-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou;

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend sections 433 (b), 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jer-

sey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of John George Papailias;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Izumi;

H. R. 860. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwky;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 1448. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1477. An act for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin.

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 1814. An act to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 2447. An act for the relief of George M. Sanger;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sumako Egashira;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 2774. An act for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2856. An act for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel);

H. R. 2906. An act for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Vito Aiuto;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Anny Scher;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 3382. An act for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi;

H. R. 3438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80);

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3705. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney;

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju;

H. R. 3778. An act for the relief of Wong See Sun;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Aldo Vallesa;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of Franco Berardi;

H. R. 4001. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for the use of the board of water supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft, pump station, and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, T. H., the status of Hawaiian homelands;

H. R. 4407. An act to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4797. An act to ratify and confirm act 291 of the session laws of Hawaii, 1949, section 2 of act 152 of the session laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of act 171 of the session laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County waterworks board, Kauai County waterworks board, and the board of water supply, county of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935;

H. R. 4799. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4800. An act to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Silas B. Morris;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5055. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods and effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5087. An act for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5120. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 5198. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in St. Thomas, V. I., to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 5327. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug;

H. R. 5481. An act for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Rollins P. Baker and other employees of The Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5788. An act to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 5911. An act for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde;

H. R. 5917. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6025. An act for the relief of David Daryl Dalko;

H. R. 6070. An act for the relief of Paul Gust Williams;

H. R. 6083. An act for the relief of Amalia Architetto;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6278. An act for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi);

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6356. An act for the relief of William J. Martin;

H. R. 6831. An act for the relief of Ayako Sukiura;

H. R. 6446. An act for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura; and

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted as follows:

Mr. WOLVERTON with reference to the election of the President of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURDOCK in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. IRVING in four instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. SHEEHAN (at the request of Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHATHAM and to include an editorial from the Winston-Salem Journal.

Mr. HOWELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JARMAN (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include a speech.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include appropriate material.

Mr. MILLER of California and to include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include an address by Chairman Meade of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. RAINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include the address that General MacArthur will deliver in Chicago tonight.

Mr. CANNON (at the request of Mr. THOMAS) and to include certain tables and other extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 240, the second session of the Eighty-second Congress adjourned sine die.

BILLS ENROLLED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, after sine die adjournment, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7268. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7800. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

BILLS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER announced that pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 241, Eighty-second Congress, that he did on Wednesday, July 9, 1952, sign enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7268. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7800. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to sine die adjournment, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 7, 1952:

H. R. 707 An act for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 1843. An act for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa; and

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco).

On July 8, 1952:

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 6544. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 6556. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of ofcer's pay;

H. R. 6637. An act for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino;

H. R. 6640. An act for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu);

H. R. 6681. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins;

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Port Laramie irrigation district, the Goshen irrigation district, and the Pathfinder irrigation district, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof;

H. R. 6850; An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 6869. An act for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7009. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott;

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7255. An act to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans);

H. R. 7289. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7301. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7303. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservations;

H. R. 7313. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7366. An act for the relief of Erika O. Eder, and her son, James Robert Eder;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray;

H. R. 7502. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents";

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Corp Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters;

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field services of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan;

H. R. 8499. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives;

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchants Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

On July 9, 1952:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann;

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen.

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Milagros Aujero;

H. R. 2190. An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3177. An act to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 3209. An act amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 4021. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States Military Reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo;

H. R. 4157. An act for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska, and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk;

H. R. 4163. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4326. An act for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son.

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 4588. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Plandolit and Fuencisla Segimont.

H. R. 4632. An act for the relief of Linda Lee Converse;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Johann Komma;

H. R. 4709. An act for the relief of Baron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken;

H. R. 4762. An act for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson;

H. R. 4792. An act to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H R. 5442. An act for the relief of Martin A. Dekking;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo;

H. R. 5624. An act for the relief of Tokusaburo Imamura Glasscock;

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6839. An act to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post office purposes;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 6915. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz;

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobemeier;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Calumet River;

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor;

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 8271. An act to amend sections 433 (b), 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across, the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn., and Wis.;

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the Mail Equipment Shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes.

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.;

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Ai-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou;

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

On July 10, 1952:

H. R. 7268. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7800. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives, notified the Clerk on July 14, 1952, that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 3, 1952:

H. R. 404. An act to amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 699. An act for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Richards, owner of the Bozarth Nursing Home, Toppenish, Wash.;

H. R. 885. An act for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann;

H. R. 966. An act for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Francis A. Gunn;

H. R. 1690. An act for the relief of Carl M. Campbell, James R. White, and Frederick J. Powers;

H. R. 1267. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Stamey Construction Co. and/or Oklahoma Paving Co.;

H. R. 1788. An act to authorize the Choctaw, Chickasaw, Cherokee, Creek, or Seminole Tribes of Indians to make contracts with approval of the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of Margaret Frankel;

H. R. 2221. An act for the relief of Gertrude Manhal;

H. R. 2510. An act for the relief of Mrs. Beverly Brunell Roth;

H. R. 2813. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colbran reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3616. An act for the relief of the Pacific Fruit Express Co.;

H. R. 4070. An act for the relief of Isabelle F. Story;

H. R. 4277. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a claim of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.;

H. R. 5543. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elisabeth Rosalia Haste;

H. R. 5599. An act to provide for the conveyance of the Centre Hill Mansion, Petersburg, Va., to the Petersburg Battlefield Museum Corporation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Peter Mihaly Berend;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for research into the development of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6754. An act to provide that salaries of rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes shall not be reduced by reason of increases in the length of such routes;

H. R. 6857. An act to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia, approved May 29, 1928";

H. R. 7231. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind";

H. R. 7758. An act to revise certain laws relating to the mail-messenger service;

H. R. 7877. An act to amend section 1699 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels;

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution approving the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; and

H. J. Res. 477. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond April 1, 1953.

On July 5, 1952:

H. R. 5768. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 20, 1944;

H. R. 7072. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7151. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7216. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7314. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1952:

H. R. 4686. An act authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., to the city of Crawford;

H. R. 6673. An act to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work;

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 418. Joint Resolution to amend the act of July 1, 1947 (61 Stat. 242); and

H. J. Res. 492. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

On July 8, 1952:

H. R. 1853. An act to authorize the granting to Kaiser Steel Corp. of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands, and of patent in fee to certain other public lands.

H. R. 3554. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

H. R. 3600. An act for the relief of Dr. Alexander Symeonidis;

H. R. 7345. An act to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7876. An act relating to the taxation of life insurance companies;

H. R. 8222. An act to authorize the loan of certain naval patrol-type vessels to the Government of Japan; and

H. R. 8499. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, with respect to the accumulated balances on telephone and telegraph accounts of Members of the House of Representatives.

On July 9, 1952:

H. R. 3705. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of William Mooney;

H. R. 3707. An act for the relief of Edgar L. Dimmick;

H. R. 4197. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for the use of the Board of Water Supply of the city and county of Honolulu for the location of a water shaft pump station and tunnel, and to amend section 203 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, so as to confer upon certain lands of Auwaiolimu, Kewalo-Uka, and Kalawahine, on the island of Oahu, T. H., the status of Hawaiian home lands;

H. R. 4407. An act to amend sections 213 (b), 213 (c), and 215 of title II of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended;

H. R. 4408. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4799. An act to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 4800. An act to further amend section 202 (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, relating to membership on the Hawaiian Homes Commission;

H. R. 5426. An act relating to the reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of F. Archie Meatyard;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Delma L. Mauzey;

H. R. 6850. An act for the relief of Martha Bridges;

H. R. 7176. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7313. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

On July 10, 1952:

H. R. 1098. An act for the relief of the estate of C. G. Allen;

H. R. 1558. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 2073. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas H. Campbell;

H. R. 2713. An act for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Evan L. Krogh;

H. R. 2789. An act for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to the Catholic bishop of northern Alaska for use as a mission;

H. R. 3527. An act for the relief of Morris Tutnauer;

H. R. 3653. An act for the relief of the estate of Michael R. Marsiglia;

H. R. 3858. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Copeyon;

H. R. 4109. An act to amend section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895, as amended, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of the Statutes at Large, and sections 411, 412, and 413 of title 28, United States Code, relating to the printing, binding, and distribution of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4163. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Francis C. Dennis and Marvin Spires, both of Eastover, S. C.;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Joseph Denekar and Mrs. Mary A. Denekar;

H. R. 4188. An act for the relief of Josephine F. Garrett;

H. R. 4792. An act to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration;

H. R. 4842. An act for the relief of Joseph Manchion;

H. R. 4891. An act for the relief of the estate of Emil A. Peshek;

H. R. 4921. An act for the relief of Silas B. Morris;

H. R. 4932. An act for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and others;

H. R. 5004. An act for the relief of Terminal Warehouse Co.;

H. R. 5055. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands of the United States situated in Ontonagon County, Mich., for lands within the Ottawa National Forest, Mich., and for other purposes;

H. R. 5327. An act to amend the act of July 26, 1946 (Public Law 551, 79th Cong.), relating to the issuance of general obligation bonds by the city of Anchorage, Alaska.

H. R. 5481. An act for the relief of Norman E. Dole, Jr., William F. Smith, John G. Harris, and James E. Chamberlain;

H. R. 5515. An act for the relief of John H. Vogel;

H. R. 5578. An act for the relief of Rollins F. Baker and other employees of the Alaska Railroad;

H. R. 5911. An act for the relief of David Braithwaite and Orvin E. Wilde;

H. R. 6326. An act to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945, as amended;

H. R. 6544. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7331. An act for the relief of Andrianne Luiz and John Luiz;

H. R. 7391. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7654. An act to amend section 508 of title 14, United States Code;

H. R. 5006. An act for the relief of Gallagher's Warehouses, Inc.;

H. R. 5198. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain property located in Saint Thomas, Virgin Islands, to the control and administrative supervision of the Department of the Interior;

H. R. 5917. An act to authorize the sale of land on the Crow Reservation, Mont., allotted to William Big Day;

H. R. 6558. An act for the relief of George Blech and others;

H. R. 7268. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6601. An act to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174, ch. 195), so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay;

H. R. 7204. An act to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948;

H. R. 7269. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late William S. Cox a commission as third lieutenant, United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to authorize the quartering in public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in inaugural ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

On July 11, 1952:

H. R. 5917. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to William Big Day;

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the Mail Equipment Shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7665. An act for the relief of Annalyn Earley;

H. R. 7952. An act to authorize the combination of the Truck Crop Insect Laboratory and the Citrus Insect Laboratory of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, located at Alhambra and Whittier, Calif., respectively, and to provide for new quarters; and

H. R. 8272. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Fulton County, a political subdivision of Georgia, of certain land in said county.

On July 12, 1952:

H. R. 1222. An act to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide for the crediting of certain service in the Army of the United States for certain members of the Reserve components of the Air Force of the United States;

H. R. 1732. An act to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands;

H. R. 1814. An act to authorize the admission of Flora Fung Wah Miu Wong to the United States;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 3209. An act amending section 25 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 3211. An act for the relief of the Alma Cooperative Equity Exchange, Alma, Nebr., and others;

H. R. 3438. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80);

H. R. 4797. An act to ratify and confirm act 291 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1949,

section 2 of act 152 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, and section 2 of act 171 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, which included Maui County Waterworks Board, Kauai County Waterworks Board, and the Board of Water Supply, County of Hawaii, under the definition of "municipality" in the issuance of revenue bonds pursuant to the Revenue Bond Act of 1935;

H. R. 5065. An act to authorize payment for transportation of dependents, baggage, and household goods effects of certain officers of the naval service and Coast Guard under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5350. An act to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6004. An act to provide for the payment of retroactive increases in compensation for services rendered by certain deceased officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6556. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 6356. An act for the relief of William J. Martin.

H. R. 6681. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John B. Cummins;

H. R. 6812. An act to provide that the existing project for a navigation channel on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 7317. An act authorizing the conveyance of certain lands to the town of Hope, N. Mex.;

H. R. 7850. An act for the relief of Leopold Laufer and Elfriede Laufer;

H. R. 8170. An act relating to burley tobacco farm acreage allotments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 8234. An act to amend section 5 of the act of June 29, 1888, relating to the office of Supervisor of New York Harbor.

On July 14, 1952:

H. R. 728. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Lewis Morgan;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of John George Papailias;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of Mary Izumi;

H. R. 963. An act for the relief of Chu Bud Yick;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mercedes Hernandez Saguar;

H. R. 2840. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hee Shee Wong Achuck;

H. R. 3071. An act for the relief of Vito Aiuto;

H. R. 3168. An act to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion;

H. R. 3334. An act for the relief of Paul Busbey;

H. R. 5120. An act to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act so as to require the insurance of deposits payable at branches of insured banks in Puerto Rico;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland;

H. R. 5458. An act for the relief of Joyce Oerlemans Haug;

H. R. 5767. An act to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum or stipulated resale prices and which are extended by State law to persons who are not parties to such contracts and agreements, and for certain other purposes;

H. R. 5788. An act to extend certain 10-year oil and gas leases;

H. R. 6845. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7009. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yarlott;

H. R. 7301. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Viola Delaney;

H. R. 7302. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7303. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents in fee to certain allottees on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 7305. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Utah to the Bench Lake Irrigation Co., of Hurricane, Utah;

H. R. 7721. An act to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after the termination of the state of war between the United States and the Government of Japan and prior to July 2, 1955;

H. R. 8120. An act to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8006. An act to provide for an adjustment in the compensation of certain employees transferred from the field service of the Post Office Department to the General Services Administration pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 18 of 1950, and for other purposes.

On July 15, 1952:

H. R. 954. An act for the relief of Elvira Suzanne Oosterwyk;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1477. An act for the relief of Linda Azar Karam Batrouny;

H. R. 1490. An act for the relief of Henryk Kramarski;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tomiko Munakata Millhollin;

H. R. 1838. An act for the relief of Fong Bat Woon and Fong Get Nan;

H. R. 1843. An act for the relief of Nahan Abdo Haj Moussa;

H. R. 2166. An act for the relief of Sister Anita (Vincenzina Di Franco);

H. R. 2190. An act to provide for the conveyance to the town of Dedham, Maine, of a certain strip of land situated in such town and used as a road right-of-way;

H. R. 2351. An act for the relief of Naoki and Yoshiki Sakamoto;

H. R. 2572. An act to provide for the alteration, reconstruction, or relocation of certain highway and railroad bridges over the Columbia River or its navigable tributaries;

H. R. 2606. An act for the relief of Dimitra Gaitanis;

H. R. 2635. An act for the relief of Sumako Egashria;

H. R. 2856. An act for the relief of Jan J. Wojciechowski;

H. R. 2860. An act for the relief of Inez Pryer (Sister Mary Carmel);

H. R. 2906. An act for the relief of Kenji Kusumoto;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Anny Scher;

H. R. 3275. An act for the relief of Miyoko Nakagawa;

H. R. 3280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Emi Yasuda and her minor son, Keichiro Yasuda;

H. R. 3382. An act for the relief of Haruyo Takahashi;

H. R. 3564. An act for the relief of Reuben Krakovsky;

H. R. 3592. An act for the relief of Paul Tse, James Tse, and Bennie Tse;

H. R. 3774. An act for the relief of Dr. David M. Ju;

H. R. 3778. An act for the relief of Wong See Sun;

H. R. 3969. An act for the relief of Franco Berardi;

H. R. 4001. An act for the relief of Dr. Manuel Magtalis Geronimo and Dr. Rita Villaroman Geronimo;

H. R. 4002. An act for the relief of Sandra E. Dennett;

H. R. 4128. An act for the relief of Antonio and Francesco Lo Schiavo;

H. R. 4157. An act for the relief of Sister Helena Ginal, Sister Anna Szoldrska, Sister Anna Gluchowska, and Sister Bronislawa Szewczyk;

H. R. 4250. An act for the relief of Ruben George Varga and Mrs. Ilona Varga;

H. R. 4326. An act for the relief of Toshiko Nakamuta Takimoto and her minor son;

H. R. 4396. An act for the relief of Elias Papadopoulos;

H. R. 4466. An act for the relief of Rahel Zakar Peters;

H. R. 4503. An act for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schartz;

H. R. 4538. An act for the relief of Mark Yen Hui;

H. R. 4632. An act for the relief of Linda Lee Converse;

H. R. 4709. An act for the relief of Baron Fred Alexander D'Osten-Sacken;

H. R. 4762. An act for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson;

H. R. 4866. An act for the relief of Emma Gazzaniga, Cecelia Trezzi, Clelia Mainetti, Bonosa Colombo, Emma Baldisserotto, Lina DalDosso, Lucia Paganoni, and Regina Pagani;

H. R. 5087. An act for the relief of Hoong Moy Lam;

H. R. 5107. An act for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita;

H. R. 5442. An act for the relief of Martin A. Dekking;

H. R. 5517. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katharina Luise Trenye;

H. R. 5591. An act for the relief of Sister Angelantonia Diana;

H. R. 5618. An act for the relief of Young Wai Kit;

H. R. 5624. An act for the relief of Tokusaburo Imamura Glasscock;

H. R. 5864. An act for the relief of Sachiko Kanemochi;

H. R. 6025. An act for the relief of David Daryl Dalko;

H. R. 6070. An act for the relief of Paul Gust Williams;

H. R. 6083. An act for the relief of Amalia Architetto;

H. R. 6109. An act for the relief of Helga Eveline Matz;

H. R. 6278. An act for the relief of Samuele Rossi (also known as Renato Rossi);

H. R. 6381. An act for the relief of Ayako Sukiura;

H. R. 6446. An act for the relief of Jeanne Marie Miura;

H. R. 6505. An act for the relief of Karen Ann Crowley;

H. R. 6515. An act for the relief of Tracy Ann Corley (Elisabeth Lecorche);

H. R. 6637. An act for the relief of Gaetana Giambruno Tomasino;

H. R. 6640. An act for the relief of Hitomi Matsushita;

H. R. 6641. An act for the relief of Leu Wai Ung (Wong Wai Ung) and Leu Wai Chiu (Wong Wai Chiu);

H. R. 6732. An act for the relief of the alien Ilona Lindelof;

H. R. 6869. An act for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee;

H. R. 6870. An act for the relief of Louie Bon Kong;

H. R. 6215. An act for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill;

H. R. 6945. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoffmann;

H. R. 6969. An act for the relief of Bozie Lincoln Donalson;

H. R. 6978. An act for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm;

H. R. 6983. An act for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian;

H. R. 7095. An act for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek;

H. R. 7366. An act for the relief of Erika O. Eder and her son, James Robert Eder;

H. R. 7477. An act for the relief of Carol R. Gray;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese ancestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7645. An act for the relief of Maria Grazia Maranto;

H. R. 7713. An act for the relief of Gisela Helen Snowdy;

H. R. 8163. An act for the relief of Hildegard Hobmeier;

H. R. 8370. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 446. Joint resolution relating to the continuance on the payrolls of certain employees in cases of death or resignation of Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

On July 16, 1952:

H. R. 651. An act to provide for issuance of patents to persons claiming title through Charles A. Gann;

H. R 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 707. An act for the relief of John Michael Ancker Rasmussen;

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Biolzi;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of Sumiko Yamamoto;

H. R. 1180. An act to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1448. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Fuxman and their two daughters;

H. R. 1849. An act for the relief of the alien Malke Kresel Mohrer;

H. R. 1913. An act for the relief of Milagros Aujero;

H. R. 2358. An act for the relief of Joseph R. La Porta;

H. R. 2447. An act for the relief of George M. Sanger;

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R 2774. An act for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt;

H. R. 3177. An act to amend title IV of the National Housing Act, as amended;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jane P. Myers;

H. R. 4021. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes," approved September 5, 1950;

H. R. 4590. An act for the relief of Jose Luis Segimont de Piandolit and Fuencisla Segimont;

H. R. 4634. An act for the relief of Johann Komma;

H. R. 5567. An act to provide for the conveyance to Potter County, Tex., of certain surplus lands located at the Veterans' Administration hospital near Amarillo;

H. R. 5803. An act to extend the provisions of the act of May 20, 1926, as amended, so as to further regulate the interstate shipment of fish;

H. R. 5954. An act to provide for the release to the city of Camden of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land heretofore conditionally granted to such city;

H. R. 6007. An act to authorize the improvement of Humboldt Bay, Calif., as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 143, Eighty-second Congress, first session;

H. R. 6521. An act to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel;

H. R. 7126. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway-construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for the apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7241. An act to authorize the payment to the Empire District Electric Co. for reasonable costs of protecting its Ozark Beach power plant from the backwater of Bull Shoals Dam;

H. R. 7656. An act to provide vocational readjustment and to restore lost educational opportunities to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7667. An act for the relief of Marie Luise Elfriede Steiniger;

H. R. 7855. An act for improvement of Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.

H. R. 8052. An act for the relief of Ai-Ling Tung Tsou and her son, Moody Tsou.

H. R. 8127. An act to amend the act of June 21, 1940, relating to the alteration of certain bridges over navigable waters, so as to include highway bridges, and for other purposes.

H. R. 8190. An act to amend the act of February 7, 1905, as amended, authorizing the Kensington & Eastern Railroad Co. to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa.

H. R. 8194. An act to amend an act approved May 26, 1928, relating to a bridge across the Mississippi River at Bettendorf, Iowa;

H. R. 8270. An act to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States.

H. R. 8321. An act to authorize the improvement of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.; and

H. J. Res. 480. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

On July 17, 1952:

H. R. 746. An act for the relief of Harris A. Bakken;

H. R. 948. An act to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida;

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of the Food Service of Evansville, Inc.;

H. R. 3060. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Commerce Trust Co.;

H. R. 3569. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

H. R. 3727. An act for the relief of the Professional Arts Building Corp.;

H. R. 3810. An act for the relief of Aldo Vallesa;

H. R. 3975. An act to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, so as to permit a joint patentee to bring suit on a patent in the Court of Claims in certain cases where one or more of his copatentees is barred from doing so;

H. R. 5095. An act for the relief of the estate of Edward B. Formanek, deceased;

H. R. 5734. An act to amend section 3268 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt certain recreational facilities from the tax prescribed therein, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6163. An act to provide for authorization of a study and report of irrigation works in connection with Chief Joseph Dam;

H. R. 6723. An act to approve contracts negotiated with the Gering and Fort Laramie Irrigation District, the Goshen Irrigation District, and the Pathfinder Irrigation District, and to authorize their execution; and to authorize the execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 7255. An act to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to employee stock purchase plans);

H. R. 7722. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for equality of grade, pay, and allowance between the Chief Medical Officer of the Coast Guard and comparable officers of the Army;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial and relating to the General Counsel of the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 7594. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the importation of the feathers of wild birds, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8122. An act to continue the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8315. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8316. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, authorizing the Delaware River Joint Commission to construct, finance, operate, maintain, and own a vehicular tunnel or tunnels under, or an additional bridge across,

the Delaware River and defining certain functions, powers, and duties of said commission, and for other purposes.

On July 18, 1952:

H. R. 1095. An act for the relief of Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.;

H. R. 7800. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to preserve insurance rights of permanently and totally disabled individuals, and to increase the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7833. An act for the relief of Prof. Werner Richter and Prof. Max Horkheimer.

On July 19, 1952:

H. R. 7502. An act to amend the act of June 6, 1924, as amended, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7794. An act to revise and codify the laws relating to patents and the Patent Office, and to enact into law title 35 of the United States Code entitled "Patents."

On July 21, 1952:

H. R. 8271. An act to amend sections 433 (b), 457, and 459 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes.

DISAPPROVAL OF HOUSE BILL AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, after sine die adjournment, transmitted to the Clerk of the House a bill disapproved, together with his reasons for such action, as follows:

On July 19, 1952:

POSTAL DEPARTMENT LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS

H. R. 6839. I am withholding my approval of H. R. 6839, "To modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes."

Although H. R. 6839 would grant desirable authority to the Postmaster General to enter into lease-purchase agreements for acquiring space to be used for postal purposes, it contains a provision which would infringe upon the functions of the executive branch to such an extent that I feel I cannot give my approval.

Section 8 of H. R. 6839 requires that every lease-purchase agreement negotiated under authority of this bill receive the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the House and Senate Committees on Public Works.

I do not dispute the right of the Congress and its committees to take an interest in real-estate transactions made by the executive branch of the Government, but I do question the propriety and wisdom of giving committees veto power over executive functions authorized by the Congress to be carried out by executive agencies. Full information regarding any property transaction has in the past, and will in the future, be made available to the committees of Congress.

I hope that the Congress will, at its next session, give further consideration to legislation to accomplish the purposes of H. R. 6839, and that it will frame legislation free from the difficulties which impel me to withhold my approval from this measure.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 19, 1952.*

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 14, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel (P)	$5,823.00
Altavene Clark	Executive officer (P)	5,823.00
Mabel C. Downey	Clerk (C)	5,823.00
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant (C)	3,224.94
Alice Baker	do	2,890.32
Lorraine Greenbaum	do	2,428.32
Betty Prezioso	do	2,252.37

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,902.98
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	7,898.75
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	18,801.73
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	31,198.27

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	The clerk	$5,823.00
Kenneth Sprankle	The assistant clerk	5,823.00
William A. Duvall	Second assistant clerk	5,823.00
Corhal D. Orescan	Assistant clerk	5,823.00
Robert E. Lambert	do	5,823.00
Paul M. Wilson	do	5,642.52
Ross P. Pope	do	5,642.52
Jay B. Howe	do	5,642.52
John J. Donnelly, Jr.	do	5,366.04
Arthur Orr	do	5,296.92
Robert P. Williams	do	5,158.68
Adelbert W. Heinmiller	do	4,639.00
Frank Sanders	do	4,605.66
Carson W. Culp	do	4,605.66
Robert W. Moyer	Assistant clerk	$4,398.06
Robert L. Michaels	do	3,663.06
Lawrence C. Miller	Junior assistant clerk	3,145.26
G. Homer Skarin	do	2,826.60
Earl C. Silsby	do	2,826.60
Francis G. Merrill	Clerk-stenographer	2,189.34
Samuel R. Preston	do	1,911.36
Robert M. Lewis	Messenger	1,854.78
Willie Tarrant	Janitor-messenger	1,443.60
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,216.14
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to the majority	4,951.26
Robert E. Lee	Clerk to the minority	5,823.00
Lawrence A. DiCenzo	Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member	2,189.34
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman	2,189.34
William J. Neary	do	2,189.34
Nora Jean Ray	do	2,189.34
Michael J. McGrath	do	2,189.34
Marie Silvers	do	1,824.45
Theodora M. Grant	do	2,189.34
Lena W. Adams	do	2,189.34
Dorothy D. Vitale	do	1,094.67
Claudia Robinson	do	182.44
Ann M. Woodward	do	924.38
Ernestine Green	do	912.22
Ethel M. Scholl	do	729.78
Mona E. Keating	do	595.97
Katie Prince Esker	do	170.27
Elizabeth H. Pascual	do	364.89
Mary Nell Lea	do	364.89
Geneva Nichols	do	729.78
Joseph V. Gartlan, Jr.	do	364.89

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$275,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	128,597.13
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	135,547.59
Total amount expended from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	264,144.72
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	10,855.28

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, INVESTIGATIVE STAFF

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
James E. Nugent	Chief investigator	$4,712.70
Frederic D. Vechery	Chief investigator (from Jan. 1, 1931)	768.74
Robert E. Rightmyer	Investigator	3,751.65
Charles G. Haynes	do	3,001.32
M. Phyllis Monaghan	Clerk-stenographer	1,748.75
Helen G. Terry	do	1,379.88
Lois A. Eggers	do	717.84
Florence M. Leonard	do	336.34

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Atomic Energy Commission: Duvall Stoaks.	Investigator	$1,661.53
Civil Service Commission:		
James S. Crawford.	do	1,620.00
Wilfred V. Gill	do	1,446.96
Department of the Air Force:		
Joe M. Hansman	do	1,348.02
Harold K. Knoy	do	587.56
Department of the Army:		
Charles W. Hart	do	3,241.06
Christopher A. Deiss.	do	1,000.88
Department of Commerce:		
Blutcher E. Prescott.	do	1,197.42
Jefferson D. McPike.	do	213.76
John N. Sweeley	do	183.04
Department of the Interior:		
Miles M. Delano	do	254.25
Joseph G. DiMisa	do	277.32
Roland A. Fallin	do	256.20
William R. Reed	do	227.44
Department of the Navy:		
Fred P. Bowser	do	1,472.32
Howard H. Terhune.	do	431.20
Lee J. Smith	do	192.24
Department of State: Wilfred Williams.	do	906.92
Department of the Treasury: Bryant G. Hiers.	do	1,109.97
Economic Stabilization Agency:		
William J. Klima	do	418.08
Alexis P. Bukovsky.	do	1,286.34
Olin O. Taylor	do	1,350.72
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Robert E. Rightmyer.	do	771.86
Marshall J. Bell	do	225.10
Paul G. Travers	do	1,471.70
Frederic D. Vechery.	do	815.39
Charles G. Haynes.	do	285.85
Albert T. Healy	do	2,668.78
William M. Alexander.	do	1,939.38
Richard A. Miller	do	2,122.16
Edward T. Steele	do	205.70
Samuel Virden	do	180.92
Carl L. Bennett	do	514.46
Federal Civil Defense Administration:		
Stephen J. Grillo	do	3,655.38
Carlton H. Jencks	do	1,702.97
General Services Administration: Wesley C. Mohnkern.	do	1,707.70
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Joseph B. Montgomery.	do	933.03
Perley W. Cloggston.	do	93.58
George G. Bell	do	173.23
Interstate Commerce Commission: Alexis P. Bukovsky.	do	408.98
National Labor Relations Board: Carroll K. Shaw.	do	2,042.33
Office of Defense Mobilization: John D. Young.	do	1,892.32
Post Office Department:		
Marlin W. Brown	do	1,217.70
Joseph P. Sherr	do	952.54
Joseph J. Zarza	do	664.77
Veterans' Administration:		
Leonard S. Dixon	do	722.39
Vern L. McMurrin.	do	642.64

TEMPORARY CLERICAL AND STENOGRAPHIC ASSISTANCE

	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Department of Agriculture:	
Catherine Gonzalez	$5.98
Sam Neel	1,639.92
Henry Rothenbach	1,184.35
John Walker	1,070.30
Department of Commerce:	
Elizabeth A. Dendo	52.48
John R. Dolan	1,351.55
Teresa M. DiGuiseppi	36.72
Patricia O'Day	46.12
Altha Willoughby	76.80
Ruth Gaines	6.00
Carlene Klett	3.84
Department of Defense: Richard A. Carr, Jr.	1,777.85
Department of the Interior: George Varan	1,075.21
Department of Justice:	
Charles E. Loven	1,346.55
Meriam M. Howell	742.00
Department of State: William A. Robey	1,353.32
Department of the Treasury: Evelyn M. Postal	564.56
Atomic Energy Commission: A. C. Worley	1,370.76
Bureau of the Budget: William Pfleger	2,034.72
Federal Bureau of Investigation: Lois A. Eggers	227.23
Federal Civil Defense Administration:	
Alice F. Brady	106.29
Betty F. Rypys	75.56
Mildred C. Croom	57.53
Maxine Farrell	39.34
Jean J. Lewis	38.00
Mary Radford	31.04
Patricia Costine	30.60
Clara McGaha	30.00
Edith B. Cissel	25.48
Marie Mayhan	13.65
Federal Security Agency: William H. Allen	1,286.16
Post Office Department: Leslie E. Bowman	1,432.32
Interstate Commerce Commission: Selma Madden	528.00

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$260,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	119,391.55
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	115,359.53
Total amount expended from July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	234,751.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	25,248.92

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JULY 2, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
James A. Deakins	Assistant clerk	2,810.70
John R. Blandford	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	5,823.00
Philip S. Kelleher	Counsel (Jan. 8 to June 30).	5,564.02
Janice Angell	Clerical staff	2,612.86
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,513.94
Elizabeth Gilmore	do	2,513.94
Olga K. Greene	do	2,810.70
Agnes H. Johnston	do	3,065.58
Berniece Kalinowski	do	2,810.70
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	5,823.00
Paul L. Monahan	Assistant to special counsel.	4,771.56
Robert N. Tyler	Assistant to special counsel (Apr. 1 to June 30).	$1,532.79
Richard W. Webb	Assistant to special counsel.	4,674.78
Mary E. Morrill	Secretary to special counsel (Office of Special Counsel operating under H. Res. 38, H. Res. 114, and H. Res. 557).	2,810.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	29,586.86
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	28,393.09
Total amount expended from January 1951 through June 1952	57,979.95
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	92,020.05

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JULY 11, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Orman S. Fink	Technical staff	$5,158.68
John E. Barriere	do	4,774.98
William J. Hallahan	Clerk	5,823.00
Elsie L. Gould	Assistant clerk	4,093.92
Helen E. Long	do	2,858.46
Jeannette M. Devlin	Stenographer	903.20

AMOUNTS PAID TO EMPLOYEES OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 436 AND HOUSE RESOLUTION 437

W. Kenneth Watkins	Consulting architect	$3,200.00
Hershell McNutt	Investigator	1,938.26
Mildred Childers	Stenographer	1,839.99
Jeannette M. Devlin	do	215.16
Eileen C. Burke	do	150.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,804.37
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	17,913.33
Total amount expended from Oct. 17, 1951 to June 30, 1952	28,717.70
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	21,282.30

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 3, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of

the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
William N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$5,822.28
Wendell E. Cable	Minority clerk	4,615.65
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
George R. Stewart	Attorney	5,527.31
Marie E. Hurda	Assistant clerk	2,667.30
Flora McLeod	Assistant clerk-stenographer (services ended Apr. 30, 1952).	1,366.61

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	902.47
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	20.20
Total amount expended from Feb. 20, 1951 to June 30, 1952	922.67
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	1,077.33

JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
John S. Forsythe	General counsel	5,823.00
David N. Henderson	Assistant general counsel.	5,823.00
Russell C. Derrickson	Investigator	5,823.00
John O. Graham	Minority clerk	5,823.00
Mary Pauline Smith	Assistant clerk	3,001.66
Barbara Ann Stent	do	3,001.66
Kathryn Kivett	do	3,001.66
Myrtle Locher	Assistant clerk (minority).	3,001.66
Frances Roberts	Assistant clerk (Apr. 10 to June 30, 1952.	1,350.83

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	[1] $30,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,558.92
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	3,279.38
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	8,838.30
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	21,849.59

[1] Plus credit $687.89.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas A. Kennedy	General counsel	$5,853.00
William A. Young	Staff director	5,853.00
Christine Ray Davis	Chief clerk	5,853.00
Martha C. Roland	Assistant chief clerk	5,296.92
J. Robert Brown	Research analyst	4,605.66
William F. McKenna	Minority counsel, Jan. 1-31, 1952.	917.36
Annabell Zue	Minority clerk	4,605.66
Dolores Fel'Dotto	Clerk-stenographer	3,463.92
Mabel Baker	Clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1 to May 31, 1952.	2,753.80
Alice Cravetts	Clerk-stenographer, Jan. 15 to June 30, 1952.	2,459.84

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Unexpended balance of appropriation, Jan. 1, 1952		$80,205.82
Additional appropriation, H. Res. 623, approved June 30, 1952		150,000.00
Total		230,205.82
Expenses from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952:		
Full committee	1,161.23	
Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN, chairman	5,220.91	
Special Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman	88.34	
Special Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	448.66	
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman	6,255.45	
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman	13,187.85	
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman	4,296.40	
Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman	51,255.26	
Total spent from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952		81,914.10
Total unexpended, July 1, 1952		148,291.72

Expenses of full committee:

Stationery supplies for full committee and subcommittees	$739.93
Telephone	81.40
Papers and periodicals for use of the committee	79.95
Taxi, official business	12.60
Plane transportation	93.74
Repairs to adding machine	3.00
Railroad transportation	150.61
Total	1,161.23

Public Accounts Subcommittee, Congressman FRANK M. KARSTEN, chairman:

General Accounting Office, reimbursement for the salary of Harry E. Harper	2,883.58
Henry A. Pulliam, Feb. 15 to Apr. 15, 1952	2,334.88
Telephone	2.45
Total	5,220.91

Special Subcommittee on Veterans' Administration, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:

Witness expense	88.34
Total	88.34

Special Subcommittee Making Inquiry Into Federal Home Loan Bank Board and Related Agencies, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:

William McKenna, plane fare and hotel expenses	346.51
Reporting	102.15
Total	448.66

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman:

John H. W. Small, counsel	3,304.56
Cora Louise Harris, clerk-stenographer	2,507.94
Plane transportation	220.55
Rental of wire recorder	25.00
Audographs	1.50
Additional expenses for subcommittee studying military supplies, disposal of surplus property, and ECA aid to foreign countries in Far East and Europe	195.90
Total	6,255.45

Government Operations Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., chairman:

Michael P. Balwan, staff director	4,417.85
William A. Brewer, counsel	4,055.30
Eugene F. Sullivan, legal assistant	2,308.79
Thomas G. Flemming, administrative assistant	4,813.02
Smith Blair, Jr., administrative assistant, Jan. 1 to Feb. 29, 1952	1,260.84
Lewis J. Lapham, administrative assistant	3,583.37
Robert E. Shaw, administrative assistant, Jan. 1 to Mar. 13, 1952	1,437.10
Charles A. Miller, administrative assistant, Jan. 1 to June 21, 1952	4,572.18
H. Sander Bell, administrative assistant, May 26 to June 30, 1952	705.80
John C. Vick, administrative analyst	2,707.13
Stephen G. Carnes, special adviser, inquiry into activities of Veterans' Administration	864.00
Frances G. Hardy, research clerk	3,224.94
Sylvia Swartzel, clerk-stenographer	2,481.39
Mildred Deen, clerk-stenographer	2,156.15
Garnette S. Benton, stenographer	1,806.96
General Accounting Office, reimbursement for services of Ralph E. Casey	5,212.17
Plane transportation	2,011.10
Railroad transportation	274.82
Telephone	119.68
Expenses, conducting investigations away from Washington, D. C	3,242.67
Total	51,255.26

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman:

Herbert Roback, staff director	5,823.00
Dorothy D. Morrison, clerk	3,463.92
Olive M. Willeroy, assistant clerk	3,463.92
Altha P. Deming, clerk-stenographer, June 7 to 30	306.48
Telephone	58.35

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman—Continued	
Expenses in connection with writing report	$72.18
Total	13,187.85
Federal Relations With International Organizations Subcommittee, Congressman HENDERSON LANHAM, chairman:	
Franklin D. Rogers, Jr., clerk	4,246.02
Telephone	5.95
Expenses in connection with investigation	44.43
Total	4,296.40

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JULY 9, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk.	$5,823.00
Sheldon Z. Kapian	Staff consultant	5,823.00
Roy J. Bullock	do	5,823.00
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	5,823.00
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,145.25
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,384.23
Mabel Wofford	Staff assistant (resigned Apr. 7, 1952).	1,694.94
Helen C. Mattas	Staff assistant	3,145.25
Myrtle M. Melvin	Staff assistant (service began Jan. 15, 1952).	2,459.84
Helen L. Hashagen	Staff assistant (service began Apr. 8, 1952).	1,384.19

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	3,731.69
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	13,550.07
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	17,281.76
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	57,718.24

J. P. RICHARDS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JULY 1, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Lea Booth	Clerk	$4,951.26
Marjorie Savage	Assistant clerk	4,813.02
Jack Watson	do	4,674.78
Lura Cannon	do	3,304.56
Ruth Bradley	do	2,348.64

THOS. B. STANLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JULY 2, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Preston E. Peden	Committee counsel	$5,823.00
James K. Carr	Technical consultant (Irrigation and Reclamation).	5,823.00
James R. Queen	Consultant (mines and mining).	5,573.40
William H. Hackett	Consultant (Territories and insular affairs).	5,573.40
Clerical staff:		
Virginia McMichael	Assistant to the chairman.	5,823.00
Claude E. Ragan	Clerk	5,823.00
Nancy J. Arnold	Minority clerk	4,093.92
Geraldine Eaker	Clerk	3,145.26
Ruth I. Timmony	do	3,065.58
Elizabeth L. Angus	do	2,866.44

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	35,487.54
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	12,473.95
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1951, to June 30, 1952	47,961.49
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	2,038.51

JOHN R. MURDOCK,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JULY 23, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
CLERICAL STAFF		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$5,823.00
Royice Reno (deceased Jan. 19, 1952).	Assistant clerk	
Harold W. Lincoln	do	3,065.58
Kenneth J. Painter (from Feb. 4, 1952).	do	2,503.53
Georgia G. Glasmann	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	2,826.60
Helen A. Grickis	do	2,731.02
Roy F. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,189.34
Elizabeth J. Gergely (resigned Apr. 30, 1952) (employed May 1, 1951).	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516).	1,618.88
Camille O'R. Agnew (from May 1, 1952).	do	809.44
Melba J. Coutsonikas	do	2,707.14
Herbert Burstein (from Jan. 15 to Feb. 29, 1952).	Consultant counsel (authorized H. Res. 123).	950.00
Louis Rosenman (from Mar. 1, 1952).	Research assistant (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516).	1,406.44
Margaret P. Hogan (from Feb. 21, 1952).	Assistant clerk-stenographer (authorized H. Res. 123 and 516)	1,451.70
PROFESSIONAL STAFF		
Arlin E. Stockburger	Aviation and engineering consultant.	5,823.00
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	5,823.00
Kurt Borchardt	Professional assistant.	5,823.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	5,511.30

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (funds authorized under H. Res. 123 and H. Res. 516)	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	5,698.12
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	29,627.92
Total amount expended from Jan. 3 to June 30, 1952	35,326.04
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1952	44,673.96

ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess Effrat Dick	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Cyril F. Brickfield	Committee counsel	5,823.00
William R. Foley	do	5,823.00
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant	5,823.00
Velma Smedley	Assistant chief clerk	5,823.00
Violet T. Benn	Clerical assistant	3,583.26
Helen Goldsmith	do	3,862.20
Anne J. Berger	Clerk-stenographer	3,291.28
Frances Christy	do	3,025.74
Jeannine S. Coble	do	2,859.79
Jane Hahn	do	3,025.74
Berta Kaslow	do	4,246.02

1. Funds for preparation of United States Code and Revision of the Laws:

A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1951	$71,039.14
Amount expended	12,125.24
Balance June 30, 1952	58,913.90
B. Revision of the Laws, 1952:	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1951	6,753.04
Appropriation in Third Supplement Appropriation Act of 1952	800.00
Total	7,553.04
Expended	7,389.99
Balance June 30, 1952	163.05
C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):	
Unexpended balance Dec. 31, 1951	27,372.18
Expended	1,934.46
Balance June 30, 1952	25,437.72

2. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures by H. Res. 470 (pursuant to H. Res. 469) 18,000.00
Amount expended 13,939.23
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952 4,060.77

3. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures by H. Res. 54, 487 and 628 (pursuant to H. Res. 95) 290,000.00
Amount expended 132,926.32
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952 157,073.68

Pursuant to H. Res. 95 (H. Res. 54, H. Res. 487, and H. Res. 628) employees were paid as follows during the period Jan. 1, through June 30, 1952:

Antitrust Subcommittee:	
Mary Ahern, clerk-stenographer	1,657.80
Eileen R. Browne, clerk	3,463.92
Peter S. Craig, special assistant	177.80
E. Ernest Goldstein, general counsel	5,823.00
J. Bruce Hannaford, clerk-typist	1,870.68
Virginia North, clerk-stenographer	2,029.98
Veronica Strozak, clerk-stenographer	2,428.32
Jerrold L. Walden, assistant counsel	4,118.76
John F. Woog, assistant counsel	3,463.92
Total	25,034.18
Subcommittee to Investigate the Justice Department:	
Stephen A. Mitchell, chief counsel	5,925.00
Daniel G. Kennedy, associate counsel	2,102.74
Robert A. Collier, assistant counsel in charge of investigations	4,431.94
Arthur H. Crowl, investigator	2,816.97
Morris Best, investigator	2,401.05
Thomas J. Connor, investigator-accountant	1,000.44
John C. Weigel, research analyst	1,803.59
Kathryn Henley, staff assistant	1,614.69
Della L. Sayre, staff assistant	500.68
Robert Willett, legal clerk	1,194.84
John X. Ward, chief file clerk	1,139.02
Elizabeth Jean Morgan, secretary	943.70
Orville Stewart, messenger	817.44
Leo N. Nulty, investigator	625.27
Mrs. Judith A. Smith, stenographer	187.18
Kenneth R. McIntire, investigator	557.80
William B. Mooney, investigator	1,275.56
Mary P. Malone, staff assistant	663.39
Total	30,091.30

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY —, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from December 31, 1951, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John M. Drewry	General counsel	$5,823.00
Thomas F. Flynn, Jr.	Assistant counsel	4,951.26
Reginald S. Losee	Chief investigator	4,882.14
Gus S. Caras	Investigator to minority.	3,471.71
Frances P. Still	Chief clerk	5,124.00
Madonna Haworth	Assistant clerk	3,304.55
Leonard P. Pliska	Clerk to the minority.	3,304.55
Lucile P. Lamon	Secretary	2,667.30
Total		33,528.51

EDWARD J. HART,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JULY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George M. Moore	Chief counsel (Jan. 1 to Feb. 29, 1952).	$1,941.00
Frederick C. Belen	Counsel	5,823.00
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel (June 9 to 30, 1952).	664.29
John B. Price	Staff assistant	3,463.92
Lucy K. Daley	Assistant clerk	3,224.94
Elayne M. Hoffman	Secretary (Jan. 1 to 15, 1952).	235.54
Lillian Hopkins	Secretary	2,826.60
Ann Hayden	Stenographer	2,667.30
Donna J. Brannock	Stenographer (Feb. 9 to June 30, 1952).	1,332.01

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS.

JULY 16, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Tierney	Counsel, professional staff.	$5,823.00
Robert F. McConnell	Professional staff assistant.	5,823.00
S. Philip Cohen	Professional staff	$2,830.68
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Chief clerk	5,823.00
Mrs. Alice B. Norton	Clerk and assistant clerk.	3,735.45
Mrs. Margaret R. Beiter	Assistant clerk and clerk.	4,054.11
Joseph H. McGann, Jr.	Assistant clerk	4,054.11
Mrs. Helen Dooley	do	4,054.11
Mrs. Florence Palmer	do	3,862.20

EMPLOYEES UNDER AUTHORITY OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 415

Charles D. Curran	Staff director	$5,523.21
Ferol F. Davis	Secretary	1,824.45
Martha A. Webster	do	1,847.65
Barbara Deshotels	Stenographer	888.05
Richard Christiansen	Research assistant	123.60
James W. Hudson	do	123.60
Bayley F. Mason	do	79.60
Dewitt C. Black, Jr.	do	104.58

	H. Res. 237	*H. Res. 415*
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$20,000.00	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	12,134.81	5,880.15
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	1,722.25	16,313.24
Total amount expended from May 31, 1951 to June 30, 1952	13,857.06	[1] 22,193.39
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	6,194.94	52,806.61

[1] From Sept. 27, 1951.

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Humphrey Scott Shaw	Clerk	$5,822.28
T. Howard Dolan	Assistant clerk	4,444.22
Richard R. Haas	Assistant to the clerk.	2,932.04
Frank Klepal	do	1,466.02
E. M. Libonati	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
Mrs. Lyle O Snader	Minority clerk	3,463.92

A. J. SABATH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JULY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from

January 1, 1952, to July 1, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Willia n A. Wheeler	Investigator	$5,435.16
C. E. Owens	do	5,066.48
C. E. McKillips	do	4,674.78
James A. Andrews	do	4,582.62
W. Jackson Jones	do	4,605.66
Robert B. Barker	do	4,697.82
Earl L. Fuoss	do	3,558.42
Frank Bonora	Investigator (appointed May 23, 1952).	707.29
William F. Hynes, Jr.	Investigator (appointed June 15, 1952).	328.49
Alvin W. Stokes	Investigator	4,467.42
Raphael I. Nixon	Director of research	5,227.80
Lillian E. Howard	Research clerk	3,065.58
Helen I. Mattson	do	3,224.94
Mary Ann Mericle	do	1,778.20
Asselia Poore	Editor	3,304.56
Blanche McCall	Liaison director (January 1952).	497.66
Pearle Gay	Clerk-stenographer	2,707.14
Sidney Phillips	Clerk-stenographer (January through Feb. 15).	626.98
Jane Collins	do	2,667.30
Barbara Jean O'Neal	Clerk-stenograper (appointed Apr. 18, 1952).	952.53
Sally R. Hayett	Clerk-stenographer (March 1952).	362.23
Rose Sanko	Clerk-stenographer	2,707.14
Ruth Tansill	do	2,707.14
Kathryn Zimmerman	Clerk-stenographer (January through April 1952).	1,831.32
Lorraine Nichols	Secretary to director of research.	2,727.03
Virginia Truax	Clerk-typist	2,348.64
Marian McDonough	do	2,029.98
Alyce Gartrell	do	2,667.30
Lucille Fitzgerald	Clerk-typist (resigned Mar. 15, 1952).	1,111.37
Eileen Sonnett	Clerk-typist	2,547.78
Alice Walker	do	2,707.14
Gladys Slack	do	2,547.78
Annie Merle Holton	do	2,348.64
Grace O. Hall	Clerk-typist (appointed Apr. 18, 1952).	952.53
Marie Shultz	Receptionist (May 8, 1952).	678.44
Josephine Sheetz	Telephone operator	1,681.77
Riley Smith	Stock clerk	1,488.47
EMPLOYEES CARRIED ON HOUSE PAYROLL		
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Committee counsel	5,823.00
Thomas Beale	Assistant counsel	5,020.41
Louis J. Russell	Senior investigator	5,823.00
John W. Carrington	Committee clerk	5,642.52
Donald T. Appell	Investigator	5,596.45
Ann Turner	File chief	4,467.42
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant file chief	3,304.56
Rosella A. Purdy	Secretary to counsel	4,093.92
Juliette Joray	Secretary to clerk	3,045.69
Thelma Scearce	Secretary to senior investigator.	3,821.75

Balance Jan. 1, 1952	$75,494.29
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures Mar. 20, 1952	200,000.00
Total amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 1, 1952	128,611.78
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	146,882.51

JOHN S. WOOD,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JULY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ida Rowan	Chief clerk	$5,823.00
Edwin B. Patterson	Professional aide	5,823.00
Casey M. Jones	do	5,823.00
Karl Standish	do	5,823.00
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	4,951.26
Frances Montanye	Clerk-stenographer	2,826.60
Alice V. Matthews	do	2,826.60
Noah S. Sweat, Jr.	Assistant clerk	3,463.92
George J. Turner	do	2,746.98

J. E. RANKIN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JUNE 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles W. Davis	Clerk (C) to May 15, 1952.	$4,367.25
Leo H. Irwin	Clerk (C)	5,233.99
Gordon Grand, Jr.	Minority adviser (P).	5,640.52
Susan Alice Taylor	Minority stenographer (C).	2,615.52
Anne Gorden	Staff assistant (C)	2,213.24
Betty R. Hill	do	2,136.21
Jane E. Burkett	Staff assistant (C), Jan. 1 to Jan. 31, 1952.	351.61
Frances C. Russell	Staff assistant (C), Feb. 1 to June 30, 1952.	1,917.36
June A. Kendall	Staff assistant (C), Feb. 11 to June 30, 1952.	1,680.56
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P), May 16 to June 30, 1952.	816.18
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	1,575.42
Walter B. Little	do	1,489.80

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE LAWS

JULY 15, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Adrian W. DeWind	Counsel (per retainer contract June 1-30, 1952).	$1,650.00
Stanley S. Surrey	Special counsel	1,002.78
Bruno Schachner	do	5,823.00
Charles S. Lyon	Assistant counsel	4,882.14
Donald Shapiro	Assistant counsel (paid from regular committee payroll).	4,882.14
John E. Tobin	Assistant counsel	3,575.40
Thomas L. Howe	Attorney	4,833.02
Walter C. Taylor	do	4,501.98
James Q. Riordan	do	2,854.50
William H. Berman	Attorney (to May 3, 1952).	1,849.87
Walter F. Hoffmann	Attorney (to June 22, 1952).	2,434.52
Joseph H. Flom	Special counsel	375.16
William A. Silk	Investigator	2,229.18
Howard D. Levine	do	2,029.98
James W. Dowling	Investigator (to May 7, 1952).	3,444.62
James P. Donovan	Investigator	4,882.14
Beatrice B. Daly	Staff assistant	2,547.78
Norma M. Ervin	Staff assistant (to Feb. 17, 1952).	485.66
Grace Good	Staff assistant	2,332.74
Mary Ryan	Stenographer (to Mar. 8, 1952).	845.12
Sadye B. Jacobs	Staff assistant from Mar. 10, 1952.	1,438.50
Bertha A. Brito	Stenographer	2,149.50
Barbara Z. Heslowitz	do	2,149.50
Barbara A. Davis	do	1,916.90
Lillian Stillman	Staff assistant—files	1,612.42
Florence Botto	Temporary typist	1,210.00
Rita DeFilippo	Temporary stenographer.	468.00
Ernest Lieber	Temporary typist	165.00
Dorothy Marsh	do	320.75
Rose Saltzman	do	5.00
William Mellin	Temporary investigator.	102.56

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$200,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	63,874.88
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	120,408.28
Total amount expended from Apr. 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	184,283.16
Refund	158.58
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	15,875.42

CECIL R. KING,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS, EVIDENCE, AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

JULY 8, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Mitchell	Chief counsel	$5,823.00
Roman C. Pucinski	Investigator	4,142.25
Barbara R. Booke	Secretary	2,667.31

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
Authorized September 1951	$20,000.00
Authorized March 1952	65,000.00
Total	85,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,742.98
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	19,564.35
Total amount expended from Sept. 27, 1951, to June 30, 1952	22,307.33
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	62,692.67

RAY J. MADDEN,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EDUCATIONAL, TRAINING, AND LOAN GUARANTY PROGRAMS UNDER THE GI BILL

JULY 9, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Oliver E. Meadows	Clerk	$4,131.96
Helen A. Wright	Stenographer	2,754.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (includes $60,000 authorized under H. Res. 93, 82d Cong., 1st sess.; and $15,000 authorized by H. Res. 488, 82d Cong. 2d sess.)	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	59,990.44
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	11,023.76
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1951, to June 30, 1952	$71,014.20
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	3,985.80

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE USE OF CHEMICALS IN FOODS AND COSMETICS

JULY 7, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Vincent A. Kleinfeld	Chief counsel	$7,091.54
Alvin L. Gottlieb	Associate counsel	5,329.20
Camille O'R. Agnew	Clerk (Jan. 1 to Apr. 30, 1952).	1,671.96
Esther N. Schweigert	Secretary (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, 1952).	995.10
Janet K. Kimberlin	Secretary (Apr. 7 to 10, inclusive).	44.22
Burton R. Rissman	Research analyst (part time from Jan. 24 to May 10).	579.02
Mildred Darrow	Secretary (Apr. 16 to June 30).	703.10
Franklin C. Bing	Technical consultant (January to March, part time).	129.36

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	24,391.90
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1952	22,166.78
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1951, to June 30, 1952	46,481.38
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	28,518.62

JAMES J. DELANEY,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 2, 1952.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Byron B. Boatright	Consultant	$1,714.47
Duncan Clark	Research analyst	1,944.61
Jean C. Curtis	Clerk	3,025.74
Victor P. Dalmas	Executive director	5,823.00
Jane M. Deem	Secretary	3,025.74
Charles R. Delphenis	Research assistant	692.60
W. B. Harris, Jr.	Investigator	1,353.57
Marion E. Harrison II.	do	1,722.88
James E. Hay	do	1,609.44
Rowan F. Howard	Special investigator	439.24
Louise Kauffman	Stenographer	2,276.94
Arthur F. Lucas	Economist	5,573.40
Edith Marsh	Secretary	2,810.70
L. V. Monzel	Research analyst	1,652.28
Jeremiah T. Riley	Assistant counsel	3,636.51
Mary Shaw	Stenographer	2,276.94
Ernest L. Stockton	Research analyst	4,951.26
Mary D. Ward	Stenographer	2,276.94
Harriett Whitney	do	1,328.21
David E. White	Chief investigator	2,818.06

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$260,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$106,406.89
Amount expended from Jan. 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952	53,875.74
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1951, to June 30, 1952	160,282.63
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1952	99,717.37

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 8370. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953 (Rept. No. 2499). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. MARSHALL introduced a bill (H. R. 8567) to amend section 25 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that, under certain circumstances, the taxpayer shall be allowed a credit for a child whom he is in the course of adopting, which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. O'TOOLE introduced a bill (H. R. 8568) for the relief of Charles Peroulas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

800. Mr. BEAMER presented a petition of 28 residents of Markle, Ind., in behalf of H. R. 2188, the Bryson bill, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the second calendar quarter of 1952.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors? Please answer "yes" or "no": _____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount *Name and Address of Contributor*

("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)

$1,500.00 John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00 The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.

$3,285.00 TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered items is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount *Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*

$1,750.00 7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."

$2,400.00 7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.

$4,150.00 TOTAL

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese.
E. (6) $1.60; (7) $18; (8) $3; (9) $22.60; (10) $364.83; (11) $387.48.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry.
D. (6) $7,166.64.
E. $5,166.64; (4) $2,000; (9) $7,166.64; (10) $4,705.81; (11) $11,872.45; (15) $5,166.64, Hill and Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations; $2,000, the Lincoln Press, Inc., 1030 Warner Building, Washington, D. C., printing.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry in the public interest.
D. (6) $6,027.41.
E. (2) $5,573.45; (4) $333.71; (7) $120.25; (9) $6,027.41; (10) $3,069.32; (11) $9,096.73.

A. Richard H. Akagi, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Passage of H. R. 5678 (the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill) completes our legislative program.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which will or may affect members of Commercial Telegraphers' Union.

A. W. R. Allstetter, 616 Investment Building. Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.
D. (6) $50.

A. American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.
E. $1,500; (4) $100; (5) $40; (6) $40; (9) $1,680; (11) $1,680.

A. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $4,374.99; (7) $889.35; (9) $5,264.34; (10) $5,031.55; (11) $10,295.89.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East Seventieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bills pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries; for such statutes and bills.
D. (6) $3,160.78.
E. (2) $1,450.40; (4) $893.30; (5) $21; (6) $407.49; (7) $90; (8) $298.59; (9) $3,160.78; (11) $3,160.78; (15) $336.25, Abingdon Business Service, 108 West Forty-third Street, New York City, N. Y., printing; $368.18, R. S. V. P. Letter Service, 527 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y., printing.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) American Coalition is a patriotic, nonprofit organization representing organizations of like character, the purpose of which is to promote patriotism and a better understanding of the American form of government and to preserve it against attack.
D. (6) $705.
E. (2) $750; (4) $66; (5) $979.68; (6) $139.48; (9) $1,935.16; (10) $1,843.27; (11) $3,778.43; (15).[1]

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, prices, and production controls.
D. (6) $4,053.02.
E. (2) $13,922; (4) $4,914; (5) $5,603; (6) (7) $340.19; (9) $4,053.02; (10) $3,985.82; (11) $8,038.84; (15).[1]

A. American Council of Style and Design, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to protect original commercial styles and designs on textile fabrics and other commodities.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture. (3) Nation's Agriculture.
D. (6) $34,913.
E. (2) $13,922; (4) $4,914; (5) $5,603; (6) $1,137; (7) $486; (9) $22,062; (10) $21,110; (11) $43,172; (15) $896.39, Franklin Duplicating Co., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $1,054.57, Cooper Trent Co., Arlington, Va., expenses.

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the interest of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $7,213.20; (2) $14,455.76; (4) $3,923.55; (5) $1,055; (9) $26,647.51; (10) $25,197.84; (11) $51,845.35; (15) $7,213.20, Furman, Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; $3,923.55, Ransdell, Inc., 805 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., printing.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2652, H. R. 4051, S. 1874.
D. (6) $18,580.86.
E. (2) $1,000; (4) $500; (5) $200; (6) $250; (7) $225; (9) $2,175; (10) $1,360; (11) $3,435.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care or which may affect hospital care for the American people.
D. (6) $11,200.23.
E. (2) $7,103.34; (4) $1,294.15; (5) $545.87; (6) $503.22; (7) $834.96; (8) $268.69; (9) $10,550.23; (10) $10,727.66; (11) $21,277.89.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $123,488.83.
E. (2) $7,875; (8) $1,869.18; (9) $9,744.18.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Legion, National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans and their dependents, etc. (3) American Legion Magazine, Legislative Bulletin, and Merchant Marine Bulletin.
D. (6) $14,639.46.
E. (1) $66.25; (2) $12,247.80; (4) $19,288.34; (5) $2,391.90; (6) $481.60; (7) $703.01; (9) $35,178.90; (10) $31,884.98; (11) $67,063.88; (15).[1]

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect life insurance business.
D. (6) $3,894.77.
E. (2) $2,803.33; (5) $463.16; (6) $185.46; (7) $442.82; (9) $3,894.77; (10) $3,845.38; (11) $7,740.15.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The general legislative interest to advance the science and art of medicine.[1]
D. (6) $110,000.
E. (2) $28,228.16; (5) $7,878.54; (6) $816.72; (7) $926.56; (8) $431.74; (9) $38,281.72; (10) $96,279.20; (11) $134,560.92; (15).[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Price controls, forest range improvement, foot-and-mouth disease laboratory, regulation relating to brucellosis, etc. (3) American Cattle Producer.
D. (6) $60,599.58.
E. (2) $5,100; (6) $35.86; (7) $572.05; (8) $40; (9) $5,747.91; (10) $8,797.15; (11) $14,545.06.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation in the health field affecting the practice of optometry.[1]
E. (5) $1,489.98; (6) $98.06; (7) $434.31; (9) $2,022.35; (10) $3,347.69; (11) $5,370.04; (15).[1]

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 8087 and S. 2301, Nurses Education Aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, Emergency Maternity and Infant Care; S. 2552, Armed Forces Women Physicians.
D. (6) $1,045.94.
E. (2) $375 (10 percent); (4) $75.79; (5) $69 (10 percent); (6) $106.98; (7) $419.17; (9) $1,045.94; (10) $541.93; (11) $1,587.87.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulp and paper industry, its operations, practices, and properties.
D. (6) $295.
E. (2) $250; (6) $25; (7) $20; (9) $295; (10) $295; (11) $590.

A. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, support of legislation providing national school health services, appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers, bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers, appropriations for the

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Children's Bureau, appropriations for the national school-lunch program, emergency maternal and infant care.
D. (6) $1,632.17.
E. (2) $1,093.41; (4) $58.14; (5) $161.69; (6) $71.31; (7) $466.17; (8) $544.87; (9) $2,395.59; (10) $2,122.25; (11) $4,517.84; (15).[1]

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.
D. (6) $542.
E. (2) $5,625; (5) $3,400; (6) $296; (9) $10,399; (10) $10,718; (11) $21,117; (15) $3,384.74, J. E. Kane, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $3,600.13, J. L. Dwyer, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices, and properties.

A. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Pending and proposed legislation affecting the pyrotechnic industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $1,250; (6) $148.34; (7) $257.68; (9) $1,656.02; (10) $3,400.21; (11) $5,056.23; (15) $1,250, Raymond Gittelman, Washington, D. C., legal fees.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.
D. (6) $46,670.80.
E. (2) $8,750; (4) $142.50; (5) $785.83; (6) $512.77; (7) $369.63; (9) $10,560.73; (10) $10,433.01; (11) $20,993.74.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,666.68.
E. (2) $250; (5) $425.20; (6) $80.10; (7) $911.38; (9) $1,666.68; (10) $1,869.30; (11) $3,535.98; (15).[1]

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 10 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 5505.
D. (6) $15,316.66.
E. (2) $9,007.07; (4) $865.42; (5) $1,020.59; (6) $187.92; (7) $759.24; (8) $263.47; (9) $12,103.71; (10) $14,515.65; (11) $26,619.36; (15) $874.59, Chas. P. Noyes Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., rent and electricity; $32.81, Graham Etationery Co., 26 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, N. Y., stationery and supplies; $186.36, New York Telephone Co., post-office box 1411, New York City, N. Y., telephone service; $19.07, Great Bear Spring Co., 315 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., water service; $52, Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., news service, $302.67, The Biltmore, Madison Avenue and Forty-third Street, New York City, N. Y., luncheon, etc.[1]

A. American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, amendments to Railway Unemployment Insurance Act.
D. (6) $384.
E. (6) $10.14; (7) $184; (9) $194.14; (11) $194.14.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2791, H. R. 6843, Senate Joint Resolution 130, H. R. 5505.
D. (6) $4,080.
E. (2) $4,090; (6) $41.90; (7) $29.70; (8) $11.90; (9) $4,173.50; (10) $4,255.61; (11) $8,429.11; (15).[1]

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.[1]
C. (2) General legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]
E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $2,362.71; (9) $6,737.70; (10) $5,655.86; (11) $12,403.56.

A. Richard H. Anthony, 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 5505.
D. (6) $3,125.
E. (7) $95.27; (9) $95.27; (10) $68.43; (11) $163.70.

A. Hector M. Aring, 626 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Resolution 532, Wage Stabilization Board, Defense Production Act, housing legislation in general, Concurrent Resolution 83, St. Lawrence waterways, proposed amendments to Clayton Act, proposed amendments to labor legislation, constitutional amendment before the Judiciary Committee, Senate Joint Resolution 130.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (8) $832.39; (9) $832.39; (10) $950.38; (11) $1,782.77.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. ARO, Inc., Tullahoma, Tenn.
C. (2) The following rider to the Air Forces appropriation for research and development, Defense appropriation bill, H. R. 7391: "Provided, That no part of such appropriation shall be used to make any payment to ARO, Inc., for the operation of the Arnold Engineering Development Center."
E. (4) $284.78; (6) $50.85; (7) $53.49; (9) $389.12; (11) $389.12.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $900; (7) $160.08; (9) $1,060.08; (10) $933.96; (11) $1,994.04.

A. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the business of general contracting.[1]
E. (2) $1,500; (8) $5,000; (9) $6,500.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The association concerns itself with only proposed legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (11) $1,500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests. In addition to the support of our opposition to particular measures, the legislative activities during the quarter included the study and analysis of measures which were neither supported nor opposed, in an effort to determine their possible effect on transportation.[1] (3).[1]
D. (6) $55,911.95.
E. (2) $31,266.73; (3) $15,500; (4) $179.01; (5) $4,669.66; (6) $349.02; (7) $1,075.44; (8) $2,872.09; (9) $55,911.95; (10) $73,931.81; (11) $129,843.76; (15) $15,500, National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 815 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution $2,000, Harter and Calhoun, Washington, D. C., fees, $179.01, Columbia Planograph Co., Washington, D. C., printing; etc.[1]

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.
D. (6) $1,661.78.
E. (2) $1,302.85; (4) $39.67; (5) $94.53; (6) $30.69; (7) $72.99; (8) $120.85; (9) $1,661.78; (10) $1,753.78; (11) $3,415.56.

A. Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) This association is interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which do or may affect the western railroads.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding labor laws and revenue act.
E. (2) $125; (11) $125.

A. Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (7) $29,755.72.
E. (2) $20,106.13; (4) $6,632.61; (5) $1,246.16; (6) $723.08; (7) $4,491.77; (8) $47.66; (9) $33,247.41; (10) $30,284.63; (11) $63,532.24; (15) $242.56, New York Telephone Co., post office box 1411, Grand Central Station, New York, N. Y., telephone; $29.94; Elizabeth Selden, 537 Fifth Avenue, petty cash, New York office; $65, Joseph Milward, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., expenses; $100, Janann Baker, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., expenses; $40.53, Alpha Office Supply, 2 East Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., stationery and supplies; $108.46, H. C. Anderson Memograph Corp., 100 Sixth Avenue, New York, N. Y., mimeograph supplies; etc.[1]

A. Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $6,250.01.
E. (6) $23.40; (7) $40.80; (9) $64.20; (10) $77.64; (11) $141.84.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles E. Babcock, Route 4, box 73, Vienna, Va.
B. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3025–3029 North Broad Street, Philadephia, Pa.
C. (2) Restriction of immigration; improvement of free public schools; suppression of communism; any other legislation we consider patriotic to support or object to.
D. (6) $249.99.
E. (3) $10; (5) $60; (6) $7.33; (7) $41.85; (8) $1.25; (9) $120.43; (10) $118.55; (11) $238.98.

A. Frazer A. Bailey, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation relating to maritime industry.[1]
D. (6) $3,125.

A. John A. Baker, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver 3, Colo. (home office), 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington 3, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) Legislation of interest to National Farmers Union.

A. Mary Alice Baldinger, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Congressional and other action in any way affecting civil liberties.
D. (6) $375.
E. (5) $4.50; (6) $10.94; (7) $13.85; (9) $29.29; (10) $43.46; (11) $72.75.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that refers to sugar generally and the refining of raw sugar specifically.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 7268, S. 241, Senate Joint Resolution 150, Senate Joint Resolution 161, supported or opposed.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (9) $79.08.

A. Hartman Barber, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.
D. (6) $1,860.45.
E. (6) $134.86; (7) $362.58; (8) $295.50; (9) $792.94.

A. Fowler W. Barker, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Professional Photogrammetrists, 17 Dupont Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No legislative interests at present, except to get invoked section 251, paragraph 9 of the Federal Property and Administrative Service Act of 1949, for photogrammetric map-making contractors to Government.
D. (6) $5,000.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., Kingsland Underwriters Group, agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd.
C. (2) To provide for completion of payments to Americans holding adjudicated awards of the Mixed Claims Commission.

A. James T. Barnes, 203 Capital Club Building, Raleigh, N. C.
B. Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.
C. (2) House bills 14, 87, 149, 274, 348, 417, 483, 913, 910, 1140, 1272, 1368, 1502, 1545, 1644, 1752, 1781, 3456, 3298, 4079, 4212, 4371, 4373, 4405, 4473, 4519, 4549, 4569, 4577, 4579, 4605, 4723, 4912, 5414, 5426, 5718, 5853, 7426, 7800, 8390, 8391; Senate bills 1, 101, 337, 349, 351, 445, 1186, 1328, 2171, 2246, 2247, 2248, 1140, 1714, 1848, 1875, 2301, 2325, 2337, 2714.
E. (2) $2,100; (9) $2,100; (10) $2,100; (11) $4,200.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (6) $0.40; (7) $437.08; (8) $60.56; (9) $498.04; (10) $164.85; (11) $662.89.

A. Irvin L. Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (10) $100; (11) $200.

A. Earl C. Bassett, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposing St. Lawrence seaway project.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.
B. National Institute of Oil Seed Products, post-office box 3500, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Seeking enactment of H. R. 6292.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (6) $36.75; (7) $1,297.12; (9) $1,333.87; (10) $1,786.59; (11) $3,120.46.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.[1]
E. (2) $1,451.25; (4) $131.61; (5) $5; (9) $1,587.86; (10) $1,616.61; (11) $3,204.47.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, identical bills to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation affecting railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting third-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (10) $8; (11) $8.

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3; (10) $6.50; (11) $9.50.

A. Joe Betts, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIE code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair trade; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense; flood control.
D. (6) $303.75.
E. (7) $9.26; (9) $9.26; (10) $126.59; (11) $135.85.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, and American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (2) Merchant Marine Act, 1936; commercial treaties with Colombia, Israel, Ethiopia, Italy, Denmark, and Greece; H. R. 6543, elimination of narcotics traffic; H. R. 5695, jury trials in admiralty suits.
E. (5) $75.60; (6) $34.44; (7) $88.47; (9) $198.21; (10) $45.48; (11) $243.69.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.

D. (6) $162.38.
E. (2) $150; (4) $14.21; (9) $164.21; (10) $154.25; (11) $318.46.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Only insofar as legislation affects my employer.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $104.17.
E. (7) $64.72; (9) $64.72; (10) $218.96; (11) $863.68.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks; War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951; S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309, S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives; H. R. 7844, and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
E. (2) $1,150; (8) $235.62; (15) $1,385.62, Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich., fees and expenses.

A. D. A. Bodary, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,275.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and those institutions.
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $133.14; (9) $133.14; (11) $133.14.

A. John N. Bohannon, 75 Macon Avenue, Asheville, N. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business in general and particularly any advocated changes in public policy concerning fuels such as coal, oil, and natural gas; or any legislative action which might affect supply, production, gathering, transportation, sales, or distribution of natural gas and the demand therefor by consumers.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $459.71; (6) $288.93; (7) $1,288.21; (9) $2,036.85; (10) $1,957.26; (11) $3,994.11.

A. Daniel L. Boland, 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.[1]
E. (4) $3; (7) $9.50; (9) $12.50; (10) $15.50; (11) $28.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $125.
E. (7) $5.90; (8) $1.32; (9) $7.22; (10) $14.64; (11) $21.86.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative programs affecting industry, including appropriations, tax policies, Federal expenditures and subsidies, Government controls over industry, etc.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (9) $310.59.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the grain and feed industry.

A. H. B. Boyd, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948, and related legislation.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. D. H. Brackett, Post Office Box 622, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) Enforcement of Bill of Rights to reclaim our Government from petty despots and usurpers of court functions.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.
E. (9) $167.50; (11) $167.50.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the association are interested.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative problems affecting industry, including national labor and tax policies, Federal expenditures and subsidies, industrial mobilization, Government controls over industry, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (9) $1,048.73.

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (7) $59.20; (9) $59.20; (10) $43.73; (11) $102.93.

A. M. H. Brightman, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. H. E. Brinckerhoff, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $250; (7) $818.03; (9) $1,068.03; (10) $520; (11) $1,588.03.

A. A. E. Brooks, 408 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. Section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code (to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad).

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) We support or oppose legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor. (3) Locomotive Engineers' Journal.
E. (9) $6,683.07.

A. C. R. Brown, room 411, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, identical bills to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $350.

A. Brown, Lund, and Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.[1]
D. $7,500.
E. (2) $6,825; (5) $375; (6) $26.57; (7) $134.24; (8) $59.50; (9) $7,420.31; (10) $7,242.50; (11) $14,662.81; (15).[1]

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
D. (6) $445.58.
E. (6) $2.75; (7) $336.96; (9) $339.71; (10) $668.49; (11) $1,008.20.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.
E. (9) $32.55; (10) $10.15; (11) $42.70.

A. William A. Bryans 3d, 1044 Gas and Electric Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Public Service Co. of Colorado, 900 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Legislation having to do with activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and tax matters, all of which directly affect the interests of the company.
E. (7) $578.82; (9) $578.82; (11) $578.82.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.
D. (6) $6,280.79.
E. (7) $991.39; (8) $660; (9) $1,651.39; (10) $1,947.02; (11) $3,598.41.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,350.
E. (6) $4.65; (8) $51.26; (9) $55.91; (10) $53.60; (11) $109.51.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.,
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,562.51.
E. (7) $381.90; (9) $381.90; (10) $200.50; (11) $582.40.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., and National Federation of Independent Business, 352 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in rubber tire bill, basing point legislation, antitrust law legislation, and all legislation affecting independent small business.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that might affect electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $1,750.02.
E. (7) $483.32; (8) $31.15; (9) $514.47; (10) $246.06; (11) $760.53.

A. Harold Burke, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (7) $5,846.75.
E. (2) $3,016.56; (5) $255; (6) $154.44; (7) $246.97; (9) $3,672.07; (10) $3,517.06; (11) $7,190,03.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co.
D. (6) $2,887.33.
E. (2) $991.20; (4) $809.40; (5) $255.70; (6) $33.89; (7) $677.30; (8) $119.84; (9) $2,887.33; (10) $2,874.18; (11) $5,761.51; (15) $188.45, Commercial Printing Co., 517 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $104, Messenger Press, Manassas, Va., printing; $43.92, Rapid Photo Copy Co., 1214 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., photostat; $112.71, Spee-Dee-Que, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $84.62, S. & S. Mailing Service, 730 Eleventh Street SE., Washington, D. C., mailing; etc.[1]

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) St. Lawrence legislation.
D. (6) $1,630.
E. (8) $315.79; (9) $315.79; (10) $89.60; (11) $405.39.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation affecting imports of products into the United States.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts by the Congress to reduce annual leave for Federal employees, and in support of unemployment insurance coverage and other more liberal benefits for the workers.
D. (6) $2,067.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For the relief of Columbia Basin contractors.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.
D. (6) $2,475.
E. (8) $70.25; (9) $70.25; (10) $42.80; (11) $113.05.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Against the proposed increase in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits.
E. (2) $387; (4) $110; (6) $20; (7) $72; (8) $234; (9) $823.

A. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York N. Y.
B. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 6843, S. 2791, and Defense Production of 1952.

A. George P. Byrne, Jr., 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) We will seek legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. John W. Caffey, 830 Southeastern Building, Greensboro, N. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting wine.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) S. 2645, to amend and extend Defense Production Act of 1950; S. 2504, Defense Unemployment Compensation Act of 1952; House Resolution 532; Senate Resolution 169; H. R. 7391, Department of Defense Appropriations Act.
D. (6) $760.20.
E. (6) $3; (7) $10; (8) $30; (9) $43; (10) $45.47; (11) $88.47.

A. Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
C. (2) Interested in all matters before Congress affecting welfare of employees in Canal Zone.
D. (6) $3,959.70.
E. (2) $2,966; (9) $2,966; (10) $3,000; (11) $5,966; (15) $2,966, W. M. Price, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., salary.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Removal of Defense Production Act of 1952 (retention of Herlong amendment, discontinuance of Consumer Credit Control authority; H. R. 6546 and S. 2594; fair trade; H. R. 5767 (restoration of validity of nonsigner clause).

A. T. C. Carroll, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
(C) (2) During second quarter worked for passage of H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

A. Henderson H. Carson, George Washington Inn, Washington, D. C.; 600 First National Bank, Canton, Ohio.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation of interest to natural gas industry.
D. (6) $3,425.16.
E. (1) $35.59; (2) $64.50; (3) $49.10; (4) $28.90; (5) $8.20; (6) $25.82; (7) $143.90; (8) $74.15; (9) $425.16; (10) $198.80; (11) $623.96.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $634.86; (6) $79.85; (7) $371.50; (9) $1,086.21; (10) $1,129.07; (11) $2,215.28; (12) $1,086.21; (14) $1,129.07; (15) $634.86, April 1; May 1; June 1; Munsey Trust Co., rent; $79.85, April 15; May 15; June 15: Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., phone; $371.50, April 5; May 5; June 5: Statler Hotel and University Club.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on the five years of highest earnings—S. 1305 and H. R. 63.
E. (6) $16.38; (7) $52.10; (9) $63.48; (10) $58.60; (11) $127.08.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $1,064.55.
E. (8) $2.05; (9) $2.05; (10) $47.00; (11) $49.05.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The foundation has a "general legislative interest" in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. Its only "specific legislative interest" at present is the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and any amendments thereto or extensions thereof which may affect the interests of milk dealers.
D. (6) $1,666.67.
E. (7) $11.80; (9) $11.80; (10) $3.50; (11) $15.30.

A. Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. C. N. Sayen, President, Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Aviation Legislation—Railway Labor Act.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.
C. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act; and H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act (known more frequently as Central Arizona project bill). (3) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River; What the Central Arizona Project Means to You; Truth; Settling Up Time; Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project; National Tax Benefits From the Central Arizona Project.
D. (6) $25,614.27.
E. (2) $6,302.09; (4) $589.91; (5) $903.53; (6) $228.07; (7) $896.42; (8) $644.04; (9) $9,564.06; (10) $11,894.50; (11) $21,458.56.

A. William E. Chace, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, "To implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes"; and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes"; and H. R. 1755, "To regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes."
D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America,[1] 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
D. (6) $908,530.20.
E.[1] (9) $38,612.22; (10) $30,406.48; (11) $69,018.76.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr.,[1] 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. The Chase National Bank of the City of New York,[1] 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

A. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States; (3) The Christian Patriot and You Can Help Unfold the Answer.
D. (6) $5,181.24.
E. (1) $400; (2) $1,690.50; (4) $955.52; (5) $130.45; (6) $3.15; (7) $122.88; (9) $3,302.50; (10) $3,721.06; (11) $7,023.56; (15) $50, April 1, May 1, 1952, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., office rent; $15.75, April 1, April 22, 1952, Capper Engraving Co., West Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., cuts for Christian Patriot; $467.65, April 8, May 13, May 29, 1952, Floyd Burres Printing Service, Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans., printing of Christian Patriot, monthly magazine; $11.50, April 8, May 13, May 29, 1952, Arrow Engraving Co., North Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans., cuts for Christian Patriot; $77.95, May 21, 1952; H. M. Ives & Sons, Kansas Avenue, Topeka, Kans., for offset work on letter, etc.[1]

A. Elisabeth Christman, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

A. Abiah A. Church, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry. Specific legislative interests presently are: Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C. 151); Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001); McFarland bill (S. 658); radio fraud bill (H. R. 2948); copyright bills (H. R. 3589, H. R. 2464); bills to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S. 1579; S. J. Res. 76; H. R. 5829); bills re transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce (S. 1624, S. 2116, S. 1563, S. 1564); bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S. 1526; H. R. 4229–H. R. 4231); bills to amend section 315 of the Communications Act (H. R. 5470, H. R. 7062, H. R. 7782; S. 1379); resolutions re investigation of radio and television programs (H. Res. 278, H. Res. 520, H. Res. 541, S. Res. 127); bills to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages (H. R. 2188, H. R. 1514, H. R. 5889); resolutions to establish Election Day holiday (H. Con. Res. 175, H. Con. Res. 176, S. Con. Res. 54); resolutions re televising and broadcasting of congressional committee hearings (H. Res. 62, H. Res. 538, H. Res. 540, S. Res. 106, S. Res. 319).
D.[1]

A. Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fo eign policy.
E. (4) $6.06; (9) $6.06; (11) $6.06.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company, including but not limited to the following bills: Railroad safety, H. R. 269; railroad switching service, S. 446; mail-contract investigation, Senate Resolution 23; basing point, S. 719; transportation investigation, Senate Resolution 55; St. Lawrence waterway legislation; various bills to amend Railroad Retirement Act; various general and corporate tax bills; legislation to amend Reorganization Act of 1949; boxcar and railroad equipment shortage bills; all transportation bills pending before Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under Senate Resolution 50.
D. (6) $4,400.
E.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) CCBS will oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class 1-A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class 1-A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.

D.[1]

E.[1] (3) $20.40; (7) $524.02; (9) $524.02; (10) $678.61; (11) $1,202.63.

A. W. Frank Clucas, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. The National Association of Master Plumbers has an interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. In respect to legislation affecting these matters, the association's preponderant interest is in keeping informed and passing that information on to its membership and to the industry. In this connection, it sends out frequent informational bulletins, and through its official publication, Plumbing and Heating Business (circulation approximately 26,000), which is issued each month.

D and E.[1]

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 24 Mallow Hill Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

B. Active-Retired Lighthouse Keepers Association, post-office box 2169, South Portland, Maine.

C. (2) Aid in the passage of pending bills H. R. 1526, 1995, and 2273.

D. (6) $125.

E. (6) $0.40; (7) $18.29; (8) $5; (9) $23.69; (10) $38.55; (11) $62.24.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Lewisville, Ark.

C. (2) Senate Joint Resolution 27 (St. Lawrence waterway).

D. (6) $310.

E. (7) $697.10; (9) $697.10; (10) $675.75; (11) $1,372.85; (15).[1]

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; and H. R. 1755, to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

D. (6) $100.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York City.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

E. (6) $20.70; (9) $20.70; (10) $50.07; (11) $70.77; (15) telephone service, April, May, June, 1952, $20.70.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interest of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code. Specific bills in which it is presently interested will be similar to those known in the last session of Congress as H. R. 240, known as the Mason bill, S. 892, proposed by Senator Williams, and H. R. 1177 proposed by Congressman Davis.

D. (6) $480.

E. (1) $100; (5) $34.50; (8) $87.37; (9) $221.87; (10) $358.75; (11) $580.62; (15) $34.50, April 8, April 30, and June 25, 1952, Edna P. Hubbard, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services for March, April, May, and June, 1952; $100, April 8, 1952, Marion Strain, 1440 Welton Street, Denver, Colo. On account, general public-relations assistance during year 1952; $87.37, April 30, 1952, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., one-half of subscriptions collected during first quarter of 1952, which amount is due national affiliate of local organization's subscriptions received from membership as per resolution of board of directors.

A. The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee,[1] 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the above-named railroads[1]; communications or operating rules bills, railway pay bills; transportation excise taxes; the St. Lawrence seaway; the Federal Barge Lines; parcel-post rates; size and weights of parcel-post packages; repeal of Bulwinkle Act; bills changing the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; bills introduced as a result of the investigation of surface transportation under Senate Resolution 50; revenue measures; Railway Labor Act; Railroad Retirement Act; bills concerning railroad unemployment insurance.

E. (2) $490; (7) $347; (9) $837; (10) $522; (11) $1,359; (15) all of the above was paid to Mr. Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500; favoring Senate Joint Resolution 26 and House Joint Resolution 21. (3) Cost to Nation's Taxpayers, Look What This Is Going to Cost You, and California and the Colorado River.

E. (1) $1,339.81; (2) $10,160.30; (4) $5,842.31; (5) $2,054.25; (6) $793.23; (7) $5,206.78; (9) $25,396.68; (10) $25,073.84; (11) $50,470.52; (15) $50, June 5, The Addressoprint, 7090 Eastondale Avenue, Long Beach, Calif., office equipment; $14.75, May 8, Advertising Designers, 1240 South Main Street, Los Angeles, art work; $67.29, May 8, June 5, Aldine Co., 232 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, office supplies; $72.32, April 4, May 8, June 5, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; $3,598.55, May 8, June 5, Anderson & Ritchie, 1932 Hyperion Avenue, Los Angeles, printing and news mats, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Committee To Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, 843 General Motors Building, 1775 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support of bills for helping Anti-Communist China by economic aid and military equipment.

D. (6) $191.

E. (5) $240; (6) $30.84; (9) $270.84; (10) $321.86; (11) $592.70; (15) $240; April 1, May 8, June 6, Charles F. Noyes Co., 40 Wall Street, New York City, room 843, 1775 Broadway; $30.84, April 1, May 8, June 6, New York Telephone Co., postoffice box 53, N. Y., telephone service, Ju 2-4745.

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $497.

E. (8) $108.81; (9) $118.70; (10) $410.64; (11) $529.34; (15) $108.81, June 20, 1952, Hooven Letters, Inc., 352 Fourth Avenue, New York City, for process letters and lettershop work.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27, and H. R. 54. This committee is also interested in the following measures: S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 342, H. R. 146, H. R. 14.

D. (6) $20,382.50.

E. (2) $7,321.56; (4) $4,567.03; (5) $1,450.23; (6) $221.08; (7) $390.32; (8) $453.87; (9) $14,404.04; (10) $11,188.04; (11) $25,592.08.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized and functions to protect the legitimate interest of petroleum pipelines, including, when necessary, legislative interests. At this time the only pending legislation affecting petroleum pipelines, in which the committee is interested, is S. 1889, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and H. R. 5632, a bill to require interstate oil pipelines to procure certificates of public convenience and necessity before construction of new or extension of existing lines. The committee is opposed to certain provisions contained in bill S. 1889 and to bill H. R. 5632. There has been no action on either of these bills during the period covered by this report.

D. (6) $315.

E. (2) $9,086.72; (4) $6,838; (5) $3,262.60; [1] (6) $140.54; (7) $340.23; (8) $2,120.79; (9) $15,263.68; (10) $11,172.99; (11) $26,436.67; (15).[1]

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C.[1] (2) A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes; H. R. 7005; Public Law 400. The committee was for this legislation.

D. (6) $13,082.58.

E. (2) $2,037.23; (4) $2,107.44; (5) $1,569.02; (6) $397.81; (8) $410.78; (9) $6,522.28; (10) $2,858.69; (11) $9,380.97; (15) $738, April 6, May 20, June 4, the Sheraton, Inc., 1 Court Street, Boston, Mass., office rent; $22.50, April 9, May 21, June 6, Answering, Inc., 422 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., telephone answering service; $141.83, April 9, May 21, June 7, Fox-Jones Co., 1419 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $18.69, April 9, June 7, Ditto, Inc., Harrison and Oakley Boulevard, Chicago, office supplies; $4.18, April 9, Western Union Telegraph

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Co., 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., telegraph service, etc.[1]

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 60 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. H. R. 5346.

E. (1) $1,250; (9) $1,250; (10) $11,250; (11) $12,500.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

E. Received during this quarter $212.20 as reimbursement for expenditures under items E6 and E7.

A. John C. Cone, Care Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Very infrequently interested in any legislation, but may be interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways, Inc.

A. Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., Mr. Fred A. Virkus, chairman, 407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Supported fair-trade bills, H. R. 5767 and H. R. 6925.

D. (6) $11,375.45.

E. (1) $4,015; (2) $5,697.92; (4) $2,891.54; (5) $1,673.38; (6) $200.42; (7) $150; (8) $3,470.75; (9) $18,099.01; (10) $17,274.48; (11) $35,373.49.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, property and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $12,484.88.

E. (2) $1,875; (3) $7,500; (4) $1,011.40; (5) $455; (6) $900; (8) $743.48; (9) $12,484.88; (10) $8,195.13; (11) $20,680.01.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (6) $43.22; (7) $24.80; (9) $68.02; (10) $75.60; (11) $143.62.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and those affecting the coal industry.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and particularly those affecting the lime industry.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. William A. Sutherland, First National Bank Building, Atlanta, Ga.

C. (2) H. R. 3168.

A. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Defense of the right of any group of people voluntarily to organize cooperative business enterprises without discrimination against them on the part of Government, and the securing of such enabling legislation for this purpose as may from time to time be necessary.

E. (2) $500; (5) $125; (6) $50; (7) $210; (9) $840; (10) $840; (11) $1,680.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.

D. (6) $5,202.96.

E. (5) $351.27; (6) $29.15; (7) $46.92; (9) $427.31; (10) $404.33; (11) $831.64.

A. J. G. Corona, Suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) General legislative interests cover interests of the telegraph company.

E. (7) $65; (9) $65; (10) $81.50; (11) $146.50.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Retired Officers' Association, Inc., 1616 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors. (3) The Retired Officer.

D. (6) $1,200.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, in care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland. House Resolution 82.

D. (6) $750.

E. (10) $114.24; (11) $114.24.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Charles J. Crampton, 601 Castano Avenue, San Antonio, Tex.

B. State Tax Association, P. O. Box 2559, Houston, Tex.

C. (2) State and Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably.

D. (6) $9,500.

E. (11) $231.25.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo., consisting of attorneys representing the following railroads: A. T. & S. F. Ry. 16 percent; C. B. & Q. R. R. 10 percent; C. R. I. & P. R. R. 5 percent; C. & S. R. 14 percent; D. & R. G. W. R. R. 30 percent; M. P. R. R. 5 percent; U. P. R. R. 20 percent. The percentage following the names of the railroad is the amount contributed by each.

C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the above named railroads: Communications of operating rules bills; railway pay bills, transportation excise taxes; the St. Lawrence seaway; the Federal barge lines; parcel-post rates; size and weights of parcel-post packages; repeal of Bulwinkle Act; bills changing the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission; bills introduced as a result of the investigation of surface transportation under Senate Resolution 50; Revenue measures; Railway Labor Act; Railroad Retirement Act; bills concerning railroad unemployment insurance.

D. (6) $837.

E. (2) $490; (7) $347; (9) $837; (10) $522; (11) $1,359; (15) $48.60, June, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad. Pullman accommodations and dining-car services; $185.24, June, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C. Hotel accommodations, meals, and incidentals; $43.85, June, Pennsylvania Railroad and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad. Pullman accommodations and dining-car services.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Arnold Adler, 1011 Commerce Building, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) Amendment of Technical Changes Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to grantors dying after January 1, 1951.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.

C. (2) H. R. 7755, a bill to amend section 8 of the act to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code (Public Law 378, 81st Cong.) to permit persons under a disability to take advantage of same.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (4) $11.58; (7) $6; (9) $17.58; (11) $17.58.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (2) H. R. 7754, a bill to amend section 811 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to limit its application in certain disability cases.

E. (4) $11.58; (7) $30.93; (9) $42.51; (10) $28.31; (11) $70.82.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. New Process Co. (merchandisers by mail), Warren, Pa.

C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (6) $3.86; (7) $2.07; (9) $5.95; (11) $5.95.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 8159, for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

E. (6) $1.63; (7) $30.10; (9) $31.73; (11) $31.73.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 2678–2679, the Townsend plan bills in Congress.

D. (6) $2,350.49.

E. (5) $535.28; (6) $122.25; (7) $119.60; (8) $857.98; (9) $1,635.11; (10) $1,095.10; (11) $2,730.21; (15).[1]

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (6) $24.95; (8) $4.58; (9) $29.53; (10) $74.09; (11) $103.62; (12) $24.85; (14) $22.24.

A. William V. Dameron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists (Labor Union), Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277.
D. (6) $1.875.

A. N. R. Danielian, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) St. Lawrence legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 337. Proponents.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $783.15; (9) $783.15; (10) $955.11; (11) $1,738.26.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislative interests: taxation, general appropriations, old age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems. S. 2639, H. R. 4133, H. R. 6954, S. 2504, H. R. 7800, Coudert resolution, etc.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (10) $222.36; (11) $222.36.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) S. 2594; H. R. 8210, H. R. 7314.
D. (6) $2,307.72.
E (6) $268.27; (7) $2,928.76; (8) $67.70; (9) $3,264.73; (10) $4,650.46; (11) $7,915.19.

A. John H. Davis, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2357, to restrict application of agricultural exemption for motor carriers (opposed as originally introduced) H. R. 8210, Defense Production Act, for amendments; S. 2594, Defense Production Act, for amendments; H. R. 7314, Department of Agriculture appropriations, for amendments; H. R. 7391, defense appropriation, for amendments; H. R. 8337, farm credit bill, for; H. R. 8338, farm credit bill, for; S. 3388, farm credit bill, for.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $3,947.34.
E. (7) $258.13; (9) $258.13; (10) $258.13; (11) $258.13.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interest: Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba. Specific legislative interest: The Sugar Act of 1948 (Public Law 388, 80th Cong.) and 1951 amendments thereto (Public Law 140, 82d Cong.).

A. Homer R. Davison, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) S. 2594; H. R. 8210, H. R. 7314.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (4) $33.75; (6) $293.28; (9) $327.03; (10) $429.88; (11) $756.91.

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $2,862.14.
E. (6) $33.86; (7) $328.28; (9) $362.14; (10) $98.70; (11) $460.84.

A. William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Activities limited to advising association in connection with postal rate matters.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $61.71; (8) $20.41; (9) $82.12; (11) $82.12.

A. R. T. DeVany,[1] 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,375.
E. (7) $14.75; (9) $14.75; (10) $16.70; (11) $31.45.

A. C. B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3408.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $1,300; (11) $2,600.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation pertaining to war veterans and their dependents and the survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before Senate Finance Committee, Senate Labor and Public Welfare, two Post Office and Civil Service Committees, House Veterans Affairs Committee, two Armed Services Committees.
E. (3) $5,066.60; (7) $313.30; (9) $5,379.90; (10) $5,218.93; (11) $10,598.83.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting disabled veterans and their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans.
E. (2) $2,500; (7) $15; (9) $2,515; (10) $2,637.46; (11) $5,152.46.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $1,320.25.
E. (7) $99.25; (9) $99.25; (10) $68; (11) $167.25.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $77.28; (9) $77.28; (11) $77.28.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. W. H. Loomis Talc Co., Gouverneur, N. Y.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $500.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Lobbying, i. e., supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally, organized labor in general.
D. (6) $13,203.18.
E. (2) $4,567.62; (4) $150; (5) $864.58; (6) $156.69; (7) $913.16; (8) $1,292.09; (9) $7,794.14; (10) $8,557.80; (11) $16,351.94; (15) $400, April 2, 1952, N. P. Weathersby, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $42.29, April 3, 1952, Nettie Bakersmith, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., clerical service; $60.49, April 3, 1952, Mabel Almalel, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C., secretary service; $29.98, April 3, 1952, Mallorey Office Supply Co., 732 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $1.50, April 3, 1952, National Publishing Co., Third and N Streets NE., Washington, D. C., pamphlets, etc.[1]

A. Doctors For Freedom, 510 Medical Arts Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) All legislation on social matters. (3).[1]
D. (6) $1,464.90.
E. (4) $242.42; (5) $261.21; (6) $40.88; (8) $254.01; (9) $798.52; (11) $798.52; (15) $11.46, March 10, 1952, Wilson Stationery, 1020 Prairie, Houston, Tex.; $4.20, March 10, 1952, Richardson Rubber Stamp Co., 1308 Walker, Houston, Tex.; $111.08, March 10, 1952, postmaster, Houston, Tex.; $17.50, March 10, 1952, Biggers Printing Co., 100 Sabine Street, Houston, Tex.; $13.90, March 21, 1952, Moore Paper Co., 3820 Chenevert, Houston, Tex., etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D. (6) $870.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
D. (7) $125.

A. James L. Donnelly, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation of general interest to manufacturers. (3) Industrial Review.
E. (7) $427.81; (9) $427.81; (10) $269.70; (11) $697.51.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 657 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $900.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise taxes on alcoholic beverages.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Cos., 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. No specific interests during second quarter of the year.
D. (6) $99.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street, room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees' Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $1,212.32.
E. (7) $41.10; (9) $41.10; (10) $35.40; (11) $76.50.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including: S. 1657 and H. R. 189, separation air-mail subsidies; H. R. 1998, railroad communications and operating rules; H. R. 1528 and H. R. 2957, Federal barge lines; Senate Joint Resolution 27 and House Joint Resolution 3, St. Lawrence seaway; Senate Resolution 55 and House Resolution 107, transportation investigation; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, railroad unemployment compensation.
E.[1]

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $203.74; (9) $203.74; (10) $128; (11) $331.74.

A. Mrs. P. P. Douglas, League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (11) $15.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Interior Department appropriation bill (H. R. 7176) Palo Verde diversion weir bill (H. R. 6591).
D. (6) $3,222.
E. (7) $720.20; (9) $720.20; (10) $590.97; (11) $1,311.17.

A. Adin M. Downer, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration. (3) VFW Foreign Service, monthly and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $29.40; (9) $29.40; (10) $36.50; (11) $65.90.

A. Richard S. Doyle, 404 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess profits taxes. (a) Proposed amendment to the Excess Profits Act of 1950 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1951. (b) H. R. 7784, introduced May 8, 1952, by Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania. (c) 64 Stat. 1137, c. 1199; 65 Stat. 452, c. 521. (d) For amendment of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended.

A. W. A. Dosier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $225; (11) $450.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Transportation legislation: S. 2937, H. R. 7323, H. R. 7359, Government operation of railroads; against: S. 2355, H. R. 6123, amends ICC Act relating to finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight; for: Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, authorizes $50,000 for study of Railroad Retirement Act; for: S. 2357, amends ICC Act relating to the agricultural exemption clause; against: S. 2829, amends the ICC Act relating to discontinuance of intrastate service; for: S. 2364, amends ICC Act relating to revocation and amendment of water-carrier certificates and permits; for: Senate Resolution 332, provides for a study of the Interstate Commerce Commission by Senate Commerce Committee; for: H. R. 8356, separates subsidy from air-mail pay; for.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $175; (4) $12; (5) $313.30; (6) $102.25; (7) $234.52; (9) $837.07; (10) $935.52; (11) $1,772.59.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) See statement (5) of Quarterly Report dated April 11, 1949. Registrant supported amendments discussed and proposed to S. 2594 and S. 2645.
E. (15) $265.21, April, May, June, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $12.38, May, Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, Minn., lodging, meals, telephone; $16.30, May, Curtis Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., lodging and telephone; $11.88, May 19, Hotel Nicollet, Minneapolis, Minn., lodging, telephone, and meals; $18.06, June 16, Hotel Congressional, 300 New Jersey Ave., Washington, D. C., lodging, telephone, and meals, etc.[1]

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
E. (10) $63.52; (11) $63.52.

A. Matthew Dushane, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Seafarers International Union of North America, A. F. of L., 450 Harrison Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) S. 1044, H. R. 3974, H. R. 5693, and H. R. 5695 (favorable).
D. (6) $568.75.
E. (5) $41.25; (6) $26.50; (7) $442.75; (8) $71.30; (9) $581.80; (10) $511.25; (11) $1,093.05.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Petroleum legislation. S. 1498, S. 2348 through S. 2366, S. 2743, S. 2744, Senate Resolution 50, and various petroleum bills before House Interstate Commerce Committee; Current Tax Bills; House Joint Resolution 42 and House Joint Resolution 206.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $319.13.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $318.59.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $40.57; (4) $.99; (5) $23.36; (7) $2.13; (9) $67.05; (10) $36.20; (11) $103.25; (15) $15.76, April 1, May 1, June 1, Wm. A. Disque, Washington, D. C., commerce counsel; $14.36, April 18, May 17, June 1, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., banquet, meeting rooms; $15.56, June 1, LaRoe, Brown & Winn, Washington, D. C., attorneys.

A. George S. Eaton, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (2) Defense Production Act Amendments of 1952, H. R. 8210. Against exemption of small businesses from wage control. Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small business.

D. (6) $100.

A. John W. Edelman, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27, and H. R. 54. This individual is also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 14, H. R. 342, H. R. 146.

D. (6) $200.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans, and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans; more specifically, the program of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, and opposes discrimination in immigration legislation.

D. (6) $140.

E. (7) $15; (11) $30.

A. Joseph H. Ehlers, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., room 409, Washington, D. C.

B. American Society of Civil Engineers.

C. (2) Of interest to the society, S. 2594, DPA amendment; H. R. 3790, reclamation appropriations bill; H. R. 5426, Armed Services Reserves Act of 1951. Possible interest in H. R. 2752, industrial waste treatment; House Joint Resolution 218, air pollution; H. R. 1637, national water resources; S. 1144, Board of Impartial Analysis; S. 644, Davis-Bacon Act amendment. (3) Civil engineering.

E. (8) $23.25; (9) $2325; (10) $9.50; (11) $32.75.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418 Homer Building, Thirteenth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 7656.

D. (6) $900.

E. (6) $59.02; (7) $105.31; (9) $164.33; (10) $251.69; (11) $416.02.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely; (2) Promotion toward enactment of H. R. 2678, generally known as the Townsend plan. (3) None.

D. (6) $910.

E. (7) $20.53; (9) $20.53; (11) $20.53.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program, resulting from the REA Act, as amended, including REA administrative and loan funds for rural electrification and for rural telephone funds; funds for the construction of multipurpose dams; funds for transmission and related facilities to deliver Federal hydro power to rural electric load centers; proposed legislation providing for surveys and development of water resources; (3) Rural Electrification magazine.

D. (6) $4,868.50.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 402 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 430 Syndicate Building, Minneapolis, Minn.

C. (2) General legislation which might affect the business interests of independent oil jobbers—no specific legislation.

D. (6) $3,000.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting public power projects generally.

D. (6) $1,313.60.

E. (6) $27.22; (7) $263.84; (8) $22.54; (9) $313.60; (11) $313.60.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the city's rights in the Colorado River and related matters, and legislation affecting public power projects.

D. (6) $2,400.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.

C. (2) H. R. 7176, Interior Department appropriations bill, 1953, and legislation affecting social-security coverage for municipal employees.

D. (6) $2,193.10.

E. (4) $26.58; (6) $24.18; (8) $42.34; (9) $93.10; (10) $139.54; (11) $232.64.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the district's rights in the Colorado River and related matters.

D. (6) $2,171.36.

E. (6) $30.31; (8) $41.05; (9) $71.36; (10) $32.17; (11) $103.53.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.

D. (6) $5,601.11.

E. (4) $15.61; (6) $28.26; (7) $194.86; (8) $42.38; (9) $281.11; (10) $414.27; (11) $595.38.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 520 Ash Street, San Diego, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to client on legislation affecting Sun-Pacific's interest; i. e., tuna tariff legislation (H. R. 5693) and related Federal Tariff Commission hearings.

D. (6) $1,851.44.

E. (6) $30.44; (8) $21; (9) $101.44; (11) $101.44.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans' educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicesmen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project and legislation affecting Federal reclamation and public power policies and projects generally.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

C. (2) H. R. 7268, Army civil functions appropriations, 1953, and legislation affecting flood-control projects generally.

A. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Postal rate legislation.

D. (6) $1,552.73.

E. (2) $750; (4) $88.96; (6) $42.20; (7) $103.07; (9) $984.23; (10) $1,633.65; (11) $2,617.88; (15) Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses, second quarter, $904.70; Fred Keck Co., 305 East Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., printing, second quarter, $79.63.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to small business, either directly or indirectly. (3) Pulling Together.

D. (6) $2,325.

E. (7) $274.95; (9) $274.95; (10) $544.66; (11) $819.61.

A. Leon J. Engel, 29 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.

C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. O. F. Erickson, 1010 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The National Association of Master Plumbers has an interest in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by execptive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in

all legislation that affects the building construction and piping industries. (3) Plumbing and Heating Business.
D and E.[1]

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Miller's National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C.[1]
D. (6) $312.50.
E. (8) $2.94; (9) $2.94; (10) $89.93; (11) $92.87.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America,[1] 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers.
D and E.[1]

A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association.
C. (2) All bills affecting retail automobile dealers; Federal aid to highways; tax bills.
D. (6) $6,081.35.
E. (7) $1,426.07; (9) $1,426.07; (10) $1,166.49; (11) $2,593.56.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry. Specific legislative interests presently are: Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C. 151); Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001); McFarland bill (S. 658); radio-fraud bill (H. R. 2948); copyright bills (H. R. 3589, H. R. 2464); bills to establish a National Citizens Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S. 1579; S. J. Res. 76; H. R. 5829); bills re transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce (S. 1625, 2110, 1563, 1564); bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S. 1526; H. R. 4229–4231); bills to amend section 315 of the Communications Act (H. R. 5470, 7062, 7782; S. 1379); resolutions re investigation of radio and television programs (Res. 278, 520, 541; S. Res. 127); bills to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages (H. R. 2188, 1514, 5889); resolutions to establish election day holiday (H. Con. Res. 175, 176; S. Con. Res. 54); resolutions re televising and broadcasting of congressional committee hearings (H. Res. 62, 538, 540; H. Res. 106, 319).

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting Savings and Loan Associations and General Mortgage Lending, Defense Production Act, 1952, renewal Housing Act of 1952.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $7; (9) $7; (11) $7.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $3,750.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. John E. Fields, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans educational-assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.
D. (6) $1,230.
E. (4) $5.30; (6) $134.86; (7) $1,816.99; (8) $97.64; (11) 2,054.79; (15) $461.33, June 14, 1952, Carlton Hotel, Sixteenth and K Streets, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, phones, and laundry-cleaning; June 22, 1952, Carlton Hotel, lodging, meals, phones, and laundry-cleaning; $34.35, June 25, 1952, Wardman Park Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, phones and cleaning; $132.50; May 14, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, phones, and cleaning, etc.[1]

A. Russell Fifer, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.
E. (6) $20; (7) $150; (9) $170; (11) $170.

A. H. L. Filer, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $5,550.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the alcoholic beverage importing industry.
D. (7) $375.

A. James Finucane, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as: Mutual Assistance Program; appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation including universal military training and service; proposals leading to the revision of peace treaties; economic assistance (point 4); disarmament; expellees and displaced persons; educational exchange.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.[1]
D. (6) $900.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., and Raymond C. Baker and Jay Richter, as employees.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $18,000.
E. (4) $422.04; (6) $337.68; (7) $1,977.96; (8) $175.72; (9) $2,913.40; (10) $4,012.62; (11) $6,926.02.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Particularly interested in legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.
D. (6) $1,052.08.

A. Roger Fleming, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; Mutual Security Program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIE code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation, agricultural extension service; Department of Agricultural reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair trade; United States relationships to North Atlantic treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense; flood control.
D. (6) $1,166.66.
E. (7) $19.21; (9) $19.21; (10) $89.41; (11) $108.62.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant disease control and crop improvement; items in Agriculture Department's budget affecting research and control work on black stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (2) $910.45; (4) $555.50; (5) $115.46; (6) $89.82; (7) $370.56; (9) $2,041.79; (10) $1,547.33; (11) $3,589.12.

A. W. G. Flinn, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects.

E. (2) $1,350; (8) $55.91; (9) $1,405.91; (10) $1,403.60; (11) $2,809.51.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $2,512.50.
E. (2) $1,320; (6) $4.07; (7) $124.19; (9) $1,448.26; (10) $1,326.19; (11) $2,774.45.

A. Herbert Fockler, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, suite 906–7, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906–7, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $5,000.04.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 7314, H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2752, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.
D. (6) $190.93.
E. (2) $40; (4) $15; (6) $3; (7) $142.93; (9) $190.93; (10) $175.49; (11) $366.32.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interest.[1]
D. (6) $6,842.91.
E. (7) $109.75; (9) $109.75; (10) $147.62; (11) $257.37.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
D (6) $2,160.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D. (6) $2,046.56.
E. (7) $96.56; (10) $79.69; (11) $176.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,445.28.
E. (5) $55.05; (6) $166.98; (7) $1,074.25; (9) $1,296.28; (10) $1,421.24; (11) $2,717.52.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience. (3) Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $9,479.83.
E. (1) $113.63; (2) $7,075.52; (3) $50; (4) $3,284.97; (5) $2,803.88; (6) $686.54; (7) $649.40; (8) $698.87; (9) $15,362.81; (10) $20,375.94; (11) $35,738.75; (15) $438.03, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbit Road, Cleveland, Ohio, printing and addressing supplies; $215.20, Barton, Duer & Koch Paper Co., 1111 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C., paper; $33.07, Chas. G. Stott & Co., Inc., 1310 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., supplies; $519.14, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone, etc.[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) No particular bills, but any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,174.98.
E. (7) $1,353.72; (9) $1,353.72; (10) $1,296.20; (11) $2,649.92.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6846, a proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges.
D. (7) $625.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Railroads.[1]
C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; and Federal Employers' Liability Act and proposed amendments; favor legislation favorable to railroads and unfavorable legislation.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $167.95; (9) $167.95; (10) $355.99; (11) $523.94.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including S. 658 and House Resolution 520.
E. (7) $202; (9) $202; (10) $57.50; (11) $259.50.

A. Gardner, Morrison and Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, 81st Cong., H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, 82nd Cong.
E. (7) $0.80; (9) $0.80; (10) $100.80; (11) $101.60.

A. Gardner, Morrison and Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Oceanic Steamship Co. 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. Legislative matters relating to securing payment from the United States for restoration of vessels owned by the company but requisitioned by the Government and altered and used by it during World War II; also any legislative matters pertaining to acquisition by the United States of vessels belonging to Oceanic Steamship Co.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (11) $2.

A. Gwynn Garnett, 261 Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Extension of Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act; inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies, immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; agricultural labor; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; mutual security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense.
D. (6) $1,062.50.
E. (7) $41.58; (9) $41.58; (10) $54.90; (11) $96.48.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street, NW., Washington, D. C
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Coops; and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,473.99.
E. (7) $100.54; (8) $10.95; (9) $111.49; (10) $70.47; (11) $181.96.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.; revision and extension of Defense Production Act of 1950.
D. (6) $252.59.
E. (6) $252.59; (9) $252.59; (11) $252.59.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (4) $3,215.16; (6) $100.74; (9) $3,315.90; (11) $3,315.90.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 7852, H. R. 7800.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer and McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Co.'s, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298, H. R. 3392, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 7852, H. R. 7800.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. John S. Gibson, Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.
B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.
C (2) An appropriation for dredging at St. Marys Harbor and up St. Marys River.
D. (6) $750.
E. (7) $191.40; (9) $191.40; (10) $209.75; (11) $401.15.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation—Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public relations.
D. (6) $1,354.43.
E. (7) $96.40; (9) $96.40; (10) $83.30; (11) $179.70.

A. C. C. Gilbert.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,012.50.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade-unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
D. (6) $498.34.
E. (2) $303.33; (4) $18.89; (5) $117.85; (6) $89.84; (8) $51.45; (9) $581.36; (10) $587.02; (11) $1,168.08; (15).[1]

A. George S. Goldstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,217.50.
E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (10) $195; (11) $390.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) In support of Townsend national insurance legislation.
D. (6) $910.
E. (7) $311.85; (9) $311.85.

A. Robert S. Gordon, 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For termination, exemption, or amendment of price controls of dairy foods under Defense Production Act.
E. (7) $568.09; (9) $568.09; (10) $334.70; (11) $902.79.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health, such as H. R. 8087 and S. 2301, nurses education aid; S. 1245 and S. 2337, emergency maternity and infant care; S. 2552, Armed Forces women physicians.
D. (6) $375.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relative to interests of grain and feed trade.
E. (10) $80; (11) $80.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $2.50.
E. (2) $3,686.55; (5) $412.70; (6) $61.60; (7) $1,329.46; (8) $32.15; (9) $5,522.46; (10) $5,308.25; (11) $10,830.71; (15) $2,499.99, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. David G. Gray, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Pending legislation affecting business in general, which includes practically every important measure before Congress.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $65; (7) $3,054.48; (9) $3,119.48; (10) $3,036.97; (11) $5,156.45.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (6) $22.16; (7) $52.65; (9) $74.81; (11) $74.81.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Agriculture and the processing and transportation of the products thereof.[1]
D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (7) $2; (9) $2; (10) $2; (11) $4.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $49.74; (9) $49.74; (10) $35.75; (11) $85.49.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Method for computing parity prices; transportation legislation; mutual-security program (foreign aid); amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw-worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; appropriations for defense; flood control.
D. (6) $949.98.
E. (7) $69.65; (9) $69.65; (10) $39.00; (11) $109.55.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (10) $770.98; (11) $770.98.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,875.12.
E. (7) $339.72; (9) $339.72; (10) $454.26; (11) $793.98.

A. Lloyd C. Halverson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Farm programs, health, social security, and possibly housing, taxation, farm credit and inflation control; antimonopoly, transportation, and alcoholic-beverage advertising.
D. (6) $1,686.
E. (7) $16.05; (9) $16.05; (10) $11.20; (11) $27.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, etc.[1] (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,796.43.
E. (6) $23.24; (7) $648.19; (9) $671.43; (10) $1,051.86; (11) $1,723.29.

A. William A. Hanscom, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Oil Workers International Union, CIO, 1840 California Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,830.
E. (7) $180; (9) $180; (10) $180; (11) $360.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., also 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (4) $150.83; (5) $133.15; (6) $64.85; (7) $109.07; (9) $555.40; (10) 1,230.50; (11) $1,785.90; (15) $150.83, Guthrie Lithograph Co., 1150 First Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry, including proposals involving Government controls over industry, national labor and tax policies, Federal expenditures and subsidies, industrial mobilization, Government competition with private enterprise, etc.
D. (6) $3,166.27.
E. (9) $666.27.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international, which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation.[1]
D. (6) $2,464.50.
E. (7) $44.95; (9) $44.95; (10) $37.90; (11) $32.85.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for United Nations; establishment of a Federal FEPC; restoration in cut made by independent offices appropriation bill for low-rent public housing units (for); Senate Joint Resolution 130 (against).
E. (2) $50; (6) $20; (9) $70; (10) $300; (11) $370.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
E. (7) $10.65; (9) $10.65; (11) $10.65.

A. Robert C. Harris, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764 and H. R. 7800.
D. (6) $1,000.76.
E. (6) $10.04; (7) $349.27; (8) $141.45; (9) $1,000.76; (10) $675.20; (11) $1,675.96.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in passage of S. 241, to amend Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, room 7501, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $500.
E. (6) $50; (9) $50; (10) $300.43; (11) $300.43.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock-tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control and other ranching expenditures, and livestock accounting methods.

A. Dow W. Harter, 412–14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of man-made domestic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes; repeal or reduction of present excise taxes on tires and tubes, and in certain other changes in our tax structure, and, generally, in other legislative proposals relating to tires and other manufactured rubber products which may come before Congress and committees thereof from time to time.
D. (6) $2,125.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $105.95; (9) $105.95; (10) $44.45; (11) $150.40.

A. Mrs. John E. Hayes, Box 72, Twin Falls, Idaho. President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
C. (2) Measures which affect the welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. (3) National Parent-Teacher.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, Suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 2594, S. 2645, H. R. 6546, S. 2918, H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258, S. Res. 169, H. R. 5189, H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, H. R. 7852, S. 106, S. 2713, H. R. 6802, H. R. 8124, H. R. 1938, H. R. 3622, H. R. 5505, H. R. 6174, S. 2504, S. 2164, S. 1267. (3) Stores magazine.
E. (6) $13.92; (7) $202.50; (8) $1.25; (9) $217.67; (10) $241.89; (11) $459.56.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, 1500 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, section 207.
E. (7) $391.29; (9) $391.29; (10) $460.20; (11) $851.49.

A. K. W. Hebertcn, Room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests covering any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $114.20; (9) $114.20; (10) $126.90; (11) $241.10.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction, support of legislation providing national school health services, appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers, bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers, appropriations for the Children's Bureau, appropriations for the national school-lunch program, emergency maternal and infant care.
E. (7) $31.50.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Renewal of Defense Production Act of 1952 (retention of Herlong amendment, discontinuance of Consumer Credit Control authority), H. R. 6546 and S. 2594; fair trade, H. R. 5767 (restoration of validity of nonsigner clause).
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (10) $100; (11) $200.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y. and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $375.01.
E. (7) $212.90; (9) $212.90; (10) $220.18; (11) $433.08.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $1,610.34.
E. (7) $1,665.73; (9) $1,665.73; (10) $1,355.51; (11) $3,021.24.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food canning industry.
D. (6) $2,312.49.
E. (7) $75.17; (9) $75.17; (10) $26.60; (11) $101.77.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects directly or indirectly the interests of local property agents.[1] (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $45.30.
E. (7) $45.30; (9) $45.30; (10) $297.68; (11) $342.98.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry and the wool industry.[1]
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice cream industry.
E. (4) $146.50; (9) $146.50; (11) $146.50.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,465.78.
E. (6) $2.85; (7) $212.93; (9) $215.78; (10) $148.82; (11) $364.60.

A. L. S. Hitchner, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 528 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. I have an interest in the current investigation on the use of chemicals on foods as authorized by the passage of H. R. 323.

A. Lawrence W. Hobbs, 727 Pittock Block, Portland, Oreg.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 727 Pittock Block, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) H. R. 3616.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., and Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Central Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the American merchant marine.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, CIO, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (17) $3,600; (9) $3,600; (10) $4,300; (11) $7,900.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life insurance business.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $27; (7) $415.82; (9) $442.82; (10) $545.16; (11) $987.98.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Victor Hood, 4209 Queensbury Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting labor, the National Defense Act, veterans' educational legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto; against H. R. 5234.
D. (6) $2,011.93.
E. (7) $646.93; (9) $646.93; (10) $440.47; (11) $1,087.40.

A. Jesse V. Horton, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $129.60; (9) $129.60; (10) $101.72; (11) $230.32.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Economic legislation affecting family life; against all fair trade bills.
D. (6) $110.75.
E. (4) $61.50; (5) $50.54; (11) $112.04.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; all legislation of interest to railway employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $500.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $929; (7) $538.89; (9) $1,467.89; (10) $1,486.31; (11) $2,953.20.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.
D. (6) $3,296.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. A joint venture organized in June 1950 for the purpose of obtaining relief for applicants for Federal leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Federal Government to assert title to submerged lands.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
E. (7) $122.48; (8) $2; (9) $24.48; (11) $124.48.

A. W. T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation generally favorable to economic development of airline operation.
D. (6) $2,156.

A. Becher A. Hungerford, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
B. George P. Byrne, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) We will seek legislation, etc., for higher tariffs and import quotas for screws, nuts, rivets, and similar fasteners.

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.
E. (6) $66.70; (7) $1,361; (9) $1,427.70; (10) $1,161.42; (11) $2,589.12.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,834.
E. (6) $24; (8) $236; (9) $260; (10) $264; (11) $524.

A. Sam C. Hyatt, Hyattville, Wyo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
E. (2) $750; (9) $750; (10) $750; (11) $1,500; (15) $750, J. D. Snyder, Chicago, Ill., salary.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,630.
E. (9) $22,019.91.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $25,000.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (10) $6,050; (11) $12,100; (15) $3,750, John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,250, W. E. Disney, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $750, Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

A. Carl Indergaard, Belfield, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Hanson, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (1) $185.04; (2) $630; (4) $144.50; (7) $548.21; (9) $1,507.75; (10) $795.98; (11) $3,811.48; (15).[1]

A. Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation—the Mason bill, H. R. 5064, in the Eighty-first Congress and the 1951 revenue bill.
D. (6) $2,147.50.
E. (3) $228.75; (8) $25; (9) $253.75; (10) $89.40; (11) $343.15; (15) $25, United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., bond; $228.75, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D. C., contributions.

A. Indians of California, Inc., 225 Powell Street, San Francisco, Calif., and 2838 Twenty-eighth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Congressional legislation affecting Indians of California.
D. (6) $3,140.50.
E. (9) $2,522.39.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the social-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (1) $750; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $1,650; (10) $1,650; (11) $3,300.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, room 311, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) General interest is in Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (10) $3,750; (11) $7,500; (15) $7,500, Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298; H. R. 3392; H. R. 30; H. R. 525; H. R. 7852; H. R. 7800.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $7.92; (9) $7.92; (11) $7.92.

A. Robert L. Irvin, 502 Jergins Trust Building, Long Beach, Calif.
B. Long Beach Harbor Commission, 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) Tidelands legislation; supporting Senate Joint Resolution 20.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (2) $310; (5) $439.30; (6) $122.86; (7) $2,041.63; (9) $2,913.79; (11) $3,713.73.

A. Boyd J. Jackson, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
B. Klamath Tribe of Indians, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
C. (2) Legislation relating to Indians; interested in enactment of S. 737, S. 738, S. 1174, S. 1322, S. 1386, H. R. 264, H. R. 1632, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3094, H. R. 3095, H. R. 3363, and H. R. 3808.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (2) Public Law 773, Eighty-first Congress; Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress; Defense Production Act of 1950; amendments to Defense Production Act of 1951.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (6) $15; (7) $203.40; (8) $30; (9) $248.40; (10) $224.30; (11) $472.70.

A. Seward H. Jacobi, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) A nominal interest in Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $300.
E. (5) $125; (9) $125; (10) $600; (11) $725.

A. Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Passage of H. R. 5678 (the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill) completes our legislative program.
D. (6) $20,874.96.
E. (2) $900; (4) $81.34; (5) $349.34; (6) $190.62; (7) $243.81; (9) $1,765; (15).[1]

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Cooley Clay Co. and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.
C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.
E. (6) $3; (7) $352.26; (9) $355.26; (10) $294.51; (11) $649.77.

A. William T. Jobe, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General interest in matters affecting ice industry.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945; Millwood dam; legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Resolution 532, Wage Stabilization Board; Defense Production Act; housing legislation in general; Concurrent Resolution 83; St. Lawrence waterways; proposed amendments to Clayton Act; proposed amendments to labor legislation; constitutional amendment now before the Judiciary Committee; Senate Joint Resolution 130.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $832.39; (9) $2,082.39; (10) $2,200.38; (11) $4,282.77.

A. Elmer Johnson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter S. 500, S. 2963, and H. R. 7971. (3) The Annuitant.
E. (7) $50; (9) $50; (10) $50; (11) $100.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1028 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping. I am unable to enumerate the bills and other legislative matters considered by me in connection with my work as legal counsel for Lake Carrier's Association.
D. (6) $2,916.
E. (7) $67.28; (9) $67.28; (10) $59.54; (11) $122.82.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (7) $3,510.
E. (7) $1,136.66; (9) $1,136.66; (10) $594.65; (11) $1,731.31; (15) $1,136.66.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.
D. (5) $8,500.

A. Walter R. Johnson, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries. S. 940, and similar bills.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $753; (8) $123; (9) $876; (10) $532.80; (11) $1,408.80.

A. Lillian Cohen, 56 Brook Manor, Pleasantville, N. Y., for Willard Johnson, general secretary, United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide Convention.
C. (2) Senate ratification of Genocide Convention.
E. (4) $20.88; (8) $.25; (9) $21.13; (10) $417; (11) $438.13; (15) June 26, 1952, Roza Pul, Inc., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y., $20.88, mimeographing.

A. Bascom F. Jones, Tennessee Railroad Association, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads operating in Tennessee.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the industry.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) S. 1149, reorganization of Department of Agriculture; S. 2549, special sheepherder bill; H. R. 5678, McCarran-Walter omnibus immigration bill; H. R. 5505, customs simplification bill; extension of Defense Production Act, opposed to, particularly title 4; agricultural appropriation bill; H. R. 7391, Defense Appropriation Act to apply Buy American Act to wool; H. R. 7861, deficiency appropriation bill which includes ten million for the erection of laboratories to study foot-and-mouth and similar diseases.
D. (6) $2,499.99.
E. (6) $192.94; (7) $1,148.21; (8) $291; (9) $1,632.15; (11) $1,632.15.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $253.18; (9) $253.18; (10) $254.31; (11) $507.49.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists and Proprietors International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Interest in general legislation affecting Labor, The National Defense Act, Veterans Educational Legislation, the District Barber Act, and any amendments thereto—against H. R. 5234.

A. Thomas J. Keefe, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the road building industry.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $24.00; (7) $1,237.73; (8) $238.36; (9) $1,500.09; (10) $1,431.86; (11) $2,931.95.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Retained as independent contractor by city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriations, civil defense, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing, and urban development, taxation and government controls, and veterans' educational benefits.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $750; (6) $352.73; (7) $577.46; (8) $48.59; (9) $1,728.78; (10) $1,976.34; (11) $3,705.12.

A. I. L. Kenen, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Zionist Council, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7005. (3) Memorandum on Aid to the Near East.
D. (6) $3,360.
E. (2) $897.82; (4) $2,160.32; (5) $150; (6) $1,388.91; (7) $1,791.20; (9) $6,358.25; (10) $408.85; (11) $6,767.10.

A. Earle R. Kennedy, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $1,125.
E. (7) $912.03; (9) $912.03; (11) $912.03.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry. Specifically interested in: (a) Amendments to Natural Gas Act of 1938 (H. R. 3285); (b) tidelands legislation (S. J. Res. 20, S. 940, H. R. 4484, etc.; (c) any tax bill that might affect the oil and gas industry; (d) antitrust legislation, i. e., bills seeking to amend Sherman Act, Clayton Act, Robinson-Patman Act (H. R. 3408, H. R. 1233, and S. 719); H. R. 6157.
D. (6) $500.
E. (2) $125; (5) $75; (6) $40; (7) $50; (8) $25; (9) $315; (10) $335; (11) $650.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, care of the American Legion, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) See statement attached.[1]
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John Hanson, operating under name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak.
D. (6) $539.80.
E. (2) $258.57; (5) $15.02; (8) $1,249.41; (9) $1,523; (10) $4,100.78; (11) $5,623.78; (15) $86.19, April 1, 1952, Lorraine Nelson, salary; $14, April 8, 1952, Marion Vranna, files; $86.19, April 15, 1952, Lorraine Nelson, salary; $500, April 23, 1952, Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, expense at Washington and travel; $86.19, May 1, 1952, Lorraine Nelson, salary; $195.80, April 30, 1952, Sax Aviation Co., transportation witness Schnell to Washington; $17.11; April 30, 1952, collector of internal revenue, social security.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,730.
E. (2) $2,730; (9) $2,730; (10) $2,550; (11) $5,280.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration. (3) VFW magazine.
D. $3,000.
E. (7) $135; (9) $135; (10) $109; (11) $244.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes. (a) Proposed amendment to the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1951. (b) H. R. 7784, introduced May 8, 1952, by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. (c) 64 Stat. 1137, ch. 1199; 65 Stat. 452, ch. 521. (d) For amendment of the Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 as amended.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Employed to seek adoption of amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session; Public Law 909; H. R. 7784 and H. R. 8271, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Williford I. King, Room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.
D. (6) $3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $330.
E. (7) $39.29; (9) $39.29; (10) $208.05; (11) $247.34.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.
E. (6) $50.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Melben Oil Co., Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting oil industry, especially tidelands.
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (6) $480.73; (7) $3,219.53; (8) $677.80; (9) $4,378.06; (10) $4,259.46; (11) $8,637.52; (15) $1,016.24, various dates in quarter, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging and related expenditures; $2,032.63, various, American Airlines, travel to-from Washing-

ton-Dallas; $471.07, various, Southwest Bell Telephone, Dallas, long-distance business calls; $55.72, various, Harvey's Restaurant, Washington, D. C., meals, etc.[1]

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
C. (2) Legislation affecting directly American agriculture.
D. (6) $1,250.
E.[1]

A. Robert E. Kline, Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Palmer-Bee Co., Detroit, Mich.
C. (2). Appearing before congressional committees relative to private bills for relief of Palmer-Bee Co., to reimburse company for loss of $725,285.60 in manufacture of radar equipment for Navy. S. 116 and H. R. 3739.
E. (6) $3; (7) $3; (9) $6; (10) $57; (11) $63.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
E. (7) $38.40; (9) $38.40; (10) $25.10; (11) $63.50.

A. John Kolanda, Room 413, Railway Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Employees' Department, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639 to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,400.

A. John A. Kratz, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For the enactment of S. 1000 and H. R. 3793, identical bills, to amend section 7 (h) of the Natural Gas Act.

A. Alfred U. Krebs, counsel, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Senate Joint Resolution 104—Sale of ships to Korea; H. R. 3715, H. R. 3271, H. R. 3797—Amendment of section 457 of Internal Revenue Code; House Joint Resolution 480—Extension of time for use of construction reserve funds; S. 241—Amendment, Merchant Marine Act, 1936; H. R. 5695—Trial by jury in admiralty; H. R. 5796—Amendment of Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; H. R. 7443—Transportation tax on passengers; H. R. 6245—Remission of duties on dunnage; H. R. 5678—Revision of immigration and naturalization laws; S. 2550—Revision of immigration and naturalization laws; H. R. 6959, H. R. 7759, H. R. 7877—Unloading of mail from vessels; H. R. 5505—Customs Simplification Act; S. 354—Overtime and holiday pay for Federal employees.
D. (6) $500.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing. Oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry. Supporting S. 3066; H. R. 3177, H. R. 7699; S. 3312. Opposing S. 2564; H. R. 3674.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex. A continuous study of State and Federal tax legislation to bring about constructive cooperation between community property and common law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the State and Federal tax structure; to support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner; to support the elimination of Federal estate taxes and restore estate taxation to the several States; have supported and will continue to support the American Bar Association's recommendation for tax equalization.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $900.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Defense Production Act amendments, Department of Agriculture appropriation bills, H. R. 7128, S. 3042, H. R. 3257, and H. R. 6292.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,648.15; (7) $55.84; (9) $2,703.99; (10) $2,821.01; (11) $5,525.

A. La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act amendments, Department of Agriculture appropriation bills, H. R. 7128, S. 3042, H. R. 3257, and H. R. 6292.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $2,648.15; (6) $98.01; (7) $195.38; (9) $2,941.54; (10) $3,273.17; (11) $6,214.71.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare, oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,458.34.
E. (7) $1,590; (9) $1,590; (10) $1,666; (11) $3,256.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc.)
D. (6) $6,499.98.
E. (7) $11.80; (9) $11.80; (10) $7.35; (11) $19.15.

A. Joseph S. Lawrence, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 N. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $4,220.95.
E. (7) $681.55; (9) $681.55; (10) $758.07; (11) $1,439.62.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically, this includes but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper, such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D.[1]

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting transportation including pending bills.
D. and E.[1]

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,445.20.
E. (2) $511.20; (4) $1,585.13; (6) $14.16; (9) $2,110.49; (10) $2,093.59; (11) $4,204.08.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. Sugar Act of 1948 and Public Law 140, Eighty-second Congress, amending the Sugar Act of 1948. Trade Agreements Act and tariff acts.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $2,013.10.
E.[1] (4) $59.30; (6) $20.67; (8) $133.13; (9) $213.10; (10) $1,799.87; (11) $2,012.97.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association. Revision and extension of Defense Production Act of 1950.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States (J. L. McCaskill, director), 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education. (3) Flash.
E. (2) $1,575.06; (4) $1,414.61; (5) $164.88; (6) $67.36; (7) $256.06; (9) $3,477.97; (10) $4,361.15; (11) $7,839.12; (15).[1]

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639, identical bills to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. All legislation of interest to railroad employees.

A. Mrs. Newton P. Leonard, 341 Sharon Street, Providence, R. I. (National Congress of Parents and Teachers.)
C. (2) Legislative interests: Welfare of children and youth in the field of education; social and economic well-being; child labor and environmental situations; Federal research agencies in education, health, juvenile protection and homemaking; world understanding and peace among nations. The national congress may support or oppose specific statutes and bills which relate to the area of its general legislative interests.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce. Specifically, this includes but is not limited to, the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, second session, October 10, 1951 (65 Stat. 373); ILO; custom duties, including copper, such as Public Law 38, Eighty-second Congress, first session, May 22, 1951.
D.[1]

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) $4,512.63.
E. (6) $4.63; (7) $7; (8) $1; (9) $12.63; (10) $57.89; (11) $70.52.

A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
D.[1]
E. (6) $25; (7) $300; (9) $325; (11) $325.

A. The Liaison Committee of the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries. S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes.
D. (6) $3,605.73.
E. (2) $3,128.23; (4) $260; (6) $75.50; (7) $142; (9) $3,605.73; (11) $3,605.73; (15) $856.41, April 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $928.57, May 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $1,343.25, June 1952, Weaver & Glassie, 1210 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C., legal fees and expenses; $477.50, (entire quarter), (printing, travel, meetings, and miscellaneous expenses.)

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas; manpower legislation, including universal military training and service; proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany; economic assistance (point 4); disarmament; expellees and displaced persons; educational exchange.
D. (6) $1,362.56.
E. (7) $137.57; (9) $137.57; (10) $85.65; (11) $222.22.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (Washington address: 1000 Vermont Avenue).
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific. (See p. 3.) [1]
D. (6) $6,451.11.
E. (2) $4,555.41; (5) $1,551.16; (6) $167.12; (7) $177.42; (9) $6,451.11; (10) $5,592.31; (11) $12,043.42.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance as it relates to Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character. House Joint Resolution 323 for limiting income-tax rates.
D. (6) $10,331.56.
E. (2) $3,166.50; (4) $2,047.99; (5) $765.52; (6) $255.22; (7) $2,405.39; (8) $3,530.47; (9) $12,173.09; (10) $10,292.07; (11) $22,465.16; (14) $52.75; (15).[1]

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mr. E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) As Washington representative I support or oppose legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry. During the second quarter of 1952 my chief legislative interest was to oppose the extension of price and wage controls. These controls are socialistic, arbitrary, unworkable, and inequitable. They add to the cost of goods, create disrespect for law and government, and should be promptly terminated. Other legislation with which I was concerned in the second quarter were items in the appropriation bills for agriculture and the Department of Defense that relate to the livestock and meat industry.
D. (6) $2,500.02.
E. (4) $42.37; (7) $110.21; 9) $152.58; (10) $83.01; (11) $235.59; (15) $43.37, April 10, 1952, May 7, 1952, Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $11.20, May 9, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment; $51.25, June 20, 1952, June 26, 1952, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.
C. (2) (a) Amendment to title V of Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, (b) H. R. 6846. (c) A proposed amendment with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges. (d) In favor of the bill.
D. (7) $375.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $2,595; (7) $589.59; (8) $39.99; (9) $715.53; (10) $659.57; (11) $1,375.10; (15) $47.33, April 3 to April 7, Hotel Muehleback, Kansas City, room; $13.79, April 3 to April 7, Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, room; $57.82, April 9 to April 12, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room; $14.10, April 22, Fan & Bill's, Washington, D. C., luncheon; $11.40, April 25, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., luncheon, etc.[1]

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major Steam Railroads of California. (See schedule attached.)[1]
C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project.
D. (6) $1,857.85.
E. (6) $5.88; (7) $1,013.15; (9) $1,019.03; (11) $1,019.03; (15) $102.06, June 4, 1952, Southern Pacific Railroad Co., San Francisco, transportation to Washington, D. C.; $10.80, June 5, 1952, Overland, Ltd., Southern Pacific Railroad, dinner; $10.10, June 9, 1952; Ted Lewis, Washington, D. C., dinner; $47.25, June 11, 1952, Willard Hotel, theater tickets; $15, June 11, 1952, United States post office, postage stamps, etc.[1]

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to the pipeline industry and activities against any proposed legislation we think harmful

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

to the industry. The committee is interested in S. 1889 and H. R. 5632. Both provide for amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act. We are opposed to some provisions of S. 1889. We are opposed to the enactment of any part of H. R. 5632.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. F. S. Lodge, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eighty-first Congress as H. R. 2756, to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes, and bills in the Eighty-second Congress such as S. 1693, to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; and H. R. 1755, to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $25.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (a) Insurance and reinsurance of war risks. War Damage Corporation Act of 1951 and War Disaster Act of 1951. S. 114, S. 439, S. 1309 and S. 1848, and similar bills in House of Representatives. No position for or against this legislation. (b) H. R. 7844 and other legislation relating to payroll deductions for Federal civilian employees and allotments from pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $1,150.
E. (6) $34.70; (9) $34.70; (10) $235.62; (11) $270.32; (15) $34.70, April–May–June, Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Detroit, Mich., long-distance telephone (legislative and other interests).

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 500 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Otto Lowe, University Club, Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting canning of food products.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See page 3).[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Passage of fair trade legislation, specifically H. R. 5767.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coaches as mobile homes.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend plan, as per H. R. 2679.
D. (6) $75.
E. (7) $75; (11) $75.

A. Gerald J. Lynch, Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
C. (See statement attached to preliminary report filed June 7, 1951.)[1]
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (4) $178; (5)[1]; (6)[1]; (9) $863.45; (10) $96.49; (11) $959.94; (15).[1]

A. A. L. Lynn, vice president, Island Creek Coal Co., Pond Creek Pocahontas Co., Huntington, W. Va.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc.; including so-called Federal mine-safety bill.
D. (6) $5,500.

A. John C. Lynn, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale-price maintenance; education; immigration legislation; Mexican farm-labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment-insurance payments; increased lending authority for Export-Import Bank; mutual-security program (foreign aid); Customs Simplification Act; amendment of BIR code relating to tax treatment of livestock; legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter; grazing land; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; tobacco; peanut-oil provisions of agricultural legislation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; REA; screw worm research appropriations; meat inspection funds appropriation; appropriation agricultural extension service; Department of Agriculture reorganization; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; family farm policy review; establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities; selective service; universal military training; fair trade; United States relationships to North Atlantic Treaty Nations; farm credit legislation; appropriations for defense; flood control.
D. (6) $2,156.22.
E. (7) $116.05; (9) $116.05; (10) $88.84; (11) $204.89.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railroad Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor—especially railroad labor.
D. (6) $600.

A. H. T. McAnly, Ernst & Ernst, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 7447.
E. (7) $313.18; (9) $313.18; (11) $313.18.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
C. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, specifically House Joint Resolution 466 to extend emergency powers; Senate Joint Resolution 161 to create a commission on labor-management relations.
D. (6) $2,499.99.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. In support of S. 2752, a bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers.
D. (6) $1,750.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $303.09; (9) $303.09; (10) $231.50; (11) $534.59.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government Employees and District of Columbia Government employees.
D. (6) $1,615.
E. (7) $11.20; (9) $11.20; (10) $15.20; (11) $26.40.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) (See attached statement.)[1]
D. and E.[1]

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $220.63.

A. Warren C. McClure, Box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $100; (9) $100; (11) $100.

A. Glen McDaniel, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Extension Defense Production Act; FCC appropriation bill; Walsh-Healey Act; defense appropriation bill.

A. Angus McDonald.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) Legislation on matters of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. A. J. McFarland, field secretary, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Christian amendment bills, House Joint Resolution 156; Senate Joint Resolution 29. The Christian Patriot, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (7) $10.
E. (10) $550; (11) $550.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, United States of America, 4012 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation filed or/and presented to Congress. Specific, repeal Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress; Public Law No. 439, Seventy-eighth Congress; amend 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, etc.; (3) caused to be published for fee.
D. (6) $180.
E. (2) $180; (9) $180; (10) $180; (11) $360.

A. M. C. McKercher, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, ORT Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.
D. (6) $1,017.81.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation in connection with parcel post.
D. (6) $1,458.
E. (7) $760.39; (9) $760.39; (10) $678.71; (11) $1,439.10.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry; specifically during the second quarter of 1952, S. 2444, H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, H. R. 6492, and H. R. 6925.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $287.50.
E. (7) $14.56; (9) $14.56; (10) $6.27; (11) $20.83.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. (See below under C (2) for name and address of clients.)
C. (2) S. 106, H. R. 4528, S. 2325, S. 2552, S. 2714, S. 2738, H. R. 7320, H. R. 6319, H. R. 6921, and H. R. 6720 on behalf of the American Optometric Association, Inc., care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio; on behalf of Ruth Obre Dubonnet, 50 E. Seventy-second Street, New York City, bill to reacquire American citizenship, S. 1772; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Conn., bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by the United States Government.
D. (6) $200.
E. (6) $40.70; (7) $6.20; (8) $21.25; (9) $68.15; (10) $154.36; (11) $222.51.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge and John Hanson, trustees operating under the names of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees in behalf of former owners of land sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.
C. (2) Are interested in S. 2563 and H. R. 6386 giving former owners of lands sold to the United States the right to repurchase the minerals in said lands.
E. (6) $98.84; (7) $3,145.76; (9) $3,244.60; (10) $3,359.24; (11) $5,603.84; (12) $2,948.58.

A. Lachlan Macleay, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) River and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American Merchant Marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $855.25; (9) $855.25; (10) $703.57; (11) $1,558.82.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secre-

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2950, Wages of Crew Members; S. 241, amendment, Merchant Marine Act, 1936; H. R. 5796, S. 991, amendment of Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; Senate Joint Resolution 150, removal of discriminations against American shipping; H. R. 6245, remission of duties on dunnage; Senate Joint Resolution 27, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 7072, Independent Offices Appropriation Act; S. 3086, H. R. 7005, Mutual Security Act of 1952; ILO Conventions Nos. 68, 69, 73, and 74.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (7) $31.43; (9) $31.43; (10) $31.43; (11) $62.86.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association. Interest to continue indefinitely.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $21.95; (7) $146.19; (9) $166.14; (11) $304.17.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry.
D. (6) $2,600.
E. (6) $21.95; (7) $146.19; (9) $166.14; (11) $304.17.

A. Mrs. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the interests of independent tire dealers.
D. (6) $60.
E. (7) $1; (9) $1; (11) $1.

A. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation having direct or specific relationship to air transportation costs, H. R. 508 (air-mail-subsidy-separation bill). In favor of enactment.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (4) $109.97; (9) $109.97; (10) $256.24; (11) $366.21.

A. Mrs. Etsu M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Passage of H. R. 5678 (the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill) completes our legislative program. With this report the undersigned resigns as legislative lobbyist of the Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee. No other report will be filed.
D. (6) $200.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) Passage of H. R. 5678 (the omnibus immigration and naturalization bill) completes our legislative program. With this report the undersigned resigns as legislative lobbyist for the Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee. No other report will be filed.
D. (6) $600.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York City.
B. American Jewish Congress, Inc.
C. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto.
D. (6) $112.50.
E. (7) $30; (9) $30; (11) $30.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,820.
E. (6) $21.90; (8) $221.10; (9) $243; (10) $186; (11) $429.

A. P. H. Mathews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C.[1]
E.[1] (7) $850.40; (9) $850.40; (10) $355; (11) $1,205.40.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M.D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 N. Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills relating to health and welfare.
D. (6) $2,815.48.
E. (7) $227.66; (8) $227.66; (9) $60.40; (10) $288.06.

A. E. A. Meeks, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate, Fleet-McGinley, Inc., Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla., an association composed of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Southern Railway System, Florida East Coast Railway Co., Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Railway Co., Live Oak, Perry & Gulf Railroad Co. and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association set forth under B.
D. (6) $320.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See attachment A).[1]
D. (6) $1,312.
E. (6) $42.72; (7) $39.25; (9) $81.97; (10) $79.51; (11) $161.48.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Senate Joint Resolution 27.
D. (6) $220.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See attached statement, p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $7,015.08.
E. (1) $225; (2) $1,666.67; (3) $3,500; (4) $760.01; (6) $28.82; (7) $834.58; (9) $7,015.08; (10) $1,831.70; (11) $8,846.78; (15).[1]

A. Charles C. Miller, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Rubber legislation and Customs Simplification Act.
E. (5) $239.01; (6) $90; (7) $107.17; (9) $436.18; (11) $436.18.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $150; (5) $39.37; (6) $13.81; (7) $624.82; (8) $72; (9) $900; (10) $900; (11) $1,800.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations: H. R. 7268, H. R. 8127, H. R. 6175, H. R. 6812, House Resolution 565.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $45.75; (7) $79.91; (8) $45.24; (9) $170.90; (10) $688.95; (11) $859.85.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $859.19; (6) $55.09; (7) $258.55; (8) $10; (9) $1,182.83; (10) $1,462.92; (11) $2,645.75.

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (2) $312.50; (8) $2.94; (9) $315.44; (10) $402.43; (11) $717.87.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (6) $565.
E. (3) $513.58; (4) $80.29; (5) $162.38; (6) $3.85; (7) $76.20; (8) $25; (9) $861.30; (10) $1,155.28; (11) $2,016.58; (15) $162.38, Norman E. Biorn, St. Paul, Minn., stenographers, postage, phone; $59.20, Radisson Hotel, Minneapolis, luncheon; $513.58, National Associated Businessmen, Washington, D. C., contribution; $80.29, St. Paul Letter Co., St. Paul, printing and mailing; $20.85, Bachman-Anderson Inc., St. Paul, travel and postage; $25, A. J. A. Imsdahl Co., St. Paul, accounting.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 605–607 Plaza Building, Post Office Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business and taxation such as Mason bill, H. R. 240, Davis bill, H. R. 1177, and Senator Williams' bill, S. 892.
D. (6) $682.03.
E. (2) $480.22; (3) $1,000; (4) $105.09; (5) $130; (6) $110.65; (7) $27.85; (8) $26.70; (9) $1,881.76; (10) $1,135.73; (11) $3,017.49; (15).[1]

A. Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., 1210 Waltower Building, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Association is interested in legislation relating to taxation of independent business, labor legislation, and encroachment of Government into private industry.
D. (6) $700.
E. (4) $28.11; (5) $8.87; (6) $1.25; (9) $38.23; (10) $927.33; (11) $965.56.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Price controls, forest-range improvement, foot-and-mouth-disease laboratory, regulation relating to brucellosis, etc.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (6) $35.86; (7) $572.05; (8) $40; (9) $647.91; (10) $1,276.17; (11) $1,924.08.

A. Donald Montgomery, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft Agricultural Implement Workers of America Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $326.86; (9) $326.86; (10) $441.45; (11) $768.31.

A. William W. Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.
B. The Townsend Plan Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Townsend Plan bills, H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
D. (6) $716.
E. (3) $10; (7) $248; (9) $258; (10) $223.73; (11) $481.73.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 7268 (civil function appropriation bill, 1953, and Senate Joint Resolution 150 (foreign discrimination against American-flag vessels).

A. Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Bank holding company bills and similar legislation.

A. Giles Morrow, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2348, S. 2351, S. 2518, S. 2519, S. 2753, favor if amended; S. 2712, S. 2713, S. 2746, favor; S. 2352, S. 2653, oppose.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $26.44; (6) $7.29; (7) $29.40; (9) $63.13; (10) $59.62; (11) $122.74.

A. Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

B. The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $106.75; (7) $352.20; (8) $3; (9) $461.95; (10) $420.58; (11) $882.53.

A. Moss & Weis, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 (S. 2645) and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (5) $7.25; (6) $96.31; (7) $93; (8) $159.47; (9) $356.03; (11) $356.03.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, Sixteenth and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the moving industry; S. 2653, a bill to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the United States Government for its employees, which we support.
D. (6) $77.07.
E. (4) $62.50; (6) $14.57; (9) $77.07; (10) $832; (11) $900.07.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Rhoads Murphey, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden of world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties, and adequate recognition of rights of conscience. (3) Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,299.98.
E. (6) $3.40; (7) $208.49; (9) $211.89; (10) $43.69; (11) $255.58.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $300; (11) $600.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Company, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $99.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) H. R. 7314, H. R. 3994, S. 1767, H. R. 2572, S. 1149, H. R. 5474, H. R. 565, H. R. 3527. (3) The Forest Farmer.
D. (6) $40.
E. (6) $3; (7) $142.93; (9) $145, 93; (10) $100.49; (11) $246.42.

A. Francis J. Myers, 2026 Land Title Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. National Foundation for Consumer Credit.
C. (2) Regulation W, Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.
D. (7) $937.50.
E. (7) $442.34; (9) $442.34.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation which directly or indirectly affects the interests of agricultural limestone producers.
D. (6) $785.07.
E. (2) $500; (4) $75; (5) $171.67; (7) $38.40; (9) $785.07; (10) $749.70; (11) $1,534.77; (15) $538.40, Robert M. Koch, salary; $100, Harry M. Atherton, 222 Express Court NW., Washington, D. C., rent; etc.[1]

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security and tax-privileged corporations in business. (3) Washington Report.
E. (2) $5,094.96; (4) $8.75; (5) $1,016.52; (6) $99.55; (8) $156.90; (9) $6,976.68; (10) $4,641.97; (11) $11,618.65; (15) $5,000, Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., fee; $699.96, Helen Herman, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (2) $3,601.10; (4) $130.91; (5) $449.87; (6) $341.52; (7) $876; (8) $963.12; (9) $6,362.52; (10) $7,557.53; (11) $13,920.05; (15)[1].

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418–419 Homer Building, 601 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all types, particularly bills relating to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) The Business School News and the Executive.
D. (6) $2,069.66.
E. (2) $5,191.83; (4) $1,768.70; (5) $1,024.19; (6) $63.91; (7) $444.25; (8) $126; (9) $8,618.88; (10) $10,194.97; (11) $18,813.85; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) S. 2298; H. R. 3392; H. R. 30; H. R. 525; H. R. 7852; H. R. 7800.
D. (6) $13,743.75.
E. (4) $44.47; (5) $2.16; (6) $55.48; (8) $11.09; (9) $113.20; (10) $38.21; (11) $151.41.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect electric-utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $83,481.53.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (1) $28,798.06; (2) $81,611.10; (4) $3,461.45; (5) $4,614.57; (6) $2,308.97; (7) $5,380.03; (8) $3,931.59; (9) $130,105.77; (10) $102,771.27; (11) $232,877.04; (15) $108.12, Byron S. Adams, 512 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing, $106.14. Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio, addressograph plates, multigraph machine supplies and maintenance, $190.74; American Airlines, Inc., 910 South Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Okla., transportation, $191.39, American Photocopy Equipment Co., 2849 North Clark Street, Chicago, Ill., supplies for Auto-stat; $15, American Trade Association Executives, 820 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C., registration fee; $471.05, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., First and H Streets SE., Washington, D. C., office supplies, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Independent Tire Dealers, Inc., 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in statutes or bills which affect the interests of independent tire dealers; at present interested in H. R. 2820 and S. 719 (against). (3) Dealer News.
D. (6) $71.97.
E. (2) $60; (4) $0.57; (6) $10.40; (7) $1; (9) $71.97; (10) $1.52; (11) $73.49.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
C. Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents. (3) American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,633.43.
E. (2) $3,203.04; (5) $462.82; (6) $300.41; (7) $45.30; (8) $198; (9) $4,209.57; (10) $4,422.26; (11) $8,631.83; (15) $2,423.04, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., salary; $780, Margaret E. Yeager, 4115 Nicholas Avenue SW., Washington, salary; $360, Washington Loan & Trust Co., Washington, D. C., office rent; $45.30, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., travel expense; $300.41, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy Ration Statute (34 U. S. C. 902a); interested also in passage of H. R. 5012 and S. 2083, both of which are likewise designed to amend the Navy Ration Statute; interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.
D. (6) $131.80.
E. (2) $125; (7) $6.80; (9) $131.80; (10) $56; (11) $187.80; (15) $175, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing. There were no specific legislative interests during this quarter.
E. (10) $164.50; (11) $164.50.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting postal employees, including supervisors, and the postal service. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $6,001.25.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (2) $2,400; (4) $2,142.43; (5) $300; (6) $10; (7) $129.60; (9) $4,981.03; (10) $4,623.37; (11) $9,604.40.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Public Relations Department and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $44,438.38.

E. (1) $263.60; (2) $19,246.72; (4) $3,639.30; (5) $3,897.37; (6) $587.53; (7) $4,756.58; (8) $273.73; (9) $32,664.83; (10) $27,935.35; (11) $60,600.18; (15).[1]

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 500, S. 2968, and H. R. 7971. (3) The Annuitant.

D. (6) $300.

E. (4) $250; (7) $50; (9) $300; (10) $300; (11) $600.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of the travel industry.

D. (6) $3,980.

E. (2) $333.99; (4) $18.50; (5) $78; (6) $12; (9) $442.49; (10) $442.49; (11) $884.98.

A. National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular which would affect our position—United States storekeeper-gaugers.

D. (6) $966.

E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $500; (11) $1,000; (15) $500, Robert E. McLaughlin, care of Roberts & McInnis, 400 DeSales Building, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street, Washington, D. C., legal representation and advice.

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for United Nations (for); establishment of a Federal FEPC (for); restoration in cut made by independent offices appropriation bill for low-rent public housing units (for); Senate Joint Resolution 130 (against).

E. (2) $50; (6) $20; (9) $70; (10) $300; (11) $370.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

E. (2) $600; (7) $10.65; (9) $610.65; (10) $600; (11) $1,210.65.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D. (6) $292,582.64.

E. (2) $3,812.49; (4) $394.09; (7) $1,957.11; (8) $21.25; (9) $6,184.94; (10) $4,778.44; (11) $10,963.38; (15) $2,312.49, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; $1,500, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; $75.17, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., local transportation; $13.28, Louis Ratzesberger, Jr., Hoopeston, Ill., travel expense; $20, Sibyl A. Sills, Washington, D. C., transcript; $137, C. A. Ray, New Era, Mich., travel expense; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

E. (9) $21,786,74.

A. National Committee To Limit Federal Taxing Powers, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to taxes and the national debt.

D. (6) $629.56.

E. (4) $579.33; (8) $195.79; (9) $775.12; (10) $172.24; (11) $947.36; (15) $13.09, Columbia Business Service, 1028 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C., autotyped letters; $12.35, Margaret E. M. Crosby, 4305 Van Ness Street NW., Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses; $25.62, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., postage and mailroom service; $137.70, Capozio-Kenney, 915 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., art work, etc.[1]

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.

D. (6) $100.

E. (9) $557.07.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.

D. (6) $164.97.

E. (2) $135.50; (5) $23.68; (6) $5.79; (9) $164.97; (10) $396.79; (11) $561.76; (15) $143.89, Callaway & Reed, Dallas-Washington, retainer; $10.50, Louise Paine, Memphis, Tenn., salary.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $8,859.66.

E. (2) $4,877.53; (4) $1,494.15; (5) $196.50; (6) $197.94 (7) $2,093.54; (9) $8,859.66; (10) $5,047.49; (11) $13,907.15; (15).[1]

A. National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Its only legislative interest is opposition to peacetime conscription. (3) Conscription News.

D. (6) $2,649.63.

E. (2) $178.89; (4) $536.63; (5) $282.18; (6) $77.88; (7) $79.12; (8) $38.63; (9) $1,193.35; (10) $12,797.54; (11) $13,990.89; (15).[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 7852, and all other legislation relating to the postal service.

D. (7) $429.55.

E. (1) $900; (4) $373.74; (5) $15.10; (7) $140.71; (9) $1,429.55; (10) $2,459.76; (11) $389.31; (15) $964.70, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., public relations counsel; $266.52; Geo. F. McKiernan, 1035 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill., printing; $107.22, Olson Letter Service, 19 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; mimeographing; $76.01, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging; $14, Time magazine, 540 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill., subscription.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2357, H. R. 8210, S. 2594, H. R. 7314, H. R. 7391, H. R. 8337, H. R. 8338, S. 3388, H. R. 1535, S. 2362, S. 2518, S. 2519.

D. (6) $3,250.

E. (2) $1,692.32; (4) $204.53; (5) $214; (6) $86; (7) $182.17; (8) $457.48; (9) $2,826; (10) $2,024.50; (11) $4,850.50; (15) $1,031.48; Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, Richmond, Va., withheld taxes and social security; $2,500, International Federation of Agriculture Producers, Washington, D. C., membership dues; $228.09, C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone; $11.05, Addressograph Multigraph Corp., Washington, D. C., office supplies and expenses; $495.48, John H. Davis, Washington, D. C., salary; $306.99, John J. Riggle, Washington, D. C., salary, etc.[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Senate Resolution 326, immigration refugees from Western European Nations; S. 2968, civil-service retirement; H. R. 7800, social security, H. R. 5678, immigration; S. 2550, and H. R. 7376, immigration. (3) Junior American.

E. (2) $249.99; (4) $47.80; (9) $297.79; (10) $724.09; (11) $1,021.88.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as mutual-assistance program, appropriations and supplementary appropriations particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including universal military training and service, proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany, economic assistance (point 4), disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange. (3) Peace action.

D. (6) $7,797.08.

E. (2) $5,169.08; (4) $422.27; (5) $1,519.01; (6) $124.25; (7) $265.88; (8) $1,868.73; (9) $9,309.22; (10) $11,230.44; (11) $20,539.66; (15) $1,224.99, Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $398.77, National Publishing Co., Washington, D. C., printing; $1,099.98, James Finucone, salary; etc.[1]

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Favor any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and oppose measures that work contrariwise.

D. (6) $27,149.48.

E. (2) $12,123.50; (4) $4,270.69; (5) $5,846.44; (6) $835.48; (7) $4,770.12; (8) $949.17; (9) $28,795.40; (10) $35,277.48; (11) $64,072.88; (15).[1]

A. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance—S. 1140, S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, H. R. 7800.

D. (6) $19,533.32.

E. (1) $4,137.32; (4) $15,396; (9) $19,533.32; (10) $15,233.05; (11) $34,766.37; (15) $8,049.16, Medical Mailing Service, Inc., 2611

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill., mailing; $563.64, Low's Reproduction Service, Inc., 205 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing and printing; $200.66, Lincoln Printing Co., 732 Sherman Street, Chicago, Ill., printing and mailing; $4,645, Riley Printing Co., 732 West Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill., printing and postage; $1,800, E. Hofer & Sons, 1405 Southwest Harbor Drive, Portland, Oreg., subscription; $1,019.47, Norman Letter Service, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, mimeograph and mailing; etc.[1]

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. (3) News Letter and Qualified Contractor.

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting shipping.[1]

E. (2) $5,531.25; (4) $452.37; (5) $1,350; (6) $388.92; (7) $585.02; (9) $8,307.56; (10) $8,756.16; (11) $17,063.72.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation which affects favorably or adversely the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Women.

D. (6) $26,474.40.

E. (1) $875; (4) $243.06; (5) $100.71; (7) $57.88; (8) $1,276.65; (9) $1,339.14; (10) $2,615.79.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, Suite 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk.

D. (6) $143,316.71.

E. (2) $7,152.48; (4) $7,188.72; (5) $380; (8) $5,960.01; (9) $20,681.21; (10) $32,558.36; (11) $53,239.57; (15) $110, Sound Studios, Inc., advance postage on transcription; $24.48, Congressional Quarterly News, subscription; $100, E. C. Hallbeck, expenses; $340.80, Radio station WCFM, program and talent; etc.[1]

A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

D. (6) $100.

E. (4) $57.36; (6) $91.01; (7) $263.19; (8) $32.62; (9) $444.18; (10) $543.41; (11) $987.59.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Opposing S. 719.

D. (6) $766.55.

E. (2) $500; (4) $109; (5) $30; (6) $126.55; (7) $1; (9) $766.55; (11) $766.55; (15) $500, Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

E. (2) $7,352.89; (6) $6.25; (7) $139.34; (9) $7,498.428; (10) $72.60; (11) $7,571.08.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in all housing legislation.

D. (6) $19,186.37.

E. (2) $7,605.09; (3) $50; (4) $306.77; (5) $1,987.40; (6) $587.50; (7) $709.08; (8) $9,024.41; (9) $20,270.25; (10) $14,562.88; (11) $34,833.13; (15) $25, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C., contribution; $25, National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, New York City, N. Y., contribution; $765.31, Ann T. Henderson, 4205 Seventieth Avenue, Landover Hills, Md., salary; $497.76, Gloria M. Fullmer, 12605 Hathaway Drive, Silver Spring, Md., salary; $1,480.81, Laurine A. Winlack, 1032 Crittenden Street NE., salary; $1,612.60, Alexander L. Crosby, 20 West Fortieth Street, New York City, N. Y., editorial services, etc.[1]

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.

D. (6) $475.75.

E. (1) $22.15; (2) $152.20; (4) 46.07; (5) $17.27; (6) $2.31; (7) $70.31; (9) $510.31; (10) $238.11; (11) $748.42.

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) S. 2791, H. R. 6843, Senate Joint Resolution 130, H. R. 5693, and H. R. 5505.

D. (6) $12,650.

E. (1) $462.27; (2) $1,649.37; (4) $262.02; (5) $793.41; (6) $69.57; (7) $178.86; (8) $132.27; (9) $3,547.77; (10) $3,431.35; (11) $6,979.12; (15).[1]

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

D. (6) $9,796.26.

E. (10) $5,626.68.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.

D. (6) $11,304.96.

E. (1) $2,346.11; (2) $3,607.56; (4) $1,446.89; (5) $200.01; (6) $14.19; (7) $4,534.86; (8) $2,813.34; (9) $14,962.96; (10) $10,898.16; (11) $25,861.12; (15) $636.41, Darby Printing Co., Twenty-fourth and Douglas Streets NE., Washington, D. C.; $236.83, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., First and H Streets SE., Washington, D. C.; $98.87, Lithographic Photo Service, Inc., 1713 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; $204, Sauls Lithograph Co., 1731 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

D. (6) $41,527.69.

E. (1) $552.16; (2) $25,216.97; (4) $3,092.83; (6) $1,176.09; (7) $4,074.84; (8) $993.64; (9) $35,311.24; (10) $50,707.72; (11) $86,018.96; (15).[1]

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

C. (2) Appropriations for public health.

E. (1) $600; (7) $106.71; (9) $706.71; (10) $622.64; (11) $1,329.35.

A. National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation that more or less specifically affects the paint, varnish, and lacquer industry.[1]

E. (7) $9.50; (9) $9.50; (10) $15.50; (11) $25.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Defense Production Act and 1952 amendments; S. 2918; H. R. 7256; H. R. 7257; H. R. 7258; appropriations bills 1953; S. 2713, H. R. 6802; H. R. 5505; H. R. 1938; H. R. 7447; H. R. 7554; H. R. 7852; S. 106; H. R. 8124; H. R. 3622; S. 2504; H. R. 6174; S. 2164; S. 1267; S. Res. 169; H. R. 5189; H. R. 5767; H. R. 6367; H. R. 7800.

E. (2) $4,250; (4) $2,646.45; (5) $517.60; (6) $13.92; (7) $222.18; (8) $2.50; (9) $7,652.65; (10) $5,683.39; (11) $13,336.04; (15) $3,875, John C. Hazen, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., fee; $375, Erskine Stewart, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., fee.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Renewal of Defense Production Act of 1952; retention of Herlong amendment; discontinuance of consumer credit control authority; H. R. 6546 and S. 2594, fair trade; H. R. 5767, restoration of validity of nonsigner clause.

E. (2) $800; (4) $600; (5) $400; (6) $200; (9) $2,000; (10) $1,700; (11) $3,700; (15) $500, Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $300, Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Retired Teachers Association, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.

C. (2) Forand bill, H. R. 2764 and H. R. 7800.

D. (6) $1,000.76.

E. (6) $10.04; (7) $849.27; (8) $141.45; (9) $1,000.76; (10) $675.20; (11) $1,675.96.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $435.

E. (2) $1,593.93; (5) $42,90; (6) $71.69; (7) $762.11; (8) $967.09; (9) $3,437.72; (10) $5,708.15; (11) $9,145.87; (15) $19, American Bar Association, 1140 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., membership dues; $71.69, the C. & P. Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone bill; $603.14, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and FICA taxes; $125, Ruscoe H. Crowell, Stoneleigh Court, Washington, D. C., annual audit; $42.90, Ginn's, 1417 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., stationery and supplies; $61.32, Gulf Oil Corp., 1515 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa., charges, etc.[1]

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation which will further the country's rural electrification program. (3) Rural Electrification Magazine.

D. (6) $9,493.40.

E. (1) $1,506.10; (2) $2,434.25; (3) $1,010; (4) $1,336.75; (5) $426; (6) $404.86; (7) $1,009.63; (8) $200; (9) $8,327.59; (10) $6,539.32; (11) $14,866.91; (15) $115.40, Ad-

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

dressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio, office overhead; $706.06; Advertisers Mat Service, 1428 U Street NW., Washington, D. C., public relations; $2,106.53, American Airlines, Inc., 910 South Boston Avenue, Tulsa, Okla., travel; $446.24, Lewis E. Amend, Rocky Ford, Colo., travel, food, and lodging; $77.02, T. B. Amis, Newberry, S. C., travel, food, and lodging; $152.50, American Management Association, 330 West Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., membership application, etc.[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

D. (6) $16,850.

E. (1) $250; (2) $8,051.30; (4) $6,818.48; (5) $589.47; (6) $709.88; (7) $2,272.93; (8) $184.98; (9) $18,877.04; (10) $15,738.94; (11) $34,615.98; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimical to interests of savings and loan industry.

D. (6) $2,804.97.

E. (2) $2,500; (4) $298.68; (9) $2,798.68; (10) $2,828.42; (11) $5,627.10.

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (2) $3,900; (5) $1,440.87; (6) $220.17; (9) $5,561.04; (10) $6,717.50; (11) $12,278.54.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically: Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Davis-Bacon Act, Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence bills, National Science Foundation, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills. (3) Legislative Bulletin.

D. (6) $51,320.50.

E. (2) $1,183; (4) $279.90; (9) $1,462.90; (10) $875; (11) $2,337.90.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) General legislative interests relate to corporate income-tax legislation.

D. (6) $13,067.88.

E. (1) $2,334.49; (2) $3,324.94; (4) $1,982.45; (5) $441. 47; (6) $1,486.15; (7) $1,518.25; (9) $11,087.75; (10) $16,752.23; (11) $27,839.98; (15) $32.28, Railway Express Agency, 817 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., express charges; $1,997.63, Standard Printing and Letter Service, 517 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., printing; $28.50, Ardmore Printing Co., 200 South Peoria, Chicago, Ill., printing, etc.[1]

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, Box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Favor tax limitation.

D. (6) $260.

E. (2) $375; (9) $375; (10) $2,050; (11) $2,425.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (2) S. 1149, S. 2549, H. R. 5678, H. R. 5505, extension of Defense Production Act, agricultural appropriation bill, H. R. 7391, H. R. 7861.

D. (6) $2,291.50.

E. (2) $2,499.99; (6) $240.60; (7) $2,229.14; (8) $1,144.40; (9) $6,114.13; (10) $5,493.24; (11) $11,607.37.

A. William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reduction of Federal expenditures, revision of tax laws, maintenance of anti-trust laws, opposition to wage and price controls, and allocations beyond those necessary for defense.

D. (6) $4,522.73.

E. (9) $606.05.

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) Legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) $250.

E. (8) $101.26; (9) $101.26; (10) $153.09; (11) $254.35; (15) $101.26, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the mortgage-banking industry.

D. (6) $6,141.96.

E. (2) $98.19; (5) $1,469.58; (6) $424.23; (7) $525; (9) $2,517; (10) $1,799.72; (11) $4,316.72.

A. C. Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).

E. (9) $9.80; (11) $10.80.

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

A. George H. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

D. (6) $2,391.30.

E. (6) $6.90; (7) $1,754.91; (9) $1,761.81; (10) $1,676.72; (11) $3,438.53; (15).[1]

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $375.

A. Harold F. Neumann, 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

B. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely affecting business.

E. (4) $4.50; (5) $10; (6) $16.05; (9) $30.55; (10) $94.99; (11) $125.54.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely effecting business.

D. (6) $80.

E. (4) $7.86; (5) $10; (6) $16.05; (8) $255; (9) $288.91; (10) $449.99; (11) $738.90; (15) $255, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., Washington, D. C., dues; $30.55, Harold F. Neumann, Jersey City, N. J., expenses.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

A. Herschel D. Newsom, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange. (3) The National Grange Monthly.

D. (6) $2,138.89.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,217.50.

E. (7) $195; (9) $195; (10) $195; (11) $390.

A. W. R. Noble, Suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel DeSoto Building, St. Louis, Mo., and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

C. (2) Keeping associations informed as to pending legislation and interpretations of legislation; special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer.

D. (6) $3,375.

E. (6) $141.80; (7) $348.17; (8) $239.05; (9) $729.02; (10) $717.02; (11) $1,446.04.

A. J. S. Noffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private (non-tax-supported) schools.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) All legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $4,437.52.
E. (7) $260.80; (8) $19; (9) $279.80; (10) $183.45; (11) $463.25.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, mineral, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $3,100.
E. (2) $2,445.28; (9) $2,445.28; (10) $2,570.24; (11) $5,015.52; (15) $2,445.28, Fred J. Fredrickson, Valley City, N. Dak., salary and expenses.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting physicians and surgeons in the practice of their profession.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan, taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.
E. (9) $20; (11) $20.

A. A. E. Notarianni, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt and Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., acting in the interest of P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 8159 for the relief of P. Diacon Zadeh.

A. Charles E. Noyes, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting certified public accountants.[1]
D. (6) $375.
E. (6) $50; (7) $169.79; (9) $219.79; (10) $610.15; (11) $329.94.

A. T. C. Nugent, 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
B. The California Co., 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) All types of legislation, regulation, or order affecting the limits of the United States and the procedures by which exploration and production of oil and gas are to be accomplished; interested in the enactment of any law or resolution that will authorize the development of submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (6) $90; (7) $925; (9) $1,015; (11) $1,015.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in acquiring information from time to time on all legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 27, H. R. 54, S. 2639, H. R. 6525, H. R. 5594, H. R. 7800
D. (6) $7,160.34.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.[1]
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $131.88; (7) $156.74; (8) $11.65; (9) $300.27; (10) $81.21; (11) $381.48.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 320 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company; H. R. 5693, an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930, opposed.
E. (6) $229.18; (7) $135.08; (8) $17.55; (9) $381.81; (10) $373.94; (11) $755.75.

A. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests; Senate Joint Resolution 27 and House Joint Resolution 337.
E. (7) $215.56; (9) $215.56; (10) $417.66; (11) $633.22.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; etc. (3) American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $1,929.24.
E. (7) $16.95; (9) $16.95; (10) $17.05; (11) $34.

A. Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Sixth and Cherry Streets, Chattanooga, Tenn.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to public power.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $100; (8) $60; (9) $160; (10) $160; (11) $320.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,051; (6) $77.94; (9) $3,253.94; (10) $3,227.91; (11) $6,481.85.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post-Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the classified employees of the Federal Government.
D. (6) $68.36.
E. (2) $119.50; (4) $20.82; (9) $140.32; (11) $140.32.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,430.
E. (10) $546; (11) $546.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Better laws for maternal and child health and welfare.
D. (6) $40.
E. (7) $40; (11) $40.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the merchant marine, particularly the tanker division thereof, including, without limitation, amendments relating to titles 14, 33, and 46 of the United States Code Annotated, the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Transportation Act of 1940, appropriations relating to agencies charged with the duty of administering laws affecting transportation, etc.
D. (6) $200.
E. (2) $900; (9) $900; (10) $900; (11) $1,800.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 7073 and H. R. 7074, airman training bills, and H. R. 7656, GI training bill.
D. (6) $3,217.13.
E. (2) $1,683.82; (4) $370.21; (5) $172.78; (6) $170.70; (7) $254.58; (9) $2,652.09; (11) $2,652.09.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, and Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, all of Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous-coal industry and the television-broadcasting industry.

A. George F. Parrish, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.

C. (2) St. Lawrence seaway project.
D. (6) $3,249.99.
E. (7) $124.50; (11) $124.50.

A. James G. Patton, 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office), 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, care of White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect the interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $5.65; (7) $357.82; (8) $0.75; (9) $364.22; (10) $306.87; (11) $671.09.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States, Agana, Guam, M. I.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $6.35; (6) $12.43; (7) $544.75; (8) $3; (9) $566.53; (10) $132.18; (11) $698.71.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.
B. U. S. Airlines, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) For legislation favorably affecting freight air carriers and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436 and other bills separating mail subsidy so as to allow freight air carriers to carry mail.
D. (6) $416.66.
E. (6) $30.76; (7) $14.64; (8) $1.90; (9) $47.30; (10) $148.71; (11) $196.01; (12) $1,029.33; (13) $47.30.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) All legislation which might affect the New Haven Railroad and its subsidiaries (the Connecticut Co., New England Transportation Co.).
D. (6) $1,996.50.
E. (7) $54.25; (9) $54.25; (10) $81.20; (11) $135.45.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.
C. (2) Excess profits tax bills.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Excess profits tax and excise tax bills.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: None.
D. (6) $52.50.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Vegetable Products, Inc., Vacaville, Calif.; Gentry, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Puccinelli Packing Co., Turlock, Calif.; and J. R. Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho; all producers of dehydrated onions and other vegetables.
C. (2) Tariff and customs legislation, appropriations for Tariff Commission. Customs simplification bill, H. R. 5505. Against certain provisions which are not truly simplifications of customs procedure or administration. Tariff Commission appropriation, H. R. 7072—for.
D. (6) $100.
E. (7) $1.80; (9) $1.80; (11) $1.80.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, foreign trade, agricultural and appropriations for agriculture and Tariff Commission. Customs simplification bill, H. R. 5505, against certain provisions which are not truly simplifications of customs procedures or practices.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif., Northwest Nut Growers, Dundee, Oreg., and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif., agricultural cooperative marketing associations.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters. Agricultural appropriations. Customs revisions: H. R. 5505—against. Defense Production amendments: H. R. 7072—For. H. R. 7952—For.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (4) $241.92; (6) $26.75; (7) $39.75; (9) $308.42; (10) $49.88; (11) $358.30; (15) $205.81, various, Batt Bates 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $30.60, June 30, 1952, C. E. Hill, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $11.76, June 2, 1952, Western Union Telegraph Co., 708 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telegrams.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association and Cultivated Mushroom Institution of America, both of Kennett Square, Pa.
C. (2) Tariff and customs legislation. Tariff Commission appropriation, H. R. 7072, for.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; and Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers Association, New York City, manufacturers of fountain pens and mechanical pencils.
C. (2) Tariff Commission appropriation, tariff and tax legislation. H. R. 7072, for increase in Tariff Commission appropriation.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pin Clip and Fastener Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign-trade legislation generally, and defense production legislation. Customs simplification bill, H. R. 5505—Against certain provisions which are not truly simplifications of customs procedure or administration. H. R. 6843 and S. 2791—For H. R. 7072—For increase in Tariff Commission appropriation.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (4) $9.55; (6) $14.97; (7) $71.75; (9) $96.27; (11) $96.27; $12.52, April 30, 1952, C. & P. Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (See explanatory statement.)[1]

A. James E. Poulton, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. Indefinite. (See report filed by International Association of Machinists.)

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,062.54.
E. (7) $5.90; (9) $5.90; (10) $6.10; (11) $12.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. William H. Press, Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $3,712.50.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. William M. Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of Canal Zone, Balboa, C. Z.
C. (2) All legislation affecting employes on the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (2) $260; (3) $100; (5) $140; (6) $55; (7) $1.175; (8) $70; (9) $1,800; (10) $1,800; (11) $3,600.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Member of the law firm of Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. Oliver & Donnally is general counsel for the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City, and represents and advises that association in all legal matters including Federal legislation.
E. (10) $10.25; (11) $10.25.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry.
D.[1]
E.[1] (4) $136.80; (7) $100; (9) $236.80; (10) $236.80; (11) $473.60.

A. The Prudential Insurance Company of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the business of the company.
E.[1] (2) $3,500; (7) $732.22; (9) $4,232.22; (10) $2,778.81; (11) $7,011.03.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E. (8) $9.80; (9) $9.80; (11) $10.80.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests, foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
E. (6) $5.13; (8) $27.20; (9) $32.33; (10) $6.40; (11) $38.73.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by the Congress in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and such other legislation as may affect the development of an adequate merchant marine.
D. (6) $406.25.
E. (7) $104.89; (9) $104.89; (10) $67.59; (11) $171.48.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (7) $267.40; (9) $267.40; (11) $267.40.

A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS); Suite 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) CCBS will oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I-A clear channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I-A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.
D.[1]
E.[1] (7) $503.62; (9) $503.62; (10) $558.01; (11) $1,061.63.

A. Earl Quale and Arno Wisness of Watford City, N. Dak.
B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge, and John H. Ha..son, trustees, operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak., trustees on behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States seeking recovery of mineral rights.

A. Frank Quigley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting Bell System communications: (a) Defense Production Act of 1950 (as amended); King tax bill, proposed amendment to Communications Act of 1934, and Federal-aid highway legislation. (b) S. 2594; H. R. 7893; S. 658; S. 2585, and H. R. 6697.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $825.68; (9) $825.68; (10) $917.61; (11) $1,743.29.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, 47 Beaver Street, New York City; United Cerebral Palsy Associations, 50 West Fifty-seventh, New York City; Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 537 Fifth Avenue, New York City; National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York City.
C. (2) Public Health. The specific interest is to present the need for adequate appropriations by the Federal legislature for research in the fields of diseases which kill and disable people.
D. (6) $6,874.98.
E. (2) $2,399.98; (5) $638.56; (6) $285.24; (7) $1,707.91; (9) $5,031.69; (10) $3,554.83; (11) $8,586.52.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $87.60; (9) $87.60; (11) $87.60.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems. Specific legislative interests: (a) Amendment to Social Security Act (H. R. 7800). (b) Interior Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1953. (c) Army Civil Functions appropriation bill, fiscal year 1953. (d) Senate Joint Resolution 27, St. Lawrence seaway and power project.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washton, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interest: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Extension Defense Production Act; FCC appropriation bill; Walsh-Healy Act; defense appropriation bill. (3) RTMA.
E. (2) $2,145; (8) $38.76; (9) $2,183.76; (10) $3,570.93; (11) $5,754.69.

A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sole proprietor.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) For enactment of 30-year retirement regardless of age at half-pay based on the 5 years of highest earnings, S. 1305 and H. R. 63.
D. (6) $133.
E. (1) $18.48; (4) $119.15; (5) $79.18; (6) $16.38; (7) $52.10; (8) $5.34; (9) $290.63; (10) $184.82; (11) $475.45.

A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the members of the association have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing. There have been no specific legislative interests in the period April 1, 1952, to June 30, 1952.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry. No specific bills at this time.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving silver. H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,249.98.
E. (7) $1,060.67; (9) $1,060.67; (10) $859.86; (11) $1,920.53.

A. Frederick V. Rand, 10608 Nash Place, Kensington, Md.
B. One employer only, namely, the Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $110.

A. H. J. Raymond, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Ernst & Ernst, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 7447.
E. (7) $916.64; (9) $916.64; (11) $916.64.

A. Jacob Reck, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers' Association, 1346 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supported amendment to Defense Production Act of 1950 decontrolling price ceilings on toilet preparations and beauty or barber shop equipment and supplies.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (8) $15.20; (9) $15.20; (10) $9.50; (11) $24.70.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The organization is interested in the over-all field of social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) $5,449.98.

A. Otie M. Reed, Wyatt Building, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Creameries Association, 817 New York Building, St. Paul, Minn.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers and dairy product manufacturing concerns.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $1,500; (4) $42.30; (5) $150; (7) $233.68; (8) $42.75; (9) $1,968.68; (10) $1,506.06; (11) $8,476.76.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. Specific interests: S. 2358, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle; S. 2361, a bill to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers; S. 2362, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict certain operations of private carriers by motor vehicle, and to restrict the leasing of vehicles. Position: Generally in opposition to all three, but favorable to amendments thereof. In support of S. 2752, a bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers.
D. (6) $6,645.94.
E. (2) $2,900.30; (4) $3,152.58 (5) $247.81; (6) $206.10; (7) $104.15; (8) $35; (9) $6,645.94; (10) $4,060.43; (11) $10,706.37; (15) $1,116.42, April 14, April 28, May 12, May 26, June 16, extra, June 23, American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. bi-weekly news letter; $440.64, April 7, Federal Lithograph Co., 6011 Blair Road NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $163.15, April 7, Huff Duplicating Co., 1602 L Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $43.50, April 9, Ward-Paul-Kahn-Monick, 1760 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., transcript of hearings; $10, April 11, Leon Typewriter & Adding Machine Co., 400 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C., rental-typewriter, etc.[1]

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $16,200.01.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.
D. (6) $11,218.26.
E. (2) $3,772.30; (4) $452.25; (5) $542.64; (6) $36.23; (7) $140.35; (8) $663.50; (9) $5,607.27; (10) $4,354.45; (11) $9,961.72; (15) $107.64, April 2, May 1, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $1,419.50, April 3, April 7, April 18, May 1, May 16, May 29, June 13, June 27, Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $1,583.42, April 4, April 17, April 18, May 2, May 7, May 15, May 16, May 29, June 13, June 23, June 27, C. L. Dorson, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary, expenses, and office petty cash fund; $548.10, April 4, April 18, May 2, May 16, May 29, June 13, June 27, Clare C. Martin, 2138 California Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary, etc.[1]

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) The Reserve Officer.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities.
D. (6) $283.50.
E. (7) $3; (9) $3; (10) $6; (11) $9.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 Fourteenth Street Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (7) $167.70; (9) $167.70; (10) $159.30; (11) $327; (15) $25, May 1952, reception for 10 persons.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any specific legislation that may relate to margarine. Also interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy ration statute (34 U. S. C. 902a). Also interested in passage of H. R. 5012 and S. 2083, which are likewise designed to amend the Navy ration statute.
D. (6) $125.
E. (7) $6.80; (9) $6.80; (10) $6; (11) $12.80.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 8210, Defense Production Act, for amendments; S. 2594, Defense Production Act, for amendments; H. R. 7314, Department of Agriculture appropriations, for amendments; H. R. 1535, customs simplification, for amendments; H. R. 7391, defense appropriation, for amendments.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,444.
E. (6) $22.20; (8) $223.80; (9) $246; (10) $250; (11) $496.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $195.11; (4) $118.01; (5) $182.86; (6) $27.94; (9) $523.92; (10) $689.44; (11) $1,213.36; (15).[1]

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, post-office box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit the right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets.
D. (6) $335.
E. (2) $87.75; (4) $31.92; (5) $86.13; (6) $3.12; (7) $205.94; (9) $414.86; (10) $491.97; (11) $906.83; (15).[1]

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically Taft-Hartley Act, Fair Labor Standards Act, Walsh-Healey Act, Bacon-Davis Act, Universal Military Training and Selective Service Act, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence bills, National Science Foundation, Armed Forces Reserve legislation, Defense Production Act, Hoover Commission bills. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Dr. Frederick E. Robin, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27 and H. R. 54. This individual is also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H. R 146. (3) (See attachment B.)[1]
D. (6) $2,243.04.
E. (7) $56.41; (9) $56.41; (10) $61.49; (11) $117.90; (14) $56.41.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry. (See attached sheets for specific bill numbers.) [1]
D. $1,250.
E. $22.95; (9) $22.95; (11) $22.95.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 911 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil and Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting the petroleum industry in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, and Nevada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposing S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that under the Robinson-Patman Act it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. General appropriations bill. Favoring increase of appropriations for the Federal Trade Commission.
D. (6) $500.

A. George B. Roscoe, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (Continued on p. 3.)[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes, and a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries.
D and E.[1]

A. Carlton H. Rose, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are confined to legislation affecting the operation of National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products. H. R. 6856, H. R. 6845, H. R. 5445, and H. R. 4948.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers. (a) Fair-trade bill, so-called basing point bill, amendments to Defense Production Act. (b) H. R. 5767, S. 719, H. R. 8210, S. 2594. (c) Miller-Tydings Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Clayton Act, Sherman Act, Defense Production Act. (d) For H. R. 5767, against S. 719, for some amendments to S. 2594 and against other amendments thereto.
D.[1]

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
D. (6) $450.
E. (7) $448.70.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $7,375.

A. Charles J. Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (7) $997.65; (9) $997.65; (10) $364; (11) $1,361.65.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $223.30; (9) $223.30; (10) $238.25; (11) $461.55.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $104.29; (9) $104.29.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $410.95; (9) $410.95; (10) $256.80; (11) $667.75.

A. William Henry Ryan, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Suporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,499.94.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $15; (11) $30.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In support of act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $50.
E. (10) $750.53.

A. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Hedwig Lydia Riedner, Astor Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) S. 302, H. R. 1620, and H. R. 2656, amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.
E. (4) $1.43; (6) $95.13; (7) $68.40; (9) $65.06; (10) $61.65; (11) $227.61.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in matters affecting second-class postal rates, particularly Public Law 233.
D. (6) $750.
E. (4) $9.43; (6) $33.87; (7) $111.40; (9) $154.70; (10) $56.42; (11) $211.12.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, attorney for Hedwig Lydia Riedner, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) S. 302, H. R. 1620, and H. R. 2656, amendments to Public Law 859, Eighty-first Congress.
E. (4) $1.43; (6) $95.13; (7) $68.40; (9) $165.96; (10) $61.65; (11) $227.61.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock-Textile Fiber Institutes of National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Amendment to H. R. 7391 concerning wool.
E. (4) $22.05; (6) $31.06; (7) $36.08; (9) $189.19; (11) $189.19.

A. J. T. Sanders, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) I am employed to support any legislation on which the National Grange has expressed policy statement.
D. (6) $1,689.
E. (6) $5.50; (7) $72.14; (9) $77.64; (10) $59.64; (11) $137.28.

A. Charles E. Sands, 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 525 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Labor and social legislation.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session, Public Law 909; H. R. 7784 and H. R. 8271, Eighty-second Congress, second session.
E. (2) $6,000; (9) $6,000; (10) $3,000; (11) $9,000.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests are in legislation relating to nurses, nursing or health; specific legislative interests include support of H. R. 910, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for nursing education, and support of H. R. 911 and S. 661, a bill to provide for the appointment of male citizens as nurses in the Army, Navy, and Air Force. (3) The American Journal of Nursing.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $30.75.

A. Paul W. Schoen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
D. (6) $300.
E. (6) $50; (7) $25; (9) $75; (10) $45; (11) $120.

A. Schoene and Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill to amend Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; H. R. 6525 and S. 2639; for an amendment to the bill S. 2546.
D. (6) $2,312.50.
E. (7) $7.60; (9) $7.60; (10) $3.94; (11) $11.54.

A. E. L. Schoenhals, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Repeal of Internal Revenue Code 101 (12).
E. (5) $450; (9) $450; (11) $450.

A. Ed. D. Schorr, 33 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Coal Association, 1615 NBC Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to mine safety.
E. (2) $953.49; (4) $241; (5) $4,902.86; (7) $3,010.50; (8) $1,120; (9) $10,227.85; (10) $11,359.68; (11) $21,587.53; (15) $720, Wilbur Cory, Columbus, Ohio, legal services; $25, Ruth Hormel, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services, $10, Jane Mithoff, Columbus, Ohio, clerical services; $125, E. S. Manogue, Cincinnati, Ohio, legal services; $54.10, Alderson Reporting Co., 306 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., stenographic services; $13.39, Bureau of National Affairs, Washington, D. C., reporting services; etc.[1]

A. John W. Scott, 317 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Harvey B. Jacobson, patent attorney, Clarence A. O'Brien and Harvey B. Jacobson, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Pending legislative matters include: H. R. 3097, S. 17, and S. 1725 (82d Cong.); and H. R. 1566, H. R. 4446, H. R. 8201, and S. 1928 (81st Cong.), bills to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; H. R. 7794 and H. R. 3760 (82d Cong.) and H. R. 9133 (81st Cong.), proposed bills for general revision and codification of patent laws.
D. (6) $500.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2651, H. R. 4051, S. 1874.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25.

A. Vernon Scott and Lorin A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, Government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business.
D. (6) $5,000.
E. (7) $60.50; (9) $60.50; (10) $48.15; (11) $108.65.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Soliciting support for legislation favorable to the interests of labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.
E. (7) $17.30; (9) $17.30; (10) $17.55; (11) $34.85.

A. Harry L. Senger, 1539 Larry Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. National Retired Teachers Association.
C. (2) Forand bill (H. R. 2764).
D. (6) $62.53.
E. (5) $3; (7) $59.53; (9) $62.53.

A. A. Manning Shaw, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C.[1]
D. (6) $4,224.99.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4, etc.; favor plans for universal disarmament; favor full cooperation with the U. N. in economic and social welfare; favored Humphrey-Lehman bill S. 2842; opposed McCarran bill S. 2550; oppose UMT, UMS, and military-aid programs; oppose rearming Germany and Japan; other measures related to peace and war. (3) Peace Action.
E. (7) $53.10; (9) $53.10; (10) $60.90; (11) $114.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Port of New York Authority, 111 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For S. 2722, to amend Defense Production Act; for S. 2815, to amend Federal Airports Act; for H. R. 4484, with respect to submerged lands; against Senate Joint Resolution 20, with respect to submerged lands.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $0.81; (7) $83.87; (9) $84.68; (10) $243.17; (11) $327.85.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $110.

A. Robert H. Shields, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting sugar, particularly the Sugar Act of 1948 and related legislation.
D. (6) $10,000.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 E. Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
D. (6) $215.56.
E. (7) $215.56; (9) $215.56; (10) $384.81; (11) $500.37.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $2,665.
E. (2) $6,530.60; (5) $942.59; (6) $558.78; (7) $1,060.67; (8) $661.94; (9) $9,754.58; (10) $9,436.08; (11) $19,190.66.

A. Six Agency Committee, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River, including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, and House Joint Resolution 21 and Senate Joint Resolution 26, Colorado River litigation resolutions; and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies.
E. (2) $4,220; (8) $281.11; (9) $4,501.11; (10) $5,901.02; (11) $10,402.18; (15) $4,501.11, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses.

A. Stephen G. Slipher, room 512, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations, housing, home financing, thrift, and financial institutions.[1]

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago, Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, narcotics, international relations, women and children.[1] (3) Union Signal.
D. (6) $612.
E. (5) $147.50; (6) $30.49; (9) $177.99; (10) $891.67; (11) $1,069.66.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Forestry, regional development, resource conservation, labor relations.
D. (6) $126.

A. George C. Smith, Jr., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests including the improvement of Government efficiency, elimination of waste, and economy in Government.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $40.14; (8) $556.76; (9) $596.90; (10) $284.34; (11) $881.24.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co.
D. (6) $2,085.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in all Federal legislation that might affect member electric utility companies.[1]
D. (6) $16,250.01.
E. (7) $685.24; (9) $685.24; (10) $263.69; (11) $948.93.

A. Robert E. Smith, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance as it relates to the Federal policies or measures which are deemed to be inflationary in character.
D. (6) $900.
E. (7) $1,042.95; (9) $1,042.95; (10) $912.85; (11) $1,955.80.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (6) $33.67; (7) $625.28; (8) $5; (9) $663.95; (10) $630.87; (11) $1,294.82; (15).[1]

A. J. D. Snyder, 1040 La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.
D. (6) $750.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free-enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $23,145.84.
E. (2) $13,989.36; (4) $3,639.56; (5) $1,422.15; (6) $158.35; (7) $616.99; (8) $1,397.12; (9) $21,223.53; (10) $19,784.75; (11) $41,008.28; (15).[1]

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $394.
E. (3) $5; (4) $219.64; (5) $46.99; (6) $3.31; (7) $40; (9) $314.94; (10) $101.15; (11) $416.09.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, H. R. 6228, H. R. 2422, S. 510, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, T. A. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, and all legislation pertaining to the Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure for all railroad employees covered by this act additional benefits. (3) Rail Pension News.
D. (6) $1,320.
E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $200; (6) $44; (7) $153.35; (9) $1,931.85; (10) $3,325.20; (11) $5,257.05.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies; numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees, and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $8.50; (9) $8.50; (10) $6.75; (11) $15.25.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,615.32.
E. (7) $55.10; (9) $55.10; (10) $38.40; (11) $93.50.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. (3).[1]
D. (6) $3,521.89.
E. (7) $197.64; (8) $24.25; (9) $221.89; (10) $334.01; (11) $555.90.

A. Erskine Stewart, suite 808, Sheraton Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1938, H. R. 3622, H. R. 5505, H. R. 6174; S. 2504, S. 2164, S. 1267, S. 2594, S. 2645; H. R. 6546; S. 2918; H. R. 7256, H. R. 7257, H. R. 7258; Senate Resolution 169; H. R. 5189, H. R. 5767, H. R. 6367, H. R. 7852, S. 106, S. 2713, H. R. 6802, H. R. 8124, H. R. 7800, H. R. 7447, H. R. 7554.
D. (6) $375.
E. (7) $19.68; (8) $1.25; (9) $20.93; (10) $17.45; (11) $38.38.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. (3).[1]
D. (6) $2,460.
E. (7) $2; (8) $11; (9) $35; (10) $62.56; (11) $97.56.

A. Sterling F. Stoudemire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000
E. (7) $36.06; (9) $36.06; (10) $6; (11) $42.06.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents' Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support of Federal aid for school construction; support of legislation providing national school health services; appropriations to establish program of education for children of migratory workers; bills to safeguard health and welfare of children of migratory workers; appropriations for the Children's Bureau; appropriations for the national school-lunch program; emergency maternal and infant care.
D. (6) $981.24.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Oppose S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3599, H. R. 4748, S. 2651, H. R. 4051, S. 1874.
E. (2) $1,000; (7) $200; (9) $1,200; (10) $1,360; (11) $2,560.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, The National Labor-Management Council, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2 and 3) (See the National Labor-Management Council's lobbying report for this quarter—organization report).[1]
D. (6) $1,625.01.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. The Upper Mississippi Waterway Association employs A. D. Strong to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.
D. (6) $1,092.15.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the retail industry.
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $7.50; (9) $7.50; (10) $11; (11) $18.50.

A. J. E. Sturrock, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to House Joint Resolution 102, approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. For H. R. 1344, to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several State. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $57.50; (5) $12.48; (6) $35.94; (7) $660.11; (8) $70.03; (9) $836.06; (10) $1,305.80; (11) $2,141.86; (15) $57.50, April 7, April 11, April 18, April 25, May 1, May 5, May 16, May 23, May 30, June 7, June 13, June 20, June 27, Billy White, Austin, Tex., janitor service; $42.98, April 14, May 23, June 22, Austin Club, Austin, Tex., dues, locker rental, entertainment; $13.83, April 19, Hotel Angelina, Lufkin, Tex., room, telephone, meals; $12.15, April 25, Raleigh Hotel, Waco Tex., room, telephone, meals; $25.65, April 29, Hotel Cortez, Weslaco, Tex., room, telephone, meals, etc.[1]

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) The DAV is interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. The majority of bills in which we are interested are before the Senate Finance Committee; Senate Labor and Public Welfare; House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; two committees on Post Office and Civil Service; two Armed Services Committees.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Louis Cary, successor trustee of Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) For H. R. 6813.
E. (6) $4.75; (9) $4.75; (10) $52.70; (11) $57.45; (12) $57.45.

A. Paul Taber, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Providing information to organization's membership on legislation in the field of agriculture, and to assist legislative counsel as needed.
D. (6) $1,776.
E. (7) $24.64; (9) $24.64; (10) $3.75; (11) $28.39.

A. Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont.
C. (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in sections 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
E. (10) $3.61; (11) $3.61.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101 IRC.
D. (6) $674.85.
E. (2) $521.25; (4) $97.35; (5) $210; (7) $5.77; (8) $20.40; (9) $854.77; (10) $762.52; (11) $1,617.29.

A. Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) Repeal of Internal Revenue Code 101 (12).
D. (6) $1,345.
E. (3) $497.50; (5) $450; (9) $947.50; (11) $947.50.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute (OEMI), 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Mutual Security Agency, Department of Agriculture appropriations.
D. (7) $2,500.
E. (7) $225.62; (8) $9.41; (9) $235.03; (10) $198.30; (11) $433.33.

A. John Thomas Taylor, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative consultant for the American Legion.
C. (2) The general program of the American Legion as outlined by their national convention and executive committee as it affects veterans and their dependents and allied and kindred subjects dealing with our national security.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $2,368.95.
E. (8) $6.45; (9) $6.45; (10) $2.85; (11) $9.30.

A. Tyre Taylor, 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.
D. (6) $2,156.28.
E. (5) $426.38; (6) $40.68; (7) $146.15; (9) $1,164.31.

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (See attached statement.) [1]

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 303 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) S. 75 and H. R. 1500.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies. Opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources. Opposed to House Joint Resolution 102, approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin. For H. R. 1344, to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State. For bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States. (3) Texas Water.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (2) $1,806.74; (4) $602.80; (5) $243.14; (6) $237.14; (7) $617.80; (8) $1,302.95; (9) $4,870.57; (10) $5,355.71; (11) $10,226.28; (15) $225, April 1, May 1, June 1, C. S. Heacock, Austin, office rent; $617.80, April 1, April 8, April 21, May 1, May 6, May 20, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., traveling expenses; $342.39, April 1, April 16, June 23, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., out-of-pocket expenses for office; $1,205.10, April 15, April 30, May 15, May 31, June 15, June 30, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary; $562.86, April 15, April 30, May 15, May 31, June 15, June 30, Mildred B. Vaught, Austin, Tex., salary; etc.[1]

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation: H. R. 5695, H. R. 6521, H. R. 6566, H. R. 6580, H. R. 7268, H. R. 7507, H. R. 7647, H. R. 8127, H. R. 8165, and House Joint Resolution 485. S. 241, S. 991, S. 2355, S. 2364, S. 2743, S. 2744, S. 2745, S. 2746, S. 2754, S. 3016, S. 3069, S. 3146, S. 3157, S. 3374, Senate Resolution 332, Senate Joint Resolution 27, and Senate Joint Resolution 167.
D. (6) $6,166.66.
E. (7) $267; (9) $267; (10) $103.75; (11) $370.75.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: (See p. 3.)[1]
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $159.28; (9) $159.28; (10) $74.84; (11) $234.12.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislation pertaining to the pay of military personnel.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $15; (9) $15; (10) $18.75; (11) $33.75.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (See attached statement.) [1]

A. S. G. Tipton, general counsel, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry. For specific legislative interests (see p. 3 attached).[1]
D. (6) $4,067.31.
E. (7) $60.25; (9) $60.25; (10) $38.50; (11) $98.75.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,241.80.
E. (6) $2.13; (7) $2; (8) $58.95; (9) $63.08; (10) $46.20; (11) $109.28.

A. John H. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) No specific legislation. Any matters affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
D. (6) $125.
E. (6) $4.64; (9) $4.64; (10) $10.94; (11) $15.58.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) The only interest I have has been in the size of the appropriation for the Southwestern Power Administration.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $750; (9) $750; (11) $750.

A. Matt Triggs, American Farm Bureau Federation, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950); Government credit policies; Federal Reserve policy; repeal of resale price maintenance; immigration legislation; Mexican farm labor importation; method for computing parity prices; farm machinery and supplies; fertilizer; agricultural labor; transportation legislation; Federal contributions to State unemployment insurance payments; St. Lawrence seaway; taxation; ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing; agricultural appropriations; ACP payments; appropriation Agricultural Extension Service; control and eradication of brucellosis; farm program; selective service; universal military training; fair trade; flood control.
D. (6) $1,687.50.
E. (7) $40.20; (9) $40.20; (10) $65.98; (11) $106.18.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry. Specifically in the Eighty-second Congress: H. R. 1755 and S. 1693; S. 2325 and S. 2714. Position to be determined.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland and Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.

A. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The organization is interested in the over-all field of social security. (3) The Advisor.
D. (6) $31,935.
E. (2) $11,872.73; (3) $20; (4) $2,057.89; (5) $3,312.89; (6) $635.38; (7) $3,973.53; (8) $349.74; (9) $22,322.16; (10) $21,968.86; (11) $44,291.02; (15) $149.94, April, June, Byron S. Adams, Eleventh Street, Washington, D. C., printing; $13.98, April, May, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $15, June, Barron's, 40 New Street, New York, N. Y., publication; $97.40, April, B. & O. Railroad, Washington, D. C., travel; $10.20, June, Brentano's, F Street, Washington, D. C., office supplies, etc.[1]

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 50 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Appropriations for public health.
E. (1) $999.99; (7) $177.87; (9) $1,177.86; (10) $1,037.72; (11) $2,215.58.

A. U. S. Airlines, Inc., Air Lines Cargo Carriers, 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) For legislation favorably affecting freight air carriers and against legislation that would adversely affect them. For certain amendments to S. 436 and other bills separating mail subsidy so as to allow freight air carriers to carry mail.
E. (2) $1,249.98; (6) $30.76; (7) $14.64; (8) $1.90; (9) $1,297.28; (10) $565.37; (11) $1,862.65; (15) $1,249.98, April 1, May 1, June 1 (accrued $416.66 paid), J. Hardin Peterson, attorney at law, Polk Theater Building, Lakeland, Fla., retainer, legal and legislative services, $5,000 per year payable monthly.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) This office spends very little time on legislation and lobbying. The Sugar Act comes up before Congress once every 5 years.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) See appended statement.[1]
D. (6) $27,526.17.
E. (1) $2,063.78; (9) $2,063.78; (10) $9,272.27; (11) $11,336.05; (15) $600, April 15, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., public-relations fee; $96.99, April 30, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., incidental items; $600, May 15, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., public-relations fee; $117.96, May 29, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., incidental items; $600, June 13, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., public-relations fee; $48.83, June 30, 1952, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., incidental items.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (Schedule attached.)[1]
D.[1]
E. (2) $4,465.47; (4) $6,359.94; (5) $810.59; (6) $68.69; (7) $267.63; (8) $345.40; (9) $12,317.77; (10) $11,216.90; (11) $23,534.67.

A. U. S. Wood Screw Service Bureau, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) There are no bills or statutes yet introduced in which we have any interest, except H. R. 6343, Senate bill 2791, and the Defense Production Act of 1950.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See rider.)[1]

A. H. Jerry Voorhis, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) (See report of the Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc.) I have a personal interest in all legislation affecting the health, welfare, and safety of the American people.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5).[1]
D. (6) $7062.52.
E. (6) $8.25; (7) $466.40; (8) $46.15; (9) $542.80; (10) $523.82; (11) $1,066.62.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, AFL, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Duties are to represent the member unions and the Government Employees Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,277.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (7) $732.22; (9) $732.22; (10) $28.81; (11) $761.03.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D.[1] Receipts (including contributions and loans).

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.
E. (10) $500; (11) $500.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry.

A. J. R. Watson, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, Illinois Central Railroad passenger station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi; bills pertaining to St. Lawrence waterway project.
E. (7) $146.71; (9) $146.71; (11) $146.71; (15) $15.99, June 7, 1952, the Pullman Co., for Pullman accommodations while traveling; $15.99, June 11, 1952, the Pullman Co., for pullman accommodations while traveling; $27.01, June 11, 1952, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., room, meals, and incidental expense.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $25; (11) $50; (14) $25.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Henry B. Weaver, Jr., Henry H. Glassie, and Thomas M. Cooley II, Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The liaison committee for the mechanical specialty contracting industries, a committee comprised of executives of the National Association of Master Plumbers, National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., and the Heating, Piping Air Conditioning Contractors National Association, address, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Continuing interest in all legislation respecting mechanical specialty contracting industries, and in any legislation dealing with contracting or subcontracting by the Government, Government construction contracts, public works, and building. In particular they are interested in legislation forbidding unqualified and inexperienced contractors from undertaking mechanical specialty work on a cost-plus basis and forbidding bid shopping after award of fixed-price contracts unless the net saving therefrom accrues to the Government.

D. (6) $2,250.

E. (4) $628.13; (6) $130.42; (7) $283.32; (9) $1,041.87; (10) $106.14; (11) $1,148.01.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor improvement, flood control, navigation, irrigation, reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $1,296.30.

E. (3) $10; (5) $7.65; (7) $279.88; (8) $291.06; (9) $588.59; (10) $696.05; (11) $1,285.44; (12) $10; (15).[1]

A. Wayne M. Welshaar, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Registrant has been interested in bills dealing with ROTC as they apply to colleges and schools engaged in aviation training (H. R. 1168 and S. 325); also airmen's training legislation (H. R. 7073, H. R. 7074, and S. 2892). All of foregoing bills have been supported in principle. Registrant also has been interested in H. R. 7656 and H. R. 7642, bills dealing with training of Korean veterans. Registrant has supported these bills except on matters related to qualification of schools for participation in training programs.

D. (6) $3,300.

E. (2) $3; (4) $38.29; (5) $48.50; (6) $3.97; (7) $11.55; (8) $1; (9) $106.31; (10) $11.15; (11) $117.46.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (See report of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $1,350.

A. Charles F. West, Jr., Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman, including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) $500.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, Suite 906-7, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat packing industry, supporting or opposing such legislation as it affects the interests of the industry. During second quarter, 1952, chief legislative interest of association was to oppose extension of price and wage controls. We maintain that these control measures are impractical, unworkable, and unenforceable and that they should be terminated promptly. We recommend the effective methods of the free price system. Other legislative interests were directed upon the appropriation bills for agriculture and the Department of Defense, which relate to the livestock and meat industry.

D. (6) $27,899.72.

E. (4) $42.37; (7) $110.21; (9) $152.58; (10) $83.01; (11) $235.59; (15) $43.37, April 10, 1952, May 7, 1952, Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $11.20, May 9, 1952, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment; $51.25, June 20, 1952, June 26, 1952, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev.; Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.

C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands oil question. Any proposed legislation which affects the rights of the companies represented.

E. (8) $4.25; (9) $4.25; (10) $3.25; (11) $7.50.

A. George Y. Wheeler, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.

E. (7) $30; (9) $30; (10) $13.50; (11) $43.50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.

D. (6) $1,500.

E. (8) $12.75; (9) $12.75; (10) $11.70; (11) $24.45.

A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance. S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401, S. 1140, H. R. 7800. (3) (See p. 7 of this report.)[1]

D. (6) $3,112.50.

E. (4) $58.07; (7) $162.07; (9) $220.14; (10) $172.60; (11) $392.74; (15) $162.07, April 15, May 6, May 14, June 4, June 5, travel expense and entertainment, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago; $13.07, April 30, May 6, Low's Reproduction Service, 205 West Monroe, Chicago, mimeographing; $45, May 15, Jean Raeburn Studio, 565 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., photographs.

A. Leone Baxter Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.

D. (6) $3,112.50.

E. (4) $58.07; (7) $162.07; (9) $220.14; (10) $172.60; (11) $392.74; (15).[1]

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.

D. (6) $3,125.02.

E. (2) $31.25; (4) $8.22; (5) $13.56; (6) $3.51; (7) $2.43; (9) $58.97; (10) $71.14; (11) $130.11.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ability of hospitals to render good care for the people.

D. (6) $1,812.51.

E. (7) $453.06; (9) $453.06; (10) $174.12; (11) $627.18.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance.

D. (6) $1,372.07.

E. (2) $800; (5) $203.55; (6) $41.23; (7) $227.29; (8) $100; (9) $1,372.07; (11) $1,372.07; (15) $41.23, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia, Richmond, Va., long distance; $203.55, Mutual Building, Richmond, Va., part of office rent; $114.91, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., rooms, meals, etc.; $36.24, Edgewater Beach Hotel, Chicago, Ill., rooms, meals, etc.; $61.07, Chesapeake & Ohio Railway, Richmond, Va., transportation; $15.07, Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad, Richmond, Va., transportation.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.

B. Confederated Bands of Ute Indians, Fort Duchesne, Utah, and Ignacio, Colo.

C. (2) H. R. 7653 and S. 3085 have been introduced in Congress as a means of bringing about a settlement of case No. 47568, now pending before the Court of Claims; we are supporting enactment of this legislation.

E. (2) $1.62; (8) $5.45; (9) $7.07; (10) $2.15; (11) $9.22.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Indians of California, care of Clyde F. Thompson, Post Office Box 901, Redding, Calif.

C. (2) Registrants are interested in enactment of H. R. 3979.

E. (2) $2.16; (8) $2.30; (9) $4.46; (10) $10.22; (11) $14.68.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) The Menominee Tribe is interested in all legislation relating to Indian affairs; favors enactment of H. R. 264, S. 1396, S. 2969, and H. R. 7104, and is opposed to enactment of H. R. 1551 and S. 2167.
E. (2) $8.60; (6) $5.25; (7) $26.05; (9) $39.90; (10) $40.41; (11) $80.31.

A. Wilkinson, Boyden & Cragun, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bill for the relief of Nicholas B. Perry, H. R. 5557.
E. (2) 2.16; (8) $2; (9) $4.16; (10) $36.36; (11) $40.52.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, etc. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) H. R. 5678, S. 2550, H. R. 7376, S. 2968, H. R. 7800, Senate Resolution 326. (3) Junior American.
D. (6) $47.80.
E. (5) $47.80; (11) $47.80.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience.[1] (3) Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,812.50.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (6) $35.04; (7) $74.32; (9) $109.36; (10) $190.22; (11) $299.58.
A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (Senate and House) relating to health and welfare. (3) Informational bulletins and legislative notes published in Journal of American Medical Association.
D. (6) $3,024.56.
E. (7) $499.11; (9) $499.11; (10) $400.02; (11) $899.13.

A. Robert J. Wilson, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Restaurant Association, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., and National Restaurant Association, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (7) $369.13; (9) $369.13; (10) $958.82; (11) $1,327.95.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]
D. (6) $6,373.70.
E. (6) $95.23; (7) $2,813.24; (9) $2,908.57; (10) $1,574.72; (11) $4,483.29; (15).[1]

A. Frank K. Woolley, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Inflation control (Defense Production Act of 1950), Mexican farm labor importation, method for computing parity prices, farm machinery and supplies, fertilizer, agricultural labor, Mutual Security Program (foreign aid), legislation to authorize allocation of livestock for slaughter, grazing land, St. Lawrence seaway, tobacco, peanut-oil provisions of agricultural legislation, ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing, agricultural appropriations, ACP payments, REA, meat-inspection funds appropriation, appropriation Agricultural Extension Service, Department of Agriculture reorganization, farm program, family farm policy review, establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities, appropriations for defense, flood control.
D. (6) $2,119.38.
E. (7) $22.90; (9) $22.90; (10) $46.24; (11) $69.14.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting California wine and brandy industry.

A. Mrs. Frances Wright, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Against fair-trade bill.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2115, S. 450, and S. 2996, national farm policy, against; H. R. 7005, mutual security, for, with reduction in amount; Senate Resolution 306, investigation of plant seizure, for; S. 2594, addition to Walsh-Healey amendments, for; S. 2594, continuation of Defense Production Act, against continuation of wage and price controls; S. 2999, plant seizure authorization, against; separation of air mail subsidies, for; authorization for school construction funds, against; S. 241, long-range shipping bill, for, with revisions; S. 3066, Housing Act of 1952, against; S. 2744, transportation project review, for; H. R. 7888, Joint Committee on the Budget, for; H. R. 7868, soil conservation program, for; H. R. 5426, makeup of Reserve forces, for; S. 2742, Inland Waterways Corporation, for; Senate Joint Resolution 20, tidelands oil, for overriding veto; International Materials Conference, for its elimination; Hoover Commission bills, for; H. R. 565 and H. R. 7000, national forests, against.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $42.82; (9) $42.82; (10) $353.83; (11) $396.65.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $79.85; (9) $79.85; (10) $14.49; (11) $94.34.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1952:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ←

A. W. R. Allstetter, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are very minor and are only incidental to principal activities. No term has been fixed for continuance of legislative interests—presumably such interests will continue if and as occasion may arise. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy. (4) Of salary received by me during the quarter, $50 may be allocable to legislative interests.

A. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East Seventieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinite—until objectives are realized. To support Mutual Security Program for 1953, insofar as the economic assistance and technical aid sections of the program are concerned. (2) Bills now pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries. For such statutes and bills. (3) None as yet.

A. American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Train Dispatchers Association, 10 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Temporary assignment, indefinite. (2) H. R. 6525, S. 2639, amendments to Railway Unemployment Insurance Act. (3) No publications issued or caused to be issued as result of legislative activity.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Federal Republic of West Germany.
C. (1) Undetermined. (2) Matters of general interest to Federal Republic of West Germany and its residents, specifically with respect to compensation for former Embassy property seized by United States and removal of disabilities, under United States veterans liquidation now imposed on German residents or nationals.

A. Earl C. Bassett, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National St. Lawrence Seaway Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Opposition to all proposals to construct St. Lawrence seaway. (3) None. (4) $150 per week salary, plus actual cost of meals, lodging, telephone, taxi, etc.

A. Roy Battles, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests will occupy a very small part of my time. (2) My legislative interests will be those required by this organization in its broad national agricultural policy as defined each year in its annual convention. Within that scope my activity will be confined to assisting in case of inability of others to fully meet the demands, and to interpreting the National Grange position to Members of Congress, to Grange members, and to the public. (3) I shall assist in preparing material for the National Grange Monthly issued the first of each month; 160,000 copies printed by the Phelps Publishing Co.; also supervise internal news bulletins to our Grange leaders and general publicity which are duplicated in our own office. In all of the above, reports of national legislative activities of the Grange is a small part of the whole. (4) Compensation is paid monthly at the rate of $10,000 per year. Employment is permanent. I will be paid for actual traveling and entertainment expense. Only a very small portion of my salary and a minor amount of expense can be justly charged to lobbying.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue during employment. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.

A. Julian W. Caplan, National Retail Furniture Association, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Sporadic. (2) Renewal of Defense Production Act of 1952; retention of Herlong amendment, discontinuance of consumer credit-control authority, H. R. 6546 and S. 2594; fair trade, H. R. 5767; restoration of validity of nonsigner clause. (3) Information regarding progress of legislation in general membership bulletin, distributed to approximately 8,500 members on a regularly scheduled semimonthly basis, but legislative news only when pertinent. (4) No expenses anticipated; salary at rate of $100 per month, allocated for assigned duties in connection with activities for which reports are required.

A. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative activities may terminate at the end of the present session of Congress. It is uncertain whether or not the committee will continue after that time. (2) The committee is interested solely in getting appropriations for the International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) for 1952 and 1953. Section 11 of H. R. 7005 contains an authorization of $12,000,000 for UNICEF. Section 11 of S. 3086 contains an authorization of $20,952,000. The Committee favors the Senate bill and hopes at least to get a compromise when the Conference Committee meets. (3) Fact Sheet on UNICEF (one page, mimeographed); (b) 1000 copies; (c) beginning May 7; (d) AAA Letter Service, Victor Building, Washington, D. C. Small quantities of pamphlets and mimeographed material for distribution are received as gifts from the International Children's Emergency Fund, United Nations, New York, N. Y. (4) Estimated expenses March 15 through August 31, $2,500. This covers salary of fulltime secretary, office rent, telephone and telegraph, stationery, supplies, postage, mimeographing.

A. Committee for the Protection of Claimants Pursuant to United States-Yugoslav Claims Settlement; 16 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interest will continue for the duration of the International Claims Commission insofar as it adjudicates claims under the United States-Yugoslav Claims Settlement of July 19, 1948, which by statute will be completed no later than March 10, 1954. (2) To seek such amendments or modification of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 as will more efficiently and expeditiously result in the distribution of the $17,000,000 settlement under the Yugoslav Claims Agreement of 1949.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Not determined. (2) Award of just compensation for requisitioning of use and possession of the tanker *Oilshipper*. (4) Expenses not determined; no daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation to be paid.

A. LaVern R. Dilweg, 801 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brown County Airport Committee, Green Bay, Wis.
C. (1) Legislative interest to continue until H. R. 7890, a bill to authorize supplemental payments to the sponsors of certain projects under the Federal Airport Act is enacted into law. (4) Received $1,000 retainer and will receive additional $5,000 if H. R. 7890 becomes law.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sun-Pacific, Inc., 701 East Harbor Drive, San Diego, Calif.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legal services in support of amendments to H. R. 5693 (the tuna-tariff bill) to protect the interests of American companies operating abroad.

A. Northcutt Ely, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legal services in support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

A. John E. Fields, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Support of amendments to H. R. 7656, veterans educational assistance legislation, which would grant to Korean veterans the same rights in attending universities which are not tax supported as was granted to veterans of World War II by Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

A. Gerald FitzGerald, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government and Civic Employees Organizing Committee, CIO, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Support of all legislation favorable to the internal peace, security, prosperity, and general welfare; and to oppose all legislation detrimental to those objectives. (3) Such publications as may be issued will in all probability be of limited distribution, mimeographed in, and financed by our organization. (4) Anticipated expense to be limited to No. 3 above, compensation $3,888 per annum.

A. Robert S. Gordon, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) June 30, 1952. (2) On behalf of the Dairy Industry Committee which is registered and reports under the act, for termination, exemption or amendment of price controls of dairy foods under Defense Production Act. (3) None; but the Dairy Industry Committee reports or will report as to such publications issued or distributed by it. (4) No expenses except as reported by Dairy Industry Committee, and no compensation.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Oscar W. Holste, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station

Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639. Also interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.

A. Housewives United, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) We don't know. (2) Economic legislation affecting family life. Against all so-called fair trade bills, particularly the McGuire bill, H. R. 5767. During the last 2 weeks in April and the first week in May 483 mimeographed newsletters (three sheets) sent to our list of housewives and to each Representative and Senator. These were paid for by Mr. Samuel Rosenthal, of Richmond, Va.

A. Gardner Jackson, Room 902, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, and CIO, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting labor such as Defense Production Act, FEPC, and civil-rights measures, etc. (4) $7,500 per annum. Expenses will not normally run beyond $10 to $15 a week for cab fares, telephone calls, etc. Travel expenses out of city would naturally be more.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 205 West Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Legislative interests will probably continue throughout the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Passage of fair-trade legislation, specifically H. R. 5767. (4) Compensation at the rate of $1,500 per quarter. Anticipated expenses of not more than $200.

A. H. T. McAnly, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R. 7447. The interest in this legislation of the undersigned and the firm of Ernst & Ernst is a professional interest in the advancement of sound accounting practices and does not represent employment by any specific client. (4) No additional compensation is being received on account of my legislative interests.

A. Kenneth J. McAuliffe, 233 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

B. Institute of Makers of Explosives, 343 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) To support enactment of H. R. 6521, introduced February 11, 1952, by Mr. Boggs, of Delaware, a bill to amend section 4472 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to further provide for the safe loading and discharging of explosives in connection with transportation by vessel; and the identical bill, S. 2702. (4) $125 per day for time consumed, plus travel expenses.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting construction and housing. Specifically interested in H. R. 7656, S. 3066, and Defense Production Act. For parts and against other parts of these bills. (4) Expenses about $20 per month; annual salary, $9,000.

A. William F. McKenna, 3415 Wake Drive, Kensington, Md.; 1212 Ninth and Hill Building, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. California Conference of Savings and Loan Associations, box 850, San Jose, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Interest is in the advancement of legislation that promotes thrift and home ownership, particularly legislation relating to community thrift and home-financing institutions, including the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, National Housing Act, and proposed legislation, such as H. R. 7699. (4) Anticipated compensation, none; anticipated expenses, actual travel and accommodations, under $500.

A. Evelyn Merson, Washington representative, 1419 Thirty-sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; to support Mutual Security Program for 1953.

B. American Citizens Committee for Economic Aid Abroad, 124 East Seventieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite—until objectives are realized. (2) Bills now pending in Congress or which may hereafter be introduced appropriating funds for economic assistance and technical aid to foreign countries. For such statutes and bills.

A. Ernest S. Meyers, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interest limited to H. R. 3589. (2) (a) Amending title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, (b) H. R. 3589, (d) have not supported or opposed this bill but have submitted an analysis of an ambiguity in H. R. 3589 to Senate Judiciary Committee and to some of its members and have made suggestions to obviate an unintended result. (4) Nature of anticipated expenses: postage, telephone, and carfare. Amount incurred to date: postage, 42 cents; telephone, $5.08; taxis, $2.00. Retainer does not cover legislative interests; no additional compensation expected.

A. A. E. Notarianni, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Not determined. (2) Award of just compensation for requisitioning of use and possession of the tanker *Oilshipper*, P. Diacon Zadeh, 50 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., sole owner. (4) No specific compensation will be received for these services. Covered by general contract of employment as associate counsel with Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross. Compensation under said contract will not be increased or affected by these services or this registration.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Tariff, customs, foreign trade, agricultural and appropriations for agriculture and Tariff Commission Customs simplification bill, H. R. 5505, against certain provisions which are not truly simplifications of customs procedures or practices. (4) Anticipated expenses; minor cash expenditures—travel, taxis, telephone, telegraph, etc.; rates of compensation (fees): $90 per day.

A. H. J. Raymond, Ernst & Ernst, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Ernst & Ernst, 1356 Union Commerce Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R. 7447. The interest in this legislation of the undersigned and the firm of Ernst & Ernst is a professional interest in the advancement of sound accounting practices and does not represent employment by any specific client. (4) No additional compensation is being received on account of my legislative interests.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) This association has a general interest on behalf of its members in any legislation affecting the record industry; also (a) a bill amending title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works, (b) H. R. 3589; (d) have not supported or opposed this bill but have submitted an analysis of an ambiguity in H. R. 3589 to Senate Judiciary Committee and to some of its members and have made suggestions to obviate an unintended result. (4) Nature and amount of anticipated expenses are not known at present, will probably consist of incidental traveling disbursements for counsel.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Legislative interests are continuous. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry. (3) No publications issued or caused to be issued. (4) Five thousand dollars is proportion of annual salary covering activities in connection with legislative interests; anticipated expenses in this regard probably will not exceed $50 per quarter for local travel and food.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wool Stock-Textile Fiber Institutes of National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Approximately July 15, 1952. (2) Amendment to H. R. 7391 concerning wool. (4) Legal fees to be determined.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639. Also interested in all legislation affecting labor—particularly railroad labor.

A. Otts D. Steinback, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 6525 and S. 2639. Also interested in all legislation affecting labor, particularly railroad labor.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, 3211 Northampton Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) (a) Interest will continue always; (b) nursing registries. (2) To license all nurses alike, national and the District of Columbia, S. 304.

A. Wilson E. Still, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized. (4) No compensation for legislative duties.

A. Unemployed Service Association, 225 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) No specific bill but various proposals for unemployed people.

A. W. J. Varley, Western Merchandise Mart, suite 557, 1355 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Liaison Committee for the Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, 610 Ring Building, Washington 6, D. C.

C. (1 and 2) The committee has a continuing interest in all legislation affecting the mechanical specialty contracting industries. The committee's preponderant interest is to keep its constituent associations informed of matters of this nature and to promote and advocate the passage of beneficial legislation concerning fair bidding procedures, Federal contracting policies, controls and subcontracting policies and procedures. The committee is particularly interested in the enactment of S. 2907, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes. And the committee is also interested in the enactment of H. R. 7819, a companion measure to S. 2907. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Actual expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.

A. W. J. Varley, Western Merchandise Mart, suite 557, 1355 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1, 2, and 3) The National Electrical Contractors Association has a continuing interest in all legislation that affects the building construction and electrical industries. In respect to legislation affecting these matters the association's preponderant interest is in keeping informed and passing that information on to its membership and to the industry. In this connection frequent informational bulletins are sent out to the industry, including those in the association's weekly News Letter (circulation 3,300) and in the association's official magazine, Qualified Contractor (circulation approximately 17,500) which is issued each month. (4) Reimbursement for certain actual expenses only. Salary and certain expenses paid by the National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.

B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Services will continue indefinitely. (2) All measures affecting taxation of mutual fire and casualty insurance. (4) Employment on basis of reasonable compensation for whatever time and service rendered plus reimbursement for actual expenses incurred.

A. Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Textile Broadcasting Co., Greenville, S. C.

C. (1) Duration of current Congress. (2) Section 7 (D) of S. 658, in opposition. (4) Modest expenses, consisting of taxi fares, telephone and telegraph; compensation at usual rate for legal services for time actually expended.

A. Mrs. Frances Wright, 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Don't know. (2) Economic legislation affecting family life. Against all fair trade bills, particularly McGuire bill, H. R. 5767.